FOREIGN MISSIONS

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE CHARACTER OF CHRIST TO NON-CHRISTIAN RACES.

An Apology for Christian Missions. By the Rev. Canon C. H. ROBINSON. 3s. 6d. net.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

By the Right Rev. H. H. MONTGOMERY, D.D. 2s. 6d. net.

CHURCH AND EMPIRE.

A Series of Essays on the Responsibilities of Empire. Edited by the Rev. JOHN ELLISON, M.A., and the Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D. 3s. 6d. net.

MANKIND AND THE CHURCH.

Being an Attempt to Estimate the Contribution of Great Races to the Fulness of the Church of God. By SEVEN BISHOPS. Edited, with an Introduction, by the Right Rev. H. H. MONTGOMERY, D.D. 7s. 6d. net.

A SHORT HANDBOOK OF MISSIONS.

By EUGENE STOCK. Sewed, 1s. net; cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

MISSIONS TO HINDUS.

A Contribution to the Study of Missionary Methods. By the Right Rev. LOUIS GEORGE MYLNE, M.A., D.D. 3s. 6d. net.

CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER RELIGIONS.

Three Short Sermons. By S. R. DRIVER, D.D., and W. SANDAY, D.D. 1s. 6d. net.

THE WHITE MAN'S WORK IN ASIA AND AFRICA.

A Discussion of the Main Difficulties of the Colour Question. By LEONARD ALSTON. 3s. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

FOREIGN MISSIONS

BEING A STUDY OF SOME PRINCIPLES AND METHODS IN THE EXPANSION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

BY

R. H. MALDEN, M.A.

CLASSICAL LECTURER, SELWYN COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

1910

MATRI · MEAE

CVIVS · INSTINCTV · HOC · QVALECVMQVE · SIT

CONSCRIPTVM · EST · OPVSCVLVM

PREFACE

THE following pages are merely an essay. They can lay no claim to completeness, and more experienced eyes will convict them of many inadequacies besides those of which I myself am conscious.

We may sometimes be irritated by the seeming lethargy of our Church, and its activity in the Mission Field does not always compare favourably with that of some other communions.

But it is probably true to say that the Church of England takes more interest in the Mission Field now than it has done at any period since the Norman Conquest.

Missionary meetings are many, and the output of missionary literature of various kinds has become so large that it is impossible to maintain an acquaintance with it all. To prevent being lost in a maze of detail, I have tried to consider the missionary work of the Christian Church as a whole. I have tried to set forth shortly the grounds upon which missionary enthusiasm rests, to sketch the missionary history of the past, and to offer some suggestions as to methods of maintaining and extending interest in missions, and of equipping missionaries for their work.

In writing I have thought less of the professed student than of the ordinary reader. I have therefore tried to keep the text free from technicalities. Considerable use has been made of foot-notes, partly to supply fuller information where it seemed necessary, and partly to suggest possible lines of further study.

I have appended a very short Bibliography to show the general sources from which my historical information has been drawn, and to indicate where a fuller discussion of points upon which I have only touched may be found.

King Henry VI. has left it on record that the object of his Colleges, at Eton and in Cambridge, was to be "the dilatation of conning (*i.e.* spread of knowledge) and stablishment of Christian Faith." I hope that it will not be thought presumptuous for one who owes to those Colleges more than he can readily express, to say that he has tried to make some small contribution to the fulfilment of the purpose which their founder designed them to serve.

R. H. M.

Selwyn College, Cambridge,
Feast of the Conversion of S. Paul, 1910.

FOREIGN MISSIONS

It may be hoped that future generations will look back upon the first decade of the twentieth century as a landmark in the history of missionary progress. About the beginning of the last quarter of the nineteenth century it seemed as if interest in the spread of the Church in heathen lands were dying down. Missionary societies found that their wheels drove heavily, and there was a general feeling of discouragement. Matters had begun to mend fully twenty years ago, but it is since the opening of the present century that the greatest change has taken place. The Missionary Exhibition held at Manchester in the autumn of 1907, and the "Orient in London" held under the auspices of the London Missionary Society, attracted very large crowds, and have proved that interest in missionary work is very real and widely diffused. The Pan-Anglican Congress of the summer of 1908 can hardly have failed to stir the most sluggish imagination; and the Lambeth Conference, which followed it, brought the extension of the Kingdom of God into still fuller prominence.

The Student Volunteer movement inspires the highest hopes for the future, and the recent Eucharistic Congress of the Roman Church has probably contributed something towards making people realize that the Church of Christ is not restricted to the parish or congregation in which they themselves are accustomed to worship.

In spite of complaints as to the increasing neglect of Sunday and decline in the attendance at public worship, it is certain that interest in religion—in the broadest sense of the term—has never been as widely diffused as it is to-day. The extraordinary output of religious literature, to which all publishers' catalogues testify, is sufficient proof of this. And missionary work is receiving its share of this interest; an interest which in certain quarters is rising to enthusiasm.

For all this we are bound to render our most humble thanks to God, and to take courage, for the Holy Ghost is greatly at work in our midst. But we are also bound to increase our vigilance and care. For history teaches us that it is much easier to evoke enthusiasm than to use it. A band of determined enthusiasts, even a single eloquent preacher, can stir multitudes and make them believe that they are ready to make any sacrifice on behalf of the cause which is advocated. Yet such enthusiasm may easily die away almost as quickly as it has come without having achieved anything consider-

able or lasting. A signal instance of this is to be found in the history of the Crusades. It is no exaggeration to say that the whole of Western Europe was thrilled by the preaching of Peter the Hermit and his associates. The project appealed very strongly to the temper of an age which loved adventure, and saw no incongruity in trying to extend the Kingdom of God by force of arms. The highest authorities supported it to the utmost of their power, and great sacrifices of men and money were made on its behalf. But beyond the establishment of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem—an achievement of doubtful value—the Crusaders accomplished nothing, and the Holy Sepulchre is still in the hands of the Turks. In the fifteenth century the idea of a Crusade failed to evoke any enthusiasm at all, though the recent capture of Constantinople had brought the Turk nearer than ever before.

The repeated failure of enthusiasm, which has brought to nothing many hopeful religious movements, is one of the saddest facts with which the student of Christian history is confronted. It is one of the strongest weapons in the armoury of the enemies of religion. It is most probably to be explained by the fact that the nature of enthusiasm is very frequently misunderstood. Enthusiasm is an emotion, and therefore, like all other emotional qualities, must be more or less fleeting. It cannot

be continued at its highest. Attempts to perpetuate any emotion, and maintain it at its highest pitch for any considerable period, are bound to be reduced to hysterical appeals and sensational methods. These end either by falling upon deaf ears, or by weakening stability of character in those whom they influence. In either case a reaction is bound to set in, which may more than undo whatever good has been done in the first instance. Our Lord Himself likened the operation of the Holy Ghost to the action of the wind,[1] the symbol of uncontrollable varying power in Nature. We know that the conditions which prevailed upon the Day of Pentecost were not continued.[2]

It is not, of course, my purpose to disparage enthusiasm in any way. It is absolutely necessary in religious work—more necessary perhaps than in anything else. But we must be careful not to misuse it, and try to make it discharge functions for which it is not fitted. We cannot have progress without it, but we cannot have sustained progress if we rely entirely upon it. For then, when it begins to flag (as it must), we have nothing else upon which to lean. If a rough illustration may be adduced, enthusiasm is like a leap. It is often necessary to

[1] S. John iii. 8.

[2] In 1 Cor. xiv. we see the dangers attendant on the belief that the gift of tongues would be a permanent possession of the Church. The history of the Irvingites in our own day is a striking testimony to the soundness of S. Paul's judgment.

take a leap to surmount some obstacle beyond the compass of our ordinary stride. But the human frame is not so constructed as to be able to progress satisfactorily by a series of leaps. Similarly, while we welcome enthusiasm as a means of overcoming special difficulties, we must look elsewhere for sustained motive power. When enthusiasm for a cause has been aroused, the next step is to transform it into reasoned conviction—to translate the fleeting emotion into a settled attitude of the will. By ballasting ourselves, so to speak, in this way, we can obtain an unwavering determination which is not to be cast down by apparent failure, but translates our aspirations into wise, far-seeing action on behalf of the cause which we have at heart.

This is the task which lies before the Church at the present moment. Enthusiasm for the missionary cause has been wonderfully reawakened of late years, and we thank God for it. But we must not be content with merely trying to maintain that enthusiasm by repeating the methods by which it has been evoked. Rather we must try to transform it into a clear, settled, disciplined conviction which will issue in effective action. If we cannot do this, then the work of the last few years will have gone for very little, and the next generation will take up the task of evangelizing the world almost at the point where we have taken it up, and the most that they will be able to say of us is, that we did not let

things go back. But if we can succeed, who dare predict what great things the next few years may bring forth? Never has the Christian opportunity been so wide as it is to-day. A door has been opened in China and Japan such as could not have been imagined a generation ago; railways are being constructed in some of the remotest parts of Asia and Africa; every quarter of the globe is being made more accessible than ever before, and with these facilities there is undoubtedly a desire to spread and to receive the Gospel. All depends upon our power of clarifying and focussing a somewhat vague enthusiasm, and so transforming it into a working force. The following pages are intended to be a small contribution to the performance of this all-important work, and are written in the hope that God will allow them to be of some service to some who desire to see the extension of His Kingdom upon earth.

A dissertation on Foreign Missions composed with this object naturally falls into three sections.

(i.) APOLOGETIC.—This term ought not really to be applied, as it is altogether beneath the dignity of the subject. No apology—as the word is generally understood—is needed for the mission work of the Church. But the English language does not seem to possess a substitute. By "apology" in this connection, I do not mean a defence, but an exposition of the rationale of Foreign Missions, explaining the

claim which they have upon all who make any profession of Christianity.

(ii.) HISTORICAL.—We ought to know something of the past mission work of the Church, both for encouragement and instruction. Eighteen centuries of Christian history ought to provide us with many noble examples to imitate, and to save us from repeating many unfortunate mistakes.

(iii.) PRACTICAL.—This section should contain suggestions as to the means by which interest may best be maintained at home, and the material resources which the work demands supplied. It should deal also with the training and distribution of mission workers, and their relation to workers of other communions whose fields overlap their own.

I. APOLOGETIC

In spite of the progress of recent years, there are still many highly respectable people who dare to say that they do not approve of Foreign Missions, and many more whose interest in them is very languid. Such people are very likely regular church-goers, even perhaps communicants; and recognize that they are bound to contribute something to the work of the Church in their own neighbourhood. But missions they regard as an amiable weakness of a few clergy, and other faddists, who allow their imagination to run away with them.

They do not believe that efforts to convert the heathen will ever succeed upon any large scale, having apparently overlooked the fact that our own forefathers were heathen once, and lived so utterly outside the pale of civilization that a Roman army mutinied when required to cross the English Channel. They consider that the heathen have evolved a religion which suits them very well, better than any substitute which we can offer; that they get on very well as they are; and that it is a pity to unsettle their minds and introduce discord into their homes. Also that "there is so much to do at home." When the slums of our own great towns, and the squalor of many of our picturesque country villages, are things of the past—when every man, woman, and child in this country is leading a truly Christian life, then perhaps we may turn our attention elsewhere. They seem to have forgotten that if the Apostles and their companions had taken this view of their duties, no one of them would have set foot outside Jerusalem after the Day of Pentecost; and if Christianity existed at all to-day it would be an obscure Jewish sect without influence in the world, and unknown to all save a few professional students.[1] We require to convince these people that mission work is so essentially a part of the Gospel that indifference to

[1] Perhaps the warning, "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel until the Son of Man be come" (S. Matt. x. 23), was intended to keep the Apostles from falling into this mistake.

it is incompatible with any profession of Christianity whatever.

A century ago the supporters of Foreign Missions could have justified themselves by appealing to what the Duke of Wellington is said to have called "the marching orders of the Church." "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (S. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). But our position would not be very strong now if we were to rely in this way upon a single passage. In the first place, we cannot be absolutely certain that in such a passage we have the exact words which fell from our Lord's lips. Secondly, there has never been any movement in the Christian Church, however perverse in its inception and disastrous in its results, which did not rely upon an interpretation of some text of the Bible which seemed obvious to its adherents and untenable to the rest of Christendom. If we rest our zeal for missionary work avowedly on a single verse, we are not likely to carry conviction to those who do not agree with us already, and we expose ourselves unnecessarily to attack.

Neither should we be wise to make too much of tribute paid to the work of missionaries by colonial governors and others who are well qualified to judge. Their testimony is very valuable as corroborative evidence, and we are grateful for it. But we should be

deliberately weakening our own position if we took it for our sole, or even our principal, support. For the fact that any institution appears to be producing practical results of a beneficent nature does not prove that it is desirable in itself. For example, the Casino at Monte Carlo is said to be extremely charitable, and to have conferred many solid benefits upon the whole principality of Monaco. But no thoughtful Christian would attempt to justify the practice of gambling on these grounds. And there have been missionaries who were unworthy of their great calling, and aimed at gaining political power in the countries where they worked, or acted unwisely in other ways; and eventually, it must be admitted, did more harm than good. It would be rash to assume that there will never be such again, and if we were to base our position entirely on the practical results which missions produce, a few such would cut away the ground from under our feet. We ought rather to try to show that there is in the Gospel some general principle, too important to be neglected for a moment, which can only find expression in missionary work. In other words, that missionary work in the abstract is an obligation imposed upon all Christians by the very terms of their faith.

Now, no one can read the Gospel with any real desire to grasp its meaning without seeing that it was intended by its Author to be universal. He addressed Himself to all men. Take away this

universality, attempt to limit the Gospel as suitable only to the needs of certain races or certain ages, and much of its distinctive character is gone at once. It becomes merely one among many religions. Its claim to be a divine revelation cannot stand for a moment. For the idea of a divine revelation which is not intended for all alike, and is not equally applicable to all men at all times, is absurd. It is unreasonable, unthinkable. Either the Gospel is for the whole world—and in that case it is plainly the duty of those who have received it already to impart it to those who have not—or else the Word never became flesh. There is no possible halting-place between these two opinions, and the alternative must be pressed upon those who call themselves Christians but do not support missionary work. They must either deny our Lord and renounce the Gospel entirely, or else do what lies in them to spread it to the heathen world.

And it should be noted that if we have much to give to the heathen, we have also much to receive from them. No two races are precisely alike, and the fact that the Gospel is for all means that each race has a special contribution to make towards the interpretation of it. And until this contribution has been made we cannot know the exceeding greatness of our treasure. There must be an interpretation of Christ far deeper and wider than anything that we have learned as yet. Just as in the past we can trace

the special contributions made by various peoples, so will it be in the future—but on a grander scale. The Greek-speaking world brought the inherited traditions of centuries of philosophical training to bear upon the deepest mysteries of the Christian faith. And although an over-subtle intellect often led individuals into wild speculations which impaired the fulness of truth, yet the Church could ill have spared the Greeks. The theology of to-day owes more than it can readily express to such names as Basil and Athanasius, and to the schools of Alexandria and Antioch.

The Latin Church did more than any other to bring order and discipline into the Christian world, and it would be almost impossible to over-estimate the importance of this service, however deeply we must regret that in its latter days it has elected to subordinate truth to order. The naturally legal turn of mind conspicuous in the great Latin theologians has produced some unfortunate results; but the Church owes more to Augustine than to any other Christian writer after the close of the New Testament. The Papacy could not have become what it did become if Latin civilization had not produced imperial Rome; and we can no more deny the debt which Western Christendom, at least, owes to the Pope, than the United States of America can deny the debt which it owes to the civilization of this country.

Again, the Teutonic nations have made a contribution of inestimable value by vindicating the rights of the individual conscience. We have declared that no system, however great its services to religion in the past, can continue to claim the allegiance of consciences which it violates. Thus it has been our privilege to develop the ethical side of Christianity, and to present it as the inspiration and guide of right conduct. We are consequently in danger of regarding a divine revelation as nothing greater than a code of morals, and even of allowing people to think that the right conduct which we all value so highly can be obtained without the religion which has produced it. But we cannot assume that Greek, Latin, and Teutonic theology have exhausted the whole content of the Gospel. The Body of Christ will not reach the fulness of its stature until it includes every nation.[1] And what may we not hope for when the Holy Spirit is made manifest in minds which have been trained in the ancient civilizations of the East? It is said—to take one single instance—that the advanced philosophy of the Hindus is so profound that European intellects can hardly grasp it. We may confidently expect that they will find in the Scriptures, especially in S. John's Gospel, meanings which are hidden

[1] Compare the thought of Origen on Eph. i. 23: "Wherefore Christ is fulfilled in all that come to Him, whereas He is still lacking in respect of them before they have come." (Quoted by the Dean of Westminster in "The Vision of Unity," p. 4.)

from us at present. And so with every other nation. Because the Gospel is nothing if not universal, we owe it to them all; not only for their sakes, but also for our own. It is really most irreverent to think that anything less than the whole world can draw out the whole meaning of the revelation which God has given us. It amounts to assuming that His ways *are* as our ways, and His thoughts as our thoughts.

Secondly, if the Gospel is anything, it is Life. Now we cannot conceive of life in any form which does not involve growth. We may say that the power of growth is the distinctive mark of life in the world of Nature. The most rudimentary plant grows, while the most costly and beautiful precious stone does not. Death is the cessation of the power of growth. And we can have no reason to suppose that the life of the Church is not subject to the same law. As soon as it has ceased to grow, the Body of Christ will have ceased to live. No doubt the Church would not disappear immediately if its missionary work came to an end. It would continue for a time without much apparent alteration. But it would be dead. It would have become a mere institution, and, like all other institutions, would be doomed to decay. It might still, for many centuries, direct practical activities of a highly beneficent kind; it might still compel admiration by its zeal and the perfection of its organization.

It might be many things for many years, but one thing it could no longer be, the living Church of the living God. Little by little its spirituality would decay, till at length men would find that it had nothing to offer which they desired to receive, and the cry would be heard, "Cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?" It would disappear as little regretted as were the philosophical schools of Athens—once the centre of learning for the whole civilized world—when Justinian closed them in the sixth century. They had been, perhaps, the noblest of all human institutions, but they were only an institution; and the time came when their work was done, and in spite of all their past glories they were unable to retain their hold upon the intellect and imagination of the world. A Church which had ceased to grow, and therefore to live, would have placed itself in the same category: its disappearance would be only a question of time.

The truth of this principle will probably not be questioned by any thoughtful reader of the New Testament, but it may be noted that it is remarkably illustrated on a small scale by statistics of Church work. Statistics are always to be viewed with caution, but in so far as we are entitled to use them in such matters, they seem to have proved that the vitality of any religious body at home is in exact correspondence with its activity in the mission-field.

Thirdly, the general conditions of our time have made missionary work more imperatively necessary than it has ever been before. The nations of Europe have divided among themselves a very large portion of the habitable globe. We are busily engaged in trying to raise the inhabitants of these territories to the level of our own civilization. The same process is going on in countries which are not under European rule. We have introduced Japan to the material achievements of the Western world: we are introducing China, Persia, Siam, and other countries. We believe that this civilizing work is worthy of the great Christian Powers of Europe, and trust that we are creating something which will endure. But we can hardly help a certain feeling of disquietude when we remember the great civilizations which have preceded our own. The civilizations of Babylonia, Assyria, Egypt, Greece, and Rome lasted longer than ours has as yet. In many respects they surpassed our highest achievements. Almost every year the spade discloses some unsuspected triumph of ancient culture. And therefore we cannot repress certain insistent questions when we reflect on these things. What brought these splendid fabrics to the ground? How has it come about that they are represented to-day by little save ruins? We know that the government of the later Roman Empire was admirable, yet all the skill of the best organizers and jurists that the world has ever seen could not arrest

its decay. Have we any guarantee that the complex civilization which we are propagating with such assiduity will not share the same fate? If it will, the benefit which Europe is conferring on the world, at so much cost to itself, is a very doubtful one.

The ancient civilizations of the world were not failures; on the contrary, they were destroyed by their own success. They became so complex and elaborate that they fell by their own weight. For every advance in civilization makes life harder, because it demands more of the individual character. An uncivilized society can be satisfactorily carried on on a foundation of a few simple virtues, but a highly civilized one imperatively demands a great deal more of its members, and if its demands cannot be met, it cannot be carried on. The Roman Empire, for example, withered away because it could not produce enough characters of sufficient strength to do its work. The remark which Pope Gregory the Great has put into the mouth of S. Benedict has proved perfectly true: "Rome will not be destroyed by the barbarians . . . she will decay internally."[1] To this burden of civilization we may apply our Lord's saying, "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him will they ask the more" (S. Luke xii. 48).

An increasing civilization which does not provide

[1] "Dialogues," Bk. I., Dia. ii. ch. xv.

for a corresponding development of character is doomed from the beginning. Circumstances may hasten or postpone its final collapse, but the downfall is only a question of time; and the one power in the world which can develop character indefinitely and enable it to bear any burden which may be laid upon it is Christianity. Many other things (*e.g.* good government) may be helpful up to a certain point, but history teaches us indisputably that they have shown themselves to be inadequate. A stage is reached beyond which they can do no more. Then either the civilization must be arrested at that point—as appears to have been the case with China in the past—or it must go forward to its own ruin. It would be idle to imagine that we could arrest the spread of our civilization, even in our own dependencies, supposing that we should wish to do so. In the words of Bishop G. A. Selwyn, "In we are, and on we must." But if we attempt to civilize upon a non-Christian basis—if we even try to treat Christianity as one among many beneficent agencies, instead of the foundation upon which everything else must be built, we are wasting our time and deceiving ourselves. We are doing a positive disservice to the peoples under our care, for we are raising an elaborate superstructure upon foundations which cannot possibly support it. The greater our activity and apparent progress now, the more complete will be the final catastrophe. The opening

of a new line of railway in Africa ought to mean the departure of a fresh band of missionaries, because it places a fresh tax upon the character of the people through whose territory it passes. The best that we can give without Christianity is law, which our subjects, if not Christianized, will probably try to reject as soon as an opportunity of doing so arises.

On these three grounds, therefore, Foreign Missions claim the unfaltering support of every professing Christian :—

1. If the Gospel be of God, it must be for all men. Therefore it requires the peculiar contribution of every race to develop its whole content.

2. The Gospel is Life, and life without growth is inconceivable.

3. By contact with less highly civilized races we confer upon them many material benefits. At the same time we place a fresh tax upon their character. Unless we provide for a progressive development of character in them we shall merely defeat our own ends. Christianity is the only force which has not been proved to be unable to inspire such development.

If there should be any who, while convinced of the necessity of Foreign Missions in the abstract, still doubt their practical utility and success in any given instance, they have only to make some study of missionary reports. Until they have taken the

trouble to do this, they have no right to express any opinion on the subject.

II. HISTORICAL

It would be a gigantic task to attempt any treatment of mission work from the historical standpoint which should approach completeness. It would amount to little less than a complete history of the whole Christian Church. The story of Christian Missions begins in the New Testament, and is continued to our own time. At times the work has been hampered by unfavourable conditions, internal or external, but it has never been entirely abandoned. No exhaustive treatment is, however, needed here. It is not necessary to examine the work in detail until we approach our own time. A general review of the earlier ages will be sufficient for us. We cannot do more than try to grasp a few broad outlines, and deduce a few general lessons. One principle may be laid down at the outset. We must not expect to find the methods of any age exactly suited to any other. The continuity of the Divine Society is not expressed by a capacity for indefinite repetition, but by its capacity for unbroken development.

We see from the Acts of the Apostles that the generation immediately succeeding the Ascension was a time of great missionary activity. Every

Christian realized the paramount necessity of spreading the Word as widely as possible. The obligation which lay upon the Apostles was shared by all. SS. Peter and John were but voicing the feelings of the whole Christian society when they said, "For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard" (Acts iv. 20). And so even persecution became a means for the spreading of the Gospel more widely (Acts viii. 1). Circumstances were exceptionally favourable to missionary enterprise; for in the preparation of the world for Christ, God had permitted the conquests of Alexander of Macedon and the Greek kingdoms of Asia Minor and Egypt. One outcome of these had been that by our Lord's time Greek had become an almost universal language. It was understood by any one with any pretensions to education at all, and by many others, from the Indus to Marseilles, and from the Cataracts of the Nile to the Crimea. He had also permitted the conquests of the Roman Republic, and subsequently the establishment of the Roman Empire. The Empire was strong enough to be more tolerant in respect of the religious beliefs of its subjects than any mediæval State could venture to be. Its admirable organization made travelling more rapid and secure than it was at the beginning of the last century. It was probably easier for S. Paul to make his way through Asia Minor than it is for any traveller at the present day. Facility of inter-

communication and the existence of an almost universal language were two advantages which the early Church enjoyed in an exceptional degree, and we know that the fullest use was made of them. S. Paul is, of course, the chief figure in the missionary history of this period;[1] and we see that his method was to pass as quickly as possible from one great centre of population to another. So far as we know, he never spent more than from two to three years in any one place—usually a good deal less. There can be little doubt that the idea of the Empire appealed to him very strongly, and that he set himself to carry Christianity throughout the length and breadth of it. Whether his policy was consciously thought out, or whether he was only conscious of the power of the Holy Spirit driving him from city to city, we cannot say with certainty. But we can see that the policy which he adopted was that of a wise and far-seeing statesman, and may therefore assume that it was deliberate. Persecution was bound to come upon the Church, and it was therefore the duty of the first missionaries to create as many different centres of Church life as possible. If S. Paul had devoted himself to building up a large Christian community in one or two places, he would have given the government an opportunity of striking with deadly effect. The Church at Ephesus or

[1] Compare "S. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen," by Sir W. Ramsay.

Corinth might have been completely destroyed, and, if there had been no other, Christianity might have disappeared. We are accustomed to say that "the blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church," and it has often been so. But, on the other hand, there have been successful persecutions. Christianity was extinguished in Japan in the seventeenth century, and in China at an earlier date. A persecution is very likely to be successful if the persons against whom it is directed are all to be found within a limited area, and have no friends elsewhere to whom they can resort. But a widely diffused society, with a large number of centres, has—to say the least—a very good chance of defeating any attempt to extirpate it. And that is the condition in which S. Paul's labours left the Church of Europe and Asia Minor. He spared no pains to make the Church in each locality feel that it was one with all other Churches, but did not try to concentrate it into a few places. He left an organization too close to fall to pieces or perish of inertia, but too loose to be extirpated by a single blow. But, wise as his action was, it would be in the highest degree unwise for us to imitate it at the present day. Organized persecution is no longer to be feared, and therefore we shall probably do better if we concentrate ourselves on building up native Churches, which shall be really strong Christian centres, in a few places. Their influence will then radiate more

powerfully than would the influence of a large number of weaker Churches, which we had been compelled to abandon in their early days and leave without adequate supervision.

For S. Paul's method had its disadvantages, as we see from the rest of the New Testament. His infant Churches soon showed how sorely they needed a strong guiding hand. Within a few years of their foundation, Galatia and Colossæ were on the brink of falling into fatal errors, and we do not know quite enough of their subsequent history to say how far S. Paul's letters to them were able to avert the threatened disaster. But most striking of all is the testimony of the Letters to the Seven Churches, which probably belong to the extreme end of the Apostolic Age (*i.e.* A.D. 90–100). Viewed in the light of subsequent history, the second and third chapters of the Apocalypse are one of the most encouraging documents ever written, because of the apparent hopelessness of their outlook. Whoever the author may have been, few men can ever have had to pen such a dismal record. Ephesus possesses "labour and patience," but "has left its first love." Against Pergamos and Thyatira the writer has "a few things": he is, however, able to bestow some slight commendation upon them. Sardis is dead in reality; Laodicea knows not that it is "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." Smyrna and Philadelphia alone receive anything

which can be counted as real praise. Yet Ephesus had received a larger share of S. Paul's personal attention than any other city. The other six Churches must all have come within the range of his influence, though he may never have visited them in person. There is no reason to doubt the ancient tradition that they had all enjoyed the supervision of S. John for a considerable number of years. Yet, in spite of these advantages, at the close of the first century they all seem to be tottering on the verge of extinction. Their collapse must be attributed, to a very large extent, to the rapidity with which they had grown up. Still it was better that a few local Churches should fail to fulfil the hopes with which they had been founded, than that the whole Church should be so concentrated that one persecution might be able to sweep it out of existence. And we can never be sufficiently grateful to the author of the Apocalypse for having included these letters in his book. Surely no modern mission work has ever, to all appearance, failed so completely as did the labours of the men who founded these Churches. The Christian society had not been in existence for a century; it ought still to have possessed everything that the enthusiasm engendered by novelty could bestow upon it. The cities of Asia were strong centres of intellectual activity. If the Church in them could fall so far below its original ideals in so short a space of time, it would seem that

its final disappearance from the face of the earth could not be very far distant.

If experience had not proved the contrary, we should have felt certain that a society which had merited such stern rebuke in some of its important centres before the end of the first century could not have survived at all until the twentieth. And therefore we must thank God for having shown us in these letters that the early days of Christian history were not free from disappointment and failure; and also for having showed us that His Society is not as others. Again and again it may seem to be sick unto death, but it never fails to exhibit a unique power of recovery. To study the failures of the Church strengthens our faith at least as much as the knowledge of its greatest triumphs. For its continued power of recovery shows that—despite all human weakness or wrong-doing—the whole Body is instinct with the Life of its Divine Head. We have no trustworthy information as to the missionary policy of the other Apostles, but behind the various legends there is probably a stratum of truth. Probably they did travel very widely in different directions, but if the scene of their activities lay outside the Roman Empire, it is unlikely that they were able to attempt or accomplish as much as S. Paul did. But it seems probable that they too aimed at extensive rather than intensive evangelization; that is, they tried

to carry the Gospel to as many different points as possible, and left the young native Churches to manage themselves. The reason for this policy and its disadvantages have already been pointed out.

After the close of the Apostolic Age it has been said that "Christian history passes through a tunnel." Our knowledge of the condition and progress of the Church during the second century is very incomplete. We learn from Pliny's well-known letter to the Emperor Trajan, that, by the year 112, it had made such way in the northern part of Asia Minor that the trade of the purveyors of animals for the temple sacrifices was almost gone. It is, however, easy to over-rate the amount of truth contained in this statement. The tradespeople affected would naturally make the most of their grievance when laying it before the newly-arrived governor. Moreover, the conditions of life in an entirely rural district do not conduce to independence of thought or action, especially if the common life of the villages be well organized and strong. It is possible that many Bithynian villages came over *en bloc* to the new religion when a few of their leading people had been converted. The rest of the inhabitants might, almost as a matter of course, become diligent in the observances of their new worship, though many of them had only a very slight grasp of its real import. It would hardly be a matter of conscience at all. It is said mission-

aries have to contend with this difficulty at the present moment in the highly organized village life of Southern India.

It is possible that during most of this period the Church was fighting for dear life against the foes of its own household. Our Lord had foretold the rise of false Christs and false prophets (S. Matt. xxiv. 24), and they had begun to make their presence felt before the close of the New Testament (1 Tim. vi. 20–21; 1 John iv. 1; Rev. ii. 14–15). It is likely that they would increase rapidly, and be more successful in gaining adherents after the death of the last of those who had known the Lord in the days of His flesh. The Church of the second century probably found itself attacked on every side by wild speculators, whose views contained enough truth to endow them with considerable vitality, but involved the denial of some essential part of the Gospel. We know that various forms of Gnosticism became rife very early, and the theosophy of our own day shows that this kind of fantastic theorizing has not lost its power of attracting certain minds; for missionary work, in the strict sense of the term, there was therefore probably little opportunity. The Church doubtless grew, but it was probably more by what may be called natural expansion than by organized missionary effort.[1] By the year A.D. 177 there was a

[1] An illustration may make the distinction clearer. The Christianity of the United States of America can hardly be called the outcome of missionary effort on the part of Europe. It has grown

Latin Bible, but we do not know how long before that date the translation had been made. Probably not very many years. We do not touch the full stream of Christian history and tradition until we come to Tertullian at the extreme end of the century. He declares that parts of Britain which the Romans never reached have been conquered by Christ.[1] The statement is very possibly a rhetorical flourish, but it could hardly have been made if it was utterly at variance with the known state of affairs. We may take it that the second century had been, generally speaking, a period of progress. We know that by the middle of the third century the Church of Rome possessed one bishop, forty-six priests, seven deacons, seven subdeacons, fifty-two exorcists, readers, and door-keepers, together with fifteen hundred widows and distressed persons who depended upon its alms for their maintenance.[2] The entire Christian community must therefore have been very considerable. The position of the bishop and clergy must have resembled that of the clergy in the larger Indian cities at the present day. They were not primarily

up, for the most part, because men and women who were already Christians settled there to seek a livelihood. Similarly Christians who were not specifically missionaries must have travelled all over the Roman Empire in the army and the civil service, and even beyond it in the way of trade.

[1] "Adversus Judæos," § De Nativitate Adventus Primus. Christianity undoubtedly reached Ireland very early. The Romans never conquered any part of Ireland.

[2] Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.," bk. vi. ch. 43.

missionaries—at any rate in theory. They had a considerable Christian population to edify and rule. But because this population was only a small fraction of the entire population of the city—10,000 out of 2,000,000 is perhaps a reasonable conjecture where we have no certain information—in practice much of their work must have been missionary. And it may be presumed that similar conditions prevailed in the other great cities.[1]

Before the third century had run half its course, the Church began to feel the stress of one of the most serious conflicts in which it has ever engaged. It had to meet an opposition more serious than its worst internal dissensions—not even excepting the Arian heresy, which, in the earlier part of the fourth century, counted more than half Christendom among its adherents—or than the fiercest persecution ever directed against it by the civil power. It had to meet a pagan revival—in other words, a hostile *spiritual* power. This revival did a great deal towards improving morality, and purified the old beliefs of many of their grosser elements. To a great extent the movement took the form of religious syncretism, trying to borrow from a number of religions what seemed best in each. Christianity was among the contributors to this curious patchwork; for example, the Emperor Alexander

[1] The fact that "paganus" means a countryman shows that Christianity was strongest in the great towns.

Severus (A.D. 221–235) is reported to have had statues of Christ and Abraham in his private chapel by the side of Orpheus, Apollonius of Tyana, and other noted sages.[1] The centre of this revival was the worship of Mithras. Little is known of the details of the cult,[2] but it originated in Persia, and seems to have been a form of sun-worship. Much of its teaching seems to have been very spiritual and noble, and it spread with great rapidity, especially among the army. About the year 300 it seemed—humanly speaking—to be quite uncertain whether Mithraism or Christianity were destined to be the religion of the future. The conflict has left one permanent mark upon the Church by fixing the date of Christmas Day. There is no doubt that December 25 was chosen, in default of any tradition, to counteract the great Mithraic festival celebrating the triumph of the sun after the winter solstice. Apart from its intrinsic importance, this pagan revival is of special interest to us at the present time, for exactly the same thing appears to be happening in India and Ceylon. Hinduism and Buddhism are said to be making strenuous efforts to reinvigorate themselves. They have borrowed some Christian ideas for the purpose: for example, the Buddhists in Ceylon are said to have introduced a

[1] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 112 (ed. Bury). He is even reported to have contemplated building a temple to Christ.

[2] All that is known about it will be found in Professor Cumont's book on the subject, "Les Mystères de Mithra."

personal God into their system, which does not properly provide for the existence of such a Being. Altogether the revival is said to be meeting with considerable success, and to be exerting a beneficial influence upon its adherents. No doubt that means that missionary progress will receive a decided check, which may last for more than a generation; but it also bids us be of good courage. For beyond doubt it means that the final collapse of those religious systems is almost within sight, and that the triumph of Christianity in those regions may be looked for within the present century, or at least at no very distant date. To acknowledge Christ as a good man, to wish to graft any of His teaching into an older religious system of very different traditions, is, among people who have never yet known Him, a step toward the spiritual experience which alone can enable them to say "Jesus is Lord" (1 Cor. xii. 3).

In the year 324 the Emperor Constantine[1]—to borrow Dante's phrase—"turned the eagles": that is to say, declared Christianity to be the State religion of the Empire. This change of policy on the part of the government was by no means an unqualified blessing to the Church. It brought certain very solid advantages of an obvious kind, but at the same time certain less obvious, but

[1] The date of his own conversion is uncertain. He had proclaimed religious toleration, and given the Christians absolute freedom of worship by the edict of Milan in 313.

seven years to Connaught, where he has left his mark to this day, in numerous dedications of churches and popular tradition. He then went to Ulster, regulating his movements by the principal trade routes of the country, preached in Donegal, and revisited his old friends in Antrim. Finally, in the year 445, he founded the see of Armagh. At this point his biographers insert a fictitious visit to Rome to obtain the Pope's sanction for all he had done in Ireland.[1] The truth is that he left Ulster, and travelled southwards, finally reaching Munster, where he is said to have spent seven years. Then, becoming conscious that his end was near, he made his way back to the north, and was overtaken by death at Saul, near Downpatrick. His body is believed to be buried on the site of the present cathedral of Downpatrick.

So much can be disentangled from the legends which have gathered round his name. He may be regarded as a typical example of the manner in which the barbarous races of Europe were converted. His individual success was probably greater than that of most other missionaries; but it must be remembered that he had exceptional advantages. It can seldom have happened elsewhere that a missionary has landed in a heathen country where he

[1] The legendary nature of the story is sufficiently shown by the fact that he is supposed to have stolen—with the connivance of the Pope—a number of relics while the keepers of them slept.

has lived for some years previously. We see strongly developed in him the three great characteristics which must be found in every missionary:—

(1) An overwhelming sense of the inward call to the work, which can enable a man to say with S. Paul, "Woe unto me if I preach not the Gospel" (1 Cor. ix. 16).

(2) A high degree of personal courage in the face of active hostility. S. Patrick knew that he was risking his life by his action at Tara.

(3) A statesman-like grasp of the strategic points in the geographical formation of the country, and the character of the people.

Many of the conversions brought about by any great missionary pioneer are inevitably only skin-deep. But once the foundations have been laid, smaller men can be found who are able to build upon them.

S. Patrick's career is in no sense unique. It has had its parallels elsewhere in the past; under altered conditions, it has them even in our own day. We may be sure that God will never fail to raise up such men so long as the heathen world calls for their work. It will now be appropriate to give a very brief sketch of the "Apostles" of other countries, to whom we owe it that Europe has been a Christian continent for nearly a thousand years.

British Isles

S. Columba[1] was born in Donegal on December 7, 521, and belonged to the royal clan of the O'Donnells. He was brought up a Christian, and educated chiefly at the famous monastic school of Clonard. The first forty years of his life were spent in Ireland, but a quarrel with S. Finnian led to a pitched battle at Cooldrevny, in the year 561, between the inhabitants of Ulster and Meath. S. Columba's party were completely victorious, and 3000 of the Meathmen were slain. For this he was excommunicated by a Synod, and his confessor, S. Molassius, abbot of Inismurray, off the coast of Sligo, advised him to leave the country and atone for his wrong-doing by trying to evangelize the heathen Picts of Scotland. He set sail, and finally established himself, with about 200 followers, on a little island adjacent to the isle of Mull. It is said that his choice was determined by the fact that this was the first spot which he reached from which the Irish coast could not be seen. The real name of the island seems to have been Y or Hy. This was Latinized by his biographer into Ioua, and then misprinted Iona. It must have taken some months to organize the community, and provide for

[1] The authority for his life is the biography of Adamnan, ninth abbot of Iona (679–709). Adamnan was a man of remarkably wide culture, and also wrote a treatise on the Holy Places, *i.e.* a narrative of travel in Palestine, Syria, Egypt, and Constantinople.

its material needs; but by the end of the first two years Columba had converted many of the inhabitants of Mull and of the mainland. He then determined to attack Pictish paganism in its stronghold, and made his way to the residence of the renowned King Brude, near to the modern Inverness. He had not yet gained a complete mastery of the Pictish language; but fortunately two of his community, Comgall and Canice, were Picts by birth, and he availed himself of their assistance. The story of his dealings with King Brude recall those of S. Patrick with King Laoghaire. The Druids opposed him by every means in their power; but their magic was completely surpassed by the Saint's miracles. In 565 King Brude was converted, and the foundations of the Church of Scotland were laid.[1] The monastery of Iona soon became a very famous centre of missionary enterprise. Its sons penetrated as far north as the Orkneys, and as far south as the Midlands of England. In the next century it sent Aidan (Bishop of Lindisfarne, 635–651) to Northumbria, to whom more than to the Roman Paulinus the conversion of that part of our country is due.[2]

[1] Before Columba's time a small number of Irish Christians had established themselves in a second Dalriada in Argyllshire. But they were hard pressed by the Picts, and had been nearly exterminated by King Brude in 560. The knowledge of their plight may have influenced Columba's movements.

[2] It had no doubt been Christian in Roman times; but the Saxon invasions of the fifth century had reduced the British Church to the western half of the country.

Finan, Aidan's successor, was also a monk of Iona. Columba himself died peacefully on June 10, 597, before the altar of his church. His biographer tells us that his face was like that of a man who in his sleep had seen a vision of heaven. Nine days before his death the first Christian king of English race had been baptized at Canterbury.

National pride forbade the ancient British Church to take any part in the conversion of its conquerors. It maintained a separate existence till the thirteenth century, when, though Wales was still independent of the English crown, the four Welsh dioceses were formally incorporated in the province of Canterbury. The Churches of Strathclyde and Cornwall (West Wales) had been absorbed in the Church of England at an earlier date, when those territories passed under Saxon rule. The second great root of English Christianity is the Roman mission under S. Augustine. The story of its inception is well known. The attention of Pope Gregory the Great was caught by the appearance of some slave boys exposed for sale at Rome. He inquired to what country they belonged, and when he learned that it was a heathen one determined to do what he could for its conversion. It is worth while to notice that England had no special claim upon him of any kind. Its political connection with Rome had ceased nearly two centuries earlier. The Pope neither exercised nor claimed any jurisdiction over the remnants of

the British Church. Famine and pestilence had brought the fortunes of the Romans themselves to a very low ebb. But the mere knowledge that there was a heathen country which might be reached was a sufficient reason for trying to reach it without delay. The Pope's first step was to commission his agent in Gaul to buy any English slave lads of seventeen or eighteen who were being taken through the country, and forward them to him, that he might have them educated and send them back as missionaries to their own country.[1] We have, however, no information as to the success of this scheme. About the same time he despatched Augustine—one of the chief officials of the monastery of S. Andrew—with about forty monks to preach to the English. They set out, probably in the early spring of 596, When they had got as far as the famous monastery of Lerins (an island off the southern coast of Gaul) their courage failed them. They were ignorant of the English language, and received alarming reports as to the ferocious character of the people. Augustine was sent back to Rome to beg that they might be relieved of their mission. When he returned he brought a letter from the Pope, dated July 23, 596, exhorting them to persevere. The party advanced

[1] It is interesting to note that a precisely similar plan was adopted by Bishop G. A. Selwyn in Melanesia. During his voyages among the islands he persuaded parents to entrust boys to him. He then educated them at the college which he had founded in New Zealand and returned them as missionaries to their homes.

slowly, engaging, we are told, some Frankish priests to act as interpreters; and it was not until after Easter 597 that they landed in the isle of Thanet. After a few days, Aethelbert, King of Kent, consented to receive them,[1] and was so favourably impressed by the first interview that he allowed them to settle in his capital city, Canterbury, and made provision for their maintenance. On June 1 he was baptized—tradition says in S. Martin's Church—and many of his subjects followed his example. Augustine realized that he was to do more than merely found the Church of Kent, so betook himself to Gaul, where on 16th November he was consecrated Archbishop of the English by Vergilius, Archbishop of Arles, with the assistance of other Gallican bishops. His return was followed by a vast increase in the number of converts.[2] On Christmas Day 597, ten thousand are said to have been baptized in the river Swale, near the mouth of the Medway, and it was plain that the Christian faith had taken hold of Kent. The policy recom-

[1] The way had been to some extent prepared by his marriage with Bertha, daughter of Charibert, King of Paris. She was a Christian, and her family only consented to the match on condition that she should be allowed the exercise of her religion. She brought with her a Frankish bishop named Liudhard to act as her chaplain. Tradition states that S. Martin's Church, Canterbury, which is still in use, was her chapel.

[2] The absence of a powerful native priesthood like the Druids of the Celtic countries no doubt accounts to some extent for the rapid progress made.

mended by Gregory was to retain as far as possible what had belonged to the old religion. Temples were to be used as churches, and the festivals which had been kept with heathen rites were to be made aids to Christian worship. At the seasons at which the people had been wont to sacrifice oxen to idols, they were to come to the same buildings—now Christian churches—and, camping round them, feast their cattle, and give thanks to God, the Giver of all good things. So it has come about that the chief Christian festival is known among us by the name of the heathen goddess Eostra, in whose month it usually fell. The advantages and dangers of such a policy are obvious. On the one hand, it conduces to the rapid spread of the Gospel; on the other, it may help gross superstitions to survive. There does not, however, seem to be any evidence that the struggle between the profession of Christianity and practices incompatible with it was more protracted in England than elsewhere. It may, however, be laid down that a Church which adopts Augustine's policy must be a preaching Church, and must direct itself especially to the development of conscience. Augustine died on May 26, 604 or 605. In 616 Aethelbert was buried in S. Martin's by the side of Bertha. On his death the Church suffered a violent reverse. His son Eadbald was a heathen, and in accordance with heathen custom married his step-mother (Aethelbert had been married twice). This

act was the signal for a widespread return to heathenism in Kent, and with the death of Sedbert, king of the East Saxons, about the same time, that people also relapsed into idolatry. There were only three bishops in England—Mellitus, Justus, and Laurentius, and the first two withdrew to Gaul. Laurentius was on the point of joining them when the conversion of Eadbald improved the position of affairs. But during the next few years no progress could be made. When Justus, one of the last survivors of the original mission, became Archbishop of Canterbury in 624, the mission seemed to have been an almost complete failure. But the fortunes of the English Church had reached their lowest ebb, for three years later Paulinus converted Eadwine, the powerful King of Northumbria. Though Eadwine's sons apostatized, and the work had to be done over again by Aidan, still this temporary success put heart into the Church at a time when encouragement was sorely needed. In 635 Wessex received the Gospel from Birinus, an Italian monk who apparently came direct from Rome. In 658 Wulfhere, a Christian, became King of Mercia, and during the seventeen years of his reign did all that he could to further the spread of his religion. In 681 the kingdom of the South Saxons, which, cut off from external influence by the almost impenetrable forest of Anderida, had remained heathen and barbarous, surrendered to the preaching of the fire-

brand Bishop Wilfrith,[1] and the last stronghold of paganism in England was broken down.

The early history of English Christianity presents features in common with that of many other great missions: over-rapid success at first, immense numbers of superficial conversions, then relapse into the old ways and apparent failure. If all history is the best cordial for drooping spirits, of no history is that more conspicuously true than the history of Christian Missions. In 620 it seemed as if Pope Gregory's mission (despite the great qualities of its first head) had been a complete failure. When Mellitus and Justus were tempted to return to Italy heartbroken, and did actually withdraw to Gaul, no one could have foreseen that the people upon whom it seemed impossible to make any lasting impression would themselves be sending great missionaries to other lands in less than two hundred years, and in the remote future would be called by God to play a leading part in the evangelization of the world;

[1] The story is that a three years' drought had produced a famine so terrible that numbers of the people drowned themselves to escape the pangs of hunger. They could not fish in the sea, being perhaps afraid of deep water, and so only caught eels. Wilfrith showed them how to join eel-nets together, and so gather the inexhaustible harvest of the sea. Gratitude impelled them to listen to his preaching. Their King, Aethelwath, was already a Christian. Wilfrith was an outlaw at the time owing to political and ecclesiastical complications in his Northumbrian diocese, and the rest of England was closed to him. Eleven years before the South Saxons had tried to murder him and his companions. See *infra*, p. 63.

perhaps even to be the centre round which the sundered fragments of Christendom may yet be gathered into one.

Burgundy and Central Europe

Towards the close of the sixth century, France[1] had become a byword throughout Europe for immorality and irreligion. For more than a hundred years it had been the prey of foreign invaders, and the civilization of the fourth and fifth centuries had been swept away. The Merovingian kings were probably the worst dynasty that ever occupied a European throne. King Clotaire burned his rebellious son alive with his wife and daughter. We even hear of a Bishop of Tours burning a man alive to obtain the title-deeds of an estate which he coveted. The assassins sent by Fredegonde to murder Childebert were in holy orders. She caused the Archbishop of Rouen to be murdered while chanting service in church, and a bishop and an archdeacon were her accomplices.[2] Into this frightful whirlpool an Irish missionary flung himself with the headlong courage of his race. S. Columbanus was born in Leinster in 543—the year in

[1] By the year 177 there was a strong Church in the South of France maintaining close relations with Asia Minor, but we do not know how or when it had been founded. There is no good ground for believing that Dionysius the Areopagite was the first apostle of France. Christianity probably came there by natural expansion.

[2] Milman, "History of Latin Christianity," bk. iii. ch. ii.

which Benedict, his great monastic predecessor and rival, died.[1] The sixth century was a golden age of the Irish Church. S. Columbanus received the greater part of his education at the monastery of Bangor, on Belfast Lough, then at the zenith of its fame, and perhaps the best educational establishment in Europe. He landed in the north of France, and made his way to Burgundy. He was favourably received by King Gontran, who gave him the old Roman castle of Annegray. Here he founded a monastery which quickly became a famous school, and gave birth to the great daughter foundations of Luxeuil and Fontaines. He soon came into conflict with Brunehault, queen of the south-eastern part of Gaul, on a plain point of Christian morality. His determined adherence to certain Irish customs,[2] which were at variance with those of the Roman Church, also made him unpopular with some who might have been expected to support him. His monastery was boycotted, and finally he was arrested and placed on board a ship bound for Ireland. The ship was driven by weather into the mouth of the Loire, and the captain, thinking that he had an

[1] The authorities for Columbanus' life are his own writings, consisting of his "Monastic Rule," in ten chapters; a book on the daily penances of the monks; a book on the measure of penances; an instruction on the eight principal vices; a considerable number of Latin verses; five letters and seventeen short sermons. Also a biography by the Abbat Jonas, an Italian monk of Bobbio, who was his contemporary.

[2] Especially as to the right form of the tonsure and the date on which Easter ought to be kept.

unlucky passenger, refused to keep him on board. He was landed, with a few companions, to go where he would. His quarrel with Brunehault had closed the greater part of France to him, but he spent a short time at the court of Clotaire II. Thence he made his way by boat *up* the Rhine—in itself no small achievement—till he reached the lake of Constance. Here he and his companions stayed for a time and preached the Gospel to the heathen Swiss, and founded the great monasteries of Reichenau and S. Gall.[1] His labours met with success, but his impetuous temper made him unpopular. The people stole his cattle and slew his monks, and complained that the strangers scared away the game by infesting the forests with their presence and prayers. Thierry, son of his old enemy Brunehault, had also extended his dominions till they included the spot where Columbanus was living. So he set out with only one companion, and crossed the Alps to the court of Agilulf, king of the Lombards. The north of Italy was at this time a stronghold of Arianism[2] and pagan superstition,

[1] S. Gall was one of his companions. His name is preserved to this day as that of a Swiss canton.

[2] Arianism was very popular, first at the imperial court and then among the Teutonic invaders of the Empire. Its contention was that a father must have existed prior to his son, and that therefore "there was when the Son was not." This made the Son a creature, and so destroyed both the Trinity and the Incarnation. It is perhaps the most signal example of the incapacity of common sense to appreciate the central mysteries of the Christian faith. It is encouraging to remember that at one time it commanded a majority in Christendom.

and it seems that Columbanus had long desired to visit it. He was favourably received, and land was granted to him at Bobbio, in a retired gorge between Genoa and Milan. Here he founded his last great monastery, which was a centre of light and knowledge for many centuries. It was suppressed by the French in 1803, but the church still serves as a parish church. Towards the close of his life the passion for solitude increased upon him. He discovered a cavern in the neighbourhood, which he transformed into a chapel. There he spent his last days as an anchorite, until his death on November 21, 615. History shows us few more courageous missionaries, and few whose life-work produced more enduring results. The foundations of S. Gall and Bobbio alone exercised a widespread influence for many centuries. Modern learning owes an almost incalculable debt to the collections of manuscripts which were made there. We cannot entirely condone his impetuous temper, but it may be doubted whether a less fiery disposition could have ventured to attack France at that period. He at least showed Queen Brunehault that there were Christians who would not bring the Gospel into harmony with her desires. Like Columba, S. Francis of Assisi, and some other notable saints, he is said to have had remarkably close sympathy with birds and animals.

Frisia

As soon as the Church was fairly established in England, the Saxons recognized the duty of spreading the Gospel in heathen lands. Naturally their thoughts turned first to their own kinsmen on the Continent. A beginning was made in Frisia (now Friesland in the north of Holland) by what might almost be called an accident. In 678 Ecgfrith, King of Northumbria, arranged with Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, to divide the vast diocese over which Bishop Wilfrith was presiding into three. Wilfrith himself was apparently not consulted. His fiery temper had doubtless made him personally unpopular, and he decided that he had been ill-treated. He appealed to the Pope as the only hope of redress. His ship was driven out of its course by tempest (whereby he escaped his enemies, who were in wait for him near Etaples) and he landed on the coast of Frisia. It speaks volumes for the missionary spirit of the time that, although it was most important in his own interest that he should reach Rome as quickly as possible, before his enemies had discovered his whereabouts, he could not pass through a heathen country without some effort to bring its inhabitants to a knowledge of the truth. He obtained leave from King Adelgis to preach the Gospel, and baptized many of all ranks. His work seems to have been

evanescent, but he at least prepared the way for the great work of S. Willibrord[1] a few years later.

In 687 an attempt to send out a mission to the people from which the Angles and Saxons of Britain were known to have derived their origin was made by Ecgbert, a Northumbrian. When on the point of departure, he was prevented from sailing by what he believed to be a divine warning. But three years later he was able to despatch a party of twelve under Willibrord, a Northumbrian who had been brought up in Wilfrith's monastery at Ripon. They landed at the mouth of the Rhine, but Rathbod the King would not give them a hearing. Pippin of Heristal, Duke of the Franks, had conquered the south-western part of Frisia, and he received the missionaries gladly. Their preaching met with great success, and Willibrord showed extraordinary courage in destroying idols. He was greatly helped by the spread of the Frankish power, and in 719, on the death of Rathbod, Pippin gave him Utrecht for his archiepiscopal see. He had been consecrated Archbishop of the Frisians without a see by Pope Sergius twenty-three years before.[2] He even made an expedition to Denmark, but found that the Danes would not listen to him. He managed, however, to obtain thirty boys to

[1] His life was written by Alcuin of York, who died in 804.

[2] Episcopacy is, of course, a much older institution than the diocesan system. The early Irish bishops lived in monasteries, and exercised their functions wherever required, much as our judges go on circuit at the present day.

scarcely less solid, drawbacks. It is not wonderful that it was received with a burst of enthusiastic thankfulness by men who could recall the horrors of the fiercest and most extensive persecution in history. It meant that the reign of terror instituted by Diocletian could never recur. It gave the Church peace so far as its relations with authority were concerned, and therefore an opportunity for the better ordering of its own affairs. In gratitude it honoured the Emperor with the title of "The Equal of the Apostles." But Constantine was very far from being a real Christian at heart. As was not uncommon at that time, he held a low and superstitious view of the Sacrament of Baptism, and therefore refused to receive it until he was on his deathbed. The Roman attitude to religion had always been essentially Erastian; religion was for them an important part of the machinery of the State, and ought to be kept efficient like any other department. The question of its abstract truth or falsehood was of secondary importance. It was a strong influence—however it might have come into being—and as such was to be fostered and regulated by prudent rulers. Constantine's motives were probably much the same as those which had led Augustus to restore the temples, and provide for the maintenance of public worship, three and a half centuries earlier. Public worship of some kind there must be, and it had become plain

that the Church could be of more use in the conduct of the government than the old religion. It was therefore the part of a judicious ruler to avail himself of it as far as possible. A distinguished modern religious leader has stated that he regards Constantine's action as the most successful blow ever dealt to the Church by Satan.[1]

Its first result must have been to increase enormously the burden of the Church's intensive work. Christianity became fashionable, and was nominally embraced by many who were still pagan at heart. Inevitably the whole spiritual tone of the Church was lowered. Moreover, the leaders had for the first time to deal with a problem which, in varying forms, has been with us ever since. They had to try to co-ordinate the spiritual independence which belongs of right to Christ's Society, and the allegiance which Christian men are found to pay to Christian rulers. They had to resist undue encroachment by princes, who not unnaturally thought that they had a right to direct every form of activity in their dominions, and yet refrain from raising the Donatist cry, which has not yet lost all its power to attract, "Quid Christianis cum regibus?" (What have Christians to do with kings?), which would have frozen the Church into a narrow sect. A study of the life and writings of S. Ambrose, who was Bishop of Milan from 374 to

[1] R. M. Benson in "The East and the West," vol. i. p. 293.

397, will show how hard the task was, even for the greatest.

Yet despite these drawbacks, as we look back now upon the "conversion" of Constantine, we can hardly fail to recognize it as a signal instance of the good hand of our God upon us. For, except during the brief change of policy under Julian "the Apostate" (361 to 363), it gave the Church tranquillity and confidence, and therefore an opportunity of equipping itself for the almost overwhelming missionary labours which were to be forced upon it during the succeeding centuries. The fourth century stands with the sixteenth as one of the great eras of creed-making. It saw the canon of the New Testament authoritatively determined—*i.e.* the final rejection of all the attempts to supplement by means of forged gospels, revelations, and epistles what God has been pleased to make known to us. It saw the Roman baptismal creed, commonly called "the Apostles' Creed," in almost its present form:[1] it saw the two Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople (325 and 381), whose joint labours gave birth to what was accepted by the Council of Chalcedon in 451 as the "Nicene" Creed: the only formula, be it noted, which has ever commanded the allegiance of both East and West.[2]

[1] The exact form which we use now does not seem to occur before the eighth century (Gibson, "Articles," viii.).

[2] At the Council of Ferrara in 1438 a Latin Bishop proposed the Apostles' Creed as a possible basis of reunion between East and West. A Greek Bishop immediately exclaimed, "We neither have nor know the Apostles' Creed."

If the canon of Scripture had not been authoritatively settled, if there had been no authoritative formulæ to guarantee unity of teaching, the Church must, humanly speaking, have melted away among the masses of heathen who were so soon to press upon it. The work of the fourth century secured the possibility of effective missionary progress in the future.

The same century witnessed the beginning of the monastic institutions which were destined to play a very large part in missionary work. Western monasticism usually traces its origin to S. Benedict and his foundation at Monte Cassino in 516. But the movement had begun much earlier in the East, and before the end of the fourth century there were large numbers of monks in Western Europe.[1] The idea of a monastic community (*i.e.* a number of men, or women, living together by rule, and having as little as possible to do with the rest of the world) seems to have originated with the hermit Antony in Egypt towards the close of the third century.

In 322 a regular monastic settlement was founded at Tabennisi, an island in the upper Thebais, under Pachomius. The ascetic ideal of life was invested with peculiar power at that time by the awful licence of ordinary life in the great centres of population. It is not wonderful that flight from

[1] When S. Ambrose was Bishop of Milan there was a monastery "full of good brothers" outside the walls. S. Augustine, "Confessions," bk. viii. ch. vi. sec. 15.

the haunts of their fellows seemed to be the only means of salvation to many earnest souls. The Egyptian and Syrian deserts offered a refuge which was eagerly sought, and it is probable that the monastic idea proper may have arisen in part from the banding together of a number of "solitaries" for mutual help and protection.[1]

It is possible to attack the ascetic ideal of life on many grounds. No doubt some of the early hermits and monks were barely sane, and defaced God's image by the bestial manner in which they chose to live. No doubt they were often intensely self-centred, and their view of pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father was in some respects a distorted one. Yet by the very conditions of their existence the hermits were missionaries. Their instinct was to push beyond the limits of civilization; but the regions to which they betook themselves were not always destitute of all inhabitants. It must frequently have happened that some savage tribe whose territory had not been included —or at any rate had not been effectively included— within the Roman Empire gained their first knowledge of Christianity from some hermit who had established himself in their midst. Then it might happen that the fame of his sanctity attracted

[1] The movement was probably stimulated by the persecutions under Decius and Diocletian, which made the desert a desirable refuge. The hot Eastern climate is also favourable to meditation.

disciples from the more settled regions which he had left behind, and so a little Christian colony was formed. Some of the most famous religious foundations in Europe began in this way.[1]

The hermits were not created by any missionary zeal, and we may not be able to justify all their motives. Still they were undoubtedly in many cases the pioneers of missionary work.

It is unlikely that any institution will ever be devised more admirably adapted for missionary purposes than the monastery. In the first place, the monks had no family ties to recall them from their new home. Probably no one will deny that a great deal of missionary work at the present day can be done by unmarried better than by married men. And as the monastic life was only intended for those who felt that they had a strong vocation for it, the evils which must follow any attempt to impose celibacy on any large number of men did not disfigure its earlier stages. It is probable that they never would have become rampant if a high vocation had not come to be regarded merely as a quiet profession, and so to be embraced by many whom God had not fitted for it.

Secondly, the common life must have been especially valuable to new settlers in a strange and savage land. It removed the possibility of the spiritual

[1] For example, the abbey of Crowland, in Lincolnshire, which grew up round the hut of S. Guthlac.

loneliness which weighs so heavily on many a modern missionary. The monk proper was hardly ever alone for a single instant:[1] his spiritual and intellectual life was sustained and strengthened by the constant society of his brethren. It is impossible to estimate how much Protestant communions have lost through reluctance to train monks and use them for missionary purposes. It would be outside the scope of these pages to trace the later development of monastic institutions, or discuss the question whether they might not have shared in England the ecclesiastical reforms of the sixteenth century, and so have been preserved to us down to the present day. But if we could have retained some of our monasteries, and re-inspired them with enthusiasm for their ancient ideals, there can be little doubt that Christianity would have advanced much more rapidly throughout a large part of our dominions than it has done.

Thirdly, on the economic side, a monastery was an almost ideal missionary implement. As a rule, only a small proportion of the brethren were in priest's orders, and the lay-brothers were commonly skilled in various branches of labour. Therefore, given a site, the mission became self-supporting in a very short space of time. It was not obliged to appeal to headquarters at home for funds, because it

[1] The active, practical bent of much Western monasticism is, no doubt, partly the outcome of climatic conditions. The anchorites of the East did, however, find imitators in the West, especially in the Celtic Church.

could produce everything it required—except, perhaps, books—upon the spot. Before long it might even be in a position to send an outpost still farther afield. And so the evangelizing work went on, bringing in its train the best that the civilization of the day had to offer. The monastic settlement was an example of sober, well-ordered Christian life, and wielded, on a larger scale, the resources of which the Medical Missions of our own time avail themselves with such good results. The influence of such communities helped to raise the whole tone of life in their immediate neighbourhood, and the large grants of land which they often received showed how thoroughly they gained the confidence of the people among whom they worked. We are, perhaps, too ready to reproach entire Churches, or individual religious associations, if they become rich. Certainly our Lord taught that His ministers are not to aim at accumulating wealth, and we have good reason to dread the deceitfulness of riches. But, on the other hand, a monastery could not grow rich, as many of them did, if it had not succeeded, in the best sense of the word. For people are not as a rule willing to enrich an institution with gifts of land and money until it has gained their affection and respect in a very marked degree.

In the year 378 a Roman army was completely defeated by the Goths at the battle of Hadrianople, and the Emperor Valens was killed. This date may

be regarded as in a sense the beginning of the Middle Ages. The battle showed the barbarians of the north that Rome was not invincible: thirty-two years later the world was thrilled by the news that the Imperial City had been sacked by a Gothic army.

It would be out of place to chronicle, however briefly, the struggles which filled the greater part of the next two centuries. Suffice it to say that great numbers of heathen established themselves, as conquerors, in various parts of the Roman Empire. Missionary work upon a heroic scale was literally forced upon the Church, whose energies were not confined to the lands which had been under Roman rule. It is impossible to treat the work of the succeeding centuries as a whole from any one point of view. Even the Papal chair cannot be utilized as a centre. It will therefore be most convenient to take each country separately, and sketch briefly the careers of the men who were most largely instrumental in bringing it to a knowledge of the truth. At a later date it will be more convenient to speak of the work accomplished by Religious Orders and the great Missionary Societies of modern times.

One of the earliest of the great mediæval missionaries of the West is S. Patrick. As his career is almost a typical example of the process by which the greater part of Europe was converted, and he has left a widespread and permanent mark upon the

country where he laboured, it will not be out of place to give a fairly detailed account of his achievements. A cloud of legend has, naturally, gathered round his movements, but the labours of Irish scholars have enabled us to speak with considerable certainty of the principal events in his history.[1]

He was born at Dumbarton, probably at the end of the fourth century. His father was a deacon, and a *decurio* (*i.e.* a town councillor), and his grandfather was a priest. It is therefore probable that the future Apostle of Ireland had no Irish blood in his veins. At the age of sixteen he was carried off by Irish pirates, and sold as a slave to Milchu, a chieftain of Dalaradia, a district which corresponds roughly with the modern county of Antrim. For six years he was employed as a swineherd near the hill of Slemish. During these years of hardship and misfortune he was gradually recalled to a higher life.[2] He tells us himself that the love of God increased in him so much that he would often in a single day say as many as a hundred prayers, and in the night almost as many. "I felt no evil," he adds, "nor was there any laziness in me, because, as I now see, the Spirit

[1] This account of S. Patrick's life and work is taken from Professor G. T. Stokes' book on "Ireland and the Celtic Church." The original authorities are his own Confession, Maccumthenius' Life, and the Book of Armagh.

[2] His own estimate of the profligacy of his earlier days is probably exaggerated.

was burning within me." When he was nearly twenty-three he heard in a dream a voice saying to him, "Thy fasting is well: thou shalt return to thy own country." He waited a little, and again had a dream in which the same voice told him that the ship was ready which was to convey him. Thereupon he fled from his master, made his way to the coast, and succeeded in escaping to France, whither his family had apparently migrated. But instead of being resolved never to revisit the scene of his sufferings, his heart had been won by the land of his enforced adoption, and he was determined to return thither as a missionary on the earliest opportunity. He tells us in his Confession: "Again, after a few years, I was with my relations in Britain, who received me as a son, and earnestly besought me that at least after I had gone through so many tribulations I would go nowhere from them. And then I saw in the midst of the night a man who appeared to come from Ireland, named Victorius, and he had innumerable letters with him, one of which he gave to me. I read the commencement of the epistle containing 'The Voice of the Irish,' and, as I read aloud the beginning of the letter, I thought I heard in my mind the voice of those who were near the wood of Fochlut, which is near the western sea, and they cried out, 'We entreat the holy youth to come and walk still among us.' And my heart was greatly touched, so that I could not read any more. So I

awoke. Thanks be to God that after very many years the Lord hath granted them their desire."

The exact manner in which S. Patrick began his mission has been the subject of bitter controversy. There is no evidence to show that he received any commission from Pope Cœlestine, and the probability is against his having done so. The Pope of the fifth century did not occupy anything resembling the position which he now holds in the Roman communion. The Congregation de Propaganda Fide, which now controls the whole missionary activity of that Church, did not exist. It is more probable that he was consecrated bishop by Germanus[1] of Auxerre, and received his commission—so far as he did receive one—from him.

About the year 432 S. Patrick landed with a few companions on the spot now occupied by the town of Wicklow. His knowledge of the language and customs of the Irish secured him a not unfriendly reception, but he did not stay long at Wicklow. His heart was set upon the scene of his captivity.

[1] Germanus was a distinguished bishop of Gaul, noted for his opposition to the native British heresy of Pelagianism. About the year 425 the British bishops summoned him to their assistance. He not only expelled the heretics, but, falling back on his early military training (he had been a general before he became a bishop), he organized the British forces and routed the combined forces of Saxons and Picts. The battle was fought near Mold in Flintshire, and is known as the Hallelujah Victory. Palladius, who had been sent to Ireland by the Pope, had just been martyred by the Picts, and Germanus may well have recognized in Patrick the man suited to carry on the work.

Accordingly he sailed northwards along the coast, touching at a few convenient points. Finally he landed at the mouth of Strangford Lough, and proceeded to explore the country. The party had not gone very far before they met a swineherd, who naturally assumed that they were pirates or robbers. He told his master, a chieftain of high descent, whose name was Dichu. Dichu came out sword in hand to oppose the invaders, but, struck with S. Patrick's appearance, received him kindly, and took him to his house. He listened to his preaching, became a believer in Christ ("the first of the Scots,"[1] say more than one of the lives, "who confessed the faith under Patrick's ministry"), and was baptized. Tradition says that he at once presented S. Patrick the ground on which they were standing. There the Saint erected a church, since called Sabhall Padhrig, in English "Patrick's Barn." This barn became a favourite resort of S. Patrick, and it was in the monastery of Sabhall—or Saul, to give it its modern spelling—that he finally entered into his rest. Saul has continued a Christian church and parish down to our own day. But still S. Patrick had not reached the scene of his captivity, so after a short time spent at Saul made his way northwards into Dalaradia. The story goes that Milchu, his former master, heard of the approach of his fugitive slave,

[1] For many centuries the inhabitants of Ireland were always known as Scots.

and feared that he should be unable to withstand the magical powers with which he was invested, and should therefore become a slave himself. So (at the direct instigation of the devil) he gathered all his substance into his house, and, standing on it as a funeral pile, burned himself to death. S. Patrick arrived in time to witness the conflagration, and gave vent to his feelings in sighs, groans, and prayers. He then prophesied that none of Milchu's seed should sit upon his throne for ever. The chieftain's family did, however, receive the faith. His son, Guasacht, became bishop in the church at Granard, and two of his daughters became consecrated virgins. S. Patrick at once returned to Dichu on the shores of Strangford Lough, to prepare for his next great step, his assault on Tara,[1] the very centre of Irish paganism. He arrived at the mouth of the Boyne, and, abandoning his boats there, advanced a day's journey up the river to the great pagan cemetery of Slane. S. Patrick must have seen the huge sepulchral mounds of Knowth, New Grange, and Dowth, much as we see them now. Here he determined to stop to keep Easter, pitching his tent upon the hill of Slane. No doubt he had arranged that the crisis

[1] The hill of Tara is situated in the middle of Meath. Legend makes it the seat of the Irish kings from immemorial antiquity, but none of the extant remains are older than the reign of Cormac Mac Art (218–260), with whom the authentic history of Ireland begins. The tribes ceased to meet there after the year 563. Cormac himself is said to have been a Christian, or at least to have imbibed some Christian ideas, probably from British captives.

of his missionary life should coincide with the great Christian festival. At the same time King Laoghaire and his priests were keeping a great pagan feast at Tara, whence Slane is easily visible. It was their custom to proclaim by edict that no fire should be lit on that night within sight of Tara until the royal beacon had blazed forth. Death was the penalty for disobedience. S. Patrick was probably ignorant of the edict, and even if he had known it would have treated it with contempt. He therefore began to celebrate Easter as usual, by lighting the Holy Fire.[1] This was seen from Tara, and the King at once summoned a council of his great men, that he might learn who was the audacious offender. Whereupon the Druids[2] declared: "This fire which has been lighted before the royal fire will never be extinguished, unless it be extinguished this night. Moreover, it will conquer all the fires of our religion. And he who has lit it will conquer us all, and will seduce all thy subjects, and all kingdoms will fall before him, and he will fill all things, and will reign for ever and ever." At this the King was greatly enraged, and set out with his two principal magicians to punish the offenders. A number of prodigies occurred, both on that night and the following Easter Day. The accounts of them are clearly

[1] This custom is repeatedly referred to by writers from the fourth century onwards. Duchesne thinks it was of Celtic origin.

[2] The Druids were the powerful priesthood which we find in all Celtic nations. The Romans abolished them in Gaul and Britain.

imitations of the apocryphal story of the struggle between S. Peter and Simon Magus,[1] and of Moses' contest with the magicians of Pharaoh. Of course the Saint was victorious in each encounter, and finally Laoghaire was baptized at the prayer of his chief men, and gave S. Patrick a safe-conduct through Ireland.

The Saint's direct success at Tara was not, however, very great. He won two or three of the King's courtiers, who afterwards became bishops, but the traditions of the place were too strong to yield to a single assault. Still he had obtained his safe-conduct, and of this he made full use. He addressed himself primarily to the chiefs, knowing that the strong tribal organization of the Irish would naturally induce them to adopt anything which had met with the approval of their rulers. The chiefs were, so to speak, the strategic points in the campaign.[2] He spent some time in Meath, and then went for

[1] "Constitutiones Apostolicæ," vi.

[2] Exception may be taken to this policy on the ground that it is the opposite of that of our Lord and the Apostles, and that the power of the Gospel should be manifested first in the raising of the lowest classes in any country. But this is a question which may be decided by local conditions. The Roman Empire set itself deliberately to destroy all tribal or national feeling of any kind. It was governed by official rulers who might relapse into private life at the expiration of their term of office. A Roman pro-consul or pro-prætor was much less influential than a hereditary tribal king. It was inconceivable that each tribe should not be homogeneous in its religious belief, and no change could be made except in obedience to the chief.

educate and send back as missionaries. He died in 739, in the eighty-third year of his age, in a monastery which he had founded at Epternach, near Trèves.

In 716 another noble man came to Frisia, in the person of Winfrith. He is better known under the name of Boniface.[1] He was born at Crediton in Devonshire about 680, and came of noble family. He sacrificed the honours which would certainly have come to him in his native land to take up missionary work. When he landed in Frisia he found a state of war between Rathbod and Charles Martel, which made missionary work impossible. A year or two later Pope Gregory formally appointed him missionary to the Germans. In 719 he returned to Frisia, and stayed three years helping Willibrord, but refused to become his permanent coadjutor and successor. In 723 he again went to Rome, and was consecrated bishop, though no place was named for his see. His courage in cutting down the sacred oak of Thor at Geismar, in the presence of a heathen crowd, led to the conversion of the Hessii. He succeeded in reforming the Church of Thuringia, which had become extremely corrupt, and Gregory III. made him archbishop of it. Large numbers of men and women of the monastic order came to help him from England, and his statesman-like qualities

[1] There are two lives of S. Boniface: one written by Willibald of Mainz for Archbishop Lul, Boniface's contemporary, and one by Othlo, written in the eleventh century.

enabled him to lay broad and deep foundations for the German Church. In his old age he desired once more to preach among the Frisians, many of whom were still heathen. He resigned the administration of his province, and journeyed through the Frisian marshes at the head of a band of clergy, of whom some at least were of English birth. On June 5, 755, he had arranged to confirm some newly baptized persons at Dokkum, near the Lauwers See. Soon after sunrise he was told that a heathen force was advancing against him. Some of his younger companions wished to fight, but he would not allow them, and almost all the party was put to death. His body was buried in the church of the monastery of Fulda, which he had founded.

One point in his career calls for special notice. When he became bishop he took an oath of obedience, strongly expressed, and unreserved, to the Roman See. Thus from its outset the German Church was brought into close connection with the Papacy. There can be little doubt that this was a wise course. It kept the German Church from becoming a mere appanage of the Carlovingian house. For many centuries the Papacy was the only source to which it was possible to look for reform in Church matters, and it directed the events of Europe with incomparable skill. S. Boniface would have required more than human foresight to divine how intolerable its claims were destined to become.

Scandinavia

The first missions to the Scandinavian countries were occasioned by political rather than purely religious considerations. Feuds arose in Denmark touching the succession to the crown, and Harald Krag, one of the princes of Jutland, asked the Emperor Louis the Pious to interfere. In 822 Ebbo, Archbishop of Rheims, was despatched as ambassador to the Danish court. He was a man full of missionary zeal, and one of the objects with which he was charged was the conversion of the country. In 826 Harald and his wife were baptized with great pomp in the presence of the Emperor at Ingelheim. It was impossible for Ebbo to settle permanently in Denmark because of the claims upon him at home, so he selected a young monk of Corvey, named Anscar or Ansgar,[1] to return with the King as his chaplain and adviser. Anscar was born in 801, and seems to have been one of those exceptionally gifted souls who from childhood find no interest in any save spiritual things. He believed himself to have been favoured with visions and divine warnings on more than one occasion. When asked whether he would return with Harald to Denmark, Anscar professed himself willing and anxious to go. Only one companion, Autbert—a monk of noble birth—could

[1] The original authority for Anscar is his life by Rimbert (printed by Putz in "Monumenta Germaniæ Historica").

be found for him, and none of the servants of the monastery would face the dangers and hardships of the unknown North. Anscar began by establishing a school of twelve boys to be educated in the principles of Christianity. The unsettled condition of the country probably made it impossible to attempt more. In 828 Harald had been driven from the country by his enemies, and ill-health had compelled Autbert to return to Corvey. Meanwhile the Emperor had received some Swedish envoys, with a request for priests,[1] so Anscar was asked to undertake this further task. The Danish Mission was entrusted to a monk called Gislema, and Anscar set sail for Sweden, accompanied by a monk named Witmar.

During the voyage they were attacked by pirates, but eventually they landed at Birka. Every facility for preaching was afforded them, and they worked for a year and a half. Anscar then returned to obtain reinforcements, and the North was formally committed to him by Pope Gregory IV.

Denmark was now subject to Horick,[2] who showed himself a violent opponent of Christianity. Direct access to the country was impossible, but Anscar continued his policy of buying suitable captives, whenever possible, and educating them for future

[1] Commercial transactions had brought them into contact with Christian nations. Anscar found a number of Christian captives.

[2] There is some difference of opinion as to the correct spelling of many of these Scandinavian names. I have for the most part followed that adopted by Neander.

work. In 845 a heathen insurrection interrupted the Swedish Mission, and in the same year the city of Hamburg, which had been made the base of operations for the whole North, was destroyed by Norman pirates. Anscar lost everything he had, and barely escaped with his life. Five years before, his powerful patron Louis the Pious had died, and Ebbo had become engrossed in the quarrels of the Frankish Empire. Anscar found himself destitute, without friends to whom he could turn for support, or any immediate prospect of renewing either of his missions. But by 849, Lewis, King of Germany, had managed to rearrange certain of the bishoprics in his dominions in such a way as to secure to Anscar a sufficient income for his work, and the arrangement was sanctioned by the Pope. He at last succeeded in gaining the respect and confidence of Horick, and, though the King himself did not become a Christian, he allowed a church to be built, and the new religion to be propagated. In 851 Ardgar, a priest, was despatched to re-open the Swedish Mission, and found several who had not forsaken their faith during their trying isolation. Two years later Anscar himself returned.

The progress of the Church in the Scandinavian countries was slower and attended with greater difficulties than in any other part of Europe. The turbulent character of the people, who had never been tamed by Roman civilization, made them unwilling to submit to authority in any form, and they

were exceptionally tenacious of their ancestral customs. It was not easy for them to desert the gods who had brought them victory over their more civilized neighbours, and their rulers were sometimes actively hostile to the new religion.

Anscar died on February 2nd or 3rd, 865, after having laboured for thirty-four years for the salvation of the heathen North. His work was taken up by his faithful disciple Rimbert, but for some time little progress was made.

During the first half of the tenth century the Danish throne was occupied by a usurper named Gurm, who was bitterly hostile to the Christian faith. Harald Bluetooth, who reigned from 941 to 991, was favourable to the new religion, though, like Constantine, his personal convictions were vague. After his death there was a relapse, but with the accession of his son, Canute[1] the Great, in 1014, the Church entered upon a period of unhindered progress. For seventy years after Anscar's death the Swedish Mission was practically at a standstill, but during Harald Bluetooth's reign in Denmark some progress was made. During the first half of the eleventh century the Swedish king, Olof Stautconnung, declared himself in favour of Christianity, and tried to place it on a firm footing throughout

[1] Canute's English dominions helped to bring him within the range of Christian influence, and his English wife Emma was a devoted Christian.

his dominions, but his somewhat violent zeal provoked a good deal of opposition. His successor, Jacob Amund, was more temperate and more successful. Some difficulty arose with regard to the Archbishop of Bremen, who claimed more authority over the Church than the Swedes were inclined to admit. But the miraculous recovery of a priest of the great pagan sanctuary of Upsala from blindness[1] did much to conciliate popular opinion. By the middle of the century Christianity was securely established in Sweden, though it was long before it could purge itself of all pagan elements. Superstition forbade the immediate destruction of Upsala, though it eventually became the primatial see of the country.

The most remarkable people in Europe during the darkest period of its history were the Northmen or Normans. The energy and enterprise of the whole Continent seems to have been concentrated for two centuries in a single people. Issuing from their home in Norway, they penetrated as far as Constantinople in one direction (where they formed for a time the imperial bodyguard) and America in the other.[2]

[1] The story is that the Virgin Mary appeared to him in a dream and promised to restore his sight if he would come over to the worship of her Son. He became a zealous champion of Christianity. It is difficult to form any definite opinion with regard to the miraculous cures of the Middle Ages. The evidence is sometimes very good.

[2] There seems to be no doubt that about the year 1000 Leif Ericsson reached the American continent, probably near what is now the State of Massachusetts. Greenland had been discovered earlier; it is said to be visible from Iceland.

In the course of three hundred years they made themselves masters of Sicily, a large portion of France, Russia, England, and Ireland, and planted colonies in Iceland. They were probably the bravest warriors and most adventurous mariners that the world has ever seen. The terror which they inspired in England was long commemorated by a clause in the Litany, "From the fury of the Northmen, good Lord deliver us."

Their wanderings brought them into contact with Christianity in various parts of the world, and in the middle of the tenth century Prince Hakon, who had received a Christian upbringing at the court of Athalstan of England, made an effort to plant the Church among them. But ancestral custom was too strong for him. He practised Christianity in secret, with the aid of clergy imported from England, but a definite proposal to his people to accept the new religion was unanimously rejected. They declared that it would take up too much time, and that its fasts would undermine their strength.[1]

The King's unwillingness to take part in the public sacrifices offered to Odin made him violently unpopular, and he finally consented to eat of the sacrificed horse and drink the cups drained in its

[1] We see already strongly developed the characteristics which have been the strength and weakness of English-speaking Christianity ever since—1, Conservatism; 2, Disregard of authority; 3, Impatience of discipline. We owe them a great deal, but it is hard to estimate how much they cost us at the present day.

honour without previously signing the cross over them, as had been his custom.[1] But for the stress of foreign invasion, he would probably have lost his throne, and about the year 960 he was killed in battle.[2] In 967 Harald Bluetooth made himself master of Norway, and tried to introduce Christianity by the same violent methods as those which he had adopted in Denmark. The natural result was a violent reaction in favour of paganism. This was turned to account by Hakon, Sigurd's son, who had helped Harald to conquer the country, and had been appointed Stadtholder or Viceroy by him. He showed great zeal in destroying Christian foundations, and the popularity which he gained by this means enabled him to seize the sovereign power. His rule was, however, so oppressive that in a few years he was overthrown by Olaf Tryggvasson. This remarkable man had travelled widely, and had become acquainted with a German priest named Thangbrand. From him he had bought a large shield bearing a representation of Christ upon the cross embossed in gold. He afterwards believed that he had owed his life to the supernatural efficacy

[1] On one occasion this act nearly produced an outbreak. The passions of the spectators were only allayed by the assertion of Sigurd, an influential noble, that what the King had really signed was not the Christian cross, but the hammer of their native god Thor.

[2] The fact that he fell fighting against a foreign enemy had doubtless helped to conciliate opinion in favour of the religion which he had professed.

of this shield on more than one occasion, and so was gradually brought to believe in the divine power of the Figure which it bore. He was baptized in the Scilly Isles, and returned to Norway fully resolved to destroy paganism. He took with him Thangbrand, whom he had met again in England, to act as his chaplain. Thangbrand appears to have been unworthy of his sacred profession. He had been banished from Germany for killing a man of superior rank in single combat, and his temper was naturally inclined to violent measures. Olaf was received by the Norwegians with open arms, and his personal popularity no doubt helped to counterbalance his high-handed conduct in religious matters. After his death, in the year 1000, there was naturally a recrudescence of paganism. Olaf the Thick, who came to the throne in 1017, imitated the methods of his predecessor. The thin veneer of Christianity which he imposed gave way before the strain of a bad harvest in 1021, and paganism was openly practised. His despotic severity probably facilitated the conquest of the country by Canute, King of Denmark and England. Olaf was killed in battle, at the head of an army in which none but Christians were allowed to serve, on July 29, 1033, and was honoured as a saint and martyr. The veneration with which he was regarded contributed largely to the secure establishment of Christianity in what had been his kingdom. The career of these two

men is a remarkable instance of the way in which God overrules unpromising beginnings to serve His purpose. Olaf Tryggvasson's first introduction to Christianity was by an unworthy priest. He was led to baptism by a faith which was largely superstitious. But the circumstances of his death, which made it possible for him to be regarded as a national hero, made his successor's task easier. The death of Olaf the Thick counterbalanced his former mistaken policy, and made him in a real sense the founder of the Norwegian Church.

In 874 Iceland was colonized by the Northmen. Irish anchorites had settled there at least a century earlier. An Irish monk named Dicuil, who wrote a book on geography in the year 825, tells us that thirty years before that time he had conversed with persons who had lived there. The truth of their statement is proved by the fact that they told him that in summer it was as light at midnight as at midday.[1] The advent of the Northmen seems to have extinguished Christian worship, and there was no attempt to introduce it for at least a century. In 997[2] Thangbrand visited the island as Olaf's ambassador, but only succeeded in hardening the prejudices of the people against Christianity. By 999 he had committed two murders, and had to

[1] Stokes, "Ireland and the Early Celtic Church," p. 217.

[2] The first definite attempt was in 981, when a bishop came to the island in company with a native chieftain named Thorwald, whom he had converted.

fly. Shortly afterwards Christianity was publicly adopted, but paganism was not prohibited, and lingered on by its side till at least as late as the twelfth century. The first native bishop was consecrated in 1056, and fixed his episcopal see at Skalholt. The Gospel was carried in like manner to the Faröe Islands[1] and to Greenland about the same time. Greenland received its first bishop in 1055. In 1059 one John, a Saxon or Irish bishop, is said to have met with a martyr's death while attempting to spread the Gospel on the mainland of North America. The Christian community in Greenland suddenly disappears from view about the end of the fifteenth century. Nothing certain is known of its end, but it was probably destroyed by pestilence. The country was practically unvisited, and almost forgotten, till 1721, when a Danish missionary named Hans Egede landed to work among the remnants of the Eskimo.

Sclavonic Countries

In the year 813 the Bulgarians, a people of Asiatic origin, who had previously established themselves along the Danube, made an irruption into the Eastern Empire, which had its capital at Constantinople, and captured Hadrianople. Among their prisoners was a bishop, who formed his companions in captivity

[1] The Orkneys certainly, and the Shetlands probably, had received the Gospel earlier from the Celtic Church.

into a Church. He was eventually martyred, and an attempt to carry on the work made by a monk named Constantine Cypharas did not meet with much success. But in the year 861 the Empress Theodora exchanged a sister[1] of the Bulgarian Prince Bogoris for him, and she laboured to convert her brother to the faith. A famine induced him to seek help from the God of the Christians (apparently as a last resort), and his sister, having remarked his fondness for painting, sent for a monk named Methodius,[2] who was a skilful artist. He drew a picture of the "Last Judgment" which produced a great effect on Bogoris' mind. About 863 he was baptized, and received the name of Michael, the Greek Emperor Michael standing godfather to him, and Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, wrote him a long letter of encouragement and instruction. He, however, tried to force Christianity upon his people, and repressed the revolt which naturally ensued with great cruelty. He was not well supported by the Greek Church,[3] and the views of Christianity which became current in Bulgaria differed so widely that the people were at a loss what to believe. In 865 Bogoris appealed to

[1] She had been brought to the imperial court as a prisoner in early youth, and had there been brought up as a Christian.

[2] He is probably the same as the "Apostle of the Slavs," who bore the same name, but the identification is not beyond question.

[3] For example, the deficiency of clergy led to a Greek layman posing as a priest. When the fraud was discovered the people cut off his nose and ears.

Pope Nicholas I., who dealt with him like a true father-in-God, and showed what the Bishop of Rome might have been, and ought to have been, to the whole Church. Eventually, however, the Bulgarians decided to adhere to the Greek Church, and the Emperor Basil took great pains to provide them with an adequate supply of Greek clergy.

The central figures in the missionary history of this region and period are two remarkable brothers, Cyril and Methodius. Cyril began his labours among the Chazars who inhabited the Crimea. Both Jews and Mohammedans were seeking to make proselytes among them,[1] and they sent an embassy to the Emperor Michael, asking for a Christian teacher. In reply he despatched Cyril, and his brother joined him soon afterwards.

The Moravians were the next people to whom they went. The Moravians were a Sclavonic tribe which had been made subject to the Frankish Empire by Charlemagne. Some seeds of Christianity had been planted among them by this means, but hitherto they had borne little fruit. The mission of the two brothers was occasioned partly by political considerations, for the Moravian Prince Radislav had formed an alliance with the Greek Empire. They were wise enough not to hesitate to use the vernacular for the

[1] As late as the year 921 their King is said to have been a Jew, and to have had some pagans as well as Christians and Mohammedans among his subjects.

most sacred purposes, and Cyril translated considerable portions of the Bible into the Sclavonic language. Presently Radislav was led by political considerations to attach himself to the German Empire, and therefore to the Western Church. At this time the schism between the Greek and Latin Churches was breaking out, and ecclesiastical complications ensued. At this crisis the brothers showed that they could rise above party differences. They repaired to Rome (where Cyril remained as a monk), and Methodius, having satisfied the Pope with regard to doctrinal matters, took an oath of allegiance to the Roman See, and was consecrated first Archbishop of the Moravian Church.[1]

Political troubles, and the jealousy of the German clergy, proved serious obstacles, and Pope John VIII. showed himself less wise and large-hearted than Nicholas I. In 881 Methodius went to Rome, and from that time we hear no more of him. Either he must have died shortly afterwards, or his enemies succeeded in preventing his return.

The political dependence of Bohemia upon Moravia led to the baptism of Duke Borizwoi, probably

[1] Of course this Church has nothing to do with the modern Moravians or *Unitas Fratrum*. They did not become an organized body till the beginning of the eighteenth century. The German bishops steadily opposed the formation of an independent archbishopric of Moravia, and it disappeared when the kingdom was divided between the Germans, Bohemians, and Hungarians.

between the years 870–880.[1] After a century of chequered fortunes, the Church was finally established, with Prague for its centre, about the year 980.

It would take too long to chronicle, however briefly, the steps by which the Gospel was slowly propagated among the Wends and other Sclavonic peoples of Eastern Europe. The process which has been traced in the British Isles and the Scandinavian countries was repeated again and again. Political or commercial intercourse prepared the way; then some great hero gave himself to the task. Over-rapid success led to relapse, and after a period of chequered fortunes the Church was firmly established. Then the long war with superstition and pagan habits, which can hardly be said to have ended yet in some Christian countries, was begun. The last people in Europe[2] to be converted were the Lithuanians, in what is now the most westerly province of the Russian Empire. They remained in undisturbed paganism till the fourteenth century.

The Church of Russia calls for special remark, because, unlike its neighbours, it does not trace its origin to any heroic missionary. No one is

[1] Some authorities place this event as late as 894, in which case Methodius could have had no part in it.

[2] Not counting the Lapps and Finns, whose geographical position made them almost inaccessible. Paganism was not finally extinguished in Lapland until quite modern times.

entitled to be called "the Apostle of Russia."[1] About the year 986, envoys from the principal religions of the world are said to have approached Vladimir, the Russian Prince. First came Bulgarian Mohammedans from the Volga, but the prohibition of wine entailed by their religion placed it out of court immediately. Next came some representatives of Western Christendom, whether from the Pope or not is uncertain. They seem to have presented Christianity in too foreign a dress to accord with Russian tenacity of ancestral custom. Next came Jews from among the Chazars of the Crimea, but the fact that they were without country or city of their own seemed to prove the futility of their creed. Eventually Vladimir decided to send embassies to the chief religious centres, and form his own opinion. The gorgeousness of the church of S. Sophia at Constantinople, and the services there, so impressed the envoys[2] that they decided that here indeed the true religion was to be found. Still Vladimir hesitated, but undertook to become a Christian if victory were granted him in a war which he was waging. His arms were successful,

[1] There is no solid foundation for the legend that S. Andrew sailed up the Dneiper and planted his cross upon the hills of Kieff. The original authority for the beginnings of the Russian Church is Nestor, the monk of Kieff, who lived 1050-1116. See Stanley's "History of the Eastern Church," p. 337.

[2] They are said to have taken the deacons and assistant deacons for supernatural beings, and to have been encouraged in this belief by their Byzantine guides.

and he married Anne, the sister of the Emperor Basil. He was baptized at Cherson in the Crimea, and shortly afterwards had his people baptized *en masse* in the river at Kieff, having previously had their principal idol, Peroun, dragged across country, scourged, and thrown into the stream. In this manner the foundations of the greatest national Church in the world were laid. Nowhere else has the Church been more closely linked with the fortunes of the nation. Its leading saints, S. Demetrius and S. Alexander Nevsky, were victorious leaders of Russian armies at times of great national peril. The Christmas Day services are, to some extent, overshadowed by triumphant thanksgiving for Napoleon's evacuation of Moscow on December 25, 1812. In the story of the foundation of the Russian Church we note the value of ceremonial in dealing with uncivilized people. Our dread of superstition, and the fact that elaborate ceremonial does not appeal to most Englishmen, have perhaps led us to under-estimate its value in the mission-field. We cannot defend the conduct of the Byzantines, but it is hardly too much to say that Russia owes the beginnings of its Christianity to the ceremonial of S. Sophia. And it may even be that we in England are too much afraid of superstition. Our own days of superstition have been left so far behind, that we have forgotten how large an element it is in the

savage character. I do not mean that it ought not to be discouraged; but the process of eradication must be a very slow one, and it seems as if superstition could often be used as a preparation for the reception of purer spiritual truth. The harm does not really begin until a superstitious temper is regarded as a religious one which ought to be perpetuated, instead of as a stage, which must be left behind in due course. It would be difficult to say that[1] the woman who said, "If I touch but His garments I shall be made whole" (S. Mark v. 28), was not grossly superstitious. She probably had no idea who He was, or any conception of spiritual power in the true sense of the word. Yet He did not refuse to heal her. It is not the duty of the Christian Church to inculcate superstitious ideas. But in dealing with primitive peoples whose religion is nothing but superstition, it may be worth our while to consider whether—as their religious ideas, however low, represent the highest that they have thought about God—superstition may not be the first channel through which the truth is to enter their minds. Undoubtedly it has often been so in the past, and it would be difficult to prove that the Kingdom of God has suffered in consequence.

We must now retrace our steps to review the

[1] For this thought I am indebted to a sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on November 10, 1907, by the Rev. J. N. Figgis, Litt.D., subsequently published in a volume entitled "The Gospel and Human Needs" (Longmans, 1909).

missionary work of the Eastern Church. Hitherto we have only come into contact with it when speaking of Russia and Bulgaria. The conversion of Russia is perhaps its most conspicuous achievement at the present day, but we must not overlook its earlier work in the farther East.

It is very greatly to be regretted that so little is known about the Eastern Church in England.[1] We are apt to assume that the Christian world is composed of Roman Catholics and the offspring of those who rejected the Papal claims during the sixteenth century.

Geographical considerations tend to make us forget that in Eastern Europe, and Western Asia, and Northern Africa there are communions which protest as strongly against the Papal claims as we do ourselves. They include about 140,000,000 souls (*i.e.* probably about a quarter of the Christian population of the world). They are the most ancient part of Christendom. They are entitled to regard our earliest beginnings as recent history. The resistance which they offered to the claims of the Pope had led him to secede from communion with them five hundred years before his successors withdrew themselves from a large part of Western Europe. For centuries they have suffered the fiercest persecution

[1] I believe that there are four churches of the Orthodox rite in England (two in London, one in Liverpool, and one in Bristol), and one of the Armenian in Manchester.

at the hands of the followers of Mohammed,[1] and we owe it to them that the lamp of Christian truth has been kept burning in many countries where it would otherwise have been extinguished.

The first Gentile natives of Asia to receive the Gospel were the Syrians. The Syrian city of Antioch gave to "those of the way" the name by which they will now be known to the end of time. The people

[1] A sketch of the history of Christian Missions can hardly be made to include Mohammedanism. But justice cannot be done to the Eastern Church if no mention be made of the chief enemy with which it has had to contend. Even Western Christendom has been influenced by dread of the Sultan at Constantinople. We may agree with Dean Stanley that Mohammedanism ought really to be regarded as an extreme variant of Oriental Christianity. There is no doubt that Mohammed himself was deeply influenced by the local legends of the Syrian and Arabian Christians, and by intercourse with a Nestorian monk of Bostra—named Bahari, or Sergius, or George. He believed that he had a Divine call to preach a purer faith to the idolatrous tribes of Arabia, and in some respects his belief was justified. The foundation of Islam is usually dated from his flight from Mecca to Medina in 622. Mohammed himself died in 632, but his religion spread very rapidly throughout Western Asia, Northern Africa, and gained a considerable foothold in Europe. The crescent has been seen in France and outside the walls of Vienna. In spite of many regrettable features, the monotheism of Islam is sufficiently spiritual and pure to possess real vitality. It is said to be spreading rapidly in Africa, and is still, as always, inexorably hostile to Christianity. Its strength is illustrated by the words in which Mohammed's father-in-law announced his death to the crowds which had gathered round the house: "They that have placed their trust in the Prophet know that Mohammed is dead, but they who have placed their trust in God know that He liveth for ever and ever." A visit to North Africa in 1892 led Archbishop Benson to think that the Mohammedan mosques were more spiritual in conception than the Roman Catholic churches there ("Life," p. 540, single volume edition).

of Antioch soon came to claim S. Peter as their first bishop. Whether that claim is justifiable or no, their third bishop was the martyr S. Ignatius, whose letters are our chief source of information on certain points of Church order at the end of the first and beginning of the second centuries. The see of Antioch was eventually raised to the dignity of a patriarchate, and ranked fourth in the world; after Rome, Constantinople, and Alexandria, and before Jerusalem. Closely akin to the Syrians of Antioch are the Assyrians—the modern representatives of the builders of Nineveh and the people who hung like a storm-cloud, which might break at any moment, over the Jews during the greater part of the prophetic period. The Assyrians of to-day call themselves Syrians, and may therefore be spoken of by that name. Probably "East Syrians" would be the most accurate title. According to one tradition, Persia and Western Asia generally received its first knowledge of Christ from the Wise Men on their return from Bethlehem. By this means the way was prepared for S. Thomas, who, with two companions—Thaddæus one of the Seventy, and Mari—chose the regions east of the Tigris to be the field of his missionary labours.[1] The apocryphal correspond-

[1] For early Assyrian Christianity generally see an article by the Rev. A. H. Lang in "The East and the West" for 1904, p. 306. The apocryphal Acts of Thomas represent him as having made his way to India as a slave, and having entered the service of a native king named Gondophares. The very ancient Christian colony on the

ence between our Lord and Abgarus, King of Edessa, is a further indication of the fact that Christianity had made its way among the Syrians in very early times. Such a document would not have been drawn up if the writer had not hoped that his forgery would be accepted as genuine. There would have been no chance of that if Christianity had not reached Edessa sufficiently early to make it conceivable, in the eyes of men whose chronology was not likely to be strictly accurate, that such a correspondence might have taken place. The Liturgy used by the Syrians of Kurdistan is the oldest actually in use in the world at the present day. The Pshitta or old Syrian version of the Bible can hardly be later than A.D. 180, and is perhaps the first translation of any part of the New Testament ever made. The chief episcopal seat of the Syrian Church was fixed at Seleucia-Ctesiphon, and remained there until the destruction of the city by the Saracens in 637.

But in the fifth century the Eastern Church was rent asunder. The Council of Ephesus in 431 condemned Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, as a heretic, declaring that by denying the title "Mother of God" to the Virgin Mary he made Christ a crea-

Malabar Coast, now numbering rather more than half a million souls, is of Syrian origin, and still goes by the name of "the Christians of St. Thomas." John, "Bishop of Persia and India," was present at the Council of Nicæa in 323.

ture. Recent investigations[1] have shown that the condemnation was in all probability a terrible miscarriage of justice. If Nestorius had held what his opponents believed that he held, they could not have acted otherwise. But both parties misunderstood each other. The confusion was probably largely due to the fact that they did not possess a common native language. Nestorius was banished beyond the frontiers of the Roman Empire. But the injustice done him did not extinguish his missionary zeal, and the Nestorian Church spread far into Asia.[2] At one time its organization included twenty-five patriarchates; its primate bore the sonorous title of Patriarch of Babylon, and some at least of the Mongolian princes embraced the Christian faith. Vague legends of this great Church in the remote heart of the East made their way into Western Europe during the Middle Ages. Little was known of its true character, for its reputed heresy

[1] "Nestorius and His Teaching," by J. F. Bethune Baker (Camb. Univ. Press, 1908). Nestorius was a native of Germanicia, in the Euphrates district, and was at one time a monk of the monastery of Euprepius, near Antioch. The attack upon him was begun and headed by Cyril of Alexandria.

[2] The Greek traveller Cosmas Indicopleustes found a Christian Church in Ceylon in the year 527. A seventh-century inscription at Madras says that "whosoever believes in Messiah, God, and the Holy Ghost is in the grace of Him who bore the Cross." In 883 Alfred the Great sent Sighelm, Bishop of Sherborne, and Athelstan on a mission to the shrine of S. Thomas at Meliapur. In 1258 the Syrians were planning a mission from Cochin to the island of Sumatra, but were never able to carry out their design.

had prevented inter-communication with the West during its early days, and after the seventh century it was isolated by the interposition of a solid and ever-increasing barrier of Mohammedanism. The stories of its splendour and extent took shape in the curious mediæval legend of Prester John.[1] He was supposed to be a Christian potentate ruling a vast empire, of a magnificence to which Europe could show no parallel, in the centre of Asia. It was believed also that he was himself a priest and came of a line of sacerdotal kings. His power went down before Genghiz-Khan in the first half of the thirteenth century. From that time the early Christianity of the Mongolian races began to decline, though Kublai-Khan, Genghiz' grandson, tried to introduce European Christian missionaries into his dominions. China had received Christian teachers as early as the fourth century. The earliest were most probably the Syrian merchants who passed to and fro through Central Asia on their business. And the way having been thus prepared, it was not long before an organized attempt was made to work this large and promising field. In 635 a band of Syrian monks, headed by one called in Chinese Olopun (*i.e.* monk), made their

[1] This seems to be the most probable origin of the story. It is less likely that rumours of the Grand Lama of Tibet had made their way westward, for stress is always laid on John's Christianity. More than one traveller has noted internal resemblances between the great ceremonies of Lamaism and those of the Roman Church, but it is hardly conceivable that one could ever have been mistaken for the other.

way to Si-ngan-fu. We are fortunate enough to possess a first-hand account of his work, and all that ensued until the year 781, in the form of a monument erected in that year. It was buried during a great persecution in the year 841, unearthed by the Jesuits in the seventeenth century, and finally roofed over by a patriotic Chinaman in the year 1858. It stands at present in the precinct of a temple. The stone is $7\frac{1}{2}$ feet high, 3 feet wide, and 10 inches thick. The inscription is in Chinese (the names of the Syrian clergy being in Syriac), and commemorates the noble law of Ta-Tsin (Rome) in the Middle Empire. It contains a brief summary of the content of the Christian faith, and gives a short account of its spread in the Chinese Empire. Olopun translated the Scriptures into Chinese, and by the end of the seventh century "monasteries had filled a hundred cities,"[1] though Buddhists derided it. In the fourteenth century Buddhist services were imposed on Christians, and, as in Japan down to 1868, the faith could only be kept up in secret. Naturally, under such circumstances, it became corrupted in various ways. But still it proved a valuable foundation for the later Jesuit missionaries to build upon.

By the thirteenth century the Assyrian Com-

[1] Buddhism had already made the Chinese familiar with monastic institutions. In fact, the monument states that the Syrians had on their arrival been placed in a Buddhist monastery, with injunctions not to mingle the "illuminating" religion (*i.e.* Christianity) with the "pure" religion (*i.e.* Buddhism).

munion extended from the Tigris to Japan, from Ceylon to the Arctic Ocean.[1] It is quite impossible to form any estimate of the number of its adherents, but no other communion has ever covered so wide an area. No ecclesiastic has ever held effective jurisdiction over so many miles of the earth's surface as did the Patriarch of Babylon. For it would seem that his rule was not merely nominal. Each of his twenty-five patriarchs had to appear before him annually or at intervals of three or five years, according to the distance of his throne. One of these metropolitical sees was at Kabul; another at Cambaluc, the modern Pekin. To-day this great Church is represented by a remnant ready to perish—which would in all probability have perished by now if it had not been for the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission—of some 200,000 souls in the mountains of Kurdistan. Their Catholicos bears the hereditary title Mar Shimûm (*i.e.* Lord Simon), and lives at Qudshanis on the banks of the Pison—one of the rivers of Eden. The whole episcopate is represented by about a dozen men—chosen for the office from infancy—whose poverty is so great that they are compelled to earn their living by manual labour. Huge and populous areas where this communion was once firmly established have now to be converted

[1] So J. M. Neale in "The Sea Tigers: A Tale of Mediæval Nestorianism." I have not been able to find his authority for the statement that it extended to the Arctic Ocean.

afresh, though it seems that in some cases (notably in parts of China) the seed once sown has never been completely destroyed.

It would be altogether beyond the scope of these pages, and the powers of the writer, to try to explain this collapse. No doubt investigation would show that it is to be attributed to a variety of causes. But to a large extent it seems to have been due to direct persecution. It is possible that such persecution was not undertaken on purely religious grounds.[1] The Church may have become too rich. Its officers may have seemed to be idlers—a mere burden imposed upon the more industrious portion of the community; or it may have acquired—or have tried to acquire—undue political influence. Its misfortunes may have been (in part at least) of its own making. It will be more valuable to our present purpose to try to estimate the cause of its extraordinary success.

Now there seems to be no doubt that the success of the missionary work of the Assyrian Church (and probably to a lesser degree of all Eastern Churches) was due very largely to its wonderful freedom from what may be called provincialism. That is to say,

[1] It is probably true to say that Mohammedans are the only people who have ever persecuted systematically for religious reasons only. In Europe a heretic was a public danger in a mediæval State, and was persecuted on that ground. The one Church was the only real bond of union in countries which were nominally united under one ruler. Anything which impaired its influence threatened the cohesion of the State.

it was not distinctively Assyrian wherever it went;[1] it had thoroughly mastered S. Paul's principle of becoming all things to all men. It did not appear to the nations to whom it went as a foreign agency, which aimed at destroying all ancient habits, and making its adherents as much like foreigners as possible. It offered them translations of its sacred writings in their own tongue. In such matters as the structure of its churches, and generally in its organization, it was prepared to follow closely lines to which the people were already accustomed. Its clergy do not seem to have put the power and prestige of their own patriarch first. They did not work to strengthen their original Church at home by enlisting, as it were, a foreign legion in its support. Their aim was rather to create genuinely national Churches wherever they went. The advantage of this method is obvious, but it is exposed to two equally obvious dangers. In the first place, it may lead to pure congregationalism.[2] It may mean that the historic organization of the Church is made of no account. Each district—eventually each congregation, however young, small, and ignorant—may lay claim to a perfectly free hand in the manage-

[1] This adaptability would be particularly valuable in China, where the people are exceptionally conservative in their ideas and habits.

[2] Not necessarily in the technical modern sense. Such Churches may retain the episcopal order, but a bishop may be the worst possible kind of congregationalist at heart if he surrenders himself to what Archbishop Benson once called "Diocesanism."

ment of its own affairs. That means that its polity becomes steadily narrower in outlook. The wisdom which has been accumulated by long experience in wider fields goes for nothing; its very existence may hardly be suspected. The counsels of the Church are those which can gain a local majority at any given moment. Its assemblies provide full scope for the fanatic, the partisan, and the plausible agitator, and very little for leaders of any other type. The conception of unity hardly finds any place among its ideals, and it has little power of resistance in times of exceptional stress, because it has to stand alone.

And, secondly, it may lead to the compromising of Christian principles. His anxiety not to appear to be a foreign innovator may lead the missionary to allow his native converts to continue practices which really traverse the truth of his message. The missionary, even more than any other man, needs to be able to discriminate between what is essential and what is not. He has to steer, on the one hand, between Congregationalism and a Papacy; on the other, between making his work too foreign in appearance to succeed, and adapting himself so closely to the ideas which he is trying to raise, that he sacrifices everything which might have succeeded in raising them.

In other words, a missionary needs to have an exceptionally firm and clear grasp of principles. Once the principles are clearly grasped, the applica-

tion of them to particular instances as they arise is comparatively easy. The missionary will, like S. Paul, know exactly how far he can go.[1] He will recognize when any concession for which he may be asked must be met with a decisive and final No. And any mistakes which he may make are not likely to prove very serious. If the right principles are at work, errors of application will soon correct themselves. The real danger lies in opportunism. If the missionary be content to live, as it were, from hand to mouth, dealing with every problem as it arises by the light of common sense, in view of what seems to be the best course at the moment, he is merely courting disaster. It may not come in his own time, but come it must. Probably the explanation of the weakness of much modern English missionary work lies in our national incapacity for principles, particularly theological ones. "Practical" and "efficient" are what we seem to have taken for our watchwords. They are admirable words—but they ought to mean rather more than "active" and "energetic."[2] The strength of the Eastern Churches,

[1] For the idea of this paragraph, I am indebted to a sermon preached before the University of Cambridge by the Bishop of Birmingham on May 2, 1909.

[2] It is difficult not to be a little disturbed by the small place which—to judge from the printed reports—principles seem to occupy in the minds of many of those who spoke at the Pan-Anglican Congress of 1908. The effect produced on the mind of the reader is that organization is regarded as the sovereign remedy for all our shortcomings. We shall do well to bear in mind the saying of Joab to Ahimaaz: "Wherefore wilt thou run, my son, seeing that thou hast no tidings ready?" (2 Samuel xviii. 22).

and of the Assyrian Communion especially, has been their innate capacity for theology. Even the remnant of the Assyrians of to-day, ignorant though they have become from lack of opportunities of learning, are said to move naturally, almost as it were by instinct, in the region of principles. Their pre-eminent interest is theology, and their natural gifts enable them to handle it with an ease which their Western brethren can only envy. Thus the early Assyrian missionary could deal with the problems of his work with a consistency and certainty that the European of to-day has failed to reach. He moved confidently in regions where we blunder and hesitate. If we are ever to rival their achievements, it will not be solely, or even chiefly, by the organizing and busy energy which are so dear to us. They are only, at the best, instruments. Behind them must lie the real grasp of fundamental principles which can only be the fruit of prolonged thought. Unfortunately we find thinking more difficult than organizing, and so tend to walk more and more in the easier path. The objection to it is that it will eventually prove to be a blind alley.

The other great field of early Eastern missionary enterprise was Africa. At the beginning of our era the genius which had led Alexander the Great to choose the barren, sweltering sandhills at the mouth of the Nile to be the site of a great city had amply justified itself. Alexandria was the second city of

the Mediterranean world: in commercial importance it rivalled Rome itself. Its geographical position made it the clearing-house of three continents.[1]

From its earliest days it had attracted a very large number of Jewish immigrants—in whose interest the Old Testament was translated into Greek. At the beginning of our era there was probably hardly any important nation unrepresented there. Its Museum (which was practically what we understand by a University) possessed the finest library in the world. The city was also a principal centre of the worship of Serapis. The cult of this divinity was one of the orgiastic Oriental creeds which obtained a wide popularity in the Roman Empire during the first three centuries A.D. Whether we accept the tradition that S. Mark became the first Bishop of Alexandria or not, there is no doubt that Christianity—as was natural—established itself there in very early times. The importance of the city made the see one of the most important in the world. In the third century it produced[2] Origen, who was probably the most learned and laborious student of the Bible there has ever been. His chief work, the Hexapla, *i.e.* a Bible in six parallel columns, containing the

[1] To be accurate, of course, only of such parts of them as may be regarded as sharing a common civilization, *i.e.* the Mediterranean countries of Europe, N. Africa, and W. Asia. But that was the world for practical purposes.

[2] Or rather, to be strictly accurate, was the scene of his life's work. He may have been born elsewhere.

Hebrew and different Greek translations, required so much labour to produce, that, so far as is known, no other copy was ever made. In his interpretation of some of the earlier parts of the Old Testament he anticipated much of what is regarded in some circles as "advanced criticism" at the present day.[1]

In the fourth century it produced the well-known heretic Arius[2] (whose mistaken views probably, at one time, commanded a majority in Western Christendom) and his great opponent, Athanasius. There has seldom been a greater champion of the fulness of Christian belief than Athanasius, or a century which had more need of him than the fourth. Of course the Church of such a city became a strong missionary

[1] *e.g.* "Philocalia," ch. 17: "Who would be so silly as to imagine that God, after the fashion of a human gardener, had planted a garden in Eden towards the east, and set in it a tree of life that could be seen and felt? Any one who is not blind can collect multitudes of such examples written down as though they had occurred, and yet never having occurred in the literal sense." I owe this reference to "Some Thoughts on Inspiration," by the Very Rev. J. Armitage Robinson, Dean of Westminster (Longmans, Green & Co., 1905). It is only fair to add that Origen is sometimes fanciful in interpretation, and presses allegory too far.

[2] Arius made the generation of the Son an act in time, thereby reducing Him to the level of a creature. If his views had finally prevailed, the Church would have become as nerveless and destitute of saving power as the Unitarian body is to-day. But he did not see that. He owed his vogue to the fact that he appealed strongly to the ordinary common sense of the plain man. It seemed obvious that a Father must have existed before His Son. He was probably also helped by the fact that his stock phrase, "There was when He was not," runs in Greek in a way that makes it an almost ideal catchword for a party.

centre. It spread westward along the north coast of Africa, and southward far up the Nile. But the mob of Alexandria came to have an evil reputation for riotousness and ferocity,[1] and its Church could not help being tinged with these characteristics. It is to the Egyptian Church that we owe the beginnings of Christian monasticism. The first definite rule for a Christian community living apart from the world was believed to have been revealed to one Pachomius by an angel towards the close of the third century. Soon the deserts of Upper Egypt became dotted with "religious persons" (in the technical sense). In many cases these were solitaries—hermits who separated themselves as far as possible from all other human beings. Sometimes a number of such gathered together for mutual help and protection under a common head. But, even so, the individual members were more isolated than in the monasteries of the West. The religious communities of the Egyptian desert bore little resemblance to the homes of quiet thought, artistic production, and useful labour of various kinds which the word "monastery" suggests to us. They tended to be little more than hotbeds of savage fanaticism, which sometimes bordered upon downright insanity. The visits of large parties of the dwellers in the desert

[1] There is a very graphic description of the people and Church of Alexandria in the fifth century in Charles Kingsley's novel, "Hypatia." In general outline it is probably fairly accurate.

to Alexandria were not likely to conduce to the healthy growth of the Church. Since the Mohammedan conquest the Egyptian Church has been exposed to relentless persecution, and has been brought very low. It is represented to-day only by the small remnant of the Copts. It is to be feared that they are sunk in ignorance and superstition, for it is said that there are few, even among the clergy, who can understand the language of their liturgy. But we are bound to respect them as the modern representatives of all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and for the fact that they have not allowed Christianity to become wholly extinct in the Nile Valley. It is to be hoped that brighter days are in store for this very ancient Church under our régime. Like ourselves, they have had to resist the aggression of the Roman See.

There is one living memorial of their missionary activity, during the days of their greatness, in the Church of Abyssinia. There are probably still many people in England who do not realise that south of Latitude 15°—speaking roughly, between Khartûm and the south-west shore of the Red Sea—there has been a Christian State for nearly 1500 years. In some respects the Abyssinian Church is the most remarkable in the world. For many centuries it was completely cut off from the rest of Christendom. At the present day it is an island surrounded by a ring of peoples bitterly hostile to Christianity in any

form. And it may probably be regarded as the extreme instance of the extent to which Christianity can be overlaid with superstition without ceasing to exist. Among other peculiarities, it is the custom of the Abyssinian Christians to keep models of the Ark of Zion[1] in their churches, and to make them an object of worship.

But whatever can be said against the Abyssinian Church, it has preserved a seed of truth in a region which would otherwise have been surrendered, first, to some low form of paganism, and then to the religion of Mohammed. And it is also a valuable reminder of the vigour of the Church that was once in Egypt. Having given this very brief outline sketch of the missionary work of the Oriental Churches,[2] we must turn once more to the achievements of the principal Church of the West.[3]

During the earlier part of the thirteenth century

[1] An English translation of a MS. in the possession of the Emperor of Abyssinia, called "Magda, Queen of Sheba," has recently been published. It professes to describe how the son of the Queen of Sheba and Solomon stole the Ark from the Temple at Jerusalem and brought it to Abyssinia. The Ark is continually spoken of as "Our Holy Mother and Queen," and the book was probably composed to justify the worship of models of it against objections which had been raised by more enlightened opinion.

[2] The final separation between the Eastern and Western Churches took place in the eleventh century. Their relations had been strained for some time before. But the Papacy has never dared to deny the validity of Eastern Orders.

[3] For this sketch of the Franciscan Missions to China I am indebted to an article by the Bishop of Gibraltar in "The East and the West," April 1904, p. 121.

the rise of the great Mongol Empire under Genghiz Khan began to cause uneasiness in Europe. Probably no one has ever reigned over so great an empire, for his dominions extended from Poland to the Yellow Sea. The united powers of Europe would have had little prospect of withstanding his armies if he had made any serious attempt to conquer their territory. But, as the Mongol Emperors were not barbarians, but wise and enlightened rulers, it was soon seen that there might be better ways of averting the danger than by force of arms. It seemed possible that the Great Khan himself (that is the title by which the Mongol sovereign was commonly known in Europe) might be converted to Christianity. It looked as if the Church might gain the most magnificent triumph of its history, if missionaries of sufficient devotion and courage could be found to undertake the work; and of these there was at the moment no lack. The rise of the mendicant orders had produced a Papal militia which was exactly what was required. Preaching the Gospel "to the enemies of Christ" had been part of the original plan of S. Francis, and the Dominicans had adopted the same ideal. At the Council of Lyons in 1245, Pope Innocent IV. appealed to these two orders for a spiritual army to convert the Mongols, and there was no lack of response. A Franciscan friar, named John of Pian-Carpino, was chosen to lead an embassy to Muscovy, and thence to the Far East.

He started from Lyons on April 16, 1245, and was joined *en route* by two companions. The party penetrated far into Asia, and seem to have been well received, for on his return in 1247 Pian-Carpino was made Archbishop of Antivari in Albania. His stay in the East had been too short to produce any permanent result. A second mission of Dominicans, which started soon after, returned in July of the same year, with nothing to show for the expedition but an insulting letter from the Mongol general at Baidju, which put an end to all prospect of immediate success. Neither of these parties had reached Cathay itself, though the existence of the great city of Cambaluc (Pekin) was known in Europe. It was first visited by two Venetian merchants, Nicolo and Marco Polo, in the year 1260.[1] On their return they brought letters to the Pope praying that learned missionaries might be sent to instruct the people in the liberal arts.[2] It does not seem certain that Kublai Khan had any desire for religious instruction, though expressions to that effect have been put into his mouth.

In 1279, whether in consequence of the letter or

[1] An English translation of Marco Polo's travels, edited by T. Wright, has been published by George Bell & Sons: London, 1897.

[2] This is, perhaps, the first recognition of the purely educational side of missionary work, which has been brought into prominence of late years, especially in India. It should be remembered that the thirteenth century was a period of exceptional intellectual activity in Western Europe.

not, Pope Nicholas III. determined to make another attempt, and a commission of five Franciscans was despatched from the second Council of Lyons. But their way was blocked by the disturbed condition of some of the districts through which they had to pass, and they were unable to accomplish anything. An effective beginning was not made till the year 1289, when Nicholas IV. despatched the famous friar, John of Montecorvino,[1] with letters addressed to Arghoun Khan in Persia, and to Kublai himself at Cambaluc. Little or nothing was heard of him till 1305, when he managed to send a letter to his friends in Europe. In it he speaks of having baptized about a hundred persons in India *en route*, and of finding a strong and unfriendly Nestorian community in China. He had been kindly treated by the Great Khan, who was not, however, disposed to change his own belief; and at the time of writing had contrived to build a church in Cambaluc, and furnish it with three bells. He had baptized about six thousand persons, and estimates that he could have baptized five times that number if there had been no other calls upon his time. He had also purchased a hundred and fifty boys from pagan parents, out of whom he had managed to form the nucleus of a choir.

[1] A village near Salerno. John was born in 1247, and may be regarded as one of the greatest missionaries which the Church has ever produced.

Not long afterwards (probably early in the following year) he wrote another letter giving some particulars of the work to the brethren of the Franciscan and Dominican Orders in Persia. In it he speaks of having been definitely persecuted by Nestorians, and of having opened another "station" (*locus*) close to the gate of the Lord Khan (*i.e.* the entrance to the imperial city). He also mentions the presence of many monks of various kinds, wearing different habits, who were "of greater abstinence and austerity than our Latin monks." These were doubtless Buddhists.

On receipt of these letters, Pope Clement V. at once caused a Bull to be prepared nominating John of Montecorvino as Archbishop of Cambaluc and Primate of the Far East. Seven Franciscan friars were consecrated bishops, and despatched with a commission to consecrate their archbishop, and then remain with him as his suffragans. Only two of them reached Pekin in safety. In 1308 the Archbishop was consecrated with great pomp, and soon afterwards the Pope sent them a reinforcement of three more suffragans.

Meanwhile the Dominicans had been working with great effect among the Mongols of Persia. In 1304 they had converted the Nestorian Patriarch, Mar Jabalaha, and induced him to write a letter of submission to Pope Benedict XI. Fourteen years later John XXII. consecrated Francis of Perugia

to be first Archbishop of Sulthanyeh, and supplied him with six suffragans. It looked as if a Christian Mongol Empire were almost within sight. We have a letter from Andrew of Perugia (one of the two consecrators of the first Archbishop of Cambaluc), written from the city of Zayton (really Zaïtun), which he describes as being on the shores of the ocean three weeks' journey from Cambaluc. It is addressed to the warden of his convent at Perugia, and depicts a most flourishing state of affairs. Zayton possessed a cathedral, built and endowed by a wealthy Armenian lady, and another "convenient and handsome" church. This church also possessed monastic buildings sufficient for twenty-two brethren, who, it may be assumed, were of native descent. The allowance for maintenance made by the Emperor to the bishop was so much in excess of his requirements that he was able to devote a large part of it to church-building. Some Genoese merchants resident there estimated it at about a hundred golden florins per annum. After this letter, which is dated January 1326, we have little further knowledge of the missions to Cathay. Archbishop John must have died about 1330, and his place was never really filled, though efforts to provide a successor were made. The last authentic fact we know is that, in 1362, James of Florence, fifth bishop of Zayton, was martyred

with many followers, and this seems to have brought the Church to an end.[1]

It is obvious that the constitution of the mission was bound to be in itself a source of weakness. The fact that it was directed entirely by friars made it depend directly from the Papacy. So intimate a connection with a base so remote would not be likely to conduce to satisfactory working, when once the mission had established itself firmly.[2] At the outset it was probably of the greatest value. It is possible, too, that the Church suffered somewhat from the liberality of the Great Khan. An infant Church, with a gigantic missionary task still before it, is probably better without the patronage and support of those in high places. Less than any other kind of Church can it afford to risk even seeming to offer any but purely spiritual advantages to its converts. We know nothing about Andrew of Perugia's twenty-two native brethren. They may

[1] A Franciscan writer of the present day, Père Léon, in his book "L'Auréole Séraphique," vol. i. p. 274 *note*, states that in 1456 the see of Pekin was occupied by a Franciscan, the seventh from John of Montecorvino. If this is anything more than a mistake, he can only have been a titular bishop who was never within a thousand miles of his see. (I owe this reference to the Bishop of Gibraltar's article mentioned above.)

[2] Still it should be noted that the missionaries were given a remarkably free hand in some respects. For, in his first letter John speaks of having translated the Canon of the Mass into Tartar, and of celebrating habitually in that language. Of course we do not know how this piece of information was received at Rome. But he does not think it necessary to offer any kind of apology for his action.

have been men truly called by God to the life of a Christian monk, or they may have been men of no real spirituality at all. The fact that the bishop enjoyed a liberal allowance from the imperial treasury may have suggested adherence to him as an easy means of acquiring an assured competence for life.[1] But the principal cause of its extinction was doubtless persecution. The tolerant Tartars were succeeded by the Chinese Ming dynasty, and religious toleration ceased. Probably the Ming sovereigns did not feel themselves sufficiently secure upon their thrones to tolerate subjects who looked to any authority beyond their own.

We must now turn to the other side of the globe, and speak briefly of the early missions of the Roman Church in the New World. It is unnecessary to go into details, and to do so would involve the relation of much that is better forgotten. Those who desire more detailed information can glean it from the pages of Prescott's "Conquest of Mexico" and "Conquest of Peru." The Spanish conquests in America were accompanied by unspeakable cruelties, and they tried to extend the Kingdom of Christ by the

[1] The present writer has seen it seriously advanced as a proof of the superiority of Buddhism to Christianity, that a ship's fireman, who became a Buddhist monk at Singapore, found himself transferred from a life of exhausting toil to an easy and comfortable profession. The author of the article in which the fact was recorded went on to ask triumphantly: "What other religion in the world could have done that for him?" (Mormonism is said to make a somewhat similar appeal.)

same methods as those by which they extended the empire of Spain. But, without proposing to defend their conduct, it is not fair to judge it by modern standards. They were probably no worse than any of their contemporaries would have been under similar circumstances. For centuries previously, the Spaniards had been fighting almost continuously—not for empire, but for national existence. The long struggle with the Moors could not fail to accentuate any latent tendencies to ferocity and cruelty that there might be in the Spanish character. Shortly after the final subjugation of their ancient enemy, a prospect of empire and wealth upon a scale of which no man had ever dreamed suddenly opened before them. The existence of the great American continent became known. It was hardly possible to exaggerate the riches which it contained, and it was given into their hand by the supreme authority of the Vicar of Christ on earth. It was not wonderful that they were like men intoxicated. They had but to make good their hold upon what they believed to be their lawful inheritance, and Spain would be supreme throughout the whole world.

And we must try to be fair to their missionary methods. They belonged to an age which saw no harm in trying to propagate spiritual truth by material methods. It was commonly held that men could be, and therefore ought to be, compelled

to accept the views which had commended themselves to those in authority. Coercion was the recognized method of spreading or suppressing opinions of any kind.[1] It is unreasonable to expect the Spaniards in the New World to have advanced so far beyond the views held by the rest of Europe as to have realized that a new continent could not be converted by violence. And if they went beyond what had been done before in Europe (and it is by no means certain that they did), it must be remembered that they were beyond any restraint which a slightly more enlightened public opinion might have exercised. There was no one else in America to be shocked by their treatment of the Indians, and little if anything could be known about their doings by the rest of Europe. Probably no one else has ever had such an opportunity of acting cruelly or so much temptation to do so.

For in this respect their Church gave them no help. It had long ceased to make any account of theology. Religious teaching, as we understand it, barely existed. Its thinkers were occupied with devising arguments in support of a particular theory of Church government, and with very little else.

[1] The Church Discipline Bills which are brought forward in the House of Commons from time to time by private members show that there are still some people in England who cling to this antiquated view. The spirit of such bills is that of the Middle Ages at its worst. It does not make much difference whether the instruments employed are the stake, or deprivation and imprisonment. Both are equally bound to fail.

The Church had become a vast and complicated system which nobody understood: from which everybody made his own selection. Men were left to form their own conception of God, and of what was acceptable in His sight. The seat of authority was too much engrossed with European politics, of which it was the hub, to have time to offer much guidance in religious matters. Bishoprics in general were merely a convenient means of providing for the support of the great officers of State or rewards for public service. Such teaching as was given aimed at stimulating enthusiasm rather than at diffusing knowledge of God. It was not wonderful that men trained in such a system—or rather left to grow up in such a chaos—should have seen no harm in conduct which we see to have been utterly un-Christian. They believed quite honestly that they were serving God faithfully according to His will. And it must always be remembered to the Spaniards' credit that they did, collectively, feel the obligation of bringing the Gospel to their new subjects. Missionary work, as they understood it, was to them an inevitable accompaniment of their conquests. Probably no other nation[1] has ever acted so systematically on the principle that the cross must accompany its flag to the ends of the earth. Certainly we our-

[1] The Mohammedans, of course, always took their religion with their armies, and imposed it on their new subjects. Long contact with them may have done something towards convincing the Spaniards of the obligation.

selves have not. More than once by placing difficulties in the way of forming new bishoprics, our Government has positively hindered the progress of the Gospel in regions newly brought under its care. It has seldom done anything to help it. And when Protestantism has said all that can be said about the Inquisition in the New World, and has repeated all the stories of newly baptized children having their brains dashed out by Spanish soldiers to ensure their salvation before they had had time to sin, the fact remains that the Spaniards and Portuguese did cause Christ's name to be named upon the American continent over eighty degrees of latitude. The Church of Latin America may be degraded and corrupt, but still it is a Christian Church, and administers the Sacraments to many who at the present day would never, in all probability, have heard of them from any other source. The condition of its most ignorant and superstitious members does not compare unfavourably with that of the residents in the "back-blocks" of Australia, some of whom have lapsed into such complete heathenism that they have never heard the name of Christ, and do not recognize the attitude of prayer when they see it. The fact that the cross was planted throughout the length and breadth of Central and Southern America almost as quickly as those regions became known to Europe is a unique missionary achievement in the history of the Church. The Spaniards

and Portuguese set their hands to a great work, and probably few of their contemporaries would have seen anything to object to in the way in which they carried it through.

The religious changes which passed over Western Europe during the sixteenth century naturally affected the spread of the Gospel in heathen lands. After the Reformation missionary work falls into two great divisions.[1] First, that of the Roman Church, which in heathen countries is conducted very largely by members of various religious orders. This also includes propaganda among those who do not recognize the supremacy of the Pope. The policy of the Roman Church for the last three hundred years has been to ignore the existence of all other Churches, and to treat the whole world outside its own communion as a legitimate field for missionary activity. Secondly, that of the various Reformed Churches, which has been, and still is, to a very large extent, conducted by semi-private societies. Before proceeding to give any sketch of the work that has gone on from the sixteenth century down to our own time, it will be convenient to consider briefly as a whole the missions of the preceding period—*i.e.* from the fifth century, which may be regarded as the beginning of the Middle Ages, down to the Reformation.

[1] With the exception of Russia, about which something will be said below, none of the Eastern Churches have been in a condition to attempt much in the way of missionary work since the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

Speaking generally, it may be said that mediæval missions usually began by being extremely successful, and subsequently collapsed and had to be built up again almost from the beginning.[1] Certainly when we recall the Churches that were great once, and have now practically ceased to exist—for the rebuilding was not always possible—we have no reason to be discouraged by any of the collapses of our own time. Failure in the mission-field is no new thing.

One great advantage which the mediæval Church possessed is that it seems to have had comparatively little difficulty in obtaining men to fill its posts in the mission-field. This must be ascribed to a variety of causes. The love of adventure was often very strong, as appears from the way in which people would go on pilgrimages. The excitement of departing to preach the Gospel in a distant and unknown country must have been in some cases a powerful motive. The spirit of obedience also was strongly developed. Men were probably more ready to do what they were told to do, and go where they were told to go, than they are now, and authority was perhaps more ready to issue its instructions with no uncertain voice. This temper was directly fostered by monastic institutions, whose immense value in missionary work has been pointed out

[1] The early history of Christianity in the kingdom of Northumbria is a case in point. See page 57.

above. When Augustine and his companions were alarmed during their journey through France by the reports which reached them of the state of England, they were disposed to turn back. But Gregory bade them go on, and it was then that the discipline of their monastic training told. They were told to advance, and like well-trained soldiers they did. Probably, if they had not had years of habitual obedience to superiors behind them, they would not have been strong enough to overcome their natural fears.

The mediæval missionaries often produced very remarkable results in a very short space of time. This is largely due to the fact that they usually began at the top. They addressed themselves first to the king or chief, and to the principal men by whom he was surrounded. And if they were not immediately successful in gaining the personal allegiance of the king himself, they usually managed to secure a measure of his goodwill. And the conversion of any one of high rank usually meant the conversion of his dependants *en masse*. In places where clan or tribal feeling was strong, it was natural for every one to imitate his chief. It would have been presumptuous, if not worse, for any one in a humble walk of life to question what had commended itself to his superiors. It was natural for the missionaries to begin that way, for they were unacquainted with any but monarchical

institutions, and believed that monarchy was the only form of government which was acceptable in the sight of God. To them it would have seemed almost sacrilege to address themselves to any one before the king. And this method had certain great practical advantages. In the first place, it secured a certain measure of personal security against attack to the new-comers, and in the second, the king was usually ready to provide them with means of subsistence. The gifts of land made to them ensured the continuance of the work. On the other hand, it may be urged that this method is not that of our Lord and His immediate followers. They began with the lowest classes, and from them the Gospel worked upwards. But it is difficult to say whether that method ought to be regarded as a principle, to be observed always in all missionary work or not. It may have been merely dictated by the social conditions of the Roman Empire in general, and Palestine in particular, at the beginning of our era.[1] Our Lord may have begun with the poor, simply because in that particular case there was nothing to be done with the rich. But the social outlook of the Gothic or Germanic or Keltic peoples was very different from that of the Jews, Romans, or Greeks. Their national life was organized in an entirely different way. If, as seems

[1] The sense of solidarity produced by caste is said to be causing mass-movements towards Christianity at the present day in some parts of India.

probable, each nation is to be won by being approached through its own existing institutions, that may mean beginning with the humble in one instance and with those in high places in another. The cry, "Quid Christianis cum regibus?"[1] was first raised by the heretical Donatist sect. It does not necessarily represent the view which the Church ought to take. We cannot always accuse missionaries who began by addressing themselves first to rulers of disregarding a fundamental principle of the Gospel, and of trying to wage the warfare of the spirit with the help of the flesh; under some circumstances, to address the rulers first might be the right course, and the only one which could offer any prospect of success.

Its drawbacks are very obvious. The king is converted, and his subjects follow suit by thousands, many of them having only the vaguest ideas as to what they were accepting. We read of wholesale baptisms in rivers, which really meant very little.[2]

[1] "What have Christians in common with kings?"

[2] Of course much of the work of the mediæval Church was weakened by a rather mechanical view of Sacraments. A Sacrament was commonly regarded as an *opus operatum—i.e.* as something complete in itself. If it were administered and received duly, so far as all externals were concerned, that was all that was required. This view was perhaps carried to its extreme development by the early Jesuit missionaries in North America. They would brave any tortures at the hands of the Red Indians to baptize children, who would probably never exchange a word with a Christian as long as they lived. Probably this extreme is preferable to the other, which barely recognizes Sacraments at all.

Or in some cases, notably in Norway, they are not inclined to adopt the new views, and the king tries to impose them by force of arms. A great deal of blood was shed during the conversion of Europe by rulers who found their subjects less tractable in religious matters than they had expected; and what one king had imposed by violence, his successor was entitled to uproot in the same way if he chose.

Christianity might spread rapidly over the surface, but in many cases it was necessarily only a thin veneer. It was often tainted with heathen superstitions which it made little effort to remove. Such a faith was not calculated to stand persecution if the sympathies of the sovereign changed.

And even if things went well with the Church, the fact that it had begun at the apex of society tended to hasten one unfortunate development. The rulers of the Church were naturally about the king's person. They could hardly escape from taking a considerable part in politics. No doubt the great affairs of State were better directed by them than they would have been by any one else available at the time, but the effect upon the Church was not wholly good. The spiritual office tended to become an appanage of the secular. Bishoprics soon came to be regarded as merely means of providing for public servants. Possibly a Church which had been

built up from the lower to the higher ranks of society might have escaped this danger for a longer period. It might have been in a better position to resist such partial absorption by the State when the process, which was probably inevitable, began. It is easy for us to find fault with many things in the conduct and methods of the missionaries of the Middle Ages. But the greater part of such criticism is really unfair. It consists in blaming them for not having been in advance of the ideas of their time. The courage and devotion of such men as Patrick, Boniface, Columbanus, Anscar, Methodius, and John of Montecorvino—merely to cite a few examples—are really beyond praise. The positive results of their work were enormous. We can owe nothing but gratitude to the men into whose labours we have entered. We cannot reproach them for sharing the ideas of their time because such ideas are not those of our own day.

The Reformation is an event of such importance in our political, as well as in our religious, history that we are sometimes inclined to overlook the effect which it produced upon its opponents. The anti-Protestant movement in the Roman Church, which is generally called the counter-Reformation, is really at least as remarkable as the Reformation itself. Probably it would be no exaggeration to call it the most remarkable single episode that has ever occurred in the history of the Christian Church. Its

immediate success was greater than that of the Protestant movement, and its permanent results are fully as large at the present day. It called forth a burst of missionary enthusiasm such as has not been seen since the first day of Pentecost. So far as organization is concerned, there can be no question that the mantle of the men who made the Roman Empire has fallen upon the Roman Church; and it has never given more striking proof of its vitality and power than it did at this time immediately after a large portion of Europe had been torn from its grasp. Printing-presses poured forth literature not only to meet the controversial needs of the moment, but also admirable editions of the early Fathers to whom the Reformed Churches appealed—sometimes with more confidence than knowledge. Armies of devoted missionaries were scientifically marshalled. Regions of Europe which had seemed to be lost for ever[1] were recovered to the Papacy, and the claims of the Vicar of Christ were carried far and wide through countries where they had never been heard before.

The leading spirits in this movement were the Jesuits. As they may fairly be regarded as some of the most intrepid and successful missionaries that the Church has ever possessed, it will not be out of

[1] For example, the southern portion of Germany and parts of Austria-Hungary. Even France and Spain were not well affected to the Papacy at the Council of Trent.

place to give a short account of the origin and progress of their order. Their founder was a younger son of a noble Spanish house, and was named Inigo Lopez de Recalde. He was born in the province of Guipuscoa, and followed, as was natural for one in his circumstances, the military profession. In 1521 he was severely wounded in defending Pampeluna against the French. During his convalescence his imagination was fired by the glowing stories of the "Legenda Aurea," and he determined to set himself to imitate the deeds of Christ, S. Francis, and S. Dominic. On March 24, 1522, he suspended his shield and sword before a miraculous image of the Virgin at Montserrat, in token that he had renounced his temporal knighthood for a spiritual. He believed that the deepest mysteries of Christianity were displayed to him in a series of special revelations, and, after travelling for some time in the East, went to Paris in 1528. His object was to equip himself more thoroughly for public teaching by a regular course of study at the University. Learning seems, however, not to have been congenial to him. His enthusiastic temper and severe asceticism found their natural outlet in influencing those with whom he was brought into contact. Two fellow-students who came especially under his influence were Faber, a Savoyard, and Xavier, a native of Navarre. To them he first suggested the idea of forming a religious order, to be

called the "Company of Jesus." [1] Their first project was to sacrifice their lives in absolute poverty at Jerusalem for the conversion of the Saracens and the edification of the Christians. If circumstances should make that impossible, they resolved to place themselves unreservedly at the disposal of the Pope for any service he might select. When the order was fairly constituted, de Recalde assumed the name Ignatius Loyola, by which he is better known. Early in 1537 Loyola took up his quarters at Venice with eight companions, but the outbreak of hostilities between the Turks and Venetians put an end to any immediate prospect of embarking for the East. Meanwhile they employed themselves in preaching and setting an example of self-renunciation in Italy. In 1543 they received the unconditional approval of the Pope. Of course such an effective spiritual army—prepared to go anywhere and attempt anything—was an invaluable instrument in his hands. The order spread with almost inconceivable rapidity. It drew converts from every class of society. It recognized from the outset the supreme importance of educational work. Its schools and colleges could hardly be multiplied fast enough to accommodate all who wished to enter

[1] The title indicates that it was to be modelled on the lines of an order of chivalry. De Recalde is said to have composed in earlier life a romance of chivalry, in which the hero was the Apostle S. Andrew.

them.[1] When Loyola died in 1556, the Company had possessed itself of thirteen provinces beside the Roman. Seven of these belonged to Spain, Portugal, and their colonies. In 1551 thirty Jesuits established themselves at Vienna under the auspices of Ferdinand, King of the Romans, who placed the management of the University in their hands.[2] Before the third quarter of the century the tide of Reformation was beginning to be turned, and members of the Company were actively at work in almost all the chief countries of Europe. In some respects the Jesuits were unlike other religious orders. Their rules dispensed with the offices of common worship, and allowed them to lead a more secularized existence than other "religious." They were thus enabled to throw themselves into their work of preaching and teaching with more freedom and effectiveness. The confessional was prominent in their system from the first. Before the end of the century their orthodoxy had been seriously questioned by the Inquisition. But they had proved themselves too valuable to the Pope for him to interfere with them. They did not confine themselves to trying to regain ground that had

[1] In some of these the education was at first purely secular. But it tended to aim more and more exclusively at fitting its pupils to do battle for "the old religion," whenever and wherever they might be called upon to do so.

[2] It is said that there had not been a single candidate for holy orders in the University for nineteen years previously.

been lost in Europe. One of the original members of the Company was the great Francis Xavier, whose heroic labours have earned for him the title of the "Apostle of the Indies."[1] On May 6, 1542, he landed at Goa. There he found that many of the Portuguese settlers had virtually abandoned even the outward profession of Christianity. With the sanction of the bishop, he began a vigorous mission to them. He visited hospitals and prisons, and used to walk through the streets ringing a bell, and imploring all heads of families, for the love of God, to send their households to him for instruction. His simple, earnest character soon gained the affection of all, and he quickly brought about a wonderful change in the conduct of the people, especially of the young. Six months later he departed to work among the Paravars, in the neighbourhood of Cape Comorin. They were a poor and degraded people, who had been, till shortly before Xavier's coming, the slaves of their Mohammedan neighbours. They had been liberated by the Portuguese, and were, therefore, disposed to look with favour on Christianity. A few had been baptized, but had had no instruction in the faith. Xavier lived on rice and water in native fashion, and his success was no less striking and rapid than it had been among the Portuguese. After fifteen months he returned to

[1] It is a matter for regret that the records of his noble life have been interlarded with a number of very improbable anecdotes.

Goa for reinforcements, and early in 1544 took three European colleagues to the south of India. Each had a different station assigned him, and Xavier himself broke fresh ground with his wonted success in the kingdom of Travancore. It seems that he was unacquainted with the native languages, but produced a great impression both on the Paravars and people of Travancore by exhibiting great physical courage. He then proceeded to the islands of the Malay archipelago, some of which had been opened up by Portuguese traders. He was successful in Malacca, but nearly lost his life in Java and Del Moro. In the summer of 1547 he met at Malacca a native of Japan called Anger. This man became a Christian, and proceeded to the Jesuit College at Goa. In August 1550, Xavier and Anger, with two companions, landed in Japan, and during the next two years a small Christian community was formed. But the goal of Xavier's ambition was the great empire of China. This hope was, however, unrealized. He died of fever on the island of Sancian on December 2, 1552, at the age of forty-six. The subsequent history of the Church which he founded in Japan is briefly told. By 1587 it is said to have numbered 200,000 souls. Then a storm of persecution broke upon it, and almost all the Jesuits were banished from the country. More persecution arose in 1596, and again in 1617, when the Christian population was thought

to have been nearly 2,000,000. Finally, in 1624, Christianity was forbidden. In 1638 the Portuguese and their religion were finally expelled, and Japan had no intercourse with Europe, except through one Dutch factory at Deshima, for more than two hundred years. In storming the last stronghold of Christianity the Japanese were assisted by the Dutch, who made no effort to propagate their own beliefs. When the country was reopened, a dim tradition of Christianity is said to have been found lingering on in one remote corner. The Japanese Government thought that Christians had pledged their allegiance to a foreign Power. They were also accused of having acted offensively in Shinto and Buddhist temples.

Xavier's Indian Missions were carried on steadily, though by less worthy hands, after his death. But no serious beginning was made in China for thirty years. In 1582 an Italian Jesuit named Ricci landed in China as a member of an embassy from the coast of Macao. His methods differed completely from those of Xavier. Instead of directing his appeal to the emotions and preaching repentance, he tried to disarm the natural hostility of the Chinese to any novelty by a lavish display of learning. His particular forte seems to have been mathematics. He adopted native costume, and even hinted that what he had come to teach was merely the development of ideas which had already been promulgated in the

writings of Confucius. Then, when he considered that he had disarmed the hostility of those in authority and had gained a sufficient knowledge of the leading features of the Chinese character, he embarked vigorously on the preaching of the Gospel. His success was immediate and remarkable. When he died in 1610 the Church bid fair to permeate all classes of society. The conversion of China seemed to be almost in sight. By 1616 there were churches in five provinces. From 1622 the work was carried on by Adam Schalk, a German of similar attainments. In 1631 reinforcements of Dominicans and Franciscans began to arrive. Towards the close of the century the successful negotiation of a treaty between China and Russia by a Jesuit missionary named Gerbillon led to the legal toleration of Christianity.[1] But even before this time troubles had again arisen. The Jesuits had allowed their converts to continue ancestor-worship, regarding it as the equivalent of prayers for the dead and the invocation of saints. To this the stricter Dominicans objected. Exception was also taken to the Chinese rendering of the word God[2] adopted by the Jesuits. After much disputing,

[1] Schalk's successor, Ferdinand Verbiest, rose high in the estimation of the Chinese by showing them an improved method of founding cannon.

[2] The expression they used meant literally "chief ruler" or "lord of heaven." It was doubtless inadequate, but it appeared that the Chinese language did not contain a thoroughly appropriate word. The Dominicans do not seem to have had any satisfactory alternative to suggest.

Clement XI. despatched a legate, Cardinal Thomas de Tournon, to investigate the question on the spot. Following the decision of the Roman Propaganda, he, in 1704, disallowed the Jesuit rendering absolutely, and further condemned a number of minor concessions to Chinese prejudice which they had made. He was arrested by order of the Emperor—who was under Jesuit influence—and died at Macao in 1710. Naturally the Jesuits were accused of having had him murdered. In 1715 Clement XI. formally condemned the admission of pagan usages into the Church. In 1745 Benedict XIV. did the same, in more emphatic language. From this date the Church was systematically persecuted in China, though not exterminated. It was weakened by the suppression of the Jesuit Order in 1773, and still more seriously by the French Revolution.[1]

In Thibet the early Jesuit Missions produced little result, in spite of the fact that religious orders (Buddhist) had been developed there to an extent unknown in any European country. At the beginning of the eighteenth century a Capuchin Mission, under Orazia della Penna, was somewhat more successful, and was granted a house of residence at the capital. The permanent result seems, however, to have been inconsiderable.

The Jesuits were no less active and successful in

[1] From 1663 it had drawn very largely upon a missionary seminary in Paris.

the western hemisphere.[1] In 1549 a body of them accompanied the governor to the new foundation of Bahia (San Salvador). In 1586 a detachment was summoned from Brazil to undertake the evangelization of Paraguay. Here they were given an entirely free hand. The government of the country was entrusted to them in all respects, and they were able to exclude all other Europeans. In a short space of time they completely changed the character of the natives. From a low and brutal type of savage, they were transformed into respectable members of society. But the policy of their rulers arrested all development beyond a certain point. The Paraguayans were jealously guarded from the acquisition of any knowledge which might do them harm. They were treated like children. Although the spectacle of a prolonged childhood of grown men and women cannot be particularly edifying, still it must be acknowledged that Paraguay is perhaps the only instance in which the European colonization of America has been to the advantage of the original owners of the soil. The French Jesuits founded the Church in Canada in 1611, and in 1675 Louis XIV. caused a bishopric to be founded at Quebec. Several of its earlier occupants were worthy representatives of

[1] Special mention should be made of Pedro Claver, who called himself "the slave of the negroes," and did a great work among them in Cartagena. He died in 1654. In many parts of America the Franciscans and Dominicans did very good work. But the Jesuits are responsible for the greater part.

what may be regarded as the Golden Age of the French Church. It would be out of place to go into details of the early work of the order in Canada, but mention must be made of the martyrs Goupil, Foques, Lallemand, Brebeuf, and Daniel, who suffered at the hands of the Indians.

Their exploits and the constancy of their faith (and they were but the chief among many) represent perhaps the highest pitch that human endurance and heroism have ever reached. The strength of the Roman Church in Canada to-day is a testimony to the devotion of its pioneers, and the solidity of the work which God enabled them to accomplish.

California received the Gospel and civilization at the hands of Jesuits from 1697. After the suppression of the order the work was carried on by Dominicans and Franciscans.

The laws of the English Colonies in North America were of course extremely unfavourable to Roman Catholicism. In 1700 Roman priests were forbidden to enter New York on pain of death. In Maryland alone was there toleration. This was originally due to the personal influence of the founder, Lord Baltimore, who was himself a Roman Catholic. It was subsequently secured by law.

No student of Foreign Missions can fail to be interested in this great and wonderfully successful

missionary order.[1] We must therefore proceed to try to gain some insight into the causes of the strength and weakness of the Jesuits, and their methods. We possess the original constitutions,[2] so can see what stamp the founder desired his Company to bear.

The remarkably rapid growth of the order is probably to be ascribed largely to the extent of the demands which it made upon its adherents. It had the courage to appeal directly to the instinct of self-sacrifice. From the outset, its theology was in some respects remarkably lax, so the order was peculiarly attractive to the enthusiastic spirits who are prepared to make any sacrifice of themselves. There are always men to be found who will undertake any task, however difficult, rather than sit down quietly to think out principles. (Reference has already been made to the fact that Loyola himself did not find the life of a student congenial.) Such men are naturally fitted for activity, and for this the order offered exceptional scope. It is not meant, of course, to imply that the society did not number many learned men among its members; still less to disparage the heroic self-sacrificing temper. That temper is always

[1] At the time of its suppression in 1773 the order possessed 22,589 members, of whom 11,295 were priests. Its unpopularity was probably largely due to the jealousy excited by its extraordinary achievements.

[2] An edition with an English translation was published by Messrs. T. G. and F. Rivington in 1838.

latent in mankind, and the Church always has need of it; though it is difficult to handle it in such a way that it shall not eventually do as much harm as good. The Jesuits stimulated it, and pressed it into their service with remarkable skill. The education of the young was by their constitution one of their primary duties. By this means they were able to lay their lofty ideals of service before boys at a time when the mind is peculiarly susceptible, and ready to be fired by heroic impulses. Every school in their hands became a recruiting-ground for the order. The thoughts which Thackeray has put into the mind of Henry Esmond must really represent the thoughts of thousands who had received their education at the hands of Jesuit tutors:—"Father Holt used to delight to tell Harry during their walks of the glories of his order, of its martyrs and heroes; of its brethren converting the heathen by myriads, traversing the desert, facing the stake, ruling the courts and councils or braving the tortures of kings; so that Harry Esmond thought that to belong to the Jesuits was the greatest prize of life and bravest end of ambition; the greatest career here, and in heaven the surest reward. And when little Tom Tusher his neighbour came from school for his holidays, and said how he too was to be bred up for an English priest—it tasked young Harry Esmond's powers of reticence not to say to his young companion, 'My dear Tommy, do you call yours a Church and a priesthood?

What is a fat living compared to converting a hundred thousand heathens by a single sermon? What is a scholarship at Trinity by the side of a crown of martyrdom, with angels awaiting you as your head is taken off? Could your master at school sail over the Thames on his gown? Have you statues in your church that can bleed, speak, walk and cry? My good Tommy, in dear Father Holt's Church these things take place every day!"[1]

And such statements as to the influence wielded by the order were hardly exaggerated. For Jesuits were all picked men. The constitutions lay down that physically deformed or defective candidates were not to be accepted. Neither were men who did not possess intellectual qualifications sufficient to promise valuable service.[2] The probation was long and strict, and might be begun at fourteen years of age. It was impossible to become a professed member before twenty-five. Such careful selection, and the difficulty of obtaining admission to the order, would naturally help to stimulate enthusiasm to belong to it.

The main principle upon which the life of a Jesuit was founded was implicit obedience to his Superior. This was pushed to what we must regard as an

[1] "Esmond" p. 27. The date is the last quarter of the seventeenth century.

[2] Men who were unable to become professed members of the order for any reason might serve it in purely temporal matters. They were called Coadjutors, and were to be "content with the part of Martha in the society."

immoral and unreasonable pitch. He was charged to regard his Superior as being in the place of God. He was to be "like a corpse," or "like a stick," in his master's hands. Nothing commanded by the Superior "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, or in virtue of holy obedience," could constitute a sin: whatever it might be, it was to be performed, "that the greater glory of Christ our Creator and Lord may follow."[1]

Such a system naturally produced a machine of extraordinary efficiency. Probably no one has ever had such a perfect instrument for the execution of his will as that which is wielded by the General of the Jesuits. From its inception the society possessed in an exceptionally intensified degree all the power which the common life of discipline confers on any religious order. It probably represents the limit which human nature can reach in this direction. Of its working value there can be no question. The Bull of Clement XIV. suppressing the society frankly acknowledges that its power was so great that it had become a menace to the peace of the world, and the good government of the Church. The Bull of Pius VII., re-establishing it in 1814, admits that the Papacy[2] could not afford to despise such valuable support. But because the system was overdone, it

[1] "Constitutiones Societatis Jesu," ch. v.

[2] During the early years of the last century the prestige and influence of the Papacy were at a very low ebb.

produced certain very regrettable results. The exaggerated ideal of obedience deprived the inferior of all moral responsibility in practice. This inevitably tended to weaken his moral sense. Moral sense which had been weakened for many years in this way was not likely to be strengthened by accession to the practically unbounded power which rested in the hands of the General. Thus one outcome of the system was to destroy the corporate conscience of the society.[1] Anything which helped it to gain its ends was lawful. Those who were actively employed in helping it to gain its ends did not in all probability know exactly what those ends were in any given instance, and were not called to have any opinion about them if they did. The individual Jesuit was in the position of a private soldier in one corner of a huge battle-field. He was not in his General's confidence, and had merely to execute the orders he received. This lack of conscience led to the undesirable developments of casuistry with which the

[1] Loyola himself did not in all probability foresee this consequence. If he had, he could hardly have appreciated the seriousness of it. His military training had impressed him with the value of unconditional obedience. Bishop Creighton once gave it as his opinion that conscience had a noticeably smaller hold upon the Latin or the Slav than upon the Teuton ("Life," vol. ii. p. 250). Its hold upon the average Spaniard during the first half of the sixteenth century must have been remarkably small. It is not fair to blame Loyola and his associates for not possessing a sense which would have differentiated them from the great mass of their fellow-countrymen at the time, because we are fortunate enough to share it with the majority of our own.

Jesuits are peculiarly associated. In itself casuistry is entirely unobjectionable. In fact it is the essence of pastoral work in the Church, and of real statesmanship in politics. It might almost be said to be the essence of administrative work of any kind. Casuistry is properly the application of principles to particular cases. But to do that with profit the casuist must be very sure of the principles which he proposes to apply, and the principles must be sound in themselves. It was in this respect that the Jesuits failed. They were so sure of themselves, and their society, that in many respects their work was wonderfully effective. But in theology—as has been pointed out above—they were always weak. In consequence, instead of really applying permanent principles to human needs, they tended more and more to modify the principles to suit the exigency of the moment. Thus they became involved in almost every imaginable form of deceit, and their conscience was not sufficiently strong to arrest their progress along this path. They made so much of the means and methods of carrying on their work, that they had to sacrifice the moral sense by which it ought to have been dominated. We see in them a perfectly elaborated system with almost unlimited ability, loyalty, and heroism at its command. Whatever could be done by these means the Jesuits did, and the rest of Christendom has much to learn from their achievements. But the system was the product of a bad

period in the Church's history, and was only completed at the cost of excluding the element which might have made it a permanent blessing to the entire Church of God.

The[1] supreme control of all Roman Catholic missions at the present day is vested in the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide—*i.e.* a Central Board of Missions, the members of which reside at Rome. It was instituted in 1622, chiefly by the efforts of a well-known Roman preacher, Girolamo da Narni. It began by establishing a college for missionary clergy, and a printing-press for the production of literature. It has recently been deprived of its endowments by the Italian Government.

Besides this there is a general association for the support of Roman Catholic missions all over the world. It was founded at the beginning of the last century, and its earliest members were women engaged in the silk industry at Lyons. In 1823 Pope Pius VII. bestowed his blessing upon the society, and the bishops of the various nations joined in its work. Finally Pope Gregory XVI. raised it to the rank of universal Christian institutions, and commended it to all churches in an Encyclical Letter. It was founded by laity, and its administration is almost entirely in their hands.

[1] For the greater part of the information given about modern Roman Catholic missions I am indebted to an article by the Rev. R. Eubank, which appeared in "The East and the West" for 1905, p. 46.

There are two central councils: one at Lyons, the other at Paris. The working expenses are very small, for the services of the directors are given gratuitously. It has no permanent endowments of any kind, and all the money received annually is distributed annually. It has nothing to do with the selection or training of priests for the mission-field, and it does not attempt to interfere with the working of any missions which it supports. It is simply concerned with supplying the proper rulers of the Church with the funds for discharging this part of their duty. At present over 300,000 copies of its annals are published bi-monthly in a number of different languages. The first English edition appeared in 1840, and an American edition is produced at Baltimore. It is a law of the society to make its affairs public.

It is sometimes spoken of as if it were the only Roman Catholic missionary agency. Comparisons are drawn between the sums which it raises and those raised by the Reformed Churches, and the conclusion is hastily drawn that the Roman Church does very little missionary work among heathen. As a matter of fact, there are many societies and religious orders engaged in the work, but the sums raised by them, and the progress made, are not made public.

At the present time there are some thirty-three religious orders and societies carrying on missionary

work, mainly supported by their own exertions. Besides these there are more than thirty orders of Brothers,[1] and 125 of Sisters engaged in the same task. Without counting native workers the Roman Church has in the mission-field at the present day at least 15,000 priests and monks, 5000 teaching brothers, and 45,000 sisters. A century ago it had hardly a thousand all told.

The progress of the Roman Church in India has been greatly impeded by the Portuguese Government,[2] and the corrupt condition of the Church in Goa. Matters were brought to a crisis by the civil war in Portugal between Dom Miguel and Dom Pedro, which ended in an almost complete revolt from Rome. With the consent of the English Government, Pope Gregory XVI. established vicariates apostolic [3] in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Ceylon, and other districts. When the Goanese broke into open schism, the Pope abolished the

[1] These brothers are almost, if not quite, entirely engaged in educational work of elementary character. Few, if any, of them ever proceed to priest's orders. They devote their lives to the teaching of little children.

[2] In the sixteenth century the Papacy conferred upon the Portuguese Crown the patronage of all bishoprics founded in Portuguese colonies and adjacent provinces. This was grossly abused till the Papacy was compelled first to ignore the right, and then to abrogate it.

[3] This title is given to administrative areas in which the Church has not advanced sufficiently for a properly equipped diocese to be constituted. It corresponds to a "missionary jurisdiction" in the Anglican communion.

metropolitical rights of the see, defined the limits of his vicariates, and made them dependent on himself alone. The schism brought no credit to its promoters, and did a great deal of harm to the cause of Christianity in India. In 1886, Pope Leo XIII. established an Indian hierarchy, and by a concordat with Portugal rearranged the sees subject to the patronage of the Portuguese Crown. The Archbishop of Goa is now styled "Patriarch in the East Indies," and has four suffragans directly under him (including the Bishop of Macao in China). There are seven other metropolitical sees, having under them nineteen bishoprics. Three native vicars-apostolic govern the portion of the ancient Syrian Church which has accepted the supremacy of Rome. These last, however, retain their own form of service. In British and French India there are 809 European missionaries, 349 native priests, and a total Roman Catholic population of a little more than 1,200,000. It seems to be difficult to arrive at exact statistics with regard to the jurisdiction of Goa, but we should probably not be far out in placing the whole Roman Catholic population of India at about 2,000,000. It must be borne in mind that the Roman Church was in the field before ourselves. Here, as always, one of their great sources of strength lies in the care which they bestow on educational work.

The Roman Church made rapid progress in Indo-China during the seventeenth century. In Tong-king and Annam, Christians were systematically persecuted with the utmost cruelty from 1720 down to the French occupation. Within living memory whole populations were exterminated for refusing to deny their faith. But speaking generally, the persecutions were unsuccessful. In Burma and Siam the Gospel does not seem to have taken such firm hold upon the people, and there has been less persecution. At the present time the Roman Church in Indo-China consists of sixteen bishops, 512 European missionaries, 527 native priests, and nearly 1,000,000 members. The total population is about 40,000,000.

As has been already mentioned, Roman Catholic missions in China were paralyzed by the suppression of the Jesuits in 1773. With the re-establishment of the order, they reawoke to vigorous life, From 1815[1] down to the Boxer rising of 1900 the Chinese Christians have faced relentless persecution with invincible constancy. The reason alleged in an imperial edict of 1832 was that "every one of them down to a blind old woman despised the authority of the Emperor to obey a European."

[1] On September 14 in that year Bishop Dupresse was led to execution at the head of thirty-two confessors, after a ministry of thirty-nine years. A Chinese priest, on being told that he must die for Christ's sake, replied, "I should never have ventured to hope for so signal a grace."

It was admitted that they were not guilty of any crime. In 1900 the Roman Church in China possessed more than 40 bishops, 904 European missionaries, 471 native priests, and a total population of nearly three-quarters of a million. It has probably increased considerably since then.

The story of Korea is much the same. Christianity entered the country with the return of an embassy from Pekin in 1783, but as it traversed the national ancestor-worship, persecution ensued almost immediately. Mass was celebrated for the first time by a Chinese priest on Easter Sunday 1795, and the number of Christians steadily increased. Freedom of conscience was proclaimed in 1894, and in 1901 the Roman Church possessed 32,000 adherents there.

Reference has already been made to the early missions in Japan,[1] and the virtual extinction of the Church by persecution. As soon as the Government learned that a remnant had been discovered in 1865 by a French priest named Petitjean, persecution broke out afresh, and in 1869 4500 Christians were deported. When liberty of conscience was granted in 1873, more than 2000 had been martyred. In 1891 Pope Leo XIII. established

[1] In 1862 Pius IX. canonized the first twenty-six martyrs of Japan, and in 1865 a fine church in their honour was built at Nagasaki, where they were crucified. In 1867, 205 martyrs were beatified, and the feast of the "Finding of the Christians" was ordered to be kept by the Japanese Church for ever on March 17.

a national hierarchy. In 1903 the Church possessed an archbishop and three bishops, 82 European missionaries, 31 native clergy, and a total population of 58,000; 1649 pagans were baptized in that year. The mission is worked from the foreign missionary society of Paris.

At one time it seemed as if Africa would be evangelized from the Portuguese settlements, and good progress was made with some regions; but with the political and religious decline of Portugal the work fell to pieces. The great missionary revival of the nineteenth century, and the opening up of hitherto unknown districts, have led to a great restoration and extension of the decaying African Churches. The occupation of Algeria by the French in 1830 opened a door for Christian enterprise in the north of the African continent. In 1838 Algiers was made an episcopal see, and European colonists were invited to settle there. The French Government, however, placed every possible obstacle in the way of the conversion of the natives. In 1866 Algiers was made an archbishopric, and bishoprics were established at Oran and Constantine. Napoleon III. and MacMahon, the Governor of Algeria, deliberately set themselves to oppose Christianity and favour Mohammedanism. But they found an unexpectedly serious hindrance to their policy in the person of Archbishop Lavigerie. They tried to induce him to

accept a metropolitical see in France, but without success. In the year 1868 there was a dreadful famine, and the archbishop soon found himself responsible for the education and maintenance of some two thousand destitute Arab children. He could get no help from the French clergy, for the Government strictly forbade all ministrations among Moslems. Accordingly he founded an order of missionary priests, trained to live as Arabs and natives lived, to learn the dialects of the country, and to devote themselves to the conversion of the inhabitants. From their adoption of the white Arab dress they are called the White Fathers. In 1873 they were enabled to break ground among the Kabyles,[1] in the mountains between Algeria and the Sahara. In 1876 three of them were despatched for Timbuctoo, but they were murdered by the Moslems before reaching their destination. When the news reached Algiers, all the members of the society offered themselves to the archbishop for the post. But he thought that so young a Church ought not to be asked to make such an enormous sacrifice. Every year since 1878 fresh missions have left the mother-house for various places in the interior of Africa. The White Fathers are now at work in Algeria, Tunis, Sahara, Sudan,

[1] The Kabyles are descended from the ancient native Church of North Africa, and have preserved some Christian customs and traditions.

Nyassa, Congo, Tanganyika, and round the Victoria Nyanza. They have made nearly half a million converts in those regions.

The English Missionary Society of S. Joseph, founded by the late Cardinal Vaughan, is carrying on a very successful mission in Uganda. Various Belgian societies are at work in the Congo State. In the Portuguese possessions progress is prevented by the action of the Government, and the existing Church is said to be in great need of reform. In British South Africa the Roman Church has made steady progress, though it is not considered to have developed sufficiently as yet to have a national episcopate.[1] The whole of Africa, including the islands, has 15 archbishops and bishops and 31 vicariates. The total number of adherents in the missionary countries is about half a million. This does not, of course, include the more settled and civilized areas, or probably Roman Catholics of European parentage.

Reference has already been made to the missionary work of the Roman Church in America. At the present time it is the largest religious body in the United States. Its growth has been helped by the immense numbers of Roman Catholic immigrants which pour into the country every year. In

[1] The traditions of the Dutch Church are, of course, very strongly opposed to it.

the opinion of many good judges, the Roman Church is to be seen at its best in North America. It is possible that it may at some future period make an important contribution to the reunion of Christendom. There are some who hope for great things from an American Pope.

In New Zealand the Society of S. Joseph has some flourishing missions under its charge; but, speaking generally, comparatively little mission work seems to have been done in Australasia. A beginning is now being made in Melanesia—in regions where the Anglican Melanesian Mission has been in the field for a generation. In Australia itself the Roman Church is numerous and influential, deriving its strength largely from the Irish who have emigrated thither. So far as can be judged by statistics, there can no be question about the extent and success of the missionary work done by the Roman Church in recent years. Nothing but personal knowledge gained at first-hand could justify any expression of opinion as to its real value and tendency. And to such knowledge the present writer can make no claim. We are sometimes told that the methods of the Roman clergy leave much to be desired, and that they are content with very superficial knowledge in their converts. It may be that in some cases they do little more than substitute Mary and Joseph for the idols to which the people have been accustomed. It may be that the Host is adored in place of the

ancestral fetish,[1] and that the new worship produces as little moral change in the worshipper as did the old. But even the very brief references which have been made to the modern martyrs of the Roman Communion prove that its converts can show themselves at least as worthy of their profession in time of persecution as those of any other body have ever done. And there is no doubt that the Reformed Churches have still much to learn from Rome. In organization we are far behind them—though it must always be borne in mind that organization can be over-elaborated until it defeats its own ends. A great system cannot work perfectly smoothly until it has stifled criticism. And the stifling of criticism is apt to destroy vitality. It can hardly fail to weaken it. But at the present time that danger seems to be very remote from ourselves. One respect in which the Roman organization of missionary work is superior to our own is in its use of native material. Priests for service abroad are very largely recruited in the countries where they are to minister. They are then sent to be educated at Rome, in one of the numerous colleges under the direction of the Propaganda. Thus they receive

[1] A fetish is an object of reverence: a stone, a stick, or anything of that kind. It is probable that those who cultivate it have little idea why they do so. They may conceive it to be the abode of some supernatural power. The point on which they are clear is that neglect of the fetish will bring about disastrous consequences. The word is said to belong to Western Africa.

(probably) a better education than would be possible in their own country, and are thoroughly imbued with all the associations which belong to the capital of Christendom. Great importance is, naturally, attached to these. The Roman Church has also made more of lay-work.[1] In its orders of teaching Brothers it possesses a large and very valuable army of auxiliaries, who are thoroughly well trained for their work. But they do not need the educational qualifications which must be possessed by priests, because they never have to bear the responsibilities attaching to the higher orders of the ministry. Thus it is easier to obtain men to fill their ranks, and their education and maintenance are comparatively inexpensive. Such men—and the numerous Sisterhoods—may be regarded as specialists in a narrow field. In their field they are remarkably effective. And we must also admit that the Roman clergy possess exceptional knowledge of human nature. They realize that good intentions are not all that is required in the mission-field, but that men must be studied, and studied scientifically. They have raised the handling of individual cases to a fine art. They seem able, as it were, to range freely over the entire key-board of an instrument, while we confine our-

[1] Or rather, to speak more accurately, of persons who were not priests. A large proportion of monks are only in minor orders, *i.e.* below the rank of sub-deacon. These orders were abandoned—unwisely, as it seems now—by the Reformed Churches in the sixteenth century.

selves timidly to a few notes. They know how to strike the imagination, how to kindle enthusiasm, and, above all, how to use it when kindled.[1] To our thinking, they have gone too far in this direction. In aiming at elasticity and adaptability they have compromised principles. Theologically their weakness and confusion are extreme. But it is certain that the Reformed Churches have gone too far in the opposite direction. We have lost much by rigidity and narrowness. Part of the very difficult task before us now is to make ourselves so sure of our principles that we can enlarge the range of our appeal without risk of injury to them. We do not desire the imposing fabric of the Roman communion, with its proud claim to embrace the whole of Christendom, though we recognize the power of such a weapon. But, as Charles Kingsley once said, "when Popery has no more to teach us it will disappear—and not before."

It would be impossible to bestow too much praise on the noble, self-sacrificing lives of many Roman missionaries. No Church has ever produced men

[1] Macaulay has some interesting remarks on the capacity of the Roman Church for using enthusiasm in an essay on Von Ranke's "History of the Popes." He seems to think it possible that this capacity may eventually enable it to swallow up National Churches. The English Church of his day was much narrower and more frigid than it is now, and he did not know enough about the Roman to realize that it has sometimes retained enthusiasts by allowing them to follow their own devices, without reference to abstract truth. The Infallible Guide has usually waited to see which way its subjects had determined to go before raising its voice to bid them proceed.

more ready to devote themselves entirely to those to whom they minister. It is undoubtedly to this, more than to anything else, that the success of their work must be ascribed. And no one can grudge success won by such means. It cannot be necessary to do more than allude to the work of Father Damien, a Belgian priest, among the lepers.[1] The spirit conspicuous in him is widely diffused among members of his communion, and the whole Christian world must thank God for it. But it seems as if much of the work of the Church were becoming a struggle between the ennobling influence which flows from such lives and the degrading outcome of earthly teaching which has lost the power to regenerate. We in England believe that the Unity for which our Lord prayed is something larger and more mysterious than acceptance of the supremacy of one Vicar of Christ on earth. One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism cannot be reduced to One Rite, One Code, One Chair. We believe that the future of Christianity is not with the Roman communion. The Roman Church has erred in the past, and may again. It cannot be the sole standard and judge of truth. But it would be worse than foolish to disparage its ancient glories, or to ignore what it has done for the conversion of the heathen in our own day.

[1] On the island of Molokai, where it was the practice of the Government of Hawaii to deport them. He tended them from 1873 till he died of leprosy himself in 1889.

It will be convenient to speak next of the mission work of the Eastern Churches. The Western reformations of the sixteenth century left the most ancient portions of Christendom practically untouched. As early as 1525 a little correspondence passed between Constantinople and Wittenberg, and in 1573 the Emperor Maximilian II. appointed a Protestant ambassador at Constantinople, who took with him as his chaplain Stephen Gerlach, a Greek scholar of considerable reputation. He invited the Patriarch Jeremiah to examine the Augsburg Confession, and overtures were made to cement a permanent union between the Greeks and Protestants. The correspondence was still proceeding when Jeremiah was driven from his throne; but it ceased in 1582, and nothing came of it. In 1599 a meeting was arranged at Vilna, between Greek priests and representatives of the Reformed Saxon, Bohemian, and Helvetic communions. They were to discuss the terms of a confederacy against "the Roman Anti-Christ," and it is probable that the motives of the promoters of the meeting were as much political as religious. The two parties found that, though they had some common ground, they diverged widely on many points. The Greeks rightly decided to do nothing until they had had an opportunity of consulting the Eastern Patriarchs, especially their own mother-church of Constantinople. The replies they received have not been preserved; but it may be assumed that they were

unfavourable. Political alliance was concluded to resist the Romanists, who were gaining ground rapidly in Poland.

In the following century, Cyril Lucar[1] (Patriarch of Alexandria in 1602, and of Contantinople in 1621) corresponded with various Reformed Churches, including our own. In 1616 he sent Metrophanes Critopulus to Oxford, for instruction in the principles of the English Church.[2] In 1628 he testified his goodwill towards us by presenting Charles I. with the famous Codex A (Alexandrinus) of the New Testament, now in the British Museum. But his difficulties were increased by the opposition of the Jesuits, and he failed to accomplish anything permanent.

The charge is commonly brought against the Eastern Churches that they do no missionary work. Of most of them it is true, in fact. But, for the last four centuries, they have not been in a position to undertake it. The Patriarchs are held responsible by the Turkish Government for the good conduct of their people in civil as well as religious

[1] He was a native of Crete, which was at that time a Venetian possession, so he had been brought up within the range of Western ideas.

[2] The Archbishop of Canterbury (1610–1633) was George Abbot. He seems to have been a thorough Calvinist at heart. His office has probably seldom been filled by a man less well fitted by temperament and outlook to understand the Greek Church, or to commend the English to its representative. If Cyril had had either Parker or Laud to deal with, it is possible that something might have come of his overtures.

matters. The Christian Churches in the Ottoman Empire are habitually oppressed, and frequently persecuted with great severity. Most people in England are probably unaware that in 1821 Gregory, Patriarch of Constantinople, was hanged at the door of his cathedral on Easter Day. Another patriarch, Cyril, was hanged at Adrianople. The Archbishop of Cyprus, his three suffragan bishops, and all the hegumens (*i.e.* priors) of the Cyprian monasteries were hanged upon one tree before the palace of the ancient kings. Many other prelates and prominent ecclesiastics were put to death in the islands and in Anatolia. Mount Athos[1] was devastated. And yet none apostatized. We cannot say that there is no spiritual life among people who have shown themselves so ready to die for their faith. And Churches which have been so persecuted almost within living memory can hardly be reproached for not having tried to make converts elsewhere.[2] It may be hoped that the new régime in Turkey will bring about a better state of affairs in this respect. The only one of the Eastern Churches which has been in a

[1] Mount Athos is the chief centre of Greek monasticism. There are probably several thousand monks, in all, resident upon it. It is called the "Holy Mountain" in the Greek Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, which is the one commonly in use.

[2] "Question Réligieuse d'Orient et d'Occident," by M. Mouravieff, formerly secretary to the Most Holy Governing Synod of the Russian Church. Quoted by the Rev. R. Eubank in an article in "The East and the West" for 1904, p. 143. I am indebted to Mr. Eubank's article for most of the information about the Russian missions given below.

position to address itself to the conversion of the heathen in recent years is the Church of Russia. That is by far the largest national Church in the world, for it possesses a membership of some 90,000,000 souls.

Down to the latter part of the fourteenth century Russia was subject to the dominion of the Tartars. The Russian Church and nation were brought so low during this dismal time that they were represented by little more than the small band who gathered round Demetrius of the Don at the Monastery of the Troitza (Trinity), sixty miles from Moscow. His first great victory was won in 1380, and from that time the second expansion of the Russian Church began. It has spread steadily with the growth of the Russian Empire ever since. The Mohammedan kingdom of Kazan was conquered in 1552, and that of Astrakhan four years later. Bishops were at once appointed, and the conversion and colonization of the vast new fields which had been opened up went on together. The ancient Christian kingdom of Iberia, which was hard pressed by the Turks and Persians, appealed to the Czar Theodore, and priests were immediately despatched to its assistance. In 1588 the Russian Church was relieved of its dependence on Constantinople by the elevation of the see of Moscow to the dignity of a patriarchate. This was done with the consent and co-operation of Jeremiah II., the then Patriarch

of Constantinople, and though the change was probably inspired chiefly by motives of policy, it has undoubtedly proved beneficial. It has made the Church more truly national than it could have been otherwise. Devotion to it has thus become a part of the intense patriotism of the Russian people, and its extension throughout the dominions of the Czar a matter of course.[1] The annexation of Siberia began in 1580, and soon afterwards an archbishop was appointed to Tobolsk. Cossacks, hunters, and adventurers pushed steadily eastward, and towns sprang up in the uninhabited wastes. An episcopal see was established at Irkutsk, and became the chief centre of Christianity for the north-east of Asia. The Russian Church has worked so well in these regions that Siberia may now be counted a Christian country. It contains some 7,000,000 Christians, as against little more than half a million heathen. In the Kirgiz steppes and Turkestan the Mohammedans are still in a majority. But the Church is gaining ground there, so that we may hope that in another generation or two large areas of Tartary and Turkestan will be as Christian as Siberia is now.

[1] The patriarchate was suspended by Peter the Great. The supreme authority in the Russian Church is now "The Most Holy Governing Synod," which is a body of bishops nominated by the Czar for the purpose. Their meetings are presided over by the Czar himself — in theory; in practice, by his lay-procurator. Theoretically the patriarchate has only been put into commission from motives of expediency, and might be revived by any Czar at any time. By the present arrangement the Church is (probably) subjected to the State to an undesirable extent.

The Chinese Mission began through the capture of some Russians and Cossacks, at Albazin on the Siberian border, by a Chinese force at the end of the seventeenth century. There was a priest among the prisoners, and when they reached Pekin the Russians asked for a place of worship. A heathen temple was granted to them by the Chinese Government. In 1716 a mission party arrived, consisting of two priests, a deacon, and seven students. The Government received them warmly, and made them an allowance for their support. The clergy were raised to the rank of mandarin. In 1721, Innocent Koutchinsky, Chaplain-general of the Navy, was consecrated bishop for the Chinese Mission, with the title of Bishop of Perislav. But a new Emperor had ascended the throne, and he was very unfavourable. Innocent was never allowed to enter China, so threw himself vigorously into mission work in Siberia. The subsequent history of the mission has been uneventful. It has been supported by the Russian and Chinese Governments to a somewhat paralyzing extent, but it has managed to open a branch at Urga, the capital of Mongolia, and the seat of the worship of a living Buddha. It has produced a Chinese translation of the Bible and other religious books. It suffered severely during the massacres at Pekin in 1900, but has been re-established since, with a bishop, who is a master of the Chinese language, at its head.

No formal mission was opened in Japan till 1870. But a beginning had been made a few years before by a monk named Nicholas, chaplain to the Russian Diplomatic Consulate at Hakodadi. In 1872 some ill-disposed local authorities tried to revive the laws against Christianity, which had never been repealed, though the Imperial Government was not hostile. Some 120 were imprisoned, and some officials who had embraced the new religion were dismissed from their posts. The Russian Consul protested vigorously, with the result that in a few months the prisoners were released, and officials were forbidden to hinder the progress of the Gospel. In 1882 Nicholas was consecrated bishop, and a splendid cathedral was built in Tokio. On January 1, 1900, the Orthodox[1] Church in Japan was represented by 231 communities, with a total membership of a little more than 25,000. It possessed 1 bishop, 28 priests, 5 deacons, 16 readers, and 152 catechists. Only the bishop, one priest, and one deacon were Russians; all the rest being Japanese. It says much for both parties that the advance of the mission is said not to have been hindered by the recent war. It has always treated English missionaries with the utmost

[1] It may, perhaps, be worth while to mention that "Orthodox" is merely the normal title of the Churches in communion with Constantinople. It is used to distinguish between them and the various heretical, or semi-heretical, sects and Churches of the East. It contains no offensive implication so far as English Christianity is concerned.

courtesy and consideration. The Orthodox Missionary Society and the Holy Synod contribute £6000 a year between them for the work. Christianity reached the shores of Russian America with the first Russian settlers about the middle of the eighteenth century. It owed its propagation in part to motives of policy. The early Russian settlers were anxious to convert the natives, because they thought that the closer intercourse which would ensue would benefit their trade. A great deal of missionary work has been undertaken from such mixed motives at various periods of the Church's history. We may regret that the motives have not been pure, but cannot deny that they have often produced very solid results. The Russians were, at least, prepared to treat the natives as human beings. They wished to be able to deal with them on equal terms as men. They did not regard them merely as a commercial asset to be exploited in any way that seemed likely to prove profitable to the European trader. The first missionaries arrived at Kadiak in 1793, and the whole expense was borne by the two founders of the Russian-American Company. In 1796 one of the missionaries — a monk named Juvenal — was murdered by a hostile tribe. A bishop was appointed, but was lost at sea, with most of his clergy, soon after his arrival. In 1816 one of the most zealous lay supporters of the mission died, and it was almost abandoned. But it was

soon revived by a priest of Irkutsk, named John Veniaminoff.[1] After labouring for sixteen years with great success among the fierce Aleoutines and Koloshes, he was sent to S. Petersburg to try to obtain further support for his mission. The Emperor Nicholas insisted that he should be consecrated bishop, and he returned at the end of 1841 as Bishop Innocent of Kamchatka. For twenty-eight years more he led the life of a true apostle of the Church of God, travelling thousands of miles by sea, and in sledges drawn by reindeer.[2] He taught the Aleoutines to read and write, and translated the Gospels into their language. During the last eighteen years of his work he held the rank of archbishop. Finally, in 1869, after forty-five years service in the mission-field, he was recalled to fill the highest office in the Russian Church. Though over seventy years old, he succeeded in establishing the "Orthodox Missionary Society," to work for the conversion of non-Christians resident in Russia,[3]

[1] The Russian-American Company was granted extended privileges in 1821. It was expressly stipulated that the company should maintain a sufficiency of priests for the colonists. Most of these were supplied from Irkutsk.

[2] It is a curious coincidence that during these years a similar work was being carried on by his slightly younger contemporary, Bishop G. A. Selwyn, in New Zealand and Melanesia. It is probable that the two most heroic missionaries of modern times never heard of each other's existence.

[3] Russia contains a considerable number of Jews, and there are some Mohammedans and Buddhists on the lower Volga. The society extended to foreign work afterwards. There was a special Society for the Propagation of Christianity in the Caucasus already existing.

before his death. With the cession of Russian America to the United States, the mission found itself in a new position. The Bishop of Alaska was obliged to undertake the oversight of all communities of Orthodox immigrants. He removed his see to San Francisco, and regards the whole of North America as his diocese. The Orthodox Church in North America possesses at the present day 52 churches, 76 ecclesiastics, and rather more than 33,000 adherents. It makes about 900 converts yearly. It is therefore a small body, and its position has become rather anomalous. It may be hoped that it will in course of time become united with the American Episcopal Church.

The Napoleonic wars were followed by a great Christian revival. The Russian Church had not escaped the spiritual lethargy which fell upon Europe during the eighteenth century. But it shared to the full the general quickening of national life which followed the deliverance from the invader. Mission work was actively prosecuted in the remoter parts of the empire. A notable instance is the Altai Mission, which was begun in 1830 by Father Macarius, in the Altai Mountains, on the borders of Chinese Turkestan.[1] The population consisted of nomad Tartars and Kalmucks, with a sprinkling

[1] His resources at starting were so slender that he could not even afford tea—almost a necessity of life for a Russian—and it took him three years to get a house built. During that time he lodged in the cabin of a Russian settler.

of Russian settlers. From the beginning it was worked on strictly scientific principles. The centres from which the work was to be carried on were carefully chosen, and the dialects of the tribes systematically studied to determine which would be the most suitable for translations of the Bible and Liturgy.[1] As the work progressed, Christian villages were formed, to free the new converts as much as possible from the danger of associating with heathen neighbours. In 1865 the entire Liturgy was celebrated in the Telungut language for the first time, and since 1880 the head of the mission has been a bishop, who takes his title from the town of Biysk. Of the 45,000 native inhabitants of the district, 25,000 are already Christians. They occupy 188 villages, and possess 67 churches, in which the services are performed in the local dialects. There are seven other Siberian missions conducted on similar lines.

It is easy to accuse the Eastern Churches collectively of formalism, superstition, and ignorance. There may be some truth in the charge, but it is probably based largely on no more than the fact that their ways are not as ours. Their very elaborate ritual—so complicated as to make that of Rome bald and meagre by comparison—and protracted services are not readily intelligible to us. And we are apt to condemn, in religious matters,

[1] *i.e.* The Communion Office.

anything that we do not understand. But the very brief sketch given above will be sufficient to show that the only Eastern Church which has had an opportunity of doing any missionary work in recent years has some very remarkable achievements to its credit. It is probably true to say that policy has played a part in Russian missions. They have been undertaken at the instigation of the Government, partly with a view to consolidating or extending political influence. The Russian Church has never entered the mission-field in remote parts of the world, where Russian diplomatists had nothing to gain by its success. But still the work has been done, and we must not be too ready to condemn the motives which have prompted it. For Russia is still a Church before it is a State. The Church is national there to an extent which we can hardly conceive. It is not only the spiritual organ of the great majority of the people: it is one of the chief expressions of their national consciousness.[1] It is practically impossible for a Russian to contemplate any divorce between his nationality and his Church. Therefore, when he desires to extend the influence of his country, he naturally, instinctively, tries to extend the influence of his Church. It would probably not be fair to say that the Russian Government

[1] The other is devotion to the Czar as Autocrat of All the Russias. To the Russian peasant he is a sacred personage, and is regarded with something closely akin to religious reverence.

deliberately uses the Church as a piece in the game of politics, and therefore encourages its missionary work. It is rather that to extend the influence of the Church is to a Russian statesman the natural method of compassing his political ends. It is inevitable that it should be so under the conditions which obtain in Russia. Given similar conditions in England, our Government would probably have encouraged the missions of the English Church in exactly the same way.

It should be noted that the Russian is the only Church which seems able to make any considerable progress in the conversion of Mohammedans.

It is said that the Russian Church suffers from neglect of the ministry of preaching. Sermons are seldom preached in ordinary parish churches. This reacts disastrously on the intellectual attainments of the clergy, and means that many of the laity have little opportunity of receiving instruction in the tenets of their belief. The priesthood has also become, to a very large extent, a hereditary profession,[1] and so comes to be embraced by men who have no very special vocation for it. But when we

[1] A Russian parish priest must be married, and must marry before his ordination. A bishop cannot be married, and therefore the episcopate is recruited from the monasteries, which are a very important feature in Russian religious life. The outcome of this system is that none of the bishops have had any parochial experience whatever. And it is difficult not to suspect that a monastic episcopate is often not on the best of terms with the parochial clergy.

have criticized what seem to us to be weak points in the Russian Church, we cannot accuse it of deadness or lack of zeal. There is probably no communion in Christendom which as a whole understands so well the meaning of worship, appreciates the power of united prayer,[1] and has so strong a consciousness of the Presence and Power of the Holy Ghost. These are its three great sources of strength, and such a threefold chord is not quickly broken. The religious fervour of the Russian seems to need no stimulating on the part of the clergy. Their task is rather to guide a force which the clergy of other countries have to labour to create. How far it can ever be used solely for the extension of Christ's Kingdom apart from the glorifying of Holy Russia—that is, how far the Orthodox Church can ever spread outside the Russian Empire or Russian spheres of influence—is a question about which we cannot as yet express any opinion. Its capacity in this respect is being tested now in Japan.

It is not at all easy to give any coherent general account of the missionary work of the various Reformed Churches. It is practically impossible to find any standpoint from which it can be viewed as a connected whole. It has no centre round which its component parts can be grouped. The rejection

[1] Bishop Creighton says that all the churches in Moscow were crowded during a service of intercession, lasting for four hours, on the eve of the imperial coronation. ("Historical Essays and Reviews," p. 304.)

of the Papal claims naturally led to great confusion. The reaction was, in some cases, almost as bad as the abuses which had produced it. The history of Protestant Christendom during the last three and a half centuries sometimes seems to be little but a procession of fleeting movements, many of which came to very little. Sects have sprung up, split, multiplied, and died in a bewildering fashion, and the larger and more permanent Protestant bodies have not worked together. It is impossible that they should, for they differ widely on many important points. Their missionary work can therefore only be treated, as it were, by compartments. The most convenient method will be to speak first of the principal achievements of the Reformed Churches of the Continent, and then to touch briefly on what has been done from our own country.

For the first generation or so of their existence, the Reformed communions were not in a position to undertake work in different mission-fields. They resembled small garrisons closely beleaguered by an enemy who was immensely superior in numbers. In some parts of Europe they failed to hold ground which they had won; and after they had come through their initial dangers in safety, the political disturbances which ensued hampered their progress. In England the Civil War and the suppression of the Church for eleven years put serious missionary enterprise out of the question during the greater

part of the seventeenth century. During the same century Germany was being devastated by the Thirty Years' War. It is probably true to say that it is only in our own time that she has thoroughly recovered from the injuries inflicted upon her during that fearful struggle. Thus, during the seventeenth century, the Reformed Churches which might have done most in the mission field were paralyzed through no fault of their own. The eighteenth was not a time of widespread enthusiasm for the enlargement of Christ's Kingdom; and both in England and in Germany the rulers of the Churches were fighting hard against the foes of their own household.[1] During the prominence of Sweden there was sufficient work for its Church at its own doors. Some of the Lapps[2] in the far north were not even nominally Christians; and the Lithuanians, whatever their nominal profession may have been, had not entirely abandoned their ancient snake worship.

[1] The position taken up by the English Deists during the eighteenth century has been completely abandoned for so long that the literature of both sides is to us tedious, and almost ludicrous, reading. We are apt to forget how serious the attack was. It was directed with great ability, and at one time seemed almost to have succeeded. It must be recorded to the credit of the English Church at that time that it overthrew these very formidable opponents by intellectual superiority and sheer weight of reasoning.

[2] It is doubtful whether heathenism is quite extinct among them at the present time.

France

The French Huguenot community entered the mission-field as early as 1556. The project originated with a French Knight of Malta named Villegagnon, who wished to plant a colony in Brazil to rival the Portuguese settlements there. His motives were no doubt purely commercial. But by representing himself as highly favourable to the Huguenots, he secured the support of their great admiral, Coligny. The Huguenots came forward in large numbers, partly perhaps to escape from the storm which was plainly gathering in France, and the party landed at Rio Janeiro. Villegagnon invited two ministers and twelve students from Geneva to undertake purely missionary work. The hopes of the colonists were, however, frustrated by their leader. Villegagnon presently declared his strong aversion to Genevan doctrines, and finally forbade the religious meetings of the Huguenots. In 1558 he sent the Swiss ministers back to France, having lodged a formal charge of heresy with the master of the ship. After suffering almost incredible hardships from leakage of the ship and famine, they landed at Hennebon. Commiseration led the French judges to acquit them. Soon afterwards the colony was destroyed by the Portuguese.[1]

[1] The French Protestants are now a very small though influential body. Doctrinally they seem to be very close to the English Unitarians, and they undertake no missionary work on any considerable scale.

The early English adventurers in America recognized that one of the duties of a colonist was to try to bring the native population to a knowledge of the truth. But nothing could be attempted on any considerable scale. The first baptism of a native took place in 1587, and a little later Raleigh presented the Virginian Company with a hundred pounds "for the propagation of the Christian religion in that settlement." [1]

Holland

As the power of Portugal declined, the Dutch began to supersede the Portuguese in their settlements in the East Indies. In 1602 the Dutch East India Company was formed, and missionary enterprise was included among its avowed aims. In Ceylon no one was eligible for any government post until he had signed the Helvetic Confession of Faith. By 1722 there are said to have been 400,000 Christians in the island. The same methods were adopted in Java, and naturally produced similar results. A mission was also set on foot in Brazil, but collapsed with the abandonment of the colony in 1667. It is to be feared that the temporal advantages offered by the Dutch to the profession of Christianity militated against the value of their

[1] The Preface to the Book of Common Prayer (1662) states that "the Office for the Baptism of such as are of Riper Years . . . may always be useful for the baptizing of Natives in our Plantations, and others converted to the Faith."

work.[1] At the present time the only considerable mission undertaken by them is among the natives in South Africa. No accurate statistics of the progress made seem to be available; but it is difficult to hope for much from the narrow Calvinism which is apparently all that the Dutch Reformed Church has to offer.

Germany

The pietistic movements of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries produced a fitful activity in the mission-field. About 1634 Peter Heiling, a lawyer of Lübeck, made his way to Abyssinia, and translated the New Testament into the language of the country. In 1664 Ernest von Welz appealed to his Lutheran fellow-countrymen to found a missionary society, and to establish a training college for missionaries in every university. He went himself as a missionary to the Dutch territory on the Guinea Coast, but died shortly afterwards, and his efforts produced no permanent results. Towards the close of the century the philosopher and statesman Leibnitz propounded a scheme for uniting all Christian states and princes in missionary enterprise.

[1] Speaking generally, the spirituality of the Reformed Churches of the Continent (with the exception of France) seems to be at rather a low ebb. In Martin Luther's Catechism of 1539, "Give us this day our daily bread" is explained as referring to material, temporal benefits only. The tone of such teaching is bound to tell eventually.

Probably he had no conception of what his proposal involved.[1] In the early part of the eighteenth century Germany brought into prominence a sect which, though small numerically, has always been remarkable for its activity in the mission-field. The continuous history of the Moravian Brethren, or *Unitas Fratrum*, may be considered to begin in 1722.[2] In that year a small party, led by Christian David, a mechanic, left their homes in search of liberty of conscience. They were invited by Count Zinzendorf to settle on his estate near Zittau, in Saxony. For a short time the immigrants attended the Lutheran parish church, but in 1727 the society adopted a code of rules of its own, and ordained twelve elders to carry on pastoral work. Zinzendorf became their first bishop. In 1731 two of its members departed to preach the Gospel to the Eskimo in Greenland, and the year following two more went to the negroes of S. Thomas. By the end of the century it had more missionaries in the field than all the other Reformed Churches together. At the present time it has representatives in most European

[1] It seems to be a tendency of German Protestantism to try to ignore fundamental doctrinal differences in the interests of practical activity. The combined Jerusalem Bishopric—to be held by a Lutheran and an Anglican alternately—of the last century is a case in point.

[2] The existence of the society can be traced back to the middle of the fifteenth century. It is probably a relic of the reforming movement in Bohemia, which was virtually extinguished by the death of John Hus.

countries, and more than three hundred ordained missionaries in various parts of the globe. It is said that in proportion to its total strength the *Unitas Fratrum* sends out about three times as many missionaries as any other body. The Moravians possess no formal creed, and are probably narrow in their interpretation of Scripture. Their religion may be described as a very pure pietism, and we can therefore hardly look for any great achievements from it. A Moravian fellow-traveller exercised a very deep influence over John Wesley; and we can perhaps trace the unhealthy element inherent in their doctrines in the subsequent career of the great preacher. But in any case they set the rest of the world a very good example in respect of missionary enterprise.

Denmark

Danish missions were not begun upon any appreciable scale till the beginning of the eighteenth century. In 1705, Frederic IV. commissioned Lütken, his Court Preacher at Copenhagen, to select men for work among the heathen. Lütken was on friendly terms with the German pietists, and his choice fell on two theological students of the University of Halle, named Ziegenbald and Plütschau. They went to the Danish settlement of Tranquebar in India, and the King provided for their maintenance. They were both men of unusual ability, and

their work met with great success. In 1714 the Danish Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was founded, but its operations continued to be directed chiefly from Halle. The leader among them was August Hermann Francke, who wrote a remarkable tract called "The Lighthouse of Evangelical Missions," in which he urged the King of Prussia, Frederic I., to take up the cause of missionary work in China. Under the guidance of the society, the Tranquebar mission flourished till, by 1778, it had received more than 15,000 converts. Its influence was felt beyond the limits of the Danish settlements.

In 1721, a party of forty-six persons under Hans Egede, a Norwegian who had been educated at Copenhagen, landed in Greenland, and founded a Christian community there, which is still in existence.[1] He died in 1758, and was succeeded by his son, who in 1766 completed the translation of the Bible (which had been begun by his father) into the language of the country.

But, with the honourable exception of the Moravians, the Reformed Churches of the Continent do not seem to have done much in the mission-field.[2]

[1] Reference has already been made to the mediæval Danish colony and mission to Greenland. It was utterly destroyed in the fifteenth century, but whether by attack, weather, or pestilence, or a combination of all three, we do not know.

[2] There are now considerable colonies of the Scandinavian Churches in the United States of America. But they seem to confine themselves almost entirely to the spiritual care of emigrants of their own communion.

Doubtless they are for the most part small, and none of them is in the position of mother-church of a great empire. In some cases they are probably still hard put to it to maintain the ground that they have already occupied. But, even if these disadvantages should be removed, we can hardly think that they have any great future before them abroad. Lutheran theology seems to be becoming too nebulous to be an effective weapon in the teacher's hands. It is more a subject for discussion than an instrument wherewith to save souls. The services of the Calvinistic Churches are so bald that they are not likely to capture the imagination of many.[1] And all the Reformed Churches of the Continent have—to our thinking—fallen into the error of exalting the human institution of the sermon overmuch, at the expense of the Divine Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord.

England

By the close of the seventeenth century the Church of England found itself in a fairly assured position. The eleven dismal years, during which it had been a penal offence to use the Book of Common Prayer, had made it certain that the Church would never again be displaced in favour

[1] There seems to be no doubt that a rich and dignified ritual is very useful—if not absolutely necessary—in the mission-field.

of any form of Protestant Nonconformity. The failure of James II. had shown that the Pope need no longer be regarded as a dangerous foe. The growth of the East India Company on the one hand, and the formation of settlements in North America on the other, made it plain that the future of the English Church was not to be restricted to the British Isles. The state of morals at home was low, as is shown by Evelyn's Diary, and the fact that in 1697 William III. issued a proclamation against the "open and avowed practice of Vice, Immorality, and Prophaneness." From 1678 earnest men had begun to form Religious Societies, or "Societies for the Reformation of Manners," of various kinds. By 1699 there were thirty-nine such societies in or near London and Westminster, and several in other parts of the country, beside ten in Ireland. During the spring of that year the oldest of the extant societies in the English Church was founded: The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.[1] As its title implies, it threw itself mainly into educational work. At the present time its publishing department is very large; but both by the production of literature, and by direct contributions in money, it has done, and is still doing,

[1] The first meeting was held on March 8, 1698–9, and was attended by four laymen, Lord Guildford, Sir Humphrey Mackworth, Mr. Justice Hook, Colonel Colchester, and one clergyman, Dr. Bray. For further details as to progress, see "The History of the S.P.C.K." brought out by the Society in 1898.

a great deal for Church extension in our colonies and dependencies, so must be included among the missionary agencies of the Church.

Early in 1699 the Bishop of London despatched Dr. Bray — a clergyman of some distinction — to Maryland to act as his commissary[1] there. From the first, Dr. Bray regarded his task as including missionary work among heathen. It was soon found that the work could not be carried on satisfactorily without the aid of some body having the status of a corporation. An attempt was made to have the infant S.P.C.K. incorporated for the purpose, but this proved impracticable. On his return from America in 1700, Dr. Bray secured the support of Archbishop Tenison and Bishop Compton of London, and on June 16, 1701, the King granted a charter to "The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts." The S.P.C.K. paid for the drafting of the charter. From the first, this Society regarded missions to the heathen as its primary task, and in 1710 formally resolved that they ought to be prosecuted "preferably to all other endeavour." From that day to this its policy has been consistent.

Ten months later its first two missionaries sailed to Boston, and until the year 1785 clergy were steadily supplied to various parts of what are now

[1] There was no bishop in America as yet, and so the English colonies there were under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London.

the United States of America.[1] In some places, as in Maryland and Virginia, their ministrations were confined to the English colonists. But missionary work was done among the Indians with solid results, notably among the Iroquois in the State of New York. Four of their Sachem visited England in 1710, and Queen Anne presented them with some communion plate. At the time of the Declaration of Independence, political feeling ran so high in the State of New York that Dr. Inglis, a missionary of the Society, and afterwards first Bishop of Nova Scotia, was driven from his parish for refusing to omit the prayer for the King. From the small seed sown by the Society has sprung the American Church, which at the present time possesses more than a hundred bishops, and some five thousand clergy. Though small numerically, it is said to be an extremely influential body. At the present time it has despatched missions, with bishops at their head, to China, Japan, West Africa, Hayti, Brazil, and the Philippine Islands. Throughout the eighteenth century, the Society contributed generously both in men and money to the Church in other parts of America. But progress was hampered by the absence of any American episcopate. There is no doubt that the Church of England lost a great

[1] For further information see "The Spiritual Expansion of the Empire": published by the Society in 1901. The fact that the Archbishop of Canterbury is *ex officio* President gives the Society a semi-official position in the English Church.

opportunity by its reluctance to supply the growing Churches beyond the seas with the sorely needed third order of the ministry. Just before the last difficulties had been overcome, Wesley's faith failed (he had seen the need with his own eyes, and knew how urgent it was), and he "consecrated" two "bishops" for service in America. This was the fatal act that placed him in the position of a schismatic, and made the separation between his followers and the Church inevitable.[1] It is impossible to estimate how much this hasty act has cost both sides. For, setting aside the vexed question whether a presbyter has any right to ordain others, it is obvious that no religious body could allow one of its members to ordain upon his own initiative without the approval of the occupants of the higher offices. The bishops were doubtless to blame in their treatment of Wesley, but no amount of missionary zeal could justify his action.

We must not attribute the unwillingness to provide a colonial or missionary episcopate (which continued well into the last century) to mere indifference on the part of the bishops or ministers of the Crown. Their outlook was limited by ideas which had been produced by circumstances not of their own making. During the eighteenth century

[1] On his deathbed Wesley said: "I live and die a member of the Church of England, and no one who regards my advice will ever separate himself from it!" His advice was formally disregarded four years later.

the conception of the Church that was uppermost in men's minds was that of an "Establishment." By force of circumstances it had come to be of great political importance. In Elizabeth's reign any one who was not a member of the Church was at least open to suspicion of being a traitor to the Crown. The Civil War was—among other things—a struggle between the Church and Nonconformity. The House of Hanover was preferred to the House of Stuart on religious grounds, and therefore the Church was regarded by the Hanoverian sovereigns, to a large extent, from the political point of view. It was difficult to look upon a bishop as anything but a spiritual peer. His position in the State tended to overshadow the spiritual side of his office. Naturally the Crown was averse to the multiplication of peers (for a peerage meant much more then than it does now) for the sake of a handful of settlers some thousands of miles away. And what would be the status of a colonial or missionary bishop? If he were not a peer, what was he? And a peer who could never occupy his seat in the House of Lords seemed to be an absurdity. That is how the question presented itself to the mind of the eighteenth century; and we can hardly blame the authorities of that day for not being able to grasp immediately views that seem obvious to ourselves. The solution of the difficulty was hastened by the Declaration of Independence, for when the United States ceased

to belong to the English Crown, its episcopate would naturally cease to be of political importance in England. Dr. Seabury was consecrated at Aberdeen on November 14, 1784. Three years later, Dr. White and Dr. Provoost were consecrated Bishops of Pennsylvania and New York respectively, in the chapel of Lambeth Palace. In 1790 Dr. Madison was consecrated in the same place to be Bishop of Virginia. On March 12, 1787, Dr. Inglis—formerly rector of Trinity Church, New York—was consecrated as our first colonial bishop. His diocese embraced the whole of British North America from Newfoundland to Lake Superior.

The work of the Society in Africa began on the Gold Coast in 1752. Mr. Thompson, Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, who had been for five years a missionary in New Jersey, gave up everything to undertake work among the negroes. In five years he had sent three negro boys to England, and in 1765 one of them, Philip Quaque by name, was ordained by the Bishop of London to become a missionary to his own people. But in 1824 the work came to an end. Probably it had been spread over a large area too rapidly, and therefore lacked solidity.

The colonization of South Africa was not formally begun until 1820. The progress of the Church was extremely slow, and suffered for want of a bishop. Episcopal functions were sometimes per-

formed by bishops *en route* for India. In 1847 the diocese of Capetown was founded by Miss (afterwards Baroness) Burdett-Coutts, and from that time the work has branched out steadily in every direction. Perhaps the most remarkable single mission is that of S. Augustine at Rorke's Drift.

There are few more miserable chapters in our history than the story of the early settlements in Australia. In 1787 the first shiploads of convicts were sent out. The Government not only declined to make any spiritual provision for the prisoners and their guards, but were with great difficulty persuaded to allow a chaplain, Mr. R. Johnson, to volunteer at his own charges. The authorities could not for very shame fail to order attendance at public worship, but every conceivable obstacle was placed in Mr. Johnson's way. It was six years before he could succeed in building a rough church, at his own cost, and almost with his own hands. His first schoolhouse was deliberately set on fire. Fresh convict ships were continually arriving, and so, despite his efforts, there grew up in Australia a society which competent observers declared to be immoral beyond anything conceived elsewhere. The country is said to be suffering still from those awful years.[1]

[1] For forty years no official steps were taken to promote Christianity there, though the S.P.G. had begun supporting schoolmasters there since 1793. Then the whole continent was made an archdeaconry of Calcutta, 6000 miles away. Finally, in 1836, under

The story of New Zealand, which belongs to the next century, is better reading. The first Christian service held there was performed on Christmas Day, 1814, by Samuel Marsden. In 1841 G. A. Selwyn was consecrated first Bishop of New Zealand. A better choice can seldom have been made for any post.[1] He so laboured there for eight-and-twenty years that he not only firmly established the Church in the country which had been entrusted to him, but did much to quicken the missionary spirit in the Church at home. A geographical error in his letters patent made the diocese of New Zealand include the whole of Melanesia.[2] By long and perilous voyages among the islands, the Bishop laid the foundations of the Melanesian Mission, in which Bishop Patteson subsequently laid down his life. One outcome of Bishop Selwyn's work in New Zealand is that the Maoris are one of the few native races in a country which has been settled by Europeans who are not in danger of becoming extinct.

In India the English Church did nothing till 1814, when Bishop Middleton was sent out to

the auspices of the Duke of Wellington, the then Prime Minister, Bishop Broughton was sent out to preside over a mere handful of clergy. Norfolk Island—the worst of all the convict stations—is now the headquarters of the Melanesian Mission.

[1] For further information see "The Life and Episcopate of Bishop G. A. Selwyn," by H. W. Tucker (Gardner, Darton & Co.).

[2] It was made to extend from 50° South to 34° North, instead of 34° South: 34° North includes about a third of Asia.

Calcutta. At that time the only Anglican clergy in the peninsula were the chaplains of the East India Company. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel did not begin work there until 1818. At the present time the Indian Church is in a somewhat anomalous position. It is an Establishment: that is to say, its bishops are appointed by the Government, and it is maintained out of public funds for the purpose of ministering to the English residents. But at the same time it undertakes missionary work among the heathen, for which it has to rely upon voluntary effort.

The limits of an essay such as this preclude any attempt at giving a complete sketch, even of the barest and most statistical kind of the work of our oldest missionary society. At the present time it is engaged in spreading the Gospel throughout the length and breadth of the British Empire, and in China, Japan, Korea, and Borneo.

We must now speak briefly of the other chief missionary society of the English Church. In 1783 a society was founded bearing the name of "The Eclectic Society."[1] It used to meet in the vestry of S. John's Chapel, Bedford Row, and from time to time discussed the question of Foreign Missions. Charles Simeon and John Venn, rector of Clapham,

[1] For the information given I am indebted to the Historical Sketch at the beginning of the centenary volume issued by the Society in 1902.

were two of the leading members. On March 18, 1799, Venn introduced the subject, "What methods can we use more effectually to promote the knowledge of the Gospel among the heathen?" On April 12, in the same year, sixteen clergy and nine laymen met at a hotel in Aldersgate Street, Venn being in the chair, and passed four resolutions,[1] forming themselves into a Missionary Society. The name adopted six weeks later was "The Society for Missions to Africa and the East." The name "Church Missionary Society" was at first colloquial, and was not formally adopted till 1812. Admiral Gambier was appointed first president in that year. The other presidents have been the Earl of Chichester (1834–1886), Captain the Hon. Francis Maude (1886), and Sir John Kennaway from 1886 onwards. The patron is a member of the Royal Family, and the title of vice-patron is reserved to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Society began its operations by despatching two missionaries to Sierra Leone in 1804, and a second party followed in 1806. The climate proved exceedingly unhealthy, and in 1818 three deaths occurred in a single week. Whereupon one of the

[1] The second was to the effect that the S.P.C.K. and S.P.G confined their labours to British plantations in America and to the West Indies, so that the Church did not possess a strictly missionary society. The brief sketch given above will have shown that this view was not correct. There was, however, of course, ample room for the new Society.

survivors wrote home, "And now, dear sirs, be not discouraged. Let more labourers put their lives in their hands, and come to help those that are left. Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands unto God." In 1842 the value of the Society's work there was recognized in the report of a parliamentary committee. The West African missions have suffered many vicissitudes, but their progress also affords encouragement.

The first two English missionaries[1] despatched by the Society were laymen. They sailed for New Zealand in 1809, in response to an appeal made by Samuel Marsden for Christian workmen to help civilize the Maoris. But the disturbed condition of the country[2] made it impossible for them to land until 1814. In 1822 William Williams arrived, and in 1825 the first baptism—that of a chief upon his deathbed—took place. The first public baptism was in August 1829.

In 1811 the attention of the Society was directed to the Levant, and in 1815 Mr. Jowett—the first English clergyman and graduate who offered himself to the C.M.S.—started to inaugurate a Mediterranean

[1] The C.M.S. availed itself largely during its early days of the services of German missionaries in Lutheran orders. Probably English ones were not to be had, but such action raises difficult questions with regard to Church order. It assumes a community of doctrine and discipline which does not exist in fact. Much excellent work has been done by these men.

[2] The crew of the British ship *Boyd* had been killed and eaten by the Maoris in revenge for murders committed by traders.

Mission. The first missionaries were well received by the patriarchs and bishops, and it was hoped that their presence might serve to quicken the Oriental Churches. Political disturbances, however, prevented the accomplishment of any lasting work, except in Egypt. There are, of course, many in England in whose eyes the institution of such a mission is an unwarrantable intrusion into regions where an older and larger Church than their own has been at work since the Apostolic Age.

From 1814 the Society has played a large part in India and Ceylon, and at the close of the last century was spending more than £100,000 annually on its Indian missions. In 1899 it possessed 170 ordained and 38 lay missionaries, 39 unmarried European ladies, 142 native clergy, 3906 male and female native catechists and teachers. The total number of adherents gained by its missions was a little more than 130,000, of whom one quarter were communicants.

Work in Canada began in 1820, with a small grant to Mr. West—first chaplain to the Hudson Bay Company—for the education of some native children in what was then called the Red River Settlement, now Winnipeg. The first out-station was opened in 1840, on the Saskatchewan, under the charge of an Indian convert named Henry Budd.

During the last century the work of the Society

advanced steadily in all parts of the world,[1] and it should be noted that to the C.M.S. belongs the honour of having made the first attempt to bring the Gospel to the Australian Aborigines. It is now strongly represented in Palestine and Persia, as well as in more obvious mission-fields.

It would be impossible to give any complete outline of the missionary work which is being carried on by the English Church within the prescribed limits of an essay such as this without overloading it with statistics, whose real significance cannot be grasped very readily by the reader. Those who desire further information must turn to the annual reports of the great societies, or of individual missions. Beside the societies already mentioned, the English Church possesses, among others, a South American Missionary Society (whose success among the most degraded natives of South America induced Charles Darwin to become a subscriber), a Zenana Mission for reaching the women of India, and a Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews. Missions of a special character are the Cambridge University Mission to Delhi, the Oxford University Mission to Calcutta, the missions of the Society of S. John the Evangelist ("Cowley Fathers"), the United Universities' Mission to Central Africa (founded in

[1] In 1874 it decided to abandon its mission in Madagascar. Since the French occupation every possible obstacle is placed in the way of missionary work of any kind.

response to a special appeal made to the Universities by Dr. Livingstone), and the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrian Christians. This last aims at reviving, along its own lines, a very ancient Church with a glorious past. It was founded in response to an appeal from the Assyrians themselves in 1836, and reconstituted on a permanent basis in 1886. Trinity College, Dublin, also maintains a strong mission at Travancore in the south of India. In all, the English Church has at the present time 104 bishops and some 5000 clergy of its communion at work in foreign parts.[1] The number is not really large compared with our resources, but it may be hoped that it will increase rapidly during the next few years. It is said that only one-seventh of the missionary work being conducted by English-speaking people at the present day is in the hands of members of the English Church. We have certainly been culpably remiss in the past, and have thereby thrown away great opportunities. We do not yet realize the claims of the mission-field as fully as we ought, but there are signs on all sides that a great improvement is taking place in this respect. Without attempting to justify our omissions, it may be pointed out that

[1] Some of these are not, of course, strictly speaking, missionaries, *e.g.* on the Continent of Europe, and in the more settled parts of Canada, Australasia, and Africa. These figures do not include the Church of the United States. The two assistant bishops in Western Equatorial Africa are negroes. There is also a large army of European and native lay workers.

there is probably no Church whose resources are so severely taxed at home. Our communion is more liberal than any other, and therefore opinions diverge widely within its borders. Such diversity is doubtless desirable, but it does not facilitate corporate effort upon any large scale. The temptation is always to enlist support by appealing to narrow party spirit. We are also confronted with the necessity of bringing an ancient system into closer harmony with the needs of the present day, and the experience of the sixteenth century warns us against recklessness in discarding what it would be difficult, if not impossible, to replace. And there is probably no other Church which offers all its privileges to all, irrespective of whether they contribute to its upkeep or no. There are many in our Church who would be indignant if its ministrations ever ceased to be brought to their doors—however rarely they avail themselves of them—and still more indignant if they were required to make any return for them, either in money or personal service. This temper is not the product of our own day. Doubtless it ought never to have been allowed to spring up. But the responsibility for it does not rest with the present generation, which has to bear the burden which it imposes.

Before proceeding to speak briefly of the missionary work of the principal Nonconformist bodies, reference must be made to two societies in whose

work Churchmen and Nonconformists combine. The British and Foreign Bible Society was founded on March 7, 1804, mainly through the exertions of Mr. Thomas Charles of Bala, for the purpose of circulating copies of the Bible throughout the world. It now has colporteurs in almost every quarter of the globe, and distributes over five million books annually. It has produced translations of the Scriptures, or of portions of them, in nearly four hundred different languages. Its colporteurs frequently suffer great hardships in their journeyings in remote places, and they are sometimes, even at the present day, exposed to downright persecution. During the last year they were stoned in Peru. It is impossible not to admire their heroism, and the translating work done by the Society is very valuable.[1] But it is doubtful whether much solid result can be looked for from mere distribution of copies of the Bible. The policy implies a view of the nature of the Bible, and the way in which it should be used, which has never been shared by the greater part of Christendom, and has fewer adherents in England than was

[1] It is, however, much to be regretted that the Society always publishes its Bibles in incomplete form (*i.e.* Old and New Testaments only), and that from this example the practice has become general in England. The religious life of England is undoubtedly impoverished by the fact that the Apocrypha is almost unknown. Our people lose a great deal by knowing nothing of Jewish history between Malachi and the birth of Christ, or of the noble Wisdom of the son of Sirach. Some acquaintance with such stories as Tobit, or Bel and the Dragon is also a great help towards understanding what is meant by inspiration.

formerly the case. Probably the chief value of the Bible Society's distributions will be found to be in preparing the ground—to some extent—for real missionary work. It is difficult to believe that character can be permanently transformed and elevated without the aid of Church-membership, and the definite duties and privileges which it brings. There is, however, some evidence that the circulation of copies of the Bible is useful in stimulating a spirit of inquiry. The London Missionary Society was founded in 1794, and was from the first avowedly "undenominational." The fundamental principle announced ran as follows: "The design is not to send Presbyterianism, Independency, Episcopacy, or any other form of Church order or government, but the glorious Gospel of the blessed God to the heathen;"[1] and again, "We are called together for the funeral of bigotry, and I hope it will be buried so deep as never to rise again." We cannot help admiring the tolerant spirit which dictated such a declaration, but its working value is unfortunately very small. "The glorious Gospel of the blessed God" is not merely a number of facts to be imparted; it is a life to be lived, and therefore calls for some organization in which to live it. Preaching

[1] It may be noted that this assumes that no question of Church order involves any fundamental principle. Probably few among the leaders of any communion would be inclined to share this view to-day, or to agree that adherence to a denomination is necessarily bigotry.

that does not aim at attaching the hearer to a Church presents no more than a very small fragment of the Gospel, and robs it of more than half its saving power. Conversions may indeed be made by such methods, but what prospect has the newly-made Christian of being able to withstand the temptations of his old life if unattached to any Christian body? and how can his teacher fail to bias him in some one direction? In our Lord's own words, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen" (S. John iii. 11). There cannot be a really undenominational Christian teacher, because the very act of communion involves fellowship with some organized Christian body. We must all regret our unhappy divisions, but we do not stand to gain anything by ignoring facts and pretending either that our divisions do not exist, or that important questions are not involved in them. And therefore, although the London Missionary Society has spread far afield—in its earlier days at any rate in the face of bitter opposition,[1] and has numbered devoted men and women among its adherents, it seems to the present writer that great permanent results cannot be looked for from it. It tries to embody an unworkable principle, and starts from the false hypothesis

[1] One of the directors of the East India Company declared that he would rather have a band of devils in India than a band of missionaries. The first mission ship *Duff* was captured by a French privateer during her second voyage to the South Seas, and her loss cost the infant Society £10,000.

that a really undenominational teacher can be found. Either the Society will find itself compelled to abandon the principles laid down at its inception, or else the positive content of its teaching [1] will become less and less until it ceases to have any saving power. It has hardly been in existence long enough as yet for the difficulty to have become acute. The chief fields of its operations have been with the island of Tahiti for a centre and in India.

The principal Nonconformist bodies have always thrown themselves into missionary work with admirable energy.[2]

The Baptist Missionary Society was founded in 1792. It owed its inception to the enthusiasm of a young preacher, a shoemaker of Northamptonshire, named William Carey. At first he met with nothing but contemptuous indifference from the members of his own body. The meeting at which the "Particular Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen" was founded was held at Kettering. Only twelve persons were present, and the collection for the world-wide task amounted to £13, 2s. 6d. A surgeon in the employment of the East India Company in Bengal had already begun to preach the Gospel there. He happened to be in

[1] The chairman's speech at the Jubilee Conference in 1844 contains little but an indiscriminating attack upon the Roman Church.

[2] It was not until the end of the eighteenth century that they found themselves in a position to attempt anything considerable.

London at the time, and Carey was appointed to return with him as fellow-missioner. They landed at Calcutta on November 9, 1793. Carey was joined soon afterwards by two others, named Marshman and Ward. A printing-press was set up for the production of a Bengali New Testament, but the hostility of the East India Company compelled the missionaries to take refuge in the Danish settlement of Serampur. Eventually Carey became Professor of Bengali in the College at Fort William. The profits of his government appointments, together with those of the printing-press, and the schools instituted by Mr. and Mrs. Marshman, enabled the party to contribute altogether £80,000 to the mission. Carey himself died on June 9, 1834, worn out by forty years of devoted labour. Marshman survived him by three years. The Society has grown steadily during the last century, and now has extensive missions in various parts of the world.[1]

The real history of Methodist missions begins a few years later, for the Wesleyan Missionary Society was not founded until 1816; but its inception was due principally to the energy which had been displayed by a very remarkable man a few years earlier. Dr. Thomas Coke was born in Wales in the year 1747, and after a distinguished career at Oxford was ordained. The church of the parish which he served

[1] For further information see the proceedings of the Baptist World's Congress, held in London in 1905.

as curate soon became crowded, and his fervent preaching and numerous services led his superiors to regard him as a dangerous fanatic. He was admonished for his irregularities[1] by the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and finally expelled from the Church. He then attached himself to John Wesley, and was one of the two "bishops" whom Wesley's failure of faith despatched to preside over the Church in America. Besides extensive work on the mainland, his energy extended to the West Indies. He was also enabled to inaugurate a successful mission to West Africa. In his sixty-sixth year he sailed to begin mission work in Ceylon, but died during the voyage. Others of the party reached their destination, and were favourably received by Lord Molesworth, the commandant, and the early progress of the mission was remarkably successful.

The Congregationalist body entered the mission-field about the same time. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was instituted in 1810, and has done valuable work in various parts of the world. Its members played a large and honourable part in the anti-slavery agitation. English Congregationalists seem to avail themselves

[1] Without defending the action of the authorities, it should be noted that the preaching of the great Evangelicals of the eighteenth century was often marked by very disorderly scenes. The bishop and rector may have had better reasons for their action than appear on the surface.

largely of the London Missionary Society for discharging this part of their duty.

The smaller Nonconformist bodies also prosecute missionary work with great vigour in proportion to their strength.

The three principal bodies—the Baptists, Methodists, and Congregationalists—are very strong in N. America. This is due partly to the fact that many of the earliest settlers were Nonconformists whom religious intolerance had driven from England during the seventeenth century to seek a home in a new country. Their growth was further stimulated by the refusal of the English Church to create an American episcopate during the eighteenth century. The reasons for this reluctance have been discussed already. These American Churches have shared to the fullest extent the missionary revival of the last century, and are doing valuable work in various parts of the world, particularly in India. They have also a very large number of adherents among the negroes of the Southern States. It is to be feared, however, that the extreme emotionalism which is the least attractive feature in Methodism meets with an unhappily ready response in the negro character, and that serious difficulties are in store for the Methodist communions there on this account.

The English-speaking Nonconformist communions seem to possess two very valuable qualifications for missionary work. First, their comparatively recent

origin has enabled them, as it were, to start clear. They are not hampered by many of the difficulties by which very ancient institutions, such as the Church, are necessarily beset. They are not as yet confronted with the problem of maintaining many costly edifices out of resources which have become hopelessly inadequate. Their projects are not hampered by having to work in accordance with what seemed good to an earlier age, when modern conditions and requirements could not by any possibility have been foreseen.[1] The difficult problems which will be raised by the question of their relation to the State have yet to be worked out. Secondly, their looser organization enables them to spread with greater ease and rapidity under new conditions, and (probably) also to avail themselves more readily of the services of laymen. But in many respects their difficulties are still to come. They have been in the field for little more than a century[2] at most, and a century is a very short period in religious work. Hitherto they have been concerned with little save the laying of foundations, and it is a matter of historical experience that as the superstructure rises problems multi-

[1] In these respects their relation to the Church is parallel with the relation which the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge bear to those which have been established of late years in Liverpool, Birmingham, Manchester, Sheffield, and elsewhere. In each case the newer institution misses something, but has many obvious practical advantages.

[2] This is also the position of many particular missions and societies of the English Church.

ply and become more acute. It remains to be seen whether these active communions are sufficiently sure of their theological principles, and whether their system is sufficiently strong to resist the strain which must come upon them when their Asiatic or African converts enter the field of religious speculation. All communions will be tried severely, but the creeds and system of the Church have proved their power of resistance again and again in the past. Those of the Nonconformist bodies are as yet untried. We have our Lord's word for it that new heresies will arise. We can see for ourselves that it is inevitable that they should. As soon as the Gospel has been diffused over any area an intensive, as opposed to purely extensive, work assumes the foremost place. Men will begin to ask questions. They will begin to speculate on the various doctrines of the Christian Faith, and it is impossible to say what forms their speculations will take. Then comes the hour of trial for the Christian teacher—of trial in some ways more severe than persecution itself. He has to decide whether what is new to him is a real contribution to the fuller understanding of the Gospel, which he must welcome with gratitude, or whether it is "another Gospel," which he must reject with the uncompromising vigour of S. Paul. He knows too that his decision may affect the spiritual welfare of thousands for years—it may even be for centuries—after his own time. At

such times of difficulty he needs not only the personal guidance of the Holy Ghost, but all the help which he can receive from the corporate wisdom and experience of his communion. Because the life of a Church is larger than that of a single individual, it follows that the Church collectively can receive the Holy Ghost in a larger measure than is possible for any individual member. And therefore, when the individual member is in any special difficulty, he must rely less upon himself than upon the collective wisdom of his Church.[1] Now it may be predicted with some confidence that before the end of the present century India, China, and possibly Japan, will have become hotbeds of every imaginable form of heresy.[2] It is inevitable that this should be the case when Christianity has become the centre of their religious thought. India has given birth to one strange semi-Christian sect already in the followers of Chet Ram. No doubt some of these perverted beliefs will be fairly familiar types. They will not differ very much from some of the various forms of Gnosticism with which the Church had to wrestle in the early days of its history. But it is probable that some will be original. We shall have theories

[1] It has been pointed out earlier in this essay that the intellect is the special sphere of the operation of the Holy Spirit. We must look to Him for help in dealing with intellectual problems especially.

[2] It is not, of course, meant that they will not also have made valuable contributions to the understanding of the Gospel.

of which we had never dreamed pressed upon us as essential parts of Christianity, or it may be even as the full content of the Gospel. They will come to us with all the authority which they can derive from having already commanded the assent of more subtle intellects than our own. Every communion will feel the strain severely, and it remains to be seen whether the doctrine and discipline of the Nonconformist missions will be found to possess the necessary power of resistance. The question can only be settled by actual experience. But certain recent developments of English Congregationalism, and the religious vagaries of the United States (where the Nonconformist communions possess a very large number of adherents), cannot but make us feel anxious with regard to the future of their widely diffused and vigorous missions in the more important fields of the East.

It may seem that too much space has been devoted to the history of the missions of the Church, and especially to the remote past. The work of earlier ages has been described in some detail, while that of our own time has been dealt with more briefly. The work of foreign Churches also may seem to have been allowed to occupy too large a place. It may be thought that it would have been more useful to have spoken more fully about what touches us more nearly. But the line

which has been followed in the historical part of this essay has been followed of set purpose.

In the first place, the information relating to earlier ages and foreign Churches is not very readily accessible. To a large extent it is beyond the reach of the ordinary reader. It has to be pieced together from various sources, and the task can hardly be attempted by any one who has not the command of a considerable library. There is abundance of cheap literature about the missionary work of our own country, and of recent years, that can be procured without difficulty by all who wish for it. The year-books of the various Churches give the statistics of their work, and most missions of any importance issue an annual report. Many produce a monthly magazine as well. The biographies of great missionaries, such as Bishops G. A. Selwyn, Steere, Patteson, and Hannington, or of Henry Martyn or Dr. Livingstone, can be obtained without difficulty. And therefore it has seemed better to the present writer to pass over this ground very rapidly. The aim of this essay has not been to stimulate enthusiasm so much as to broaden knowledge, and it would therefore have been beside the point to recapitulate what can be gathered without difficulty from other sources. Moreover, it would be impossible for any single person to possess a detailed knowledge of all the missionary work now in progress. The most we

can do is to take a general interest in it as a whole. We shall do the cause of Christ better service by focussing our interest upon the details of one or two particular missions. Each must select for himself some particular work that happens to appeal to his sympathies in an especial degree, or that has, by force of circumstances, some special claim upon him. But it would be wrong for any one to try to relieve us of the responsibility of making our own selection. To try to do so would not advance the interests of the cause. For the working value of our choice—that is, its power to elicit solid and continuous support by prayer and alms—must be derived chiefly from the fact that it is our own. The mere process of making the choice for ourselves is of the greatest educational value.

And secondly, there is in some ways more to be learned from the past than from the present. An old Greek proverb advised that no man should be called happy until he is dead, and the saying enshrines a great deal of truth. We cannot really judge the value of any contemporary work; especially of religious work, the value of which resides in its capacity for permanence. We can never be sure whether some new structure, however imposing it may be in our eyes, is built of stubble or of material that can endure. Nothing but time, and the slow tests which time applies, can tell us that. And this

testing is necessarily slower where religious work is concerned than in any other case. For the field is larger, and immediate apparent success means less. Opportunism commonly plays a large part in politics, and perhaps it is right that it should. The statesman may be satisfied when he has dealt satisfactorily with the needs of the moment. He knows that any arrangements he may make will not last for ever: probably he does not desire that they should last even for a century. He is concerned more with passing exigencies than with permanent principles. And it is probably true to say that opportunism of the best kind has a particularly large place in English politics. We are inclined to rely upon successful opportunism in our political life, and as a rule it seems to serve us very well. But whatever place opportunism may be entitled to occupy in politics, it can have no real place in religious life. Religious work that does not concern itself primarily —almost exclusively—with permanent principles is worth nothing. And to the present writer the importing of opportunism into religious work seems to be the great danger which lies before English-speaking Christianity at the present time. Both in England and America we seem inclined to overrate the value of success, or rather to insist, to an extent which may prove disastrous, on seeing some immediate result in everything to which we put our hands. Sixteen years ago Archbishop Benson declared that

"noiselessness" was one of the marks which must be upon all Christian work, and that without it no Christian work could be brought to perfection.[1] That was not the temper of the time at which he was speaking, and still less is it the temper of our own day. The impatient, advertising, temper of our day has made itself felt in our religious life, and it leads directly to opportunism of the worst kind, in action as well as in judgment. We are inclined to base our opinions on the knowledge of a few facts which are, so to speak, immediately under our eyes. We must beware of forming our judgments in a matter so large and important as Foreign Missions upon a knowledge of recent or contemporary work only. Some contemporary mission may appear to be doing good work; converts may be flocking in, and support from England may not be wanting. But time may show that the conversions have been altogether superficial, or that they have been gained at the cost of some compromise which ought never to have been made. Whenever this has been done, there has always been a heavy reckoning to be discharged at some future time. Or a mission may seem to be a failure. Years of work may have produced no visible result. But all the while the Christian leaven may have been slowly spreading. The missionary may have been strong enough to resist some tempting alliance with the world which would have brought him popularity.

[1] "Fishers of Men," p. 148 (Macmillan & Co., 1893).

He may have gone on quietly and faithfully sowing his good seed without caring whether the harvest be reaped by his hands or those of others. In such cases, when the harvest does come it is worth the gathering.[1] And therefore a knowledge of the past is really more important to us in some ways than a knowledge of the present. Or rather, the latter is apt to be altogether misleading without a solid background of the former. We stand on more solid ground when we pass judgment on the work of former generations, than when we criticize our own. It is upon knowledge of the past, primarily, that our judgments must be formed. We can only think out our principles by learning what has happened—by seeing what results certain courses of action did actually produce. For it often happens that the results were by no means those which the actors themselves expected. When we have thought out our principles in the light of past events, then it is time to acquire a knowledge of existing circumstances to see how those principles are to be applied. But we can never deduce right principles from knowledge of the present alone, and if we try to work without clearly thought out principles, we shall probably succeed in doing very little that had not better have been left undone.

And thirdly, nothing but knowledge of the past

[1] For example, Henry Martyn only lived to baptize one old Hindu woman.

can give us a due sense of proportion. Without that, hardly any work of any kind can be brought to a successful issue, and religious work less than any other. We all need the power of seeing things in their right relation to each other, and so of being able to estimate their relative importance. And it seems to the present writer, that this sense is one in which our time is singularly deficient. It is probably true to say that as a nation we are weak in this respect, and we do not seem to be making much advance.[1] It is possible that this is a natural first consequence of the spread of education, and the universal diffusion of the power of reading. More judgments are formed and widely disseminated than was the case fifty years ago. If so, it may be hoped that it will soon pass, but while it lasts it is a very serious danger. Unless we can acquire a better sense of proportion, our missionary work is bound to suffer severely. It is most important that we should not be completely wrapped up in our own efforts, and ignore those which have been and are being made by others on different lines. Our natural tendency to "insularity" —that is, to neglect whatever has not originated with ourselves—will do even more harm in the mission-

[1] A well-known preacher is reported to have said recently in New York that the agitation in favour of female suffrage was "the greatest movement for humanity since the death of Christ." It is noteworthy that many newspapers devote more space to a murder, a suicide, or a petition for divorce, than to really important home or foreign intelligence.

field than anywhere else. The first step towards unity—and even towards the comity of which missionaries feel the need even more than we do at home—must come from better knowledge and more generous appreciation of the work of other Churches. And it is to be hoped that such knowledge will do something towards rousing us to efforts which shall correspond more closely with the extraordinary opportunities which God has given to our race.

And it is also essential that we should not make the mistake of thinking that no times have ever borne any resemblance to our own. Our difficulties are not without parallel in the past. We have neither succeeded nor failed upon any unprecedented scale. There have been missions which made at least as rapid progress as any of ours do now, and there have been others which—like some at the present day—seemed unable for a time to make any headway whatever. The more striking successes of the past afford us perhaps the most valuable warning, for they have sometimes been followed by almost complete collapse.[1] Nothing but a knowledge of the past can save us from undue elation or despondency. Without it we can hardly fail to overrate the value of immediate apparent success, and we shall be in danger of trying to purchase what looks like progress by undue concessions to popular demands. In this way we might be led into very serious compromising

[1] Notably in the case of the early Assyrian missions. See p. 91.

of principles. That is probably a greater danger than the risk of being unduly discouraged by apparent failure. For it seems as if this century would be one of very rapid advance in the mission-field. All observers are agreed that there is a new spirit abroad in many parts of Asia. And therefore it is especially incumbent at this time on all who have the extension of Christ's Kingdom at heart to set themselves to solidify their judgment as much as possible by broadening the knowledge upon which it is formed. The present writer is convinced that there is nothing so steadying amid the whirling difficulties of the present as a knowledge of the triumphs and failures of the past. And the more we know of them the more shall we realize the truth of the closing sentence on the monument of the Wesleys in Westminster Abbey: "God buries His workmen, but carries on His work."

III. PRACTICAL

When one who has never been a missionary himself, or had any opportunity of forming a first-hand opinion on missionary work, sets himself to write of Foreign Missions from the practical point of view, he must be conscious that his most urgent need is a becoming humility. He cannot but feel that there is something presumptuous in venturing to offer, from the sheltered life of England, criticism or advice to

men who have, literally, hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. If there should be anything in the following pages with which any missionary can have good cause to be offended, I trust that it will be recognized that the offence is altogether unintentional, and is the outcome of ignorance rather than ill-will.[1]

Viewed from the practical stand-point, the subject naturally falls into two main divisions:—

(1) The development of the missionary spirit at home, and the home organization of the resources required for the work.

(2) The actual conduct of operations in the field.

Before proceeding further, it may be well to try to rescue the word "practical" from the degradation which seems to have overtaken it. It is to be feared that in many peoples' minds "practical" has come to be regarded as the equivalent of "by rule-of-thumb." "Practical" gifts are held to be a satisfactory substitute for deep or accurate knowledge of any subject, or even to render the existence of such knowledge quite superfluous. We are often told that "what the Church wants to-day is not scholars or theologians, but practical men." On examination,

[1] There is a useful sketch of the present state of the mission-field and its claim upon us in the "Evangelization of the World in this Generation," by J. R. Mott, published by the Student Volunteer Missionary Union. It also contains a useful bibliography. But the author restricts his view to what he calls "evangelical denominations," and so ignores the Latin and Greek communions, which probably contain four out of five of the Christians of the world.

this ideal of the practical man often resolves itself into a person of unbounded energy, who is content to pass his days in a whirl of multitudinous business, without ever stopping to think whether his activities are promoting or hindering the cause which he has at heart. The true meaning of "practical" is "efficient." The really practical man—that is, the man who really gets things done—is the man who has the power of bringing theoretical knowledge to bear with good effect upon the conduct of affairs. That power ought to be immensely valuable in any walk of life; but its value becomes very slight if it leads to neglect of any of the resources which it might employ. It may be laid down that no great cause can be really advanced by bustling activity alone, unsupported by careful thinking. To those who are inclined to over-value mere activity, and to speak of thinkers as "dreamers" or "visionaries," it may be worth while to point out that the seeing of visions and the dreaming of dreams is to be one of the signs of the Presence of the Holy Ghost. "And it shall come to pass afterward that I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions" (Joel ii. 28). Again, the spirit of wisdom and understanding is the first of the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit (Isaiah xi. 2). This truth was fully recognized in the Middle Ages, when it was customary to intro-

duce the figure of the Dove in pictures of the councils of learned doctors; but it is to be feared that it has rather dropped out of sight in our own day. We should perhaps be slow to invoke the guidance of the Holy Spirit when sitting down to arrange the details of, say, some complicated scheme of Church finance. Yet to do so would be completely in accord with the general feeling of earlier ages.

Now, because missionary work is spiritual work, it follows that it can only be advanced by spiritual methods. That is a principle of which we must never lose sight for a moment. It is impossible to estimate how much the Church has suffered from attempts to advance the Kingdom of God by unspiritual methods, especially when, as has usually been the case, the employment of such methods has been accompanied by enormous professions of belief in spiritual power. The story of the Inquisition is a case in point. Unfortunately it is by no means the only one.

First among spiritual methods we must place Prayer. Regular intercession on behalf of Foreign Missions in general, and for individual missions or missionaries, should be one of the normal duties of every Christian. It may be worth while to point out that this cannot be a very easy task. Prayer of any kind, especially Intercessory Prayer, may without irreverence be called an Art. It must be labori-

ously studied and slowly acquired, like any other art. We could have no right to expect that the supreme Christian power, to the exercise of which our Lord devoted Himself with such earnestness, could be easy to acquire or put into force. And it is probable that we tend to exaggerate our own difficulties in prayer, or rather to under-estimate those of other people. We are perhaps inclined to think that others find prayer much easier than we do ourselves, and to assume that we are the prey of some special difficulties. In reality all but a very few exceptionally-gifted souls must always find prayer difficult, and therefore we ought not to be discouraged if we find that our difficulties do not seem to diminish appreciably with practice. To a Christian the fact that prayer is difficult is a testimony to its efficacy and value. We must expect that Satan will seek to hinder by every means in his power this most effective method of destroying his works. The difficulty of regular intercession will probably be found to diminish somewhat if a band or Guild of Intercessors can be formed. The members should agree to use the same prayers, and, if possible, to use them at the same time of day. There is great spiritual support in the knowledge that one is not isolated, but is acting in concert with others. Elijah would not have wished to die if he had known that there were seven thousand faithful in Israel beside himself. Every clergyman, or

minister, should endeavour to organize such a guild among his communicants, and many missions issue monthly or quarterly papers of intercession suitable for the purpose. He should make a special point of trying to enrol the aged and invalid members of his congregation. They have, of necessity, the leisure which the younger and more able-bodied often find it almost impossible to obtain. And no one who has ever had the privilege of ministering to the sick can have failed to notice what unsuspected graces and powers are often developed in the course of a long illness. Those whom sickness has promoted to the Ministry of Prayer are often able to exercise it with a power which they never possessed when in good health. And to be members of a Guild of Intercessors would remove the feeling of uselessness which must be, for those who have been accustomed to activity, the most trying feature of a prolonged period of weakness or ill-health. It would entitle them to feel that, so far from being withdrawn from God's service, they were wielding the most effective of all the weapons which we can employ for the extension of His Kingdom. Such a Guild of Intercessors would, at any rate in its early stages, be entirely private. Individuals would be asked to become members privately by their pastor. But at the same time there should be public services of intercession for Foreign Missions held in the church. It will probably be found best to hold these on some week-

night rather than on Sunday; but, of course, no absolute rule can be laid down in the matter. The most convenient method will probably be for the minister to have a paper containing a list of various missions and their special requirements at the moment, and to invite the prayers of the congregation for each in turn, silence being kept for a few moments after each petition. All should be invited to attend these services, and it will be best to hold them at regular intervals, or at some special time of year. The custom of devoting the Advent season, and especially S. Andrew's Day, to this purpose is spreading rapidly in the Church of England, and the example might well be followed by other bodies if they have no other existing arrangement. To those who cannot for any reason make use of printed papers of Intercessions, and do not feel able to compose prayers for themselves, it may be pointed out that in the Lord's Prayer the words "Thy Kingdom come" may be used with missionary intention. Beyond doubt they have a missionary significance, and this may be emphasized mentally by any one who uses them. A great proof of the divine origin of the Lord's Prayer is the wealth and variety of meaning which may be found within its brief compass.[1]

[1] For example, Justin Martyr (c. A.D. 120) considered that it might be a sufficient formula for the consecration of the elements in the Eucharist, instead of the Words of Institution which all Christian bodies have decided to use. Compare also S. Gregory the Great, Ep. ix. 12.

Doubtless the number of those who would join such a guild or be present at such services would be few at first. But we feel sure that the two or three could always be found to gather in Christ's name for this purpose, and that the movement once set on foot would spread rapidly. The development of it would mean that from every parish and congregation spiritual power would flow out to the ends of the earth. The missionary would feel himself wonderfully invigorated; he would know that he was not forgotten by those whom he had left behind, and that as from time to time he made his needs known at home, they would be laid before the Throne of Grace by a united band of fellow-workers. The new convert, too, struggling with temptations springing from tradition and environment, the force of which we can hardly realize, would feel that there were other wills, strengthened by years of Christian habit, striving for and with his own. This aspect of the Communion of Saints would be realized as it has perhaps never been since the days of the Apostles. It is surely one of the first duties of all who, in any capacity, have charge of souls to try to develop this power among their people.

Next to Intercessory Prayer must be placed the influence of the Pulpit. Missionary sermons might be more frequent than they are at present in most churches. Congregations are sometimes heard to complain that sermons are dull, and

there is no doubt some justice in the charge. It is unreasonable to expect to find a Chrysostom in every pulpit, but any man whose heart is in his ministry ought to be able to inspire and interest his people with accounts of the pioneer work in the Kingdom of God. The romance of Empire is always to be found upon its frontiers. A day in the life of an administrator on the North-West Frontier of India, for example, is as a rule more interesting to hear about than a day in the life of a magistrate at home. There are many excellent biographies of great missionaries which would supply abundant material for many sermons. Yet we can seldom recollect having heard them utilized in this way. It would probably be better that such sermons should be preached on occasions when the collection at the close of the service is not to be given to missionary work. There is in many people's minds an invariable connection between a missionary and a money-box. They do not expect to hear anything about Foreign Missions without being asked to contribute to them at the close of the service. That tends to oust missionary work from its proper position. It tends to make people regard it as something irregular, something additional, to which it is an act of especial virtue to contribute, instead of one of the most important of the normal duties of the Church. The missionary sermon and collection are viewed as a kindly concession to the

enthusiast whose work is to be assisted by them. We do not want to have to rely on special appeals for contributions to missionary work any more than we do for funds to meet normal church expenses. We want to bring people to contribute regularly as a matter of course; and it is therefore most desirable that missionary sermons should be preached by the regular staff of the church. It is no doubt a very good thing to have the pulpit occupied from time to time by one who is, or has been, himself a missionary. His account of what he and his companions have adventured for God will come with a force and freshness which can only belong to first-hand narratives of actual experience; and a missionary lecture, illustrated with lantern-slides, given in the schools or parish-room, may do much to stimulate interest among children and young people. But we shall weaken our cause very seriously if we rely on the occasional visit of an ex-missionary as our principal means of awaking and maintaining interest in the work; for the ex-missionary or missionary deputation is almost compelled to ask for money wherever he goes. That is expected of him by the society or organization under which he works, and, as has been pointed out, that is not always desirable.

It is not right that the progress of the Kingdom should invariably be associated with a direct appeal for money; and the process bears very hardly upon

the missionary himself. When he returns to England for a few months, he desires a complete holiday. His work requires that he should build up his spiritual and bodily powers, which have been severely tried. Instead of being able to do this, he too often finds himself expected to scour the country preaching, lecturing, and begging for money. And he knows that if he does not do this his work will be crippled; some great opportunity perhaps will be missed for lack of funds and may never recur. If the home clergy were more assiduous and regular in trying to create strong missionary interest among their congregations, a great part of this necessity would disappear. The gain from every point of view would be enormous. The temper which resents sending money out of the parish for any purpose must be fought as patiently, gently, and stubbornly as the temper which finds its principal recreation in gambling or drunkenness.

In practice it will probably be found best to try to attach the people to some particular district or station. That gives a centre for their interest, and it is to be feared that a large proportion of our average congregations have scarcely enough imagination or sympathy to rise to a keen, sustained interest in the whole field of missionary work. The grandeur of the whole cause in its largest aspect should be laid before congregations from time to time, but for practical working purposes it will probably be found

better to try to focus sympathy upon some special point in the mission-field. People can then be informed definitely of the exact progress which the work is making, and this will help to satisfy our strong commercial bent, which makes us like to know positively what we are getting for our money. Despite its obvious limitations, this temper has the advantage that it makes for efficient administration in matters of detail; and whether good or bad, it is undoubtedly a factor which cannot be disregarded in dealing with a large proportion of English people. The printed report and any other publications of the particular mission in question should be circulated as widely as possible, as they will be the best means of refuting those who declare scornfully that "missions do no good." The plain statements of fact contained in a report are very difficult to explain away.

Where there is a Parish Magazine, that can also contribute something to fostering interest in the cause. The editor can from time to time insert paragraphs about missionary work, and these would sometimes meet the eye of people who do not take in, or perhaps do take in but do not read, any exclusively missionary publication. Such paragraphs might be made at least as interesting as some of those whose appearance in parish magazines at present suggests that they have been inserted by an editor who was at his wits' end for copy to satisfy the printer.

The Sunday School and Young People's Bible Class are another important area within which missionary zeal may be developed. We are all agreed as to the importance of enlisting the sympathies of the young. With every year that passes, after a certain age, the mind becomes less elastic and less able to receive new ideas. It is very difficult to convince a middle-aged man, who has for many years been accustomed to regard the religious condition of his own neighbourhood as the extreme limit of his responsibility, that he owes, or can possibly owe, any wider duty to the whole Body of Christ. But young people are naturally more impressionable. If all the children in our Sunday Schools could be brought up to know that it is as much their duty to support Foreign Missions by every means in their power as to practise Christianity at home, an enormous advance would have been made. Every Sunday School should, as a matter of course, possess a library for the benefit of the teachers, and all such libraries should contain some missionary literature. Biographies of eminent missionaries will probably be found most useful for this purpose, and the superintendent should urge the teachers to give lessons from them at regular intervals. He might also sometimes give a short missionary address himself to the whole school. The Conferences of the Student Volunteer movement show with what force the missionary idea can

appeal to the young, and we believe that it can appeal with equal force to children at a very early age. For boys especially, lessons from the lives of great missionaries could not fail to be of the highest value. It is a common complaint that boys as soon as they have left school drop out of the religious life in which they have been brought up. In many cases this is probably due to the fact that Christianity has never been presented to them in such a way as to strike their imagination.

Meekness is a very important Christian virtue, and therefore one of the most difficult to practise. It is probably the last in which any European can hope to excel. And therefore it is an ideal which cannot be expected to appeal strongly to the young, especially to boys. Can a healthy, vigorous boy, who is conscious of growing powers within himself, and has just attained for the first time some measure of independence, be expected to be meek? We may regret his tendency to undue self-assertion, but must recognize that it is only natural. At an early age it is often an indication of real force of character, and may be trusted to disappear as time goes on. By dwelling too much on meekness we may easily lead a growing boy to regard Christianity as something unmanly—suitable for women and girls, but not for himself. He may struggle hard against this idea, but none the less it rises continually in his mind, and he cannot banish it altogether. He has also,

probably, been taught that religion is our great stay in sorrow and misfortune. Neither of these have as yet come his way, and therefore he does not value religion any more highly on that account. He tends possibly to regard it as a kind of Salvation Army: a refuge for those who have failed in life. But *he* means to be a success. His mind is not sufficiently developed, and his knowledge of character is not sufficiently wide for him to appreciate the supreme *strength* of Christ. The characters of the Bible he hardly regards as human. To him they are beings of another order, who lived in a world so far removed from his own that it never occurs to him to compare himself with them. And so, without necessarily falling into evil habits, he becomes indifferent to religion. He knows that he ought to lead a good life, and is ready to make an honest effort to do so, but allows the organized life of the Church in which he has been brought up to go by. He has never been shown anything in religion which appeals to him naturally. It is to be feared that the teaching which many boys receive in the Sunday School causes far more irreligion in later life than all the exploded fallacies disseminated by the Rationalist Press Association and its sympathizers. I feel sure that much of this evil might be averted if lessons from the lives of distinguished missionaries formed a regular part of the course of every Sunday School. If boys were taught something about such

men as David Livingstone, Henry Martyn, Bishops G. A. Selwyn, Patteson, Hannington, and Steere,[1] to take a few examples, it would give them a new idea of Christianity. It would show them its heroic side, and English schoolboys and young men possess the capacity for hero-worship in a very marked degree. They would be shown a type of Christian life which they could thoroughly appreciate. They would begin to learn that Christianity is not merely, or chiefly, a woman's business. They would discover that some of the greatest of modern Christians have displayed the highest possible degree of courage, resolution, and endurance; that they have in fact excelled in all the qualities in which every growing boy wishes to excel himself. I am convinced that in the story of missionary work, more than in any other department of Christian activity, can be found an ideal to appeal to the class which every religious communion finds most difficult to retain within its fold. And is it too much to hope that in this way some might receive their first call to the mission-field? There are probably some—perhaps many—young men (and women) whom God has intended to serve Him in this work. But they have never heard their call, and so have found their way into other lines of life, from which they will, in all probability, never extricate them-

[1] The list might be extended almost indefinitely, and made thoroughly representative of any communion. It will probably be best for the teacher to confine himself to comparatively modern times.

selves. Of course, we ought not to try to get children to pledge themselves early in life to a task for which they may have no real qualifications whatever: if we try to sweep them off their feet, as it were, with a wave of missionary enthusiasm, we should merely be courting future failure and reproach. Such action would deservedly bring discredit upon the whole cause. But any one who is engaged in giving Christian teaching, in any capacity, ought to make it a part of their duty to keep watch for any indications of vocation for the missionary life. The task is difficult, and awful in its responsibility. Much earnest prayer and thought will be needed to guard against self-deception on either side. But we owe it to the whole body of Christ to undertake the task. The least that we can do is to give vocation an opportunity of developing by teaching those who are entrusted to us something about the heroic pioneers of the Kingdom in the ends of the earth. And we in England shall not be wrong if we teach our children that God has called us to play a larger part than any other nation in the evangelizing of the world. He has entrusted us with a dominion such as He has never entrusted to any other people. To say that we have gained our empire by our own prowess would be to take our stand by the side of Nebuchadnezzar, and deserve at least as great humiliation. We dare not say that God has given it to us as a reward for some special virtues which

we possess. To do so would be to sink to the lowest spiritual level ever reached by the Jews. The only tenable view of the position which we occupy in the world at present is that it is a great opportunity to be used in God's service. The story of the way in which we have acquired our empire contains many inspiring chapters. It thrills us with its list of heroic achievements. But if we can rise to the opportunity which has opened before us in this way, that story will be dull and poor compared with the story of how we showed ourselves worthy of what has been entrusted to us. If we fail, the most miserable and shameful chapter in the world's history has yet to be written. If those who are bearing the responsibility of imparting Christian teaching disregard the possibility of the existence of a missionary vocation in those whom they teach, and are silent upon all that belongs to the mission-field, it will surely be that some whom they ought to have told will rise up against them in the judgment to reproach them for their neglect.

It has been laid down above that our methods in promoting the missionary cause must be spiritual, and suggestions have been offered as to the way in which spiritual power may be brought to bear upon it. But the highest degree of spirituality does not preclude the most careful administration of material things. Indeed, we see from the Acts (chap. vi.) that the former ought always to issue in the latter. The

material things which pertain to the work must now claim our attention.

It is impossible to speak of the actual administration of funds in the mission-field without having had personal experience of various methods. But attention has already been called to the economic value of the monastic principle.[1] Some attempt to reproduce the valuable side of monastic life has been made in the "Bush Brotherhoods" which have recently been instituted in some parts of Australia. It is to be hoped that the principle will be more widely and fully developed. With regard to the raising of funds at home, the ideal at which we must aim is that every Christian should make some definite contribution to the work every year. It would be an enormous gain if each mission could count upon a certain fixed income every year. At present many needful plans for expansion have to be abandoned, because the promoters cannot feel certain that they will receive next year as much as they have received the year before. It might be better never to have tried to go forward than to be compelled to retreat for lack of funds after a few years. Thus the generous contributor to Foreign Missions—the man who can afford to give large sums—is always a source

[1] The industrial community life developed with such success by S. Columba in Iona is said to have been employed by the Moravians in their missions, with equally happy results.

of some anxiety to those whom he supports. They have to ask themselves anxiously as each year comes round, Will he repeat his generosity? If he does not, what shall we do? And when he is removed by death, it may not be in his power to bequeath a capital sum to make up for the loss of his yearly contribution. Of course the income of any mission or missionary society must fluctuate to some extent by reason of unforeseen legacies. But our aim should be to make it as certain and constant as possible by trying to increase the number of small subscriptions. It is really better to obtain eight subscriptions of half-a-crown than one of a pound. And it may therefore be doubted whether the existence of the great societies, such as the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Church Missionary Society, the London Missionary Society, and others is really conducive to the welfare of the cause. It would be worse than foolish even to wish to disparage the loftiness of their ideals, the excellence of their administration, or the greatness of the services which they have rendered, and are rendering, to the Church of God all over the world. But they are the outcome of private zeal working at a time when the corporate conscience of the Church had not recognized its responsibility in the matter. And therefore it may be questioned whether their continued existence does not tend to hinder the development

of that conscience to the full extent. Of course we are not yet in a position to do without them, nor shall we be, in all probability, for many years to come. But that is the ideal which we ought to keep in view. A missionary society is of the nature of an expedient for stirring the sluggish conscience of the Church; the crowning proof of its success would be for it to have rendered its continuance unnecessary. For as long as we have specifically missionary societies within the Church, so long will many worthy people continue to hold the view that missionary work is in some sort an extra, and not a necessary, normal, universal duty; for any society must be smaller than the whole communion within which it works. Our other societies are all, to a certain extent, exclusive. They exist to serve the interests of some particular section or class (*e.g.* young men, young women, mothers, sailors, boys between twelve and eighteen, and so on). To such societies there can be no possible objection. They meet special needs which could not receive adequate attention without them, and they provide a field for the exercise of special talents in the service of the whole Body of Christ. We cannot expect every Christian to take an equally keen and active interest in, let us say, the Girls' Friendly Society and the S. Andrew's Waterside Mission. There is no reason why he should. The specializing societies enable him to

promote the work to which he feels especially drawn, whatever it may be. But we can, and do, expect every Christian to take an equally keen and active interest in the general cause of Foreign Missions; that he ought to do so is the very forefront of our position. But a great missionary society inevitably tends to be classed with any other society, as promoting good, useful work which appeals to some, but has no claim to universal support. I think that the claim of Foreign Missions upon the whole community would be greatly strengthened if the work at present discharged by the great quasi-private societies could be made one of the normal activities of the whole Church. The formation of such bodies as the Australian Board of Missions and the United Board of Missions for the Provinces of Canterbury and York in the Church of England seem to be a step in this direction.

Further, there must always be a danger lest the home executive of a great missionary society become too dictatorial, and come to regard its missionaries too much as its servants, to be ordered about at its good pleasure. Once established, the missionary ought to have as free a hand as possible; he ought not to receive instructions from home as to how he is to do his work, unless he seems to be on the point of adopting measures altogether out of harmony with the communion to which he belongs. The danger of over-interference on the part of the

home authorities would probably be diminished if the relation of the missionary to his supporters were the same as the relation between each individual clergyman and the whole Church at home.

I have said that the ideal is to ensure a fixed income—subject to the inevitable fluctuations caused by legacies—by bringing every Christian to make some regular annual contribution to the cause. For this purpose, as for the purpose of intercession, it will probably be best to try to attach every congregation at home to some particular spot in the mission-field. The congregation should then assess itself, and undertake to remit a certain sum annually direct to the missionary whose work it has undertaken to support. His annual report will show how the funds have been applied. This assessment should be very carefully made by a committee that it may be in due proportion to the resources of the congregation, and it may, of course, require revision from time to time, as the character of the population in any given district may change. Care should be taken not to fix it too high in the first instance; our Lord Himself warned us against embarking on enterprises for which we have not sufficient strength.[1] But once it has been fixed, it should be reckoned among the normal working expenses of the church. The missionary assessment should have to be met annually as a matter of course, as much as the bills for light-

[1] S. Luke xiv. 28.

ing and warming the building; and it should be the last of all accounts to be subjected to retrenchment. Economize on the music or decorations if need be—on anything rather than the missionary assessment. It might be no bad thing to let the congregation shiver in a dimly-lighted church for a few Sundays in winter because the contributions to missions had fallen short of the prescribed figure, and the deficit had to be made good by economy in other directions. It is to be feared that there are but few congregations ripe for such a policy at present; but if the guilds of missionary intercessors were an invariable element in our religious life, we believe that the financial policy suggested above would become possible in a very few years.

There is no reason whatever why we should not pray directly and specifically for the funds required in any particular instance. Those who feel a difficulty in doing so have surely missed some of the teaching of the Lord's own prayer, with its clause, "Give us this day our daily bread." And again: "*Whatsoever* ye shall ask in My name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask anything in My name, I will do it" (S. John xiv. 13, 14). This was well understood by the man who of all others entered most fully into his Master's mind: "And this is the confidence that we have in Him, that if we ask *any thing* according to His will, He heareth us. And if we know

that He hear us, *whatsoever* we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of Him" (1 S. John v. 14, 15).

The temper of our time is not particularly prayerful, and the prayerless atmosphere which hangs about like some poisonous gas has not been without its effect even upon devout minds. Inability[1] to distinguish between omniscience and wide knowledge, or between omnipotence and very great power, has led many to imagine that there can be human needs beneath God's notice. They think that it is in some sort more reverent to adopt what is sometimes described as a "generally prayerful attitude," than to formulate direct petitions for particular needs. Yet the efficacy of prayer has seldom been more forcibly attested in recent times than when financial needs have been made the subject of direct petitions. The late George Müller is said to have disbursed £2,000,000 during his lifetime, and yet never to have asked any human being for a penny. He obtained it all in answer to prayer. The progress of the Candidates' Fund in connection with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel is another case in point.

[1] Heine said: "The Supreme Being, perfectly omnipotent and all-seeing, if He existed, was too great to trouble Himself with what a wretched little mouse in the Rue d'Amsterdam might believe." This limiting the power of God in the attempt to ascribe greatness to Him is not uncommon among ourselves. See Archbishop Benson, "Fishers of Men," p. 99.

The children in the Sunday School should be encouraged to make their contribution, and a collection for missionary purposes might well be made by each teacher at regular intervals. It will probably be necessary to attach the children to some special mission about which they can be taught from time to time, otherwise we can hardly expect to arouse their interest. The best plan is to get the Sunday School to charge itself with the maintenance—or a part of the maintenance—of some child in a mission school: £7 per head seems to be the sum usually required. The children at home feel naturally more drawn to some one of their own standing, and follow his progress through the alphabet and the thorny ways of the spelling-book with keen interest and real sympathy. Some of them will be glad to write letters to their "mission-child," and to receive answers from him. The knowledge that white children in distant England have him in their prayers and thoughts, and are glad to hear that he is doing well, must help to increase the mission-child's self-respect. And any increase in self-respect must make the spiritual work of the missionary on the spot much easier.

Of course we must always be careful not to pauperize native churches by continuing to supply them with funds after they have become strong enough to stand alone. Money raised in England must always be devoted, as far as possible, to the

opening up of new fields. We should be doing a real disservice to our converts if we failed to give them every opportunity of developing habits of self-sacrifice and reliance on their own resources. The Church of England undoubtedly suffers in some respects from the possession of ancient endowments, and the deadening effect of an endowment or quasi-endowment would be increased if the funds came from another part of the world. The readiness of native churches to provide for their own requirements is often most encouraging, and the admirable temper which they frequently display in the matter ought not to be checked in any way. No doubt work which is just self-supporting might seem to advance more rapidly if aided by remittances from England, but the gain would be only apparent. We should not be acting in accordance with the real interests of those whom we wished to serve, and the outcome of our mistaken policy would, some day, become painfully evident. In this matter we at home must of course be guided chiefly by the authorities on the spot. They must realize—as they probably do already—that they must aim at making the work self-supporting as soon as possible, and that it is their duty to inform us as soon as it has reached that stage. It is in some ways a real misfortune that what are now the mother-churches in Europe and America are very much richer than any that can be established in other parts of the world. The

mother-church of Jerusalem was probably the poorest of the Apostolic Age,[1] and could not have supported its daughters in other lands had the request been made. Without doubt, S. Paul's foundations owed a great deal to the fact that they might fairly be called upon to contribute to the needs of their mother-church.

We now come to the most important factor in the missionary question, namely, the missionary himself. How can the supply of missionaries best be increased, and what preliminary training will be the best preparation for their work? For the actual offering of men and women we must rely upon the calling of the Holy Spirit. Something may be done by human agency to inspire missionary enthusiasm, and we must watch over the first signs of a vocation for the work as soon as they begin to appear. But the real call must come from within: it can only be the work of the Holy Spirit. We cannot forestall

[1] Except, perhaps, for a brief period under David and Solomon, Jerusalem must always have been a poor city. It was never much more than a village, compared with Babylon, or Antioch, or Alexandria, or Corinth, or Rome. The surrounding country was mountainous and barren. It was at some distance from the sea, and had no navigable river, so that it could have little trade. And in the Apostolic Age it must have been almost impossible for any one who was known to be a Christian to obtain employment there. The Jerusalem Christians must have been almost destitute, which explains the exceptional measures which were adopted for their support (Acts ii. 44, 45 and iv. 34, 35). These passages have sometimes been used as an argument for communism as the normal ideal of Christianity. It was merely a temporary expedient to meet an exceptional need, and was not tried elsewhere.

the vocation, or pretend to dispense with it. Only, when it has become plain, we at home are bound to do anything we can to remove any obstacles which might hinder it from being carried into effect, and to ensure that the hearts and minds of all who have been so called may be enlarged to receive the grace of God to the fullest possible extent. It is to be feared that in some cases parents will raise objections, and if they choose to exert their authority over a boy or girl, and refuse to allow them to be trained for missionary service, they cannot be disregarded or overruled. In such cases we can only warn them that they may be found to be fighting against God, and pray that they may be enabled to take a more Christian view of the matter. Speaking generally, it may be laid down that the training of the future missionary should be as wide and deep as possible. We have probably lost a great deal in the past through men whose minds were not sufficiently well trained to obtain any real grasp of the problems to which they had addressed themselves. It is to be feared that the Gospel has suffered grievously in the hands of men who could draw no distinction between an African savage bowing before his fetish and the most intellectual type of Brahmin, but classed both together as heathen, and would have tried to convert both by the same methods.

Every effort should be made to secure a University education—preferably at Oxford, Cambridge, or

Dublin—for the future missionary;[1] and the present writer is of opinion that he should not be encouraged to take his degree in theology. A preliminary course in arts, or some other subject, should be insisted on whenever possible. If the student has any aptitude for natural science, it would be well worth his while to acquire some medical knowledge.

The objection to an exclusively theological course at the University is that it seems to destroy the student's sense of proportion. Theology is the science of the grace of God. It means knowledge of the way in which that grace has been imparted to men at sundry times and in divers manners in the past, knowledge of that grace itself, and lastly knowledge of the means by which it may be brought to bear on human needs at the present time. It must therefore be an inexhaustible study. But personal observation has led me to think that if young men are allowed to devote themselves to it

[1] The training of women missionaries must, of course, be rather different. They cannot be ordained to the ministry of the Church. Presumably they never engage in bazaar preaching, and they cannot be called upon to give judicial decisions on such points as whether any given native custom is an interesting piece of harmless symbolism, or something incompatible with Christianity. Their work must be chiefly preparing native women, to whom male missionaries cannot have access, for baptism and confirmation, or teaching girls in school. In any case it must be carried on under male supervision, so it is doubtful whether the equivalent of a university education is required in their case. The present writer does not feel qualified to express any definite opinion on the whole question.

exclusively from the age of nineteen they often fail to appreciate its greatness. They fail to realize that it is not on the same footing as other studies, and regard it merely as a preparation for their future career instead of the business of their whole life. Thus they are tempted to think that when their degree examination has been safely passed they have done with theology for ever. All cannot become what is meant by "a learned theologian," but it is a grievous thing if any man is ordained to the ministry of the Church without having realized that he has as yet only advanced a very little way in theology, and that it is his life's work to try to progress in the knowledge of the grace of God; in its intellectual as well as in its devotional and administrative aspect.

But if a man takes his degree in some other subject, it means that he does not devote himself exclusively to theology until he has reached the age of twenty-two, or perhaps a little more. His mind is much more mature than at nineteen, and he is beginning to lay aside the schoolboy's belief that a subject can be exhausted in a few courses of lectures. He will have passed through many new experiences during the last three years, and they ought to have altered his whole attitude towards anything which he has to learn. It does not matter much if a missionary is not a sound scholar or an accurate mathematician; but it does matter very much

indeed if he is not a sound and accurate theologian. If he is not that, his labours are likely to end in giving his flock a totally wrong conception of the great Christian doctrines, which will probably result in a disastrous schism when any better equipped teacher comes to take his place. If we can help it, we ought not to risk our missionaries, or any of our clergy, mislearning their theology at the beginning, by allowing them to make it their sole study while their minds are still quite immature. The additional cost involved by the longer training would more than repay itself.

In any case, his training should include a systematic course of comparative religion. During the last few years an immense amount of material relating to primitive religious beliefs has been collected by various scholars. With this the future missionary must have some general acquaintance quite apart from any detailed study of the beliefs of the people amongst whom he is to work. For it is essential that the missionary should be able to take a large view. In common with all other Christians, he must recognize that God has never left Himself without a witness,[1] but hath in every nation them that feel after Him if haply they might find Him,[2] and that there is a Divine Light which lighteth every man[3] coming into the world. But beside this, it falls upon him to try to fasten upon what-

[1] Acts xiv. 17. [2] Acts xvii. 27. [3] S. John i. 9.

ever truth there may be in the beliefs with which he is surrounded. Like S. Paul at Athens, he must make the best of what confronts him. So far as possible he must treat it as a stepping-stone to a more perfect knowledge of God rather than as an enemy to be destroyed. He will not be able to do this unless he has learned something of the ideas which lie at the back of the mind of primitive man, and are more or less clearly expressed by his religious practices.

There are undoubtedly ceremonies[1] and doctrines in other religions which resemble those of Christianity. Such resemblance is, of course, made the most of by those who wish to disparage the Gospel in general and missionary work in particular; and the missionary must always be prepared to deal with such. If he has been accustomed to regard Christianity as something standing entirely by itself, possessing nothing in common with any other creed, he may find these resemblances somewhat disconcerting. They might seriously impair his faith in what he is to teach. But if he has approached the study of comparative religion in a scientific manner, under the guidance of competent teachers, he will find in the resemblances between Christianity and

[1] *e.g.* something akin to our sacramental doctrines seems to exist, or to have existed, in Central America, where it cannot be ascribed to Christian influence. The Buddhist ritual in Thibet has been commented on as suggesting that of the Latin Church. (See p. 89, *note*.)

other creeds the strongest possible proof that God has given a revelation to man. His revelation to the Jews is not the only means by which He has been pleased to make Himself known to us. Other nations, too, have learned something of Him. Nothing shows the divine origin of Christianity so strongly as its comprehensiveness. If it is what it professes to be, it must of necessity have some ideas which exist, albeit in a less fully developed form, in other creeds. It must include all the best and highest that any men have thought of God at any place or time. It must gather up all that is good in any creed, interpret it more perfectly, and develop it more fully. Nothing can enable a man to appreciate the exceeding greatness of God's revelation to us so fully as a knowledge of the religious ideas which have taken shape in the minds of other portions of the human race.[1]

It is probably desirable that every missionary should spend at least a year at some specifically missionary college before going abroad. There he can learn something of the mechanical arts which

[1] To make the *exclusiveness* of Christianity the principal proof of its divine origin is to weaken our own case immensely. This was the common error in the Church of England during the eighteenth century, and made the attack of the Deists possible. The Deists summed up their position in the words, "Christianity as old as the world," believing that if they could show that Christian morality or Christian ideas had existed in any degree before our Lord's time, belief in a divine revelation in the Person of Christ would become impossible. Their orthodox opponents did not see that this was in reality no attack at all.

may be required of him in his new surroundings. It may often be an advantage to him to be able to use an axe, milk a cow, and perform various agricultural tasks.

It may be presumed that most, if not all, of those of whom we have been speaking will spend the greater part of their lives in the mission-field. They have heard the call of the Holy Spirit to this particular work, and find in it a life-long occupation. But beside them there is no reason why the missionary ranks should not be strengthened by a number of "short service" men. It is a common complaint that the younger clergy do not show much readiness to volunteer for service abroad. It is said that they ought to go as readily as soldiers. The comparison is not really a fair one, for the conditions are not at all parallel. The soldier goes with his regiment, and knows that he will return home at the end of a definite number of years, probably with a higher rank, and will continue to follow his profession in a garrison town in England. But the missionary has much less possibility of retreat. If he finds that he is doing no good, he may still be obliged to remain on for want of money to pay his passage home; or, when he does come home, he does not as a rule find it very easy to earn a living in England. It may be discreditable to the Church at home that it should be so, but such is said to be the case. We

do not ask that all difficulties and risks should be removed from the paths of those who have devoted their lives to Christ's service in any capacity, but that their way should not be hindered by unnecessary stumbling-blocks of an economic kind. A great deal is often done financially for men before they are ordained, but the case of the ordained missionary does not seem to have enlisted much sympathy as yet. There are probably many men who are ordained because they believe that they have been truly called to the ministry of the whole Church, who have not felt any special call to any particular branch of the ministry. The work of the Church is divided in various ways, and most men have to find out by experience in what particular direction their own talents can be most usefully employed. This they have to do during the years immediately after their ordination. Few men find the sphere of their life's work in their first curacy or charge. Now it is to be hoped that most of these would be ready to take up missionary work, if such a step were not almost irrevocable. They do not know whether they have been called to that particular part of the ministry or not, but are quite ready to find out by experiment, provided that they were certain of being able to retreat if it should prove not to be their proper sphere. Some no doubt would find in it their life's work; the rest would return to England at the end of three or

five years to resume work there, and their places would be taken by men who had come out on the same understanding. Thus there would be a continual passing to and fro of men between the Home Church and the Mission-field. Each would fill the places which had just been vacated by the other, and it cannot be doubted that the work of the Church at both ends would benefit enormously. The mission-field would receive a continual stream of fresh blood, and the knowledge and ideals of many in the home ministry would be enlarged. It will no doubt be some time before a period of foreign service comes to be regarded as a normal part of a clergyman's career; but it would be much more reasonable to ask that it should be so regarded if provision could be made for it on the economic side.[1]

The most important practical problem which presses on the individual missionary is the question of his relation to other Christians of different communions. Nowhere are our unhappy divisions a

[1] *Per contra* it may be argued that it would be a mistake to demand anything but the highest degree of self-sacrifice from the missionary. The great French missionary society, "La Société des Missions Étrangères," is said never to lack recruits, and it never permits those whom it has accepted to return to their native country for any purpose whatever. But though such a system may work well in a Church where the early training of the clergy is not calculated to develop individuality, it would not suit any English-speaking communion. It is impossible to ascertain what proportion of French missionaries (if any) come to regret their irrevocable choice.

more grievous hindrance to the work than in the mission-field. It is only natural if the heathen decide that they will not pay any attention to the Gospel until we have settled what it is and how it should be taught. It is, however, worth while to remember that this difficulty is no new one. There never was a golden age when all the forces of Christendom were absolutely one. The imposing fabric of mediæval Christianity stood for an ideal which was never realized. From the day when the Judaizing teachers came to Antioch (Acts xv. 1) the Church has always been troubled with internal dissensions, and the temper of the contending parties has often been much worse than it is now. So while we regret the fact, we need not let it discourage us as if it were something altogether modern. Yet we are all bound to do whatever lies in our power towards restoring the broken unity of the Body of Christ. The question must not be degraded to the level of mere expediency. We ought not to desire unity merely because divisions hinder our work, but because disunion is directly contrary to the fundamental principles of Christianity: it is really the negation of our whole position.[1] Yet it would be no advantage to pretend that our differences do not exist, or that they are not important. We are bound to regard them as very important indeed, and the practical question before us all, whether at home

[1] See especially S. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians.

or abroad, is, How far can we unite with members of other communions for any purposes without compromising principles which we hold dear? How is the Churchman to bear himself towards the Congregationalist, or the Baptist towards the Moravian? In some ways the difficulty is likely to become more acute in the mission-field as time goes on. At present it is often possible for missions of different communions not to cross each other's paths. Common courtesy demands that no body shall intrude into a district which is effectively occupied by another. At present there is ample room for us all. But as the work extends and the network of mission stations becomes complete, the unoccupied territory in which any mission can isolate itself will cease to exist. We shall be forced into contact with our neighbours on all sides, and shall be compelled to determine our relations with them. It is impossible to make any definite suggestions as to the lines along which reunion might be achieved, but it may be hoped that the general reunion of all Christendom may be promoted from some distant corner of the mission-field.[1] There the evils of disunion are most apparent, and the memory of ancient quarrels and injustices is not so bitter as in the older countries. Hampering conditions with which we have to struggle at home do not exist. But so far as can

[1] Negotiations for union have been set on foot by the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches of Australia.

be judged at present, the time for definite schemes for reunion has not yet arrived. The desire for it must be stronger and more widely diffused; the vision must have been seen by many before we can hope for any great results. The most that can be done at present is probably to arrive at some general agreement with regard to such things as marriage customs, the relation between the living and the dead, and so on. There are doubtless some heathen social customs incompatible with Christianity, but on the other hand we must guard against trying to enforce European social customs needlessly, in the belief that they are the only ones which ought to be regarded as Christian. We have probably missed many opportunities by presenting Christ to the world in too European a guise,[1] forgetting that, according to the flesh, He was an Asiatic. We have to steer between trying to Europeanize rather than evangelize the world, and letting Christianity be degraded to the level of the people whom it is intended to raise.[2] No doubt it would appear to spread more rapidly if it were allowed to be in harmony with all the social habits of the heathen; but to those who urge such a policy upon us, we can only reply, *Non tali auxilio.*

[1] See a remarkable article called "Interpreting Christ to India," by S. E. Stokes, in "The East and the West," April 1908.

[2] The Abyssinian Church is perhaps the most striking example of the amount of corruption which can be worked into a Church; also of the fact that the veriest dregs of Christianity are better than the new wine of any other creed. (See page 100.)

Yet at the same time we must not forget that marriage—which is likely to be the centre of many missionary difficulties—is older than Christianity. It existed before our Lord's time in its twofold aspect as a legal contract and religious ordinance. Roman law acknowledged three legal forms of wedlock: after one particular ceremony divorce was impossible. Christianity took over to some extent the existing rite, purged it of some gross elements, and invested it with new meaning. But certain pre-Christian ceremonies were retained. The "giving away" of the bride is undoubtedly the relic of the Roman ceremony, *per aes et libram*, when the bride was conveyed to her husband by a mock sale. The veil and orange blossoms represent the wreath and flammeum of the Roman bride; and the use of the ring is a piece of symbolism without any especially Christian significance. We must therefore try to do again for heathen marriage rites what the Church did for the marriage rites of the Roman Empire. The meaning which we attach to marriage is distinctively Christian, and rests upon the authority of our Lord Himself.[1] Therefore it can never alter. But the symbolical rites by which that meaning is expressed are *not* distinctly Christian. They must always be a matter of arrangement, and their exact nature is unimportant, provided always that they do not in any way traverse the Christian ideal.

[1] S. Matthew xix. 5–10.

Again, the light in which the dead are regarded is another source of difficulty.[1] Ancestor-worship is customary in many heathen countries, and cannot of course be sanctioned by the missionary. On the other hand, it is most desirable and truly Christian that we have those who have gone before us in continual remembrance. To do so is to invest the Communion of Saints—a clause which is to be feared means very little to many people—with real meaning. There can be no doubt that religion has suffered in all Protestant countries by neglect of the dead. We have often assumed that the final state of the soul is fixed at the moment of death—an intrinsically improbable view for which the Bible gives no sufficient support whatever.[2] We have been too ready to identify any form of prayer for the dead,[3] or even commemoration of them, with certain unsound views which became prevalent in the Middle Ages, and have never been completely disavowed by the Latin Church. It may be hoped that we shall learn a much-needed lesson from the mission-field in this respect, and certainly we must be careful not to

[1] It is worth while to notice that this has always been the case. See, for example, S. Augustine's "Confessions," bk. vi. ch. 2.

[2] The parable of Dives and Lazarus (S. Luke xvi.) is not to be understood as conveying authoritative detailed information as to what befalls us immediately after death. Our Lord adopted the imagery and language to which His hearers were accustomed.

[3] It is probable that Onesiphorus was dead when S. Paul prayed for him (2 Tim. i. 18). See also 2 Maccabees xii. 43–45. Neither S. Paul or Judas Maccabæus can be called Roman Catholics.

destroy a truly Christian impulse in our converts because it has been misapplied in the past. But it is most important that missionaries of all communions should come to some working agreement as to the attitude which ought to be adopted with regard to such questions.

In conclusion, it may fairly be said that the outlook at the present time is most encouraging—perhaps more encouraging than it has ever been at any other period in the history of the Church. We need now repentance for our shortcomings in the past—and perseverance. We must pray without ceasing, and be instant in season and out of season (*i.e.* persevere whether the cause happens to be fashionable at the moment or not). History shows us that we have no right to expect unbroken success, and no reason to be discouraged at apparent failure. It is our duty steadily to proclaim Christ as the Key to the mystery of existence; to affirm that whatever is noble in any man finds its interpretation and fullest development in Him. We must declare our conviction that Christianity is for all the world, and that the Body of Christ cannot reach its full stature until there is no nation or people which has not been incorporated therein, and that therefore missionary work has an undeniable claim upon all who profess and call themselves Christians. It is our duty to perfect and extend our organization in every way. Much more may be done in the direc-

tion of systematic raising of funds and recruiting of men and women. But in the midst of all the bustle and turmoil which this involves, we must never forget that the work is spiritual, and that there can be no real advance except by spiritual methods: "Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts" (Zechariah iv. 7).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"S. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen." Professor Sir W. Ramsay.

"The Letters to the Seven Churches." Professor Sir W. Ramsay.

"The Church in the Roman Empire down to A.D. 170." Professor Sir W. Ramsay.

"Life and Letters in the Fourth Century." J. R. Glover.

"Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire." S. Dill.

"Confessions of S. Augustine." (Edited by J. Gibb, D.D., and W. Montgomery, D.D.)

"General Church History." A. Neander. (English Translation by J. Torrey.)

"History of the English Church." (Edited by W. R. W. Stephens and W. Hunt.)

"Ireland and the Celtic Church." Professor G. T. Stokes, D.D.

"Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." E. Gibbon. (Edited by Professor J. B. Bury.)

"History of the Eastern Church." A. P. Stanley, D.D.

"Church History—Modern Period." S. Cheetham, D.D.

"Church History—Reformation Period." C. Hardwick. (Edited by W. Stubbs, D.D.)

"The East and the West." (Published Quarterly by the S.P.G.)

"Digest of Records of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel."

"The Evangelization of the World in this Generation." J. R. Mott.

"The Ecclesiastical Expansion of England." Bishop Barry.

"A History of Christian Missions in the Middle Ages." G. F. Maclear, D.D.

"Report of the Pan-Anglican Congress." (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.)

"Religious Progress of the Century." (Edited by W. H. Withrow.)

INDEX

Printed by BALLANTYNE, HANSON & Co.
Edinburgh & London