

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1919.

## THE MONTH.

It is objected by the critics of the present Govern-  
**Actions,** ment that whilst their speeches are admirable their  
**not Words.** action, or rather want of action, leaves much to be  
desired. The same remark applies with equal force to the attitude  
of the Church towards the poverty of the clergy. We hear again  
and again from dignitaries of the Church of the sad case of many  
of the clergy, but very little is done to alleviate the position. The  
Bishop of London raised a considerable sum and distributed it among  
his clergy, some of whom were said to be starving, but it is not  
of that kind of relief of which we are thinking. Doles are very  
useful to tide over an emergency, but they afford no permanent  
relief; and what is really needed is that the question of the poverty  
of the clergy should be seriously grappled with and a real remedy  
discovered. The first thing required is to find out the facts, and  
for this purpose small Commissions, authorized by the Bishop,  
should be appointed in every diocese, to discover the financial  
position of the clergy. It would not be enough to be told that  
there are so many livings under £300 a year or under £250 or £200  
or £150, as the case may be, because that does not by any means  
cover the whole ground. A man's official income may be £150,  
but his private means may be three times that amount, and to  
send him a grant to relieve his need would be ridiculous; or, again,  
the holder of a benefice worth £300 may be a married man with  
four or five children, and he would be infinitely worse off than a  
bachelor or a married man without family would be whose living  
was only worth £200.

**Expenditure  
the Test.** The fact is, of course, that the real conditions cannot be gauged by merely taking into account the question of income; it is much more important to find out what is the man's necessary expenditure. Again, the present system of measuring everything by the rule of income works hardly in another way. Some official body—a Diocesan Board, the Central Church Fund or the Ecclesiastical Commission—makes grants to men whose incomes do not exceed, let us say, £200; and the whole Church, or the official element of the Church, says "Excellent; what more *can* we do?" But what of the man whose income is just above the line, say by £2 or £3? He gets nothing, yet his need may be as great as, and perhaps greater, than that of the man whose income is on the line or just below it. The real facts require to be known, and they can only be discovered by local inquiry, patiently and laboriously undertaken. No central body can do this effectively; it must be done diocese by diocese, archdeaconry by archdeaconry, or even rural deanery by rural deanery. The more limited the area, the more effective the inquiry will be, for it is common knowledge that the clergy most in need of help do not obtrude their difficulties, and their real condition can only be ascertained by private inquiry. The matter urgently requires careful attention. It is a grave reflection upon the whole diocese when a man is so weighed down by financial anxiety that he loses his mental balance and commits suicide. Such a case has happened within quite recent times; it is exceptional, of course, but many are crushed by the burden they carry. Is it not time, therefore, that the Church stopped *talking* about clerical poverty and began to *do* something effectually to relieve it?

**The Church  
Congress.** The Church Congress has been revived. It last met at Southampton in 1913. A great Congress was anticipated at Birmingham in 1914, but on the outbreak of war, the meeting-places were commandeered by the Government, and the pressure of public events was so great that it had to be abandoned. In the following year, the Bishop of Chelmsford, with characteristic courage, invited the Church Congress to meet at Southend-on-Sea, and the invitation was accepted, but long before the arrangements materialized the air-raids came, and it was hopeless to expect that people would willingly spend the inside

of a week in the danger zone. Again the Congress was cancelled, and no attempt was made to revive it until this year, when in the spring an invitation came from Leicester, and, although the time for preparation was quite unusually short, it was determined to accept the proposal and, all being well, the Congress will be held from October 14 to 17 under the presidency of the Bishop of Peterborough. "The general subject of the Congress will be "The Church in the New Age," and it will be considered in its connexion with "The Faith in the Light of the War," "Christian Ideals in World Politics," "Christian Ideals of Education," "The Christian Doctrine of the Future Life," "Christian Ideals of Citizenship and Service," "The Church's Equipment for Corporate Life and Witness," and "The Church of England in its relationship to other Churches." It is a bold and comprehensive programme, and the Congress should prove of real service at this juncture of the nation's history. The nation is waiting for a lead, for a message; it is looking to the Church for guidance. It may be questioned, indeed, whether the Church ever had a more superb opportunity than is now presented to it, and the question in many minds is whether the Church is able to make adequate response. If the Church Congress can succeed in focussing attention upon the things that matter, and then frame a message to the nation such as the nation will understand and to which it will pay heed, it will render conspicuous service to the State and to the Church.

THE CHURCHMAN has so long and so ardently advocated the interchange of pulpits that it is with special pleasure we note that the question is at length receiving attention at the hands of the Church's leaders. It cannot be said, however, that much real progress has been made towards the goal: indeed, the cause would seem to have suffered a serious check in the action of the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury, which referred back the Report of a Joint Committee which essayed to deal with the matter on lines more liberal than those usually associated with Convocation; and more serious still is the decision to suspend further action upon the Report until after the Lambeth Conference has met next summer. But these hindrances notwithstanding the movement is receiving attention, and Bishops are discussing it in the public press. They could

Interchange  
of Pulpits.

not well keep silent, seeing that the letter signed by seven of the most prominent Nonconformist leaders has altered the whole aspect of the question.

The present position may briefly be explained. **Nonconformist Acceptance.** The Bishop of Norwich recently preached in a Baptist Church and propounded a scheme for the interchange of pulpits subject to these conditions : (1) Assent to the first three articles of the Lambeth Quadrilateral ; (2) that the preacher should not deal with the subject of Church order unless invited to do so ; and (3) that the interchange has the consent of the proper and regular authorities. It seemed at first that this proposal would fall flat, when to the great delight of Reunionists a letter appeared in *The Times* signed by Dr. Forsyth, Mr. Gillie, Mr. Jowett, Dr. Scott Lidgett, Principal Selbie, Mr. Shakespeare, and Dr. Carnegie Simpson welcoming the proposal, declaring that, made by a Bishop of the Church of England, it was " a challenge to us all to translate into action the desire for unity which is in so many hearts," and expressing the hope " that it will meet with a sympathetic and practical response." It was distinctly unfortunate that this letter was followed by the publication of a correspondence which had taken place earlier between the Bishop of Gloucester and the Archbishop of Canterbury concerning the postponement of the question until after the Lambeth Conference. What made the matter more serious was that the Bishop of Gloucester was able to say that the Bishops of London, Chichester, Coventry, Exeter and Salisbury were in entire agreement with him in begging for postponement, and that the Bishops of Winchester, Rochester, Southwell and Ely were also favourable to the delay, although the first three were members of the Joint Committee and the fourth is in favour of that Committee's original proposals. It looked at first sight as if this were to be the only answer to the Nonconformist acceptance, and if it had been the cause would have been hopeless indeed. But it was not. The Bishops of Bristol, Carlisle, Hereford, Norwich and Manchester have written splendidly in *The Times* on the question, and Nonconformists may and, we hope, will take heart that there are among the English Bishops some, at any rate, who are prepared to carry the matter to a conclusion.

**Bishop Gore's** These Bishops were moved to write by a peculiarly  
**Objections** characteristic letter from Bishop Gore. We need not  
**Answered.** refer to it further than to say that his main argument  
 was that " deep in the heart of the Catholic principle lies the equating  
 of faith and order as equally essential elements in the Christian  
 religion as it was delivered to us. Accordingly at no period would  
 the Catholic Church (using the term in its historical or technical  
 sense) have been willing to accept among its preachers those who  
 were not participators in its sacraments." We quote so much of  
 it to serve as an introduction to the following passage from the  
 very effective reply from the Bishop of Carlisle :—

Bishop Gore is, I think, undoubtedly right when he says in yesterday's  
 issue of *The Times* that the interchange of pulpits is contrary to Catholic  
 tradition and Catholic principle in the technical—*i.e.*, the ecclesiastical—  
 use of the term " Catholic." Why is this saying true? Is it not because the  
 interchange of pulpits implies the brotherly fellowship of all Christian commu-  
 nions, whereas Catholic tradition and principle repudiates that fellowship?  
 Technical Catholicity is founded on exclusiveness and monopoly, an exclusive  
 priesthood, a monopoly of valid sacraments, and a special favouritism with  
 God. As the Jews considered themselves the elect of God, so the Catholics  
 consider themselves God's elect. To interchange pulpits and *a fortiori* to  
 share in common Communion at the Table of the Lord would demand the  
 abandonment of these claims to Divine favour for ecclesiastical monopoly.

And yet the Christian Gospel makes this demand. Hence it is a hard  
 Gospel. Its essence is the Cross, the Cross of self-crucifixion and fellowship  
 with the crucifixion of the incarnate Lord. The two foundations of Christi-  
 anity as revealed by Christ are the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of  
 men. These two, however submersive of Catholic tradition and principle,  
 make the interchange of pulpits and common Communion the most natural  
 of Christian duties and the most reasonable of Christian privileges. For if  
 Nonconformist ministers are ministers of Christ's Gospel, why should they  
 not preach in Anglican pulpits? But if Nonconformists are not the children  
 of God, how can Bishop Gore count them " among his most honoured  
 friends " ? And if Nonconformists are, equally with Churchmen, children of  
 the universal Father, why should they not all be guests at the Table of the  
 Lord, Who lived and died to save them all?

The Bishop says that preachers of the Gospel are bound not to strive and  
 please men. True! But are they not equally bound to strive to please  
 God? Yet how can it be pleasing to the Founder of the Christian Faith to  
 equate His Faith with ecclesiastical order and to teach as necessary to salva-  
 tion doctrines not even alluded to by Him or by His Apostles? In the  
 Collection of Christ's sayings, commonly called the Sermon on the Mount,  
 the traditions and principles which Bishop Gore calls " Catholic," are not  
 only not approved, but by implication are severely condemned for their pride  
 and partiality. Moreover, Christ said that whoever built the house of his  
 life on His sayings, which contain none of these Catholic traditions and prin-  
 ciples, would find that he had built on rock. But whosoever built on any  
 other foundation would find that he had built on sand. This solemn saying  
 is as true of Churches and nations as of individuals.

## THE GREAT PRAYER.

### SHORT CHAPTERS ON JOHN XVII.

BY THE BISHOP OF DURHAM.

#### V.

OUR brief studies have led us hitherto over the Theism of the Great Prayer and over its Christology. We approach now, in what seems a natural succession, its doctrine of grace, its indications of the secrets and of the characteristics of the life of the disciple, and of the function of the disciple as his Lord's vessel for the carrying of His Name, His vehicle of operation and influence.

The present study, to be true to the Prayer, will take two main directions. The Intercessor has a special regard, in the opening of the Prayer and through the larger part of it, to the disciples then with Him, the apostles. Towards the close He goes out to the uncounted numbers who should become disciples through their message, the long succession of the evangelized and converted even to the end. It will be useful to keep this division in view; and in the present paper we consider accordingly the Lord's intimations about His apostles' secrets and privileges of grace, reserving for the next what He forecasts about those who should "believe on Him through their word." But the two themes cannot be kept rigidly apart. It is clear that much at least which is said directly of the apostles is true of every true disciple. And also much which is distinctly said of the first messengers and witnesses has a valid reference to all disciples of every age who should in any way be their successors. It is most true, and never to be forgotten, that the apostolic company had a position and commission quite distinctive and apart. All of them in their spoken delivery of the message, and the writers among them in that inestimable and peculiar vehicle of revelation, their epistles, were attended with a heavenly guidance over thought and word which made them mouthpieces of their Lord in a sense, with an authority, which has belonged to no later generation.

There is a tendency in the Church just now to forget this, if I see aright. It was not for nothing that an eminent lay Christian said,

not long ago, so I was told, to an eminent ordained Christian, in the course of a discussion: "I see that to you St. Paul is an able writer; to me he is an apostle." Nevertheless, there surely is, within this great limit, an apostolic *succession*. And I allude not only to the monumental fact of the age-long continuity of an ordered and commissioned ministry, pastoral and instructional, drawn as to its origin from the first apostles, however its types may have varied. I have also in mind all the sacred activities within the Christian community which have to do with the living transmission of "the faith once delivered," ranging from fathers, expositors, evangelists, masters of meditation and of sacred song, pastors and missionaries of every order, to the teacher in the Sunday School, and to that true vessel of the Name, the mother with the children at her knee. These all are so far in the succession that through them, through their word, through their living and loving transmission of the word of the Master and of His first and heaven-guided messengers, human souls believe on Him. Who, after all, shall limit the width of this bright line of succession? Putting aside possible cases altogether abnormal, there is no true disciple whose life at least, filled with Christ, inspired by His Gospel received and loved, has not an apostleship of its own, a mission to other lives.

With these recollections awake in us, let us make some simple notes on our Intercessor's words about the privileges and graces of His serving followers.

First we note a mystery, holy but profound, "dark with excess of bright." These men are, in some respect most special, "given by the Father to the Son." "The men Thou gavest Me out of the world; Thine they were and Thou gavest them Me." "I pray for those whom Thou hast given Me." "Holy Father, keep in Thy name that" (that company; so I interpret ver. 11) "which Thou hast given Me." We cannot go astray here, so I venture to affirm, in recognizing that great secret of the will of God, a special dealing with human persons, expressed here as "gift," in other Scriptures as "choice," and such that its reasons lie altogether above our sight. The mystery of a choice to blessing, "not according to our works," according only to "purpose" deep within Deity itself, seems to me to be plainly laid down in revelation as a spiritual fact, and I think we have it here. This becomes a real trouble to faith,

I venture to say, only when we put it out of proportion, distorting it into a truth dominant over all others. Our wisdom, on this side the veil, is to lay it in peace beside other (and more truly dominant) truths, the truths which glow with "tender mercy over all His works" and His "will that none should perish," and rest in the strong assurance that this mighty "antinomy," this defiance to our weak logic, weak because its premisses must be imperfect here below, has a glorious conciliation above the clouds. This "bright cloud" meanwhile, this mystery of "choice" and "gift," is meant for nothing but cheer to the humble soul. It is meant to lift the disciple, awfully conscious of demerit and of weakness, so that he may lean on the transcendent will of Him Who is love, whose purposes of mercy originate wholly in Himself, and draw their loving perseverance always from their origin.

Then, in an utterance deep as that other, but radiant without a cloud, the Lord lets us know, once and for ever, what the way is by which the human being "given to the Son" finds that divine privilege turned into life indeed. "Thou gavest Him authority, that He should give to them eternal life. And this is the life eternal, that they should know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, Whom Thou hast sent."

On this great verse I offer only the simplest comments. Its gracious glory seems to forbid elaborated discourse. Who shall discuss and analyse "eternal life"? Shall we not rather bow down before the words, and let them work as it were inarticulately within these spirits of ours, which our Author made to be responsive to His, and which therefore must be such, in their depth and mystery, as to surpass always our own merely rational insight? Life, eternal life; existence, interminable existence. Yes, only it means much more. It means an existence rich and overflowing with power and love, holy all through; interminable in duration, but not so as to suggest an exhaustion at length like that of a Tithonus, under which the finite ego might ask, as a relief, to cease to be. No; eternal means here a larger and fairer thing than only interminable. It means a correspondence with Him Who (the words only feel for a tangible meaning, but they have their truth) transcends time, and sits above it; to Whom succession is but a mighty harmony; Who can give His creature, in oneness with Himself, a deathless energy and bliss, kept free from the *fatigues* of progress,

because each moment comes to the happy creature from the Creator's unfathomable life of love.

That life awaits its deathless and ever-growing maturity hereafter. But it begins, indeed it begins, here. For its essential, its secret, and also its motion, its experience, is this—to know the Father and the Son; to know the Father as in being and character the absolute and fontal counterpart of the Son, to know the Son as the Beloved of the Father, the gift of the Father, the Christ for us, the Christ in us, Who is the supreme vehicle of the inflow into us of the Father's life of love.

This is a knowledge whose essence is not of the intellectual sort. It is neither to be won nor to be enjoyed by processes of merely mental action. True, it has the very noblest relations with the intellect, when once that intellect has recognized, as a grand fact for reason, that the living God transcends it. In that living God, spiritually known, it will then find for ever matter for apprehending meditation which will lift and refine for ever the intellectual power. But this knowledge of God in Christ, of Christ as one with us and one with God, is in its essence no more merely mental than is a child's knowledge of a mother, a man's knowledge of a perfect human friend. It means an insight (the gift of revealing grace) into the supreme Character. It means the response of trust to the infinitely Faithful. It means the love of Author and Redeemer met on man's part by the love which at once worships and embraces. It means all this developed by the intercourse of faith and obedience, as the disciple "walks with" Him Who is known as an eternal while most tender Father, through Him Who is alike our pardon, our power, and our purity, our King and our Companion, our God and our Brother.

That knowledge, as it deepens, is the path to heaven. And when the end is reached that knowledge will be heaven. "They shall see His face," and, as a result, "His name shall be in their foreheads."

The Prayer has more to say of the happy experts in this immortalizing "knowledge," these assured believers (ver. 8) that the Father sent the Son. It tells us, as we listen, that the Lord Who loves them, and Who now for a season leaves them as to physical presence, well remembers that they have to remain "in the world"; not "of it" (ver. 16), for they have a life now whose spring is in

God, but "in it"; and He commits them solemnly to the Father's keeping power, to be "kept in His Name," surrounded, filled, with that great word, "ABBA." He would have them not only pure and safe, but happy. He "speaks in the world," in these wonderful words of intercession, audible once for all to mortal ears, that they may have "His joy" (ver. 13), His experience of bliss in the obedience of love, "fulfilled in them," in their spirits, as they respond to His. Like Him, they have tasted, and will taste, "the world's hatred," in one form or another; the antagonism which the life true to God must in measure awake in the environment which does not love Him. Yet they are to live, for its own good, in that world, only "kept" from the snares and clutches of "the evil one," its god; so kept, in the life-giving "knowledge," that they are "sanctified in truth," hallowed, consecrated, through and through, to their Lord.

One closing note let us make as we listen: "I am glorified in them" (ver. 10). "O generous love!" These very disciples, with a candour about themselves learnt in their heaven-given "knowledge," never tire, in their Gospel story, of disclosing their own imperfectness. But such is the Lord they "know," so does He know Himself in them, that He does not pity them only, nor even love them only. He is glorified in them. They are His exultation. "On His breast their love He proudly weareth."

H. DUNELM.

*(To be continued.)*

## STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

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

### X. GOD THE INVITER.

*Text.*—"He invited you."—2 Thess. ii. 14.

[Book of the Month: Plummer's Commentary on 2 Thessalonians<sup>1</sup>  
= P2. Other refs., Milligan's Comm. = Mg. Moffatt's Comm.  
in *Expos. Gr. Test.* = Mt. Moffatt's Translation of N.T. = M.  
Plummer's Comment. on 1 Thess. = P1.]

"God is the great Inviter" (P2. 77); so on 1 Thess. ii. 12, "Walk worthily of the God Who is the Inviter." With "the Inviter"

<sup>1</sup> Published by Robert Scott, 6s. Sterling work, as always with Dr. Plummer.

compare "the Deliverer" in i. 10. The verb here is often used of invitations: Mt. xxii. 3, 9; Lk. vii. 39; xiv. 7-9 (P1. 27).

I. THE INVITATION (2 Thess. ii. 14).—It has already been given. "Here we have the aorist (*ἐκάλεσεν*) in harmony with 'chose' (*ἔειλατο*) in v. 13. The choice was made from all eternity; the invitation to realize it was given when the missionaries began to preach at Thessalonica" (P2. 77). There is nothing "forbidding" about God's aspect. It is "winning." He is eternally "The Inviter." Christ was always dwelling on this. There is in the thought an "Affinity with the 'invitation' in the Parable of the Supper: Mt. xxii. 1 ff., Lk. xiv. 16 ff." (Mg. 27).

II. THE PURPOSE OF THE INVITATION (2 Thess. ii. 14).—A genuine enjoyment and enrichment: "*with a view to the securing*: we have the same phrase, *εἰς περιπόησιν*, in 1 Thess. v. 9 and Heb. x. 39, and the meaning is the same in all three places" (P2. 77). "Not merely heard it with their ears, but embraced it and appropriated it in their hearts" (P1. 29). It carries with it a responsibility now. "God is The Inviter, to Whom they owe their admission into the Kingdom, and they must habitually live in a manner which befits such a privilege. It does not mean that He is now inviting them into a Kingdom which they have not yet entered. Throughout the New Testament the Kingdom of God is both a privilege possessed and a prize to be won" (P1. 27). They have already something and they are always being pressed to take more. "Throughout the New Testament the Kingdom is spoken of sometimes as present, but more often as future." "In the main the two views correspond to the two Advents of Christ." "What is specially meant is the existing spiritual Kingdom which the Thessalonians had already entered" (P1. 27). This means definite acquisition and progress. "He called you by our gospel, to gain the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ" (M. 259). "This term *Kingdom* is commonly used of the beginning of the Christian life, of being admitted into Christ's fold and called to be saints. But something future seems to be included, if not to prevail." "The domain in which God rules is partially realized in this world; and it will have its full development hereafter." It "may be merely His invitation to *enter the fold*," but "includes, or even primarily means, the invitation to *enter the kingdom which will be inaugurated when the Lord Jesus is revealed in glory*" (P2. 31). "Kingdom means in several undoubted instances

the *present* kingdom of God's grace (Rom. xiv. 17 ; 1 Cor. iv. 20 ; Col. i. 13) ; its reference in the main is to the future, this is the case here " (Mg. 27). " Usually applied to the initial act of salvation as a Divine invitation carrying with it great responsibilities " (Mg. 93). There is " no reason however why the word should not be definitely extended to include the final issue of the calling, [much in the sense of τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως in Phil. iii. 14 or κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου in Heb. iii." (Mg. 93).

III. THE RESULTS OF THE INVITATION.—" The glory of our Lord Jesus Christ " (Pz. 78). Christ carries out the work He has begun. He is pledged to its success. " ' He Who calls you to be saints, has an interest in your sanctification.' ' Calls,' not ' called ' (ὁ καλῶν not ὁ καλέσας). He is their Caller, their Inviter ; that is His relation to the converts. He will, therefore, be true to His character as One Who calls men to a holy life. He does not call and then leave those who are called to fail for want of His help. If they strive to respond to His invitation, they are sure to be sanctified and preserved " (P. I 105). " The absolute use of ποιήσει in i. 5. 24, is very striking, and sets in bold relief the *doing* with which God accompanies His *calling* " (Mg. 79). " ' Calling ' is used in its technical sense of ' call to the kingdom,' with the further idea, as throughout the Pauline Eps., that the calling as God's act has been effectual " (Mg. 26). " The call implies that God will faithfully carry out the process of ἀγιάζεσθαι and τηρεῖσθαι, which is the divine side of the human endeavour outlined in the preceding verse " (Mt. 43). " The divine purpose does not work automatically, but implies the co-operation of Christians—in this case, a resolute steadfastness resting on loyalty to the apostolic gospel " (Mt. 50). " ' Calling ' in ii. 1, 12, is ' the position you are called to occupy,' as heirs of this splendid future. This implies that a certain period of moral ripening must precede the final crisis " (Mt. 47).



## BENEDICTION AND ITS ADVOCATES.

BY W. GUY JOHNSON.

ENGLISH Churchmen may well feel bewildered by the rapidity with which first one and then another of the "newest fashions in religion," to use a phrase of Mr. Gladstone's, are being, may we say, "hustled" into the foreground and then claimed as so inalienable a part of our Catholic heritage that it must not be surrendered even if all the Bishops on the Bench combined to forbid it. The particular novelties for which agitation is being made at the moment are "Exposition" and "Benediction," ceremonies of which scarcely one Churchman in a thousand has ever even heard and at which very few even of those have ever been present.

In "Exposition" the Sacrament, by which is meant in this case the consecrated wafer, is exposed on the altar for veneration by the faithful. In "Benediction" the congregation is "blessed" by the sign of the Cross being made over them with the Sacrament, which is placed for that purpose in a receptacle called a monstrance.

The service of Benediction is very simple. It is described in the *Catholic Encyclopædia* as "ordinarily an afternoon or evening devotion and consists in the singing of certain hymns or canticles before the Blessed Sacrament, which is exposed upon the altar in a monstrance and is surrounded with lights. At the end, the priest, his shoulders enveloped in a humeral veil, takes the monstrance into his hands and with it makes the sign of the Cross (hence the name Benediction) in silence over the kneeling congregation." With regard to the accompaniments of the service the article just quoted says, "the use of incense and wax candles, which even in the poorest churches must not be less than ten in number, the singing of the 'Tantum ergo' with its versicle and prayer, and the blessing given with the Blessed Sacrament are obligatory everywhere."

These constitute the irreducible minimum of the service, which, however, usually has a litany of the Virgin, a litany to the Blessed Sacrament, and other similar elements added as a part of it.

John Henry Newman in one of his books gave a brief description of the service, which we borrow from a recent pamphlet:—

"Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is one of the simplest rites of the Church. The Priests enter and kneel down; one of them unlocks the Taber-

nacle, takes out the Blessed Sacrament, inserts it upright in a Monstrance of precious metal, and places it in a conspicuous place above the altar, in the midst of lights, for all to see. The people then begin to sing; meanwhile the priest twice offers incense to the King of Heaven, before Whom he is kneeling. Then he takes the Monstrance in his hands, and, turning to the people, blesses them with the Most Holy, in the form of a cross, while the bell is sounded by one of the attendants to call attention to the ceremony. It is our Lord's solemn benediction of His people, as when He lifted up His hands over the children, or when He blessed His chosen ones when He ascended up from Mount Olivet. As sons might come before a parent before going to bed at night, so, once or twice a week, the great Catholic family comes before the Eternal Father, after the bustle or the toil of the day, and He smiles upon them and sheds upon them the light of His countenance. It is a full accomplishment of what the Priest invoked upon the Israelites: 'The Lord bless thee and keep thee; the Lord show His face to thee and have mercy on thee; the Lord turn His countenance to thee and give thee peace.' Can there be a more touching rite, even in the judgment of those who do not believe in it?"

We have before us four forms of service for the use of those in the Church of England who observe this rite. The earliest is contained in *Catholic Prayers*, compiled by the late Rev. A. H. Stanton, of St. Alban's, Holborn, of which the fifth edition was published in 1901. Two different forms have more recently been published by the Society of St. Peter and St. Paul, dated 1915 and 1918 respectively. The fourth was published this year by Messrs. Cope & Fenwick. In the case of the three last there is no name given of compiler or editor. From these four, which do not materially differ from one another, we may discover in what this particular service consists when it takes place in an Anglican parish church.

The Rubric at the beginning enjoins "When the Priest opens the Tabernacle and incenses the Blessed Sacrament, the following hymn is sung"—

"O Saving Victim, opening wide  
The gate of heaven to man below;  
Our foes press on from every side;  
Thine aid supply, thy strength bestow.

All praise and thanks to thee ascend,  
For evermore blest One in Three;  
O grant us life that shall not end  
In our true native land with thee. Amen."

After which, we are told, usually follows the Litany of the Blessed Virgin. This is sometimes called the Litany of Loretto, and it is printed in Latin and English in *Catholic Prayers* and in *Emmanuel* (the Service of the SS. Peter and Paul Society). The latter suggests the reason for this in the following prefatory Note:—

“ No apology is needed for the Service of Benediction which is printed in Latin and English. Like the stations of the Cross, The Three Hours' Agony, Compline and numerous other services now part of our Church worship, it is frankly borrowed from the prayer books of Catholics of the Latin Rite. We may be grateful to them for it. We have followed them in great matters such as the *filioque* in the Nicene Creed—may we not say too of Church Worship?—What Rome does to-day, Canterbury will do to-morrow.”

Space will not admit of transcribing this Litany in full, but the following extracts will indicate its character to readers who may not be acquainted with it :—

“ Holy Mary  
*Pray for us*  
 Holy Mother of God  
*Pray for us*  
 Mother of the Creator  
*Pray for us*  
 Virgin most mighty  
*Pray for us*  
 Mystic Rose  
*Pray for us*  
 Tower of David  
*Pray for us*  
 Tower of ivory  
*Pray for us*  
 Ark of the Covenant  
*Pray for us*  
 Gate of heaven  
*Pray for us*  
 Refuge of Sinners  
*Pray for us*  
 Help of Christians  
*Pray for us*  
 Queen without original sin conceived  
*Pray for us*  
 Queen of the most holy Rosary  
*Pray for us*  
 Pray for us O Holy Mother of God  
 That we may be worthy of the promises of Christ.”

In one of the forms of service the following collect concludes this Litany :—

“ Grant, we beseech thee, O Lord God, that we thy servants may rejoice in perpetual health of mind and body, and at the glorious intercession of blessed Mary, Ever-Virgin, may be delivered from the sadness here and attain to eternal gladness hereafter. Through Christ our Lord.”

The forms vary slightly as to the order of the service, and one of them states that any other litany, or psalm or hymn suitable to the occasion or to the day may be substituted for the foregoing. It would seem, however, that normally it should be used. The Litany of the Blessed Sacrament and the Litany of the Holy Name are

respectively set out in two of these forms. It should be borne in mind that these last two Litanies, if either of them is used, are directly addressed to the Sacrament, which is being exposed before or exhibited to the people.

Then follows the hymn *Tantum Ergo*, the English version being as follows:—

“ Therefore we, before him bending,  
 This great Sacrament revere ;  
 Types and shadows have their ending,  
 For the newer rite is here ;  
 Faith our outward sense befriending,  
 Makes the inward vision clear.  
 Glory let us give, and blessing  
 To the Father and the Son,  
 Honour, might, and power addressing,  
 While eternal ages run ;  
 Ever too his love confessing,  
 Who, from both, with both is One. Amen.”

After this is prescribed the following:—

V. “ Thou gavest them Bread from heaven (Alleluia).

R. Containing within itself all sweetness (Alleluia).

O God, who in a wonderful Sacrament hast ordained unto us a remembrance of thy Passion ; grant us, we beseech thee, so to honour these holy mysteries of thy Body and Blood, that we may evermore perceive within ourselves the fruits of thy redemption. Who livest and reignest world without end. Amen.”

Then comes the actual ceremony of Benediction, when the Priest makes the sign of the Cross with the wafer, the congregation being instructed to “ bow down in reverent adoration and receive the Benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament.”

After this comes “ the Divine Praises,” from which we quote the following:—

“ Blessed be the Name of Jesus.  
 Blessed be his Most Sacred Heart.  
 Blessed be Jesus in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar.  
 Blessed be the great Mother of God, Mary most Holy.  
 Blessed be her holy and Immaculate Conception.  
 Blessed be the name of Mary, Virgin and Mother.  
 Blessed be God in his Angels and his Saints.”

The service is concluded by the singing of the following:—

“ Let us adore for ever the Most Holy Sacrament,  
 O praise the Lord, all ye heathen, praise him all ye nations ;  
 For his merciful kindness is ever more and more towards us, and the truth  
 of the Lord endureth for ever. Praise the Lord. Glory be to the  
 Father, etc.  
 Let us adore for ever the Most Holy Sacrament.”

It must be remembered that the ritual accompaniments to the service include a great number of lighted candles, the use of incense, and the most marked forms of outward adoration—bowings, genuflections, and sometimes prostration before the consecrated wafer.

Such is the service which, in defiance of the authority of the entire episcopate, is being steadily introduced into English Churches. A few years ago nothing was heard of it. We are told that Mr. Lowder and Dr. Littledale both used it, but our informant, the anonymous author of a pamphlet issued by the "Faith Press," gives no authority. He merely says that he is "credibly informed" that they did so. They may have done, but the evidence is insufficient. Only one case was reported to the late Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, and there is some doubt whether it was in fact technically Benediction. But as with other similar matters, so with this, the opportunity afforded by the preoccupation of people's minds with the war has been seized upon to advance the "Catholic" cause. Comment upon the character of the service is needless. It speaks for itself. Like many other services introduced by the "Catholic" party, it has avowedly been taken bodily from the Roman Church. The late Mr. Stanton, with plaintive alliteration, pleaded in excuse that "there is in our midst such a plethora of protestant piety" (*Catholic Prayers*, Preface to second edition, 1893).

The service has been prohibited by the Bishops as a body, and Dr. Burrows, when Bishop of Truro, deprived one of his clergy, the Vicar of Cury and Gunwalloe, for refusing to yield to his authority in the matter. The Bishop of London has issued a formal prohibition of the service in his diocese, and up to the present seems to be resolute about it. The Bishop of Chelmsford is taking action in the case of the Vicar of Thaxted, who retorts by inviting his people to pray for the Bishop. The Bishop of Bath and Wells has forbidden the Vicar of St. John's, Taunton, to continue the service; but the Vicar's reply is, "Nothing in this church will be given up" (*Church Times*, 2 May, 1919). Their lordships will have the sympathy and support of all loyal Churchmen in these endeavours to suppress so monstrous a misuse and perversion of the Sacrament which our Lord ordained.

There is, of course, a considerable outcry. The Bishops are accused of betraying the faith, persecuting faithful and self-denying

priests, and making sad the hearts of devout and innocent congregations. Of late years on occasions of this kind we have noticed an improvement in the controversial style of the Ritualists ; but the present agitation has produced a revival of the truculent invective which met the first serious episcopal efforts to secure obedience to the law of the Church of England. Two publications issued lately afford examples of this. One is a small book entitled *Benediction and the Bishops*, by the Rev. A. H. Baverstock ; the other an anonymous pamphlet entitled *The Bishop of London and Benediction : A Reply*. Mr. Baverstock, though he writes in a tone of more than papal infallibility, does however observe some moderation in his language ; but the author of the Reply to the Bishop of London, secure in his anonymity, lets himself go without restraint. To him the Bishop's attitude is nothing less than " transparent dishonesty and hypocrisy " (p. 7). We will, however, consider Mr. Baverstock's brochure first.

It is an instructive little volume for the light it throws on the theological position and mental attitude of the writer and those who think with him. The Pope could not write with more assurance of certainty. For example, he tells us (p. 28) that the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Gore) is " one of the few English Bishops who can claim to be regarded as a theologian." Yet, on the very next page, he says, " we are convinced that Bishop Gore is gravely at fault," and later on (p. 32), " we may surely assume that they (i.e. the great teachers of the Middle Ages) were at least as likely to understand their (i.e. the Fathers') teaching as the Bishop of Oxford." Again (p. 39) reference is made to " the Bishop of Oxford's misleading account of the primitive Eucharist " ; a statement which is more definitely emphasized two pages further on, where we read that " The Bishop of Oxford's account of the early Eucharist is vitally misleading." Accordingly, without any undue display of modesty, he undertakes " to substitute for it a brief but more accurate account." If Bishop Gore, whose theological attainments are admitted, is thus dealt with, we need not feel surprised to find that the Bishop of London, who is described as " a busy and overworked dignitary who is no theologian," receives similar treatment. It is true that he is said to have " won the affection and respect of Catholics " (p. 26), and to have " earned the affection and gratitude of Catholics " ; but his authority is denied, his reasoning is rejected, and it is plainly

asserted that he has been driven "to the uneasy putting forth of prohibitions *unsupported by any strong convictions of his own*" (p. 57). The italics are ours. Again we read, "Were the Bishop of London surrounded by Bishops who would receive with approval, instead of with a stony and hostile silence, his brave words defending access to the Blessed Sacrament, an access which he had for some years endeavoured to check, we believe he would be willing enough to sanction Exposition and Benediction. We are not without hope that he will yet arrive at sanctioning them, when he finds that Catholics will not do without them" (p. 57). Charges of weakness, timidity, insincerity and inconsistency which are here implied, coupled with flat defiance, to say nothing of the anonymous accusation of "transparent dishonesty and hypocrisy," seem a strange way of showing either affection, respect, or gratitude; but these "Catholics" are a strange people.

Mr. Baverstock claims that there is an increasing demand from the laity for this service, though the fact is not very obvious. It did not at Cury, nor does it at Thaxted, attract the laity. At both places the dissenting chapels are well attended and the churches practically empty. But the reason given for the statement is more interesting than the question of its accuracy. Mr. Baverstock tells us that "the war increased the number of churches in which there was Reservation," and "the increase of opportunities of access to the Blessed Sacrament *led inevitably* to the demand for something in the nature of Exposition and Benediction." "The clergy inside the circle knew, what others who objected even to access suspected, that *the demand could not stop there*: that whole congregations would demand some corporate expression of their devotion to the Blessed Sacrament *reserved in their midst*" (12-14). If it is not clear that the congregations make this demand spontaneously, the "Catholic" clergy may be relied upon to educate them up to doing so, and herein is a principal objection to Reservation. It will not, and indeed cannot, stop there. First follows the demand for access and then for Exposition and Benediction, then for processions with the Sacrament in the Church, then for such processions (as at Thaxted) through the streets, and so on. How far we should be led may be seen in Mr. Baverstock's open adhesion to the doctrine of transubstantiation. He says, "We do in fact adopt the doctrine of transubstantiation as held by modern Western (i.e. Roman) eucharistic theology, and

find in it nothing contrariant to a right philosophy, still less to the principle of the Incarnation" (p. 30). He similarly supports communion in one kind, telling us that "the Canon Law of Western Christendom, promulgated in these provinces, never repealed, and therefore still binding, not only requires the Blessed Sacrament to be reserved in every parish church, but requires it to be so reserved under one kind only" (p. 50); and he takes opportunity to twit the Bishop of London with inconsistency in demanding canonical obedience while at the same time he (the Bishop) disobeys in this particular the Canon Law on which he bases his authority to prohibit Benediction. Mr. Baverstock admits that the ceremony is modern even in the Roman Church, that there are no Anglican canons relating to it, and that authority in matters of the kind is vested in the Bishop; but he declines to bow to authority in this instance because the motive which actuates the Bishop is a wrong one, and also because whatever may be the rule in normal conditions, the present conditions are not normal. It is obvious that if every person under authority is at liberty to refuse obedience to a definite command when the reasons for it do not commend themselves to him or when he thinks that the circumstances are not normal, he himself being the sole judge in both cases, there is no security that any one will ever obey anything. Mr. Baverstock tells us again and again that the real issue in the present case is "the honour due to our Lord truly present in the Sacrament of His Body and Blood. We hold, as the constant teaching of the Catholic Church, that the Blessed Sacrament is Jesus Christ Himself, and, therefore, to be adored with the supreme homage due to God. This is the truth which Exposition and Benediction express" (p. 21). Again, "The Blessed Sacrament is Jesus, and Jesus is God" (p. 74). And it is, he asserts, because the Bishops do not believe this doctrine that they forbid Benediction. Their prohibition, therefore, is invalid, and consequently he refuses to obey. It would take too long to discuss here the above propositions, or the garbled snippets from patristic sources by which an attempt is made to give them an air of respectable antiquity. We have stated, we hope without unfairness, the position taken by Mr. Baverstock. In a Roman Catholic it is an intelligible position, though not the more credible or reasonable on that account. But it passes the comprehension of an ordinary man how any one can reconcile such a position with the authorized formularies of the

English Church, or even with the teaching, order and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church from which he has borrowed so much.

The anonymous reply to the Bishop of London requires but little notice. The writer is very angry, unless, like Newman's in the *Apologia*, the anger is simulated; and he can do nothing but scold. We have already given one example; here is another: "The Bishop of London requires personal instead of lawful obedience. His requirement is that of the autocrat; he demands loyalty to himself before obedience to Truth, and obedience to his word as though it were the Word of God. The claim to absolute obedience as of Divine right is not deceiving any one in these days of fallen Kaisers, and neither the Bible nor law give help to the supreme egotist, whether he be War Lord or Lord Bishop, when he erects himself into the law and substitutes personal will for law and custom" (p. 7)—and so on for seventeen pages. Yet these are the people who insist on the necessity of episcopal ordination. The whole production suggests a parody after the style of Defoe's *Shortest Way with the Dissenters* or Burke's *Vindication of Natural Society*, where the absurdity of certain opinions is shown by putting them in their most extreme and extravagant form in the mouth of a supposed advocate. It hardly sounds real.

Whether it is real or simulated, a hint as to the reason for all this frenzy is given in an appendix. It is there said: "*We have not a long time in which to get people used to everything Catholic. When legislation comes it will allow nothing but what is in vogue and generally accepted. It is better to fight for the whole thing if you fight at all.*" These people realize that if they can intimidate even some of the Bishops into recognizing such services as Exposition and Benediction in the manner in which the Bishop of London has permitted access to the Reserved Sacrament for purposes of adoration, it may be possible to claim that the revised Prayer Book, should it ever obtain proper authority, cannot be interpreted in a sense contrary to such services. Whether this be so or not, the very grave danger involved in some of the proposals for revision, the permission of Reservation in particular, is becoming more evident the more it is looked into. It is impossible, as Mr. Baverstock rightly says, that it can end there. It will inevitably and inexorably lead to adoration of the Sacrament, and if, as the Bishop of London said when preaching on the subject, the only difference between prayers

said before the Reserved Sacrament and Benediction is that the one is permitted by the Bishop of the Diocese and the other is not, there is clearly no ground of principle upon which the prohibition of the latter by the same prelate can be maintained. In either case, of course, the idolatry is the same.

It is asserted, in most of the pamphlets and letters which have appeared on the subject, that the monstrance is an "Ornament" the use of which is enjoined by the Ornaments Rubric. There is some inconsistency in the great dependence placed on a rubric which prescribes only such Ornaments "as were in this Church of England, by *authority of Parliament*, in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth" on the part of men whose whole aim is to destroy the authority of parliament in matters of religion. They do not, however, produce any "authority of parliament" in that particular year which requires the use of the monstrance. When pressed on the subject of the use of this vessel by the Royal Commission, the Rev. Edward Denny admitted that "The fact that the monstrance was in use in the second year of Edward VI does not carry with it the right to use it, because there is no service in which it was anciently employed represented in the Book of Common Prayer" (q. 18,563). And a much-needed caution was given by the Rev. Edmund G. Wood, in the *Church Times* of August 29 last, as to the ready assumption that because the name monstrance is to be found before the sixteenth century it meant the same thing as the "Ornament" which bears the name now. He writes: "the name was applied to vessels quite other than those now so called and used in the service of Benediction. For instance, reliquaries were so called, and even small lockets to contain a minute relic and hung round the neck," etc.

The case for Benediction breaks down at every point. There is nothing remotely like it in the New Testament. There is no primitive authority for it. It is not even medieval, and there is nothing in the Prayer Book which can by any ingenuity be shown to support it. If the Bishops have not authority to prohibit this service, then they can have no authority to prohibit anything.

W. GUY JOHNSON.



## THE CHURCH AND INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS.<sup>1</sup>

BY SIR GEORGE B. HUNTER, K.B.E., D.Sc.

I HAVE accepted the invitation to give one of the addresses at York on the Church and Industrial Problems because it is a duty to express some truths which are being ignored or denied, and to assist in withstanding tendencies and claims which I believe to be wrong and harmful. I cannot claim any special ability to express what I believe to be truth, but I know my subject better than most of those who speak on labour subjects.

I approach the subject as one who desires to apply the teaching of Christ to Industrial and Social questions and to all others. We must also take into account common sense, experience, psychology and economic science.

I claim and believe that every man and woman and every child has an equal right to happiness and freedom, that it is the duty not only of the wage earners, but of every man and every woman, whether poor or rich, to work for the common good. It is the Commandment of God, "Six days shalt thou labour." St. Paul commanded, "If any man will not work neither let him eat." We ought to approve and support and labour for all that will promote the greatest good of the greatest number. The man who only works five days a week is breaking the commandments, and is not playing the game or doing his duty to his brothers.

I believe in the stewardship of wealth and also in the stewardship of the capacity to work.

I have again gone through the Archbishops' "Report on Christianity and Industrial Problems." Much as I sympathize with it and admire it, and greatly as I regret to have to say so, I cannot regard it as in all respects wise and well informed. With its claim that the spirit and teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ must be applied to labour questions, I entirely agree. That Christianity teaches that all men are brothers and should labour for the community, that "every soul is of infinite and equal value," that what is wrong for an individual cannot be right for any company or collective body, that

<sup>1</sup> The substance of a paper read at a Conference at York.

no one should suffer want while others have more than they need, is quite true. I would add, if it is wrong for an individual to seize another's possessions it is wrong for the State.

But the Report contains statements made, if not lightly, yet without full knowledge, which are not sound, and some of which I think are quite misleading and mischievous. I cannot discuss these at length in this short address.

It is not true that our industrial system is inconsistent with the teaching of Christ. It is not true that a competitive system is anti-Christian or wrong, or that the effects on the whole are evil. They are, on the whole, more healthy and good than any other that is possible. It is not true that there is any conflict between economic science and the teaching of Christ or Saint Paul. It is not true that the introduction of labour-saving machinery causes unemployment. It is not true that any of the evils that we most deplore are caused by or incurable under our social or industrial system. The Socialism that appears to be suggested in the Report would bring in new and greater evils. The development of the modern factory system has been not harmful but very beneficial. Under present conditions Labour does receive in Britain, in all the great trades, not less than a fair share of the products of Industry.

There is no reference in the Report to the enormous improvement that has been made in the living conditions of the people during the last century or to the truth that that improvement will go on unless prevented by erroneous teaching or revolutionary changes. It amounted, before the war, to not less than 100 per cent advance, in almost every direction, attained since the beginning of the nineteenth century. How strange that the Archbishops' Committee seems unaware of this. It is in no way due to Trade Unions or legislation. It has been achieved by the use of Capital.

The names of the members of the Committee inspire respect; but they are not, so far as I can see, names which command confidence for their freedom from bias or their full knowledge of all aspects of the modern industrial system. It would be very desirable for the conclusions of the Report to be examined by a more really representative Committee.

In thinking of "Our Contribution towards the Labour Problem," what is to be our aim? For the moment only, let us confine ourselves to physical and material considerations and to the more

urgent of these. I feel very strongly that our aim should be, not the claims of the Labour Party or Parties, but what are quite different objects, the relief and the elimination of extreme poverty and its causes, the care and support of the sick and weak and the wageless unemployed, the care of the widow and the child, of the friendless woman and of the aged. The ordinary strong man in good health can take care of himself, and does. His wife works harder—often very much harder—than he does. The average artizan in good health (or indeed in bad health) suffers no wrongs, but benefits greatly, under our present industrial system. All his just claims—and I might add, some that are not just—are willingly conceded. The married man with many children, though much less so than the married woman with children and perhaps weak health, should command our sympathy and may need our help. The Trade Union and the Labour Party do not help but hinder him. They limit his earnings and reduce his “real wages.” They deprive him of his freedom and opportunities, in many ways. Some labour men insult their brothers by talking nonsense about “wage slavery.” It is an insult. The British working man is a free man, except so far as the Trade Unions limit his freedom. Under a communistic or socialistic system he would not be free but a slave to the state.

We talk much of a “better England,” but what does that mean? It means, or it should mean, more regard to “the two great commandments,” more of the spirit of Christ. Better living. Less regard for rights and more regard for our duties. Better houses and better food and better clothes and better education—yes. But not necessarily bigger wages and shorter hours of work. Not these at all, if they increase, as they are increasing, the cost of living, and the hardships of life for the poor, or if they are a cause of trade depression and unemployment, as they may well be—and as indeed they are now. It is not the employers but the workmen who are delaying the coming of a better England. That is my deep conviction based on long and deep experience.

As a practical proposal for alleviating poverty and promoting the good of the greatest number, may I say I do not know anything that would do so much good as Mr. Dennis Milner’s “Scheme for a State Bonus,” because it would benefit those who really need it. I bespeak for it your consideration and sympathy. It would give the widow and the children a better chance. It would abolish

extreme poverty. I might almost say it would abolish all poverty.

When we talk of a better England in the sense of better conditions for the people to live in ; and of the attitude and the contribution of the Church towards these questions ; where are the means for providing this materially better England to come from ? Who is to pay for them, and how ? These questions are of the very essence of the labour problem. Neither pious sentiment nor any change in the attitude of the Church or of the employers can provide the means. Neither can Trade Unions, nor the State. Confiscation or conscription of wealth and any violent changes in our industrial system, would not supply the means, but would deprive us of them. They have to be created by Capital and Labour. They are not now being created, because at present we are working too little and spending too much.

The means are perhaps now being partly and temporarily provided (and I think rightly) by taxing the rich. I do not believe that it is possible to do more in that way. I know many so-called rich men who, by income taxes, super taxes, excess profits duties, local rates, provision for death duties, and voluntary gifts, are contributing four-fifths of their income or more than that. But their obligations are not less and their cost to live is increased. The poor have nobly given for their country their sons and their own lives. The rich have equally and as nobly given their sons and their own lives, and they have also given in addition their wealth. Without their capital the war would have been quickly lost. The lives lost would have been given in vain. In five years of war, nearly half of the accumulated wealth of generations past has been spent. How long will the remainder last ? Wealth has been, and is being, conscripted.

It is a delusion to suppose that any large contribution can be permanently obtained by reducing the rate of interest or profit on the employment of savings and capital. Capital is so necessary, that if it is killed or driven away by bad legislation, or if a fair payment for its use is made more uncertain, the rate of interest will increase. On an average and in ordinary times, it is very low in England, and cannot be reduced without injury to the workmen and the community. If all the average profits of industrial undertakings were received by the wage earners, that would only increase their wages by about 10 per cent or less and for a short time; and

then after that time their earnings would be greatly reduced, and their work and their wages, in many trades at least, would cease altogether. Some profits and dividends are too high and some are too low, but the average over a course of years and taking into account business losses, is low and cannot be reduced. Losses instead of profit are common and must be, and ought to be, balanced by occasional high profits. The claims of the Labour Party that others should bear the losses but the workers take the profits is unreasonable and absurd. In one of my own associated businesses the whole capital was lost three times over. In another not one farthing of profit was made during ten years.

So far as high wages are now being paid, as they are, out of borrowed money, that cannot go on much longer without bankruptcy, which will cause poverty, distress and unemployment. Poverty can be relieved and some of the labour problems solved by a more equitable distribution of wages rather than of profits. Some wage earners are receiving too much and some too little. Too much because they do little work.

There is only one healthy and effective way to provide for the materially better England that labour seeks, and that is by increasing the production of wealth. That is the one thing that is needed now more than ever before, after the enormous waste of wealth during the terrible war; and it is the one thing that is being neglected, and which "Labour" in Great Britain is unfortunately not aiming at, but is obstructing. That is largely no doubt due to misunderstanding. Miners are causing unemployment by providing less coal, bricklayers are laying fewer bricks. An experienced builder has assured me that only half as much work is being done now in the building trades at 1s. 6d. per hour, as used to be done at 9d. per hour. That, which means increasing the cost fourfold, is one chief cause of the shortage of houses. Yet nobody mentions it. That is a great cause of unemployment as well as of the housing difficulty.

The Archbishops' Report speaks of the loss of wages due to fluctuations in demand for labour during a period of ten years, as amounting to a total of £40,000,000; but ignores an expenditure on drink during the five years of war, amounting (it is estimated) to £975,000,000! What colossal waste—even after allowing for taxation—and how small are most of the social evils dealt with in

the Report compared to it. Double that amount to allow for the consequential losses, and you still have not got nearly the total of the bill. Our own Church, by shaking off its apathy and awakening the national conscience, can save us from this enormous waste. That reform would solve the housing problem and almost all our social and economic problems.

Why do I talk in the foregoing strain? It is because of the present national peril and the imperative present need of plain speaking. Because there is a serious danger of the Churches being misled. I believe we are, because of false teaching by politicians and the Labour Party, and exaggerated expectations, and less work, drifting towards a time of greater poverty, of greater unemployment, of greater discontent, of greater unrest; which through disappointed hopes and unfulfilled (because impossible) promises, may result in revolution, and a time of Bolshevism, anarchy, bloodshed and ruin; before we return again to sanity and sound industrial ideas and methods. It is not nice to be Micaiah, the son of Imlah. How much pleasanter it would be to speak only pleasant and popular things! Unless we spend less and do more work we are within sight of national bankruptcy and disaster.

I can claim to speak of industrial problems with intimate and sympathetic knowledge, having been closely engaged in industry and a student of its problems, during sixty years, as apprentice, foreman, manager and employer. I am not prejudiced or extreme, and my sympathies are equally with employers and employed. I sympathize most with the poor and with the bottom dog. The artizan, the miner, the railwayman, is now the top dog. I do not sympathize much with "the idle rich" (if they are really idle) or with some of the more highly paid but discontented and aggressive Trade Unionists and labour men. The changes that have taken place during the war, by which the majority of the people have benefited, have made life better for them, but much harder for men and women with small incomes, and for the really poor and distressed. I greatly doubt whether a compulsory 48-hours week and a legally fixed minimum wage will benefit these or indeed any class. I believe they are serious mistakes which unnecessarily and indeed tyrannically restrict the liberty of the workers and will be injurious to the poor. The present legal minimum wages for coal miners is one of the chief causes of the fall in the output of the mines.

The Claim of the Labour Party is that the Church should take sides with it in enforcing its policy and its demands. But is that claim reasonable? Labour has a right to the sympathy and support of the Church, as far as its demands are wise and right, and if granted would be conducive to the material, moral and religious well-being of the whole people. It has no claim to the support of the Church for the promotion of its class interests, class warfare and class gains. It is the duty of the Church to fight against everything that is wrong and evil, and it is the duty of the Church to examine for itself and not to accept, as many are ready to do, the decision of the Labour Party or any other as to what is wrong and what is evil. It is the duty of the Church to work for a better England, but the Church must be very careful in deciding what it means by a better England, and it must be very careful—more careful than it sometimes is—to think over in what way that better England can and in what way it cannot be realized.

The predominant aim of the Trade Unions, which like the Labour Parties, represent a small though important minority of the nation, is to further increase the wages and reduce the working hours of their own members. They are not, so far as I can see, seriously concerned with the relief of the poor or about the elevation of the poorer and unskilled labourer. They now incidentally advocate a legal minimum wage for all, but a wage much lower than for themselves. Trade Unions are not only warring against employers and other classes but against other wage earners. Among the worst strikes are "demarcation strikes" by one Trade Union against another. When their own trade is prosperous and other trades are depressed, they will not allow those engaged in the latter to participate in their prosperity. That is a very great cause of unemployment and consequent suffering. While the unskilled worker is suffering from low wages and high costs of living, they—the Trade Unions—do not allow him to fit himself, by learning a trade, to earn better wages, nor when so fitted will they allow him to enter their Union and share their prosperity. I have been all my life and am still a friend of the Trade Unions and of many of their leaders, but I am being driven to the conclusion that, excepting the drink, they are now the greatest cause of poverty.

At a meeting last month of the Tyne District Committee of the Federation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Trades, at which a pro-

posal that a small number of disabled sailors and soldiers, to the extent of merely 3 per cent of the numbers employed in the industries, might be admitted to share the benefits and privileges of the members of the Trade Unions, the proposal was not accepted.

While the Labour Party is insisting on higher and higher wages, with shorter and shorter hours of work, we find no wide and general recognition of the obligation on their part to do in return their honest best to give labour of equal value to the wages they ask, or to do their part in increasing the wealth of the community on which alone they must depend for any real improvement in their living conditions. It is well known that in almost all trades the workers restrict the efficiency of their labour. They resist and obstruct the introduction of new labour-saving appliances. They adopt the policy of "ca' canny." They act unfortunately on the fallacious and destructive theory that the less work they do the higher their wages may be and the better it will be for themselves. That can only be true from a very narrow and selfish consideration and with an utter disregard of the welfare of the whole community. It will maintain the high cost of living, and in consequence reduce what is known as "real wages." It will not diminish but increase unemployment. The plea that it is done as a protection against employers cutting down their wages is not true. If it were true, it would be insufficient. Nothing can prevent the workers reaping the chief benefit from an increase in the production of wealth.

The Labour Party in England has not recognized, nor does the Archbishops' Committee's Report, that the progress in material well-being of the wage earners, which has been so very great, has been due in the past to the steam engine and to improvements in labour-saving machinery and tools, and that future progress can only be attained in the same way, by an increase of production and of wealth and not by the aggressiveness of labour.

The real ultimate aim of those who control the Labour Party machine is admittedly revolutionary, as revealed in a Memorandum on the Causes of and Remedies for Labour Unrest, signed on their behalf by Mr. Arthur Henderson, and dated February 27, 1919. This memorandum expresses a vehement determination to challenge and destroy "the whole existing structure of capitalist industry." Their expressed object is not so much to redress any evils or introduce

reforms as to overturn the present social system. That means socialism, syndicalism, and, in the end, chaos, communism, anarchy. To quote a recent review in *The Record*, "The real leaders of labour are bent not on reform—they do not even wish for reform—but on the complete reversal of the old order, and the establishment on its ruin of a completely socialized (and possibly atheistic) world communism." They would substitute for the present order that which would be much worse. The duty of the Church is to expose and oppose such aims. They are founded on ignorance, covetousness and malice.

That teaching and the teaching of Christ are as wide as the poles asunder. Yet, unfortunately, there are statements in the Report on Christianity and Industrial Problems of the Archbishops' Committee of Enquiry which will be quoted and used to support such teaching.

It is not the capitalist and industrial system that is wrong. The failure, if it is a failure, is in the men who do not use it rightly, whether the employers or the workmen, or both. The system works well when it is allowed to work well. The workers have now more than an equal voice with the employers in the disposal of their labour. In the trades that I know, the failures are (I believe, after fifty years' experience) not on the part of the employers but of the Trade Unions. I believe—indeed I know, and it applies to my class as well as to myself—Labour owes more to me than I owe to Labour. The great majority of large employers have been generous and ready to deal with any grievances or to submit alleged grievances to arbitration. The employers have kept their agreements, but employes have refused to abide by arbitration awards. There have been no lock-outs during the war, but there have been many strikes—and none necessary.

We find nothing in the Bible to countenance the extreme Labour Party's aggressive and menacing attitude, but much to condemn it. The possession of riches is not condemned, if a right use is made of them. The command, "Sell that thou hast and give to the poor," was to only one individual. Dives was not condemned because he was rich, but because he was selfish. Without the large capitalists, the condition of the people would be much worse than it is and there would be more poverty.

The Lord Jesus Christ held Himself aloof from and took no part

in political disputes. His aim was higher and so should His Churches be. He did not seek to overturn or change the social and political conditions of the times in which He lived. When asked to take a part in dealing with disputes about property and the ownership of wealth, He said, "Who made Me a divider over you?" Instead of inciting to any class warfare or to the assertion of individual or class interests and rights, He exhorted to meekness and peacefulness. "Blessed are the Peacemakers for they shall be called sons of God." Not those who stir up discontent and strife.

Christ taught us by precept and example, to protect and assist the poor, the sick and the unfortunate. He taught that all men are (not equal, but) of equal value in the sight of God. He spoke against the Pharisee and the hypocrite, but against only the idle, self-indulgent or dishonest rich. He did not advocate an equal division of wealth or property or that the poor should covet and under the form of law seize the property of the rich or those better off than themselves. His appeal to men was "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His Righteousness." "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness for they shall be filled." "Live high and pure Lives." "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted." That was not addressed to employers only. The prayer He taught was "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth."

We cannot do better than to follow His example. We cannot improve upon His appeal. Only by accepting it can men live the truest and best lives, and only by accepting it can their deepest needs be satisfied. Only by accepting it can we have "a better England." The duty and the privilege and the work of the Churches, is to bring the people, rich and poor, to Christ as their Lord. To labour and aim, not at the assertion of our own rights and theories but at doing His will and working for the coming of His Kingdom on earth. That way only lies a really better England. It is not another social system that is needed, but better and wiser men. With better men and women the evils of our present conditions will disappear. They are gradually and not slowly being diminished. Without better men and women, a socialist system would be a change for the worse and a threefold worse failure. It would exchange liberty, progress and opportunity, for tyranny, servitude, dreary monotony and stagnation. It would greatly reduce the production of wealth, and would decrease the happiness as well as

the freedom of the people. It has been tried and has always failed. It was abandoned by the early Church. It is a frightful failure in Russia.

I have spoken, and somewhat strongly, but not unfairly or half so strongly as some of the Labour men. Some will resent plain truths, but it is a pressing and patriotic duty to speak plainly, and especially when few are doing so. Many of the labour spokesmen are men of high character and high aims. Some of them are now pointing out the need of more work, and the wrongfulness and folly of the selfish, reckless strikes. But many are afraid or unwilling to say unpopular things. I hold that our British workmen are mainly quite as good as the men of other classes. There are no better or higher characters in this world than the best of our wage earners and trade unionists. It is not the men but their mistakes and errors that I would oppose. If they disagree I hope that they will pardon me for my sincerity.

Labour has no right to say that the Churches in our days have opposed any of their just claims or aspirations, and Labour cannot rightly accuse the Churches of any want of sympathy with poverty and distress. It would be more correct to claim that only the Churches have cared for the poor.

If I venture in a few last words to criticize the Church, it is not from the Labour Party's standpoint, which I am not sure is not fair or reasonable. If my criticism is in any way mistaken, it will do no harm to the Church and again I hope for pardon. Where the Church fails is that it so often and so usually makes no appeal—no great spiritual appeal. It is too secular, and it would be a vital mistake to allow itself to be drawn still more aside from its true work into secular, political, or social disputes, ambitions and controversies. It occupies itself in Organization, in forming Committees, and laying down plans and theories. Its preaching is not inspired nor inspiring. Its sermons are (with exceptions) little theological essays of no importance and of no interest to the hearers, or are concerned with some social and secular subject. They do not aim at "conversion" to a new life. They are not inspired by the Holy Ghost. If they were, and if they always conveyed the appeal of Christ to the individual, to turn from life aimless or devoted to self to the acceptance of Christ as his and her personal Saviour, and the real, earnest acceptance of His service, the people, rich and poor,

would respond, and we should reach a better England. That should be the Church's contribution to the Labour Problem.

"We shall not get a country fit for heroes to live in until our heroes are heroic all round, until Englishmen add to their physical courage and strong political opinions, moral courage and moral convictions of equal strength—until they are capable of conquering not only Germany but themselves."

"All thoughtful sensible people throughout the nation are agreed that if one fine morning the nation should wake up to find itself Christian, it would find that all these problems were solved, and solved in a permanent and satisfactory way in the course of the following week."

G. B. HUNTER.

---

#### SHORT NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH. By Rev. Constantine Callinicos, B.D.,  
Protospresbyter of the Church of the Annunciation in Manchester.  
London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 3s. 6d. net.

In about sixty pages, the author of this essay gives us a bird's-eye view of the Greek Orthodox Church, its Patriarchate, doctrine, worship and organization. We learn that when the Turks captured Constantinople in 1453, they did not only turn St. Sophia into a Mohammedan mosque, but they also cut the tongues of thousands of Christians in order that they might prevent the transmission of the Greek language from parents to their children.

Doctrinally the Greek Orthodox Church accepts the seven sacraments, but rejects purgatory, indulgences and superabundant personal merits and "the other products of Roman casuistry."

Its worship is gorgeous and ritualistic. Clergy and laity alike communicate in both kinds. Baptism is by immersion and is followed immediately by Confirmation. Statues are prohibited, but icons or holy images are permitted. No organs are used in their services. This booklet is both informing and interesting. Bishop Welldon contributes a Preface.

---

THE SECOND CENTURY. Being a series of Readings in Church History for Lent and other times. By J. P. Whitney, B.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* 3s. 6d. net.

Mr. Whitney tries to give his readers "some information about the greater characters, the Christian literature, and the Church life of the second century." The task is very difficult, but on the whole Mr. Whitney has succeeded in giving a general idea of some of the Fathers and Apologists of the second century.

## THE BOOK OF DANIEL AND ITS INTERPRETATION.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. A. H. T. CLARKE, M.A., Rector of Devizes.

NO subject engrosses the mind of to-day more than the study of prophecy, and especially that side of prophecy which deals with the coming of the End, which is called Apocalypitics.

There is this difference between the form of language in which Prophecy is conveyed to our minds and Apocalypitics. A Prophet, strictly speaking, *hears* the Word of God. An Apocalyptic Seer *sees* it dramatically presented in a series of visions. And for this reason. A Prophet has to convey the message of Jehovah to his contemporaries in the language of their day. An Apocalypse, which deals with the Last Things, has to speak in SYMBOLS which can be understood of all men because he is addressing posterity in the language of all time. In Old Testament days Isaiah, though occasionally a Seer, was essentially a Prophet whose "ear the Lord wakened morning by morning and opened to hear as that of one of the initiated" (Isa. l. 4). Daniel, though a Prophet, was essentially a Seer—one who "saw," "beheld," "considered the visions of his head upon his bed" (Dan. vii., viii., ix., x.-xii.). So in New Testament times St. Paul's message chiefly came by "the *hearing* of faith." St. John's was a Revelation "of all things that he *saw*." Hence, the Book of Daniel, like its counterpart, the Book of Revelation, is specially to be studied in "these last times" (I Peter i. 20).

For we, too, like the Apostles, are nearing the end of an era. For them the Jewish era was passing away, and the Christian era was being set up. For the Fathers of the fifth century the Apostolic age was passing away and melting into the Catholic era. For Luther and our Reformers Catholicism was the departing system

<sup>1</sup> Being a continuation of two Papers on "The Fulfilment of Prophecy" and "The Book of Revelation," contributed by the same author to THE CHURCHMAN for April and August, 1916. Of lucid commentaries on this book I know of none. Hävernicks monumental work, the parent of all subsequent orthodox compilations, such as Dr. Pusey's, Dr. C. H. H. Wright's and the *Speaker's Commentary*, is largely out of date (1832); while Ewald's performance, which has laid the basis for all future High Critical exploits in this fruitful field, is itself founded upon an extravagant myth—that Daniel is a Maccabean fiction! A colossal Roman Catholic work in four volumes by Fabre D'Envieu champions Daniel along with the Apocrypha. Bishop Wordsworth and Auberlen are, perhaps, the most useful of any.

and the new era of Protestantism was coming in. To-day we stand on the eve of new changes greater still. The period of St. Peter the Apostle, and St. Augustine the Churchman, and Luther the Reformer, are yet to culminate, as Neander has said, in a fourth era in which there shall be emphasized not so much the incarnate or the redeeming as the ascended Christ and the outpouring of His Spirit in Pentecostal power.

The Book of Daniel is a uniquely human book written half in Hebrew and half in Chaldee. It is a contemporary document (Ezek. xiv. 14; xxviii. 3) coloured by the high-flown Persian grandeur of its age, but re-edited and revised so often since Ezra's day, and so clumsily adapted by the Septuagint translators to the requirements of their later day, that it is difficult to reproduce the exact features of the original text. Yet in the minutest particulars of historical *data*, passed over or contradicted by the ignorance of later heathen chroniclers, Daniel has been so amply confirmed by the verdict of the monuments that it may safely be said that the name of Darius alone, the last King of the Medes, is the only point left that presents any difficulty which still awaits the attestations of science.

What is the design of the Book of Daniel? To teach that there is a Providence in the world, that history is not (as Gibbon thought) a register of the crimes and follies of mankind but (as Lord Acton wrote) a record of the conscience of mankind.

“ There's a Divinity that shapes our ends  
Rough-hew them how we will.”

And this book was written “ to the end that the living may know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men and giveth it to whomsoever He will ” (iv. 17, v. 21).

In proof of this Daniel is permitted to see the full and final development of four great world-empires in all the glory of their power :—

1. The empire of **BABYLON**, with the consummate and brilliant Nebuchadnezzar at its head.
2. The empire of **PERSIA** conquered and led by the far-famed and magnanimous Cyrus the Great.
3. The empire of **GREECE** sped by the genius of the all-accomplished Alexander the Great.
4. The empire of **ROME** rebuilt on the ruins of the Republic and

attaining the climax of all worldly glory in the person of the immortal Julius Cæsar.

What a roll of names! What a succession of epoch-making events! But they were not to stand. *The Roman Empire was to be the last on earth.* In its day should be laid the foundations of a kingdom not of this world which should endure for ever. "In the days of these [Roman] kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never pass away." "A stone cut out without (human) hands shall smite the Image upon its feet of iron and clay and break them in pieces. And the stone that smote the Image shall become a great mountain and fill the whole earth" (chap. ii. 44, 45). *Christ's Kingdom was founded in Cæsar's day!*

Such were the visions of chapter ii. In chapter vii., Daniel beholds the same vision in another form. The Four World-Empires, representing hitherto the four Ages of gold, silver, brass and iron, have now become four beasts of prey. The Lion of BABYLON appears with Eagle's wings reinstated in his pride. The Bear of MEDO-PERSIA, clawing the three tributaries of Lydia, Egypt and Babylon, has changed its Median rulers and is now seen to be "raised up" by Cyrus "on its (Persian) side." GREECE leaps like a panther with four wings from continent to continent in the might of the youthful Alexander. ROME comes last, most "terrible" of them all,

"Black as a fury, terrible as Hell,  
And shook a dreadful dart."

So far the two visions agree. The ten horns of savage ROME correspond with the ten toes of Nebuchadnezzar's Image of the superman. *Rome did fall when the Church became world-wide!* (454, A.D.).

But there is a significant addition to the picture.

"Behold, there came up among the horns another horn, little (at first). And before it three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots"—to make way for it. "And behold in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man"—that is, astute human intelligence, politic and far-seeing—"and a mouth boasting marvellous claims" (chap. vii. 18).

To deal with this apparition the Son of Man is called upon to pronounce sentence and "its body is given to the burning flame"—the Lake of Fire.

Now who and what is this mysterious power? It is evidently

however expedient it may be, which is not found in the New Testament. The Apostolic Church gives us these as facts and principles.

#### NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH.

*Organization.* The New Testament stands for the principle that *no form of Church government and organization can claim Christ or the Apostles as its founders* (Hort). The needs of time, place and occasion decide, and it is as the Christian people or Church think best. There was little or no organization in the New Testament Church, and, as to it, Christ and the Apostles just gave broad guiding principles and expected the Christian people to apply them for themselves; e.g., Christ's: "Be ye not called Rabbi, for One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren," constitutes the Church a Brotherhood, where no one is above or below other, no one stands between a man and his God. The Apostles added: "Let all things be done decently and in order, and to the edification of the Church." The fact is Christ's return was daily expected. Preach Christ's kingdom, prepare for it, win men into it, was the Church's one aim. All else, organization included, was secondary. Converted souls, not machinery, mattered. Hence the Apostles' reply when urged to organize: "It is not reason that we should leave the Word of God and serve tables. Look ye out among you seven men of honest report . . . but we will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the Word."

*Ministry.* The New Testament has a *higher ministry for which the only ordination is that of the Spirit, and a lower ministry of administration to which men appoint.* It is quite true, as Hort says, that there was nothing like our own clergy and bishops;<sup>1</sup> they were not needed, for the congregation conducted its own services. Yet there were two ministries: (1) The "Ministry of the Word," or highly-prized preaching ministry; its ministers were "apostles, prophets, teachers," tied to no Church, not appointed by man, for theirs was a call and ordination of the Spirit, needing no human warrant, for it was patent to all. They were in no sense office-bearers; they were responsible to no congregation of Christians, burdened by no cares of office and no pastoral duties, simply mis-

<sup>1</sup> "Much profitless labour has been spent in trying to force the various terms of Paul's lists into meaning so many ecclesiastical offices. The feat is impossible . . . he is not speaking of Church-officers or posts at all, but of spiritual 'gifts' or functions open to the whole congregation."

It was these last two kingdoms that by their geographical situation fatally affected the future of the Jews. Chapter viii. describes how a certain King of Syria corrupted and destroyed in the interests of Greek manners and Greek licence the loyalty of the servants of Jehovah. Chapter xi. describes the long wars and stratagems by which the "Kings of" Syria in "the North" and the Kings of Egypt in "the South" tried to overreach each other for *world-dominion*, while Judah lay exposed to their internecine rivalry, ground down as between an upper and a nether mill-stone. Both these chapters treat of the rise of ANTIOCHUS, a "King of the North," whose portrait shades off into the darker lineaments of the Antichrist that is yet to come (viii. 23; xi. 36 sq.). Such is the dim language of PROPHECY.

The first Book of the Maccabees gives us the HISTORY. *For over six years* (170-164 B.C.) the conflict between the Jews and Antiochus on the Syrian throne continued to rage. In the first year Jerusalem was taken, the Temple entered and a sow sacrificed upon the Altar. This was "the Transgression (or 'abomination') that causeth Desolation" (viii. 13; xi. 31; xii. 11). In the third year the religion and services and customs of the Jews were interdicted, the Temple dedicated to Olympian Zeus, and the Greek religion (with a revival of its games, its licence and its idolatry) made compulsory. It was now that Judas and his faithful band of Maccabees retired to the mountains and in *a little over three years and a half* recovered Jerusalem, restored the altar and cleansed the Sanctuary (168-165 B.C.). In the next year their royal persecutor was dead!

With this explanation of the subsequent history in our hands, let us go back to Daniel and read the sacred hieroglyph.

Chapter viii. 8: "The he-goat [Alexander] waxed very great and at the height of his power the great horn was broken, and instead of it there came up four notable horns toward the four quarters of heaven. And out of one of them [Syria] came forth a horn from small beginnings which grew exceeding stout toward the South and toward the East and toward the land of glory. And It grew stout against the host of heaven [the Priesthood] . . . yea, It magnified Itself against the Prince of the host [God Himself], and by It the daily sacrifice was taken away. . . . Then I heard one Angel speak and another Angel said unto a certain mysterious Angel which asked: How long shall last . . . the Transgression that causeth

Desolation . . . ? And he said unto me : *For 2,300 evenings-and-mornings ; then shall the sanctuary be put right* " (*i.e.*, the *six years and more* of the Antiochian persecution from 170-164 B.C.).

In the eleventh chapter the description is resumed. Antiochus' usurpation of the throne is first described, then his interminable intrigues to get world-dominion, and to "honour the god of Forces" (chap. xi. 38).

Chapter xii. 6 : " And one said . . . How long shall the end of these signs be ? . . . *For a time, times and a half.* And when God shall have finished scattering the power of the holy people all these things shall be accomplished. And I heard but I understood not. Then said I : O my Lord what shall be the outcome of all these things ? And He said : . . . From the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away and the Abomination of Desolation set up there shall be 1,290 days. Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to 1,335 days " (or *just over six years*).

The dates here have a significance by ANALOGY, as they stretch onward beyond the first Coming to the second Coming. *The Jews' sufferings under Antiochus are made the symbolic TYPE of the final great persecution of the Christian Church* by the future Anti-Christian State or Church ; and he will live to see the triumph of Christ who can stand firm. " By patience ye shall win your souls."

Once Daniel alone of all prophets risks a CHRONOLOGY for his visions of the future. Bolder than Isaiah himself he predicts " Seventy septads " (*i.e.*, 490 years) from Artaxerxes' edict to rebuild Jerusalem to the coming of the Gentiles, and " half a septad " (*i.e.*, three and a half years) for our Lord's ministry, for the rejection of which Jerusalem was to be laid desolate by the Roman armies (chap. ix. 24-27). If the first Book of Maccabees guarantees the chronology of the former visions of Antiochus' persecution, Josephus has not less amply and deliberately confirmed the chronology of this last (*B.J.* vi. 2, 1).

The Jews, as St. Paul reminds us (1 Cor. x. 1-6), were a TYPICAL people. Their history foreshadowed the future Church of God. Prophecy cannot be tied to its primary fulfilment (2 Peter i. 20), but has ever-expanding circles of further adaptations to the course of the world's history before the final end comes.

## CHRISTIANS AND RECREATION.

## II

BY J. T. BUDD.

## DISPLACEMENT.

“ I NSTEAD of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle tree.” On these words the Rev. Dr. Jowett recently wrote a suggestive article, entitled “ God’s Ministry of Displacement,” in other words, on the expulsive power of a new affection, or, as some would put it, the mighty power of a new Inhabitant, “ Christ dwelling in the heart.”

When a man is absorbed in solving an intricate problem, or a preacher immersed in preparing a searching discourse, or an author writing an entrancing story, or treatise, petty fault-finding letters coming in daily, and trivial interruptions, which in hours of comparative idleness would vex and worry, almost cease to affect the mind, and fail to distract a soul occupied by noble and enriching ideals and aspirations. The Field-marshal who is directing divisions in a great aggressive movement, and who sees that his wounded are being cared for, does not include in his list of casualties those suffering from mosquito bites !

## THE MINISTRY OF OCCUPATION

for adults, and for many people in hours of leisure, has not been given a place of pre-eminence in helping those who tell us they only seek to “ kill time.” Amusements, perpetually provided, even when pure and exciting, do not in the long run, satisfy. England needs a new soul, high-toned pronouncements—spiritual precepts in healthy practice. How many of our self-sacrificing soldiers have spoken about amusements lavishly and kindly provided, and have said of them, “ We have been fed-up with such.” Men can be satiated with pleasure ! They really want as well, something substantial for spirit and mind. When their higher nature is approached, they instinctively *respond*, as well as when the senses and passions are touched.

Then take the case of many lads, soldiers in peace times, how comparatively little is done to reach their better self, by people in

general, when the men are off duty. There are, of course, grand exceptions where Soldiers' Homes have been instituted. Because of idleness and want of wholesome occupation, men readily visit wet canteens, and succumb to the temptations of the public-house, and alas, are led, too, to visit demoralizing dens of iniquity.

The Ministry of Health Bill, which has been introduced in the present Parliament, embraces the vital matter of housing, but we trust the Government will also deal in a masterly way with provision for supplying the needs of the mind as well as the body. We want on an elaborately munificent scale, educative lectures and classes which will appeal to the higher instincts of men and women; women to wisely teach girls, and men sanely to teach lads, of the power of their physical nature, and of the *sacredness of pure thoughts and actions*. Early in life they learn evil from one another. Wise parents must forestall unholy temptations.

#### CANADIAN WITNESSES.

Think of the splendid physique of sober, clean-living Canadian boys when they first landed here. Tens of thousands of these had never been inside a drinking saloon and had never seen a drunken woman until they reached Christian England! Boys in this country are allowed to enter public-houses when over fourteen years of age, the very time of adolescence—fourteen to eighteen—when they should be shielded from temptations. Our franchised sisters, who will now have a wealth of power and influence, will see to it, we doubt not, that social purity questions, in their varied aspects, shall not be shunned nor skurried over in Britain's future House of Commons! They will see that legislation shall rectify past disastrous provisions, on questions of morality for men as well as for women, securing equal laws for both. If governors or lords won't act, six millions of noble women will haste to the rescue of their weaker sisters. The war will not have been in vain if pure homes, and cleansed streets, and an undefiled atmosphere are the direct results of bloodshed, agony and tears.

#### SPIRIT, SOUL AND BODY.

Promoters of pure Re-Creation must recognize the tripartite nature of boys and girls. What magnificent work may be done by the Church Army, the Y.M.C.A., the S.C.A., the Y.W.C.A. and workers in all Churches, who have laboured in huts and hostels in

Belgium, France and the East as well as in England, Ireland and Scotland, when these huts and buildings, no longer needed for war purposes, are brought back and established through the country. Sane, godly leaders, men and women, will be needed to control and guide all who enter such. Those who conduct classes, Bible, educative, musical, recreative, will need patience and sympathy, self-sacrifice, tact and godly wisdom.

Philanthropic and patriotic souls have found that serving others enriched their own lives. We long to see such going a step further, and consecrating every gift and talent to Him Who loved them unto death—becoming “new creatures in Christ Jesus.” Individual Christian men and women—one by one—must see to it that righteousness and God’s Kingdom are not any longer neglected, or disaster will overwhelm England’s indifferent soul.

English family life needs to be guarded. Early marriages need careful scrutiny. Engagements ought not to be regarded as a mere trivial enjoyment. An *engagement ceremony*, such as some continental people adopt, would prove a splendid preliminary safeguard to marriage itself. Public opinion on all such matters must be expressed through the right agency. *There is a place* for wholesome enjoyment, for needed recreation. Where ministers and consecrated individual Christians present a full-orbed, satisfying Christ, all secondary things will fall into their right place. But we do not think it is the business of the Church to provide amusement for the *world*. Too many of the world’s amusements receive sympathetic recognition from half-hearted Christians. They think too superficially. Some amusements require close examination. We can refer only to a few.

#### THE THEATRE AND THE STAGE.

We were once talking to two ladies about theatres; they thought we had no right to indulge in criticism about a subject of which we knew nothing from personal observation. But do not playbills, photographs of actresses and actors, ordinary conversation, and illustrated newspapers’ reports and critiques, afford abundant scope and light to enable one to form a judgment? Must we frequent public-houses, or get drunk, in order to secure sufficient material to advocate total abstinence from intoxicating liquors. Must we spend nights in a gambling saloon, in order to point out the dangers

associated with cards, whist drives, and bridge, and that the mania for gambling for money is as intoxicating as the effect produced by drinking alcohol as a beverage? If successful at card games for money, one is encouraged to go on and risk losing a fortune; if unsuccessful one is goaded to try and retrieve one's losses! So-called debts of honour often end in depths of degradation. If needs be, we could give an alarming instance from personal knowledge in the fall of a young Scotch banker, and the ruin he brought on others!

#### THE CHARACTER OF PLAYS.

In a large proportion of plays, as they come from the printer to the performer, witticisms abound, concealing more than they tell, yet telling what they conceal, observations which could not be repeated in a drawing-room by any man anxious to preserve his reputation. If the theatre, *as loved to-day*, is so good, pure, educative and illuminating, why do some Christians make so many excuses for it; why does the Lord Chamberlain absolutely refuse to licence some plays in the interests of morality; or why should a censor of plays insist on passages being expunged before some plays are produced in public?

Why are lying, intrigue, bigamy, domestic infelicities, family quarrels and jealousies between husband and wife brought into requisition in order to form *amusement for young people*?

We shall never support a good cause we may be advocating by a bad or unfair argument. Too often religion on the stage has been represented in the person of an "Abinodab Sleek," a strait-laced Pharisee, and if an act of meanness and parsimony was brought on it was connected with some deacon, or ranter, or clergyman. There is a change in this respect. Quite recently a well-known actor sent for a clergyman hurriedly to come to his theatre. When he came, the manager told him he felt his responsibility towards the audience, and asked him to say a few words to them. The minister gladly did so and ended with prayer!

Whilst this is praiseworthy, we can't help asking, why did General Smith-Dorien not so long ago take action against a theatre, and why did the proprietors amend their ways, scenes and words, in order to prevent the General's action going on? The boasted general improvement in plays and acting is largely, we fear, in the imagination of *conscience-troubled Christian supporters of the theatre*!

## MIXED ACTING AND EXCITEMENT.

“Take the two great divisions of the drama—tragedy and comedy. Tragedy deals as a matter of course with the crimes of men, and either has a fatal issue, or a fatal issue narrowly escaped, and a termination which has been skilfully concealed! Comedy deals with the foibles, the faults, and what are termed the lighter sins of man. How are you going to make a popular entertainment, unless you mingle these in a most dangerous way? It never was done, and it never will be done, because the excitement cannot be produced. We affirm on the testimony of a theatrical man, that four out of every five in a theatrical audience consist of persons between fifteen and thirty years of age, and such persons fond of excitement will not pay to see a play in which there is little or no provision for the stimulation of the passions. The inexorable law that they that live to please *must* please to live, has kept the theatre down, and will continue to do so.” The Romans and Greeks did not permit mixed dancing. It was reserved for Christian Britain to so do! The idea that whilst such mixed acting continues the stage can be reformed, is a mockery and a snare! Some Christians pay only occasional visits to playhouses. They say “We discriminate, we only go to see good, pure, elevating plays.” Yes, quite so, but when you *do* go, are you not known as a theatre-goer? You cannot put a label on your arm, as you enter the door of a theatre, informing other citizens that you go only to see good plays! *Your influence is that of a theatre-goer*, and nothing else. Responsibility does not end with pure motives.

Whilst some plays may be more or less unobjectionable, you cannot take isolated cases of theatrical representation, as though they could be separated from all the surroundings of the playhouse or music hall in general. There are, of course, good actresses and pure actors; men who desire to have a pure stage, but they run great risks in order to please. The character of all recreation, as of anything else, must be decided, not by a single point in connexion with it, but by its *general tendency and results*.

## CHRISTIAN SANCTION.

The character of those who take part in any secular or musical gathering, and the nature and spirit of the words sung or expressed, must to a great extent determine the propriety of extending to

such entertainments, Christian sanction. At the same time we must take care not to "create artificial sins, there are quite enough of real ones already." We heartily endorse words of a consecrated writer who has recently said that "table games, card games, and costume games are all to be judged by the *people who play them*, rather than the people judged by the games they play. Never play anything which must be put away when the clergyman or minister comes in, or anything that would make you ashamed before the Lord at His coming." It is hardly necessary to observe that there is hardly any recreation, no matter how useful, pure, innocent and elevating, which may not be perverted by being carried to excess. "Let your moderation (in good things) be known unto all men."

#### BALLS AND DANCING PARTIES.

These involve lavish expenditure of time and money, and usually turn night into day, the mind and body being over-excited when they ought to be at rest. The reaction next day must be injurious. These gatherings minister to pride, love of appearance and dress, and appeal to unworthy passions. Personally, we see no objection to girls dancing in the daytime in the open air, by themselves, but we can find no countenance in the Scriptures for *mixed* dancing. We are certainly told by Solomon that there is "a time to dance," but is it a permission, or simply a declaration that there *is a time* when people do dance? He also says there is a time for killing men and a time to die. There are twenty-three passages in the Bible which speak about dancing.

(1) It was a religious act both of the true and of idol worship. (2) It was practised exclusively on joyful occasions, such as national festivals or after great victories. (3) It was performed by maidens only. (4) It was usually performed in the day-time in fields or groves. (5) Men who perverted dancing from a sacred use to purposes of amusement were regarded as infamous. (6) No instances of dancing are found in God's Word in which the two sexes united in the exercise as an act of worship or amusement. (7) Lastly, there is no instance upon record in the Bible of social dancing for amusement except that of the "vain fellows" devoid of shame; of the irreligious families described by Job, which produced increased impiety, and ended in destruction. There is also the case

in the New Testament of Herodias, which terminated in the *rash* vow of Herod and the murder of John the Baptist !

The excitement, surroundings, desires, ambitions and *familiarities* of the ballroom are injurious to health, morals and modesty, and do not tend to humility of spirit, or domestic felicities. As the result of its conversation, attractions, dress and gaieties, do men grow stronger in body, happier in mind or purer in heart ? Simply to ask, what "harm" is there in any amusement, is not the question to be put by followers of Him who "went about doing good."

#### A ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP AND DANCING.

Writing on this subject a Roman Catholic Bishop said : " It is impossible not to regard dances as offensive to Christian modesty and fraught with danger. The attitudes and movements in these dances are manifestly incompatible with a due regard for propriety and decorum. But they are young persons, it will be said, simple and pure-minded, who engage in these dances. I answer—the enemy can find access even to pure minds ; he is too malignant to allow such a favourable opportunity to pass ! Others plead the usages of society ; but we have been warned not to ' conform to this world.' On such occasions a style of dress is witnessed which is painfully indelicate. That a modest young lady should so appear in her own family in such a state is indeed surprising, but that so dressed she should expose herself to the gaze of the miscellaneous gatherings of a ballroom is simply inconceivable ! To such girls I must say, ' You are not your own, you have been purchased at a great price, glorify and bear God in your body, your members are the temples of the Holy Ghost.' " We fear too many young Christians to-day forget St. Paul's admonition, " In like manner that women adorn themselves in modest apparel . . . through good works." The Food Controller has *rationed* many articles ; apparently the Dress Controller has also adopted his policy !

#### HORSE RACES AND BETTING.

It is said that the Puritans of England frowned on all amusements, even of a simple character, and that consequently others of an injurious character sprung up, and hence, in part perhaps, the terrible reaction in the reign of Charles II. We ought to take delight in seeing all God's creatures happy. We do not envy the man who could

never be amused at watching a two-months-old kitten chasing its own tail!

Horse-racing and its *inseparable adjuncts* of the bookmaker, the betting man, and gambling, risks much, with little practical advantage towards breeding horses for farm purposes. During the War, we read letters on this subject in *The Times*, addressed by Newmarket lovers and others, to the Government, but they were not convincing. The Government compromised, not for the first time, about what is injurious, but with no great advantage!

Fortunes, reputations, characters, have all been lost on the racecourse, aye, and life itself, when the object—Money—has missed the owner's grasp! Listen, not to our opinion, which some might say was biassed, but to that of one of the *most successful turf men* of his day. He says, "My campaign on the turf has been a successful one, still, all the success has not prevented frequent disgusts, and I derive anything but unmixed pleasure from this pursuit, even when I win by it. Besides the continued disappointments and difficulties incident to it, which harass the mind, the life it *compels* me to lead, the intimacies arising out of it, the associates, and the war against villainy and treachery, being haunted by continual suspicions, discovering the unworthiness of one's most intimate friends, the *necessity* of insincerity and concealment—sometimes when one feels one ought, and would desire to be most open; then the degrading nature of the occupation, mixing with the lowest of mankind, and absorbed in the business for the sole purpose of *making money*, the consciousness of a sort of degradation of the intellect, the conviction of the deteriorating effects upon the feelings and the understanding which are produced, the sort of dram-drinking excitement of it—all these things and these thoughts *torment me*, and often turn my pleasure into pain!"

Is not this the *bitter wail* of a successful, but disappointed man of the world, who knew he had a character to form, an intellect to cultivate, a soul to save, but who preferred to sink all, *and fill his purse*, rather than to build a character; to gratify his passions rather than enrich his mind, and who *stifled conviction*, until he almost forgot there was a hell to be shunned and a heaven to be gained! It was vanity and vexation of spirit.

Every Christian man or woman, who directly or indirectly associate themselves with that which begets and inflames the

*spirit of gambling*—which proceeds from a spirit of selfishness—lays a train of blasting powder, which at any moment a spark may explode, with disastrous effects. If only young lads who read some of our daily papers with “latest tips,” and servant maids who put their sixpences to back favourite horses, and promoters of whist drives and bridge parties, of raffles, games of cards, which are directly *associated* with gambling, could only hear the *bitter wail* we have quoted, we wonder if such would awaken and alarm the conscience, and save Christian Churches at least from any complicity with such dangerous, unhealthy, and unscriptural methods of raising money for “good and charitable objects”?

#### SPIRITUAL BUT NATURAL.

Soul-winners, who are winsome, and therefore win some, know that there is nothing that gives such deep-rooted joy as seeking to point lost ones to One mighty to save (3 John 4). Life is meant to be a glad sweet song. But even such people need hours of relaxation and change. Some enjoy concerts of praise, as well as concerts of prayer. Most Christians depend for recreation on books, music and conversation, coupled, especially for the young, with tennis, golf, cricket, swimming, driving, walking in the country or by the seashore, or up grand Scotch or Swiss mountains, at suitable times. Singing, reading, debates and conversation are specially adapted for long winter evenings.

As to reading, of course we may become so absorbed as to become selfish. The author of a book, its nature, the design of the writer, the spirit of the characters described, must guide us as to the propriety of giving away, or reading such books. We need to discriminate. Happy intercourse, too, is essential between young people. Such occasions ought to be provided, wisely guarded. Dr. Saleeby reminded us recently at a Conference on the “Moral Reconstruction of Society,” that parents must not shelve their responsibility, but exercise discipline and control; that they must not be dictatorial, but seek to win the confidence of their children; that prayer must be learnt *first* at a mother’s knee, not at school; that fathers must not be institutions nor mothers jealous! A real home, results in the ties of a happy family. More thinking is needed to-day, not so much emotion. We must think out our convictions. We need to watch the stories our children read, and the songs they

sing. But to abstain from good reading or good singing on Saturday will do the soul as little good as abstaining from good meat on Friday.

#### CONSECRATION.

An Irish minister's sane words, recently written, are worth remembering. He says: "If some lovers of classical music did but know the enthralling joy of some simple Gospel hymns, and the uplifting rapture of some psalms of praise, I think their lives would be richer. To live a consecrated life means constant self-denial, and when things that *might be allowed* are so mixed with *evil*, as to baffle us to disentangle them, when liberty may be a snare to others, when amusement may endanger those who contribute it, when recreation threatens to become the *business* of life, when Christ is dishonoured, or the Spirit grieved within me, then—without judging others, it is best for me to walk in the narrow way, and to walk it with a smiling face!" These words of our friend, the Rev. W. Y. Fullerton, are like apples of gold in pictures of silver. "The self-sacrifice in which we have devoted ourselves to God's service, made us also entirely our fellowmen's. For every Christian who gives himself entirely to His service, God has the same honour as His Son; He uses him as an instrument of blessing to others." But we must take prayerful care, that we do not relapse into mere receivers instead of transmitters, of being absorbers instead of radiators of Divine Grace!

On earth for Christ this day, each day, are we

On earth that Christ in us on earth may be.

As He in Heaven our surety doth appear,

And we by faith in Him to God draw near,

So would He now by miracle of grace,

In us through us, draw near to our poor race.

God *make each life*, through sacrifice, a way

Whereby the Christ may reach some soul, each day!

J. T. BUDD.



## REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

## PASTORAL LIFE AND WORK.

PASTORAL LIFE AND WORK OF TO-DAY. By the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Lichfield, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 6s. net.

In the preface the Bishop declares that this book owes its existence to the leisure of convalescence from illness, and modestly disclaims originality. None the less the writer has brought forth much that is new from the treasures of experience accumulated in six different parishes. The Bishop lays stress on the necessity for a complete and up-to-date treatise on pastoral theology, and emphasizes the fact that at least one volume of such a treatise should be devoted to the all-important, but too little studied, subject of moral theology.

Though employing the term Church in reference specially to the Church of England, the writer "does not for a moment overlook the great contributions which other communions have made to the moral and spiritual life of the nation."

As might be expected in a work by Bishop Kempthorne, the outstanding features are deep spirituality, wide experience and sound common sense.

After a short introduction, the reader is brought face to face with the aim in Pastoral Work—as viewed from the standpoint of Christ, the Church and the Minister. Then follow fourteen chapters dealing with the subjects, the Priest, Worship, Evangelists, Preachers and Teachers, Holy Baptism and Confirmation, Holy Communion, Personal Dealing, the Home, the School, Organization of a Parish, the Church and the Social Movement, Study, Self-discipline, the Devotional Life of the Priest.

In the chapter entitled "Our Aim," the clergy are brought face to face with matters of primary importance—"to bring men into union with God." "The principal business is conversion, the bringing men into union with God and into active co-operation with His purpose of love to the world. If the Church is not out to seek and to save, it is faithless to Christ" (p. 13).

The chapter on the Ministry declares Christianity to be "a priestly religion, for mediation implies priesthood"—but this might be said of other religions. It is true that "the sacerdotalism of the Christian religion rests wholly and absolutely on the priesthood of our Lord" (p. 17), and it is well to be reminded that "we cannot insist too often or too strongly that the whole Church and every one who belongs to it has a real priesthood" (p. 19). But one would like to see that side of the priesthood of the ministry more emphasized which sets it forth as representative of the Church.

There is much that is wise in the chapter on Worship, particularly with regard to the style of the services and the character of the hymns; but we meet more than once with the misleading and unhistorical statement, "the Church's ancient principle of fasting communion" (pp. 31 and 81).

The Duty of the Church, which is "a missionary fellowship," "To preach the whole Gospel to the whole world is the whole business of the whole Church." First among the qualities required in an evangelist is this—"If we are to convert others we must be converted anew ourselves" (p. 48).

Sound and healthy advice is given to Preachers and Teachers in Chapter VI; and it is pointed out that new religions, like "Christian Science" and "Spiritualism," would never have existed if the Church had preached the whole faith: "their strength lies in the element of truth which their weird errors contain, or even conceal" (p. 65).

The Bishop regards twelve years as the normal minimum age for Confirmation, "with a loop-hole in quite special cases." It is unfortunate that the minimum is not put a year higher. He declares that "he finds himself" in complete agreement with Bishop Gore's "Body of Christ" (p. 79, note), which is rather surprising, and proceeds to claim that the Bishops have the right to permit "reservation." He even says there is "a strong case for allowing perpetual reservation, at certain convenient centres, and especially in Hospitals, to provide for special emergencies" (p. 81). The testimony was borne before the Commission on Ritual that such special emergencies had not arisen in the experience of many parish clergy of varied schools of thought. But the Bishop deprecates strict rigorism with regard to fasting communion.

Parochial visiting is wisely insisted upon and the organization of the parish is based upon spiritual principles from which the narrow "parochial" element is wholly absent.

The Church and the Social Movement is a valuable chapter and timely. The Bishop, who is chairman of the Christian Social Union, gives an excellent résumé of the position, which should stimulate clergy to read and study this important question.

The Pastoral Life of the Clergy is dealt with in the last three chapters, in which the Bishop sets a high level and shows how it may be attained.

This is a very valuable book and young clergy would do well to read and weigh its every chapter. Amid so much that is excellent, it seems captious to take exception to any part of it.

#### TRANSLATIONS OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

- (i) THE OCTAVIUS OF MINUCIUS FELIX. By J. H. Freeze. 3s. 6d. net.  
 (ii) ST. DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA, Letters and Treatises. By C. L. Feltoe, D.D. 3s. 6d. net. (iii) THE LAUSIAC HISTORY OF PALLADIUS. By W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D. 5s. net. (iv) ST. AMBROSE "ON THE MYSTERIES" AND THE "TREATISE ON THE SACRAMENTS," by an Unknown Author. By T. Thomson, B.D., and J. H. Srawley, D.D. 4s. 6d. net. All published by S.P.C.K.

(i) *The Octavius*. Marcus Minucius Felix was a heathen lawyer in Rome and was converted to Christianity late in life. His book entitled the *Octavius* was written sometime between A.D. 160 and 250 for the educated heathens, and has been described as "the pearl of apologetics." It is really a dialogue between Caecilius Natalis, an opponent of Christianity, and Octavius, a representative of the new religion. Caecilius's objections are for the most part singularly modern, and anticipate most of the attacks which have been levelled against Christianity during the last two or three centuries. The book shows what kind of distorted notions the heathen entertained about Christian creed and life. For instance, they accused Christians of worshipping an ass's head, of murdering infants and drinking their blood, and of practising the most abominable incest at their feasts. Octavius, in his defence, makes no reference to Christ or to specific Christian dogmas. He appeals solely to reason and to heathen poets and philosophers. His reasoning is so convincing that Caecilius is converted to Christianity. The translation is well made, the footnotes are most valuable, and the introduction gives all the information a student may need.

(ii) *St. Dionysius* was converted to Christianity by the reading of St. Paul's letters. Having studied under Origen, he became the Head of the famous Catechetical School of Alexandria in A.D. 230. In his treatise *On*

*Nature* he undertakes to refute the Atomic Theory of Epicurus and his followers. In 247 he became Bishop, and took a prominent part in all the leading movements and controversies of the day, such as baptism by heretics, Sabellianism and millennium. Dr. Feltoe has given us here an accurate translation of some of the letters of Dionysius, and some extracts from his treatises *On the Promises*, *On Nature*, and *Refutations and Defence*. It is in the treatise *On Promises* that the Bishop, like a modern higher critic, advances arguments to prove that the book of Revelation could not have been written by St. John who wrote the Gospel and the Epistles.

(iii) *The Lausiaca*. Palladius was born in Galatia in 363 or 364. Having adopted a monastic life, he went to Egypt and spent some years in a district in the desert called *Cellia* from the multitude of its cells. In the year 400 he was consecrated Bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia and soon became involved in the controversies which centred round St. John Chrysostom. The *Lausiaca History* was written in 419-420, for the edification of Lausus, who was a *praepositus* or chamberlain at the Court of Theodosius II. It is a collection of tales and legends about the monks and nuns in Egypt and district. Some of the tales are edifying, others are fantastic and grotesque. Still, for the students of monasticism they are important. The translation is based on Abbot Butler's revised text.

(iv) *St. Ambrose*. This volume contains two treatises. The one *On the Mysteries* is probably by St. Ambrose, and consists of addresses given by him in Easter week to those who had been baptized on Easter Eve. The other, entitled *On Sacraments*, is evidently by an unknown author who lived in the early part of the fifth century. Dr. Srawley contributes a good introduction and notes. Unfortunately one cannot be sure that the texts have come to us as St. Ambrose and the unknown author wrote them. There are clear evidences that the texts have been tampered with by later monks in the interest of transubstantiation.

KHODADAD E. KEITH.

### THE LIFE BEYOND.

THE DREAM THAT COMES TRUE. A BOOK OF THE LIFE BEYOND THE HORIZON.  
By J. Napier Milne. London: *The Epworth Press*. 5s. net.

Mr. Milne is a Wesleyan Minister and he dedicates his book, published on the eve of his departure to New Zealand, to his many friends in the Circuits in which he has served, "whose kindness and appreciation will remain, through all the years, a gracious and inspiring memory." These friends, and many more to whom the writer will be but a name, owe him a debt of gratitude for the message contained in this delightful volume. Many books have been published recently upon the subject of the After-life, and he is indeed a bold man who ventures to add to the number, but every one who reads this will put it down with the feeling that Mr. Milne has accomplished his task with conspicuous success, and we prophesy that his book will live and not die.

Nor does he pass unnoticed Sir Conan Doyle's *New Revelation*. "Think," he says, "of the Table at which we have communion with our Lord, and then picture the tilting, dancing table at which people are supposed to have communion with their departed friends. What a descent!" On the subject of prayer for the departed he is cautiously reserved. Naturally he reminds us that Dr. Forsyth, "the doughtiest and most passionately orthodox theologian in Nonconformity," has advocated a return to the ancient Christian custom, and has declared his conviction that the doctrine would never have been lost to Protestantism but for the gross abuses of the Roman Church.

The chapter on Judgment and Destiny is suggestive, but at the same time loyal to what is "written." Very inspiring is the chapter on the Life of the World to Come, enriched like other parts of the book with apt quotations from prose and poetry. Indeed to the volume as a whole we may fitly apply the author's words, used in another connexion, and describe it as "gracious and inspiring."

In a popular but at the same time scholarly way this subject is discussed, and every page shows how widely Mr. Milne has read. He has—by way of example—an effective quotation from Dr. Horton on the subject of Conditional Immortality. It concludes with these words, "I surrendered the doctrine, not because it was disproved but because of its rapid effect upon my own thought. I could not afford to believe, even for a day, that my fellow man is not immortal. . . . You cannot treat men properly if you think they are animals; you can only treat men properly if you know that they are immortal souls."

The claims of Spiritualism are, of course, considered, and after some quotations from Sir Oliver Lodge's *Raymond*, Mr. Milne observes: "It is impossible to believe that these passages are genuine communications from the beyond." On one of Sir Oliver's comments (on the tunnel-boring simile, *Raymond*, p. 100) he says, "His comment is proof, I think, how humour may sometimes desert a man in whom humour is not the least conspicuous quality; and how a man of science may work in departments other than his own without the temper and caution which characterize his investigations in his own department." An observation worth pondering over.

#### A CRITICISM OF MR. WELLS.

MR. WELLS' INVISIBLE KING. A Criticism. By Rev. L. Elliott Binns, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Plymouth. London: S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. net.

A most useful exposure of the fallacies of Mr. H. G. Wells' brilliant, captivating, and therefore very subtle and dangerous book. Mr. Binns is well qualified for his task, for he has an admirable critical faculty, and while he whips Mr. Wells soundly, he has a well-balanced judgment that enables him to discern points that are helpful. He disposes of Mr. Wells "as a prophet"; exposes his prejudice against Christianity, "a handicap to him in his search for religious truth," and charges him with failing to realize the limitations of his knowledge and of the methods which he has adopted. "He resembles," Mr. Binns observes, "the tourist who can write learnedly of the Problems of India after only a few weeks' sojourn in that Empire." He shows that the misstatements in the book are (a) either exaggerations, or (b) statements which are absolutely untrue, or (c) statements which, without being untrue, are yet calculated to give an entirely erroneous impression. He then takes those which come under these several heads. Mr. Wells certainly suffers severe handling, but Mr. Binns emerges triumphant. Nor is he less effective when he deals with the characteristics of Mr. Wells' *Invisible King*—"a reversion to paganism . . . merely a revived Olympian," and as such a poor substitute for the Christ of the Gospels. At the same time, with commendable fairness he (Mr. Binns) admits that there is "much in the teaching contained in the book itself which cannot but commend itself to those who dare in all sincerity and humbleness of heart to call themselves followers of Jesus Christ." We agree with him that this is a book that the Clergy ought to read, as well as "others who have sufficient knowledge to see through its sophistries." He commends Mr. Wells' insistence on the

necessity for sincerity and for the way in which he emphasizes "many of the truths Christians hold most dear," as well as for his "protest against materialism." He frankly recognizes that "unlike so many of the advocates of 'modern religion' he is conscious of what is called the sense of sin. From first to last Mr. Binns reveals himself as an apologist of insight and good temper. He has secured confirmation of many of his statements by effective quotations from a variety of sources, indicating a broad-minded outlook upon the things of others. We hope his book will have the wide circulation it deserves.

S. R. CAMBIE.

#### ST. MARK'S GOSPEL.

ST. MARK, Vol. 3. By Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D. London: R.T.S. 3s. net.

The Devotional Commentaries of the R.T.S. are widely known and appreciated. This is the third volume of Dr. Jones' St. Mark, and it takes us from chapter x. 32 to the end of chapter xiii. The author maintains his reputation for originality, vigour and insight, and those who turn to these pages will find an astonishing amount of suggestion, served up in the pleasing style that is characteristic of everything that comes from the pen or lips of the popular Bournemouth pastor, whose praise is in all the Churches. No difficulty is shirked. He does not, for instance, discuss the differences between the accounts given by the Synoptists of Bartimæus—he simply recognizes them and makes some useful observations on them. He courageously faces the difficulties presented by the cursing of the barren fig-tree and they seem to disappear under his skilful hand. As proof of the insight to which we have referred let one instance suffice. He fastens upon the words "Jesus entered into Jerusalem, and into the Temple." Upon this he remarks, "Surely the terminus of the procession is significant. . . . Had it been an earthly kingdom our Lord was set upon establishing, had it been Herod's or Caesar's throne He wished to occupy, He would have marched, not to the Temple, but to the Castle or the procurator's palace. But Jesus had . . . no wish to sit in Pilate's or Herod's room; and so He bent His steps, not to the palace but to the Temple. . . . Our Lord declared to the world that it was a spiritual kingdom He came to establish."

It is good in these days to read "I believe in what is technically known as the Second Coming of Christ." He is not, however, greatly concerned about the *date*—"What really matters is . . . that when ever the Lord comes we should be ready to receive Him." We cordially welcome this little commentary.

#### THE GOSPEL IN EUROPE.

HOW THE GOSPEL SPREAD THROUGH EUROPE. By Canon C. H. Robinson, D.D., Editorial Secretary of S.P.G. London: S.P.C.K. 5s. net.

"The object," says the author, "has been to emphasize the labours of typical missionaries together with the salient features of their work." The plan adopted is to follow the progress of the Gospel in each country separately. The drawback of this plan is that the reader does not get a general idea of the Church's missionary activity in Europe in any given period. To remedy this, the author has given us at the end a useful general survey and chronological table.

The story of the spread of the Gospel in Europe is not sufficiently known, even in educated circles, and yet it is one of absorbing interest. Canon Robinson is very optimistic as to the Christian Missions to-day. After

showing that physical force had unfortunately a great part in the conversion of Europe, he says :—

“ It took more than a thousand years to secure the nominal conversion to Christianity of the northern half of Europe, but no one who has made a careful study of modern Missions anticipates that a similar space of time will elapse before Christianity has spread throughout the whole world ” (p. 171).

“ When we compare the rate of progress in the principal mission-fields of to-day with that in Europe in the past, and remember that whatever progress has been attained during recent times has been attained without any appeal to physical force, we cannot but face the future with hope and expectation ” (p. 172).

On p. 84 there is a misprint; the date of the coming of Wilfrid is stated to be 861. It ought to be 681. The volume will prove a useful handbook for Study Circles.

### QUESTIONS OF FAITH.

**BELIEF AND CREED.** By Frederic Henry Chase, D.D., Bishop of Ely. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 3s. net.

Last year Canon Glazebrook published his book entitled *The Faith of a Modern Christian*. In this book he claimed that the two clauses of the Apostles' Creed—“ Born of the Virgin Mary,” and “ the third day He rose again from the dead ”—can legitimately be interpreted symbolically. The Bishop of Ely took exception to this in the *Ely Diocesan Gazette*, whereupon the Canon replied in *The Times*. The Bishop, reluctant to carry on controversy in a newspaper, undertook to challenge, on a later occasion, the arguments by which the Canon endeavours to justify his conclusion. The present volume is the outcome of that undertaking and deals only with the Virgin Birth of our Lord and His Resurrection.

It is alleged by opponents of the Virgin Birth that St. John did not believe in it because he does not refer to it in his Gospel. Dr. Chase, after having examined the evidence, says :—

“ I am myself convinced on grounds of literary criticism alone that the writer of the fourth Gospel knew and accepted the story of the Lord's Virgin Birth ” (p. 76). He believes that the story of the Birth ultimately must have rested on the word of the Lord's Mother.

The Bishop also subjects to a severe criticism the Canon's claim to interpret the Resurrection symbolically. This is the work of an exact scholar, profound theologian and scrupulous apologist.

### DR. CAMPBELL ON LIFE'S PROBLEMS.

**PROBLEMS OF LIFE.** By Rev. R. J. Campbell, D.D., Vicar of Christ Church, Westminster. London: *Williams & Norgate.* 7s. net.

This book is a reprint of papers which originally appeared week by week in *The Church Family Newspaper*; consequently they are more or less unrelated. They deal with a bewildering variety of subjects—many of them being, as the title indicates, problems of life. The dark shadow of the Great War was across the face of the country and the hearts of many people when these papers were first written, and there are evidences of this everywhere. Dr. Campbell, as every one knows, has a graphic and arresting style, and his literary work is never slipshod; but it cannot be claimed for these chapters that they reveal a very profound thinker. He is, however, a candid critic, with something, too, of the soul of the prophet. No doubt many persons will find their perplexities touched upon in one or other of these forty-seven papers, and those who read them will be glad to have them in a permanent form.

## CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

MANY causes have led to the spread of Spiritualism during the last few years. So many have been bereaved there is a natural anxiety to know all that we can about the future state. Even those who do not really believe in the ordinary methods of Spiritualists are anxious to find out if there is any communication between this world and those who have passed from it. Many are prepared to make experiments in order to see if there is any truth in the claims that have been made. This tendency has been increased by the more or less scientific support that has been given in the efforts of the Psychical Research Society and in the works of Dr. Myers and Sir Oliver Lodge, and the active propaganda which its votaries are now engaged in. There seems to be a natural tendency on the part of large numbers to resort to clairvoyance, crystal gazing, palmistry, and in fact anything of an occult and mysterious nature. It is as well that these movements and the claims that are made for them should be clearly examined in order that a sane view may be maintained. For us as Christians we believe that in the Gospel life and immortality are brought to light—we believe that the dead in Christ are in His safe keeping, and that as we are in Him we are one with them in Him. We can maintain our closest communication with their Lord and ours, and in Him we can realize our oneness with them. There is little use in mere denunciation, but there is considerable value in a careful and clear examination of the whole subject.

---

Bishop Hassé in a little booklet (2d. net) has dealt with Spiritualism, its character, teaching, and effects, and we recommend it to those who are interested in the subject, and especially to those who are willing to be taught what may be learnt from the Scriptures. We believe that there are schools for the young in some parts of the country to teach Spiritualism. It would be well if those who read this pamphlet would use the information that he gives to point out to parents the dangers of allowing their children to imbibe such teaching. The chapters in this pamphlet deal with the true nature and character of Spiritualism, the attitude of Spiritualism towards Christ and the Holy Scriptures, the effects of Spiritualism on its votaries.

---

Other pamphlets on this subject which would repay reading are *Spiritualism, what it is and what it leads to*, by the Rev. E. W. Moore, M.A. (1d. net); *Spiritualism exposed*, by Mrs. J. B. Horton (1s. 6d. net); and *Modern Spiritualism briefly tested by Scripture*, by A. J. Pollock (2d. net).

---

Dr. Dowden, the late Bishop of Edinburgh, stated that "No one who desires to make a critical and historical inquiry into the subject of the doctrine of the Church of England in regard to the Sacraments can afford to dispense with a minute and thorough study of the Rev. N. Dimock's works on the subject." He went on to say that "For solid learning, not only in the authoritative documents of the Reformation period, but in the writings of the great divines

**The Rev. N.  
Dimock's  
Books.**

of the Church of England, Mr. Dimock is quite unrivalled." We mention two books which contain special reference to the questions of Reservation and Adoration which are still being thrust upon us so urgently. *Eucharistic Worship in the Church of England* (2s. 6d. net) contains very abundant evidence of the vast range of Mr. Dimock's reading and scholarship. It is a general examination into the history and origin of the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence in the Eucharist, and of the adoration which is its necessary complement. The author quotes from leading Anglican divines such as Hooker and Bishop Morton, and the whole argument is enforced by liberal quotations from the early fathers and other authors, but even those who have "little Latin and the less Greek" will be at no loss to catch the spirit of this treatise, which we can confidently recommend. *Some Notes on the Conference held at Fulham Palace in October, 1900, on the Doctrine of the Holy Communion and its expression in Ritual* (2s. net) is the other book particularly valuable in studying the present controversy. The general purpose of the notes is to examine some statements set forth at the Conference, and to find the exact point at which divergence of opinion begins. Mr. Dimock quotes from various authorities, and it is interesting to note that with regard to the presentation of the sacrifice, he points out that in the Eastern Churches the most solemn signs of apparent adoration are exhibited when the unconsecrated elements are brought in with the ceremony which accompanies the greater entrance.

---

*Papers on the Doctrine of the Church of England concerning the Eucharistic Presence* (2 vols., 5s. net). In these two volumes Mr. Dimock has gathered

**Eucharistic Presence Papers.** together such a collection of statements as render his position incontrovertible. He gives us the views of four great Archbishops of Canterbury at the Reformation time, Cranmer, Parker, Grindal and Whitgift, on the question of the Real Presence in the elements; then he turns to the reformers of Henry VIII's and Edward VI's reigns, and gives the views of men like Tyndale, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper and Hutchinson, and then he adds quotations from the divines of Elizabeth's time, including Beza, Jewel, Hooker and Rogers. These all provide an overwhelming mass of evidence as to the rejection by the reformers of any teaching implying a change in the elements. The second volume continues the examination of the formularies of the Church, and treats especially of the order of the administration of the Lord's Supper, upon which a series of appendices are added, accumulating a mass of evidence which it will be impossible to find collected in any other volume. The Thirty-nine Articles close the actual examination of the authorised books of the English Church.

---

In *Christian Unity: Some Considerations on the Subject* (1s. 6d. net), we have a discussion of the exclusive claims which are made on behalf of an episcopally ordained ministry. This volume exhibits very strikingly Mr. Dimock's characteristics of learning, fairness, and love of peace. He is a convinced Episcopalian, and abates no jot of the rightful claims of episcopacy. But he will have none of the view which would unchurch all non-episcopal bodies and invalidate their ministry.

---

A full list of Mr. Dimock's books can be sent on application to the Church Book Room, and copies can be seen at the National Church League stall at the Ecclesiastical Art Exhibition at the coming Church Congress.