

known that the name of Charles I. was put in the English Prayer Book in the time of his far from saintly son, Charles II., but, since 1857 the Form of Prayer has been omitted from the Calendar and it is not at all likely that the British Parliament will sanction the restoration. But, quite apart from this, it is essential and important that the English Church should show itself to the nation and empire as concerned about realities, for it is pitiable to find a Church gathering more absorbed in such insignificant matters, than in stirring up the nation to a consciousness of their attitude in the sight of God at the present moment. On every hand there are testimonies to the effect that the spiritual revival hoped for at the beginning of the War is not coming, and this, beyond all else, necessitates continuance in prayer and effort to arouse the whole nation and empire to a consciousness of their need of God and of His Grace.

The Gospel that Saves

A recent article has called special attention to some of the more important and serious aspects of modern preaching. While much of it is exceedingly able, marked by great literary freshness, and is intensely interesting, it must be confessed that it does not awaken, arrest, and convict. It does not seem to concern itself with Conversion, its aim being to instruct and cultivate. The result is that hearers often fail to find their interest sufficient to reach to a second service on the same day. While there is a natural desire for something practical, and especially for preaching that avoids theological interpretation, yet there can be no sort of question that the most urgent and indeed the most practical need of the whole world is Regeneration, and if preaching does not concern itself with this it fails at the vital point. The New Testament doctrine is salvation by Grace through faith in the Atoning Sacrifice of Christ and this is not only in accord with Divine truth, but it is eminently applicable to the needs of human nature all over the world. This cannot be said of any other system of religious truth, and the salvation of the Gospel proclaimed far and wide is still God's power for human redemption. Evolution does not work. It is a mere hypothesis, even in the physical world, and often breaks down, but it is utterly hopeless in the kingdom of the spirit. Intellectual preaching may interest, but the proclamation of Grace alone saves.

The Value of the State

In the course of a lecture Sir Henry Jones, of Glasgow, dwelt on the importance of honest and genuine thought in the life of a nation and the disaster of false ideals. One of the most important factors in determining men's conduct at a time of national crisis is their conception of the State. If men think of the State as the final expression of natural and brute force the inevitable result will be the lowering of moral standpoints in the individual life. These words are particularly timely and have a very wide application:—

To command the respect of its citizens the State must be in their minds an ethical and moral rather than physical thing. One's ideal of the true gentleman was that he respected other men's personalities, and to wield an improving and uplifting influence on the lives of its citizens the State must be an ethical rather than a physical power. Concerning the influence of ideals on national and individual life, there was never a practical human life that was not theoretical in all its ways, and there was never a theoretical life that was not practical. Everything went to show that men

were potent only in the line of their thinking.

Once again we are reminded of the intimate and necessary connection between thought and action and between individual and corporate life. Everything goes to show that men are "potent only in the line of their thinking." "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he."

"Love Your Enemies"

The War is making people examine certain texts of Scripture as perhaps they have never done before, and the result is that not a little light is being cast on them. It is suggestive to observe how circumstances alone seem to enable us to understand passages of Scripture, which, so far as theory alone is concerned, might fail to be properly understood. Life is often the best commentary on the Word of God. One of these texts is "resist not evil," and it has been shown that the command is against non-retaliation, and must not be confounded with non-resistance or the avoidance of force for defence against aggression and cruelty. Perhaps there may be another opportunity of looking more carefully at this passage.

At present we are concerned with another text much before the public eye, the one given at the heading of this article. In commenting on it, "The Times" recently remarked that it depicted the Christian ideal which is to be regarded as impossible, though, because it is an ideal, we are ever to strive in that direction. But this interpretation has rightly been felt unsatisfactory and, as a consequence, comments both interesting and suggestive have been forthcoming. One writer maintains that the effort to explain the command is not necessarily an effort to explain it away, and that it is not at all satisfactory to say that Christianity implies our always attempting impossibilities. Then, attention is called to another passage of our Lord about hating father and mother in order to be Christ's disciple (St. Luke 14:26). Thus the same Master commands us to love our enemies and to hate our parents. This is a problem for the literalist and shows that there must be some better explanation than the idea of attempting impossibilities. The words "love" and "hate" concern behaviour rather than personal emotion. If we are to be true followers of Christ, we must not allow even our natural affection to stand in the way of obedience. In a word, we must act like one who hates his father. So also with enemies, we must act towards them like those who love them and do good to them. The words "good to them" is always "good for them." As it has been frequently pointed out of late, it is not "good" for a criminal or a bully to have his own way. Literalism of interpretation is compelled to yield, not only to commonsense, but to Christian doctrine. It is surely impossible to believe that Christ, by demanding the impracticable "deliberately drove men to choose between insincerity and despair" and, in the same way, it is unthinkable that Christianity should demand the same personal affection for a sister and for the brute that has maltreated her. But it does command goodwill, a willingness to do for the brutal whatever is best for them. The Archbishop of Armagh, with refreshing frankness, has called attention to the serious misuse of scripture found in connection with this passage. And he aptly points out that nowhere in Holy Scripture are we told to love other people's enemies, or to love the men who are doing the devil's work in God's own world. We have no desire to retaliate, even though we hate the methods of men. The German Emperor, and those associated with him, are not personal

enemies, but enemies of civilization, foes of all that is lovely, and thus the conditions are wholly different from those of personal animosity. While, as Christian men and women, we tenderly succour the weak and wounded, even of our enemies, we pray God to change their hearts and lives. While we never return hate for hate, we are no more called, says the Archbishop, to love them, than we are required, when they have smitten us on one cheek, "to turn to them the other also."

There seems to be no doubt whatever that the Archbishop's interpretation of the passage is at once consonant with Scripture itself, with ordinary commonsense and with the entire genius of the Christian religion.

Perhaps, however, the best presentation of this subject appeared the other day in a letter in "The Spectator" from the Bishop of Durham, and because it is so forcible, true and compelling, we reproduce it in full. It requires no comment because it carries its own obvious message:—

Amidst the present discussion, from several sides, of the meaning and incidence of this great precept of our Lord, it may be worth while to call attention to a certain confusion of thought which attaches to some applications of it to international relations. I take it that its sacred weight and force is to be received without reserve by the individual—so that the word "love" is reasonably explained, not as including complacent affection, but as excluding the wish for real evil. But when the case of an organized State is considered, elements enter the problem which forbid us to take the precept to denounce and condemn national hostility, indignant and resolute, towards an enemy State. There is no approach to a complete analogy between an organized community and a person, however much we may "personify" the community. The State is not at all a personality; it is a great complex of personalities. It is such a complex that its organization largely exists on purpose that the community may safeguard its personal components in their several interests and liberties, particularly its weaker components. From this point of view the State is morally right, is morally bound, to take indignant and resolute action when its members' lawful interests, of peace, security, liberty, are violated or forcibly threatened by another State. We are nowhere commanded by our Lord to love other people's enemies as such. Where others are concerned, as victims of wrong, a wholly new element enters the scene. We see a ruffian maltreat a woman or a child. The aggressor, as such, is in no respect an object for our goodwill. He is an evil to be, by all possible means, quelled and also punished. And the State, when its member suffers violence and wrong, is called to act thus, as the third party interposing to protect and to avenge another party.

THE OLD ADAM

What shall we give him? A meal and a coat,
And counsels illumined by anecdote?
Yea, these and more. But still there is needed—
The Christ, whose love he has left unheeded.

What shall we give him? A bungalow
Away from the slum; green fields and a cow?
Oh, give him things lovely, that touch, not harden,
Yet—sin sprang first in the midst of a Garden.

Alas, for man's blindness, that misses the track,
Blaspheming in fulness or weeping at lack!
To cry: "I have sinned," not: "Dole me a ration,"
Is Adam's first need in the Way of Salvation.