





BR 45 .H363 v.6
Newbolt, M. R. 1874-1956.
The missionary question

✓
Handbooks of
Catholic Faith and Practice

EDITED BY W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D.

THE MISSIONARY QUESTION

HANDBOOKS OF
CATHOLIC FAITH AND PRACTICE

Cloth, each 3s. net.

- INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF MORAL THEOLOGY.
By the Rev. F. G. BEDTON, B.A.
- MONASTICISM. By the Rev. Father DENYS, M.A.
- CHURCH MUSIC. By the Rev. A. S. DUNCAN-JONES, M.A.
- SOME DEFECTS IN ENGLISH RELIGION. By the Rev. J.
NEVILLE FIGGIS, D.D.
- SACRIFICE, JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN. By the Rev. S. C.
GAYFORD, M.A.
- THE DOCTRINE OF THE MINISTRY. By the Rev. H. F.
HAMILTON, D.D.
- CATHOLIC OR ROMAN CATHOLIC? By the Rev. T. J.
HARDY, M.A. *Second Edition, revised.*
- CONSCIENCE OF SIN. By the Rev. T. A. LACEY, M.A.
- A GENERAL SURVEY OF THE MISSIONARY QUESTION.
By the Rev. M. A. NEWBOLT, M.A.
- REUNION. By the Rev. Canon S. L. OLLARD, M.A.
- THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS. By the Rev. H. LEONARD
PASS, M.A.
- RECENT FRENCH TENDENCIES. By the Rev. G. C. RAWLIN-
SON, M.A.
- CHRISTIANITY AND THE ARTIST. By R. ELLIS ROBERTS.
- THE PRAYER OF CONSECRATION. By the Rev. W. J.
SPARROW SIMPSON. Introduction by the LORD BISHOP OF
OXFORD.
- THE RESERVED SACRAMENT. By the Rev. DARWELL
STONE, D.D. *Second Edition, revised and enlarged.*
- EUCCHARISTIC SACRIFICE. By the Rev. DARWELL STONE, D.D.
- THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE. By the Rev. H. U.
WHELPTON, M.A.
- THE EPISCOPATE AND THE REFORMATION. By the
Rev. Professor J. P. WHITNEY, D.D.
- THE PLACE OF WOMEN IN THE CHURCH.
- THE PLACE OF THE LAITY IN THE CHURCH.

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT,
ROXBURGHE HOUSE, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

THE MISSIONARY QUESTION

BY THE REV.
M. R. NEWBOLT, M.A.

VICAR OF ST. MICHAEL, BRIGHTON, FORMERLY
PRINCIPAL OF DORCHESTER MISSIONARY COLLEGE

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT,
ROXBURGHE HOUSE,
PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:
THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CO.,
MILWAUKEE, WIS.

MCMXVIII

All rights reserved



CONTENTS

	PAGE
I A GENERAL SURVEY OF THE MISSIONARY QUESTION	1
II ROME IN THE MISSION FIELD	12
III PROTESTANTISM IN THE MISSION FIELD	25
IV THE ATTRACTIVE POWER EXERCISED BY PROTESTANTISM ON THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND	37
V THE CATHOLIC SYSTEM AS A MISSIONARY FORCE	47
VI ANGLICANISM IN THE MISSION FIELD	62
VII THE PRAYER BOOK IN THE MISSION FIELD	74
VIII THE SACRAMENT OF Penance IN THE MISSION FIELD	88
IX TRAINING OF MISSIONARIES	98
X THE THEORY OF NATIONAL CHURCHES	120

THE MISSIONARY QUESTION

I

A GENERAL SURVEY OF THE MISSIONARY QUESTION

THE subject of the missionary work of our Church is bound sooner or later to bring us up in a very practical way against the sad fact of the divisions of Christendom. Sooner or later this grievous difficulty is bound to confront us; it is an inevitable problem that lies ahead, demanding our consideration, in any schemes we formulate, in any hopes we dream or see for the conversion of the world to Christ.

No longer can Christendom as a united body face outwards from one centre, as did the first disciples from Jerusalem, to carry the one witness to the one faith to "all Judaea and Samaria and unto the uttermost parts of the earth."

Nor is it honest in the face of facts to pretend to ourselves that we can do so. We must confront the sad circumstances as they are, remembering with sorrow that the sin of man has produced them, remembering also that the overruling mercies of

God can, out of all man-made confusion, bring eventual victory and peace, and can build up his heavenly kingdom in spite of our apparently irreconcilable dissensions.

There is an ideal which we must never allow to vanish from our mind, and that is the hope of the ultimate reunion of the Holy Catholic Church militant here on earth. To despair of it, to cease to pray and work for it, to acquiesce in our present division, to come to think of it as something inherent in the necessary order of things, far more so to look upon it as a sign of vitality, or a convenient adaptation of religion to the diverse idiosyncrasies of national genius or of types of human personality is to be unfaithful to the central claim of the Christian faith.

But while we are loyal to this ideal and this hope, we owe an equal loyalty to truth, and an equal obligation honestly to face the facts. To ignore our divisions, to profess, under the impulse of a generous-hearted charity, to start hand in hand upon the task of the conversion of the heathen world with those whose ultimate aim really differs from our own, whose conception of the faith which we are to promulgate, and of the methods whereby the kingdom of God is to be built up, is not the same as that which we hold to be the truth; this is to ignore the consequences of man's sin, and treat what is as if it were not.

We cannot stroll back into the lost Paradise of Christian unity by merely pretending that the flaming sword that guards the gates is no longer

there. The Church must tread a long and thorny way before that lost unity is once more regained.

Soloviev, the great Russian thinker who made his submission to the Church of Rome, seems to have had a premonition of the great effect that world-wide war would have upon the future of the Church on earth. Writing before the war broke out, he sketched a striking picture, fantastic, but concealing much that is serious and thoughtful under its apocalyptic form, of the future course of the world's history. "The twentieth century after the birth of Christ," he begins, "was the period of the last great wars, civil dissensions and revolutions." He imagines a great world war in which Europe is conquered and overrun by the races of the Farther East. Beneath that invasion, and the consequent domination of Europe by the Mongol, Christendom shrinks in his vision to a comparatively small number of people, less numerous but more faithful than to-day.

When Europe re-emerges from the sway of the Mongol national distinctions have practically ceased to exist in it. There emerges a great United States of Europe, who come to live in an era of unexampled material prosperity: "an equality of general repletion," under one ruler who is Antichrist. Christendom, as he imagines it, consists at the time only of the Roman Church, the Orthodox Church, and Protestantism. Anglicanism has been absorbed, chiefly into the Church of Rome.

And at the end of his imaginary reconstruction of the future, all Christendom, represented by its

three great leaders, confronts the Antichrist of materialism, who has summoned them to a general council at Jerusalem. Here, after a struggle of a fantastic and apocalyptic character in which the aforesaid leaders suffer grievously at the hands of the prince of this world, the bishop who represents Orthodoxy and the professor who stands for Protestantism make their submission to the Pope, saying *Tu es Petrus*, and the Pope leads the attenuated remnant of the Christian flock into the wilderness.

The only reason for quoting this strange and fanciful dream is that it presents a picture of the reunion of Christendom, and of Christendom reunited under the Pope. It is written by a deep thinker who was himself in sympathy with the Papal claims ; yet it seems to show that the only way in which he could conceive of a Christendom reunited under the Papacy was as a small and persecuted remnant of mankind. With all his enthusiasm for the see of Peter, the great Russian thinker cannot picture the Vicar of Christ as ruling a world-wide Church in security and splendour from the Vatican, only as leading a faithful remnant into the wilderness.

We also with less of the licence of poetic imagination, and in a more prosaic spirit, need to look forward into the future and to take long views, seeking to form some estimate of what the world is likely to become some centuries hence, and to speculate whither those roads are leading in which our feet stand to-day.

Too often our missionary efforts are based on a

short-sighted policy, or on no policy at all. We live from hand to mouth, caught by the mere interest and glamour of missionary work, and we speak of carrying the gospel to the heathen without always holding a sufficiently clear conception of the content of the gospel which we mean to carry. We set out to found a Church upon some unfamiliar portion of the map without pausing long to ask whether any other body of Christians are working there, or whether if that be the case, we of the Church of England have any reasonable warrant for taking our Church to that country, or any hope (and if so, what hope?) for her future there.

Missionary literature and missionary speeches mean to us more than anything else a description of unfamiliar lands, of strange native customs and religions, of scenery and climate.

All these things are dealt with in detail, but the writer or the speaker is generally content either to take our duty as a Church of carrying the gospel and our own Church polity to that land for granted, or to urge us to it in the most general terms.

And, indeed, so long as vast regions of the world remain as virgin soil it is possible to be content with nothing more than this. So long as we can say of any country, "It is true that there are Roman Missions there, and also Protestant Missions, but they have but touched the fringe of a vast heathen population," we can be content to leave the matter vague. It may be the case to-day that there is room for all, with only very little overlapping, and the work cries out for every possible extra helper.

If so we have not really got to face the question, "Why should the Church of England, as the Church of England, with her own formularies and her own peculiar features go to this country?"

But the question is only postponed, and some day it must be answered; we must be preparing a reply.

The time is coming and may arrive more rapidly than we suppose, when there will be no more blank spaces on the missionary map of the world, when all the territory is staked out and many claims overlap perhaps three deep, and Roman, Protestant and Anglican missionaries are competing as close neighbours. What is likely to become more and more common in the future may be gathered from the following extract from a little book called *The Open Sore of Christendom*, by the Rev. W. J. Sexton. "Dr. Thornton, formerly Bishop of Ballarat in Australia, once said that in almost every township there were at least five separate houses of prayer, where five very scanty congregations assembled, and were ministered to by five underpaid ministers, who rode on five underfed horses to preach what is substantially the same gospel." He also quotes a missionary in Ceylon who writes, "In one small station after another you will find, besides the Roman Catholics, two Christian bodies with rival churches and rival schools." Perhaps the phrase "substantially the same gospel" may cover too lightly a real difficulty, and the implication of the phrase "besides the Roman Catholics" may strike us as unpleasantly characteristic of a certain school

of missionary thought ; but the broad facts are plain.

Let us therefore set ourselves to ask, what is the distinctive contribution which the Church of England, or that part of the Catholic Church which is in communion with the see of Canterbury, has to offer to the great task of converting the world to Christ. What do we mean to do in the Mission Field ?

If we could put ourselves in the position of a devout and thoughtful Roman Catholic missionary in China and imagine his perplexity at our presence, should we have any arguments that would seem convincing to our own minds to justify our presence in a land where Roman Catholic Missions are so strong and vigorous and our own so small and weak ?

Or more appropriately still, we may try to put ourselves in the place of an educated and thoughtful Chinaman who is drawn towards Christianity, yet hesitates between the various forms in which he sees it presented to him.

He sees Rome and what she has to offer, her sacramental life, her continuity with antiquity, her world-wide communion of so many ancient civilizations ; he sees Protestantism with its greater intellectual freedom, its laxer discipline, its attractive connection with so much that is representative of the more liberal and progressive forces of modern civilization ; and he sees the Church of England. What has she to offer him which neither of the other so sharply differentiated forms of Christianity can give ? Remember, we must disencumber our own minds, in giving him an answer, of much that

may seem obvious to ourselves. He has different preconceived ideas and prejudices, as deeply seated possibly as are our own, but totally different. He cares little for the fires of Smithfield, or the Spanish Armada, nor do his ideas of "superstition" march exactly with our own.

There are many answers that may be given. Perhaps the commonest is that which we have already touched upon. It is the simplest statement of mere missionary duty: the mere task of proselytizing, of bringing souls into the net. On this view every missionary who labours in the name of Christ is considered as a unit engaged upon the same great task; the sea of heathenism is wide enough for all nets to be let down into it, and every convert adds to the sum total of potentially redeemed humanity.

But on this theory there must inevitably arrive a point at which the distinctive differences of Christianity become a positive hindrance.

If the sole task of *Ecclesia Anglicana* were to add her quota to the mass of those who profess and call themselves Christians, this task would be performed more effectively and with far less friction if she were content to merge her distinctive existence in that of one of the two larger bodies, Rome or Protestantism. But this she cannot do without being unfaithful to her trust.

There are also those who adopt a more modern, more subtle and elusive theory. The advocates of this view, an instance of whom is Mr. Bernard Lucas, author of *Our Task in India*, decry prose-

lytizing altogether. The test of successful missionary work, according to them, is not the mere multiplication of individual converts but the gradual permeation of national thought by Christian ideals. On this theory the conversion of single individuals here and there, with the inevitable consequence to the convert of persecution, or at least of a sudden and painful break with all his national and family environment, is not the best method of spreading the gospel. Rather we should promote a general "spiritual uplift," a gradual enlightenment of public opinion, whereby the national consciousness may move as one great body towards the beliefs and ideals of the Christian faith. Concerning this we may believe that something of the sort is taking place. The East is awakening, and Africa is awakening, to the influence of the thought of the West, which Western thought is built upon some kind of Christianity. But whether the result of the movement or of missionary zeal which deliberately works only on these lines will be anything that bears any resemblance to historic Christianity is most doubtful. All the signs point rather to the growth of heresies more strong and more antagonistic to the gospel than any that the world has ever seen. The strength of Theosophy in India alone is most significant of this. Nothing is more likely than that Indian thought may seek to combine much of Christian ethic, even of Christian belief and terminology with ancient Indian religion; it is most probable that China in her own way may move on similar lines.

But this can never be the gospel. Nor does the experience of history allow us to believe that any man can ever give himself to Christ without that sharp renunciation of the past, that clear and distinct cleavage between the "old man" and the new which conversion has always involved, and baptism has produced and symbolized.

The Church of England does not go into the Mission Field merely to amass a number of converts somehow, and so to help to swell the census figures of "Christianity" among the religions of the world. Nor does she go forth to dilute the crude and imperfect religious thought of the non-Christian world with an infusion of Christian ethics and philosophy. She has a more definite and precious contribution to offer than either of these alternatives, a contribution which she is in a peculiarly favourable position to give. She can offer to the world, if she wills to do so, the Catholic faith in its fullness and purity, enshrined in a corporate body, the Church. And she can offer Catholic order and discipline based not on the Papacy, but on the Episcopate. And this corporate body finds expression for its message in all that concerns the presentment of truth to mankind, not through one divinely inspired head, but through "the gradually swelling murmur of thoughtful and earnest men," as the Holy Spirit, working naturally and freely in the corporate life of the body, guides it to all truth.

In the following chapters we will try to expand this thought. But for the present we would claim that our missionaries go out, not merely as competi-

tors, friendly or rival, in the great race for gathering multitudes of non-Christians into the various forms of Christianity (though it is far better to win souls than to enlighten a national consciousness, or contribute to a vague "spiritual uplift"), but they go with a definite polity to found. It is in their power to plant the Catholic Church of all the ages, freed from much that is of later and non-Catholic growth, from many forces that cripple and restrain her spiritual and intellectual development. They go carrying with them the treasures of the mysteries of Christ, of which they are stewards, and the Episcopate which is the guardian and assurance of those treasures of God's grace. In spite of her internal dissensions, her small size and her great weakness, the Church of England holds, if she will use it, the key to the conversion of the world. This is not to say that she is perfect, nor superior in faithfulness or zeal or virtue to any other Christian body. It is only to say that she possesses a unique gift if she will use it, that she bears within her the germ of vast possibilities for the future blessing of the nations of the earth.

II

ROME IN THE MISSION FIELD

THERE was a custom once, in popular magazines, of presenting tables of statistics in pictorial form in order to impress upon the eye the relative proportions of various subjects under discussion, such as the amount of beef eaten by a normal person in his lifetime, represented by a diminutive picture of a man side by side with an enormous ox. One such picture represented the proportionate size of the various armies of the world by means of a row of different sized soldiers each in his national uniform. At one end of the line stood the Russian, overtopping all the rest by head and shoulders and with an important figure in some millions written at his foot. Far down among the minuter figures of the smaller nations was a little British soldier, representing our own standing army.

In the particular instance the comparison suggested may have been more picturesque than trustworthy, for the war has taught us that the mere numbers of potential soldiers and the number that can be equipped and mobilized do not by any means necessarily correspond.

Nevertheless we could wish that all students of Missions had some such chart always before their eyes. One can never form a just estimate of what Christian Missions mean in any world-wide view of them unless one keeps steadily in the mind's eye a sense of relative proportion. And the salient fact of any such comparison is the enormous size and widespread area of the Roman Catholic Church. In any table of pictorial statistics the Missions of that Church would overtop the rest by far more than the Russian soldier in the chart we speak of, for her Missions are greater than those of all other denominations of Christians put together. Nor is their preponderance a merely paper one; it cannot be said to be such that on examination it would prove to be more nominal than actual. Obviously it would be impossible and worse than useless to apply any criterion of spiritual reality, or to ask what proportion of Roman Catholics are true and living members of Christ, or how far they show in their lives and conversation the genuineness of their professed religion. We could not apply this test to any body of men; we should have the greatest reluctance to see it applied to ourselves.

If we employ the more natural criterion of asking ourselves how far this vast body of Christians are knit together into one homogeneous whole, how far they realize their union by such tests as submission to the Pope, by being subject to ecclesiastical discipline and accepting the main truths of religion as inculcated by the Church, we shall not see much shrinkage in the imposing figure.

In fact it ill becomes us of the Church of England to make any criticism of that kind, for there is probably no religious body in the world which contains so large a proportion of merely "paper members," or entirely nominal adherents, as ourselves.

Yet there is a curious reluctance on the part of English students of Missions to see this great numerical preponderance of Roman Catholic missions. In some cases there seems to be even an unwillingness to admit them as Christians at all, and converts from Romanism are enumerated by Protestant missionary associations side by side with converts from paganism.

Other less bigoted writers on missionary topics give the impression that they are negligible, or, at any rate fail utterly to show the proportion they should occupy in an impartial study of the whole field to be surveyed. We have in mind a recent authoritative volume on *Christian Missions*, which manifests this tendency very markedly. The casual reader would gain a very false impression if he supposed that Roman Catholic Missions filled a place in the world corresponding to the space allowed to them in the book. Roman Missions if treated "to scale" would have required more than one extra volume of equal size to themselves.

We may disagree with Roman Catholic Missions; we may even dislike them; but they are there, and no sort of useful purpose is served by ignoring their importance and their size.

Let us take India as an example. The total

number of Christians in all India according to the last census returns (1911) was 3,574,770. Of these the Roman Catholic Church claimed 1,806,854 (including something less than half a million Uniats). This is more than half the total Christian population of India. Non-episcopal Christianity or Protestantism comes next with a combined total of 1,062,688. Anglicans and Syrian Christians contribute the remaining totals, *viz.*, the Church of England 332,807, and Syrian Christians (Jacobite, Reformed, Chaldaean) 315,157. (The Christians in the native states are omitted from the separate totals for the various denominations, but included in the grand total for all India.) Included under the head of non-episcopal Christianity are six denominations: Baptists, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, and the Salvation Army, one of which alone, the Baptists, numbers nearly as many adherents as the Church of England, *viz.*, 332,171, compared with our 333,807.

These figures contain much food for thought, but the two main points which seem most pertinent to our present consideration are, first, that Roman Catholicism is the religion of the majority of all Indian Christians, and secondly, that the Missions of our own Church have hitherto been comparatively unfruitful. Side by side with Romans and Protestantism they look minute. Indian Christians in communion with ourselves (of whom many are distinctly of the Low Church party, and approximate to Protestantism in their ideals) number three hundred thousand odd; those of other communions

exceed three million two hundred thousand.

In China, according to the census of 1913, there were about a million and a half Christians, of whom the total number of Anglicans and Protestants combined amounted to less than a quarter of a million of communicant Christians, the remaining million and a quarter being Romanists. Should we gather that this was the case from the literature we are accustomed to read on Chinese Missions? Do we realize that the total number of Anglicans is only 28,317, divided among seven dioceses?

Nor are the facts about the Roman Catholic Church in our colonies always seen in fair proportion. The figures for Canada are complicated by the French-Canadian Provinces, which are almost exclusively Roman Catholic, but the fact remains that the Roman Catholic Church is more than twice as large as any other religious body in Canada. The census for 1911 gives more than eighty religious bodies in Canada, the smallest of which, "The Exclusive Brethren," numbered only fourteen adherents. But out of these emerge four bodies, the Roman Catholics, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and the Anglicans, of which the Roman Church is by far the largest, with two million eight hundred thousand odd adherents, and the Anglican the smallest, with one million forty-three thousand.

More than a fifth but less than a quarter of the population of Australia is Roman Catholic. Not only in regard to their size, but in their wide dispersion over all parts of the world, do Roman Catholic Missions command respect and admiration.

It has been pointed out that of every twenty-one workers in the Mission Field, fourteen are Roman Catholics, six are Protestants, and one only is contributed by the Anglican communion. This refers to missionaries only; if the size of the corporate body is considered the preponderance of Rome is seen to be greater still. And, as we have said, the Anglican student of missionary work is oddly reluctant to admit or face this fact. Sometimes when it is brought home to him he will quote, apparently as reasons explaining this preponderance away, the fact that Roman Missions are more ancient than our own, that Christianity has been preached in Goa since the early days of the sixteenth century, that Roman missionaries are content with a simpler and poorer style of living than our own, that they are celibates, or that in some cases, such as the White Fathers, or *Missionarii Africani*, they go to the Mission Field never to return, even for furlough, but die in the country.

These facts, indeed, go to account for part of their success, but they can convey no cause for self-congratulation to our minds.

The true state of the case, to which it is folly to close our eyes, is that both in efficiency, experience, size, and devotion the Roman Catholic Church is far and away the greatest missionary body in Christendom. And Rome has the great secret of individual missionary work, training her converts from infancy, and labouring patiently with single souls.

Criticism of many kinds might justly be levelled

against their work. Possibly if Anglican Missions were upon the same vast scale, and our missionary workers recruited from so many classes and nationalities of men, our own faults and errors would loom more largely than they do. But here and now let us content ourselves with one point only, that of the question of Papal Supremacy. And in order to do this let us exercise a little imagination, for missionary study, if it has any value, must concern itself with far-off ideals, with the goal, however distant, towards which the Church is working, and the hope she longs to see some day realized in fact.

To the truly missionary-hearted Christian the Church of to-day must appear a child in its infancy, not a Church "far down the ages now, her journey wellnigh done," but a youthful body showing the latent promise of future full-grown strength.

Such is the Church in Africa and Asia, an infant just beginning to stretch tiny limbs. We have no reason to suppose that Europe stands at the acme of the human race, or that our civilization which has burst into the flame of this appalling war represents the best contribution which the sons of men can make towards the building up of the Body of Christ. We are quite as much justified in believing that the Church is only at the beginning, not near the end, of her history here on earth.

Now the claims of the Roman Catholic Church are quite exclusive. From her point of view those who would profess and call themselves Christians must either make their submission to the Papal

claims as they are stated by her to-day or stand outside the pale.

On other points she is more yielding than we always realize. She permits to the Uniat Churches a married clergy (though not the marriage of those already in holy orders), vernacular liturgies and varieties of local rite.

The Uniats comprise Churches that follow twelve local rites: Armenian, Coptic, Abyssinian, Greek, Melchite, Roumanian, Bulgarian, Ruthenian, Syriac, Chaldaean, Maronite, and Malabar, and it is claimed that their adherents total in all some six and a half millions, or half a million short of the population of Canada.

But upon one point she is inexorable, and that is the supremacy of the Pope, not merely as a Patriarch, *primus inter pares*, but as supreme, without appeal, over all the faithful. He must be recognized by all who belong to the Church as recognized by Rome as the Vicar of Christ, and the visible head of the whole Church Militant. His jurisdiction, resting on divine right, is a real sovereign and independent power. None may review the judgment of the Apostolic See, or pass judgment on its decisions. This is defined as the teaching of the Catholic Church, and no one can deviate from it without the loss of his salvation. Nor does the authority extend only to matters of faith and morals, but also to those matters which relate to the discipline and government of the whole Church.

Once again, let us keep in mind the ideals towards which we are working, the direction of those paths

in which our feet stand to-day. The hope which a consistent Roman Catholic must hold is nothing short of this: that every soul on earth shall be brought into one great communion co-extensive with the race, and all as one united body submissive to the Papal claims and governed by the Roman See.

Is this a conceivable ideal? Could we set this as a hope before us? Can so colossal a theory be visualized, far less carried out into fact?

Certainly we may truly say at present that such an idea is outside the range of practical politics. It is a dream that the most enthusiastic Papalist probably spends little time upon: a nightmare, if you will, that never causes the most timid Protestant to lose his sleep at night. But so is the conversion of the world a dream. And it is only in these terms that to a Roman Catholic the conversion of the world can be envisaged. Soloviev, as we have seen, could picture to himself all Christendom reunited under the representative of Peter. But the Church he saw was not a world-wide kingdom; there was no vision of "the earth full of the glory of God as the waters cover the sea," but a dream of a persecuted remnant at war with a materialistic world power; not ruled by a Pope enthroned in all the splendours of the Vatican, but led by him into the wilderness, weak, persecuted, and despised by men.

At the present time, when Roman Catholicism is in practice only one form of Christianity among many, the Papacy works. Its very strength lies in its dignified claim to a position which the world

denies it. But should that position ever be grasped and perfectly attained the Papacy would perish by the very weight of its attainment.

The position demanded by the Papal claims is such that with every accession of power to the Roman Catholic Church the person of the Pope must be withdrawn into a deeper seclusion of unapproachable mystery and must be elevated to a higher pinnacle of unique responsibility.

Yet even in this day of small things, when the Pope is an object of reverence only to the members of a limited, if vast, communion, a closer knowledge of the Papal court usually brings a sense, not of added reverence, but of disillusionment. Those who have the opportunity to know, who "are admitted to the deepest corridors of the Vatican," often bring tidings of little else but obscure intrigues between rival Italian cardinals, or unedifying tales of the wirepulling of ecclesiastical politics and diplomacy. The atmosphere revealed by such books as Mr. Purcell's *Life of Manning* shocks us by its contrast with the high supernatural claims made by the Papacy. In the entourage of an Italian Patriarch this state of things might seem not unnatural, in the Papal court as the Papacy now exists, it seems distressing, the thought that from such a centre should radiate the infallible headship and authority of a Church coterminous with all mankind is an impossible one.

To many minds the severest blow which has been sustained by the Papacy will seem to be that inflicted by the war. Here again the test is not

one of theory but fact, the appeal is not one of interpretation of vexed points of theology or Scripture, but to life.

What do we see in fact to correspond with those great claims so lately and so solemnly asserted? We might have expected to see a servant of God who feared neither emperors nor princes, who was ready to risk everything for righteousness, who would make his voice heard in the cause of the weak and the oppressed, in the face of anything that man or devil could do against him. But we have heard no such voice. Whatever the Pope may do or say before this war is ended, when the decision of the contest lies in doubt no longer, history will have but one verdict on his attitude when the brute forces of triumphant wickedness first broke loose.

That which is least admirable in the Roman Catholic Church as we know it to-day is the love of power, whether temporal or spiritual power.

She has seen the vision of the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them, and has built up a conception of spiritual dominion, grandiose indeed and fascinating, but in its essence a worldly ideal clad in a spiritual garb.

This love of power runs into all her activities, and reappears in many unexpected forms (it may be noticed in her occasional use of unscrupulous diplomacy in the competing interests of the Mission Field), and disfigures much that is beautiful, noble, and self-sacrificing in her work for God.

The inevitable consequence would seem to be,

that every increase of her dominion (we can hardly use another word) must of itself minister to this lust for power, and by so ministering to it must eventually weaken progressively the very central foundation stone upon which her ecclesiastical system rests.

God speaks in history and leads and guides man by it. And there can be no doubt that the present war takes shape more and more as a contest between the democratic and the autocratic ideals. Whatever the result there can be no doubt which of these ideals is on the side of good.

The fall of the Russian Imperial system marks an epoch ; it is a manifestation of autocracy in feeble hands, foolish, weak and inconceivably injurious to mankind. We see in the dust and crash of its fall how inherently rotten and corrupt it was. The German Empire is a picture of absolutism in strong and capable hands, presenting the phenomenon of an autocracy devoting all the resources of thought, progress and civilization to one unswerving purpose through generations, and that purpose its own aggrandisement. Monarchy, as the British genius has evolved it, as a symbolic focus of the loyalty of scattered continents, is another thing. But the Papal autocracy is an autocracy of jurisdiction and of execution, liable, as all such concentrations of actual and real power in the hands of one man must always be, to boundless potentialities of evil. The centralization of machinery in one point, marked as it has been for so long by extreme intellectual rigidity in all that touches the development of

thought, must of itself prove a fruitful source of difficulty, even of downright disaster.

The Head of the Church, as Fr. Waggett is reported to have said, must be in another element from the Body, even as the swimmer's head is in the air while his limbs are in the water. The true Head of the Body is Christ. He is the Church's King reigning at the right hand of God. The Church must always be a Body knit together in one corporate union, one in faith, in discipline and sacramental life, linked on to her Head as one great organism; and an essential part of her organic structure is her hierarchy. But she does not gain but loses by seeking to develop the Chief Bishop of that earthly hierarchy into an earthly Head. Her "great High Priest over the house of God" is Jesus.

Grand as the theory of the modern Papacy is, attractive as it is to many types of mind, it is a perilous theory, impossible to carry to its logical conclusion in the distant future.

And as we see it here and now it does not stand the test of facts.

III

PROTESTANTISM IN THE MISSION FIELD

AFTER the great body of missionary effort put forth by the Church of Rome we must next consider the work of Protestant Missions. This is no easy matter, for the subject is large and complicated, and our judgment is apt to be confused by the fact that the Church of England has to a certain extent shared the use of some of the methods and machinery of these Missions. There has not been here anything like the same sharp line of separation as exists between ourselves and Rome, and one result of this closer approach to co-operation has been to give us an exaggerated idea of the comparative bulk of non-Roman Catholic missionary work. The nearness of the view distorts perspective.

Soloviev imagined a future and far distant time when Rome, Orthodoxy, and Protestantism would be the sole surviving forms of Christianity. Mistaken as we believe his view of our own future history to be, we can follow him in looking upon Protestantism as one body. Of course the Missions of the various Protestant denominations have nothing

like the same homogeneous character as those of Rome, they do not form one organic whole. But they possess already so much that is common to one another, they produce so similar a result, they share so strongly marked a common atmosphere, that one is quite justified in considering them under one head.

In our imaginary row of proportionately sized figures the Roman Church would come first, as by far the tallest, and Protestantism would be shown next, not as a row of small figures of similar appearance, but as one great figure, a composite figure of Allied Protestant Forces, smaller indeed than Rome, but far overshadowing the Church of England.

The movement towards reunion between Dissenting bodies is becoming more and more marked in our own country. In Canada the three greatest Protestant bodies, the Congregationalists, the Methodists, and the Presbyterians (with a minority of dissidents in the last-named body), are only waiting for the necessary legislation to be secured before they merge into organic union in "The United Church of Canada," a body which, without the addition of smaller communions which may very likely be attracted by its mass, will be more than twice the numbers of our own Church in Canada, and only second in size to the Roman Church in that country. The whole trend of the times is towards Pan-Protestant reunion. "There are hundreds of Protestant Churches," said Dr. Mirbt, speaking for German Missions at the Edinburgh Conference, "and no one can tell how many more

will arise. . . . Nevertheless Protestant Missions show when compared with Catholic Missions a relative uniformity."

Moreover, it is in the Mission Field that Protestantism is seen at its best, its missionary zeal is its greatest glory. And it is in the Mission Field that influences of many kinds are drawing the various Protestant bodies into a close and ever closer union.

If France is the nation which leads the way in the Missions of the Roman Church, the nation that deserves to be considered as the most prominent among Protestant missionary forces is America. Probably the modern American is more enthusiastic about the great work than the man of any other nationality in the world. I once heard two men, both of them great travellers, talking together. One of them prefaced a story of a voyage from Africa with the words, "Some men were talking in the smoke room about Missions." "Americans?" said the other. "Of course," he replied; "English don't talk about Missions." The rather unpleasant millionaires who figure in the stories of O. Henry are as liberal to Missions as they are to universities or Universal Benevolent Associations. The English caricaturist who wished to produce a convincing picture of this type of *nouveau riche* would not represent him as drawing enormous cheques for "The Amalgamated Missionary Society for the Conversion of the Koreans." We wonder with some envy in this country, which possesses so vast a colonial empire, why this should be so. Yet

the amazing fashion in which missionary enterprise has captured the hearts of Americans is no longer so astonishing when we appreciate the work that has been done to educate Christian opinion in that continent on the subject.

To attempt to give any kind of sketch of the results achieved in the Mission Field at large by Protestants would be wellnigh impossible. Figures are here particularly misleading, for not all of these bodies reckon their converts in the same way. Some draw distinction between converts and adherents, others do not, and some aim definitely at methods of general uplift which are not expected to yield immediate results in the way of actual conversions.

Bishop Montgomery reckoned in 1902 that of non-Roman missionaries all branches of the Anglican Church and Churches in full communion with her claimed one-fifth, and of adherents one-seventh of the whole.

But it will best answer our purpose, which is to see our own Church's contribution in its true proportion, if we confine ourselves to home organization and to the amount of energy put forth in educating public opinion, in recruiting missionary workers, and in prayer. We may be sure that this energy exercised at home produces a proportionate effect in the actual work all over the world.

And few things are more striking in the history of modern Christianity than the admirable work done for the missionary cause by these bodies separated from the Catholic Church.

The leaders of this movement have the inestimable gift of imagination, and that best form of imagination which knows how to translate its vision into activity.

It is just the lack of this great quality from which our own Church seems to suffer. "We can get romance," says Fr. Adderley, "with the Roman and the Russian Churches, even with Puritanism, and Quakerism, and the Salvation Army, but hardly with latter-day Anglicanism. I defy any one to write a readable novel about a jolly young heretic who went out to the war a pagan and came back a member of St. Peter's, Eaton Square." We can see what he means. Our eyes have not been opened to the romance of religion, and it is partly because our young men have not been shown what worlds there are to conquer, what dragons to be slain in distant lands beyond the sea.

But Protestantism has found Romance; Missions have opened the magic casement for her, and the vision has breathed into her a veritable breath of life.

Listen to Dr. John R. Mott, that prophetic personality who sums up in himself so much of this new spirit, and who has more authority than any other man to speak for Protestant Missions: "We are living at the most dangerous time in the history of the world. This is due to the shrinkage of the world caused by the greatly improved means of communication. In many ways the whole world is smaller now than that part of the United States east of the Mississippi River was a century ago. It is, indeed, one great community; it has become

a whispering gallery. As a result the nations and races have been brought into the most intimate contact. This has led to great perils." How absolutely true this is! One may meet to-day a man from Ontario travelling to Leicester to meet his brother just back from a military prison in Bagdad, and not think it unusual. And Dr. Mott is not content with mere large visions. His voice has made itself loudly heard in that whispering gallery which he calls the world. Not only in America and in Europe, but in Constantinople, in Cairo, in India, China, Japan, and Korea, he has addressed enormous audiences and has obtained a hearing for the Gospel where only a few years ago the attempt to do so would have been madness. And everywhere he proclaims the Deity of Christ. Yet so thoroughly does he represent interdenominationalism that few could tell one to what body of Christians he belongs.

Imaginative power of vision is much, but it is not enough. Almost more remarkable is the zeal for knowledge. It would obviously be untrue to say that there was anything distinctively Protestant or even missionary about the Study Circle method. Yet it would be unfair to fail to recognize that this clever educational system had its origin in the zealous friends of Missions in America. The members of the Young People's Missionary Movement in America realized the possibilities of the scheme, they sent a Biblical Professor to Africa for three months, and the first Study Circle volume was published in 1905 as a result of his tour.

Since that time the number and circulation of such books has been immense. *The Uplift of China*, *The Desire of India*, *The Reproach of Islam* are titles well known to us all.

Dr. Mott's famous book *The Decisive Hour of Christian Missions* has had a huge circulation; and in the single year 1910 no less than 50,000 copies of these various textbooks were sold in Great Britain alone.

There are other agencies engaged on the same task. There is, for instance, the United Council for Missionary Education, now amalgamated with the Young People's Missionary Movement (which last-named society was inaugurated by the Free Churches in London in 1894). The output of missionary books for juniors printed by this society amounts to over 102,000 volumes. The International Mission Study Bulletin for May, 1914, says: "It is becoming more and more recognized that missionary education is absolutely necessary to Church efficiency, and in America steps are being taken to ensure this by the Missionary Education Movement." Missionary debates, clubs, study classes, meetings, essays, vacation conferences, etc., are features of this work, and the sale of adult textbooks and reference library volumes under the auspices of this Movement in America was over a million and a quarter during the years 1902-13.

In relation with the forces we have noticed should be seen the Student Christian Movement.

It may have come as a surprise to us that in the scheme for a Representative Church Council put forth

by the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State a suggestion should be made that students (by which term is meant "the large and increasing body of young men and women at Universities and University Colleges, and members of the staffs of Universities, Colleges and schools") should, together with "wage earners," be adequately represented on the Council which is intended to secure a measure of self-government for the Church.

No stronger proof could be needed of the respect with which the Student Movement is regarded in responsible quarters.

It makes its appeal, not to members of any one denomination, but to students as a class; it finds its original justification in the lack of any religious provision for the needs of students in modern universities; it has proved its worth by its phenomenal success. And it has grown out of the association known as the Student Volunteer Missionary Union. The Student Movement as a whole makes a strong appeal to young men and women at the most impressionable period of life, it makes full use of the spirit of *camaraderie* among students, it is widely international, and it allows considerable freedom for differences of religious outlook.

But the Student Volunteer Missionary Union, which is associated with it, lifts the whole movement on to a higher plane than a mere society for discussion or devotion. It is comparatively easy to blow youthful enthusiasm into a flame, but unless the flame has something on which to feed it may burn itself out. Opportunities for translating all

their energy into action are at home comparatively vague, limited and overcrowded. The S.V.M.U. (to call it by its familiar initials) throws open the doors to the limitless possibilities and the overpowering need of the Mission Fields of all the world.

The basis of membership is a declaration signed by every member: "It is my purpose, if God permit, to become a foreign missionary." And its watchword is: "The Evangelization of the World in this generation."

Here again we see the large idealism and the energy of America as a factor in the situation.

The movement, which may be said to date its origin from 1884 when the band of men known as The Cambridge Seven, led by two well-known University athletes, Mr. Stanley Smith and Mr. C. T. Studd, volunteered for missionary work, owed its revival and reconstruction on its present lines in no small measure to the American Volunteer Movement and its founder, Mr. Wilder, of Princeton University, who came over to England and visited several Universities in 1892.

The annual conventions at Swanwick serve to keep the various branches of the movement in touch, and provide a centre where all its members can meet for mutual intercourse, discussion, and prayer.

The total membership is 4,905. The total number who have sailed for the Mission Field is 2,195, of whom 529 have gone to Church of England Societies (C.M.S., S.P.G., C.E.Z.M.S., U.M.C.A., S.A.M.S.), and the remaining 1,666 are divided

amongst some ten or twelve non-episcopal bodies. The total number of students in Universities and University Colleges in Great Britain and Ireland before the war was 45,000. Now it is 25,000, the majority of whom are of course under military age, or women.

It will be seen that this is a movement that cuts across denominational divisions, and strictly speaking it cannot be classed as Protestant. But in view of its origin, and of the fact that Protestants form the large majority of its total members, we may consider it under this head.

Last but not least among the evidences of Protestant missionary zeal and effort we may notice briefly the method of conferences, culminating in the World Missionary Conference held at Edinburgh in 1910, under the chairmanship of Dr. Mott.

The origin of interdenominational missionary conferences may be traced to a meeting held in New York in 1854, on the occasion of a visit by Dr. Alexander Duff. Subsequent gatherings of a similar kind were held in London and Liverpool, of which the best known was the Centenary Conference of Protestant Missions held at Exeter Hall in 1888.

In 1900 a conference called the Ecumenical Conference was held in New York, and ten years later a project, arising out of a correspondence between the Secretary of the Livingstonia Mission of the United Free Church of Scotland and the Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions in New York, led to the Edinburgh Conference.

This occasion marked a great advance, for the

meeting was no longer simply a great demonstration, as its forerunners had been, but a conference for study and counsel, prepared to advise definite lines of policy and common action, and securing continuity and a certain permanence by the election of a Continuation Committee.

“Never,” says the official History and Record of the Conference, “has there been such a gathering in the kingdom of God on earth.” One hundred and fifty-nine societies were represented, and these societies “stood for practically every type of doctrine, worship, and polity included in the Church of Christ, with the exception of the Roman Catholic and Greek Churches.”

In other words, it was a great representative Conference of Protestant Missions in which for a moment all these scattered forces came together and realized their unity and strength. The Missions of the Church of England were represented at the Conference, but not all of our societies sent representatives, nor was the feeling of the Church by any means unanimously in favour of our taking part in it.

To sum the matter up: A great wave of enthusiasm and achievement in the cause of Missions has arisen in that part of the Christian world which calls itself Protestant. The period of its history covers the quarter of a century preceding the Great War, and up to the outbreak of the war it has rapidly increased in impetus and volume. It has coincided with, and has been largely inspired by, the rapid changes that have come over the

political aspect of the world, and there is no reason to suppose that the war when it is over will mark the close of the movement. It is far more likely that this world upheaval will throw many more doors open to Christian missionary work.

Though Protestant both in origin and as regards the religious belief of the great majority of those who have been stirred by its influence, its effects have been strongly felt by the Church of England, many representative leaders of religious thought among us have shared in the movement, numbers of our clergy and laity have derived inspiration from it, its literature has had a great sale among our reading public, and we have to our own advantage learned a great deal from the methods employed.

The movement as we see it in two of its greatest concrete achievements, the World Conference on Foreign Missions held at Edinburgh, and the formation of the Student Volunteer Missionary Union, is interdenominational. It leaves each contributing body free to hold and express frankly its own peculiar beliefs, and it invites all Christian denominations to combine. In practice, however, the refusal of the Roman Catholic and of the Holy Orthodox Churches to co-operate confines its scope to limits very far short of those of universal Christendom, and marks it as sectarian.

The friends of Pan-Protestantism see in it the strongest grounds for encouragement.

Many of those who have at heart the cause of the Catholic revival in the Church of England look upon it with perplexity.

IV

THE ATTRACTIVE POWER EXERCISED BY PROTESTANTISM ON THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

ANY wide view of the total missionary effort put forth by adherents of the Christian religion, even so hasty and imperfect a sketch as we have here attempted, must make it quite clear to our minds that the contribution of the Church of England to the work of evangelizing the world is both actually and proportionately a small one. It is quite necessary to grasp this sense of proportion if we are to be preserved from the danger of self-complacency, and if we are to form a true conception of the special opportunity which lies before her as a missionary body.

Yet the very sense of our own smallness of numbers and influence when it is borne in upon us brings a very natural temptation.

Smaller bodies nearly always feel the attractive force of larger ones, and minds that are in sympathy with Catholic ideals are specially prone to this attraction. To the individualist isolation is his natural element. The mere fact that he is in a small minority is itself consoling, either because

he takes pleasure in pitting his own opinion against the majority of mankind, or from a lack of knowledge of any wider trend of thought than the accepted views of his own small circle.

But the whole spirit of Christianity, the natural effect of the study of the Gospel, and the working of the law of Love, are all against the forces that make for division, and in favour of whatever leads to unity.

The Church of England stands as a religious body between two larger and more powerful masses of Christendom—Rome and Protestantism.

In the case of Rome there is no question of the force of attraction resulting in any intermingling of the smaller with the larger mass. The uncompromising attitude of Rome makes this impossible. The only result in this direction is that units, single priests or converts here and there, may be detached entirely from the English Church and absorbed into the Roman.

Protestantism, unlike Rome, has shown signs of ardently desiring to intermingle with the Church of England. Instead of enforcing or creating barriers Protestantism desires to ignore them, or at least to stretch the bounds of mutual toleration of our differences to its utmost limit. It is developing more and more a genius for syncretism.

And there has been seen in recent years a very powerful movement within the Church of England, considered as a missionary Church, towards a closer union, or at least co-operation, with non-episcopal bodies.

Of course there are many reasons to account for this. Some desire it because their theological views are in real sympathy with Protestantism. Others because they hold no strong theological beliefs at all, and are moved more deeply by humanitarian impulses than by any very definite hold upon supernatural religion.

But there remains another motive which undoubtedly operates very strongly to this end, and we shall do best to confine ourselves to this, which we have already mentioned, namely, the attractive force naturally exercised on a small body by a larger.

Directly the scattered forces which labour in the "far-flung" Mission Field are brought together as they were at the Edinburgh Conference, this force begins to exert itself. Missionaries in distant lands feel it precisely according to their circumstances. If they never come in close contact with non-episcopal Missions they may be unaware of it; it is in the counsels of those who study and seek to direct the general missionary policy from the Church at home that it makes itself most powerfully felt.

And in itself the temptation is the same as that which finally drew Newman over to Rome.

Whatever St. Augustine meant by his phrase "*securus judicat orbis terrarum*," it seems to have meant to Newman that the larger body of believers is likely to be right.

Nothing is more dangerous than to quote out of their context the epigrammatic sayings of the great maker of phrases that St. Augustine was. In its place and for the purpose it was intended to serve

the saying is of course quite true. The claim of the Donatists, an intensely "insular" local African sect, to unchurch the rest of Christendom left the world unmoved (*securus*, free from care), but St. Augustine would hardly have used it as applicable to our controversy with Rome. The parallel saying of St. Jerome is not an expression of opinion but a statement of historic fact: "Ingenit orbis terrarum et Arianum se esse miratus est." "The whole world groaned and marvelled to find itself Arian."

But the precise interpretation is immaterial. "It is plain," says Dr. Salmon, "from Dr. Newman's account of his life that this was the argument that made a convert of him. He compared the numbers which were ranked on the Romish side and on the opposite, and he said, 'What is the English Church that she should set herself in opposition to so much larger a body?'"

That there were other and much more serious motives operative in the mind of Dr. Newman is immaterial to the present argument. All that we need to notice is that even in so great a mind as his the attraction of the larger body was so strangely powerful, the words "orbis terrarum" hypnotized him as (with far less excuse because the title is less true) the words "World Conference" hypnotize so many men to-day.

It is extremely significant that the word "World" is appended to so many movements of an interdenominational character. It is a telling word. It is a word that appeals to the average man's con-

ception of what is "Catholic in the best sense of the word." Together with the prefix Pan, it appeals to that natural instinct in the weaker side of us to be on the side of the big battalions, and to that nobler instinct that always prefers co-operation to discussion and unity to strife. Any worker in the cause of Missions who argues that the Church of England should hold aloof from co-operation with Protestant bodies must expect to find himself in opposition to many good men and women, and must expect to find himself unpopular. In various forms and with great persistency the invitation to such co-operation has been put forth. It comes sometimes as an invitation to corporate communion with members of non-episcopal bodies, as a challenge to approve of members of our Church receiving communion at the hands of ministers of Protestant congregations, or of priests of our Church administering the sacrament to members of such bodies. Sometimes it comes in the form of exchange of pulpits, sometimes as an invitation to mutual conference and discussion, sometimes in the shape of proposals for a system of common missionary education for Anglican and non-episcopal missionaries, and these last proposals may confine themselves to the sharing of non-committal subjects of the missionary's curriculum such as the study of languages, or it may include the "study of the Bible as the missionary's handbook."

In all cases, and to whatever stratum of opinion in the Church of England it may be addressed, the final object is *rapprochement* and co-operation.

On some of these points our unpleasant duty of refusing such invitation is quite clear, on others it is less easy to see which way our duty lies. Our present object is to present, with much deference, an argument for extreme caution, a defence of the point of view which aims at guarding very jealously against the forces that make for this kind of union.

One argument we may note in passing. It is this : " We Catholics know the Faith ; these earnest souls are yearning to learn all that we can give them of the truth. How dare we hold back when they are crying to us for enlightenment ? " Words like these one has often heard from English clergy.

It has always seemed to the present writer to be an overestimate of the value of conferences and conventions to suppose that they will ever produce this result. He cannot speak from personal experience of the result of such meetings and discussions upon Christians of other communions who attend them. The Swanwick Convention has been going on some years now, but from all one hears, though personal goodwill and breaking down of prejudice is a notable feature of these reunions, no advance towards a sense of common ground in matters affecting the Catholic Faith has been observed.

Of the result of such meetings upon Christians of our own communion the writer can speak from personal observation. And it has often been surprising to see the disastrous effect which they have had even upon those who preface their remarks with the words, " We Catholics who know the Faith." One has met priests in official posts in the

home missionary world who have lightly propounded theories evolved at such conferences which if logically carried out would give away the whole case for the necessity of a ministry and valid sacraments.

The unpalatable fact is this. Many leaders of Nonconformity are well grounded in their own position, but the majority of Anglican priests and students are not. The average English student of the type that attends meetings of the Student movement is quite prepared to discuss or even dogmatize ; he is not always aware that the questions on which he or she is asked to give an opinion contain much matter for study. The belief ingrained in the English mind is that whereas all other branches of knowledge require special training, theology and matters of religious belief and practice are questions to be settled by the light of nature, and decided in the long run by personal predilection.

It may be said that this disadvantage is inherent in all discussions among young and enthusiastic people, but that discussion nevertheless has its value in widening the outlook and enabling minds of different mould to see each other's point of view. And there is much truth in this assertion, but not all the truth.

As a means of arriving at practical policy discussions among amateurs are seldom trustworthy.

Among the clergy who feel most strongly the attractive power of these conventions is to be found the type of man whose generosity of heart, strong emotional fervour in the cause of the Gospel, and single-minded simplicity are not counterbalanced

by the technical knowledge and intellectual grasp of first principles, or detailed acquaintance with the subject matter under discussion, which should form the necessary equipment for debate. It is the trained thinker who is also a devout and humble-minded man who alone can be of much use to others in an interdenominational discussion, or engage in it without risk of danger to himself. We turn out scores of priests who are devoted pastors but poorly provided with professional or theological training: such men as would readily appreciate the gibe about splitting Christendom over an iota in the word *ὁμοουσίον* (were it told them as a novelty), but would fail to see that its insertion would have made it impossible to worship our Blessed Lord without idolatry. In all controversies of "Athanasius contra mundum," we feel instinctively it would be "mundus" for them every time.

We cannot escape from the feeling that the fascination of "orbis terrarum" is a dangerous snare for us to-day. Perhaps it is the greater because "orbis coelorum" (if we may coin so barbarous a phrase) has come to mean so little to us.

We feel the attraction of the crowd in the great tent at Swanwick; we think too little of the blessed saints and all that innumerable company of the souls of just men departed into whose heritage we have stepped, in communion with whom we live, whose patrimony we are charged to hand on whole and undefiled as mysteries committed to our stewardship for the salvation of the world. Yet if

he remembers this the faithful Catholic who tries to hold fast to the Head, and earnestly contend for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, may, as he confronts the heathen world that is hostile to Christ, always feel sure that "they that be with us are more than they that be with them."

The words of Christ are, "Ye shall be witnesses unto Me." Do not let us substitute for them, "We will be businesslike organizers of Christianity."

The prevailing humanistic religion has had a most deplorable and subtle effect upon our common conception of missionary work. We lay far too much stress upon man's personal attitude towards and personal profits from religion.

The fashionable science of psychology, valuable as of course it is, tends to make man's varieties of religious experience loom too largely in our conception of the Gospel. Our own views, other people's views, the viewpoint of the native, all these considerations tend to obscure the primary conception of witness altogether.

The intensity of conviction with which a St. Francis Xavier witnessed to his belief is after all more valuable as a converting agency than all the most up-to-date methods of the modern scientific missionary curriculum.

If we probe deep into interdenominational Christianity shall we find that fervent belief in Christ is the real and not the merely nominal missionary motive?

We hope and pray we may; often we find it in an intensity that puts our own lukewarm zeal to

shame, but in some quarters we seem rather to find a fervent zeal for Christianity than for Christ, a desire to spread a *kultur* rather than to witness, in failure it may be, for Him; a motive that falls short of the sole desire that God may be glorified, a humanitarianism which, noble and splendid as it is, is yet a different thing from supernatural religion and a living conviction of the powers of the unseen world.

The Heavenly City, New Jerusalem, always descends out of heaven from God. It is Babylon that is built upon a base of earth, whose builders, starting from the sense of power gained by the fact that "the whole earth was of one language and one speech," seek to build a "city and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven."

V

THE CATHOLIC SYSTEM AS A MISSIONARY FORCE

JUST as in Ethics so in Religion as a missionary force there are two rival tendencies. One is to lay stress upon results and to approve a course of action because experience finds it to be beneficent. The other is the tendency to be guided solely by our knowledge of what is right, and to be indifferent to consequences. So the early nineteenth century school of ethics, the "Utilitarian" school of J. S. Mill, made beneficial results the test of moral action. Honesty was to be approved because in the long run it is the best policy, the final end to be kept in view was the greatest good, or happiness, of the greatest number of people.

The opposite or "Rationalistic" school of ethics cared little for such tests. To it the criterion of moral action was our knowledge of right and wrong. If the result of obedience to this knowledge proved disastrous to human happiness, unfortunate as such a state of things would be, it could not affect a good man's conduct. His motto must be *Fiat justitia ruat coelum*. "And because right is right to follow right were wisdom, in the scorn of consequence."

Neither the Hedonistic nor the Rationalistic school of ethics can by itself provide a satisfying philosophy. Both must be blended, and a consideration of the truth which each contains will bring us nearest to a solution.

In religion there are also two types of mind, one of which judges by results, and fixes its eyes upon the human society, its health or disease, its happiness or suffering; the other keeps chiefly in view the divine laws and truths for which it is pre-eminently jealous.

The one finds the chief motive for missionary work in the benefits which Christianity brings to mankind, the light it sheds on those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death, the loosing of those who are imprisoned in the chains of ignorance and evil, the general advance, emancipation and progress which result from the acceptance of the Gospel.

The other is influenced simply by the desire to do the will of God, to be faithful to His purpose and to seek His glory. There may arise circumstances in which a mind of this type will say, "This is the Catholic Faith, as I have received it so I hand it on." And he will not be influenced primarily by the fact that the result is, humanly speaking, such as to promote happiness or progress: it may do the reverse and lead to persecution or the Cross. The other type will always be moved by the conviction that ultimately the Christian religion advances the well-being of the race.

In religion, even more clearly than in ethics,

a true solution is found in the combination of the two. The final end of man is beatitude: this is the object with which God created every soul. And this beatitude is to be obtained through Christ. The ultimate end of man, the final object of all his actions, must be the greater glory of God. And these two objects, man's beatitude and God's glory, coincide. It is impossible that we should work for the second, if we do so faithfully, without thereby ensuring the first. There can be no competition or rivalry between them. The tree of the Church is justified by its fruit: that is a fact of experience and an encouraging reward to our faith. But it is in faith we have to plant; we cannot take the fruit first and plant the tree if we approve of it. Nay, even if we should see no earthly fruit we must still plant in faith, sure that the fruit will come hereafter. We may ask with confidence for all things needful for our souls and bodies, but in the order of our asking, the glory of God, the hallowing of His Name, the coming of His Kingdom precede our daily bread. Missions are great humanitarian agencies. They are the most mighty force we have for the amelioration of the evils of mankind, the greatest ground of hope for the final elimination of war, but this is not their first and chiefest motive.

The kingdom of God and His righteousness must be sought first. Then all these things shall be added unto us. We do not first of all desire to teach the world about God, because it is so good for the world. We seek to do this that we may

bring the world as an offering to God, in the firm trust that He will bless our oblation.

The duty of the Church is to witness; this is her first and primary charge. The golden age of Missions, the apostolic and the sub-apostolic age, was an age of witness. The Apostles themselves were chosen as witnesses of the resurrection, which was a supernatural fact; they received their commission in these terms, "Ye shall be witnesses unto Me both in Jerusalem and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

It is indeed the case that from their work sprang all we mean by European civilization, and the arts and social polity of Christendom. Millions who have had but little interest in its spiritual message have reaped the benefits that flow from Christianity. No one can deny that Christendom has made a freer, larger life possible to mankind than exists in the world beyond its borders.

But it would be a mistake to suppose that the Apostles, or their immediate successors, had such an aim in view. Nothing could have been farther from their minds than any policy of pouring new life into a decadent civilization and a dying Empire so that Europe might arise upon the ruins of ancient Rome.

They were quite careless of the probable results of the Faith as a civilizing agency in this sense. They did not come as preachers of superior *kultur*; the world looked upon them as foes to all that made life beautiful and even tolerable, not as being benefactors but as enemies of the human race.

They themselves were more than doubtful if this world would endure much longer. So far as they thought of the future of the world at all they believed it would be short, that they were in the last days of it.

All their energies were concentrated on bearing witness to the truth, whatever the consequences might be : and in many cases the immediate consequence was martyrdom, witness carried to the point of death. In one sense of the word they were men without a policy. "All authority is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations." Like stewards or servants whose responsibility is limited to obeying certain clear orders they obeyed those orders and left the policy behind the orders in the hands of Him who sent them. Authority, the ultimate responsibility, was not theirs but His.

And just because of that their influence was undying, and in their own generation they "turned the world upside down."

The modern missionary necessarily stands as the representative of a race more powerful and civilized than the people to whom he goes. By the African, and even by most Asiatics, by the Melanesian or the Australian aborigine, he is accepted as something like a superman ; he cannot be unconscious of the fact that he is a material benefactor bringing light to the unenlightened and civilization to the barbarian. He sets great store by the testimonials of officials of the State to the ameliorating influence of his work.

So he is inclined to lay more stress on "policy" and less on "witness," but with all his consciousness of this necessity for foresight and for statesmanship we do not see results of corresponding value.

It is a question of the point of view and a matter of emphasis. The introduction of the Faith to a people that have never known it must always be a great experiment, and therefore missionary policy, method, and principles are of extreme importance. But the duty of a steward is not to decide matters already settled by his master; it is to work upon a programme given him, and he must leave ultimate responsibility to Him whose commission he bears. Witness, not policy, comes first.

And above all "it is required in stewards that a man be found faithful." Their duty is to hand on what they have received, with the sure conviction that they handle treasures which are not their own, of which therefore they must give strict account.

Whatever obvious advantages may seem to be promised by compromising that which has been committed to their charge, they go beyond their commission if they swerve a hairbreadth from their loyalty.

Obviously if Christianity were a man-made thing evolved from our own consciousness we should be justified in adapting the Gospel somewhat freely to racial and other conditions. It would be mere conservative stupidity to force our own beliefs upon unwilling hearers when points of disagreement arose.

So in the sphere of conduct, if Christian laws of sex or of any other branch of morality were merely what we Europeans had evolved as most convenient to our social well-being, we should be justified in a considerable licence of adaptation to the immemorial customs of native peoples. And if the order and discipline of our Church, her ministry and sacramental system were a purely man-made thing we should be free to sit very lightly to all our rules in order to ensure hearty co-operation with other bodies of Christians who hold different views. We could be very statesmanlike indeed, and things would doubtless move most rapidly.

But none of these things are so. Neither our beliefs, nor our code of morality, nor our order and our sacramental system are our own. It is precisely because they are not our own, but something external to ourselves to which we are to bear witness, something committed to our charge to which we are to be faithful, that they have such power.

All missionary effort presupposes faith. And we are called upon to have the faith that the Catholic beliefs and the Church's laws of conduct and the Catholic system are according to God's will.

Far be it from us to claim that we are always faithful. It would be arrogant and foolish to proclaim that we have always been, or that we are now, even in our best Missions, completely possessed of Catholic faith or Christian morals and of the unfettered exercise of the Catholic system. But this is not to say we do not believe in and strive

with all our might towards these things. For they represent to us the guidance of the Holy Spirit, Who through all the ages has been guiding His Church into all the truth.

The ideal missionary's first thought should be, not Am I commending myself to men? but Am I being faithful to my Lord? Not Am I wisely adapting my message to these foreign minds? but Am I giving my message intact and pure? Not Am I shaping my course so as to promote united action with the more powerful bodies of other sects whom I see around me? but Am I being faithful to the Catholic system?

And if this attitude of mind be kept there is no sort of doubt that the results which we desire so anxiously have, not indeed a certainty, but a strong probability of being achieved. If the messenger is faithful to his Lord the foreign mind will accept or reject his Lord. And it is better for the messenger that his Lord should be seen and rejected than that the messenger should be acceptable and his Lord refused. If he gives his message intact and pure, and if he adheres as faithfully as he can to the Catholic system, he may leave the reunion of Christendom in the hands of God. He may miss immediate popularity, but he may contribute to building up a future Church upon which the scattered elements of Christendom may rally. And that is a far greater thing.

Christian Missions proceed upon the basis of belief in the solidarity of the human race. The average Englishman abroad is often very far from

willing to agree to this belief; the "natives" or the "aborigines" are in his eyes a distinct order of being, and his sense of difference from them makes him anything but ready to admit them to the privileges implicitly claimed by those who would make Christians of them. He even resents the thought that an African from a native kraal can be supposed to share his religion. He disowns the implied relationship. But Christianity is committed to a belief in the essential unity of the human family, as a race, and to its potential unity in all its peoples, languages and tongues, in Christ. St. Luke traces our Saviour's genealogy back to Adam, symbolically representing by this the truth that He is the possession of all mankind. He goes back for the fountain head of His humanity to "Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God."

Everywhere where man is found, in the jungles of tropical forests, in the icefields of the Arctic circle, in the villages of China or the plains of Central Africa, there is the son of Adam which is the son of God.

We are all one great family. And science also corroborates this doctrine of our faith. Psychology teaches that all men, as men, react with marvellous uniformity to the same stimuli, possess the same nervous system, think and behave in obedience to the same laws, with extraordinary similarity of method. But nowhere has science taught us this solidarity of the race in a more surprising manner than in that field of research which deals with the

phenomena of religion, or with questions cognate to religion. The enormous mass of evidence collected by Dr. Fraser in *The Golden Bough*, and in his other works, all goes to demonstrate this solidarity in a most remarkable manner.

It is far from being the case that Christianity can be left outside such a scientific survey; the scientist is not prepared to leave our religion as a thing apart, secure in its position as the possession of civilized man, and to confine himself to the *bizarre* and unfamiliar phenomena of native cults or primitive paganisms. On the contrary, he shows how the mental processes which are found among the Australian aborigines, or are unearthed from the records of Aztec civilization, reproduce themselves with startling fidelity among the peasants of modern Europe. This phenomenon of the curious uniformity of the human mind thinking religiously may be used, as Dr. Fraser used it, in an attempt to discredit all religion. But the interpretation of the phenomenon is of secondary importance; the great fact remains that, broadly speaking, the unity of the race shows itself more marvellously in the sphere of religion than in any other department of life. Amid all the additions and the distorted manifestations of religious instinct there emerges the fact that there are certain deep instincts underlying all religious life which run like steady ocean currents through the stream of humanity all down the ages. We cannot easily trace these currents: they betray themselves by the constant reproduction of similar ceremonies, beliefs and

practices at all periods of recorded history, and in the most widely separated races of mankind ; but the deep undercurrents of religious instinct and desire are there. The human race thinking religiously naturally travels along certain lines that are broadly common to all mankind as such.

It has been pointed out that the Bible is a universal book in a sense in which no other book is universal. The range of intelligibility of the Vedas or of the Koran is comparatively limited. They can never make the same appeal in Europe that they make in the lands of their origin ; they are cast in comparatively local modes of thought, they do not bear translation. But the Bible, itself in the main a product of Asiatic minds, has captured Europe, and is intelligible to every race of man.

For God's revelation fits man's instincts. And we would claim that the Catholic faith and system have also this universal appeal. Often we can see how Catholicism supplies the corrective to distorted or evil tendencies in non-revealed religion. What stronger weapon could the Church possess against the low and degraded conception of the dignity of womanhood, which is the worst feature in the whole of Islam, than faithful teaching of the honour due to Mary the Mother of the Incarnate God ? Would that Protestants who labour so bravely among Mohammedans could bring themselves to see how the reverence for the Virgin Mother has raised the position due to woman in all the Christian Church ! What truer corrective could be found to all that is evil in the ancestor worship of the

nations of the Far East than the Church's doctrine of prayers for the faithful dead? To quote Dr. Robinson's *History of Christian Missions*: "On the other hand," (he has been sharply criticizing the policy of Roman Catholic missionaries with regard to ancestor worship in China) "the missionary who knows anything of the early history of his religion cannot fail to remember how helpful and inspiring memorial services for the dead have been, especially in countries where Christians have formed a small minority of the population, and how incomplete is the presentation of Christianity which does not lay emphasis upon the indissoluble connection which exists between those who are striving to live the Christ-life here and those who are with Christ in the life into which they have passed. There is no problem raised by missionary work in the Far East on which it is more difficult to formulate a definite policy and which at the same time presses so urgently for a solution." Doubtless there are difficulties from the point of view of Chinese thought; but there should be no hesitation on the missionary's part in his desire to plead the Holy Sacrifice openly and frequently for the repose of his converts' souls.

It is that which is Catholic in the system of the Roman Church which, united to the energy of the Western mind, makes her so successful as a missionary to day. It is that which is insular and national in the Church of England which, despite the energy and devotion of her agents, holds her back from being the great force she might be in the Mission

Field. The Catholic system has its roots and origins in many lands and many races of mankind. In the early days of the Church, Asia and Africa as well as Europe contributed to the development of her polity; not only Jerusalem and Antioch, but the hybrid and precocious civilization of Asia Minor, where Hellenic culture mingled with the wisdom of the East, formed seed plots where her system was developed. Africa, which gave her an Athanasius, a Cyprian, an Augustine, brought its share towards her treasures.

Throughout the ages the various streams of contribution brought by nation after nation to the common heritage of Catholicism have tended more and more to keep the Church's system in touch with the main currents of natural religious tendency, so that in a real sense the soul of man is not merely *naturaliter Christiana* but *naturaliter Catholica*. And this is true despite the fact that the Church is ever resisting the debased or superstitious in natural religion, constantly fighting against and rejecting its perverted practices and instincts. If it is true that the primitive religion of the Hebrews was closely related, as regards its outward form and expression, to many other Semitic forms of worship, what does this prove save that God works in and through the normal and inherited modes of human religious thought?

If it is true that early Christian worship was influenced by the Greek mystery religions, the fact would seem to point in the same direction. For the "mysteries," whether of Eleusis or of

other types, were an instance of reversion from the over-sophisticated national religions of the ancient world to forms more primitive and archaic, whose origins are hidden in the mists of time. If the origin of many Christian festivals, such as Easter, be due to the adoption by the Church of annual customs already prevalent among mankind, the same truth follows.

If the use of incense (to quote a minor detail) was universal from immemorial times in Mesopotamia and spread to Europe in the eighth century B.C., we have an argument which goes to show how wide and primitive and natural is the appeal of this small adjunct of worship. The same may be said of the liturgical use of bells, and of many other minute points of religious custom; as well as of the deeply prevailing sentiment that an act of sacrifice must be enshrined deep in the heart of religion, or that confession of misdoing and guilt, and the need for lustration of some kind from sin are among the most prevalent instincts of the human race.

It is our duty to be faithful to that Catholic Church in which we profess belief. This is our obvious obligation of witness and of stewardship. And in the long run it is also our most hopeful line of policy for the conversion of mankind; for that which has most claim to stand the test *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus* will be found most universal in its converting and sanctifying power to-day.

A religion that goes from a highly artificial and

conventionalized civilization like our own, clad in the garb of our modern nationality, bearing on its back the stamp of a University degree, and in its head the forms of thought struck out by our domestic controversies, our mutual suspicions and dislikes, will always be severely handicapped. We shall never be a great missionary Church until we learn to throw our Moderate Anglicanisms, our coloured or black stoles, our M.A. hoods, our stiffness and our mild ethical teaching to the winds, and go out boldly as a Church that preaches the unsearchable riches of Christ, that acts as a faithful steward of His mysteries, as the true Catholic Church of all the ages, free from the despotic rule of Rome, yet faithful to the fullness of the Catholic faith and system in its purity.

VI

ANGLICANISM IN THE MISSION FIELD

“AFTER the taking of Peking and suppression of the Boxer rising, the triumph of Christianity in the English form was celebrated by a chaplain, in surplice, hood, and stole, saying Matins along with a deaconess, both of them standing literally on the ‘Great Stone of Heaven,’ living symbols of the world-wide character of Moderate Anglicanism.”

Mr. Osborne, in his most suggestive book *Religion in Europe and the World Crisis*, repeats the story of this incident as it was related to him, and there is every reason to look upon it as typical.

Now it is easy to abuse Moderate Anglicanism, specially in the Mission Field where its incongruity is so glaringly apparent, but we must try to be fair in our criticism, for it is as difficult for the great mass of our people to avoid falling into its ways as it is for a man to jump off his own shadow. We understand the saying attributed to Cardinal Newman that the ideal of the Church of England is to plant the vicarage and drive the pony cart over the *orbis terrarum*, and the criticism is just in respect of much of our missionary work ; but until

the great central body of the Church at home awakens to a wider view of religion we must not blame our missionaries over much.

Nevertheless, while facts bear witness to the power of Catholicism to build up vast and stable dioceses all over the world, and to the converting force of Evangelical Protestantism, they also point to the comparative sterility of Moderate Anglicanism. Our Missions carry to the heathen the pure Gospel of Christ, and this is so great a thing that any disparagement of their work is to be made only with the utmost caution. Nor do they fail to produce a wonderful effect; but the effect is more limited both in extent and intensity than we have a right to hope for. It is not too much to say that they are comparatively sterile.

Leaving for the present any comparison with Rome, let us look at our Mission in Japan side by side with the Japanese Mission of the Russian Orthodox Church. In that country our communion has erected seven dioceses which are united in the *Nippon Sei Kokwai*. Of these South Tokio and Osaka are supported by S.P.G., Kyu-Shu and Hokkaido by C.M.S., North Tokio and Kyoto by the American Episcopal Church, and the diocese of Mid-Japan by the Anglican Church in Canada. Apart from the C.M.S. dioceses the character of the work may be said to be that of the "central party of the Church of England," or Moderate Anglican. The baptized members of the *Nippon Sei Kokwai* number about 17,500. At the end of 1913 there were seven bishops and sixty-four European or

American clergy; the Japanese clergy were ninety-four. And it is to be noted that our Missions in Japan have always laid stress upon the importance of recruiting missionaries of good intellectual qualifications.

The Russian Mission was founded by Father Nicolai, who died, as its bishop, early in 1912. He never had more than six Europeans as members of his staff; in 1900 only the bishop, one priest, and one deacon were Russians: all the remainder were Japanese. He built up the entire system of Orthodox worship in Japan; and the Orthodox Church of Japan which extends throughout the whole expanse of the country, though its chief centres are in the great towns, is entirely national and independent in character, depending only in the person of its bishop on the Most Holy Governing Synod of the Church of all the Russias. In the great Russian Cathedral of Tokio the Divine Liturgy is celebrated with all the dignity of ceremonial and of liturgical music that would be found in a Russian Cathedral, though the services are all in the Japanese language. The total number of adherents at the death of Bishop Nicolai was 30,000; they now number more than 33,000. That is to say, that during the lifetime of its founder this Church has grown to a highly organized and stable community relying almost exclusively upon native converts for its ministers, providing its own wants, (all the icons, for instance, are painted in the girls' school in Tokio), and that with comparatively small support from Russia.

The entire amount contributed from home is £6,000 a year, of which £2,600 is provided by the Orthodox Missionary Society, and £3,400 by the Most Holy Synod. Its converts to-day number rather less than twice as many as those of our seven dioceses combined, in which are labouring seven bishops and sixty-four English and American clergy.

And the most remarkable thing of all is that the Russian Orthodox Mission emerged uninjured from the searching test of the Russo-Japanese War. This is too striking a phenomenon to be explained away, and too great a result to be attributed to the personality of any one man, however capable and holy. There can be no doubt that it is the Catholic system of the Orthodox Church, and above all the attractive power of the Liturgy that has produced this result.

Now there is a very great difference in many points between the types of religion presented by the Russian Church and by our own Missions in Japan. We may not agree that in its essence the Russian Orthodox type is superior to our own. Let us be content to note some obvious points of contrast. Orthodoxy inherits from its Byzantine origins an atmosphere of archaic splendour, which Anglicanism does not possess. When one is present at a great Russian service it is easy to believe the truth of the legend of the conversion of the Russians in the tenth century, when Vladimir is said to have sent envoys to observe and report upon the various religions of the outer world. These commissioners

brought back such a description of the Christian Mass in St. Sophia at Constantinople, which they described as the worship of heaven itself, that Vladimir decided to embrace Christianity. The witness of worship has always been very strong in Russia. One can imagine of their Orthodox liturgy that "if there come in one unbelieving or unlearned . . . he will fall down on his face and worship God, declaring that God is among you indeed"; but Moderate Anglicanism lacks this note of majesty in worship.

Mr. Osborne points out as an increasing weakness our loss of "the supernatural note, the note of spiritual distinction, the air and mark of one who bears a message from Heaven, the mien and gait of her who is the King's daughter, all glorious within," and reminds us of the classic passage in *Marius the Epicurean*, "in which the author describes the feelings of his hero as he is present for the first time at the primitive Eucharist, 'the Mass the same in all essentials from the days of the Apostles,' his sense of something being enacted which was an echo and reverberation from the eternal harmony, a transaction under conditions of time having its counterpart in the changeless order of eternity."

Also the Orthodox Church is certain of its own mind. Friendly as they may be towards our own communion, and tolerant as they are of external diversity of rite, we can never imagine an Orthodox Christian having any confusion in his mind as to the difference between his own religion and Pro-

testantism. One hears of our converts in China and Japan that the desire to mingle with Protestantism is very strong among them; and one knows that there is far less uniformity of mind among our clergy of the "Central party" than would be found among the Orthodox. Anglicanism rejoices in the open mind, it is prolific of "views," suggestions, points of view. Its typical theological product is the essay, not the dogmatic treatise. It is extremely educated, even academic. This open-minded character has its great advantages for cultured minds, but it makes for inefficiency and confusion in a Church that seeks to guide the simple or convert the heathen.

Orthodoxy has that system of discipline and reconciliation that centres round the Sacrament of Penance. It is difficult to speak with certainty about this matter, but we say, hoping to be contradicted, that the Missions of our Church in Japan make no use of this sacrament as part of the normal life of their converts, even if they allow it in exceptional cases.

Here then are some of the obvious differences between our own Missions in one country where the Moderate Anglican ideal prevails, and the system of another brand of Christendom. Whether they supply the explanation of the startling difference between the respective energies expended and the respective results it would be hard to say with certainty. But in any case they are instructive.

To a great extent the missionary of the Moderate Anglican, or of even the High Anglican school, goes

to the heathen with a religion that is typical of our public schools. And English public school religion is within its limits a very fine thing, but it has great limitations. He goes with the spirit of adventure and chivalry, with a very high ideal of honour, clean living and morality, a fine contempt of danger, and a great desire to reproduce the virtues of the honest English gentleman among his converts. But he is very undogmatic, very shy of "ritual," extremely opposed to all that he labels "Roman," under which heading he puts vaguely much that is distinctive of the universal Church, and, most fatal of all failings in a missionary to heathen lands, he is apt to relapse into a religion that lays too exclusive a stress upon a system of ethics, too little stress upon the supernatural grace of the sacraments.

We must not judge, as we are rightly reminded, by the criterion of success. It is a mark of the character learned in our public schools to hate advertisement; all our traditions are against the proclamation of "results"; we feel sure there must be more in our Missions than can ever be shown in a tabulated statement of converts. Let all this be granted.

If we are witnessing before an irresponsive world to an ideal which we are quite certain is the truth, then we may be happy, "whether they will hear or whether they will forbear." But if we are saying nothing about the communion of saints because we are vaguely frightened of the charge of Mariolatry, if we are (in the midst of ancestor-worshipping peoples) saying nothing^a about prayers for the dead,

because we have not made up our minds about their efficacy, or are too tender-hearted for those who disbelieve in them ; if we are simply uncertain whether Christ is present in the Holy Eucharist, or if so whether or no His presence is to be adored, then whatever we are doing we cannot be said to be witnessing to any definite truth in these matters. The Protestant teaches a religion based on Conversion, the Catholic teaches a religion based on Baptismal Regeneration, both are clear-cut ideas. Not all Anglican teaching is so clear cut.

But the kind of religion that has failed to convert and hold the mass of industrial England is never going to convert the industrialized East.

Dr. Dearmer, a recognized authority in his own line, has recently written to the *Church Times* a passionate outburst upon the subject of the externals of worship in our Indian Missions. He sees the Church of England's unexampled opportunities in India, and he laments bitterly the way in which those opportunities are thrown away. "English congregations," he says, "of course, are conservative, . . . but in providing for Indian congregations there is no reason why we should import the dim customs born of obsolete controversies and of the sins, negligences, and ignorances of our rude forefathers." Yet this, he considers, is precisely what we are doing. The congregations are overburdened with dull conventional "duty sermons"; the beauty of the great Christian sacraments, Baptism and the Mass, is overclouded by our method of presenting them. Whether we put

Indian choir boys into "nice albs or long rochets," or make them "swelter in cassocks and horrid little tight surplices," may be a small matter. But the stupid tragedy is that we are importing all our cramping national idiosyncrasies, our hesitating compromises, and our memories of stale controversies into the young Church of India.

The Eucharist by itself rendered as a solemn act of worship with the surroundings of Catholic devotion should be the central point of the converts' devotional life. Instead of this Dr. Dearmer seems to have come across "mechanical Matins . . . or that muddling up of Matins and the Communion Service which I heard an Indian Christian the other day call 'Combinations.'"

It is not externals only that matter, but they count for much more than we are always willing to admit. Their importance is tenfold greater in the Mission Field than at home. They matter far less to cultured people with centuries of Christianity behind them, whose whole life is saturated with inherited Christian culture, yet even in England devotion and the sense of the supernatural die down when externals are neglected. To a people who are children in the faith they mean much more, for unfamiliar truths and an unfamiliar atmosphere can be absorbed more easily by the eye than by the unassisted mind. Sermons from a foreigner who speaks the language with at best an uncouth accent, even if he be perfectly intelligible (which is not always the case), go home far less quickly than the lesson conveyed by worship.

But besides externals we need a clear decisive method of teaching, precision instead of vagueness, doctrines instead of views. It is doubtful whether our Anglican method of suggestive instruction with its shyness of rule and system succeeds well at home. But even if we are content with trying to stimulate our educated congregations to think for themselves, in our dread lest they should become formal and mechanical, we make a fatal error if we carry vagueness of method into the Mission Field. "The nominal Church of England fish," says Mr. Osborne, "slip in thousands through the wide meshes of general principles. Views and aspects and schools of thought, the tackle of Anglican fishing, can neither catch nor hold the common people." If they are ineffective at home, far less trustworthy are they among heathen peoples.

And behind the externals, and behind the method of teaching must go the firm hold of the truths that are to be taught, to whose reality the worship and the ceremonies of the Church bear witness.

Our missionaries must be dogmatic theologians with a real and vital grasp of the whole Catholic Faith. They must be trained men, not amateurs, and they must be trained in supernatural religion.

It is not enough that they should understand the main outlines of all the religions of the world, or of the particular religion of the county to which they are sent. Let them know this by all means, but let them know their own religion first. It is still too often taken for granted that an Englishman is born a theologian and needs no special training

either to understand his own faith or to teach it.

But a missionary should be so completely a master of Christian theology that he can translate it easily into simple forms. And this power of being able to teach the faith in its fullness and due proportion to unlearned people is not attained without a definite training. It need not demand a very abstruse knowledge, but it requires a professional equipment, and nothing in the way of the study of social, economic, anthropological, or geographical questions can begin to make up for its absence.

It is a supernatural religion that will convert the world; ethical teaching can never by itself work the great miracle that is implied in the conversion of a soul to Christ, nor build up the Church to the measure of the stature of His fullness.

Our footsteps are dogged by the fear of superstition. And there are reasons for thinking that superstition is the chief danger that attends the Catholic presentment of religion. Every quality has its defect, and it may be true that the defect of Catholicism lies here.

If we have taught men who are children in the faith to see the power of the unseen world, they may fall into believing that they see it in regions where it does not exist. To us, trained in the materialistic school of nineteenth century science, superstition is the most hated enemy of what we hold as truth. And, of course, all superstition is deplorable. But is it after all the only, or the worst, perversion of the truth? Is it more killing to the soul than utter materialism? It is our duty

to fight against it wherever we find it with might and main, but let us beware lest we produce a state of mind in which not only superstitious belief in the supernatural but true belief in it also cannot grow; lest in gathering out the tares we root the wheat up also, or rather so tend the field that neither tares nor wheat can grow. It is probably no worse to teach a man to trust too much in the saints than to teach him to trust too much in himself.

Pelagianism is a heresy, that is to say, it is a strong and coherent error which in the long run destroys man's sense of any need of a Saviour or of divine grace. Superstition is a folly, and if extreme a vice; we must attack it wherever we find it, and a Church that witnesses to the truth can never make terms with it. But it is not a heresy. Because high explosives are most dangerous things we do not cut down their use by our armies to a minimum. Superstition is to supernatural religion something like what an explosion in an arsenal is to the use of high explosives. But religion is powerless without the supernatural, and we have watered down the expression of it, in many of our Missions, to a dangerously low point.

VII

THE PRAYER BOOK IN THE MISSION FIELD

THE question of the adaptability of our Book of Common Prayer to the needs of native congregations is a large and difficult one. All that it is possible to do here is to offer some general observations, and that with a great sense of diffidence.

It cannot be said that the original Reformers had the missionary work of the Church in view when they drew up the Prayer Book; their whole outlook was intensely national, and the needs that pressed upon their minds were the requirements of the Church in England. It is, of course, true that they based their liturgical reformation upon the ancient service books of the Catholic Church, and that they availed themselves to a certain extent of the labours of foreign reformers; they even showed that they had not left the study of Eastern liturgies outside their consideration. But the determining factor in all their alterations, omissions, and amendments, was the condition of sixteenth and seventeenth century Englishmen, torn as they were by their national religious dissensions and

influenced by all the violent currents and counter-currents of the Reformation. They certainly never asked themselves how their servicebook would supply the needs of Indians, Chinese, or Africans; such a notion would have been quite foreign to all their deliberations. And the Prayer Book, as interpreted by general current use to-day, is a very national, a peculiarly British thing. Long prayers, such as those prescribed to be used at the end of Matins and Evensong, and long exhortations full of abstract terminology must be exceedingly difficult for many of the simpler races to whom our missionaries go; and the same applies to the long lessons from the Old Testament, and from many of St. Paul's Epistles.

Here again we would claim as an axiom, that the more ancient, Catholic, and universal any liturgical form of devotion is, the wider and more immediate is its appeal. Baptism and the Holy Eucharist stand pre-eminent as services within the reach of every type of mind. And for normal congregational worship the Lord's own service, as a great corporate act of sacrifice and communion, stands quite by itself as a form of devotion which is eloquent to all mankind.

The Eucharist is more universal in its appeal than Matins; the Our Father than any sixteenth century prayer; the Psalter than the Book of Chronicles; and these three great weapons of prayer, the Eucharist, the Our Father, and the Psalter, lie enshrined in all the liturgical armoury of the Church. They are difficult in the sense in

which all beautiful and inexhaustible things are difficult, but even that which is most full of difficulties, the Psalter, is probably not much more abstruse to the most simple type of man than to ourselves.

We must let these great instruments of worship speak for themselves; the priest must not obtrude his own personality to the detriment of the sacred rite which he performs.

The Eucharist is primarily a great action, something done; too many Anglican clergy look upon it as something read, merely as one form of public prayer performed by the minister to which certain symbolical acts are attached, not very different in kind from other forms of worship.

To illustrate what we mean, let us contrast two widely different conceptions of the method of performing or interpreting the Holy Mysteries, the instruction given by Mr. Griffith Thomas to candidates for Holy Orders in his book entitled *The Work of the Ministry*, and the *Ritus Celebrandi Missam* in the Roman Missal.

Out of four hundred and sixteen pages on the duties of a priest, Mr. Griffith Thomas devotes five to the Holy Communion; and in these pages he considers in careful detail the best method of conducting the service. The following is a short specimen of his advice: "The Lord's Prayer at the opening is now invariably said by the clergyman alone. . . . Let it be prayed slowly and solemnly as the keynote to the service. . . . In the opening Collect it adds to the impressiveness if a slight

pause is made after each of the three opening statements about 'Almighty God.' Whether we pronounce the word 'Inspiration' with a long or short vowel in the second syllable will depend upon taste or custom." In the words of administration "a real distinction should be made in voice between the two parts of these words."

And as a specimen of the detailed instruction given in the *Ritus Celebrandi Missam* we may quote the following: The priest (after the *Gloria in Excelsis*), "with hands joined as before, returns by the same way to the book, where, extending and joining them before his breast, bowing his head to the Cross, he says, Let us pray; then extends his hands before his breast, in such a manner that the palm of the one hand faces the other, and with the fingers touching, with the tips not raised above the level of his shoulders, which position is observed in every extension of the hands."

As we read the one set of instructions we feel that it is the spoken word that is looked upon as of exclusive importance, everything is concentrated upon making that as impressive as possible; the Holy Mysteries are to be declaimed with all the care of an exercise in elocution. It is the preacher's ideal.

As we read the other set of instructions we feel that it is the action that counts. Few directions concerning the spoken word are more explicit than that the priest is to speak here and there *intelligibili voce*, but every gesture and motion is ordered with minute and hieratic discipline.

Now these two contrasted ideals do really represent two widely separated conceptions of the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, one considering it as a thing done, the other as a service read.

Putting aside for the moment all prejudice and all ideas of a doctrinal nature we must recognize that the method of Rome has great practical advantages. Provided that the convert is instructed in the meaning of the Mass, according to the doctrine he has received, the Mass will always have its message for him. He knows that the great Christian sacrifice is being offered, he knows that he can through it receive communion, and the very actions and outward ceremonies speak a language which he can understand, create an atmosphere at once familiar and unchanging. The very fact that the service is in Latin sets free the priest from much difficulty and distraction, and proves no greater barrier to the Chinese convert than to the European peasant.

The Protestant interpretation of the rite obviously depends much more for its appeal, for its very intelligibility, upon the personality and skill of speech of the presiding minister. And there will be far less of the impressiveness which is gained by uniformity of custom, far more room for the play of individual peculiarities.

The Church of Rome is really handicapped in the long run, in spite of certain obvious advantages, by the inability to use the vernacular. The Eucharist is an action, but to reduce it practically to an inarticulate action, so far as the listening faithful are

concerned, is a great falling short from what the Mass was meant to be.

There can be no sort of doubt that the Orthodox Church in her use of the vernacular, and her combination of ceremonial with the impressiveness of the spoken word, is far more true to the ideal of a great corporate action in which each one of the faithful takes his appointed part in the converse and intercourse of priest and people.

But we surely have very much to learn in many parts of the Mission Field in the manner in which we put the Holy Eucharist before our converts. As Dr. Dearmer says in the article we have already quoted, "If we really wish to teach by the eye, we had better confine the surplice to its proper use at Matins and Evensong," we had better make the Eucharist "stand by itself, not tacked on to anything else, but by itself and for itself at the chief hour of the day, preluded by bells and a procession to the altar and marked out as a special service by the change into rich-coloured garments. By this simple process you have done more than you will do by a century of sermons."

And this is simply common sense. It is madness to go on in the Mission Field as we have done so long in England, to teach that the Holy Eucharist is the chief Christian service, and to behave about it in a way that either relegates it to the position of an optional addition to Morning Prayer, or to keep it in the background as a gathering for the few devout before the worship of the day begins. Yet what seems to have struck Dr. Dearmer as a visitor

to our Indian Missions is the prevalence of that mixture of Matins and the Eucharist evolved by us bewildered Anglicans, which a native described as "Combinations."

An average convert to Christianity, or, indeed, an average churchgoer at home, will learn more from the things he sees than from many years of teaching from the pulpit.

But the real point does not lie here. We do not adopt Catholic ceremonial because it happens to provide a useful object lesson. This is only to fall back into the error of excessive didactiveness from another point of departure. We adopt Catholic ceremonial because we seek to do honour to God. The Church of all the ages did not don the vestments in order to teach the people, but in order to surround the most Holy Mysteries with the atmosphere of devotion due to holy things. They did not burn incense to attract the catechumen, but for the greater glory of God. And unless this be our motive, if the underlying faith and devotion be not there, then all ceremonies are unmeaning and even disingenuous devices.

The whole point of our contention is this: that if we give the Eucharist its proper place and dignity because of our belief that it is right to do so, aiming at and seeking God's greater glory, then it will follow as a natural and inevitable sequence that it will attract mankind. Our object is not to hunt for the most attractive type of service so that we may increase our numbers and deepen their devotion; our object is, or ought to be, the setting forth of God's glory.

But if we do this faithfully we shall find our reward. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." Christ, if He be lifted up, will draw all men unto Him. We show the Lord's death till He come because we are commanded to do so, and by proclaiming it we shall find that we are drawing men to Him. We keep to Catholic usage and seek to restore it in its purity because we believe in the Holy Catholic Church, and the more we aim at this ideal in every detail of our worship the more we shall find that we are giving to mankind something that awakes an answering echo in the hearts of men of every race and language.

And there is no reason at all why the Church of England should not do it. To present the Holy Eucharist with the full dignity and beauty of Catholic devotion is not alien to her spirit nor beyond her powers. In the Church of the Holy Name at Panch Howds, Poona, in the churches of our Mission in Korea, in the cathedrals of Zanzibar and Likoma, in the West Indian diocese of Nassau (to quote from a list of Mission Churches that might be much enlarged) the Holy Mysteries are celebrated with the dignified beauty that the Catholic Church has known how to provide. In many ways our national genius demands a higher and more refined standard of external devotional expression than that of other European countries. Even in their Puritanism the English have always strongly felt the need of decorum and external reverence. The looser ways of the Italian, to whom much that

affects us strongly seems indifferent, have never found a home amongst us. Few people lay so much stress upon externals as we do, only, unfortunately, we have gone so far astray from the general stream of Catholic life, we have developed such peculiar ceremonial of our own, with hoods and coloured stoles, with surpliced choirs and stiff conventionalities, as to create an equally peculiar atmosphere of worship, congenial perhaps to ourselves, but unattractive to the simpler portion of mankind.

* The Church of England can, and in parts of the Mission Field does, set an example to the world of what Catholic ceremonial may be. She can present the Holy Eucharist as the great corporate action of the faithful. And wherever she does so she finds it an enormous source of strength. When she does not we have cause to fear that she is reproducing just the same formalism, the same lukewarmness, the same shyness of Holy Communion as we are familiar with in rustic parishes at home. But if the Prayer Book is not in itself perfectly adapted to the Mission Field, nor perfect in itself, neither is the Roman Missal. The use of Latin, though it has certain obvious advantages, produces a far greater counterbalancing handicap.

The Roman Church is committed irrevocably to this use, but from the common-sense point of view it is indefensible. It is one of those conservative customs of the Church that needs long explanation, but cannot logically be defended when all is said.

The correlated custom of saying Mass inaudibly

is likewise against all common sense. The best minds among Roman Catholic theologians are well aware of the departure from ancient Catholic ideals which the practice involves: the *rapprochement* between priest and faithful is broken, the congregation if forced to relapse from the high standards of liturgical worship to the use of private devotions of far less value and solidity.

The Church of England is free from these two serious handicaps. She has liberty to work out her way to a far better method of presenting the Eucharist to the people. She can display it as the great action, the great Christian act of sacrifice and worship, and she can, by the spoken word of prayer and praise, retain the intelligent co-operation of the faithful with all that the priest, their minister, performs.

She has this power in her hands, but over large areas of the Mission Field she does not fully use it.

And afterwards, a long way afterwards in point of importance, comes the public non-Eucharistic worship of the Church: that type of Christian service which is represented by our Morning and Evening Prayer. Here the use of the Prayer Book involves, we should suppose, far greater difficulty.

The mere translation of practically all the Bible for the lections is a serious matter. To expect all converts, who have neither the intellectual capacity nor the inherited momentum of Christian tradition which the sixteenth century Englishman possessed, to make intelligent devotional use of our long Old Testament lessons is surely to ask too much.

Broadly speaking, the ideal kept in mind by the Reformers who produced our Prayer Book was that "all the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) should be read over every year." And this not by the clergy alone, but in order that "the people (by *daily* hearing of Holy Scripture read in the Church) might continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God." And this they looked upon as a return to primitive practice, to "the first original and ground" of Divine Service.

Obviously an essential part of this ideal was the daily attendance of the faithful at Morning and Evening Prayer. The custom to which the rest of Christendom had arrived amounted to this: the services, instead of being of a uniform nature for all the faithful, were as it were graduated in practice. The recitation of the Divine Office in its entirety, with the long Scripture lections of Matins, was obligatory on all in Holy Orders and upon religious communities. The amount of Scripture which the ordinary congregation heard read in church outside the lections of the Mass, the Gospel and Epistles, was extremely small.

Surely we are coming to see, even at home in educated England, that a great deal of the Old Testament, and parts even of the New, are far more suited for study than for public recitation in Church. Many of the lessons from Chronicles, Job, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and even from the Acts, are very hard to understand as detached lections given to folk without any general knowledge of their meaning.

The question of putting the whole Bible at once

into the hands of uninstructed natives for purposes of private reading is another matter; but it is akin to the question of reading it in lessons. And the Church of England ought never to forget the result of this policy as pursued by the first missionaries to the Maoris of New Zealand in the early nineteenth century. The whole Bible was given to them with an implicit belief in its ability to tell its own story and work its own converting result.

Many of the Maoris fastened on those parts of the Old Testament which seemed to their then uninstructed minds to be most suited to their case; and the result was the fanatical outburst of "Hau Hauism," a kind of pseudo-Judaic heresy of the most bloodthirsty type.

Another root idea of the Prayer Book is that the Psalter is to be read through every month, not only by priests and deacons who are bound by the obligation of reciting the daily office, but by all the faithful. For the implied idea is that the people should hear the Divine Office every day.

The custom of the rest of Christendom was that at Matins and Vespers the Psalms should be said "in course," that is to say that the greater part of the Psalter should be recited at Matins consecutively, more or less, as we recite it, only so as to complete the course in a week; and that a smaller selection of Psalms (some thirty-five) should be recited every week at Vespers also in course or rotation. This meant in practice that the more difficult form of prayer (Matins) was left to the clergy and to religious orders, and that at Vespers, which was

more frequented by the laity, the Psalms would be familiar by the recurrence of the same selection at weekly intervals (five invariable Psalms for Sundays, Mondays, Tuesdays, etc.). The Hours of Lauds, Compline, and, to a certain extent, of Prime, had Psalms chosen for their appropriateness to the hour of day, and were nearly invariable. The 119th Psalm was divided daily between Prime, Terce, Sext and None.

The Psalter, like the Eucharist and the Our Father is one of the Christian's great weapons of prayer. We have the great advantage of saying it in the vernacular, but do we in other respects make the best and most intelligible use of it ?

Surely there is very much to be said in favour of some principle of worship that allows a greater use of invariable Psalms, chosen for their appropriateness and familiar by repeated use. This would provide simplicity of worship for the majority who need milk and not strong meat, without sacrificing the great principle of the recital of the Psalter in its entirety by the Church as an official body.

If there is much to be said for it at home (and experience has shown the great popularity of such an office as Compline with simple people), how much more is there to be said in its favour in the Mission Field ?

There is no need for the Church of England to embark on the production of new and original forms of liturgical worship. This is not her *forte*, and the great age of liturgical construction is in the past.

It is worth considering the point whether she might not do wisely by recognizing officially, and for use in all her missionary dioceses, some form of the ancient offices such as Lauds, Vespers and Compline. The great and increasing private use of these, and of the lesser Hours at home encourages us to hope for something of the kind, and it is perhaps significant that the widely used manual *Prime and Hours* was published with a commendation from a Bishop in South Africa.

VIII

THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE IN THE MISSION FIELD

“**T**O confess our Sins to a Priest, even in Health, is a pious Custom, instituted by God Himself, required by the Apostles of their Converts, and universally practised by all succeeding ages. The *Romanists* indeed have wretchedly abus'd it, but it hath, on the other hand, been too much neglected by *Protestants*; and therefore it is heartily to be wish'd that it might be reduc'd to its Primitive Institution, it being the best means we can use for obtaining Pardon and for amending our Lives.” So wrote Mr. Wheatley in *The Church of England Man's Companion; or a Rational Illustration of the Harmony, Excellency, and Usefulness of the Book of Common Prayer*.

We are not concerned to defend this eighteenth century writer's description of St. John Baptist as an Apostle, nor to attempt a treatise upon the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament of Penance, but merely to contend for the value of confession in missionary work. Here again there is great advantage in trying to get away from our peculiar

national point of view. We as a nation inherit a code of morality handed down by generation after generation of Christian tradition; and we also inherit a mass of complicated prejudice on the subject of confession. We have yet hardly reached the stage when it is possible to speak upon this subject to an assembly of Church people without feeling that metaphorical quills are rising upon some of our hearers' backs. The majority of Church of England people are so sure that "the Romanists have wretchedly abused" this sacrament, even if they are not still convinced that it is a distinctly Popish practice, and not a sacrament at all.

But in the Mission Field there is neither that inherited tradition of morality which keeps the greater part of our Sunday congregations from temptation to violent and flagrant sin, nor is there any of the vague preconceived dislike, the prejudice and distrust which surround the popular view concerning confession at home.

Behind the converted Asiatic or the converted African lies a whole world history of moral evil. Practices condemned by the universal consent of Christian Europe are often to him part of the weft and woof of his whole social fabric and instinctive custom. The most experienced European missionary may easily live among his people for years and never come to grips with their sins at all; that is, he may not do so unless he is accustomed to deal with them one by one in the Church's own appointed way.

In England a standard of ethics is inherited, in

heathen lands it has to be taught. And the confessional is by far the most useful method of teaching it. It is very hard for us to realize what struggles native converts from heathenism have to endure, how frequently they fall and how grievously they need the cleansing of absolution.

If the Church makes no use, or only half-hearted use, of this great weapon in her armoury against Satan, she goes into battle like a man with one arm tied behind his back. The whole weight of heredity, tradition, family influence, and social custom drags one way; it is nothing short of cruelty to withhold the appointed means whereby the fallen sinner may be restored to grace through "the word of reconciliation."

Priests who work in Missions where the confessional is a recognized and regular part of the religious system find that nothing imposes a greater strain upon their energies than the constant consideration of "cases" brought by penitents to the Church's tribunal. All kinds of most serious and complicated questions have to be decided, cases arising out of native marriage laws, tribal or social customs, cases arising out of the absence of Christian moral law, or the existence of a traditional moral code whose every instinct is totally foreign to the whole spirit of the Gospel.

Marriage customs alone produce a whole host of difficulties and entanglements which must be dealt with one by one. The ordinary audience at a missionary meeting can never quite understand the condition of social order brought about by such

a custom as that of polygamy. They hear with surprise and horror of a lapsed Christian who takes more than one wife. In Central Africa there is nothing disreputable in having several wives; it is no more odd to the African than it was to Esau or to Solomon. On the contrary, it is a mark of some eccentricity or of poverty to be faithful to only one.

The Chinese, Japanese or Indian convert requires constant careful individual shepherding, and will always require it until that distant day when the standard of his world is Christian and not heathen. These are some of the reasons why the regular and fullest use of the sacrament of Penance is peculiarly and specially necessary in the Mission Field. But after all the plainest and most obvious reason is because of the constant need of cleansing from sin that is common to all the human race. The convert who has relapsed and stained the whiteness of his baptismal innocence by plain and flagrant sin must have the means of cleansing from his guilt. The Church must still put pardon through the precious Blood in the very forefront of her message to the world, just as the Apostles did. "Be it known unto you, brethren, that through this man is preached unto you remission of sins."

It is not merely a general "uplift," nor the building of some kind of Christian body that she goes to give; she goes "to proclaim release to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised," by dealing in the Church's appointed way with individual souls; and that not

by advice and counsel only, but by the benefit of absolution, by restoring the fallen sinner to full communion and the life of grace.

The Church of England has repeated for more than three hundred and fifty years her hope for the godly discipline of the primitive Church, speaking of the day "when the said discipline may be restored again (which is much to be wished)." Surely in the new conditions of the Mission Field the time has come when she should face this question everywhere openly and boldly.

For the prejudices that hinder her devout wishes from being fulfilled in England do not exist abroad, unless she herself takes them with her. As an instance of this we may quote a story of a revivalistic Mission in a diocese belonging to the Evangelical party of our communion. The district where the revival was held had deteriorated very seriously from the Christian standards—some of the most prominent Christians had taken several wives according to the custom of the country, there had been much backsliding. The clergyman in charge was amazed to find that after the revival the people spontaneously desired to confess their sins, they demanded to do so, and he dealt with the men himself and sent the women to his wife.

But to the African mind this desire for open confession is no strange thing, for in many tribes confession of misdoing forms part of their native rites. It is a normal and natural thing for them to do unless they are taught by the silence or even the explicit precept of a missionary that it forms

no part of the Christian system. It is pathetic that the natural desire when it exists should not receive the satisfaction of the Church's absolution.

In all the world, apart from those few countries where confession has existed as a religious custom, the instinctive desire of the burdened heart to open its grief is a natural prompting of the soul.

We may not have so much faith in the value of anthropology as a subject for missionary study as some modern authorities evince, but we may at least be reminded by the anthropologist that the sense of "collective responsibility" is one of the commonest sentiments of primitive man. He who has injured his brother man owes a debt of reparation not to the injured person only but to all the injured person's tribe or kindred. This is akin to a doctrine implied in the use of the sacrament of penance, namely that the sinner offends not only against God but against the Church, and that confession of sin is to be made to God and the Church in the person of her representative, the priest.

The individualism of the Protestant, ingrained as it is in so many English minds, is an acquired and not a primitive idea. The Catholic doctrine of corporate unity, and of the responsibility of the single soul to the whole Church of which he is a member, lies close to the heart of the natural man.

Unfortunately in many of our Missions the Church of England does not make full use of the sacrament of Penance, and in many others she does not make use of it at all.

And here we would draw a distinction. As at

home so also in the Mission Field there is a party which would describe itself as definitely Protestant, which would strongly repudiate any belief in the use of sacramental confession at all. We disagree with them as strongly as possible, but this is not the place to go into the doctrine of absolution. We take it for granted here that the words of our Ordinal, "Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained," are to be interpreted in the sense in which the Church has always understood them. And we must also recognize that Protestantism has developed a method of moral discipline which is peculiar to itself. If it does not offer absolution through this sacrament, it very frequently imposes strong discipline and open acknowledgment of guilt.

But the "great Central party of the Church," while holding in theory the doctrine of absolution, and even expounding it in private to selected cases, or at occasional instructions before confirmation, never succeeds in making it an integral part of the system of the Church's life.

And thus the party falls between two stools. Its followers miss the red-hot fervour of the Evangelical; and they fall far short of the practice of the Catholic. They will tell you that they teach confession for cases of grievous sin, but that in practice the sacrament is not much used. I have known a bishop in the Far East, who would be considered "a good Churchman," refuse to accept a candidate for ordination who desired to teach confession as

a normal and regular thing, though he would allow it for special cases. In spite of all we have said about the absence of Protestant individualism and prejudice in the natural man the fact remains that confession is always a humiliating discipline against which the "natural man" in all of us rebels. If so much stress is laid upon its optional character that sinners see they can be retained in full communion without absolution being received, if public teaching concerning it is exceedingly infrequent, and its use is seen to be abnormal, then the natural result must follow, and the sacrament becomes a dead letter.

Of course confession cannot be "compulsory," any more than saying our prayers can be made "compulsory," but unless we teach our converts their grave responsibility for using this means of grace they will seldom learn to use it. They are wise words which Mr. Belton has written in his *Manual for Confessors*. "Once a priest allows his people to assume that there are two ways of receiving absolution, one easy and the other hard, he may expect to find his confessional unfrequented, for he ministers to frail human beings who will almost inevitably choose the easier way."

Nor is it satisfactory to have divided opinions in one diocese upon this question. Sometimes there are in the same diocese priests here and there who make use of this means of dealing with their flock, while others in the majority do not. This must inevitably lead to confusion and uncertainty in the mind of the native Church.

We may well doubt if any solid foundation can be laid to missionary work except where confession is taught and practised, not as the private method of certain priests but as a natural and normal part of the life of the Christian.

And we may be thankful that in so many of our Missions it is so practised. The normal round of itinerating work to many missionaries means something like this : At the end of a long day's journey the priest reaches the station where the native catechist assembles the flock who are to receive Holy Communion next morning. He remains in the church till a late hour hearing the confessions of the people : very difficult and tiring work, both because he must deal with them in a foreign language and because the beginner in the faith makes such heavy demands upon his skill and patience. Next morning he meets his flock in church again and gives them their Communion, and soon afterwards he is starting on another long walk to repeat the process at another station.

It must be hard work truly ! But it is work that will surely tell. How many priests are there at home who would give anything to get the chance to talk to their people about their souls, to hear their troubles, to warn them against their sins, but have to be content with general conversation upon matters that may have little relation to religion at all.

In the confessional the priest comes directly to grips with essentials. He may be left with few illusions, he may realize, even when he has done all

he can, the enormous difficulty of his task ; he may be confronted with the responsibility of making great decisions with only dim understanding of the best solution ; but he is at least in closest touch with his people's nature and their troubles. And he is setting free the power of the Cross of Christ to work its miracle of absolving forgiveness in every heart that is truly penitent. He brings his people, erring and wilful as they may be, back again and again to the cleansing fountain of the love of God.

IX

TRAINING OF MISSIONARIES

IT is quite obvious that training is needed for the difficult work of a missionary; and that this need has been very acutely present to the minds of those interested in missionary work is witnessed by the fact that the "British Board of Study for the Preparation of Missionaries" issued its fifth Annual Report in March, 1915.

We are all of us convinced that better training for missionaries is required, but we are not all convinced of the best way of giving it, nor even in what it should consist. If we fairly consider all the facts the conclusion we must come to is this: that we need not confine our sense of the present lack of training to candidates for missionary work, for it is part of a larger problem; we are sadly and curiously deficient as a Church in provision for proper training for the ministry at large. As things stand now the Church of England, in these days when efficiency is demanded in every other branch of life, is still to a great extent staffed by amateurs who are expected to pick up their training as they practise their profession. Our

clergy learn their business mainly by a system of apprenticeship; but too often they are articed as curates to vicars who are unable to teach them much. After a short year's course of general study at a theological college (which is not always required of them), whose nature is dictated by the syllabus of the "Universities' Preliminary Examination," and by the Bishop's Ordination examinations, which approximate to the same standard, they go as deacons to serve under a parish priest who may or may not have either the capacity or the time for training them in their ministerial duties. In fact, the whole system of the training of the clergy of the Church of England is one with which it is easy to find fault. The training of our missionary clergy is only a minor department of a larger whole. For the priesthood in England is alone among the professions in that the amateur standard is considered by many as a positive ideal for the clergy. The average layman, moved by some vague dread of a seminarist education, actually prefers that his priest should have the ordinary public school and university training, without any definitely professional equipment at all. So he gets the kind of clergy he prefers, good fellows with public school traditions if possible, but in no sense specialists in their vocation.

But in the Mission Field there is no room for the amateur. The missionary must be a trained man able to depend on his own resources for every demand that his work may make upon him.

Probably the method of apprenticeship in some

form or another will always supply a great part of a missionary's final training. He must learn much that is special to his particular task from older priests in his own diocese ; but first and foremost the missionary must be a trained priest. If he is to go as an agent of the Holy Catholic Church he must know the duties which her priests have to perform, and the best manner of fulfilling them. He must not be left to pick up the method of rightly and duly administering the holy sacraments as best he can.

He must know the doctrine and theology of the Church thoroughly, with something at least of that mastery which enables a teacher to impart his teaching clearly and correctly to simple and un-instructed minds. And there is no greater test of thorough mastery of a subject than that.

Also he must have some grasp of the elements of moral theology, for he will not be able to fall back upon a generally accepted consensus of correct opinion about moral questions, as so many of our home clergy have to be content to do. He must be able to hear the confessions of penitents very uninstructed in Christian ethics.

And above all, he must be firmly set in the devotional life. He must have acquired a habit of devotion which shall produce the priestly character. There is a disposition among some of the laity at home to argue in this way : If the religion we are to be content with is the " old-fashioned Anglican religion," then, they say, the old-fashioned Anglican clergyman suffices for our needs ; but if we are to

be taught a high sacramental religion, then we prefer the professional to the amateur, and they "go over to Rome." But it is the Church's fault if her priests are amateurs; there is no reason why this must be so. Our whole contention is frankly this, that old-fashioned Anglicanism is a weak influence in the Mission Field, and that the Catholic faith in its fullness and purity is what the heathen world requires. Consequently the first essential in a ministry that is to carry the faith to the heathen world is a thorough training in the office and work of a priest, considering that work and office as a highly skilled profession. We do not say that it is necessary that our missionaries should have the same training as a Roman priest receives in the ministry of the sacraments, nor the same as a Protestant minister receives in preaching and the study of the Holy Scriptures; but we do maintain that it is not right that he should have less training than either of these. In the whole question of the education of missionaries we must observe proportion: training in the work and life of a priest must come first, specialized "missionary subjects" must come second; knowledge of his own religious faith and practice is essential, knowledge of non-Christian religions is desirable; specialized knowledge suitable to a missionary may be grafted on to a thorough training for the Christian priesthood, but without this essential training it is of no great value.

Now the members of the Board of Study for the Preparation of Missionaries, 1916-17, include

representatives from the following bodies: the Baptist Missionary Society, the Baptist Zenana Mission, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Central Board of Missions of the Church of England, the Church Missionary Society, the Church of England Zenana Missionary Society, the Church of Scotland Foreign Missions Committee, the Church of Scotland Women's Foreign Mission Committee, the English Presbyterian Church Foreign Mission Association, the London Missionary Society, Medical Missions, the Presbyterian Church in Ireland Foreign Mission Committee, the Primitive Methodist Missionary Society, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the South African General Mission, the Student Christian Movement, the United Free Church of Scotland Foreign Missions, the United Free Church of Scotland Women's Foreign Mission, the United Methodist Church Mission, the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, the Wesleyan Methodist Women's Work, the Women's Missionary Association of the Presbyterian Church of England, the Zenana Bible and Medical Mission, University Representatives, and seventeen specially co-opted members.

It is not likely that out of such a committee could come much consensus of united opinion as to the character and training of a priest of the Catholic Church. The only ground upon which they can unite is what may be called specially missionary subjects; and so as a matter of fact we find the case to be. We may also note in passing

that the Roman Catholic Church, whose experience of missionary work is longer and more widespread than that of all these bodies combined, is perforce omitted from list. This is the more to be regretted because the Roman Catholics have long possessed in their great seminary at Mill Hill and its branch houses just such a training college for missionaries as this Board of Study for the Preparation of Missionaries are seeking to evolve.

One more point needs clearing up before we discuss the training of the future missionary. Is the training we propose to give a course of education that is intended for candidates for the priesthood, to be received along with their preparation for Holy Orders? Or is it a course intended for men who have already spent some considerable part in their lives in the priest's office at home, and desire to offer themselves as priests of ripe experience, for new work in some missionary diocese? The two things are obviously quite different, yet the difference is not always recognized. The Board of Study seems to have in view the first of these classes. It is a post-graduate, not a post-ordination course, and is intended for young men and women before they enter on their work either as ministers attached to some Protestant body, as priests of the Church engaged in work overseas, or as medical missionaries, or as women workers in the Mission Field.

The promoters of the scheme will assure us that it is taken for granted that such training as each religious body requires of its ministers shall have already been given. Of course it ought to be

presupposed, but in fact, so far as our own Church is concerned, such training is woefully inadequate in the majority of our ordinands. The candidate for the ministry should study his own religion thoroughly first, and see other religions in the light of it. The modern Protestant method exposes the candidate to the great practical danger of studying heathen systems of religion with an open mind, before he has had time to master his own. These are the words of Principal Garvie in a paper on the Education of Missionaries, reprinted and circulated by this Board :

“ Christian theology has tended to be far too isolated. While we may hold that Christ answers the questions of the mind as well as meets the needs of the heart as no other founder of a religion can, as He alone is not only Teacher but Master and Saviour, we hold that conviction only with full sincerity if we are prepared to compare His gifts and claims with theirs. While the history of religions may present to us a bewildering variety of belief, custom and rite, yet the comparative study will bring us back to a most illuminative similarity.”

By all means let the missionary candidate study the religion of the people to whom he is going (it may be doubted whether a missionary to Kaffraria will be much helped by a study of the Vedas, or of Shintoism), but considering the lamentably low standard of Christian theology among ordinands let us insist that he shall know his own religion first.

And be the missionary a priest or a layman, a

doctor or a nurse, it is essential that he shall be a devout, convinced and well-instructed Christian before he dares to enter on the delicate and responsible work of religious propaganda in a non-Christian land.

The utmost respect is due to every man's religious convictions, and this respect should make us pause before we undermine the religion professed by any race of men, until we are absolutely convinced, with a certainty of deepest and humblest faith, that the religion we offer to substitute for their own is perfect, ultimate and final truth. It may seem absurd to express a fear lest those who seek to carry the Catholic Faith to others should not be well grounded in the Faith themselves. But experience will show that it is no imaginary danger.

The chief fruit of the deliberations of the Board of Study for the Preparation of Missionaries is a scheme for the creation of a Central College of Missionary Studies. This scheme was suggested at a Conference of Missionary Societies at Swanwick in 1914, and was put forward the following year. The College is to be central in the sense that it is open to all Protestant bodies and to the Church of England. Its need is specially felt by the Free Churches, since they have no missionary colleges of their own ; it is felt by those Churchmen and women who support it because they are, quite rightly, not content with our own missionary colleges, although some of them have been in existence more than thirty years.

One of the main reasons which move many of

its supporters among those who are most active and influential in the organization of missionary endeavour is the desire to see our young missionaries imbued with "broadness of mind," by contact with students belonging to non-episcopal or Protestant denominations. This seems to be an instance of that power of attraction exercised by strong and powerful bodies upon bodies numerically smaller to which we have already made allusion. It is the dread of being left out of the running.

The hope of the Board is that the College shall become residential, but provision is to be made of a hostel where Church of England students may share a common life. The subjects suggested are as follows :

I. The Study of the Bible as the Missionary's Handbook. (This course is suggested as an invaluable means of accomplishing the aim of the College. It is considered, however, that if any society felt that the teaching of this subject in the College would be inconsistent with the principle by which the Board of Study is guided, its students should not be required to take the course.)

II. Missionary Principles.

III. Missionary Method.

IV. Missionary History.

V. Introduction to the Study of Religion from the Missionary Standpoint.

(1) The methods of studying Religion.

(2) The development of the Religious Consciousness, Animism, Polydaemonism, etc.

(3) Non-Christian Religions in (i) the Literature

of the Countries, and (ii) the Religious Life of the Countries in the present day.

- (4) The Contact of Christianity and other Faiths.
- (a) Action of Christianity on other Faiths.
 - (b) Reaction of other Faiths on Christianity.
 - (c) Adaptation of the Gospel to Racial and other conditions.
 - (d) Preservation of the Essentials of the Gospel.
 - (e) The Wider Historical Problems arising out of the Contact.
 - (f) This series of lectures should be supplemented and related to present-day conditions by securing lectures from missionaries who will deal with the non-Christian religions in their present state, and modern offshoots.

VI. Anthropology, Ethnology, and Sociology.

VII. Education.

- (1) General Educational Principles as applied to (a) the Preaching of the Gospel, and (b) the Instruction in Christian Faith of different types of inquirers and converts.
- (2) Supervision of Schools in Mission Districts.
- (3) Management of Sunday Schools.

VIII. Linguistics.

- (1) Phonetics taught in relation to the languages of the field.
- (2) The Science of Language.
- (3) Guidance in Study of Particular Languages, mainly in their classical forms.

- (4) Study of Vernaculars by Students to whom Language Schools will not be accessible upon the field.

IX. Business Methods.

X. Care of Health in the Mission Field.

XI. Geography, History, Literatures and Vernaculars of the East and Africa."

It would take too long to criticize this scheme in detail. First we must remember that its promoters, the majority of whom are Nonconformists, are not to be expected to have in mind any training for the priesthood as such. That they would take for granted as already given, and the same applies to instruction in Christian doctrine. But if we do take for granted that such foundation instruction is already given, how far is the course likely to be useful to the student who is going to a Mission on the Rand, or to Bengal, or to Japan, or to the West Indies? For this is how we should criticize it, from the point of view of men doing some small piece of work in a very isolated part of the great world. No one is less concerned with generalities than a missionary; a priest labouring among the Esquimaux has no use for knowledge of the religious peculiarities of the Hindus, and *vice versa*. The scheme suggests too strongly the work of a committee which had to draw up a tentative syllabus. And such no doubt it is: it would not be fair to suppose that it is final. Many points suggest themselves for criticism; for instance, that several of the subjects are violently contentious: that entitled "The Reaction of other Faiths on Christianity" might provoke

very serious criticism of Protestant Missions in China, and of much missionary work in India. Nor could an old-fashioned Christian brought up to believe what St. Paul said in Galatians i. 8, 9, listen with equanimity to some modern missionaries' views upon "The Adaptation of the Gospel to Racial and other Conditions," or "The Preservation of the Essentials of the Gospel."

Educational methods are enormously important, but the suggested course on "The Management of Sunday Schools" opens up a vista of dismal possibilities.

Linguistics also, especially the study of the elements of Phonetics, are most valuable. But it is at least an open question whether the actual languages cannot be better studied in their native land, during the necessary period of apprenticeship; and in any case both Educational Method and Phonetics can well be taught without erecting a special college. Of course, the number of special subjects which a missionary requires is legion; one might add to the list, long as it already is. Horse management is more useful in many parts of the world than geography, for instance.

But we cannot avoid feeling that the true motive of the scheme is to ensure that broadening of the outlook which it is hoped to gain by co-operation with other religious bodies, to create a common atmosphere by sharing so far as possible in united study with students from the great non-episcopal bodies.

And while the advantages are obvious, in our

opinion the counterbalancing disadvantages outweigh the benefit of such co-operation.

It is easier to criticize than to construct ; and it is ungracious to carp at a scheme that has meant so much thought and care. But if the criticism is honest and tends, in however small a degree, to advance the cause of efficiency in missionary work, surely it may be pardoned.

Is it consistent to lay such stress on the importance of Church atmosphere in our elementary schools and yet deliberately seek to dilute the same atmosphere in the training of our missionaries ? For be it remembered that young candidates for the ministry are singularly open to influence for good or ill by the atmosphere of their environment.

Could we not set ourselves to think first of all how we can help on and improve the system of training we already possess in our own missionary colleges and theological colleges generally, before embarking on a dubious and novel venture ?

The ideal education of a missionary should comprise as good a liberal education as possible. It is not necessary for all missionaries to be philosophers, nor historians, nor students of classical literature. But the more any man knows of all these subjects the better. The study of theology is enormously assisted by some knowledge of philosophy and the power of abstract thought that is thereby gained. The East as well as the West has its own metaphysics ; and the result of Eastern metaphysics is Asia. Europe has been built upon the philosophy of Greece ; Platonism,

not Buddhism, Aristotle, not Açvaghosha, provided the terms in which our thought has found expression. In the providence of God Christian religious thought has framed itself in the clear and lucid forms which we learned originally from the Greeks. It will help the missionary to have some knowledge of Western philosophy before he begins his theological course.

The study of Church history cannot be profitably pursued without some knowledge of general history, and history is perhaps more useful than any other subject for students who are looking for the best direction in which to improve their education so as to fit themselves for a subsequent course of definite preparation for the ministry.

Classical literature generally, that is all great writing that ranks as art, is an invaluable mental food for men who have to think for themselves and teach others. The missionary ought to be a reading man. The fact that he is will inevitably open for him doors into many minds, whereas the man who never reads unless he is forced to do so is almost sure to be a failure as a teacher.

As regards the immediate training of the missionary, by which we mean here the young man, graduate or non-graduate, who desires to serve God in non-Christian lands in the office of the priesthood, it should follow the main lines of preparation for the ministry, considered as a special vocation or profession. The candidate must be well grounded in the elements of theology, taught with a due regard for the proportion of the faith,

in a positive, not a controversial school, and with rather special intention of enabling him to impart it in instruction to simple minds. He must see the faith from the point of view of one who may have to present (as a new thing in a world where no previous knowledge can be taken for granted) "the principal things a Christian man ought to know and believe." And in view of the surroundings in which he is to work let his instruction not be too much cramped by the detailed exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles. When one remembers the historical setting, the fact that the generation in which they were written had grown up in the atmosphere of a traffic in masses for the dead, the language of the Thirty-first Article (to take it as an instance) may be comprehensible enough. But it is an unfortunate thing for the Church of England that the only explicit teaching of the Articles upon the Eucharistic sacrifice should be the denunciation of the "commonly said" sixteenth century theory of "sacrifices of masses" for actual sin, erected as a money-making rival to the Sacrifice of Calvary. There is no need in this or other points to carry bitter memories of long dead and buried controversy into the young Churches of the Mission Field.

The would-be missionary should know the history of the Church, but his survey ought to be a wide one. He should know something of the Church Universal as well as of the Church of England, and he will probably find the history of early Christianity more valuable for his purpose than that of the

later periods, though he should of course know both.

His study of Liturgiology must go side by side with his use of liturgical devotions. Having before his mind the duty of rightly and duly administering the Holy Sacraments after his ordination, he will become perfectly familiar with the Holy Eucharist by regular attendance and worship, and by serving at the altar. He will also be taught before he leaves his college the manner of reverently celebrating the Holy Mysteries, and will be urged to keep this in mind during his diaconate. He will learn much of the duty of hearing confessions which will one day be his, by making his own confession to an experienced priest; and he will, also unconsciously, learn a reverent and careful method of reciting the daily office from the daily worship of the college chapel. But besides this he must be taught the origin and development of all Christian worship and the place of the Prayer Book in this development.

The instinct of the Church of England is to trust largely to sanctified common sense as guide for the priest in hearing confessions. But in view of the difficulties of the Mission Field and of the enormous importance of this sacrament as part of the missionary's equipment, he ought to have definite instruction on the matter. Some study of Moral Theology is at least most desirable, or failing this the study of Psychology will set him thinking on right lines about the machinery of human behaviour, which is the same the world over, and some simple instruction in Ethics will at least arouse a curiosity in the subject

of morals. He will realize that moral as well as mental difficulties exist, and that he may be called upon to give advice in complicated cases. But an ideal course would certainly include a careful study of Moral Theology; for wise and skilled confessors are rarely produced by nature without training.

Besides these subjects the candidate should be taught the duties of a teacher and a pastor. By constantly learning to express himself on paper in his own words, he must learn how to put together the subject matter of his sermons and instructions. And he can learn by carefully supervised practice in an empty church how to deliver a sermon as regards manner, clearness, and the right use of the voice. He should also be regularly taught how to read and sing. The study of the Fathers must not be neglected; and side by side with all these subjects must go a careful study of the Bible. His regular attendance at the daily offices, in which the lessons are read by the students in rotation, will ensure that he *reads through* the major part of the Bible in the year. His daily meditation should teach him to dwell carefully upon selected portions of it; and he will study it also with the aid of lectures and for purposes of examination.

The value of the Old Testament for intending missionaries is obvious, and if the lecturer has a background of knowledge of comparative religion he cannot fail to set the student thinking on right lines that will be useful to him when confronted with the religions of the heathen world. In fact all

the instruction which the missionary candidate receives ought to be, and easily may be, coloured by the special outlook of his vocation. The close connection of the college with the Mission Field is maintained by the fact that all its old students are working there, and frequent visits from missionaries keep the students in touch with the work of the Church abroad.

This is a very short and necessarily imperfect sketch of the kind of training that seems essential for a candidate for Holy Orders who is to be a missionary. At a non-graduate college four years is all too short a period for the training; what length of course would be the ideal for graduate colleges it is hard to say, but in any case the present course of one year's training is quite inadequate. Until we have secured a better training for the priesthood in itself, it is no part of wisdom to insist upon a year devoted to such subjects as "The Study of Religions," "Anthropology, Ethnology and Sociology," to be spent in the heated atmosphere of unsettlement which is inseparable from constant contact with other students differing fundamentally in their views upon highly controversial matters.

To sum up: the ideal training for a missionary priest is the best possible training for the priesthood as such. While it will be possible to orientate that training in all its parts by bearing the special conditions of the Mission Field steadily in mind, both in the lectures and in devotional instruction in the college chapel, it is a mistake to draw too

clear cut a distinction between missionary and non-missionary work. We serve no useful purpose by keeping missionary work among the heathen in a water-tight compartment ; to do so is almost a peculiarity of Protestantism, caused partly by the unfamiliarity of English-speaking peoples with any Christianity in an alien tongue. Rome does not do so ; the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* includes in its survey work in Europe and America as well as in China and in Africa. The Church in so far as she is Catholic and not national must ever be spreading out her activities into a cosmopolitan world, and extending the same organization into it all. When Dr. C. H. Robinson, in his *History of Christian Missions*, makes the statement that St. Augustine of Hippo was "not himself distinguished for missionary zeal," we can only explain so remarkable a saying by remembering that in the fourth century there was no S.P.G.

The whole Church was then one great missionary body, and there is no more classical handbook for the missionary of to-day than S. Augustine *De Catechizandis Rudibus*. Directly we look at the facts as they stand to-day, and get away from the artificial "missionary" standpoint we realize that the majority of our missionaries minister to flocks well grounded in the faith even while they are bringing in fresh converts daily from the heathen. In South Africa "white work" goes on side by side with "native work." The worst danger for the Church in that Province is too sharp a distinction or rivalry between the two ; the less "Missions"

are kept in a water-tight compartment the better. The priest who ministers to dark-skinned congregations in the scattered islands of the diocese of Nassau is truly a missionary ; but he has no problems of heathenism in the sense of organized non-Christian religion to face.

Nor can we deny the title of missionary to the Bush brother or the priest in North-Western Australia. He may never meet a "heathen" unless he works on a Mission to the Aborigines, but the Bishop of North-West Australia, in leaving the diocese of Nyassaland for his present see, passed from a flourishing branch of the Church with crowded altars and strong sacramental life to a region where public religious observances can hardly be said to exist for the great mass of the scattered population. Foreign Missions are not a sharply distinguished department of Church activity requiring a class of ministers to itself ; they are the ever-growing fringe of one great homogeneous body, the Catholic Church of all the ages, one in every language, people and tribe. A doctor remains a doctor when he is a medical missionary ; he does not become a veterinary surgeon. And even as he keeps in touch with and shares a common training with the brethren of his profession at home, so the priest should do. Both have to acquire much special knowledge and adapt it to the conditions of their work, but they are not a separate kind of beings from the rest of their profession.

While something may be done to provide special missionary training at home, and some of the

languages that will be required may be studied before leaving England, the main part of that which is peculiar to the missionary can surely be best learned by a system of apprenticeship in the diocese to which the candidate eventually goes. The special needs of his future country are better learned on the spot than by imbibing doctrinaire ideals in a lecture room at home. It must be confessed that this last is a contentious point, there is much to be said on both sides, but there can be no doubt that our chief and crying need in the Mission Field is for trained priests, educated carefully and thoroughly for the work of the ministry and well grounded in the devotional life.

The need for knowledge of Missionary Principles and Method is more appropriate to the bishops and the senior clergy of the diocese; what the young student requires is to learn his own immediate business, the great and difficult duties of a priest in the Church of God. There is no sort of reason why the Church of England should not provide him with this training, and she is beginning to do so.

But hitherto she has not made full use of the talent committed to her care. She has the priesthood of the Holy Church, and she has splendid material from which to recruit men for it. It is her own fault, not the fault of the Catholic system, that she has failed to use to the full the great weapon of a well-educated ministry trained and equipped for the winning and shepherding of the souls of men. She will continue this great fault if she

urges her ministers to study every 'ology except Theology, and puts Missionary Method and Comparative Religion before the office and work of a priest in the Church of God.

THE THEORY OF NATIONAL CHURCHES

WITHIN the Church itself, disregarding for the moment the wider lines of cleavage that separate Christians, there are forces that make for division: differences of doctrinal teaching, of ceremonial usage, of racial disposition, of colour and the like. African Christianity tends to express itself in a different form from that assumed by Indian Christianity, Melanesian from Japanese, and so forth. Bearing this obvious fact in mind, let us ask ourselves what precisely we mean when we consider the question of what are called "national Churches." Diversity there must always be; are we wise in throwing ourselves enthusiastically into the policy of accepting and accentuating national peculiarity, or should we strive first and foremost for the principle of Catholic uniformity and resist rather than foster the tendency to rest in an expression of the faith that prides itself upon being national? Bishop Montgomery, in his book *Principles and Problems of Foreign Missions* (p. 86), writes: "It must be sufficient for us to say

that no branch of the ancient Church so much as our own is pledged to the principle of national and self-governing Churches. For that cause we have shed our blood, and for it, too, we have endured bitter and protracted controversies. But it is the breath of our life, and in the providence of God it appears to be certain that we shall give to the Church of all the ages the first bishops of their own race in India, China, and Japan."

By all means let us work and pray for a native ministry; but this does not involve a "national Church." Let us do our utmost to make the dioceses of our communion founded in heathen lands self-supporting, and self-governing, so far as regards matters that come within the competence of a single bishop; but this does not entitle them to be called part of a "national Church." It would be unfair to say from the passage quoted that Bishop Montgomery prefers the ideal of a national Church to that of the Catholic Church, but we shall probably be quite safe in saying that there are many who have a strong desire for the first and no clear grasp of the second. "The construction of a national Church in Africa is a primary object of Christian Missions," says Dr. Robinson in his *History of Christian Missions*. But is this so? And what do we mean by a national Church? Do we mean a Church in which the *esprit de corps* centres most in that which is national, or in that which is oecumenical? In practice there is a vast difference between the two points of view. The one is easy to produce, in fact difficult to avoid when the

Church becomes a living force in the nation, the other is hard to attain ; the one relies on a natural bond of union, the other on a supernatural. If we make the episcopate the unit of government, as we do make it, are we to emphasize and rest in that side of the bishop's office in which he is considered as the father of his own separate flock, sitting in synod with his own diocesan representatives, or that side of his office in which he is a member of a council of his peers, a provincial council of bishops, or a larger council representing all provinces of his communion throughout the world ?

From another point of view, to take a concrete instance from Church history of the principle of national Church custom affecting the individual Christian, we may quote the description of St. Monnica's encounter with St. Ambrose, given by M. Bertrand in his *Life of St. Augustine* : " At Milan she (St. Monnica) was regarded by Bishop Ambrose as a model parishioner. She never missed his sermons, and ' hung upon his lips as a fountain of water springing up to eternal life.' " But St. Ambrose found Monnica's religious practices a little undesirable. " For him Monnica was a worthy African woman, perhaps a little odd in her devotion, and given to many a superstitious practice. Thus, she continued to carry baskets of bread and wine and pulse to the tombs of the martyrs according to the use at Carthage and Thagaste. When, carrying her basket, she came to the door of one of the Milanese basilicas, the doorkeeper forbade her to enter, saying that it was against the bishop's

orders, who had solemnly condemned such practices because they smacked of idolatry. The moment she learned that this custom was forbidden by Ambrose, Monnica, very much mortified, submitted to take away her basket, for in her eyes Ambrose was the providential apostle who would lead her son to salvation. And yet it must have grieved her to give up this old custom of her country."

Here we have an instance of the national custom of a barbaric diocese, and of the exercise of that continual process of movement away from local custom and towards the habit of the Catholic Church that must have constantly gone on throughout the early days of undivided Christendom. Was St. Ambrose right or wrong? The Lambeth Conference of 1888 set down as the fourth and last essential of any scheme for reunion, "The historic episcopate, locally adapted to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church." How far are we to go in the direction of local adaptation? And how far are we to make nationality the basis of such local colouring of the Church as may be necessary? These are large questions opening up many difficult and controversial subjects, on which we have no right to dogmatize. But we may surely believe that our best hope for the ultimate reunion of Christendom, and the best contribution we can make towards our own share in working for this end, is to labour towards the maximum of uniformity, cohesion, and corporate union in all the scattered branches of our own communion, both as regards ecclesiastical

discipline and the customs of Church worship.

Let us consider the question from the point of view of ultimate reunion of all Christians. And directly the word "reunion" is mentioned we are faced first of all by the oldest line of cleavage in the Christian Church, that between the Holy Orthodox Church and the Church of Rome, a breach that goes back through so many centuries and presents to-day so formidable a spectacle of division. Though we cannot do more than speculate rather vaguely about the future of Orthodox Christianity as a world force in the Mission Field, it would be most unwise to ignore it. It is at least possible (and it is a thought of enormous hopefulness) that the revolution in Russia may set free long pent-up forces of militant Christianity and may light a new fire of missionary enthusiasm in that wonderful nation.

For the Russian Church has long been a missionary body, and the third and greatest period in the history of Russian Missions opened as recently as 1830.

The field of her enterprise extends through Siberia and the Eastern portions of the Russian Empire. It is a barren field populated by nomad tribes speaking a number of ill-developed languages and comprising some of the most difficult material that any missionaries in the world have had to work upon. It imposes conditions of the greatest hardship upon the priests and evangelists who initiated and who carry on the work. It is only because of our unfamiliarity with the Russian Em_

pire that we have sometimes overlooked this side of the activities of the Holy Orthodox Church. Behind the barriers that conceal these vast and sparsely populated regions from the European world a wonderful missionary work has been going on; it is a vast field for the Church's labour, and there are still more than thirteen or fourteen million Mohammedans in the Russian Empire itself.

The Very Rev. Eugene Smirnoff, author of *Russian Orthodox Missions*, speaks of John Veniaminoff who laboured among the Aleutes of what was Russian North America, as "the most famous missionary of the nineteenth century, and not only of the Russian Church, but of the whole Christian world." He also tells of a pastor of the Lutheran Church in Mulhausen, who wrote to the procurator of the Holy Synod for any Russian translations of the Holy Scriptures into native languages, expecting to receive two or three copies, who was utterly amazed to receive an enormous box of native translations published in Kazan.

It is a little unfortunate that one of our most authoritative publications upon missionary work should speak of Father Nicolai, the late Bishop of Tokio, in these terms: "He took away the reproach of sterility from the Church of Russia, for his example in Japan kindled a fresh zeal for Missions in that Church, so that all over Siberia little groups of devoted Christians are working for the Master and preaching Christ in all that wide Empire." There were great Russian missionaries before Archbishop Nicolai, and there may still be

a great future before the Russian Church as a missionary force in years to come. It is surely worth while to keep in view the possibility that our own communion may be the means, at some future date, of drawing bodies of Christians into closer relationship with the great severed bodies of Eastern and Western Christendom. It was politics and the feeling of national pride that lay at the root of the original quarrel between the Eastern and the Western Church. That body of Christians which is most careful to avoid the identification of the Church with the warring interests of the world will have the best chance of serving the cause of Christian reunion. This is not to be "national."

We live in the day of small things, but our hope must be for great developments in the future, and if the Church of England is to be in any sense a mediator or a force that makes for peace she must aim at being in truth a Church that is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, not circumscribed by any narrower formula than this. And this implies that she aims everywhere within her own communion at a unity which transcends the barriers of nationality and even colour, that she stands as a Church that repudiates utterly any tendency that may divide her doctrine or practice in essentials, and while not desiring a rigid uniformity like that of modern Rome, a Church that views with dislike any diversity of discipline or of ceremonial and liturgical use so strongly marked as to create unnecessary divisions between Christians. While allowing the fullest possible liberty for national contributions

of positive value to the common stock of the Church's treasure, we should hope to eliminate as far as possible local idiosyncrasies of a merely negative character. Thus while we should leave the African room to develop his natural gift for enthusiastic religion, he shews other racial tendencies less to be encouraged. We should not be content if the Church in Africa relaxed her moral discipline nor her demand for a high intellectual standard by way of concession to African custom or inclination. So again we should welcome the contemplative genius of the Asiatic, but resist that national temper which in many Asiatic races leads to quietism. All this is obvious; but there are dangers not so universally recognized in allowing too great freedom to local Churches to develop their religion in their own idiom even as regards externals. Diversity will come easily through man's natural inclination; unity can only be arrived at by faithfulness and effort.

In the ideal Church, as in "the new man" which the Church ever seeks to form, "there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman." National distinctions, Greek, Jew, Scythian, barbarian, are as foreign to the *bene esse* of the Church as class distinctions: bondman, freeman. The tendency of the world is always towards separation and cleavage; the will of God is for communion and unity.

It is at least doubtful whether national sentiment and national divisions form the best basis for build-

ing up the secular welfare of the human race. Broadly speaking, the sense of nationality fosters war; the sense of Christian unity should lead to peace. In any case there can be no doubt whatever that the Catholic Church is bound to hold up before mankind the vision of a larger unity transcending the limits of nationalism altogether.

The very point in which the Churches of the Orthodox communion are most open to hostile criticism is their extremely national character. With them, as with us, the identification of the Church with the nation, and of the nation with the Church, has fostered the many evils which seem inseparable from the idea of a State Church. The Church's officials have approximated too closely in character to secular officials of the State; and the Church has too often been swayed by motives that were political rather than religious. Nor does the unity of different branches of the Orthodox Church seem to be more than an understanding of mutual courtesy. There does not appear to be a vital intercommunion between the Russian and the Greek Churches; the very strength of their nationalism is a hindrance to this. Yet in the case of the Holy Orthodox Church there is the very powerful bond of union of similarity of liturgy, of use, tradition, and of all external forms of religious expression.

If we set out to build up national Churches in the Mission Field we can never ensure this similarity; it will be the chief thing we shall seek to avoid. But we shall intensify the national spirit, and even infuse it into races where, as in Africa or India,

it is at present weak. We may agree that in making submission to the see of Rome the *sine qua non* of membership, the great Church of the West has but substituted another essentially mundane bond of union for that of nationality; but it is the secret of half her strength that she has taught men to find in the Church a larger unity, a sense of communion with men of every race and clime. Except in the case of the Uniat Churches, where she has compromised in the face of the conservatism of the East, she has ruthlessly overridden local peculiarities of rite; she has carried this policy of uniformity of use to an extreme point, and to a point unknown in the earlier Middle Ages. But while we may not admire the rigidity that has crushed out the Gallican uses, we must admit the strength of her cosmopolitan comprehensiveness.

In the words of Bishop Creighton, "All Roman arguments resolve themselves into the assertion of the necessity of submission to *papal jurisdiction*. . . . This view is that . . . of an institution which grasps at *power*, because so many officials depend on its existence." Side by side with this centralization of authority in the Papal Curia must go a policy of uniformity; local idioms of religious expression must be severely standardized in the interests of centralized efficiency. This can never be the ideal of our Missions; we lack the centralized body of autocratic power which Rome possesses, nor do we even seek to gain it. We lack also the uniformity of ecclesiastical use and tradition which is hers. Such attempts as we make to impose

Anglicanism on our missionary Churches are not the result of policy, but rather of the lack of policy. A certain absence of imagination, not the consistent policy of deeply thought-out schemes, lies at the back of our stereotyped English system. But if we free ourselves from undue Anglicanism there is little need for us to beware of over-insistence on too rigid a conformity to one use, for we have neither the temptation to desire it nor the capacity, at present, to produce it.

It is rather in the contrary direction that our danger lies ; for there is a real risk lest we should produce several mutually antagonistic types of Christian polity.

Among the perils that attend the ideal of national Churches is one that is mainly political. Such countries as Africa and India are not, of course, nations ; they are continents inhabited by many races, each as separate in its history as are the nations of the continent of Europe. Under the impact of Western civilization these national barriers tend to break down, and a sense of racial unity unknown before begins to spread. Faced by the contact of an alien European race the Indian begins to feel his kinship as an Indian with the other races of his native continent. The bond of a common religion which shall be an Indian Christianity, separate by its national complexion from European Christianity, expressing itself in terms of Indian nationality and binding in its communion, not all races of mankind, but merely Indians as such, would be a perilous disaster, and

a great temptation to the native mind. The Ethiopian movement in South Africa is a symptom of the same danger. And what is this but a movement for an African form of Christianity, having as its aim a national Church with strong political ambitions, overriding indeed all branches of African nationality, but excluding Europeans, widening the breach between the white and black races in the continent, and inscribing on its banner the legend, "Africa for the Africans."

Apart from this eccentric and dangerous development, there is no question more serious and more bristling with difficulties than that of the union of native and European Christianity in our Church in South Africa. Great patience will be needed before the present antipathy can be overcome, but enormous harm might easily result from any radical cleavage between the two.

If the Church becomes national in a political sense, she will be identifying herself with one of the forces most fraught with peril for the future peace of the world. The lesson which she should steadily set before mankind is not the rights of nations, but the brotherhood of man.

There are also perils of a more purely religious nature in preaching that each race of men may bring its own contribution to the faith, or express the faith in its own peculiar manner. We who believe in Christianity as a unique revelation and in the Church as the Spirit-bearing body, may understand the reservations with which this doctrine can be preached. But we cannot presuppose

this knowledge or this sense of reservation in the non-Christian world.

Many thoughtful Indian students are quite ready to agree that Christianity should be interpreted in an Indian manner; but they mean by this something quite different from what leaders of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel mean by the same idea. These are the words of Mr. B. M. Malabari, a prominent Indian reformer whose life has recently been written by one of his compatriots: "The religion of the mystic will probably be the religion of the world, uniting all beliefs in one organic faith. Perhaps the new religion will rise in India. Here Christianity and Islam, Zoroastrianism and Buddhism, Hinduism, with its many sects, act and react on one another, and may all merge into one grand world religion. In the glowing hour of a new-found faith all mysteries will become clear from without, and transparent from within." Without the authoritative statement of the apostolic faith and the discipline of Catholic practice India bids fair to fall a victim to a religion of mysticism and mixed metaphor.

Among Protestant missionaries in India are many who desire to go to great lengths in order to make Christianity more "national." An Indian bishop has been asked by a professor in a theological college for permission to read a chapter from the *Bhagavad Gita* in the college chapel in place of one of the Bible lessons. It has been suggested that *Aum*, the sacred monosyllable of the Hindus, should be used instead of *Amen* by Christians; that the

phrase *asleep in Christ* should be translated by a word used in Hinduism for *absorption into God*. In these and other similar ways the enlightened native and the liberal Protestant join hands in working towards "a national Church" as they understand the phrase.

In China also we hear of a movement on the part of some bodies of Christians to get rid of their European ministers, to declare their national independence, and to profess a nominal Christianity bearing very slender resemblance to the historic faith. This has not occurred in our own Missions, but it points to an obvious danger.

The most completely national Church in all the world is that of Abyssinia, as the most completely non-national is that of Rome. It is because the Church of Abyssinia is so cut off from the main stream of Christendom and so jealous of any outside influence that she is far more African than Christian.

There are many regions of the world where separate nations meet in the same territory, as in Korea, where there are numbers of Japanese, or New Zealand, South Africa, or India, and here at least one of the most obvious functions of the Church is to strive to bridge the divisions of nationality and bind together in one body men of different, even of hostile races.

And if it be said that the "national Church" ideal means no more than that we should encourage native Christians to express their religion in forms so far as possible familiar, from long usage, to

themselves, is not this what we often blame the Church of Rome for doing? In China she has been too lenient in respect of ancestor worship, in India in respect of caste, and in some Indian Missions of her communion much native superstition is said to mingle with her Christian worship.

If even Rome, with her strong instinct for standardizing worship and discipline, finds the pressure of native custom a danger, we should exercise great caution lest we find our own Church doing what we condemn in others. There is a distinction to be drawn between more or less informal devotions, such as hymns, meetings for prayer and intercession or instruction and the like, and the ordered liturgical worship of the Church. In the first of these categories of religious exercise many missionaries find great scope for making use of native melodies, customs and forms of local usage. They find that by so doing they gain great influence; African melodies are often preferred by the native to *Ancient and Modern* hymn tunes. Indian forms of devotion may be converted and consecrated to the Church's use; but it is well recognized that there is a limit to this policy, and it is only safe when guided by priests of knowledge and discretion. The very melodies may be associated with most unchristian words, the customs may encourage the memory of rites best forgotten. Wisely used this kind of national colouring of the Christian religion is of the greatest possible assistance, and is capable of wide development in the informal devotions which accompany the Church's life. But it has never

been good policy to let "devotions" usurp the place of that liturgical worship which must be the backbone of religion. A "Service of Song," for instance, may become more attractive than the Eucharist, but it is a bad sign if it does. And surely the liturgical worship of the Church should be kept as free from local peculiarities as is compatible with reasonable freedom.

For of course a Church can be indigenous and self-governing as regards internal affairs that fall within its jurisdiction, without being national in the sense of limited to the one nation. We hope earnestly to see a native ministry, and even in due time a native episcopate, in every new diocese of the Universal Church; but the diocese whose episcopate and ministry it is would derive strength and life from feeling that she was but a unit in a province in the whole Catholic Church, bound by the discipline and "obedience of faith" of the great body of which she is a part.

In all things we should be guided by the desire for unity through faithfulness to the Catholic ideal as we have received it. The tendency of humanity to produce local differences in the One Church will always exist, whether we foster it or no, and will manifest itself as soon as the Church takes deep root among the people.

To guide, direct, or even restrain this centrifugal tendency is at least as much a part of the Church's duty as to encourage it.

It is our undue nationalism or Anglicanism that is proving the weakness of our Church at home. If

we import the defect into her daughter Churches we shall both weaken them and deprive ourselves of the fortifying and vitalizing effect they should have upon their mother Church.

}

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01146 9097

