

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

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1921

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The
Outlook.

FOR most of us the holiday season is ended, and we have to face the work and responsibilities of the winter. It is impossible to do so without some measure of quite natural anxiety, for whichever way we look the situation is nowhere clear, and in some directions the clouds are black and heavy. Industrially the outlook is menacing, for if, during the summer months, unemployment and the distress arising therefrom have been disastrously and dangerously great, what, it may well be asked, will be the position during the coming winter? A Government Committee is sitting and some palliative may, and, we hope, will be found, but it is difficult to see how the position for those who, like the parochial clergy, come daily into touch with the lives of the people, can be otherwise than supremely difficult and anxious. In social and moral affairs it cannot be said that the atmosphere is at all clear. The summer season has revealed, perhaps more strongly than before, the passion for pleasure, amusement and gaiety which has taken possession of the masses of the people. The utter disregard of the religious obligations of the Lord's Day has been a marked feature of life at our seaside resorts; and in places where the good sense of the Municipal authorities has imposed certain reasonable restrictions, agitations are on foot for the removal of the limitations. More serious still is the extension of the drinking hours both on weekdays and on Sundays, which is bound to cause mischief and put fresh obstacles in the way of those who are working for the moral and spiritual uplift of the people. And when we turn to the religious life of the country there is much in the outlook to perplex and sadden. The attendance at Divine Service is not what it ought to be, and, we are afraid, not what it was even a few years ago. What

a jeremiad ! we seem to hear some readers say. But it is not so. We are not pessimistic ; we only desire to face facts, however unpleasant they may be, for so alone can the remedy be found ; and we believe there are signs, clear and unmistakable, that Christian people are coming to realize that the state of the country, in its industrial, social and religious aspects, places upon them a responsibility for larger, keener and more devoted service in the cause of their Divine Master than they have yet put forth. In this is our hope ; and we pray God that His people may face the future in His strength, knowing that the Lord reigneth, and determined to do all they can to bring men and women to the acknowledgment of Him in Whose hands are all their ways. When we find a popular novelist writing in trenchant terms, " England must find time for God " we may be sure there is a cause. And each sincere Christian is bound for himself and herself to face the challenge, " Who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this ? " The greatness of our country's need is the measure of our opportunity and of our responsibility.

In this connexion we desire to give special prominence to the proposal of " A London Incumbent," who, we happen to know, is a particularly close observer of the signs of the times, that there should be " a great evangelistic campaign in every Evangelical parish." His proposal was launched in the columns of the *Record* as far back as July 28, and every week since that date letters have appeared in that journal witnessing to the widespread interest the proposal has aroused and to the growing feeling that the time has come for a great forward movement on the part of all sections of Evangelical Churchpeople. It has, however, been questioned in some quarters whether " our unhappy divisions " do not militate against unity of effort, but the objection was to some extent anticipated by " A London Incumbent," who in his first letter wrote that on the great fundamentals of the faith " there is no division among us."

" Is it beyond the power of those who stand for Evangelical truth," he continued, " to summon a preliminary conference of prominent clergy and laity to act as the initial body that will form a strong central committee, who will frame the programme for a larger Conference when a lead can be given after prayer

and consultation for a venture of faith and hope? I suggest that the Church Pastoral-Aid Society, the National Church League, and the Church Parochial Mission should combine and summon the preliminary gathering in London. All sections of Evangelicals should be represented, and I have not the slightest doubt as to the result of a few hours spent in prayer and friendly conference. We live in days of rapid change. Christianity is at the cross-roads, and unless Evangelicalism proves its fitness to do its Master's work and its readiness to take occasion by the helm, I fear its candlestick will be removed from the Church of England and be placed elsewhere. It has the truth, it has the faith that moves mountains. Is it going to be weighed in the balance and found wanting through lack of cohesive energy and sacrificial belief in its principles? "

The suggestion, as we have said, has been remarkably well received. The Church Parochial Mission Society, in the person of its revered Superintendent, Canon Hay Aitken, and its Secretary, the Rev. D. E. Davies, has heartily endorsed the appeal; the National Church League, in its official organ, *The Church Gazette*, has promised full support to such a movement; and it can hardly be doubted that the Church Pastoral-Aid Society, which, two years ago, organized and carried through a splendid series of Evangelistic Conferences, will, as soon as its Committee meets, be ready to take action. The prospect of such a Conference being called at an early date is, therefore, extremely hopeful, and we feel no manner of doubt that when once a number of good men get together and unitedly in prayer seek the inspiration, guidance and power of the Holy Spirit, they will be led, whatever may be their surface differences, to hear the call and to make response. Bishop Ingham, with that wisdom and foresight which ever distinguish his actions, suggests that "it is not enough to convene a conference of our most trusted Societies to arrange for a General Mission in Evangelical parishes. We want a preliminary conference to ascertain where we stand." "Let us," he continued, "who belong to the old conservative school meet together somehow, somewhere, soon, to examine this apathy of which 'A London Incumbent,' justly complains, and find out the reason why. Let us wait upon God. Let us (both clergy and laity) take counsel with one another. Let us remember that our cause is God's cause, that we are His servants, that He has promised His guidance, and has, moreover, in His Word told us, beforehand, some of the features that are actually causing alarm at this time." In

thus insisting upon the necessity for clearness and definiteness in the message delivered, the Bishop has done good service, for "if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"; and it is most encouraging to find in letter after letter the strongest possible insistence upon absolute loyalty to fundamental truth. Mr. Arthur W. Sutton, in another letter in the *Record* of September 15, put the whole matter in a nutshell when he wrote: "With the Word of God as our all-sufficient authority we have an Evangel to take to men, but if we presume to limit or to detract from the authority either of the Divine Christ, or of the Bible, which has proved itself to be the Word of God, we have nothing to offer but the imaginings of our own finite and fallible minds." We are perfectly sure that the heart's desire of those who are supporting this movement is that the message to be proclaimed shall be that and only that which the Lord Himself shall give. We shall watch, as we are sure our readers will watch, the development of the proposal for an evangelistic campaign with the utmost sympathy, and we ask that continuous prayer may be offered that every step taken, whether in a preliminary conference or in the larger assembly, may be according to the Divine will.

To turn now to other matters, the three months **Councils and their Powers.** which have elapsed since our last issue have been very full of events of interest and importance to Church-people. First may be noted the passing through Parliament of the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure, to which has been given the Royal Assent. It is of the utmost importance that this Measure, which confers very large powers of self-government upon Parochial Church Councils, should be thoroughly understood and loyally and heartily worked in every parish in the country. In order to help clergy and other councillors in the right interpretation of the Measure the Church Book Room has published a handbook, written and compiled by Mr. Albert Mitchell, which we regard as practically indispensable to the successful working of the Councils. Points of difficulty and doubt under the Measure are bound to arise, and unless they are wisely and rightfully handled may easily cause friction. But with Mr. Albert Mitchell's handbook available the strangest problems will be easily solved. We strongly urge every Parochial Church Councillor to purchase a copy—it will

be money well spent. It has this further advantage that it is not merely a legal handbook, but is written with the religious and spiritual responsibilities of Parochial Church Councils fully in view and its tone is admirable. It may be obtained at the Church Book Room (6 Grosvenor Mansions, 82 Victoria Street, S.W.1), price 1s.

When a Benefice is Vacant. A "Further Powers" Measure was under discussion at the July session of the National Church Assembly and practically passed all its stages. This relates to two matters of great moment—the powers of the Council (1) on the appointment of a new Incumbent, and (2) in regard to changes in the conduct of Divine service. These "powers" were included in the original Measure, but being regarded as highly controversial were deferred and ordered to be embodied in a separate Measure, which was discussed in July. It was debated very fully, and all views were represented. In regard to the voice of the Council on the appointment of a new Incumbent there was an overwhelming feeling in favour of the clause more or less as it stood, although some weighty opinions were expressed against it, and these by no means from all of one school of thought. It can hardly be questioned that the clause does impose a new disability upon the clergy, but it was strongly felt that in practice it would cause no real hardship, while the advantage it would confer upon the parish of preventing an unfit appointment was very great. We all of us know parishes to which unfit men—not by reason of any defect in their moral character, but unsuitable to the particular position—have been appointed to the great detriment and hindrance of the Church's work. There is no power under the present law to stop the square man being jammed into the round hole, but under the new Measure it will be possible for the Parochial Church Council to make objection and for the Bishop to refuse to institute. Of course the powers thus conferred will have to be used with the greatest care in order to be sure that no injustice is done, but with that proviso it must be abundantly clear that the clause does effect a very real and much-needed improvement in the exercise of Church patronage. The clause was amended and amplified in several particulars and passed by the Assembly as follows:—

Every Council shall have power to make representations in writing to the patron of the benefice within twenty-eight days of

the voidance of such benefice, or of notice of the expected voidance sent by the patron to the Secretary of the Council, with regard to the exercise of his power of presentation thereto, and the patron shall not exercise his power of presentation thereto until such a period has elapsed, provided that in reckoning the date for lapse such period of twenty-eight days shall not be counted, but the Council shall not suggest the appointment of any individual by name.

The notice required to be served on the churchwardens of a parish by Section 2 (2) of the Benefices Act, 1898, shall be served also on the Secretary of the Council, and within fourteen days from the service of any such notice the Council shall have power to petition the Bishop to refuse to collate, institute, or admit any person proposed to be collated, instituted, or admitted by him. Upon receiving any such petition the Bishop shall be entitled, after consulting a permanent Board of Assessors to be constituted for that purpose by the Diocesan Conference, to refuse to collate, institute, or admit such person if he thinks fit, irrespective of any other power of refusal which he may possess by statute or otherwise. Provided that, when objection has been made on grounds affecting the moral character of a clerk, the Bishop shall take no action until an opportunity has been afforded the clerk of making such answer as he may think fit to the accusations made against him. In reckoning the date for lapse no account shall be taken of the period between the first presentation by the patron and any refusal by the Bishop to collate, institute, or admit a presentee of the patron under the powers conferred by this section.

The underlying principle of the clause is that the interests of the parish are the first consideration, and from this point of view it will be received, especially by the laity, with warm approval.

The result of the discussion on the other clause **Changes in the Services.** in the Further Powers Measure—that relating to changes in the services—was much less satisfactory. As originally drawn the clause ran as follows:—“Nothing in this measure or in the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure, 1921, shall affect the rights, liabilities or duties of the Incumbent in respect of the Church or the services or public worship therein or of the churchyard or of any property belonging to the benefice. Provided that the Incumbent shall from time to time consult with the Council concerning the services of the Church, and particularly concerning any important changes which he may propose to make in such services. And if, after such consultation, the Council shall be opposed to any such change, they shall have the right to make

representations to the Bishop in respect thereof." We thought at the time, and we still think, that if the clause had been passed in that form it would have effected a very real reform. The first part of it was passed practically without debate, but when the second part was reached there was a storm of opposition from those who hold—quite wrongly as we think—that the laity have nothing to do with the conduct of Divine Service. The opposition was, in our view, both unreasoning and unreasonable. Sufficient attention was not paid to the importance of the word "consult," which was inserted, we understand, by the Committee responsible for the Measure, after a long and anxious discussion, in order to emphasize the principle of "co-operation" which was made a cardinal principle in the first Powers Measure. The final decision of the Assembly was taken hurriedly, and if the discussion could have been deferred to the following day, it is possible the result might have been different. An amendment, moved by Lord Hugh Cecil, which to the amazement of many was accepted by Lord Parmoor and the members in charge of the Measure, was finally adopted by the Assembly not unanimously, but by a considerable majority. The whole of the words of the second part of the clause as drafted were cut out and the following words substituted:—"Provided that nothing in this measure shall hinder the Council from making representations to the Bishop in respect to the services in church by exercising the power conferred upon the Council by subsection 5 of Section 6 of the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure of 1921." We regard the rejection of the original proposal as disastrous. The amendment gives to the laity no more power than they at present possess—the power of writing a letter to the Bishop. The Assembly has, in fact, ruled that they have no right to a voice in the conduct of Divine Service, but the Incumbent who asks for the "co-operation" of the laity in the extension of church work both within and without the parish will be a very foolish person if he neglect to take them into consultation in regard to any changes he may desire to make in the conduct of Divine Service.

The Anglo-Catholic Position. It may fairly be questioned whether the Anglo-Catholics have improved their position by the Priests' Convention which was held recently at Oxford. The discussions showed the existence of a deep cleavage between the

newer and the older members of the School. It is now obvious that there is a powerful and representative section of the party which is frankly Roman, and it will not have escaped notice that it was at the *official* service that the Mass of the Holy Spirit was sung, and the Roman rite followed. The existence in our midst of a party with avowedly Roman aims is a source of weakness to the Church, and the question must soon be faced whether it is right that they should be allowed to pursue their way unchecked. It is all too obvious that there is a growing tendency to disregard the plain intentions of the Book of Common Prayer, and to substitute for it the Roman rite, or at least to supplement it by the use of large sections of the Roman Missal. Now this is a practice which is fundamentally disloyal to the Church of England, whose priests they are, and whose bread they eat. It cannot be defended, and the best men in the party do not attempt to defend it, or excuse it. Indeed, one of the speakers at the Convention expressed a doubt whether the practice of celebrating without the minimum number of communicants to communicate with the priest could be squared with their "pledged word." Of course it cannot be; and yet there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of priests who thus violate their ordination vows. The real fact is that there is no room in the Church of England for these semi-Romanists, and we hope the time is not far distant when they, or a large proportion of them, will realize the fact, and act accordingly. We do not question the religious sincerity of these men; indeed there was a tone, an atmosphere, about some of the proceedings of the Convention which showed that there is a deep longing in the hearts of many for a deeper realization of the things of the Spirit. But spirituality of heart and mind affects conduct and character; does it not, therefore, involve the strict observance of vows, and the honest, whole-hearted fulfilment of the obligations of the "pledged word"? This is an aspect of the matter to which Anglo-Catholic priests might well give serious attention. We note, also, that the Convention engaged to undertake "a great evangelistic campaign"; and in so far as it is intended to be as described, an effort to seek "the conversion of men, women and children to a living faith in, and devotion to, the Person of our Lord," Evangelical Churchmen will watch its development with sympathy and interest. But what is to be the relation of this effort to the Catholic position? We

dissent absolutely from the view of the *Church Times* that "if any one became a Catholic he is necessarily a Christian"; we are much more in agreement with the delegate from America who, speaking at the Convention, said that "some priests were so eager to make Catholics that they overlooked the need of making Christians." The terms "Catholic" and "Christian" are not interchangeable, any more than are the words "Protestant" and "Christian." The man who possesses "a living faith in and devotion to the Person of our Lord" is a Christian whatever label he bears; and there is a great necessity laid upon the Churches at this time to endeavour to make men, women and children "Christian" in this sense. God give us all the grace and the power to go forth in His name and strength thus to evangelize our own people and the peoples overseas.

The number of the *Modern Churchman* containing the full text of the papers read at the Conference of Modern Churchmen at Cambridge reaches us too late for detailed criticism, but a hasty glance at its contents convinces us that many of the anxieties and fears which were engendered by the newspaper reports of the Conference are entirely without foundation. There is much in the Dean of Carlisle's paper with which we do not agree, but there is no reason to believe that in the argument he used there was any intentional derogation from the Deity of our Lord. Indeed, the Dean himself has told us through the columns of the *Guardian* that he sees no distinction between "Divinity" and "Deity." This is a great gain, for there are some "Modernists" who use the term "Divinity" in a sense differing little, if at all, from the way in which Socinians use it. There were some papers read at the Conference which by no stretch of charity could be regarded as Christian in the commonly accepted meaning of the word, but these were excrescences and were as stoutly resisted by other members of the Conference as they would be by the most orthodox believers outside its borders. Nor must we omit to notice the reverent devotional tone which pervaded the Conference. There was unquestionably a desire to come into personal spiritual touch with the things of God; and for ourselves we see in this fact solid ground for hope. But we feel bound to say that Conferences such as this should not be open to ordinary reporters of the secular

press. They have not the training to enable them to know the true bearing of deep theological discussions ; they seize upon one point and give it prominence, without reference to the other part of the paper, whereas a proper understanding of the context would probably put a totally different interpretation upon it. These incomplete or garbled reports work much mischief ; and the discussions which followed the accounts the daily papers gave of the Cambridge Conference showed that the simple Christian faith of some weak souls was seriously disturbed by what was reported to have been said there. It is a very grave matter to cause offence to, or to put a stumbling-block in the way of, any of " those little ones who believe " in the Lord Jesus Christ ; and, if these speculative theological problems must be discussed, we beg those who are responsible to take the utmost care that no word of their own doubts, difficulties and disputations shall reach those who rest their souls upon the simple faith of Christ. And the same word may be passed on to parochial clergy. These problems raised by Modernists should, as far as possible, be left out of the pulpit. Our congregations are composed of men and women who are hungering for the Bread of Life, and if, instead, they are given the stones of Criticism, their souls are not merely unsatisfied, but receive positive harm. The message from the pew to the pulpit is, " Sir, we would see Jesus," and the preacher who can present Him in all the glory of His redeeming love is the one who is best fulfilling the purpose of his ministry, which is to win souls.



THE RESTORATION SETTLEMENT OF THE CHURCH.

BY THE REV. HAROLD SMITH, D.D.

THE importance of the settlement of the Church at the Restoration, with its modifications at the Revolution, is only second to that at the Reformation. In fact, in speaking of the Reformation Settlement we must take into account the important codicil added at the Restoration. It was then that the Prayer Book underwent its last revision until the present day, in fact the only systematic revision since Edward VI; and it was then that various acts of legislation determined the limits of the Church, so establishing modern Nonconformity.

The Restoration had been brought about by a combination of two parties: (1) the old Cavaliers, whether Laudians or not; and (2) the Presbyterians, who had as a body strongly opposed the execution of Charles I, and had in many cases suffered in 1650 for refusing to take the "Engagement," a pledge "to be true and faithful to the Commonwealth of England as it is now established without a King or House of Lords." Thus they were quite consistent in supporting the Restoration. In the Convention Parliament of 1660 they were very strong, if not predominant.

In April, 1660, Charles issued from Breda in Holland a declaration whereby among other things he promised liberty to tender consciences, and that no man should be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion on matters of religion which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom. He would accept an Act of Parliament for the free granting of this indulgence. Several leading Presbyterians interviewed him at Breda; he replied to them kindly on the lines of his Declaration, but at once refused to give up the use of the Book of Common Prayer or of the surplice in his own chapel. When he arrived in London, the Prayer Book was at once used in the Chapel Royal; many churches followed this example. Patrick, Rector of Battersea, tells us that he was pressed by some in his parish to do the same, but thought it best to preach a few sermons on the matter first. He, however, started it on July 22, and no one objected.

The general legal position taken up at the Restoration was that all the measures of the Long Parliament which had received the Royal Assent were valid and still held good ; all the rest, passed without the King's consent, during the course of the war, were invalid. Thus the ordinances abolishing the use of the Prayer Book were of no force, and its disuse was in strictness illegal ; some ministers were molested for this. But the King's Declaration granted that the matter must be newly settled by Parliament.

The Presbyterians now presented an address and proposals, expressing assent to a limited episcopacy balanced by a due commixtion of presbyters, and to the lawfulness of a liturgy ; but not to the Prayer Book as it stood. They desired that learned, godly and moderate divines should be employed to compile a new form, as much as possible in Scripture words ; or at least to revise the old with alternatives in Scripture phrase ; and that ceremonies should be left optional. The Bishops' reply was not very conciliatory ; but on October 25 the King issued a declaration largely acceding to these proposals. (A draft was shown the ministers and suggestions and criticisms invited ; these were considered in the final form.) No bishop should ordain or exercise any part of jurisdiction appertaining to the censures of the Church without the advice and assistance of the presbyters. (The Presbyterians had suggested " and consent," but the King would not accept this.) The archdeacon should exercise no jurisdiction without the advice and assistance of six ministers of the archdeaconry, three nominated by the Bishop and three elected. An equal number of learned divines of both persuasions was to be appointed to revise the Prayer Book, to make such alterations as should be thought most necessary, and some additional forms, in Scripture phrase if possible. The King wished that those who objected to some parts of the Prayer Book would use the parts against which there was no exception ; yet none were to be punished or troubled for not using it until it were revised. Ceremonies were to be left optional for the present.

This declaration was so much in favour of the Puritan contentions that it is doubtful whether the King was sincere, or only wished to gain time to substitute a new Parliament, probably less Presbyterian.

It may be remarked incidentally that in present proposals for

Reunion under a system of episcopacy it is never clearly stated how far episcopacy is to be modified, how far, e.g., a bishop could be vetoed by his synod or conference. Mention of "primitive episcopacy" does not help; some of the bishops of the Early Church were very autocratic, and would never have allowed interference by mere presbyters. If the Church is to be democratized—for it is generally held nowadays that unlimited democracy is far and away the best form of government, though this involves a great triumph of faith over sight—this should begin with the bishops, not with the parochial clergy. Episcopacy is consistent with bishops having no more authority than in the ancient Irish Church; but this is perhaps going too far.

Not till March 25, 1661, did the King issue a warrant for a conference to be held at the *Savoy*; and then its scope was much less than that laid down in the Declaration, though the Puritans do not seem to have noticed the difference. The Conference began April 15; I pass over details of this, because readily accessible in all books on the Prayer Book. It is a most depressing and disheartening story of a great opportunity wasted. Neither side was willing to make any real concession, or endeavoured to understand the position of the other. The only difference was that the Bishops rightly estimated the feeling of the country, and especially that of the new Parliament, while the Puritans seemed unconscious of this. Two further things should be remembered: (1) the Puritans were represented only by the Presbyterians, who had nominally been in possession for nearly twenty years; the Independents were not represented, much less the Baptists and Quakers; (2) the common impression that the changes in the new Prayer Book were due to this Conference is quite wrong; it was an absolute failure; the revision was due to the independent action of Convocation.

On November 21, 1661, a committee of eight bishops, including Wren, Cosin and Sanderson, was appointed to revise the book. But this was clearly just a ratification of work already done. The whole House set to work at once, sending each part as soon as done to the Lower House for amendment or approval. The new book was subscribed December 21, 1661; it was for some time in the hands of the King and Privy Council before submission to Parliament.

The alterations are said to number six hundred, but many were

only verbal or hardly more. The principles of the revision are clearly set forth in our present Preface, by Sanderson, Bishop of Lincoln, no extreme man, who though deprived of his Oxford professorship had kept his living of Boothby Pagnell throughout the Troubles. The general tendency was to promote clearness and avoid obscurity ; hence come many minor changes and new rubrics ; there are also many additions. There is some slight anti-Puritan element, but very little considering the occasion. On the other hand some changes meet Puritan objections at the *Savoy* Conference.

The centre of interest is now Parliament. The Cavalier Parliament of 1661 was vehemently Anglican and anti-Presbyterian. The chief ecclesiastical Act of the Convention Parliament had been that for "Confirming and Restoring of Ministers." By it all ministers presented since 1642 to a benefice legally void, whether by death or resignation, were to be adjudged lawful ministers ; but also those ejected were to be restored, unless they had declared for the King's execution, or against Infant Baptism. This meant (1) all sequestered and ejected Royalists were restored, the intruders being ejected ; but (2) all ministers appointed during the Troubles to benefices actually void were recognized as legal incumbents whatever their orders or ecclesiastical opinions (except Baptists). But in practice a fair number were ejected from livings in the patronage of the Crown or Bishops, because appointed by a usurping patron, e.g., "Oliver, Lord Protector."

The spirit of the new Parliament which met May 8, 1661, was very different ; this was shown almost at once by its order, May 22, for the Solemn League and Covenant to be burnt by the common hangman ! There is grim irony in the very people who had magnified the authority of Parliament against the King now suffering oppression by Parliament in spite of the King's declaration. They had insisted that the King must act in harmony with Parliament ; they now learnt that he could not interfere in their favour, whatever his professions had been.

The Corporation Act was now passed, ordering that no one should hold any office or be a member of any Corporation without taking not only the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, but also a new one, "that it is not lawful under any pretence whatever to take arms against the King ; and that I do abhor that traitorous position of taking arms by his authority against his person or against them

that are commissioned by him." A declaration was also to be subscribed declaring that no obligation lay on the subscriber or any other person from the Solemn League and Covenant, which was an unlawful oath imposed against the known laws and liberties of the Kingdom. In future no one was to hold office until having taken the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Church of England. This last requirement was at the time of passing, before the limits of the Church were fixed, less narrow than it became later. The unlawfulness of resistance, or at most of anything more than passive resistance, to the King, was an accepted Anglican tenet throughout this period so long as the King was on their side; when James II turned against them, they reconsidered the matter, and only the Nonjurors adhered to this doctrine, which they called "the doctrine of the Cross." But James had been warned long before by Bishop Morley that the devotion of most Englishmen to it was not very deep and could not be relied upon. The position of taking up arms against the King in the King's name had been the regular one of the Parliamentarians in the Civil War. Thus when the King summoned Gloucester to surrender the answer was that it "was held for the King and they were always ready to obey his commands, *as notified by Parliament.*"

The Commons were keen on Uniformity. They thought at first of exacting conformity to the book of 1552, but finally sent up their Bill to the Lords with the book of 1604 annexed, on July 9, 1661. But the Lords, who knew the Bishops were revising the book, did not read the Bill till January, 1662. On February 25 the new book was brought in, and the Bill was made to refer to it. In April the Bill was sent down to the Commons, who considered it carefully. On the 16th they decided by a majority of nine that no debate should be allowed on the amendments to the book made by Convocation; but a motion was carried that they had the right to have discussed them. The Bill received the Royal Assent May 19, 1662, and came into force August 24 (St. Bartholomew's Day). It enacted that the new book (annexed to the Act) was to be used in all churches, chapels, places of public worship; all clergy were on some Sunday before St. Bartholomew's Day to read Morning and Evening Prayer publicly, and openly and publicly before the congregation declare their unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything therein contained and prescribed. All those neglecting

to do so (except for some lawful impediment to be allowed and approved by the Ordinary) were to be deprived. All clergy and schoolmasters and tutors were also to take the oath of non-resistance, and to declare the Covenant an unlawful oath. From St. Bartholomew's Day no one could hold any living or ecclesiastical promotion without having been episcopally ordained; any one now holding a living was to be deprived unless he obtained episcopal ordination. (There are many other clauses in the Act.)

A very large number of ministers refused to conform, and were therefore ejected or at least silenced. This was the establishment of present-day Nonconformity, the final separation from the Church of a large body of the Puritans, though by no means all. The moderate Puritans who conformed formed the beginning of the Latitudinarian or Low Church Party.

There is a popular idea that all those ejected were really intruders. This is far from true; the intruders into sequestered livings had been ejected in 1660. Many of those now ejected for refusal to conform had been ordained by Laud and his suffragans before the Troubles; in some cases, e.g., in Essex, John Stalham of Terling, John Beadel of Barnston, John Willis of Ingatestone, Thomas Peck of Prittlewell, they were ejected from livings to which they had been instituted by Laud himself when Bishop of London. Many younger men no doubt refused to be re-ordained; but many had received orders by episcopal ordination. Thus Nonconformity might spring from various causes—inability to assent and consent to everything in the Prayer Book; refusal to be re-ordained; inability to take the non-resistance oath, or even (in the case of John Ray, the naturalist) to declare the Covenant to have been intrinsically an unlawful oath. As regards episcopal ordination, we read of a number of private ordinations during the Troubles, e.g., by Bishops Skinner of Oxford (who ordained Bull), Hall of Norwich (who ordained Patrick), Duppa of Salisbury, King of Chichester, Warner of Rochester. After Cromwell's death, when far-sighted men expected the restoration of the Monarchy, ordinations increased; and after the Restoration many incumbents sought ordination from bishops, especially from Bishop Sydserf of Galloway, who made things very easy, and Bishop Fulwar of Ardfert and Aghadoe, who probably did the same.

In 1664 the first Conventicle Act was passed, forbidding attend-

ance at any assembly, conventicle or meeting under colour or pretence of any exercise of religion other than that allowed by the Liturgy or practice of the Church of England, when five or more persons should be present beyond the household. The penalty for the first offence was imprisonment for not more than three months or a fine not exceeding £5, to go to the relief of the poor ; for the second offence, imprisonment up to six months or a fine up to £10 ; for the third, transportation for seven years to the plantations, other than Virginia or New England (where they might find sympathizers) or a fine of £100. The wheel had come full circle. In 1645 the ordinance of the Long Parliament substituting the Directory for the Prayer Book had enacted similar penalties against the use of the latter—first offence £5, second £10, third a year's imprisonment ; for failure to use the Directory, 40s. each time ; for assailing it by speech or writing, a fine not less than £5, or more than £50. In the original draft the penalty for doing this a third time was loss of goods and perpetual imprisonment. Thus there is little to choose in point of severity between this ordinance and this Conventicle Act, though the Act was enforced more than the ordinance actually was, as far as infliction of penalties went.

In 1665 followed the Five Mile Act. All clergy and persons in Holy Orders or pretended Holy Orders or pretending to Holy Orders, who had not declared their unfeigned assent and consent to the Prayer Book, and who would not take and subscribe the non-resistance oath, or should preach at any conventicle, were forbidden to be (except in course of travelling) within five miles of any corporation, town or borough, or of any place where they had held cure since the Act of Oblivion, or had held a conventicle. The penalty was £40, which applied also to any such persons keeping a school. The non-resistance oath was now strengthened by a clause " that I will not at any time endeavour any alteration of government, either in Church or State." Only by taking this oath could exemption be gained. This Act was enforced for only a short time, during which, however, it produced great hardships ; ministers had either to leave their families and visit them only by stealth, or else to remove altogether to a new place. In Essex there are several cases of removal to the bare minimum distance.

In 1670 came the second Conventicle Act, said by some to be worse than its predecessor, which was only a temporary measure.

But this applies not to its penalties which were very much lighter—in theory at least—but to the severity with which it was enforced. It said nothing about imprisonment or transportation, and imposed fines on a much lower scale ; but encouraged informers to inform, and magistrates to convict, by dividing the fines into three parts : (1) the King, (2) the poor of the parish, i.e. relief of the rates, (3) the informer or informers, or others diligent in discovering or suppressing the conventicle. Some informers made a very good living. The fines were : for a first offence five shillings, and for its repetition ten shillings ; only, in case of the poverty of some offenders, their share might be exacted from others, provided that no one had to pay more than £10. The penalty for preaching was £20 for the first offence, £40 for its repetition ; if the preacher could not be caught, or could not pay, his fine might be levied from any of his hearers. The penalty for allowing a conventicle in any one's house or premises was £20. Slackness on the part of parochial officers was punishable by a fine of £5 ; on the part of a magistrate, by that of £100.

The Test Act, 1673, was directed primarily against Romanists, but struck also at Nonconformity. It enacted that all persons holding any office or any place of trust under the King, or receiving any pay from him, must qualify by receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in some public church on a Sunday. The penalty for refusal was incapacity of prosecuting any suit, of acting as guardian of a child, or as executor of a will, and of receiving any legacy, as well as a fine of £100.

This was the last of this series of penal acts, if we except two passed about forty years later, and in force for only a few years—the Occasional Conformity Act, and the Schism Act ; the former dealt with those Nonconformists who were willing to receive the Sacrament in their parish church as a qualification for office, but still attended their own places of worship. The advocates of the measure, which subjected such to dismissal and a heavy fine, maintained that they were all time-serving hypocrites ; its opponents (e.g. Patrick) held that it struck at the best of the Nonconformists, who acknowledged Anglicans as Christian brethren, and had no objection to worshipping occasionally in their churches, though preferring their own. The question of the requirement of Confirmation does not seem to have been raised. This Bill passed the Commons early in Anne's reign, but was stopped by the Lords, who all along

showed themselves the more tolerant and liberal of the two Houses. It was finally carried there only as the terms of a party deal. At the close of the reign the Schism Act forbade Nonconformists keeping schools or acting as tutors. Both were repealed by 1720. Both these Acts were only temporarily successful efforts to alter the state of things permanently established in 1689 by the Toleration Act.

The line taken by this Act was not to repeal the existing statutes, but to exempt freely from the application and penalties. Various Elizabethan and later statutes, especially those requiring attendance at church, were not to apply to persons dissenting from the Church of England who should take certain oaths and declarations ; in particular, the Conventicle Act should not apply to them, nor should they be presented in any ecclesiastical court for nonconformity. No person dissenting from the Church of England in Holy Orders or pretended Holy Orders, or any preacher or teacher of any congregation of dissenting protestants who should make a certain declaration and take the oath, and also subscribe to the Articles of Religion, except XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, and part of XX, should be liable to the penalties of the Uniformity, Five Mile and Conventicle Acts. Baptists might subscribe with the further omission of part of Article XXVII, Quakers might substitute a declaration for the oaths, but were also to subscribe a profession of their Christian faith. But all the laws for the frequenting of divine service on the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, were to be still in force, except against such persons as come to some congregation or assembly of religious worship allowed by the Act. No such congregation or assembly was to be allowed until the place of meeting had been notified to the Bishop, or to the Archdeacon, or to the Justices in Quarter Sessions, and duly registered.

This remained the legal settlement till the nineteenth century. The Test and Corporation Acts were not repealed till 1828, though for many years an annual act had usually been passed exempting from penalties all who had inadvertently failed to comply with the tests ; and in practice this was interpreted very widely.

Records of Quarter Sessions show the practical working of some of these acts even at the end of the eighteenth century. They contain many notices of officers, magistrates or excisemen, bringing certificates of having received the Sacrament. In those of the Liberty of Havering-atte-Bower (Romford) we find notice of a conviction

under the Conventicle Act in 1776, when Robert Haskins was convicted of "preaching or teaching in a certain assembly, conventicle or meeting in the public highway, the place of such meeting not having been certified to the Bishop of the Diocese or to the Archdeacon or to the Justices." He was fined twenty pounds, and two of his hearers five shillings each; they paid the preacher's fine between them. The total fine, £20 10s., was divided, according to the Act, into three equal parts of £6 16s. 8d., each part being given to the right person. At the very Quarter Sessions where this was reported, notice was given (under the Toleration Act) that a room in a certain dwelling-house was intended to be used for a meeting-place of a congregation of Protestant Dissenters from the Church of England under the denomination of Independents; a certificate of the registration and record was given. There are several other instances of the kind.

Upon the whole history two remarks may be allowed: (1) The Laity have persecuted quite as much as the Clergy. It is only in purely doctrinal matters that the clergy have been the worst persecutors; wherever political or social interests are at all involved, the laity have far out-run the clergy. The number of deprivations by Bancroft and Laud was far exceeded by the sequestrations or ejections by the Long Parliament. The ejection of nonconformists in 1662, and the punishments for holding and attending conventicles, was the work, not of the Bishops, but of the Cavalier Parliament, especially the House of Commons, from which clergy were even then practically excluded; though we find very occasional instances till over a century later, when in order to keep out a troublesome radical parson, Horne Tooke, the Act was passed definitely excluding them.

(2) Politicians seldom see the ultimate outcome of their actions. All these Acts of the Cavalier Parliament aimed at promoting the interests of the Church; but some of them proved ultimately injurious to it; not only by filling Dissenters with a sense of grievance, but in other ways. The Act of Uniformity was for many years a check to development and enlargement of the Church's worship. It was not amended till 1872. Since then, however, it is largely a dead letter; the Bishops have recently discovered that it cannot possibly have taken from them their inherent *Jus Liturgicum*; and the parochial clergy have in practice assumed that the same

right is possessed by themselves, probably on equally substantial grounds.

The Test and Corporation Acts involved a profanation of the Sacrament. Cowper's words were not too strong :

“Hast thou by statute shoved from its design
The Saviour's feast, His own blest bread and wine,
And made the symbols of atoning grace
An office key, a picklock to a place,
That infidels may prove their title good
By an oath dipped in sacramental blood ? ”

But apart from this, it meant the end of all discipline of the Church. If notorious evil livers, e.g., Bolingbroke, must receive the Sacrament, none could well be excluded. Any attempt to exclude such would have been suspected of political animus.

The Conventicle Act as modified by the Toleration Act was one great cause of the gradual withdrawal of the Methodists from the Church. Freedom of such congregations from pressure by incumbents of parishes could be most easily gained by registering the place of worship as one of Protestant Dissenters from the Church of England. Hence Lady Huntingdon, pressed by the Rector of Clerkenwell, got her chapel in Spa Fields so registered ; and later on, Wesley acted similarly. One wonders how it was that the Conventicle Act was not more frequently put in exercise against the Methodists ; they could hardly have escaped. One can only suppose that the enforcement of this Act would often have run counter to public opinion, or that the informer would not have been sufficiently rewarded.

The Conventicle Act was modified in 1812. But as late as 1854 it was illegal for any religious meeting to be held in an unlicensed place or for twenty persons outside the family to pray together in a private house. Hence the earlier meetings of the great religious societies were not opened with prayer. Even after Lord Shaftesbury had carried the Religious Worship Bill in 1855 it was possible for the Vicar of St. Michael's, Burleigh Street, to prohibit evangelistic meetings in Exeter Hall. A subsequent Act enabled the Bishop to over-ride an Incumbent's veto. (See Dr. Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, I, 280, II, 26-28.)

Thus in practice, after the passing of the Toleration Act, the Conventicle Act tended simply to hinder irregular Church work, and to drive those who engaged in it to formal separation.

On the tomb of Sir Thomas Smith, a leading statesman of Elizabeth's reign, the words are repeated, "See the end ; see the end." A good motto for all statesmen ; to look not simply at immediate gains or popularity, or even fine ideals, but at the natural and probable ultimate results of the proposals, human nature being what it is. Less desire to put down Puritanism after the Restoration and real alteration of these Acts at the Revolution, not merely exemption of certain people from them, might have saved much mischief. But to condemn our predecessors may be no better than the Pharisees' condemnation of their fathers for killing the prophets ; while to make too much of our own spiritual ancestors is open to the criticism that, like potatoes, the best part of us is underground ! We need men of insight and foresight to-day, and need ourselves to avoid being misled by fine phrases and popular catchwords. We need to "see the end."

HAROLD SMITH.

[The bulk of the Acts of Parliament and other documents mentioned are to be found in *Documents Illustrating the Act of Uniformity* ; many of them also in Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, or Cardwell's *Conferences*.]

Mr. Le Fanu, Secretary of Queen Anne's Bounty, gives a short account of its history and work. The booklet costs a shilling, and is published by Messrs. Macmillan. We confess that until we read its pages we had no idea of the extent and variety of the work done by this well-administered Corporation.

Messrs. Macmillan sends us *The Suggested Syllabus of Religious Instruction used in the Diocese of Manchester* (1s. 6d.) When it originally appeared in the form of an Appendix to Mr. Grigg Smith's *The Child's Knowledge of God*, we were impressed by the ability shown in its compilation, and are glad to welcome it in its new form.

The S.P.C.K. sends us two sixpenny pamphlets on *Synodical Government*, by the late Archbishop of Melbourne, and *The Anglican Deaconess*, by the Rev. Oscar Hardman. Both contain information not easily obtained elsewhere. Mr. E. H. Blakeney gives us through the same publishers an excellent translation with Text, Introduction and Notes of *The Hymn of Cleanthes*, which has been called by Lightfoot "the noblest expression of heathen devotion which Greek literature has preserved to us." This little book is a model of what a Students' Text should be, and is well worth sixpence.

A PRECEDENT IN REUNION DISCUSSIONS.

BY THE REV. W. S. HOOTON, B.D.

ONE reason why the Book of the Acts of the Apostles is of such unique value is the too little recognized fact that its carefully selected incidents are not merely (as of course they are) vital points in the development of primitive Church history, but also enshrine seeds of guidance for the Church of Christ in all ages, as conditions and problems arise, infinitely varied and not in the least foreseen or even foreshadowed in those early days. This is one mark of Divine inspiration, as well as of the unique value already mentioned. No human author could have put together a series of key-incidents affording unfailing guidance for the Church in all generations and countries. Historical sense may enable an acute author to distinguish critical points and set them in telling proportion, omitting others less necessary for record; though St. Luke had special inspiration even here. But to select exactly the points which are suitable for guidance, e.g. no less in the missionary operations of the Church in Oriental countries like India and China than in the problems and perplexities of the Western Church at home—and that too in this far remote twentieth century—is something far beyond human insight or foresight. If the matter could be put to the test, it would doubtless be found that no difficulty has beset the Church of Christ, through all the ages, which could not have been solved if His servants had been content to settle it in accordance with some principle of eternal application which could have been discovered, by sincere and prayerful seekers, embodied in some incident or incidents either definitely recorded in the Acts or reflected in the Epistles of the New Testament.

The Council at Jerusalem, described in Acts xv., has probably been indicated by many writers and speakers in the course of the past few years as enshrining in this manner principles of immeasurable value for the solution of the Reunion puzzle. There is no claim to originality in the subject thus put forward; but the moment seems opportune for a closer examination of the principles so clearly applicable, as well as of certain difficulties not so clearly met by this case, and for suggesting, possibly, some points not hitherto noticed.

I. There is no question about the startling aptness of the precedent. Here were two parties to a controversy. One side took its stand upon what it understood to be a ceremonial obligation of direct Divine command and perpetual binding force. The other side pointed to the irresistible fact that God had Himself vouchsafed unquestionable tokens of His approval to those who had not fulfilled the alleged obligations, and on this ground they pleaded for the liberty so manifestly sanctioned and commended.

Can the Baptist have deeper convictions on the necessity of adult baptism and immersion than the Judaizer had about circumcision? In the one case the question is merely of the interpretation of a command—in part, of a word: in the other, two interpretations may well have seemed impossible. Can the most rigid view of Episcopal grace and order exceed the rigidity of that which was alleged—and apparently upon such unassailable grounds—to be the sole door of entrance to the covenant of Divine favour? That ancient situation was far more hopeless in appearance than any difficulty of our own. For Judaistic observances meant to the Judaizer literally everything. But to St. Paul they spelt—if reliance were placed on them for salvation and Divine favour—nothing less than spiritual death, and the very negation of the Gospel of Christ. On the other hand, consider the present position of our Reunion controversy. If any considerable number of people ever really believed that Nonconformists were outside God's covenant of grace, that opinion, at any rate, has had its death-blow in the Lambeth message. On such a point the Judaizer could yield nothing: and some of the leading Apostles themselves were, before the Council, no more free from such prepossessions than some of our Bishops have been from corresponding prepossessions in our own day. If *such* a difficulty could be settled in authoritative conclave then, why not our problem of less far-reaching proportions? The Council, too, was held in the Judaizers' stronghold. No favour was likely to be shown to Gentile laxity in Jerusalem itself, under (seemingly) a president famed for strict reverence for the law of God, in the very heart of all the influences of early prepossession and hoary tradition. It was a bold challenge of faith on the part of St. Paul and his comrades: and their faith and courage were amply vindicated.

And how was the matter settled? Without going too much

into detail, two points are very noticeable and important, apart from what is the leading secret of all—sincere submission to and expectation of the Holy Spirit's guidance in authoritative Church assembly. Apart from this—or rather as methods of discovering and recognizing this guidance—there are two marked features of the Council, viz. the two-fold appeal to Scripture and experience. This is how the Spirit's working is recognized and the Divine guidance acknowledged. These are the eternal lines for the discovery of the will of God. Not alleged experience alone, let us mark. That involves serious risk (of which there are many present-time warnings) of claiming the guidance of the Spirit of God for doctrines or practices which are in flat contradiction to the Word He has Himself inspired. Modernism and Romanism err equally in this way, though in different directions. It is true that the Spirit has not ceased to lead God's people forward ever still: it is true that the Living Voice may still be heard: it is true also that earnest deliberations in authoritative Councils may claim true guidance if sought on the prescribed lines. But it is not true that the Spirit of truth will ever contradict Himself. He will not tell us to-day what is exactly opposite to what He told Apostles nineteen centuries ago.

So we find that the eternal fount of truth was explored under the guidance of the revered James, before any decision was attempted. And the voice of prophecy—the voice of God through His Word—was confirmed by what Peter had told of Cornelius and his party, and by what the first foreign missionaries related of their experience among the heathen. (It is largely the testimony from the foreign field that is so convincing in the Reunion controversy too.) Perhaps it might be truer to say that it was these notable testimonies which for the first time shed full light upon the ancient prophecy and revealed in a flash to St. James, who quoted it, the true bearing of what he had known from childhood but never understood. Thus in the older Scriptures are enshrined those eternal principles of guidance which we have already recognized in the new, and the march of events continually interprets them to watchful souls humbly depending upon the Spirit's teaching, so that with Spirit-taught wisdom they bring from the fathomless depths of that inexorable storehouse things new as well as old!

The prophecies, interpreted thus by experience, showed that the commands of the Law (equally inspired for their special and

limited purpose) were not universal or perpetual. There is no contradiction here, but only the shining forth of true interpretative light. Thus was a difficulty, as insoluble as any that could be imagined, proved to be easily reconciled to teachable souls. The experiences at Cæsarea, at Antioch and elsewhere, proved that God Himself had settled the question—even as He has settled ours if we will but own it! “God, which knoweth the heart, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as He did unto us; and He made no distinction between us and them, cleansing their hearts by faith.” So said St. Peter, mindful of that first marvellous scene of Gentile conversion, to which he had been led himself by three-fold vision and providential connexion of circumstance. “Then all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them.”¹ “Theory and prejudice had to yield, when true witness was borne to God’s will and work. What was the use of arguing about the position of the Gentiles under the new dispensation, when it was proved by reliable witnesses that God had declared for their admission on equal terms with His favoured people?”²

One other lesson of special significance before we proceed to the difficulties which seem peculiar to our case and less easily touched by the precedent. The matter was settled as it were in a moment when the guidance of the Holy Ghost was really sought. “It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us . . .”³ That is the true way! They could never have dared to write that in their letter if they had not submitted to His guidance with a full heart and a clear conscience. Did those servants of Christ despairingly aver that such a radical difference could “never be settled in their day”? That it would be a fatal mistake to hurry things? That discussion must be *very* cautious and gradual and detailed, lest we fall into something worse? That to welcome the Christians of Antioch would only mean to split the Church at Jerusalem?

We know they did not. And we know why. They were men of courage and of faith—men, above all, *willing to follow the Spirit wherever He led*; ready to *do*, not only to talk and confer. Such

¹ Acts xv. 8, 9, 12.

² *Missionary Ideals*, by the Rev. T. Walker, p. 155.

³ Acts xv. 28.

men were not the men for tiny doses of reconciliation ; for helpless palliatives and endless procrastination. Because they were willing for anything, they surrendered their prejudices : and it is when we do that that we get to know His will and find grace to do it. And prejudices can be surrendered in five minutes as easily—more easily than in a hundred years, if there be the ready will.

No doubt there were many who would not submit. St. Paul soon found that. But whatever the result, he would never have counselled caution and the continuation of a scandal to God's kingdom, and the negation of God's truth, for fear of fresh splits and worse divisions. We shall wait for ever if we wait for everybody.

All this sounds terribly one-sided and ill-balanced perhaps. But wait a moment. We are now turning to our acknowledged special (but not therefore insoluble) causes of perplexity.

2. And first to a very practical obstacle. The Church was then fairly small and manageable. It was not indeed so ideally free from internal discord as is often fondly imagined : yet it was, as yet, one single entity ; and it was, moreover, easily possible for those primitive leaders to point to Jerusalem as a recognized centre and to gather there representatives of all who were concerned. How difficult it is for us, now, to gather in any one place any really representative assembly of even those parts of the Christian Church which are ready honestly to repent of their discords and to seek God's way of restoration without dictating beforehand what that way must be ! And in consequence it seems inevitable that every severed branch should discuss by itself first of all its own standpoint, with all the interminable further difficulties of deciding how a more general and an authoritative Council could be called.

This obstacle has two most unhappy results. Discussions of that order need special grace indeed if each body is not to prejudge some vital aspect of the case which the more balanced constitution of a more representative Council might at least help to present in truer proportion. Opinion may easily harden thus, and prejudice deepen. The ultimate Council, if ever arrived at, is less likely to be free to follow *wherever the Spirit may lead*. Or, if the conclusion be that an ultimate General Council is impossible, there will be even greater difficulty in securing balanced considerations in any quarter whatsoever.

The second unhappy consequence is that such processes inevitably prolong that heart-breaking procrastination which has already been in our view.

But surely we cannot believe that such perplexities are wholly insurmountable. Our quarrel with current opinion is that they are everywhere assumed to be so! No two situations are absolutely similar in *details*. We cannot expect Acts xv. to cover us completely here. Its thrilling narrative of simple obedience gives us *all the principles of guidance*. It is our duty, and especially the duty of the Church's leaders in all its branches, to apply those principles, unchanging as they are, to the changed details of our current problems. That may well be admitted to be a formidable task; but it is not so nearly impossible as it is well-nigh always hopelessly assumed to be—at any rate as far as early action is concerned. God would enlighten our minds to-day, as He enlightened theirs, to see new things both in Scripture and in experience, if all were really open to His teaching and desirous of it. It is mainly a fault of the will, after all. The difficulties suggested even by this statement of the matter are great indeed; but if the scandal of our divisions means all that it is constantly declared to mean to the cause of Christ and the souls of men, is it not appalling to find that every responsible declaration on this subject seems to assume that it cannot be settled for years if not for generations? May a corporate sin, any more than an individual one, be condoned for an indefinite period? God has surely some better thing than that prepared for faith; and courage, and *surrender to His will*, faith, courage, and *surrender on all sides*. Are we sure that immediate and full concord is not as much a matter of life and death for us as it was for them?

It is important also to recall the fact already briefly named—that whatever our special difficulties, they had one which we have not, and which must beforehand have seemed insuperable. For none could dispute that circumcision was an ordinance of God, and the Law of Moses of Divine obligation. We may easily underestimate the seriousness of this factor from long custom of viewing these institutions in their due proportion, and fully comprehending their temporary and local significance: but the battle had then to be fought and won, and the attitude of many of the leaders showed how little idea even they had of the truth at first, and how dull

they were in comprehending it, or even timid in acting accordingly, however plain the Divine intimations of it had been.

How different is the case with us ! The most convinced Presbyterian can never plead that government by elders is a distinct command of God. The most ardent advocate of Episcopal succession cannot point to anything more than disputable inferences, or ignore the significance of local differences in Episcopal organization. In this respect our task in composing disagreement ought to be much easier.

One other perplexity in our case must not be forgotten. The logical consequence of what has been said, and of much else that could be considered, might appear to be that many of our differences in organization and discipline might well be allowed to continue side by side in a reunited Church. That, of course, was the case in the matter of circumcision. It was impossible indeed, after the Council, loyally to teach that these legal observances were essential or connected with saving truth ; but presumably the Jew was free to continue them if he wished, and also to circumcise his children. The full significance of the great principle then promulgated would only gradually permeate the Church, especially with the growth of the Gentile element. St. James himself emphasized the object of the decree as a due concession to *Gentile* believers, and at least one view of his closing words is that the Law of Moses would still be widely read and obeyed.¹ St. Peter probably contemplated such a dual arrangement when he said that " we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they."² (Notice how he excludes the ordinances from connexion with salvation.) St. Paul later wrote that neither circumcision nor uncircumcision was anything, but faith working through love.³ Nay, just after the Council, he himself circumcised Timothy to meet Jewish objections.⁴ These side-lights probably reveal the attitude of the Church. The ordinances had nothing to do with salvation, which is by grace for Jews as well as Gentiles : but they were apparently legitimate for Jewish believers, though they may often have led to a false ground of confidence.

From a practical point of view our case is very different. It is true that the Lambeth message has been widely interpreted on rather

¹ Acts xv. 19, 21.

² *Ibid.*, ver. 11.

³ Gal. v. 6.

⁴ Acts xvi. 3.

similar lines. But take the crucial case of Episcopacy. In very early times, Alexandria might organize its Church on rather different lines from (say) Antioch, without any schism or danger of it. But it would have been difficult, if not impossible—at any rate as a lasting arrangement—for different groups of Christians to be differently organized in any one city—say Rome. Now that is our position. In every town—practically in every village—Episcopal and Presbyterian or some other form of government exist side by side; and such a state of things could scarcely continue harmoniously in a reunited Church, as the Lambeth decisions of course fully recognize. This is going to be perhaps the great testing-point: but once again solution is not impossible if we unitedly exclude the controversial spirit, and instead show the apostolic spirit of humility, faith, and self-effacement; and if there be no bigoted predetermination to reserve from discussion any form of government whatsoever, or any particular interpretation of any such form.

3. One aspect of this great precedent at Jerusalem requires separate treatment. Yet more vividly does it illustrate the *varied* application of principle to detail. The encyclical letter acknowledged certain necessary exceptions. These have been described as indicating a compromise. That seems extremely dubious as an explanation. For one thing, the term has acquired an unenviable meaning, and we may be certain at any rate that these were not the men to sacrifice principle for peace. But even if the less invidious usage of the word may be intended, it is unquestionable that one at least of the exceptions was a matter of essential morality. And without going into discussion on the other points, the opinion may be ventured that possibly not one of them was of merely ceremonial import, but that they were *exceptions of vital principle in view of the local and temporary conditions of the infant Churches of that era*, while possibly also enshrining considerations of eternal necessity. That is all we need. It means this—that here we have, alongside of any permanent principles the narrative may contain, a sample, a specimen, of detailed difficulties capable of infinitely varied forms of expression, but all soluble on the line of general principle. There will always be special reservations, probably, in every settlement.

What will they be in our case? Probably not chiefly matters savouring at all of ceremonial observance, though such matters cannot entirely be overlooked. There is a powerful though not

perhaps relatively large section of our own Communion which greatly insists on some such things which cannot be conceded. But we are now dealing with a vastly larger body of Christians, in both hemispheres, far outnumbering our own Communion, and caring nothing for points of ceremony—not to mention the very large number of our own people to whom ceremonies are of little or no importance. No: the radical exceptions in any Reunion would be mainly in matters of doctrine. On the side of practice, broad general agreement might be attainable with far less difficulty: it is in doctrinal laxity that the real peril of any widely embracing scheme of Reunion, however otherwise successful, would lie. Never can we be thankful enough that successive Lambeth Conferences have consistently maintained, as a *sine qua non*, acceptance of the Bible, and upon its truths as expressed in the Creeds. Even here we are not free from the snare of the "non-natural" interpretation—one of those disguising phrases so ominously prevalent, concealing the real fact of an interpretation which not merely is most *unnatural* but positively contradicts the meaning of words, and practically inserts a "not" into almost every vital article of the Christian Faith. That matter needs to be settled, and is imperilling all the Churches and threatening widespread apostasy. But already there are complaints that this Lambeth reservation is too stringent. On the contrary, it is the vital safeguard against a mechanical union lacking spiritual efficacy. These are the conditions in our day which require reservations parallel to those of the Jerusalem encyclical. To abandon Episcopacy itself, root and branch, would be a trifle compared to the sacrifice of this.

If any attempt be made to argue that precisely the contrary is the case, and that this adherence to apostolic doctrine is exactly the sort of burden which is too heavy to bear in this generation, the answer is clear. We might get unity on other lines, but it would not be Christianity. Nor would it be the kind of unity attained at this ancient Council, which rested not merely on experience but upon the appeal to the Scriptures. Is it alleged that experience proves the necessity of relief for the modern mind in face of modern science and modern criticism? That is only half the apostolic Council's appeal—nay, far less than half: it is practically not any real appeal at all. For there are many to dispute this very alleged experience itself. We *know* the effect of faithfully

ministering and witnessing to the eternal truths of the Bible and the Creeds in the power of the Holy Ghost. We see it in changed lives, evidences of saved souls—in earnest soul-seeking at home and missionary endeavour abroad. Is it equally beyond dispute that the effort to relieve sceptical minds by surrendering Bible truth about the Fall, the Nature and Work of our Lord, and other central doctrines, produces equal fruit of the Spirit, equal missionary zeal? This is a consideration of primary importance, for it touches the root of the only side of the apostolic appeal which the advocates of such a method can pretend to imitate. But the other side, which they cannot even pretend to follow, is yet more important. Experience, even if far more specious in appearance than this, is illusory if not backed and confirmed by the Word of God. It is easy to imagine what St. Paul or St. John would have said to those who claim to remain in the fold while throwing doubt on Christ's Deity, the necessity and efficacy of His Atonement, the reality of His Resurrection and His Return. In these earliest days of all, the days of the Jerusalem Council, these questions were not to the fore as others were—however soon they were, in some cases, to show themselves. In our generation the danger-point is here, and here must be the reservations—or shipwreck.

W. S. HOOTON.

[NOTE.—In order to avoid misunderstanding, it should be stated that this article was written and the MS. in the Editor's hands before the publication of recent articles treating the Jerusalem Council in somewhat similar fashion.—EDITOR.]

DR. HEADLAM has issued the last number of the *Church Quarterly Review* under his editorship. He has established such a high standard that it will be difficult for even Mr. Matthews and his King's College colleagues to maintain its excellence. The July number has two contributions from the Editor on Divorce and Arabia, and we should not be surprised to learn that the writer of *The Reign of Folly* is also the versatile Professor. If he is not, we hope the new Editorial Board will retain him on its staff. Mr. Gavin deals with contemporary life in the Greek Church, Mr. Conran writes on the Reports of the Archbishops' Committees of the National Mission and the Dean of Carlisle has many acute remarks in his short paper on Moral Theology. The late Archbishop of Melbourne describes Church Constitutions and the articles on Charlotte Mary Yonge and the Sutta are well balanced and informing. As usual the book reviews are well and carefully done.

HERBERT SPENCER ON "SOCIALISM THE COMING SLAVERY."

BY E. H. BLAKENEY, M.A.

IT is almost exactly a hundred years ago since Herbert Spencer was born, and he has been in his grave nearly twenty years. Do many read him to-day? Possibly not: *stat magni nominis umbra*. Yet time was when the opinions of "our great philosopher," as Darwin called him, were listened to with deference; his influence on the thought of his generation was admittedly greater than that of almost any other contemporary writer; but, since his death, that influence has so dwindled that his name is rarely mentioned in scientific or philosophical circles: "now none so poor to do him reverence." It is the penalty a distinguished man has often to pay for being over-estimated; and that he was over-estimated few will deny. The idol of the seventies is found now to have feet of clay, and it is smashed to pieces in consequence. So we read of certain pagan worshippers who, displeased with their deities, take them down and beat them for not responding to the worshippers' desires. It is a curious thing for people so to revenge themselves for their own folly and extravagance. But it may not be unbecoming to remark that the idol with feet of clay may have a head of gold, though the disillusioned devotee deems this gold to be, after all, but lead.

Spencer had his day: those that have succeeded him are having their day—and their vengeance. "So runs the course of life from hour to hour."

Nevertheless, if we consider the matter a little more closely, Spencer's influence cannot be so gaily discounted as it is the fashion to do in these times. He had faults of temper, faults of insight, faults of understanding; yet, in his fashion, he was a considerable man; and it is not to be assumed that his "wisdom"—irritating as its oracular tone might sometimes be—is fit only to be thrown into the limbo of forgotten audacities. There is an element of real and permanent value in his best work, not lightly to be disregarded. He has much to say, on political and kindred questions that now exercise and exacerbate champions on either side, which it is important for us to weigh, even when his views run directly

counter to the views of a dominant majority. We admit that the climate of thought has so changed since the Spencerian epoch that much of his most characteristic teaching is highly unpopular. But the popularity of opinions is no fixed criterion of their intrinsic worth.

It is not as a philosopher nor as a scientist, in the narrow sense that Spencer will ultimately be remembered, though his indirect influence on the world of thought ought not, in justice, to be minimized. He was not the mere sciolist that his enemies have represented him to be. His most abiding work may be found in his political and social discussions: such publications as *Social Statics*, *The Study of Sociology*, *Education*, and perhaps—above all—*The Man versus the State*, are his best title to fame. As a corrective to many of the false formulas and loose dogmatism that do duty for thought in our midst to-day, Spencer is not without real value. His prescience was sometimes remarkable, not least in his forecast of the trend of Socialism. He was an unbending individualist, and if he overstressed his doctrine, it must be admitted that recent events have fully justified those fears to which he courageously gave expression. Take, for example, this passage on the need for limiting State interference:—

“ Popular influence will inevitably go on increasing. Should the masses gain a predominant power, while their ideas of social arrangements and legislative action remain as crude as at present, there will certainly result disastrous meddlings with the relations of Capital and Labour, as well as a disastrous extension of State administrations. Immense damage will have been inflicted, primarily on employers; secondarily, on the employed; and eventually on the nation as a whole. If these evils can be prevented at all, they can be prevented only by establishing in the public mind that there are certain limits to the functions of the State, and that these limits ought on no account to be transgressed.”

These words were written sixty years ago, but the fundamental verity they imply holds good still.

Spencer's mistrust of current political fetichisms and easy economic nostrums—we have raised a notable crop of them since the year 1860—was constant. No one knew better than he the maleficent power of common catch-phrases—“ words, words, words ”—to impose upon an ignorant and gullible electorate. We are deluged with such phrases to-day; we tend to ascribe to them a

sort of supernatural efficiency which they certainly do not possess ; a cliché from over the water appears to have, for many, an ecumenical authority ; and the daily papers—nothing if not “ derivative ” in the thoughts they utter—enable such phrases to harden into totems.

There is no political superstition more rife in our midst than that State control will cure economic ills and social sores. “ Why does not Government intervene ? ” is a pretty continual cry, and the paid parrots of the press play upon the imaginations of their readers by their vain repetitions. The fact that State control (as opposed to private enterprise) has again and again proved a failure, produces little effect in the mentality of the devotees of this strange cult. Men of the type of Mr. Smillie demand with shrill insistence the nationalization of the coal mines—which is admittedly only a step towards a further demand for the nationalization of all industries. And this, despite the well-grounded belief that State interference is almost certain to achieve failure in the long run, owing to the wastefulness, slowness, and lack of imagination which are inherent in the official mind. All that is envisaged by these ardent advocates of bureaucratic control is the curing of some proximate evil ; the idea that some ultimate, and unforeseen, mischief may arise, sufficient to counterbalance, and more than counterbalance, the immediate evil, never appears to occur to them. It is a curious commentary on the persistence of human faith in the graven images they themselves—or their representatives—have erected. “ These be your Gods, O Israel.”

M. Guizot has justly spoken of “ that great delusion, a belief in the sovereign power of political machinery.” Indeed, we may term it the great superstition of our time—that, and the notion that all progress is in a straight line, and that regress has no qualifying part in the evolutionary process. Tennyson knew better, when he wrote (*Locksley Hall sixty years after*) :—

“ Evolution ever climbing after some ideal good,
And Reversion ever dragging Evolution in the mud.”

In point of fact the word “ progress,” as it is used by our light-hearted schemers of the present, is one of the least edifying words in the common vocabulary. Progress : yes, but whither ? how ? “ Let us hush this cry of ‘ Forward ’ till ten thousand years are done.” Herbert Spencer’s comment runs thus :—

“ A great service would be done by any man who would analyse the legislation, say of the last half century [this was written in 1865], and compare the expected results of Acts of Parliament with their proved results. He might make it an instructive revelation by simply taking all the preambles, and observing how many of the evils to be rectified were evils produced by preceding enactments. His chief difficulty would be that of getting within any moderate compass the immense number of cases in which the benefits anticipated were not achieved, while unanticipated disasters were caused. And then he might effectively close his digest by showing what immense advantages have followed the entire cessation of legislative action. Not indeed that such an accumulation of cases would have an appreciable effect on the average mind. Political fetichism will continue as long as men remain without scientific discipline . . . until the thing which now usurps the name of education has been dethroned by a true education.”

Again, in one of his later essays, he uses pregnant words, which our Socialists—blind worshippers of the Great Political Fetich—might do well to take seriously into account :—

“ The fanatical adherents of a social theory are capable of taking any measures, no matter how extreme, for carrying out their views¹; holding, like the merciless priesthood of past times, that the end justifies the means. And when a general socialistic organization has been established, the vast, ramified, and consolidated body of those who direct its activities, using without check whatever coercion seems to them needful in the interests of a system (which will practically become their own interests) will have no hesitation in imposing their rigorous rule over the entire lives of the actual workers; until, eventually, there is developed an official oligarchy, with its various grades, exercising a tyranny more gigantic and more terrible than any which the world has seen.”

Prophetic words! the wheel has well-nigh come full circle; and we see to-day, in the rule of Trades Unions in England—and, in a far more virulent form, in the Soviets of Russia—the establishment of the very despotism foreseen by Spencer. We are fast passing “ from freedom to bondage.”

Why is this? Surely because, in some occult fashion, the sense of justice is less vigorous than it was. Yet, as Spencer says, “ the root of all well-ordered social action is a sentiment of justice, which at once insists on personal freedom and is solicitous for the like freedom of others; and there at present exists but a very

¹ Burke's *Reflections on the French Revolution* is one long extended commentary on this plain statement.

inadequate amount of this sentiment." Here Spencer joins hands with the great prophets of Israel, to whom the idea of justice was a passion. Pure justice, in this distempered world, is perhaps unattainable; but the very thought of it ennobles and strengthens. The central truth at the heart of every great concept is like a flaming fire, approached but never attained.

One of the most incisive writers of our time, Dean Inge, very properly associates the pathetic but fallacious belief in a coming millennium wrought through the agency of administrative regimentation, with the general delusions of democracy. The rule of the democrat is merely another form of autocracy; it is the transference of power from the tyranny of the individual to the far worse tyranny of a machine-made majority.¹ "The corruption of democracies proceeds directly from the fact that one class imposes the taxes and another class pays for them." Under any tolerable monarchy, all men pay taxes; under democratic socialism one-tenth of the population pays five-sixths of the taxes. Justice hardly enters into the scheme, and perhaps it was never meant to do so. Justice *qua* justice is the last thing a modern democracy loves; what it aims at, under the camouflage of social reform, is to compel the good-for-somethings to work out the economic salvation of the good-for-nothings: it is the victory of sentimentality over reason. That is why democracies have been, and always will be, cruel at bottom; for sentimentality is a poor substitute for justice and righteousness. "Of all broken reeds," said Mr. Roosevelt in his Guildhall speech, "sentimentality is the most broken reed on which righteousness can lean"; and this simply because it is, in the inmost fibre of its being, self-deception. Democracy, as wise students of history are aware, is peculiarly subject to panic, and the spirit of panic is the spirit of cruelty.

To all criticism of past failures democracy turns a deaf ear.

¹ Aristotle observes that a democracy has many striking points of resemblance with tyranny: τὸ ἦθος τὸ αὐτὸ, καὶ ἀμφὶ δεσπορικὰ τῶν βελτιόνων, καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα ὡσπερ ἐκεῖ τὰ ἐπιτάγματα, καὶ ὁ δημαγωγὸς καὶ ὁ κόλαξ οἱ αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀνάλογον, κ.τ.λ. Cf. Burke, *Reflections*: "Of this I am certain, that in a democracy the majority of the citizens is capable of exercising the most cruel oppressions upon the minority; and that oppression of the minority will extend to far greater numbers, and will be carried on with far greater fury than can almost ever be apprehended from the dominion of a single sceptre." As Mr. Birrell cynically remarked once in the House of Commons: "Minorities must suffer—it is the badge of their tribe." Justice, we observe, may be a rare and refreshing fruit; but it is certainly rare.

“This time, at least, we shall make no such blunders as the past can show,” is the invariable retort. Hear Spencer again :—

“The welfare of a society and the justice of its arrangements are dependent on the character of its [individual] members ; and improvement in neither can take place without that improvement in character which results from carrying on peaceful industry under the restraints imposed by an orderly social life. The belief that, by due skill, an ill-working humanity may be framed into well-working institutions is a delusion. There is no political alchemy by which you can get golden conduct out of leaden instincts.”

The truth is there, in a nutshell. Christianity, rightly applied, can alone solve the problem, because it alone has adequately declared that social reform can only come through an inward regeneration of the individual heart.¹

Meddling legislation has been the bane of this country. We have witnessed its disastrous effects, but the calm verdict of history has small power of appeal, despite the known truth that such meddling is but “a proposal to improve life by breaking through the fundamental conditions to life.” Nowhere is this more clearly seen than in the never-ceasing efforts of Trades Unions and other similar agencies in pressing forward the demand for legislation, and ever more legislation. Not that way lies the true cure for the disease in the body politic. We do not reach heaven by piling Pelion upon Ossa. We have witnessed in Russia, during the past three years, a complete reversal of order, justice, decency and good faith, in the demoniac effort to achieve, through legislative enactment, changes that can be brought to pass only by the slow processes of economic and social growth. If the old system was defective—and defective it was—the new is infinitely worse, and the misery increases. Have we not once again before us an example of the poignant truth that to the impatience of the idealist are

¹ I fear that the major part of Socialism—the genuine article, not that mixture which is known as Christian Socialism—is profoundly anti-Christian (see Belfort Bax, *Religion of Socialism* ; Capero and Reclus, preface to *God and the State*) ; indeed how can it be otherwise, for the living kernel of the creed is injustice ? State Socialism, says Mr. D. M. Panton, is the ideal of the sensuous, worldly man ; the Utopia of unbelief dressed in arguments of economic wisdom.

due most of the tragic miscarriages of history? ¹ Revolution is rarely a final and positive cure for political or social evils; it ends in devouring its own offspring. Only when a gangrene has become so deeply embedded into the vitals of the state that the knife and cautery must be used, are such desperate remedies tolerable; and even then the proximate benefits achieved always have within them the seeds of unsuspected reactions. It is not by socialistic schemes, however rosy in the eyes of their makers, not by revolutionary violence, however necessary in the heated imaginations of its contrivers, but by the gradual and orderly adjustment of internal to external relations that the balance of benefits is finally and firmly secured to the community at large. The end of all true government lies in the freedom of the governed.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

¹ "Political arrangement, as it is a work for social ends, is to be wrought only by social means. There time must conspire with mind. Time is required to produce that union of minds which alone can produce all the good we aim at. Our patience will achieve more than our force" (Burke, *Reflections*).

SERVICE AND PERSEVERANCE. By the Hon. Mrs. Corfield, O.B.E.
London: *Robert Scott*. 3s. net.

Mrs. Corfield has had a wide experience in addressing meetings in connection with the Mothers' Union. She is the President for the diocese of Bath and Wells, and formerly conducted an exceptionally large Branch when her husband was Vicar of the Derbyshire mining parish of Heanor. She is also Divisional Commissioner of Girl Guides in the County of Somerset and is much in request as a speaker. In this book she has given the substance of some of her addresses. In addition there is an interesting chapter dealing with well-known people she has met. The Bishop of Bath and Wells wrote a commendatory preface. The subjects dealt with are (1) "Examples of Men and Women," (2) Self-Sacrifice, (3) Duty and Love, (4) Fellowship in Service, (5) Citizenship. It is an inspiring book though written in simple language. Many speakers to women make the sad mistake of condemning faults, instead of showing the attractiveness of virtue. Those who have heard Mrs. Corfield give these addresses must have gone away with an earnest longing to live nobler, purer, more unselfish and more useful lives. There is a distinct "pull" heavenwards in the chapters. There are four illustrations, including one of her early home, Castle Wemyss, on the Clyde.

UNSPOKEN TESTIMONIES.

BY THE REV. HENRY L. BLEBY.

THERE is an exceptionally interesting line of study, rich in suggestion for thought, which presents itself to us if we put aside, for the moment, the words spoken by contemporaries of our Lord and by His Apostles, to investigate the teaching, the view point, and the beliefs which are implied in the attitude they adopted and the actions they took in various instructive instances. The evidence which these afford us is not without a peculiar value of its own. It is free from that inadequacy inevitably appertaining to any expression, in mere human speech, of things transcending our human limitations. It does not offer ambiguity and uncertainty of language as an opportunity to those who will to "wrest . . . Scriptures" (2 Pet. iii. 16). It is to a large extent free from complication by questions of textual criticism. It is not as readily obnoxious to the attacks of Higher Critical controversy as are arguments which depend directly upon terms of expression. Further, we hope that the following examples will show that the results are singularly cogent and convincing. We must notice that unspoken testimony is most frequently also quite undesigned.

TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE MIRACULOUS.

Let us select as our first illustrative examples the actions of our Lord's enemies upon certain important occasions. The opposition of the Jewish authorities to the Prophet from Galilee developed a new and acute phase with the controversy which arose when Jesus wrought His miracle at Bethesda on the Sabbath day (John v. 16). Are we not at once confronted with the question: What did this activity of the rulers of Jerusalem mean, unless a miraculous healing really had occurred? Is not their sudden access of fresh vindictive opposition more eloquent than any protestation, more conclusive than any verbal argument, in confirming the miraculous story which precedes it? Furthermore, the deputation of "the Scribes which came down from Jerusalem" (Mark iii. 22), who from that time with hostile intent dogged the footsteps of the Christ, seem to have been intent at first upon this now prominent question of Sabbath

observance, and to have taken the earliest opportunity on their arrival in Galilee to open their attack upon this line. They seized an immediate opportunity presented by the action of Christ's disciples in plucking and husking the ears of corn (Matt. xii. 1-8); and this was followed by a test case in which they deliberately challenged Him in the synagogue, as to the propriety of His exercising healing powers on the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 10). What an admission of His miracles is implied in the fact of this challenge, and how far is such an admission from their intentions! Nor is it the challenge alone. Their whole action on this occasion, and their plan for bringing an accusation against Him, depended upon a knowledge that He did indeed exercise such powers. Their watch was to see if He would, not if He could, heal. Here we find that their attitude affords us another altogether convincing proof that the miraculous accompaniments of His mission were not the exaggerations of favourably disposed advocates, nor the superstitions of an excited and uncritical audience, but realities which compelled the unspoken acknowledgment of hostile authorities.

The High Priests and Rulers of the Jews, when negotiating with Pilate, carefully guarded their speech and disdainfully termed our Lord "*ἐκείνος ὁ πλάνος*" (Matt. xxvii. 63). But the fact that they sought for authority to seal the tomb and place a guard furnishes most conclusive evidence of a disturbing consciousness that in dealing with the Nazarene they were liable to meet occurrences beyond the ordinary and natural.

We submit that all this is valid evidence of the most reliable sort for the miracles of our Lord. Moreover it is contemporary evidence, carrying us right back beyond the possibility of any allegation that the miraculous element is a later accretion to the Gospel narrative, growing from the fond adulations of devoted reverence.

CONCERNING SOME POINTS IN THE CHARACTER OF JESUS.

Let us now look at some small incidents in which the actions of those who are connected with Jesus Christ are evidence for points in His wonderful and beautiful character.

The hesitation of John the Baptist in being the ministrant of baptism to our Lord (Matt. iii. 14)—a hesitation and witness occurring before the descent of the Holy Dove, which first revealed to

John the Messiahship of Jesus (John i. 33)—must have arisen from some knowledge of His holiness of character. It therefore throws a flood of light back upon those earlier years of which no account is given us in the Gospels. Most impressive is the unpremeditated attitude of the great Preacher of Repentance to the Sinless One.

The request of the man who came to Jesus with a mistaken plea for judgment between himself and his brother (Luke xii. 13) seems to certainly imply a public reputation for acumen and justice in dealing.

The over-hasty reply of Peter with regard to the payment by our Lord of the "δίδραχμα" (Matt. xvii. 24-27) must surely represent what seemed to him the obvious conclusion from our Lord's habitual attitude towards the temple and religious observances. Very often the record of gainsaying and opposition by the religious authorities so occupy the forefront of the Gospel narrative that they preclude an adequate view of things we would fain have studied more deeply. On this account there is very great value even in the record of Peter's mistake, since it shows us what impression was being made upon those who saw the ordinary daily exercise of the Master's attitude towards the religious organizations of His day.

It is possible that the dispatch, by Martha, of a messenger to Jesus informing Him of the illness of Lazarus may have been prompted largely by the hope of a miraculous cure, but it certainly seems to indicate a knowledge that there was deep and understanding sympathy in One whose presence was longed and called for in a time of stress and anxiety.

There can be no doubt that Zacchæus knew something of Jesus by repute: otherwise he would hardly have taken so much trouble to obtain a sight of Him. The events which took place in the house of Zacchæus may indicate some elements in this public reputation. It is clear that in his profession of charitable beneficence and restoration (Luke xix. 8) it was his intention to gratify his Guest; and we must conclude that he knew the character of Jesus to be such as would be pleased by altruism and reparation.

We see then in the above, wordless witness to the Holiness, Justice, Piety, Sympathy, Altruism and Equity of the Man of Nazareth.

Leaving the Gospels, let us now take further examples chosen

from the events recorded in the book of "Acts." This book furnishes us with evidence of the manner in which the Apostles understood the commission given to them and the Church : how they exercised the gifts, prerogatives and graces with which they were endowed. It is a divinely inspired commentary on Matthew xvi. 19, xviii. 18 ; John xx. 23. The powers conveyed on these occasions are seen in practical application in the hands of the Apostles themselves. The actions taken by them under various circumstances bear testimony to their beliefs and attitude of mind. We shall do well therefore to consider these with the greatest care.

CONCERNING THE DIVINITY AND THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

We find it recorded in the first chapter of Acts that in the interval between the ascension of our Lord and the day of Pentecost, the thought occurred to St. Peter that it would be proper for the assembled disciples to appoint a successor who should fill the vacant position in the Apostolic band. (It is not necessary, for our present purpose, to enter upon any discussion concerning the vexed question as to the rightfulness of their action upon this occasion. It is sufficient that as a matter of fact such an election took place.) The most arresting feature of the transaction appears to be that, when proceeding to find an occupant for one vacancy, *they made no attempt to fill the greatest vacancy of all.* On the basis of a Rationalistic or a Unitarian view of the person of Jesus there can be no satisfactory explanation of the omission by the Apostles (assembled for the very purpose of election) to take the obvious course of appointing a new leader for the bereaved band in place of the Carpenter of Nazareth. If we acknowledge that they apprehended the true divinity of the Master ; if we believe that they had experienced "many infallible proofs" of His actual bodily resurrection, so that there was not any real vacancy because the risen Christ is the Head of His Church ; if we accept the story of the visible bodily ascension into heaven : then the inaction of the Apostles was inevitable, and so natural that we are in danger of overlooking its vast significance. But if, on the other hand, we suppose that the Apostles knew no divinity in Jesus Christ, that they had not indubitable evidence of His return from the tomb : then their attitude upon this occasion would become an insoluble enigma. Here, then, within two months of the crucifixion, before

there could be time for any alleged accretions to the historical narrative, before any possibility of a Pauline—or other—development modifying an earlier simpler non-miraculous story, we see that the convictions of the original witnesses are definite and in accord, and so unhesitating that neither the possibility of a successor to the Master, nor the idea of the existence of a vacancy occurred to any one of the assembled company.

CONCERNING DIRECT SPIRITUAL WORK.

At the present juncture, when the relative importance of " Social Service " on the one hand, and direct evangelization and spiritual edification on the other hand, is a matter of much debate, there seems to be a peculiar importance in studying the lesson which may be found in the action of the Apostles in delegating to " The Seven " those duties which were concerned with the administration of church funds and relief of the poor. That the Apostles considered " Social Service " a necessary part of church work is clear from the provision they made for it to be effectively carried out. That they regarded it as a high grade of Christian activity cannot be gainsaid when we note the type of men to whom it was entrusted. That they even recognized it as a definitely, though indirectly, spiritual ministrations, we gather from the choice for these duties of men " full of the Holy Ghost." Yet, in contrast with this, the action of the Apostles is not less eloquent than the words of the passage (Acts vi. 2) in teaching us that to " give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word " is a higher commission, which we should not do well to subordinate to its accessories of bodily provision for the needs, or (softly be it spoken) even the amusements of the brethren.

CONCERNING THE PRIESTHOOD.

We must now consider the attitude of the Apostles in its bearing upon a question of fundamental importance to our view of the Christian ministry. The subject is suggested by the startling and effective argument put forward by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. viii. 4), that the Aaronic priesthood still occupied the ground during Apostolic times, to the exclusion of the possibility of any other sacrificing priesthood upon earth: even rendering impossible the mundane exercise of such an office by the Divine

Head of the Church Himself. It becomes then of the greatest moment that we should investigate the attitude of the Apostles to the priestly functions and the position of the Aaronic line during the period covered by the inspired record. (We are tempted to pursue the question further, and to ask whether even the destruction of the Temple, and the suspension of the Mosaic sacrificial ritual, could so far modify the situation as to make possible a second valid hierarchy, even in later times. But this lies beyond the scope of our present considerations.)

Perhaps we should be unfair if we insisted on an argument that the continued frequent use of the title "ἱερεὺς" was anything more than a conforming to popular usage in the term employed. Yet it is not without suggestion that the functions and exclusive rights of the priesthood still belonged to those who were thus described.

What first claims our attention in this connection is, that the Apostles, in common with the other members of the primitive Jerusalem Church, made use of the Temple and its ministrations for their daily worship at the Jewish hours of prayer. (Acts ii. 42. Note the use of the article, ii. 46, iii. 1.)

We must not take it for granted that the recognition of the High Priest and Chief Priests, by the Apostles, when brought before them for trial, was more than an acceptance of their position as *de facto* judges; although we are ourselves convinced that it did go beyond this. But when we turn to examine the attitude of St. Paul to the High Priest, at his trial (Acts xxiii. 2-5), the case is very different, for we find that while administering a rebuke to his unjust judge, he afterwards apologizes to the same man as High Priest. It would be wholly disingenuous exegesis which could find in this anything but an acceptance of a still existing authority and sanctity, belonging to the then holder of the High Priestly office.

Our most convincing evidence in this connection is afforded by the incidents recorded in Acts xxi. 19-27. Here we find St. Paul, St. James, and a number of the "πρεσβυτέρους" of the Church at Jerusalem, all in agreement in availing themselves of the sacerdotal functions of the Temple priests. It seems impossible that the course here pursued should have been taken by men who knew themselves to be "ἱερεῖς," the successors of and substitutes for the Aaronic priesthood. Neither would the situation harmonize well with even

a position of equal and temporarily overlapping co-ordinate functions, even were it possible to entertain such an idea. We cannot escape from the dilemma by suggestion of latent powers which should come into full activity with later developments ; for whatever of priesthood is (according to sacerdotal theories) necessarily associated with the Lord's Supper and the rite of Ordination was certainly in exercise during the whole of this period. Since we see, therefore, that the Apostles by their attitude and action bear unspoken testimony, more convincing than any verbal statement, to the continued validity of the Aaronic priesthood, unless we frankly admit the truth that Christian priests are "πρεσβυτέρου," not "ιερείς," we are shut down to the following alternatives : either we must accept the theory of a dual, co-existing, valid hierarchy upon earth (with all the difficulties this involves, including a rejection of the teaching of the epistle to the Hebrews), or we must try to explain away somehow the hiatus at the commencement, which of itself is quite fatal to any later validity of a sacerdotal order.

HENRY L. BLEBY.

THE SOURCE OF POWER.

SYMBOLS OF THE HOLY GHOST. Outline addresses by Canon W. H. Cole, M.A., Vicar of Aston. Birmingham: *Midland Educational Co.*, 6d.

Birmingham is holding this year a "Mission of the Holy Spirit." These outline addresses by the Vicar of Aston have been published to give suggestions and helps to those who desire to speak or preach on the subject. The symbols dealt with are Fire, Dove, Water and Dew, Oil, Wind, and Seal. The teaching is clear, vigorous and scriptural, and the appeals are truly pointed and searching. Illustrations from nature and the Bible abound. The country has no greater need to-day than that the Church should experience a second Pentecost. Clergy, therefore, who awaken their people to a consciousness of the work and Person of the Holy Spirit on the lines of Canon Cole's pamphlet are doing a great work, and there is no need to wait until Whitsuntide before speaking on the subject. We recommend these addresses for an autumn or Lent course.

F. M.

EARLY CHRISTIANITY OF IRELAND.¹

III

ST. COLUMBANUS—A.D. 543-615.

BY THE REV. S. HARVEY GEM, M.A.

COLUMBANUS was born in Leinster about the year A.D. 543 : it is interesting to note that in this very year Benedict of Monte Cassino, the great founder of the monastic system which bears his name, died.

Columbanus studied in various monasteries in Ireland, and, as has been already stated, a very high education was then given in the Irish schools of learning, and not only in theological knowledge, but in many other branches of study. The following passage is quoted from Moore's *History of Ireland*, by Smith and Wace, under the heading "Columbanus": "The writings of this eminent man display a varied and extensive acquaintance, not merely with ecclesiastical, but with classical literature. From a passage in his letter to Pope Boniface, it appears that he had some acquaintance with both the Greek and Hebrew languages, and when it is recollected that he did not leave Ireland till he was over forty years of age, and that his life afterwards was one of constant activity and adventure, the conclusion is obvious that all his knowledge of elegant literature must have been acquired in the schools of his own country." Such a result from a purely Irish education in the middle of the sixth century is not a little remarkable.

He remained in his own country till about the same period of his life at which the great Columba had emigrated, and then he sailed, with twelve companions, for the coast of France to enter on a missionary career. Avoiding those parts of the country which were already Christian and civilized, he settled with his small band in the wild mountains of the Vosges, where the former Roman civilization had been crushed, and where towns in ruins were girt with dense forests. One of these, Anagratis, was his first choice, and there a monastic establishment sprang up. But the holy man decided to retire into more complete solitude. Seven miles off he

¹ Previous articles in this series appeared in the *CHURCHMAN* of January and July last.

found a cave, of which the only tenant was a bear. The Irish saint succeeded in evicting the bear without any unpleasant consequences on either side, and indeed it is said that the wolves and bears, and the hardly less wild natives, revered the presence of the saintly monk.

Many aspirants to a better life gathered round him, and soon he founded another monastery on the ruins of the Roman town Luxovium. "The forest around was strewn with marble statues, and magnificent vestiges of the old Pagan worship."¹ On this wreck of heathenism rose the monastery of Luxeuil, which became the parent of several others in his own day, and of a vast number of the French monasteries in after days. At Anegray, at Luxeuil, at Fontenay, forests were cleared, trees felled, and the lands ploughed by hands so often lifted up in prayer, and all acting in obedience to one head. Franks and heathen alike were deeply moved by this mysterious union of the life of heaven with beneficent earthly toil, and hundreds crowded round to receive religious instruction.

The rule of Columbanus was severer than that of Benedict. Whether this was a wise arrangement may perhaps be doubted. However, the intention of the author of it was altogether noble. Columbanus was far too spiritual to teach his disciples to over-value externals as compared with inward piety. "Again and again," says Maclear,² "he reminds them that true religion consists not in the outward humility of the body, but of the heart. He himself ever set them a worthy example. At once practical and contemplative, he would work as hard as the best of them in clearing the waste, and then he would penetrate into the deepest recesses of the forest, there to read and meditate on the Scriptures, which he always carried with him. On Sundays and high festivals he would seek some secluded spot and devote himself entirely to prayer and meditation, and so prepare for celebrating the holy services of the day without distraction. 'Whosoever overcomes himself,' he was wont to say, 'treads the world under foot. *No one who spares himself can really hate the world.* If Christ be truly in us we cannot live to ourselves: if we have conquered ourselves we have conquered all things. Let us die unto ourselves, let us live in Christ, that Christ may live in us.'"

¹ Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 48.

² Maclear, *Apostles of Mediæval Europe*, p. 62.

For twenty years, we are told, Columbanus carried on this peaceful yet laborious life. But troubles were at hand. There were to be troubles with the Church, and troubles with the world.

The Gallican clergy were annoyed with him for setting a higher standard than they had themselves kept up. Again, they were irritated by his retention of the customs of the Celtic Church, such as the Irish tonsure, and the Irish time of keeping Easter. Several Bishops of the Frankish Church decided to hold a synod with a view to condemning his practices. He wrote to them a letter, of which the following words are an extract.

“ I came as a stranger amongst you,” he says, “ in behalf of our common Lord and Master Jesus Christ. In His name, I beseech you, let me live in peace and quiet, as I have lived for twelve years in these woods beside the bones of my seventeen departed brethren. Let France receive into her bosom all who, if they deserve it, will meet in one heaven. For we have one Kingdom promised us, we have one hope of our calling in Christ, with whom we shall reign together if we suffer with Him on earth. Choose ye which rule ye will respecting Easter, remembering the words of the Apostle, ‘ Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.’¹ Let us not quarrel with one another, lest our enemies, the Jews, heretics, and heathen, rejoice in our contention.” Then he concludes, “ Pray for us, even as we, humble as we are, pray for you. Regard us not as strangers, for we are members together of one Body, whether we be Gauls or Britons, or Iberians, or to whatever nation we belong. Therefore, let us all rejoice in the knowledge of the faith, and in the revelation of the Son of God, and let us strive earnestly to attain together unto a perfect man :² ‘ unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ,’ in communion with Him let us learn to love one another and pray for one another, that with Him we may together reign for evermore.”

Columbanus might have hoped to escape attacks from members of the Church of God ; he could not expect, nor did he expect, to please the world. The mother of the young king of that part of France was an atrociously wicked woman, who encouraged her son in evil. Our Saint behaved like a second St. John the Baptist, but he was eventually obliged to yield to force, was torn from his beloved Luxeuil and sent into exile. He betook himself to Switzer-

¹ 2 Thess. v. 21.

² Eph. iv. 13.

land and preached the Gospel to the fierce heathen on the shores of the lakes of Zurich and Constance. Into the details of his efforts we have not now time to follow him, but must not omit to notice that one of his companions, Callech, an Irish monk, whose name was changed to Gallus, took a distinguished part in this mission, and all who know Switzerland will remember him to this day as St. Gall. After a while Columbanus and Gallus were driven from the neighbourhood of Zurich, owing to venturesome attacks which they made on heathen customs. Often it was a good plan and succeeded well for one or two monks to fall upon the heathen idols with axes, and to cut them down, for it showed to the awestruck crowds who gathered round the powerlessness of their gods to defend themselves, and consequently the folly of trusting in them for protection. But on this occasion Columbanus went too far. In the spirit of a modern teetotaller he broke a vat of beer which was going to be used for a festival in honour of Woden. This proved too much for the heathen Suevi, and the missionaries were driven out. They betook themselves to the lake of Constance and founded a monastery, clearing the forest round it. Gallus was a great fisherman: he made nets, and provided thereby the food of the monks. An interesting legend connects itself with his efforts to catch both fish and men. It runs as follows: "One night," we are told, "while he was engaged in fishing, he heard the Spirit of the Mountain call to the Spirit of the Waters, 'Arise, and hasten to my assistance. Behold, strangers have come and driven me from my temple. Hasten to my aid, and help me to expel them from the land!' To whom replied the Spirit of the Waters, 'Lo, even now one of them is busy on my surface, but I cannot injure him. Oftentimes have I desired to break his nets, but as often have I been baffled by the invocation of an all-prevailing Name, which never fails to cross his lips. Thus defended, he always escapes my snares.' Gallus shuddered at this unearthly dialogue, but quickly crossing himself, addressed the spirits, 'I adjure you in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye depart from this place, and never venture to injure any one any more.' He recounted to the abbot what he had heard, who rejoiced at this manifest proof that even the spirits were subject unto the brethren."

Later on Columbanus went over into Italy, St. Gallus remaining in Switzerland, and the former betook himself to the court of Agilulf,

King of the Lombards, from whom he received a hearty welcome. Agilulf gave him the territory of Bobbio, a valley in the mountains between Genoa and Milan. Here he remained and founded a monastery, and died at the age of seventy-two, A.D. 615. It is interesting to know that Bobbio became a considerable school of learning, and that the monastery founded in this remote age lasted until the beginning of the nineteenth century.

On being driven from Luxeuil, Columbanus addressed a letter to the brethren, making a special address to his intended successor Attalus. This interesting record is quoted at some length by Montalembert¹—the few closing sentences, which the enthusiastic Montalembert designates as some of the finest and proudest words which Christian genius has ever produced, are as follows:

“ I had at first meant to write thee a letter of sorrow and tears, but knowing well that thy heart is overwhelmed with cares and labours, I have changed my style, I have sought rather to dry thy tears than to call them forth. I have permitted only quietude to be seen outside, and have chained down grief in the depths of my soul. But my own tears begin to flow; I must drive them back, for it does not become a good soldier to weep in front of the battle. After all, this that has happened to us is nothing new. Is it not what we have preached every day? Was there not of old a philosopher wiser than the others, who was thrown into prison for maintaining, against the opinion of all, that there was but one God? The Gospels also are full of all that is necessary to encourage us. They were written for that purpose, to teach the true disciples of Christ crucified to follow Him, bearing their Cross. Our perils are many; the struggle which threatens us is severe, and the enemy terrible; but the recompense is glorious, and the freedom of our choice is manifest. Without adversaries, no conflict, and without conflict, no crown. Where the struggle is, there is courage, vigilance, fervour, patience, fidelity, wisdom, firmness, prudence; out of the fight, misery and disaster. Thus then, without war, no crown! While I write they come to tell me that the ship is ready—the end of my parchment obliges me to finish my letter. Pray for me, my dear ones, that I may live in God.”

S. HARVEY GEM.

¹ *Les Moines d'Occident*, vol. II.

THE AGENT OF GOD.

SOME THOUGHTS ON HIS POSITION AND TRAINING.

BY THE REV. J. GORDON HAYES, M.A., Vicar of St. Andrew, Radcliffe; sometime Civil Engineer.

INTRODUCTORY.

THE principal purpose of the Christian ministry is the propagation of the Gospel. This mighty object might have been left to the "natural" production of spirit by spirit, but it was not. It seems little enough to expect every Christian to bring one other to Christ, yet even in the apostolic age this was not done. If it had been done the whole world would have been converted in thirty years. But "official" agencies were also appointed, and it is these which must be mainly responsible for the success or failure of the Christian Church. Unofficial agents have probably accomplished more than we know, but man cannot handle them. We are able to deal with the organized ministry, and thus it seemed advisable to reconsider its purpose and equipment in the light of the present, and as much as lieth in us with an open mind. The standpoint of the writer is that of the Church of England, but he has endeavoured to treat the subject with freedom, and with as little prejudice and preconception as possible. It was deemed well to be unhampered by practical considerations until assured of what was desirable. The means of realizing the ideal follow of necessity.

The use of a new term for the "official" minister was felt to be expedient, in order to lift the mind out of its old associations. The term "Agent" is chosen to denote all whose lives are to be devoted to the service of Christ, primarily those in preparation for the ministry, but also clergy generally. The word "servant" seems a fairly colourless synonym in connexion with the subject.

NEED OF ADAPTATION.

The late Bishop of St. Albans wrote, in reference to the freshness of Pastoral Theology, that "the conditions of life and work vary so greatly that the man who simply uses old methods, and fails to understand the generation in which He lives, will fail to touch

many who are capable of being won and converted into active workers for the Master." ¹

This is scientifically true. The life of any organism depends upon its power of adaptation to its environment. And adaptation is a biological necessity for human institutions, political and religious. The Church, which can only remain the Church of Christ by the conservation of its original spiritual principles, because they are its life, is yet dependent for its continuity upon the adaptability of its non-essential or external elements to the changing world in which it has to live. In so far as the Church awakens to this fact, and adapts, not its doctrine, which is Divine and hence eternal, but its human methods of propagating its beliefs, to the conditions which surround it, so far and so far only, will its life and usefulness continue and extend.

FUNCTION OF ORGANIZATION.

Turning back to the work of our Lord and His apostles we find the necessity for organization admitted, but only in strict subordination to the work of God in the souls of men, and obviously to this end, as matter is to spirit. And as most human affairs fail because they violate Divine order, so the Church is, and has ever been, in danger from the usurpation of its mechanical methods to a position of authority over the soul. The function of organization is in reality extremely limited. The world is not going to be saved by it. No political or religious organization can of itself do anything, its use depends entirely upon the spirit which animates it. The living force of Christianity is the Spirit of God. Human systems, however perfect at their inceptions, always fail somewhere, sooner or later. Hence it is futile to trust to them. But everything has its use, and if the Church is to make any arrangements whatever for carrying on its Divinely appointed mission, it should do so, under the guidance of God, by the full use of its reasoning powers. Then, after having given the fullest consideration to the subject, reliance should be placed not upon the work of its own hands, but upon Him who alone can give the increase.

PROVINCE OF PREPARATION.

Long ages before the creation of man his benevolent Creator was laying the foundations of the human habitation. The physical

¹ Preface to *The Pastoral Idea* (J. T. Inskip).

needs of the future occupants were being prepared in the carboniferous forests. While our spiritual necessities had been provided for, even in that "timeless state before the dawn of life," in the Lamb that was slain *before* the foundation of the world.

The need for careful preparation is in proportion to the importance of the ultimate work to be done. First must be found the means which are most likely to be suited to the execution of the work, and then the required instruments must be adequately prepared for their functions. The Church does not appear to have realized either the magnitude or the exact quality of the preparation necessary for properly carrying out its own work. Before a pianoforte, an engine, or a gun can be made, special tools have to be constructed, often large and intricate machines, with which to produce these or whatever objects are desired. And usually much greater skill, labour and time are required for the production of the tool than in the use of it, when made, for the manufacture of the finished article. When the proper tools are prepared the ultimate object is assured, and continuously so. Hence "toolmakers" or the engineers who make machines, etc., are the indispensable preliminaries to all manufacturing.

Furthermore, that which is finally produced depends entirely upon the species and quality of the tool and the character of the operator. But an ideal operator could not drill holes with a saw, or make a casting in a pattern shop. He must have exactly the implements which the work demands, and they must be good ones of their kind, if good work is to be produced. There is no greater fallacy, even among proverbs, than the one relating to bad workmen and their tools.

Transfer the illustration to its application. The work to be done is the building of the Temple of God, the material to be used is humanity, the Grand Architect is God. He has ordained that human workmen, endued with His Spirit, shall erect the sacred edifice. And He has amply shown how much preparation is required, and of what kind, in the Scriptures. The classical instance is Israel, the Servant of Jehovah, chosen, as is the Church, for the salvation of the world, or perhaps more correctly, as His witness to all men. Consider the selection of Abram, as one who would obey Him; note His patient training of that patriarch's character and that of his son, grandson and their children. The careful

forming of the individual to give the correct character to the race which was to serve Him. Consider Moses who was given eighty years' training for forty years' service. The first half of his preparation being among men and the second alone with God.

It is the same with all the agents whom God prepared, many years being spent in carefully fashioning His instruments for their appointed tasks. It is by no means a case where haphazard or empirical methods will do. To return to our illustrations; if so much care is requisite to prepare the instruments for producing merely inanimate objects, how much more must be necessary before an agent is fit to handle immortal souls? And if the result is to be regulated by the quality of the tool, what consideration can be deemed excessive if its object be to fashion the agent who is to control, humanly speaking, the destiny of the race? Agencies for training the agents of God are the tool-making establishments without which His Kingdom cannot be extended in this present age; and only in so far as they produce the right instruments can the blessed work be carried out. Once, however, the precise character of the work is ascertained and instruments are specifically formed for performing it, their utilization is a relatively simple matter. Not that the most perfectly prepared instrument never fails, but that it has no excuse for doing so; whereas an improperly prepared one is a blunt tool which cannot be expected to do its work. The failure of Israel, as the agent of God for the conversion of the world, was culpable on this account. And should the Church of Christ, God's new agent, likewise fail, would it not be even more blameworthy than Israel?

When God has had important work to be done by human agency we always find that He has gone to considerable trouble to prepare His instrument for it. Particular attention is directed to this, because the writer feels that our chief cause of failure lies just here. A certain course of mental training is assumed to be all the qualification required for our clergy, and the result is that the Church can hardly keep pace with a declining birth-rate. It is like a locomotive with insufficient power to move *its own* weight. At present we do not even consider the facts of the case, or the elements with which we have to deal. Too many indeed cannot even see their importance when they are pointed out to them, because their minds are not adjusted to the relative importance of relative facts. The

result of any adequate examination of the subject should be to see that the training at present given is not that which the case requires. As the quality of the work will be conditioned entirely by the quality of the agent, it is absolutely essential to find out what qualities are needed for the work of God among men. It must then be considered how these qualities may best be cultivated.

THE QUALITY OF THE AGENT.

Throughout the organic kingdom the character of each organ is found to have been formed strictly for the functions it is its business to perform. This should be the law of the spiritual kingdom also. The agency by which the Church is extended must be conditioned by the elements, human and divine, which are concerned. For the development of His kingdom among men in this age God has ordained human instruments, their nature being fixed by that of God and of man. This two-fold character of the agent of God is seen under ideal conditions in the blessed nature of our Saviour, who was perfect God and perfect man because both were essential for the reconciliation of God and man. It is encouraging to reflect that the need of being partakers of the divine nature has been maintained by the Church, at least in theory, in nearly all ages ; but the equal necessity of possessing a perfect and complete humanity is to this day almost entirely forgotten. The human side may not be so noble as the divine, but it is perhaps equally important in this matter of Christian service, from the nature of the case. Both are essential, correspondence with both environments, the spiritual and the material ; man's appointed place in the universe being under the rule of God yet set over the other works of His hands upon earth. The success of the agent, therefore, will depend upon both divine and human qualities. " But that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual." The divine shoot is grafted upon the human stem, when root and stem, both works of God, have been remodelled according to His will.

THE HUMAN ASPECT.

On calling fishermen to follow Him our Lord promised to make them " fishers of men." Is it too much to assume that His agents should be such in all ages ? If not, and if they are to have

any human training for their work, it should surely be regulated by the character of the creatures to be caught. Men do not become fishers by learning how to shoot, nor by studying the habits of game but of fish. The fundamental need of the Christian agent on the human side, therefore, is knowledge of men. But what is man?

Man is primarily and principally an active agent, and nine-tenths of humanity are almost exclusively so. Their one great business is to live. Very few know *how* they live, or the part played by reason, emotion, or will; but this does not make any material difference, for their practical knowledge of life is quite sufficient for their purpose, and one might add for their happiness also. Dr. Illingworth bases his argument for the reasonableness of faith upon this fact, that man is made for action. Reason is the means, but living the end. And he points out that those who live by their dealings with men-in-the-concrete possess an intuitive knowledge of humanity which cannot be tabulated but which works in actual practice. It is by this practical knowledge that the great world of politics, commerce, finance, etc., is conducted. What of religion? Is it the great and only exception?

“Now Christianity . . . deals with man in the concrete, as an active agent who has to realize himself in the experience of life. And moreover it deals with him more completely in the concrete than any other influence can do, for it involves . . . his entire personality in all its relations . . . man in his entire context.”¹

The character of God's human agent should be nothing less than this; his personality must be complete in its “entire context.” He must correspond with the whole, and not merely with a part of his proper environment. He has the highest motive for doing so, the glory of his Master. On the Divine side he must preserve continuous communion with his God, and on the human side with his fellow-men. The former maintains his savour as salt of the earth, the latter uses it. Otherwise how can he expect to deal successfully with those for whose salvation he exists? If he is a “smaller man” than others, he can sway no influence over them, but on the contrary they have the advantage over him. He needs all the great qualities that make up complete manhood, and in particular he must have that indefinable, and characteristic-

¹ *Reason and Revelation.*

ally British, *practical ability*, because this is the one great faculty possessed by nearly all our countrymen. We are not an intellectual or artistic race as a whole, but men of action, the Romans of the modern world. The race which by its manly virtues and knowledge of human nature, by its opportunism and tact, has acquired a world-wide empire "in a fit of absence of mind" is the last in the world to be influenced very much by pure scholars or by any who are devoid of its great national characteristics. Without such it is impossible to handle the English for any purpose. The agent of God must be an entire man.

TWO STAGES IN TRAINING.

There should therefore be two well-defined stages in the preparation of the humano-divine agent. The first or foundation, is the making of the man.¹ Upon this the second part or superstructure of the agent proper should be built. Hitherto the Church officially has given no consideration whatever to the making of foundations. It has built upon whatever happened to exist, like a "shoddy" contractor. Sometimes it has chanced upon a firm subsoil, and frequently upon sand. The Church should do its work thoroughly, and after the manner of a competent engineer examine the ground, clear away rubbish, delve below the surface to test the character of the subsoil, and either select only suitable sites, or make them fit by deliberately constructing a substructure, massive if need be, certainly capable of bearing whatever weight may be placed upon it. An inferior man can never make a superior agent. And there is no natural or spiritual law which makes the saint a fool.

Shall we ever see that to get men into the Church its agents must be such as to appeal to those *outside*? The cultivation of human qualities is not derogatory, evil only excepted. The Master Himself first attracted men by His perfect sympathy and understanding of their lives. Our object is to reconcile men to God by showing them that *He* is reconciled to *them*. They do not know this, and they would not listen to angels. So God would send "men of like passions" with themselves, men who, like St. Paul,

¹ We are probably indebted to Bishop Phillips Brooks for this expression. But the conception has always appeared to the writer to be perfectly obvious.

can be "all things to all men" because like him they are also perfectly obedient to the Master's will.

During both stages of preparation the agent in formation must be kept from becoming unpractical. The besetting sin of the Church, as of the student class generally, has always been that of getting out of touch with actuality. So far has this gone that the human side is entirely ignored in the Church's official curricula, and on the divine side practical spiritual work is absolutely shelved for theoretical theology. But mental knowledge is of no use if disconnected from personal knowledge of humanity. Ninety per cent of the population are not students, yet we continue to do everything from the student's standpoint, and then wonder why we fail. The scholar's mental atmosphere is very delightful, above the dust and heat of the world's work, and it should by no means be an unknown region to the agent; he must be able to retire there for contemplation. But the world will not be won for Christ by looking down upon it, but by descending into its arena as our Saviour did. This involves self-sacrifice, but that is axiomatic to the true servant of God. The only way to win men is by understanding them and being able to give all the great facts of their lives their proper weight.

In some quarters it seems to be assumed that the public has suddenly become intellectual, and that hence the great demand of the hour is for men with modern book-learning and good university degrees. Such is not in agreement with the facts. The spread of what is politely termed "Education" is on the whole no more than that of the means by which the mind may be trained. And all honours men are not thinkers. A huge majority of mankind still have no real interest in intellectual matters. Thus a purely intellectual Christianity does more harm than good, for people cannot understand it, but they can see that it has little or no connexion with actual life, and as it is practical help they want, to enable them to live better lives, they soon get "bored" and remain away from church. On the human side, reason leads us to practical ends.

The Church should be truly Catholic in the sense of meeting the needs of "all sorts and conditions of men." At present it only provides for the insignificant minority of students who have a religious bias, and women largely attracted by its externals. We

actually forget that the gospel is for all men. Christ appeals to the great primary instincts of humanity in all ages. Now the decisive question with most men is "What is the use of it?" And they are perfectly correct, not only from the inexorable demands of life, but in undesigned accordance with the Sermon on the Mount, that action is the vital point, and that unpractical people are building upon sand which the storms of life will wash away.

The agent must not be a one-sided creature, but a good "all round man," with natural as well as spiritual faculties properly developed. Upon his "Gentile" foundation must be built the beacon-tower of a more than Hebrew witness for God. *Like* other men in human knowledge and sympathies, *unlike* others in being "separated unto the gospel of Christ." As far as possible knowing something of everything, and everything of the one thing needful. His general education and experience of men being the background upon which the result of his special training as God's representative among men, should stand boldly out. His natural affinity with man having its complement in his spiritual affinity with God. If, on the human side, man is primarily an active creature, on the Divine side he is above all a dependent spirit. And the secret of his most useful activity among men is his perfect plasticity in the hands of God.

(*To be continued.*)

J. GORDON HAYES.

THE MASTER OF MAN. By Hall Caine. London: *Wm. Heinemann*.
6s. net.

Sir Hall Caine is a great writer and his books have a fascination, particularly to those who have some acquaintance with the quaint customs and peculiar atmosphere of the Isle of Man. His latest book gives a picture of the Island and its people which is intensely interesting, and it is published at 6s. net, an old-time price which it is a joy to encounter once again. But what does the author mean to convey to his readers? A moral undoubtedly, but what is it? Is it that no matter how one may sin, excusably or otherwise—and Sir Hall Caine does excuse his hero—that sin must come to light and must be atoned for? Certainly the author drives his hero into a veritable slough of despond, and gives the reader a wealth of detail which, to say the least, is not edifying. Sir Hall Caine is, however—Sir Hall Caine.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

CHRISTIANS AND DIVORCE.

WHAT DID CHRIST TEACH ABOUT DIVORCE? By the Bishop of Ely. *S.P.C.K.*, 1s. 6d.

DIVORCE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By G. H. Box and Charles Gore. *S.P.C.K.*, 2s.

DIVORCE. By the Rev. A. C. Headlam, D.D. *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1921.

The questions associated with divorce are no longer academic. The growth in the number of marriages dissolved, the vigorous attempts made to enlarge the grounds of divorce and the changing atmosphere in which public opinion moves all point to the need of Churchmen having their minds made up as to their duty in the matter. The situation needs enlightenment, and we must be sure of our ground when we make statements that are bound to influence action. Christian men and women desire to follow the teaching of our Lord on the question, and the more aid we receive in interpreting that teaching the better for the Church and Nation.

Dr. Chase gave evidence before the Royal Commission that inquired into the question from the State point of view. He has issued his evidence in a closely reasoned pamphlet which deserves careful consideration, and its value is increased by the three notes in which he deals with the position taken by Archdeacon Charles. As was to be expected from so distinguished a scholar the whole ground is covered with point and lucidity. We think, however, that he goes beyond the evidence in Scripture when he seems to conclude that St. Paul bases his teaching on the subject on his interviews with James, Cephas, and John. We know nothing concerning the details of the conversation of the Apostles, and a good case is weakened by all those suppositions as to what may have passed during their discussions. Dr. Chase examines all the allusions to Divorce in the New Testament and concludes, "while several questions as to Christ's teaching about divorce remain uncertain, one conclusion is beyond doubt. There is not any version of Christ's judgment on divorce, there is not any interpretation of any version of Christ's judgment on divorce, which does not forbid divorce except on the one and only ground of adultery." He says, "the Christian Church has from the second century onwards accepted the Gospel according to St. Matthew, containing the exceptive clause, among its canonical Books and therefore as authoritative."

Drs. Box and Gore have combined in writing their pamphlet,

but they are not responsible for more than their individual chapters. They go over the evidence and Dr Box has made a very strong case against the contention of Archdeacon Charles that the death penalty for adultery was imposed during our Lord's ministry. He says, "If Dr. Charles's view were accepted, it would have the inevitable result of lowering the standard of Christian doctrine and practice of marriage all round, with the added disastrous result of depressing still further the already lowered standards that prevail outside the Christian Society." Dr. Gore holds that National Churches have the right to avail themselves of the exceptive clauses in St. Matthew and to sanction the marriage of the innocent party. On the other hand Dr. Box contends that Dr. Gore had adopted a doubtful position and is in favour of Canon Lacey's argument that "the bond of marriage remains unbroken by divorce." A very strong case is made against the interpretation of Dr. Charles, whose critical methods are subjected to very severe handling by two scholars who know the documents and have every right to expect to be listened to by their contemporaries. We are convinced that had not Dr. Charles had a principle to establish he would not have treated his texts with so great liberty.

Dr. Headlam having discussed the whole subject with his accustomed skill and clearness concludes that the Church should never marry divorced persons who have the former spouse alive, and should never recognize the remarriage of the guilty party, "however hard it might be in individual cases." Communion ought not to be denied to the innocent party who has remarried. He adds, "If under the influence of the present wave of lax thinking various other grounds of divorce are admitted, the action of the Church should be quite rigid, and should not allow those who have been divorced and have married again to be admitted to communion. It is important that the ideal standard of marriage should as far as possible be retained." Dr. Headlam argues that the innocent party should alone be permitted to re-marry after divorce. "There is probably no more harmful sin than adultery, there is no one who inflicts more hardship on others than the adulterer or the adulteress. If people knew that no good would come to them in this way, that a woman who had sinned would not be made what was called an honest woman, all the recklessness, headlessness and thoughtlessness which are revealed day by day in the Divorce Courts, the unrestrained yielding to passing emotions, the undisciplined affection would be checked. There is no reform, we believe, that would do greater good." We are aware of the strong volume of Christian opinion behind this view, but we do not think the legislature would sanction it. At any rate we must be on our guard against passing emotional appeals to extend grounds of divorce on account of hard cases. We have in the three pronouncements to which we have referred, and in the book (*The Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce*) by Dr. Charles, opposing views fully presented and students can judge who have the best claims to be considered faithful interpreters of the New Testament.

TEACHERS AND TAUGHT.

RELIGION AND THE CHILD. A manual for Teachers and Parents.

By Archd. McDermott and Canon Bindley. London: S.P.C.K. 3s. (paper, 2s.)

MY SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHING. A Book for beginners in Sunday School work. By the Rev. J. R. Lumb, M.A., National Society and S.P.C.K. Paper boards, 2s. 6d. (paper, 2s.).

There is no lack of manuals at the present time-giving direction and inspiration for the religious training of the young. A large proportion of the most recent of these publications is devoted to the effort to present the truth to the child in terms of modern knowledge, guided by the principles of up-to-date psychology. Some of these manuals are extremely helpful, but others, placed in the hands of the ordinary Sunday School teacher, would tend to confuse and dishearten, rather than guide and inspire.

The book which Mr. Lumb has written is an excellent one for fulfilling the purpose of the author. As the sub-title points out, it is intended to be given to (or bought by) any one about to undertake Sunday School work. It lifts that work to the highest level and gives most practical, common-sense and yet spiritual guidance. First things are always kept in the first place. The personal life and example of the teacher are shown to be more important than the brilliancy of his lessons, though no pains are to be spared to make them the best possible. At the end of each of the ten chapters there are four questions for further thought and prayer, and also for discussion if the book is used in class or "circle." This work can be unhesitatingly recommended, and it would well repay a school if a copy were presented, or even loaned, to each new teacher.

Religion and the Child deals with the subject matter of the teaching. It is an effort to present the Christian Faith as a vitalizing power in agreement with modern science and philosophy. Wide views of inspiration are held by the authors, and the living Church rather than the written Book is the vehicle of God's dealings with men. Hence such statements occur as: "The story of 'The Fall' is a wonderful allegory" (p. 9). "It is important to realize that in the early Church there was no such hard-and-fast line drawn between canonical and uncanonical books as we have, *unfortunately*, been brought up to recognize" (p. 42).

"It is unfortunate that the predominant idea in our minds connected with God's revelation of Himself should be associated with a book" (p. 11). "The origin of Christianity dates from *Pentecost*" (p. 28). "Church History is a record of His (the Holy Ghost's) work," and ought to be taught in preference to much that is contained in the Old Testament. From this standpoint, and with distinct emphasis on the spiritual and moral teaching rather than the historical or scientific statements, suggestions are made as to the best methods of giving instructions on the Bible, the Prayer Book, the Catechism and Church History, the great object being Christian worship, life, and service, rather than Biblical knowledge. A

large number of books are recommended for further reading. The ecclesiastical standpoint will readily be seen from the two following quotations: "We earnestly advise the teacher to adhere carefully to the Catechism, and to avoid all manuals with party views either on one side or the other" (p. 80). "What is required? The conditions here laid down for those who come to the Lord's Supper should be carefully explained, and *none other imposed*" (p. 82).

Those Evangelicals who accept the "modern" view concerning the Bible will find this book sane, moderate, practical and spiritual, but those who hold to the older views will be pained by many of its dogmatic statements.

F. M.

THE CHURCH IN SWEDEN.

THE SWEDISH RITE. By Eric E. Yelverton, O.B.E., B.D. (S.P.C.K. Translations of Christian Literature, Series III, Liturgical Texts. 8s. 6d. net.)

The S.P.C.K. is doing a very useful work in providing Translations and Texts for the use of students of Church History, and this volume, the latest of their translations of Liturgical Texts, will fill a gap in the knowledge of a good many readers. Comparatively little is known generally in this country of the history of the Church in Sweden, which though, like the English Church, it retained its episcopal succession, ranged itself on the Protestant side at the Reformation. It came, however, unlike the English Church, into the Lutheran and not the "Reformed" group of Churches. The Resolutions (24, 25) of the last Lambeth Conference recommending intercommunion with the Church in Sweden, and the recent mission there of two English Bishops, have awakened interest in it, and Mr. Yelverton's translation of the Swedish Prayer Book will stimulate and increase this interest.

Great simplicity and naturalness mark the structure of the services, and the language of their various parts, and many of the prayers might well be used or adapted for either public or private prayer by ourselves. The doctrinal basis is, of course, Lutheran, and this empties of any significance the retention of the name "High Mass" for the Lord's Supper, or of altar for the Holy Table. Indeed the words, "Holy Meal," "Lord's Supper" and "Holy Table" occur in the service. It is, moreover, deserving of notice that the Marriage Service may include what is called the Nuptial Mass (*Brudmassa*), but this is merely an optional addition, in certain cases, of a slightly more elaborate form of service, and has no relation to the Eucharist at all.

There are two interesting forms of service for Public Confession and Private Confession, the latter being, however, in the presence of "two or three members of the congregation." Neither has any resemblance to the Roman or Ritualistic forms for Auricular Confession. The Absolution, in the case of Public Confession, and also of the Communion of the Sick, is as follows:—

“ If this your confession of sin is sincere, and therefore you with a penitent heart desire forgiveness of your sins for Jesus Christ’s sake, then it is sure and certain in the power of God’s Word and promise that God in His mercy forgiveth you all your sins ; and I pronounce unto you the forgiveness of your sins by the command of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the name of God the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Amen.”

It may be observed in connection with this that in the ordination service (“ Consecration to the office of Priesthood ”) the words, “ whose sins thou dost remit,” etc., are not used.

The tone of all the prayers is deeply devotional, and stress is laid throughout on the personal repentance, faith and practical conduct of the worshippers. The book will well repay careful attention and study, and we cordially commend it to the notice of our readers.

W. G. J.

THE JEW AS A CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIANS.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE JEWS IN ENGLAND. By the Rev. H. P. Stokes, LL.D., Litt.D. London: *Central Board of Missions and S.P.C.K.* 5s. 6d. net.

THE JEWS OF EASTERN EUROPE. By the Rev. J. H. Adeney, M.A. London: *C.B.M.* and *S.P.C.K.* 3s. 6d. net.

Interest in the Jews has of recent years been very much revived. The situation in Palestine and the question of the establishment of a Jewish National State, together with the faked story of a Jewish revolutionary plot to overthrow the world civilization, have naturally kept the Jew in front of public thought. It is, therefore, all to the good that these “ Jewish Studies ” are now being issued. They are edited by Dr. Lukyn Williams, and will prove of great value. There is always a need for the public to know more of the Jew and for Jews and Christians to learn to understand better the religion of the other.

The volume *A Short History of the Jews in England* is written by Dr. Stokes, who is well known as the author of *Studies in Anglo-Jewish History*, and as a President of the Jewish Historical Society of England. The book consists of some sixteen short chapters, which very well cover the ground. There are eight splendid illustrations. We thank Dr. Stokes for providing us with an excellent handbook.

It is very interesting to follow the story of the Jews in England. They came to England with the Conqueror ; after two hundred years, they were expelled by Edward I ; and then, after an absence of some three centuries and a half, they were welcomed back by Cromwell. Dr. Stokes, therefore, divides his book into three parts—the Pre-Expulsion Period, the Middle Period, and the Return. The author treats the Expulsion of 1290 in detail, and has interesting comments on the history of the Conversion of the Jews. Towards the close he keeps the reader’s interest in carefully-written accounts of the gradual removal of Jewish disqualifications, of the growth of the Liberal Reform movement in their religion, and of the English attitude towards Zionists’ hopes.

The second book—*The Jews of Eastern Europe*—is by the Rev. J. H. Adeney, who writes from his knowledge and experience as missionary to the Jews in Roumania. Mr. Adeney rather apologizes for his work, in that it was written in the intervals of a very busy missionary life in a peculiarly difficult year. But he has given us a most interesting book. He presents a good deal of useful and readable information about the Jews of Russia, Hungary and South-Eastern Europe. At the beginning, five short chapters give the historical setting for the rest of the book.

The author presses home the fact that the Jewish nation has a future as well as a past. He fears, however, that Zionist dreams are largely actuated by material aims, rather than the purely spiritual ones. It remains, Mr. Adeney feels, for the Christian world to remind the Jew of his mission as one of God's chosen instruments. The book concludes with an earnest appeal for missionaries to the Jews.

These two works are very valuable in that they both will help the Christian reader to appreciate the Jewish problem much more readily and sympathetically.

W. D. S.

THE CHURCH'S MISSION.

THE CHURCH'S LIFE. A Study of the Fundamentals of the Church's Mission. By Wm. C. Sturgis, A.M., Ph.D. New York Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, and London: S.P.C.K. 5s. net.

Dr. Sturgis is the Educational Secretary of the Board of Missions of the American Church. He was appointed to that office in 1917 and was at once distressed by his own and his fellow-Churchmen's ignorance of the *raison d'être* of the Church. At once he began to study the subject, and soon to lecture upon it. For three years much of his time has been devoted to an endeavour to awaken a lethargic Church to a comprehension and a fulfilment of its true mission. This book is the outcome of that effort and contains the substance of his numerous lectures.

The objective of the Church's mission is described "as being the transmission of life from those who have it to those who have it not." He speaks strongly of the evil that has been wrought by limiting "missionary" work to work overseas, or to that done through the official ministry.¹ "No man on earth has quite the missionary opportunity of the Christian man of affairs in a heathen country, unless it be the Christian on his summer holiday in rural districts; yet one would almost say that by none other is the opportunity more fatally neglected" (p. 22). "The Christian physician or surgeon has opportunities for missionary service unequalled in any other vocation" (p. 66). "I remember hearing a deaconess, whose life-work lay in a busy down-town parish, say that she had never worked in the mission-field—an astounding statement from

¹ He deprecates the use of the word "Missions," and always employs the singular form "Mission."

one who passed every day of her life in just such a field " (p. 126).

Whilst thus emphasizing the essential missionary calling of every Christian, his natural objective is the work overseas. Dr. Sturgis makes use of some powerful arguments to awaken the Church to a sense of the need for active and efficient propaganda. One chapter is devoted to a study of our Lord on "The Model Missionary." The book is full of good things, and if wisely read will certainly help to arouse the Church to a consciousness of her great and glorious mission. His distinction between "pity" and "compassion" is arresting (p. 162); also his statement concerning our Lord's promise that the Holy Spirit should guide the disciples into all truth (p. 173). There are a few expressions that an Evangelical will consider extreme and unwarranted—especially two references to the Sacraments—but with these exceptions the work is one that can be strongly recommended as a means for awakening the "blessed company of all faithful people" to a sense of their "high calling in Christ Jesus."

F. M.

CAN WE LOOK TO THE DIDACHE FOR HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY ?

BARNABAS, HERMAS, AND THE DIDACHE. Being the Donnellan Lectures delivered before the University of Dublin in 1920. By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D., Dean of Wells. London: S.P.C.K. 6s. net.

The importance of this work is that it challenges the common dating of the Didache, and so more or less directly has a significant bearing upon the history of the Christian Ministry. As is well known, the Didache is one of the most important of modern discoveries in the region of early Christian literature. Some forty years ago it was discovered in a monastery in the Greek quarter of Constantinople, and was published by Archbishop Bryennius. Since then a large literature has sprung up around it. It is only a short work, about the size of one of St. Paul's smaller Epistles; but its significance is great in that it has usually been taken to cast direct light upon the first century or so of Christianity. It is remarkable for the central significance of the Prophet and the absence of a presiding administrative official.

There has been at times a tendency to discount the significance of this early document, and Dr. Robinson has now published clearly his position in this respect. He holds that the Didachist's account of the Christian ordinances and ministry is not to be taken as representing the Church of his own time or place, but rather as "an imaginative picture of the primitive Church as it was planted by the Apostles in Gentile lands." Such a view, he naturally concludes, "deprives it indeed of most of its historical value." To Dr. Robinson it appears to be rather of "a third century date."

In these Donnellan Lectures he examines in a very detailed way the much-discussed relation of the Didache to the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. He comes to the conclusion that the

Didache took "The Two Ways" from the Epistle of Barnabas and also made use of the Shepherd of Hermas. He gives a table of parallels between the Didache and "Barnabas," and finds that the Didachist was a great borrower. He discards the theory of a Jewish manual, which has been variously embodied in "Barnabas," the Didache, and other writings.

Dr. Robinson's views naturally provoke discussion. We are glad to have them stated so frankly and freely; but we venture to doubt whether they will carry much conviction to the students of early Christian literature. Those, however, who wish to examine the question cannot possibly do without a careful study of these lectures.

W. D. S.

MISSIONARY VOLUMES.

PATTESON OF THE ISLES. By Mary H. Debenham. *Oxford University Press.* 4s. net.

SCHOOLS WITH A MESSAGE IN INDIA. By Daniel J. Fleming, Ph.D. *Oxford University Press.* 6s. net.

"The Pathfinder Series," edited by Mr. Basil Mathews, is known far and wide for the excellence of the first four volumes. These biographies of famous pioneer missionaries are all written in such a fascinating and vivid style as to appeal to the adolescent. The authors understand well what to insert and what to omit. They know what will inspire and what will weary the reader. They scrupulously avoid dullness. It is giving high praise to this latest volume (which tells the story of Bishop John Coleridge Patteson) to say that it well maintains the standard of the previous works. The author naturally expresses her indebtedness to the great biography of the Bishop by his cousin, Miss Charlotte Yonge. The book is well illustrated, and would make an admirable present to any adolescent. The young people who are fortunate enough to receive such a present will feel the power of "the truth that a life given to the service of God and man is the only sort of life worth living at all."

Two years ago the foreign mission boards of Great Britain and North America sent to India a strong commission, under the chairmanship of Principal A. G. Fraser. They were to inquire into "Village Education in India." With great dispatch they published their Report in October, 1920 (*Oxf. Univ. Press*, 5s.). Professor D. J. Fleming was a member of the commission. The volume he has just published contains a selection from a large amount of material which he gathered during the investigations. The commission is in no way responsible for the contents of this volume. Some of the subjects dealt with are outside their terms of reference altogether. But Prof. Fleming took full advantage of his opportunity in India, and the facts and suggestions he now makes will be extremely valuable. Also, as Mr. Oldham points out in the Preface, "It is an important supplement to the report, supplying a body of concrete experience which illustrates the arguments and conclusions of the commission." Those, therefore, who possess the Report would do well to procure

this volume also. The book has over twenty photographic illustrations. It could well be used for Study Circles during the coming winter. The style of the book makes it very suitable for this purpose.

F. M.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

WILLIAM HONYMAN GILLESPIE, of Torbanehill, Scottish Metaphysical Theist. By Jas. Urquhart, F.S.A. (Scot.). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 5s.

The life-story of W. H. Gillespie and his *A Priori Argument* is fairly well known, but is worth repeating. Born in Glasgow in 1808, he showed early in his student days a special leaning towards the study of Logic and Moral Philosophy. In his opening studies, many religious questions naturally passed through his mind. He was not long out of his teens when he chanced upon a copy of David Hume's philosophical works. He revelled in the pages of that great Scottish metaphysician, but was astounded when he came across a passage in the Dialogues, which placed the truth of the Existence of God as, at best, among the mere *probabilia* of knowledge or science. "Had a bullet gone through me," he wrote, "I could hardly have received a greater shock. . . . The brightness had all gone out of my life." But about the same time, he perused and was helped by Dr. Samuel Clarke's *Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God*. The study of these two books formed the turning point of his life. Not quite satisfied with Clarke's argument, Gillespie began a process of independent inquiry, which resulted in his *A Priori Argument for the Being and Attributes of God*. He wished to have the Existence of God proved with mathematical certainty. This he recognized as his life-work, and to it he gave his attention for nearly forty years.

Gillespie has a convinced admirer in Mr. Urquhart, who is well known as a competent expounder of the work of the Scottish master. Of Mr. Urquhart's previous volume, *The Life and Teaching of W. H. Gillespie*, some thousands of copies were put into circulation, and it is now practically out of print. At first there was contemplated an enlarged edition of it; but the additional material to hand justified the issue of this new volume. There is a foreword by Professor H. R. Mackintosh. This work provides an account of Gillespie and an excellent abridgment of his *A Priori Argument*. W. D. S.

DR. HOLDEN'S NEW BOOK.

YOUR REASONABLE SERVICE. By the Rev. J. Stuart Holden. London: Marshall Bros. 3s. 6d. net.

Dr. Holden gives in this volume a selection from his Keswick addresses. They are all deeply spiritual, sanely practical, and intensely interesting. Though Dr. Holden has his own firm and deep convictions, he knows that God is greater than any man and wider than any method. Hence he freely recognizes that the spirit of Jesus may enter some men by a different channel from that which seems normal to him. He is more concerned with life and reality

that with any " *form* of sound words," however correct that " *form* " may be. " It is necessary that we get rid of the idea that essential power for life is an inevitable consequence of holding certain more or less accurate conceptions of God and His Word. For, after all, there is nothing necessarily in common between theology and religion. That is why the term 'dead orthodoxy' has become one of reproach " (p. 33). Again, " We hear of people estimating men, especially, I grieve to say, religious leaders, according to their ability to steer an uneventful course on an even keel. Their highest commendation is, ' He is such a safe man.' . . . The churches are literally cursed with safe men in prominent places " (p. 35). That is strong language to use at Keswick, but Dr. Holden is a past-master in saying just the thing that will strike home. He knows how to wield the Sword of the Spirit, not against absentees, which is so easy, but against those who are listening to his words. Yet this is not a severe book. The " wooing note " is constantly present, and many must have been wooed and won as they listened to these powerful addresses. Clergy who possess themselves of this book will long to pass on most of the contents to their own people. The volume includes the address on " But if not " (Dan. iii.), which made such a profound impression at the time of its delivery in July, 1914, a few days before the Great War began. F. M.

THE LURE OF SPIRITISM.

THROUGH SÉANCE TO SATAN; OR, THE LURE OF SPIRITISM. By the Rev. Chas. H. Rouse. London: *Robert Scott*.

The author of this book is an " advanced " Churchman. He does not give any hints that he knows his subject from the inside, but like all clergy he has had to deal with those who have come under the baneful influence of this modern craze. Whilst referring to the common account of fraud practised by mediums, he fully admits that some of the phenomena are genuine. It is with this that he deals. He has no doubt that Telepathy and Demonism account for that phenomena. A remarkable personal experience of Telepathy is related on pp. 15 and 16. He points out that Spiritism is both un-Christian and anti-Christian, and he compares the experience at a séance with the experience at the Lord's Table. This latter is from the definite High Church standpoint. He gives an instance of literal Satanism with its ornate temple in a Parisian suburb.

The book is written in a popular style, and the language is distinctly moderate, considering the subject and the author's standpoint. It ought to be a real help to clergy who desire to be fair to the evidence, and yet long to take their part in overthrowing the attacks on the Christian faith and life which come from Spiritism. One sentence may be quoted which deals with the insidious suggestion that " the new Revelation " is to help forward a modified Christianity. " You will see that this modification of Christianity means—bringing against Christ the old charge of blasphemy, flouting

the idea of Redemption, and so completely demolishing all the fundamental doctrines of our religion as to leave nothing standing to mark the site except the name. One may just as well talk of the Huns modifying the beauty of Ypres, Louvain and other places." That is well said!

F. M.

MORE TRANSLATIONS.

- i. THE PILGRIMAGE OF ETHERIA. By M. L. McLure and C. L. Feltoe, D.D. 6s. net.
- ii. THE APOCRITICUS OF MACARIUS MAGNES. By T. W. Crafer, D.D. London: S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d. net.

i. This book, which was formerly regarded as the work of *Silvia of Aquitaine*, is now believed to have been written by *Etheria*, an abbess either in Spain or in the South of France. Toward the close of the fourth century, or, according to Meister, about the year A.D. 534. *Etheria* visited Palestine, Syria, Sinai, Mesopotamia, Asia Minor and Constantinople. In this book she gives us a chatty account of her pilgrimage. Of the organization of the Churches which she visited she gives us very scanty information. We gather that Holy Communion, which she calls "oblation," was celebrated on Saturdays and Sundays at 9 a.m. and on "Station" days throughout the year at 3 p.m., and on Maundy Thursday in the evening. Church services consisted of Psalms, prayers, and the reading of Scriptures with sermons. Of the latter, she tells us that in Jerusalem: "All the priests who take their seats, as many as are willing, preach, and after them all the bishop preaches, and these sermons are always on the Lord's Day, in order that the people may always be instructed in the Scriptures and in the love of God. The delivery of these sermons greatly delays the dismissal from the Church, so that the dismissal does [not] take place before the fourth or perhaps the fifth hour" (p. 51).

The Feast of the Nativity, she tells us, was kept on January 6, the language employed in the services was Greek, but the interpretation of the lessons and the instructions were given in Syriac. *Etheria* is probably the earliest writer to speak of the use of incense in a Christian church. Incense seems to have been used for fumigation, but not ceremonially.

The translation of this interesting book is the work of the late Mrs. McLure and her brother, the Rev. George Herbert. Dr. Feltoe, who has edited it, has contributed an important introduction.

ii. Harnack identifies the author of *Apocriticus* with the Macarius, Bishop of Magnesia, who was at the Synod of Oak in A.D. 403. Dr. Crafer places the author a century earlier. The book is a detailed answer to the attacks of an unnamed heathen philosopher on the New Testament. The words of the attack which are given *in extenso*, are remarkably modern, and read like the pages of the Rationalist Press publications. Macarius's answers, though frequently far-fetched and fantastic, are still interesting because they show how a Christian of the fourth or fifth century met the arguments

of a blasphemous opponent of the faith. One example will suffice. The heathen contemptuously calls the words of our Lord in St. John vi. 54, "beast-like and absurd." Macarius answers: "Except [the new-born child] eats the flesh and drinks the blood of its mother, it has no life. . . . It is true that the nourishment comes in the form of milk, but milk is really the same as blood; it is only its proximity to the air that gives it its lighter colour" (pp. 80 and 81). "The flesh and blood of Christ . . . are the words of the Old and New Testaments spoken with allegorical meaning, which men must devour with care and digest by calling to mind with understanding, and win from them not temporal but eternal life" (p. 82).

K. E. K.

TERTULLIAN TREATISES.

TERTULLIAN, i., *Against Praxeas*, 5s. net.; ii., *Treatises Concerning Prayer and Concerning Baptism*, 3s. net.; both translated by A. Souter, D.Litt. London: S.P.C.K.

i. Tertullian, the earliest of the Latin Fathers, was evidently a layman. He was born of pagan parents, about A.D. 160, in the Roman province of Africa, which corresponds roughly to modern Tunis. He received a good education in law, literature and philosophy. The date of his conversion is uncertain. Later, he was led to adopt the doctrine of the Montanists. *Praxeas* was a Greek who lived in Rome and attacked the Montanist prophets, but fell into the heresy of Patripassianism by laying so much stress on the Divine Unity as to destroy the Trinity. In Tertullian's vigorous language: "Praxeas managed two pieces of the devil's business at Rome; he drove out prophecy and brought in heresy, he put the Paraclete [Montanus had this title] to flight and crucified the Father" (p. 27). Tertullian has no difficulty in refuting the teaching of Praxeas. He evinces an amazing knowledge of the Bible. The Church is indebted to him for the first formulation of the doctrine of Trinity.

ii. *De Oratione* and *De Baptismo*, forming the second volume, were written between A.D. 200 and 206. *De Oratione* is the oldest surviving exposition of the Lord's Prayer. It follows the form given by St. Matthew, but places "Thy Kingdom come" after "Thy will be done in heaven and in earth" (sic). The petition, "Lead us not into temptation" is explained as meaning: "Do not allow us to be deceived, of course, by him who tempts," but "Draw us away from the evil one" (p. 27). He calls prayer a spiritual sacrifice (p. 43). *De Baptismo* is a treatise on the Baptism and the Confirmation. In those days, Confirmation was a part of the Baptism. He denies the validity of heretical baptism, but allows baptism by laymen, "for that which is received alike by all, can be by all alike conferred, unless you argue that the name 'disciples' belongs only to Bishops or Presbyters or Deacons" (p. 66). He says: "Neither is sin forgiven nor the Spirit granted by any one save God alone."

K. E. K.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

As in previous years there will be a large stall at the Church Congress Exhibition at Birmingham during Congress week at which the publications of the Church Book Room, and other books recommended by its Committee, will be on sale. Clergy and friends are specially invited to visit the stall, and to recommend others to inspect and purchase the literature on view, which will include books and pamphlets on the following subjects: Parochial Church Councils, National Assembly, Confirmation, Sunday Schools, The Bible, Church Doctrine, Church History, etc. During the week certain books will be offered at a special reduction. Amongst them some remainder copies of *Foundations of Faith* by the Dean of Canterbury, 2s., published price, 7s. 6d.; Report of the Fulham Conference, 1901, 1s., published price, 3s.; Sir Edward Clarke's *New Testament*, 1s. 6d., published price, 5s.; and the *Book of Psalms*, 1s., published price, 2s. 6d.; The Rev. F. E. Spencer's *Short Introduction to the Old Testament*, 1s. 6d., published price, 2s. 6d.; and a number of slightly shop-soiled copies of the Anglican Church Handbooks, 1s. each, now published at 1s. 6d.

The Church Congress.

The Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure has now received the Royal Assent and become law, and the Church Book Room has published the Measure itself, together with an introduction and explanatory notes by Mr. Albert Mitchell, a solicitor, and a member of the National Assembly, who so ably did a similar service in connection with the Enabling Act. Parochial Church Councillors will be anxious to know what their powers are under the Measure, and they will naturally wish to consult the Act itself, but as it is couched in legal phraseology, many will find a difficulty in interpreting its unfamiliar language, and this pamphlet will prove a useful help to all who are puzzled by some of the provisions of the Act, and will at the same time provide instruction, and we hope inspiration, as to the spirit in which members of Church Councils should undertake their responsibilities. The pamphlet is issued at 1s. post free, or 10s. a dozen when quantities are required for distribution. The Enabling Act, which has been similarly annotated by Mr. Mitchell, is published at 6d. net, or 5s. a dozen for distribution. All members of Parochial Church Councils will find it necessary to refer from time to time to the Constitution of the National Assembly, and the Councils which have been called into being by the Enabling Act, and this pamphlet with its lucid explanation and advice will be found of great service.

It cannot be too strongly urged that the Parochial Rolls of the various parishes should be kept up to date, and that new parishioners should be enrolled as soon as they are qualified. Every parish should, therefore, be fully equipped with literature on this subject, and we take this opportunity of mentioning some of the material published by the Church Book Room. First the Declaration as to Qualification, with form for non-resident electors, which is supplied at 2s. per 100, the same without the form for non-resident electors, 2s. per 100, supplied with a special appeal to parishioners printed on the back of each form, or cards simply arranged for the card index system at 2s. 6d. or 3s. per 100 respectively. Then there are the Electoral Roll Sheets

at 3s. per 100, Electoral Roll Books, arranged alphabetically or specially ruled and headed, with particulars as to qualification, etc., which are supplied at 6s., 8s., 12s. 6d., 20s., and 25s. For general distribution *The Ladder of Lay Representation in the Councils of the Church of England*, and *The New Constitution of the Church of England*, which are supplied at 2s. per 100, and a paper on Parochial Church Councils at 1d. each, are recommended.

In 1917 the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, B.D., Rector of Bradfield, issued a valuable little manual for Confirmation candidates entitled *Confirming and Being Confirmed*, with an Introduction by the Bishop of Liverpool. This is now out of print, and Mr. Gilbert has issued through the Church Book Room a new edition, which has been considerably revised. The manual has been written with a threefold object, as a help to young clergymen in the preparation of their candidates, as a help to adult candidates for Confirmation, and as instruction to those who are not yet members of the Church of England. The Bishop of Liverpool points out that in the first case it will give clear, forcible, and scriptural teaching, and will prove an invaluable help. It will give the teacher the right tone, useful matter, and telling illustrations. In the second case it will help those who need some full and arresting account of the nature of the promises they are about to make, and it will supplement the oral teaching of their clergyman, and suggest subjects upon which they can talk to him in the hours of preparation. In the third case, the manual carefully read by a fair-minded inquirer after truth will dispel many fallacies, and even if it fail entirely to convince will, at least, remove prejudices, and give occasion for serious thought. By the aid of subscriptions the book is now published in a stout paper cover at 1s. net, and in cloth at 2s. net.

The Church Book Room has recently purchased the remaining stock of *The Glad Tidings of Reconciliation*, by Bishop Knox, late Bishop of Manchester. In his Preface the Bishop writes: "An apology is needed for adding to the literature on the great doctrine of the Atonement.

The Atonement. That apology is furnished by the strange shrinking of a large number of preachers from this primary doctrine of the gospel: so primary that, if there had been no reconciliation of God and man in Jesus Christ, there had been no gospel at all. But a nervous dread seems to have crept over no inappreciable portion of the Church that this, its special message, is somehow out of date. . . . All this timidity is in sharp contrast with the boldness, the simplicity, even "the foolishness," of the Gospel that the Apostles were glad to proclaim. . . . It seemed right that one who had been charged to banish and drive away strange doctrine should endeavour to do his best once more to present this truth, as far as in him lay, free from incrustations and speculative explanation." The book was published in 1916 at 4s. 6d., and is now offered at 1s. 4d., post free.

Several copies of *The Churchman* for October, November and December, 1920, remain unsold and a copy of each will be sent on receipt of a postal order for 1s. 6d. These numbers contain useful articles on

"The" **Churchman.** the Sixth Lambeth Conference of 1920 by the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft; The Case for the Mosaic Tabernacle by Dr. Montgomery Hitchcock; Studies in Texts by the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, the Archbishop-Elect of Melbourne; and a very valuable article on Millennial Dawnism or Russellism by the Rev. E. L. Langston.