

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE CHURCHMAN

July, 1930.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Church and State in Malta.

MALTA has been the scene of a dispute between the civil authorities and the Church of Rome which involves important questions of principle. Lord Strickland, the head of the Ministry, who is himself a Roman Catholic, became involved in a controversy with the authorities of the Roman Church through his refusal to allow a Maltese friar to be expelled from the island. When a general election was to be held recently two of the bishops issued a joint pastoral in which they laid the faithful under an obligation not to vote for Lord Strickland. Priests were ordered not to administer the sacraments to those who disobeyed this order. No vote could be cast for him "without committing grave sin." In consequence of this action on the part of the bishops, the election was postponed. At least half the electors, it was said, would have been placed in the dilemma of having to vote against their political principles or to violate their consciences. The bishops took the further step of interfering with the liberty of the press. Every newspaper which supported the Government was placed under ecclesiastical ban, the reading or selling of any of them was forbidden under penalty of mortal sin. The whole matter was taken up with the Vatican, and the recent issue of the correspondence between the British Government and the Vatican has shown the serious nature of the claims of the Roman authorities. As *The Times* pointed out, the correspondence "really converges on this central point—partisan ecclesiastical intervention in the civic affairs of a British dependency." Malta has become the arena in which a question of grave importance to the future of our Empire must be decided. If the British Government allows the claims put forward in Malta by the Church of Rome, they will have granted the right of the authorities of that Church to issue instructions which, in the words of the Government despatch, constitute "a direct incitement to discredit, and even to resist, the freely and constitutionally elected Government of that Colony." The extension of the claim to other parts of the Empire will only be a matter of time, and the aggressive spirit of Rome will lead to the advance-

ment of other demands which must ultimately destroy the liberty derived from the teaching and practice of Protestantism.

South India Church Union Scheme.

It is generally recognized that the subject of most interest and perhaps of most importance to be considered at the Lambeth Conference is the South India Church Union Scheme. The proposals are already well known to Churchpeople. They have been explained and discussed in numerous books and magazine articles for months past. They have been strongly supported by all who desire to see the future of Christian work in the Mission field strengthened, and developed on lines in harmony with the teaching of the New Testament and the Primitive Church. Opinion in India, where the conditions are best understood, has been emphatic in favour of the scheme. A recent manifesto of Indian Christians has expressed warm approval of the movement towards unity. They said that "it is felt that the attainment of unity is fundamental for India's progress" and added that "the United Church of South India must form an integral part of the Universal Church, and whatever is of abiding value in her must be conserved here. . . . In view of the fact that the present scheme provides ample room for development, and also the possibility for union with other Churches, we urge our fellow Christians in South India to accept the present scheme as early as possible." The great majority of Churchpeople throughout the world are prepared to support the view so strongly put forward in this manifesto.

Opposition to the Scheme.

On the other hand, a small body of extreme Churchmen in this country appear to have set themselves to wreck the scheme, and are determined to make every effort to induce the Conference of Bishops at Lambeth either to reject it or to refrain from expressing any opinion upon it. They are asserting that the opinion of the Lambeth Conference will have no value, as the Conference has no authority to make any decisions binding upon any branch of the Anglican Communion. They have suddenly discovered that the Lambeth Conference is only a Consultative Body, and that its resolutions may be ignored as it is no part of the Synodical Constitution of the Church. This is an example of the ingenuity which has been exercised on many occasions by the same party, when it feared decisions hostile to its doctrinal theories of the Church. The practical importance of the present proposals is too great to allow them to be treated as a merely academic matter. The evidence is too clear that there is nothing in the proposals contrary to the Catholic position when rightly understood, and the Bishops at Lambeth will, we have no doubt, recognize the enormous responsibility which will rest upon them in regard to the future of Christianity when they are discussing the proposals, and will act with sound judgment in the interests of the future of our own Communion and its place in Christendom.

The Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen.

For purposes of reference we give the Findings at the Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen held at St. Peter's Hall last April. The papers read at the Conference are given in this number of *THE CHURCHMAN*, and it will be seen that the chief points in them are supported in these resolutions of the Conference.

The following findings were agreed upon at the final session of the Conference. They are to be taken as in previous years as expressing the general sense of the Conference and not as representing in detail the views of individual members.

As previous Conferences have issued Findings on the subject of Reunion with which the present Conference is in agreement, these Findings are intended to present points of special significance and urgency bearing on the existing situation, which were brought forward during the discussion.

1. The Conference thankfully and whole-heartedly believes that the movement towards union is according to God's Will, even as our Lord prayed that we might all be one, that the world might believe; and that He calls Christians to give outward expression to the working of the Spirit in the hearts of His servants.

2. The Church is the Assembly of those redeemed by Christ, a spiritual fellowship, Kings and Priests unto God animated by the Spirit of Christ. The bond of union is from within and has, as its Divine element, fellowship with Christ. The organized expression of this fellowship must be earnestly sought; and it should embrace those national and racial characteristics best adapted for the expansion of the Kingdom of God in different lands.

3. The Conference holds that in all schemes for reunion Holy Scripture should be accepted as the rule and ultimate standard of faith and practice, with the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as Symbols which safeguard the Faith.

4. The Conference reiterates its conviction that the ministries of the organized non-Episcopal Churches are real ministries of the Word and Sacraments. In essentials, the ministries of Episcopal and non-Episcopal Churches, which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, share the same Divine authority.

5. The Conference maintains that the Sacrament of Holy Communion derives its efficacy from Christ as the sole source of grace and power; and that the grace received through the Sacrament depends on the faith of the recipient and not on the precise form of the ordination received by the minister.

6. The Conference desires that the Church of England should have fellowship with all Christian Churches, and, while welcoming signs of a desire on the part of the Eastern Churches to act reciprocally, regrets that it must regard approaches for reunion between the reformed and the unreformed Churches as at present impracticable.

7. The Conference rejoices that the proposals for Union in South India seek the achievement of union by unifying the ministry through the adoption of the rule of episcopal ordination; and it desires to express its grateful appreciation of the service which has been rendered to the common cause by those who have been willing to change their customs in order to make this possible. The theory generally known as Apostolic Succession has never been a doctrine of the Church of England and it should be made clear that it cannot be imposed on any uniting Church.

8. The Conference rejoices that the South India Scheme has been approved by the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon and has been widely endorsed by leaders of the non-Episcopal Churches. It prays that the Lambeth Conference may do all in its power to facilitate the adoption of the scheme as a step in the advancement of the Kingdom of God in the mission field.

9. The Conference, believing that inasmuch as the worship of the one Lord is incomplete unless Christians are able to share the fellowship which they have with Him at the Lord's Table, reaffirms the conviction that intercommunion is one of the most effective means for promoting, and not only consummating, organic union between the Anglican and non-Episcopal Churches. The Conference respectfully urges on the Lambeth Conference the necessity of actively furthering this purpose. It considers that the time has now come for full liberty to be granted to enjoy this privilege.

As the call to Reunion comes from God, the Conference appeals to all Christian people to unite in prayer that God will guide the Bishops at the Lambeth Conference in all their deliberations concerning the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer that all His disciples may be one.

Archbishop Lord Davidson.

The death of Lord Davidson has occasioned a sense of loss throughout the country, and many tributes have been paid to the value of his services to the Church during his long life. He was qualified in a unique way for the Archbishopric of Canterbury which he held for twenty-five years. His long association with Lambeth had given him an intimate acquaintance with the work of the Anglican Communion throughout the world. Many Bishops and Clergymen working in remote parts of the globe were astonished at the Archbishop's knowledge of the details of the difficulties with which they had to deal. In addition to this wide knowledge he was skilled in dealing with men, and knew how to win support for any cause in which he was interested by the exercise of his gift of tact. It was generally believed that his sympathies were with the supporters of the Reformation, and since his death fresh evidence has been given of his private sympathy with the movement for reunion with the non-Episcopal Churches. His official attitude was, however, probably influenced by some of the advanced Churchmen to whom in these later years he seems to have yielded for the sake of peace. His primacy closed an epoch in the history of our Church, and we can only hope that the growing recognition of the dangers which face all Christian Churches will lead to a clearer discernment of the fundamentals which all must accept, if the conflict with materialism and indifference is to be won.

Editorial.

The present number is mainly filled with the important papers read at the Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen. They deal with "God's Call to Union" and are of special value in view of the consideration by the Bishops at the Lambeth Conference of the South India Church Union Proposals. There are two other articles to which we wish to give prominence as they are of special interest. Archdeacon Paige Cox examines with careful discrimination some "Hindrances to Christian Unity"; the Rev. N. W. Parsons states clearly some facts which need constant emphasizing on the teaching of our Church in regard to "Confession and Absolution." We also offer our readers the opinions of well-known writers on some important theological works recently published.

HINDRANCES TO CHRISTIAN UNITY.

BY THE VENERABLE W. L. PAIGE COX, B.D., Archdeacon
of Chester.

A RETIRED Indian official of high standing has been referring lately to the Scheme of Church Union in South India. He regards it as a scheme of pressing importance, from the political and not only from the ecclesiastical point of view. He considers that the people of India will not be fitted for self-government till the barriers of race and religion between them have been removed by the common adoption of the one form of faith that can produce unity of spirit amid such great diversity.

Those who framed the Scheme of Reunion would, no doubt, be the last to deprecate a full and free discussion of it. They by no means claim that it is incapable of improvement. What they would desire is that, in any judgment of the scheme, the circumstances in which it has been drawn up should be very carefully considered, and especially the question of the practicability of any other scheme which might seem to some to be ideally better.

A challenge to the propriety of the scheme is coming very strongly and persistently from one school of thought in the Church of England, and the issues involved are so serious that it is a matter of importance to inquire into the credentials of that school for pronouncing a decisive word on questions in which accuracy of statement in doctrine and scholarship is concerned.

In the early days of the Tractarian Movement Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, noticed that its leaders laid great stress on the "ideas of beauty and love," but did not give a similar lead in the direction of "truth and righteousness"—graces of character which the Apostle Paul places in the forefront of all, as necessarily preceding the rest. "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just . . . think on these things" (Phil. iv. 8). In the Introduction to the volume entitled *Christian Life*, published the year before his death, Arnold gave an instance of the inveracity which he attributed to "Mr. Newman and his friends." He quoted them as stating that the "security expressly authorized by our Lord for the continuance and due application of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is the apostolic commission of the bishops, and under them the presbyters of the Church." Arnold's comment on this is:

"If they had merely asserted that our Lord had sanctioned the necessity of apostolical succession we might have supposed that, by some interpretation of their own, they implied His sanction of it, from words which, to other men, bore no such meaning. But in saying that He has 'expressly sanctioned' it they have, most unconsciously, I trust, made a statement which is untrue. . . . I am not speaking, it will be observed, of apostolical succession simply; but of the necessity of apostolical succession as a security for the efficacy of the Sacrament" (pp. xxxi-xxxv).

Any student of the New Testament can test for himself the soundness of Arnold's criticism. The point is of importance because it has a crucial bearing on the South India Reunion question.

A book specially written with reference to this question is being circulated under the auspices of the English Church Union. In this book there are items of information and expressions of opinion which contribute usefully to the general discussion; but there are some points in the book which darken rather than elucidate counsel. Almost at the beginning there is a statement somewhat similar to that to which Arnold took such vigorous exception. The writer says :

“ According to the conviction of the majority of Christians (though doubtless not the majority of Christian Englishmen) the vital essence of the service of the Holy Eucharist depends upon the fact that by a valid consecration the bread and wine undergo a spiritual change, in virtue of which we are able to present to God the one true and perfect offering of the Sacrificed Body and Blood of Christ.”

This is mentioned as the “ conviction ” of a large body of Christians, and as a “ conviction,” merely, it might not be a matter of so much concern. But it is made the subject of definite teaching, mainly through popular manuals, and this compels the warning in the same plain terms as those used by Dr. Arnold that such teaching is untrue. It is not true that in the Holy Eucharist “ we present to God the one true and perfect offering of the Sacrificed Body and Blood of Christ.” It is teaching that since Newman's time has been conclusively refuted by some of our most eminent divines.¹ Yet in spite of all this reiterated refutation the teaching is persisted in by way of “ vehement assertion,” as it has been said, “ more particularly to the ignorant and unlearned.” In the book referred to there are various other instances of confident inferences from dubious premises on matters which are really of very serious import in connection with the South India Scheme.

It has been noted elsewhere that irregularities in argument of the same sort occur in another book with which the English Church Union has been specially associated, *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*. In an American review of that Commentary it is said that one of the editors, in his notes on St. Luke, “ constantly assumes what is quite unproven.”²

That sort of thing savours so much of inveracity that the divine alluded to would not, we may be sure, allow himself to resort to it in everyday life : it is obscured to him in his theological teaching, no doubt, by his prepossessions. Certainly in other branches of study it is scarcely to be met with in these days, when we have learnt the extreme importance of precision of statement—as a matter of expediency as well as of propriety. It is unthinkable in scientific circles, in which there can be no advance of exact and agreed

¹ Particulars are given in *The Heavenly Priesthood of Our Lord*. Second Edition, with an Appendix in answer to some criticisms. By W. L. Paige Cox, Archdeacon of Chester. (Basil Blackwell, 1s.)

² *Homiletic Review*, May, 1929.

knowledge without the most rigid attention to facts on all hands and the most scrupulous and exhaustive sifting of evidence.

Of course, religious teachers of a certain type are not solitary in their tendency to be entrapped into the *indiligentia veri* in matters of controversy. The Head Master of Harrow, Dr. Cyril Norwood, in his book on *The English Tradition of Education*, says :

“ It was but the other day that I heard an eminent man of science relate his experiences in the War, how he was called in to help in a technical question, and found that the politicians and administrators were quite unable to realize the nature of a fact, or the elementary laws of causation. They thought they could get round facts, and that they could always make them out to be something else ” (p. 86).

The moral of this is that all of us, whatever be our calling in life, would be the better for some study of science and for a thorough training in the scientific method, so as to acquire a veneration for facts, and a conscientious accuracy of statement in reference to facts.

One of the commonest forms of inaccuracy of this sort is the use of words in senses alien from their original and proper meaning. Take the word “ Protestant ” for instance. There are many members of the Church of England who not only repudiate the title themselves but apply it in a scornful way to any and all who differ from them in their ecclesiastical views. Yet every student of language and of history knows that the word “ Protestant ” came into use as denoting one who “ protested ” against the errors and encroachments of Rome in her deviations from what is truly Catholic. To quote the well-known saying of Bishop Wordsworth, “ The Church of England became Protestant at the Reformation that she might be truly and more purely Catholic.” Those members of the Church of England therefore who repudiate the name of Protestant practically admit, in doing so, that they are in a false position. They ought, on their own showing, at any rate, to be members of the Church of Rome.

Another ecclesiastical word which is often used with inexcusable and mischievous inaccuracy is “ priest.” It is applied to the clergy in a sense that suggests a distinction of fundamental importance between clergy and laity. The word “ priest ” is, of course, a contraction of “ presbyter,” the “ elder ” of the Bible. It means an elder and no more. The Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, Dr. Kennett, has lately preached a sermon on the subject, which was published in *THE CHURCHMAN* last April, and it is to be hoped that it will be widely read, for it clears up a point on which there has been much confusion and misconception. It is only the general community of Christians to whom the Hebrew and Greek words are applied in the New Testament.

It is noteworthy that Arnold, in his strictures on Newman’s teaching, emphasized precisely the same point.

“ A priesthood (in the Hebrew sense),” he says, “ belongs to the relations subsisting between God and man. These relations were fixed for the Christian Church from its very foundation, being, in fact, no other than the main truths

of the Christian religion; and they bar for all time the very notion of an earthly priesthood (as applied to a distinct order of Christians)."¹

In the South India Scheme the chief Governing Body, the Synod, is to consist of bishops, presbyters, and laity. The spokesman for the English Church Union, in the book referred to above, accepts this terminology, and adopts the title "presbyter" in speaking of clergy of the second order,² and he has some frank and useful observations on "the fact that the episcopal, presbyteral, and congregationalist systems" each contribute "elements which must all have an appropriate place in the order of life of a reunited Church."³ He has, however, a remarkable *petitio principii* in the following passage: "It must be noticed that presbyterate is not necessarily the same as priesthood in the sacerdotal sense." He then goes on to say:

"In Cyprian's idiom the word 'priest' (*sacerdos*) means a bishop, and it is noticeable that presbyters began to be called priests roughly about the same time as parishes began to be formed and put under the government of members of the second order. Obviously it would then become necessary for them to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice, and so it would also become natural to call them priests."⁴

It is historically true of course that the word *sacerdos* came to be applied to bishop and priest in Cyprian's time, but the writer entirely overlooks the fact that by that time the Church had become impregnated with pagan and pre-Christian notions of sacrifice, the object of which was to propitiate inauspicious deities; and by that time also the popular conception of God the Father had become largely paganized.

We are thus brought face to face with two fundamentally different views of the functions of the Christian Ministry, the one in accordance with New Testament teaching and the other a departure from it in a pre-Christian or non-Christian direction. So fundamental are the differences that they really stand for two opposite and irreconcilable types of religion. The two types have lately been contrasted thus by the Head Master of Harrow, Dr. Cyril Norwood.

"On the one hand, we have as the central object of our faith Jesus born of a Virgin, a Son and a Mother, or it may be, primarily, a Mother and a Son. The figure of God the Father is nebulous, the Holy Spirit is not as a wind that bloweth where it listeth, but it is operative through the Church, through the lives of many saints, through a Divine Society—whose life is entirely mediated by a priesthood possessing all the prerogative and authority of Apostolic Succession, and through the Sacrament which is through the same power and privilege of the priesthood a daily enacted Miracle. The Bible has not much place in this system, for little authority for it can be found in the Bible. It ignores modern science because it claims to be operative in another plane. It does not look back to Galilee and Jerusalem, but to Imperial Rome and the Mystery Religions.

¹ *The Christian Life*, p. 1. On page lix Arnold has a note on the word "priest" corresponding exactly to what is said by Professor Kennett.

² It is rather unfortunate that in the Church Assembly the titles should be bishops, clergy, and laity, as though the bishops were not clergy.

³ *The Case for Episcopacy*, by Kenneth D. Mackenzie, p. 118.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

“ On the other hand there is another interpretation of Christianity which frankly accepts the Bible and bases itself on what it finds there, and as frankly accepts all knowledge that proves itself worthy of incorporation into the system of science. With the Bible and through the pages of the Old Testament it traces the progress of the revelation of God. With the New Testament it believes that in Jesus God became Man, the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us. It believes that the Holy Spirit was given and continues from generation to generation to illumine all those who live the life and seek the spiritual values. It believes that God was in Jesus, is in Christ, is in the Holy Spirit, a Trinity in Unity. It holds that he who lives for the good, the true, and the beautiful, begins to live eternally, and will find a place eternally in the Father's House that has many mansions. It relies on the words of Jesus Christ and it finds its highest inspiration in the Fourth Gospel.

“ It is clear that these are two systems, a faith once for all delivered, and a faith progressive and widening, as the thoughts of men widen. They cannot exist together inside the same Church without disrupting it, as they are disrupting the Church of England to-day.”¹

“ They cannot exist together in the same Church without disrupting it.” So writes Dr. Norwood. The majority of the bishops of the Church of England—of the present bishops, not of their immediate predecessors—have thought differently. They have made it their endeavour, in revising the Prayer Book, to provide within the Church of England for both systems; and the attempt has gone far already towards producing disruption. The proposed licensing of continuous Reservation, though under specified restrictions, and the alternative Communion Office have not satisfied the adherents of the former of the two systems described by Dr. Norwood; and they have produced the revolt on the part of the adherents of the second system which has brought about the rejection of the New Book on account of the portions representing the new episcopal policy.

One leading cause of the widespread opposition to the New Book as finally shaped by the bishops, is dissatisfaction with the method adopted in the attempt to associate the two opposite types of religion in the one Church. There were many who at once objected to the alternative Prayer of Consecration, not only because of the change of doctrine implied in it, as noticed by our leading scholars,² but chiefly because of the ambiguous language resorted to, language lacking any clear warranty of Scripture. We were told again and again in recommendation or defence of some expressions in the alternative Canon that they were “ patient of an Evangelical interpretation.” Obviously also they were patient, and intended to be patient, of a quite different interpretation, as some of the bishops admitted. It was this disingenuous method of dealing with the most sacred prayer in the whole Book that was especially condemned as compromising the character of the Church of England as a teaching Church.

It is refreshing, by contrast, to turn to the account given by the

¹ *The English Tradition of Education*, pp. 51-4.

² See a letter by Cambridge Professors and others to *The Times*, dated February 3, 1929. Cardinal Bourne has said that the “ suggestion of alternative uses necessarily implies contradictory doctrines.”

Bishop of Madras of the negotiations leading up to the South India Scheme. A certain form of declaration, we are told, was proposed to be adopted with reference to the commissioning of ministers ; but it was at once rejected by the leaders of the negotiating Churches because it seemed to be a "subterfuge." It was capable of "a double interpretation," and they would have nothing in the scheme but "what was sincere and unequivocal in intention."¹

We have an echo here of the resolve of the compilers of the Old Prayer Book to admit nothing into the book that was "untrue or uncertain, or not in accordance with the very pure Word of God, the Holy Scriptures."²

Bacon, in his essay "Of Unity in Religion," says :

"There be two false peaces or unities : the one, when the peace is grounded but upon an implicit ignorance ; for all colours will agree in the dark : the other, when it is pieced up upon a direct admission of contraries in fundamental points ; for truth and falsehood in such things are like the iron and clay in the toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image—they may cleave but they will not incorporate."

There can be no real Church unity except on a basis of truth ; and our Church accordingly bids us pray that "all who profess, and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth." With unity in view there must be on all hands an open-minded search for truth, and a common determination to reject anything in doctrine and worship which is not plainly consistent with fundamental Christianity as taught in the New Testament.

Within that limit there may be much room for diversity in matters that are non-essential. And there may and should be a readiness in all members of the Church to learn from one another. We may not narrow the Church. We need the contributions which each school of thought may make to the richness of the Church's system of teaching and service. We need the influence in our midst of those who are concerned for Church order and regular devotion, and the association of art with religion : we need the work and example of those who, as a duty to the God of truth, are reverently desirous of distinguishing between the Divine and human elements in the Bible, and the permanent and transitory elements in the theological formularies which have come down to us from days other than our own ; and we need also the witness that some may give more particularly to the paramount importance of personal religion and of individual as well as corporate fellowship with God in Christ.

We may not narrow the Church. We must broaden it. And there is unprecedented hope of that now. There never was a better understanding and a more friendly feeling between Church people and Nonconformists than there is to-day. We are co-operating with them in study. Their scholars are in full concord with ours. There is agreement between the mass of enlightened Churchpeople and the mass of enlightened Nonconformists on the main matters of religion, and there is every prospect of our coming closer to one

¹ *Church Union in South India*, pp. 69, 70.

² Preface "Concerning the Service of the Church."

another on the things that still divide us. The spur to the desire of this on both sides should be the need of union in view of the home and foreign missionary work that lies before us. We are looking on together this year at the experiment that is in contemplation in South India. If that experiment succeeds, a consequence of it must surely be that we shall begin to envisage a Scheme of Home Reunion on carefully devised lines.

" My heart leaps up when I behold
A Rainbow in the sky."

There is a rainbow in the ecclesiastical firmament now, though set, like all rainbows, on a dark surface of cloud. That cloud—of division within the Church and of unsettlement without—may be, after all, the precursor of a sunlit day when the Church of England will become again in actuality the Church of the whole nation.

In view of that possibility there should be no further talk of a separation between the Church and the State. Christian reunion in England would strengthen and consolidate both; and the "powers that be" in Church and State would go forward in harmonious collaboration in their respective spheres of influence, with untold promise of good to the country and the world.

The Rev. W. Wilson Cash has shown in several interesting books a brilliant capacity for writing a fascinating narrative. His latest contribution to missionary literature shows the same qualities. It is an account of *The Changing Sudan* (C.M.S., 1s. net). The subject lends itself to graphic description and to moving incident, and Mr. Cash from his long and intimate acquaintance with the country does full justice to the opportunity. The history of the Sudan during the past half-century has been marked by many vicissitudes. From the death of Gordon in 1885 till the re-conquest by Lord Kitchener in 1898, the country was under the domination of the Moslem power. Mr. Cash's picture of its pitiable condition must convince every reader of the incapacity of Islam to raise any people and of the necessity of Christian missions to bring light into dark regions. Recent developments have opened up the land in a wonderful way, and there is a strong appeal for men and means to make full use of the many openings for evangelistic, educational and medical work. Mr. Cash's moving story will, we hope, meet with a ready response. Opportunities now open may pass and never come again.

Pressing Forward is the C.M.S. Story for the Year 1930 (1s. net). It should be read by all churchpeople so that they may gain from it something of the enthusiasm which will inspire renewed efforts to enable the Church to cope adequately with the needs of the workers overseas.

CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION.

BY THE REV. A. W. PARSONS, L.T.H., Vicar of Holy Trinity,
Leicester.

NO subject can be more important than this: How may a sinner be freed from the burden of his sins and be so restored to the consciousness of communion with God that he is encouraged to live a truly Christian life? It is important not only because on a right answer depends the spiritual happiness of the individual, but also the peace and purity of the family and the honour and well-being of the Church and Nation.

There are three kinds of confession. The first and most important is confession to God alone. The second is confession to a fellow-creature, whether a clergyman, a layman, or even a woman, for the purpose of acknowledging that we have injured the party to whom we confess; or, if not for that reason, then to obtain spiritual help and advice from him or her to whom we confess. Both these kinds of confession are scriptural. But there is a third kind—the auricular confession of the Church of Rome. This confession must be made to a priest only; it must be secret, for no third party can be present to hear the confession, and it must be full. Every so-called “mortal” sin of thought, word and deed which the penitent can remember, even those of a most horrible and degrading character, must be told; and further, the confession must be made with a view to receiving from the priest pardon or absolution—that is, remission of the punishment due to sin by the law of God.

Now I do believe in confession to a priest. But my Confessor is the great High Priest of our profession, the Lord Jesus Christ. “If we say that we have no sins we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness” (1 John i. 8, 9). Who is the best priest to whom one should confess—Jesus Christ or some earthly one? Surely if the text I have quoted be true it must be wrong to confess to Jesus Christ and then insult Him by turning to another priest, as though the Saviour Who in His great love died for us were not sufficient? Besides, our Saviour is always, so to speak, in the Confessional. Wherever we are this loving Priest is always with His own people, ready and willing to hear our confessions.

“I need no human ear
In which to pour my prayer;
My great High Priest is always near,
On Him I cast my care—
To Him, Him only, I confess,
Who can alone absolve and bless.”

In harmony with this, our Church substituted the General Confession to God in Morning and Evening Prayer for private

confession to a priest, and the public absolution which follows was put in the place of private absolution. Our Church directs intending communicants to "examine themselves" and to "confess themselves to Almighty God" (Exhortation before Holy Communion); it advises the perplexed soul "to open his grief" to a discreet and learned minister of God's Word "that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of Absolution" and Spiritual Counsel—an entirely different thing from auricular confession. The confession which it recommends in the Service for the Visitation of the Sick is only for a sick person troubled by some weighty matter; it need not be private, and it has nothing to do with the practice of secretly retailing sins to a priest by those who are in ordinary health. Moreover, according to Canon 67 no man who is a preacher need use this service, but shall instruct and comfort the sick as he shall "think most needful and convenient." Besides, as the late Dr. Griffith Thomas says in his recently published work, *The Principles of Theology*:

"The prayer for forgiveness significantly follows the pronouncement of the absolution. All this is totally different from the teaching and practice of the Roman Church, which compels auricular confession as a practice flowing out of the Sacrament of Penance. In the Church of Rome absolution is described by the word *judicium*, while with us we have its equivalent in *beneficium* by the ministration of God's Word."

Recently I found myself involved in a controversy in the *Leicester Mail* arising out of an address I gave in one of our Leicester Churches at the invitation of its Vicar. I was vehemently attacked by an anonymous writer called "Crux." In his first letter he wrote:

"Mr. Parsons knows that when he was ordained a priest, the Bishop laid his hands on his head with these words: 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained.'"

These latter words he quoted twice in one short letter. They are from John xx. 23. They cannot have a different meaning in the Prayer Book to what they have in the Bible. But people like "Crux" always think of them as implying that the priest at ordination is made a judge in the penitential tribunal, invested with power to forgive sins, and that as a consequence secret confession should be made to him. As we see, however, by comparing St. John's account with that in Luke xxiv. 33, the words were spoken to the whole company of believers, and they were a commission to proclaim publicly and authoritatively God's conditions of pardon. "Whatever the words mean," says Bishop Westcott in his *Commentary*, "they must be regarded as the commission of the Christian Society and not as that of the Christian Ministry." The Fulham Conference (1903) with the present Lord Bishop of London in the chair unanimously took this view. Further, as I reminded "Crux," these words are not found in any Ordinal for the first twelve hundred years, and even then were no essential part of the words of ordination. They are not found in any Greek Ordinal to-day. That is, they are no

ancient, catholic or necessary part of whatever is conferred in the ordination of priests. Furthermore, how did the Apostles understand our Lord's Commission? We search the New Testament in vain for any teaching about the Confessional. The Apostles remitted and retained sins by preaching the Gospel. See Acts x. 42, 43; xiii. 38, 39; Luke xxiv. 45-47. The fact is that in the whole Bible there cannot be found one single passage enjoining the practice of auricular confession to a priest.

Again, in the New Testament the Christian Minister, as such, is never called a sacerdos or priest. He is called a bishop, a presbyter, an elder in the Church of God; but never a priest. And where is he bidden to hear confessions or to pronounce a solemn absolution? His office is to preach the word. He is told that he must be watchful and do the work of an Evangelist and make full proof of his ministry. Bishop Gore has admitted in *The Church and the Ministry* that sacerdotal terms are only found connected with the ministry at the end of the second century.

Auricular confession was made compulsory for the first time in 763.¹ The system of penance as it now exists in the Church of Rome was not formulated until the Fourth Council of Lateran, 1215. It seems but truth to say with Canon Meyrick: "These assumptions of the medieval priesthood, ignorantly acquiesced in, laid the layman a slave at the foot of the priest." In this matter the Church of Rome's own champions are against her. Bellarmine says: "The secret confession of all our sins is not only not instituted or commanded *Jure Divino*, by God's law, but it was not so much as received into use in the ancient church of God."²

The first writer to defend formally the judicial form of absolution was the celebrated Thomas Aquinas (1227-74) in his short work, *De Forma Absolutionis*. That at this time the practice was a novel one is clear from the account Aquinas himself gives of a certain learned man who found fault with it on the ground that up to within thirty years of his writing—that is, about the year 1220—the only form used by the priests and known to the objector was the deprecatory one—that is, prayer. (Almighty God, give thee remission and forgiveness.) In one of his replies to me "Crux" quoted, as other Anglo-Catholics have quoted, some words from the Apostolic Constitutions of the fourth century. They are introduced in this ingenuous way.

"I turn now to Mr. Parsons' statement [which may be *verbally* correct] that the words 'whose sins ye forgive,' etc., were not said to the priest for the first twelve hundred years of the Church's history. . . . What he does not tell us, however, is that a form, not verbally the same, but exactly similar in purport, is put in the mouth of the consecrating Bishop in the Apostolic Constitutions. 'Grant him [the priest], O Lord, by Thy Christ, the fulness of Thy Spirit that he may have power to pardon sins according to Thy command, that he may loose every bond that binds sinners by reason of the power which Thou hast granted to Thine Apostles.'"

I replied that this was an example of precatory absolution and that if he would read the Apostolic Constitutions he would find it

¹ Fleury, *Ecc. Hist.*, Vol. 13, p. 390.

² *De Perit*, lib. 3; c. 1.

stated that the Bishop himself absolved only by prayer and the laying on of hands. I stated that no verbal absolution but that of prayer is known to have been preserved from the early centuries.

I also pointed out that it was not fair to ignore my argument that the words he quoted to prove that I was commissioned at my ordination to hear auricular confessions were not included in any Ordinal for twelve centuries.

“ If the words are understood as I understand them, there is no difficulty. But if the words quoted (John xx. 23) confer the right to forgive sins judicially, then for 1,200 years the Church ordained her priests without conferring this power upon them.”

The argument is quite simple and must be faced by anyone who holds Anglo- or Roman Catholic views. It was certainly not argument to say that what I stated was verbally correct, and then proceed to say that because the words were said at my ordination I must accept “Crux’s” view of them. It is this intolerance of the opinions of one’s fellow-Churchmen which has led to the present unpopularity of Anglo-Catholicism in spite of the splendid and devoted work done by some Anglo-Catholic priests.

Finally, I gave my own view of the place of my ministry with regard to this matter in the words of the *Homily of Repentance* :

“ I do not say but that if any find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned curate or pastor, or to some other godly, learned man, and show the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them, that they may receive at their hand the comfortable salve of God’s Word ; but it is against the true Christian liberty that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins, as it hath been used heretofore in the time of blindness or ignorance.”

I also quoted these words from the same source : “ It is most evident and plain that this auricular confession hath not the warrant of God’s Word.” In reply, “Crux ” threw over the Homilies and referred to them as a volume of sixteenth-century sermons. He asked me whether I accepted all the statements of doctrine in the Homilies. My reply was that I accept them as an authoritative standard of doctrine in the Church of England and that that was why I quoted them. The 80th Canon, which is still in force, orders a copy of these Homilies to be provided in every parish church. The second rubric after the Nicene Creed still says : “ Then shall follow the Sermon, or one of the Homilies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth, by authority.” The attempt to prove that the Homilies are of no doctrinal value is one of the outstanding failures of the Modern Anglo-Catholic movement. Even Dr. Newman admitted in the famous Tract 90 that “ they are of authority so far as they bring out the sense of the Articles and are not of authority when they do not.” The least that can be said of the Homilies is that they are of more authority than any sermons preached by particular clergymen, seeing they are the Church’s own sermons showing how the facts and truths of the Gospel are to be brought home to the consciences of men. But, of course, even their statements are to be

brought to the test of God's Word, seeing that: "Ignorance of the Scriptures is the cause of an error" (Homily 1).

In conclusion, it is worth noting that our English Ordinal does more than quote the words from John xx. 23. It adds to it the words: "And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His Holy Sacraments." If we are to interpret all the words of authoritative commission we may do so by a reference to the exhortation which precedes it in the service, and we shall then see at once that priests in the Church of England exercise their functions by being "Messengers, Watchmen and Stewards of the Lord," by teaching, premonishing, feeding and providing for the Lord's family, and the manner of compassing the doing of so weighty a work is with doctrine and exhortation taken out of the Holy Scriptures and with a life agreeable to the same. The interpretation imposed upon the words: "Whosoever sins ye remit," is in no way qualified by any reference to a tribunal of penance or even by a remote suggestion of judicial authority exercised therein by the accredited pastor. My own deep and personal conviction is that the modern attempt to revive the Confessional is the most perilous of the developments of the mediæval reaction which has so largely obscured scriptural truth in our land. There is no authority whatever in the Word of God or in the Prayer Book for auricular confession and priestly absolution of a judicial kind. And as the *Homily of Repentance*, Part 2, says:

"We ought to acknowledge none other priest for deliverance from our sins but our Saviour Jesus Christ; Who, being our Sovereign Bishop, doth with the sacrifice of His body and blood, offered once for ever on the altar of the Cross, most effectually cleanse the spiritual leprosy, and wash away the sins of all those that with true confession of the same do flee unto Him. It is most evident and plain that this auricular confession hath not the warrant of God's Word."

In an open Bible and a fully proclaimed Saviour there is still resident that Divine power with which the newly Crucified in His Risen Might invested the cowering company to whom He addressed the words. It is along this line that our own beloved Church must find "The Way of Renewal."

The second edition of *Principles of Theology*, by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., completing 4,000 copies, is now ready, price 12s. 6d. It is particularly encouraging to find that the first edition of this important work should have been sold out in the short space of twelve weeks and that there is every indication that the demand will continue. The new edition contains a slightly more complete index, but beyond the correction of some printers' errors, the text remains the same.

THE OXFORD CONFERENCE OF EVANGELICAL CHURCHMEN

(IN CONTINUATION OF THE CHELTENHAM
CONFERENCE)

HELD AT

ST. PETER'S HOUSE, OXFORD,

April 7, 8 and 9, 1930.

SUBJECT : GOD'S CALL TO UNION.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY THE REV. CHRISTOPHER M. CHAVASSE,
M.C., Master of St. Peter's House.

MY dear Brethren,—It was my privilege last year to welcome you for the first time to St. Peter's Hall. We were then only a Hostel, and living in a corner of what seemed a busy mason's yard, with building going on feverishly all round us. Building for twenty additional sets of rooms is still proceeding on the northern extremity of our property; otherwise we can entertain you in these well laid out and pleasant surroundings, where forty undergraduates are already taking their full share in the activities of the University. It is a great satisfaction thus to have the opportunity of showing you the encouraging progress of the last twelve months, especially as very many of you have interested yourselves most actively in the project of the Hall. And it is a mark of their faith in the future of St. Peter's which led the Committee of this Conference to change its name from "The Cheltenham" to "The Oxford Conference." Thereby they have brought all the fine traditions of scholarship and service for which these gatherings of Evangelicals became famous under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Chelmsford, when he was Vicar of Cheltenham, and have planted them here in Oxford, when the creation of this Hall offered a new and more convenient home.

I would, then, remind you that one of the great reasons for the founding of St. Peter's was that it might thus afford a much-needed meeting place for Evangelical fellowship and discussion. And I am bold to pray that the Oxford Conference may influence the Church and serve the Evangelical School even more effectively and faithfully than those much-blessed gatherings at Cheltenham, for which we shall always thank God.

MISSIONARY REUNION AND INTERCOMMUNION.

Last year the subject of our discussion was that of Reunion; and we were able, in Findings which carried much weight, not only to arouse the whole Church to consider the paramount importance of the South India scheme, which will be laid before the

Lambeth Conference this summer; but also to disclose much opposition to the scheme, and to bring it into the open, where the light of Christian principle, historic precedent, and sanctified common sense might play upon its objections. Thanks to the correspondence which ensued in the papers, to pamphlets, and to weighty books, we can congratulate ourselves, I think, that the Church is educated on this question, and is alive to the issues on which the Bishops will have to decide. As Lambeth, therefore, will meet in a few months' time, the Committee makes no apology for bringing up the question of Reunion once more for our discussion. Reunion is the matter of the hour, and its cause is a sacred trust for those who have been called to this hour. A false move at Lambeth would be fatal indeed; and the principles at stake demand all the energy of our thought and study, our work and our prayers. Also, our findings of last year have been discussed all over the world, and often challenged. In the light, therefore, of all that has appeared in the way of manifestoes and statements during the last twelve months, we wish to review the position, strengthen our case, or, if necessary, modify our opinions. It is truth, and truth alone, that we seek. Especially do we wish to be practical; and all our discussions will have, as their special objective, the two burning questions of Missionary Reunion, and of Inter-Communion at home. In these two respects Reunion has passed beyond the stage of discussion into that of action. The Bishops will have to declare upon them; and we desire, God helping us, to put forward the contribution of the Evangelical School.

My object this evening, will be an attempt to clear the air for free and unfettered thought, by facing frankly one great weapon that has been employed, often ruthlessly, against all proposals of reunion and intercommunion with "our sister Churches of the Reformation." The arguments against such proposals have been chiefly *ad hominem*—"Bishop Gore is not in favour of the scheme"; and then *ad baculum*—"Well, anyway, if Reunion comes you will force a secession from the Church."

As regards the former—much as we honour and admire Bishop Gore, I agree with a distinguished religious leader in this University that "it is time the Church of England ceased to be afraid of Bishop Gore." But as regards the latter an issue is raised which must be faced. Though the threat is often used, very unfairly, by those who are shown by after events to have no intention of seceding at all, yet there are some (though not many, I believe) who will leave the Church if active steps are taken towards reunion with the Free Churches. And the charge is levelled against us that whereas we prate about Christian unity, in reality we are effecting a schism in our own Church. It is not necessary for me to point out that the advocates of Reunion with the Free Churches extrude no one; and that those who warn us that their position will thereby be made intolerable in the Church, really mean that they must leave the Church unless we agree to let them fashion

the Church and its doctrines into something quite different from what they have been either in primitive times or since the Reformation.

AN ANGLO-CATHOLIC SECESSION INEVITABLE.

But however that may be, I believe that some sort of secession on the part of a few extreme Anglo-Catholics is inevitable, and that we had better recognize the fact and see what may be done about it.

For many years past two statements have been made repeatedly about the Church of England for which no proof is offered and concerning which no facts to the contrary are accepted. Instead, the statements are merely repeated till by constant reiteration many believe them to be accepted truth.

First, as regards Holy Communion, it is stated that the Church of England teaches that in some way the Consecrated Elements contain the Presence of our Blessed Lord. Secondly, as regards the ministry, it is stated that the Church of England holds that the ordination gift can only be bestowed by the hands of bishops, through whom it has come down from the Apostles ordained by Christ Himself. That is, the apostolic succession is to be held not only as an historic fact, but as being an essential channel to communicate grace, by which alone a Church can exist. The Church will authoritatively repudiate both these statements before the year is out. The former has already been denied by the new Prayer Book, and the latter must be by the Lambeth Conference. In which case I cannot see how some devoted but extreme Anglo-Catholics can any longer remain in what must be an intolerable position in the Church of England. It is true that there have always been a group in the Church who have held such views, though not with such intensity, or to such an extreme, as their successors to-day. But it is one matter for the Church to allow great latitude of private opinion; it is quite another when the Church is called upon to authorize such doctrines for public teaching, and to legislate or to administer order in accordance with them.

The new Prayer Book (not to mention the present book) definitely declared against all modern interpretations of Transubstantiation when it refused to make any provision for the sacrifice of the Mass, and instead categorically forbade Reservation for purposes of adoration. For both these practices are logically necessary, and indeed inevitable, if any doctrine of a localized Presence of Christ in the Elements is allowed. Furthermore, by licensing the new Book when Parliament refused to authorize it—a proceeding which the Primate himself has confessed to be morally dangerous—the Bishops have sealed the solemn pledge they gave when first they pressed the book upon a reluctant Church—that they conscientiously intend to regulate Church worship according to its provisions. Some Bishops have already begun to do so; and unless the whole Bench follows suit they will stand self-condemned before the world. This means that they must,

as Christian leaders bound by their sacred word, forbid, by strong action, the Consecrated Elements to be Reserved either for public or private devotions. We are told by many that such practices are essential for their faithful ministry in the Church of England. Holding the doctrines that they do, I agree with them, and fully sympathize with their position, which is quite impossible. But will their link with the Church, thus strained already to breaking-point, be able to survive a declaration on Reunion which, if it does not in so many words repudiate the interpretation of Apostolic Succession which they hold to be essential, will yet as effectively deny it (even as they point out) by encouraging that which their theory would make impossible?

THE CRUX OF THE WHOLE SUBJECT.

For what is the crux of the whole vexed subject of Reunion with the Free Churches, as now brought to a head by the South India proposals? We believe with all our hearts, that as the preface to the Ordinal puts it, "From the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of ministers, bishops, priests and deacons. Which Offices were evermore had in . . . reverend estimation." We would countenance no scheme of Reunion which allowed an unepiscopal ministry. We are absolutely faithful to the Lambeth Quadrilateral. But we also hold other forms of orders in reverent esteem. Not to do so would be to accompany St. Peter to Caesarea and yet to deny the Holy Ghost when He came upon Cornelius. We therefore believe that unepiscopally ordained ministers can consecrate a "valid" Sacrament; and in the present emergency we are as willing as were the Elizabethan and Caroline Bishops to allow Free Church ministers to minister in a United Church without requiring them to be episcopally ordained, so long as the combined Episcopal and Presbyterian ordination, which is the rule of our own Church, is thenceforth adopted and so regularizes the position after one generation. Such a course is Christian and obvious, and has good precedent behind it. It would no more invalidate our Orders for future hopes of Reunion with the Orthodox or Roman Communion than the same action which has taken place in the past, and which is now almost forgotten. But such a course (which is proposed for South India) is to reassert the doctrine of the Church of England that Episcopacy is the *bene esse*, not the *esse*, of the Church. And we are warned that such a declaration would make inclusion in the Church impossible for some whose position within its borders is already most unhappy. The fact is that for nearly a century there has been a sustained and determined effort to force the Church of England to enlarge its already wide limits of comprehension. To this end, and with this hope, earnest, but to my mind misguided, men have been content to remain in a Church whose doctrines could not satisfy them. It is a Church of Henry VIII that they desire; a Roman Church, but without the Pope. In their own eyes, they have been loyal

to the Church of England and have loved it. But their loyalty and love has been given not to the Church as Reformed and as she actually is, but to the Church as they thought she ought to be and as they believed she might become. The Prayer Book controversy and the Reunion question have opposed a decisive "No"; and, their hopes frustrated, some kind of a secession seems inevitable. What is the right and brotherly course for us to pursue under such circumstances? It is quite evident that there is not room in the Church of England for their doctrines and the Sixth Article. May I recall to your minds the secession of the Non-Jurors, whose history roughly embraces the first half of the eighteenth century? I believe that from their experience we may discover the right solution. You will remember that the occasion of the secession was a political one. Eight bishops and 400 clergy refused to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary, because they had given it already to James II, his heirs and lawful successors.

But behind this occasion there was a distinct and definite sacerdotal doctrine which after their secession wrought them into a new Church of England, very different in character from the Established Church which accepted William, Anne, and the Georges. The Non-Jurors certainly believed in the divine right of Kings (to whom they would only offer passive resistance), as distinct from the divine right of the Pope on the one hand and of the People on the other. But this belief was strongly engendered in them, because, in Erastian days, "they held the existence of the Church as a distinct spiritual society with laws of its own, whose connection with the State, however beneficial, was purely accidental." Therefore they insisted on their independence, and denied the right of any king or government to turn them out of their spiritual offices.

A VERY SACRAMENTAL DOCTRINE.

Thus the political cause of the schism soon lost its force, and one of their Bishops described their communion as "a distinct spiritual society, whose object was to revive the practices of the primitive and undivided Church." As was natural with their high conceptions of the Church, their doctrine was very sacramental, and their worship centred round the Holy Communion, which they invested with a strong sacrificial character. The chief usages they advocated were four in number, the mixed Chalice, Prayers for the faithful departed, the Invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements, and an Oblatory Prayer in connection with the elements. At first many non-juring priests used the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. which contained all these usages; but in 1717 a new Prayer Book was introduced which split their communion into Usagers—those for the New Book, and Non-Usagers—those who still held to the ordinary Prayer Book. And though in 1732 the Usagers joined up once more with the Non-Usagers, after declaring that all these usages found a place or were implied in the Book of Common Prayer, it was yet repeated splits which

finally dissolved their communion even more than the death of the Pretender in 1788.

All through these years Bishops had been duly consecrated and priests ordained for what was sometimes termed "the ancient British Church"; they had kept in communion with the Episcopal Church of Scotland, which had certainly consecrated one Bishop for them, and accepted the oversight of the London congregation on the death of its last Bishop; and ineffectual overtures had been made for communion with the Greek Church.

If needs must, would it not be possible for a similar Church with much the same doctrinal outlook to take shape once again, but which this time should be treated only with respect and consideration by the Established Church? Like the Non-Juror Church it would still be a Church of England, inheriting all its traditions, and moreover it could remain as much in communion with the Established Church as is the present Episcopal Church of Scotland.

The piety and learning of the Non-Juror leaders was a real loss to the Church of England; and no one can face the secession of some devout Anglo-Catholics without great searchings of heart.

But if communion between two such Churches of England could be maintained, then not only would England at large be free to accept the unfettered ministrations of extreme Anglo-Catholics but the Established Church would still benefit from their undoubted spiritual contribution to religion. Even in the case of the Non-Jurors, though bitterness ran high, yet personal friendship largely existed between Churchmen and their non-juring brethren; many Non-Jurors, including some of the Deprived Fathers, worshipped in Established Churches; and William Law's writings had far more influence among ordinary Churchpeople (indeed, they may almost be said to have occasioned the Wesleyan Revival) than among those of his own communion, who hardly approved of them. To-day, by mutual agreement and prayer, it should be possible for the schools of thought in England to regroup themselves without bitterness, and with ties of fellowship still maintained. Thus, there must be no such re-grouping as I have outlined (for I will not call it secession) without just and generous provision being made by the Established Church in the matter of buildings and endowments. And though an Anglo-Catholic Church of England would inevitably have to forgo all claim to cathedrals or to power and position in the State, yet this would not, I think, trouble them, for no one has ever accused Anglo-Catholics of place-hunting or of lust for worldly honour.

But if, instead of copying the hopeless example of politicians and exploring avenues to discover formulae which shall unite us by meaning several different things at the same time, we could only agree to differ, then I see three great advantages that would accrue to the benefit of all.

THREE GREAT ADVANTAGES.

First, our Anglo-Catholic brethren would be free to develop what they believe to be true and essential, with no opposition either on the part of the authority or of their own conscience. Their present position in the Church of England is not only cramping but definitely bad for their morals. Character is injured by this wholesale taking of oaths by priests who feel they cannot conscientiously keep them and have no intention of doing so.

Secondly, we shall then have the right of seeing that a church with Prayer Book worship is available for every inhabitant of this country. In towns little hardship exists at present, for the parish system has broken down and town dwellers can generally choose a suitable church within reasonable distance of their homes. But the position in villages is quite monstrous. It is nothing short of a crime that in many a village loyal members of the Church of England should be faced with the alternative of attending Mass or a Chapel Service; and that when they wish their children to be confirmed, they must send them to one who will teach what is generally regarded as superstition, and is definitely repudiated by the Prayer Book and the Articles. Whatever the future may have in store, some action must be taken with regard to village worship.

Then thirdly, if such re-grouping must come, it would make possible the definite hope of our Reunion with the great Wesleyan Communion. Here is another secession from the Church, of which we are bound to take account! We are often reminded that we owe duties to our Anglo-Catholic brethren, who are the spiritual children of the old Non-Jurors (though infinitely more advanced in doctrine), and who are already practically speaking a Non-Juring Church within the Church of England itself. But we owe a far greater duty to our Wesleyan brethren, lost to us by our own folly, and whose doctrine is indistinguishable from our own. It is only the accident of schism that divides the Church and the Wesleyans to-day. Would, think you, the great Head of the Churches counsel our generation to acquiesce in such a position? The fact of the separate Wesleyan Communion is not our fault, but it becomes our sin if we tolerate it.

IN CHRIST'S FOOTSTEPS. By Rev. Alfred Thomas, M.A., F.R.S.L.
London: Skeffington & Son, Ltd. 3s. 6d. net.

The Vicar of St. Barnabas', Jesmond, is not by any means a stranger to our readers, and most of the addresses in this volume were originally given to his own congregation. The volume contains eleven discourses well suited for Lenten or devotional reading.

THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH.

BY THE REV. CANON D. DAWSON-WALKER, D.D.,
Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham.

IN any attempt to understand the nature of the Christian Church, and to give clearness to one's thoughts on the subject, the desirable thing seems to be to go back to the time of its origins, and to realize the thought of our Lord and of His earliest followers about it.

Throughout the long course of subsequent history the idea of the "Church" has become greatly changed, greatly modified by various other influences, ecclesiastical, social and political. The treasure has been contained in earthen vessels and has been affected by the vessels which have contained it.

It may, then, help our deliberations at this conference, if we attempt, at the beginning, to rediscover the earliest characteristics of those who came out of the contemporary Jewish or heathen world to be joined together in fellowship as disciples of Jesus Christ. Our word "Church"—as you will recall—represents the Greek word "ecclesia"; a word which had associations both for Jews and Greeks. To the Jew it recalled the assembly of Israel convened by the blowing of silver trumpets. To the Greek it meant the assembly of the people as a whole—not of any committee or council of it.

When, in response to the confession of St. Peter, Jesus said: "Upon this rock I will build my Church," the word "ecclesia" implied that it had been the congregation of Jehovah; and the word "My" implied that, without losing its continuity with the past, it was to become the congregation of Jesus Christ.

The first Christians did not regard themselves as being a new Society, but simply as God's ancient people; that is, as the particular part of the Church of the Patriarchs and Prophets which had not, by rejecting the Messiah, cut itself off from "the promises of God."

They were, in fact, the "remnant" spoken of by the prophets, who by recognizing Jesus as the Messiah, showed that they, and they alone, had understood the prophets aright.

From this conception of Christians as the "new Israel," the "remnant," continuing from the ancient people, and, like the ancient people, scattered abroad amongst the peoples of the world, we can see that they would, in the first instance, be drawn together naturally, without the aid of any external form of organization. As the Jews of the Dispersion clung together in their synagogues, so would the earliest Christians in their assemblies. In fact, the precise method of organization would be comparatively unimportant. As Canon Streeter puts it: "Membership of the Ecclesia, the 'congregation of Israel,' was the important thing; and all who were baptized

in the name of the Lord were *ipso facto* members of the 'remnant,' however it might locally be organized." ¹

The actual word "ecclesia" has its real home in the Pauline and Lucan writings. The word occurs 110 times in the New Testament writings, and of these 86, *i.e.*, 78 per cent of the whole, are to be found in the Pauline Epistles and in the Acts of the Apostles.

As we survey these instances, and try to take in what they convey to us, we see that certain clear characteristics emerge.

It is a fellowship with Jesus Christ. That is the Divine element in it. The rock on which the Ecclesia was to be built was a "human person acknowledging our Lord's Divine Sonship." It was a man in whom long companionship with Jesus, and the revelation from the Father, had created a personal trust in His Messianic mission.

"In virtue of this personal faith in Christ, vivifying their discipleship, the Apostles became themselves the first little ecclesia, constituting a living rock upon which a far larger, and ever enlarging ecclesia should very shortly be built slowly up, living stone by living stone, as each new faithful convert was added to the Society." ²

I need hardly remind you how St. Paul rings the changes on this thought of fellowship with Jesus which constitutes the Church. The Churches to which he writes are described as "in Christ Jesus." Yet he is always careful to impress on believers the personal relationship in which they stand to their Lord, even when he is addressing the Church as a whole.

The individual believer is never lost in the Society; and yet, he is never regarded as alone and separated from it. The bond of union between Christians is not an external framework impressed from without; it is a sense of fellowship springing from within.

While Jesus lived on earth this fellowship with Him was the external mark that distinguished His followers from all others. They were His disciples, His *μαθηται*, sharing in His teaching, drinking in His words of wisdom, united by a common hope and a common future. It was through their relation to Him that they were to share in the coming Kingdom. After His departure from the earth, it was the other aspect of fellowship that became prominent—their fellowship with one another through their fellowship with their common Lord. They had, as St. John puts it, "fellowship one with another." ³ And this thought of fellowship was the ruling idea in all Christian organization. "Visible fellowship with each other, the outcome of their hidden fellowship with Jesus, was to be at once the leading characteristic of all Christians, and the bond which united them to each other, and separated them from the world outside." ⁴

And how, after our Lord's ascension, was the distinctiveness

¹ *The Primitive Church*, p. 48.

² Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, p. 17.

³ I John i. 7.

⁴ Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 9.

of His Church indicated? It was by the possession of the Holy Spirit.

It is not easy for us, in these later days, to recapture that earlier atmosphere and to recall the vivid reality of those earlier experiences. For there was something intensely real, intensely distinctive, in this outpouring of the Spirit.

Its effect on the Church as a whole is portrayed by St. Luke in the second chapter of Acts. And it not only affected the Society as a whole; it affected the individual Christian. To quote Canon Streeter's very graphic words: "The reception of the Spirit was something as definite and observable as, for example, an attack of influenza."¹

It was something which had been consciously experienced, and to which appeal could be made. "Received ye the Spirit," says St. Paul to the Galatians, "by the works of the Law, or by the hearing of faith?"² "You know you have received the Spirit. From what source did you receive it?" The very form of the question suggests something of the meaning indicated. The Spirit was pre-eminently a Spirit of power, of supernatural power, bestowed upon men to enable them with a strength coming upon them, coming into them, to live in communion with Christ and to be active members of His Church.

The disciples had been taught, in the language of Old Testament prophecy, to expect that the Messianic age would be marked by a special visitation of God's Spirit. And the extraordinary ferment of spiritual power and enthusiasm which prevailed amongst the Christians of the early Apostolic age was associated with that outpouring of the Spirit which was believed to usher in the Messianic age.

And as the Gospel spread and the Church grew, the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church was its distinguishing mark. It was the distinguishing mark of the Church as a whole, as well as of individual members of it. "No man," says St. Paul, "can say that Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit";³ *i.e.*, any true confession of the Lordship of Jesus is inspired by the Spirit. Again, St. Paul says: "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Him."⁴

It is apart from the purpose of this paper to enter on any theological discussion of the place of the Holy Spirit in the Divine Trinity. But it is to be observed that St. Paul's language fluctuates in harmony with the manifold greatness of the Spirit. Just before speaking of Him as "the Spirit of Christ"⁵ he speaks of Him as "the Spirit of God, dwelling in you,"⁶ and he also speaks of Him as "the Spirit of Him that raised Jesus from the dead."⁷

He conceives this Holy Spirit of God as entering into a man, dwelling in him, taking up his abode in him, transforming his character, overcoming evil in him, strengthening and developing the good in him. And, conversely, he can speak of Christians as being

¹ *The Primitive Church*, p. 69.

² Gal. iii. 2.

³ 1 Cor. xii. 3.

⁴ Rom. viii. 9.

⁵ Rom. viii. 9.

⁶ Rom. viii. 9.

⁷ Rom. viii. 11.

“in the Spirit.” The Spirit is the environment in which their life is lived, the very atmosphere they breathe, and—let us recall again, it was visibly perceptible to the world around.

You will remember that the actual presence of God's Spirit in the Church revealed itself in a variety of ways. There were “spiritual gifts” of prophecy, tongues, and so forth; some more excellent and useful to the corporate life of the brotherhood, others, rather more spectacular and emotional and less permanently useful. The “gift of tongues,” for example, did not contribute so much to the welfare of the Church as the “gift” of prophecy. It gave more occasion for what might seem to be individual display.

And it is here that we are able to realize the simply overwhelming service rendered by St. Paul to the early Church. While admitting freely that all the “gifts” were exhibitions of the presence and the power of the Spirit, he insisted that they must be graded, that some were preferable and more to be sought after than others, and that they *were* preferable just in proportion as they were helpful, as they contributed to the illumination and fortification of the whole Church.

In this he was, not improbably, rather rowing against the stream, going contrary to generally accepted views. But it was he who brought the whole Christian life within the sphere of the operation of the Spirit. In his teaching the Spirit became the creator and sustainer of the new life of peace with God and of holiness which constitutes the Christian and is the essence of his life. As Gunkel says: “The early community regarded as spiritual, the extraordinary in the Christian life; St. Paul, the usual. They, what was characteristic of individuals; he, what was common to all. They, the impulsive; he, the permanent. They, isolated elements in the Christian life; he, the life itself.”¹

I have permitted myself to dwell at some length on this characteristic of the life of the earliest Church—the conscious possession of the Holy Spirit—because it seems to me to reach to the innermost essence of it. It was the ground of their abounding joy; it was the secret “of their *παρησια*—their glad, courageous self-expression.”² It was not only within them, but without. “When they had prayed, the place was shaken wherein they were gathered together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost.”³

The early Christian Church, then, seems to have regarded itself as God's Israel, God's chosen people continuing on earth, recognizing Jesus as the Messiah, saved by Him, a fellowship happy in the enjoyment of the Spirit.

To say so much in no way exhausts the subject, and one might add other distinguishing marks, as, for example, that the Church had authority over those who were its members; and that it was a priestly body. It is the ideal Israel and, as such, does the work which Israel, of old, was appointed to do. But the former limitations have now disappeared. God can be approached at all times, and in every place, and by everyone amongst His people. “There

¹ *die wirkungen des Heiligen Geistes*, p. 75.

² Kennedy, *The Theology of the Epistles*, p. 112.

³ Acts iv. 3.

is one Mediator only, and all, men, women and children, have the promise of immediate entrance to the presence of God, and are priests." ¹

So we have the new Israel, a fellowship spiritual, authoritative, priestly in its corporate character. This whole conception is summarized by St. Paul in his well-known figure of "the Body of Christ."

The fundamental thing for him, let me repeat, was the union of the believer with Christ personally and individually. Obviously those who are joined to Christ by the Spirit are joined to one another by the same Spirit. The one Spirit, as the real life principle of the Society, suggests the correlative idea of the one Body, the living organism which gives expression to the life of the Spirit. So the Christian community is designated by St. Paul as the Body of Christ, and those who belong to it are His members. "We, though many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another." ²

Now, it would seem that in a body so conceived there must be something of order, something that would give it perpetuity, something that would act as connecting link between past, present and future, something, as we should say, in virtue of which the Society could carry on and prolong its life.

So we might think ; but there was one feature in the life of the early Church that seriously modifies this conclusion. As Canon Streeter puts it : "the hammer of the world's clock was raised to strike the last hour." ³ They were looking for the more or less immediate return of their Lord.

"To understand the history of early Christianity we must begin by eliminating from our minds the traditional picture of the Twelve Apostles, sitting at Jerusalem, like a College of Cardinals, systematizing the doctrine, and superintending the organization, of the Primitive Church. They had a more urgent work to do. The Day of Judgment was at hand ; their duty was to call men to repent before it was too late. When the Lord might any day return in glory, it was unprofitable to build up an organization, about which the one thing certain was, that it was never meant to last." ⁴

It is probably to be connected with this, that there is such a singular lack of reference in St. Paul's extant Epistles to any details of Church organization. Yet he was not oblivious to the need for order. He refers to Apostles, Prophets, Teachers. But these terms appear to indicate, not officials, but men who had special endowments of the Spirit which they placed at the service of the community. This brings us to a really fundamental difference of opinion, with reference to which we must take our stand on one side or the other.

The more extreme "High Anglican" view of the ministry holds that the Episcopate, as the essential mark of the Church's unity, *must* have been there from the first ; that it has the sanction of our Lord's own ordinance.

This argument is largely *a priori*. In view of the sanctity

¹ Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 35.

³ *The Primitive Church*, p. 69.

² Rom. xii. 5.

⁴ *ib.*, p. 38.

and importance of the Episcopal commission, it *must* have been authorized by Christ.

And yet, when we turn from what "must have been" to what was, and carefully scrutinize the New Testament writings, we find that the ministries of which St. Paul speaks are, primarily, spiritual; that there seems to be no hint of formal official organization, though we can trace out the gradual emergence of a local official ministry, with a monarchical Episcopate, by the early years of the second century A.D. We have the gradually accumulating evidence in St. Paul's address to the Ephesian elders at Miletus, in the salutation of the Epistle to the Philippians and in the 2nd and 3rd Epistles of St. John. But the earlier evidence points to what is spiritual and occasional, the service of particular men to meet the particular need, the spiritual ministry of spiritual men.

"Much informality must have existed, side by side with what would have been regarded as the obvious practice to follow, wherever possible. We cannot find sufficient indications to justify any theory which would assert that the Apostolic Churches considered the ministerial grace to flow in a stream, of which the Twelve and the Twelve alone were the sources; or that all Church officials were universally and indispensably bound to receive a commission from existing officials, as an essential condition of valid office."¹

In this conclusion there is nothing new. It has long been held by scholars of ability and eminence. It has, as it seems to me, been strongly reinforced by Canon Streeter's recent book on *The Primitive Church*, in which he claims—and, as I think, claims successfully—to have established the point that:

"In the Primitive Church there was no single system of Church Order laid down by the Apostles. During the first hundred years of Christianity, the Church was an organism alive and growing—changing the organization to meet changing needs. Clearly in Asia, in Syria, and Rome, during that century the system of Government varied from Church to Church, and in the same Church at different times. Uniformity was a later development; and for those times it was perhaps a necessary development."²

"Perhaps a necessary development." The early Apostolic Church, with its variety, its spontaneousness, its absence of fixed formal organization, was ultimately transformed into the Catholic Episcopal Church. As Sohm says: "With her Episcopal constitution the Church put on the armour which gave her power to withstand the storms of the coming ages."³ Humanly speaking, it is not easy to see how she could have lived through the clash and conflict of those ages, unprotected by that armour.

But if we read aright the story of her early years, I think we seem to see her living her life in the power of the Spirit, and gradually feeling her way by experience and by experiment, towards a uniformity of constitution. It was reached afterwards, but it was not there at the beginning. And it seems therefore questionable

¹ Blunt, *Studies in Apostolic Christianity*, p. 101.

² *The Primitive Church*, p. 261.

³ *Outlines of Church History*, Sohm, p. 42.

whether the form of Church Government finally attained should be insisted on as of primary, essential, determining importance.

May I, in conclusion, put the issue in what seem to me to be very wise words, penned by Mr. Barry, the Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford.

"If it be true," he says, "that God's eternal purpose is so far irrevocably committed to one form of ministry and government that no other can be instrumental to it, then, of course, there is nothing more to say. If it be true, as Dr. Gore declares in the *Church Overseas*, that 'the principle of succession in the ministry from the Apostles is as essential a part of the Divine plan as the Creed or the Scriptures'—why, then, the proposals for Union in South India can hardly be defended.

"But there are many who are not satisfied by that line of argument. At a time when every year and every week, God is giving to men new disclosures of His unsearchable power and glory, we cannot believe, without further question, that the whole content of the Divine purpose is expressed by any institutions of past history, however glorious and however strong. . . . But the story, after all, is not yet ended. Christianity is still in its infancy; it is just emerging from its pupa stage in which it has been cocooned in the West, spreading its wings to take the rising sun, as a truly world-wide, universal religion. New Christian nations are being born in Asia, Africa and the islands of the sea. It seems to us impossible to argue that what has been the safeguard and the Sacrament of Catholic unity in those countries which have sprung from the Græco-Roman inheritance is necessarily the only or the final form in which the living Spirit of the Church can find expression in the coming time. . . . If the Spirit is alive within the Church, He must be leading us to richer meanings in all that has been called Catholicism, corresponding to those wider visions of Divine activity in the Universe, which the Spirit of Truth is giving us in other ways. . . . We may be fighting against God if we are not ready to anticipate such new developments or adaptations as may make the structure of the Christian Church more responsive to its vital function, better able to interpret and express the glory of God and His will to redemptive unity in the changing conditions of an 'emergent' world."¹

These are brave words, and true words. May I add to them, and in adding bring this paper to an end, some words of Bishop Welldon.

"The Church of England," he says, "as believing that 'where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty,' may well accord these national Churches the opportunity of ordering their corporate lives in such a way as to allow the full satisfaction of their Christian aspirations. For it is impossible that the Christianity of the Far East, not of India alone, but of China, Japan and Persia, should be in all external aspects the same as the Christianity of England to-day."

But, may I add, if that Christianity should recall the picture of the Church as God's Israel, the assembly of those redeemed by Christ, a spiritual fellowship, kings and priests unto God, animated by the Spirit of Christ and ministered to by those in whom is the Spirit of Christ—it will, at any rate, be in harmony with the Church of the Apostles and their first followers.

¹ *Guardian*, July 12, 1929.

HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE CREEDS.

BY THE REV. CANON J. B. LANCELOT, M.A., Vicar of St. James,
Birkdale, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Liverpool.

‘CHRISTIANITY is Christ.’ This is almost a truism of evangelical belief, even let us confess of Anglo-Catholic belief, not only according to that wider sense in which we are all Anglo-Catholics, but the narrower and more partisan; for so I read in the admirable reply to Father Vernon which has been published recently—

“The authority of the New Testament is the Person of our Lord and the guidance of the Holy Spirit working through His followers. . . . This guidance depends, not on their acceptance of the authority of the church, but on their loyalty to the example and the Spirit of the Lord Himself.”

If that be so, then we are indeed in essential agreement :

‘Christianity is Christ,’ and Christian Theology is just our attempt to answer the questions, the legitimate and indeed inevitable questions—Who then is He, and what does He mean to the soul, to the church, to the world? This it tries to do in the language of the day, and in response to the needs of each succeeding age. In very truth, He is the same throughout the centuries, Wonderful, Mysterious, Ineffable, but in our interpretation of Him inadequacy is unavoidable, and even error not impossible, if only for the reason that

*Words, like Nature, half reveal
And half conceal the soul within,*

and, sometimes, the revelation they make and the concealment they effect are not so evenly distributed. Anyhow, ‘we have no celestial language.’ Political or economic creeds we can express more or less fully, but words are unequal, really, to the burdens which Religion lays upon them. No formula, therefore, it would seem, except perhaps the shortest, and what we call simplest, can stay permanently unaltered, for by its very nature it is inadequate to the truth of which it is the vehicle, and subject to such revision as new forms of thought, new grasp of truth, certainly new modes of expression may render necessary. Besides, as is declared in that very Protestant book to which I have already referred, there is always the danger that too much insistence on the doctrinal form may actually result, not in enabling men to understand our Lord, but in turning them away from Him.

Nevertheless, there is authority behind the Catholic creeds, not indeed to dictate, but to commend. In one sense they are a platform, as it were, on which we stand together: in another, a testimony addressed to them who are without—‘This is what we stand for.’ Historically they have, it may be, safeguarded rather than exhibited the ‘deposit,’ especially perhaps, the so-called

Athanasian: nevertheless they were necessary, if only 'to prevent belief trickling away into the morass of loose thinking.' At the same time, the search for truth is a duty of the church and of individual churchmen: yet, in all our thinking, and whithersoever our studies take us, we should be conscious of a background—perhaps I should rather say, foreground—whereon stands the Person of Christ, Himself the Truth, 'the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.'

Accordingly, if He be thus kept reverently in view, even if imperfectly apprehended, I am disposed to agree with Bishop Hall in thinking that the most useful of all books of Theology might be one with the title, *De paucitate credendorum*. Many a sceptic has declared the cause of his doubts and troubles to have lain in the fact that once upon a time he was asked to believe too much. 'I consider,' says Jeremy Taylor, 'there are but few doctrines that were ordered to be preached to all the world, to every single person, and made a necessary article of his explicit belief.' The oldest, simplest, shortest, perhaps best of all creeds is *Kurios Iesous*—a Life, a Person, declared to be supremely significant and utterly trustworthy for the things both of time and of eternity. A longer creed tends towards 'rationalising explanations,' things 'more plain than true.' Hence, in my own teaching, I set great store by the Catechism summary—it is more than a summary—of the Apostles' Creed, the last question in the same catechism (with its requirement of repentance, faith in God through Christ, and charity), and the Collect for the 19th Sunday after Trinity. True, there is no explicit reference to Immortality in any of these: that however, to us, is the corollary of our faith in God, and it is this on which we need, above all, to insist, and keep first, in all our thinking. The tendency of human nature, I fear, is not to rest quietly upon large central truth, but to move towards the circumference, in pursuit of 'curious and unlearned questions' to which the answer (as Aristotle said long ago) is, peradventure Yes, and peradventure No. There is, we may remind ourselves, no specific solution in *Job* to the problem raised: the only reply to doubts and questionings is, God is; believe in God. Contention about lesser matters, or about subtleties relating to those that are greater, we may regard (with Archbishop Tillotson) as inspired by the powers of darkness, to defeat the true ends for which the Son of God came into the world.

'De paucitate,' however, is not enough. We must add *de magnitudine*, or some such word, to suggest Infinite Reality. And here, as indeed everywhere, we know only 'in part.' One of our classical sermons has for its title, 'The Ignorance of Man.' Hence, perhaps, the instinctive objection of the average man to statements that sound over-dogmatic, or even to 'dogma' of every kind. There is always what Bishop Talbot has called 'a great unknownness,' and therefore a right and Christian agnosticism. The Athanasian Creed seems to know too much. At the same time, however large (or however limited) be our credal statement, the

question still lurks behind, Is it true? We may be worshippers rather than philosophers, but of What? of Whom? Mysticism has its merits, but it is not always very strong at this point. Intuition may play a large part in the genesis of faith, but it has to reckon with intellect and reason later on. Besides, for us, history comes in. Certain things have happened on this earth, so arresting in themselves, so linked up to a long and deeply interesting series, so vastly significant to all serious-minded men that they have been driven to ask, What do they mean, to me, and to the world? Ours, in other words, is a historical religion—with 'values,' however, attached to its manifested facts, and spiritual convictions required: history *alone* will take no man into the Kingdom of God.

Note then—and here we come on the question of Scripture—the long historical preparation behind the revelation of the New Testament, recorded for us in the Old—a series of books of surpassing interest and value, though Christianity does not answer with its life for all the details therein recorded: then the tremendous experience encountered in the Ministry of Christ, which, with the Resurrection and Pentecost, made the Christian Church—without these, a kind of Judaism, I suppose, would still be the faith of most thoughtful men: then, the signal victories of the first age, Jerusalem, Antioch, Corinth, Rome, all adding their witness: lastly, and, in the main, after these were won, a literary expression of the facts and their meaning. This, however, was not formal but occasional: legend notwithstanding, the apostles never met and said, We must have a recognized treatise on the Life of the Lord and His significance for the human race—a good thing, for we should have been chained to the written word almost as closely as if our Lord had written Himself. 'It seemed good to me also,' says one of our choicest literary benefactors by way of preface to his works. But there is power about his writings, about all the writings: can we doubt that, like the impulse to write, it too came from above? At the same time, for all their importance and value, these did not make the Church. The river was already flowing. Its source was in Galilee, but now it is becoming a broad stream, and these Books may be described as precious freights floated upon its breast, and charged with blessing wherever they are landed. But the River first, and, in our creed, belief in God first, as revealed in Jesus Christ: add, if you will, the society of believers, the home and workshop of the Holy Spirit, and say of the literary output of that great first age, "Blessed Lord, Who hast caused all Holy Scriptures to be written for our learning." Be content to say that, for it gives all we really need say: the society, guided by the same Spirit, settled which writings should survive, and which should sink, if not to the bottom, at least below the surface.

But here, likewise, questions arise which ought to be faced, and have been, especially of late. Are the Books, historically, fact or fiction? If searched as title-deeds do they come out trustworthy? Do they, in other words, adequately exhibit the Life, manifest the Person, deliver and unfold the Teaching? These are legitimate

inquiries, for there is obviously a human element in the sacred literature: Hebrews *e.g.*, and the 1st Epistle of St. John, though inspired by the same Spirit, manifestly do not come from the same pen. Historical criticism, rightly understood, is not hostility, not sacrilege, but necessary, helpful, provided it be carried out in a spirit of reverent search. It has a bad name because so many have entered upon it with a bias or prejudice. This, however, where it exists, is unfair, nor does it reveal that scientific mind which sits down humbly in front of a fact, and learns from it what it can, or, in philosophy, as Plato says, follows the argument faithfully wherever it may lead.

Now to accept this position is to differ *longo intervallo* from the view taken, say, in the 'Westminster Confession,' where the supremacy of Scripture takes the first and dominating place. To use the analogy—not a perfect one, I admit—which I suggested just now, the Presbyterian divines lost largely the sense of the River, but fastened on the literary freights, and substituted an infallible Book for a Church which they did not believe our Lord ever meant to be infallible. No doubt, like the Quaker doctrine, the Confession has the proviso that it is authoritative only as it is borne home to a man by the testimony of the Holy Spirit: yet, as a matter of history, I fear it is true that it went far to make Christian people, like Jewry of old, the people of a Book, and to encourage a view of Holy Scripture which neither some earlier Reformers nor a majority of modern scholars have found themselves quite able to endorse.

Where now exactly does the Church of England stand in regard to these two—Creed and Scripture? It regards them as interdependent. Of the latter it says that it 'containeth all things necessary'—*containeth*, shall we say, rather than *is* the word of God, for 'is,' in proportion to its size, is fat and away the most difficult word in the English language! 'Containeth' comes, I believe, from the Council of Trent: if that alarm you, set over against it the fact that it is used, more than once, in this connection, in Butler's *Analogy*.

Of the Creeds our Church says that they may be 'proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.'

Now if our doctrine of Holy Scripture be really a little wider than that with which we are sometimes credited, then I submit that the word 'proved' must not be taken in any narrow or too literal sense. There are proofs *and* proofs. It has been proved to most people's satisfaction that the three interior angles of a triangle are together equal to two right angles: can you deal with matters of faith that way? To me, so-called 'Scripture Proofs' have their value, though nowadays they are a little unfashionable. We need not less Scripture but more, though words and phrases torn from their context will hardly do, but, rather, the complete and essential witness given there to Him Who is, after all, *the* object of Faith, Jesus Christ our Lord. Though, in popular language, we believe in the Creed and believe in the Bible, we do believe absolutely only on Him. Whatever imperfections may be alleged against it,

the Nicene Creed with its strong emphasis on His Person will, I suppose, in any Christian Reunion, be taken for a sufficient statement. For one thing, it has only one (but highly significant) negation in it, as opposed to the Athanasian twenty-one—'begotten, *not* made.' In its account of our Lord, it goes (and rightly goes) beyond the Apostles' Creed, and makes His Saviour-hood explicit—'for us men,' it says. On the other hand, thanks to the exercise of men's curious and subtle wits, as Hooker calls them, it introduces language, *e.g.* about 'substance,' which is not scriptural in the strict sense: but then, like the redness of a Devonshire stream, it bears witness to the colour of the soil through which it has passed, and its terms were selected to express securely in the language of the day—dare I add, of our own?—the Scriptural doctrine of our Lord's Being. But 'proved'—is it quite the word? I do not think it is. Can you 'prove' the existence of God? Does the Bible? No, it rather assumes it. Many things point that way—instinct, reason, conscience, need, experience: faith, however, is not the result of a logical process, otherwise 'babes' would have but a poor chance: it is rather, on the Divine side, the gift of God, on the human, a venture. Nevertheless, we read the Bible—nothing like it to strengthen faith: we study the Gospels and Epistles, for the glory of One Supreme and adorable Person shines over and above and through them all. At the same time we require and appeal to sound Biblical learning. Evangelical scholars are badly needed: what distress one has felt before now at hearing our case presented with earnestness and conviction, but in a way which to thoughtful people must have been quite unacceptable, or supported by arguments that would not really hold! But we study the New Testament, at least I hope we do. 'Read your Bibles, young men,' Bishop Ryle used to say in his plain, gruff manner to his ordinands, for so will the essentials come to stand out like peaks, and the non-essentials be left in the shadows and obscurity of the valley. What, after the most painstaking and careful study, cannot be said to be 'contained' there, or to be in manifest line with the mind of Christ, as therein revealed—the *Jus Divinum* of the Papacy for instance—we shall reject; and we shall not be rigid about episcopacy, for we do not find that Holy Scripture itself is. But we shall not waver in our adherence to the doctrine of our Lord's origin—He 'came down from Heaven'; though when articles of the Faith like the Virgin-birth or the Empty tomb are called in question, we shall in our defence of them take a hint from Holy Scripture, from St. Peter's sermon, *e.g.*, on the day of Pentecost, and ask, Was it some ordinary person who is declared to have been so born, or a man who proved *extraordinary*, 'approved of God by mighty works'? Was it the Resurrection of a sinful body, like our own? Far from it. Put the emphasis, then, as Holy Scripture does, on Him, His Personality, His sinless character, and those others will fall into their due place, with a 'felt congruity' attaching to them which, for all their marvel, will satisfy most reverent minds: taken with the evidence we have for both in the Gospels, it certainly

satisfies my own. But we shall not, I think, begin with them : in our apologetic, certainly, the initial emphasis will be elsewhere.

To conclude then—We cannot do without a creed, brief though it be, and it must be in strict keeping with the Apostolic witness, its nearer lines definite and precise, though stretching towards Infinity. Is He the Everlasting Son, or has He only the value of God, whatever that may mean ? Here you want a plain answer. At the same time, I would not force dogma on men, at the sword's point :

' For modes of faith let graceless bigots fight :
His can't be wrong, whose life is in the right.'

There is at any rate just this much truth in Pope's couplet that the way to more light and surer faith is obedience to what we already have. Readiness to do the Will must always condition knowledge of the doctrine, for ' this is His commandment that we should believe . . . and love ' : certainly high thinking and high believing are only possible where there is also a Christian rightness of life. ' If I could only believe in your creed,' said a dissolute youth to Pascal, ' I should be a better man ' : ' Begin,' was the reply, ' by being a better man, and you may come to believe in my creed.' And, at this later hour in the world's history, with creeds to re-think, and reunion to achieve, what we need is more love ; and in view of our unhappy divisions and devastating uncharitablenesses, the old prayer should often be upon our lips,

Try me, O God, and seek the ground of my heart : prove me and examine my thoughts. Look well if there be any way of wickedness in me, and lead me in the way everlasting.

The Rev. Ernest Evans, B.D., Sub-Warden of the Missionary College of St. Augustine, Canterbury, has written *A Reason for the Faith, Offered to Young Men and Women of England* (John Murray, 5s. net). The Bishop of Oxford contributes a Preface in which he refers to the interest taken in religious problems at the present time, but warns anyone who questions the Christian Faith that he " must be prepared to take trouble and spend time in ascertaining what it is as a whole, if he is to have any chance of reaching a true and sane conclusion." One difficulty for the enquirer must be that there are points of difference on various matters of importance among upholders of the Faith. Thus we find Mr. Evans an excellent guide on a wide range of elements in the Faith, but we cannot accept a number of his statements on the ministry and the sacraments. We regard them as just the kind of Christian over-statement which may easily repel the young men and women of England. While so much in the book is so good, and so well expressed, we regret we cannot recommend it whole-heartedly.

THE MINISTRY AND THE SACRAMENTS.

BY THE REV. T. C. HAMMOND, M.A., General Superintendent of the Irish Church Missions.

IT is obviously impossible to deal adequately with a topic of such dimensions within the compass of a paper strictly limited to time.

In the circumstances I propose to confine attention to two opinions recently brought to our notice. For the purpose of adhering to the title set me, the first theory will relate to the Christian ministry and the second will relate to problems connected with the Holy Communion.

A particular ministerial theory has recently been urged with great earnestness by Lord Hugh Cecil as affording a possible solution of the vexed South India problem.

It is well known that the section of the Church of England to which Lord Hugh Cecil attaches himself regards all ministerial functions performed by non-Episcopal ministers as irregular, if not invalid. The theory of the ministry which Lord Hugh Cecil proposes has for its aim to bring in this widespread army of assumed irregulars. The suggestion offered is that all trouble will end if we remember that there is at once a prophetic and a priestly ministry in the New Testament. The underlying assumption being, further, that while the priestly ministry is rigidly confined and mechanically determined in the sense of being dependent on a definite verifiable historic succession, the prophetic ministry depends solely on the direct energizing of God. Notwithstanding this, the priestly ministry is regarded as more important. The formulation of the theory calls to mind forcibly the methods of Cyprian. He transfers boldly certain features of the Old Testament economy to the circumstances of his own day and reduces the Presbyter to a Levite—a bold anticipation of the degraded priest theory of modern criticism—Cyprian also had aspirations to be a statesman.

It must be admitted that there is a *prima facie* support for this novel solution. We find references to apostles and prophets in the New Testament records. Philip had seven daughters who were prophetesses—an interesting situation is here created concerning the recognition of the orders of Miss Maud Royden. But then, of course, Phoebe was a deaconess in the other branch of the profession.

There is further the parallel with the Old Testament. There the prophetic order functions side by side with a rigid priestly succession. It is a fashionable modern theory that the prophet's whole time was occupied in keeping the priests straight.

A NEST OF DIFFICULTIES.

But a close examination of the evidence reveals quite a nest of difficulties. The Acts of the Apostles presents Paul and Barnabas as sources of the regular presbytery in the Gentile Churches. Was

Paul ordained? We are told that his earnest repudiation of any human appointment, "An Apostle, not of men nor by men," etc., renders such an assumption most unwarrantable. But still there is the calm record of the "separation" to work in the Church accompanied by the laying on of hands. To our modern minds the two ideas may seem incompatible. But we must avoid carrying back with us the traditions of centuries of Church order and imposing the whole mass upon the necks of the early disciples. The phenomenon of a definite human separation for work is here before us, and it ought to be explained, not waved on one side as impertinent. The fact that on two occasions St. Luke seems anxious to show that contact with the existing body of believers is established when new spiritual centres arise, offers a reasonable explanation of the phenomenon of Acts xiii.

Peter and John are sent down to Samaria. The germ of the idea of the Catholic Church is here. The new converts are recipients of spiritual gifts through the intermediary of the established brethren at Jerusalem. As the Church develops in missionary zeal, and centre is added to centre, it becomes necessary to express in visible form the essential oneness of all separate Churches. Paul is indeed an Apostle of Jesus Christ. He has his Divine commission direct from the Master and none can question his authority in that regard. But how can it be brought home to the scattered Gentile communities that each one of the separated companies of believers is related to the other? How can the Pauline, Petrine, Apolline tendency that so speedily displayed itself be most suitably checked? Surely in the recognition by the parent community, this time from Antioch, of their oneness with the Apostle and his oneness with them. In obedience to the prophetic message they designate the already divinely designated one to the work of evangelization and associate his helper in this human commission. Was Barnabas ordained? The only evidence we possess on this point is in that chapter which presents such puzzling features to those who demand at least a third-century constitution for a first-century Church. At any rate, from this chapter we are compelled to trace the original unity of order in the Gentile communities. The subjects of the prophetic designation are those who "ordained elders in every city." On the face of it there is here an intermingling of the prophetic and the priestly functions in the matter of designation to office. Nor is this an isolated and inexplicable phenomenon. The evidence of the Pastoral Epistles, so far as it is relevant, goes to establish this relation as the normal mode in the Early Church. "Neglect not the gift which is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." An order which derives in the first instance from prophets and teachers and which, over a lengthened period, is conferred in obedience to prophetic direction, can scarcely be elevated into a position of immediate and sharp contrast to that from which it arose. Nor does the Old Testament parallel, to which allusion has been made, help as unequivocally as at first sight appears. There were prophets who were also priests,

such as Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Moses, the prototype of the prophet, was also of the tribe of Levi. And Aaron, the priest, became the prophet of Moses who was as God. When we study the New Testament it seems clear that between the presbyter and the prophet there is a clear difference in function, but no clear divergence of office. The same feature is manifest in the list of gifts in Ephesians and Corinthians. The presbyterate is an office, prophecy is a gift. It is at least noteworthy, that neither the diaconate nor the presbyterate is enumerated specifically in these lists, although functions associated with these offices find a proper place. If an Apostle can describe himself as "an elder" and the elder can be also a pastor and teacher or an evangelist, then it creates logical confusion to attempt a clear division by utilizing the parallel categories of office and gift. There is no *a priori* ground for assuming that a presbyter cannot be a prophet.

Surely a moment's reflection would cause us to hesitate ere we placed all the prophets outside the Anglican communion.

Great as is our respect for the noble work done by the so-called Free Churches, we ought not to be deemed wanting in Christian kindness if we dare to say of them, "All the Lord's people are not prophets."

When we turn to Early Church History the findings given above are abundantly justified. The "Didache," with that singular perversity that exposes it to harsh language, actually tells the disciples that the prophets are their "high-priests." It allows to them the liberty to give thanks as they may desire at the Holy Communion. There may or may not be an echo of this provision in Justin Martyr's careful use of a non-committal word for "the president" at Holy Communion to whom the deacons bring bread and wine and water and who gives thanks "as well as he is able."

The recent attacks on the authority of the "Didache" are not only not well-founded, as Dr. Vernon Bartlett has conclusively shown, but they do not affect the argument urged here. The fact that a representative divine like Athanasius, as late as the middle of the fourth century, could regard the "Didache" as deuterocanonical is sufficient to establish the fact that even then the identity of the priestly and prophetic offices presented no difficulty to the guides of theological thought. A forgery gains credence by its affinity with the modes of thought current at the time of its appearance. Evidently, then, in the fourth century, the conception of a "prophet" ministering the Holy Communion with a degree of liberty denied to a regular "priest" had not yet become entirely anachronistic.

THE ROOT QUESTION.

Purposely the root question: Is there real evidence for a continued special class of sacrificing priests within the limits of the New Covenant? is not discussed. Much has been written on the point and on it, of course, the whole controversy turns.

One further consideration needs to be mentioned. The ministry of the Word and the Sacraments is combined in our Ordinal and

indeed in all primitive Ordinals. Maskell (*Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, Vol. II, p. cxxviii) quotes Lyndwood's gloss on this question, assigning the office of preaching to Bishops, inferior prelates, curates (even though deacons) and doctors in theology, and other such approved and called to this office. The note begins: "But a mere layman is not permitted to preach neither in public nor in private nor is a woman." Evidently the mediaeval Church had no conception of the prophetic office similar to that outlined in the theory under review.

Yet at the period when Lyndwood advanced this prohibition on preaching it was lawful for a layman or even a woman to baptize. The peculiar office of the prophet is therefore discharged solely by the regular priesthood, while the administration of the Sacraments is not wholly confined to that order. And that Sacrament is committed to the hands of laymen concerning which Chrysostom wrote in his exaltation of the priesthood: "These indeed are they to whom your Spiritual begettings are committed. In fine thy birth from God by baptism is committed to them. . . . They in truth are the authors for us of that nativity which we have from God" (*Sacerdotium*).

To sum up the evidence. We discover in the New Testament that there are regular and special ministries. Those ministries that are special frequently obtrude into the regular ministry, so that those who have been appointed to distinct office are found possessed of special gifts: for example, St. Paul claims to speak with tongues, and St. Peter displays the prophetic gift of discerning spirits in the case of Ananias and Sapphira. None of the extraordinary features, however, are prominent either in the early Epistle of James or in the later pastoral Epistles.

The regular ministry attains a concrete form in the Pastoral Epistles and is there committed to the hands of men for preservation. The special ministry remains in the hands of God alone. The suggestion which we have considered not only draws an unwarrantable line between the ministry of the Word and the ministry of one Sacrament, also unwarrantably divorced from its companion ordinance, but seeks to regularize the non-normal, in itself an amazing suggestion.

THE HOLY COMMUNION.

With reference to the second position which has been proposed for examination we are in a wholly different atmosphere.

Much controversy has centred round the view that there is a continual offering of our Lord's sacrifice in heaven. The *ἀναξ* of the Epistle to the Hebrews used in relation to the offering of our Lord seems to negative any such idea of a continual offering. If that be so, then the Holy Communion relates to a *past offering*. It must, to that extent, and in that connection, be strictly commemorative and not directly sacrificial. As a consequence the Church on earth must be represented not as doing what our Lord is now doing, but recalling to the worshippers what our Lord *did*.

An alternative view, however, has recently been proposed. It has two wings. (a) Relying on the passage, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die it abideth alone," the argument is framed that our Lord's death released a new vital power. It was only when through death He exercised His office as Second Adam that He became a life-giving spirit. Consequently we cannot go back to the period of Institution in order to obtain for ourselves the full significance of the Sacred Feast. The Institution of the Lord's Supper is prior to the death of Christ. We must read into the scene of the Last Supper the later effects brought to our knowledge by the Epistolary expansion of the prophetic words "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die," etc. (b) Further, it is a mistake to fix moments in our Lord's Offering. The Act of our Lord is a timeless Act. We only involve ourselves in continual difficulties if we seek to fix an eternal presentation to a moment of time. The question "When" is altogether irrelevant.

When we consider the position suggested by (a) it is important to notice that the language employed by our Lord Himself is strictly anticipatory. Close students of the Gospel narrative are aware of the difference between the Latin and English Bibles in the attempt to reproduce the thought of the Greek. The Latin Vulgate renders: "Hic est sanguis meus novi testamenti, quo pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum," which is closely followed in the Rhemish Testament, "For this is My blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins," whereas in our English version the crucial clause reads "which is shed for many."

The difference between the two versions is usually explained by the difficulty that is experienced in turning a Greek present participle into English, or even Latin. The language of our Lord suggests that He conveyed the meaning to His disciples, "This is My blood in the act of being shed." A reference to the actual historic effusion suggests the reading, "This is My blood which shall be shed," as the historic condition was future at the time of institution. A closer regard to the tense prompts, on the other hand, the reading, "This is My blood which is shed"; but in either case the strictly anticipatory nature of the language must strike the observer. The question naturally arises, if the two great thoughts of the effusion of blood, and of such effusion being for the remission of sins are brought before the mind of the disciples, why is it that the institution of the Lord's Supper is fixed at a time prior to the sacrifice when it could quite as readily have been placed later and formed part of the teaching of the great forty days? Surely the simplest explanation lies in the fact that a symbol can look backwards or forwards, while a fact cannot. The time of the institution taken in connection with the very argument here offered supports the Protestant view. We are presented with a condition of our Lord's body and blood not then historically existent. Our celebrations look back to a condition of our Lord's body and blood not now historically existent. It is the sacrifice historically enacted on Calvary that fulfilled the conditions embodied in the saying, "Except

a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die," etc. The Supper merely presents these conditions in symbolic form, and it is connection with the Person Who achieved the great victory on Calvary that secures the blessing. He was present in living power at the first ordinance. He is present in living power at every subsequent ordinance and the message of faith in Him is eloquently proclaimed at each meal. Those who raise this particular question seem to have overlooked the old dilemma with which earlier controversialists confronted the advocates of the Roman Mass. It lay in the question, Was there an effusion of blood in the Last Supper? If there were, what occasion were there for the death of our Lord on the morrow? If there were not, in what sense can the first supper be regarded as a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice? It seems as if the theory under discussion attaches to the Lord's Supper qualities and properties that strictly belong only to that true sacrifice of which it is a commemoration. St. Paul, who discusses the position of believers under the old covenant in the classic passage in the Romans, regards the sacrifice as a declaration of the righteousness of God for the passing over of sins done aforetime. Just, therefore, as the older forgiveness anticipated Calvary and secured in anticipation blessed results that can only accrue because the second Adam was made a quickening spirit, we are justified in saying that the sacred feast, in the very language of our Lord, foreshadowed the deeper blessing secured to the human race by that death which took place on the morrow. It is not necessary to invest the words of institution with any different meaning than that which describes the later experience of believers conditioned to them by the death of Christ and therefore the distinction between the first and subsequent observances of the Lord's Supper is not valid.

The position outlined in (b) seems at first sight to be wholly inconsistent with the discussion under (a). It seems impossible to urge that a timeless offering should have as its condition the fact that at a given moment, as a result of an historical experience, the sacred Person of our Lord acquired new properties. Yet, inconsistent as it may appear, both arguments are urged not only by the same school of thought but actually by the same writers.

SACRIFICE AND OFFERING.

With reference to the statement, given above, of the position now under discussion, an immediate weakness in the argument manifests itself. Sacrifice and offering are not separated in thought either in the Old or in the New Testament. At the most they are two phases of a composite but complete act. It would follow of necessity from this that the meaning which is applied to offering must be equally applicable to sacrifice, but the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ was not timeless in the sense that we are now asked to consider. Many years ago the writer remembers being present at a religious meeting in Trinity College, Dublin, when the chair was taken by Mr. Frederick Purser, a distinguished Fellow of the University, characterized by peculiar acuteness of thought. On

that occasion Mr. Purser criticized a statement of Professor Jowett in reference to the Atonement in which the Professor said, "These things are not matters of fact." Mr. Purser observed that he regarded this remark as rather shallow. "We all," he added, "are aware of the difference between a matter of fact and a transcendent fact, but it is idle to divorce the two. The real problem for the philosopher resides in their relation." It is remarkable that after many years this particular criticism should present itself forcibly when discussing this new orientation of the offering of the Lord once for all. There is unquestionably a problem in the relation of time to eternity. It may well be that in this matter no adequate solution has as yet been found. But the New Testament revelation demands as a necessity that the timeless should have its correspondent expression in time. The only experience which is possible to men is an historical experience, and that involves in its very nature a proper sequence of thought and sensation. It seems idle, therefore, to invite a peculiar metaphysical problem as a solution of a particular individual occurrence. We cannot stop at offering nor even at sacrifice in our discussion of the relation of eternal verities to their time form, rather, we are compelled to say that eternal reality is a fibre from which time is made. In the view of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, sacrifice and offering are simultaneous in the case of our Lord Jesus Christ. We are distinctly advised that the separation of the presentation of the blood from the moment of effusion in the Old Testament was part of that symbolism which signified that the way into the Holiest was not as yet made open. We would be compelled to say they are both historic and they are both transcendent. "The fullness of time" applies to both, while the eternal reality which they manifest is equally evident in both. The two are correlates in the great purpose of Redemption hid in Christ since the foundation of the world.

NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE.

If, further, we are to accept the New Testament evidence, offering and suffering have an immediate and necessary connection which seems sufficient to expose the fallacy of the "timeless" argument. Is, then, suffering timeless? To answer in the affirmative would be to give a docetic appearance to the tragedy of Gethsemane and Calvary. We are compelled, therefore, by the pressure of evidence to declare that the offering of the blood of Christ is as truly and in the same sense historical as the offering of His body on the Cross of shame. There was a real historic effusion of blood and we are assured that this effusion was in the sight of Him Who spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all. In commemorating the offering of the blood of Christ we are commemorating an historic reality. It is perfectly true that this reality has eternal significance, but that is only to say, the death of the Lord Jesus Christ occupies a position in relation to the race that is in its character unique and is a consequence of His special relation

to that humanity which He took up into the Godhead. No useful purpose is served by the employment of language which in relation to historic evidence is properly meaningless. A timeless sacrifice could not come within the range of human experience and, therefore, neither could a timeless offering. It is the peculiarity of the Christian revelation that it expresses in the time form those eternal verities which otherwise would be entirely hid from our eyes.

If this discussion has been followed and the writer has been able to make his position clear, the net result must inevitably be that the modern ingenious diversion of argument is strictly irrelevant to the questions at issue and leaves unimpaired the old-fashioned, but strictly Scriptural view so forcibly expressed in our Prayer Book that our Lord has instituted "mysteries as pledges of His love, and for a continual remembrance of His death, to our great and endless comfort."

NOTE.

We cannot quite accept Canon Lukyn Williams' statement in the *Pulpit Commentary*, on St. Matthew :

"The Vulgate has *effundetur* with reference to the crucifixion of the morrow : but this is tampering with the text."

"Rather, by using the present tense, the Lord signifies that His death is certain—that the sacrifice has already begun, that the 'Lamb slain from the foundation of the world' (Rev. xiii. 8), was now offering the eternal sacrifice. The whole ordinance is significant of the completion of the Atonement."

There is confusion of thought here. The language, we are told, is significant of completion and also signifies that the sacrifice has already begun. It is an eternal sacrifice offered "now" : Dr. Denny has shown that the exegesis of Rev. xiii. 8, offered above is precarious (*Death of Christ*, p. 249, 2nd edit.).

But what is meant by an eternal sacrifice? Dr. Salmon once criticized the title of Dean Farrar's book, *Eternal Hope*. "In English," he said, "it can only mean a hope that can never be realized." Beza is more explicit. His comment runs :

"Loquitur enim de re mox futura tanquam jam præsentē ut Joh. x 17. Pono animam meam. Quæ enallage in linguis omnibus locum habet, sed præterea mihi videtur Dominus in hujus mysterii institutione, licet de re mox futura loquen tamen presentis temporis verba utrobique usurpasse ut admonerentur discipuli hunc esse istorum symbolorum usum, ut oculis fidei res mox futurae quasi jam præsentēs in iis spectentur, sicut nos illas, licet jam olim peractas et non reipsa sed recordatione presentis fide in hoc actione quasi ante oculos positas contemplari oportet."

ROME AND THE EAST.

BY THE REV. O. A. CRAWFORD IRWIN, B.D., Tutor, St. John's Hall, Highbury.

I.

GOD'S call to union must be thought of in terms of the *whole* of Christendom. We cannot set any limits to the number of Christian groups both greater and lesser which the Holy Spirit may in the course of time lead into the unity of the Church that is to be. The Church of the future, if it is to fulfil in the highest measure the Divine purpose, must conserve and harmonize in due proportion under the Spirit's guidance those particular truths which it has been the function of different Christian groups to emphasize even at the price of separation from other groups. There have been of course various causes operative in different degrees in producing divisions, but seldom has the chief contributory cause been other than a felt need for maintaining or reasserting some truth or truths which seemed likely to be ignored. God's call to union does not, as we believe, involve the sacrifice or even the minimising of any such Christian truths, but rather leads to the setting of each truth in its proper position to be shared by others in the life of a united Church. There are also the varying spiritual gifts, the richness of personal understanding of the One Lord and the treasures of religious experience which each Christian group—Quaker and Roman Catholic, Congregationalist and Eastern Orthodox, Presbyterian, Lutheran and Anglican—may contribute to the fuller life of the Church which is to be.

No Christian group may be left out of consideration in the endeavour to interpret aright God's call to union. We must note where the signs of the Holy Spirit's guidance are becoming most manifest—where, for example, the desire and even the passion for unity is progressively revealing itself in different groups, where the yearning for and experience of fellowship with other Christians in the worship of One Lord is dissolving old doubts and inherited prejudices, where the spirit of real humility is enabling different groups to admit that they have much to learn from one another in the understanding of Christ, where the temper and openness of mind is growing which makes possible frank and free discussion of differences in matters of faith and order, and where on the other hand the road to reunion seems barred and a more convenient season must be awaited.

This paper is intended to examine briefly how God's call to union affects English churchmen in their relations with Rome and with the Orthodox East.

II.

Some Anglicans regard reunion with Rome as of chief importance, and, as Dr. Darwell Stone expresses it, "attach most value to such

a reconciliation as will make Western Catholics one united Church under the primacy of the Pope." But, whatever signs there may be of some change of outlook by the Roman Church towards the Orthodox, the attitude towards the Church of England has not changed. English Roman Catholics have shown little desire for co-operation with Anglicans, even in many activities of Christian service. They were not officially represented at the "Copec" Conference in 1924. They hold aloof from the Student Christian Movement—one of the most comprehensive and far-reaching movements of our times. The language used and the spirit shown on some of the platforms at Catholic Emancipation Celebrations were scarcely calculated to promote friendliness of relations. They were in many respects more reminiscent of the eighteenth century than of the twentieth.

The outstanding event was the Malines Conversations, 1921-5. To what extent these discussions were semi-official has never been made quite clear, not even in Lord Halifax's recent volume. A great many Anglicans who had no objection to frank discussions with Roman Catholics of the differences between the two Churches were dissatisfied for several reasons as soon as the fact that the conversations were going on was made public. It was felt that the five English theologians were not really representative of the Church of England as a whole; they were drawn from one school of thought within it. This feeling was intensified after a study of the report which was issued in 1928 after a long delay. It was also considered that English Roman Catholic theologians would have been the more natural representatives to discuss matters with Anglicans and from their closer personal knowledge the better able to understand the historical Anglican position.

The recent publication on his own responsibility by Lord Halifax of the minutes and the original documents has added to our knowledge of the conversations. Thus we learn from the minutes (p. 13) that at the first session in December, 1921, Cardinal Mercier, after receiving Anglican explanations from the original three representatives, stated: "On the doctrine of transubstantiation the Anglicans declare that they admit the change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ by the Consecration. In the eyes of Catholics the word transubstantiation does not signify anything else." This identification of the two positions by Cardinal Mercier was not apparently contradicted. If his pronouncement is correct, what becomes of the subtle distinction so often insisted upon between Roman and extreme Anglo-Catholic teaching? If he is right, we may wonder how the explanations he received, and which he reconciled with the views of his own Church as being none other than Roman, are themselves to be reconciled with the plain statements of Article 28, which officially repudiates the Roman doctrine on this point.

An anonymous memorandum (pp. 241-60), to which much publicity was given in the Press, and the authorship of which has since been revealed through the Archbishop of Malines, affords

interest as a Roman view of reunion without absorption. It suggests a kind of autonomy for the Church of England, the Archbishop of Canterbury receiving the pallium from the Pope and becoming Patriarch with a position of precedence among Cardinals. The Anglicans would retain a liturgy of their own, i.e., an older Roman liturgy, and also the historic sees, the present Roman sees, which date from 1851, being suppressed. The Roman Catholics at Malines, however, took no responsibility for these suggestions. Cardinal Mercier considered that concessions might be made regarding communion in both kinds and the use of the vernacular.

Suggestive also is the attitude taken up by one of the Roman Catholics (p. 58) in a discussion about distinctions between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrine—"There is among Anglicans a liberty of belief which we judge excessive." These words are indicative of a temper of mind alien to most Englishmen. It is the spirit which crushed the rise of liberal movements in the Roman Church twenty years ago.

In view of the Malines report it should be stated that the differences between ourselves and Rome are not limited to questions about Papal supremacy, Papal Infallibility and the Immaculate Conception. They concern the Reformation itself. The extent of the doctrinal differences can best be seen by a painstaking comparison paragraph by paragraph of the doctrinal decrees of Trent with the Anglican Articles, noting in each case whether the Roman or English statement possesses priority of date. Professor Alison Phillips has written :

"For more than three centuries after the great religious revival of the sixteenth century in England there was little difference of opinion as to its character and consequences. The issues remained clear. The dividing line between Roman Catholic and Protestant was definitely marked in England, as it still is on the Continent; and the test used to separate one from the other was, not the question of Papal supremacy, but the acceptance or rejection of the doctrine of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass."

The Roman answer to the Malines Conversations was given in January, 1928, by Pius XI in the Papal Encyclical *Mortalium animos*. No doubt the conferences at Stockholm and Lausanne were also in mind. The *whole* Roman doctrine must be accepted without reserve :

"All who are truly Christ's believe the conception of the Mother of God without stain of original sin with the same faith as they believe the mystery of the August Trinity, and the Incarnation of our Lord just as they do the infallible teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, according to the sense in which it was defined by the Oecumenical Council of the Vatican."

Submission to the Papacy is set forth as the only road to reunion—"The union of Christians can only be promoted by promoting the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it." "In this one Church of Christ no man can be or remain who does not accept, recognize and obey the authority and supremacy of Peter and his legitimate successors." This encyclical excludes any Anglican approach except on Roman terms even more definitely

than the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, with its condemnation of the validity of Anglican Orders, crushed a movement towards rapprochement towards the close of the last century.

So the situation remains. Whether or not any change is likely to occur in the Roman Catholic Church in the future is pure speculation. It is in other directions that we see the signs of the Holy Spirit's guidance towards Christian reunion.

III.

Anglican relations with the Orthodox Churches of the East fall into a different category. From the days of Cyril Lucar onward there has been among Anglicans and the Eastern Churches a growing interest in one another, and an increasing friendliness of approach. The marked advance in both ways within the past fifteen years is partly due to a more awakened interest in the West in the emotional and the mystical phases of Christianity, partly to the general spread of the desire for reunion, together with a deeper realization of the contribution which the Churches of Origen, of Athanasius, of Basil and of Chrysostom have to make to the Christianity of the future. Men's hearts also in the West have been stirred to sympathy with our fellow-Christians in their sufferings in Asia Minor and Smyrna in 1922 and in the persecutions in Russia from 1918 onwards to the present time. We remember in prayer those who are suffering to-day, and we thank God for the loyalty with which they have kept the Faith. Further, the great Diaspora, as it has been aptly called, of Russian *émigrés* has spread a wider knowledge of the Orthodox creed, worship and religious life, while fresh contacts have been established with the Orthodox in the Balkan States, in Poland, and in the new countries on the Baltic.

This friendliness and mutual interest provides conditions for the discussion of matters of Faith and Order. One outcome of the Lambeth Conference of 1908 was the appointment of a permanent committee to take cognizance of relations with the Eastern Churches. The Orthodox delegates who were present at Lambeth in 1920 gave a favourable report to the Holy Synod. In July, 1922, came the decision of the Synod of Constantinople regarding Anglican orders which was subsequently approved in Jerusalem and in Cyprus:

"The Holy Synod . . . has concluded that, as before the Orthodox Church, the ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal Confession of bishops, priests, and deacons, possess the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the Orthodox point of view for the recognition of the 'charisma' of the priesthood derived from the Apostolic Succession."

In 1925 the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem attended a Communion Service in Westminster Abbey in commemoration of the sixteen hundredth anniversary of the Council of Nicaea.

But matters of faith must always take precedence of matters of order. These are naturally affected by the different historical experiences of Eastern and Western Christendom. Among the

Orthodox there was no Renaissance, no intellectual awakening, no stirring of soul as in Western Europe four centuries ago. They were not affected by the Reformation movements. It is true that Cyril Lucar, Patriarch first of Alexandria and from 1621 Patriarch of Constantinople, had strong leanings towards the Reformed Faith. The confession of Faith which he drew up states—"We believe that man is justified by faith without works. But when we speak of faith we mean the correlative of faith which is the righteousness of Christ on which faith takes hold" (Art. 13). He admitted that the Church could err (Art. 12), while on the question of final authority he said, "The authority of Holy Scripture is far greater than that of the Church, for it is a different thing to be taught by the Holy Spirit from being taught by man."¹ But the attempt at reformation on Western lines came to nothing, and after his death both Cyril and his Confession were anathematized by a synod at Constantinople.

Since then there have been in the Orthodox East no movements analogous to the Reformation, and many observers find no signs of their being likely to arise. Movements indeed exist and also tendencies towards reform, but in matters of discipline rather than in matters of faith. Nor again are there symptoms of the rise of liberal movements which might produce a marked effect upon the beliefs and life of the Orthodox Church. Some observers, however, consider that the Eastern Church is "in the midst of a new upburst of spiritual and intellectual life."

The Orthodox hold the Faith of the undivided Church of the seven Oecumenical Councils, which they maintain is in every essential the Faith of the Apostolic Church. The one symbol of Faith is the Nicene Creed without the filioque addition. Very great value is attached to the Patristic writings, especially to the *De Fide Orthodoxa* of St. John of Damascus, "the most orderly and systematic exposition of the accepted theology." What are called the "symbolic books" do not indeed possess oecumenical authority, but short of that possess high authority, especially the Catechism compiled in 1640 by Peter Mogila, Metropolitan of Kiev, and approved by the four Patriarchs, and also the Confession of Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, which was appended to the acts of the Synod of Jerusalem (1672). These are very valuable as showing how the Faith of the first eight centuries has been and actually is interpreted in the Orthodox Church. Professor Zankov of Bulgaria has however pointed out that in modern Orthodox theology clear distinctions are drawn between (1) a dogma, i.e. "truth determined by an oecumenical council," (2) a theologumenon, i.e. "a theological opinion of one or many of the holy fathers of the undivided Church" and representing probable truth which can be, but need not be, accepted, and (3) private theological opinion which is free provided it does not conflict with dogma.²

Nothing need be said here about the historical differences regard-

¹ Cf. Adeney, *Greek and Eastern Churches*, pp. 314 ff.

² Zankov, *The Eastern Orthodox Church*, p. 39.

ing the filioque clause except that it is perhaps true to say that the Eastern objection was primarily directed against the clause as an innovation upon the faith and only secondly as inconsistent with it.

Both the "symbolic books" already mentioned were drawn up setting forth the Orthodox faith in view of the doctrinal standards of Rome and of the Churches of the Reformation. Consequently they are of great importance to-day as representative of Orthodox belief on certain crucial points.

Thus the Catechism of Peter Mogila says regarding the Holy Communion :

"We are hereby taught that the body of Christ is in Heaven only and not in earth after the manner it used to be while He conversed among us : but only after a Sacramental manner ; whereby in the Holy Supper, the same Son of God, God and Man is present on earth by a change of substance, for the substance of the Bread is changed into the substance of His most Holy Body, and the substance of the Wine into the substance of His most precious Blood. Wherefore we ought to glorify and reverence (with divine worship, *λατρεύωμεν*) the Holy Eucharist as our Saviour Jesus Himself."¹

With this agrees the Confession of Dositheus :

"The same Body and Blood of the Lord in the Sacrament is to be adored in the highest manner that may be and to be worshipped with latria. For one and the same worship ought to be paid to the Holy Trinity and to the Body and Blood of the Lord. It is also a true and propitiatory Sacrifice which is offered for all the faithful, both living and dead, and for the benefit of all as is expressed in the prayers of this Sacrament."²

The answer of the Patriarchs to the Non-Jurors in 1718 is on similar lines—"To be against worshipping the Bread which is consecrated and changed into the Body of Christ is to be against worshipping our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, our Master and Saviour. For what else is the sacrificial Bread after it is consecrated? Truly nothing less than the real body of our Lord."³

The Longer Russian Catechism drawn up by Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow (1823), and approved by the Holy Synod, says in explanation of the word transubstantiation : "Only this much is signified that the bread, truly, really and substantially becomes the very true Body of the Lord and the wine the very Blood of the Lord."⁴

On the subject of the Ministry the Confession of Dositheus states :

"For indeed we say Episcopacy is so necessary that, if that were taken away there would be neither Church nor Christian. For the bishop being the successor of the Apostles, called to that office by imposition of hands and invocation of the Holy Ghost, having received by a continued succession the power given by God to bind and to loose, is the living image of God upon earth, filled with the powerful assistance of the Holy Spirit which perfects his ministrations, the fountain of all the Sacraments of the Catholic Church by which we obtain salvation. This episcopacy seems to us as necessary to the Church as breath to a man, or the sun to the world."⁵

¹ I. 56. See J. A. Douglas, *Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Orthodox East*, p. 143.

² Cap. 17, p. 158.

⁴ Douglas, p. 146.

³ P. 57. Douglas, p. 146.

⁵ Cap. 10, pp. 147-50.

Regarding the Invocation of Saints the same Confession says : " We believe that the Saints not only while they are upon earth are our orators and mediators (*προσβευτάς*) with God but chiefly after their death." ¹ Concerning the departed it says : " We believe that the souls of the deceased are either in rest or in torment . . . nothing contributes (to help them) more than the Unbloody Sacrifice, which each person particularly offers for his relations, and which the Catholic Church daily offers for all." ²

An eminent Russian theologian of the nineteenth century, Khomiakoff, writes in an essay on the Church : " Concerning the sacrament of Penance the Holy Church teaches that without it the spirit of man cannot be cleansed . . . that he himself cannot remit his own sins . . . and that the Church alone has the power of justifying, for within her lives the fullness of the Spirit of Christ." ³

The significance of such quotations is apparent when we read Canon J. A. Douglas's statement in the *Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Orthodox East*, p. 24. For the Orthodox

" the vital necessity of episcopacy to the existence of the Church, the sacerdotal powers and office of the Priesthood, the Real Presence, the propitiatory character of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Invocation of Saints, the Seven Sacraments, the supremacy of the Oecumenical Councils as infallible organs of the Christian Society and so forth are as much fundamental to the Faith of Chalcedon as the dogmatic statements of the Creed which that Council made the affirmation the duty of every Christian."

In that case it is easier to understand the attitude of the Orthodox representatives at Lausanne, which may not unfairly be described as rigid. In that case, although we share very much in common with our fellow-Christians in the East in matters of belief, and although Professor Zankov (pp. 155-6) among others regards the Orthodox Church as being " in many points nearer Protestantism," meaning thereby Lutheranism and Anglicanism, " than to Roman Catholicism," it still remains true that there are marked doctrinal differences between the historic Anglican position and that of the Easterns.

One method of attempting to bridge the gap is that of approximating the Anglican standards to those of the Orthodox. That method is represented more or less in the Declaration of Faith drawn up by the English Church Union, and presented to the Oecumenical Patriarch. That method was apparently in the mind of Archbishop Germanos in his address to the Cheltenham Church Congress. But that method would in effect close the door against Home Reunion ; it would involve the surrender of truths reasserted at the Reformation ; it would mean turning our backs upon much which we believe to be primitive Christianity.

Another method is to admit frankly that at present we do not see how to bridge that gap, and to turn our immediate attention to the problems of reunion at home, though always bearing in mind the possibilities of wider union which would include our fellow-Christians

¹ Cap. 8, p. 146.

² P. 160. Douglas, p. 157.

³ Cf. Birbeck, *Russia and the English Church*.

in the Orthodox East. In the meantime we would in every way maintain and promote friendly relations with our Eastern brethren, share with them in the many things which do not concern our differences—religious literature, worship and prayer, and re-examine our own beliefs and standards in the light of the New Testament and encourage them to do the same with theirs.

Why should we not think a time is coming when the Churches of England and of the East should not *both* so closely approximate to the Apostolic Church in belief, in practice of devotion, in spiritual power, in breadth of vision and in courage in experiment that reunion should not only be possible but inevitable? May it not be by this method that God calls us to union?

The excellent custom, which we owe to *The Times*, of having an article each week devoted to some subject of religious interest, has happily been adopted by a number of other newspapers throughout the country. It is not always easy to find writers with the special gifts for this work, and editors must be greatly gratified when they find an author who can combine constant freshness of treatment with an easy and attractive manner of expression and illustration. Sir James Owen, Editor of the *Exeter Express and Echo*, was happy when he found in the Rev. F. Sparrow just such a writer as he needed. Mr. Sparrow's articles became a feature of the Saturday issue of that paper, and a number of them have been published by Oliphants Ltd. in *Life's Golden Treasure*. Sir James Owen bears warm testimony to Mr. Sparrow's gifts. He tells how he sought a suitable writer who would broadcast "the Christian message of faith and hope, of responsibility and duty." "A Sermon on conventional lines is not suitable, nor is there virtue in a hotch-potch of suave generalities. The Newspaper pulpit must deliver a message, a message that arrests attention, that grips." He found in Mr. Sparrow the qualities he wanted, and says of him that his prime quality is sincerity. "He speaks of what he has experienced: the homeliest subject has a touch of the Divine. For him the Christian religion is a practical seven-day-a-week rule of life, and for life. He accepts the revelation of science; but they do not shake his glowing faith in the revelation of God. He does not flinch from the baffling mysteries of life and death, of pain and evil; he clings fast to the Fatherhood of God, through faith in the brotherhood of Christ."

Those who read these essays will endorse this opinion. They strike a strong human note. They reveal a wide sympathy, and are based on a firm faith. They must have helped and cheered many, and they will reach a wider audience in book form.

THE CHURCHES OF THE REFORMATION.

BY THE VEN. J. W. HUNKIN, D.D., Archdeacon of Coventry.

IN approaching the subject of this paper it is important to remember three things. The first is that long before the Reformation of the sixteenth century the Church in countries like England enjoyed a considerable measure of independence. The triumph of Ultramontaniam as we know it is a modern development. William the Conqueror politely but firmly declined to give temporal homage to the Pope. Robert Grosseteste, the great Bishop of Lincoln in the thirteenth century, respectfully but flatly refused to appoint one of the Pope's nephews to a Canonry in his Cathedral. "In a filial and obedient spirit," he said, "I disobey, I refuse, I rebel."

The second thing we must bear in mind is that the centuries preceding the sixteenth had seen many attempts at reform in the various departments of Church life. The most comprehensive and drastic was that of John Wyclif (1324-84), who attacked the doctrine of Transubstantiation from the philosophical point of view and gave England the first English version of the Gospels. Thus by the beginning of the sixteenth century England had already been inoculated with the reform spirit, and when the full tide of the Reformation came the English people, having already received a kind of subconscious preparation, were not swept into such iconoclasm as some other peoples were.

The third thing we must not forget is that the Renaissance preceded the Reformation.

"The Turks came over the sea,
In fourteen fifty three."

And the capture of Constantinople¹ meant the dispersion of Greek scholars over Europe. They brought with them some of the Greek Classics, and when the West began to learn Greek and to catch again something of the Greek spirit it was as if it rubbed sleep out of its eyes and saw the whole world in the light of a fresh morning. The first effects of the Renaissance may be studied most easily in the life of such a man as Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519).² Thought was freeing itself in all directions, and it is important for us to try to realize how free, in some quarters at all events, thought became. Upon the Renaissance as a wide humanistic movement followed the Reformation as a particular expression of it in the ecclesiastical sphere. It was recognized on every hand that the Church needed reform. The re-discovery of an older civilization less hampered by rules and conventions opened men's eyes to some of the anomalies of their own situation. They became aware of much that rested on mere "idle fantasy." Above all, with the

¹ For other factors, see E. F. Jacob, *The Renaissance*, p. 15.

² See, for example, the historical novel by Dmitri Merejkowski, *The Fore-runner*.

New Testament in their hands, they were brought into touch with a Christian polity "which knew not the name of papacy." "It would be difficult to exaggerate the dissolvent force of the revived study of the New Testament upon mediæval Church Order, and its influence in producing the varied experiments of the Protestant societies." The New Testament was studied as never before. The invention of printing "enabled Luther to succeed where Wyclif failed in circulating rapidly a vernacular Bible." The Church herself professed to rest upon the authority of the Apostolic age. Here the Apostolic age came to life again, but speaking with a voice which was not quite the voice of the Church. As between the two voices the Reformers chose what they believed to be the earlier and the more authoritative. It was a voice that, in the New Testament, spoke directly to the mind and to the heart. Sound learning, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, could go to the original sources and find the Truth. Martin Luther nailed his famous theses to the doors of the Castle church of Wittenberg on the 31st October, 1517. In 1536 John Calvin published *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Henry VIII, as is well known, rejected the claim of the Pope and suppressed the monasteries, partly as centres of papal influence and partly for other reasons; but he wished to retain substantially the old tradition. In the latter part of his reign there was some burning of those who could not accept the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Still, Henry believed in sound learning, and in 1537 he authorized the publication of the Bible in English.

The next reign, the short reign of Edward VI, saw the Reformation making great advances in England. Peter Martyr became Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and Martin Bucer the corresponding Professor at Cambridge. The first English Prayer Book was published in 1549, and revised to make it more definitely Protestant in 1552. The Reformation touched the highest classes both in Church and State. Some of the most ardent as well as the best instructed Reformers were to be found among the Bishops themselves. This fact goes a long way to explain why Episcopacy was retained in England but not (for example) in Germany and Switzerland where, in point of fact, the Episcopate furnished no such leaders.

With the advent of Mary came the well-known wave of reaction, stopped and rolled back by the gallant resistance of Latimer and Ridley, Cranmer himself, and many other martyrs. The conscience of the nation was shocked by the burning of such eminent and good men, and henceforth the sympathy of the large towns and the more progressive parts of the country became steadfastly Protestant.

There followed the Elizabethan settlement, the most succinct account of which is still that written by the late Professor Maitland for the Cambridge Modern History. The principle of nationality in ecclesiastical matters was now established. The Church of England and the Protestant Churches on the Continent were

recognized as standing together on an equal footing as all national Churches. Elizabeth, indeed, insisted on preserving Episcopacy as the form of Church government. The nation remembered that Cranmer and Latimer and Ridley had all been Bishops and accepted the form readily enough; though some, like Parkhurst, himself Bishop of Norwich, regarded the polities of the Continental Reformers as a more perfect model.

The three main forms of Protestantism which had emerged from the Reformation—Lutheranism, Calvinism, and the Church of England—had a great common basis. They

“agreed in rejecting the Pope and the mischievous developments of the Middle Ages, accepting the ancient creeds, and restoring what they deemed to be the primitive doctrine and government of Christ’s Church. In this sense they may be each called catholic. They were further agreed on Justification by faith only, and on the supremacy of Scripture.”¹

“The Church is a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, not its final interpreter.” The meaning of Scripture is left to Reason to determine. It is assumed that Scripture is clear on essentials and that the Holy Spirit will so far guide every one who truly seeks Him.

As to the form of ecclesiastical government the general principle was accepted that each nation had a right to choose the form most suited to it. Thus Dr. John Whitgift, afterwards Bishop of Canterbury, writes in 1574:

“I find no one certain and perfect kind of government prescribed or commanded in the Scriptures to the Church of Christ, which no doubt should have been done, if it had been a matter necessary unto the salvation of the church.”²

“I ‘condemn’ no ‘churches’ that have appointed any order for the electing of their pastors which they think agreeable to their state, and most profitable for them; for therefore I say that no certain manner or form of electing ministers is prescribed in the scripture, because every church may do therein as it shall seem to be most expedient for the same.”³

The English retained the historic Episcopate; the Germans and the Swiss did not. The Continental leaders, however, did not object to this retaining of Episcopacy. Calvin, for instance, “held them to be worthy of anathema who would not submit to truly Christian bishops.”⁴

At first the tone of the English writers in defending Episcopacy was inclined to be apologetic, but even before the end of Elizabeth’s reign the apologetic note disappeared. Its disappearance was largely due to the struggle with Presbyterianism within the English Church. Men of Presbyterian convictions like Cartwright and Travers tried hard to capture the Church of England for Presbyterianism. In the struggle with them the English authorities became convinced of the superiority of the Episcopal form of

¹ *The Church Past and Present*, ed. H. M. Gwatkin, p. 206.

² *Defence of the Answer to the Admonition*, Works (Parker Society), I, p. 184.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 369.

⁴ *Tract. de Reform. Eccles.*

Church government as they themselves had retained it. So Lord Bacon writes :

“ First therefore for the government of Bishops, I for my part, not pre-judging the precedents of other reformed churches, do hold it warranted by the word of God and by the practise of the ancient Church in the better times, and much more convenient for kingdoms, than parity of ministers and government by synods.”

The attitude of Richard Hooker and of the Caroline Divines is similar. They definitely preferred Episcopacy. On the other hand they admit “ that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a Bishop.” So Hooker writes as follows :

“ Men may be extraordinarily, yet allowably, two ways admitted unto spiritual functions in the Church. One is, when God Himself doth of Himself raise up any, whose labour he useth without requiring that men should authorize them ; but then he doth ratify their calling by manifest signs and tokens Himself from heaven : . . . Another extraordinary kind of vocation is, when the exigence of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep ; where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain ; in case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give, place. And therefore we are not simply without exception to urge a lineal descent of power from the Apostles by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination. These cases of inevitable necessity excepted, none may ordain but only bishops : by the imposition of their hands it is, that the Church giveth power of order, both unto presbyters and deacons.”¹

In the opinion of Hooker and of the Caroline Divines the circumstances in which the Continental Reformers were placed justified them in departing from the Episcopal tradition of the Church : and they were very far from rejecting Continental orders as invalid. The following letter of John Cosin dated February 7, 1650, speaks for itself :

“ If at any time a minister so ordained in these French Churches came to incorporate himself in ours, and to receive a public charge or cure of souls among us in the Church of England (as I have known some of them to have done so of late, and can instance in many other before my time) our Bishops did not re-ordain him before they admitted to his charge, as they would have done if his former ordination here in France had been void. Nor did our laws require more of him than to declare his public consent to the religion received amongst us, and to subscribe the articles established. And I love not to be herein more wise or harder than our own Church is.”

Even Laud fully recognized that “ the Ecclesia Anglicana and the other Reformed Churches are sisters dwelling in the same Catholic habitation.”²

This continued to be the official attitude of the Church of England throughout the next century. It will be sufficient to quote Archbishop Wake, who writes as follows (1719) :

“ The Reformed Churches, though differing in some points from our

¹ *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book VII, xiv, 11.

² Durel, *Eccles. Angl. Vindiciae*, p. 355. For other quotations from Laud see Hunkin, *Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation*, pp. 45 f.

English Church, I willingly embrace. I could have wished indeed that the Episcopal form of government had been retained by all of them. . . . Meanwhile, far be it from me that I should be so iron-hearted as to believe, that, on account of such a defect (let me be permitted without offence to call it so), any of them ought to be cut off from our communion, or with certain mad writers among us, to declare that they have no true and valid sacraments, and thus are scarcely Christians." ¹

The Society for the promotion of Christian Knowledge (founded 1698) was at work in India throughout the century and for nearly the whole of that time employed a body of Lutheran clergy. Lutheran ministers were sent out similarly by the S.P.G. (founded in 1701) and the C.M.S. (founded in 1799). In short, in 1859, Dean Goode was quite justified in summing up the position thus :

"It is quite clear, that the original doctrine of the Church of England, the principles upon which our Church was founded, and the opinions of nine-tenths of her great divines, are all in favour of the cultivation of a spirit of brotherly communion between that Church and the foreign Protestant Non-Episcopal Churches." ²

The Lutheran Churches of Europe are still characterized by Evangelical piety. The War of 1914-18 brought very great economic difficulties to the Lutherans of Germany. The Lutherans of other countries, notably those of the United States of America, came to their assistance to a considerable extent, and their normal activities are by this time partially resumed. I have the following information with regard to the present condition of religion in Germany from a friend of mine who knows the country well. ³ The Churches, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, are now disestablished, but the State collects a Church tax from every one (rich or poor) and hands it over to the denominations to which the individuals belong. Everyone must pay this tax, unless he declares himself to be without religion (which few like to do). In such a case he loses all right to religious ministrations.

Religious teaching in Schools, both elementary and secondary, is common throughout Germany. Both Roman Catholic and Protestant teaching are supplied, and the Jews are exempt. Practically every scholar is ranged in one of these three groups. The Public Bodies pay for the teaching. That in secondary schools is often given by the local clergy, both Roman Catholic and Protestant. Indeed much of their time is spent in this way.

Protestants are usually considered as belonging to either Positive or Negative tendencies. Negatives are advanced Modernists; Positives are not usually Fundamentalists, but are often what we should call Moderate Liberals. The main point, however, is that the Positives hold the Divinity of our Lord in the orthodox sense. While many able theologians belong to the Negative School, the religious life of the country (Home Missions, Foreign Missions, etc.), is very preponderantly on the Positive side. Also it is the Positive preachers who commonly draw the larger congregations.

¹ Quoted Hunkin, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

² *Ibid.*, p. 64.

³ Rev. G. A. Schneider, M.A., lately Librarian of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

A greater proportion of the population than in England holds aloof from religion: the Socialists almost all do so. On the other hand, the small nucleus of very godly people is particularly sincere, consistent, and lovable.

In the United States and Canada in 1927 the Lutheran Churches had over 2,700,000 communicant members.

For Lutherans in general let Adolf Deissmann, the well-known Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin, be the spokesman. The following words are taken from the concluding paragraphs of his recently published lectures on *The New Testament in the Light of Modern Research*:¹

“After all, the religious value of the New Testament is contained in this: that this little book brings us into sure contact with our Lord Jesus Christ and His first witnesses.

And this contact with Jesus and with His disciples means fellowship with the living God, means a steady hope for the Kingdom of God and of eternal life, it means forgiveness of sin and salvation, triumph in the midst of affliction, power and help for all good, moral earnestness, self-denial, brotherliness, unity.

Considered historically, the New Testament is the trustworthy record of Jesus and His Apostles. Religiously considered, it proves itself from within by its influence to be the Magna Charta of the present Jesus Christ.”

The Church of Calvin survives in Switzerland, where in 1920 Protestants still formed 57·5 per cent. of the population. In France Protestantism, chiefly of the Calvinistic type, showed signs of spreading in the sixteenth century, but the Protestant population was depleted by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. When, much later, ideas of toleration again prevailed, Protestant groups were formed again, and they now number about a million persons, divided under some eight denominations.

Holland is predominantly Protestant, the Dutch Reformed Church numbering nearly three millions of adherents. The government of the Church is Presbyterian.

None of these Churches appears to be conscious of any desire to recover for itself the historic episcopate. Dr. Dibelius speaks for Germany, but his words would probably be equally applicable to the other countries mentioned: “No Protestant Church of Germany,” he writes, “would consider the remodelling of its episcopal order on the pattern of the Roman Catholics or the Anglicans even as worth discussing. The practical necessity for this does not exist.”²

On the other hand, in Denmark, Norway and Sweden, countries which are solidly Lutheran,³ the succession of bishops has been maintained.⁴ The Moravians⁵ also have taken pains to preserve an episcopate, though they allow deacons to administer Confirmation and the Holy Communion. The Moravians will be always remem-

¹ P. 192. ² In *The Reunion of Christendom*, ed. Sir Charles Marchant.

³ Over 98 per cent. of the population.

⁴ They have bishops and presbyters, but no diaconate.

⁵ Numbering in 1928 nearly 81,000 and supporting over 2,300 missionaries.

bered as the first Protestants to declare that it was the duty of the Church as such to evangelize the non-Christian world.

We turn next to Scotland. A very thorough and logical Presbyterianism was established in Scotland under the leadership, first, of John Knox and then of Andrew Melville.

The type of religion set forth in the *First Book of Discipline* (1560) is that of Geneva, the unit being the self-governing congregation, and the great aim of the system the pure preaching of the Word; no complete scheme of Church government being worked out. Such a scheme was fully supplied under Melville's influence in the *Second Book of Discipline* (1577).

In the next century the well-known attempt to introduce Episcopacy and a Book of Common Prayer modelled on the English, failed; but during the Commonwealth the Scottish Church accepted the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Westminster Directory of Public Worship. Another attempt after the Restoration to force Episcopacy upon Scotland failed again.¹ Under the House of Hanover the Presbyterian Church enjoyed the royal favour and was treated as a firm ally of the Government. In the eighteenth century there was a good deal of difficulty over patronage, and large numbers of the people quietly left the Establishment and erected meeting houses. Towards the end of that century, under the influence of the brothers Robert and James Haldane, the Church experienced a kind of Evangelical revival. In 1829 Dr. Alexander Duff went to India as the first Missionary of the Church of Scotland. Fourteen years later, in 1843, occurred the famous disruption. Of 1203 ministers, 451 left the Established Church to form the Free Church. With them went a third of the laity and all missionaries except one. The two Churches, of course, did not differ in doctrine but only in the question of the relation between Church and State. Happily the spirit of conciliation gradually prevailed. The leaders of the Established Church approached Parliament more than once in order to secure Acts which might remove the scruples of the other Church. After long negotiations and preparations both the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church resolved on an incorporating union. This was finally consummated at an adjourned meeting of the Assemblies of the two Churches, which was held in the Autumn of last year (1929).²

It is time to return to England. We have already referred to the attempt of Presbyterians like Thomas Cartwright and Walter Travers to capture the English Church at the end of the sixteenth century. Though defeated for a time, they and their successors

¹ The present Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church are direct successors of those consecrated to Scottish sees at the Restoration: but Episcopalians in Scotland are a very small minority—about 60,000, according to the latest statistics.

² For Bishop Charles Wordsworth's efforts to promote unity between the Scottish Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches (1880-1893) see Hunkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 74, 107.

did not relax their efforts until at length in 1642-43 Parliament abolished the episcopal form of government as the form of government for the Church of England.

By this time, however, it was clear that those who opposed the Bishops were of more than one kind. As early as 1581 Robert Brown had laid the foundations of the Congregational system and established at Norwich the first Congregational Church outside London. A little later, in 1609, John Smyth published *The Character of the Beast*, setting forth the view that infants ought not to be baptized. Smyth proceeded to baptize himself and some of his friends. He may be regarded as the founder of the Baptist Church in England. On the question of Church government Baptists and Congregationalists were, in the main, agreed. Christ being sole head of the Church, they held that all the members of the Church must be Christian and that the government of the Church must be in their hands, the State having no right of interference.

This period also saw the beginnings of the Society of Friends. George Fox, the son of a weaver of Fenny Drayton in Leicestershire, started preaching in 1647.

All these groups were centres of spiritual fervour, though few of them were altogether free from extravagances of one kind or another. It is greatly to be regretted that they were not treated with more conciliation by the Episcopalians when they came back to power at the Restoration. The action of Charles II's Government in 1662 convinced a great many people that the Established Church would not provide scope for the religious life they felt they needed. On St. Bartholomew's Day a large number of clergy (though the figure often given, 2,000, is probably considerably exaggerated) left their livings rather than conform. They and their followers, the Nonconformists, suffered great disabilities. The generous support given by the Nonconformists to the policy of the seven Bishops under James II, however, led to better feeling. All along the gap between moderate Nonconformists and the party nearest to them in the Church of England had been a narrow one, and a considerable number of them continued to attend services in their Parish Churches as well as their own meetings. Richard Baxter used to speak of Occasional Conformity as "a healing custom."¹ With the cessation of persecution the Nonconformists began to drift back into the Established Church, and at the beginning of the eighteenth century it looked as though Nonconformity would gradually die out.²

Then came the Evangelical Revival led by John and Charles

¹ For details and instances see Hunkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 97 ff. As Dr. C. S. Carter points out (*Ministerial Commission*, p. 94), if the rubric at the end of the Confirmation Service really excluded Nonconformists from Communion in their Parish Churches "there would have been no need to pass an Occasional Conformity Act (1711)" to stop the practice. The enforcement of the rubric itself would have sufficed.

² See Abbey and Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 430.

Wesley. The Church of England, though by no means dead, lacked the vigour necessary to deal with the new movement.¹ The new wine did not indeed burst the bottles, but it was spilled. Yet looking back we may well see even in this spilling the overruling of Providence. For, owing to the Industrial Revolution, great new populations in the North and West of England were growing up beyond the Church's reach ; and it may be said that it was because of John Wesley's bold and independent methods of dealing with them that the English nation was kept Christian. The Church of England itself received new life from the Movement. It was an Evangelical Churchman, William Wilberforce, who was the great champion of the abolition of slavery (1807) ; and the Church Missionary Society was founded in 1799.

But if the effect on the Church of England was considerable, the effect on the Nonconformists was still greater. " In 1676 Dr. Sherlock had estimated the proportion of Dissenters to Anglicans as 1 to 20. At the end of the eighteenth century the proportion had become 1 to 8 : in 1880 a careful calculation made it 28 to 72." ² The Methodists themselves are, of course, taken into account in these figures. They are now found in Great Britain in three main divisions : the Wesleyans with a membership of over half a million, the Primitive Methodists with a membership of over 220,000, and the United Methodists with a membership of over 150,000 : but Methodist reunion has already been decided upon.³ Alongside of the Methodist revival there grew up a new Nonconformist culture, which included not only the conscientious, abstemious business man who spared himself no more than his employees and who had few interests outside his factory and his Chapel, but also philosophers and scientists. Priestley was a Unitarian Minister and Dalton a Quaker schoolmaster. Such men were by religious tests debarred from the older Universities. The University of London was founded largely to meet their needs in 1828 ; but tests were not abolished at Oxford and Cambridge till 1871.

And so we come to the present day.⁴ The principle on which modern movements towards reunion have been proceeding has been, as Dr. Carnegie Simpson puts it, that "*Churches nearest each other should unite.*" " For the Church of England," writes Dr. Head, the Archbishop of Melbourne, " the real task is to bring back to itself the Puritans and Methodists whom it ought never to have

¹ The attitude of the Church at this time is quaintly illustrated by an inscription in one of our Cathedrals to a worthy Canon : " he was an enemy to all enthusiasm."

² Hunkin, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

³ Far larger in numbers is the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States, the membership of which reaches a total of over nine millions.

⁴ Those who desire brief, illuminating, just, and sympathetic sketches of the history of religion in England may be referred to the chapter on *The Historical Causes of Division*, by Dr. F. W. Head in the *Call for Christian Unity* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1930), and to *The Making of Modern English Religion*, by Mr. B. L. Manning, Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge (S.C.M., 1929).

lost.”¹ And even if we feel that the chickens have now grown too large merely to come back again under their mother’s wing, we may well agree with the Archbishop that it is towards closer relations with the English Free Churches that Anglicans should look and strive first of all.

All of us, members of the Church of England and Nonconformists alike, live in a new age and have not yet adjusted ourselves to it. The study of the Bible and of the history of our own religion and of other religions by modern scientific methods, the advance of Psychology, and the critical inquiries of the philosopher, have altered our outlook and deeply affected our thinking. The new knowledge has dissolved many of the old differences of opinion. Many labels are now obviously obsolete. While the things that cannot be shaken remain, things that can be shaken are being shaken; in the process individuals and groups are re-sorting themselves; and the end is not yet.

Although we cannot see far into the future, we can promote Christian unity by mutual recognition and by realizing our need of one another. First, by mutual recognition. The chief difficulties here have been connected with the ministry. As far as the ministries of the Free Churches are concerned members of the Church of England may take their stand on the declaration contained in a *Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry* drawn up by the Church of England representatives at the Joint Conference at Lambeth Palace, July 6, 1923.²

“It seems to us to be in accordance with the Lambeth Appeal to say, as we are prepared to say, that the ministries which we have in view in this memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ’s Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ’s Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church.”

We may take our stand on such a declaration as this, accept its implications, and act upon them. It surely means that at least there should be no bar to what is commonly called “interchange of pulpits” on special occasions; or to the welcoming of members of one Church, at all events in special circumstances, as guests at Holy Communion in another.³

Secondly, both we and our Nonconformist friends have to realize that all is not well with either of us. The Church of England with its fine parochial system, its noble liturgy, its venerable buildings, its tradition of awe and self-restraint in worship; planned on

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 103.

² The Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishop of London (Dr. Winnington-Ingram), Winchester (Dr. Talbot), Ely (Dr. Chase), Lichfield (Dr. Kempthorne), Peterborough (Dr. Woods), Chelmsford (Dr. Watts-Ditchfield), Hereford (Dr. Linton-Smith), Ripon (Dr. Strong), Salisbury (Dr. Donaldson), Gloucester (Dr. Headlam), Bishop Gibson, and the Rev. W. H. Frere, D.D.

³ This practice, happily, has never entirely ceased. For instances, see Hunkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 107 ff.

a large and generous scale, but now unsteady for lack of support : the Free Churches with their wonderful standard of personal giving and with the splendid participation of their laity in spiritual work, but constantly slipping towards the mere "pleasant Sunday afternoon," and bereft of much that is beautiful in tradition and art.

Both of us alike on the one hand beset by obscurantism and on the other threatened by revolt : both alike labouring under the ever-growing burdens of finance. Is it not true to say that we without them and they without us shall not be made perfect ?

Above all, let us all put first things first. Questions of organization, important as they are, can never be of the first importance. There is, and always has been, a deep spiritual union between all sincere disciples of our Lord. The more we think of that and are able to realize that, the brighter glows the hope of dealing successfully with obstructions that lie upon the surface.

In our present confusions an individual may well come to find himself in a false position. If so let him do his best to change the situation or let him move himself. I sometimes think a considerable re-shuffling among individuals will and should take place. Meanwhile, and always, it is for each to be true to the things of the Spirit as they are revealed to him. With regard to the adjustment of details we can afford to be patient : one step at a time ; here a little, there a little ; while our inmost thought and prayer is the Apostle's : *Peace be to the Brethren, and Love with Faith, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in Uncorruptness* (Ephesians vi, 23, 24).

The Cambridge Platonists are a subject of interest to many students. They hold a very definite place in the history of Religious thought in England, and quite a considerable literature has arisen around them. They were the subject of the Hulsean Prize Essay in Cambridge University in 1926. The prize was won by Mr. G. P. H. Pawson, who has published his essay under the title, *The Cambridge Platonists and their Place in Religious Thought* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d. net). Dr. Alexander Nairne, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, contributes a Foreword in which he warmly commends the care and study which Mr. Pawson has devoted to his theme. The Essay brings out the main elements in the teaching of Benjamin Whichcote, John Smith, Henry More, Ralph Cudworth, Nathaniel Culverwel, and some minor members of the School. The author is convinced that there is an essential connection between the spirit of Platonism and the spirit of Christianity. The value of the work of this Cambridge group was that they kept alive the Platonic tradition. They kept a light burning. "Their task was to clothe the old truths of forgotten wisdom in new forms, which should give those truths vital expression."

THE SOUTH INDIA SCHEME.

BY THE REV. A. J. M. MACDONALD, D.D.,
Rector of St. Dunstan in the West, Fleet Street, E.C.

WHILE it is a fair comment to say that the South India Scheme of Reunion reveals concessions made by Anglicans on the one hand and by Free Churchmen on the other, yet as Dr. Carnegie Simpson has suggested, stress should be laid rather upon the contributions willingly made by each of the contracting parties than upon concessions extracted from them. The suggestion represents more than phrase-making, it indicates accurately the attitude of friendly zeal on behalf of the Scheme which I found in vogue among all types of Christians in South India. The negotiations were conducted in an atmosphere of mutual helpfulness, each side asking to be provided with all that the other had to offer, not bargaining with coins on the counter and demanding a complete *quid pro quo* for every concession made. Dr. Palmer has given expression to the same idea. The Scheme does not, he says, involve "union by absorption or submission, but union by comprehension." From the best that Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Wesleyans and Anglicans have enjoyed since the beginning a contribution is being made to complete the fullness of the new whole. Of the riches garnered long ago, the best elements from each several repository are being comprehended within the new treasury. The diocese, the circuit, the presbytery and the congregation long ago proved capable mediums of the Spirit's operation, and it is not surprising that now, when they are being fitted together, they are found easily adaptable to each other, without ceasing to be what they were—to use an Ambrosian phrase—and that when extended, like the several tubes of a telescope, they contribute to a larger vision, and make clearer the distant view of the one body of Christ's Church here on earth.

Let us dissect the Scheme. To it is contributed the episcopate, without theory, though not without definition. It is a constitutional episcopacy—we had some discussion about that here last year. It is constitutional because elected, elected by a process which sifts the nominees over and over again, so that he who is finally chosen has passed the closest scrutiny of his lay and clerical brethren. The election is conducted by the Synod and the particular Diocesan Council concerned. The Synod consists of all the bishops of the church, and three presbyters and three laymen from each Diocesan Council. The Diocesan Council consists of the bishop and presbyters of the diocese and lay representatives, mostly elected but a few nominated. The Diocesan Council makes its own nomination of candidates for the vacant bishopric, and the Synod nominates not more than three names of clergy, who in this case may not be resident in the diocese. From the combined list the Diocesan Council nominates not less than two nor more

than four names, all of whom must secure two-thirds of the votes of those actually present. These names go before a board consisting of the Moderator (who is the Chairman of the Synod) and six members appointed by the Executive Committee of the Synod. This board makes the final selection. The strong lay-membership of the Diocesan Council and Synod ensure the democratic nature of the whole procedure, while the oversight of the Synod secures that no unsuitable candidate with biased local support shall be finally appointed.

Again, it is a constitutional episcopacy because diocesan committees or other bodies are to be consulted before a minister is authorized to officiate and to preach in any locality. It is constitutional because no suspension or excommunication—necessary functions in a church newly converted from strange religious rites and practices—can be pronounced or remitted without consulting the Pastorate Committee or Panchayat of the congregation concerned. It is constitutional because although president of the Diocesan Council the bishop has no control over the finance of the diocese. The power of the purse lies with the Diocesan Council. It is constitutional because the bishop may be removed from his charge when adjudged to be “mentally or physically incapable of discharging the duties of his office” (Section VII, Part I, A 10), or for other reasons. If the bishop has the right of suspending a discussion of the Diocesan Council on faith, doctrine and worship and some other matters, that is because again, in a church newly won from strange beliefs and ceremonies, error might easily creep into the doctrine of the infant community. The bishop has from the beginning been the guardian of the faith. In this contingency the interests of the Diocesan Council are guarded by right of appeal to the Synod (Section VIII, B 3).

To the scheme is contributed an organization resembling the Kirk Session and the Presbytery, while the Synod has the character of the General Assembly, with a chairman who is styled “Moderator.” I take for consideration as the characteristic element in this organization one which most resembles the Presbytery—namely, the Diocesan Council. It includes the Bishop of the Diocese, who shall be ex-officio president; “all the presbyters holding the bishop’s authorization and regularly engaged in the work of the Church, and lay representatives, whether elected, nominated or ex-officio; and may include other ministers of the diocese, whether presbyters or deacons” (Section VIII, B 1). The last provision allows for the attendance of Government chaplains, and other clergy who may not be comprehended within the Scheme. The general management of the affairs of the diocese, especially in the matter of finance, forms the special duty of the Diocesan Council (Section VIII, B 4), and the Council has power “to frame, amend or alter its own constitution,” with the approval of the Synod.

The Presbyterian organization of the diocese is by no means rigid. Opportunity is provided for its adaptation to meet special local needs. A Diocesan Council may “combine several Pastorate

Committees into a group, which shall be entrusted with administrative and financial functions within its area " (Section VIII, B 7).

To the Scheme is contributed the principle of Congregationalism. It provides for a Pastorate Committee. "A pastorate is the sphere of a pastor (with his assistants if any), consisting of one or more congregations" (Section VIII, A 1). In the latter case we see Congregational and Presbyterian elements combining together, but the Congregational principle predominates in the locality. "Every such pastorate shall have a Pastorate Committee, which shall consist of the pastor (the presbyter in charge) as chairman, and of lay communicant members of the Church elected by the communicants of the pastorate, and which may also include ex-officio and nominated members in accordance with rules laid down by the Diocesan Council" (Section VIII, A 2). The Pastorate Committee, together with the Pastor, has general oversight of the area and "all its religious activities" with power to delegate some of its functions to sub-committees. Rules will also be laid down by the Diocesan Council for the care of financial and administrative work by the Pastorate Committee. It is suggested (Section VIII, A 3) that "provision should also be made in the diocesan constitution for purposes to be defined by the Diocesan Council."

To the Scheme is contributed the Wesleyan institution of lay assistants possessing pastoral and spiritual functions. "To the whole Church and to every member of it belongs the duty and privilege of spreading the good news of the Kingdom of God and the message of salvation through Jesus Christ" (Section VII, Part II, 1).

In addition to the diaconate, in which a minister may pass his whole life if desirable, the Scheme arranges a "ministry of the laity" in three grades. Firstly as Elders who, after being "set apart at" a "solemn service," assist the pastor in spiritual and administrative work. The Elder is set apart for life, but only functions when called upon to do so by the Pastorate Committee or some other authorized body. Secondly as Leaders or Pastoral Assistants, who may be appointed to the pastoral care of village congregations or groups of Church members in a town pastorate. They may be appointed by the Presbyter and the Pastorate Committee, though without the "solemn service" which sets apart the Elder, and it is recommended that the office should be renewed annually. Thirdly as Lay Preachers, who like the other lay assistants must be communicants. They must possess the necessary gifts, and be authorized by the Pastorate Committee on the recommendation of the Pastor to preach in the public services of the church.

Lay men and women will also be selected to serve as stewards of Church funds and administrators or trustees of Church property; as deaconesses or women workers; as representatives on Church Committees and members of disciplinary Courts.

In all these and other matters the Scheme shows that they who contend that it represents the combination of valuable con-

tributory elements, and not a series of mutual concessions to meet old prejudices, are fully justified in their contention. This is no less than we should expect after the history of the negotiations. Twenty years of quiet conference, prayer and thought lie behind this scheme, and the fruit of that slow and patient process is a programme which promises enrichment in the spiritual life and organization of the whole Church in South India. Exactly how it has come about we know not, nor what the future holds for it, but even as when the Spirit of God cometh and goeth we know not how, while spiritual grace is left behind—new birth, new inspiration—so the negotiators find in their hands an instrument of marvellous minute and delicate structure, big with potential forces for continuing the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in South India, and for the organization of the thousands who are to be won for Him.

Let us now glance at the actual state of the negotiations so far as they refer to the Anglican Church. The Scheme was considered at the beginning of this year by the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, sitting at Calcutta, under the chairmanship of the Metropolitan. When the reports of its resolutions first reached this country a certain attempt was made to convey the impression that the General Council had courteously but definitely bowed it out of court, as if saying, "These matters are too high for us, go with them to Lambeth." But since the arrival of the full report of the resolutions, it is clear that the bishops and clergy and laity assembled at Calcutta, while making certain recommendations, none the less quite definitely gave approval to the Scheme, and blessed its future progress on the way towards final adoption in South India. There is a notion in some quarters that the Calcutta Council was expected to give complete and final approval to the Scheme, which would then possess complete authority so far as Anglicans were concerned. But this was never contemplated. The Scheme, at present, represents the proposals of the Joint Committee, consisting of Anglican and Free Church delegates, charged with its construction. It has yet to secure the sanction of the existing South India United Church (Presbyterians and Congregationalists) and of the Wesleyans in that area. Thus the reference of the Scheme to Calcutta, and in due time to Lambeth, is part of an orderly course pursued by the Joint Committee to secure amendment leading on to final approval by the authorities which constituted the Committee.

That the General Council at Calcutta fully realized the part it was asked to play is revealed in the Prefatory Note to its Resolutions, which states that

"the Council was deeply conscious that the Holy Spirit, by inspiring the Joint Committee with mutual trust and common desire to learn the truth as God should reveal it, had enabled its members, who started with many and great divergencies of thought and tradition, to arrive at agreement on a great many important points; and therefore wished to shew by the terms of its resolutions its belief that *the continuance of such discussions is the surest*

and quickest way to ensure that the uniting Churches shall reach such real agreement upon all essential points as is necessary for a true and stable union."

The Prefatory Note of the Episcopal Synod concludes by referring the Scheme to Lambeth for advice, both on the Scheme itself and on the Resolutions passed on it by the Calcutta Council, and states the intention of the Synod to consult the Lambeth Conference on certain technical points. Then follow the two Resolutions.

The first resolution sends a greeting to the contracting bodies in South India ; expresses the desire of the General Council to promote unity ; shows a " spirit of sympathy and mutual trust while earnestly exploring every approach to unity, to bring into the United Church whatever of truth they have inherited " ; and calls for prayer on behalf of the Lambeth Conference and on behalf of the Councils in England and America which may consider the Scheme. This resolution was passed unanimously.

The second resolution expresses thankfulness that the doctrinal basis of the Scheme is the Trinity and the Incarnation, the authority of Holy Scriptures, the Creeds, the two sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion and Christ's gift of the ministry of His Church. It expresses gratitude for the " adoption of the rule of episcopal ordination " as a means of " unifying the ministry " ; and continues :

" The Council believes that the Committee has been led to produce a situation in which it is possible to proceed towards the realization of that union which our Blessed Lord desires His people to have without passing judgment upon any particular form of ministry or view of the ministry. It believes that the Committee has thus been enabled to bring the negotiations into an atmosphere of mutual love and trust in which all can be sensible that the things which they accept and hold in common outweigh all differences that still remain."

The Resolution concludes by directing the delegates of the General Council on the Joint Committee to continue their work ; instructs them on some of the suggestions ; and offers " some statements of opinion on certain important points."

Of these points the chief are that in the opinion of the General Council not all ministries are equally certainly valid, but it agrees that the other uniting churches shall not be considered to have endorsed any particular theory of the ministry. While agreeing that the Church in South India should have sufficient autonomy to carry through the Scheme, the General Council urges that the Church in the North be kept informed of future procedure through the medium of a common Consultative Council on which the northern dioceses shall be represented. It urges that the practice of Confirmation should be adopted by the United Church " as early as possible," " not meaning thereby that the Anglican rite need be followed in detail." The rest of the " instructions " and " opinions " are concerned with minor points, confined mostly to matters of drafting.

This important resolution was passed with only two dissentients on "one small item." That the attitude of the General Council representing the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon towards the Scheme is one of ardent sympathy is clear ; that it approves the work already done is equally clear ; but what is most significant is the fact that obviously it desires the negotiations to proceed along the lines which they have hitherto followed, and in that cordial spirit of approval the General Council has handed on the Scheme to Lambeth.

THE REPLY TO FATHER VERNON.

ONE GOD AND FATHER OF ALL. By Eric Milner-White and Wilfred L. Knox. *Mowbray*. 2s. 6d.

From many points of view this is a remarkable book. It proves that there is a strong vein of Protestantism among a section of Anglo-Catholics and shows that positions adopted by many of them have been thrown overboard in the light of historical fact. We naturally find many things with which we disagree and many that we wholeheartedly accept. There is a frank acknowledgement of the fruits of the Spirit among Nonconformists, but are they quite right when they assert that the joining of Nonconformists to the Church of England is not talked of as their "conversion." The authors may not do so, but their friends do. It may be due to some congenital defect in our character, but we must look upon the attitude of "Father Vernon" in the presence of the relics of St. Thérèse of Lisieux as unintelligible to us. We have no doubt of her piety, but the sentimentalism with which he surrounded the relics is not what we expect from a virile personality. In fact, as we read his books we are impressed by a strain of emotionalism, which subordinates reason and common sense to the desire to feel as he thinks he ought to feel.

The chapters that deal with St. Peter and the Papacy put the Protestant position with a clarity and emphasis that surprise us, and when we come to the Authority of the Church we wonder how our authors find themselves in the face of the contentions of many of their friends able to write: "Do not let us pretend that we need an Infallible Living Voice when this only means that we shall find it more comfortable to believe that we have one, when we have really nothing of the kind. And do not let us pretend that it is necessary, when the real truth is only that it will save us a certain amount of worry. After all, our Lord never promised His disciples that faith in Him would save them a certain amount of worry." We commend the book as a whole to those who wish to know how some Anglo-Catholics face what are difficulties to their friends.

INTERCOMMUNION.

BY PROFESSOR BERESFORD PITE, M.A., F.R.I.B.A.

THE implications of this polysyllable, at the present moment, involve not only problems of Christian polity in the mission field and their reactions upon Anglican mentality at home, but the personal attitude of Evangelical Churchmen to their nonconformist neighbours in the faith. To most this is a practical question affecting conduct as well as opinion. Intercommunion may be illustrated as presenting problems, if we think on the one hand of the more or less technical difficulties of the Anglican mind, and on the other of the spiritual scrupulosity that has crystallized communion into exclusiveness among the "brethren."

Sympathy must be requested for some impatience with the "beggarly elements," so important to the Anglican, and with the seeming unbrotherliness of the "brethren"; it will be more helpful to attempt a consideration of the spiritual conditions underlying intercommunion as an experience than the technicalities of either controversy. The feeling must be confessed that, however interesting to the liturgiologist are the details of practice and form, and however difficult to the historian the nature of episcopacy or the development and status of nonconformity, their discussion proves ultimately arid of spiritual stimulus. Unless our consideration of this subject of intercommunion can be transferred to its spiritual aspect it will be unpractical and barren. We desire to derive that result, which we call blessing, from this subject, and are therefore compelled, in looking upward to the source of all spiritual insight, to overlook the inferior details with which it is so apt to be entangled.

Intercommunion is necessary in the development of a society designed for the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts—the delightful title of a venerable institution which crystallizes the marching orders of the Church and to whom we may commend this suggestion—and necessary if a universal fellowship of the Spirit is to be attained in the Church militant here on earth. The capital of this trading society is to be intercommunicated and multiplied in fellowship, not laid up in the napkin of self-preservation. It will be evident that no problem of intercommunion will remain for discussion if we hesitate, as to this initial premiss, that it is the purpose of the Great Shepherd to collect into one flock His sheep of different folds.

The prerequisite to intercommunion is Union with Christ. This, being a truth of Divine revelation, passes human understanding in its definition, but the reality is experimentally experienced; the heart is enlightened to know that it is the object of the eternal purpose of redemption; that the Head at Calvary experienced a mystical union with His members which the Spirit of Life, by whom He rose from the dead, demonstrates in them. This demonstration

of union here is, though partial, typical ; it is an earnest of the manifestation to the worlds of the culminating glory of God in Christ, and its expression is involved in, and implied by, the intercommunion of His people.

Is not the whole of this Divine purpose and operation enclosed in these pregnant sentences ? “ I believe in the Holy Ghost ; the Holy Catholic Church ; the Communion of Saints.”

The first prayer book of Edward VI published the alternative thanksgiving in the Holy Communion Office and also the Collect for All Saints. Bishop Dowden traces in these the influence of Hermann von Wied, Archbishop of Cologne, who, like Cranmer, was afterwards excommunicated for heresy. The Collect describes the “ Elect ” as “ knit together in one communion and fellowship in the mystical body ” of Christ ; the Communion thanksgiving adds the definition “ which is the blessed company of all faithful people,” and prays that we may continue in that holy fellowship. The connection of this definition with the Lord’s Supper, or Communion, in St. Paul’s words is that “ We being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread.”

Fellow-members of the body discern their interrelationship ; this, a fruit of the Spirit, is a token of participation in Eternal life. The one loaf of the Lord’s Supper (which the use of wafers obscures) is an embodiment of fellowship with Him and with one another. The liberty of the Spirit characterizes the family life in God, spiritual friendships ensue in prayer and praise, in the Scriptures, in the experiences of the pilgrimage and in Gospel labours.

The proclamation and exposition of the truth of the mystical union of Christ’s body creates a spiritual emotion which draws men out of the shallows into the deep and calls urgently for the fellowship sacrament. This has been illustrated at Keswick, at Jerusalem, and in the mission field. The ideal becomes in a measure actual ; prayer for unity has been answered ; and the Communion of Saints has become not only a creed, but an experience.

Under such circumstances and influence it is anomalous to refrain from the sacrament of fellowship, it restrains both charity and faith. Intercommunion of spirit cannot stop short of sacramental fellowship without denying the nature of a sacrament.

Descending into a consideration of denominational problems—the term seems antithetical—an endeavour must be made to appreciate the hesitation of a school of Anglican churchmen to such intercommunion as we have indicated. It is difficult to apprehend how this can be based upon any fundamental difference of spiritual values, as union with Christ and the evidences of His Spirit’s presence will not be questioned by the most hesitant. The objection seems to arise from that root of division, the attempt to identify a visible entity with a spiritual reality. To the Evangelical—are we mistaken in so using the term ?—the Church of the living God on earth is a spiritual fellowship, and not the resultant of a combination of spiritual and sacerdotal qualifications, in which the

latter may compromise the former, limiting or preventing the wider fellowship of faith.

The hesitation is, unquestionably, conscientious; conscience adheres naturally, and often indiscriminately, to authority; but while respecting the element of obedience to truth we may ask, is not any doctrine of the nature of the Church of Christ brought to the test by the emotion of fellowship in the possession of the heavenly treasure of union with the Lord and His members? Is a bondage which hinders the privilege of intercommunion a fruit of the Spirit?

The challenge to the conscience is not really to the greater and essential principles of the Presence of the Master in the hearts comprehended in fellowship, or to the work of the unifying Spirit, but to the detail of the authority of the ministrant of the sacrament which expresses the recognized fellowship.

Is this a sufficient ground upon which intercommunion should be declined? Does the person of the minister invalidate or pre-empt the Spirit? Authority has now raised its ominous hand; it questions validity, and, in losing sight of the substance, the investigation of this shadow may shift us back from the deep into the shallows, where the roots of division germinate; and like the Nile *sudd* develop until they obstruct the stream of intercommunion.

At this point Evangelicals shiver; not that their individual peace is threatened, but the quickened hope of intercommunion is endangered. A strange wind is blighting the garden, hindering the flowing out of its spices, those happy contacts of heart which witness the unifying companionship of the Master, tokens of everlasting pleasure.

S. Paul's nervousness, like other apostolic experiences, reappears; fearful of offending the scrupulous but unyielding in its grasp of liberty. "I am afraid of you": lest any deprive you of your fellowship, "after the tradition of men and not after Christ"; "let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink"; things that are shadows, "for the body is of Christ."

What is this authority and what is the validity contingent upon its imprimatur? The Evangelical shortly refers all authority in the Church of Christ and all effectual operation to the Holy Spirit; undelegated and unintercepted; recognized by, and mutual to, His subjects by faith.

The ground of fellowship is our direct access by one Spirit, without the interposition of authorized or unauthorized priests. Are the experienced gifts of the Spirit of Grace to be retrieved from us for lack of traditional authorization? Our Lord answered the ecclesiastical challenge to His authority by reference to the admitted validity of the Baptist's extraneous Ministry; and we may also resort, in this irrelevant questioning, to the evidences of the Holy Spirit's fruitfulness in divers ministries.

Evangelicals must shake themselves into freedom from the web of tradition, with which authority and validity entangle inter-

communion. We must maintain freedom of heart and conscience for fellowship in Holy Communion with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in incorruptness ; and reflect that the infallibility, which is a logical necessity for the solution of the dilemma of the visible Church, does not belong to any one branch of the fellowship of Christ.

Fellowship by intercommunion, however, must imply organization. The order involved in doing "decently" connotes an ordained ministry of the word and sacraments. We remind ourselves that what becomes necessary does not become unscriptural. The promise of the Presence, where two or three are gathered in His name, is as effectual if the number enlarges, ten or a hundredfold on earth, or to millions in heaven. Earthly conditions demanding organization, the problem of intercommunion becomes that of the administration of the sacrament of fellowship—that is, of the office of minister among the brethren as "he that serveth." Does the promised blessing fail, and does spiritual fellowship cease, if the ministrant lacks aught but the Divine Call? It is a proper deduction from Article XXVI that the minister is not the agent of the effect of the Sacrament ; the spiritual reality lies outside his hands. That movement of the Spirit which creates the desire for intercommunion is deflected by discussion of the status of the minister. Is not this after all one of the "weak and beggarly elements"? If His Divine Presence is the valid power in the Sacrament of fellowship, this interposition of human conditions jeopardizes rather than ensures that blessing.

It is necessary to recall that the scriptural qualifications for communion, in the members of the fellowship are true repentance and lively faith.

The rubric, exhortation and invitation of our Service are simple and explicit as to the discipline of conscience and the necessity of faith. Slackness and formality are negated and the ultimate necessity of excommunicating evil-livers and heretics is stated.

In spite of the apparent difficulty, at home, of exercising primitive discipline and discrimination among communicants, difficulties which can be dealt with in the more primitive conditions of infant Churches, it must be urged that heart-searching leads to holiness, and that it would be well for the Church of England if the modern tendency to multiply services of Holy Communion indicated that the exhortations of that service were solemnly impressed upon communicants. There is nothing in the Prayer Book to authorize their omission ; even where daily administration is practised.

The Sacrament has happily ceased to be employed as a political test, through the failure of the ideal that occasioned it, but we cannot regard its use as a test of Churchmanship as otherwise than dangerous, in the absence of a fencing of the table, once a searching ordinance in Scotland.

It would be a symptom of spiritual vitality if the problems of intercommunion were practical instead of theoretical ; related to

self-examination, the lively character of faith and mutual charity ; subjects on which there is no divergence between the Churches. Intercommunion would thus be related to revival and progress to spiritual reunion could be more easily envisaged.

Unity of doctrine also has a fundamental relation to fellowship. The most characteristic physical quality of a building is adherence to its foundation. A principle most simply expressed in the passive injunction " Abide in me." The simple doctrine of the Gospel, which in effecting conversion insists upon child-likeness of mind, needs not to be complicated with doctrinal controversy and definitions. Unity of heart with Christ is wrought by the Holy Spirit often through a single shaft of truth, with infinite results.

The Church, throughout its branches, continuously responds and vibrates to the Spirit of life Who testifies of Jesus. There may be as little agreement as to sacramental definitions as to sacramental rites, but there is harmony in the notes that glorify Him.

It must be obvious that the simplest forms and rites will be the most unifying, and that intercommunion demands this simplicity. Emphasis upon the method may weaken the sense of fellowship, but concentration upon the doctrine that is according to Godliness cannot tend to mere sacramentalism.

Neither does the Gospel of fellowship with a living Head lead to private interpretations that produce exclusiveness, the antithesis of intercommunion. Have we not, each for himself, discovered that the magnetic potency of Divine love, with its positive as well as negative forces, is a unifying force, despite our peculiarities and inherited divisions ?

The psalmody of the universal Church is already preparing the way ; it is already an intercommunion of praise and prayer ; striking the collective harmonies, to which the individual heart responds, without questioning the human instrument. " The truth, as it is in Jesus," is unifying ; He is the focus of intercommunion, subduing imaginations and hearts to Himself.

It will follow that the vindication of the power of the doctrine of His name over the bonds of sectarianism becomes a manifestation of His glory, for which the Church should pray and to the attaining of which it should make an energetic advance.

It may be asked if by freedom in communicating the integrity of the Church of England as an organism held together by its historic orders would be lost ?

The bold answer may be attempted that the effort should be made to render the Church of England, in fact, what it assumes to be in name, the fellowship of Christ in this nation. This may, indeed, be stark Protestantism, but we need not be any more nervous of the term than of Catholicism. We protest that all who are Christ's are of His Church and we claim their fellowship. The battle of the Reformers was fought for the liberation of the truth of the Gospel, and their vision of a national Church was created by their perception of its simplicity and liberty.

The recovery within a reunited national Church of the consciousness of unity in Christ, expressed by intercommunion but admitting existing diversities of administrations and gifts, may be an ideal ; it may be charged with overlooking history and forgetting the disparate tendencies that have followed upon freedom from papal rule ; but history may yet be made, as it was at the Reformation. The Spirit of God works His own "revivals," and we cannot limit His operations by historical or ecclesiastical precedents.

The missionary propaganda of the last century, out of Europe into Africa and the East, emanating from the Protestant Churches, is now reacting upon the Church at home and compelling the consideration of this relatively local matter of intercommunion. It is small as compared with its issues and strangely local when we reflect upon the anomaly of expanding the Church of our island into a community more extensive than the British Empire.

The opportunity of revising the Prayer Book in conference with the Protestant Churches, most of whom regard it with affectionate sympathy, has been lost ; skilful piloting has deflected the purpose of the revision into a reversion. It may be that the opportunity will recur, as the Bishops' book satisfies neither the extremes nor the centre of the line. The hindrance to intercommunion with Protestant Churches by the alterations of the Communion Service should be rectified. The purpose of achieving a liturgy to illustrate, maybe, a *via media* for Roman, Greek and Anglican has never been more than a dream.

It should be the Evangelical policy to promote a new demand for a revision that would assist home reunion by recognizing intercommunion, and for this a few rubrics would probably suffice.

As we consider the strength of the bonds of Christian love and truth and remember how they strengthen themselves in exercise against our common enemy ; how such comradeship unites ; how the great work of Moody and Sankey a generation ago drew earnest helpers from all the Churches without a sign of difference ; how the great Conferences at Keswick evoke in scriptural exposition the practical fruits of the ministries of teaching ; and how missionary policy when brought under review compels unity of heart and worship, we may well take courage and offer thanksgiving and praise to the Father of Spirits for these manifestations of the unifying power of the prayer of the Lord Jesus.

The plaintive beauty of our petition for unity cannot remain in the Prayer Book without anticipation of an answer. What answer ? Intercommunion would be one patent cause for thanksgiving that "as there is but one Body, and one Spirit, and one Hope of our Calling, one God and father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart, and of one soul united in one holy bond of Truth and Peace, of Faith and Charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify God."

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

THERE is an aspect of the Reformation which has not perhaps received as much attention as it deserves. We think of the movement most frequently as a great spiritual awakening, as the throwing down of an ecclesiastical tyranny and the return to purity of doctrine. We are inclined to forget that the medieval Church had deep roots in the organization of society through its wide possessions and through the positions of temporal power held by its Bishops, and the wide acres under the control of great monastic establishments. Oscar Albert Marti, Ph.D., Professor of History in the Central Missouri State Teachers' College, has done a useful service in writing a scholarly examination of the *Economic Causes of the Reformation in England* (Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 10s. 6d. net). He shows the process by which ecclesiastical endowment developed, and the extent and ramifications of ecclesiastical wealth. "The Church was a great business as well as a religious corporation, its interests touched the whole economic life of the people, and its power was felt at every turn." The protests against papal finance in the thirteenth century were frequent, and the revolt against ecclesiastical exactions developed increasing strength till they reached their climax in the sixteenth century. There were many factors that led to the secularization of Church property at the Reformation. Dr. Marti follows out these movements with a wealth of illustrative detail. There were no doubt abuses when so great a social upheaval occurred, but the new régime proved itself more conducive to the welfare of the people than the old. The pictures which have been drawn by biassed historians of the beauty of life when the monasteries were great landowners and were supposed to be the benevolent patrons of the people and of the poor represent only half the truth. Dr. Marti presents the facts of the economic situation and the inevitable clash which had to come between the old system and the new life bursting through the ecclesiastical bondage. This is a valuable study of many important features in the movements which led to the English Reformation.

The Rev. R. Mercer Wilson, M.A., Lecturer on Church History, Wycliffe College, Toronto, has published a series of lectures delivered before the Alumni Association of the College under the title *Before the Reformation* (Chas. J. Thynne & Jarvis, 2s. net). It is well known that numbers of writers have set themselves to represent the ages before the Reformation as the period when our country could be described as "Merrie England." They draw highly-coloured pictures of the happy condition of the country. They endeavour to ascribe to the Church of that period the development and maintenance of this condition which they produce out of their own imagination. Dr. Coulton has, however, presented the true state of affairs in a number of important historical surveys of the medieval ages. It is not possible for everyone to read through his

numerous and detailed volumes. Mr. Mercer has in brief form given some of the chief points of the results of Dr. Coulton's studies in these handy and popular lectures, and helps to correct the mis-statements of the "medieval romanticists." He deals with the conditions produced by feudalism, and goes on to show the monk of the Middle Ages as Squire, with the hard lot of the poor which brought half the population into servitude. The widespread ignorance was unrelieved by the Religious system, and with knowledge came emancipation, and liberty was the result of the Reformation. These pictures of medieval life are clearly drawn and serve the useful purpose of correcting misrepresentations largely circulated for the purposes of propaganda. The lectures close appropriately with the statement of Dr. Coulton, "Every day more clearly the modern world sees God where the Middle Ages only shuddered at a black and hopeless void."

A Memoir of G. H. S. Walpole, Bishop of Edinburgh, by W. J. Margetson, Provost of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh (Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., 3s. 6d. net), presents a charming picture of a saintly life. The boyhood of the future Bishop was not a happy one. His father had been an officer in the army and resigned his commission to take orders. He carried the army spirit into his parish and his home. He was described by a contemporary as "an 'ultra-ritualist' who offered the people an advanced ritual and teaching that they had to accept whether they liked it or not. It was the same in the home. He ruled sternly. The boy was delicate, but for him, as for his three brothers, the hard rule could know no mitigation. The one ray of light was a mother's love, poured out lavishly on her delicate boy." He went to Trinity College, Cambridge, and in spite of the opposition of his father, who wished him to enter the army, he followed the vocation which he strongly felt and took orders. He had a varied ministerial experience. He began in a curacy at Truro in 1877, and in 1882 went to New Zealand as incumbent of St. Mary's Church, Auckland. In 1889 he was appointed a Professor in the General Theological Seminary in New York. In the year 1896 he returned to England as Principal of St. Bede's College for the training of elementary schoolmasters at Durham. After seven years' work there he accepted the living of Lambeth from the Archbishop of Canterbury, and in 1910 he was consecrated Bishop of Edinburgh in succession to Dr. Dowden, the great liturgical scholar. He was an indefatigable worker in every sphere, but his special gifts were those of a missionary, and he was never happier than when conducting retreats or missions. His devotional books are well known and are appreciated by all sections of churchpeople for their depth of spirituality, although the teaching of some of them is not that of the Evangelical School. His son, Mr. Hugh Walpole, the well-known novelist, contributes to the volume two chapters of reminiscences of his father and his mother, which give a delightful impression of their characters and add considerably to the interest of the memoir.

Many beside those who knew the Bishop will be glad to have this record of a life of service to the Church and of devotion to its Master.

A little book by Canon J. B. Lancelot, of St. James, Birkdale, *The Religion of the Collects*, Brief Meditations (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.), provides the type of devotional study which many find most helpful. A page of thoughtful meditation on each collect in the Christian year gives a keynote. Original in thought and full of spiritual experiences these meditations will be found a help and inspiration. It is a booklet which may well find a place on the bedside table for the early morning devotional study. As examples, the following passage from the meditation on the collect for Quinquagesima Sunday will give an idea of their point and richness, "In a man real worth means richness and clarity of mind, honesty of conviction, generosity of character, and true nobility of doing has love for its supreme motive;" and this on the Whit-Sunday Collect: "The Spirit on Pentecost was shed abroad. All are, or may be, within the range of His operations. We are not all called to the Ministry of the Word, or of teaching or of healing, but we all have our Christian Service to render as well as our lives to manage, and may not a right judgment save us from mistakes which not only lead to much private unhappiness, but actually often hinder the cause of God?"

Those who have read Miss Constance Padwick's most interesting biography of Canon W. H. Temple Gairdner, of Cairo, will be glad to have the further insight into the charming character of that great missionary which is given in the collection of his letters and informal writings published under the title *W. H. T. G. to His Friends* (S.P.C.K., 5s. net). His interests were varied. They included Music, Travel, Works of Art, and the Beauties of Nature, and on all of them he writes with peculiar charm. The most revealing portion of the volume is probably his letters to his children, which show the ideal relationship between a parent and his family. There are also two interesting essays, one "On the Writings of H. G. Wells," and the other "On Elgar's Second Symphony." The following comment on the New Prayer Book reveals a desire shared by many: "Talk of alternative Prayer Books! The alternative book we really need is one in modern speech that you could use with children and illiterates and stand a chance of being understood. I baptized a boy of ten yesterday, and had written out for him into modern English the Questions and Answers, and the Words of Reception. I felt it made a stupendous difference—the difference between dignified ceremony and soul-transaction."

The latest numbers of *The Study Bible* issued by Messrs. Cassell & Co. (3s. 6d. net each volume) maintain the high standard and special features of this interesting series. In the volume on the General Epistles the Rev. A. J. Gossip, D.D., writes the general introduction on *The Religious Message of the General Epistles* for

the Present Day, and the Rev. J. F. McFadyen the Critical Study. The Archbishop of Armagh contributes the general introduction to the volume on the Book of Revelation, Dr. Arthur S. Peake an essay on Principles of Interpretation. The extracts on the various passages are drawn from a wide range of ancient and modern authors, and are full of helpful suggestions, and aids to the understanding of the books.

The Life of Love, by Prebendary H. W. Hinde, M.A. (Religious Tract Society, paper 9d.), is a small book with a great theme. Into a short space its author has packed a harvest of thought garnered from a rich experience and close study of the mind of Christ and of St. Paul. The first chapter explains the Motive of the Life as shown in St. Paul's experience, "The love of Christ constraineth." The three following chapters deal with the Measure—in Self-negation, in Spirit enduement and in World Service. The next chapter, "The Manifestation," shows the significance of the supreme example in St. John xiii. The final chapter is on "the Mainspring—the love of God" which appeals to us to lead the Life of Love, loving God and loving others, and in loving service to glorify Him. The heart of Christianity is revealed in these thought-provoking chapters.

"Many of the clergy to-day, whether to their liking or otherwise, have much leisure time, and it is a pity that educated men do not occupy this more profitably than is sometimes the case." With this rebuke Mr. H. M. Barron, B.A., Wadham College, Oxford, opens a book entitled *Your Parish History*: How to discover and write it (Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., Ltd., 3s. 6d. net), in which he advises the parsons to provide "an ever-increasing interest and recreation for themselves" by writing the history of their parishes. For those who might say that they did not know how or where to begin, he supplies the necessary information, and gives advice as to the various sources of the history and how they are to be reached. Printed books by previous writers are for the most part to be avoided as they perpetuate mistakes. Every statement must be verified, and if possible the original source discovered and examined. The student is advised as to the best way to use the Record office in Chancery Lane, the Wills office in Somerset House, the Manuscript Room at the British Museum, and the offices of the Society of Genealogists in Bloomsbury Square. He is told of the chief authorities, the Ancient Chronicles, the State Papers, the records of Domesday Book, the Rolls, the lists of Taxpayers, Itineraries, Manorial histories, Monastic Registers, and Parish Registers and Papers. This guide to the source of history will prove a help to those who are contemplating the production of a parochial history, and it may also prove a source of inspiration to those who have not as yet felt able to undertake the historian's task for want of the necessary equipment.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

BERENGAR AND THE REFORM OF SACRAMENTAL DOCTRINE. By the Rev. A. J. Macdonald, D.D. *Longmans, Green & Co.* 21s.

Review by the Rev. Canon A. J. TAIT, D.D.

Whosoever hath, to him shall be given, were the arresting and challenging words in which our Lord gave expression to a law that governs all intellectual achievement ; and it causes us no surprise to learn from Dr. Macdonald that in pursuing one bit of research he was being led to another, and that this book on the Berengarian controversy owes its inception to his study of the life, the work and the writing of Lanfranc (*Lanfranc*, Oxford University Press). What may cause us surprise is the fact that the subject of the book now under review has "not hitherto been allowed the dimensions of a volume in English."

We congratulate and thank the author for having supplied the deficiency. For English readers he has done in respect of Berengar what Bishop Handley Moule did in respect of Ratramn and Bishop Ridley in his book *Bishop Ridley on the Lord's Supper* (Seeley & Co., 1895), and, we may add, what the published researches of N. Dimock have done in respect of the Eucharistic doctrine of the English Church (available since 1908 in the editions published by Longmans, Green & Co., notably *The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Eucharistic Worship in the English Church, The History of the Book of Common Prayer in its bearing on present Eucharistic Controversies, and Notes on the Fulham Conference*, 1900).

There are two outstanding facts in the history of Eucharistic doctrine to which Dr. Macdonald's account of the Berengarian controversy bears its strong witness. The first fact is that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is a relatively late development. It is true, the author warns us against the opinion, which appears to exist in some quarters, that it was not the recognized doctrine of the Church until the thirteenth century : he is prepared to place it in that category two centuries earlier. But the fact remains that it was a relatively late development. In the ninth century Ratramn was commissioned by Charles the Bald to denounce as an innovating error the opinion that the Eucharistic elements become through consecration the Lord's Body and Blood *ipsius rei veritate* (see Moule, *op. cit.*, p. 288).

The second fact is that the Evangelical interpretation, which associates with the consecrated elements *the value* of the thing signified, does not date from the time of the Reformation : "it is no mere teaching of yesterday, but has a long and honourable history from the Apostles to Berengar." Indeed a notable feature of the position of Ratramn in the first Eucharistic controversy, and of Berengar in the second, and of the English Reformers in the third, is the claim that they were not introducing novelty, but were standing for Apostolicity and the true tradition of the Church.

Their writings are rich in Patristic citation, and their appeal is to the New Testament as interpreted by the Fathers of the Church.

"It is necessary to go behind the Reformation in order to trace adequately the venerable history of the Evangelical tradition, and when we do that we find it flourishing in the very centuries when Catholicism was in the making" (Preface, p. ix).

Dr. Macdonald's book is divided into two parts: the first part describes with fullness of detail the life and work of Berengar, the second part is doctrinal and contains a careful examination of Eucharistic opinion of centuries nine to twelve.

The Biographical section, which provides in the footnotes a critical examination of the work of Continental scholars, gives us the detailed history of the Second Eucharistic controversy. Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, in his book on the Thirty-Nine Articles (published A.D. 1699), wrote of Berengar that he was "a man of great piety, so that he passed for a saint, and was of such learning that, when he was brought before Pope Nicolaus, no man could resist him." Nevertheless in the end Berengar was silenced.

"Many councils" (writes Burnet) "were held upon this matter; and these, together with the terrors of burning, which was then beginning to be the common punishment of heresy, made him renounce his opinion: but he returned to it again; yet he afterwards renounced it: though Lanfranc reproaches him, that it was not the love of truth, but the fear of death, that brought him to it. And his final retracting of that renouncing of his opinion is lately found in France, as I have been credibly informed. Thus this opinion, that in the ninth century was generally received, and was condemned by neither pope nor council, was become so odious in the eleventh century, that none durst own it: and he who had the courage to own it, yet was not resolute enough to stand to it. The anathemas of the church, and the terrors of burning, were infallible things to silence contradiction at least, if not to gain assent" (Burnet, *Articles*, Ed. 1845, p. 381).

Dr. Macdonald's estimate of Berengar helps us to understand the position.

"The story of Berengarianism illustrates the fate which overtakes ideas when unsupported by a dominant personality for their publication. Berengar was not a Luther. His temperament was not qualified for the rough-and-tumble of life among ambitious churchmen, who place expediency before principle and lose no opportunity of advancing themselves by crowding to the wall the men of scholarship and thought. His personal influence was exerted rather in the class-room than the council-chamber. Before the shallow but confident criticism of zealots like Humbert, or experienced pleaders like Lanfranc, he was unable to make an impression. That his ideas made an appeal when quietly considered is proved by the attitude of Hildebrand, and by the long list of distinguished clergy who were counted among his friends. But he had no force of personality sufficient to impress the minds of adversaries. Within his smaller academic sphere, in the presence of the generous open-mindedness of young men when listening to intellectual genius, the spirit of Berengar felt no restraint. Here he was master of himself. Here could he successfully plant his teaching and draw the love of those who listened" (pp. 214 f).

In the doctrinal section of the book, the author shows Berengar's place in the stream of tradition. He completed rather than started a long line of spiritual teachers who stood for the principle of dynamic

symbolism in the Eucharist, the Elements being regarded as *relatively* changed by the consecration which gives to them the *value*, and produces through their faithful use the effect, of the Body and Blood of Christ. The theory that the consecration in the Eucharist is evacuated of meaning and effect, if the Elements are not thereby rendered tabernacles of the Lord, has no place in this tradition. The consecration gives to the Elements "the spiritual value of the Body and Blood of the Lord. But the spiritual actuality depends on the relation or attitude of the recipient to the Sacrament, and mere reception does not effect communion. Berengar draws the Augustinian distinction between a sacrament and the thing of the sacrament" (p. 262).

The following six chapters provide a well-annotated examination and discussion of the teaching of both sides in the controversy. There follow three chapters on the history of Eucharistic doctrine in the twelfth century, when medieval theory was developed in the era before the fourth Lateran Council. The book closes with an estimate of the influence of Berengarian teaching upon the English Church.

"To-day there are not wanting signs that his theory of dynamic-symbolism, expressed not in the terms of virtue or effectiveness, but of value, will come again into its own. . . . Modern thought is moving towards a new interpretation of symbolism. In the doctrine of Berengar, derived philosophically from Neo-Platonism, theologically from Augustine, a foundation can be found upon which to create a new interpretation of eucharistic symbolism, centring round the Berengarian conception of the religious value or effect—the dynamic influence of the consecrated symbol upon the believing communicant. So the great Reformation doctrine of Faith, which is also being re-emphasized, will be given its true function in sacramental doctrine" (p. 2414).

The author has added a rich bibliography, and the indexing has been thoroughly done. It is a great book: and I do not hesitate to think that it will be indispensable for any serious study of this phase of Eucharistic history.

THE VATICAN COUNCIL. The Story told from the inside in Bishop Ullathorne's Letters. By Dom Cuthbert Butler. *Longmans*. 2 Vols. 25s.

HISTORY OF THE PAPACY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (1864-78). By J. B. Bury. *Macmillan*. 10s.

We hope that these two books will have many readers, for it is necessary for students of contemporary events to understand the position of the Church of Rome and the doctrines held by it. We are told that the adjourned Vatican Council will soon meet again and that its proceedings will be of surpassing interest. The Council that defined and declared the Infallibility of the Pope, in the teeth of much teaching to the contrary, marked an epoch in Church History. The interpretation of the Dogma may be either Maximist or Minimist—the fact remains that since its promulgation Encyclicals from Rome have greatly increased in number and they are received by the faithful as if they are infallible and the duty of obedience

is taught by every Roman Catholic Bishop and Priest. As long as it is compatible with policy, the documents remain infallible, but even when they are endorsed as in the case of the *Apostolicæ Curæ* by the Pope in later documents, they seem to have only a temporary value when events make it necessary to forget their contents. And from Dom Cuthbert Butler we gather that for the last hundred years only two occasions occurred when the Pope spoke infallibly, i.e. when he declared the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and declared his own infallibility.

Dom Cuthbert Butler is very anxious to defend the freedom of the Council and uses the Letters of the able Roman Catholic Bishop of Birmingham to prove his point. He has also had the advantage over previous writers of consulting the complete records of Mansi, and therefore has had before him the speeches made and a running commentary on the proceedings. He is most anxious to discredit Salmon, Dollinger and Lord Acton, who, according to him, have given misleading accounts of the Council and its proceedings. We are told that they are wrong when they say the speeches were either not heard or misheard by men who did not possess familiarity with Latin. On the first point we gather that Bishop Ullathorne had no difficulty in hearing even when acoustical conditions were bad and when they were improved; and although he approves of the changes made in the Hall, it does not seem to us that they ever made the Hall ideal for a Conference. As to the non-intelligibility of Latin, Dom Cuthbert Butler argues that he has come across only one instance of such difficulty: "While Pie was making a great speech some Italian Bishops called out that they could not understand. He repeated a sentence slowly in his best Italian style, and then said, 'Gallus sum, et Gallice loquor.'" This, we think, is evidence that there was difficulty, and we are sufficiently sceptical of the gifts of Bishops to believe that even those trained in Latin-speaking Seminaries retained the gift of following long discourses more like treatises than anything else. He is also anxious to show that the Council was not in the hands of the Pope, who only paid L.200 a day for the cost of the proceedings. But he admits that there were over 200 Italian Bishops as compared with 110 from France and Germany. The poorer Italian Bishops were unable to afford carriages to attend on wet days. The Pope took a leading part behind the scenes and rebuked those Bishops who spoke most strongly against the Dogma—stating on one occasion that he was tradition!

But one of the worst features of the whole Council was the action of those who so manipulated the choice of the chief Committee as to exclude all who were in favour of the non-defining the Dogma. The sinister figure of Manning flits to and fro as chief whip of the Infallibilists. He was a master of every cunning plan to secure the Decree, and Ullathorne certainly loses no love in his remarks on his proceedings. It is plain to all that the Council was summoned to decide "*the question*," and that all else was mere skirmishing. We have no doubt that Ullathorne and Dom

Cuthbert Butler desire to set forth things as they were, but impartial readers, while admitting that the Vatican Council was not as disorderly or as carefully manipulated as other Councils, will come to the conclusion that the Pope who on his own authority declared the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception could not suffer the Council to act freely in opposing what he had claimed. The word "freedom" has various meanings, and we leave it to students to determine its connotation with regard to the Vatican Council.

Professor Bury is an Irishman from the North, while Dom Cuthbert is a Dublin Roman Catholic. Bury had the training of an historian and had his prejudices, as Dom Cuthbert has his. His book is much briefer and his statements much more direct. His discussion on the Syllabus (which, by the way, Spanish Bishops still declare has the force of Law in their country, and Maltese Bishops act as if it has the same vigour in a British Colony) merits the closest reading. It is at once a corrective to the longer work and a piece of very clear writing. The impression left on the mind is that Infallibility depends on the interpretation given it by the Pope, and in the last resort Roman Catholics are in a very large number of matters without that "indefectible certitude"—the absence of which they make a source of attack on Protestants. We close by recommending students to read carefully both these books, for within a short time we may find ourselves in the midst of a discussion on Infallibility. We may say that we have re-read the pages in Salmon on the Council, and with the fuller light thrown by the two Treatises under review we have come to the conclusion that they may be trusted as a truthful *résumé* of the proceedings and work of the Council. We do not place implicit confidence in Ollivier, and are not prepared to write down as untrustworthy Acton, Döllinger and Friedrich. In spite of all Dom Cuthbert Butler says, we believe with Bury on what to us is of more practical importance than the exact meaning of Infallibility. "The true conclusion is that the *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII has been confirmed by the Vatican decree, and that its doctrine is binding *de fide* on members of the Church of Rome," and this means the "direct power" of the Pope over temporals.

MY HOPES AND FEARS FOR THE CHURCH. Edited by the Very Rev.

H. R. L. Sheppard. *John Murray*. 7s. 6d.

This book had evidently been written some months before publication, and it therefore may not be as "up to date" as would be wished. It professes not in any way to dictate to the Lambeth Bishops, but it has been composed with the Conference in view. It is by no means of one way of thinking, for the writers are drawn from all parties in the Church and therefore we have subjects approached from different angles. We have found the comparison of views extremely attractive, for they prove that what one set of minds deprecate, others approve. Dr. Mozley holds that on the main issue of Reunion "as in 1920" should be the decision of the Conference in 1930. He is, however, sympathetic in his treatment

of the South India Scheme. But he contends that nothing should be said which "should commit Anglicans to the view that episcopacy was simply the most convenient form of church government and the one most likely to promote and safeguard unity. Secondly, during the interim, ministers who have not received episcopal ordination should, under no circumstances, be given charge of Anglican congregations. . . . The question of intercommunion during the interim could be left for settlement by the representatives of the Anglican Church in South India and of the United South India Church. Certainly there should be no difficulty in the admission of United South Indian Christians to Anglican altars. There are only two final obstacles of the nature of Church order to the receiving of the sacrament of Holy Communion—lack of baptism and formal excommunication." We welcome the last two sentences from his pen. Dr. Mozley writes wisely on the Prayer Book issue when he says, "Perhaps something like a microcosm of the mind of the communicant members of the Church of England may be found in the resolution of the Parochial Church Council of an important Church, approving of the Revised Book, but in a rider expressing the hope that it never would be used in that Church."

We have quoted Dr. Mozley as one of the central minds in the book and when, for example, we turn to the Essays of the Bishop of Middleton, the two Anglo-Catholic writers, and of Canon Guy Rogers, we see differences of temperament and something more in their expositions. Mr. Child tells us that "all the time the dignitaries who love to speak of the English Church as a 'Bridge' Church are either feverishly lopping off the posts at either end, forgetful that folk do not live on a Bridge but on the land at each side of the stream." "A canon of Westminster has outraged the religious convictions of Christians by openly questioning the Resurrection," Dr. Parsons writes: "I hope the Bishops will most carefully consider whether the Church's loyalty to the essentials of Christian truth really requires insistence on the acceptance of these clauses in the Creed which deal with our Lord's Birth and the physical Resurrection as a necessity for sincere and honest membership in the Church. Can they be included among those things of which the rule holds good *in non necessariis diversitas*? I hope they can." And Canon Guy Rogers says: "The real interest of Lambeth will be to see whether it will boldly welcome the coming day, or keep the shutters up, or merely fiddle nervously with the bolts." It is impossible to review briefly a book of this type, which provokes agreement and disagreement as we turn from writer to writer. Its hall-mark is sincerity, and this is a real benefit.

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF RELIGION: THEIR HISTORY IN RELATION TO OTHER FORMULARIES, ENGLISH AND FOREIGN.
By Harold Smith, D.D. S.P.C.K. 2s.

Dr. Harold Smith, of St. John's Hall, Highbury, has had considerable experience as a teacher of theology, and he is also well

known as an accurate and scholarly writer on historical subjects. His work as a teacher has led him to believe that there is room at the present time for a short account of the Thirty-Nine Articles, and he has produced in brief compass a valuable statement of the principal facts essential to an understanding of the origin and development of our English standard of Doctrine. The older work by Hardwick is well known to students and still remains the standard text-book, but since Hardwick's time a number of fresh points have come to light or been brought into prominence and with these Dr. Smith deals. It is specially appropriate that this brief history should appear so soon after the issue of Dr. Griffith Thomas' great book on the Articles—*The Principles of Theology*, which has turned the attention of many Evangelical students afresh to the value and interpretation of the great statement of the doctrine of our Church.

Dr. Smith explains in his opening chapter the special character of the various Declarations of Faith which appeared in the Reformation and post-Reformation periods. They were coloured by the conditions of thought of the time, and the emphasis on some doctrines and the omission of others were largely the outcome of the Roman controversy on the one hand and the Anabaptist contentions on the other. The first of these Doctrinal Statements was The Confession of Augsburg in 1530. The character of this is indicated, and from it is traced the series of doctrinal pronouncements which followed in more or less rapid succession till the XXXIX Articles assumed their ultimate form in 1571. Various disputed points are carefully considered, the evidence is weighed, and Dr. Smith's opinion carries the weight due to learning and sound judgment. The differences between the Lutherans and the Swiss Protestants had their influence, especially in regard to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The brief account of the Council of Trent gives a clear impression of the sessions of that important gathering, and the influences at work to secure the repudiation of the doctrines of the Reformers. The later doctrinal statements are explained. The Lambeth Articles of 1595, the Irish Articles of 1615, the Armenian controversy and the King's controversy are dealt with. The Westminster Confession receives special notice, for as Dr. Smith explains, it is little known in Anglican circles, and he adds: "In my opinion the Assembly forms part of the history of the Church of England, and, if allowance be made for its Augustinianism and Calvinism, its Confession is a most valuable theological document. It is the best available standard document of British Protestant theology, and knowledge of it and of the Directory secures against crude ideas often held of such theology, while their language often shows that similar phrases in our Prayer-Book need not be taken in an Anglo-Catholic sense."

The concluding chapter deals with the important matter of Subscription to the Articles. We recommend very heartily to students and others interested in the history of our doctrine this useful and reliable handbook.

SOUTH INDIAN SCHEMES. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D.
S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

No reader of this book will learn anything fresh concerning the South Indian Reunion proposals. The best sources of information are still the "Proposed Scheme of Union" prepared by the Joint Committee of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, and the other contracting parties (*S.P.C.K.*, 1s.), and Bishop Waller's *Church Union in South India* (*S.P.C.K.*, 2s.). Of the thirteen chapters into which Dr. Sparrow Simpson's book is divided, only five are devoted to the scheme. The rest deal with Lausanne, Canon Streeter, Dr. Headlam, Apostolic Succession, the Lambeth Conference, etc.—all matters which have been treated over and over again in current periodicals and special treatises. The only apparent reason for the writing of this book, and it is an insufficient reason, is the desire to assist with the wrecking of the scheme at all costs. Indeed the critics are getting nervous as Lambeth draws near. Dr. Sparrow Simpson clearly expresses alarm by attempting to prejudice before the event any opinion favourable to the proposals, which Lambeth may put forth. We are informed that "no individual can be justified in acting on a resolution of the Lambeth Conference unless and until that resolution has been accepted by the local Church of which that individual is a member"; he quotes Dr. Gore's plea that Lambeth is purely a consultative body, and continues, "a Lambeth Conference is not part of the synodical constitution of the Church, has no canonical authority. . . ." All this may be true, but the practical value of the decisions of Lambeth as the only œcumenical body of the world-wide Anglican Communion is a fact which even Dr. Sparrow Simpson is driven, also, to admit. Canon Streeter and Dr. Headlam are, of course, directly criticized, the academic apologia based upon Apostolic Succession is emphasized with more than the usual pedantic reiteration, and the theory is buttressed by an attempt to trace the succession back to Christ through the apostolic commission, which is an entirely different thing. The bankruptcy of constructive criticism among Dr. Gore and his friends has all along been made obvious by their insistence upon the comparatively modern notion of Apostolic Succession. The central feature of interest for Anglicans in the South India Scheme remains unimpaired. Episcopacy is given a central place, and the Free Churches are willing to adopt it. The strength of Dr. Palmer's presentation of the case lies in the fact that the Free Churches in South India are desirous of accepting Episcopacy as a necessary contribution towards the new constitution, to which they also are contributing special features. The practical problems of the mission-field, which are compelling Anglican and Presbyterian, Congregationalist and Wesleyan to seek for union are ignored in this book; nothing is suggested which might help towards amending the scheme; a deliberate attempt is made to belittle the movement of the Spirit, which has surely driven the contracting parties, they know not how, through ten years of negotiation, into the present atmosphere of fellowship and Christian comity. This is the most distressing feature in the book.

SHORT HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By C. P. S. Clarke, M.A. *Longmans*, 1929. 10s. 6d.

Prebendary Clarke has rendered a service to all students of Church History by writing this book. It is the fruit of wide reading and of practical experience as a Lecturer at Salisbury Theological College. In no other volume in English is the whole field of Church History covered. The Early Church receives some 50 pages, the Middle Ages 260, the Reformation 100 and the Modern Period about 240 pages respectively. This allotment indeed fairly maintains the relative balance of significance between the several epochs. It was time that the over-emphasis upon the first five centuries, and the comparative neglect of the Middle Ages, which have been the weakness of English writers on Church History, should be rectified, and Prebendary Clarke leads the way in this necessary reform. But it is doubtful whether the first section supplies quite enough information for students who have to show a competent knowledge of the early period. A little more space might have been devoted to this era, without unduly interfering with the admirable sketch of the Middle Ages.

In several places the English is loosely colloquial, and some curious slips in detail appear. For example, Lanfranc was Prior not Abbot of Bec; the protagonist against Berengar was Humbert, not Lanfranc; the Corpus Christi festival was first officially recognized in 1264 not 1262; Urban VI, not Urban II, was the contemporary of the anti-pope Clement VII; the next Lambeth Conference will not be held in 1931, nor are the Baptists negotiating with Wesleyans and Anglicans for union with the South India United Church. The sketch of the Scottish Episcopal Church is inadequate, and reference should be made to Sir Thos. Fowell Buxton's work on behalf of the liberation of the slaves, and of the work of Cambridge University and its colleges among the settlements and missions of South London.

But these are small defects in a work of great merit. The treatment of Protestantism and Evangelicalism is full and sympathetic; the account of foreign missions, and of the Eastern Church, is well done. The book will not only be of the utmost value for every student, but its pages, especially on the Modern Period, form an enjoyable recreation for the general reader. It deserves a very wide circulation.

The Rev. Frank H. L. Paton, B.D., in *Patteson of Melanesia* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d. net), gives a brief life of John Coleridge Patteson, Missionary Bishop. The story is a familiar one to all interested in Missionary work, and Mr. Paton tells it again with freshness and charm. His aim is to interest others in one of the great heroes of the Mission Field, and he has succeeded admirably in his task. It is a life to inspire others to give themselves to the work.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

DEAN WACE HOUSE, WINE OFFICE COURT,
FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

Reunion.—In view of the Lambeth Conference the following pamphlets may be of interest : *Steps towards Reunion* by Bishops W. G. Peel and J. J. Willis (1s.) ; *Intercommunion* by the Rev. J. P. S. R. Gibson (2d.) ; *The Confirmation Rubric : Whom does it bind ?* by the Rev. H. M. Gwatkin, D.D. (2d.) ; *The Malines Conference* by the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft (3d.) ; *Why South India Churches are considering Union* (6d.) ; *Church Union in South India* (2d.) by the Bishop of Rangoon ; *Christian Unity in the New Testament* (6d.) by the Rev. O. A. Crawford Irwin, B.D. ; *A Modern Theory about Confirmation* (2d.) by the Bishop of Tuam ; *The Meaning of Holy Baptism* (1s.) by the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton ; *Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation in relation to Inter-Communion and Reunion* (2s. 6d.) by the Ven. Archdeacon Hunkin, D.D. ; and the following Kikuyu Tracts : “ *That They All may be One* ” by Dr. Moule, late Bishop of Durham ; *The Ministry and Unity* by the Bishop of Manchester ; *Episcopacy in Scripture and Episcopacy in the Church of England* by the Rev. H. M. Gwatkin, D.D. ; *What is the Church ?* by Archbishop D’Arcy, and *Co-operation at the Home Base* by the Rev. H. U. Weitbrecht Stanton, D.D. These tracts are published at 1d. each.

Other valuable books and papers on the subject are : *Documents on Christian Unity* (7s. 6d.) by Dr. G. K. A. Bell, Bishop of Chichester, and *Church Union in South India*, the story of the negotiations (2s.) by the Bishop of Madras. Some copies are still obtainable of the Bishop of Chelmsford’s book *Episcopacy and Unity* (1s. 3d.) net.

Book-Racks.—During the summer months in many seaside places the book-racks supplied by the League have been found to provide a very useful means of distributing literature. In one particular case in the West Country the book-rack at a village Church, which is visited by a very large number of people, disposes of many hundreds of pamphlets during the season. The racks can be supplied as follows : one which contains space for a Parish Magazine, and which is suitable for standing on a table, 22 in. × 12 in. × 7½ in., and the other, size 19 in. × 22 in. × 2½ in., more suitable for placing on a wall. This is designed to show more manuals, but holds fewer of each kind. Each rack is fitted with a strong money-box, with a lock and key, in which purchasers can place the amount of their purchase. A label is affixed to the front of the box with the words “ Please take one and place money in the box.” Both racks can be supplied at 16s. net each, or with 100 1d. manuals at 20s., or 100 2d. manuals, 25s., carriage extra, which varies according to distance, but might be taken on an average at 2s. 6d. The racks are sent packed in strong wooden cases.

In the correspondence column of *The Church Gazette* for June the following is an extract from an interesting letter : “ I find great ignorance among all classes on these vital questions of our religion, and by giving leaflets, pamphlets, booklets, etc., of which the National Church League has such a large supply, I have helped many people to get a better knowledge and understanding of them.”

Private Prayers for a Boy.—We are glad to be able to announce the immediate publication of a book of private prayers for a boy, compiled by the

Rev. R. R. Williams, of Leyton Parish Church, under the title of *Father and Son*. The book contains prayers for a week and opens with a concise instruction on the Christian Religion, God, Jesus Christ, The Church, and Prayer. The Lord's Prayer is then given with special annotations, and the daily prayers, morning and evening, follow. The little book is published in dukeen covers at 3*d.* per copy or 18*s.* per 100.

The Eastward Position.—A reprint of the pamphlet on the Eastward Position by the Rev. Gilbert Karney, sometime Vicar of St. John's, Paddington, has been issued, price 2*d.* net. This pamphlet is a valuable inquiry into the whole question of the position.

Jewel's Apology.—In response to several requests Canon F. Meyrick's booklets *On the English Reformation* and *The Faith of English Churchmen*, being extracts from Jewel's *Apology of the Church of England*, have been bound together in an attractive cloth cover. The book is published at 1*s.*

Young People's Services.—A third edition of the Rev. R. Bren's *Young People's Services* (3*d.* each or 18*s.* per 100) has been issued, making the eleventh thousand. This contains a fourth form of Service based on the Exhortation and the Catechism, with an additional Psalm. The aim of the book is three-fold. First, to provide within limited compass a variety of services. Thus while only four forms of service are provided, each form is capable of considerable variation. Secondly, to help children to pray and not merely to hear prayers read. To this end the greater part of each service has been arranged so that (if it is desired) the whole congregation can join with the Minister. Thirdly, to secure a sense of reality in worship. An endeavour has been made not to sacrifice dignity of language to simplicity. At the same time the thoughts are expressed in phraseology natural to most children and young people.

Collecting Boxes.—In response to several requests the Church Book Room now stocks collapsible cardboard collecting-boxes in a convenient form for Freewill and other offerings. These can be dispatched for 4*s.* per 100, post free. Prices for quantities can be had on application, and if any special printing is needed this can be done on payment of a small charge which depends on the extent of the printing required.

Church Booklet Series.—Two additions to the *Church Booklet* series (1*d.* each) have just been issued, reprints of Bishop Handley Moule's *Holy Baptism*, and *Bible Reading* by Mr. W. Guy Johnson. These two booklets have both had a large sale in the previous editions, and will be found very helpful for circulation in parishes. The other booklets in this series are: *A Communicant's Manual* by the Ven. C. W. Wilson; *Time to Think*, for Invalids, by E. B. B.; *Why Go to Church?* by "Pax"; *A Talk About Your Baby's Baptism* by the Rev. B. Herklots; *Conversion* by Bishop Handley Moule; *Why stay away from the Holy Communion?* by "Pax"; *The Holy Communion: Its Meaning* by Bishop Chavasse; *Fasting Communion* by the Rev. J. Russell Howden, B.D.; *Should the Vestments of the Roman Mass be used in the National Church?* by W. Guy Johnson; *Protestant and Catholic: Can We be both?* by Prebendary E. A. Eardley-Wilmot. These booklets are sold at the rate of 7*s.* per 100 for distribution.