

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# THE CHURCHMAN

July, 1920.

## THE MONTH.

The Cheltenham Conference. THE annual Conference of Evangelical clergy and laity who forgather at Cheltenham under the presidency of the Rector, the Rev. H. A. Wilson, was held on June 2 and 3, being preceded by a public meeting at the Town Hall in the evening of June 1. The promoters of the Conference have every reason to be satisfied with the result. The attendance, perhaps, was not up to the level of some recent years, but the papers read reached a high standard of excellence, the discussions showed remarkable grip and vigour, and the conclusions reached as embodied in the Findings were of singular weight and importance. The Cheltenham Conference is inseparably associated with the cause of Christian unity; indeed, it has been the pioneer in all proposals for intercommunication, and we hope that when the Lambeth Conference comes to make its report, at least some reflection of the Cheltenham Findings may be found in its recommendations. It is interesting to find that in the pamphlet just issued by the S.P.C.K. (2s. net), *Documents bearing on the Problem of Christian Unity and Fellowship, 1916-1920*, are included the Findings of the Fourth Cheltenham Conference (i.e. the one held last year) so far as they relate to Christian unity. The main subject on this year's programme was "The Fellowship of the Churches," considered from the three-fold point of view of the Homeland, the Dominions and the Mission Field; and the consideration of these aspects was preceded by a more general discussion on "The Position of the Anglican Communion in the Christian world." In view of the widespread interest in the questions discussed and the uniform excellence of the papers read, we are giving up practically the whole of this number to their insertion.

The Cheltenham Conference discussed also the question of "The Self-Government of the Church" in the light of the Enabling Act, but we are compelled to hold over until next month the four papers which were read concerning it.

There were one or two notable incidents of the **Bishop-designate of Hereford and Reunion.** Cheltenham Conference, outside the appointed papers, which call for a word or two of notice. The first was the magnificent speech at the Public Meeting by the Bishop of Warrington (Dr. M. Linton-Smith), whose appointment, since announced, to the Bishopric of Hereford has given such wide satisfaction. It is to us no small pleasure that one so intimately and so sympathetically associated with the Reunion movement should have a place among English diocesan bishops, and his appointment gives added interest and importance to his Cheltenham speech, of which we give an abstract:—

Speaking of reunion, he indicated some difficulties which must be faced, and then went on to mention points that must be made clear.

(1) Reunion would never be brought about by expediency; they must go deeper than that. There could be no reunion without conviction, and conviction was based on principle. It would never come about without a high doctrine of the Church, one which set great value upon the Christian society as such. They needed to realize that the "broken fragments" were no fit organism through which Christ could work. Nothing less than devotion to the Lord Jesus Christ and loyalty to His purpose would bring His people together.

(2) It was said that there must be agreement on doctrine before reunion could be brought about, but, as Principal Tulloch had pointed out, dogma divides. Reunion would be brought about, not by agreement, but by agreeing to differ and yet to live in common loyalty to their common Lord.

(3) Any union or fellowship which was partial or sectional would defeat its purpose. There were two opposite poles in religion—the Protestant and the Catholic; and for good or ill their Church embraced them both. They needed to practise fellowship within their own communion.

Continuing, the Bishop said that when once the difficulties of the task were faced, there were certain practical lines of advance which would contribute in varying degrees towards the desired goal. There must be—

(1) A full and frank discussion of differences, without reserve and without bitterness.

(2) There must be some measure of common worship.

(3) There must be the recognition of that which Nature—the Spirit in action upon matter—teaches by analogy—*e.g.*, that function precedes and creates organ, and that organisms which fail to respond to their environment are doomed to death, life finding expression in other forms.

(4) There must be insistence on the principle that the presence of the Spirit is not guaranteed by the validity of the ministry, but the validity of the ministry is guaranteed by the presence of the Spirit, and that where the works of the Spirit are manifest there the validity of the ministry cannot be questioned.

The forces arrayed against them were great, but (said the Bishop in conclusion) if there were behind the movement the Spirit of God working out

the purpose of Him Who died for His Church, then they might be assured that "they which be with us are more than those that be with them."

Nor must we omit to mention the illuminating and altogether helpful speech of the Rev. D. C. Lusk, Presbyterian Chaplain at Oxford, who, following the Bishop, said that the spirit or attitude in which we must approach this question must be that which is entirely Christian.

The Chairman of the Conference, in his opening address, made a palpable hit when, pointing to the progress made towards the solution of the reunion problem, he said that there was only one quarter in the Church where there had been no response to the appeal for fellowship. High Churchmen as a whole had nothing to contribute, only the weary reiteration of outworn and obsolete tags which sounded even more strangely out of touch with modern needs and present-day thought. He submitted that it was a very grave thing indeed for a great body of Christians to stand in the way of a movement admittedly so desirable and so sadly needed at home and abroad. "If," he concluded, "this chance be lost, which God forbid, the responsibility will lie at their door." Another difficulty in the way of reunion—certainly in some localities—was indicated by the Rev. H. J. Carpenter, whose very interesting paper on the Home aspect of the problem is not, unfortunately, available in the form necessary for publication.

Are we willing (he asked) to divide our parish with our brethren of other communions? He very much doubted whether any of them would be willing to agree to such a course. Why not? Because they differed widely from many of the brethren of other denominations in matters too important to forgo. As a Chaplain to the Forces he had been present at many Conferences on reunion, and he mentioned one from which three Nonconformists retired as they did not accept the Deity of Christ. Mr. Carpenter proceeded to mention other instances of Nonconformists whom he had come across at home which afforded terrible examples of defectiveness in doctrine. "Are our creeds," he asked, "of no importance to us, or are they everything?"

The Findings were drawn up by a specially appointed Committee, and after full and free discussion by the Conference were ultimately adopted in the following form:—

#### A.—THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE CHURCHES.

1. The Conference reaffirms that reunion can be contemplated only with such Churches as accept "(a) the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testa-

ments as 'containing all things necessary to salvation,' and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; (b) the Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith; (c) the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him."

2. In view of recent discussions it affirms its belief that Episcopacy is not only agreeable to the Word of God and primitive practice, but, rightly adapted to local needs, is the form of Church order most likely to command general assent in a reunited Church.

3. It reaffirms its conviction that, as preliminary steps and as a witness to the fact of spiritual unity, interchange of pulpits between the accredited ministers and reciprocal inter-communion of members of Episcopal and Evangelical Free Churches are desirable. It is convinced that in the Mission Field this mutual recognition is even more urgent than at home. The Conference claims that such inter-communion would be a return to the practice common in our own Church in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It respectfully appeals to the Lambeth Conference to give definite approval to these steps.

4. In view of the growth of the spirit of nationality in India and other parts of the Mission Field, and of the prospect of the formation of local Churches, any ecclesiastical isolation of Anglican Native Christians would tend to exhibit their type of Christianity as alien. On the other hand, the proportion of Anglican converts to the whole number of native Christians makes it unreasonable that they should necessarily expect to impose their Church order upon the majority, while if they seek to combine with other Communions their position will give them great influence in framing the polity and constitution of native Churches. The Conference therefore urges that Anglican Missions should be officially encouraged to join in local efforts for reunion.

5. In view of the fact that in the Dominions existing divisions between the branches of the Anglican Communion and the Evangelical Free Churches lead to wasteful overlapping in some districts and a deplorable lack of spiritual ministrations in others, the Conference pleads that the approaches towards local reunion now being made in more than one Dominion should also be encouraged.

6. The Conference calls upon Churchmen to pray that through the guidance of the Holy Spirit all professing Christians may be led into such unity and concord as may enable the Christian Church to bear adequate witness to the faith of the Gospel. It respectfully supports the appeal already issued by authority that daily prayer may be offered during their sessions for the Lambeth Conference and its Committees. It trusts that the Spirit of God may so guide their deliberations that they will manifest to the world the oneness of the Body of Christ while preserving the unity of the Anglican Communion.

#### B.—SELF-GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCHES.

1. The Conference urges all Evangelical Churchmen to co-operate whole-heartedly in promoting the efficient working of the self-government scheme.

2. It reaffirms its support of the Baptismal franchise, and its desire for the withdrawal from the electoral declaration of the clause "and do not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England."

3. Owing to the variation of methods in compiling electoral rolls, these rolls do not at present furnish an adequate record of Church membership. The Conference therefore urges that the forthcoming Census Bill should include provision for ascertaining the religious beliefs of the people of England.

[*Cheltenham Conference Paper*]

## THE POSITION OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION IN THE CHRISTIAN WORLD.

### I.

BY THE REV. CYRIL C. B. BARDSLEY, M.A., Honorary  
Secretary of the C.M.S.

THE term "Anglican Communion" dates from about the middle of last century, and originates from nobody knows where. It was used to describe the Church of England and her sister Churches in Ireland and Scotland, and her daughter Churches all over the world, including the Protestant Episcopal Church of America.

The story of the Anglican Communion and the history of the expansion of the Empire go together. Three hundred years ago missionaries were sent to the American Colonies and the West Indies. The American Revolution led to the separation of the American Church, but the Church secured its succession from Scotland, and fellowship continued with the English Church. With the growth of the Empire the Church spread to South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, India, etc. With the growth of Missions it spread to Africa, China, Japan, Persia, South America and other parts of the world. Now there are nearly 300 dioceses—102 in the United States of America, 122 in the Overseas Church Dioceses in connection with our own Church, 41 in England, 7 in Scotland, 13 in Ireland. All these dioceses are linked together, possessing the same ecclesiastical order, using practically the same Prayer Book, translated into many languages, united together in one spirit of fellowship. Upon the Anglican Communion the sun never sets.

The only authoritative statement as to conditions of membership is that adopted by all its Bishops, known as the Quadrilateral. (i.) The Historic Canons of Scripture; (ii.) The two historic Creeds; (iii.) The Sacraments; (iv.) The Historic Episcopate. The Quadrilateral does not assert that Episcopacy is of the *esse* of the Church. As a matter of fact, the Lambeth Conference, in one of its Encyclicals, speaks of "Non-episcopal Churches." I must confess I sometimes find it hard to be patient with men who seem to seek for other expressions than that of "Church" in speaking of our Free Church brethren. What the Quadrilateral says is that Episcopacy is of the *esse* of the Anglican Communion, and so it has been for 1,300 years. Its numbers are large, but not relatively to some other Churches. In China the number of members is less than 10 per cent. of the whole. In India Protestant Christians are two-fifths of the total number, and the Church of England members are less than a quarter of the two-fifths. At the same time, the position of the Anglican Communion is very strong. What are the reasons for this?

It has been pointed out that the Eastern Churches take their stand on the infallibility of the first seven General Councils, and that they lack the power of adaptation to subsequent thought.

The Roman Church recognises the principle of growth and development of doctrine, but, with its principle of infallibility, when once fresh doctrine has been enunciated, it has been continually forging fresh theological chains. The other Churches which have come into being since the Reformation have, except in the case of the Presbyterian and Lutheran Churches, lost to a large extent their connections with the past.

The Anglican Communion, on the other hand, is rooted and grounded in the past. It maintains the faith once for all delivered to the saints, the ancient Orders of the Ministry, the Sacraments, the Holy Scriptures as containing all things necessary to salvation. It has its ancient lineage and its rich inheritance, but it has, compared with the other ancient Churches, a far greater power of adaptability; for, repudiating their doctrines of infallibility, it has a greater freedom. Its position as between the other ancient Churches and the other Reformed Churches is clearly of immense importance.

2. Its position is strong because, in the eyes of a great part of the Christian world, it stands for so much that is devout and sane and strong. It is honoured for its saints and its scholars, and not least for its missionary enterprise. The fact that it has definite leaders in its Bishops undoubtedly helps to give it, again and again, a position of leadership in the Mission Field, the Bishop in his Diocese, with courtesy and friendship, constantly being invited by representatives of other Churches to preside at united gatherings. We shall not lose the respect which others have for us unless we deserve to lose it.

3. Its position is strong because of its comprehensiveness. It is difficult for those outside to understand how this can be. They seem to see so much that is conflicting in its different elements. Yet—I do not include the definite Roman cult—the Church would be the poorer and the weaker without these varying elements. The Lambeth Report of 1897 quotes a distinguished Roman Catholic, who declared his conviction that the English Church was endowed with a quality analogous to that possessed by chemical intermediaries of combining irreconcilable substances.

One very important change needs to be realized. The Anglican Communion is no longer Anglo-Saxon. To-day it is not a racial Church. The word "Anglican" implies limitations which no longer exist. As we look over the world, one of the greatest forces to-day is the growth of the spirit of Nationality. We have to recognise this in the distant parts of the Empire, in the nations of Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand. The change in the Anglican Communion is, most of all, due to the fact that it now includes Indians, Chinese, Japanese, Africans. Technically, every Indian baptized in an Anglican Church in India is a member of the Church of England in India. The Archbishop appoints Bishops over a large number of Dioceses linked with the Church of England. The Church in the Mission Field is, in many cases, rapidly passing from one stage to another in its history. Undoubtedly the development of Diocesan organization in Japan, China, India, and the

organization of Provinces, is strengthening the position of the Anglican Communion. We need to remember that our aim is not to anglicanize these new Churches. We rather desire that the Church in these countries should maintain and express the personality and national character of the people. One of the great hindrances to the growth of the Church in India is its State connection. Seven of its Bishops are State officials. It is an established Church. Our ambition is a truly Indian, Chinese, Japanese, African Church. The world is suffering from an acute attack of Nationalism. It is of vital importance to discover the true doctrine of Nationalism and its relation to Internationalism. Lord Hugh Cecil said: "I am a Christian first and an Englishman afterwards." I believe that the right place of Nationalism will be found in and through the Christian Church. We must not ignore or depreciate nationality; rather, we have a message for nationality to-day; we have a vision of each nation as a Province in the Kingdom of God.

The Anglican Communion, as a spiritual Communion, is essentially non-racial and non-Imperial. It stands for a higher citizenship which transcends and over-rides all racial distinctions. Each nation has its own contribution to bring to the enrichment of the whole. The Anglican Communion is not Anglo-Saxon. It is non-racial.

But this fact raises a new problem, and vitally affects the whole question of Re-Union. Upon our attitude to this vital question our whole future position very largely depends. We have a God-given opportunity and responsibility. If we rise to it, if we have sufficient courage, humility and sacrifice, a new stage will be reached in the history of the Christian world, and new hopes will be opened up for the evangelization of the world. There are some who fear Re-Union with other reformed Churches, because it will compromise—in their judgment—our position with the Church of Rome. Even if Rome would unite with us—which she is not willing to do—we could not unite with her as she is. She must be cleansed first. To delay action for this reason means indefinite postponement and the failure to follow the guidance of the Spirit of God with regard to Re-Union with the Free Churches. My own conviction is that a great united reformed Church, such as we foreshadow, would have a real influence upon the Church of Rome. Many of its members look with apprehension at what they call the Pan-Protestant Movement. Edinburgh of 1910 gave a new vision of this possibility to some of the leaders of the Church. We have to face the fact that Re-Union with the Free Churches will be bitterly opposed by a strong section of our Church. We have a deep respect for many members of that section. Many of us have very intimate friendships with some of them. We do not desire anything that will bring strife; but we cannot allow them to prevent our Church following a course which we believe to be in accordance with the Mind of our Lord. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the Lambeth Conference. Re-Union is the chief subject. It will be brought up in a very definite way, most of all through the scheme for Re-Union in South India. If



clear guidance is not given immense harm will result, and the glorious opportunity which is now given to us will be lost. Many Free Church leaders at home are ready to accept Episcopacy which is not prelacy—Episcopacy which is essential for unity, not for grace. In the Mission Field the position is the same, and even more so. The need of personal supervision and direction is felt in the Mission Field. A striking illustration is given by the adoption among the Congregationalists of the system of district superintendents. The great hindrance comes from those who insist on the doctrine commonly known as the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. Our brethren in these other Churches are ready to accept the *bene esse*. We have no right to press the *esse* upon them. The late Professor Gwatkin wrote as follows :—

“ Our debt to episcopacy is enormous. Imagine what our history would have been if Anselm and Langton, Cranmer and Parker, had never held Augustine’s Chair, and the seven had never stood for the liberties of England. Only we must not make it more than the government which God’s good Providence has given to ourselves. To claim for it a binding command of Christ or His Apostles is a defiance of history, and to make it necessary for other Churches, without such a command, comes near to a defiance of Christ Himself.”

We have to realize how pressed the Free Church leaders are by many of their followers who are anti-episcopal. All honour to them for their courage and for the way in which they are holding out the hand of fellowship to us. There cannot be indefinite delay. If we fail to meet their advance, we must expect Re-Union amongst themselves, and the results will be :—

(i) The great Church so formed will be poorer without our contribution. Not least will it miss our contribution of discipline.

(ii) Our own Church will be in a much weaker position.

(iii) The Re-Union which we so desire will be indefinitely postponed.

(iv) A great set-back will be given to that movement of co-operation in the Mission Field abroad and at home, which is of such incalculable value to the whole missionary enterprise.

Another point of view needs to be grasped. Can we expect Indians, Chinese and Africans who are members of the Anglican Communion to refrain from uniting with their fellow-Christians? Can we desire it? Dare we wish our divisions to be perpetuated amongst them?

Fears of secession at home will be expressed and used continually to postpone Re-Union. The greater fear is the secession of these growing and virile Churches in the Mission Field. Please God, neither secession will take place, but, if there is to be any secession, which will involve the greatest loss? Look thirty, forty or fifty years ahead, and think what it will mean in loss to the whole Anglican Communion if these Churches in the Mission Field are separated from us. Our position is now full of immense opportunity for promoting that Cause which we know to be so dear to the heart of our Lord Jesus Christ. There are immense difficulties, but no situation is beyond God; there are no problems which He cannot solve. There comes to us, as His servants, a great challenge to courage, faith and, above all, to prayer.

[*Cheltenham Conference Paper.*]

## THE POSITION OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION IN THE CHRISTIAN WORLD.

### II.

BY THE REV. STUART H. CLARK, M.A., Vicar of Tonbridge.

THE heading under which my name appears in the Conference Programme at first greatly perturbed me. So I wrote to the secretary, and he assures me that "The position of the Anglican Communion in the Christian world" is "the heading under which a general paper on Reunion would best come." I know the value of obedience to secretaries; so with entire disregard to the letter of my subject, I plunge at once into its spirit, and talk about Reunion in the Anglican Communion.

The logic of events has persuaded me that this is the critical spot at the moment in the history of that wider Reunion which is in all our minds.

Let me explain. Three years ago a few Evangelicals stretched out a hand towards Free Churchmen, and were beyond words drawn by the warm, kindly grip of true response. So under the genial influences of the Holborn Restaurant, we walked right through the hedges, and found first-rate human friendship in the fellowship of Christ. We knew each other from the very start. The personal movement of the soul towards the personal Christ was familiar to every one of us. We were Evangelicals of different folds, but a single flock.

So we met again, and yet again, deepening and widening our fellowship. Individual thought crystallized in corporate discussion, and from time to time we put out our results in resolutions, and also in book form, not challenging any one, or assuming finality, or anything evil or absurd of that sort, but just suggestions, queries, if you like, asking Christian people everywhere whether any progress could possibly be made along lines which seemed so fruitful to us.

Agreements were as easy on the whole as they were delightful. The kindly fellowship of it is still a warm memory with all of us. But there soon grew a feeling that we must make haste slowly; that we must take other schools of thought into our councils, and we grew into the Third Mansfield Conference.

The resolutions of that Conference were passed in perfect good faith. At the suggestion of one of the highest Churchmen present, we all went straight at the close into Mansfield College Chapel to sing the *Te Deum* together, as the only adequate expression of our praise and thanksgiving to Almighty God. One leading Free Church Minister said afterwards that he had never understood the *Te Deum* properly before, so perfectly did it voice our emotion and our devotion at that moment.

So the resolution passed into the press, and the trouble began. Men who had not moved with us step by step under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, could not follow us. Misunderstandings arose under the pressure of criticism on all sides, until at last a most responsible and weighty manifesto was put forth which was not unjustly called a counterblast.

I hope the Conference will forgive this bit of history by way of preface. It serves to illustrate, and I think prove, that the critical spot in the history of a wide Reunion is reunion within the Anglican Communion itself. It is this then of which I wish to speak to-day.

A Free Church correspondent in one of our Church papers went straight to the heart of the real point. He complains that "the Church which absorbed all the cultures (as Harnack described the Catholic strain) cannot understand a Church of Grace Absolute. The Church of the Logos, with its rational mentality and its mystical sentiment, cannot readily understand the more primitive and central Church of the Kingdom, with its moral redemption and its Holy Spirit." This I think is profoundly true, and, although the correspondent does not admit it, the converse is true too. The gospel of moral redemption in its deepest heart has scant patience with a divinity which absorbs, and is apt to lose itself in the humanities of culture and fellowship, and to forget the deep surges of divine redemption in the human soul.

But, I submit, both are securely set in Christianity through St. John and through St. Paul; and we simply must find our way out into the broad path that accepts, and reconciles them both.

These strains, of course, are called the Catholic and the Evangelical. They strike right across all the divisions of society and race, piercing to the dividing asunder of a single home, and even of an individual life. Try as we will, it is hard to see the other side of the mountain of truth, without a mental disturbance which endangers stability itself. Some men can sometimes see it intellectually, and even express it verbally, but not *vitally*. The arguments for it are easily forgotten, when they have not gripped the soul. It is an age-long difference, wide in history and deep in the human heart. Augustine could not piece them together, though he saw them both with a clearness that went straight to the heart of each. That spacious personality was content to let them lie side by side in his own mind, as unreconciled antinomies of life. His *Confessions* and his share in the Donatist Controversy witness to the reality of the struggle to adjust these conflicting truths.

We meet it again to-day in a crucial form. There are now eager Catholics of both the Anglican and the Free Church sort. It is scarcely too much to say that we are witnessing a strong movement within the Evangelical Free Churches towards Catholicism; and notable Anglo-Catholics are moving towards definite Evangelicalism. It is high time to take careful note of this new phenomenon.

But around this softening of outline due to the variety of men, there are the two outstanding contraries of which I have spoken.

There is the cultured, orderly, mystic, universal sacramental Catholicism, and the rugged, free, plain, personal, moral Evangelicalism, which in its deepest heart glories in none of these things. But let us Evangelicals admit it at once. There is divine truth and power in both. If there is in the one strain, an emphasis on the human side of order, and culture, and sacrament, it is all bathed in a rich glow of mystic adoration and devotion to the one Lord of the whole earth, our Lord and Master Jesus-Christ. If in the other, the emphasis seems to rest on the free, strong, silent movements of the Divine Spirit in the individual soul, it all finds its true expression in a moral robust vigour, and uncompromising witness amongst men to the realities of spiritual life. We cannot admit any monopoly of spiritual life in either strain; nor can we allow them any longer to exclude or oppose each other. There is breadth in one, and depth in the other, and height in both, and the height and breadth and depth of the Kingdom of our Redeemer are all equal. There is in our judgment, no mere question of mechanical versus spiritual, in the ultimate, as some seem to argue. There is no controversy among the saints, who take no sides, but are found in every Church. Nor is it a simple matter of order in the Christian society, as against the freedom of the individual; or any other easy antithesis of phrase or fact. Nor can we content ourselves with some *via media* or compromise, which lays down two great lines of apparently conflicting truth, and asks that every Christian shall take his choice, within the defined limits of faith. Neither fellowship nor power lie that way. The Christian society that cannot secure vital fellowship in faith, will still wander wearily on through history, broken and forlorn, with no voice or presence or power that will convict the world of the reality of Christ, the Captain of the Hosts of God. "Terrible as an army with banners" the Church of Jesus may yet be, when she finds a new-born unity and fellowship of faith. It is left to our generation, at this great watershed of Time, to move at least one step towards the fulfilment of the prayer and purpose and passion of our Lord, "That they *all* may be one"—one in heart and mind and soul, in the deep unities of love and truth and faith—"even as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee." Let the words "even as" burn into our consciences, as they unveil that perfect union of the Father and the Son; for the day that sees the perfection of unity within the Church will see the great awakening of the world,—“that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.” Nothing less than this can satisfy the Christian heart that has once seen the vision of one, pure, and radiant Body of Christ, *which is His Church.*

I apologize to the Conference for this long preamble, but it may serve to point to the critical moment we have now reached. We must face it, as men and as Christians, and seek the wisdom and the grace which come from God only. The solution of the problem when it comes will be vital, not verbal, because it is human; it will be simple, not complex, because it is divine. In simplicity and in life, we find the solution of all our deepest needs.

A word of reconciliation which may prove fruitful will, I think, be found in the saying of an old Father, that it is a nobler form of faith to find the spiritual in the earthly, than to find the spiritual in the purely spiritual.

I desire to suggest to this Conference that this word defines the true position of the purest Catholicism, and the truest Evangelicalism.

At this point let us be quite clear. I am *not* at all thinking of the man who has turned, let us say, to the sacrament, with devotion and passion, because it vaguely seems to stand for some mystic experience which he does not share; the man who knows that there is something there, even Some One there, but finds it all a matter rather of obedience than of joy. In reality, the pure sacramentarian is finding only the earthly in the earthly, though it is earth bathed in a mystic light. Still, let us try and find in our hearts some true sympathy for a brother who is really seeking the pearl of great price even superstitiously, thinking that if he may but touch His garments, he may be whole.

But I am thinking of many true Evangelical minds to whom the mystery of the Gospel is nothing less than, "*Christ in you*, the hope of glory"; and who feel in their soul the danger of losing the Christ in His robes of beauty, goodness and truth. He dreads the possibility of finding himself wandering in a culture, or a system of sacrament and order, saying, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him." He knows deep in his heart, that man is *not* his own Holy Ghost; and that the spiritual man is not man at his best, renewed by sacrament, but a new creation of God. So he often instinctively turns from the earthly, to find the spiritual only in the spiritual. To him Bible and prayer are the only vital things, for there God speaks direct to his own soul, and his own soul to God.

And I am thinking too of some noble Catholic minds, whom it is my privilege to know, who have passed through the gate of the Sacrament, ordained by Christ Himself, into the wider prospect of the Lord of all good life. He has tasted and seen the essential spiritual reality of the material body, and of mother earth, through the Holy Communion. He has succeeded in drawing up the earthly into the spiritual, and has found it to be a true and glorious vehicle of spiritual life. He now can gather in all the humanities into the broad bosom of his Lord.

He contends that a religion which begins with a physical Incarnation, and ends with a psychical Resurrection, embraces all that is human in the Divine; and that the Sacraments are at once the proof and the extension of that truth. We may not, and probably do not agree with his expressions of his faith; but let us see that we at least understand it, and can weigh justly the measure of its truth.

We shall all gladly bear witness to the purity of soul, and honesty of purpose, of both the men of whom I am speaking. But if the early Father is right, he is pleading that we shall try and grasp

afresh the *greater* grandeur of a faith that wants passionately to assert the essential spirituality of every earthly thing, humanity in all its physical and spiritual forms, and finds in sacrament, alike its expression and its power.

It may well be that somewhere here lies the secret of that Catholic influence, which is alike so impressive, widespread and prevailing.

I have not, I fear, spoken directly of Reunion, but of the rock on which every scheme of Reunion will break, unless we move just now on both sides with great charity, wisdom and grace. We see the hardening process in full swing on both the Church and the Free Church sides. Both Catholics and Evangelicals are asserting their views as final utterances of the whole truth. For instance, the *Church Times* and the *British Weekly* have lain down in wait together to destroy the Mansfield resolutions, while both remain curiously dumb on any constructive alternative. Neither of them can suggest anything that has not been given a fair trial during the last 300 years of growing separation. They remind us of the lay view of it all which finds expression in the *Manchester Guardian*: "It is, of course, true that nobody, or almost nobody, declares himself the enemy of union. On the contrary, we are all ready to pay to it at least the homage of our lips. The pity of it is that so often out of the same mouth come blessing and cursing: blessing for union as a general principle, and cursing for every practical proposal that seeks to give effect to it."

We supremely need at this moment, at least so it seems to me, constructive proposals which will bring together the two great strains in history and in modern life, the Catholic and the Evangelical, the only two as it seems that will count in the long run; and I venture to invite this Conference to endorse and strengthen the hands of the Mansfield group towards this end. There is no doubt, misunderstanding as to the meaning and purpose of the resolutions, but there *is* both meaning and purpose in them. They are at least constructive, and have this outstanding merit that they have never yet been tried. Rightly interpreted, and set in the atmosphere of devotion and fellowship, they have reconciled in conspicuous instances, the two divergent elements of which I have spoken; and they may do so again, if we can only get rid of mutual suspicions, and try and see the features of the Master in the face of men from whom we differ most.

This, as I see it, is the present position of the Anglican Communion as it concerns Reunion. It must recover unity within itself, amongst the true lovers of the Lord, before it will reach union with those that are without. And it is a first charge on Evangelicals to move out with freedom, wisdom, and prayer to its recovery, in these urgent days.



[Cheltenham Conference Paper.]

## FELLOWSHIP OF THE CHURCHES.

### (a) PROBLEMS OF THE HOME CHURCH.

BY THE REV. J. S. FLYNN, B.D., Vicar of St. John's, Hove,  
Sussex.

IF Reunion or steps thereto were not in our minds we should probably all agree in the opinion that the Evangelization of England is our first and greatest Home Problem. To draw England to Christ, to save it from the scourge of a selfish and materialistic Syndicalism, to displace the Gospel of Marx on the one hand and of Smiles on the other by the Gospel of Christ, to create a spirit of Brotherhood and righteousness amongst all classes, this surely is the problem of problems.

And though it is not before us to-day, may we not say that what we are to discuss is so related to it that we can never hope for its realization until we have found a practical solution of the question under discussion. England refuses to be evangelized by a divided Church; and a divided Church is incapable of England's evangelization.

The National Mission of 1916 emphasized a National indifference to religion. True, it was notably successful in many parishes in drawing large and interested congregations of devout people to Church, but it produced no effect on the country; it left England as ignorant and as wicked and as careless as it found it. The Bishops, always yielding where pressure is strong, influenced by a narrow and reactionary party in the Church, refused the generous offer of the Free Churches to mobilize their forces in alliance with ours; and so we lost the war; as France would have lost the war had she refused the aid of England and America.

"That is our case" for Reunion. The Salvation of men; the honour of Christ; the establishing of His Kingdom are very much more to us than the views of an eminent bishop of Carthage of the third century, whose Church principles, however useful and even necessary in his age, are quite impossible in ours. "It does not follow," writes that wise man John Selden, "we must have bishops still, because we have had them so long. They are equally mad who say Bishops are so *Jure Divino* that they must be continued, and they who say they are so anti-Christian that they must be put away." Nevertheless it is not Bishops but certain disputable and even discredited theories about Bishops that is our chief stumblingblock in the road to Reunion.

The first Home Problem then from the viewpoint of an Evangelical and Liberal English Churchman is the problem of relating Episcopacy to the general movement towards Reunion; that is assuming our aim to be corporate Reunion. There is, of course, the alternative policy of maintaining the *status quo ante* in all

the Churches on the principle of equality of ministrations and inter-communion. This alternative has much to commend it, and would possibly be readily accepted by the Evangelical portion of the English Church,—as a matter of fact Cheltenham has accepted it; but it is morally certain that High Churchmen would reject it; and on the other hand, if Free Churchmen persist in their demand that they must have unity with the whole of the English Church or with none of it, in itself a demand just and reasonable, we should have reached a deadlock along this road, that is if we are, as I presume we are, bent on immediate action. All the same the matter is not one that we should dismiss from our minds, for it is quite possible that one day the Free Churches may modify their views with regard to it, as they certainly would do in the case of the disruption of the National Church—a contingency which may be nearer than many of us realize, but which it is our wisdom to oppose with all our resources.

For the present, however, we may be well advised to keep to the consideration of some form of Episcopacy, which our Free Church brethren could cordially accept. As to this it must be made clear, once for all, that no form should even be presented to them for their acceptance which would involve their Ministers in a repudiation of their present standing as fully authorized Ministers of Christ's Church, in the respective communions to which they belong. In our judgment their position is sufficiently covered by our Church Article 23, which recognizes the validity of Ministers who have been duly called and sent by men who have public authority in the congregation to do so. Richard Baxter was without exception the greatest and most representative of the Puritan divines. James Usher, Archbishop of Armagh, was possibly the most learned bishop in Europe. It may not be known to all of you that these two friends arrived at a perfect understanding with regard to a National Church, Episcopally governed, and embracing all the Christians of England. As Bishop Lightfoot took up the Epistles of Ignatius and practically restored them, after their many mutations, to where Usher left them, is it, we may well ask, beyond the bounds of possibility for the successors of Baxter and the successors of Usher, to take up this question at the point where the good intentions of those ripe and holy Scholars were frustrated by the fury of Jeffreys and the selfishness and obstinacy of the Stuarts?

I am of opinion that Free Church Scholars would find the best of our English divines eminently reasonable. We should not be wrong in claiming Jewell and Hooker as the best exponents of the English Church position. A broad-minded Free Churchman would find little to object to in their writings. Hooker stands to us in a somewhat similar relation to that of Aquinas to the Church of Rome. I have read his immortal fifth book some seven times, and having with great pains (being slow of thought) read myself into his position, I discovered that so far is he from endorsing the Cyprianic conception of Episcopacy, or claiming an exclusive position for it, the whole weight of his powerful argument is concentrated on



proving that there is really after all no great harm in Episcopacy, and that the system is not nearly so black as some of its Puritan adversaries had painted it. This reasonable and moderate position is the real secret of Hooker's massive strength.

I have mentioned these circumstances to show that it is by no means impossible that, working on the lines of our English Reformers and later divines, a form of Episcopacy agreeable to Scripture and acceptable to our Free Church brethren may in time be worked out.

Should we then have reached the end of our differences? By no means, I fear. In dealing with some of the Free Churches, we shall find that we and they are poles asunder on the subject of the relations of Church and State. The true Anglican position is that of Hooker, and later of Thomas Arnold, both of whom maintain that the English Church is the English State viewed from its religious side, that every English citizen who professes and calls himself a Christian is a member of the English Church in virtue of his citizenship. This noble conception has received almost its death-blow by the much be-lauded Enabling Act; and we have now the comforting assurance of some of the bishops that at the earliest moment they will move the substitution of the Confirmation test for the Baptismal. Yet this is a measure which had the support of some highly popular Evangelicals. O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you! To some of our minds the worst service the Tractarians rendered the country was the making war on this position; but the difficulty I anticipate arises from the fact that while Tractarian opposition was by implication—involved in its teaching—Free Church opposition is explicit, open and undisguised. Hooker's idea meant something more than a partnership, for in his mind Church and State were one; to the modern Independent and the Scotch Free Churchmen this is Erastianism to be abhorred of all faithful Christians; sharply dividing Church and State they will countenance no right of State interference with the affairs of the Church. For them the Church must be self-contained and all-sufficient for all the purposes of teaching religion and for Ecclesiastical legislation. To the English Churchman, who really knows the mind and genius of his Church, this attitude is unacceptable. He cannot regard the State as hostile, pagan or godless. He knows that in the long and glorious history of this land Church and State grew up together; that the Church is less the creation of the State than the State is the creation of the Church; that to tear them asunder would, in the words of Mr. Gladstone, leave England a bleeding and lacerated mass. The separation of Church and State would therefore in his judgment be too high a price to pay for even so desirable an object as union with the Free Churches. In this connexion it should be mentioned that the modern Free Churchman has departed widely from his great Puritan forbears, Cromwell, Baxter, Selden. Cromwell stoutly maintained that the care of religion is the duty of the State, and that if any whosoever denies that their interests are one let not, he says, my soul enter into their secret. John Selden goes so far as to say with regard to Church affairs, "All is

as the State wishes." It would help matters in no small measure if this reasonable state of mind, or something approaching to it, possessed our Free Church brethren to-day. There is something unreal and even sophistical in the argument that since the British Parliament is now composed of men of all religions and of none, it is an unfit place for the discussion of questions affecting the Church. As a matter of fact the British Parliament is a vastly more moral and righteous body to-day than it was in the days of George III, and the House of Lords is an assembly of Saints compared with the immoral gamblers and winebibbers who tenanted the gilded chamber in those days.

Moreover, the members who take part in debates on Church questions are for the most part men interested in religion; and if a devout Nonconformist joins in the discussion of such questions he is quite within his right in so doing. Since the Church is the Church of the nation, even the voice of a Bottomley might not be considered out of place as showing us what men of the world think about the Church.

Amongst our Home Problems there is another matter deserving our attention. Evangelical Churchmen have no place for Sacerdotalism. It is not surprising then if they are made a little uneasy by what appears to be a steady growth in the Free Churches of sympathy with high sacramental views; and that a very considerable number of those who pass from Nonconformity to the English Church ally themselves not with the Evangelical School but with the Sacerdotalists. Are we to be blamed if we feel a little anxiety as to whether in the event of a union in one Episcopal body, with, of course, wide liberty in the matter of public worship, the weight of Nonconformity might not be thrown on the Sacerdotal side, and thus the last state of England become worse than the first?

I feel that the points I have raised to-day are more or less of an academical character, and I have dealt with them in that way.

A United Church, Episcopally governed, with diversities of worship as wide as we at present enjoy, is one solution. A confederation of Christian Churches in communion with each other is another. The difficulties presented by our very different views in the relations of Church and State call for consideration.

But all the time I have a feeling that perhaps we are following a wrong scent. God's idea of Unity may be very far removed from ours. Our different modes have not been wholly disadvantageous. England is a more enlightened, progressive and Christian country than Spain. It may be that like Maeterlinck's Blue Bird the thing we are in search of is in the home all the time, and that God's will is that we should remain as we are; and that all that is needed at present is the cultivation of love and fellowship. Work together, worship in each other's churches, including above all joint partaking of the Holy Supper, preach in each other's pulpits, gladly recognize each other's ministrations. Thus manifesting to the world that we are not divided in spirit and that there is but one Church of Christ—one flock with many folds—the world's

attention will be arrested by the sight of this great, new thing ; and seeing we are one may be led to believe that the Father has sent His Son to be its Saviour and its Lord.

Whatever lies before us in the future, it seems quite clear that this is our first step. Let us take it, courageously, in dependence upon God and wait on Him till He guide us to the next. Greater things must surely follow, but we may safely leave them in His hands.

“ Keep Thou my feet, I do not ask to see  
The distant scene ;  
One, step enough for me.”

### SOME S.P.C.K. PUBLICATIONS

The Rev. J. H. Swinstead, D.D., gives an interesting account of the *Relations between the Anglican and Swedish Churches* in a pamphlet bearing that title and issued by the S.P.C.K. as No. 4 of the “ Church Historical Pamphlets ” (4d. net).

Chancellor P. V. Smith's illuminating and informing pamphlet, *Church Self-Government* (S.P.C.K., 8d. net), ought to be studied by all Churchpeople, not only for its intrinsic interest, but for its clear exposition of the methods of election under the new constitution.

The Parish Cards of the S.P.C.K. are always useful. A new one lately issued (No. 170) is beautifully illuminated and can be adapted for use as a memento of almost any occasion. Ample space is allowed for localization (4d. net). Another richly illuminated card depicts Christ blessing little children, and spaces are left for the insertion of name and dates of baptism, confirmation and first Communion.

Under the editorship of Dr. Sparrow Simpson the S.P.C.K. is publishing a new quarterly, *The Christian East*, to appear in March, June, September and October (1s. 6d. a number or 6s. per year, post free). The first number secured a word of “ God-speed ” from the Archbishop of Canterbury, who thinks that the review will go far to remove the difficulty which now, as always, besets the inter-relations of the Anglican and Eastern Churches—“ the absence on either side of accurate knowledge of the facts.”

Two daintily arranged little volumes are included in the “ Manuals of the Inner Life ” series, viz., *The Devotions of Bishop Andrewes*. The first volume is a reprint of Newman's translation of the Greek Devotions of Bishop Andrewes made from the edition of 1675 and issued by Newman as one of the *Tracts for the Times* (No. LXXVIII) in 1840. The present edition contains an interesting introduction from the learned Professor Swete, written just before his death in 1917. The second volume is a reprint of Dr. John Mason Neale's version of the Latin Devotions of “ the holy Bishop,” as Andrewes is called in the original preface. Each volume is issued at 3s. 6d. net.

Three additions to the series of S.P.C.K. Tracts call for notice. *Aspects of the Eucharist* (by T. W. Crafer, D.D., 6d. net) has much in it of value on the devotional side, but we find ourselves at variance with the author on the doctrinal side, especially in regard to the “ sacrificial ” aspect of the Eucharist. *Varieties of English Religion* (by E. C. Hoskyns, M.C., 6d. net) contains the four addresses given in the chapel of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, each of which, but particularly that on Anglicanism, provides much food for thought. *The Child's First Ideas of God* (by A. H. McNeile, D.D., 4d. net) offers guidance to parents in the religious training of their children and will be found eminently useful and suggestive.

[Cheltenham Conference Paper.]

## FELLOWSHIP OF THE CHURCHES :

### (a) PROBLEMS OF THE HOME CHURCH.

#### II

BY THE REV. CANON BAINES, M.A., Vicar of St. Helens, Lancs.

**D**IFFICULTIES constitute either a challenge or a warning. The human problem is to discover their purpose. If God has opened a door, then difficulties obstructing our immediate entrance are a challenge to faith and effort, to loyalty, imagination and courage. If God has closed a door, then no man shall open it. To us it seems there are two doors. The one behind us, the other before. The one opening out the prospect of wider horizons and more spacious fellowship: the other receding into the narrow channels of the old exclusiveness. We speak humbly and for ourselves when we say that there can be no turning back; we stand by the findings of the former Cheltenham Conferences. The door *behind* us is closed. So it remains, that the difficulties which confront us are a challenge to faith and courage. For God, we believe, has opened *that* door. If not at Jordan it is at all events at the Red Sea, and this door of hope must finally bring us to the Promised Land. If God has led us, as we believe He has, to face these difficulties with which the pathway to greater fellowship is strewn, in His own way and in His own good time He will discover to us their solution if we are faithful in the quest. We may not know how or when the solution may come, but we do know that it will never come unless we prepare for it by study and instruction and concentration. We must prepare the way of the Lord: we must strive to enter in. The question for us is, as has been said in another connexion, "Have we let the Spirit lead us into hard problems? Have we let Him urge us into tasks for which we ourselves have not the capacity, except as we rely upon Divine wisdom and power?" The spirit of fellowship is, finally, the fellowship of the Spirit. God is pointing the Churches to fellowship by the logic of facts. There is the realized fact of the unity of the world. "The world is one and the world is small"; the manifest need of a common front in the face of united foes, the felt weakness of divided armies, and the imperilled position of religious education in the day schools. On the other hand, there is the renewed emphasis of to-day on the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and the consequent renewed desire in many hearts for fuller fellowship, which is not a matter of accommodation but revelation. God has given the vision; we must not let it fade. But even in this light our difficulties, which have the promise of dissolution in them, remain anxious and perplexing.

If I refer in my brief allotted time to those aspects which seem to constitute but minor difficulties, it is because they are, neverthe-

less, very real difficulties, and also such as we can contribute something towards their solution.

1. *The wide Divergence of View within our own Church.*—Such divergence swings from the stiff and impossible position of Absorption, which says, The door of fellowship is ever open—but it is plain that the return may only be made on the rigid terms of those who still regard every Nonconformist as a Schmitist, to that of the free lance who over-leaps all difficulties in his laudable ambition to reach the goal, but still leaves those difficulties unsolved. A stable condition of fellowship with others can only rest upon a sound fellowship amongst ourselves. We must welcome, therefore, all that makes for greater unity within our own Church, as an aid to the greater fellowship. There is place and space for propaganda work at home. Much, it is true, has been done, but much still remains to be done. The fruits of corporate thinking are very evident in this movement. A well-organized effort of conference has drawn in and carried forward a considerable body of clergy to a mutual understanding, whilst the educational work of this and similar conferences has been of proved value. But the circle of instructed opinion is still too small. To use a phrase, We have got the expeditionary force, but we need the whole army—or as much of it as we can enroll. This constitutes a difficulty we must seek to remove. Our laity are still largely untouched. One way of approach has been opened through the parochial councils which will be sadly misused if they are stultified by finance or merely kept in reserve as business advisers, when they might become receivers and transmitters of matters relating to live issues of modern Church life. Let us make the attempt to carry our councils with us in the matter of fellowship, for the laity will have much to say in moulding the future of the Church. We can thus advance our pioneer work. It has been remarked that all that can be said has been said on this subject. This is not true. We have faith to believe that the Lambeth Conference will say something more and something new, and even if it were true, my point is what has been said has not been said to all.

2. *The Difficulties on the other Side.*—It is a truism to remark that all the difficulties are not on our side. We need to cultivate an intellectual and spiritual sympathy with those who are not of our communion, and to appreciate their difficulties. If there is some room for disappointment that their response has not seemed to us at all times to be as whole-hearted as we could have wished, it is for us to remember that the problem presents difficulties to them as it does to us, though their difficulties are of a somewhat different order. I hope I may say without offence that the more one seeks to enter into sympathetic comprehension of the difficulties on the other side, so far as they spring out of past history and present outlook, the more one realizes that it is the responsibility of the Anglican Church to play a very active and persuasive part in preparing the way for a better understanding.

3. *The Laity are not Abreast of the Clergy.*—I suppose it is true

beyond question that, whilst the man in the street, if I may be allowed the expression, waving aside all difficulties, demands somewhat peremptorily that we shall close up our ranks, the lay-members of the various bodies are far behind their clerical leaders in their desire for closer fellowship. The difficulties here are not, perhaps, mainly theological or ecclesiastical. Are they not rather, to state the case as smoothly as possible, inherited and traditional? If this is an approximately correct diagnosis, we are encouraged by the thought that such a spirit represents the past and not the present. The new democratic feeling is inimical to aloofness. I believe one honest fear that lurks in the minds of many good laymen is that, if walls of separation were broken down, the result would be not gain but loss. It may be that their emphasis in Church matters is somewhat misplaced. We clergy must apply the corrective.

4. *Complacent Contentment.*—But is not our chief difficulty embodied in the complacent contentment with things as they are? We need a divine discontent. A keen realization that the desire, the passion for fellowship, is not the outcome of amiable feelings, nor generous good-will, nor noble emotions alone, but the conviction of the faith that it is the will of the Invisible Head whose body in its component parts cannot receive the fulness of His Grace except they be compacted and fitly joined together. As the Bishop-designate of Pretoria says in his recent book, “Everywhere the question must be faced, Do the separated Churches need one another for the knowledge of their God and for the fighting of His battles?” That question is a keen challenge to thought, and a sad implication with respect to the Church’s experience. But it has the further merit of reminding us that we must keep to first principles. If we can secure the recognition that unity is the will of the Head for the well-being of His Body, then there is no room for complacent contentment with things as they are.

*In Conclusion.*—This conference has a history. For us the resolutions of the past stand good. The door of retreat is shut. Neither can we stand still. We trust that the findings of the present conference will carry us further. By every means in our power let us reduce any remaining barriers of pride and prejudice: by every means which imagination can suggest let us spread the conviction of the profound basis upon which we believe fellowship rests, and stand as men ready for immediate and courageous action, praying that God will show us quite clearly what He would have us to do.



[Cheltenham Conference Paper.]

## FELLOWSHIP OF THE CHURCHES:

## (a) PROBLEMS OF THE HOME CHURCH.

## III.

BY THE REV. H. FOSTER PEGG, M.A., Vicar of Battersea and  
Rural Dean.

THE writing of a short paper on a large subject is a task for a genius, and as I am not one of the Immortals, I have found it a very difficult matter. Shakespeare may be right when he asserts that "brevity is the soul of wit," it certainly is a sore travail to the writer of a short paper. Perhaps the promoters of this Conference, by adopting the plan of ten-minute papers, have unwittingly revealed their conviction that the time for speech is drawing to a close and the hour for action is at hand. I shall not protest if it be so, for after long but not lost years of waiting (the Lambeth Quadriateral was promulgated in 1888), after protracted but profitable discussion, after minute and necessary examination of the points on which we agree and those on which we differ, after spasmodic attempts at interchange of pulpits and other friendly and united activities, we have now reached the most delicate and difficult stage in the movement towards reunion. The processes I have alluded to, have compelled all those interested in reunion to state their positions clearly. All have expressed their yearning for a closer unity, and that alone is surely a great gain.

One had hoped that the experiences of the Great War, when the force of grim circumstances brought the Churches into close touch in the administration of the Faith, would have given an irresistible impetus towards reunion. I am inclined to think that the movement in that direction since the war has been decidedly disappointing. I do not wish to undervalue the great gain that has arisen from a vastly wider and more intimate knowledge of each other's methods of operation in dispensing the saving efficacy and ministrations of religion. The result of such co-operation has been a greater feeling of respect for each other, and for each other's ways, a respect which may have been wanting in its sympathetic fullness prior to the war. We have looked each other in the face and discovered that we are brethren in the Lord, aiming at the same end, and agreeing in all the main points of our faith. We have thus learned to respect each other and each other's ways and been drawn nearer together. Yes, we have learned to respect and to reverence one another in the Lord.

Now the first point which strikes one is this, that such being the case we have reached the psychological moment of approach to each other, and all history and experience teaches that such a moment is fraught with momentous possibilities for weal or woe, in the cause we have at heart. With this view agree the latest

utterances of Dr. Scott Lidgett in the *Contemporary Review* for May. "It is safe to say, that the relations between the Anglican Church and Evangelical Nonconformity cannot remain as they stand at present. If British Christianity with its conservatism, caution, and acquiescence in anomalies were prepared to tolerate the existing state of things for another generation, it is pretty certain that powerful forces operating elsewhere would compel us to face the issue in the near future." Dean Welldon, in the *Nineteenth Century* for May, urges the same view for other reasons: "The decadence of the Christian Faith as a commanding influence upon the national life has for some time been a cause of serious anxiety among patriotic citizens. In old days men might or might not act upon the law of Christ in their daily life; but they accepted it in theory. To-day there are an increasing number of men who do not accept it. Even before the war, the signs of revolt against the accredited standard of life in Christian countries was only too evident. The war has revealed in the full light of day the spirit which has long been working all over Europe. . . . The problem of Christian reunion was never so urgent or so vital as it is to-day, because Europe stands confronted by a system which would, in its final issue, be the negation of all Christian faith and the destruction of Christian life."

Now both of these are problems confronting us, and neither of them can be shelved by those anxious to see the cause of Christ progressing in our land. The increasing indifference to religious observances is one of the most serious facts we have to face, and any tendency or influence, however slight, which makes in that direction is palpably perilous.

The man-in-the-street regards our differences with good-natured contempt, because he fails to see efficient reasons for them, and thinks that we are weak-minded to quarrel about such trifles. He thinks that he can safely wait before making up his mind until we have agreed as to the best form of expressing our creed. This may seem a slight matter, but I fear that it accounts for some, probably many, being outside our places of worship. In my own deanery we are on very friendly terms with our Nonconformist brethren and act with them. I as Rural Dean and Vicar am asked to the institution or to the departure of their ministers, and frequently to their anniversary services. I believe that this outward friendliness is doing good to the cause of Christ in our neighbourhood.

I know that some feel that such may tend to confuse the minds of people as to the real differences between us, but I am inclined to think that the good far exceeds the ill in such co-operation.

I have been surprised at the way in which, to my mind, the Holy Spirit has been ignored in this movement. I hope that I may be mistaken, but there seems to me so little reference to the Holy Spirit in the literature on the subject, or at all events in that portion known to me. It has been well said that "It is in the presence of the Holy Ghost that we find the true union of the Church. There are diversities of operation, and must always be such, but diversity of operation does not destroy, or in any degree impair, the unity of



the Spirit." There is one Spirit, and in the unity of that one Spirit we alone shall find the true unity and the true bond of the Churches. We are aiming at something deeper and more radical than uniformity; we are seeking union, and nothing less. That union can alone come through the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit of our God. This is the one point I would press upon the Conference, that only in the unity of the Holy Spirit shall we, or can we, reach the desired end at which we are aiming, and I hope that this definite note may be sounded forth. Prayer and faith are necessary as never before. Let us pledge ourselves to a daily calling upon that Holy Spirit to bring about in His own way that which He has put into our hearts to seek after and desire.

Let me again quote the words of Dr. Scott Lidgett: "This widespread movement toward reunion springs from a far deeper source than sense of practical utility, and is being fashioned by quite other instruments than the skill of constitution-makers or the learning of ecclesiastical historians, important as these are in their place. It is born of the sense that Christianity consists above all in a divinely-implanted life, which is found to exist in equal measure throughout all the Christian communions. It matures into a deliberate purpose in the growing recognition that this divinely-imparted life is social and catholic in its character; that the Church is the divine and indispensable expression and instrument of its catholicity, and that therefore there is a hopeless contradiction between the full recognition of the Christian life and the maintenance of separate Christian communions in isolation from or even antagonistic to one another. This contradiction hinders the perfect development of Christian life and the complete realization of Christian truth, mars the ideal of the Christian Church, weakens its ministry to spiritual life, and damages its witness to the Kingdom of God throughout the range of Christian life."

Yes, the present state of affairs hinders the full manifestation of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer and throughout the whole Christian community.

Let us remember Christ's own words: "And the glory which Thou hast given Me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as We are one; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that Thou didst send Me, and lovedst them, even as Thou lovedst Me" (St. John xvii. 22, 23).

I cannot do better than close my short paper with another quotation from Dr. Scott Lidgett: "Grave responsibility rests upon the whole body of Anglican Bishops for taking such preliminary and practical steps as may give fresh inspiration and impetus to the movement towards reunion. Upon their decisions will depend whether the saner forces making for this great goal shall be strengthened and directed or whether the movement shall be thrown into confusion by decisions that will bring despair to the practical statesmen of all denominations. No greater occasion for the display of vision, wisdom, and courage on the part of the Episcopate has arisen for generations. The Lambeth decisions will either

give hope of the prevalence of catholicity, in its truest and largest sense, or will intensify the sectarian spirit within the Anglican Church, and therefore, by inevitable reaction, throughout Evangelical Nonconformity."

These are weighty and wise words of warning and ought to bring all those who desire and long for reunion, for the sake of their Master and His cause, to their knees, in continuous prayer that His Holy Spirit may grant at this time vision, faith and courage to go forward to mend the torn but seamless robe of Christ.

We are living in perilous times for the Church, the nation, and the world; we are constantly faced with moral and social questions of far-reaching importance. Our Empire was saved in the Great War by our unity. As a parish priest in a large South London parish, daily facing these problems, I long for such a unity of the whole of the Christian forces of this land, as (for the Churches) to be able to speak with one voice, one heart, one sentiment, upon the great moral and social questions of the day. Such united speech, such united action, would command recognition and respect and go far to create an enlightened public opinion. Our unity would be our strength. May we who pray for, wish for, this unity simply, solely and only for the extension of Christ's Kingdom, and God's glory, be granted to see the fruition of our desire.

---

"Gather us in,  
 Thou Love that fillest all!  
 Gather our rival faiths within Thy fold!  
 Rend each man's temple veil, and bid it fall,  
 That we may know that Thou hast been of old;  
 Gather us in!

"Gather us in!  
 We worship only Thee;  
 In varied names we stretch a common hand;  
 In divers forms a common soul we see;  
 In many ships we seek one Spirit Land;  
 Gather us in!"

---

#### THE POSITION IN INDIA.

"The movement towards unity in England is of the few, and not of the many. However deep and sincere are the aspirations of its leaders, they are so far in front of the mass of Church-goers and Chapel-goers, that the movement still produces on many minds an impression of artificiality. It is consequently opposed, and opposed by methods and arguments which in their turn have an air of unreality. It will be a great mistake if those in India whose spiritual pabulum consists of the English Church newspapers reproduce the arguments which they find in them in the different circumstances of India. For the movement towards unity here is a popular movement, not a movement of leaders. It concerns not the adjustment of Christian forces, but the birth-throes of the Church of India."—THE BISHOP OF BOMBAY in his *Diocesan Magazine*.

[*Cheltenham Conference Paper.*]

## FELLOWSHIP OF THE CHURCHES:

(b) IN THE DOMINIONS.

BY THE REV. J. D. MULLINS, M.A., D.D., Secretary of the  
Colonial and Continental Church Society.

I CONCEIVE it to be my function to try to give some idea of the position of the Church of England, and of progress towards Re-union, in the overseas dominions so far as it has come within my knowledge; and this means that I must confine my remarks to Canada and Australia.

British visitors to Canada are usually surprised to find how relatively inconspicuous is the Church of England compared with the Church of Rome and even the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches. The Church of Rome, chiefly owing to her overwhelming preponderance in the Province of Quebec, together with her transplanted colonies of French Canadians elsewhere, claims about two-fifths of the entire population of the Dominion. Her great wealth, for she ranks with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Standard Oil as one of the three great financial powers of Canada, enables her to "get in on the ground floor" in all advances into new regions or new extensions of population. Thus she imposes herself upon the imagination in most places by prominent buildings. Her political influence also penetrates everywhere. The Presbyterian and Methodist Churches are only slightly larger than the Anglican, but speaking generally their buildings are finer and their clergy rank in public estimation at least as highly as, or higher than our own. At a public gathering, for instance, where prayer has to be offered, it is quite likely that the Presbyterian or Methodist parson will be called upon rather than the Anglican. Personality, however, is in all cases the governing factor: position and rank count for nothing, and the Anglican clergy have no prestige as such.

The Anglican community is about one-eighth of the whole population, and in some parts falls as low as one-twelfth. It is weakest (next to Quebec) in some parts of Eastern Canada where the original settlement was chiefly from Scotland and the North of Ireland, and where the Church was late in the field. The complexion of its ritual seldom rises beyond what would here be thought very moderate, and would usually be voted by Englishmen exceedingly low. On the other hand there are churches where the teaching is advanced far beyond what the ritual would lead any one to expect. This disproportion will probably be found wherever the laity have a controlling voice in Church affairs: the lay mind has generally no liking for elaborate ritual, while it does not, unless carefully instructed, trouble itself much about errors of doctrine. It might have been supposed that such a Church would have been ready to assimilate with non-episcopal bodies. It is unestablished, and enjoys no special social prestige, its views are not predominantly

sacerdotal, its laity—and the laity are as a rule less exclusive than the clergy—have a full share in its affairs. Yet with one exception I have not heard of any official movement in Eastern or Western Canada towards re-union, while projects for re-union between Presbyterians and Methodists have been publicly discussed. Possibly the fact that the Church is the under-dog with the resultant instinct for self-preservation, resentment at overlapping and suspicion of "sheep-stealing" may have something to do with this reserve.

Individually there is a good deal of fraternisation. In country districts, where the Church clergy are not stiff Anglicans, it is not uncommon for Nonconformists to suspend their services when some special preacher or special ceremony is announced in the Anglican church; and the Anglican laity in such cases expect reciprocal courtesies to be extended. At Montreal, under the Rev. Dr. Rexford, Principal of the diocesan theological college, a system of combined lectures for divinity students by professors drawn from the Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist and other Protestant colleges has been at work for many years, with excellent results. Some co-operation between the Presbyterian college at Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, and our own Emmanuel College has also been tried, but less extensively.

As for inter-communion—I imagine that it does not take place to any great extent in the larger cities, but in the pioneer districts Nonconformists frequently attend and are welcomed at Holy Communion at Anglican services. Probably the converse is true to a certain extent, but I imagine that when Anglicans, for want of their own services, get into the habit of attending those provided by Nonconformists they end in becoming members of that particular body, and do not readily return to their church even if, later on, its services become accessible. The Church has certainly lost considerably in places by this process.

The important move, already referred to, in the direction of unity, is that which has recently taken place in British Columbia, between the Anglican and Presbyterian Synods of the Province. Certain of the Bishops and a committee of the Presbyterian Synod met last year and in October unanimously agreed upon a series of resolutions which, while not directly touching the crucial questions of faith and order, do involve mutual recognition and co-operation to a remarkable extent. The following is the text of these resolutions:

1. "That before occupying new territory, where there are few settlers, and there is little prospect of rapid growth, or where other special circumstances exist, conference be held between the Bishop of the diocese and the Superintendent of (Presbyterian) missions, so as to prevent overlapping during the pioneer stage."

"This agreement to be upon the clear and definite understanding that each communion reserves to itself the right to send a clergyman from time to time into such districts to administer the Sacraments to its own people."

2. "That in cases of sparsely settled districts, when missionaries of both communions are at work, services should be held either on different Sundays, or at different hours on the same Sunday, so as to avoid apparent conflict,

and that the Bishop of the diocese and the Superintendent of missions should use their influence to promote such arrangements."

3. "That in the opinion of this conference the time has arrived when an adequate religious survey of this province should be undertaken, so as to ascertain what portions of the population are destitute of religious ordinances."

4. "That an effort should be made towards instituting a committee for the promotion of inter-Church conferences and the diffusing of information, regarding the presence and mode of life of Orientals in this Province, and also regarding Oriental immigration and the action of Government in relation to such immigration."

5. "That the two communions actively co-operate in the matter of law, enforcement in connection with the illicit sale of liquor, gambling, sexual vice, supervision of places of amusement, the rescue of victims of vice, etc."

6. "That the two communions continue to act together in regard to religious teaching in public schools, and that they co-operate in the work of religious education generally and in the effort to link up the young life of the people with the life and work of the Church."

7. "That the conference recommends the most complete co-operation possible in the matter of preparing and distributing popular literature, elucidating and advancing Christian principles of faith and conduct, and combating widely diffused errors in social and religious matters."

These resolutions were reported to the Anglican Synod on January 29 last, and were approved, the discussion showing that members regarded them as small beginnings from which they hoped great results might follow. On the following day the Bishops, now as a committee of the Synod, continued their conferences with the Presbyterian delegates, and began on the deeper questions which had hitherto been deferred. Bishop Doull of Kootenay, in an article in the *Canadian Churchman* of March 25 last, considers that the whole proceedings were so cordial as to lead them to look forward to more public discussions "in the confident expectation of arriving at a solution which can be honourably accepted by both communions." He points out that the proceedings are fully official on both sides and emphasises their significance as follows:

"The Province of British Columbia is in some degree the very last province in which such action might have been expected. It is the most English of all Canadian provinces. In the Anglican Church the strength of the High Church School of thought is probably as great or greater than in any other part of Canada. Of the four Bishops forming the Anglican committee, only one can be fairly described as an out-and-out pronounced Evangelical.<sup>1</sup>

"The Lambeth Quadrilateral, as interpreted and elucidated by the action of the Church in Southern India in its negotiations with the United Church of Southern India, is forming the bases of our discussions.

"There seems to be every prospect of agreement upon matters of real importance, it having been frankly recognized on both sides that rigid uniformity is impossible, and that a united Church must be more comprehensive, not less comprehensive, than the Anglican communion at the present moment."

Bishop Doull adds an interesting personal expression of opinion—that the Presbyterian influence "will, in the main, be found exerted in the direction of maintaining high and exalted views of the Church, the ministry and the Sacraments. All they ask is that

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop here refers to Archbishop Du Vernet of Caledonia.

they should not be called to deny their past or to take any step which would involve or imply any doubt regarding their status as part of the Holy Catholic or Universal Church."

Our own attitude towards such a movement can only be one of surprised gladness and a hopeful anticipation that discussions conducted in such a spirit will affect the whole question of re-union at large. I regret however to hear that Churchmen in other parts of Canada are disposed to look unfavourably upon the British Columbian proceedings.

The position of the Church in Australia is wholly different from that in Canada. It claims the nominal adherence of about 40 per cent. of the inhabitants, though the proportion is not uniformly distributed over the Commonwealth. The peculiarity of Australia is the concentration of population in a few great cities while the rest of the continent is most sparsely inhabited. In the older parts of the cities there are cathedrals and stone churches which would grace any town in England, and here and there even an endowed church is to be found. The newer parts of the cities have churches of a more provisional character, and the spiritual care of the vast stretches of the bush is an anxious problem, too great for the unaided efforts of the colonial Church.

The prevailing type of Churchmanship in Australia is rather high. Of the twenty-four bishops not more than five can be called Evangelicals, and in only Sydney, Bendigo and Gippsland is there a preponderance of Evangelical clergy. Formerly it was otherwise. Evangelical bishops have been succeeded in diocese after diocese by men of varying degrees of High-Churchism, and they have gradually moulded their dioceses to their views.

In Australia, as in Canada, the Roman Church is self-assertive, though without the initial advantages it possesses in the Dominion. Of the Protestant Churches, the Presbyterian seems to me the most prominent. Certainly in its splendidly equipped Ormonde College in Melbourne, its vigorous efforts to secure higher education throughout Victoria, and its energetic Australia Inland Mission, it is showing exceptional signs of life and vigour.

In contrast with Canada, the subject of re-union has long been mooted in Australia, and, contrary to expectation, the chief movers have not been on the Evangelical side. One of the leaders is the Bishop Gilbert White of Willochra, formerly of Carpentaria, a tolerant High-Churchman. He has been chosen to represent the Australian Church at the forthcoming Conference on Faith and Order.

Two important Conferences were held last year, one in Queensland, the other in South Australia, at which the two Interim Reports of the Archbishops' Committee on Faith and Order were considered. The South Australian Conference met on January 22 and 23, 1919, when all the Churches were represented except the Roman Catholics, Lutherans and the Salvation Army, who refused, namely, the Church of England, the Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregational-

ists, Baptists and Church of Christ. After two days' full discussion each clause of the Interim Reports was put separately and passed *nem. con.* On one or two points only one or two representatives did not vote: there was no adverse vote on any point.

The similarly constituted Queensland Conference met at Brisbane on May 30, 1919, and on following days. The same six Churches were represented. Here the proceedings were not unanimous, the non-episcopal brethren objecting to the view that our Lord established a visible Church. With regard to the continuity of the Historic Episcopate, a rider was passed showing the hesitation with which the majority accepted this condition in any form. Whilst thinking the clause premature, they state :

"The majority were prepared to approve the clause with the proviso that it does not necessarily imply any acceptance of the position that ministerial authority cannot be otherwise obtained or that Episcopacy is the only channel of Divine Grace, nor as implying that the form of government in the re-united Church would necessarily be episcopal. But the establishment of such a continuity would give the minister of the re-united Church an authority which all its members would recognize."

Leaving out some other conferences between the Churches, I would refer lastly to the negotiations between the Presbyterian and Anglican Churches in 1906 and 1907, in which a working arrangement between the two Churches was practically agreed upon as a basis of union.

The Conference of Committees appointed by the General Synod of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania and by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia passed a series of resolutions, of which the first three embodied the first three conditions of the Lambeth Quadrilateral. The next four carefully define ordination, the eighth opposes any possible establishment of a State Church in Australia. The crucial resolutions were as follows :—

"That a Union of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania and the Presbyterian Church of Australia be effected and consummated by a joint Solemn Act under the authority and sanction of both Churches, in which each Church shall confer upon the Presbyters of the other all the rights and privileges necessary for the exercise of their office in the United Church, so that from the moment of such Union all the Presbyters of each Church shall have equal status in the United Church.

"That some form of individual superintendence and government, constitutionally exercised, is expedient for the United Church, and that authority to execute such superintendence and government shall be conferred by a Solemn Act of Consecration duly administered on a Presbyter, with the title of Bishop exclusively attached."

"This Conference, while recognizing that the authority to perform an act of ordination is inherent in the Church, agrees that as a matter of order in the United Church all ordinations of persons to the office of presbyter as ministers of the Word and Sacraments shall be by a Bishop and three Presbyters at least.

"And further, that in the consecration of every Bishop, three Bishops at least shall take part and such Presbyters as may be appointed for the purpose."

The rock on which the plan was wrecked was the bond between the Australian and the home Church, commonly referred to as the *nexus*.

The nexus is an integral part of the constitution of the Australian Church which has by this means bound itself voluntarily but unmistakably to follow the leading and usage of the Church of England. The nexus could not be dropped without a special Act of Parliament, and responsible leaders shrink from taking such a step for fear of other consequences within the Australian Churches. The matter was therefore referred to the Lambeth Conference of 1908, which practically shelved the plan, and report points to Bishop Gore as its chief opponent.

Resolution 75 of the Conference possibly has the Australian proposals in mind when it says that—

“in the welcome event of any project of reunion between any Church of the Anglican Communion and any Presbyterian or other non-episcopal Church which, while preserving the Faith in its integrity and purity, has also exhibited care as to the form and intention of ordination to the ministry, reaching the stage of responsible official negotiation, it might be possible to make an approach to reunion on the basis of consecrations to the episcopate on lines suggested by such precedents as those of 1610. Further, in the opinion of the Conference, it might be possible to authorize arrangements (for the period of transition towards full union on the basis of episcopal ordination) which would respect the convictions of those who had not received episcopal Orders, without involving any surrender on our part of the principle of Church order laid down in the preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer.”

These cautious phrases refrain from facing the issue while speciously commending as possibilities the very course actually adopted. At any rate, in 1909 the Australian Joint Conference, having the Lambeth Resolutions before it, merely reported the eighteen Resolutions “as a basis of future negotiations.” The project therefore seems to be in abeyance.

The writer remembers a saying of the late Bishop Walsham How at the Shrewsbury Church Congress, to the effect that Home Reunion could only take place if, through a special outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the existing Nonconformist ministers were willing to accept episcopal ordination, or if, through a similar outpouring of grace, the episcopal Church became willing to accept such ministers without re-ordination. The Australian resolutions seek to translate that saying into action, and may be commended to the attention of all those who are labouring for reunion.

It is worthy of note that in both these great oversea dominions definite steps towards local reunion should have been taken, that in both cases the Presbyterian Churches should have been the responding party, and that in both the main Anglican leaders should have been not Evangelicals, but Moderate or High Churchmen. We can but trust that the forthcoming Lambeth Conference will give more definite encouragement to such proposals than previous Conferences have felt free to do. Public opinion is certainly far more ripe for reunion than it was twelve years ago. Nor should there be any disposition to wait until the Anglican Communion as a whole, or even the Church of England throughout the



Empire, can adopt uniform action. The Church of South Africa is expressly independent of the Church of England. The Church in Canada is unhampered by any obligation to follow the home Church : indeed, it has recently shown its independence by revising the Prayer Book along its own lines. The Church in Australia cannot move except with the concurrence of the Church in England. The Church in India is a part of the State Establishment. The circumstances, therefore, of these Churches, of the disestablished Church in the West Indies, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, differ fundamentally. The Anglican Communion as a whole is so vast and so diverse an organization that to wait until it moves as one mass is to wait till Doomsday. If each of the component Churches is set free to negotiate for local reunion, either with one non-episcopal Church such as the Presbyterians or on a wider basis, as in South India, the way would be paved for a more general reunion. It will be evident from the foregoing that in my opinion the Presbyterian Church, whose instincts and form of Church order most nearly approximate to our own, offer the most promising outlook for the beginnings of the formation of a united Church under a "constitutional episcopate adapted to local needs."

Finally, I wish to state emphatically that the surest, if not the only, way to secure adequate spiritual ministrations for our own brethren in the pioneer regions of the Empire is by some effective combination with fellow-workers, now non-episcopal. The deplorable overlapping and rivalry which now exist in even out-back towns and villages waste the energies of Christians, are a source of mockery to the non-religious man and to the Roman Catholic, while other areas are left without any ministry of religion. Concordats between the Churches, if not at first organic reunion, are plainly indicated by the facts to be required. Such approaches as those recorded in this paper, coupled with the remarkable movement in South India between the Anglican and the South India United Church and the Kikuyu Federation, are evidence of so widespread a desire for union that surely the Lambeth Conference will be bound to give them countenance, lest haply it be found to be fighting against God.



[*Cheltenham Conference Paper.*]

## FELLOWSHIP OF THE CHURCHES :

(b) IN THE DOMINIONS.

## II.

BY THE REV. CANON MORROW, M.A., Vicar of Clifton.

IN the findings of the World's Missionary Conference the following words occur : " It is true that in the matter of unity the Mission-field is leading the way, but it does not seem that the movement can advance far with safety, apart from the co-operation of the Church at home. It is undesirable that the links that bind the churches in the mission-field to their parent churches should be severed at too early a date, or that a Church should grow up in Japan, China or India that has not intimate relations with the Church at home, to which it owes its origin." To this statement a great number here to-day might subscribe even though it might require qualification in specific cases. If, however, this principle is accepted with regard to the mission-field, the fellowship of the Churches in our Colonies would seem to present a very strong case for the cause of Christian Unity, and possibly make all the running towards that goal in the near future. And for these reasons.

(1) The Colonies, in the first place, are to all intents and purposes new countries with practically nothing in common with older countries. They have no established customs to observe and no traditions to respect. They look forward and not backward. Their whole philosophy is idealistic. Their whole outlook is coloured by the new conditions with which they are surrounded and of their possible influence on their lives. The sense of fellowship and brotherhood is felt more acutely in new countries, where men and women of all classes are faced with the same difficulties to be overcome, and with the same inspiration for a fresh adventure.

(2) In the second place, they already possess both the elements of missionary propaganda and of home organization. There are—speaking especially of Canada—the missionary problems no less acute than in some parts of the foreign mission-field. The Bible for example, has to be translated into *III* different languages and dialects in order to reach every one in that great British Dominion. There are thousands of Chinese and Japanese, to say nothing of the Galicians, Czechs, Poles and Lithuanians. In addition to all these there are those who are called " old timers," or those descendants of the Selkirk settlers who have intermarried with Indian tribes and therefore present, to some extent, the same problems as do the heathen in other lands. Side by side are the emigrants from the motherland with those elements of religious perception which are at once old and new. These constitute a real and strong link with the

Home Church, and make it possible for the Colonies to take an independent step forward towards unity.

(3) Then there are, thirdly, elements of character arising from the broad acres of a great colony which at once sweep away any traditional prejudices and especially any tinge of insularity which one, alas, finds here at home. Those ideals which a huge territory creates must be of immense value to our spiritual as well as our national outlook, for there is a greater freedom from that narrowness and partizanship which insularity undoubtedly produces.

(4) There is, fourthly, an illuminating factor which may have a distinct bearing on the possibilities of Christian union, to be gathered from the independent legislation in social matters. Our Colonies are free to initiate any such schemes and to place them on the Statute Roll quite independent of the Home Government. As an illustration which will come home to us all, Canada has adopted Prohibition and has by the consent of her people settled it as the law of the land.

From these considerations there could be no better arena for the launching of any schemes for union that are possible. What are those possibilities.

1. Fellowship is a distinct advance on federation. Federation is practised to-day to some extent, but it cannot serve as great a purpose as fellowship rightly understood. It does not prevent overlapping. I speak of one township in Canada where I visited as one of the Mission of Help. It was on the whole a most delightful and friendly visit. I was met at the station by the Wesleyan minister, and at the mission services both he and the Baptist minister took part. Yet the spectacle that religion presented in that small township of less than 5,000 people in a radius of twelve miles was humiliating and saddening. Especially so to us Anglicans. There were fully ordained and able ministers sent out by the Wesleyan, Presbyterian and Baptist Churches. They were the best that could be found, and well paid and supported. These men were able to give their congregations the fullest privileges of their Church life as represented by their denomination. The Anglican Church, on the other hand, was trying to hold the fort for years with only a catechist who was not able even to pronounce the Absolution. Here was surely a waste of excellent material, for with a Union Church two ordained men would have been quite sufficient for the needs of that centre, while the others could be released for service at some other point which at present is untouched for lack of the living agent.

2. Fellowship of the Churches would mean aggression. The Church of Jesus Christ lives only by being aggressive! There is the greatest need for a wide spiritual aggression in both Canada and Australia to-day. In Canada the passion for real estate is leading towards a materialism which is having a deadening effect upon the whole community. In parts of Australia it is even worse. The younger generation is growing up without any knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. To give an illustration from North Queensland. A show was expected in a certain township, but the day before it

arrived one of the parsons supported by the Colonial and Continental Church Society arrived for the first time in that place. He was hailed with delight by all the young folk, who greeted him with the question, "Are you the showman?" He replied in amazement, "Don't you know a parson when you see him?" They replied, "How should we? We have never seen one." This is typical and points to the absolute necessity of a spiritual aggressive. At present both Canada and Australia are in a formative condition. They are really waiting for the true mould which shall develop them nationally as well as spiritually. It is ever true that the value and progress of any nation is measured by those ingredients of character in its people without which no nation will live. But in the face of this absolute need of a great spiritual adventure there is the humbling fact that there is no Church or denomination strong enough or living enough to take the lead. I have not the slightest doubt that, if a national Canadian or Australian Church were established, it would impress itself on the life of their people at once and thus secure them not only for the Empire for ever, but also for the Church of Christ. Therefore if we of the mother Church and land want our Colonies to keep clear of the dry rot of materialism and agnosticism, of the paralysing effects of expediency or opportunism, of the incoherency and impotence of a divided Christendom; if we want those new nations, full of the lustre and glory of victors in the late war; if we want them to be handed down to posterity as a synonym for good men and modest women, for honest industry and fruitful labour, for disciplined youth and pious, honourable age, for the absence of vice in their new townships or misery in their new homes, then we of the older country of the mother land, with all our past sad experiences as a terrible warning, must help them to seek the only power possible for these things at the hands of a united ministry in a united Church which proclaims with one united voice, One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism. Or again: who shall doubt that the missionary work would be increased a thousand-fold were that work of thrusting forth to the fields already white unto harvest entrusted to and performed by a United Colonial Church? The possibilities of world evangelization would be immense. Canada is only eleven days from Japan. Australia is less from those larger fields of India and the Straits settlements. I believe this to be gloriously possible, but it will only be so when a united Church filled with the one Spirit sends forth its Barnabas's and Sauls to proclaim, not sectarian Christianity, but the new spiritual Zion where Christ is all and in all.

3. Fellowship of the Churches would in time obviate any necessity for subtle distinctions between unity and uniformity which are a stumbling block towards reunion in many minds. Fellowship lifts the whole situation from the low level of polemics to the lofty spiritual atmosphere of eirenic. Fellowship involves more than either partnership, agreement or co-operation. It is founded always upon a common interest. It proclaims a unity not of organization, but of a common life. All the Churches are partakers of the Divine

nature. They are proclaiming a common salvation through the one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus. The fellowship of the Holy Ghost—a subject upon which we have been all meditating recently—is the response that Churches as well as individuals give to the strivings and leadings of that Blessed Spirit Who maketh men to be of one mind in an house.

Can we not therefore with faith and optimism look to the new nations which are arising in our Colonies for this practical interpretation of the Catholic Church of the future? Can we not hope, with those national ideals which have already cemented those great lands into one homogeneous whole, for a similar unity in their spiritual counterpart? Is it too much to believe that their freedom and independence shall, when spiritualized by the Blessed Spirit, find a way for its impress on the home Church and its missionary handmaid? I do not think it is! The Colonies are the new bottles of spiritual opportunity. They do not want the old wines on the lees of narrowness, sectarianism or foolish controversy. They will in the near future demand, and they will have the right to demand, the new wine of a holy enthusiasm, and a life-giving message for a world sick and tired of the old shibboleths and ready for that truly Catholic Church—that city which is coming down out of Heaven.

This is our vision of the fellowship of the Churches in our Colonies. It is no mirage, deceiving to the eyes through mists which arise from Round Table Conferences or from the specious reasonings which cloak the timidity of leaders. It is bound to come. "Though it tarry wait for it, for it will not tarry." The one Lord, in whom all believe is preparing it. He asks us to help Him, and I am certain He will not ask in vain. Yea, rather that even now you are saying in the words of the great builder of the early Church, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?"

---

#### THE BISHOP OF MOMBASA'S TESTIMONY.

Speaking at the Cheltenham Conference, the Bishop of Mombasa referred to India and East Africa, pointing out the problems before the national Churches. The Church of India, he said, needed the thought and prayer and contribution that all nationalities in India could bring into it. The Church at home must move with the Church in the mission-field, for, unless something did happen, the native Churches might be cut off from the Home Church. In Africa there was a tendency to cleavage between the white man and the black man, and the Church of Christ was the force to bring them together. Referring to the working of the Kikuyu Alliance, it had many encouragements, but it had emphasized some of the difficulties as well. Four Communion were linked up with the Alliance and four were not. The difficulties were not all on one side. Difficulties had come into being such as they had never thought of before, but they were out to meet difficulties and to overcome them. Questions of all sorts were constantly arising, and were referred to the Alliance. The beneficial effect of the Alliance was seen in many directions; the Government, for example, now always applied to the Alliance in regard to matters upon which they needed information or guidance, whereas when the Churches were separate they were ignored. But there was one great weakness; at present they could not meet together at the Table of the Lord, and he hoped that Christians at home would pray earnestly that that difficulty might be done away with.

[*Cheltenham Conference Paper.*]

## FELLOWSHIP OF THE CHURCHES :

(b) IN THE DOMINIONS.<sup>1</sup>

### III.

BY THE REV. GEORGE F. IRWIN, B.D., Vicar of Wallington,  
Surrey.

I THINK the Conference has been very fortunate in having the clear statement given by Dr. Mullins of the numerical position of the Anglican communion in the Dominions, and of the relations between it and the Roman communion on the one hand and the non-Episcopal Churches on the other. Many facts are pointing to the absolute necessity of union among the Christian Churches. One of the speakers at this Conference has pointed out that the condition of the world demands it. May I mention one matter of significance? For last Empire Day *The Times* prepared an *Empire Supplement*, dealing with practically every aspect of life in our Dominions except one. There were articles dealing with industry, commerce, finance, agriculture, and even athletics, but there were only two references to religion, both of them in a measure depreciatory of mission work. To those of us who believe that the future of the Empire depends before all on the spiritual and moral qualities of its people, this is a startling omission. It shows the indifference of the average man to religious interests, but it could not have occurred if the Christianity of the Empire were a united force. Journalists require to be careful not to offend contending interests, and it would have been difficult to deal with the Christianity of the Empire in such a way as to satisfy every section of its divided forces. In contrast, may I point out that in yesterday's (June 2) *Times* a leading article over a column in length is given to the Pope's decision to receive sovereigns at the Vatican.

I had reason to go through the Reports of the Pan-Anglican Congress of 1908 a short time ago, and I read with special interest the portions dealing with the Anglican communion in the Dominions. Three chief points seem to stand out prominently: (1) That the Anglican communion was unable of itself to overtake the growing needs of the increasing population of the oversea Dominions; (2) that great waste was caused by the overlapping of the various Christian Churches. Churches were multiplied in small towns and in districts where the population did not warrant them; (3) and that the Church of Rome was strong in organization and in the outstanding position it obtained by its organized plan of advance. It is well known that in every likely district where a town may arise, the Roman Church secures a large section of land in a central position, and when the town is formed the portions that are not required are sold at a large profit and the proceeds used for the erection of an imposing block of buildings. The Roman Church and

<sup>1</sup> Summary of an address.

buildings are thus a prominent feature everywhere. In addition to this, large blocks of land are secured and filled with a compact body of Roman Catholic settlers. In Australia the Roman Church uses all its power to secure an advantageous position, especially in educational matters.

These facts of 1908 hold good to-day, and they form a powerful argument for the union of the Churches of the Reformation. At the same time, speaker after speaker at the Pan-Anglican Congress deprecated any action which might ultimately retard union with the Roman and Greek Churches. But with regard to this it is perhaps sufficient to say, as has already been said at the Conference, to delay action on this account is to fail to follow the Spirit of God. We hope that reunion with the Roman Church may be possible some day, but it cannot be until that Church is reformed. There is little hope of reformation at present, and we may well bear in mind Professor Gwatkin's remarkable words: "For an infallible Church reformation is suicide." There is no doubt that union will come among the Churches of the Reformation, especially in the Mission Field. If we are left out, the advantages that are claimed for our central position will be of little practical value to us. Let us press for the unity of the Reformed Churches. Let us start from the point of the spiritual union already existing—the union in Christ. That spiritual fact prepares the way for the further work of the Holy Spirit, and His guidance may well be followed to a wide comprehensive unity that need not imply uniformity.

Humanly speaking, everything depends on the Lambeth Conference. We know the result of the action of the Conference of 1908 in regard to the proposals put forward in 1906 for the union of the English Church and the Presbyterian Church in Australia. After the decision of the Lambeth Conference they were referred back to their respective Churches, and no action has since been taken. We hope that the Lambeth Conference this year will continue the advance that has marked the last three Conferences. During these years they have advanced from a quiescent to an active attitude in regard to reunion. In 1888 the Bishops were prepared to receive advances from other Christian communions. They held themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with their representatives. In 1897 they advanced to the position that they were to watch for opportunities of united prayer and mutual conference, but in 1908 they suggested that advances might be made, and even suggested that reunion might be possible on the basis of consecrations to the Episcopate on lines suggested by such precedents as those of 1610. May we not hope that in 1920 a further step will be taken, and that the Conference will originate definite action to remove the obstacles that block the path. Otherwise, as has been pointed out at this Conference, our Church is preparing for itself a position of unfortunate isolation in the English-speaking world, and especially in the Mission Field.

[*Cheltenham Conference Paper.*]

## FELLOWSHIP OF THE CHURCHES.

(c) IN THE MISSION FIELD.

BY THE REV. G. T. MANLEY, M.A., Secretary of the C.M.S.

IT is well that we should undertake the consideration of so important a subject as Fellowship of the Churches with a proper sense of geographical proportion; and I hope I may assume at the outset that the order of our programme which puts the Mission Field after the Churches at home is not intended to represent the order of importance. Among the many causes of division in Christendom not an infrequent one has been the lack of the geographical sense: for we are all disposed to magnify the importance of the locality in which we dwell, whether that locality be England, or Rome, or Zanzibar. Let us therefore remember that the importance of the Church of England in England is very different to its importance in the world. In India the Anglican Christians are less than one-seventh of the whole Christian population: in the rest of the Mission Field they are in a smaller proportion.

In the United States of America the Episcopal Church reckons a membership of one million, or making a liberal allowance for children, a population of four millions, out of ninety millions, or less than one twenty-second of the population. Moreover, the best equipped and the most rapidly expanding Missions to-day are those of the American Churches, notably of the Baptist, Presbyterian and Methodist Episcopal bodies, and this whether gauged by the number of baptisms or by the strength of their material and educational equipment.

If we would render real service to the Church of God in our own day and generation, we must face the facts and not live in a dreamland of our own devising. We must remember that the membership of our Anglican Communion abroad is but a small proportion of the Protestant body, and that the Native Christian Church includes also in most parts of the world a very large number of Roman Catholics. In the light of these facts I ask, what is our aim in regard to the Fellowship of the Churches in the Mission Field?

In general terms the answer is easy. We pray and we work that the universal Church may be inspired with the spirit of truth, unity and concord; and that all who call upon God's Holy Name may agree in the truth of His Holy Word, and live in unity and godly love.

On this general aim we are agreed: but if our agreement is hearty and sincere it will, I think, carry further our consent to three general propositions which I wish to put before the Conference, and each of which I will endeavour briefly to illustrate. These three propositions are:—



- I. It is our duty to pass on to the Native Churches our heritage of catholic belief and worship based upon God's Holy Word.
- II. It is our duty to inspire all who call on God's Holy Name with a spirit of unity and godly love.
- III. It is our duty not to hinder unity by the unwelcome importation of foreign distinctions.

The first proposition is that it is our duty to pass on to the Native Churches our heritage of catholic belief and worship based upon God's Holy Word. We pray that they should agree in the truth of God's Holy Word. Is this prayer deep and sincere? If so, we shall endorse the solemn basis of the Kikuyu Alliance, which runs as follows:—

“The basis of the Alliance shall consist in the loyal acceptance of Holy Scripture as our supreme rule of Faith and Practice: and of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as a general expression of fundamental Christian belief; and in particular, of belief in the absolute authority of Holy Scripture as the Word of God, in the Deity of Jesus Christ, and in the atoning death of our Lord Jesus Christ as the ground of our forgiveness.”

The restriction of the Alliance to those who accept the historic creeds and the supremacy of Scripture is, I believe, a divinely guided limitation, and one which we shall do well to follow. It has also been adopted as the basis for the proposed union between the Episcopal Synod of India and Ceylon and the South India United Church.

The common acceptance of this basis by the C.M.S. with the concurrence of the two bishops concerned, by the Church of Scotland Mission through their Assembly, by the United Methodist Mission and by an interdenominational Mission like the Africa Inland Mission was surely no small triumph of Christian fellowship. If the Kikuyu Alliance had effected nothing but this, it would have done much. But it did much more in the direction we are considering.

It also brought to the front the value of our catholic heritage of worship. It has been agreed that in all the Missions there shall be taught and used in worship not only the Apostles' Creed but also the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, prayers of confession and forgiveness, for church and state, for country and for all sorts and conditions of men, also Psalms and acts of General Thanksgiving. A common hymnary with translations of many ancient hymns is also being prepared.

Furthermore, mutual agreement has been reached as to the establishment in all the Missions of a native ministry, ordained with the laying on of hands, after a minimum course of training generally approved, and for the administration of the sacraments through this ordered ministry.

I think it would be generally conceded by other Protestant Christians that one of the chief contributions which the English and Scotch Churches have to give is the established order of their ministry of the word and sacraments and their fidelity to truly catholic tradition. If this be so it is a really great thing that in

East Africa this catholic heritage is being passed on not only to a section, but to the whole number of Protestant Christians. If the same could be done in other parts, especially in India and China, how immense would be the gain! The heritage which belongs to all Christians by right will become theirs also in fact in proportion as the principles and the spirit of the Kikuyu Alliance gain general acceptance.

Some would add to the catholic heritage which we are bound to pass on that which is commonly called episcopacy. I propose to leave the discussion of this point to a later stage in this paper, and to pass at once to my second proposition.

My second proposition is that it is our duty to inspire all who call on God's Holy Name with the spirit of unity and godly love.

The Scripture saith that all who call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved: and however we interpret this, it is at least our duty to inspire all such with the spirit of loving unity in Christ.

Now in reality this is a hard thing: and because it is hard, it is worth doing. Unity in the name of the Lord and the exercise of Christian love is the very marrow of Church life, and Church life is more important than Church government. Any one with a lawyer's mind, and some experience, can draft Church rules: but to inspire unity and godly love tests the very foundations of the spiritual life, and can only be done by the power of the Holy Spirit.

Let us illustrate this by some actual difficulties in the Mission Field, and by considering how unity and godly love may be promoted in such cases.

Ex. 1. At the Kikuyu Conference in 1913 one group of missionaries were inclined to insist upon abstinence from alcoholic liquor being made a necessary condition of baptism, to which the remainder were opposed.

Ex. 2. A native clergyman, a strong and godly man, and an earnest soul-winner, is nevertheless unwilling to accept the regulations which govern the Church body to which he belongs, and deliberately breaks these regulations.

Ex. 3. A "free-lance" Mission, through premature and unwise dealings with government officials, raises difficulties for all the neighbouring Missions.

Ex. 4. A group of native Africans split themselves off upon the question of polygamy.

These are not imaginary, but real cases, and in every instance they have threatened or broken Christian Fellowship, and the reflections to which they give rise have practical importance.

In the first place unity begets unity. Our broken unity is the greatest hindrance to the maintenance of a high standard of morals, of discipline, and of broad-minded charity. If an individual Christian, setting himself against the order of his own Church, finds another Christian body ready to receive him, all discipline is weakened. And if a small Mission receives a protest against some action, only from a single neighbouring Mission, such protest has far less force than an appeal presented by all the Missions combined.

Again, in questions like polygamy it is a strong universal Christian opinion only that can effect real changes : and in all things the weakness of one member of the body is the weakness of the whole body. All Christian Missions *are* one body whether or no they like to recognize the fact.

For this fundamental reason every act of Union or Alliance which strengthens the bonds between the branches of the Church of Christ tends at the same time to raise the standard of godly love and of Christian discipline.

But deeper still is the need of a great increase of brotherly love, not only to those with whom we agree but to those from whom we differ, to the erring and recalcitrant, to those who are guilty of schism, and to those who injure the cause by their injudicious actions. It must be extended freely to all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity ; patience and charity will be the most potent factors in winning the unwise and the narrow-minded.

Let us finally look at our third proposition, namely, that it is our duty not to hinder unity in the Mission-Field by the importation of unwelcome foreign distinctions.

On this point there is a large measure of agreement. The Bishop of Zanzibar and many others have expressed their desire to do away with any arbitrary and unmeaning distinctions.

In South India when several Presbyterian bodies of different origins united, and when later there was an accession to this union of other bodies, there was a chorus of approbation on all sides.

Such acts of union involving no fundamental principle of doctrine or order are universally approved. The real crux is admitted to be the distinction between episcopal and presbyterian ordination, a distinction European in origin and arising from historical causes long dead and almost forgotten.

Now, the writer of this paper wholeheartedly accepts the Church of England ordinal with its threefold order of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, and is convinced there is nothing in it contrary to the Word of God. But when the distinction between this order and that of the sister Church of Scotland is presented as a real and vital issue, his intelligence completely fails, even after reading Light-foot's famous essay, Gore's book on the Christian Ministry, and our chairman's illuminating writings on the subject.

The distinction of name and form is obvious enough : but when we come to deal with reality, where does it lie ?

It surely does not lie in the form of service used, for all would admit that the Churches which framed these services could modify them. It does not consist in any distinction laid down in the New Testament, for all know that the words *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος* are there used interchangeably of the same persons. It is not found in the laying on of hands, for from apostolic times that custom has been preserved in both Churches. In both Churches also the laying on of hands is by those, both presbyters and so-called bishops, who have themselves been similarly ordained, so that in both cases the ministerial succession goes back to the earliest ages of the

Church. On what real thing then is this elusive distinction founded, upon which such real issues are made to turn?

The outsider might imagine it to consist in the difference between a monarchical and a democratic system of church government. But the Bishop of Zanzibar tells us expressly that it is not so. In a recent address at Kikuyu he said, "Episcopacy need not involve us in a monarchical diocesan episcopate. Many Bishops may serve one local church. The bishops should be freely elected, and should rule with the clergy and laity. Nor is it essential that we hold any one view of episcopacy on the doctrinal side, provided the fact of its existence, and continuance, be admitted." From the other side we have a specially appointed sub-committee of the Assembly of the South India United Church accepting in almost identical terms "the principle of the historic episcopate . . . as a basis of unity," and no responsible body asking us either to abandon episcopacy or deny its existence.

What then, in the name of God, really divides us, or requires us to excommunicate our brethren? Can it be that we are separated by a mere name, and that were moderators called bishops, or vice versa all would be well?

I have wearied you with this search after a distinction which eludes the grasp of the ordinary mind. But if you are wearied who are accustomed to this controversy, how utterly fatuous and unmeaning must it appear to the Indian or Chinese intelligence? Can we wonder at Bishop Azariah's indignant protest that divisions should be thrust upon the Indian Church which in their essence are not theological but geographical?

Does not the real difficulty lie elsewhere, in the vain hope that emphasis on episcopacy may hasten reunion with Rome? But this is a dream whose futility must soon be recognized. On the contrary, nothing is so likely to hasten the larger unity for which we also pray as a strong union of Protestant Churches which will force the Roman and Greek Churches to consider the duty of seeking such unity by the only possible way, namely, by the reformation of their life and doctrine in accordance with the revealed Word of God.

One word in conclusion. The Kikuyu Alliance and the Nairobi Conference in 1910 which preceded it have set an admirable example. Leaving aside "strifes of words," they set to work to face the facts, and to build up the Christian Church in their country in a practical manner and with a view to the spiritual realities of an existing situation. We need to follow their example: for wherever love is practically exercised; wherever missionaries meet for common counsel and realize their common interests; wherever they are prepared to subject individual opinion to the common judgment, believing still that God's Holy Spirit guides the catholic church; wherever the united body shows patience and persevering love to persuade the erring or foolish few to unity of action; wherever the members of older or stronger nations and Churches are willing to foster and strengthen those that are younger and weaker; these will be real acts of fellowship, and there God will give His blessing.

[*Cheltenham Conference Paper.*]

## FELLOWSHIP OF THE CHURCHES :

### (c) IN THE MISSION FIELD.

#### II.

BY THE REV. C. S. WALLIS, M.A., Principal of St. John's College, Durham.

WE are all agreed on certain points :—

(1) That it was, and is, our Lord's divine plan that there should be real unity in His Church. His prayer was "That they may be one"—a statement enlarged and uplifted beyond our finite understanding by the succeeding clause—"As we are one." It is well that we should think what those words may mean. "There is to be a unity in love, for God is love. . . . The rub of difference often robs us of all sense of love, of all inclination to speak loving words. . . . The unity of the Father and the Son is a unity of will. "I came, not to do my own will, but the will of Him that sent me." How much wilfulness there is yet left in us all! The unity of the Father and the Son is again a unity in work. "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father doing; for whatsoever things He doeth, these also the Son doeth in like manner." How strange to the modern worker is the key-note of that unity in work: it is dependence, not freedom; it is dependence, not originality. . . . The unity of the Father and the Son again is, in some sense which we infer from our Lord's words rather than apprehend, a unity of diversity. Yet diversity means between us Christians competition, if not jealousy and mutual exclusiveness. But how far those last three ideas are from any notion that we have learned of the unity of the Father and the Son. We have learned that the divine richness consists in the diversity within the divine unity. This is to be our standard of the ideal unity of the Church." We cannot rest until we have shown the diversities not to be contradictory to one another, till we have secured that they have ceased to be competitive."—(Bishop of Bombay, *Reunion in Western India*, p. 31).

(2) That the want of fellowship between the Churches—their actual dis-union—means bewilderment of the convert, inefficient working, and is a source of danger, for it renders impossible one definite strategic plan, and so throws open the way to a break in the battle-front—a break which may imperil the whole line and necessitate a general retreat.

I will comment on only one point; the others are too obvious to need any discussion.

The bewilderment of the convert. Yes, I believe that our distinctions and little hedges are absolutely bewildering to the convert—not understandable at all. It is hard for us who have been brought up in a Christian country and have been accustomed to hear

of various bodies of Christian people all our lives, and even to discuss their various distinctions, to realize how very different is the position of one who has taken the tremendous step of passing over the gulf between heathenism and the service of the living God, of passing from darkness to the light of Christ, with all that that entails. The question is not then one of the subtle distinction between different denominations, but rather it is the clear cut one of Christianity versus Paganism.

Forgive me, if I illustrate from personal experience. For a good many years now I have had fairly close dealings with many of the Chinese students who have come to Great Britain for the purpose of study. I have taught some of them; I have been in conference with them; I have lived with them in holiday times; I have seen them under varying conditions and have been honoured with the personal friendship of many, yet never have I heard the question raised among them, either individually or collectively, about differences in the Churches. It simply never enters their minds. The one thing that is asked about a new-comer is always, "Is he a Christian, or is he not?" That is all that matters. They would not understand if, when in conference with them, I were to say some Sunday morning, "I cannot administer the Holy Communion to Wong because he is a Presbyterian, and to Li because he is a Wesleyan, and to Oon because he is a Baptist. I am an English churchman and so can admit to the Communion Chow only because he has been confirmed." They all acknowledge Christ as Lord and Master, they look to God as Father and trust to the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Why should not they be one united body? I must confess I agree with them—and act on that belief.

Again, in other cases it is not so much perhaps bewilderment that is caused, but rather that the whole thing is viewed from another angle altogether—that the differences are secondary things and so non-essential. I have had the joy of preparing a number of these men for Baptism and have always felt it to be my duty to impress upon each candidate the necessity of attaching himself quite definitely to some branch of the Church. In common fairness I have tried to explain broadly and simply what caused there to be different branches of the Church, yet over and over again the matter has been set quite calmly on one side as being of no importance. I well remember one case in particular—a young science student, a graduate of one of the Scottish universities, who when I talked of these things asked, "Well, what are you?" and when I replied that I belonged to the English Church I was promptly faced with the retort, "But I thought all Christians were one," and there was the naïve afterthought, "Oh, well it doesn't matter. I'll be the same as you!" It was a revelation at the time to me of the young convert's state of mind—of his estimation of the point at issue. You and I may not be able to view the matter in the same perspective exactly, nor to wipe out all differences so easily, but I am not sure that that Chinese student was not more in the right than we. Was it not one instance of what must be happening over and over again to thousands of con-

verts across the seas? (In passing, I may say that the student in question was baptized into Christ's Church and the Anglican Office was used. He was later confirmed, but now out in China he worships with the Presbyterians and is a member of their Church—for it is the only Christian community in his town. I rejoice that there has been no bar of sectarianism.)

(3) My third point of agreement is that in view of the fact that the appeal of the Christian Church loses force while she shows a lack of fellowship and is disunited, in view of the fact that such a state of affairs causes her to fail in carrying out her commission to the full, something must be done. If knowing the facts and seeing some of the obstacles in the way, she does not set herself to remove all that hinders-fellowship, nay unity, she is blameworthy, for she does not manifest the spirit of Him whom she calls Master.

Enough has been said. Now it is time something should be done.

The question has, during the last twelve years, become increasingly pressing, and we can only pray God that at the forthcoming Lambeth Conference some real lead shall be given, not only to the Anglican Church, but to the Church of Christ as a whole—that some broad general principles shall be laid down, which can be worked out in each province according to its own local circumstances, something clear, wide-*visioned* and definite. We cannot reasonably expect more. It would be absurd to think that even the different parts of the Anglican Church can speak for the whole of its own body, e.g., that the Church in South Africa with its own particular outlook can legislate in detail for the Church in Canada or in the Province of Armagh, where entirely different conditions prevail. I say it would be wrong to expect the Lambeth Conference to settle details, but we have the right to expect that broad outlines of policy and action shall be drawn clearly and decisively—not pious resolutions, but something which can be put into practice. The Lambeth Conference of 1888, with the first three proposals of its Quadrilateral, did much to clear the ground, even if its fourth has proved a stone of stumbling.

All I would say here about those first three is that they seem to offer a generous basis for fellowship and ultimately full reunion—one that we cannot well minimize.

(a) "The full recognition of the Holy Scriptures as the supreme rule of Faith and Practice." We have to face the danger in the Homeland of a recognition that is less than this on the part of some. The danger is no less in the mission-field. Bishop Molony, of Chekiang, told me only a few days ago of an instance which had come under his notice of an American Missionary returning from furlough in the States and saying that she had brought back with her the New Testament only; for she had no further use for the Old! I am not for tying people down to any one line of interpretation—we can catch the light from many facets of a diamond—but if the Rule Book be thrown on one side, many other things will necessarily follow. There can be no ground for Christian fellowship, let alone

reunion, if the Bible be not loyally accepted as "the Heart of God in the Words of God."

(b) "The loyal acceptance of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as a general expression of fundamental Christian belief."

Again I do not press for any one interpretation of the different Articles, but surely there must be a general acceptance of the Creeds as a whole. "The Creed is not a strait waistcoat to cramp spiritual movements" (Bishop of Bombay). Even the Bishop of Zanzibar will allow this. "While in our Communion there is an official Creed, there certainly is no official interpretation thereof" (*Ecclesia Anglicana*, p. 10). But a still more important particular—the kernel of the whole, is to be found in the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ. "Whom say ye that I am?" is still the vital question for man to-day. The Bishop of Bombay in his report, *Reunion in Western India*, issued in 1910, declared that one of the great obstacles in the way was the vagueness of Christological thought—a tendency towards Unitarianism. The same tendency is at work to-day in the student world, and if the Church be not wise she may have sometime in the future to face another Council of Nicæa. A Chinese correspondent in a letter received quite recently wrote to me about the looseness of much of the teaching concerning the Person of Christ, which is being given to-day in China. "Now Christianity owes its vitality to the belief in the truths formulated in the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect God and perfect Man"; and unless the Church is sound on this point there can be no bond of union which will stand the test of time or strain. A real substantial Creed is a necessary condition of anything approaching unity. It is interesting to note that this is being realized in China to-day, for there the Congregationalists and Presbyterians have agreed to set on one side their own Confessions of Faith and to adopt the Apostles' Creed as a basis of union.

(c) "The regular administration of the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, ministered with unfailling use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him." This proposition is quite clear in what it does, and in what it does not, demand. It insists on the things which are essential and leaves other questions open. Any difficulty that may arise surely springs from its connexion with the fourth proposal, i.e., that the question of validity rests upon episcopal ordination. . . . One might well bear in mind the wise and cautious statement of Dr. Sanday, "On the broad general question of the validity of a particular ministry, it seems to me that no human tribunal is really competent to judge" (*The Primitive Church and Reunion*).

(d) "The historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church." To-day the movement towards Episcopacy in some form seems to be spreading, and the matter of the fellowship of the Churches even upon this basis is more and more one of practical politics. During the time of the C.M.S. Congress in Birmingham I stayed in the same house with Bishop



Azariah and had the opportunity of many interesting talks with him. He then told me of a conference which had been held in his own diocese in South India where members of all the various Christian bodies had met and had discussed this very question of Episcopacy. With the exception of two dissentients all had agreed that they could accept the fact of Episcopacy. (Details of this conference will be found in the Report of Reunion Proceedings all over the World, which has been prepared in readiness for the Lambeth Conference, and is due to be published by the S.P.C.K.) It will be the *fact* of Episcopacy that will be accepted, not the Tractarian view of the Office—the *fact* as a desirable thing, without any theories attached. If this can be the attitude of the Church in general, the question of validity will not arise. It will be great gain if the Lambeth Conference can bring itself to view the fact in a detached manner, if not, I fear nemesis will overtake it. Doubtless we shall hear a good deal about the threat of schism at the time of the Anglo-Catholic Congress at the end of this month. But, as was pertinently said to me by a Bishop of the Church in India a little time ago, if the Lambeth Conference holds back through fear of a schism caused by a small body of extremists in the provinces of Canterbury and York, which are but a fraction of the whole communion, the Anglican Church may have to face the really great loss of a united Indian Church—numbering many thousands of adherents.

“There is a real logic of facts. Action outruns theories—it is often better than the theories of the actors.” You and I are face to face with facts.

(1) The mission-field is full of potential Kikuyus. Practices of fellowship are already in force to some extent, while discussions all over the field are paving the way for closer union. You have only to think of: (a) the remarkable letter sent by the Presbyterian Church of Australia to the Anglican Church there; or of (b) the definite reunion of many non-episcopal bodies in different parts of the field.

(2) “By their fruits ye shall know them.” Are we not much in the position of St. Peter when he was dealing with Cornelius? “If then God gave unto them the like gift as He did also unto us when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I, that I could withstand God?” We cannot deny the fruit of non-episcopal missions.

(3) The overwhelming necessity for the Christian Church to have a united front, in view of the menace of Islam, of indifference, of materialism, in view of the clamorous call of the nations. Lord Thurlow when preaching the ordination sermon in Durham Cathedral last Sunday morning said to the candidates: “Let your home service in this diocese be used to test your vocation for service abroad. And in reckoning the forces in any area do not underestimate the value of those which are furnished by other Christian bodies, differing indeed in some important details of organization, but actuated by the same ardent love of Christ and by the same divine Spirit. It is by unity amid diversity abroad in the face of a common foe that we

shall at length achieve unity amid diversity of operations at home. A league of Churches is an indispensable preliminary to a league of nations." *A league of Churches!* If that be needful, and I believe it is, why cannot we give a lead in the home Church? Is China or India or East Africa to set the example to so-called Christian England?

We must not be content with fellowship, we must pass on to a closer organic union. It is for the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace that we need to unite in supplication to-day. Let the Church to-day dare like the Council of Jerusalem, after conference, with reliance on God's will and the guidance of the Holy Ghost realized, to look facts in the face and act. May she build up a constructive policy and by the practice of acts of love bring about, not only fellowship, but that unity in love and will and work for which our Lord prayed.

---

#### SHORT REVIEW NOTICES.

The Rev Laurence Bomford has used his leisure from parish work (he was formerly Vicar of Colney Heath) to give us some "Studies in the New Testament," and these are included in a little volume, *Their Angels*, just published by Mr. C. J. Thynne (1s. 6d. net). They are six in number, and deal respectively with St. Matthew xviii. 10-12; 1 John iii. 9 and kindred passages; St. Luke x. 36; references in St. Luke and the Acts to the expression "full of the Holy Ghost"; 1 Timothy iii. 15 and St. Matthew vii. 15. The "studies" are interesting if slight.

The death of the beloved Bishop of Durham calls fresh attention to one of his last volumes, *Christ and the Christian* (Marshall Bros., 2s. 6d. net). It is made up of a revised reprint of the Bishop's addresses at the Keswick Convention last year, not the least interesting of which was the one on "Possessing our Possessions," in which he told the beautiful story of how he came to be a "Keswick."

Two missionary books—*Heroines of India* (for senior girls) and *O Hana Sara*—may well be commended. Miss Edith Williams tells of our Indian sisters, and Miss Constance C. A. Hutchinson pictures for us the girl of Japan. Both are published by the C.M.S.

A series of "childhood pictures" is given by O.K.C. in his entertaining volume *When all was Young* (Arthur H. Stockwell, 4s. net).

Prebendary H. P. Denison in *The Blessed Sacrament: Faith and Works* (Robert Scott, 2s. 6d.) sets out to show that the Blessed Sacrament is "per se Adorable." He thinks this is the point on which official Church of Englandism has not quite made up its mind. He, however, has no doubt on the matter, and with his belief he is prepared to defend the service of Benediction against all comers.

The title of the volume, *Some Dimensions of the Cross*, by the Rev. W. Taylor (Robert Scott, 2s. net), is a little misleading. It is not concerned with the geometry of Calvary's Tree, but with the breadth, and length, and depth and height of that Divine Love of which the Cross is the fullest exposition. "Its great purpose," as the late Bishop of Carlisle wrote in the introduction, "is to lift up the crucified Saviour." Its special appeal is to those who "in the anguish of these stricken years have climbed the Hill of Sacrifice and laid upon the altar their dearest and their best." But it will be read with profit by others as well. It is strong in its spiritual uplift.

## STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

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

## VI. THE NEWNESS OF GOD'S OLD LAWS.

*Text.*—"These things happened unto them : and they were written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the ages are come" (I Cor. x. II).

[Book of the Month : MOSES, THE FOUNDER OF PREVENTIVE MEDICINE,\* by Wood =W. Other reff. *Divine Hygiene*, by A. Rattray, M.D. =R. *Diseases of the Bible*, by Risdon Bennett, M.D. =B. *Sanitary Code of the Pentateuch*, by C. Gillespie. =G. A. Macalister's art. "Medicine," in *Hastings' Dict.* =DB. Creighton's art. "Medicine," in *Encycl. Brit.* =E.B. Moulton's *From Egyptian Rubbish Heaps.* =M. Kellogg's *Leviticus* =K.]

Dr. J. H. Moulton renders this verse "'To us the toll of all ages has come as our inheritance.' We are the heirs of the spiritual wealth of all the ages past" (M. p. 30).

W. is filled with admiration for the sanitary efficiency of the Pentateuch. "This book is a product of the great War" (W. p. v.). And "A state of war, actual or contingent, gives occasion to special developments of medical and surgical practice" (EB xv. 797). "Under the head of military hygiene we may include the general subject the sanitary arrangements of camps, and the various forms of epidemic camp sickness" (EB xv. 797). "When, having to give a lecture on sanitation to the officers of his battalion, the author chanced to think of the plague of flies as recorded in the book of Exodus ; and as he read through the whole series of plagues with his mind fixed on the subject of his lecture, a new meaning seemed to light up these events" (W. v.). "But for the war, the author could not have gained an insight into the problems which beset every army in the field" (W. v.). "Moses was the founder of preventive medicine. All that is new in this book is the method of displaying wares as old as the hills in the garb of comparison with modern experience" (W. vii.). So also "the Mosaic sanitary code

\* By P. Wood, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., Capt. R.A.M.C., S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d. A fine, straightforward piece of writing, with inferences deeper than are drawn.

may be said to constitute the basis of modern sanitary legislation " (B. 10). It is full of " minute detail, the value and import of which it is for the most part easy to see " (B. 10). This is worthy of attention in a Book which claims divine authority for its instructions.

" It might seem at first sight unreasonable to seek for any principles of preventive medicine in the four books of the Bible which deal with the period of Moses " (W. 4), " and yet the surprising fact emerges that there did exist a definite system " (W. 4), in spite of the other fact that " the medical knowledge of the Biblical peoples was small in amount and crude in character " (DB III. 221). " The divine purpose is stamped upon every line of the history of these Israelites " (W. vii.), and yet for the modern devout student there is " an added interest in demonstrating how natural were the agencies through which that purpose was wrought " (W. viii.).

" The Levitical code contains a large number of *Hygienic enactments*, with regard to food, sanitation, and the recognition of infectious diseases " (DB. III. 321). " Mainly by the strict enforcement of these sanitary agencies " claimed as " designed by Jehovah, but faithfully carried out by Moses, the sanitation of the Hebrews was kept in perfection " (R. II. 149). " They were taught from the outset that uncleanness was unholiness " (W. 15). " The inculcation of the laws of hygiene was attained by appeal to religious instincts " (W. 16). And in contrast W. claims that the plagues were traceable on the human side to insanitary conditions: " The object was to undermine the public health of the Egyptians until their physique and morale were so reduced that further resistance was out of the question " (W. 24). This mode of attack is subtle, and " something without parallel in human endeavour " (W. 24). Included in this we find that " the water supply was fouled. The air and ground were polluted. The people and their cattle were verminous. The food supplies were diminished and seriously contaminated." (W. 27).

W. calls special attention to the regulations on—

#### A. HYGIENE.

- I. Preservation of water and food.
- II. Disposal of decomposable material, which means prevention of flies and contamination of food.
- III. Personal Hygiene " (W. 35).

I. *Preservation of water and food.* See Lev. xi. 32, 39; Num. xix. 14, 15. This last "is one of the most remarkable examples of hygiene in the whole of the Mosaic code" (W. 37). "Moses refers specifically to an open vessel without a cover" (W. 38). "Food and drink thus exposed would quickly be contaminated by flies after they had settled on the corpse" (W. 38). Moses calls it unclean, we say infected. But it means the same in the end.

II. *Decomposable matter.* "Few understand the close relationship between flies, organic refuse, food and disease" (W. 40). Moses evidently did. "The best modern method of destroying refuse in an army on active service is burning" (W. 42). See Ex. xxvii. 3, Lev. iv. 11. "Outside the camp was a large incinerator" (W. 43). See also Lev. i. 16; iv. 30; vi. 10. "The only reasonable inference is that all this highly decomposable material was taken straight to the incinerator and burnt" (W. 45). Further (Deut. xxiii. 14) "the deduction is irresistible that it was applied to all decomposable material" (W. 46). "There is another method, i.e. that of burial" (W. 45), for which see Lev. xvii. 13; Deut. xxi. 23.

III. *Personal Hygiene.* Frequent ablutions (e.g. Ex. xxix. 4; xl. 31). W. also mentions circumcision; it was pre-Mosaic, of course, but "whatever be the origins of circumcision, it remains the fact that it is a health measure, beneficial in many ways that need not be specified here" (W. 49), though some writers on morals attribute the remarkable achievements of Jews in all ages to it. "It is certainly true that practically all modern instructed opinion regards it as of considerable value" (W. 49).

Take also tables of kindred and affinity like Lev. xviii. and xx. "After many years of first-hand dealing with his flocks he may have learnt some principles of eugenics by noting the bad effects of close in-breeding, which would have helped him afterwards in his compilation of the 'table of kindred and affinity.'" (W. 13).

## B. THE CONTROL OF INFECTIOUS DISEASE.

(1) *Isolation.* "The task of the sanitarian is definitely aided by consideration of the means provided by the Divine wisdom for reducing the general susceptibility to disease among the people, and for stamping out sources of infection" (G. 92). "In the practical life of a community revering the Fatherhood of God, the Mosaic system of sanitary law appealed to every man as his brother's

keeper. And it is interesting and helpful to see that the broad outlines of such treatment as the latest investigations have shown to be the most effective, even under conditions so widely different in structure and detail, are clearly indicated in the sacred sanitary code of the Pentateuch " (G. 92). " The control of infectious disease is one of the most important links in the chain of preventive medicine " (W. 51). In this light consider such texts as Lev. xiii. 46, 4, 50 ; xiv. 45, 41, 48 ; xi. 39 ; Num. xix. 11, 14, 20 ; ix. 10 ; v. 2. " At a time when all the world believed that disease was a ' visitation ' sent by an offended Deity, or even the caprice of some malicious spirit, and thousands of years before superstitions of this and of a kindred nature had died out from our own country, Moses recognised that some diseases were infectious and, what is far more striking still, that they could be controlled by human forethought and care " (W. 59).

(2) *Disinfection*. See e.g. Lev. xiv. 8 ; Num. xix. 17 ff. " It would pass the wit of any modern M.O.H. to devise a more thorough or searching cleansing than this " (W. 61). See Num. xix. 2-6. " This was a case of disinfection, as pure and simple as it could be in those early days " (W. 65-6). See again Num. xxxi. 14-16. " The close link here between the immorality and the succeeding plague points strongly to the cause of the plague being venereal disease " (W. 67). " With a vivid recollection of the source of the disease which had ravaged his people once before, and horrified at the probability of such a dangerous epidemic becoming rampant amongst them again, he preemptorily directed that every Midianitish woman *not a virgin* was to be put to death. Viewed in this light, there can be no doubt that the order was neither more nor less than a very strong measure of preventive medicine " (W. 67). Num. xxxi. 19 shows that " the whole army and its captives and all its spoil had to be submitted to seven days' quarantine and thorough disinfection before being permitted to re-enter the camp. It will not be overlooked that the most efficient of all the methods of disinfection, i.e. sterilisation by heat, was not unknown to Moses " (W. 69). " But his fundamental principles were so sound, as sound now as they were then, his laws so clear, his attention to detail so marked, and his spirit so undaunted to the end, that when there was failure, the blame should rather be laid at the door of the ' congregation ' " (W. 111). " The code of Hammurabi,

about eight hundred years older than the Mosaic code, deals only with civil and criminal matters. There is no preventive medicine mentioned in it" (W. 112). But this of Moses is "one of the most remarkable pieces of work ever accomplished, so remarkable that it is amazing that, for thousands of years, it should have been lost sight of" (W. 110). "Each priest became a state medical officer" (W. 71). "Moses laid down such principles as notification, isolation, frequent inspection, quarantine, and disinfection" (W. 71). "The control of infectious disease is to-day, in essentials, precisely the same as that originally established by Moses thirty centuries ago" (W. 71).

### C. FOOD CONTROL.

"Food control is a very necessary branch of health administration" (W. 75). "It is not surprising to find this subject looming large in the Mosaic code" (W. 75). "Underlying nearly all of them may be detected a strong basis of preventive medicine" (W. 76). E.g. Lev. xi. 3, 9, 27, 29; Deut. xiv. 11, 21; Ex. xxii. 31.

The conclusions are that we have here no dead code: "it tells of living realities, of men who underwent the same hardships and faced the same problems that confront us to-day" (W. viii.). It exhibits "minute acquaintance with abstruse physiological, pathological, sanitary and other medical subjects, far ahead, often by centuries, of the then existing knowledge, which was practically nil" (R. I. 116). "In this day, when, at last, men of all schools, and those with most scientific knowledge, most of all, are joining to extol the exact wisdom of this ancient law, a wisdom which has no parallel in like laws among other nations, is it not in place to press this question: Whence had this man this unique wisdom? There are many who will feel compelled to answer: 'The Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron'" (K. 304).



## REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

## GOD AND HIS RELATION TO MAN.

**THE SPIRIT.** God and His Relation to Man, considered from the standpoint of Philosophy, Psychology and Art. Essays by Prof. A. Seth Pringle-Pattison, LL.D., D.C.L., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh; Lily Dougall, author of "Pro Christo et Ecclesia"; Captain J. A. Hadfield, M.A., M.B., of Ashurst Neurological War Hospital, Oxford; Prof. C. A. Anderson Scott, M.A., D.D., Professor of the New Testament at Westminster College, Cambridge; the Rev. C. W. Emmet, B.D., Vicar of West Hendred and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford; A. Clutton Brock; and the Rev. Canon Streeter, M.A., D.D. (Editor), Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, and Canon Residentiary of Hereford. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 10s. 6d. net.

This collection of essays has an origin similar in nature to its predecessors "Foundations," "Concerning Prayer" and "Immortality," viz., a series of conference-retreats, which the majority of contributors were able to attend, supplemented by individual discussion for mutual criticism and information. But this volume owes much to the discussion of the Holy Spirit, which subject occupied the attention of a joint retreat of the Anglican and Free Church Fellowships at Easter, 1917. These essays are designed to form a continuous series, the order of which is, with one exception, meant to be self-explanatory. The aim of the volume is to put forward a conception of the Spirit of God which is definite but not scholastic, and which is capable of affording an intellectual basis both for a coherent philosophy of the universe, and for a religion passionate and ethical, mystical and practical.

In the first essay, entitled "Immanence and Transcendence," Dr. A. S. Pringle-Pattison restates the relations between immanence and transcendence, a fundamental issue on religious philosophy, and reaches the conclusion that the two aspects of God as immanent and transcendent imply one another. "A purely immanent theory means the denial of the divine altogether as in any way distinguishable from the human, and involves, therefore, the unqualified acceptance of everything just as it is. A theory of pure transcendence, on the other hand, tends to leave us with a "mighty darkness filling the seat of power," for only so far as God is present in our experience can we know anything about Him at all."

The following essay, by Miss Lily Dougall, entitled "God in Action," suggests first that the workings of God are always through the natural: in accordance with nature, and not by overriding natural ways and laws; secondly, that on this view apparently miraculous and supernatural religious experience may be understood in the light of psychological law; thirdly, all that happens must not be regarded as the work of the Spirit: He works always for good and opposes evil; and fourthly, the universal good for which the Spirit works is man's perfect correspondence with environment, i.e., the Kingdom of Heaven.

The third essay—by Capt. J. A. Hadfield—is full of special interest, by reason of the fact that it embodies much of the writer's personal experience gained in dealing with "nerve cases" in the Ashurst Neurological War Hospital. It is entitled "The Psychology of Power." The illustrations given support the main contentions that there is within us a reserve of power that can be made to respond to suggestion, though normal efforts fail to reach it; and that the true secret of energy lies in keeping the mind at rest, even in the



multitude of life's activities. Speaking as a psychotherapist, the author of this essay is convinced that "the Christian religion is one of the most valuable and potent influences that we possess for producing that harmony of peace and of mind and that confidence of soul which is needed to bring health and power to a large proportion of nervous patients."

Professor C. A. Anderson Scott contributes the fourth essay, "What happened at Pentecost." This, he maintains, was not so much the coming of the Spirit, nor the birth of the Church—these had not been lacking prior to Pentecost. The new thing was "the emergence of the Fellowship," of which the symbol was the loaf. The essay concludes with an interesting forecast of what might be expected, if the prayers of the Church were to be answered, and a modern Pentecost were vouchsafed.

The Rev. Cyril W. Emmet contributes two complementary essays, "The Psychology of Grace: How God helps," and "The Psychology of Inspiration: How God teaches." In the former essay he argues that "Grace is simply the result of contact of man's personality, or spirit, with God's." It has been conceived of as "an external, semi-physical 'something' which comes into some souls at certain times and under certain conditions, much like an electric current . . . and which has its special channels and means." The difference between nature and grace does not correspond to that between evil and good. In the second of his essays Mr. Emmet defines inspiration as "the quickening of vision, the enhancement of the personality, which can only come to a person." It is not a rare gift bestowed upon a few. "The inventor, the thinker, the artist, in whatever medium, is inspired in so far as his thoughts and the expression of them correspond to the divine thought. It is crucial to realize that God has not one method of speaking to and teaching the prophet, and something quite different for us ordinary folk."

Miss Dougall contributes as her second essay, "The Language of the Soul: some Reflections on the Christian Sacraments." Language is necessary to the growth and development of human life, and equally necessary in the life of the soul. Hence the Sacraments.

The two following essays by Mr. Clutton Brock, entitled "Spiritual Experience," and "Spirit and Matter," present the subject in its relation to art. There are two kinds of experience: one scientific, the other aesthetic. Spiritual experience is a certainty, and while worship is an effort to share it, art endeavours to communicate it.

Canon Streeter, who edits the volume, writes the closing essay: "Christ the Constructive Revolutionary." There are home-thrusts in plenty here, and much to call to serious thought. Christ has been calling His Church forward, but she has halted and looked back, checked by authority, autocracy and tradition. Two great moral activities have made their appeal to her: the humanitarian movement and the passion of truth for truth's sake; but she has not followed. While the best men have been seeking truth, the Church has been interested in defending tradition. Christ was a great constructive thinker, and He is "the portrait of the Spirit."

In laying down this most fascinating volume of essays the reader is impressed by the lack of sequence observable in them. The connection between the essays is hard to trace—if, in some cases, there is any connection intended. Further, it is quite evident that the whole volume is an essay, i.e., a trial, a venture, and the reader may be pardoned if he refuse to accept conclusions and deductions that seem often to have very slender premisses. Much patient work has been put into this volume, and the writers have the supreme satisfaction of knowing that they have at least made their readers think.

## THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

We regret the late appearance of our reference to the April number of *The Church Quarterly Review* (S.P.C.K., 5s.), but its contents are so interesting and so valuable that even a belated notice must be given.

The number opens with a spirited article by the Rev. Yngve Brilioth, D.Phil., of the University of Upsala, on "The Church of Sweden in its Relations to the Anglican Church." His exposition of the fundamental teaching and worship of the Church of Sweden is singularly clear and illuminating, but from the English side he refers to "the extreme difficulty which arises from the differences between the main Anglican schools of thought and their varying attitude towards the Thirty-nine Articles." Yet he does not know any problem more urgently requiring solution than that of the relations between Anglicanism and Lutheranism: "The religious types they represent supplement each other wonderfully; neither is complete without the other; they seem only to need being brought into real contact to be fructified by each other." On the vital question of Orders, "the claim of episcopal succession and other symbols of Christian inheritance are to us very clear and venerable. . . . Yet we cannot regard these things as the essential criteria of the Church of Christ. . . . If therefore Anglicans should make any material changes in our Church order a condition of entering into communion with us, it must here be clearly stated that this would only be another form of frank refusal." Whether the Bishops of the Anglican Communion will be able to take the necessary steps to promote the closer relationship indicated in the report of the Commission appointed in 1909, time—and no very long time—will show.

The Dean of Carlisle's article on "Personality in Recent Philosophy" is, like everything that proceeds from his pen, extremely able. He confines his examination of the teaching in recently-published works, notably Dr. Inge's *The Philosophy of Plotinus*, to their treatment of Personality in God and man and "without denying the value of his contributions to religious philosophy in other ways, I am compelled," says Dr. Rashdall, "to regard the Dean of St. Paul's as illustrating chiefly the wrong attitude towards the subject." Perhaps we may have an equally vigorous rejoinder later on from the Dean of St. Paul's.

Professor A. A. Cocks's article on "A Mediæval Mystic's 'Fiery Soliloquy with God'" is quite charming in the beauty of its literary form and expression; and of still greater and wider interest is the Bishop of Gloucester's paper on the origin and history of the expression "The Rock of Ages" and its applicability as a title of our Saviour. It has been popularized chiefly by Toplady's hymn, and scarcely less by the line in one of John Newton's hymns, "On the Rock of Ages founded," but its source is the marginal reference in the Authorized Version of Isaiah xxvi. 4, and the Bishop examines the reason for its late appearance, no ancient version giving any rendering approaching to it.

Prebendary Cook, in an article on "The National Assembly of the Church of England," is warmly appreciative of the reform and looks forward to "the growing up of an increased and better informed Church life, and one possessed of such evangelistic zeal as will go far to solve most of our many difficulties."

Dr. Headlam (under whose able editorship the *Review* is produced) contributes a forcible and convincing article on Reunion and Theories of the Ministry. He is justly severe upon Bishop Gore's theory that the Apostolical Succession must be reckoned with as a permanent and essential element of Christianity and challenges Bishop Gore to take the opportunity of telling us "by what right he and his friends can say that something which has never been part of the formularies of the Church, which is not contained in the New Testament, which is no part of the Creeds, is essential to Christianity." And he adds, "It is a very serious thing for any one to take upon himself, or for any party in the Church to take upon themselves, to put their own opinion before that of the authorized formularies of the Christian Church." Dr. Headlam is not less severe upon Dr. Bartlet's "attempt to make ordination in the Primi-

tive Church meaningless." He commends to thoughtful consideration Dr. Goudge's pamphlet, *The Catholic Party and the Nonconformists*, but dissents from his views on "one priesthood of the Eucharist," and states his preference for the rule of St. Augustine as expounded in the following passage from the charge of the Bishop of Madras: "The principle laid down by St. Augustine that the sacraments derive their efficacy from Christ, and not from man, is very far-reaching in its bearing on the whole controversy with regard to the validity of the sacraments. . . . It has been applied to solve the difficulty as to the moral unworthiness of the minister; but may it not be applied with equal force to solve the difficulties that are felt as to the method of his ordination? What gives the sacraments their power, according to St. Augustine's principle, is the name of Christ and the Word of God. As that power is independent of the moral character or beliefs of the minister, surely it must be still more independent of the method of his ordination."

It will be seen that the *Church Quarterly Review* takes an eminently sane and reasonable position on many of the questions which are engaging the attention of the Church at the present time.

---

#### FELLOWSHIP OF THE CHURCHES.

The pamphlet issued by the S.P.C.K., *Documents Bearing on the Problem of Christian Unity and Fellowship*, 1916-1920 (2s. net), is of the greatest importance and interest at the present time. It gathers within one cover the various documents, resolutions, etc., of the various Conferences—official, semi-official and unofficial—held during the last four years on the question of Christian Unity and Fellowship. In no other form is such information so readily obtainable, and the pamphlet should be in the possession of all who would keep themselves abreast of the progress of the Unity Movement.

---

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

In *The Chronicle and Bookman* of the Central Board of Missions we recognize an old friend in a new dress. It is to be issued four times a year, March, June, September and December, and is published at 2s. a year. It is full of good, solid, valuable information, as we should expect from its editor, Dr. Weitbrecht Stanton. The Bibliography—a new feature—is contributed by Miss Willink, S.T.L., and is very well done (S.P.C.K.).

So many people ask for information concerning what has been done by Convocation in the matter of Prayer Book Revision and it is well, therefore, that they should know that the S.P.C.K. reports are most useful for reference. No. 533 sets out the *Proposals as Approved*, including the changes in the Communion Service, and should be carefully studied (1s. net): Other reports of interest are No. 528 (Joint Committee on Infant Baptism), 3d. net; and No. 532 (Report of Committee of Lower House on Dilapidations), 2d. net.

A sumptuously got-up volume, *Bring-Brother*, by F. I. Codrington (S.P.C.K., 4s. net), tells the story of "one of the children-in-blue, from the town of Lone Bamboo," and charmingly told it is. The pictures are beautiful, and these, as well as the story, will appeal strongly to the interest of young people, especially girls.