

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

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

# THE CHURCHMAN

July, 1922

## NOTES AND COMMENTS.

**Prayer Book  
Revision.** THE second Report of the Prayer Book Revision Committee of the National Assembly will need to be dealt with in these pages far more adequately and in greater detail than is possible in the present issue. The Report, with a schedule of the proposed alterations—a volume of more than 100 pages—only came into our hands just as we were going to press, and it is not possible to do more than refer to one or two matters of outstanding importance around which controversy has ranged during recent years. The Committee was appointed to consider and report upon the answers of the Convocations to the Royal Letters of Business on the Revision of the Prayer Book. It was appointed in November, 1920, and within less than two years it has presented two Reports—one dealing with the Revision of the Lectionary, and the present Report dealing with the Prayer Book as a whole. It is a very creditable performance in so short a time, and the Committee may well be congratulated upon an excellent piece of work. In membership the Committee was representative, and included of the clergy: the Bishops of Gloucester (Chairman), Chichester, Ripon and Truro; the Deans of Westminster and Gloucester; the Archdeacons of Surrey, Sheffield and Wisbech, and the Rev. Dr. Frere; and of the laity: Mr. G. A. Bryson, Lord Hugh Cecil, M.P., Sir Edward Clarke, K.C., Mr. H. C. Hogan, Sir Frederick Holiday, Mr. G. A. King, Mr. Albert Mitchell, Lt.-Col. H. L. Oldham, Mr. Athelstan Riley, and Dr.

Eugene Stock. The Dean of Gloucester was unable to attend, and Sir Frederick Holiday resigned.

It will be remembered that a great protest, led <sup>The Prayer of</sup> ~~Consecration.~~ by Bishop Knox, then of Manchester, was made against the proposals of Convocation for changes in the Prayer of Consecration, and eventually these were modified in important particulars. They have been still further modified by the Committee of the Assembly, and whilst still open to some objection, the most serious feature has been removed. After the Words of Institution it was proposed to add :

“ Wherefore, O Father, we Thy humble servants, having in remembrance *before Thee* the precious death of Thy dear Son, His mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, looking also for His coming again, do render unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits which He hath procured unto us. *And we pray Thee of Thine almighty goodness to send upon us and upon these Thy gifts, Thy holy and blessed Spirit, Who is the Sanctifier and the Giver of life, to whom with Thee and Thy Son Jesus Christ be ascribed by every creature in earth and heaven all blessing, honour, glory and power now henceforth and for evermore. Amen.*”

Strong objection was taken to the words we have italicized. Bishop Knox pointed out that the words “ having in remembrance *before Thee* ” were “ inserted here to please and conciliate those who build up an edifice of sacrificial doctrine on our Lord’s simple command, ‘ This do in remembrance of Me.’ They suggest an interpretation of those words which is admitted by the best scholars to be a false interpretation.” The protest has not been without its effect, for in the form as revised by the Committee of the Church Assembly the words “ *before Thee* ” have been altogether omitted. Still more important is the other change. The most serious difficulty was felt in regard to the proposed invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the worshippers and upon the elements. As Bishop Knox clearly showed, it was unknown or little known as late as the second half of the fourth century, and that “ as soon as it appears it is connected with new teaching as to the effect of consecration upon the elements.” Again the protest has been successful, for in the form agreed upon by the Committee of the Assembly the whole sentence italicized above has been omitted ; and it will

be widely felt that Evangelical churchpeople are entitled to congratulate themselves upon the omission. The other change which has been made by the Assembly Committee will not be so well received. In the Convocation Report, the Lord's Prayer was placed immediately after the Prayer of Consecration, and the Prayer of Oblation was to retain its present position. The Committee of the Assembly, however, have joined the Prayer of Oblation to the Prayer of Consecration thus: ". . . for the innumerable benefits which He hath procured unto us; and we entirely desire Thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept," etc., down to "world without end," and this is followed by the words, "And now as our Saviour Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say, Our Father, which art in heaven," etc. It should be added that the Prayer of Consecration is now broken up into four paragraphs, viz.: (1) "Almighty God . . . His coming again"; (2) "Hear us, O merciful Father . . . in remembrance of Me"; (3) "Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father, we Thy humble servants . . . other benefits of His Passion"; and (4) "And here we offer and present . . . world without end."

It is to be regretted that no alteration has been  
**Reservation.** made by the Committee of the Assembly in the proposals of Convocation for the Reservation of the elements for the communion of the sick except to provide that the Ordinary shall "direct" instead of "approve" the place and manner of keeping the elements and taking them to the sick person. The Committee has, indeed, added a new rubric to the effect that when the provision made is not sufficient to secure that a communicant at his last hour shall be able to receive the Holy Communion, the Curate, with the permission of the Ordinary, "given in accordance with Canon, or such rules as may be from time to time made by the Archbishops and Bishops in their Convocations," may make further provision. It must be pointed out, however—and we do so with great thankfulness—that five of the lay members of the Committee—a majority of their number if Sir F. Holiday, who resigned, be left out—have attached a "Note" to the Report expressing their dissent from the proposals. These five members are Sir Edward Clarke, Mr. H. C. Hogan, Mr. G. A. King, Mr. Albert Mitchell, and Dr. Eugene Stock, and their Note is as follows:

“ We regret that we are unable to concur with the majority of the Committee in approving of the proposed new rubrics to the Order for the Communion of the Sick (numbered 145 in the Schedule to the Report), which contemplate reservation of a part of the consecrated bread and wine and (in the event indicated) ‘ further provision to meet the needs of the sick and dying.’ Notwithstanding the care with which these rubrics have been settled, we do not think that it is possible adequately to safeguard the practice from abuse. We do not admit that the practice of reservation is either primitive or catholic ; and we believe that the teaching associated with it is not conformable to Holy Scripture.”

This is a weighty protest, and the fact that it emanates from laymen is of high significance. It should certainly raise the issue of Reservation in an acute form when the Report comes to be discussed in the various Houses of the Church Assembly and in the Assembly itself.

It is too early yet to suggest what should be our **The Question of Policy.** attitude as Evangelical Churchmen towards these revised proposals for Prayer Book Revision. It must be candidly admitted that in many respects the proposals, if carried into effect, would greatly enrich the Book of Common Prayer. Particularly is this the case in regard to the Office for the Visitation of the Sick, and some other instances where new and very beautiful services have been introduced. On the other hand we cannot help thinking that the changes in the Communion Office will seriously disturb large numbers of loyal Churchpeople without any corresponding advantage ; and the provision made for the Reservation of the elements in Holy Communion for the use of the sick—even though it is provided that they are to be used for no other purpose whatsoever—is frankly objectionable. But we shall discuss the proposals in detail in later issues. There does not seem to be any immediate hurry in the matter. The Report will be presented at the Summer Session of the Church Assembly, but it is hardly likely that it will come before that body in the form of a Measure until February next. In the meantime the proposals should be most carefully studied, and it should be remembered that the changes will not, in any case, be embodied in the existing Prayer Book, but will be issued as a separate volume or schedule, to which it is proposed that permissive use should be accorded for a term of years.

**Christian Unity.** The Joint Conference of leading representatives of the Church of England and the Free Churches has resulted in an agreement on some of the outstanding points of difference on Christian unity, which has been described (to quote the words of one of the Bishops) as simply amazing. "Stalwarts" on both sides were present, yet conclusions were reached which a year ago would have been thought to be impossible within so short a time. If some of us are apt to be impatient and to complain of the slow progress made towards Christian unity, we cannot do better than obtain a copy of the Report of the Conference (now published as a pamphlet by the S.P.C.K. at one penny) and study it in the light of the Lambeth Appeal. We shall then thank God for what has been achieved and take fresh courage for the future. There are still many stiles to cross before we come to the open road which leads to the realization of the vision of the United Church, but this Report clearly shows that the representatives of both sides are marching together with the honest determination to overcome, if possible, all obstacles; and we think that each one would be prepared to say that, "Best of all God is with us." We hear from more than one source that during the Conference members felt that they were being moved and guided by a power not their own; and we shall all recognize that in our strivings after Christian Unity, as in every other Christian aspiration, it is emphatically true: "Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts." We ought, therefore, to pray ever more earnestly that God the Holy Spirit will guide, direct and control this movement till the goal be won to which He is assuredly leading us.

**Resolutions on the Ministry.** The *crux* of the Unity problem has always been the different views which have prevailed on the question of ordination. Bearing well in mind past controversies on the subject, it is important to place on record some of the principal resolutions now agreed upon by members of the Joint Conference:—

7. Within the many Christian Communion into which in the course of history Christendom has been divided, various forms of ministry have grown up according to the circumstances of these several Communion and their beliefs as to the Mind of Christ and the guidance of the New Testament. These various ministries of Word and Sacrament have been, in God's providence, manifestly

and abundantly used by the Holy Spirit in His work of "enlightening the world, converting sinners, and perfecting saints." But the differences which have arisen with regard to the authority and functions of these various forms of ministry have been and are the occasion of manifold doubts, questions, and misunderstandings. For the allaying of doubts and scruples in the future, and for the more perfect realization of the truth that the ministry is a ministry of the Church, and not merely of any part thereof, means should be provided for the United Church which we desire, whereby its ministry may be acknowledged by every part thereof as possessing the authority of the whole body.

8. In view of the fact that the Episcopate was from early times and for many centuries accepted, and by the greater part of Christendom is still accepted, as the means whereby this authority of the whole body is given, we agree that it ought to be accepted as such for the United Church of the future.

9. Similarly, in view of the place which the Council of Presbyters and the Congregation of the faithful had in the constitution of the early Church, and the preservation of these elements of presbyterial and congregational order in large sections of Christendom, we agree that they should be maintained with a representative and constitutional Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the United Church.

10. The acceptance of Episcopal Ordination for the future would not imply the acceptance of any particular theory as to its origin or character, or the disowning of past ministries of Word and Sacrament otherwise received, which have, together with those received by Episcopal Ordination, been used and blessed by the Spirit of God.

We are persuaded there will be a very general feeling of thankfulness that the Conference of **The Coleshill Conference.** Evangelical Clergy, held at Coleshill on June 12-16, was so eminently successful that the statement agreed upon was carried with only two abstentions. It should be remembered that the Conference was not called for the purpose of defining what is or what is not the Evangelical position. It was called rather that earnest men of both the Conservative and Liberal wings of the Evangelical School might speak together as in the presence of God, seek to understand each other better, and, if possible, discover some way by which all might work together in the spirit of Christ without mutual distrust and suspicion. The proceedings were private, but those who were present are unanimous in their testimony that the working of the Holy Spirit was very clearly felt by all. It was a most solemn occasion; misunderstandings were removed and regret was expressed by both sides for any harsh, unkind or un-

charitable words that may have been used in the past towards each other. This was, in itself, a great gain, and it will give a new tone and a new temper to discussions in the future. And all this was carried through most happily without any compromise of principle on either side. The Conference has demonstrated how very much can be accomplished when men pray together with the sincere desire that they may be guided by the Spirit of God. It should prove an immense help to the Committee of the Church Missionary Society when it meets on July 12 to discuss and, if possible, come to some agreement upon, the grave issues that are awaiting settlement. It is much to be desired that every member and friend of the C.M.S. will pray earnestly and continuously that the gracious guidance of God the Holy Spirit may be given to the Committee in its deliberations, that unity may be reached, and that the work of God may go steadily forward both at home and abroad. The Coleshill Conference was attended by about seventy Evangelical Clergy, including ten Bishops. For convenience of reference we quote the full statement agreed upon as follows :—

“ After prayer, and long and anxious conference, and with an ever-growing consciousness of the presence of the Holy Spirit in our midst, we have been drawn closer together in a deeper understanding of the movements, intellectual and spiritual, which have been influencing the minds of many of us.

“ We desire to put it on record that we have found in the course of our discussions a real and profound unity of spirit as Evangelical Churchmen, realizing with complete unanimity the absolute supremacy of Jesus Christ our Lord, the Divine Saviour of Mankind, the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

“ We believe that we shall work together more cordially, especially in discharging the fundamental task of preaching the gospel both at home and abroad.

“ We realize that there are important differences among us, and in accordance with the terms of the invitation issued to us, we have deliberately refrained from attempting to formulate any definition of Evangelical principles. We have learnt, however, to understand and respect the convictions of one another, and we believe that time and prayer and patience will bring us yet closer together.

“ The Conference has produced a general conviction among us that the co-operation of the various sections of Evangelicals in the work of the Church Missionary Society can be maintained, and we venture to suggest to the Committee of that Society that some method could and should be devised to make the co-operation happier and more effective.

" We have come to see afresh the desperate need of the world and of our own land to-day, and we are resolved courageously to go forward to make Christ known to the utmost of our power. To this enterprise of witness and corporate action we make bold to summon all our brethren."

It was further resolved that a Continuation Committee should be formed for the purpose of considering whether such a Conference should be held at some future time, and also as to whether the time had arrived for a great spiritual and evangelical movement to be launched.

An instructive article from the ever facile pen of **Lessons from the Past.** Dr. Eugene Stock appears in the current issue of the *Church Missionary Review*, in which he draws "Some Lessons from Past Times," in their application to present-day controversies. These "lessons" are, indeed, a cordial for drooping spirits. He agrees that problems of Biblical inspiration loom largest on the present horizon, but he submits that it is utterly contrary to the long-standing tradition of the C.M.S. to class them with the great fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith. "So long," he concludes, "as Evangelical Churchmen stand firm in their allegiance to these truths, it will be impossible for any Committee of the C.M.S. to swerve from them; and the real test for C.M.S. missionaries is that these should not merely be held intellectually as true dogmas, but that they should be the foundation and the secret of their spiritual life."

Evangelical Churchmen will do well to be prepared **Attack on Trusts.** to meet a very definite attack upon Ecclesiastical Trusts. The "Life and Liberty" scheme of Church patronage reform proposes the abolition of these Trusts and the transfer of livings in their gift to a Central Patronage Board. These proposals will need the most careful watching; at present they are in the pamphlet stage only, but they may mature very quickly.



## THE DOCTRINE OF THE BIBLE.

BY THE REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D.

SOME time ago I read these words in an English paper :—  
Amid the blows of thought that confuse and stun us, many are taking refuge in some form of religious infallibility which tries to shift personal responsibility for faith on to some authority—external, rigid, and final—on which we can unhesitatingly rely. With some it is an infallible Bible, a doctrine which seems to imply that God spoke directly to men in the days when the Bible was being written, but that He speaks so no longer ; all that we can authentically know of Him is to be found in the pages of a Book to which no word has been added for long centuries. If that were the final truth about the Bible it could only have the effect of driving God to a distance from man and making Jesus Christ a dim historic figure whose work was completed in the far-off past. Moreover, it would reduce the revelation given us in the Bible to a mere historic interest and deprive inspiration of any real meaning, for “there cannot be a revelation given once for all in the fulness of its meaning.” Even though our Lord declared Himself to be the full and final revelation of the Father, He taught His disciples that they would need the continuous guidance of His Spirit in order to recognize the full meaning of His Person.

As these statements represent a position held to-day by very many, it may perhaps be useful to make a few comments on them from the Evangelical point of view.

1. The writer speaks of the way in which many to-day are turning towards some authority on which we can unhesitatingly rely. I do not think it is quite fair to speak of those who turn to “authority” as trying to “shift personal responsibility for faith.” The need of some authority is not surprising when other departments of life are considered. Authority rules in all realms, and it is surely not to be wondered at if man feels his need of authority in regard to the soul and things spiritual. A recent writer has called attention to the way in which authority obtains in architecture ; the square, the plumb-line, and the foot-rule attest their own authority over architect, builder, and labourer. The writer adds that it would be serious to imagine a plea for liberty on the assumption that the square, the plumb-line and the foot-rule were only of the dead past and that henceforth human

consciousness would be sufficient to establish levels and shapes and outlines.

2. This authority is described as "external, rigid, and final," but there is a manifest confusion in the association of these three epithets. Years ago Sabatier wrote a book entitled *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit*, a title which expresses an utterly false antithesis, because it is at least conceivable that a religion of the spirit in the sense of the Holy Spirit can and would be a religion of "authority." In the same way when the writer of the above words unites the three terms, "external, rigid, and final," he is guilty of a serious fallacy, because our supreme authority is the Lord Jesus Christ, and while He is not "external" He is certainly "rigid and final" as an authority. It would be well if we could at once and for ever get rid of the antithesis so often stated between objective and the internal, because Christ as our authority is at once our indwelling Master and an absolutely objective authority.

3. It is said that the doctrine of an infallible Bible "seems to imply that God spoke directly to men in the days when the Bible was being written but that He speaks so no longer." But does God speak to us to-day exactly as He spoke to men in the days when the Bible was being written? Is it not absolutely true that "all we can authentically know of Him is to be found in the pages of a book to which no word has been added for long centuries"? I have always thought this represented the mere alphabet of Evangelical truth. Would the writer or anyone else to-day make the claim that St. Paul made that what he wrote were the commandments of the Lord (1 Cor. xiv. 37; 2 Thess. iii. 14). Is there anything known to-day in regard to spiritual truth which is not "found in the pages" of that book? If so, what is it?

4. It is said that if this were the final truth about the Bible "it could only have the effect of driving God to a distance from man and making Jesus Christ a dim historic figure whose work was completed in the far-off past." The writer is here guilty of an obvious *non sequitur*, because the revelation in the Bible includes that of the Holy Spirit who makes Jesus Christ real to those who receive Him and thus effectually prevents Him from being "a dim historic figure." The statement does not make clear the distinction which is so often drawn between the "Jesus of History" and the "Christ of Experience."

5. It is also said that such a view as the writer opposes " would reduce the revelation given us in the Bible to a mere historic interest and deprive inspiration of any real meaning." It would be interesting to know precisely what the writer means by " revelation " and " inspiration." The words quoted (I wonder from whom) that " there cannot be a revelation given once for all in the fulness of its meaning " entirely begs the question. We are told that the faith was " once for all delivered to the saints " (Jude v. 3). But those who are firm in their belief in such a complete revelation are equally clear that " its fulness of meaning " is a matter of gradual realization. There is all the difference in the world between additions to the faith and fresh combinations and interpretations of an already completed faith. Wherein lies the distinctiveness of the New Testament if it does not enshrine " a revelation given once for all " ? Why do we regard the New Testament as unique when compared with other books ? How is it men like Gwatkin (see his *Early Church History*) point out that the fundamental difference between the New Testament and the best Christian literature of the second century is one of the proofs of unique inspiration ? Is there not a vital difference between the Spirit of Inspiration as seen in the New Testament and the Spirit of Illumination as seen in the succeeding ages of the Church ? The Holy Spirit revealed the body of truth in the Apostolic age, and since that time the same Spirit has been shedding fuller and fuller light on the truth then given. John Robinson of Leyden gave expression to this position in the well-known words addressed to the Pilgrim Fathers. He charged them that " the Lord had yet more light and truth to break forth from His Holy Word." In this utterance he showed that we are to expect more and more knowledge, but it will always be " from His Holy Word " as the sole source from which the " light is to break forth." Herein lies the distinction between the static and dynamic in Christianity. It is fallacious in the extreme to place these two ideas in antithesis, for Christianity is at once static and dynamic.

6. The writer goes on to speak of our Lord teaching His disciples their need of " the continuous guidance of His Spirit in order to recognize the full meaning of His Person." This is of course strictly true in regard to those earliest disciples and the result is seen in the Acts and Epistles, where " the meaning of His Person "

is developed in a way that was impossible until the Spirit had been given at Pentecost. But I submit that to take these words as they stand and apply them to to-day is incorrect, for we are not on a level with those disciples. All that the words can mean is expressed by the distinction already drawn by the Spirit of Inspiration and the Spirit of Illumination. Otherwise we should be involved in a theory of development which is not fundamentally dissimilar from that of Newman. Development is natural, necessary and legitimate, but it must always be in essential harmony with Apostolic germs, or else the growth is not true but parasitic.

The whole statement is characteristic of that aspect of modern thought which tends to make man's mind the source, seat, and criterion of authority. In a book recently published these words occur :—

“ Since the revelation of God in Jesus Christ is accessible to us only through the Scriptures, there must be Scriptural proof for every proposition in Christian dogmatics ; but a proposition is not Scriptural because passages can be quoted in its support. It is Scriptural because it issues with inner necessity or consequentialness from the believing surrender to the revelation of God to which the Scriptures bear witness.”

On this view the source of Christian truth is not the Scripture considered alone or even Scripture regarded as predominant, but is found in a sort of harmony between Scripture and our religious conceptions and convictions. How these two are related and which is the more authoritative, the book does not say, but the principle stated is clearly one of essential subjectivity without any guarantee of objective reality.

Another quotation from the same book reveals the same attitude :

“ The material of dogmatics cannot be obtained from the Scriptures by *purely exegetical, historical investigation*, though such is essential, New Testament theology yields as such no Christian dogmatics. Dogmatics seeks not only to understand what is given in the New Testament in its historical actuality, but to win a judgment as to : with what *right* and in what *scope* faith may and must recognize a real revelation of God in what is narrated concerning Jesus Christ, and how correct was the understanding of the revelation by the New Testament witnesses.”

And so I maintain we must continue to assert the objective validity, the unique character, and the supreme authority of Scrip-

ture. If this is called "religious infallibility," be it so, because many of us hold that it is unthinkable that in the spiritual realm God has left us without the authority for accurate knowledge and genuine experience which we know He has given in other walks of life. It is surely much easier to believe that God has given us the Scripture as an infallible guide than that He should have left us to the discordant voices of men and the variableness of human consciousness.

There is scarcely any tendency of the present day more persistent than that which is implied in the extract given above, that of finding the seat of authority within man himself, as though the consent of the mind is the foundation of certitude. Reason and experience are valuable and necessary as the means of distinguishing the claims of authority and also as the recipients of the truths of revelation, but this is something altogether different from a claim to be the source or seat of authority itself. As Butler showed long ago, no authority can be legitimate which subverts or stultifies reason, and the right of verification is the bounden duty of every man, but if there is such a thing as reality independent of our mind, it is obvious that human consent cannot be the basis of truth, for certitude only comes as the result of accepting and experiencing the reality outside ourselves. The difficulty with reason lies not merely in its normal human limitation, but in its serious defects through sin. It cannot analyse sin and certainly it has never found out the way of escape from the guilt and power of evil. To regard reason, therefore, as autonomous is to deny the existence of objective reality. Man's consciousness cannot create; it only weighs and then accepts or rejects what is offered. The true idea of authority is that which is not against reason but in accordance with it, and for spiritual life the supreme authority is the Divine revelation of Christ embodied in the Bible.

The modern tendency to fix the seat of authority within is liable, as I have pointed out, to the fatal error of pure subjectivity, unless it is constantly safeguarded by the consciousness of a true objective element in knowledge. For this reason I do not hesitate to repeat, because of its vital importance, that the idea of the terms "objective" and "external" being identical is wholly incorrect, for since the ultimate authority is Christ Himself we can see at once that though Christ is dwelling in us, He is not thereby

identical with us. He is the Divine revelation mediated through Scripture and applied by the Holy Spirit, and as such He is at once objective and subjective, external and internal.

I will close by expressing my strong opinion that the extract which I have quoted reveals no conception of Evangelical truth concerning Scripture, but is nothing else than a reminder of that modern quagmire which is associated with human consciousness as the criterion of truth. There is perhaps no principle which is more needed at the present day than that which is stated and involved in the doctrine of Article VI; the uniqueness, the sufficiency, the supremacy and the finality of Scripture for Christian doctrine and life. And it is not too much to say that if Evangelical Churchmanship is not clear, convinced, and constantly firm on this point, it has no defence either against Romanism or Modernism.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

#### SCHWARTZ OF TANGORE.

SCHWARTZ OF TANGORE. By Jesse Page, F.R.G.S. London : S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d. net.

There are probably many missionary-hearted people to whom Christian Frederick Schwartz is only a name, and we are indebted to Mr. Page for the patient research work that lies behind this readable biography of a really great missionary. He has indeed given us not only a full-length portrait of Schwartz, but in his first chapter, "How Christianity came to India," he has given us a careful outline of early Christian effort in India, and in another chapter we find a biographical sketch of another notable missionary, Bartholomew Ziegenbalg, born in 1683, "a born pioneer, undaunted in courage, fertile in resource, patient and yet full of inspiration, with a remarkable gift of organization," and who died at the early age of thirty-six, worn out with his labours. Schwartz was born in 1726 and died in 1798. In the course of Mr. Page's narrative many things emerge. We are reminded of the splendid service rendered by the venerable S.P.C.K., which appropriately publishes this memoir. Then, of course, there are bits of Indian history recorded, troubles over the succession of native rulers, hostility on the part of some British administrators, and controversy with Roman Catholics; but the outstanding figure is that of Schwartz, patient, persevering, and untiringly energetic and with fine spiritual ideals. It is good that his wonderful work should be redeemed from oblivion.

## THE PATHWAY TO REUNION.<sup>1</sup>

BY REV T. A. GURNEY, M.A., LL.B.  
Vicar of Bishop's Nympton, N. Devon.

“NO justification can be found in the New Testament,” a recent Bampton Lecturer has declared, “for our modern divisions.” The Church appears there neither as congregational nor as infallible, but as the home of the Spirit, of salvation, and of charity. If we seek for rules and regulations in its pages, therefore, we shall be disappointed, but not if we seek for principles. What we need is not antiquarianism, the dead hand of the first upon the life of the twentieth century. We want to learn those principles, and to be inspired by that spirit. We want life and courage.

Now it was the Kingdom, not the Church, that Jesus preached. Is it not probable, therefore, that any formula of agreement which shall put an end to these “unhappy divisions,” if findable anywhere is to be found in the study of the principles underlying the Kingdom rather than the attributes of the Church, and all the more so since the latter have been for centuries the fruitful source of bitter disagreement and contention? Church reunion demands a kindly atmosphere where it can struggle into healthy life. It is not found in fields reeking with the wastage of dead controversies. The seedplots of the Kingdom, of which Jesus spoke, are wholesome soil still.

It was the present and culminating Kingship of their Lord which dominated the whole consciousness of the Early Church. The matchless imagery of the “Revelation” is inspired by it. It is the Church’s sufficient answer to her adversaries, the gauntlet she flings down, with a note of fearless defiance to them to do their worst. Her vision of the present is “the vision of a world-empire once dominated by a usurping power, which has now at

<sup>1</sup> The Lambeth Conference Resolutions, 1920; Dr. Headlam’s Bampton Lectures, 1920, *The Doctrine of the Church and Reunion*; Shakespeare, *The Churches at the Cross-Roads*; *Towards Reunion*, Conferences at Mansfield College and elsewhere; Sanday, *Primitive Church and Reunion*; Bigg, *Unity in Diversity*; Gore, *Steps towards Unity*; Scott Lidgett, *Towards Reunion*; Guy Rogers, *Towards Reunion*; Briggs, *Church Unity*; Hibbert, and other reviews, various articles.

length passed into the hands of its true Owner and Emperor." <sup>1</sup> The priesthood of Christ is distinctly secondary there to His Royalty. The word "throne" occurs no less than thirty-four times, but the word "priest" only thrice in the whole book (i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6). The fact of His Lordship (see *κύριος* in nine great passages) <sup>2</sup> calls forth again and again the reiterated note of exultation, the sense of boundless hope, the assurance of overwhelming and final victory. His kingly omnipotence (*παντοκράτωρ*, nine times, i. 8; iv. 8; xi. 17; xv. 3; xvi. 7, 14; xix. 6, 15; xxi. 22) is realized as carrying with it infinite reserves of power which make the whole future sure.

But the Church of after-ages lost the heavenly vision. Men confounded the means with the end, and strove to find in the Church the realization of the Kingdom of which it was the instrument. They reared an idol to orthodoxy and cried, "This is the only unity." They triumphed over spiritual opponents and declared, "This is the victory of God." They identified the sovereignty with an omnipotent Church and made her proclaim, "I am Cæsar and I am Christ. I am the King and the Kingdom." And the Church became so concerned about her own future that the Kingdom was lost sight of. "Every house divided against itself is brought to desolation." So, whilst theologians were splitting straws over the apostolic credentials or the precise significance of Church authority, or the credal basis of Church unity, proclaiming the supremacy of the Sacerdotium over the Regnum, the common enemy thundered at and broke down the gates unhindered. To-day it is only by the recovery of the true vision of the lost Kingship that the lost unity can be re-won. A discovery of the keynotes of the Kingdom may discover for us again the true bases of unity.

Now the three great notes of Christ's Kingship are the living authority on which it rests, the diversified unity which it expresses, and the worldwide extension at which it aims—loyalty, fellowship, service: these are the three demands which the King makes on all the subjects of His Kingship. The acceptance of these gives the true bond of union between the members of the Kingdom.

I. *Living Authority* is the first mark of the Kingdom. There is the sovereignty, and there is the obedience of faith which gives expression to it. From the first our Lord claimed that sovereignty

<sup>1</sup> Swete, *Apocalypse*, notes *in loco*.

<sup>2</sup> I. 8; iv. 8, 11; xi. 17; xv. 3; xviii. 8; xxi. 22; xxii. 5.

as a present fact. "All authority hath been given unto Me in Heaven and on earth."<sup>1</sup> This, in fact, is the clearest of all New Testament truths—clearer, at first sight, even than His Divinity or Priesthood. He is "the King that cometh in the name of the Lord," the Messiah-Prince against Whom the nations rage in vain. His kingdom excels all earthly kingdoms because its rule is the rule of perfect freedom, its realm is world-wide, its sovereignty a thing which "stands and grows for ever." The precepts of the Kingdom as such are not ecclesiastical, theological in a specialized sense, conflicting and arbitrary, but social, human and practical. "Go ye, and make disciples of all nations." "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." "Ye are the salt of the earth . . . the light of the world." "Ye shall be My witnesses." Who can question the meaning or practical application of words such as these? For ages men have disputed the nature of authority in the Church—its source, prescriptions, and possible limitations. Claims have been made based upon false Decretals, unsupported by historic proofs, and utterly opposed to all life and progress. For centuries interpretations unscientific and dogmatic have claimed a mischievous infallibility, and the Body of Christ has been rent by a needless dissension and strife. And in the emphasis of these conflicting theories of the authority of the Church the authority of Christ Himself has been almost lost sight of. The history of the later Middle Ages teems with such instances, but they are to be found even in the second and third centuries. Although, as Dr. Forrest says in his *Authority of Christ*,<sup>2</sup> "Spiritual equality in Christ, interdependence, and mutual helpfulness . . . are the essential notes of the New Testament Church," yet "we have in the third century, as the first great contribution of Latin thought to Christian history, the Cyprianic theory of the Ministry and of the Church which forms the greatest break between the Apostolic age and the Reformation," and, "as modified by Augustine, and completed by the Roman bishops, has shaped the history of the Western Church for centuries." Then, in the fifteenth century, a mono-episcopate confronts us, divorced from all association with clergy or laity, hierarchical and absolute. And, in despair, men have found their refuge from such contradictions either in absolutism or scepticism.

<sup>1</sup> St. Matt. xxviii. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Forrest, *Authority of Christ*, p. 422.

The root-fault, of course, is that authority has been shifted from its fountain-head in the King Himself to the Church whose office it is to be its interpreter only. Ecclesiastical prerogative has invaded and dethroned the supreme prerogative of Christ, "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Things which He never hinted at as authoritative have been put forward under threat of penalty or even excommunication as divine precepts; whilst things truly authoritative, such as the authority of the Church herself, and of the Christian ministry, have been placed on a false pedestal of infallibility. A theology logical, self-consistent, scholastic, mediæval has darkened or even subverted the broadly human, divinely simple doctrine of Christ. There has been a perpetual harking back to a "Catholic" tradition which, on scientific examination, proved to have nothing catholic in the true sense about it. As long as Christians persist in affirming, as a precedent to all reunion, the primacy of St. Peter and of Rome, the infallibility of the Church in certain important matters, the Divine origin of episcopacy, the existence of three orders of the ministry in the New Testament, the invalidity of all but episcopal orders, what hopes can there be for reunion among thoughtful and unbiassed men? We are not placing Episcopacy upon its strongest but upon its weakest line of defence when we affirm that "the episcopate with its claim of an apostolic succession is an essential and inviolable element of Christianity." History itself replies in indignant tones to us. Yet on how strong authority it rests when we view it historically the language of Ignatius proves when he sets it forth as the safeguard of unity and apostolic truth; "not an autocratic or absolute government, but . . . of one chosen by the people and clergy of the diocese, and administering his diocese with the synodical authority of the clergy and also of the laity," an authority delegated to him by the priestly people of God.<sup>1</sup>

Now when we make the Kingly Authority of Christ the basis of our unity we restore the Church to her true place as ambassador and servant. Our real bond of fellowship will always really lie in obedience to the Lord's supreme commands. For example, how many who are mutually divided and distrustful to-day would find in the following affirmation (part of the Declaration of Common Faith and Practice issued by the Mansfield College Conferences

<sup>1</sup> *Towards Reunion*, pp. 123, 148.

of 1916 and 1917) the basis of closer co-operation, ultimately bearing fruit in actual reunion:—

“ We affirm the sovereign authority of our Lord Jesus Christ over every department of human life, and we hold that individuals and peoples are responsible to Him in their several spheres, and are bound to render Him obedience and to seek always the furtherance of His Kingdom upon earth, not, however, in any way constraining belief, imposing religious disabilities, or denying the rights of conscience.”

The authority in the Kingdom, being a living authority inspired by love and working from within, is capable, as such, of the widest diversity of application. There is nothing stereotyped about it. It is a rule of life, a counsel of perfection, a minister of freedom. No great living earthly kingdom will be fettered in its present freedom by historic precedent, but will have large faith in its widening mission and expanding future. The British Commonwealth is an illustration. The England of the Plantagenets bears but slight resemblance to the world-wide Commonwealth of peoples—differing in religion, race, customs and political institutions—which we still call the British Empire. And in the Kingdom of God the authority to which we surrender ourselves is not an authority of slavish adhesion to apostolic precedent, or ecclesiastical infallibility. It is the living word of a living King. He was exalted that He might fill all things. His Kingship is, therefore, a present and pervasive fact. It rules all thought, all life, all conduct. It governs all relationships. It is constantly creating fresh and living precedents, as we follow the guidance of the Sovereign Spirit. So, in affirming that authority as the first mark of our fellowship in the Kingdom we are replacing dead formulas with a living principle. We are shunning “ the tragedy of the misplaced emphasis.”<sup>1</sup> We are affirming a basis of unity, real, practical, and, in the widest sense, apostolic.

II. A second mark of the Kingdom is its *Diversified Unity*. It is one in its Kingship and authority, and in the loyalty demanded of its subjects; but it is diverse in the life, service and functions which are embraced within the one rule. It is a world-federation of many free communities under one Sovereign, Who is the secret of their cohesion. From the very first it never seems to have been contemplated by New Testament writers, or those who immediately

<sup>1</sup> Shakespeare, *The Churches at the Cross-roads*, p. 52.

followed them, that the Kingship or the Kingdom could be other than one and indivisible, though it was to gather up into that unity a rich diversity of life. That was the constant argument against the heretics—that they were offenders against the visible unity of the Great Society. The very unity of the Empire till the Middle Ages demanded it. Thus Dante, in his *De Monarchiâ*, argues again and again, that “it is only by being under one Princedom, or the rule of a single Prince, that Humanity as a whole is well adapted to the Universe or its Prince, Who is the One God.” The oneness of God’s being, in the image of which man was made, he declares, demands it (*De Mon. c. 8*). The inner nature of things confirms it, as Aristotle in his *Ethics* had shown. “Then,” he says sorrowfully, comparing the age when Christ came with His own, “then the human race was happy in the tranquillity of universal peace. But how the world has fared since that ‘seamless robe’ has suffered rending, by the talons of ambition, we may read in books—would that we might not see it with our eyes!” What Dante perceived as the need of his own day each previous age had already seen. The parables of the Kingdom had always painted it as one and indivisible. The vision of the Apocalypse had been of two empires meeting in deadly conflict—“the Kingdom of God represented by the Church, the World-power represented by Rome. Each was designed to embrace the whole world” (*Lightfoot, Essay, Epistles of St. John, p. 253*). Nor would Augustine have found any comfort, when the world-empire was falling to ruin, in singing of divided kingdoms. It was the one *Civitas Dei* in a world of discord which filled him with comfort and hope. Whether the Kingdom was Millennial Apocalypse, Christian Empire, or Omnipotent Church, it must always be one. The most ultra-individualist has never learnt to pray, “Thy Kingdoms come.”

But the unity was always a *unity in diversity*, a matter of life and freedom subject to the one supreme loyalty. Whenever the thought of the Kingdom became external it ceased, to that extent, to be true to itself. The unity could only be realized in rich and harmonious variety. For it was a unity, not of conformity and compulsion, but of federation, fellowship and freedom.

The unity we are seeking to restore to the Church is a unity whose features have been the marks of the Kingdom all along. Even with earthly Rome it was a unity which embraced under

one Roman toga the widest differences of race and religion ; and among ourselves with our far-flung frontiers, and medley of many races, it is a unity, spontaneous, living, intelligent, internal, the revelation to the whole world, in spite of all its defects, of human brotherhood on the widest scale.

Cannot we learn to-day from the mistakes of former generations ? Nineteen centuries of ecclesiastical strife lie behind us, with the acquired and unreal meaning they have given to some of our greatest words. How can we recover the lost unity of " One Church, one Faith, one Lord " ? We want some new inspiring watchword that may come to present-day men and women without prejudice. Have we not found it in that Fellowship for which the Bishops make their appeal ? <sup>1</sup> That is certainly the essential feature of the Church's oneness. " We may hope," writes Bishop Robertson in his *Regnum Dei*, " for a fertilization of the conception of the Church and its relation to the problems of human life in the light of the master idea of the kingdom of Christ upon earth." Now the root-error of the old idea of unity was Submission, not Fellowship. Anglican, Presbyterian and Puritan alike showed it when in power. The communities from which they differed must be penalized into obedience. So the sects of English Nonconformity were brought to birth with Acts of Uniformity as their dry nurses. Even National unity was lost by Laud's arbitrary actions in Scotland and by the persecuting madness of the Conventicle and Five Mile Acts of the Restoration, and the folly of the Stamp Acts in America. A better and wiser spirit marks our modern national life. Federation, not servile submission, is the keynote of our imperial unity to-day. The abrogation of British prerogative in South Africa and Ireland are brilliant examples.

Why should not this note of Fellowship be accepted as our principle in achieving the spiritual unity of the Heavenly Kingdom ? Churches Orthodox, Roman, Anglican, Free—all working out their full and characteristic destiny in perfect fellowship and co-operation, " Ephraim not envying Judah " and " Judah not vexing Ephraim " any more ? That would be the Great Church, catholic as never before in a truly Christian sense, as the Visible Society of Christ whose constituent societies are all sub-kingdoms, " Free States " in one vast Commonwealth. The recognition of diversity is essen-

<sup>1</sup> *Lambeth Conference Report*, pp. 26-9.

tial to true spiritual unity. It is only an ignorant Communism or Bolshevism which seeks to reduce Mankind to one International State by compulsion. "Sectional Christianity and Sectional Churches will never do much more than influence sections of the nation and some sides of the national life" (*Towards Reunion, Democracy and Church Unity*, p. 311). What is needed is a unity broadly diverse in its methods, federated in its activities, harmonious in its loyalty and aim, and faithfully applied to all aspects of religious and civic, national and international life, the corporate expression of a common faith and love.

III. But *World-wide Extension* is a third mark of the Kingdom. The discipling was to be to the uttermost parts of the earth, and, like a net, it gathers of every kind.<sup>1</sup> The Kingship must be proclaimed "till every kindred call Him Lord," and "all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of God." These "marching orders" of the Church have been strangely ignored in the preoccupation of our foolish controversies. In nothing have the Free Churches more nobly vindicated their claim to be members of the Church universal than in their missionary service. "It is the property of Christ to be universal." Then it must be one plain mark of His Church that she is Catholic in this modern and yet primitive sense of world-service. The King ascended far above all heavens that He might fill all things, and, therefore, "Christ in His Church" means "His Church in all the world." Catholicity needs redefinition to-day, in the light of experience, as aggressive service to "make Jesus King" in every sphere, social, industrial, international, human. It must become again what it once was in the earliest days—a spiritual patriotism world-wide in its fellowship.

Here, then, in these great, simple watchwords—Loyalty, Fellowship, Service—are three marks of the Kingdom already familiar to us in the earthly sphere but receiving their full and proper interpretation in the Kingdom of God. By accepting them as a temporary basis of unity we shall be shunning "the tragedy of the misplaced emphasis" and pressing forwards to a conception of the Church as "genuinely Catholic," vitally apostolic, and holy—not in faith and sacrament only—but in life and character.

T. A. GURNEY.

<sup>1</sup> St. Matt. xiii. 47.

## THE CANADIAN REVISION.<sup>1</sup>

### SOME NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS.

BY THE REV. S. R. CAMBIE, B.D., LITT.D.

THE fact that at the present time the Church of England is contemplating a revision of her formularies tends to increase our interest in the new Canadian Prayer Book. These notes do not profess to be entirely exhaustive, but I have noted most of the changes and have ventured a few opinions, which must be taken for what they are worth, the opinions of one who has no pretensions to be an expert in Liturgiology. The first observation one has to make will allay the fears of some. The doctrinal position of the Church in Canada is unaltered by this revision. Indeed the fact that in these days of varying opinion among Churchmen the Prayer Book has been overhauled, and with this result, seems rather to strengthen the Evangelical position.

*The Lectionary* is the one now proposed for us in England, but the lessons from the Apocrypha on Sundays, to which so many have objected, have been omitted, and even for weekdays further alternatives for such lessons have been provided. Thus, at least in my judgment, our Canadian friends have "gone one better!" In the *Calendar* are some unexpected changes—Thomas Aquinas, Francis of Assisi, Clement of Alexandria and several other notables disappear, but six others are accorded a place, including Justin Martyr and Thomas of Canterbury.

The notes which precede Morning Prayer are considerably extended and the Ornaments Rubric is retained. This is followed by explicit directions as to when and how the permissible shortened form may be used. An entirely new feature is a list of four possible "combinations of services" (e.g., Morning Prayer and Holy Communion, etc.) and one fears lest the fact that there is no suggestion of Holy Communion in conjunction with Evening Prayer may possibly be urged as an argument against it.

*Morning and Evening Prayer.*—Here it may be noted that the terms Mattins and Evensong are retained in the Tables of Proper

[<sup>1</sup> The new *Canadian Prayer Book* is published in England by the Cambridge University Press in various editions and at various prices.

Psalms and Lessons. The introductory sentences are increased in number and some are also provided, as in the Scottish book, for Festivals. There is no permission to shorten the exhortation in the morning, but its abbreviation is allowed in the evening, "in Churches where Morning Prayer has been said." The Scottish book permits the shortened form to be used at either time and, in addition, provides a further alternative, "Let us confess our sins to Almighty God." Special anthems, in place of the Venite, are provided for the chief Festivals, and these are printed with the Collect for the day. After the Creed comes an innovation, in the form of a note explaining the meaning of the words, "He descended into hell." An alternative to the State prayers is provided, based on one in the Scottish book, which includes the King, the Royal family, the Governor-General and Parliament, and in the prayer for Clergy and People, instead of "Who alone workest great marvels," we have—"the giver of all spiritual gifts." The Prayer for all Sorts and Conditions of Men and the General Thanksgiving are removed from their place in our book and embodied in Morning and Evening Prayer, and an expanded rubric, before the latter, says that it may be recited "by the Minister alone or by the Minister and people together."

To the title *The Creed of Saint Athanasius* are added, in brackets, the words "commonly so-called," and the Lambeth re-translation is adopted in which the three verses which cause regret to many are separated from the Creed itself, of which they really form no part. But why not omit them altogether? Instead of doing this the revisers have merely made the use of this confession permissive, and they have added an explanatory rubric "for the removal of doubts and to prevent disquietude." But Canadian Churchmen will still, when they recite this formula, have to say "without doubt"! Will it, we wonder, drop into desuetude?

The two sections—*Prayers* and *Thanksgivings*—are greatly enriched and the rubric permits the introduction of any of the former into the Litany. *The Litany* itself has four new petitions, but is otherwise unaltered. The rubric directs that it be used "at least once a month on Sunday," and there are regulations for its use "as a separate service." Thus it will be seen that there are no very striking or significant changes in the daily office. There are some things we might have expected. Why should not the mistranslations in the Canticles have been set right, as for instance

“candidatus” and “munerari” (the most authentic reading) in the Te Deum? Considering the circumstances of the Church in Canada, I think a good many people will be surprised to find no alternative form of Evening Service. And then, after reading in the Preface to the new revision that among the “results” is the revision of the Psalter, one is astonished to find it untouched!

We turn next to the *Communion Service*, and here again we see the conservative spirit in which the work has been done. The alterations are few and unimportant. Before the Gospel we have the now very general “Glory be to Thee, O Lord” and “Thanks be to Thee, O Lord.” The ten commandments are to be said once each Sunday, but the Lord’s summary of the Law may be used as an alternative when there is a second celebration. In the rubric before the Offertory sentences the publication of banns is ordered and here “excommunications and other Ecclesiastical notices are to be read.” In the prayer for the Church Militant the word “indifferently” is replaced by “impartially,” and in several places the word “lively” becomes “living,” and “damnation” “condemnation.” One new Proper Preface appears,—for Epiphany and seven days after. The rubric before the first of the three longer exhortations is slightly altered, and while the use of the first paragraph (Dearly beloved, on Sunday next, etc.) is permitted, it is ordered that *the whole* shall be read “upon some Sunday before Christmas Day, Easter Day and Whitsunday, the people all standing.” There are three additional Offertory sentences. The post-communion rubrics are all retained. Collects, Epistles, and Gospels are added for Rogation and Ember Days and the date of each Saint’s Day is given in a footnote. Perhaps I ought to have said that it is permissible to pass from the Benedictus or Jubilate to the Communion Office, which saves a great deal of quite unnecessary repetition.

*The Public Baptism of Infants.*—The opening rubrics are considerably expanded and increased in number from three to five. There are several new possibilities. “When three sponsors cannot be had, one Godfather and one Godmother shall suffice.” Permission, too, is given for parents to act as sponsors for their own children, “if necessity so require.” Baptism is to be administered “after the last lesson or after the third collect” and a new rubric at the end of the service allows the omission of the remaining prayers, save that of St. Chrysostom and the Grace. It is worth noting that

the question "Hath this child been already baptized or no?" does not form part of the service in the Scottish book, but is put back into a rubric.

*Private Baptism.*—To this is appended a new rubric permitting lay baptism "if no lawful Minister may be had, and the child is in danger of death." It is a little surprising that no provision is made for the shortening of either service, both of which always seem to be unnecessarily long, and we might have expected to find the Apostles' Creed in its more familiar form, the resurrection of "the body" instead of "the flesh." The expression "the vulgar tongue" is retained in a rubric, but disappears from both the addresses to sponsors.

*The Catechism.*—This is usefully divided into five sections, boldly headed in block type—(1) The Covenant, (2) The Faith, (3) The Commandments, (4) Prayer, and (5) The Sacraments. The only alteration I have discovered is *not* unimportant. The comma is restored to its proper place, after the word "grace," as in the Sealed book. The Scottish revisers failed to insert it, and why it is omitted from our Prayer Book remains a mystery.

*The Order of Confirmation.*—Here a good many alterations and additions will be found. The service opens with a short form of presentation to the Bishop, and the exhortation begins, "Dearly beloved," and is considerably expanded. Three short lections from Scripture are introduced—a useful feature. The question "Do ye here, etc." is slightly altered by the addition of the words "all those things which you then undertook," obviously to meet the case of persons who were baptized in maturer years. There is also an alternative form provided which requires three replies from the candidate. From this point onwards there is no change.

*The Solemnisation of Matrimony.*—This is prefaced by the Table of Kindred and Affinity, and a new rubric forbids any clergyman solemnising a marriage within the prohibited degrees, while another forbids the marriage of divorced persons. By the way, the title "clergyman" is unusual in the rubrics, and it is strange that in these particular rubrics we should have no less than three different descriptions of the officiating minister—viz. Curate, Clergyman, Priest! The wording of the opening address has been happily altered and a Collect, Epistle, and Gospel are appended.

*The Visitation of the Sick.*—Here is some enrichment, but other-

wise the service is substantially unaltered. The exigencies of space forbid quotations.

*The Communion of the Sick.*—The introductory rubric permits the substitution of the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the day and, at the end, a new rubric appears, permitting, when the person "is very weak," a further curtailment of the service.

*The Burial of the Dead.*—To the opening sentences is added "Let not your heart be troubled, etc." and the passage from Job xix. is shortened, the words "yet in my flesh shall I see God, etc." being omitted. The reason for this is not very obvious seeing that elsewhere (Baptismal service) "the resurrection of the flesh" is retained. There is an alternative psalm (xxiii.) for use at the burial of children. It seems a pity that the revisers did not give some alternative lessons. At a funeral people are often in such a frame of mind that they are unable to enter into St. Paul's elaborate argument for the resurrection. The Scottish book gives no fewer than seven short lections, and the writer must confess that he very often uses one or more of them. It is, however, only fair to say that there are, for the burial of children, two alternative readings from Scripture. In the prayer of committal, the somewhat unreal expression "it hath pleased God of His great mercy to take" has been allowed to remain, though with strange inconsistency the similar sentiment in one of the final prayers—"we give Thee hearty thanks that it hath pleased Thee to deliver" disappears. The alternative form in the Scottish book seems to me so greatly preferable that I venture to produce it.

Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God in his wise providence, to take unto himself the soul of our brother here departed; we therefore commit his body to the ground; earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust; looking for the general resurrection in the last day, and the life of the world to come, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subject all things unto himself.

In the Canadian book "vile" is changed to "corruptible." There are some additional prayers which may be used "at the discretion of the Minister," and without any prefatory rubric, an Epistle and Gospel (2) are added, presumably for a Communion, but this notwithstanding there is no word that can be construed into a prayer for the departed.

*The Ordinal* remains unaltered, save for the additions to the Litany already noted. Finally, there are some *entirely new services*. In a special form for Dominion Day and other occasions of National Thanksgiving, there is a pleasing Thanksgiving "for our goodly heritage" and several other prayers that we like much. There is a wisely compiled Service for Children and a Special Service for Missions. For ourselves, we shall certainly make use of the excellent Form of Thanksgiving for the Blessings of Harvest. There are also forms of Institution and Induction, also for the Laying of a Foundation Stone and the Consecration of Church or Churchyard. Last, but not least, we have Family Prayers.

The Canadian revisers may well be thankful that their task is accomplished. They have kept off the rocks, and have, with sound judgment, tact, and above all with loyalty to truth, brought the venerable Book of Common Prayer up to date without disturbing the balance of doctrine. To have done so cannot have been easy. With this book the Canadian Church hopefully faces the future.

S. R. CAMBIE.

THE REASON OF THE CHRISTIAN HOPE : or, Why I am a Christian.

By the Rev. E. H. Archer-Shepherd, M.A. London :  
S.P.C.K. 6d. net.

A clear statement of the Christian position, warmly commended by the Bishop of Hereford. Just the thing to put into the hands of educated thoughtful people who are troubled with doubts as to the foundations upon which our faith rests. While the author is never flippant or unsympathetic he has yet given the agnostic some hard nuts to crack.

A BOOK OF PRAYERS. Written for use in an Indian College. London : *The Challenge, Ltd.*

Often beautiful in expression as well as varied in subject these prayers represent the searchings after God of men belonging to several differing religious systems. As such they stir our sympathies, and we feel that those who have learned to use these prayers cannot be far from the Kingdom. Nevertheless we miss the Name that is above every name. Yet as we turn the Hebrew Psalms into Christian hymns by the addition of the Gloria, so surely many Christians will be able to adapt these graceful, reverent supplications for use in private devotion or family prayer.

## THE MORAL BATTLEFIELDS OF MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE.<sup>1</sup>

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

I HAVE ventured to choose this title because it expresses the thoughts which are in my own heart, and not only so, but, by the philosophy of suggestion, it may help to crystallize those ideas which are at present in the minds of men, but in nebulous form. All enterprise constitutes a battlefield. Positions which we have reached to-day have been won by conflict of former generations. And in our own experience we have had to accept the principle whether we liked it or no that "through struggle to achievement" is life's inexorable law. In treating of moral battlefields I do not wish to think of the more popular meaning of the word, but rather of its philosophic import as to lines of human conduct implying principles and connoting certain lines of action as resultant forces.

"Two grand tasks," said Carlyle, "have been assigned to the English people: the grand Industrial task of conquering some half or more of this terraqueous planet for the use of man; and, secondly, the grand Constitutional task of sharing, in some pacific endurable manner, the fruit of the said conquest, and showing all people how it might be done." And again: "Two men I honour, and no third. First, the toilworn craftsman that with earth-made implement laboriously conquers the earth and makes her man's. A second man I honour, and still more highly—him who is seen toiling for the spiritually indispensable; not daily bread but the bread of life. . . . These two in all their degrees I honour. All else is chaff and dust, which let the wind blow whither it listeth." That is to say, that the true man of enterprise is the spiritual man, who is seeking to bring out of the Industrial and Constitutional elements of his national life those spiritual processes which will eventually leaven the whole. To do such the man of commerce has a battlefield as wide as the scope of his vision. He has to face certain moral issues and to make certain decisions which may make or mar him. But if he is spiritual he must go farther. He

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at a Board of Missions Conference at Newport.

must ask himself the question—Had I any obligations binding on me, when I was dealing with my own concerns, that should have led me to look beyond them? It may be perhaps hard to persuade him that his fortune carried a burden of moral obligation with it. But if we put it in another way and ask him for a subscription to a local charity where his works are, he admits the obligation and subscribes. We might argue from this that we as a Nation have carried out our trust Imperially with the moral and spiritual always in view. If the man of commerce has made money in India or our Dependencies he has left the impress of the English character behind him in equal laws and perfect justice, more kindly institutions and more humane instincts. These are infinitely more valuable than the mere gold; simply from their elevating and enduring character.

But, when all is said, it becomes a question, and a very searching question, whether we, or I might put it, whether Western civilization has fully compensated the Eastern Nations for the amount of injury it has caused—that is, to the established customs of those nations which are so much older than our own. It is a fact that wherever we go, we go to destroy. We have destroyed the Caste system by our Civil Service Competitive Examinations, whereby a low caste may appear at the top of the lists. We have jumbled up Brahmin Parsee and outcastes in our electric trams in all the great cities of India. Nay, more—we have seriously encroached upon their religious ideals by the inevitable intercourse which the “open door” secured. We have by means of Education changed the character and the outlook of the men. They are demanding educated brides, and are refusing to live under the Hindu joint family system; but, following Western custom, are demanding homes of their own. The position of women has also benefited by the changed conditions. The Oriental ideal of womanhood dies hard. When we understand its oppression through all the centuries we begin to realize the meaning of one of those Indian love lyrics:—

Less than the dust beneath thy chariot wheels,  
Less than the rust that never stained thy sword,  
Less than the trust thou hast in me, my Lord,  
Even less than these.

Less than the weed that grows beside the door,  
Less than the speed of hours spent far from thee,  
Less than the need thou hast in life for me,  
Even less am I.

The women of India, China and Japan are imbued with the spirit of Feminism, at least in so far as it gives them the education which they demand and the freedom which they claim. People are beginning to see that "No nation can rise above the spirit of its women, and if that spirit be asleep the nation can never be wideawake."

But far greater and more difficult issues are raised than these as a result of this Western impact. Social questions, Labour difficulties, have arisen of sufficient magnitude to compel attention, our own Social and Economic problems have their exact counterpart in the Eastern nation. The profiteer was not a unique product of our soil. He can be found in Japan, and one of their own professors (Joda) has railed at "the rampant and unrestrained behaviour of upstart millionaires." The growing self-consciousness of the working classes is making a deep impression on the whole national life. Strikes are of frequent occurrence both in Japan and India. There are injustices crying out for redress that are far more glaring than anything through which our own nation has passed. In Japan to-day there is an utter carelessness of human suffering. Women are working twelve hours a day in factories. The mortality of factory girls is 23 per cent each year. Twenty-two per cent of the women and girls are under fourteen years of age. In Persia, children from four years old are employed in making carpets, working twelve hours a day, and in so cramped a position that their limbs are twisted and permanently deformed. In China, coal can be sold in Shansi at 1s. 6d. per ton, because the miners work eleven hours a day for 7 cents, and a cent's worth of rice and meal. They are often in water up to the knees or waist. Porters have to carry a 400 lb. load for less than 1d. a mile. From this it can be clearly seen that all these countries are going through exactly the same conditions as ours did in the early nineteenth century. But it can also be seen that the world is absolutely one; that as Mr. Lenwood, in his *Social Problems in the East*, says, "You cannot save White-chapel if you ignore Calcutta."

How is the Church going to face these new conditions? What is to be her attitude to them?

If there is one fact which stands out through all these world upheavals, it is that the great religions of the East have failed to have any effect upon the unsettled races, of either solving their

problems, or giving them a scrap of comfort in their travail and pain. It might be summarized in the answer of a Hindu priest to a poor soul in great spiritual anguish. He had no more to say to her than : " Go pluck a rose from the garden of anyone who is not in trouble." A Japanese writer said that Buddhism, Confucianism and Shintoism have " none of them a strong restraining influence on the people." Just as we in the West with modern European culture are no longer confronted with the claims of Jupiter, Thor, Osiris, we have passed beyond them, for " Mankind will always exchange legend for history and fiction for fact " in the spiritual as well as in the intellectual market. Even so : the modern Asiatic has ceased to derive any inspiration from the older faiths, which his forefathers accepted from sheer ignorance, as well as from heredity.

What presentment of Religion are we to give him ? We might ask another question far more pertinent, " Are we sure of our own ground, and where we stand ? "

This is a very real battlefield ; there is a tendency in many leaders of our Church to-day to detract from the Divine all those miraculous and superhuman accessories which confirmed the witness and experience of generations. It would seem that some leaders in theology have not recovered from the panic which the war inflicted upon their mental outlook. It is a well-known fact that detractors from the Divine have always flourished in times of upheaval. Is it not the old fallacy of the Earth being stationary and the whole universe moving round it ? Modern thought has assumed this " stationary " character by its wild and uncompromising assertions ; and the Divine must cast away a great deal if it is to be squared with it. We are confident, however, that the panic will pass. The witness of the spirit will ever remain. If the contest is to take the form of an " Ethical " Christ versus a " Soterial," there is no doubt which will win ! The saying of St. Paul will stand all the blast of criticism, as well as all the shafts of a rationalistic age : " This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners of whom I am chief."

There are two outstanding features of the Religion of Jesus Christ which shall ever prove successful in their appeal to the Eastern nations. The first is that Christianity is a personal appeal

to individuals, and its influence will ever radiate from the individual soul which has been touched by the fire of God's Holy spirit. The phrase "Winning the Masses" has done much damage to the cause of Jesus Christ. It was John Burns who said very truly: "The religion of Jesus Christ is not like a factory gate into which men crowd. It is rather like a turnstile through which every man must pass by himself." I have read a beautiful quotation from Bishop Creighton's *Heritage of the Spirit* in which he says: "Christianity beautifies many an individual life and sheds a lustre over many a family. Its influence is less conspicuous in the life of business, it pales in the sphere of what is called society, and is still dimmer in politics. In the region of International obligations it can scarcely be said to exist."

The rejoicing concerning the various "Mass Movements" in Africa, India and China must be tempered by the fact that there are far too few missionaries and teachers to treat them individually. This in passing may prove a real menace; for the "Ghandi group" is the result of an insufficiently instructed Christianity.

The second feature is that it is based upon the law of self-sacrifice. That "he that seeketh to save his life shall lose it and he that loseth his life shall keep it unto life eternal." This is an inexorable law and cannot be explained away. The religion of the East as well as some forms of our Western creed are seeking to evade this, and to a great extent our Church is infected by it. In other religions it is done under the guise of magical rites. In ours it is, to our shame be it stated, by lowering the standards of Christian life. The Parable of the unjust steward has its counterpart in our National and Church life to-day. It is always "Take thy bill and write fifty or fourscore" as the case may be. There is not a movement in our social or moral life, but we have held up the white feather of shameful defeat from sheer fear of popular opinion, and we have acquiesced in a lower standard of moral life than has been since most of us remember. Our divorce proposals could never have assumed the form which they have, if our Church had risen up and with one voice condemned them. It would have saved the nation in spite of itself. It has become an aphorism of the war that "second-class standards have never made first-class men." We see the truth of this in the worldly spirit which has crept into our Church life. A church or a parish that has to depend for raising

its funds upon theatricals, whist drives and dances, had better be scrapped or destroyed lest others become infected with its virus. The inventor of the term "The line of least resistance" has indeed a lot to answer for!

I believe that these two appeals shall win the heathen. The poor outcast who is despised will be won when he hears Him Who Himself was the "despised and rejected of men" say to him, "Come unto Me and I will give you rest." The high caste and austere Brahmin will be won by the searching question, "What think ye of Christ," for the growing consciousness of personality is not only becoming "a vision beautiful," after an age of pantheistic thought; it is becoming to them "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God *in the face of Jesus Christ.*"

The second result of these features will be character. Character is the result of contact with Jesus Christ. This is unique in the history of all religion. There is no hope of building well where there is no character. The claim of the Religion of Jesus Christ to change the life and to reform the character is unique in any scheme or system of ethics. Deane Inge puts this question in his succinct way. He says: "The acceptance of the world's suffering from which every other spiritual religion and philosophy promise a way of escape is perhaps the most distinctive feature of Christian ethics. In practice it thus achieves a more complete conquest of evil than any other system, and by bringing sorrow and sympathy into the Divine life it not only presents the character and nature of the Deity in a new light, but opens out a new ideal of moral perfection."

The next question that arises is upon what lines this proclamation shall be perpetuated. The great blunder in all our missionary movements is that we have been too prone to Anglicize rather than Evangelize. This is a weakness as well as a strength in our national ideals. But it is a decided weakness in our missionary propaganda. We have in our Societies been holding a very firm hand for over a hundred years now, and controlling all the missions from home. Our mental outlook has decided that the time is not ripe for local autonomy, and we have never created a Diocesan Indian Bishop. We have, in short, with the best intention, been usurping the province and work of the Holy Spirit who in the early days of the Church guided its destinies with His Divine co-operation. We do not so trust Him to-day. The growing spirit of Nationalism has

many side issues. It shall certainly develop. It is a grave question whether we might not have prevented the unrest in India had we long ago said to them, "Now we have given you the Gospel, we have erected the first foundation of the Spiritual Temple. It is now for you to carry it up to its sublime completion. We commend you to God and to the word of His Grace which is able to build you up and to give you an inheritance among them which are sanctified." This was what St. Paul did, and it was according to the will of God. If we are to achieve the Kingdom of God amongst the nations, we shall have to relax the too tenacious hold over the churches in those countries and let them grow under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. If the churches are of His planting He will see to their watering and increase. It is humiliating to be told that the world will carry on even after our departure from it. In the days of the Commonwealth, relates Dean Inge in *The Church and the Age*, there was a certain Ambassador to the Hague named Bulstrode Whitelocke. He was one night tossing about through sheer anxiety about the condition of his Country and his Church. His old and tried servant begged to ask him a question, and on being given leave said, "Sir, did God govern the world well before you came into it?" "Undoubtedly," said his master. "And will He rule the world well when you have gone out of it?" "Undoubtedly," still replied his master. "Then, sir," said the servant, "can you not trust Him to rule the world well while you are in it?" It is related that the tired and harassed Ambassador fell into a profound slumber!

But were this brought to pass, it does not relieve us of any responsibility. In fact, our responsibility towards the Church abroad and Missions overseas is made legal and binding upon every member of the Church. By Clause 2 of the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure, 1921: "It shall be the primary duty of the Council in every Parish to co-operate with the Incumbent in the initiation, conduct and development of Church work both within the Parish *and outside*." But it might get rid of these appalling deficits in our great Societies' accounts. The cost of living is in a far less ratio to the native than to the European.

What, in conclusion, shall we say to these things? I pass by the discussion of the great problem that we cannot hope to evangelize the world from an unevangelized England. This has a primary

relation to Home Missions. It was also touched upon when speaking of the lowering of our standards. But it is with this great stumbling-block towards Missions in my mind that I close with a personal appeal. What is the measure of our own attitude to Christ? The war and its aftermath has hid Him from our vision. Christ must be re-discovered. A very few years before his death Dr. Salmon, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, was seen crossing the "quad" jubilantly flourishing a sheaf of papers which were filled with abstruse calculations. He ran into my old Tutor, Mr. Cathcart, and exultingly showed him the result of days' close study in the solving of a most difficult problem. Mr. Cathcart took them and looked over them hurriedly and then said to Dr. Salmon, "Why, you have all this worked out in your book on Conic Sections!" There it was! But the dear old Provost had at least the joy of re-discovering something that he had lost fifty years before when the book was published. The joy of re-discovery will be even greater with us. What is needed for the world to-day and especially for the Home Church, is a fresh vision of Christ upon the Cross. The woe as well as the triumph of that hour must touch each of us afresh. This will become our inspiration to fresh effort. "We see not yet all things put under Him, but we see Jesus . . . crowned." When young Dudley Ryder, who was one of the pioneer missionaries to the Niger Hinterland, lay dying of blackwater fever, he was heard to breathe this prayer couched in schoolboy language—for he was only fresh from Cambridge—"Oh, Lord, do not let Thy work suffer because of this 'kink' in it," meaning that his death might impede the mission. At his funeral the next day they sang his favourite hymn, "Jesus shall reign where'er the sun doth his successive journeys run." In an adjoining field a Moslem woman was singing a Moslem song. She immediately ceased her singing and listened to the Christian hymn. This is the promise that shall be. The songs of Christ shall drown all other music.

Prayer and consecration are the two hands that shall, when stretched out to Heaven, bring down the blessing upon the world. In prayer we may be deciding a great Labour dispute or may be heralding in a new joy for the sorrow-stricken outcasts of Heathen lands. By consecration we can yield ourselves as His instruments, and thus prepare for that great world revival which, by God's grace, may soon be a blessed reality.

CROMWELL'S GOVERNMENT.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. T. W. GILBERT, B.D.

*"Cromwell's government was the most tolerant government which had existed in England since the Reformation"* (Prof. Firth).

THIS statement made by Professor Firth on page 367 of his book on "Oliver Cromwell" in the *Heroes of the Nation* series, is sufficiently arresting even in this age which has seen the reversal of many judgments on historical personages. The process of rehabilitating the character of Cromwell has gone forward rapidly since the day when Carlyle published the Letters and Speeches of the Protector, but the mind of the average reader experiences a recoil when faced with this claim by Professor Firth. It seems apparently inconceivable that the age of the Commonwealth and Protectorate with its "irregular hewing and jostling of one another" (to use a Hobbesian phrase), because of religious bigotry and prejudice, should have been the age to produce a statesman more tolerant than Tudors or Stuarts, and it is therefore worth while examining what evidence there is in support of this claim.

By way of introduction, a short sketch of the position prior to the days of Cromwell is, of course, essential. Looking back to the earlier and later Middle Ages, one sees that the prevailing idea of Universalism, both in Church and State, tended inevitably to religious uniformity. This does not mean that the dead hand of repression crushed out all freedom of thinking, but it does mean that independence of judgment and of idea was the exception, and not the rule. When Pope and priest held the keys of heaven and hell, it was not a time for the encouragement of liberty of thought on religious matters, and apart therefore from isolated movements such as those of the Albigenses or the Hussites, the problem of religious toleration did not present itself on any large scale. The position was radically changed, however, by the "rational" appeal which was inherent in the Renaissance. It is not too much to say that Individualism in the modern sense took its rise in the Renaissance. The "rational" appeal, which was stimulated by the rediscovery of the Classics, meant a new Individualism in Art and in Literature, and when this same Renaissance spirit was applied

<sup>1</sup> A Paper read to the Sherborne Historical Association.

to the study of the Bible, and to religious matters generally, it meant a new Individualism in Religion also. It is here, therefore, that the problem of Religious Toleration begins. Prior to the Reformation the conception of Religious Toleration was practically wanting. "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus" was a cry which made for uniformity, and just as in Anglo-Saxon days Borough and Parish denoted the same settlement from the political and ecclesiastical standpoint, so then and in later days, Church and Nation were synonymous terms. But Individualism was both the cause of the Reformation and also its result, and hence arises the difficulty of harmonizing these opposites, i.e. National Religious Uniformity and Individualism.

So far as the Tudors were concerned, their attitude was clear. They still adhered to the mediæval standpoint that Religious Uniformity must be coincident with Nationality. The sixteenth-century maxim "Cujus regio ejus Religio" might produce a relatively tolerant policy amongst the small states of Germany, where it was easy for a man to migrate from one principality to another, but in England the same maxim simply meant the iron hand of the Sovereign crushing out any deviation from the national religion. Such was the attitude of Henry VIII and of Mary Tudor. It was a clear and unmistakable attitude, for it meant the attempt to crush out all innovation, and the attempt at repression involved persecution solely for religious opinions.

The problem became more difficult for Edward VI and Elizabeth. In the rising tide of the Reformation during Edward VI's reign, the position was more complex.

It was easy for orthodox Roman Catholics like Bishop Gardiner to accommodate themselves to the First Prayer Book of 1549, but the Prayer Book of 1552, with its pronounced Protestant teaching, was quite another matter. The difficulty was postponed for a time by the demise of Edward VI, but was raised again at the accession of Elizabeth. Her religious settlement, with its basis resting mainly upon the 1552 Prayer Book, was bound to raise difficulties with the Roman Catholics. For a time, however, there was no drastic action. The reformed Anglican Church had yet to find a consciousness, and the political exigencies of Elizabeth's position at her accession, precluded any drastic action, so far as the Roman Catholics were concerned. Moreover, in the uncertain position of the Counter-

Reformation, with its "fatal flaw" in the antagonism of France and Spain, the Pope himself did not wish to force the situation, and for the time being Roman Catholics and Protestants worshipped together in the parish churches. When the threatened Bull of Deposition did eventually come, Elizabeth's position was comparatively secure, and her hand began to fall heavily on Roman Catholics, and increasingly so in the second half of her reign, when her position was stronger. It was the same with regard to the Puritans. Like the Roman Catholics, the Puritans of the early part of Elizabeth's reign made no attempt to set up a separate organization. The Genevan Exiles and the Cartwright Presbyterians were no secessionists. Rather, they wished to remain within the confines of the Church, and to remodel the Church from within; but the coercion of the Crown began to fall on them at once. The Brownists and Barrowists went much farther, for the congregational principle which they adopted was really the first claim to break away from the Church of the nation, and this breach in the mediæval and Tudor ideal brought down the full weight of Elizabeth's displeasure as the statute of 1593 reminds us. Elizabeth's attitude was the attitude of Hobbes: "All subjects are bound to obey that for Divine Law, which is declared to be so by the laws of the Commonwealth"; she did not wish to pry into opinions, but she did demand an outward conformity to the Church of the nation.

It is clear, however, that the very spirit of Elizabethan England was the spirit of the Reformation, and especially in its development of Individualism. The spirit of expansion and of bold adventure, and even the filibustering spirit of the Drakes and the Raleighs, was the result of the Queen's own vigorous outlook. She had nourished and brought to vigorous life the individualism which came from the Reformation, and that individualism was expressing itself in the religious sphere just as much as in the political. Only the respect and love which men bore to Elizabeth prevented the inevitable clash.

The Stuarts therefore inherited a problem which needed careful handling, but the problem was not treated with the delicacy it demanded. It was not that James I was without ideas on the subject of religious toleration, the truth is that he had many ideas on the subject, but they were not based upon any deep principle. He seemed to have some idea of European toleration of religion, his

dealings with Spain and the Empire do in some measure reveal a broad outlook, and the League of Nations would have found some support from him, as from his contemporary Henry IV. But captiousness is the keynote of his mind, and Divine Right was the tune to which he walked. The proceedings of the Hampton Court Conference show the real attitude of James I in religious matters, just as the tearing out of the Protestation of 1621 reveals his true attitude in politics; and therefore, while we see the Roman Catholics being alternately caressed and punished, the ultra Puritans are always "harried."

The position was intensified in the reign of Charles I by the high Anglican teaching of such men as Laud and Montagu, and by the presence of a Roman Catholic Queen. When to the driving power of Puritan Individualism was added general political discontent, it was late in the day to attempt the Tudor policy of uniformity again. But the experiment was tried. Church and State were combined in the High Commission and Star Chamber Courts to crush out any deviation from the ideas held by King and Archbishop.

Turning now to the closing years of the Civil War, we are able to see how far the spirit of toleration had advanced. The three great religious bodies had each their own ideas on the subject. The Anglicans had advanced a little way, but certainly only a little. Archbishop Usher was a moderate Churchman, but his answer to the query of Sheldon on the subject of religious toleration in August, 1647, is this: "That, although every Christian prince be obliged, by all just and Christian ways, to maintain and promote to his power the Christian religion in the truth and purity of it, yet in case of such exigence and concernment of church and state, as that they cannot, in human reason, probably be preserved otherwise, we cannot say but that a Christian prince hath, in such exigents, a latitude allowed him, the bounding whereof is by God left to him" (Cary, *Memorials*, p. 334). There is here no recognition of the principle of religious toleration, but a toleration to be granted merely to save the Church and State. Yet even this goes beyond the point of view of Bishop Warner of Rochester, who answered Sheldon's query in the following words: "I affirm the necessity and exigence of state may be such, that (a Christian prince may tolerate the exercise of other religions beside the religion established), so as the religions so tolerated be not destructive to the catholic faith, or the real settled

peace of the kingdom : or so that he oblige not himself to such a toleration for ever, but until he may regain the power given him by God, whereby to reduce them, by a Christian and meek way, to one right and well-grounded kingdom " (Cary, *Memorials*, p. 346). Bishop Warner's answer would have appealed to Charles, and was no doubt drawn up with that intention. Toleration now in 1647, when the kingly fortunes were low and when there was need for some sort of accommodation with the victors, but a toleration which was to be replaced later on by reducing the non-Anglicans " by a Christian and meek way " when the King came into his own again—such a recommendation may have appealed to the versatile mind of Charles, but it lacked any real basis, since it was a mere temporary political expedient.

The Presbyterian attitude was akin to that of the Anglican, with the difference that the Presbyterians imagined themselves now the predominant party in the State, and their point of view, therefore, was as rigid as that of Episcopalians in days gone by. " Presbytery doth but translate the Papacy to a free state," such were the biting words of Hudibras later, and they only reflect the better-known words of Milton, " Presbyter is but old Priest writ large." Presbyterians had Divine Right ideas of their own organization quite as strong as those of Laud or of Charles, and they were ready in turn to suppress any forms of " heresy," whether the heresy was Episcopalianism or Anabaptism.

It is only with the Independents that we get the admission of toleration as a recognized principle. The general ground was that every man had a right to toleration, provided his principles were not inimical to the State, and the application of the principle was extended by some writers even to Roman Catholics and to some obscure sects, as well as to Anglicans (*Humble Petition of the Brownists*, printed 1641). As a leader of the Independents, we naturally expect Oliver Cromwell to have the same advanced views, and such is undoubtedly the case. We never find Cromwell advocating a policy of religious uniformity, for the mere forms of Church government made no strong appeal to him. His opposition to Laud in the Long Parliament was the attitude of those who were loyal sons of the Church. " No Interference of Bishops in political matters " was the rallying cry of men like Falkand, just as much as men like Cromwell. " I can tell you, sirs," said Cromwell to two members

of the House of Commons, " what I would not have, though I cannot what I would." Such was his attitude in those early days, it was opposition to tyrannizing over men's consciences, an effort to force the Bishops back to the more primitive position of shepherds of their flock, rather than agents of political and religious oppression. For it was the personal side of religion which was paramount to Cromwell, not the religious organization, and this it was which made him boast later on that the Commonwealth Church was not a national Church, " for a national Church endeavoured to force all into one form " (Stoughton ii. 480). Outward national uniformity was the very negation of the Cromwellian ideal, and " varieties of religious experience " was the very essence of his position.

Our next step is to consider the extent to which Cromwell carried out the ideal of toleration to which he had given assent, and in support of which he had written so strongly during the Civil War—as his various letters show. For clearness sake we must remind ourselves that the abolition of the Prayer Book took place in 1645, and the suppression of the observance of Christmas, Easter and Whit-Sunday in 1647. This was the period of Presbyterian domination, and the result of the domination is well portrayed in Evelyn's Diary, where he declares the Church of England at this stage to be " reduced to a chamber and conventicle, so sharp was the persecution." It is true that a number of Anglican divines in 1647 and 1648 took a leaf out of the book of their opponents and became appointed to Lectureships under the ordinance of 1641, which allowed parishioners " to set up a lecture, and to maintain an orthodox minister at their own charge, to preach every Lord's day where there is no preaching, and to preach one day in every week where there is no weekly lecture." The heavy hand of Parliament caused the temporary suppression of most of the Lectureships, and although perhaps in some country parishes the Prayer Book may still have been found in use, yet the impression which one gets of the country as a whole is that the Acts of 1645 and 1647 were being generally employed, and that the Church of England was becoming " reduced to a chamber and conventicle."

With the rise of Cromwell to power, however, we can see a distinct betterment in the position of the proscribed Anglicans, for " in practice, he was more lenient than the laws," as Professor Firth truly says.

The first thing that surprises us is the open and free way in which so many of the Anglican clergy exercised their ministry in London. This tolerance cannot be attributed to the moral support given by Londoners, since they were Presbyterian in sympathy, and the more obvious explanation is that it was due to the connivance of Cromwell himself. The fact remains that in no obscure corners, but openly in prominent churches and attended by large numbers, the Anglican Liturgy was practised and Anglican teaching freely given. Dr. Pearson, for instance, was Lecturer at St. Clement's, Eastcheap, where he delivered the discourses which later were published as his textbook on the Creed. Farindon, who had been ejected from the church of St. Mary Magdalene, Milk Street, was restored there in 1654. Gunning, afterwards Bishop of Ely, conducted Anglican worship in the Chapel at Exeter House, Dr. Wild at St. Gregory's, "the Ruling Powers conniving at the use of the Litany," as Evelyn tells us, and men like Archbishop Usher, Hall, later Bishop of Chester, and others constantly conducted worship according to Anglican usage, as the testimony of many contemporaries shows. Nor was the preaching in any way modified so as to trim to the times. Dr. Nathaniel Hardy, for instance, commemorated "the royal martyrdom" by an annual sermon on Charles I, in St. Dionysius, Buckchurch, in Fenchurch Street, where he was allowed to minister. Fuller shows the same outspokenness. A sermon preached at Westminster in 1654 is mainly a plea for the Restoration of Charles II, and the following passage is typical: "All that we desire to see is the King remarried to the State: and we do doubt not, but as the Bridegroom on the one side will be carefull to have his portion paid, His Prerogative, so the Bride's friends entrusted for her, will be sure to see her joynter settled. . . . The Libertie of the subject." The preface to the same sermon declares: "God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray . . . for the blessed and happy agreement of the King and Parliament, and desire thee to joyn with me, whosoever shall read this weak work. . . ." Again, in a sermon on Hezekiah's recovery, preached at Chelsea 1655, Fuller refers to the hope of seeing the Restoration as a reason why a man should wish to live longer. These instances emphasize Neal's statement (*History of Puritans*, iv. 72), that several of the clergy in London "indulged the public exercise of their ministry without the fetters of oaths, subscriptions or engagements."

Now if this is true of Presbyterian London, it is conceivable that the same condition of things would be prevalent throughout the country generally. So we find outstanding men like Ball, afterwards Bishop of St. David's, acting openly as an Anglican parish clergyman at St. George's, Bristol; we see Hacket, the later Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, acting in a similar capacity at Cheam, though the Surrey Committee later compelled him to omit certain parts of the Liturgy "as were most offensive to the government." Bishop Hall is noted as having preached at Heigham Church, Norwich, July 1, 1655. Wm. Parsons, Rector of Birchanger, though he had been imprisoned by the Presbyterians for several months for his loyalty to Charles I, returned to his living and used the Prayer Book. How far these and such like infractions of the law were deliberately connived at, it is not perhaps possible to say; though on the parallel of Cromwell's attitude later to such cases, it is arguable that such infractions had his passive acquiescence at least. There is no question, however, but that the Protector did show favour to certain outstanding Anglicans. Parr in his *Life of Usher*, and Peter Barwick in his *Life of John Barwick*, show themselves by no means friendly to Cromwell, but they have to admit, though grudgingly, the latitude allowed by him. The former writing of the year 1654 says, page 73: "That Oliver Cromwell to make the world believe that he did not persecute men for Religion, had for some time before this showed favour to some of the orthodox clergy; as particularly to Dr. Brownrigg, Bishop of Exeter, whom he had sent for and treated with great outward respect; and as for Dr. Bernard, who had been the Lord Primate's Chaplain in Ireland, and was after Dean of Kilmore, Cromwell having saved his life at the taking of Droghedah, had made him his Almoner here. . . ." The latter writer, page 218, refers to the Bishops of Oxford and Exeter, and says: "To these two, and to these only of all the Bishops, the liberty of preaching in publick was indulged by those who were then in Power, that they might seem forsooth to do some credit to their ill-gotten Government by Acts that were not ill. . . ." This concession to Bishop Skinner of Oxford is all the more remarkable, seeing that he, more than any other Bishop, was trying to keep alive the Episcopal organization by regularly conferring orders at Launton, a living which he held throughout the Commonwealth.

The way, therefore, was opening naturally towards the procla-

mation on religious liberty which was issued February 15, 1654-5, which promised toleration "to all persons in this Commonwealth fearing God, though of differing judgments, by protecting them in the sober and quiet exercise and profession of religion and the sincere worship of God." The high hopes of toleration were blighted by the Royalist insurrection under Colonel Penruddock, in March of the same year, and the reaction which followed is marked by three persecuting orders against the Anglican Clergy. On August 24 the Major-Generals are directed to inquire into the execution of the law for the ejection of "scandalous" or Anglican ministers, and on September 21 it was ordered that none of the Royalists "are to keep in their houses chaplains, schoolmasters, ejected ministers, or fellows of colleges, nor have their children taught by such," and also that "none who have been, or shall be, ejected from any benefice, college, or school, for delinquency or scandal, are after November 1, 1655, to keep any school, preach, or administer the Sacraments, marry persons or use the Book of Common Prayer," on pain of imprisonment or banishment "unless their hearts are changed, and they obtain the approval of the Commissioners for Public Preachers."

Readers of Evelyn's Diary will remember the anguish of the Diarist at these Proclamations, and his reference to Cromwell as the imitator of the Apostate Julian, but the facts show us again that Cromwell was more "lenient than the laws." Gardiner says that Cromwell promised the moderate Episcopalians in 1656 that they would not be molested so long as they caused no disturbances, though Parr in his "Life of Usher," page 75, declares that when the Archbishop went the second time to get the promise put in writing, Cromwell said, "That he had since better considered it, having advised with his Council about it, and that they thought it not safe for him to grant liberty of Conscience to those sort of men, who are restless, and implacable enemies to him and his government." In spite of this disclaimer by Parr, contemporary evidence shows that the practice of toleration previously pursued by Cromwell remained very much the same. Private chaplains are still found exercising their office. Archbishop Usher, who died March, 1655-6, had the ministrations of the chaplain of the Countess of Peterborough. Barwick acts in the same capacity to the Bishop of Durham, and Dr. Allestree is allowed to act as Chaplain to Sir

Anthony Cope, by an order of July 1, 1656 (*Cal. of S.P. Dom.* 1656-7). In fact, Gardiner goes so far as to say that there is no evidence that any ejections took place in consequence of this order, and that even Walker in his "Sufferings of the Clergy" "did not succeed in producing a single instance of a chaplain or a school-master reduced to poverty by this action of the Protector." Without necessarily endorsing this assertion *in toto*, we can at all events see from the *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*, that the Council frequently exercised the right of dispensation against the severe orders of 1655, the usual formula being, "Order therein in Council, that the Major-Generals and Commissioners permit him to preach (or to exercise his ministry) the late proclamation and instructions to the Majors-General notwithstanding." (Instances can be found on pp. 67, 104, 127, 154 of the *Cal. S.P. Dom.* 1656-7.)

Moreover, that the latitude allowed by Cromwell still continued after 1655 is evidenced in various ways. In the "Letters and Papers of State addressed to Oliver Cromwell" we find that many of them are complaints about "the body of a corrupt, ungifted and scandalous ministry yet left standing, blinding and hardning the people against the worke of reformation," and one quotation from a letter signed by fifty-six people is illuminating, especially if the probable year of publication is kept in mind, i.e. 1655 or 1656. "The Common Prayer-Book is much in use still, the superstitious observation of Saints' dayes kept alive : the blood of Christ profusely spilt in the Lord's Supper : and those Ministers that are zealous of reformation, despized and disregarded," and so they pray for the "displacing and ejecting such Magistrates and Ministers, as are destructive to, or nothing helpfull in the work of reformation. . . ."

In London itself matters continued very much as before. We find Archbishop Usher being buried in Westminster Abbey with the full rites of the Church of England by Dr. Bernard, then Preacher of Gray's Inn, on April 17, 1655-6. We see the publication by Anth. Sparrow, late Bishop of Norwich, in 1657, of a book of general exposition of the various offices in the Prayer Book, such as any average Churchman would like to read ; we read the ordinary Anglican teaching of the sermons preached by Dr. Hewitt in St. Gregory's, London, and published in 1658, and in the same year we hear of the two public disputations by Peter Gunning with Henry Denn on the subject of Infant Baptism before crowded congregations

in the Church of St. Clement Danes. And it is in these same years that people like the daughters of Dr. Cosin appeal to Cromwell for their "fifths" unpaid, and they get their wrongs righted, or ecclesiastical bodies like the surviving members of the Chapter of Norwich appeal to him for "moneys and goods due . . . which we cannot recover by law . . ." and their appeal is endorsed by Protector and Council (*Cal. S.P. Dom.* 1656-7, p. 260). The same spirit which prompted Cromwell to interfere in 1655 when the Berkshire Committee was trying to eject Pocock the Orientalist from his living of Childrey, a living in which, thanks to Cromwell, he remained undisturbed afterwards, that same spirit still prompted Anglicans to appeal direct to him when they felt the need.

Hence there is every reason to accept the statement of Bishop Kennet "that the Protector was for liberty and the utmost latitude to all parties, so far as consisted with the peace and safety of his person and government, and therefore he was never jealous of any cause or sect in the account of heresy and falsehood, but on his wiser account of political peace and quiet; and even the prejudice he had against the episcopal party was more for their being royalists than for being of the good old church" (*Life of Bishop Hall*, by Rev. Jno. Jones, p. 371).

A word or two must be said before concluding, with reference to Cromwell's attitude to religious bodies other than those of the Church of England. Here again he was more lenient than the laws. This would not appear so at first sight, so far as the Roman Catholics are concerned. His words to the Governors of Ross in October, 1649, are very forcible: "I meddle not with any man's conscience, but if by liberty of conscience, you mean a liberty to exercise the Mass, I judge it best to use plain dealing, and to let you know, where the Parliament of England have power, that will not be allowed of." Yet it is in this same year, 1649, that we get the toleration of Roman Catholic in Maryland, toleration which was withdrawn in 1654, but granted again in 1658, and he could truthfully write to Cardinal Mazarin that under his rule there was "less reason for complaint as to rigour upon men's consciences than under the Parliament."

The Quakers who had been specially exempted from the Religious Toleration Edict of 1654 had good reason to be thankful for the protection of Cromwell. In January, 1656, we are told of large

meeting houses in London holding 1,000 people being regularly filled, and of men such as Howgill and Burrough preaching constantly for three years in London. Naylor seemed to have attracted many people from the Court, and Cromwell's efforts to save Naylor from the persecution of the Parliament are well known. The same far-sighted toleration is witnessed in the admission of the Jews, in spite of the arguments of the theologians on one side, and the calculated fears of the merchants on the other.

But enough has been said to prove the truth of Professor Firth's contention, and the Protector's attitude after all was only consistent with his oft-repeated plea for toleration. To him liberty of conscience was "a fundamental," "a natural right," and "he that would have it, ought to give it." And although through political exigencies there was an inevitable tendency to make Anglicanism and support of the exiled Charles correlative terms, Cromwell's plea that he punished for treason against the State, and not for mere religious opinion, had more of truth in it than could be assigned to the similar plea made on behalf of Tudor or Stuart. Amid the tumult of many conflicting ideas, which the Civil War had made vociferous, he kept his own fundamental idea of toleration reasonably clear, and with a wise "dispensing power," which the Stuarts emulated later to their own destruction, he did something to stay the rigour of intolerant laws.

THE BIBLICAL HISTORY OF THE HEBREWS. By F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D. Cambridge: *Heffer & Son*. 10s. net.

This is a fourth edition of Dr. Foakes-Jackson's well-known Old Testament history. It has been enlarged by the addition of notes on the Apocrypha and by two new chapters dealing with the period between the Testaments, while the copious notes on the chapters have been revised and maps added. The author's position is so well known that it seems almost unnecessary to say that in these pages the conclusions of the more reasonable school of Biblical critics will be found temperately and concisely stated. He admits that "narratives once universally accepted as *literally* true are related with less confidence than was customary at one time," but he holds that "this does not detract from their spiritual value," and that it is not what Israel was, but what it became, that really matters. A great deal of information, which would have to be sought for in many volumes, is here gathered together in one.

## THE ADVANTAGES OF NON-CHURCHGOING.

BY THE REV. W. J. L. SHEPPARD, M.A.

THE above title is not ironical ! The non-Churchgoing referred to, however, is not that of an individual, in which, I believe, there is no advantage of any kind to the individual himself. The non-Churchgoing which has advantages is that of people generally, which is one of the outstanding marks of this generation (although this is by no means the only generation thus distinguished), and the advantages I hope to point out are not those of the should-be worshippers, but of the Church at large. Even so, I do not contend that there are no disadvantages in this lamentable habit of the neglect of public worship, nor even that the disadvantages do not outweigh the advantages, but I venture to think that there *are* advantages, and advantages which are so generally overlooked that it may be well to point them out. The constant contrast on Sundays of crowded streets and half-empty churches may be a bad thing, but it is not all bad, however much we may wish it were otherwise.

There is no doubt at all that a great deal of the present neglect of public worship has the war for its cause. The whole of those four years told against the observance of Sunday. The millions of men in our armies found that from the military point of view Sunday was no more than any other day, and gradually the hallowing of the first day of the week dropped out of mind. So far from the great mass of soldiers being made more earnest and devout by the war, as we were so constantly assured by Bishops and others who casually visited "the front" (although it was noticeable that very little of this testimony proceeded from Army Chaplains, and although it was also very disquieting to note that when these supposed suddenly converted men did come home on leave, they were rarely seen in the House of God), the real result was just the reverse. The same effect was produced on the still larger mass of war-workers of all kinds at home, who found that the sacredness of Sunday could be thrust aside at any time on the plea of "national necessity," an effect which was immensely augmented by the

unhappy blessing bestowed by ecclesiastical authorities on the plan of working in gardens and allotments on the Lord's Day in order to increase the national stores of food, one of the most lamentable proofs possible of the failure of our faith in God. In many cases the habit of public worship—especially in those of younger age, in whom it had not long taken root—failed entirely to survive the continual blows struck at it throughout those four years.

There was also another potent force which came into play among the men who went to the actual front. Thousands of them were Churchmen, confirmed, communicants, even Church workers, and yet had no real vital experience of personal religion. Then, in the trenches or on the battlefield, or amid the many insidious temptations of a soldier's life, they found that the religion which they believed they possessed was a powerless and a useless thing. In it there was no shelter from the power of evil, no strength or comfort in the hour when an almost certain death was being faced. Prayer had no reality in these new circumstances, and the Bible brought no message of cheer. The real fact was, that in numberless cases merely formal religion was brought to its trial and, as it always will, failed hopelessly. What more natural, or rather inevitable, that the man should feel he had no further use for a religion of this sort, and, in his ignorance of the real truth as it is in Christ, put the sham with which he had hitherto been contented out of his life altogether. The "Padre" would very seldom get the opportunity of ascertaining such a man's real need, nor would he, one fears, always be qualified to give the required help by pointing the soul in such difficulties from the unreal faith to the true. Splendid Chaplains undoubtedly there were in the Army, capable and earnest, and real spiritual guides to their men; all honour to them for the work they did. But not always so. I could tell of a School for Chaplains at which, of a dozen men present at one time, only two had any real faith in the Atonement, the rest considering it a lamentable tragedy which might well have been avoided. Nor could one, with the utmost charity, consider Clergy whose time was largely spent in dancing, drinking, smoking and card-playing as spiritual leaders. It would at any rate be hopeless to expect men of this stamp to save the faith of others from being shattered.

The number of those who eight years ago attended Church regularly, but who were merely formalists at heart, has therefore

very largely diminished, although by no means disappeared as yet. But, however much this may mean loss to the individual, it is certainly an advantage to the Church as a whole. Every merely nominal professor of religion is a weakness to the Church to which he is attached. Numbers of his friends sum up as worthless the religion which he professes, and conclude that therefore the Church to which he belongs is worthless too. But if he himself grasps the same fact and ceases to profess what in his case is a sham, true religion is all the stronger for his disappearance. Our Lord's own words to the Church which professed exactly this kind of formal religion, self-satisfied yet self-deceived, are conclusive as to this point, since He Himself frankly declares that He would rather have the coldness of entire neglect than the lukewarmness of a merely formal profession (Rev. iii. 15), while the following verse indicates His absolute abhorrence of unreality cloaked by such profession, and declares His intention to sever such from His Church and Himself.

Churchgoing as a matter of form—as a kind of amiable custom continued in deference to an effete superstition—is rapidly dying out. The Church is bound to be all the stronger and better for it. The greater the proportion of really spiritually-minded people in a congregation as compared to the number of the formalists, who act as a continual dead-weight on the Church's life and work, and cumber her progress at every step, the more keen and earnest will the Church, as a whole, become. In the days of the Neronian persecution, when to be caught at worship in the Catacombs meant certain death, there were no triflers in the congregation, and therefore the pulse of the Church's life beat so high that, despite the martyrdoms, she increased by leaps and bounds. Churchgoing has so far only reached the stage of unpopularity, but the more it approaches to that of persecution, the better for the Church. In other words, the exchange of quantity for quality is always, in the long run, of inestimable value. When, if ever, the mere fact of attending public worship means inevitable and open opposition, ridicule, injury and loss to the worshipper, our churches may only have small congregations, but the spiritual character of Churchmen and Churchwomen will be such that the re-evangelization of England may come within measurable distance.

But there are other causes than the loosening of sacred links

by the war which help to account for the lessening of the worshippers of God, and very distinct and definite will be the advantages which will accrue to the Church if she recognizes that she herself has contributed in no small measure to the present habit of non-Churchgoing.

In how many hundreds of churches have not the Clergy refused to recognize the existence of nominal Christians, at any rate as being present at public worship, and have therefore framed their teaching on the assumption that all their hearers were really and truly Christian men and women by virtue of their Baptism, until their hearers came to believe it as well as themselves. Thousands of souls who have no personal knowledge of God through Christ at all, who have never sought and found the forgiveness of sins, who have never been brought into living touch with the Saviour, Sunday after Sunday have been treated as being in a position with which they were entirely unacquainted, and have been constantly taught from that hopelessly mistaken standpoint. Excellent teaching has been given, no doubt, on habits of Prayer, and devotion, while the conditions of communicating have been dinned into the ears of worshippers without cessation, even if it were not taught in many cases that to receive the Holy Communion was all that was necessary to salvation (founded on some mistaken exegesis of St. John vi.), whereas what these souls needed first of all and above all else was to be pointed to Christ as a personal Saviour and to be brought to an actual act of acceptance of Him. Fatal, indeed, in the history of multitudes of souls has been this extraordinary process of "the cart before the horse." It will be truly an enormous gain to the Church if its teachers are eventually driven to see the mistakenness of the standpoint thus adopted, and to proceed on the far wiser assumption that, with regard to the spiritual position of many in our congregations, we cannot afford to take anything for granted.

The same mistake has caused the Church in countless instances absolutely to throw away the tremendous opportunity placed in the hands of the Clergy by the preparation for Confirmation. Nothing could be plainer than the teaching of the Church through her formularies that, at his or her coming to years of discretion, the baptized person is to be urged to make and publicly declare the personal acceptance of Christ, exactly as if he or she were now coming forward for Baptism itself as an adult. Yet how few

Confirmees ever have the plain way of salvation put before them, or have explained to them what Decision for Christ means, or are taught that this is actually essential for true Confirmation. Instead of that, explicit and laborious instructions are given them in religious habits, leaving their hearts entirely untouched; the result being that they go through Confirmation merely as a form—impressive, no doubt, but still a form—and so pass into the ranks of the nominally Christian communicant, or, more frequently, non-communicant. I well remember a discussion at a gathering of Clergy in which I ventured to press home the importance of our being assured of the conversion of our Candidates before presenting them for Confirmation, and how a venerable and famous Evangelical leader who was present declared that he considered such a condition quite unnecessary; “so long,” he said, “as they are decent and well behaved young people, and their moral character is good, I do not think anything more is required.” A girl of fifteen some while ago had been prepared for Confirmation by the Clergy of a neighbouring Church which she attended before she came to us, and as within quite a little while after her Confirmation she professed, and I believe truly, to decide for Christ, I asked her whether in her Confirmation preparation anything had been said to her about this, or any explanation given of the way of salvation, to which she replied, “No, nothing!” If the tremendous falling away in Church attendance drives it home to the Clergy that they are failing very largely to use the Confirmation opportunity aright, or that the preparation of the Candidates needs to be on much more definite lines, so that the personal conversion to God becomes the essential of presentation, then, despite the fact that many still will slip through the net, it will be an enormous advantage to the Church.

But there are advantages to the Church which may lie hidden deeper beneath the non-Churchgoing of the day, if she only has eyes to perceive them and wisdom to turn them to account. This modern symptom of more or less indifference to what is termed—not very happily, perhaps—“organized religion,” may well prove to be the pointing finger directed to aims and methods of the Church which are wrong, and which God would have her recognize as such.

For instance, in how many cases has not the Church been perfectly contented with Churchgoing as the result of her ministry? So long as the Church was full, the Parochial organizations flourish-

ing, the Communicants numerous at Easter, and the annual balance-sheet satisfactory, how often has not all this contented both Clergy and people. And yet there may have been no record in the history of the past year (or, often, years) of any definite case of true conversion to God, no instance of a worldly-minded person gladly sacrificing doubtful interests and pleasures for Christ, no offer from anyone for service in the Mission field abroad. Allowing for numerous exceptions, yet the Church as a whole has been satisfied with Churchgoing as the result of her work, and now that this is so quickly diminishing it may well be God's warning to her that her aim was wrong, and His call to direct her whole efforts towards more spiritual and more abiding results than this. Nor is the reminder unneeded that the secret of re-establishing Churchgoing or any religious observance, lies in the winning of souls for Christ. At a Mission some years ago the Incumbent put before the Missioners the desire of the Parochial Clergy that the Mission should produce more Communicants; the answer was that, if a number of conversions took place, the result mentioned would follow naturally enough. And so it proved. The Missioners scarcely mentioned Confirmation, but the number of souls brought to Christ during the Mission ensured a succeeding Confirmation which the Bishop of the Diocese described as the most remarkable he had ever seen. And it is on these lines, and these lines only, that Churchgoing can be reliably re-established. Who can gauge the advantages if the present difficulty teaches the Church this lesson?

Or again, the present distress may point equally clearly to wrong methods of work. It is certainly significant that the same period which is marked by the decrease in Churchgoing is equally marked by the Church's imitation of the world around her, and her endeavour to win people by providing the world's amusements within her own boundaries. During the last five years scores of Parishes have adopted the cry that, despite the clear statements of our Lord and His Apostles, the Church must be broad and not narrow, that friendship with the world is quite compatible with friendship with God, that Christians were never meant to be "not of the world," and that the right attitude of the Church to the world is not separation but fellowship. Accordingly, in numbers of Parishes the Church has become feverishly active in organizing and promoting Parochial theatricals, dances, and whist drives, apparently believing

that these methods would prove avenues to public worship and furnish the adequate material for the building up of spiritual character. It is striking indeed that this same period of the adoption of worldly methods by the Church should have, as one of its outstanding features, the departure of the people from the Services of the Church. Could anything show much more plainly that the method is hopelessly wrong? And not only so, but experience has again and again disclosed the fact that along this line of work lies untold spiritual disaster. When the failure and the peril of these methods is understood, and they are finally thrown aside, who can estimate the advantage to the Church?

Space forbids the discussion of how far the lack of Churchgoing is a distinct proof of the mistake of the looseness of doctrine and depreciation of Scripture which is the mark of so much present-day teaching and preaching; or how far this same diminution of worshippers points to the urgent necessity of Unity between the various Branches of the Church of Christ in our land. But there is one other aspect of the question which cannot be omitted, that aspect set forth with such trenchant power in a pamphlet from the pen of the Rev. W. E. S. Holland some years ago. Mr. Holland argued, and incontrovertibly so to many minds, that the success of the work of the Church in England depended upon God's blessing being vouchsafed to her efforts, and that such blessing could not be expected unless the work were in accordance with His revealed Will. The real reason then, he concluded, for the failure at home lay in the totally inadequate contributions of men and money which were forthcoming for the work of the Church overseas. There is no doubt that this is absolutely true. One great cause of our rapidly emptying churches at home will be found in the great masses of people in Africa and Asia who have never yet been adequately evangelized, and many of whom have never yet heard the Gospel at all. If empty churches drove the Church to the conviction that "there is that scattereth and yet increaseth," and filled her afresh with the missionary energy and enthusiasm of the Early Church, so that she began to give of her very best for the work overseas, this would perhaps prove in the long run to be the greatest of all the advantages of non-Churchgoing.

W. J. L. SHEPPARD.

## MEGILLATH TAANITH.

## "SCROLL OF FASTING."

ENGLISHED, FOR THE FIRST TIME,  
FROM THE ARAMAIC AND THE HEBREW.

BY THE REV. A. W. GREENUP, D.D.

[Continued from the *CHURCHMAN* of April.]

## IX (KISLEV).

1. **ON the third of Kislev the images were removed from the Temple<sup>1</sup> ;**

Because the Greeks had set up several images in the court of the Temple ; and when the power of the Asmonæan house prevailed they were demolished and brought out of it ; and the day of their demolition was made a festival.

2. **The seventh is a festival.**

The day when Herod died<sup>a</sup> ; for he was a hater of the sages, and there is joy before God when the wicked are removed from the world,<sup>a</sup> as it is said, Moreover the hand of Jehovah was against them to destroy them, etc.<sup>b</sup> ; and again, So it came to pass when all the men of war were consumed and dead from among the people<sup>c</sup> ; and again, That Jehovah spake unto me saying, etc.<sup>d</sup> And so it says, He is a good man and cometh with good tidings<sup>e</sup> ; and again, And the King commanded Benaiah b. Jehoiada, and he fell upon him, and slew him, etc.<sup>f</sup> So they made the day on which Herod died a festival.

3. **The twenty-first is the day of mount Gerizim, and on it one must not mourn.<sup>g</sup>**

The day when the Samaritans sought leave from Alexander of

<sup>a</sup> Tos. San. xiv. ; cf. Prov. xi. 10.

<sup>b</sup> Deut. ii. 15.

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 16.

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 17.

<sup>e</sup> 2 Sam. xviii. 27.

<sup>f</sup> 1 Kings ii. 34, 46.

<sup>g</sup> Yoma 69 a.

<sup>1</sup> See Josephus, *Antiq.*, xiii. 3, 1 ; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Herod I died in the month Adar, so the glossator's explanation cannot be accepted. Zeitlin refers the occasion to the victory over Cestius, A.D. 65, which was so recent as to render any explanation as to the cause of the festival unnecessary. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9, 9. Cf. Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, p. 284.

Macedon to destroy the house of our God<sup>1</sup>; and they said to him, Sell us five chors of land in mount Moriah. He sold it to them; whereupon Israelites came and made the matter known to Simeon the Just. What did he do? He clothed himself with his sacerdotal garments, and went forth with the nobles of Jerusalem, and a thousand councillors clothed in white, and young priests striking their musical instruments, and torches of fire burning before them all night. Some were marching on one side of the mountain, some on the other. The king said, Who are these men? They said to him, These are the Jews who have rebelled against thee. When they drew near to Antipatris the sun arose, and they approached the first guard. When they met, the guard said to them, Who are you? They replied, We are the men of Jerusalem and have come to visit the king. When Alexander of Macedon saw Simeon the Just clothed in sacerdotal garments, he came down from his chariot and prostrated himself before him. His princes said to him, Should a great king like thee prostrate himself to this Jew? He replied, When I go down into battle I see the image of this Jew and come out victorious. Then he said to the Jews, Why have you come? They replied, To ask that the place where we pray for thee and thy kingdom may not be destroyed: [these gentiles have deceived thee, and thou hast given it to them. He said, Who are these people? They replied, These Samaritans who are standing before thee. He said, Lo, their fate is in your hands. What did they do to them? They perforated their heels, and hung them up to the horses' tails, and dragged them over thorns and thistles till they reached mount Gerizim. When they arrived there they ploughed it up and sowed it with vetches and salt, just as they had sought to do to the house of our God. And so of the day on which they did this they made a festival.

**4. The twenty-fifth is the beginning of the eight days of the Feast of the Dedication,\* when one must not mourn.**

When the Greeks entered the Temple they defiled all the various kinds of oil in the Temple, so that there was no oil to kindle the lamps in the sanctuary. When the power of the Asmonæan house

\* Sabb. 21 a; 1 Macc. iv. 52 ff; 2 Macc. x. 5 ff.

<sup>1</sup> So Yoma 69 a. The temple on Gerizim was not destroyed till 128 B.C. by Hyrcanus.

prevailed and subdued them, search was made, and there was only one cruse of oil found, which was not defiled, under the seal of the high priest ; and there was only enough therein to kindle the lamps for one day. But a miracle was wrought on it, and they kindled the lamps from it on eight days. In the following year they appointed those eight days as festivals, with the recitation of the Hallel <sup>a</sup> and the Hodaah.<sup>1</sup> But why make the dedication last eight days ? Was not the dedication which Moses made in the wilderness only seven days, as it is said, And ye shall not go out from the door of the tent of meeting seven days, etc.<sup>b</sup> ; and again, And he that offered his oblation the first day, etc.,<sup>c</sup> and on the seventh day, on the Sabbath, Ephraim offered his oblation ? <sup>d</sup> And so we find of Solomon's dedication that it was only seven days, as it is said, They kept the dedication of the altar seven days, and the feast seven days.<sup>e</sup> Why then make this feast of dedication eight days ? Because in the days of the kingdom of Greece the Asmonæan house entered the Temple, built the altar, daubed it with lime, and put on it the vessels of ministry, and were busying themselves in this work for eight days.

But why should mention be made of the kindling of the lamps ? Because in the days of the kingdom of Greece when the Asmonæans entered the Temple <sup>f</sup> they had eight <sup>g</sup> spits of iron in their hands which they rubbed with wood, and so kindled the lamps ; and they busied themselves thus all the eight days.

But why say the whole Hallel ? To teach you that for every victory which God gives to Israel they must come before Him with Hallel, with song, with thanksgiving, and with the Hodaah, as it is said, They sang one to another in praising and giving thanks to Jehovah, saying, For He is good, etc.<sup>h</sup> ; and again, Victory belongeth unto Jehovah, thy blessing is upon thy people.<sup>h</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The commandment respecting the lamp for the Feast of the Dedication is this : one lamp for one man and his household, but for the more zealous a lamp for each soul. But what about those

<sup>a</sup> Ps. cxiii.-cxviii.

<sup>b</sup> Lev. viii. 33.

<sup>c</sup> Numb. vii. 12.

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.* vii. 48.

<sup>e</sup> 2 Chron. vii. 9.

<sup>f</sup> Rosh. H. 24 b ; Ab. Z. 43 a ; Men. 28 b.

<sup>g</sup> Ezra iii. 11.

<sup>h</sup> Ps. iii. 8.

<sup>1</sup> Sabb. 21 a.

<sup>1</sup> The first of the last three sections of the Prayer of Benedictions.

<sup>2</sup> The Hebrew text has "seven," but this should be corrected, as in Pesikta Rabbati.

still more zealous? The house of Shammai say, On the first day they kindle eight, diminishing daily the number by one. But the house of Hillel say, On the first day they kindle one, adding daily one more. There were two elders in Zidon, of whom one did after Shammai, the other after Hillel. Both gave reasons for their action. One said, My action corresponded to the diminution of the bullocks at the Feast of Tabernacles <sup>a</sup>; the other said, In holy things one must add and not diminish.<sup>b</sup>

The law of the kindling of the lights is this <sup>c</sup>: from the time when the sun sets till men cease to walk in the market place; and it is a duty to place the light before the door of his house outside. If he dwells in an upper room, he places it in the window which is near the public street; and if he be afraid of robbers he can place it before the door of his house on the inside; and in the time of persecution he can place it on his table, and that will suffice.

#### X (TEBETH).

**On the twenty-eighth of Tebeth the Great Synagogue <sup>1</sup> sat in judgment;**

Because when the Sadducees were sitting in their Sanhedrin,<sup>d</sup> Janneus the king with Salamis the queen sitting by him, there were no Pharisees sitting with them except Simeon b. Shetaḥ, who, when they were discussing questions and traditions for which they could bring no proof from the Law, suggested that whoever could bring a proof from the Law should be designated for a seat in the Sanhedrin, and that whoever could not do so should be considered unworthy of a seat. Once upon a time there was a matter worthy of disputation before them for which they could bring no proof from the Law, except a garrulous old man who contradicted Simeon and said, Give me time and on the morrow I will return you an answer. He went away and thought the matter carefully over, but could not bring a proof from the Law. When he saw that he could not do so, on the morrow he was ashamed to go and take his seat in the Great Sanhedrin. Then Simeon b. Shetaḥ set one of his pupils in the old man's place, saying that the number of seventy-one members ought not to be diminished.<sup>e</sup> He did this day by day

<sup>a</sup> Numb. xxix. 12 ff.

<sup>b</sup> Ber. 28 a.

<sup>c</sup> Sabb. 21 a; Sof. ii.

<sup>d</sup> San. 52 b.

<sup>e</sup> San. 2 a.

<sup>1</sup> See Jew. Ency. xi. 43 a.

till all of them were rejected, and the Sanhedrin was composed exclusively of Pharisees, as he wished it to be. And that day when the Sanhedrin of the Sadducees was ejected and that of the Pharisees was restored they made a festival.

## XI (SHEBAT).

### 1. The second of Shebat is a festival, when one must not mourn.<sup>1</sup>

Here it is written that we must not mourn, but this addition is not made above.<sup>a</sup> Why is there this difference? Because on the seventh of Kislev Herod died, but on the second of Shebat Janneus died. It is a joy to the Lord when the wicked are removed from the world.<sup>b</sup> It is said that when Janneus the king was ill he sent and seized seventy of the elders of Israel, and shut them up in prison, and said to the jailer, If I die, slay these elders, so that though Israel rejoice over me they may mourn over their teachers. They say that the king had a good wife, whose name was Salamis, who, as soon as he was dead, took his signet ring from off his hand, and sent it to the jailer with this message, Your lord in a dream set free these elders. So he set them free and they went home; and that day on which Janneus died they made a festival.

<sup>c</sup> Whenever it is written in the Megillath Taanith that one must not mourn, he may fast after that day but not before it. R. Jose says, Neither before nor after. Wherever it is not written that one must not mourn, but only that one must not fast, one may fast both before and after that day. R. Jose, however, says, After but not before. <sup>d</sup> But on festivals and new moons it is allowed both before and after. Why in the one case is it forbidden and in the other allowed? Because the days mentioned in Scripture are the words of the Law, which need no protection; those not so are the words of the scribes, which need protection.<sup>e</sup> R. Jose b. Dostai says in the name of R. Jose the Galilean,<sup>f</sup> Every man who swears that he will fast on the eves of Sabbaths or festivals swears a vain

<sup>a</sup> ix. 2.      <sup>b</sup> Cp. Prov. xi. 10.      <sup>c</sup> Taan. 15 b; Jer. Taan. ii. 12.  
Rosh H. 19 a; Taan. 17 b.      <sup>d</sup> Yeb. 85 a.      <sup>e</sup> Tos. Taan. ii.

<sup>1</sup> See note on ix. 2 for a suggestion as to the omission of any historical circumstance. Zeitlin suggests the occasion was a few days after the 28th of Tebet, and that it commemorated the inauguration of the new officers of the Great Synagogue.

oath, because part of the Sabbath eve is as the Sabbath, and part of the eve of a festival as the festival itself.

**2. On the twenty-second was destroyed the work which the enemy said he would bring into the Temple ;<sup>1</sup> on which day one must not mourn.**

The day when Caius Caligula sent the images to be placed in the Temple, and the news reached Jerusalem, was the evening of the first day of Tabernacles. Simeon the Just said to the people, Celebrate your feasts with joy,<sup>a</sup> for none of these things which you have heard shall be established. For He whose Shekinah dwells in this house shall work miracles for us at this time as He did for our fathers from generation to generation. <sup>b</sup> Immediately a voice was heard coming forth from the Holy of Holies saying, The work which the enemy said that he would bring into the Temple is destroyed ; Caius Caligula has been killed, and his decrees are made void. They noted the time exactly. When Simeon saw that the messengers were late in coming he said, Go out to meet them. When the matter was made known to all the nobles of Jerusalem they went forth with Simeon, saying, We will all die rather than such a thing should happen. They cried out and made supplication to the legate ; but Simeon said to them, Make your supplications and cries to our God who is in heaven that He would save you, instead of to the legate. When the legate came near the cities, and saw men advancing towards him from every city, he was filled with amazement and said, What a multitude these are ! The Samaritans said, These are the Jews who are advancing towards you from every city. When he came to the city he saw the inhabitants lying in the streets in sackcloth and ashes. He had not reached Antipatris<sup>c</sup> before there came a letter to say that Caius Caligula had been slain, and that his decrees were annulled. Immediately they handed over the images to the Israelites, who sawed them up ; and the day on which they sawed them up they made a festival.

**3. On the twenty-eighth Antiochus the King was removed from Jerusalem ;<sup>d</sup>**

Because he was oppressing the inhabitants of Jerusalem, whither

<sup>a</sup> Cf. Neh. viii. 10.      <sup>b</sup> Sot. 33 a.      <sup>c</sup> Gitt. 76 b.

<sup>d</sup> 1 Macc. vi. 28-62 ; 2 Macc. xiii. 1-26.

---

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 10, 5. See Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, p. 207 n.

he had come to devastate it and to destroy all the Jews, so that no one could come in or go out by day, but only at night.\* But he heard evil tidings, and went away, and died at home; and that day on which he was removed they made a festival.

A. W. GREENUP.

(To be concluded.)

\* Cf. ii. 3; vi. 2.

## HOSEA.

THE MESSAGE OF HOSEA. By the Rev. Preb. Melville Scott, D.D.  
London: S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d. net.

While we recognize the patient industry that lies behind this exposition we cannot bring ourselves to believe that Dr. Scott has greatly increased its value by making it appear to be, in the main, a severe attack upon Dr. Harper's Commentary on Hosea, in the *International Critical Commentary*. This is not the usual method of the judicious scholar, and it is moreover a method which is calculated to arouse prejudice. We find Dr. Harper's name on nearly every page: sometimes he is quoted with approval, but more frequently he is "inconsistent," "not very convincing," "strangely perverse," and so forth. We think Dr. Scott's work would have been more useful, as well as more agreeable reading, had he contented himself with stating the problem of the first three chapters and offering his solution, which is that chapter three is misplaced and should form part of chapter one, following on after verse nine. He points out the "remarkable likeness" between this verse and concluding verse of chapter two, which he believes led to the misplacement. Nor does he assume that the mistake was made by a copyist—it might, he thinks, have been an error on the part of the "preparer of the roll" who appended to a later sheet what should have been appended to an earlier one. He is in favour of the retention of what are termed "the Restoration passages" in the first three chapters as well as the fourteenth chapter, which has been excised by many recent critics. By no means the least valuable part of the book is the Critical Appendix in which the principles of criticism are discussed, and some useful notes added on the Hebrew text. The Dean of Lichfield contributes an appreciative preface. He feels that Dr. Scott has reinstated the Book of Hosea "as an evangelical message for the time when it was written; and therefore, in a measure, for all time."

S. R. C.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

## THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY. Part i: THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson, D.D., and Kirsopp Lake, D.D. Vol. ii: Prolegomena ii; Criticism. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 24s.

The first volume of "Beginnings" was published just two years ago: that book dealt with the Jewish, Gentile, and Christian Backgrounds of the Acts. A whole series of volumes is contemplated; part i, "The Acts of the Apostles," will be completed in two further volumes, comprising text and commentary. It is a formidable undertaking, in some respects a great undertaking, and if only its positive value were as great as its probable bulk, a great service would have been rendered to the whole Christian Church. It is interesting to read some of the press notices of the first volume; one reviewer says it is "one of the most valuable contributions to New Testament research which have been written in English in recent years"; another speaks of it "as the last word of scholarship." Prof. Headlam, in a slashing and damaging review in the *Church Quarterly*, holds a different opinion, and—sorry as we are to have to admit it—we are disposed to agree with him.

The question before us now is whether vol. ii shows any notable advance on its predecessor. In some ways, yes; in others, no. The book professes to be a study of the Acts in the light of the results of modern criticism; and indeed these "results" are everywhere in evidence. Whether they are likely to be *final* results is another matter: we rather think not, for—so far as we can follow them—they seem to be based on a good deal of ingenious theorizing about facts, rather than (in every case) on the facts themselves. We are not concerned to deny that some of the writers of this composite work—a co-operative affair, like so many recent books—have presented us with a most impressive number of facts, which anyone, if he feels inclined, can verify for himself. Such data are of great value, and they constitute the important part of the book. What we are inclined to find fault with are the deductions from those data; these are many and various, and sometimes contradictory.

Let us for a moment examine the contents of the book. It is divided into three main sections: (1) composition and purpose of Acts, (2) Identity of the Editor of Luke and Acts, (3) History of Criticism. There are four appendices: the first, by Mr. G. C. Coulton, deals with the story of Francis of Assisi; the second details the story—not unknown in Cambridge—of Margaret Catchpole; the third, by Prof. Burkitt, is entitled "Vestigia Christi"—it is quite brief; the fourth is a full-dress "commentary" on Luke's Preface, from the pen of Prof. H. J. Cadbury. This last is a piece

of work as exhaustive as it is excellent, and we are not sure that it does not constitute the *pièce de resistance* of the whole volume.

Now let us analyse the contents in rather more detail. In § 1 there are five chapters: (a) The Greek and Jewish traditions of writing history; (b) The use of the Greek language in Acts—a most careful and scholarly production, in which the linguistic data are marshalled with tact and learning; (c) the use of the LXX in Acts; (d) the use of Mark in the Gospel according to Luke; (e) the internal evidence of Acts. The last section (mainly the work, we should imagine, of Prof. Kirsopp Lake) runs to nearly 100 pages, and is the longest section in the book; it is clever, ingenious, and speculative. We may be dubbed obscurantist, but we find little that is new in the disquisition that seems to be really proved, and a number of assertions or suggestions that are, at the least, highly problematical.

In § 2 there are four parts: (a) The Tradition; (b) the case for the Tradition; (c) the case against the Tradition; (d) subsidiary points. Mr. C. W. Emmet, the author of *b*, makes out a very good case for “the Tradition,” and his argument is clear throughout.

In § 3 Prof. McGiffert writes a careful summary of German Criticism of the Acts, and we are glad to have such a convenient summary to refer to. One is struck with the sheer amount of clever guess-work indulged in by German critics; one learned professor sets up a number of theological ninepins for another equally learned professor to knock down; whereupon the process is repeated, leaving the reader bewildered at the chaos. When all is said and done, the old traditional view is quite as good as, and possibly more respectable than, the guesses of Tubigen or Berlin. Does it not stand to reason that, in the case of a book 1,800 years old, all attempts to assign different writers to this portion or that, to pitch upon the final “redactor,” to surmise the various sources—literary or oral—from which the book was compiled, must, in the nature of the case, be extremely uncertain?

A chapter on “British Work on the Acts” is contributed by Mr. J. W. Hankin. It is a poor “show,” on the whole, much of it occupied with an account of the provenance of the English Bible; though what this has to do with the “Acts” is not quite obvious. One rather gathers from Mr. Hankin’s account that English scholars have shown more judgment, though less ingenuity, than their German confrères. Readers will, no doubt, wonder what on earth the editors intended by inserting the essays on Francis of Assisi and Margaret Catchpole; in which case they must turn to the editorial preface. The reason given is “psychological”—“we have thought it well to illustrate the way in which the figures of history were soon invested with new characteristics, so that in the subsequent development of thought concerning them these new and relatively unhistorical features became more important than the historical facts. How this could happen can only be explained by the psychology of authorship.” In other words (to put the matter bluntly) as the two figures of Francis and Margaret collected a large quantity of false history and dubious legend about them—like snowballs rolled along

the ground by boys—so we are to suppose that the figures of Peter and Paul in the Acts collected all sorts of legendary matter about them, which matter was quasi-consciously adopted (and adapted) by “ Luke ”—or whoever wrote the book—on the ground that “ the psychology of authorship impels him [the author] to change problems into propositions.” Wonderful, indeed ! and the document born of such “ unconscious ” cerebration has managed to impose itself as genuine history on the Christian Church for well-nigh two millenniums. It *may* be so : but—*credat Judaeus Apella ; non ego.*

E. H. B.

### A PRIMARY CHARGE.

INTERPRETERS OF GOD. By Frank Theodore Woods, D.D., Bishop of Peterborough. London : S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. net.

Shorn of what is more immediately local and diocesan, this volume contains the main part of the Bishop's charge at his primary visitation, and in the circumstances we turn over its live pages with rather more than ordinary interest. To see one of our youngest and most virile Bishops, whose early associations were entirely and avowedly Evangelical, adapting himself to his environment, is certainly an interesting study. That Dr. Woods is consciously doing this would seem to be clear from one of his observations: “ I have tried to detach myself from all party points of view or prejudice of past association.” This admission reveals his courage and independence. But he is more than courageous ; he has a perfectly prodigious capacity for work, a wide outlook, a sound judgment, and, better still, definitely spiritual ideals. If there is any ecclesiastical bias discernible in these pages, it will not be found in the direction some of his old friends may expect to find it, but rather in an opposite direction. Thus it is a little surprising to learn that the Bishop sympathizes with “ those who feel that the true sacrificial view of the Eucharist is more worthily expressed in the canon of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI ” and that likewise he is one with those “ who desire to link the Prayer of Oblation with the Prayer of Consecration in the present office,” and that, as he admits elsewhere, he would like to see the Epiclesis “ restored in our canon.” It will thus be seen that he has not been wholly unsuccessful in his effort to shake off the prejudices of past associations, and we can only stay to observe that with many loyal Churchmen there are principles involved which they distinguish from prejudices.

The Bishop tells us that “ the need for ritual action in worship is a deep-rooted instinct in human nature.” True : but surely there must be some limits ? The Diocese of Peterborough is by no means free from extremists, but we look in vain for any indications of the wishes of their Diocesan as to limits to be observed. While he is willing to sanction reservation for the sick “ where circumstances make it advisable ” he yet condemns “ the cult of the reserved sacrament ” in a thoughtful, well-reasoned argument, concluding with these words : “ It is difficult to see how, in the long run, the ideas

behind this cult . . . can consort with New Testament teaching on the Holy Spirit, and it is worthy of note that it is in that part of the Church where the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is notably weak that the practice tends to prevail."

In the chapter on *Worship* the shrewdness and insight of the Bishop are revealed. But we are not sure that we always understand him. For instance, upon the subject of elasticity in our services, he says: "I find . . . that there are clergy who depreciate any departure from or addition to the prescribed routine of Matins and Evensong." What are we to make of this? Does Dr. Woods suggest that the clergy should become their own Liturgiologists and modify the regular services according to the dictates of their own fancy? Are we no longer bound by an Act of Uniformity? Yet it seems as if the Bishop is reproving those clergy who feel conscientiously bound to follow the Prayer Book!

Then there are some sarcastic remarks about "the juicy and sugary morsels provided by Barnby, Stainer and Dykes." But this is rather merciless, considering the debt we owe to these composers. Then are we to understand that the Bishop's remark about *The English Hymnal* as containing "both words and tunes far more healthy and virile than most of those to which we are accustomed in other collections" is to be taken as expressing his general approval of a book which, if we mistake not, has been forbidden by at least one Bishop who could hardly be described as an Evangelical?

The chapter on *Reunion* is a masterly statement of the whole position, an urgent plea for fellowship rather than federation, and the Bishop emphasizes the fact that the local Churches of the New Testament were one—"the only thing that separated them was distance, not faith or order"—and that each local Church represented the whole body, not some particular section of it.

The sympathetic understanding of the Bishop is shown in the chapter on *The Village*, and it deserves to be read and re-read by every country clergyman in the land, though not every one will agree with the proposal to form village dramatic societies or approve of simple Nativity plays at Christmas or see the possibility of a communal meal following Holy Communion. All the way through, the tasks with which the Church is confronted are boldly faced and calmly discussed, in a sane, statesmanlike way.

We have purposely left till the last a few observations, and they must unfortunately be very few, upon the opening chapter, headed—*The Supreme Interpretation*. It is a setting forth of Him who came to interpret to us the character of God. Here are the spiritual ideals to which we have referred, and we feel convinced that even those who may not see eye to eye with the Bishop on some points will feel that his message rings true for all who in these difficult days have to be, in their measure, interpreters of God.

S. R. C.

## AN AFRICAN ARCHDEACON'S REMINISCENCES.

STORM AND SUNSHINE IN SOUTH AFRICA. By the late A. Theodore Wirgman, D.D., D.C.L., Archdeacon of Port Elizabeth and Hon. Chaplain to H.M. the King. London: *Longmans*. 7s. 6d. net.

Archdeacon Wirgman was a well-known ecclesiastic in South Africa. Few readers of the ecclesiastical press were unfamiliar with his communications which represented the type of Anglo-Catholicism prevalent in the Province where he worked. He was rigid in his views, had the power of giving frank expression to them, and was a hammer of all that came in conflict with his convictions. The Bishop of Grahamstown says of him: "Full of loyalty to the Church he loved, he welcomed honours and dignities for himself, because, as was finely said at the time of his death, they brought honour to her." He said himself: "The entanglements of Church and State, which are the evil heritage of the Tudor Reformation, and the hopelessness of any definite solution in a Church burdened by a Secular Court of Appeal, which the conscience of such a saintly leader as Keble could not, as he quaintly put it, bring under the obedience due to authority enjoined in the Fifth Commandment, drew many of us to wish for work in a part of the Church which was disconnected with the State and was freed from the Erastian taint which clung to the Church of England." He left us for South Africa, where he found his spiritual home.

We have a full account of the controversies in South Africa, and the story of the Grahamstown Cathedral case is told at length. He does not write as tenderly as might be expected of those who were opposed to his views, but, after all, it is given to few controversialists to see the honesty and strength of what they dislike. We are glad to have his statement of the incident that has the result of making South Africa the preserve of one type of Churchmanship—a type which somehow has placed the Church in a position of comparative numerical inferiority—if nothing else—in that part of the Empire.

Dr. Wirgman has much to say of social and political life. He lived in days of stress and change. He was a strong Imperialist. In an *obiter dictum* he says: "Naturally, I regarded the British Parliament from the point of view of a Colonist who had not forgotten Majuba." Practically all the great names in South African recent history occur in the book, and from this point of view it may have permanent value, for the Archdeacon was shrewd, and in politics could see "the other side of the hedge." Cecil Rhodes was his hero. On one occasion Bishop Gaul, who was then Archdeacon of Kimberley, wrote a letter of protest against the proposal to hold sports on Christmas Day "at hours that interfered with Church services." Rhodes' obsequious satellites at once began abusing the Archdeacon's impudence and meddlesome interference, now that all the arrangements were complete. Rhodes was silent for a moment. He then said, "No, the Archdeacon is quite right, though a bit peppery. Don't you forget that I am a parson's son, and I

understand. Cancel the whole programme at once, and consult the Archdeacon about the hours to be left free for Church services." This was at once carried out, and it showed that Rhodes respected the Church. This, of course, was an outward matter, but the words he used about a short prayer in a letter to the Archbishop of Capetown give one a glimpse of his inner thoughts. He wrote as follows: "I often think that prayer represents the daily expression to oneself of the right thing to do, and is a reminder to the human soul that it must direct the body on such lines." These are not the words of the cynical Theist depicted by Canon Scott Holland. They express one side of prayer with some accuracy.

President Kruger and other Boer leaders are described, and we smile at the eccentricities of Oom Paul. Botha receives the praise that is his due. He met Lord Roberts for whom he conceived something like a veneration "as a great man, the greatest soldier of his day and time." But we must bring our notice of an interesting and quotation-tempting volume to a close. Archdeacon Wirgman never misses an opportunity of speaking his mind. He does so at times with a strength and directness that may give pain to those who survive him. He is, however, always sincere, and we think more kindly of the writer of the chatty reminiscences than we do of the rigorist theologian and ecclesiastic. What a mercy that most of us have two sides to our nature—one to show our friends, the other to scare our opponents!

---

### THE LATE BISHOP MOULE'S LETTERS.

LETTERS AND POEMS OF BISHOP MOULE. London: *Marshall Brothers*. 3s. 6d.

Canon Battersby Harford has made a selection from the Spiritual Letters and Poems of the late Bishop Handley Moule, who was as greatly beloved as he was trusted as a spiritual counsellor. Quoting Prof. McNeile, Canon Harford holds: "To write a letter carefully can often be an act of divine service," and those of us who received letters from the late Bishop know how carefully he wrote and what sympathy he threw into his communications. The eighty-seven letters, printed in whole or part, cover a great deal of ground. Some make no appeal to a reader of one type, whereas they will go straight to the heart of another type of man. Dr. Moule's genius for expressing shades of meaning make him a spiritual guide of rare excellence, and no one can lay the book down after reading the letters without feeling "Here at least is a man who interprets life *sub specie aternitatis*!" Chapter II. is the record of a hatched piece of mischief between a schoolgirl and her brother who wrote to different Bishops for advice on points of doctrine. Poor Bishops, as if they had not burdens enough! Dr. Moule did not scent a schoolroom ruse to draw him, and wrote with frankness on such questions as Private Confession, Future Punishment and more intimate matters of the soul. We here have a glimpse of the humble servant of God, which is much more enlightening than many pages

of biography. He informs his correspondent: "Private telling of our soul's needs and sins *may* be a great help, if done to a wise and good clergyman, in special cases. But it is not meant for *food*; it is only medicine for quite special times, if ever, in our soul's history." On future punishment he writes: "It is, I humbly believe, lawful to understand much of the language of the Bible about physical agonies in eternity as picture or parable of the remorse of the spirit. And, lastly, we are *never* asked to say of one single human soul that we *know* it is unpardoned and lost for ever. God knows more of His mercies than the deepest-sighted Christian knows. But oh, let us reverently take the Lord's warnings to *ourselves*."

But it is as a consoler of those in trouble that Dr. Moule excels. It almost seems that he pours out his inmost soul in his effort to get close to the sorrow-stricken, and every word is weighed before it is put in writing. "The heavenly peace of the Living Lord Jesus be with you," meant for him something that he had experienced and wished to pass on. There is a bleeding sincerity about his sympathy. His poems which complete the volume are marked by that tuneful simplicity which was characteristic of the man when he let himself go to say what he felt. Many will value this precious volume in which heart speaks to heart.

---

#### MODERNISM IN RELIGION.

MODERNISM IN RELIGION. By the Rev. J. MacBride Sterrett.  
New York: *The Macmillan Company*.

We were inclined at first to pass this book without notice. Its honesty of purpose, however, prevented our doing so, for there is no doubt as to the sincerity of the old University Professor who gave himself once more to the writing of books. He had been a pastor of a prominent Episcopal Church, his open mind gradually became more and more wedded to Modernism as he conceives it, with the result that he has published his thoughts *de omnibus rebus* in a very lively and interesting style. Minor inaccuracies deterred us from thinking seriously of the book, which abounds in mistakes, some of which are serious. Apart from these as a clue to the working of many minds, attention should be paid to the principles at work in the philosophy of Mr. Sterrett. He looks upon a Modernist as one who recognizes that he is heir of all the ages, but feels and knows that he ought to be the slave of none. Surely that is the Christian position—we are slaves of no passing phases of thought, we are bond slaves of Jesus Christ. But this does not imply that we have not a special reverence for the age when Jesus lived and taught, and His apostles proclaimed what they learned from Him. We agree that the chief use of the Bible is devotional, but unless we have a conviction that its message is true, we do not see how it can devotionally be of value. There must be objective reality in the Revelation, if that Revelation is to be of devotional value to our life and thought. Even the Creed, beloved of the writer, means more than its words imply if it is to be of real use. "I believe

in the Father of all ; and in Jesus the Revealer of God and the Saviour of men. I believe in the life-giving spirit ; in the fellowship of the children of God ; in the forgiveness of sins, the victory of love, and the life eternal. Amen." We do not think that Mr. Sterrett is a complete Modernist—he still holds by much he learned when he was a youth. He is a man who has failed to synthesize what he believes with what he fails to understand. He has not grasped the fact, "*omnia abeunt in mysterium.*"

---

### THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The *Church Quarterly Review* has not suffered in range of vision or in varied interest since it has been edited by Members of the Faculty of Theology, of King's College, London. The April number, which lies before us, has a long and arresting article by the Chaplain of King's College on "Anglicanism and Modern Problems," in which the present situation is dispassionately reviewed: "The Modernism which treats Catholic dogma as a *corpus vile*, from which, as an outworn and inadequate thing, the true rational and adequate statement of Christianity is to be distilled, is an ephemeral spurious Modernism. The Catholicism which claims exclusive adequacy for transcendental concepts is an arrogant cult whose true sectarian character cannot be hidden by a name. An enlightened moderate Anglicanism will endeavour to assist Catholic and Modernist alike to adequacy of statement, but claims to exclusive adequacy it will deliberately resist. It will resist them in the interests of a wider Catholicism and a truer Modernism than such claims can express." This is true, but whither does it lead us, and where are we to find this synthesis of moderate Anglicanism? Dr. Aveling writes generally on "The Science of Psychology." Dr. Relton has a learned and thought-provoking article on "Immortality and the Resurrection," in which he makes good use of Señor Unamuno's well-known but rather tardily translated "The Tragic Sense of Life in Men and Peoples." Prof. Cock writes on "The Problem of Prayer"; the Rev. W. J. Ferrar on "A Philosopher to His Wife," and the Bishop of Worcester continues to find time to give us the fruit of his research into the conditions of the ministry in his diocese six centuries ago.

But one article has outstanding interest, as it deals with the vital declaration of the Lambeth Appeal: "We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body." This had been attacked by the Revs. Darwell Stone and F. W. Puller in a booklet, "Who are Members of the Church?" The Archbishop of Armagh expounds the Lambeth view, and subjects to a remorseless ethical and logical examination the arguments they put forward. He says:

"I think I may venture to say that it was clear in the mind of the Conference that in adopting this position we were taking a

definite step forward along the lines marked out by the teaching of our Lord and the principles of His Kingdom. We realized fully that, though what we expressed was the belief of many individuals in the past, yet it had not been presented to the world as the confessed conviction of the whole body of authority in any branch of the Catholic Church. And my belief is that it was just this fact—the fact that we were able to found our Appeal on this great conviction—which filled us with a new sense of the Divine presence and assistance. We realized that God the Holy Ghost is as truly in the Church to-day as in the first ages of Christian history.”

Step by step he displays the Scriptural and historical basis of the position adopted, and subjects to analysis the claims made for any narrower conception of the Church. His Grace concludes :

“ It appears, however, that the rigid Anglo-Catholic is narrower in his view of membership of the Church than is the Roman Catholic theologian of to-day. Dr. Stone denies such membership to the validly baptized, who have deliberately ‘ adhered to some schismatic body.’ Even the word ‘ deliberately ’ will not save Dr. Stone from a more than Roman exclusiveness ; he leaves the sincere believer in Christ, no matter how splendid his faith or how effective his labours, if he belongs to some Nonconformist body, to the uncovenanted mercies of God. Such is the result of a narrow *a priori* doctrine interpreted by a pitiless logic. Start with the conception of the Church as a corporation possessed of a monopoly, and the whole system unfolds itself inevitably. But this is not the conception of the Church to be found in Holy Scripture, nor is it in accordance with the mind of Christ.”

The article, which is brief, deserves to be read in its entirety, and the attempt to reply to it by no means weakens its conclusive effect upon the reader’s mind.

---

### JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES.

The April number of the erudite and varied *Journal of Theological Studies* contains two articles in French, the second of which, by Mgr Batiffol, raises a point of considerable importance on “ la prima cathedra episcopatus du Concile d’Elvire.” He contests the late Mgr Duchesne’s view that the expression may mean “ simple-ment le siège episcopal par opposition à des *plebs* ou paroisses organisées dans les villes ou les villages,” and holds that “ Rome était vraiment le point de convergence de ces lettres de communion : c’est en communiquant avec Rome que les Églises dispersées dans l’univers communiquaient entre elles.” The argument deserves careful reading, even if it does not sustain the weight placed upon it. Dr. T. Stephenson discusses Canon Streeter’s views on the Synoptic problem, and Dr. Brooke gives us his conclusions on the Pastoral Epistles which are working their way back into the rank of acknowledged Pauline documents. As usual, Dr. Burkitt arrests attention by his contributions on “ Pistis Sophia ” and “ Toga in the East.” The other Notes and Studies appeal more to specialists.

The Review Section and the Chronicle on "Old Testament and Related Literature" are worthy of a Journal that always adds something to scholarship and dare not be missed by students who wish to be abreast of the thought of our time. As books go at present it is an excellent five shillings' worth for any man who desires to keep up his reading and to receive real mental stimulus.

If not too late, we may add that the January number contains an important article by Professor Bacon, on "Marcion, Papias and the Elders." We are not prepared to admit his conclusions on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, but are thankful that he acknowledges its date and origin. Is he not rather too positive when he writes, "the date for John's martyrdom cannot well be later than 62"? An Essay by Provost Bernard in *Studia Biblica* does not well fit in with this view. But the gem of the number is a review by Professor F. C. Burkitt of a Rationalist Press Association book, *The Solution of the Synoptic Problem*. We have seldom seen a more thorough-going exposure of pretentious self-conceit, and nothing could excel the manner in which the Professor discloses the deficiencies of dogmatism based on ignorance of the first principles of historical criticism. It is unnecessary to add that all the articles reach a high standard of scholarly excellence.

---

#### MISCELLANEOUS NOTICES.

The Rev. J. E. Roscoe has published a shilling volume through Messrs. Skeffington entitled *Presentations of Christianity* (Ancient and Modern). We gather they are newspaper column articles, and as such they are readable and much better informed than most contributions on the clergy and the secular press. Their value would have been greatly enhanced by a list of books to be consulted—as it is they whet our curiosity and leave us without the means of satisfying it. At any rate they will focus the mind of the well-informed on leading presentations of the teaching of Christ.

---

The Rev. C. E. Douglas issues through the Faith Press (2s.) four sermons on *The Redemption of the Body*—being an exposition of his own view of the Catholic doctrine on the subject. The four addresses are interesting, and if at times they contain somewhat irrelevant paragraphs they make good reading. Mr. Hakluyt Egerton supplies an introductory examination of the Bishop of Oxford pamphlet. He makes several good debating points, but we wish that he were a little more respectful to those who differ from him. He describes the Bishop of Oxford as "a quiet headmaster and a quiet Bishop, confirmed in prudence by his reading of history, an administrator rather than a theologian, yet mindful of the Church's need for an enlightened and instructed clergy." "That unintentional misdirection makes Dr. Headlam's interesting (though debatable) opinion wellnigh as irrelevant as Mr. Major's statement." "One scarcely knows what to say to poor Professor Watson." This is not the way high argument should be conducted.

## CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

A new Catalogue of Publications has just been issued and a copy will gladly be sent to any member who applies. The Catalogue contains particulars of the publications of the Church Book Room published since April, 1921. Where it has been possible, reductions have been made in the prices of books, including *A Sacrament of our Redemption*, by Dr. Griffith Thomas, the price of which is now 1s. 6d. net in paper cover, and 2s. 6d. in cloth. Canon Price Devereux's *About the Feet of God* is now published at 2d. in paper cover. Some copies in cloth can still be obtained at 6d. Canon Barnes-Lawrence's *The Holy Communion, its Institution, Purpose, Privilege*, is now published in cloth gilt at 2s., cloth limp, 1s. 3d., and stiff paper cover, 1s. *The Nicene Creed*, by the Rev. Chancellor Lias, is 1s. net. Of the pamphlets, the following have been reduced to 1d. or 7s. per 100: *Define your Terms*, by Bishop Dowden; *Holy Baptism*, by Bishop H. C. G. Moule; *The Power of the Presence and its Relation to the Holy Communion*, by Bishop Moule; *The Passover, The Communion and the Mass*, by Canon Girdlestone; *Recognition, Authorization and Reunion*, by the Bishop of Uganda; *The Road that Led Me to Christ*, by Lt.-Col. Seton Churchill; *What Vestments are Legal in the Church of England*, by Sir Edward Clarke; *A Word to Laymen*, by Bishop Ingham; and *Benediction in the Church of England*, by W. Guy Johnson.

---

“Can you Read?”—Under this title Mr. Albert Mitchell has written an admirable leaflet which is published by the Religious Tract Society at 1d. or 6s. 6d. per 100 for distribution. The pamphlet is most interestingly written, and is eminently suitable for general distribution as an incentive to Bible reading. Particularly is it useful to give to young communicants, members of Bible Classes and Church-workers.

---

**The Infallibility of the Church**, by Dr. George Salmon, has been described as “one of the ablest books written on the Roman controversy—marked by exact scholarship, profound learning, the greatest lucidity, and by a most charming and interesting style.” An interesting proof of its value is shown by the following extract from a recent letter received from “An Indian Chaplain”:

“A planter, who had joined the Church of Rome, has now returned to the Church of England, in which he was confirmed, as a result of reading Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church* which I lent him.” Copies of the book can still be obtained from the Church Book Room at 2s. 6d. net.

---

“**Scripture.**”—Mr. Arthur Mercer has just added another little booklet to the W.S.M.U. new series, making the twelfth. *Scripture* is admirably clear and will be, we think, very useful. The arrangement is by question and answer. The get-up is excellent, as are all these booklets, which are now in their 1,635th thousand. The price is 1d.

---

**Enabling Act.**—Mr. Albert Mitchell has added to his useful books on the Enabling Act and the Parochial Church Council (Powers) Measure by a leaflet containing the text of the *Representation of the Laity (Amendment) Measure, 1922*, with notes and explanation. This is to be obtained at 1d. or 4s. per 100.

**"Tracts for the New Times."**—The Victoria Institute has recently re-published some further additions to this series. The titles are *Modern Unrest and the Bible*, by Sir Andrew Wingate, K.C.I.E., being a paper read by him before the Institute in 1912; No. 8, *The Attitude of Science Towards Miracles*, by Professor H. Langhorne Orchard, B.Sc., a paper read before the Institute in 1910, and being the Gunning Prize Essay in 1909; No. 9, *The Old Testament and the Present State of Criticism*, by the Dean of Canterbury, a paper read before the Institute in June, 1921. The Tracts are published at 4d. each.

---

**The Sacraments.**—At the present time when unscriptural sacramental teaching is widespread, it is well to mention so forceful a challenge made in "the interests of truth" as Dr. Tait's volume *The Nature and Function of the Sacraments*, 3s. 6d. net. This is a book that should be widely read at the present time. It is not heavy reading. Dr. Tait could not have made it lighter, without the sacrifice of accuracy. He sees clearly and writes forcibly. In a long and thoughtful note he analyses the fallacious arguments so glibly passed from mouth to mouth on "the Holy Communion as the Central Service."

---

**Prayer Book Revision.**—The special Committee appointed by the National Assembly to report on Prayer Book Revision have just issued their Report and Schedule of proposed alterations in the Prayer Book, which can be obtained at 1s. net. Those who wish to follow the questions raised would do well to study the history and principles of the Prayer Book. Books recommended for study are: Hole's *Manual of the Book of Common Prayer*, 2s. 6d. net; Dowden's *Workmanship of the Prayer Book*, 6s., and *Further Studies in the Prayer Book*, 6s.; Drury's *How We Got our Prayer Book*, 2s., and *Two Studies in the Book of Common Prayer*, 2s. 6d.; Moule's *Our Prayer Book*, 1s. 6d.; Upton's *Outlines of Prayer Book History*, 2s. 6d. Of the pamphlets issued at one penny we recommend Moule's *Story of the Prayer Book*, Drury's *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, Streatfeild's *Principal Service*, Smith's *Principal Sunday Service*, King's *The Place of the Elements in the Lord's Supper*, Moule's *The Power of the Presence and its Relation to the Holy Communion*, Bishop E. A. Knox's *The Place of the Lord's Supper in Divine Worship* and Sir Edward Clarke's *What Vestments are Legal in the Church of England*.

---

**No Bishop, No Church.**—A little time ago the Church Book Room published a clear and interesting account of the Ministry of the Church as we find it referred to in the New Testament, and a comparison of that ministry with its later developments, as a means of testing some modern theories as to the exclusive authority of the Episcopate. The pamphlet is entitled *No Bishop, No Church*, or *Anglo-Catholic Claims Examined*, by the Rev. J. R. Cohu, whose name is a guarantee for sound scholarship and wide learning, and who has rendered a great service to the general reader by bringing together in a short compass a wealth of quotation from Gwatkin, Lightfoot, Westcott, Hatch, Hort and other authorities on the origin of the Christian Ministry. The price of the pamphlet is 6d. net or 7d. post free.