

"the grace" was enough. There was never such grace; it was the unique grace of the only begotten Son of God. In Colossians we also note that St. Paul draws attention to his writing, "The salutation with the hand of me, Paul." In his other Epistles—those, namely, to Timothy and Titus—he uses the shorter form, "The grace be with you" or "with you all." As time advanced there would be less fear of St. Paul's signature being forged. There were other marks by which his work would be known. In no part of the world, excepting Jerusalem itself, does he seem to have met with more bitter and unscrupulous opposition from the Jews than in Macedonia and Greece. It is in the Epistles addressed to those churches, Philippi, Thessalonica, and Corinth, that the special signature appears, where, perhaps, the danger of forgery was greater.

It remains to inquire whether we can tell the form in which St. Paul wrote. Obviously, not with certainty, unless we had the original before us; but it is interesting to remember that the phrase, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you," gave opportunity for certain abbreviations or alternative methods of writing which would enable the Apostle to adopt a peculiar one as his own special mark or signature. In this connection it is interesting to discover that in the Sinaitic, the Vatican, and the Alexandrine uncial MSS. the abbreviations are always the same, and just in the three same words, "the Lord Jesus Christ," KT, IT, XT, with a line over the T. As the phrase was essentially a Christian one, and primarily, as we have seen, almost entirely a Pauline one, and this abbreviation seems to have been adopted as the universal one in writing (for the earliest written specimens that we have appear thus in all cases), we venture to hazard the suggestion that it was actually this abbreviation that St. Paul used when he wrote the phrase thus to the Thessalonian Church: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen."

C. CAMERON WALLER.



#### ART. VIII.—THE MONTH.

A VERY important announcement was made by Mr. Balfour the other day in the House of Commons. In reply to an inquiry whether the Government contemplated taking any action for the better enforcement of discipline in the Church of England, the Prime Minister stated that he proposed to recommend to His Majesty the appointment of a Royal Commission to ascertain the nature and extent of the disorder

which had to be dealt with. It will be remembered that just about five years ago—in May, 1899—the House of Commons adopted a resolution stating “That this House . . . is of opinion that if the efforts now being made by the Archbishops and Bishops to secure the due obedience of the clergy are not speedily effectual, further legislation will be required to maintain the observance of the existing laws of Church and realm.” Mr. Balfour said it was difficult to ascertain what progress had been made in thus securing due obedience among the clergy; he believed there had been some progress, but he feared not as much as was to be wished. He therefore thought it would be better to have the circumstances definitely ascertained by a Royal Commission, that it might be authoritatively known what are the facts which have to be dealt with.

There can be no question that if a Royal Commission can discharge this office, an invaluable advance will have been made in dealing with this subject. Evidence has been brought forward by newspapers and associations of the spread of extreme and illegal Ritual practices in the Church, but it has been quietly ignored by the authorities of the Church and by the public as not sufficiently authoritative. On the other hand, Bishop after Bishop may be heard declaring that the number of disobedient clergy in his diocese is quite insignificant. If this conflict of evidence can be overborne, and the facts of the Ritual movement in the Church of England can be clearly and authoritatively placed before the Legislature and the public, a great step will have been taken towards deciding what action is requisite and practicable. All parties concerned in this controversy ought to welcome such an opportunity, and their duty will be to assist in every way in promoting the work of the Commission. The time for controversy will come afterwards; but everyone who is honestly desirous of this momentous question being justly and wisely dealt with ought to do his utmost to assist in ascertaining the facts.

At the same time, the usefulness of the Commission will largely depend on two things, of which at the moment we are ignorant. The first is the terms of reference to the Commission; the second is its composition, and especially the selection of its Chairman. There seems reason to hope that the intention is to give the reference a sufficiently limited character to render it possible for the Commission to report within a moderate time; and it may also be hoped that the Commission will be small and of a judicial character. But we must add that one other question will ultimately determine the value of the Commission. Will the Government of

the day be prepared to act on its information or recommendations or not? The Ritual Commission of 1867 formally recommended that the use of vestments and of lights and incense should be restrained, and that for this purpose "a speedy, inexpensive remedy should be provided for parishioners aggrieved by their introduction." Nothing effectual has been done, and at this moment the number of churches in which vestments, lights, and incense are used has increased from hundreds to thousands. When the facts are ascertained, the main problem will remain to be dealt with, and it will be for the Government to discover a solution. However, it will be a great thing to know the facts, and it only remains to await with patience the report of the Commission.

---

### Notices of Books.

---

*The Religious Life of London.* Edited by RICHARD MUDIE SMITH.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. xv+518. 6s.

The portly volume published under the above title contains full statistics of the census undertaken by the *Daily News*. Mr. Mudie Smith claims that the results it records represent "the first scientific attempt in the history of this country to discover the number of those who attend places of worship in the Metropolis." In the census of 1851, instituted by the Government of that day, the Churches themselves furnished the returns. In 1886 another enumeration of attendances was made through the enterprise of Dr. Robertson Nicoll, and the first issues of the *British Weekly* gave the figures. But this enumeration took place on a single Sunday. There were serious omissions in it, and the sexes were not differentiated, nor were children distinguished from adults. In the present instance the investigation extended over a whole year—from November, 1902, to November, 1903—the month of August being regarded as a holiday, and an interesting account is given of the methods adopted. The total number of places of worship visited in the twenty-nine boroughs forming London was 2,688, besides 1,338 in the urban districts of Greater London lying wholly or partly within a twelve-mile radius of Charing Cross, with the exception of Barking, Erith, and Bexley. Statistics relating to the urban districts are very properly tabulated separately at the end, and are not mixed up with the main part of the volume, making a convenient supplement for the purposes of comparison. Two fine maps of London and its suburbs much enhance the value of the book, which also contains a number of illustrative diagrams and articles on various problems that presented themselves in the course of the inquiry. We could wish that all the contributors of these essays wrote as thoughtfully