

# 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, 1917.

## The Month.

**The Evangelical Position.** THE "Modern" Churchmen have had their Conference at Cambridge, and now "Evangelical" Churchmen are in Conference at Cheltenham. The meetings are being held just as we go to press and we must reserve until next month any detailed comment on the proceedings. But there are one or two things in connexion with the Evangelical position which may be said here and now. We hope—indeed we feel confident—the Conference will prove of much greater usefulness to the Church at large, than did the Conference of the Modernists. The Cambridge utterances—or most of them—were very unsatisfying. Where they were not nebulous, they challenged opposition, and some of the things which were stated—*e.g.* that it did not really matter what our Lord said with regard to marriage, except that one was naturally influenced by what so great a soul thought and said—were distinctly painful. Whatever else it may be, or may not be, the Cheltenham message, we may be sure, will not contain anything so offensive as that. Nor will it give forth any uncertain sound on Foundation Principles. That is not the trouble with Evangelicals just now. There can be no doubt at all but that the Evangelical School of Thought is thoroughly sound upon Fundamentals; indeed we are persuaded that there is no School of Thought within the Church which holds more firmly, more devotedly and more loyally all the Essential Truths of the Christian Faith. And yet the party—the word has slipped through almost unconsciously—is sadly riven by internal differences and internecine strife, which weaken its witness and paralyse its influence; and men everywhere are asking what is to be the end of it all? If some of the

younger men appear to the seniors to be provokingly aggressive, it must in fairness be remembered that the seniors appear to the younger men to be perverse and obstinate in setting up as essentials what they (the younger men) regard only as accidentals. It is sad ; it is pathetic, it is almost tragic when we see the superb opportunities for witness and service which lie ready, to their hands, and are being slowly but surely lost. No other School of Thought has a message to the Church and the world at all comparable in magnificence and power to that which Evangelicals could proclaim on the strength of the eternal principles enshrined in Evangelicalism ; and the times are calling to them to step out into the conflict against the world and the devil. Why, then, should men, with such a power in their hands, spend their time and energy and strength over unhappy domestic controversies ? Is there no remedy ? Is the breach between the young and the old never to be healed ? Is unity—real unity—impossible of attainment ? If the answer to these questions were to be in the negative it would not need much prescience to discern something of the nature of the disaster which would follow. But we have good hope that some remedy *will* be found ; that the breach *will* be healed, and that unity *will* be attained, because we believe that there is still much work for Evangelicals to do which must be done by them and can be done by no one else.

The Cheltenham Conference, though not called primarily, as far as we understand, to deal with internal dissensions, must exercise a most wholesome influence upon the fortunes of the party. Men cannot meet together for prayer and Conference “in view of the urgency”—to quote the words of the official invitation—“of arriving at a Common Platform on such subjects as the ‘Kikuyu problems’ and the Church and State Proposals of the Archbishops’ Committee” without being drawn nearer to each other, and that, as it seems to us, is the real question of “urgency” for Evangelicals at the present time. We could have wished indeed that the Cheltenham Conference had been called more directly for that purpose ; yet, perhaps, it is better as it is, leaving to another time—not too far distant we hope—the holding of a Round Table Conference for the express purpose of coming to a working agreement. But now to

come to closer contact with the Cheltenham programme. The principal papers arranged for were as follows:—

“ ‘ Christ’s Church Militant here in Earth.’ Its Mission : Its Message : Its Ministry ” (the Rev. J. R. Darbyshire). “ The Historical Attitude of the Church of England Towards other Churches ” (The Rev. H. A. Wilson). “ Practical Steps Towards Unity ” : (1) “ Fundamental Beliefs ” (the Rev. F. S. Guy Warman, D.D.), (2) “ The Mission Field ” (G. A. King, Esq.), (3) “ Church Organization ” (the Rev. W. H. Green, LL.B.), (4) “ Intercommunion ” (the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton, B.D.), (5) “ Interchange of Pulpits and Social Work ” (the Rev. F. C. Davies). “ Our Attitude Towards the Report of the Archbishops’ Committee on Church and State ” (the Rev. Dawson Walker, D.D.).

These are important questions ; they are urgent questions, and we are justified in believing that the Cheltenham Conference will offer a wise and reasonable solution of the many problems involved.

We are able to refer to two of the papers as they appeared in full in the *Record* of September 20. The Rev. J. R. Darbyshire, dealing with “ ‘ Christ’s Church Militant here in Earth ’ ” emphasized the fact that the Christian religion is one :—

Unity and Diversity.

There are religions many, making peculiar claims of divine revelation. Christians believe that a supreme revelation came by Jesus Christ, and separated as they are unhappily from one another, yet they claim to belong to one religion ; nay, more, to one Church. But while we cannot rightly speak of varying Christian religions we can speak of Churches in the plural without falsity, for though the Church is one, its unity includes many elements or parts. The Church of Christ is one because we have one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, yet it is manifold because the limitation of time and space differentiate the Church militant from the Church triumphant, and the varieties of nationality and temperament demand varieties of worship and organization. There must be Churches as well as the Church. Much thought has been spent upon the problem of finding the principle of unity beneath this unavoidable multiplicity and variety. Controversy has raged around the terms the Church visible and invisible. I venture to submit to you that hopeful discussion will rather start from and be constantly mindful of the Church indivisible. We shall discover the *mission, the message, and the ministry* of the Church militant here on earth, and arrive at some just assignment of the functions of local and national Churches by aspiring in reverent thought to the sublimity of the divine idea and viewing the Church in its magnificent totality. We shall do well to let our every thought re-echo the tones of those ancient phrases whose very form and history unite us with ages long past and experiences widely different from our own—“ *Sursum corda : Habemus ad Dominum.*”

Then in a wonderfully suggestive passage he drew a contrast between the unity of the Church triumphant and divisions of the Church militant :—

The Church triumphant is what it is because its members are tasting the fruits of the victory of that for which they long contended. The struggle involved for them, as it still does for us, a multitude of tragic skirmishes in the mists during which the hosts of darkness snatched many an undeserved success because in the obscurity brother turned against brother, and the ranks that should have been united mistook each other for the foe. But such mistakes should become less frequent. They can only become so as we cultivate the consciousness of the great cloud of witness all about us, and remember that we do not fight alone. They that are with us are more than they that are against us. If, as we know, the Christ by His victory and enthronement makes prevailing intercession for us, is it not further true that the triumphant host of His faithful saints is an ever-increasing auxiliary force, assisting us in ways beyond our comprehension, inspiring us not only to hopefulness but to clear-sighted recognition of the character of our conflict ?

If hopes were dupes, fears may be liars :  
 It may be in yon clouds concealed,  
 Your comrades chase e'en now the fliers,  
 And but for you, possess the field.

The unity of the saints triumphant is the unity of a company arrived at the City of God—a city that is at unity with itself ; a company to whom the question as to which of the twelve ever-open gates gave them entrance is indifferent : the divisions of the Church militant are the disputes as to which of the twelve gates afford a valid entry. To change the metaphor, the unity of the Church triumphant is the possession of a common experience of eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord ; the divisions of the Church militant are the quarrels as to the legitimacy of the bodies in which that life is manifested here on earth.

Dr. Guy Warman's paper on Fundamental Beliefs contrasted Essentials and Accidentals. Quoting the **Evangelical Principles.**

Dean of Westminster he referred to these three principles to which Evangelicals owe special allegiance : (a) Holy Scripture is the one absolute standard of Christian doctrine and conduct. (b) Complete liberty of conscience and the right of private judgment are the prerogatives of the believer in Christ. (c) The National Church is independent of all foreign control. From these three principles Evangelicalism, he said, proceeded to postulate three others as typical of and essential to its position in the Church : 1. The direct access of every soul to God through Christ. 2. The all-sufficiency of Christ as the Saviour of every one who comes to Him. 3. The gift of the Holy Spirit to all who thus accept Him. These three points Dr. Guy Warman elaborated with much illuminating power, but we can only quote the concluding passages of his impressive paper :—

Evangelicalism must stand firm upon its fundamentals ; it can afford to be generous about accidentals. I believe, perhaps I am biased, it will

endanger its fundamentals if it arrays itself, as a whole, against either Church Reform or Prayer Book Revision. Our assurance of the priesthood of the whole Church should make us anxious that the laity should have a real voice in the government of the Church, and although I do not ask for acceptance of every detail I do crave a "second reading" approval of the Report on Church and State. Our proclamation of a Gospel for all should make us anxious that our service book should meet the needs of the day. Individually we all revise the Prayer Book, corporately we should be on the side of such an authorized revision as shall maintain the doctrinal balance, and at the same time meet the felt needs of both the man in the street, the loyal High Churchmen, and the cultured and thoughtful laymen. Moreover, an authorized revision will make it much easier to deal with unauthorized disloyalty. With our own preferences as to ritual we can be patient of the preferences of others like-minded with ourselves in matters of fundamental truth. Although I normally take the north end myself, I confess I have little sympathy with those who would regard the Eastward Position as disloyal to the Evangelical school. Ritual can never of itself be fundamental.

Finally, with reference to our Nonconformist brethren, while we hold to the historic episcopate as both scriptural and primitive and Catholic, it does seem to me that our principles almost compel us to recognize the ministries of our separated brethren, though they be ordered on other lines than ours. We recognize Roman orders, why not Presbyterian?

We want the Church to be fully Catholic. Fidelity to fundamental truth is an essentially Catholic principle, and we must see to it that we do not obscure our fidelity by prejudice or narrowness. We must abide by the Word of the Lord, but we must not go beyond it. For it still seems to lay upon the Church no greater burden than those necessary things. I would close with a word of appeal—of appeal for unity among ourselves, for mutual understanding and considerateness. Ours is a splendid opportunity, but we must show a united front. I stand perhaps between youth and age. I respect and reverence those who have borne the burden of the day before me; I love, and I think I understand the younger men who with real earnestness and true spirituality are facing the problems before us. We cannot all think alike. God has given us reason and conscience, a real right, within the limits of truth, of private judgment. It is not for us to ignore or condemn or exclude. It is for us to pray, to work, to teach, to live in happy harmony, "we few, we happy few, we band of brothers."

If only this appeal for internal unity were responded to the whole outlook would be quickly changed.

An agitation is being set on foot in the name of  
 Divorce Law Reform. "Divorce Law Reform," in support of the following  
 draft Bill which *The Times* tells us some people wish  
 the Government to adopt—

1. This Act may be cited as the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1917.
2. From and after the passing of this Act, all decrees for judicial separation and all orders for a separation by any Court of Summary Jurisdiction shall, after a period of three years from the date thereof, have the same effect and force as a decree absolute for dissolution of marriage; provided always that either the husband or wife so separated shall make application therefor to the Court which has made the decree or order in question, and satisfy the

said Court that cohabitation has not been resumed during the said period of three years.

3. It shall also be lawful for any husband or wife to present a petition to the High Court of Justice, praying that his or her marriage may be dissolved on the ground that they have been continuously separated for the said period of three years, whether by mutual agreement or for any other reason.

This is an amazing proposition, and we associate ourselves with the *Church Times*, which pungently points out that so far as legal recognition is concerned, "this Bill reduces marriage to the level of concubinage. It makes the union of man and woman practically terminable at the will of either party. Husband or wife has but to go apart; the law will not compel cohabitation; after three years the legal union will be dissolved. But the power to determine the connection at will is precisely what distinguishes concubinage from marriage. The Bill is therefore a Bill for the abolition of Marriage."

The "reform" proposed by the draft Bill is warmly championed by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Lord Gorell, but not content with discussing the practical side of the question they have ventured to enter into the historical aspect of the matter. But history, apparently, is not their strong point. Professor Whitney, the great Church historian, has completely pulverized the contention that Christian tradition supports their advocacy of divorce. He points out that the Report of the Royal Commission says (p. 12) that in the Middle Ages there was a rule "abolishing, theoretically at least, all absolute divorce from the Western Church." Then (p. 13) the Council of Trent "finally settled the Canon Law of Divorce," "preserving the essential features of that law." In England (p. 20) "from the Restoration onwards to 1857 the Legislature alone granted the complete divorce." That is, the English Church would have nothing to do with it. After the Commonwealth (p. 22) "the mind of the Church of England was at last convinced that there could be no divorce *a vinculo*," a view amply supported even for an earlier period by Sir Lewis Dibdin in his "English Church Law and Divorce." "There is," he adds, "no ground for supposing any departure by it from the general Christian teaching." Nor is this the extent of his exposure. Against Sir A. Conan Doyle's contention that "all Christian nations are more liberal than ourselves in dealing with this subject," Professor Whitney sets the following facts also taken from the Report :

In Italy no divorce is permitted (p. 22) ; in Austria it exists only for Protestants and Jews (p. 21) ; in Newfoundland there is no law of divorce, and in Quebec, Ontario, and Manitoba, and the newer Provinces it is possible only by private Acts of the Dominion Parliament (p. 19). It is not often that misstatements are so promptly and so effectively disposed of.

**Canonical Obedience.** The following Note by the Bishop of Oxford is of great interest—

I have always interpreted the oath of "canonical obedience" to the bishop which is taken by the presbyter as meaning "obedience according to the rules or canons of the Church," to which the bishop also is subject. This comes to much the same thing as the interpretation of the words given by the Courts of Law (see Phillimore, *Eccl. Law*, vol. 1, p. 103): "The oath of canonical obedience does not mean that the clergyman will obey all the commands of the bishop against which there is no law, but that he will obey all such commands as the bishop by law is authorized to impose." But I prefer the interpretation given above. It has, however, been objected to me that Bishop John Wordsworth (see his *Life*, p. 169) defined canonical obedience as "obedience such as befits a canonical person. It is not obedience to the rules and canons of the Church as some, rather trivially, explain it. . . . The word 'canonical' is, in this sense, derived from *κανών* signifying a roll or register, rather than from *κανών* in the sense of a rule. Canonical obedience is that due from a man on the clerical roll to him whose name stands at the head of it, under whom he chooses to place himself." I have the greatest respect for John Wordsworth's learning; but in this case I believe he was mistaken. Thomassin *Vetus et Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina* (De Beneficiis lib. ii., capp. 44-46) discusses the origin and meaning of clerical oaths and gives many references. I think that, though these chapters contain no definition, they show conclusively that the term "obediencia canonica" or "canonice obedire" means obedience according to the canons and rules of the Church.

A The unfortunate omission from Mr. Fisher's Education Bill of all attempt to deal with the religious instruction question may have serious results. Already the Rationalist Press Association has passed a resolution which, while welcoming the education proposals of Mr. Fisher, goes on to express the view that "the only just solution (of the religious difficulty) is to confine instruction in all State-supported schools to subjects now officially described as secular in the English educational code." This, however, is not the sort of "solution" which would be acceptable to the country, and it is worthy of note that this Association, which represents, we imagine, a very small fraction of the population, seeks to force its views upon the great majority of the people, who are anxious that religious education

should form a definite part of a child's training. Its proposal, were it adopted, would strike a blow at the cause of freedom, and would be bitterly resented. It is, however, no new experience in the education controversy to find strong partisans endeavouring to coerce others by imposing their views upon those who are diametrically opposed to them. During the struggles of a few years ago a section of Nonconformity, which has always opposed the definite Christian instruction for which Church schools have ever stood, was keenly anxious that, if there were to be religious education at all, it should be of only one type, undenominational in tone and character, quite regardless of the fact that such a system would not only be unsatisfying to a very large section of the community, but would be regarded also as a direct violation of the most cherished religious convictions of those who desired that their children should be educated in the faith which they, their parents, professed. But, happily, the plan failed.

**What is the  
Solution?**

It is obvious that a righteous solution of the religious education difficulty must be found; and if the question were only faced with courage and resolution, agreement ought not to be impossible. It will never be arranged on the lines of the programme of the Rationalist Press Association, for the country has always been against the secular solution; and now, more than ever, since it has seen in the case of Germany the appalling results which must ensue whenever moral sanctions and moral restraints have been thrown to the winds, it is determined that religion must enter into the education of the young. As the Bishop of Carlisle recently said, without religion both individual and national life is incomplete; in its absence there is neither sanction nor security for morals, neither cement nor stability for domestic or social life; and we feel persuaded, therefore, that Mr. Fisher will find himself compelled to deal with the problem if he desires his scheme of education reform to be of real service to the country. The broad principles which must govern any settlement of the question are apparent. Provision must be made for equality of opportunity for all, and there must be coercion for none. The rights of Church parents must be safeguarded equally with those of Nonconformist parents. The policy so long advocated by Churchmen is the only one which will meet the difficulty equitably and

justly. The key to the situation is to be found in the whole-hearted recognition of the rights of parents to have their children educated in the faith which they themselves profess, and that, too, by teachers qualified by conviction and faith to give such education. The adoption of such a policy would satisfy every legitimate aspiration and would infringe upon the liberties of none.



## The Psalms and their Interpretation.

**A**MONG the many blessings which are the direct outcome of this war stands first the quickened sense of devotion. Never was the world so painfully conscious of its need of God. Never in the history of mankind has there been such a giving up of old gods and such an inquiry among heathen and civilized nations alike for Him Who is the Truth, the Life and the Way, by Whom alone man cometh to the Father. Voluntarily or involuntarily men are learning to pray, according to the promise :

“ O Thou that hearest prayer,  
Unto Thee shall all flesh come ” (Ps. lxxv. 2).

“ All the ends of the earth shall remember themselves and be turned unto the Lord.

And all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Him ” (Ps. xxii. 27).

Of the innumerable books of devotion that this war has already evoked there is nothing to equal the Psalms. They have been called the looking-glass of the soul. But they are more. In the Psalms we see sketched as by the divine hand of the divine Physician a spiritual pathology fitted to the use of the Church Universal in every stage of her pilgrim career. What is the secret of their power ?

(1) In the first place the Psalms exhibit *the close PERSONAL contact of the soul with God*—that intimate converse with God such as Moses had “ with whom the Lord spake face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend ” ; such as John had when he says of himself and of his fellow-Christians at Ephesus : “ Truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ ” ; such as we ourselves may have according to His promise Who said : “ We will come unto him and make our abode with him.” There are, alas, not many men of whom this can be said. But David was one, a man of “ royal disposition ” (Ps. li. 12), a man of exquisite sensitiveness of soul (Ps. xxxv. 3), and yet so human, so approachable, so versatile that in him a whole world of experiences seems to reproduce itself. He was the incarnation and flower of the Jewish nation :

“ A man so varied that he seem'd to be  
Not one, but all mankind's epitome.”

In him the Divine and human seemed to meet. He was one of those

“elect” souls who “knew” that his prayers were always answered (iv. 3). He “loved” Jehovah with a peculiar personal love (xviii. 1), and felt that he was “chosen to approach” the living God (lxv. 4). To him, and to him only of all the authors of the Psalms that have come down to us, was it granted to prophesy *directly* of Christ to come. The first two books of the Psalms, which close with Psalm lxxii (concluding with the words: “The prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended,”), close also, with one exception, all the *direct* prophecies of Christ to come. And that exception, Psalm cx., is itself also a Psalm of David’s.

Again (2) the Psalms present a *great VARIETY of religious experience*. The mere editing of the Psalter covers five hundred years of Jewish history. In that range of time how many things had happened—the fall and the restoration of the Monarchy, the founding and revival of the order of Prophets, the schism and the captivity of the Ten Tribes, the reforms of Josiah and Hezekiah and the invasions of Shishak from Egypt and of Sennacherib from Assyria, the Jewish exile and its return from Babylon, the building of the first and the second Temple—what a host of memories are conjured up at the bare recital! The Psalms are the inner reflection of that race that was being specially prepared and made “perfect through sufferings” to provide in due time a maternal bosom for the Son of Man. For “Salvation” was “of the Jews.” It was from them that “after the flesh Christ came Who is God over all the for ever Blessed. Amen.”

But (3) the chief undying interest of the Psalms consists in the fact that *the Jews were a TYPICAL people*. They lived not for themselves but for the world. Their experiences were not for an age but for all time. They formed, so to speak, the soul of mankind, of which other nations formed the body. Their history was in a special manner a religious history in which all mankind could see themselves typically represented. In them God worked out His purposes as on a divine theatre. In their history could be seen as on a placard the legible writing of the Divine Hand. Other nations had, of course, a religious history. But the Jewish history was nothing but a religious history. They had no secular history. Their government, as Josephus was the first to point out, was a theocracy. God was their King. And God alone, it has been well said, was the only hero of their national literature! How God dealt with this nation was an image of how God deals with all nations. Their

history, then, was a "parable" (Ps. lxxviii. 2, Mt.) of things to come. "The things that happened unto them happened by way of TYPES" of that future universal Church which Christ was yet finally to set up (I Cor. x. 11, *ἐν τύποις*).

Let us examine some of these *types*. In the youthful David's fortunes before and after he ascended the throne, how deep and malignant was the treachery of Saul and his satellites, Doeg the Edomite, Cush (i.e., Shimei) the Benjamite, and even Ahitophel, Joab and Abiathar, his own former friends and accomplices, in turning him from the throne and utilizing his own sons, Absalom and Adonijah, in the general conspiracy against "the man after God's own heart"! In all this we see the first sketches of that spirit of ANTI-CHRIST, who, as the history of the Jews rolled on, was to reappear as Judas in the life of the Son of David and, later still, in the history of Messiah's followers was to persecute and betray to the Roman authorities the infant Christian Church! Those terrible imprecatory Psalms from liii. to lxiv. culminating in the awful retribution of Psalms lxix. and cix., have been for the Jews fearfully fulfilled to the letter (as Chrysostom shows) in the last two thousand years. And has not Psalm lix. received in them its special fulfilment—that God's people were to be treated as "heathen," "not" to be "destroyed" but "scattered" even "to the ends of the earth?" These Scriptures Christ and St. Paul and St. Peter quoted in proof that God had foreseen the treachery of His people and had used them as His unconscious instruments to fulfil His sovereign purposes for the world's redemption (John xiii. 18; Acts i. 20; Rom. xi. 8-10).

On the other hand, when the ark was brought from its hiding-place with pomp and sacrifice to Mount Zion David foresees in this ritual action, both as priest and king, the ASCENSION and session of His Son, when "He went up on high and led His long line of captives" (lxviii. 18), when the "eternal gates" of the New Jerusalem "lifted up their heads" to welcome "the King of glory" (xxiv. 7), before He "sat down" as "Priest for ever" on "the right hand" of God (cx. i. 4). As St. Peter truly says: "David seeing this before spake of Christ."

How clearly, too, in the Psalms does David grasp the fact of Messiah's lifelong SACRIFICE of willing obedience when He "came as in the roll of the Law it was prescribed for Him, to do God's will" (xl. 10)!

His "ears" were "bored" as being God's slave (Exod. xxi. 6)—the better to hear His Master's words! (cp. Isa. l. 4)—yielding thus His "body" to be "fashioned" (lxx.; Heb. x. 5) for the Master's use (Ps. xl. 6); until at last He comes to His CRUCIFIXION, when the soldiers "pierce His hands and feet" and "part [His garments among them," and then the taunts of the Jewish rabbis are distinctly heard: "Roll Thy burden upon the Lord *if* He will have Him; let Him *now* deliver Him if He delighteth in Him!" (xxii. 8, 16, 17). To the crucifixion succeeds the RESURRECTION, about which "the sweet psalmist of Israel" rests in confidence that even his "*flesh*" will "dwell securely" when he "wakes up after" the Divine "likeness" (xvi. 11, xvii. 16).

How bitterly, again, does the Psalmist's conscience feel the "hateful" yet universal power of SIN (xxxvi. 2, liii.)! How completely impotent is the law, through the weakness of our sinful flesh, to grapple with it apart from an "imputed righteousness" (xxxii. 1, 2), and the gift of the "Holy Spirit" (li. 11)! St. Paul himself might have written: "Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not (but myself), for Mine ears hast thou pierced open" (xl. 6). Lastly, when David's son, SOLOMON, ascends the throne amid all his rivals, and marries the daughter of the Egyptian king, and extends his conquests by trade and arms over many lands and over many seas, the Psalmist anticipates another aspect of Christ as the Prince of Peace, Who shall espouse the Gentiles to Him for His own Bride, the Church (xlv.), Who shall be accepted as co-regent on His Father's throne, so that all men shall honour, or "kiss, the Son" just as they honour the Father (ii. 12); and of His kingdom there shall be no end (lxxii. 7-11). If ever there were any doubt of the inspiration of Scripture the Psalter alone would supply the refutation. *Here are events of high significance foreshadowed in the life of David and Solomon which were awaiting their more complete fulfilment in the person of Christ and of His Church.*

Even the titles of the Psalms have, some of them at any rate, their TYPICAL significance. Of these the most mysterious is that of *Al-taschith*, i.e. "destroy not" (Pss. lvii., lviii., lix., lxxv). What is the meaning of this phrase? David had been promised the throne of Saul. And Saul knew it (1 Sam. xxiii. 17). He therefore made David swear an oath to the effect that he would "*not destroy*" him if ever he (King Saul) fell into his hand (1 Sam. xxiv. 21).

Jonathan, Saul's son, renewed the oath that Saul's seed should be spared in the day of David's prosperity (1 Sam. xx. 15, 16). At last the fated day arrived when Saul in his hunt for David's life was twice discovered by David's men and twice spared in memory of David's oath, that he would "not destroy" the Lord's anointed (1 Sam. xxiv. 4-10 and xxvi. 9). David knew that God would find some occasion of ridding him of his enemy: he himself would not hasten events by precipitating the final catastrophe.

Now Saul was a *type* for all time of an apostate from God's kingdom, persecuting the faithful heir of God's promise, like Ishmael's hatred of Isaac, like Edom's cruelty to Israel, like Herod, who tried to kill the infant Jesus. Saul was, in short, the first picture of Anti-Christ in the Church, who is not to be in his final manifestation an ignorant heathen, but one who falls away from the faith he once held. Hence, that maxim of David, "Destroy not," is applied *typically* to Saul's courtiers, and to all the Jewish people who could not discern in David the Lord's anointed, and to all who in their later descendants could not see in Christ their own Messiah. In Psalms lvii.-lix. this fact of their diabolical treachery is brought out; hence they are threatened for their anti-Christian plottings against David with being "not destroyed" but "scattered unto the ends of the earth" (lix. 11, 13) as a standing example of the divine vengeance! In Psalm lxxv. the anti-Christian power of Sennacherib was in like manner "destroyed, not" by Hezekiah (who refused to encounter the Assyrian army) but by the angel of the Lord who went out and smote Sennacherib's army with a pestilence. In Isaiah's words, the Assyrian yoke was destroyed from off Hezekiah's shoulder "because of the anointing" of David's line of kings (Isa. x. 27). In other words the phrase "Destroy not" was a maxim to remind the kings of Israel and Judah that it was not for man to lift his hand against any one, however evil, who was the Lord's anointed king, or to doubt, like Eli and Uzzah, of God's protection of His own Ark and His own people. That was God's work.<sup>1</sup>

In a second article we propose to treat of *the inspired order and structure of the Psalter* as having been (in Chrysostom's language) divinely pre-adjusted to the facts of the Gospel history.

A. H. T. CLARKE.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Thirtle, in his *Titles of the Psalms* (1904), has attempted to establish, on the model of Habakkuk's Psalm, the theory that the musical notices are placed *after*, never *before*, the Psalms to which they belong. This theory, while it seems to explain the double ascription of Ps. lxxxviii. and the reference to the "dove" in Ps. lv. fatally overlooks *Al-tashith* in Ps. lix. 11.; and "the hind of the morning" loses its meaning if transferred to Ps. xxi. To vindicate his theory on the title of Ps. lxxxviii. he translates *Mahalath l'annôth* ("sickness and afflictions") by "with dancings and shoutings" in order to bring the title into line with the previous Psalm.

## A Question of Æsthetics.

TO the foolish among us the War has come as a wonderful endorsement of all their ancient prejudices, and its grim incidents have simply provided confirmation of all they feared would happen were their dogmas disregarded; to the wise it has come as a challenge to examine themselves, to set their house in order, to ask what it was in them that made it easier for the nations to lapse into this tragical confusion. Not that we can guarantee the future against such another tragedy by any wisdom of ours—but the Church at least would be unworthy of herself if in some measure she did not seek to find why her influence failed to keep men in a better mind. This self-examination has resulted in a host of earnest and important books, of which one, that summons us to the re-discovery, the serious study of the philosophy of the Spirit, should command the careful consideration of all Christians. The author, Mr. Clutton Brock, asserts that Goodness, Truth and Beauty possess an absolute value as pure activities of the Spirit. In this he really utters nothing new, but the way in which he presents and develops his theme is fresh and challenging. The challenge is sounded to all Christians. Evangelical Churchmen will be tempted to reply that they have ever stood for goodness and truth (though there is room for much penitence and amendment among us in respect of these qualities), but will they be inclined even to listen to any plea urged on behalf of beauty, much less claim to have emphasized it duly hitherto? That serious thinkers are giving considerable place to æsthetics in their philosophy of life is clear enough from such a book as Mr. Balfour's *Theism and Humanism*. The question in this article is addressed solely to a section of Churchmen; and it is to ask Evangelicals whether they, as such, have any interest in Beauty as an activity of the Spirit,—whether they give any place in their philosophy to æsthetics?

This question asked at such a time may seem inopportune and even impertinent. The very horror of our present situation, however, sets men searching for the Beautiful as a relief from the grim ugliness of war; and further, though Kultur may be disgraced, it is by no means true that Culture is, and if Evangelical principles are, as all good Evangelicals must think, the most direct approach to

the heart of true religion and therefore the surest foundations of true religion in the nation, then disregard of the Beautiful must involve the alienation of a vast number of the rising generation. I say "disregard" deliberately. There may be acceptance or there may be renunciation of the Beautiful; neither of these, as I shall hope to show, need prove fatal—but disregard must prove so, for the Beautiful has too wide and too sublime an appeal, to be set on one side as a thing quite indifferent. Our question, therefore, becomes this. Are Evangelical principles compatible with Culture? Can an Evangelical take an interest in Beauty or not?

But first, what are Evangelical principles? It has been urged with justice that the words "experimental religion" sum up Evangelical principles. These words mean a real, vital, personal experience of the need of spiritual regeneration, nay more, of the fact of regeneration in Christ, and with that of immediate access to God, direct communion with the divine. This end, of course, is not exclusively confined to Evangelicals (thank God), nor should we think of Evangelicalism as claiming some monopoly in admitting to the Kingdom of God, but Evangelicalism does assert that inasmuch as the end is personal enjoyment of the Presence of God, so too the means thereto are personal and immediate, and all its principal tenets assert that immediacy—such as justification by faith, the doctrine of "assurance," the emphasis on the heavenly Session of Our Lord, and the insistence upon sacramental Communion rather than the sacrificial propitiation of the Mass. Thus conversion finds a great place in Evangelical preaching; witness is emphasized, and missionary enterprise rather than elaborate services or costly churches remains the chief monument of the Evangelical school of thought.

But how does this work out? Not long ago an Evangelical clergyman urged his hearers to have "no interests but the interests of the Lord Jesus." Who would not endorse this? But it is important to know what the preacher meant. Did he counsel a conscious jettisoning of all interests, innocent and even healthy in themselves but not specifically religious? When Frances Ridley Havergal says,—

"Take my voice and let me sing  
Only always for my King,"

one cannot evade the suspicion that she meant "let me sing nothing

but 'the songs of Zion.'" It is not a long step from this to the position that consecration is mutilation.

Now that position has a quite respectable history. When Plotinus discourses on the beautiful, in spite of his constant use of the physically beautiful in illustration, the conclusion at which he arrives is practically withdrawal from all interest in the physically beautiful to concentrate the attention of the inward eye upon the ideal, the mystical Beauty.

The same renunciation of outward Beauty marked the purest periods of the monastic system, and is clear in the influence of the early Friars and of Savonarola. It has more sacred and august example in the history of Bezaleel, whose craftsmanship in the fabric of the Tabernacle was subjected to the strictest of restraints. There is no doubt that a good and strong case could be made out for an attitude of entire renunciation of the Beautiful as expressed in Art. Such renunciation has its own power of attraction. It is a summons to sacrifice, and calls for the heroism that gladly abandons all in the service of the Faith.

But it cannot be said that Evangelicalism makes this decisive renunciation. The mere fact that grudging improvements in the outward array of our services have been admitted shows that there is no clearly defined principle of renunciation of the æsthetic appeal. Nor have Evangelicals taken a firm stand against the spread of artistic influences in domestic life. Not even Quakerism has been able to maintain its pristine austerity in matter of dress and manner of life. Evangelicalism both within the Church and outside of it has been more remarkable for timidity than uncompromising boldness, and it is this timidity which is so dangerous. In the field of scholarship it has hindered the progress of the party disastrously. The aspiring student, with a few happy exceptions, finds himself hemmed in by this feeling of timidity and tends in consequence to break away from an environment so little interested in study. The tradition is very old. Henry Venn thus once discouraged a young friend who urged the necessity of studying the Scriptures in the original tongues. Having enunciated the principle that all things necessary to be known are the same in every version as in the original, he goes on: "If so, then whatever is not to be known but by scholars and masters in the Hebrew tongue, cannot with truth be ranked higher than among matters of curiosity and amusement

which may employ idle men of a critical taste, as the whole system of plants employed the attention of Solomon. Yet he who possessed the largest intellect ever given to man had probably never been such a reproach to the Israel of God, had he spent more of his precious time upon the 'manifest necessities' and less in making the wonderful discoveries he did in the creation of God" (*Life and Letters of H. Venn*, 1853, p. 536). Comment is hardly needed upon the strange mixture in this passage of a noble resolution to "redeem the time" and an amazing confession of thought that can ascribe the great king's moral downfall to his applying his attention to making wonderful discoveries in the creation of God!

Even stronger language comes from John Newton in respect of Art. Writing to a parishioner on a visit to Rome in a letter which, according to his biographer, displays "his address in attempting to break the enchantments with which men of taste are surrounded, when standing in the centre of the fine arts," he says: "Thus vanity and mischief are the chief rulers of unsanctified genius; the artists spin webs, and the philosophers by their learned speculations hatch cockatrices, to poison themselves and their fellow-creatures: few of either sort have one serious thought of that awful eternity, upon the brink of which they stand for a while, and into the depth of which they successively fall" (*Memoir*, Ed. 1835, p. 61).

Such language, one may say, proclaims its date. Time perhaps has worn off some of the angularity displayed in such an attitude as this. But might not still the philosopher wonder if he could be at home among the Evangelicals, or the artist think that he must drop from his nerveless fingers the unhallowed brush in such company? Dare we—not to say, can we afford to—bid such men be gone to circles in the Christian community where philosophy and art shall be welcome? If so, we must face the fact that as education spreads, and the love of the beautiful is more widely cultivated, the hold of Evangelicalism will tend more and more to be relaxed. It would seem that here is a choice that must be faced. It is timely to face it now, for the present time offers no little opportunity. The taste for the florid or the bizarre seems to be giving place to taste for the simple and the austere. Beauty is sought rather than ornament, and quality is being appreciated rather than the merely superficial or the vapidly pretty. In a

word, restrained self-expression is coming into its own, and this surely marches with the Evangelical tradition of personal religion and self-control. Hitherto, in order to keep abreast of the times, we have rather encouraged than discouraged the cult of the ecclesiastical furnisher, the provider of the fashionable thing in Church decoration; again, partly in our endeavour to reach the popular mind, we have lagged behind in the matter of quality in Church music; or preoccupation with missionary endeavour or evangelistic effort has made us blind to the value of the nobler enjoyments that can occupy the mind and lift men above the craving for unsatisfying pleasures. Yet it is just in the quieter pursuits of the life of the spirit that one of the ways for the restoration of home and family religion lies open; it is precisely in noble simplicity and reticent beauty that Evangelicalism might express itself. To achieve such self-expression will cost money and thought. It will require self-discipline and some education; but I venture to submit that the results would repay the effort.

Yet when all is said on behalf of beauty, it must remain true that no beauty suffices for the worship of the Most High unless it be the beauty of holiness. Far be it from me to suggest anything approaching to a diminution of zeal or a neglect of holiness. In one sense Keswick and the C.M.S. are nobler monuments than any lovely edifice or splendid service. It is abundantly clear that an atmosphere of prayer and a sense of spiritual reality makes a Church attractive and a service helpful more truly than any wealth of ornament or efficiency of music. But there need be no divorce. Beauty mates with holiness, and the eye is an avenue to the heart. A recent correspondence in *The Times* has been discussing the relation of Puritanism to Music. As the Bishop of Durham points out, there is abundant evidence of the cultivation of music and literary art among the Puritans. The indifference or the timidity appear to be of later date than the palmary days of Puritanism, and are perhaps a belated survival of monastic asceticism. What is required of us is surely to assimilate the strength of Puritanism while learning to avoid its weaknesses, to appreciate its self-restraint while refusing its narrow prejudices. If we will do that it will be possible for us, while steadily keeping in view the high end to which we travel and would lead men, to make the road thereto a way of beauty as well as holiness.

J. R. DARBYSHIRE.

### A Missing Divine Attribute.

WHATEVER we may think of the Old Testament now, there can be no possible doubt that many of the contributors to the Sacred Library, though centuries apart in time, had a clearer conception of God's Being in one respect than those who have explained much of it away. For the Divine attitude to Nature and to man stands out distinctly in these books, poems and prophecies and histories, as that of a living present factor in the affairs of the world. He was no absentee Landlord, or an occasional Intruder, but rather the most prominent Figure in all. He never said or did exactly the same thing twice, and yet He was for ever practically the same. The so-called Tribal Deity, nevertheless, from the very first spoke with a unique accent entirely His own, and while fundamentally and prophetically anthropomorphic, with the Incarnation steadfastly in view, and varying in His conduct with varying conditions of time and place and people, His character in essentials did not alter. And if clothed with human attributes and human weaknesses, yet He moved in a sphere of action immeasurably (*toto cælo*) removed from the petty and sordid batrachomachies and myomachies of men. Not that He was so much bigger and better than we, but a different sort of Being altogether, separated from us in kind even more than in degree, though of course there could be no intimate qualitative difference, because in that case religion and morality would have been impossible. But still He proved immediately accessible, while He bore no resemblance whatever to the artificial God of the Deists. A sociable, companionable, often audible and visible Presence, He adjusted Himself and His infinite stature and gigantic steps to the wants of the individual or the nation He was dealing with, while always retaining His Divine dignity and greatness. There appeared persistently in what He demanded and what He received a beautiful heavenly accommodation, without any compromise of eternal principles. He behaved, if we may express it in this way without any irreverence, as Science performs its experiments, by exhaustive inquiries in every conceivable direction, so as to eliminate the superfluous and insignificant. A good Comrade at the least which was also the sacrifice, a fellow soldier and yet always the Captain, He made

Himself felt equally in strife and peace, in festivals and fasts, in joy and mourning as the One absolutely necessary, without whom no campaign, no service, no ceremony, no action could be completed or successful. At home and abroad, in work and in play, the Israelite found his God a Friend in need and a Friend indeed. No doubt they were perpetually quarrelling, but this did not affect their intimate relations. *Amantium iræ amoris integratio est*, the quarrels of lovers are the renewal of love. It may be fairly questioned, whether the modern conception of the Divine Fatherhood is not in some respects less close than that of friendship. In the Old Testament the two parties seem to have chosen each other, while relatives possess no choice and must accept what they find. They might have chosen differently had they enjoyed the power. We seem confronted with the happy but rare combination of an unusual identification. The family was one of friends as well as relatives. God has become the inheritance of His people, and the people are His inheritance. They constitute a perfect equation. The reactions between the two were (and are) those of real religious life, when every act was religious and Church and State coincided. But in war the character of God emerged more conspicuously, and in war man reflected most faithfully that particular aspect.

In fact, most of the Old Testament writers had firmly and clearly grasped the Christ Conception of the Divine Immanence. They saw God in everything and everything in God, as Moses felt "the reproach of Christ" in Egypt. The clouds were His chariot, He rode on the winds, He talked by the trees, His path was the pathless ocean, and what were the Cherubim and the Seraphim, but the Forces of Nature carrying His messages in storm and thunder and lightning, now in destruction that was always reconstruction and now as ministering angels of mercy? This age of ours has at last, through the services of Science, adopted a capitulation to old ideas in a tardy recapitulation of their power and presence. The predominance, the reign of Law was as evident in Old Testament times as at the present day. But we have not improved upon it, by hypostatizing a pale and anæmic Abstraction. The Israelite of old put the Lawgiver first and the Law second, while we merely personify Law and give all the honour and credit to secondary causes. During the Old Testament period, the worshippers of Jehovah thought nothing too small for His purposes and His indwelling; they did

not only recognize His action in awful geological convulsions, in catastrophic changes and solutions of continuity, in earthquake and eclipse or overflowing inundations and outbreaks of volcanic energy. They beheld His movements everywhere, alike in the physical and spiritual planes. He inhabited the praises of Israel, the human heart, and no less the very dust under their feet. This was not mere crude Animism, but a progressive expansion of religious feeling and thought. Worshippers were conscious of the immediate Divine activity everywhere in heaven and earth. In those early days spiritual speculation was very wide awake; though the spiritual and the material were not divided then, it was very curious and inquisitive, but as simple as it was sublime. It made God even stoop to the stars, He was so far above them, but He stooped lower still—to the dust of the balance and insignificant creatures like the grasshopper and the ant. Every event, every creature, everything was directly referred to God as the Creator and Preserver of all. The relation of Himself to the world was immediate and unbroken, while we see Him diluted and minimised through the vague and hazy intermediaries of second causes. We do not pretend to know much about Reality; we have at the utmost a dim and distant, a bowing acquaintance with it, which is no better than glorified ignorance. The thing in itself for ever escapes us, mocks us, defies us. But what does one of the greatest living philosophers say, what does Benedetto Croce teach? He reduces everything finally to spirit, and he tells us different news. "Philosophy examining every part of the Real, has not found any place in which to lodge the unknowable in thought." The last word in modern metaphysics is a return to the naïve distinctive belief of the Old Testament. "Whoever admits something is unknowable, declares everything unknowable." For, as the same profound philosopher writes, "Thought thinks either all or nothing."

We are at the very first confronted by four tremendous facts, the Good, the True, the Beautiful and the Useful. And as these are the chief constituents of our psychological furniture, it stands to reason that we must expect to find them all in their perfection in God, who will be all of them alike. The only true measuring rod is anthropomorphism. We can but apprehend God, in terms of man. But, as a matter of history and experience, men have simply confessed and adored the first three attributes. They have not

in so many words, and in overt act and fact, acknowledged the Divine Usefulness. They may have thought it mean and even derogatory. Mozley in one of his great sermons says the cosmos faces us as a picture and as a machine. Now we have treated God more as a Picture. Worship, admiration, awe, reverence, have been offered up without ceasing to Heaven. But it is the Picture alone that we recognised and venerated. We placed God on a pedestal, and fell down before His stupendous Transcendancy. We ignored his Usefulness, unless like Jacob we made a bargain. This invaluable idea has been lost in the course of ages, though the Israelites understood it thoroughly and tapped (so to speak) its incalculable riches. They were a practical and business people and made every possible use of God. And this is exactly what He demands of us. He says virtually in all His revelations, "Do not only worship Me, but make use of Me, for I like to be used and My greatest pleasure consists in serving My creatures." "I am your Servant as well as your Sovereign." This does not imply the low huckstering spirit of Jacob when he made a covenant with God at Bethel—a purely commercial transaction. "If God be with me and will keep me in the way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's home in peace—then shall the Lord be my God."

And so, everywhere in the Old Testament, we have the Creator offering His services freely to the men of faith and loyal lovers. He is never really absent from the arena of enterprise in whatever form, He is essentially a working God, the Divine Mechanic. Nothing appears too small, too obscure or squalid for His attention. He dwells in "no solitary grandeur"—*nulla virtus solitaria*—or on inaccessible altitudes. Heights and deeps are alike to Him, one and the same. The greatest honour men can pay Him is not worship, which indeed He accepts and appreciates, but to be employed by them as chief Actor and Protagonist in every undertaking. That constitutes God's supreme desire and delight. He does not so much ask for sacrifices, though He never disdains them, as for human burdens that He may bear and share with us. He is fundamentally a Giving rather than a Taking God, just as we are taught that it is more blessed (more Godlike) to give than to receive. At the present day during the extremity of War, we should let Him be our Captain and lay on Him the responsibility, and then the War

would soon be ended. His predominant wish is to be useful and to be granted the principal part of the onus of all and in all. But we first endeavour to do things ourselves and in our own blundering way, and only at the last take refuge in God as a *dernier ressort*. Essentially anthropomorphic as He is and was and ever will be, He reveals His Divinity most through His Humanity. The oldest story in the world is the Incarnation, not the Creation, for before that man was in God and Humanity constituted one of His attributes. Hegel at any rate thought so. God the Word became Flesh in the first man, and long before the birth of Christ we can behold the Incarnation energising through Godlike men and also betraying its presence in a perpetual Crucifixion for us. This the devout Israelite, who dwelt at the centre of things and not at the circumference as we do, before the divorce of intuition and reason among the mainsprings and ultimate sources, recognized at once. His genius for religion in its earliest and simplest forms, before the primitive and aboriginal instincts were obscured and perverted, enabled him to see and feel and know God, as we cannot with our uttermost intellectualism. With him God was everything and everywhere, above and below and around him, to serve and prosper him in each worthy effort

“To be the fair beginning of a time.”

Now we poor gropers after the Truth, we blind seekers, who have neither faith nor love, nor any spiritual faculty to apprehend Him, have lost God, as not merely our Creator and Preserver, but as Friend and Companion and working Partner in the business of life. He is no longer our true and one Yokefellow, and while we confess Him with our lips, we deny Him in our labours. There is no room for Him anywhere in our work. We discuss Him daily through the misty medium of secondary causes. We bow down to the Law and not to the Lawgiver—to mere symbols and counters and abstractions. We give Him grudgingly and nominally the first day of the week, and adore a pure hebdomadal Deity, whereas He wants to be our life partner, to meet the brunt and burden of all. To regain the lost Friend, the Supreme Servant, we must return to the fundamentals, to the elemental facts. There God stands at our side, waiting to be used, to bend His shoulders (so to speak) to any weight we choose to impose—a world at strife or a trampled worm. He displays no condescension, no pride, no atti-

tude of superiority, for the humblest thing in heaven and in earth; He is the Maker of both. "His tender mercy is over all His works." The majestic planet and the blade of grass rest alike on Him and share equally His regard. Coming to ourselves is the sole repentance required, coming to God is the sole necessary faith. But there we are surrounded by an infinite ocean of riches, the innumerable and inexhaustible Divine Usefulnesses, and we neglect them simply because we do not believe in them. We at present neither know ourselves, nor know Him, "whom to know is life eternal." If anything could awaken us from our death slumber, it should be this almost Universal War. This emerges at bottom as a conflict between Matter and Spirit, Gentleness and Force, Faith and Reason, Soul and Body. The light from the Altar fronts and combats the corpse candle of intellectualism—mere cleverness, mere cunning. Regeneration with its laver of fire is washing us in its furnace. And out of the awful crucible, the flames of trial, should arise not a golden calf, but a God or a Godlike Man, with a new and true, a simple and sublime Religion, that has been burned into him and will be a rod and a staff which will support by chastening—not a reed shaken with the wind and blown about by every breath of doctrine. Le Rochefaucauld said "*Ce n'est pas assez d'avoir des grandes qualités, il en faut avoir l'économie. La souveraine habilité consiste à bien connaître la prix des choses.*" We want a new, a living, a spiritual economy. The supply is ready and more than sufficient, but where is the demand? Christ Himself in this terrible War has been crucified afresh and daily put to an open shame. But, notwithstanding this, He offers Himself and His services too frequently in vain. Here and there souls in this awful extremity realise His Presence and receive His final blessing. Whether He appears visibly as the "White Comrade" or as a half visible Divine figure, He, who is and must be the Prisoner of Eternity, the Priest and the Vicarious Victim both in one, must continue His work as the Divine Drudge, pleading with us and fighting for us with the perpetual sacrifice of prayer. We hitherto have trusted too much in material aids, and they have their use and season now, during the agony of the present conflict. But they have no power, unless backed by the moral and spiritual sanction of faith and love. We must first come to ourselves and come to God through Christ and His Cross.

Theology settles nothing, it rather unsettles everything, because it is mainly critical and not creative. Melancthon knew this and lamented it, when he wrote that Christianity was honoured by "*Theologastrorum sententiis, de conscientia casibus, inextricabilibus, ubi nunquam non ex quaestione quaestio nascitur.*" No doubt it must ever be so. A question answered raises another question or more than one, and so we might go on in *infinitum*. But there exists another side and that a constructive side where inquiry ceases and becomes absurd, when reward fails to attract and punishment to coerce or intimidate. Hegel has summarily dismissed Compulsory Punishment in a few but scathing words of bitter mordant humour. He declares it to be a mere economic fact, by means of which the State or Judging Power opens business with goods called Crimes exchangeable for other goods, and the Code is the list of prices! But the sole pressure we may consider is the spiritual pressure of Religion, the sole sanction that counts first and last is the moral. And we must go to the Working Christ—"My Father worketh hitherto and I work"—for a practical present-day, universal Religion. "I see that all things come to an end, but Thy commandment is exceeding broad." The day of mere Forms and Ceremonies has passed for ever, and some teachers are now already trying to lay the foundations of a more spiritual service, in which all can meet and kneel together at one common Altar. The oldest symbol in the world, namely the Cross, contains or expresses all we want. We may mark it in every tree and in every hand-grip. "I put on righteousness, and it clothed me. My judgment was a robe and diadem." Far too long have we been denying the Usefulness of God! We must now make the great affirmation, and claim Him as the Brother born for adversity. He will prove now, if we allow Him the Divine opportunity, the best of War Mates and War Captains, and will lead us from victory to victory, till we are more than conquerors, and the Cross is stamped on every heart.

F. W. ORDE WARD.



## A Canadian Sunday.

### PART I.

**G**EORGE HERBERT tells us that "the Sundays of man's life, threaded together on Time's string, make bracelets to adorn the wife of the Eternal King." But the jewels of that bracelet, as we glance across the hundred years of Canadian History, vary greatly in brilliancy and lustre, at times shedding light on the day's work and on the beyond, at times barely distinguishable from the pebbles at our feet.

Among leading statesmen General Simcoe stands first in voicing a feeling of anxiety over the question of the Canadian Sunday. He speaks of a deputation which waited on him and only too truly testifying that the rising generation "was rapidly returning to barbarism," and that "the Sabbath so wisely set apart for devotion was hardly known to the children who were busily employed in searching for amusements in which they might consume the day."

This is hardly to be wondered at when we consider how few and scattered those people were, and how scanty the number of clergy of any denomination whatsoever appointed to minister to them. Few, if any, clergy were to be found, for instance, among the United Empire refugees, and the Rev. J. Stewart in 1786 writes: "I am the only clergyman in this Province, Quebec." The indifference as to Sunday continued long after General Simcoe's day. A correspondent of a Kingston paper (1816) tells how "the noise of hammers and axes resound from sunrise to sunset." A few years later a newly-converted Indian, at a conference in Adolphustown in 1826, expresses his wonder over the Sunday question. "You white people have the Bible too, you read sometimes—yet you get drunk—yet you tell lies—yet you break the Sabbath."

It is little wonder if in far-away remote, solitary homesteads, walled in by the shadow of the primeval forest, and silent but for the howl of the wolf or the cry of the wild cat, if the Sabbath were broken, and if liturgy, psalm and prayer died out. Dr. Strachan, who understood Canada perhaps better than any statesman of his day, appreciated the difficulty and sympathetically but firmly diagnosed the situation. He tells how the far-away settler begins by lamenting his distance from church and school and how, as time

goes on, those lamentations, together with the religious feelings which prompted them, gradually die away, till at last a disinclination, an estrangement, "even an hostility to God in all its deformity," takes its place.

It is easy to understand a gradual decline in the observance of Sunday in a newly settled country; it is more difficult to understand the change for the better, the growth in Sunday observance which from a quarter to half a century later gradually passed over the whole country. The change was so gradual and so simple at first that it is hardly noticed and consists mainly in "donning a clean garment on the seventh day." The next step goes further. We find now and again "a petition drawn up by respectable inhabitants that fishing on Sunday may be prohibited by law." This "happily accomplished," neighbourhoods once remarkable "for the most disrespectful negligence of the Lord's Day now strictly observe it." As the century wears on this change passed from the comparatively settled districts of Ontario to the more settled districts of the West. Thus a writer in a Minnesota paper contrasts the way in which the "entire population seems to go to Church in Winnipeg" with the "open ungodliness and unblushing wickedness of a Western town." How did such a change set in?

The answer in the East, at any rate, lies in the early half of the century and in the incoming of a new and God-fearing population. The first outstanding cause may be traced to the influence of the United Empire Loyalists, men and women as capable of fearing God as of daring exile and death in the service of king and country. Secondly, to an influx of sturdy North of Ireland Churchmen who set a high moral and spiritual standard and rapidly rose to influence. And last, but not least, to an incoming Scotch influence. An old writer tells us that wherever the Scotch predominated "a deep sense of duty, high aims, and a sincere love of the Word was noted." The Scotch shamed other settlers "by their sobriety, industry, frugality and patience," "their exemplary kindliness to one another, and above all to the stranger within the gate." Wherever the Scotch went they showed a deep consciousness "that God and His ways and His laws were written all about them." It is hard to read the old records without a thrill of admiration. "We drove forty miles to New Market (a journey possibly of some twenty hours' duration) on an ox sleigh to have my brother christened." "How

did I get to Kirk ? ” “ Through the bush, with only a blaze to go by. When I had shoes I took them off to cross the river, I could stick to the logs better without them.” It was no question of observance of Sunday, it was a passion for God and His service, and in that service a passion for Sunday. A settler picking out stitches which he had inadvertently (owing to his having lost track of the days in the bush) placed in his moccasins on Sunday shows an intensity and loyalty of conviction, no matter whether that conviction might or might not express itself in ways unaccustomed to us to-day.

But the final and determining factor seems to have been a general movement of Canadian laymen in favour of the observance of Sunday throughout the century. Wherever Canadian laymen move solidly towards any given point, moral or religious, they almost invariably carry that point whatever it may be, whether the observance of Sunday, the foundation of Sunday Schools, the formation of the Lord's Day Alliance, the Laymen's Missionary Movement, the Y.M.C.A. Campaign, or across the sea to-day the carrying of a Vimy Ridge. In the present instance we find the laymen seconding, if not leading, the advance of the clergy. In that advance they farsightedly throw their strength into Sunday Schools and through the Sunday Schools rapidly influence the rising generation. You see “ Father Ketchum,” mindful of the day when a poor homeless lad he landed from a little schooner on the pebbly beach and trudged through the pine clearing of blackened stumps, dignified by the name of Yonge Street, in later life seeking out lonely boys wherever he can find them. Intent on his quest he visits Sunday School after Sunday School, drawing Christmas gifts out of the capacious pockets of his overcoat, and at his death, mourned by thousands of his fellow citizens, leaves an annual endowment, “ Jesse Ketchum's Bounty,” to be distributed in perpetuity to the successive generations of the Toronto children.

But Jesse Ketchum is, after all, but one of the many. You find leading lawyers, leading business men, looking upon Sunday as a day of opportunity rather than a day of relaxation, and in the light of that opportunity superintending Sunday Schools or taking Teachers' Training Classes. You find a leading K.C., like the late Hon. S. H. Blake, Saturday by Saturday, and Sunday by Sunday, training two hundred teachers in the coming Sunday School lesson.

You see another leading K.C., Mr. Hamilton Cassels, for over thirty-eight years, first teaching, then superintending, the prison Sunday School, and on the prisoner's day of release holding out a hand of sympathy and relief.

But to-day the general attitude towards Sunday changes. You find a feeling arising that Sunday is a day needlessly hedged in, a day of pleasure rather than a day of opportunity. The restless feeling which is drawing men, women and children from the home fireside of an evening to theatre and entertainment is drawing men, women and children as in Governor Simcoe's time across the old boundaries in search of "amusements in which they may consume the day." In consequence, every thoughtful girl at leaving school faces a very live difficulty, that is to say, faces the problem of deciding what line she ought to take as to the right spending of Sunday. It was easy enough for her at school where definite lines were laid down and had to be followed. Now that she is free, the old-time definite lines are blurred and changing, and she has to seek out and make a new and definite line for herself. For whether we will or no the old Canadian Sunday is gradually receding out of Canadian life and customs. We know well enough the necessity for a "sufficing arrest." We know that the necessity for this "arrest" is woven into the very fibre of our intellectual and physical being. We know further that any attempt, as at the French Revolution, to substitute one day in ten for one day in seven, has failed and will fail. And yet with it all we grudge the time given for this "arrest."

The difficulty turns not so much upon whether there shall be an "arrest" at all upon Sunday as upon what the character of that "arrest" shall be. Our forefathers had no such difficulty, for they interpreted the Bible literally as it stood. They determined, since the Seventh Day was the Sabbath of the Lord their God that they would keep the Seventh Day. They determined, since commerce was forbidden by Nehemiah, that they would close their stores. They determined, that a special blessing having been promised by Isaiah upon those who turned away from their own pleasure upon the Seventh Day, that they would turn away from amusement and observe Sunday quietly. But to-day, consciously and unconsciously, we are looking upon the Bible from another point of view. We emphasize the teaching of the New Testament in place of the teaching of the Old Testament, and, instead of considering how far

the thought of the New Testament may be the development of the seed thought of the Old Testament, under a vague impression that Christ took a more lenient observance of Sunday we take a more lenient view. We are willing to take Sunday as a day of "sufficing arrest," but we make that "arrest" a time of amusement rather than a time of spiritual activity.

Two arguments present themselves for immediate consideration: The argument of custom and the argument as to Christ's definite teaching on Sunday; or, in other words, how far, if at all, Christ's teaching is contrary to the Old Testament, how far a development of Old Testament seed thought.

As to personal custom and national custom. The lead taken by our ancestors, the acted on conviction of those who have gone before us, is important and worthy of full consideration, but does not decide the question. The fact that following in their lead we keep Sunday quietly, that worldliness jars on Sunday as quarrels jar on Christmas Day, is comparatively neither here nor there. The fact that we put aside weekday customs, business letters, exciting novels, in order that one day in the week at the least, "as in the temple of Solomon the sound of the earthly hammer may not be heard in the temple of the soul," may be wise, but once again is not the deciding word in the matter. The deciding word lies in the discovery of Christ's will, and that will once discovered, in avoiding hypocrisy and in being utterly straightforward with ourselves and with our children.

Then as to the national custom. We find that Sunday is not a peculiarity of the Canadian, or of the British, or of any other nation, but that Sunday is a day of rest, ordained and sanctioned by the far-seeing statesmen of successive generations. Constantine, A.D. 331, commanded all courts of justice and workshops "to be at rest on Sunday"; Charlemagne forbade Sunday labour; Edward VI., Elizabeth and the Puritans, all threw their united weight upon the due observance of Sunday. Finally, the Statute of 1676 placed the English Sunday and the Canadian Sunday upon the footing upon which they have continued to the present century; a footing stronger in Canada than in any other nation, a footing, God grant never to be changed.

The Canadian history of Sunday is in line with the regulations just quoted. Our forefathers, United Empire Loyalists, or men of

sturdy northern breed, understood their duty to God to be as binding as their duty to their neighbour, and laid out the week so as to give time and opportunity for six days' work, and a Seventh Day's rest. The Seventh Day was set apart as a day of opportunity, a day on which parents and children could learn "to know God," could practise His presence, could learn "to enjoy Him for ever."

Recent inventions—the telephone, motors—came in, saving time, but instead of conserving energy only opening the way to swifter thought and tenser labour. In the midst of the busy thoroughfare of everyday life Sunday stands invitingly open, the one leisured day for extra labour or amusement. The question arises as to how far it is right for us ourselves, how far it is right for us to permit our workpeople to encroach upon this Sunday space; in other words, to relieve the congested week by turning part of Sunday into a continual weekday.

It is easy enough to work upon Sunday, but is it equally easy to make up for a time of rest lost? We have to remember that nervous breakdown is one of the commonest diseases of to-day. We may find that we have encroached upon our day of rest at cruel cost to ourselves and to our children. We need only look at ourselves in Canada or at our neighbours across the line to see the result of this loss of Sunday rest upon the nervous constitutions of the men and women of to-day. How many breakdowns would never have taken place if, as a nation, we had not encroached upon our Sunday rest? How many sanatoriums would to-day be closed if a healthier, wiser, Sunday had been reinstated in the land? How many homes on edge with nervous irritation, would have relaxed if a quiet Sunday had replaced a tense Sunday?

But, granted that Sunday work is inadvisable for ourselves, is it equally inadvisable for our workpeople? How far are we justified in bribing our workpeople, in paying extra money, in order that they may crowd Sunday out of their lives? During the last two years, that is to say, during war-time, Sunday labour has increased by leaps and bounds. A special Committee pleaded with Mr. Lloyd George that Sunday munition labour might be discontinued on the ground that "there are inevitable limits to hours of labour," that "they would work to 10 p.m. on Saturday if they might rest on Sunday," that "the monotony of the work killed them," and that "they were sick of it," that "foremen could not

endure the mental strain of seven days' work." A little later a Committee of Investigation, composed of scientific and medical men, reported that seven days' work in munition factories was "not worth while," and "that the output of six days' work would equal, if it did not exceed, seven days' work."

But if hours of labour practically remain the same, whether we work upon Sunday or not, what about occupations in which a forced stoppage causes waste? This question of waste was discussed at the International Congress of Sunday rest at Chicago in 1893, and the decision was given against Sunday labour on the following grounds. It was urged that more oil could be pumped in six days than in seven because machinery "so continuously used was more easily broken, and broken machinery made forced stoppage." Secondly, that the loss of home life, coupled with the loss of opportunity for intellectual and spiritual refreshment caused a corresponding loss of efficiency, for men, haunted by a consciousness that they were breaking God's will, lost self-respect, and with self-respect lost interest in their work and in their employer.

In support of these statements it was contended that the largest oil-producing company in the United States, that is to say, the Hundred Foot District, did more work under the new six-day regulation than formerly under the seven.

But after all, it is not a question of hours or of loss of capital. In the last analysis it is a social and political question, for Sunday labour is dangerous in so far as it embitters and arouses antagonism between capital and labour. We know only too well the agony of to-day's warfare between nation and nation, but we have still to learn the still bitterer agony of civil warfare, that is to say of warfare between capital and labour, a warfare which like the shadow of a man's hand hangs over Canada and over the United States. Take, for instance, the railway question. We are always on the edge of a railway strike, and we breathe freely whenever that strike is averted, in Canada or in the United States. But we do not stop to think how far the Sunday question is the underlying irritant in inducing that strike. The four hundred and fifty engineers who petitioned Mr. Vanderbilt for a cessation of Sunday labour pleaded strong grounds. They claimed that a never-ending labour made them feel "worn out like old men"; "that ignoring Sunday had a demoralizing influence" upon their children; that the strain was

impairing the "requisite energy so necessary for making them good engineers"; and pledged themselves to give "ten days' work in six," if they could only look forward to a "certain period of rest."

Is their petition unreasonable? If the heated steel of a railway engine must be cooled off, and if that engine must be given one day's rest after five days' labour, how far more surely the delicate brain and nerve power of the man occupying the responsible post of locomotive engineer must be given one day's rest after six days' labour.

Next as to private labour. We do not need to be told that to-day is the day of the servant difficulty, but we do need to be reminded that nothing aggravates that difficulty like an infringement of the just rights of our servants, and among those rights the opportunity for rest and for attending Divine service, which are too often taken away owing to Sunday entertainment. Servants resent, and resent justly, seven days' labour, and employers are beginning to feel their resentment, so that inquiry has even been made at registry offices for "servants without souls," that is to say, maids who care nothing about Sunday and who will as gladly undertake the labour incurred in Sunday entertaining as in weekday entertaining.

But supposing servants without souls can be found, can they be expected to keep a high moral standard? Can they be expected to care for our interests if we deprive them of the time necessary for religious instruction and refreshment? How can a servant avoid a feeling of bitterness if, after a few hours of freedom on Sunday, she returns to heavy arrears of work and piled up dishes? It is difficult to over-estimate the value of a high-toned, well-principled servant in a house, and the moral effect that such a servant has upon the children of the house. Therefore, even upon utilitarian grounds, that is to say, upon the lowest ground of self-interest, if we value such a servant and wish to keep her, we should avoid Sunday labour.

The war is giving us a wholesome lesson in this respect. Officers and privates draw together in the trenches, and sacrifice themselves freely the one for the other. Mistresses and maids in this war-time draw together in one common anxiety and one common sorrow. If David would not drink the water of the well of Bethlehem brought at the risk of his soldiers' lives, how can we grasp Sunday pleasure bought at the risk of our servants' souls and lives?

Finally, upon national grounds, in guarding Sunday we are

guarding the moral and spiritual tone of the country. A leading man of letters said : " As a young man I launched my fieriest darts against the English Sunday, denouncing it for Puritanical hypocrisy ; in my old age I can think of no loss which would result more seriously in popular vulgarization than the loss of the English Sunday." What is true of the English Sunday is true of the Canadian Sunday. The tone of the moral and spiritual life of Canada turns largely upon whether our Canadian Sunday of the future is the Sunday outlined in the far-sighted wisdom of Christ and in the far-sighted wisdom of our ancestors, or the pleasure-seeking Sunday which our own short-sighted, self-seeking is imposing upon us.

E. M. KNOX.



## The Wondrous Cross.

### STUDIES IN THE ATONEMENT

#### IV

#### [CONCLUDING ARTICLE]

**I**N view of the difficulties connected with this subject, some suggestions may fitly be made.

(a) There are scientific difficulties. With the evolutionary theory of man's origin and nature there seems to be no room for sin, and therefore no room for the Atonement. It is sometimes said that there is no trace of a Fall in nature, and this is, of course, true of physical nature and it is not to be expected. But what about moral nature? What of the sense of guilt and responsibility? Surely this is a fact in the moral universe. In a recent work<sup>1</sup> the author argues that evolution has really emphasized the need of Atonement, but he is careful to insist upon the fact that the doctrine of evolution does not admit of any outsider entering in, so that a theory of substitution which seems to require the entrance of such an outsider is rejected. Such a view as this, however, seems to come under the condemnation already expressed, that "there have been conspicuous examples of essays and even treatises on the Atonement standing in no discoverable relation to the New Testament." If, as one critic<sup>2</sup> of this book remarked, human thought is moving in the direction of identification rather than simple substitution, yet since, as the writer proceeds to say, such identification may undoubtedly involve some form or degree of substitution, the theory of the book will certainly be destroyed. It seems impossible on any fair statement of the theory of evolution and on any proper exegesis of the New Testament view of sin and atonement to explain the Atonement by evolution. Evolution cannot give an ethical basis for a theory of sin, and therefore all definitions of sin furnished by it are at the least defective. Sin concerns the relation of man to God, involving separation from God, and this can never be explained adequately in terms of evolution. It is no case merely of being hindered in upward progress, but, what

<sup>1</sup> Stuart McDowall, *Evolution and Atonement*, with Preface by Bishop Ryle, Dean of Westminster.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Hastings in *Expository Times*.

is much more serious, the consciousness of being alienated from God through sin for which we are responsible.

Then, too, from a scientific standpoint man's littleness is used as an argument against the thought of the Son of God coming down to redeem him. It is suggested that for such a speck in the universe it would be unworthy and unthinkable of God so to act, but, in reply to this, it may be at once said that even in nature the value of things is not judged by their size, and for this reason it is impossible to argue with fairness, because of man's relative insignificance in the universe. This would apply equally to the conception of any revelation of God quite apart from the thought of Atonement. On every ground, therefore, we maintain our New Testament position, and notwithstanding all scientific theories, which seem to run counter to it, we must continue to teach the great realities of sin and redemption.

(b) There are theological difficulties. For many years past there has been in certain quarters a tendency to preach the Incarnation. But this is not the Gospel. In the New Testament the heart of Christianity is found in the grace of Christ, and recent theological thought has been bringing us back to a truer perspective in which we are enabled to see much more clearly than before the centrality of Calvary. It is the supreme value of Denney, Forsyth and Simpson that they are recalling thought to the right direction, and the recent little volume by Mozley confirms this general line and justifies what the author himself said a few years ago :

"It cannot be said too often that the Cross, not the manger, Calvary, not Bethlehem, is the heart of the New Testament. In England the influence of Dr. Westcott from Cambridge and of the Anglo-Catholic successors of the Tractarians from Oxford combined has tended in the opposite direction. In the writer's judgment it is a perilous course to throw the doctrine of propitiatory Atonement to the wolves of Rationalism, while yet believing that the Incarnation can be preserved in its integrity, and it is a course against which the New Testament, as he reads it, stands opposed" (Mozley, *Review in Record*).

It is also sometimes argued that there is no real reason for the Atonement, since God can hardly be different from man, who is willing to forgive on simple repentance. But we have already seen the essential identity of Divine and human forgiveness, and it may also be answered that the relations between man and man have vital differences compared with those between God and man. In the latter there are governmental as well as personal aspects,

and the fact that righteousness is in the very constitution of the universe seems to suggest the impossibility of God overlooking sin, especially with its many and terrible results on the profession of repentance, however genuine.<sup>1</sup>

(c) There are also moral difficulties. The offence of the Cross has not yet ceased, and it is either a "stumbling-block" or "foolishness" to many to-day. A thoughtful writer has called attention to the way in which the doctrine of the Atonement tends to be omitted from much modern teaching, because it makes man as a sinner need such an interposition of God. This is rightly said to be due to the tendency to shape religion to people rather than people to religion.

"Every false religion aims at forming a creed that can be carried into the life as it is, instead of transforming the man so that he may live up to his creed. The religion of Christ demands that the man shall be altered, not the truth; other religions demand that the truth shall be altered, not the man."<sup>2</sup>

It is possible to preach the Incarnation in such a way as to exalt human nature. It is possible to proclaim the Trinity in a way to interest and even please reason. But the preaching of the Cross is altogether different, and tends to humble and even humiliate human nature, because it requires submission to a crucified Saviour. And yet it is the Cross which is the Christian Gospel. If it be said that God is love, and therefore will deal gently with sinners; if it be said that God is merciful, and therefore will show mercy to the wandering; if it be said that God is Father, and therefore will be pitiful to His erring children—the answer is that the facts are true, but the inferences are wrong, because this is not the Gospel. It leaves out Christ. God is Love; God is merciful; God is Father, but not apart from Christ. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (1 John iv. 10).

Further, this attitude leaves out sin, and yet it is only when we see sin in the light of the Cross that we ever get adequate views of its reality and enormity. There is far too great a tendency to-day to forget that sin is the rebellion of man's will against God, and since this is in some respects one of the fundamental Christian doctrines, it is clear that its acceptance or rejection will determine

<sup>1</sup> Mabie, *Under the Redeeming Aegis*.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. F. E. Marsh.

our attitude to all else. Notwithstanding all studies in Anthropology, indeed, it may be almost said because of them, it is essential to insist upon the truth that "every single human being needs not progress only, but recovery." Herein lies the difference between the New Testament teaching and all ideas that arise in Unitarian quarters. The issue is not at all a question of historical evidence for this or that truth, but concerns the different views of what sin is and of what it requires. No one can doubt that with the New Testament before him the deep and severe conception of sin constitutes an essential truth of the Christian revelation. "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," and our view of what He is and did will almost entirely depend on our conception of sin. If God's forgiveness is exactly the same as man's, why did Christ die at all? Sin is a fact, and Fatherhood is not the only attitude of God to us. He is a Lawgiver, Judge, and Ruler, and cannot be indifferent to sin, because Fatherhood is always moral and righteous. The only adjectives used by Jesus Christ of the Father were "holy" and "righteous" (John xvii. 11, 25). And so it is essential to emphasize the Cross. We must not proclaim the Cross without Christ, the work without the Person; nor must we proclaim Christ without the Cross; the Person without the work; we must not proclaim the substitutionary work without its practical bearing; nor must we proclaim the practical side without the vicarious element. The New Testament teaches the two sides, the objective reality of the vicarious sacrifice and the subjective power in the life of the believer. Christ saves, sanctifies, satisfies.

"There is little doubt that the sympathetic tendency is the more popular to-day, and to press salvation in a real sense is to be accused of a reactionary bias to theology. But a God who is merely or mainly sympathetic is not the Christian God. The Father of an infinite benediction is not the Father of an infinite grace" (Forsyth, *ut supra*, p. 58).

"If we spoke less about God's love and more about His holiness, more about His judgment, we should say much more when we did speak of His love. . . . It is round this sanctuary that this great camp is set and the great battle really waged. Questions about immanence may concern philosophers, and questions about miracles may agitate physicists. But the great dividing issue for the soul is neither the Bethlehem cradle, nor the empty grave, nor the Bible, nor the social question. For the Church at least (however it may be with individuals) it is the question of a redeeming Atonement. It is here that the eventual issue lies" (Forsyth, *ut supra*, p. 73).

It is sometimes said in regard to the Old Testament that we

ought not to teach anything to children which they will afterwards have to unlearn. This is undoubtedly true, and it applies with equal force to the doctrine of the Atonement. This is what we teach our young people :

“ He died that we might be forgiven,  
He died to make us good,  
That we might go at last to heaven,  
Saved by His precious Blood.

“ There was no other good enough  
To pay the price of sin,  
He only could unlock the gate  
Of heaven, and let us in.”

God forbid that we should ever alter this teaching by a hair's-breadth, whether we are dealing with children or adults. It is this that gives such force to the oft-quoted splendid words of Hooker :

“ Such we are in the sight of God the Father as is the very Son of God the Father. Let it be counted folly or phrensy or fury or whatsoever. It is our wisdom and our comfort ; we care for no knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned and God hath suffered, that God hath made the Father the sin of men and that men are made the righteousness of God.”

To the same effect is the magnificent, bold, and yet true paradox of Luther :

“ Thou, Lord Jesus, art my righteousness. I am Thy sin. Thou hast taken what was mine and hast given me what was Thine. What Thou wast not Thou didst become that I might become what I was not.”

A few years ago Professor Mackintosh of Edinburgh addressed a large gathering in Toronto on “ The Preaching of the Atonement.” He said that the present generation was looking for something much simpler, and brighter, and clearer than has been the case in the past. Young men and young women are anxious to have the Christian light put before them with clearness and intelligence, and in his opinion the belief that sermons on doctrines are not wanted to-day is wholly wrong. Dr. Mackintosh then told of a man of whom he had heard having gone through the Communion Service without once mentioning the name of Jesus Christ, and, said the speaker, “ he could not have done it better for a wager, but anything more dreary he had never heard.” Then came these words addressed to the large gathering of preachers present :

“ The Cross is the flesh and blood of the New Testament, and if you take any part away, you have only the skeleton left. It is the duty of the preacher to preach of this, the central point of the New Testament ; there is a life which beats out of its pages which we call Divine. Everything in God is

great, but nothing so great as the blotting out of transgressions. I submit that this can be preached, preached even by men who feel that it is not possible for us to say how the death of Jesus Christ affected God. And I submit further that if it can be preached, then we fail to introduce to men the whole grace of God which is in Christ Jesus as long as we leave it out. If we condemn ourselves to silence in the Cross, in the Gospel, the odds are terribly great that we may come to preach about men instead of God; but if we decide to proclaim resolutely and affectionately all that God has revealed to us by His word and Spirit concerning Atonement following after truth, and believing in the light, then our message will be pervaded by those deep tones which men love to hear in a preacher's voice."

It is now a familiar story, but is worth telling again and again. Gipsy Smith and others have passed on an incident regarding the late Dr. Charles A. Berry of Wolverhampton, who was invited to follow Beecher at Brooklyn. Late one night Dr. Berry's door-bell rang. Every one else in the house being in bed, he answered the call. At the door stood a typical Lancashire girl, with a shawl over her head. "Are you Dr. Berry?" she asked. "I want you to come and get my mother in." Thinking that her mother was in some drunken stupor, he directed the girl to the police. "No," she said, "she is dying, and I want you to get her into heaven." The Doctor did not want to go, but he yielded under the importunity and earnestness of the girl. When they came to the house, Dr. Berry found that it was a house of shame. Drunken carousing was going on downstairs. Upstairs, in a small room, he found the woman dying. It was in the early days of his ministry, and his beliefs were carrying him towards Unitarianism. So he told the dying woman of the beautiful life, the loving ministries, and the noble example of Jesus. He urged her to follow Him, but she shook her head hopelessly, saying: "That's not for the like o' me: I'm a sinful woman, and I'm dying." "It flashed upon me," said Dr. Berry, "that I had no message of hope for that dying woman, and like lightning I leaped in mind and heart back to the Gospel my mother taught me. I told her of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, dying on the Cross, that just such as she might be saved; of His blood poured out for the remission of sins, and all the blessed truths of the old, old story. And," he added, "I got her in, and I got myself in, too."

"I sought Thee, weeping high and low,  
I found Thee not; I did not know  
I was a sinner—even so  
I missed Thee for my Saviour.

“ I saw Thee sweetly condescend  
Of humble men to be the Friend,  
I chose Thee for my way, my end,  
But found Thee not my Saviour.

“ Until upon the Cross I saw  
My God Who died to meet the law  
That man had broken ; then I saw  
My sin, and then my Saviour.

“ What seek I longer ? Let me be  
A sinner all my days to Thee,  
Yet more and more, and Thee to me  
Yet more and more my Saviour.

“ Be Thou to me my Lord, my Guide,  
My Friend, yea, everything beside ;  
But first, last, best, whate'er betide,  
Be Thou to me my Saviour.”

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.



## The Missionary World.

THE wider use of missionary collects for public and private use may lead readers of the *CHURCHMAN* to welcome a hitherto unpublished prayer "For the Life and Service of the Church throughout the World."

O God with Whom is the Fountain of Life, we draw near in the Name of Jesus, to seek for the quickening of Thy Spirit, that we may be witnesses in this day of Thy power. Strengthen us that with new fidelity we Thy people in every land may serve Thee with an honest will. Enlarge our hearts that we may apprehend in fuller measure the revelation of Thyself in Christ. Direct our minds into harmony with that Kingdom Thou hast set up on earth. Separate us from the sins which hinder our devotion to Thy service, and give us grace to cast aside the bondage of unreality and of formalism in worship and in life. Equip us with the armour of righteousness and the mind that was in Christ, that we may go forth to those whom Thou art calling into the Kingdom of Thy Son. As one redeemed family in Christ, though scattered in many lands, enable us to stand in the liberty of the Spirit, being knit together in love. Though the earth do change and the kingdoms are moved, stablish us with faith in Him Who is the Desire of nations and the Prince of Peace, that we may be among the blessed who await His coming and prepare His way. Amen.

\* \* \* \* \*

Speakers and preachers will do well to turn for stores of living material to the annual reports of the various missionary societies as they issue from the press. In most cases, while the matter is arranged under various countries the paragraphs are given a separate title, so that it is easy to group material under topical headings and make it available for use. In particular, instances of desire to hear the Gospel, of readiness to receive it when preached, and of baptisms, both of individuals and of numbers, are very common, and some of them are most impressive. The simple practice of indexing, under a few general headings, the most living matter from the reports of the Bible Society, the C.M.S. and many other selected agencies would provide speakers with a store of incidents and illustrations fresh gathered year by year. We note that in the C.M.S. *Bulletin* for clergy only (the second issue of which, dealing with the effect of war upon the Moslem world and the consequent opportunities for the Gospel, is now ready) references are given not only to relevant matter in the new *Annual Report*, but also to papers and paragraphs in the C.M.S. magazines for the current year. A better use of periodical literature would greatly enrich

the average missionary address. For example, in the September issue of *The Bible in the World* there is a short paper by William Canton, called "The Invisible Wanderers," which is not only beautiful as literature but full of suggestive facts. A man freshly home from the mission field has, of course, first-hand material of his own to give.

\* \* \* \* \*

The S.P.G. *Mission Field* contains a stirring record of a visit paid by the Bishop of Assam (Pakenham-Walsh) to the Khasi Hills, which is notable for the expression of friendly appreciation for the work of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists who share this interesting field. "We are," writes the Bishop, "working in complete friendliness and close touch with the Welsh Mission, encouraging our people to attract converts from heathenism, not by proselytizing, and to become a self-supporting Church, holding the distinctive teaching we have to give them as an heritage for the future united Church in Khasiland which we know is the Lord's will for that people. . . . I was able during the tour to settle several matters which might have become causes of dispute between us and the Welsh Mission, and the friendly way in which both the local Khasi leaders of the Welsh Mission congregations and their superintending missionary reciprocated these efforts, left one with a very happy feeling that days of rivalry and misunderstanding are now ended." There are many such lessons which the home Church may learn from the mission field.

\* \* \* \* \*

One of the brightest hopes for the future is found in the Christian undertakings initiated by oriental or African converts apart from missionary organizations. The August number of the *Spirit of Missions*, the organ of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, contains a long and most interesting account of one of these enterprises in Japan, the Shitaya Mission, founded and carried on in the poorest part of Tokyo, by the Rev. P. K. Goto, a Japanese Christian leader. The mission has been at work for ten years, active steps are being taken to provide a proper church building for its work, towards which the poor church members are themselves making a notable contribution. The record of conversions is very striking. Mr. Goto states that his mission is run on the following "five great principles":

- (1) Smiling principle : that is, be always cheerful.
- (2) Fire-generating principle : that is, to make fire by stedfast prayer.
- (3) Co-operating principle : that is, each must do his own part and there must not be any lazy member.
- (4) Faith principle : that is, we must do all by faith, putting all God's words into practice by the power of living faith ; more doing than discussing.
- (5) Self-supporting principle : that is, they must do their best towards the self-supporting of the Church.

These five principles are worth adopting in home parishes and missions, following thus the lead of a Christian in Japan.

\* \* \* \* \*

Some time ago the Friends' Foreign Mission Association sent out an Educational Commission which published a valuable Report in 1916. It was more than an examination of work actually in being ; it contained much outlook and a careful discussion of the problems of educational missions. A "footnote" to this Report appears in the September number of *Our Missions*, in which one of the Quaker missionaries discusses certain aspects of the work in Madagascar schools. The writer faces the problem, now arising in so many mission fields, of the relation between the type of education given in school and the after-life of the scholars. He points out that, in school, books and paper form the main parts of a boy's life ; when he leaves school they become adjuncts at best, rarely even that. He asks whether moral qualities could not be better imparted to the character of the boy through manual work akin to his future, than through, say, French and arithmetic. In the West, handiwork appeals more to the healthy boy than "swot" ; in Madagascar the contrary is the case, and the healthy boy grows a long finger nail to show that he does not stoop to the indignity of work. The main difficulty in the way of realizing truer ideals lies in the inadequacy of the European staff. The number of pupils is far too large in proportion to that of qualified teachers, and the mission is "obliged by its past" to keep up more educational work than it can properly man. The publication of such a frank and thoughtful statement is of the highest value. Educational missions are second to none in their place in the Divine plan of missions, but they have run out of hand in many cases through their very success, and need to be freshly related to the great principles which underlie them and to the realities of the lives of boys and girls now at school in Africa and the East.

From the first the British mission-houses have had their staffs depleted by the war. But of late the editors have begun to go, and yet the magazines live on. The Editor of the Scottish *Record* is working in one of the huts of the Scottish Churches in France, and the Editor of the L.M.S. *Chronicle* is immersed in literary work in the Government Department of Information. Yet the *Chronicle* still retains its life and spirit, the September number being full of stimulating message. Each of the short papers is worthy of its place, even in a magazine where, owing to paper shortage, every line has to be weighed. One page records the story of the decision of fifty-three students in the Canton Christian College to follow Christ, as the outcome of special meetings held by a Chinese minister; the next gives a delightful account of some meetings held at Ranchi in Chota Nagpur, where the Indian pastors connected with the S.P.G., the Lutheran Mission (formerly Gossner, now worked by the S.P.G.), and others were addressed by the Bishop, by Mr. Edwin Greaves of the L.M.S. and by Indian pastors. Mr. Greaves writes warmly of the fellowship which pervaded the whole conference, and of the "breadth of sympathy and intensity of work" which characterize the Bishop, one of the great Bishop Westcott's missionary sons. Yet another brief paper is a striking study of "The New Boy in China," showing the real growth of boyish character, of healthy love of games, of courage and a sense of honour, of the spirit of sport, and at the same time of true religiousness. Mr. F. H. Hawkins gives a vivid sketch of the contrast between a Chinese quack and the work of medical missions (this, by the way, is a story which would "tell" well), and the "Hill-Top Holiday in Papua" would read aloud delightfully in the home circle or in the parish meeting. The number is a strong and living one, even with its Editor away.

\* \* \* \* \*

We have often heard that in China many of our Western habits are reversed. There is a delightful instance of this in *China's Millions*. A well-known missionary, Miss Gregg, who has had much fruit in evangelistic work, has been holding special meetings for women at a station in Shensi province. The mothers, wives and sisters of Christian men have been signally reached, and many women from non-Christian homes as well. In order to allow the women to attend the meetings in quiet in the chapel a temporary crèche was opened, where the pastor and a few elderly men looked after babies and

infants, keeping them happy with sugar-rags, feeding bottles, scrap-books, sweets and nuts. The pastor got inside an empty crate and represented a wild-beast, while a long-suffering deacon played tunes on the concertina. This much lessened the sorrow of temporary bereavement while the grandmothers, mothers and aunts of the "lamb" attended the services. At the close the deacons and schoolboys prepared tea for the women and had it ready as they came out of meeting.

\* \* \* \* \*

From time to time the China Inland Mission issues tables showing how the good hand of God has rested on its work; so far, at least, as figures can index spiritual results. The latest of these tabular statements, in the September number of *China's Millions*, is indeed a tonic for the faint-hearted supporter of missions. During the last twelve years the outstations and schools of the Mission have more than doubled, and the number of persons baptized has nearly trebled. Over 59,000 Chinese have been baptized since the Mission was founded some fifty years ago.

\* \* \* \* \*

The work of the older missionary agencies in Africa is being supplemented by several newer agencies giving themselves to evangelistic work in the centre of the continent. We can only wish for each such agency a history as rich in blessing, and a development as wise and as proportionate as that of the China Inland Mission. One of the newest of these organizations, the Heart of Africa Mission, under the leadership of Mr. C. T. Studd and Mr. A. Barclay Buxton, can already record after three years' existence that work has been established in three provinces of the Belgian Congo, in six stations, and among twelve tribes. The staff numbers already twenty-two European evangelists, there are one hundred converts and over one hundred and fifty scholars in one school alone. Translational work has been vigorously begun in Bengalla, which is a sort of *lingua franca*, and the work is finding favour with both Government officials and native chiefs. The testing time for such a mission comes when an organized Church is needed, but so far only simple evangelization is being attempted and questions of Church policy do not appear to be faced as yet.

## Preachers' Pages.

### HOMILETICAL HINTS AND OUTLINES.

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

#### Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Text: "Take thee a roll of a book and write."—*Jer.* xxxvi. 2 (Morning Lesson).

With this chapter begins the section which runs on to the end of chapter xlv, and which constitutes a record covering a period from the fourth year of Jehoiakim up to the close of the prophet's ministry. The first three chapters relate to events preceding the capture of Jerusalem, the remaining chapters deal with subsequent events.

I. HERE WE HAVE THE PERMANENT RECORD OF A FAITHFUL MINISTRY. Of Jeremiah it might be said, as of another: "The Lord let none of his words fall to the ground." Notice (1) *Its contents*. It contains the substance of a witness that had extended over a period of twenty-three years—almost a quarter of a century of faithfulness under trying conditions. (2) *Its authority*. It was not merely by Divine permission that it was compiled but by Divine command, "This word came from the Lord, saying . . . write." So there was a very real sense in which, like the tables of the law, "this writing was the writing of God" (*Exod.* xxxii. 16). So, too, with the rest of Scripture (*Jer.* xxx. 2; *Deut.* xvii. 18, 19; *Isa.* xxx. 8, etc.). (3) *Its purpose*. The written message reaches a larger audience. The object is to stir up the people to repentance (verses 3, 7), expressing itself in supplication and amendment of life. And the Divine requirements remain from age to age the same, hence *Romans* xv. 4.

II. HERE AGAIN WE WITNESS THE PASSING TRIUMPH OF A FUTILE HOSTILITY. "He cut it with a penknife and cast it into the fire." Thus he displayed his petty animosity. But the triumph of human pride is short-lived and the decrees of Heaven cannot be thus summarily disposed of. "The Scripture cannot be broken." Another roll is prepared and it contains all the "former words" and, in addition, a terrible pronouncement concerning the presumptuous

Jehoiakim and his posterity. Verily "the evil that men do lives after them." Observe that there are different ways of treating the messages and the messengers of the Almighty. Jehoiakim was deliberately hostile—Jehoiachin was calmly indifferent. These two attitudes are only too sadly common. The inevitable consequences are in either case the same. Jehoiakim has not been the last man who has attempted to destroy the Scriptures in this foolish way. It can never succeed.

---

### Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Text: "Put off . . . the old man. Put on the new man."  
—*Eph. iv. 22, 24* (Epistle).

St. Paul has been accused of being purely theological to the exclusion of practical considerations and ethical teaching. This passage disposes of that baseless contention. Here and elsewhere will be found teaching as practical as anything that St. James has given us. Here are the two tables of the law—our duty to God—"Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God" (note the title)—and our duty to our neighbour. The injunctions contained in these few verses touch human life at almost every point. Commercial morality, honesty, charity, etc., are among the subjects dealt with.

I. THE DIVESTMENT. "Put off . . . the old man." A definite act with direct consequences. It is our "original evil nature." This old life is:—(a) *A darkened life*. "The understanding darkened" (ver. 18). The capacity for seeing things in their true perspective is dulled. Consequently there are false views of God, sin, etc. (b) *A degraded life*. "Abandoned . . . to impurity, greedily indulging in every kind of profligacy" (*Weymouth*). (c) *A doomed life*. "Which is being corrupted" (*Alford*), or "which is doomed to perish" (*Weymouth*).

II. THE INVESTITURE. "Put on the new man." This is not the natural but the supernatural. It is spoken of here as an act of our own volition. There is a whole range of passages which speak of man saving himself, and though redemption is the work of God, its benefits can only be enjoyed by those who are willing to be what God wills they should be (*Ezek. xviii. 27, etc.*). Observe that the results of which the Apostle writes are mainly those which affect other people. Even dishonesty is to give place to "honest industry" (*Weymouth*), so that the man may be able to "give the

needy a share." No "unwholesome words" are to be spoken, but only such as may be "a means of blessing to the hearers," and so on.

---

Twentieth Sunday after Trinity.

Text: "What the will of the Lord is."—*Eph.* iv. 17 (Epistle).

The blessed results of "doing the will of God" are *illumination* (see *John* vii. 17); *realization*,—"Having done the will of God you may receive the promised blessing" (*Heb.* x. 36; *Weymouth*); *continuation*,—"He that doeth the will of God continues for ever" (1 *John* ii. 17; *Weymouth*). Notice some revealed purposes.

I. THE REDEMPTION OF ALL, EVEN THE WEAKEST. "It is not the will of your Father . . . that one of these . . . should perish" (*Matt.* xviii. 14). Thus our Lord has declared the infinite value of a human soul.

II. THE CIRCUMSPECTION OF HIS CHILDREN. See that ye walk circumspectly (ver. 15). *Retrospect!* "Beloved . . . be mindful" (2 *Pet.* iii. 1, 2; cf. *Isa.* li. 1). Observe the utility of both Testaments. *Aspice!* "Beloved . . . be not ignorant: the day of the Lord will come" (2 *Pet.* iii. 8, 10). Observe the same expression as that of St. Paul,—“be not ignorant,” “not as fools,” “be ye not unwise.” *Introspect!* "Beloved . . . be diligent" (2 *Pet.* iii. 14). The personal life as well as the doctrine must be looked to (1 *Tim.* iv. 16). *Circumspect!* "Beloved . . . beware lest ye also" (2 *Pet.* iii. 17). See the human wreckage on the shores of time.

III. THE SANCTIFICATION OF EACH BELIEVER. "This is the will of God, even your sanctification" (1 *Thess.* iv. 3). There is a Pentecost possible in the experience of all who are willing in the day of God's power.

IV. THE EVANGELIZATION OF THE WORLD. *Acts.* i. 8 is not only the key-word of that book but an outline of the Divine plan for the Missionary work of the Church. It also states the qualification of the Evangelist,—he must be a "witness," able to give evidence based on experience.

V. THE GLORIFICATION OF HIS OWN. "I will that . . . they be with Me" (*John* xvii. 24). He had promised this,—“Where I am, there ye may be” (*John* xiv. 3; cf. 1 *Thess.* iv. 17).

---

## Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity.

Text: "Put on the whole (*Weymouth*, complete) armour of God."  
—*Eph.* vi. 11, 13 (Epistle).

For most folk life is, more or less, a keen conflict. *Physically* it is frequently for the greater part of life, a painful fight against some inherited tendency or actual disease. *Spiritually and morally* it is a constant struggle against the forces of evil within. *In the realm of commerce*—in which the average man finds himself engaged—life resolves itself into a fierce fight for bare existence. *Nations* retain their independence by the force of arms. At least they must needs keep a standing army unless they are to fall a prey to the cupidity of their neighbours. It is, of course, the spiritual and moral aspect with which the Apostle is concerned. Let us consider—

I. THE STANDING ORDERS FOR THE DAY. "Put on the whole armour" (verses 11, 13). Observe—(a) *The various parts of "the panoply of God"* (verses 14–18). These are of two orders. Some are for personal protection and some are for aggressive action. (b) *The nature of the conflict.* "Ours is not a conflict with mere flesh and blood, but with the despotisms, the empires, the forces that control and govern this dark world" (ver. 12, *Weymouth*). It is no imaginary foe against whom we wage unceasing war. It was of "mere flesh and blood" that St. Paul was thinking when he said—"So fight I, not as one that beateth the air." The subjugation of the body is no easy task. But there are also external foes of great potentiality to be reckoned with.

II. THE ISSUES OF THE DAY OF BATTLE. In these days the word conflict has assumed a terrible significance and proportion. To the young at least, battles were, until the other day, only things they read about in their history books. How eagerly we turn day by day to our papers and yet we hardly dare open them! How anxiously we ask ourselves,—“How and when will it all end?” So in the protracted moral conflict. We know what the result must be. Listen—"Having fought to the end, to remain victors on the field" (ver. 13, *Weymouth*). There can be no conquest without conflict, no palm without pain, no crown without a cross.

## ILLUSTRATIONS.

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

**Want of Vision.** When the landing of our troops was made at Suvla Bay (Gallipoli), Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett was allowed to go, as a special correspondent, on board the s.s. *Minneapolis*, which sailed from Kephalos Bay on the night of August 6, 1915. She was a huge Atlantic transport with first-class accommodation. Mr. Bartlett was shown into a cabin fitted up with every luxury and comfort. At 6.30 the following morning, on his way to the saloon for breakfast, he saw an ancient steward busily engaged in carefully removing the dust from the carpets with a vacuum-cleaner. Through the open portholes beside him could be seen the action going on ashore—the bursting shells, the enemy replying, our own infantry advancing to the attack. One of the most momentous events in the history of the Empire at that time was taking place; but as for forty years that old steward had cleaned the gaudy carpets at the head of the stairs at that hour, so he continued doing so, without paying any regard to what was going on. “The war outside was no affair of this man; and, like all the other stewards on board, he took not the smallest interest in it.” There are many people like that steward, all unmindful of the struggle going on in the world outside between the armies of Jesus Christ and the forces of Satan, between good and evil, between suffering and the efforts that are made to combat its pain and sorrow: they have their own little narrow interests, their selfish habits, their petty ambitions; they care nothing for the eternal issues that are being fought out by others on the side of good against the powers of evil. That old steward acted mainly from the habit that was born of duty and a certain kind of humble philosophy. But that excuse will not avail for those of whom I am speaking. They may—and they ought to—enlarge their mental horizon and extend the borders of their sympathy, yea and go out themselves to take their share in the world-wide war that is going on. For each one who will realize it, there is a place waiting in the ranks of those who are fighting beneath the banner of Christ our Lord against the legions of death and hell.

\* \* \* \* \*

A young officer whom I knew was invalided home from France. His mother came up from Scotland to be near the hospital where

he was in London. Conveniently situated for this was a boarding-house where she had stayed before. She asked for a room there, but was told by the lady who kept the house that it was full. A bedroom was at her disposal for one night only. A servant-girl overheard the conversation, and afterwards came to her mistress and said, "We mustn't let Mrs. — go out hunting for a room when she wants to be near her son; she shall have my bedroom." "But what will you do?" said the mistress. "Well," said the girl, "I've been thinking it all over; I'll make up a bed for myself in the passage, and Mrs. — shall have my room." "I couldn't let you do that, Martha," said the lady. "It would be so miserably uncomfortable for you." "Miserable! and uncomfortable!" replied the girl. And then, with deep feeling and vehemence, stretching out her right arm as if towards France, she exclaimed, "What about them out in the trenches? If they can put up with all they have to go through, why shouldn't I sleep in the passage, so as Mrs. — can be near her son? She isn't going out of this house, ma'am." That girl was only a humble order of boarding-house servant, but she had the fine instinct of a true woman. For a whole month she slept on a make-shift bed in the passage, while the mother went to and from the hospital. When the time for leaving came, the lady felt she could not offer the girl money, so she bought a present for her; and when she put this into her hand, the girl just looked at her and said, "What's this for, ma'am? I want nothing. I'm only too glad to do my bit in helping you to be near your boy." Truly there are hearts of gold throbbing beneath the plain exterior of many a humble toiler among the English working-classes.

\* \* \* \* \*

"What must Britain do to be saved?—that is the question. She must be born again." These are the words of Australia's Prime Minister, Mr. D. M. Hughes. They were spoken in Cardiff, not at a religious meeting, but on the occasion when the freedom of the city was presented to him (March 24, 1916). He was appealing to the patriotic instincts of his countrymen. Several passages elsewhere in his speech, however, in which God's power is recognized, indicate that with him religion and true patriotism are found together in close alliance. If Britain is "to be saved"—saved from the deadening influences of

materialism and party strife and class feuds and social corruption—"she must be born again." She must receive the impulse of a new life in the power of a spiritual birth. No naval or military victories, however brilliant and decisive, will be sufficient. Neither domestic legislation on party lines, nor commercial treaties with the allied or neutral nations can save our country from decline. Only one thing can lift her up and keep her in that exalted place in the world designed for her by the loving will of Him to Whom she owes all her past greatness—"She must be born again." She must go back to the first principles of true religion. She must make a fresh start, on the old lines of that Gospel preached in these Islands by the early missionaries of the Cross. The humble confession of her dependence on God, repentance from the sins which have lately been corrupting her national life, a living faith in Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world—these are the elements of that new birth so greatly needed by the England of our day to make her what all true patriots fervently desire to see her become.

---

#### THE STUDY TABLE.

The Rev. Harrington C. Lees, Vicar of Christ Church, Beckenham, has written nothing better than *St. Paul's Friends* (R.T.S., 3s. 6d. net). It is a book happily conceived, compiled with infinite pains, and marked by deep insight. Round the figure of Christ are clustered the forms of twelve disciples, of whom one alone completely failed. In this volume is presented a group of twelve men who companied with St. Paul, and of these also only one was a total disappointment. In the choice of these twelve friends, as well as in *sobriquets* which he attaches to them, the writer has shown much skill. These are the twelve—"The First Friend, Barnabas"; "Silas: the Second String"; "Prisca and Aquila: a Double Star"; "Apollos: the Water-Bearer"; "Titus: the Bridge-Builder"; "Mark: the Bruised Reed"; "Timothy: the Understudy"; "Epaphras: the Lord's Remembrancer"; "Luke: the Friend closer than a Brother"; "Demas: the False Friend"; "Epaphroditus: the Ironside"; "Tychicus: the King's Messenger." Each biography is presented as a charming miniature, and an inspiring or warning example. The writer has been at great pains to possess himself of much of the available material, and has shown himself abreast of modern scholarship. He has wisely avoided stating as facts theories that are not proved or doubtful; and while he takes the reader to other levels than the bare prosaic, he never gives unchecked flight to fancy. Mr. Lees has sat at the feet of such masters of biographical exposition as Dr. Alexander Whyte, and has learnt his lesson so well, that he is able to present his characters with a grace no less charming, and with a power that will appeal to a wider circle of more sober Bible students. The result is that the Apostle to the Gentiles is revealed in a yet new and attractive light—as a kind of central luminary about whom the lesser lights move in harmony to do their appointed service: while each character is stamped with a distinct

personality and familiar names now become real, living persons. There is much to learn in the 224 pages of this book. There is fresh thought, deep research, patient "piecing together" of scattered material and disjointed reference; and with felicitous illustration and pointed application the truths are driven home. There are, of course, details upon which opinions may differ; for example, the romantic love story of Prisca and Aquila; or the close kinship between Titus and St. Luke, who are declared to be brothers; but such trifling matters do not diminish the power and value of the book. Bible students of all degrees should read this volume. It will refresh, stimulate and instruct. When we say that in its pages Mr. Harrington Lees is at his best, no more need be said.

\* \* \* \*

The Bishop of Truro contributes a Foreword to *The Christian Warrior's Home* (by the Rev. A. A. C. N. Vawdrey, M.A., Vicar of St. Budock, Falmouth. Robert Scott, 2s. 6d. net). It is a volume of short, plain sermons in which the Church is set forth as the Home of the Soul. It will be found useful for lending to those who are unable to attend the House of Prayer, and they will furnish those who have to minister to rural congregations with models of sermons well within the capacity of the hearers.

\* \* \* \*

*Thoughts on the Epistle to the Romans*, for Laymen, by one of them (Elliott Stock, 2s. net), is something a little out of the ordinary. There are many commentaries by clergy, for clergy and others, on St. Paul's great Epistle. The author disclaims authority beyond that which the intrinsic force of his words carry. As one who had the ordinary training of an average layman, and the ordinary experiences of the average member of a Christian family, he endeavours to present the outcome of his general and non-specialized study. There are sixteen chapters in the little volume, which more or less correspond to the divisions of the Epistle. This little work is marked by considerable freshness. It is very simple—but this is what the writer designs.

\* \* \* \*

The Rev. Archibald Alexander's volume, *A Day at a Time, and Other Talks on Life and Religion* (H. R. Allenson, Ltd., 2s. 6d. net), is dedicated by permission to Sir John Jellicoe. "Written in war-time to minister comfort and if it may be to reinforce hope and faith," it is made up of thirty meditations, or sermonettes, and the title is that of the first which is on the text, "As thy days so shall thy strength be" (Deut. xxxiii. 25). As may be expected, much of the application in these addresses has reference to the exigencies of the war, and there is appropriately one on "The Art of Doing Without," taken from Philippians iv. 12, "I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound." There is also a very suggestive meditation on "The Unreturning Brave," preached (or written) on Easter Sunday, 1915. There is a tone of cheerful courage about the whole, and it is written in that manly, interesting style which Scotchmen know so well how to employ. (The writer of this notice is not Scotch, but wishes to pay his tribute to the authors of North Britain.)

\* \* \* \*

On the lighter side we may mention *Why?* by E. de Vere Bartlett (Elliott Stock, 2s. 6d.), which at the very outset arrests attention, and the interest is sustained to the very last page. We are not sure of the author's sex, nor do we know if this be his or her first novel. If it be, then we hope this will not be the last from the same pen. Those who appreciate startling situations and dramatic incidents will not be disappointed.

## Reviews of Books.

LECTURES ON THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS. By the Rev. P. T. Forsyth, M.A., D.D., Principal of Hackney College, Hampstead; and Dean of the Faculty of Theology in the University of London. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Price 6s. net.

Dr. Forsyth's treatise is a great book upon a great subject: it deserves the closest attention and amply rewards the most diligent study. In the preface the learned author defines his position. "It is neither current Anglican, nor popular Protestant. I write from the Free Church camp, but not from any recognized, Free Church position, having regard, so far as I can, to the merits of the case, to early history, and the experience of religion." The fact that the contents of this volume were delivered as Lectures to students and not to scholars accounts for the element of "repetition," valuable in driving home the spoken words to those who heard them, and no less valuable in emphasizing the important points for those who read the printed page. The literary style of the Lectures is not easy to assimilate; but when assimilated is found to be telling and forceful. Dr. Forsyth is a master of epigram, and of antithetical parallelism; though the latter is sometimes overstrained, in order to gain "effect." The "view" taken is "neither memorial and Zwinglian nor is it High Catholic. It is sacramental but not sacramentarian, effective but not sacrificial." "The Sacraments are not emblems but symbols, and symbols not as mere channels, but in the active sense that something is done as well as conveyed." "As to the Sacraments, it may be surmised that the writer holds a mere memorialism to be a more fatal error than the Mass, and a far less lovely."

The volume is fresh, vigorous, scholarly, candid, and full of surprises. Dr. Forsyth does not say what we should expect of him as a Free Churchman, and says much with which the High Anglican might be credited. He declares what he holds to be the truth without fear or favour. "The Free Churches have tended to idolize *liberty* at the cost of the truth and power which makes liberty—at the cost therefore of reverence, penitence and humility. They have made a good servant a bad master. The Catholic Churches have tended, on the other side, to idolize *unity*, to sacrifice the Church's holiness to her catholicity, and to lose the moral power of the Gospel in a type of piety, or, in canonical correctness of procedure. They have sought unity of policy."

In the compass of 290 pages there are fourteen chapters—seven devoted to "The Church" and seven (including one by Professor Andrews, D.D., and reprinted from "The Expositor") dealing with "The Sacraments." From the very first we are breathing a bracing air and see a wide vision. The treatment is "Great Church," though the audience may have been "Free Church," the readers will be of all Churches—and the debt of gratitude as wide as the limits of the readers.

Chapter I deals with "Holy Church, Free Church, and Sound Democracy." Religion might go on without a Church, but Christianity could not. A Church must have a positive and featured faith, centring in the Atoning Cross of the Eternal Son of God. For this Church every soul is born. It has the secret of Society. The Free Churches tend to be much too atomist, and are apt to be too negative in their note. There are fundamental differences between the Church and democracy. In chapter II "The Church and its 'Unity'" is the theme. It is plainly stated that we belong to the Church because we belong to Christ, not *vice versa*. Here again the note is sounded that "The Church's

one foundation, and the heart of its ministry, is not simply Christ, but Christ crucified." "The sects arose as gifts of God to the Church. They rose for a churchly need and purpose. . . . They were parts and servants of the Church, and should from the first have been so regarded. The mediaeval Church was often wise enough to do this and to make them orders." The writer strikes home, in a kindly spirit, when he says, "The Anglican Church—a Church so great and even glorious—owes its separate existence to one of the great schisms of Church History, and in certain cases keeps up that schismatic spirit—where it does not know, or care to know, or do other than despise, the religious life of one-half of the nation. It is not even insular, it is but demi-insular." Chapter III deals with "The Need of a Church Theory for Church Unity," and contains an excellent description of the true apostolic succession and a vigorous refutation of the false. In a later place the author declares, "The Apostolic Succession has no meaning except as the Evangelical succession. . . . It is the succession of those who experience and preach the Apostolic Gospel of a regenerating redemption." "The Church and History" is dealt with in Chapter IV, which contains much of interest on the question of "Unity," and faces the question "Is the Church in history the *prolongation* of the Incarnation?" To this question the answer is a plain negative. Chapter V is entitled "The Kingdom of God," a term which of late years has taken a ruling place in theology. The relation between the Kingdom and the Church is considered, and the conclusion is reached that the Church is not a "means to the Kingdom, but the Kingdom in the making." Chapter VI deals with "The United States—of the Church." The pressing problem of Reunion is faced and considered. "It can take only one of two lines. It may come either by re-absorption or by federation—either by a re-absorption under the old Catholicism reformed and made elastic, or by the federation of a variety of Churches entirely equal except in age." "The word re-ordination must not be so much as named among us." This whole question reveals "a great chance for Anglicanism" and in view of *post bellum* conditions demands the closest and most persistent attention. "We are at a far more critical juncture than the Reformation was." In Chapter VII the author declares "the Ministry is Sacramental to the Church, as the Church itself is sacramental to the world." The ministry is the ecclesiastical question of the hour; for the Protestant minister is a surrogate of the Apostles, rather than their successor." There is a great truth underlying the false Roman view of the sacrament of orders. It is a new and a bold thought that "the Ignatian bishop is a congregational minister"; and it is startling, though true, that "Christianity began in an irregular ministry."

The Second Portion of the volume is no less valuable than the first. After a general consideration of "The Place of the Sacraments in the Teaching of St. Paul," three chapters are devoted to Holy Baptism, and three to the Holy Communion.

In the Free Churches there is indifference to Baptism, rather than contempt of it; and a great point is made that every Infant Baptism should be sympathetically an adult Baptism. To leave it to the minister is sacerdotal. "It is the negligent Church that forces ministers to be priests." The chapter entitled "New Testament Baptism," is followed by another called "Infant Baptism." This the author claims was unknown in the New Testament Church, which was a Church in its missionary stage. The point of origin for Infant Baptism is obscure, and much confusion has arisen from the attempt to transfer to this administration of the sacrament terms and relations which are appropriate to the baptism of adults. "Clearly the two Baptisms, infant and adult, are psychologically different." All would agree with the writer in his conviction that "There should be none but public Baptisms";

but many will differ from him when he says, "The effect on the infant at the moment (of baptism) is nil."

The origin of the Lord's Supper is found in the symbolic action of the prophets. Christ, in His rôle as a prophet, used the bread and the wine symbolically—but the symbolism was not in the elements, but in the act. To interpret the act as mainly commemorative is to impoverish worship beyond measure. The writer makes a strong case against the popular "Eastward Position" at the Holy Communion, for as "the Sacrament is more akin to preaching than to prayer," the celebrant is "not uniting with the people in prayer or sacrifice, so much as giving them the Gospel from God in action." There is, as might be expected, plain warning as to the true and the false teaching concerning "the Real Presence."

It is not too much to say that Dr. Forsyth's latest work is one of the most important contributions to the study of the Church and the Sacraments: and the consideration of his weighty utterances ought to go far to produce a better understanding between the sundered branches of the one Great Church.

CHAS. E. WILSON.

---

THE RISE OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION: A STUDY IN ORIGINS. By Charles Frederick Nolloth, M.A., D.Litt., examining chaplain to the Bishop of Rochester. London: *Macmillan*. Price 12s.

In these days of rapid, pithy writing, to enforce a particular conclusion or to elucidate a special point of view, we are accustomed to small, if important treatises presented in colloquial style, short sentences, and bold attractive type. Dr. Nolloth is not a writer of that brotherhood. On the contrary, his large book, of 600 pages, is laboriously worked out in the critical, historical, and spiritual interests of his subject. The book is a conscientious, learned, and painstaking work, enriched with valuable notes, and showing the results of much patient research. Conservative as a critic and theologian, Dr. Nolloth will through this effort lead many to see that there is a good deal to be said for the conservative position, since his knowledge of the latest literature and most recent theories in New Testament criticism is patent. The book is solid, and destined to live, though in style it is not exactly modern. The author is before all things systematic in the treatment of his subject, and the contents-table takes the student (for it is pre-eminently a student's book) through the literary and institutional sources, Jewish, Pagan, and Christian, of Christ's religion; and then, at greater length, its preparation in Judaism, in the Dispersion and Philo, in Greek Thought, Greek Religion, and Roman Religion. After that, from Chapter VIII. to Chapter XXIX., it is the direct history of Christ the Man and Saviour and Revealer of God, of the founding of the Church, and its Apostolic doctrine and development, that claim the reader's close attention. The author's endeavour has moreover been to show that "the Christian Religion, as it reached the close of its formative period, was, on the whole, what its Founder intended it to be—that it was in agreement with the mind of Christ." The book is, therefore, systematic and complete in the best of old-fashioned senses, and none the worse on that account.

Among the chapters on the "Preparation" for the Christian Religion, very interesting is that on Greek Thought. One's only regret is that it is not longer. The influence of the philosophy and language of the Greeks can hardly be over-estimated. The truth and miracle of Inspiration is seen in its taking the thoughts and words of men as already conceived and phrased, in order to convey to them its own transcendent message, much more than in

any ideal revelation which should speak a language entirely its own, and therefore uncomprehended on earth. There is, and must be, a link always between the revealer and the recipients of Truth, or revelation is impossible. That which differentiates Christianity from everything earthly is its essence, its spirit, its direct, Divine message, that which unites it with and makes possible its reception in the world, is its outer habiliment, its vehicle, its method of speech. The sequence of thought from age to age, the forms of spiritual conception, even of speculation, which have obtained among men; become the servant and handmaid of the Truth; a new power breathes in old thought: "language dead for ages awakens into life."

The influence of Rome in the world's preparation for Christianity is dealt with in the chapter on "Roman Religion." But it necessarily includes much that would hardly come under the term *religion*. The government and administration, as well as the protection of and vast facilities afforded by the Roman Empire, are dwelt upon. But we are inclined to wish a chapter had been given on the very real influence, not only of the Roman dominion, but of Roman Law itself, both in its institutions and legal conceptions, on the thoughts and language of Christianity, and in the actual expression of Christian doctrine; as, e.g., in the application of the law of adoption by St. Paul in Romans viii., or of that of the *Testamentum* in Hebrews ix. The Apostle of the Gentiles, himself a Jew, was not only conversant with the philosophy of the Greeks, but was also a Roman citizen, and used his freedom as such. And the "Messiah" of the Jews, the "Logos" of St. John, and the Divine "Dominus" of the freed Christian man (1 Cor. vii. 22, Vulgate), echo the title on the Cross, which was "written in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin."

The chapter on the "Two Natures" in Christ is reverently and strongly written, and, with its notes, should be carefully studied. We wish space allowed us to say more.

A note of the book is its insistence on the fact that the Almighty deals with man, not as a machine to be acted upon from without, but as a living being to be dealt with by sympathy which is to be responded to from within. So, in Chapter XVII., on the "Purpose and Method of Christ," this is well brought out. Consistently, in Chapter XXVIII., on "Early Christianity and Ethics," we read that "the great difference between Christian Ethics and other systems lies, after all, in the fact that while they present an external code to be observed, but go no farther, Christianity, with a code still more imperious and binding, gives the power to carry it out. It is a force within, as well as a law without. If it requires a new birth, a fresh outlook, a new heart, it supplies these requirements, and with them the power to obey its commands. God never makes a greater demand upon us than we can respond to" (p. 561). So, too, on Christ's "Public Ministry," we read, "The morality of the Gospel is on a higher plane than that of the Old Testament. Christ has set a pattern which can never be abandoned. When they have seen the best and highest, nothing lower will meet the aspirations of men. It is impossible to go back" (p. 296).

The three chapters on Doctrine, in which the Apostles St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John are considered in respect of the special form and power of their teaching, form perhaps the most interesting and helpful part of this comprehensive volume. "In studying the contributions of those three creative forces to the moulding of the Christian religion," we are prepared at once "for the entrance of a diversity of elements . . . so varied is the impression which we receive. . . . In the primitive diversity of apprehension and of teaching, we have a microcosm of the subsequent variety of thought which was to characterize the Church at large. . . . If at times we are inclined to deplore our lack of unity and the bewildering variety of men's opinions, we

are reassured on looking back to the differences observable in its first founders" (p. 499).

The chapter on "Sacraments" is excellent, and quite abreast of the recent development of controversy (alas! that it should be needful) as to the spirituality of the mode of the Divine Presence. Here is much sound reasoning, given in the calmness of language which distinguishes the whole book, and supported by excellent notes and references. Suffice it to quote one passage. On the question of Transubstantiation we read, "The Eucharist is (now) no longer a Sacrament. Its representative, symbolical character has gone. A miracle has taken place to which our Lord's action here on earth offers no parallel. The effect of such a conception on the Sacrament is like that of the Docetic view of the Incarnation upon the doctrine of the Person of Christ. To secure the Deity, the reality of the Manhood was sacrificed with disastrous results. In the same way, the sacramental value of the Eucharist is marred by the effort to obtain a literal fulfilment of Christ's words. . . . At the time of the institution, the offering of which the Eucharist is the memorial was not yet made. . . . It is the body so offered and the blood so shed that the Sacrament is the sure means of imparting. . . . The time was not ripe for its full celebration. It belonged to the Kingdom of God, and the Kingdom could not be until Christ had suffered and risen" (p. 490).

The book deserves a fuller consideration than this short notice can pretend to give. The many chapters are each so complete in themselves that they offer a series of monographic studies, and may well form helps to the composition of sermons. The earnest student and the thoughtful preacher may each thank Dr. Nolloth for a valuable addition to his library in this commendable review of the history and genius of Christianity.

EDWARD HICKS.

---

CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND HINDU PHILOSOPHY. A Treatise by Arthur H. Bowman, B.D., M.A., L.Th. London: *The Religious Tract Society*. 2 vols. Price 12s. net.

MR. BOWMAN writes with the authority of one who has had twenty-five years' experience of India, and has occupied there a position as Special Missioner, which required a close study of Hinduism and brought him into intimate contact with cultured Hindus. This study has been with him no formal and professional matter. His book bears evidence of the deep personal interest in Oriental thought, and especially in Hindu Philosophy, which he professes at the outset. He has endeavoured to omit no doctrine of any importance in the Higher Hinduism, and to state each with the greatest clearness and fairness. No one could read his two volumes here presented to us without a fuller grasp of the true bearing of Hinduism on its philosophic side, or without something approaching an understanding, so far as that is possible amid the perverse contradictions in the system, of the relationship between Polytheism and Pantheism as elements of the same creed. The unsatisfying and hopeless outlook of Hindu teaching is clearly shown, quite apart from its grosser features—and with reference to these he provides startling evidence of the real moral drift of Hinduism, showing, as one whom he quotes expresses it, that "morality here has God against it," and suggesting that modern anarchical movements in India are not unconnected with the teaching of the Bhagavad Gita.

But there is another leading current of thought in the author's mind as he approaches his task. After long absence from the West, he is "amazed to find the extent to which Hindu Pantheism has already begun to permeate the religious conceptions of Germany, of America, and even of England." The

danger which he foresees is even more threatening for the following generation than for the present, which has been trained in a Christian atmosphere and carries unconsciously into its anti-Christian speculations the restraining influences of Christian ideals. So far as those ideals remain, Christianity, and not Pantheism, deserves the credit for them ; but in truth, before his work is done, there are astounding evidences that even the wild hatred of Christianity manifested by Nietzsche has been outdone by at least one teacher outside Germany. And this extremest form of anti-Christian virulence is closely connected with the revival of Hellenism, of which in Mr. Bowman's opinion Hinduism is the modern counterpart. Such are some of the developments of the gathering crisis of history which we are witnessing. Our author's opinion of their significance is an arresting one. Here are the opening words of his first chapter—"The last and severest conflict of Christianity is yet before us. We believe the scene where this battle is to be fought out to a final conclusion, indeed is already being fought out, is not England, but on the soil of India." And his last two chapters, on "The Vacant Throne of India," and "The Anti-Christ," give an awakening summary of the development and tendencies, whether in India or in the West, of Materialism and Theosophy, of Humanism and of the rapidly spreading Spiritism which he regards as providing along with it a popular supernatural element. These chapters contain some illuminating historical data with reference to Madame Blavatsky, Mrs. Besant, and the Indian boy who is supposed to be destined to be the vehicle of the coming great World-Teacher. Those who are disposed to play with the alleged new light of modern religious systems might be disposed in many cases to call a halt if they could be induced to peruse this evidence.

The blending of these two currents of thought involves, as may be expected, interesting conclusions in the sphere of Comparative Religion. Mr. Bowman shows clearly the uniqueness of Christianity, and urges that it is to be contrasted, never compared with any Oriental religion. In this connexion it is interesting to read that he asked two representative men, an Indian prince and a Hindu graduate, how long Christian teachers would be allowed to remain in India if the people had unlimited power. The answer in both cases was the same, and was significant—"Just so long as they are willing to *compare* and not *contrast*." It is the old story. They will welcome Christ into the Pantheon, but will not accept His exclusive claims. We are being asked, he tells us, to create a Christ of our own, beautiful and attractive, but adapted to the Hindu systems of philosophy and popular religion—to leave out the supernatural truths of the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the Resurrection—an attenuated Christianity. One of the finest passages in the two volumes deals with the renewal of the old demand to eliminate the Cross. Another is in the form of a quotation from an Indian Christian who has been raised to the knighthood (a Rai Bahadur), telling of the effect of Dr. Duff's sturdy doctrine, as contrasted with such weak modern dilutions. "He made no effort," said this Indian gentleman, "as is being done now, to baptize the old religions, to reveal the Christ in Krishna, or Buddha, or Confucius. I weep when I think of the change that has come over many missionaries. . . . You come to us with your higher criticism. Would you shake my faith in Christ? Was it for this that I gave up my father and home, and became an outcaste?"

We venture to suggest a few criticisms, which may be of help in case of a reprint. We do not think Mr. Bowman holds the view that Christianity "fulfils" Hinduism in the same sense that it fulfilled Old Testament Judaism. The above quotation seems almost enough by itself to prove as much. Yet some of his statements would be improved by more cautious wording in this respect—we refer especially to vol. i., 76, 293. The explanation

of such statements probably is that the Treatise is founded on a course of lectures delivered in Indian University centres, and that the lecturer was anxious to prove that Jesus Christ fulfilled all the highest aspirations of Hindus. This is a very different thing from the view above mentioned; but it is not exactly what is conveyed by some of the rather too general statements named, as they at present stand. We think also that the reference to rationalistic Protestantism in i. 114 might be worded so as to make it more clear that it has no title to be described as representing Protestant thought. Mr. Bowman apparently takes a more serious view of the effects of the war on Oriental observers than do some of those who are still in India: but we have no means of deciding whether he or they are right. There appears to be rather a serious misprint, reversing the meaning of a sentence in ii. 220; and an Index would be a great improvement.

But these are matters of detail. The Treatise is one which we hope will be widely read, for it is emphatically a book for the times, and it will clear away, by its candid and well-balanced examination of actual facts, the haze which forms so congenial an atmosphere for the growth of unhealthy and noxious speculation in the spheres of theology and philosophic thought.

W. S. HOOTON.

---

THE LIFE AND WORK OF JOHN RICHARDSON ILLINGWORTH, M.A., D.D., as portrayed by his letters and illustrated by photographs. Edited by his Wife, with a preface by the Bishop of Oxford and a chapter by the Rev. Wilfrid Richmond. London: *John Murray*. Price 10s. 6d. net.

In his great chapter on spiritual gifts, 1 Cor. xii., St. Paul writes: "To each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit to profit withal. For to one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom: and to another the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit: to another faith in the same Spirit: but all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally as he will." The profound truth of this passage is the more borne in upon one's mind after a perusal of this most interesting life. Bishop Gore writes in his brief preface "No man ever more successfully declined to be interfered with by calls which he felt to be not for him. He never attended public meetings or sat on committees or was distracted by business. No one would have thought of making him a rural dean or an archdeacon or a bishop. He retired to his quiet parish, and there—he gave to the clear vision which he won by meditation singularly lucid and beautiful and convincing expression in a series of books which have had an immense circulation." The present writer is just one of many thousands who have read and been much helped by books which came out in steady though not rapid succession from the *Lux Mundi* essays in 1889 to the *Gospel Miracles* in 1915, and it was therefore with real interest that he took up the life of their writer. In one respect it must have been a difficult biography to write. Dr. Illingworth was rector of the little village of Longworth for thirty-two years, and for the most part he stayed within it. No burning practical questions are therefore involved in his life. No new light on the inner history of public events is forthcoming. His life is simply the story of the way in which a shy and retiring and delicate saint wrote his books. His letters are not very widely spread. The majority of them are addressed to a correspondent known only as M.C.L. to whom he wrote every week. Nor are they usually weighty in subject matter like the letters of a Kingsley. Many of them are just friendly notes, retailing the latest events of daily life in home or parish. But they are helpful as revelations of the inner life of one whom God raised up to do a great work. The book is written on a topical plan, some chapter headings being "the Rector,"

"the man," "the Christian philosopher." Perhaps one looked with greatest keenness for the story of the books. Here is a paragraph showing how they were written. "His writing cost him the most astonishing labour. I remember one sentence which was often afterwards quoted in reviews, being written over about thirty times before he was satisfied. He always would get just the one word, and no other, which he felt expressed in the best way the exact shade of meaning which he desired to express. He usually took his exercise in the morning directly after our half-past nine Mattins, and during a ten or fifteen mile ride on his bicycle would think out the subject on which he was then engaged. After tea he would sit in his big chair by the drawing-room fire, with a board on the arms to hold his paper, and after the two or three hours' work, which was the utmost he could profitably spend in this way at a time, would succeed perhaps in producing a page of writing."

His position as a Churchman needs no definition beyond the simple reminder of his membership of the brilliant "Lux Mundi" party, which for many years met annually at Longworth. "He was bathed in the sacramental idea: believing firmly in the appeal to eye as well as to ear, which was, as he often said, 'the natural outcome of a belief in the Incarnation.'" But it is noteworthy that at Longworth he would not have a surprised choir, nor have it in the chancel. He insisted on keeping it at the west end of the church. More notable still is the following passage. "Although he greatly valued the Sacraments of the Church, and had all his boyhood and college life diligently frequented them, and did so to the end, yet as time went on he did not depend on them as once he did. He was always a mystic, and in lonely cycle rides, in pacings to and fro in the garden, or before services in the churchyard, he had most of his real communings with God. He had a strange distaste for settled hours of prayer or meditation, but increasingly, I believe, spent most of his hours in this way. Nothing was too small to be made an object of prayer, nothing too great to expect from it."

He suffered constantly from ill health. Let us finish by upholding his example to those who are in like case. "In his first years at Longworth he was anything but patient. . . . He was then apt to think much of himself and his own ailments; his temper was by no means what he would have desired it to be. . . . But year by year he steadily grew in self-control; year by year he became more and more unselfish, more and more thoughtful for others . . . more and more patient, more and more gentle and loving." We lay down the book with a thought of thankfulness to God for one more addition to the roll of saintly lives. It is ours to reap the fruit of their work, and, as far as God gives us, to walk in their steps.

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

**THE CREED IN DAILY LIFE.** By the Rev W. B. Russell-Caley, M.A.  
London: *Marshall Bros.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

The Bishop of Chelmsford writes a preface to this volume of fourteen sermons, and describes them as a setting forth of "the positive teaching of Christianity, together with such helpful suggestions as to how it should affect the lives of men." These sermons are readable; the treatment of the subjects is fresh, and often original; and the doctrine is sound. \

**LARGER THAN THE CLOUD.** By the Rev. H. R. Anderson, M.A. London:  
*H. R. Allenson.* Price 2s. net.

In this his first volume of sermons the author has published, by request, a sequence of discourses in war time. At a time when many are inclined to think that "The Cloud is larger than the Blue," the optimism of these sermons is a tonic. Eight addresses are grouped under "The Blue," in

Part I, and four under "the Cloud," in Part II. The subjects selected, and the treatment they receive, are distinctly out of the common, and through every line there breathes a spirit of unflinching confidence that since "God's in His heaven" all is well with the world.

**THE RETURN OF THE KING: ITS CERTAINTY, ITS MEANING, ITS NEARNESS.**

By the Rev. F. J. Horsefield. London: *Marshall Bros.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

This small volume contains the substance of a series of lectures originally given in the author's church of St. Silas, Bristol. The lectures, which are eleven in number, and deal with "The Great Hope of the Church," "The Certainty of His Return," "The Rapture of the Saints," "The Great Tribulation," "Armageddon," "The Millennium," "The Great White Throne," "Behold, I come quickly." Throughout the volume the author adopts the historical system of interpretation in dealing with the Book of Revelation.

**THE ONE GREAT REALITY.** By Louisa Clayton. London: *Marshall Bros.*

Price 2s.

To this volume of addresses a short foreword has been written by the Rev. Evan H. Hopkins. There are ten addresses, setting forth the great topics: "God, the Great Reality," "Father, Son and Spirit," "The Voice of God," "The [Hands, the Word, the Church, the Kingdom of God," and treating them in simple language, which is made to impress the great Evangelical message.

**OUR HOMEWARD WAY.** By the Rev. S. J. Sykes, Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin, Waterloo, Liverpool. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.*

Price 2s. net.

This volume of eighteen addresses on the service of Holy Communion contains the substance of a series of addresses given to communicants. The addresses are given in outline. In the introduction the writer says: "God has given this world a Wonder-Gift in Christ. And Christ has left His Church a Wonder-Bequest in the Holy Communion. And the Communion service draws for us a Wonder-Picture of our religion." Then in an interesting manner the author draws out the teaching of the eighteen sections of his "Wonder-Picture," in the series of eighteen addresses. To find in the Communion service a "process of life which shall carry us, in Christ, through redemption and sanctification, from earth through Paradise, to Heaven, which is our home," may strike some readers as being arbitrary, or artificial, or both.

**THE HISTORY OF THE TEN "LOST" TRIBES.** By David Baron. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 1s. net.

This is an examination and refutation of "Anglo-Israelism," and is a book for which we think there is a need. The arguments of the exponents of this theory are exceedingly ingenious and specious, but the writer has shown the fallacy of many of them and pointed out the wildness of the methods of interpreting Scripture. The important question, "Are the tribes lost?" is carefully considered, and we think Mr. Baron entirely proves his contention that they are not "lost" at all in the sense in which Anglo-Israelites use the term. Quite apart from the main discussion this little volume is full of thoughtful suggestion as to the purposes of God for and through Israel.

