

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, 1936.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen.

IN accordance with our practice for the past few years, we give in this issue of *THE CHURCHMAN* the greater number of the papers which were read at the recent Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen. The subject for consideration was the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on the relations between Church and State. The papers furnish a valuable introduction to a question which is likely to provoke discussion and controversy for some time to come. There were not many points of importance which were not raised either in the papers or in the discussion upon them which followed. The Rev. C. M. Chavasse, M.C., Master of St. Peter's Hall, introduced the subject in an outspoken address from the chair. The Rev. D. E. W. Harrison, Vice-Principal of Wycliffe Hall, dealt with "Church and State in Scripture." The Rev. V. J. K. Brook, Chaplain of All Souls, Oxford, briefly summarised, from the point of view of the main subject, the History of the National Church, and the Bishop of Norwich emphasised its value. The paper of the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D., Principal of St. John's Hall, Highbury, was on "The Life and Government of the National Church." The Report itself with its recommendations and accompanying volume of evidence was discussed by the Ven. Archdeacon Storr, a member of the Commission on Church and State, and by Mr. Albert Mitchell. The Conference was concluded by a paper from the Rev. T. G. Mohan, Assistant Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, on "The Church and the People." It was altogether a very satisfactory and satisfying programme for a Conference lasting only two days. One result of the deliberations was to give an urgent call to all Churchmen to study thoroughly not only the Report, but the supplementary volume containing the evidence upon which it is, or is presumed to be, based.

The Findings 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.

1. The Conference greatly regrets the re-opening of controversy within the Church by the publication of the Report. It deprecates the dissipation of the energies of members of our English Church on controversies that must necessarily be barren at a time when the more urgent questions of Evangelisation and Intercommunion and ultimate Home Reunion (with which this Conference has always been closely associated) call for unprejudiced consideration.

2. The Conference, while regretting the one-sided character of the Commission, pays grateful tribute to the desire of the Commission to be fair.

3. The Conference is hampered in its consideration by the indefinite way in which such expressions as "The Church" and "Spiritual" are used in the Report.

4. The Conference is of opinion that it is impossible for Evangelicals to compromise on a fundamental principle of the English Reformation, namely, the restoration of the Sacrament for a Sacrifice and of open Communion for the Mass. The Conference is convinced that, at the present time, it would be impossible, at a Round Table Conference, to secure agreement on such questions as permissible deviations from the Order of Holy Communion and Reservation, and implores the Archbishops not to revive controversy by calling such a Conference.

5. The Conference declares again its belief that the Order of Holy Communion contained in the Book of Common Prayer is agreeable to the Word of God; and it holds that the existing Prayer of Consecration is the most scriptural that has yet been evolved in the Christian Church.

6. The Conference denies that there is anything in the existing relations between Church and State that prevents the Church of England from doing the work which is, at present, being left undone.

7. It is an obligation of a National Church to co-operate with the State in matters concerning the character, conduct and welfare of its people.

8. The relations between Church and State in England are not matters of purely local concern, but have an influence upon Christian communities throughout the world.

9. The Conference emphasises afresh the need for definite and systematic education, more particularly of the younger members of the Church, in matters of doctrine and worship, and more intensive pastoral evangelisation.

10. The Conference cannot close its Findings without recording its conviction that everything will be fruitless, unless in the Power of the Crucified, Risen and Ascended Christ we seek to bring each individual to a personal relationship with God through Him.

The Proposed Round Table Conference.

There was a good deal said in the discussion with regard to the proposal for a Round Table Conference and the propriety of Evangelicals taking part in it. It was pointed out that a Conference to consider the question of Reservation as a whole and whether or no it can or should be permitted ought of course to contain Evangelicals in order that their views on what the Commission describes as a "vital" matter, should be represented and adequately expressed. But a Conference where it is taken for granted that Reservation ought to be and must be conceded, and where the only purpose for which it is called is to devise means whereby this may be practically effected, is one in which Evangelical churchmen would be wholly out of place. Indeed, it is inconceivable that they would so far stultify themselves as to attend. There

is, moreover, another aspect of the matter which Mr. Albert Mitchell and others emphasised very strongly. Assuming that the proposed Conference is unfettered in its reference and that Evangelicals have a place upon it, they must be thoroughly representative of Evangelical opinion. It will not be sufficient for the Archbishops or others to nominate persons known to them who may be more or less amenable to the pressure of a majority or of official opinion. In numbers they should be proportionate to the size of the proposed Conference and they should be so nominated or appointed as to give the assurance that they are really representative. We are, however, of the opinion expressed by the Rev. C. M. Chavasse and other speakers that the present time is most inopportune for the calling of such a Conference. We are told that the Report of the Doctrinal Commission may be expected before very long and that Report will probably raise the whole matter afresh and from many different points of view. Why then should we now stir up what must be a controversy of the most acute character only to have it revived in two or three years' time. As Sir Thomas Inskip has so frequently reminded us, there is nothing in the relations between Church and State which hinders any clergyman—or layman, for that matter—from carrying on their spiritual work of Evangelisation and instruction. It is not existing conditions, but the restless and continual raising of controversial issues that hinders it.

The Commission One-sided.

The Report of the Commission raises so many questions that it would take a much longer time than was afforded by a Conference lasting only two days, to deal with them all. It was, however, possible to bring out some of its leading features and to emphasise them, and of these the outstanding fact of the partisan character of the Commission was fully noted. The protest of the Bishop of Norwich was more than once referred to. This was made in characteristically courteous and moderate language by the Bishop at the conclusion of his oral examination by the Commission, and is printed as an appendix to the Volume of Evidence. We give the following quotation :

This particular Commission was specially and directly constituted because of the fact that the House of Commons objected to the Measure which would have made the use of the new Prayer Book legal. This consideration prevents this particular Commission from being such a Commission as might have been constituted at any time whatever in recent years. The occasion, the time and the manner of its erection attach it directly to the fact that the House of Commons, acting strictly in accordance with the terms of what is called the Enabling Act, refused to authorise the new Prayer Book. It does not take many words to express my view, but I wish to state emphatically that it appears fair to consider that the direct connection existing between this Commission and the rejection of the new Prayer Book made it very desirable that in the personnel of the Commission one or two persons known to have been against the new Prayer Book should have been included, just as at least four persons who actually voted in favour of it have been included.

It is essential, therefore, to keep constantly before our minds the fact that no one who opposed the new Prayer Book was allowed a place on the Commission. The Report, as a consequence, can have no claim to impartiality ; and it manifestly proceeds on the assumption that the House of Commons while possessing an indisputable legal right, to reject the new Prayer Book, ought, morally, to have passed it. Another assumption underlying the whole Report is that the large majority vote of the Church Assembly in favour of the new Prayer Book represented the wishes of the English Church as a whole. The Commissioners might well have reflected on a statement contained in the Bishop of Chichester's most valuable and instructive *Life* of Archbishop Davidson on this very point. The Archbishop wrote :

I have found it very difficult to know what, speaking generally, ought to be my own line in regard to proposals for changing the Communion Office. On the one hand my own instinct would have been for leaving that Office alone and adhering to what has satisfied English people for more than three centuries. And I am certain that such is the view of the overwhelming majority of English Churchmen throughout the country. (Vol. II, pp. 1331-2.)

This witness is true, and in face of it any claim that the vote of the Assembly truly represented the mind of the Church was rightly dismissed by the Conference.

Vital Matters.

A point in the Report to which Prebendary Hinde called attention is the admission on page 57 that there is disagreement within the Church on certain "vital matters" and that among these two are prominent, namely, the use and limits of Reservation and permissible deviations from the order of Holy Communion. It is important to note this admission, for the two matters specified are those which provoked the greatest part of the opposition to the revised Prayer Book ; and the advocates of that Book constantly asserted that it contained no change of doctrine. But such matters are only "vital" when some change of the kind is understood to be involved in their adoption.

As a matter of fact, the assertion that the adoption of the new Prayer Book implied no doctrinal change was too specious to deceive anyone who had given any serious attention to the matter ; and it now appears to be frankly abandoned. There is an oblique reference to the proposed Round Table Conference on the same page of the Report, to which attention was called at Oxford, which, taken in conjunction with some words of the Archbishop of York when introducing the Report to the Church Assembly, should be carefully noted. Elsewhere it is implied that substantial agreement must be reached before the proposals of the Commission can go forward and that minorities must not be overridden in the process of bringing them about. But here it is only said, "We recognise that these proposals cannot be carried out until a new and deter-

mined *effort* has been made to secure agreement between men and women of different schools of thought within the Church of England on those matters, in particular, which were mainly responsible for the rejection of the Prayer Book Measures of 1927 and 1928." An *effort* to secure agreement is not the same thing as agreement; and the Archbishop of York's statement in the Church Assembly that no body of Church opinion "that *calls itself considerable*" would be allowed to stand in the way of effecting the changes which it was desired to push through had a distinctly ominous sound and ought not to be forgotten.

Church Courts and the Law.

The question of the reform of ecclesiastical courts was incidentally referred to by Mr. Albert Mitchell, who has more than once pointed out that what is needed is to modernise procedure, as has been done to a great extent in matters of civil jurisdiction, and to concentrate upon securing a strong court of first instance. The cumbrous and costly medieval procedure is a great hindrance to the working of Church Courts, and a really competent Court of first instance would render Appeals less likely to occur or to succeed, so that the question of the appellate tribunal would become of relatively small importance. The Archbishop of York in the Church Assembly expressed the view that the reform of the Courts would not be of much use until there was a *new law* as well as a new instrument for its interpretation. Here is a clear indication of what is in the minds of some, at least, of those who are behind this cry for altering the relations between Church and State. It is not the authority or character of the Courts which has been the real grievance but the law which they have to administer, and if the existing law is opposed to the restoration of the Mass, the Confessional and the adoration of the Virgin Mary, then the law must be altered! A cognate question is raised by the unhappy proposal in the Report that the Canon Law should be revised and brought up to date and that "an authoritative commission should be set up to accomplish what has been long overdue." Canon Law has very little interest for the vast majority of churchmen, its study having been as a rule confined to a few individuals of antiquarian tastes who have been singularly unsuccessful in arousing the least enthusiasm for it outside their own circle. Canon Law does not now bind the laity and it would be a task of considerable difficulty to enforce it upon the clergy. It does not seem a hopeful adventure to seek to revive a system of Canon Law which in the sixteenth century was formally declared by the Convocations, the Parliament and the King to be "much prejudicial to the King's prerogative royal, repugnant to the laws and statutes of the realm, and over-much onerous to the King's Highness and his subjects."¹

¹ 25 Henry VIII, c. 19.

The Conference at Bucarest.

In June of last year a Delegation appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury as representative of the Church of England took part in a Conference at Bucarest lasting for a week with a Commission representing the Roumanian Church, and a Report upon the results arrived at has just been issued. We cannot do more than refer to it now, for the Report was not received until this issue of *THE CHURCHMAN* was going to press; we hope to deal fully with the matter later. In the meantime we are bound to express the strongest dissent from the statements upon which, as we understand the Report, agreement has been reached. In the case of the Orthodox Church and the agreement with regard to inter-communion, there was a clause to the effect that neither side expressed any opinion with regard to the doctrinal teaching of the other. The Church of England was thus explicitly absolved from sharing or approving the special dogmas of the Orthodox Church. In the case before us, the Anglican Delegation began by informing the Roumanian leaders that the Thirty-nine Articles are a document secondary to the Prayer Book, by which they must be interpreted, an incorrect and misleading statement which appears, if words have any meaning, intended to disparage the Thirty-nine Articles. It should, we think, be obvious that a formal and official statement of doctrine to which every minister of the Church of England has to declare his adhesion is the standard by which the devotional expressions of the Prayer Book should be interpreted. The converse position would seem to deserve the Euclidean censure "which is absurd." From this unhopeful beginning the Anglican Delegation appears to have "accepted" a series of doctrinal statements from the Roumanian leaders on such subjects as the Eucharist, Scripture and Tradition, Justification and the Ministry, which plainly contradict the statements of the Thirty-nine Articles and the general spirit of the Prayer Book. There are movements for reform and enlightenment in many of the Churches of the East which might be fostered and encouraged by some rapprochement between them and the Church of England; but this will not be effected by an abandonment of the doctrinal principles on which the English Church is founded and which are the ground of her hold on the English people.

In Memoriam.

It is with much regret that we record the death of Mr. G. C. Parkhurst Baxter, Deputy Secretary of the National Church League. Mr. Baxter took an active part in the business of the acquisition of *THE CHURCHMAN* by the League and had at all times the keenest interest in its welfare. For several years he has acted as sub-editor, and his capacity, courtesy and energy were recognised and appreciated by all who came into contact with him. An extended notice of his work appeared in the *Church Gazette* for June last.

THE OXFORD CONFERENCE OF EVANGELICAL CHURCHMEN.

GENERAL SUBJECT: CHURCH AND STATE.

THE REPORT ON CHURCH AND STATE.

Opening Address by the REV. C. M. CHAVASSE, M.A., M.C.,
Master of St. Peter's Hall.

WE are met to consider the anxiously awaited Report of the Archbishops' Commission, set up in 1930, "to enquire into the present relations between Church and State." We must be careful in what spirit we approach so thorny a subject, and especially lest prejudice should prevent us giving it that impartial study which so important an issue demands and the Report itself deserves.

The task of the Commission was rendered doubly difficult by reason both of its origin and also of its composition. The appointment of the Commission was "directly due to the rejection [by Parliament] of the Prayer Book Measure of 1927."¹ When an admittedly delicate question, like the historic relationship between Church and State, is raised in the heat of indignation, if not of petulance, it is unlikely to find the right answer.

As for the composition of the Commission, it was again a bad omen, and as remarkable as it was unusual in English public life, that no person known to have opposed the revised Prayer Book was appointed a Commissioner; and that protest failed to remedy what looked like a packing of the Commission. It speaks volumes, therefore, for the patience, fair-mindedness, and wisdom of the Commissioners that their Report is a valuable contribution towards the elucidation of an intricate problem. Hereafter, it may be found that they have pointed the way to the eventual solution; though neither they nor we are likely to live to see the end of the pilgrimage. After all, we are not yet in sight of the carrying out of the conclusions of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, though it reported thirty years ago.

THE REPORT

The Report first clears out of the way two ill-advised solutions. Disestablishment it rules out as gravely injurious both to Church and State. And "The Scottish Solution" it dismisses as inapplicable. Next, the Report frankly recognises that Parliament cannot grant to the National Assembly full legislative independence in matters of doctrine and ritual, until the various schools of thought in the Church have secured agreement among themselves on those

¹ Report, p. 36.

questions which were mainly responsible for the rejection of the revised Prayer Book. It therefore recommends, as an essential preliminary before any approach to Parliament is possible, the setting up of a Round Table Conference with reference, in particular, to Reservation and the Service of Holy Communion.

Finally, as the Report foresees that "it may take some time to secure such general agreement as ought to exist in the Church before an approach to Parliament is made,"¹ it suggests that an immediate measure be framed regularising non-doctrinal deviations from the Book of Common Prayer. To this recommendation I would join the administrative measures suggested by the Commission for the restoration of discipline in the Church; for it is hard to follow the Report in regarding them as concurrent with, rather than as preliminary to, the general advance towards spiritual agreement and independence.

We shall, I think, come to the conclusion that much of what the Report terms its Interim and Judicial Proposals might well be put into effect forthwith; when the Church would find itself possessed of practically all the freedom it really requires. But it seems to me equally clear that the summoning of a Round Table Conference is dangerously inopportune; and even more perilous, at the present time, the raising of fundamental constitutional issues between Church and State.

PRESENT ACTION INOPPORTUNE.

As I see the position, there are three conditions that must be fulfilled before it is possible even to contemplate any sort of adjustment in the relations between Church and State. First, as the Report so emphatically declares, there is the need of agreement within the Church itself.

Secondly, there is the requirement of order and discipline in the Church; or the demand for spiritual liberty becomes one for spiritual licence and legalised anarchy.

Thirdly, the National Church must in fact, as well as in name, express the religion of the nation; and possess a legislative assembly truly representative of national religious feeling and tradition. This last condition is recognised, in part, by the Report, which is genuinely concerned about the rights of the laity, and admits that "some time must elapse before the general body of Church people becomes accustomed to take its part in the Councils of the Church."²

Only when a State Church is a *united* Church, a *well-ordered* Church, and a *truly national* Church, can it properly expect legislative independence. At present, none of these three conditions finds adequate fulfilment in the Church of England.

THE CHURCH AND UNITY.

First, there is not, as yet, sufficient agreement in the Church for a Round Table Conference to serve any useful purpose. In-

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 64.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 44.

stead, such a Conference would defeat its own object by reviving barren and even bitter strife; and that, just when the Report can speak hopefully of a new and better spirit of mutual understanding growing up in our midst. The object of the Round Table Conference—namely, to settle the chief points of difference in the late Prayer Book dispute—shows how the whole question of Church and State is, at the present juncture, fatally poisoned and prejudiced by its inevitable and close connection with that unhappy controversy. The Church and State Report might with equal accuracy be described as “The History of the Rejection of the Revised Prayer Book, and the Necessary Action thereon.” The second volume of the Report, containing the Evidence of Witnesses, reads like a debate upon the merits of the Deposited Book. And although the Commission expresses the hope of us all, that the excitement caused by the defeat of the Prayer Book Measures eight years ago “has long since died down,”¹ the speeches in the National Assembly, last February, when the Report was first introduced, revealed unmistakably that feeling on the subject still smouldered strongly, and would blaze up again if stirred by any ill-timed Church and State crusade. Why cannot we face facts and frankly recognise that the same generation cannot undertake both a Prayer Book controversy and an impartial consideration of its relations with the State? The fostering of that unity of the Church to which the Commission earnestly invites the co-operation of their fellow Churchmen,² must be a natural development of slow and secret growth; and any premature attempt at a manufactured agreement by a Conference, or the forcing of a division on a challenging issue, would throw us back a dozen years or more, to the time when the late Bishop Burge complained in my hearing that he had never known party feeling run so high in the Church.

There is a further consideration. Is it sanity to risk serious disunion in the Church, and the reopening of still-unhealed wounds, in order to promote a Bill in Parliament which has not the slightest hope of success? The House of Commons would be fully aware—even without reading the Report—that any measure submitted to it, at the present time, for remedying what the Commission terms “the subordination of the Church to Parliament,” was a consequence and a condemnation of their action in twice rejecting the Deposited Book. Is it conceivable that Parliament would thus pass a vote of censure upon itself; and, in the circumstances, would it not be indecent to ask Parliament to do so?

Recall the pledges given by Archbishop Davidson on behalf of the Church during the passage of the Enabling Act. “We are not taking away from Parliament any power which it at present possesses. By all means let Parliament use that power if it will and if it can.” And again, “I rejoice in what has been said as to the recognition of the right and privilege and duty of the Houses of Parliament to exercise absolute freedom of judgment on the

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 96.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 98.

final rejection or acceptance of Measures which come before it in this way"—that is from the National Assembly.¹

Bear in mind, also, the Primate's declaration on December 12, 1927, during the debates on the Deposited Book. "We hear words which I think windy and even foolish to the effect that this is not really a matter for Parliament, that the Church has spoken its own mind decidedly, and that the duty of Parliament is to endorse what the Church has said. I dissent altogether from that view and dissociate myself from those statements. . . . Every member of this House has, in my view, his absolute right to vote upon a matter of this kind." Would it not be an incredible exhibition of peevish littleness and lack of humour to request Parliament, after hearing such emphatic assurances, to proceed against itself for acting upon them? The State is exceedingly well disposed towards the Church and sincerely anxious for its welfare. Why, then, force a friendly Parliament into an inevitable conflict, and precipitate a crisis that might be disastrous?

The answer of the Commission is that the attainment of spiritual liberty by the Church is a living problem, of pressing interest and urgent importance.² But is this a sober judgment?

THE CHURCH IS FREE.

Is the Church really in bondage to the State? The terms of reference, under which the Commission was appointed, set forth the "inalienable right" of the Church, "*when its mind has been fully ascertained,*" to formulate its doctrine and ritual uncontrolled by the authority of the State.³

Is that right seriously questioned? The State has never presumed to formulate or dictate the faith and practice of the Church. The State certainly does possess the "right of veto in spiritual matters." But, and this is the crux of the whole matter, the Report recognises that Parliament never refuses to authorise proposals submitted to it by the Church, "*when its mind has been fully ascertained.*" It was, indeed, as the Report admits, because Church opinion was divided, that the revised Prayer Book was rejected. And the main conclusions of the Report are based upon the significant assumption that the State may be depended upon to accept any measure upon which the Church itself has first secured general agreement.⁴ What more spiritual autonomy does the Church desire? Not, surely, the despotic power of forcing upon protesting minorities innovations about which there is strong disagreement!

The whole demand for spiritual freedom rests upon a delusion; for the Church already possesses freedom in proportion as it possesses agreement. We can apply to the ideal of Spiritual Freedom precisely what Bishop Creighton said of Socialism⁵—that it "will only be possible when we are all perfect. and then it will not be

¹ *Op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 161.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 96.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 1 and 42.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 96.

⁵ *Life*, vol. ii, p. 504.

needed." Or we can adapt the logic of Peter Piper, if we want a *reductio ad absurdum* :

"Parliament passes proposals approved by powerless Apostolics.

Does Parliament pass proposals approved by powerless Apostolics ?

If Parliament passes proposals approved by powerless Apostolics,

Where are the powerless Apostolics whose approved proposals Parliament passes ? "

We, I think, will elect to be numbered among those of whom the Commission says "to some, perhaps to many, of those who read our Report it will appear that the matters with which we have been dealing are of theoretical rather than of practical interest."¹ We shall feel, I am sure, that it would be a crime to unsettle what the Report describes as "the ordinary life in the parishes of England" which "goes on for the most part undisturbed by questions as to legislative or judicial autonomy."² We shall, I hope, refuse (again to quote from the Report) "to run the risk of fanning into flame the embers of forgotten controversies";³ and all for the illusory gain of extorting from the State the empty title to a right which, in practice, is freely conceded to the Church.

THE RESTORATION OF DISCIPLINE.

The second condition to be realised, before a State Church can qualify for legislative autonomy, is the possession of order and discipline within its own domain.

The Report attributes the refusal of Parliament to authorise the New Prayer Book very largely to the fact that it "found difficulty in trusting the will, or at least the power, of the bishops"³ to enforce its provisions, as they had promised. The same consideration of impotent administration must continue to prevent the State relinquishing its veto over spiritual innovations, as long as anarchy persists in the Church. Especially is this the case, now that the misgivings of Parliament, eight years ago, have proved to be well founded. The Commission justifies the action of the Bishops in authorising the use of the rejected Prayer Book, on the ground that they intended, thereby, to restore order on its basis.⁴ Yet one of the Commissioners, the Archdeacon of Westminster, speaking in the name of fifteen hundred Liberal Evangelical clergy, describes the failure of the Bishops to procure obedience, as the "growing sore in the position," and witnesses to an increasing anxiety in the Church lest its trust has been deceived.⁵ His fellow Commissioners seem to concur; for, in their Report, they devote more space to the present disorders in the Church than to its relations with the State.

Under these circumstances, the Church would squander its time and energy by convening a Round Table Conference; unless there first existed a real confidence that if any agreement were reached it would be certain of administrative effect. Until there have ceased

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 96.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 96.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 36.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 39.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 154.

to exist in the Church the cult of the Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, and other equally flagrant illegalities, disallowed alike by the Royal Commission of 1906 and the new Prayer Book of 1927, it is farcical to expect loyal Churchmen seriously to discuss "permissible deviations from the Office of Holy Communion . . . and the use and limits of Reservation."¹

The Commission considers that the judicial measures it suggests, for the restoration of order, must coincide with the carrying out of its proposals for legislative independence; and not be preparatory to them. The reason advanced by the Commissioners is the necessity of relaxing the excessive rigidity of the law which the present Ecclesiastical Courts are bound to administer.² But no such consideration applies to their new Pastoral Tribunals, or to their other important recommendations for the recovery of the lapsed authority of the Bishop; by which means, indeed, they hope to obviate the need of recourse to such Ecclesiastical Courts.³

With conspicuous insight the Report points out the two steps necessary for the re-establishment of discipline and self-respect in the Church.⁴ Neither of them has anything to do with the Ecclesiastical Courts; and, therefore, there is no reason why both of them should not be regarded as essential preliminaries to any advance towards constitutional independence.

The first step is the immediate legalising of "common sense,"⁵ trivial, customary, and non-doctrinal deviations from the Book of Common Prayer. It is high time that loyal clergy who, at Holy Communion, omit the Long Exhortation or encourage the response "Glory be to Thee, O Lord" before the Gospel, should be delivered from the malicious accusation of being law-breakers, and of embarrassing the Bishop in the exercise of discipline. The second step advocated is the prevention and suppression of practices which are a clear violation of the formularies of the Church. For this, the Commission relies on the moral effect of public opprobrium, enforcing an improved and strengthened jurisdiction by the Bishop.

There is only one effective guarantee that order and discipline will be secured in the Church and maintained in the future.⁶ It is the immediate adoption and enforcement by the Church of those powers which, as the Report clearly indicates, already lie to its hand in the present.

If these two steps were resolutely taken, on the lines laid down so admirably by the Report; then there would result such a strengthening of that comprehensive unity of the Church, for which the Commission appeals,⁷ that its suggestion of a Round Table Conference might well be rendered unnecessary, and most of its other recommendations as well.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 99.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 72 ff.

³ *Op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 151 ff.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 65 and 100.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

⁶ *Op. cit.* p. 57.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 97, 98.

THE OBLIGATIONS OF A NATIONAL CHURCH.

There remains the third condition before the Church of England can claim the right, conceded to the Church of Scotland in 1921, of being "free from interference by civil authority."¹ It is because the Church is not yet sufficiently *national* in character, that the Commission rules out "The Scottish Solution" as irrelevant.

The status of an Established Church must carry with it, not only the privileges of a State Church, but also the obligations of a National Church. Thus, while a denominational Church is responsible only to its own adherents; a national Church is the expression of the native religion of the people in general. It is, therefore, quite wrong for the Report to speak of measures "affecting *only* the spiritual concerns of the Church."² In the case of the Church of England, these are also the vital and organic concern of the whole nation and indeed of the Empire.³

At the present time, as the late Prayer Book controversy showed, it is Parliament rather than the National Assembly of the Church which reflects more accurately the religious opinion and traditions of the English people. The reason is not far to seek, if we compare the situation in our own country with that on the other side of the Border. In Scotland, as the Report reminds us, "since 1592 the laity have always had a full share of Church government, both locally and centrally, while in our Church the constitutional claims of the layman have only of late been at all adequately acknowledged";⁴ and (we might add) are, as yet, far from finding adequate satisfaction. As Professor Trevelyan has pointed out, the laity exercise their control of religion in Scotland from within the Church, but in England from without, through Parliament.⁵ The Commission goes to much pains in seeking the remedy. But their proposals are palliatives. They are not the radical cure that is necessary before the laity are likely to surrender their power of veto in Parliament, and hand over the fortunes of their National Church to what is now a clerically dominated Assembly. In the view of Archbishop Davidson, with his wealth of experience, "the House of Lords, speaking roughly, is never anti-Church, but always anti-clerical."⁶ Parliament must remain so, till the laity, as much as the clergy, are the Church.

But there is a difference of even greater moment between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, though it finds no mention in the Report. There is, practically speaking, only one Church in Scotland, for the Episcopal Church numbers less than 3 per cent of the population; and, what is more, the enrolled members of that one Church are well over a quarter of the whole nation. In England only three and a half million, out of its thirty-seven and a half million inhabitants, are numbered upon the Electoral Roll of the National Church; while another million and a half of, what the Archbishop of York terms, "the worshipping

¹ Declaratory Article No. 5 (see Report, pp. 53 and 134).

² Report, p. 61. ³ *Op. cit.*, vol. ii, note on p. 158.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 55. ⁵ *Op. cit.*, vol. ii, note on p. 160. ⁶ *Life*, p. 520.

laity" are Free-Churchmen. They form as large a body as the Church of Scotland, and they stand outside the Establishment. In the view of the Commission, these Free-Churchmen have no more right "to exercise some degree of supervision or control over the doctrine and ritual"¹ of the National Church, than have Roman Catholics or Moslems. I would agree, if the National Religion happened to be predominantly and traditionally either that of Rome or Islam. But as we are reminded by the Accession Declaration, shortly to be made by our new King, whom God preserve! the religion of the English people is fundamentally "Protestant." The Church of England, therefore, has close affinities, which she cannot repudiate, with what Bishop Hall called "the sister churches of the Reformation." If the Church were disestablished and disendowed, then it would be perfectly free (to the limited extent that any statutory denomination is free)² to introduce into its standards novelties of doctrine or practice; seeing that they would affect its own followers only, *and no one else*. But as long as the Church remains the National Church of the land, claiming to represent the essential Protestantism of the English, then the other smaller Protestant Churches, who gladly acknowledge its claim and the value of that national recognition of religion which the Establishment provides, must be granted some right of effective disapproval, if a new departure in the formularies of the State Church were to offend national religious opinion. Whether it will ever be possible to devise a means whereby the exercise of this friendly power of restraint by the Free-Churches can be transferred from Parliament to the National Assembly, is a riddle I leave to the apostles of Spiritual Independence. But one thing is certain. The cause of Reunion is infinitely greater than this illusory slogan of "Freedom from the State." And it offers, moreover, the straight and direct road towards spiritual freedom, by pointing to the goal of one truly national Church.

THE CHURCH AND THE NATION.

I would earnestly plead that in these critical and fateful days, big with opportunity, the Church be not distracted and diverted from its real work—for which it is as free as air—in order to follow wandering fires. As members of a National Church our true crusade is to alter the figure of our two and a half million Easter communicants into that of the eighteen million men, women, and children over fifteen years of age, who have been baptised in our founts.

It is as if the Great Shepherd of the sheep asked the question, "Were there not nine in the fold, where are the eight?" When we can return answer without shame, then, perhaps, it will be time, and we shall have time, to consider the relations between Church and State.

I hope, therefore, that the National Assembly in June will

¹ Report, pp. 42 and 43.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 51.

voice its sincere gratitude to the Commissioners for their immense labours in presenting us with so succinct a standard work on the problem of Church and State ; for placing the issues with such clarity and precision before us ; and for thrusting a stake through the heart of the bogey of Disestablishment. I hope the Assembly will get to work forthwith on the Commission's wise recommendations for the restoration of order and discipline in the Church. But I hope with all my heart that the Report itself will not be commended to the Church at large for its consideration ; to waste its time, and to throw another apple of discord into every parish in the land.

The Coming Civilisation is an examination of the popular subject of enquiry as to the future condition of our Western world. The questions considered are : " Will it be capitalist ? " or " Will it be materialist ? " Some will feel inclined to put a proper question, Will there be any civilisation at all if things go on as they appear to be going at present ? Mr. Kenneth Ingram in this book (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 6s. net) suggests that we are entering a new phase of civilisation in which the changes will be fundamental, as it will involve the substitution of society on an industrial basis for one that is practically feudal in character. The motive of this new society cannot be personal gain, as competition will have no place in it. But will Christianity have any place in it, or will it be entirely materialistic ? Mr. Ingram, in answering this question, shows the failure of materialism as a basis of morals and the need of the Christian inspiration and standard.

In *Odds and Ends* (James Clarke, 2s. 6d.) Mr. Vernon Gibberd has given us a varied collection of short addresses for children. As the title suggests, the volume is very much like a scrap-book. There is no connection between the different stories, and no attempt at systematic teaching. We are simply given a number of short stories loosely strung together, many of which will be found useful by teachers of Bible Classes and Sunday Schools. The addresses vary greatly in quality. Some are excellent ; others seem rather to miss the mark ; and we feel that all might have been presented in a more dramatic way. Perhaps the two best are the first, which bears the title of the book, and the talk entitled, " Underdone and Overdone," which explains in a vivid and original way the message to the modern world of the prophetic judgment, " Ephraim is a cake not turned."

CHURCH AND STATE IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY THE REV. D. E. W. HARRISON, M.A.,
Vice-Principal of Wycliffe College, Oxford.

IT may not be amiss to say at the outset that for the writer the subject of this paper entailed in great measure a fresh study of the process of divine revelation. The field is a vast one, and only the bare outline of the historical development is here attempted. The fact, however, that the study is fresh means, I trust, that it is free from prejudice, while on the other hand the absence of mature thought may, I hope, excuse its blemishes.

All the Pentateuchal sources, without exception, agree that the fundamental relationship of God to Israel is that of covenant, going back to Abraham as an individual and to the people at Sinai as a nation. "Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed and keep my covenant ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me, above all people; for all the earth is mine and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." Involved in this is the conviction that the adoption of Israel is an act of divine election, whereby God becomes both the Father and the King of a chosen people; and the mighty deliverance of the Exodus is the event to which all subsequent generations look back as the historical proof of this divine adoption.

Even in the period of tribal disintegration under the Judges this fundamental idea is still here. "And he (Jehovah) became King in Jeshurun when the heads of the people were assembled all together, the tribes of Israel." So in Judges viii. 23, Gideon says: "I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you: the Lord shall rule over you." Similarly in the double account of the establishment of the monarchy we find the expressed conviction, dated according to Sellin about 800 B.C., that Jehovah is Israel's rightful King. It seems therefore justifiable to say that there is a strong theocratic tendency traceable to the early days of the monarchy. But even in the other and possibly earlier account of the setting up of the monarchy it is notable that the King is anointed and the Spirit of the Lord comes upon him. Jehovah still rules, though now by a vice-gerent. And when we come to David we reach another covenant of God, and the origin of Messianic expectation. In all this early period, that Jehovah is the God of Israel, and Israel the people of Jehovah, is the fundamental basis of national life.

When we come to the prophets we may observe that the subjects of prophetic announcement are well summed up as "the affairs of the theocracy." Through them God makes clear that His people must reflect His character, that the whole life of the nation, social as well as religious, must be imbued with His Spirit of righteous-

ness, justice, mercy and holiness. At the same time Jehovah's exclusive choice of Israel has as its necessary consequence the special responsibility of the nation as well as its unique privilege. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth, therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities." Side by side with this goes the proclamation that all the nations, despite the election of Israel, are the subjects, unknown to them, of His kingly rule. "Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt and the Philistines from Capthor and the Syrians from Kir?" It is this double revelation, which we find in Amos, of God's demands upon Israel and His ultimate universal sovereignty which inaugurates a double process in all subsequent history. On the one hand is the failure of the whole nation to rise to its high calling, on the other the widening outlook of the true followers of Jehovah and their perception of the true destiny of God's people in relation to the world.

The failure of the nation is clearly seen by Isaiah, and gives rise to his doctrine of the Remnant. This is primarily an eschatological conception presupposing judgment, but Manson thinks that Isaiah viii. 16 "may fairly be considered an attempt to consolidate the remnant, the nucleus of the future people of God." The enactment under Josiah of the provisions of Deuteronomy, and the failure of that reformation, is the most eloquent testimony to the failure of Israel as a nation. It is perhaps true to say that nowhere in the Old Testament is the character of God as Father and as King more fully set out than in this great law-book (vii. 6-8, xiv. 2, xxviii. 9 f.). Consequently Israel is Jehovah's son (a conception which indeed goes back to Exod. iv. 22 (J), "Israel is my son, my firstborn son"), and the object of divine adoption (iv. 20) and care. But the attempt to secure by legislation the theocratic ideal failed, as mere legislation always must, and with Jeremiah the new covenant is individual and personal, "All shall know me," "I will put my law in their inward part."

So the nation as such is doomed, with the exile the State and the monarchy pass away, and we watch the birth-pangs of a new order. Throughout the period of exile Isaiah's concept, "a remnant shall return," represents a hope which is never extinguished. But it gives rise to two distinct conceptions of the future of the nation. On the one hand there is the thought of the purified Israel as the holy people of God wholly belonging to Him, expressing in its whole life obedience to the divine law, and separated from the heathen. This begins with Ezekiel, runs through Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra and Nehemiah, and ends with the enforcement of full Pentateuchal strictness. It is important to notice that, once again, this process which is inaugurated by the return from exile is thought of primarily as God's act. This is true both of Ezekiel and deutero-Isaiah, though more prominent in the former, where the name of the restored Jerusalem is Jahweh-shammah—Jehovah is there. The restored community is therefore in ideal a Church rather than a state, and with the priestly legislation, to which we may now come, we reach a true theocracy. Here the fundamental notion,

on which all the ceremonial law depends, is that in the domain of Jehovah's own people everything belongs to God and is consecrated to Him only—all space and time, all property and all life. The claim is absolute. But, in order that life may be lived at all, God ordains that a portion of all shall be given to Him, symbolising the whole which is His right. So we find the setting apart of priestly and Levitical cities, the Sabbatical year, the great year of Jubilee, and above all the Sabbath; the tithe which hallows all property and the sacrifices which express the consciousness that all earthly blessings are of God. So the redemption of the first-born and the poll-tax of the half-shekel express the divine claim over all human life. But above all in the worship of God, the priestly function of all male Israelites, or at least of the firstborn (Num. iii. 40), is delegated to the Levites, who thus are the gift of the people (Num. iii. 9) as their representatives to serve the hereditary priesthood of the Sons of Aaron. It is the latter class who alone can be expected to preserve the holiness necessary to Jehovah's service, and at their head stands the high-priest, who by his very clothing is shown to be the representative both of the holiness of the people of God, and of their kingly dignity.

It is this true theocracy, in which the law of God governs the whole of life, which is the ideal of Judaism, and despite the discrepancy between theory and practice it is at least true that it did produce a community in which what we call civil and ecclesiastical law were one and the same. As a system it failed to "make alive," as Paul, one of its most devoted adherents, testified; that for which it stands remains an ideal, but by grace, not law, can it alone be accomplished.

We must now return to the exile and trace the second great conception of the future of the nation, that of deutero-Isaiah. We may remind ourselves that the universalism towards which it looks is not a new thing in Israel. The prophecy of the nations flowing to the mountain of the Lord's house goes back to the eighth century. In Isaiah xix. 24—though some would date it later—is the remarkable prophecy: "In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth, for the Lord of hosts hath blessed them, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel my inheritance." Nevertheless, what is new is the function of the Servant of Jehovah. Israel's election is still to be the fount of her confidence (xli. 8) and still is the manifestation of God's love for her (xliii. 3, 4), but it is now an election to be a saving as well as saved remnant. Whether the servant be the ideal Israel, or a saving remnant within Israel, or whether, as the writer thinks, the conception narrows in the last servant-song to an individual, the divine mission is not confined to Israel, but is to all the ends of the earth, and that through the suffering of the Servant. The vision is, as Manson puts it, of a people wholly devoted to their King, conquering the world not by force of arms but by spiritual power, attracting men and women to voluntary acceptance of Israel's King as their King.

That vision never wholly dies. It is found again in Zechariah ix. 9-10, in some of the Psalms, and according to one dating in the books of Jonah and Ruth, but in the main its fulfilment remained to the Church of Christ.

There is a third element in post-exilic Judaism, of which something must briefly be said. The final vindication of God's people, the fulfilment of their hopes, and the consummation of the divine purpose is finally seen as the work of God Himself. So through this period there run the twin streams of Apocalyptic and the Messianic hope. They may be distinct one from the other or intermingled as in Enoch and possibly Daniel. The Pharisee might look for the coming glory of Israel, either in the person of Messiah or by direct divine intervention, when the law was perfectly obeyed. The common people of the New Testament clearly looked for the coming of the warrior-Messiah, the son of David, and the establishment through him of the divine Kingdom. The pre-existent heavenly Messiah, whose coming is preceded by Messianic woes, represents yet another type of thought not entirely insignificant. But what is true of them all is that the true theocracy still lies ahead.

And that means that the method of law, which in the course of post-exilic history had triumphed in Judaism, had failed to make alive. It is true that it had preserved, as it alone perhaps could preserve, the purity of the nation's faith from the assaults of Hellenism, it had conserved a pure monotheism and the ideal of a divine theocracy. But it failed by the inherent weakness of the method of law, which starts from externals and works inward. So over against it in the New Testament stands the grace of God, not a law but a gospel which alone can transform the very springs of a man's being. It is no accident that the Old Testament theocracy which points to the true ideal fails as a way of life, individual or corporate. The revelation of God was not yet complete, the Kingdom was not yet come.

So we turn to the New Testament, to One who was of the seed of David according to the flesh, born of woman, born under the law: to One moreover for Whom it remained true that "salvation is of the Jews," whose own mission was to Israel, Who Himself kept the law, to One who says, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets, I came not to destroy but to fulfil." He it is Who, acknowledged as Israel's Messiah, builds upon that confession of faith in Himself His own ecclesia, "Blessed art thou, Simon bar Jonah, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven. And I say unto thee, Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." As Hort puts it: "Here there is no question of a partial or local ecclesia. The congregation of God, which held so conspicuous a place in the ancient scriptures, is assuredly what the disciples could not fail to understand as the foundation of the meaning of a sentence, which was indeed for the present mysterious. If we may venture

for a moment to substitute the name Israel, and read the words as 'on this rock I will build my Israel,' we gain an impression which supplies at least an approximation to the probable sense." It may perhaps be added that *ἐκκλησία* is the septuagint translation of *qāhāl* assembly, and has nothing to do with a people called out from the world—though, as Hort points out, the latter idea is entirely scriptural.

But the main point to notice at present is that the Church is founded upon faith in Jesus as Messiah. But it immediately becomes clear in all the Gospels that our Lord's conception of Messiahship was the Way of the Cross. The writer, personally, is convinced that the "suffering servant" of Isaiah and the "Son of Man" of Daniel are the clues to our understanding of our Lord's conception of His work. The Son of Man as used in the Gospels has the triple connotation of manhood, suffering and glory. There is not time to analyse its use, but in St. Mark particularly its direct relation to the Cross is manifest. And the Jesus who so thought of Himself, as one who gives His life a ransom for many, is the Jesus who called His disciples to take up the cross and come after Him. The prophecy of Isaiah liii., fulfilled in Christ, is to have its continued fulfilment in the life of the society which, to use a Pauline term, is the body of Christ. "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you."

It will be seen that the life of a society has been assumed, for indeed it is required by the concept of the *ἐκκλησία*. But some further expansion is obviously necessary at this point. The difficulty is to find the right relationship between the Kingdom of God, or of Heaven, and the *ἐκκλησία*. It is clear that the two cannot simply be equated. *βασιλεία* corresponds more closely to rule than to realm. It is primarily the sovereignty of God to be received, *δέχεσθαι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ* (Mark x. 15), but this sovereignty also manifests itself in a society of those who have received it, and it will have its final consummation when at the Parousia the Son of Man appears in glory. It is the second sense of the phrase which now concerns us. That this sense is important is shown by the simple fact that the Lord's prayer is "Our Father" (at least in one Gospel), and that so many of our Lord's promises are not individual but corporate. With it we may associate the parables which imply growth, as well as those which imply imperfection in a community, such as the tares and the drag-net. It is in this sense only that we may say that Church represents the Kingdom, or to use Hort's phrase "is the primary instrument of its sway."

Now for this society of His disciples, our Lord laid down no constitution and gave no law. It is a platitude to say that He laid down simply broad principles, the double law of love to God and to neighbours, but it is nevertheless simple truth. We may add from His teaching the simile of the Vine, the promise of the Spirit of Truth, and the prayer for unity of St. John xvii., as expressing the fundamentals of the life of the *ἐκκλησία*.

It is this society which, when we pass outside the Gospels, we find actively at work in the world. It is conscious of itself as the new Israel, for it had accepted Israel's Messiah. The evidence for this is striking. Most explicit is St. Paul's simile of the grafting in of the wild olive of Romans xi., but equally important is the fact that St. James writes to the twelve tribes, and St. Peter to the dispersion. The abundant quotation of the promises of God to Israel now applied to the *ἐκκλησία* points to the same conclusion. 1 Peter ii. 9 must suffice as an example: "But ye are a chosen generation, an holy nation, a peculiar people." The same may be said of the New Testament use of *λαός*, transferred from the Old to the New Israel. Perhaps we may include all such quotations in the highly significant fact that the Church at once took over the Old Testament as its own rightful possession. It is thus clear that the *ἐκκλησία* as the New Israel is the true people of God, chosen, a purchased possession, as distinct from the world as the ancient people of God; its members are *κλήτοι ἅγιοι*.

But as the New Israel it inherited Israel's double vocation. The Christian was *ἅγιος* that he might become *δσιος*. The whole body was holy in purpose, the organ of the activity of the Risen Lord through the Spirit, and therefore the fulfilment of the Old Testament theocratic ideal, wherein the grace of God did that which "the law because it was weak through the flesh could not do." But it was also the fulfilment of Israel's mission to the ends of the earth. We need not labour the point, for it is set out for us as the Lord's final command, and the position of the Gentile within it, on the sole basis of faith in Christ, is clearly defined in Ephesians ii. Thus the Church becomes the body in which there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, "for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

As such it stood over against Judaism and the heathen world, in the world but not of the world. Within the limits of the New Testament that world was the Roman Empire. What was the relationship between this Church and State to be? Our Lord stated the principle "Give back to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's," and the rest of the New Testament is in accord with that principle. God has a primary claim on the man who has accepted His sovereignty. But the State has also a rightful claim. The powers that be are ordained of God—and when St. Paul was writing the Emperor was Nero—"Render therefore to all their due, tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour." So in 1 Timothy ii. 2 the authorities of the State are to be prayed for, and in Titus iii. 1 the civil power is to be obeyed. The same advice is given by St. Peter: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the King, as supreme, or unto governors as those sent by him. Honour all men, Love the brotherhood, Fear God, Honour the King."

The principle of the Christian man's duty to the State is therefore unequivocally stated in scripture. But equally clearly, where

there is a conflict of loyalties, God has an absolute claim. "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye," said St. Peter to the assembled Sanhedrin presided over by the High Priest. And it was not long before Church and Empire were set over against each other in direct conflict. The Church won because in the power of Christ it accepted the rôle of the suffering servant, because its way was not law but love.

There the paper ends, but I would ask the indulgence of the Conference if I draw some conclusions from this brief survey in relation to the problems now before us.

In the first place it is, I think, clear that the Christian cannot give the State an unqualified loyalty, and what is true of the Christian is equally true of the Church. The way of the cross is still an offence: where it is not, the salt has lost its savour. In modern Germany the issue is clearly seen.

Secondly, the Church transcends the boundaries of race and nation. Within it there must still be neither Jew nor Gentile, East nor West, white nor black. From which it follows, I think, that the supernatural life of the Church which transcends the nation can alone make possible the existence of a true family of nations, because it alone can transform the lives of sinful men. If this be true then the restoration of the Church's unity is the greatest need of the world to-day, and only by spiritual revival can that come.

Thirdly, and this goes beyond the necessarily limited scope of the paper, is not our primary need a sure hold on our doctrine of the Church, and especially of the true function of the laity? That as I see it is the true crux of the situation in which we find ourselves. In this connection there are some words of the late Dr. Griffith Thomas which seem to me well worth quoting:

"It is, of course, easy to say that the influence of the State on the Church is injurious, and many Churchmen would be ready to admit this. But on the other hand establishment is cherished by many because of its essential value as a national testimony to God. The matter is one involving grave differences of view, and whatever may be the precise relation in the future between the English Church and the State there can be no doubt that, as in Scotland, there will be a definite and determined insistence upon the two great principles that the State shall not control the Church and that the clergy shall not control the laity."

RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED, MAINLY IN REGARD TO THE REFORMATION AND SUBSEQUENT PERIODS.

BY THE REV. V. J. K. BROOK, M.A., Censor of St Catherine's Society and Chaplain of All Souls College, Oxford.

THERE is no need to adduce evidence to show that, at first, the Church was entirely independent of the State; it was neither instituted nor legally recognised by the State, but grew up of its own power despite attempts of the State from time to time to suppress it. The question of its relation to the State only began to arise after its legalisation by Constantine. The exact position then was that its existence, not in any sense due to the State, was none the less recognised: the Church was "*licita*." But soon, through the actions of this or that emperor, the relation between the head of the State and the Church became more intimate though, so far as I know, that relation was never strictly defined nor understood in early days. Still, Emperors did interfere in ecclesiastical matters, without protest from anyone. Each of the first four general councils was due to imperial initiative: on occasion, an emperor would even be personally present in a council and sway (if not compel) its decision—as Constantius at Milan in 355. In 380 Theodosius published a decree ordering all nations under him to obey the faith as taught by St. Peter, and laying down what that faith was—"*the sole deity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost under an equal majesty and a pious trinity*." Before long—and with the approval of bishops such as Augustine—the State was visiting with civil penalties those whom the Church rejected as schismatic. Obviously there was a close though undefined alliance, and a strong emperor could exercise considerable influence in Church affairs. None the less, I think that the Church considered itself as being, though recognised by the State, yet not the creation of the State, nor dependent for its right to exist either on that recognition or on the Emperor's will. The imperial support was used and valued so far as it helped the Church to carry out its own policy, but at times imperial interference was clearly and successfully rejected, as when Ambrose refused the request of Valentinian II to allot a church in Milan for the use of Arians, or Basil of Cæsarea actively withstood Valens about the same time. Thus, there was no fully worked-out or authoritative view of the relation of Church and State: in the main the Church thought of itself as an independent self-governing body: legally its position was that it was permitted but not created by the State. Strong ecclesiastics restrained imperial interference but, in practice, emperors did sometimes largely affect both the discipline of the Church and its expression of what constituted orthodoxy.

In the Middle Ages, the position seems to be different, and it is as important as it is difficult to gain a clear idea of it. The modern man, conscious of the difficulties in the relation of Church and State to-day, and dimly aware of acute struggles between Emperors and Kings on the one hand and Popes on the other, is apt to think of Church and State in the Middle Ages as separate, clearly marked and rival entities. But all who are able to speak with authority say that it was not so. Rather, the two were regarded simply as differing aspects or functions of one single society. Of the causes of this quasi-identification of Church and State it is not necessary to enquire—no doubt it was largely due to the fact that, in theory anyhow, all citizens were members of the Church (those who were not were outlaws). But be the causes what they may, of the fact there is no real doubt. Thus Dibdin and A. L. Smith write, "It would be a mistake to regard the Middle Ages as a continual fight between spiritual and temporal. These were rather two aspects of one united community. Bishops and abbots, besides being great ecclesiastics, were also barons with feudal obligations and political duties."¹ Of the period in England under the Saxons they say: "The bishop and the ealdorman sat side by side and heard ecclesiastical and secular cases in the same court. The king and his nobles were present and assenting parties at church councils, and the bishop was a member of the Witan. Ecclesiastical laws were made or re-made both in Church Councils and in the Witan."² As Bishop Browne puts it in the same Report: "The Church was not independent of the State, nor the State of the Church. Their relation was that of interdependence . . . each naturally taking the lead when its own affairs were in question" (p. 209). Carnegie Simpson agrees, and so does Figgis, from whom I wish to quote at some length, for he puts the condition of things very clearly.³ "Neither churchmen nor statesmen believed in two separate social entities, the Church and the State, each composed of the same persons" (p. 77). "Alike on the Imperial and the Papal side, the claims would have been inconceivable had it not been admitted that both Popes and Emperors were rulers in one society" (p. 78). "All this was crystallised in the idea of the Holy Roman Empire, the governing conception of a great Church-State, of which it is hard to say whether it is a religious or a temporal institution. Half the trouble comes from the fact that popes and emperors were heads, in theory co-equal, of the same society" (p. 205). What then, it may be asked, of all the troubles with which we are familiar between Church and State, Emperor and Pope? Dr. Figgis's answer is very clear and interesting: "The distinction that has ruled Europe for so many centuries has been a distinction not between Christian and non-Christian societies, but between cleric and layman, between the spiritual and the temporal power, each of them exercised within the Church; between the ecclesiastical and the secular governments,

¹ Report of Archbishops' Committee on Church and State (1916), p. 15.

² Report of Archbishops' Committee on Church and State (1916), p. 8.

³ Figgis, *Churches in the Modern State*.

each of them functioning within the body politic" . . . (p. 182). "In common parlance the Church in the Middle Ages meant not the *congregatio fidelium*—though, of course, no one would have denied this to be the right meaning— . . . but rather the active governing section of the Church—the Hierarchy and, I suppose, the religious orders" (p. 184).¹ "In the Middle Ages the Church is used to distinguish the spirituality from the laity, and in nine cases out of ten it means the ecclesiastical body . . . whereas in the Middle Ages 'I am a Churchman' would mean 'I am not a layman' nowadays the same phrase means 'I am not a Dissenter.'" And so "In these controversies you have practically no conception of the Church, as consisting of the whole body of the baptised set over against the State, consisting of the same people. . . . It is a quarrel between two different sets of people, the lay officials and the clerical, the bishops and the justices, the pope and the kings" (p. 190). A good illustration of this usual conception of the relation between Pope and Emperor is quoted by Carnegie Simpson from Dante (p. 88).² "There was needed, in order to bring man securely to his double end, a double directing power: to wit, the Holy Pontiff to guide him, in accordance with Revelation, to eternal life; and the Emperor, to direct him to temporal felicity. . . . It is clear then that the authority of the monarch descends to him without any medium from the fountain of all authority. . . . This however is not to be taken as meaning that the Roman Emperor is in nothing subject to the Roman pontiff; for that mortal happiness of which we have been speaking itself has a further end in the happiness which is immortal. Let then Cæsar pay such reverence to Peter as a first-born son owes to his father that . . . he may with greater virtue irradiate the whole circle of the world over which he is placed by Him alone Who is the ruler of all things temporal and spiritual."

So much for the general belief of the relation of Church and State in Middle Ages—or rather of the relation of spiritual and temporal officers in the one body corporate. On the other hand, Figgis³ admits that (p. 197) in the acuter minds of the later Middle Ages, the conception of Church and State as separate organisms was beginning to evolve, though not popularly held. Such a view was advanced by the growth of national self-consciousness which overshadowed the vague ideal of the one Holy Empire and set states instead of the State in the front of men's minds. It was helped by the emergence in history of the Papacy as a territorial power side by side with other similar powers, thereby challenging rivalry with them. It was very largely helped by the pretensions of the Papacy, based on forged decretals and the Donation of Constantine as well as the Petrine claims, to be superior to all temporal rulers—pretensions powerfully put forward by such strong popes as Hildebrand, Innocent III and Boniface VIII, who claimed that both temporal and spiritual swords belonged to him. It was helped

¹ Figgis, *Churches in the Modern State*.

² Carnegie Simpson, *The Church and the State*.

³ Figgis, *Churches in the Modern State*.

too by the growing demarcation of the clergy from the laity. By "benefit of clergy" they were marked off as a class apart, belonging as it were to a jurisdiction other than that of the territorial ruler; an impression strengthened by such an action as that of the clergy in England in 1295¹ when they claimed to sit as a separate estate of the realm with the right to settle their own taxation. Now on the Roman view of the Church—that it was constituted by its Petrine authority from above and not from below; and that all spiritual benefits came from the Pope and were mediated through the clergy, his deputies—all that tended to the conception of the Church as an organism separate from the State. But though such claims to separate independence were being made by Popes, they were not admitted by the temporal rulers; nor were the popes, despite individual successes for a time, able to enforce such claims for any considerable periods. Nor, as I have said, were the implications which such claims plainly involved recognised generally. The ordinary man thought of Church and State as allies or rivals—different officers—in the one society.

Such, roughly, was the position when the Reformation brought matters to a head. Immediately the earlier, ill-defined and idealistic conception of the relationship of Church and State became no longer tenable. The sense of nationality for one thing made it impossible; even more so did the fact that multitudes who were sure they were Christians and members of the true Church yet were definitely not members of the society of which the Pope was head. The problem had to be faced squarely. So far as the Roman Church was concerned, the result was simple. Grounded on its Petrine claims, it was sure of itself as a separate organism, over against and independent of temporal authorities. But the other churches had to work out their own positions. I propose to say something about each in turn, reserving to the end for fuller treatment the Church of England.

First of all, Germany. Now, of course, to Luther at bottom salvation did not depend on membership of the Church but on faith. Those who had justifying faith were saved and alone constituted the true Church. At first it would therefore seem as though he had no need for a visible organised community and that the problem of Church and State would not arise. But in fact he insisted on the need of a visible church, for evangelistic purposes, for "He who would know something about Christ . . . must go to the church, visit and make enquiry of it." The signs of that church are "Baptism, the sacrament and the Gospel." But, so far as I can make out, he never worked out any theory of a visible catholic church which should be a single united organism. His view was rather that the whole body of Christians formed a spiritual unity of which local churches were the Gospel and the sacraments were visible individual expressions. But—and this is of vital importance—the authority or validity of those churches did not consist in a hierarchy descended from Peter; once and for all,

¹ Report of Archbishops' Committee on Church and State (1916), p. 223.

for Luther, the possibility of the medieval way of regarding the clergy as the Church, or even the dominant element in it, was gone. All believers were of the spiritual estate, the clergy merely the deputies of the whole spiritual community—"The Bishop's consecration is as if, in the name of the whole congregation, he took one person out of the community, each member of which has equal power, and commanded him to exercise this power for the rest." In other words, the Church is *not* the clergy: it is the whole Christian congregation of which the clergy are only the ministers. As contrasted with the medieval view, it seems to me that Luther there emphasised a most important truth—and one which all Protestant bodies have accepted—that the laity as well as the clergy constitute the Church.

Logically, such a church of true believers should plainly be self-regulated and autonomous, governed by the general decision of all who are alike equal members of it. Its constitution should be democratic and independent of State control. And there is little room to doubt that at first Luther supposed that the German churches would develop on those lines. But in fact that was not the system he ultimately left behind. The reasons for the change were probably practical rather than theoretical—he lost his faith in the common people. They did not, in fact, undertake the work of organisation: e.g. immense difficulty was found in providing ministerial stipends. Even worse, many of them were (in Luther's view) led astray by Anabaptists, and the attempt to set up an Anabaptist community at Münster dismayed him. Finally the Peasants' Revolt in 1524 alienated him from the common man for, though the demands of the Peasants included many of the things for which he fought, there were also other claims which were frankly political and materialistic, with which he had no sympathy. So in the end he turned to the civil power as the agent which should carry out the reforms he wanted. Now that was not, in fact, to put the Church under the State: it was an appeal from the Church as a whole to the temporal authority within the Christian society. In a sense it was a piece of conservatism (of which there was a great deal in Luther)—a return to the old idea of Church and State as one, in which the chief person was the Christian prince who, in virtue of his pre-eminence, was naturally the principal member of the national or local Christian congregation. Moreover, such a policy was not inconsistent with his past view;—for before his break with Rome in his Address to the German Nobility he had urged them to undertake the task of reform since the definitely ecclesiastical officers (Pope and so on) would not do so. Von Ranke defends this policy on the ground that "no one could question the competency of the Empire, in the prevailing confusion, to frame ordinances respecting ecclesiastical as well as civil affairs." When, at the Diet of Speier in 1526, the Princes resolved "each one so to live, govern and carry himself as he hopes and trusts to answer it to God and His imperial Majesty" all that happened, according to Ranke, was that the Diet entrusted the exercise of its corporate

rights to individual territorial rulers. None the less, I cannot help feeling that for Luther to agree to such powers in the civil ruler was a betrayal of his fundamental principles. It was due to practical necessity. However that may be, in the Confession of Augsburg (1530)—the real official standard of Lutheranism—the civil power is recognised, and its relation to the ecclesiastical clearly laid down. To the ecclesiastical power is assigned the preaching of the word, the power of the keys and the administration of the sacraments, while secular princes are to occupy themselves in protecting the persons and property of their subjects. But the magistrates are expected to punish—i.e. to be the disciplinary power even in ecclesiastical matters—“if any teach against a public article of the faith which is clearly founded upon the Scriptures and is believed by all Christendom.” That sounds, in theory, very nice—the Church is to decide, and the State to be the executive under the guidance of the Church. But it does, in fact, open a very wide door for State control. And in practice it was so interpreted by Luther as really to make the territorial rulers dominant in the changes which were effected. In Hessen, at the instigation of the Prince, a church of true believers was formed, which was to choose its own officers. In Prussia, again with the approval of the ruler, a bishop of reforming views took charge. In Electoral Saxony, the Elector chose four commissioners to carry out reform, though later on (the first in 1539) consistories were formed to which were entrusted the guardianship of true doctrine, the arrangements for public worship, and the supervision of morals. Now whatever the theory, no matter how carefully the functions of civil and ecclesiastical powers had been defined at Augsburg, it is obvious that in such proceedings the various princes took a predominant part not only in discipline, but in imposing doctrines. There lay the seeds of the later view “*cujus regio ejus religio*.” With such a beginning, the civil power did not, says Simpson,¹ confine itself within the limits laid down at Augsburg : in protestant as well as in catholic states, coercion in religious matters was operative—and the various German state churches were fairly launched. That state of affairs continued till the present century, the churches really being controlled by the State, or rather by the prince who at times (e.g. in Prussia) rode roughshod over all spiritual liberty—e.g. Frederick William II sought to lay down on his own authority what might be taught in church and schools.² After the war, a change was made by the Weimar Constitution : the state churches were disestablished, but were given clear legal security and freedom, with different conditions in different states. At present, the attempt is being made to combine all the different protestant churches in the Reich—over 20 in number—into a single German church under a state bishop ; the outcome I do not venture to try to prophesy. But plainly, whatever the exact legal forms which have been fulfilled (synodical actions and so on), to the onlooker it appears as though the unified state is trying to coerce the

¹ Carnegie Simpson, *The Church and the State*, p. 117.

² Carnegie Simpson, *The Church and the State*, p. 190.

churches as were the separate state-churches before the war by the separate territorial rulers. In the Proclamation from Hitler read to the Nazi Party rally at Nuremberg on September 5, 1934, it was said (i.e. in the name of Hitler): "We are striving to reach an upright and honourable agreement with the two great Christian religions . . . (but) . . . we are resolved, as far as the Evangelical faith is concerned, to convert the present divided church organisations into a single great Church of the Reich."¹

Calvin was, of course, of a temperament very different from *Luther*. The dominant idea in his thought is the omnipotence and majesty of God, and his ideal of earthly government is a theocracy. Thus, whereas *Luther* was primarily concerned with the inner salvation of the individual and does not lay great stress on state control of morals, *Calvin*, as *Carew Hunt* points out, "insisted that society should see to it that the honour of God was respected by an outward conformity with the precepts of the moral law." His views are clearly and consistently expressed in the *Institutes*. There is no need of a primary see; though he does contemplate the possibility of councils, yet each local church has the right to the name of Church, and is authoritative over its members and can exercise spiritual discipline, including excommunication, over them. Such local churches will have pastors, but *Calvin* is careful to lay it down that they do not alone constitute the Church, which is the whole body of the congregation. He clearly distinguishes between the discipline of the Church and of the civil power: "The Church has no power of the sword to punish or coerce, no authority to compel, no prisons." Its business is the administration of the word and sacraments, and spiritual discipline: in such it is to be entirely beyond any control by the State. But the authority of the State he regarded as also divinely instituted—only instead of being above or equal with that of the Church, he plainly regarded it as subordinate. "No government can be happily constituted unless its first object be the promotion of piety," he said: its duty is "to cherish and support the external worship of God, to preserve the pure doctrine of religion, to defend the constitution of the Church, to regulate our lives in a manner requisite for the society of men." If it command anything contrary to God's word, Christians are excused from obedience.

The theory there is quite clear. The local Church, consisting of all Christians, is independent; the divinely instituted civil magistrates are to protect the Church and carry out its moral injunctions—but the decision on faith and morals rests with the Church, not the State. Moreover in Geneva, while *Calvin* lived, he succeeded in getting his theory put into practice—though not without a severe struggle. His position was in a sense peculiar not only because of his dominant personality, but also because the republic of Geneva had by popular vote and with an oath accepted the reformed religion. The struggle centred round the question of excommunication which, I think, involved civil penalties. *Calvin*

¹ *The Times*, Sept. 6, 1934.

instituted a moral ecclesiastical tribunal consisting, be it noted, of lay members as well as ministers. When the Consistory began to excommunicate prominent citizens, trouble arose and the Council repudiated excommunication. But in the end, Calvin was victorious—the right of the Church to pass sentence was admitted, and the civil powers carried out the decisions of the Church. That system in the end broke down because, says Carnegie Simpson, the exercise of discipline was carried too far. Moreover, it was not a system which could be established except where a state had definitely accepted the reformed faith as the only tolerated form of worship—in Geneva those who were not willing to conform were pressed to find a home elsewhere. But even where Calvinism was not so accepted by the State, Calvin's views on the constitution and autonomy of the churches had enormous effect. All over, congregations of Reformed Christians sprang up, local, compact, self-governed, admitting no control of the State in matters of belief or discipline—as the Huguenots in France. The doctrine underlying such congregations was the complete independence of the Church from the State, and it inspired the Independent and Puritan movements in England, though such movements often (though not always) wanted to go to the full lengths of Calvin and render the State subsidiary to the Church in enforcing the moral law. Some of them however did not, e.g. Cromwell was prepared to allow wide divergence of opinion in matters of doctrine without wishing the State to interfere.

This view of the complete independence of the Church from State control naturally leads up to the consideration of the settlement in *Scotland*. For this section I have had to rely almost solely on Carnegie Simpson, but his conclusions are borne out by what is said in an appendix to the Report of the Archbishops' Committee in 1916. As the Crown and prominent nobles were catholic, the movement for reform was not instituted from above, but came from the people under leaders such as Knox. In various places, congregations were formed, and in 1560 Parliament was petitioned to disestablish Popery. In reply it was asked what form of religion was to be substituted. Knox and others formulated a reformed confession of faith to which Parliament gave its sanction as the national confession of Scotland. Next, a general assembly was called not by Parliament but by the Church leaders, consisting of six ministers and thirty-four elders (note the proportion): it drew up a constitution setting forth the presbyterian order of church government. Neither Parliament nor Privy Council as yet acknowledged this, and the Queen definitely refused to authorise it—but none the less it was observed by the churches. In the Confession of Faith, it was explicitly stated that Christ was the only head of the Church and lawgiver "in which honour or offices, if man or angel presume to intrude themselves, we utterly detest and abhor them as blasphemous to our Sovereign and Supreme Governor, Jesus Christ," though in another part the Confession (in Calvinistic vein) admits that kings may and should help "the reformation and pur-

gation of religion." But plainly this would be as the servant, not the master, of the Church.

Queen Mary tried to control or overthrow this independent Church by ordering Knox, in vain, to be obedient to her directions in his teaching; by trying to put a stop to the meetings of the Assembly—again in vain—and by controlling preachers. But in 1567 came her abdication—and in the very same year a notable recognition by Parliament of the Church in an Act which embodies the Church's Confession and constitution including the statement of the Church's spiritual freedom and final jurisdiction in all ecclesiastical issues. Moreover, the Act does not speak as if freedom were being conferred by it, but rather as if the freedom were inherent in the Church and was simply being acknowledged. It orders¹ that "no other jurisdiction ecclesiastical be acknowledged than that which is and shall be within the same kirk established presently, and which floweth therefrom, concerning preaching of the Word, correction of manners and administration of the Sacraments."

That freedom the Church maintained—it was specially recognised by an Act of Security when the Parliaments of England and Scotland were united—and it was unchallenged by the State till last century. But in 1843 there was a crisis. The Assembly passed a Veto Act (to prevent ministers being forced on a congregation which did not want them). This was challenged and legal decisions were given that it was *ultra vires*, the decisions explicitly assuming that the Church derived its power from Parliament and must submit to statutes of the realm even in ecclesiastical matters. The General Assembly appealed to the government of the day, but Peel, the Prime Minister, regarded their claim to autonomy as "unreasonable," and the legal decision was upheld. Thereupon, two-fifths of the ministers resigned all that was secured to them by establishment and state protection—manse, stipend, position—so as to assert their spiritual liberty. Thus was founded the "Church of Scotland Free." In 1900 this Free Church united with another non-established presbyterian church to form the United Free Church of Scotland. This union was challenged by a small minority, and the case came to the civil courts—the point being the possession of the funds the Free Church had acquired since 1843. The final decision in the House of Lords attributed the funds to the small dissenting minority—"Wee Frees"—denying the right of the Free Church to unite with the other Presbyterians to form the United Free Church—again an attempt to deny complete liberty, even to the Free Church. But the union in fact went on, despite the loss of funds. But in 1909 there was a fresh step—the Established Church of Scotland approached the United Free Church with a view to union. After discussion, Articles of Agreement were drawn up, and those articles were declared lawful by an Act of Parliament in 1921. I think I am right in saying that, as so declared legal, they have now been accepted by both parties, and that the union of the United Free Church and the Church of Scotland is an

¹ Carnegie Simpson, *The Church and the State*, p. 146.

accomplished fact, within the last year or two. But what is of real interest after the attempts in 1843 and 1900 on the part of the judicature to deny the spiritual autonomy of the Church, is the language of the constitution drawn up by the churches but recognised by Parliament as "lawful." It asserts that the Church "as part of the universal Church wherein the Lord Jesus Christ has appointed a government in the hands of Church office-bearers, receives from Him its Divine Head and King, and from Him alone, the right and power, subject to no civil authority, to legislate and to adjudicate finally in all matters of doctrine, worship, government and discipline." It declares that State recognition, however expressed, does not affect the character of that government "as derived from the Divine Head of the Church alone," and that the State has not "any right of interference with the proceedings or judgment of the Church within the sphere of its spiritual government." Those words, included in an Act of Parliament, definitely return to the position laid down originally in 1567—that the Church is not made free by Parliament, but has its freedom recognised. They are a charter of complete ecclesiastical liberty—and a full answer to those who declare that establishment must mean State control.

Finally, let us turn to the *Church of England*. Originally, as I have said, no real distinction was made between Church and State—"the distinction between spiritual and temporal authorisation was very lightly drawn" as Stubbs put it.¹ After the Conquest, the English Church was drawn into much closer relation with the Church on the Continent—i.e. the Roman—but certainly at first the King retained his power over it. The Conqueror enjoined the Bishops "not to enact or prohibit anything but what had first been ordained by the King."² No Englishman was to acknowledge a Pope as Apostolic until the King had issued his consent, no legate might land without his permission, nor English ecclesiastic leave the country without his leave. Nor might papal letters be published without his approval. Later on, when Papal pretensions grew, they were often rejected or abridged. In 1351 the Statute of Provisors sought to check the custom of the Pope of thrusting his own nominees into English benefices: in 1353 the Statute of Præmunire sought to stop ecclesiastical cases being taken out of the courts of the realm for hearing at Rome. When Boniface VIII issued the Bull "Clericis laicos" declaring that lay persons have no control whatever over ecclesiastical property, and the clergy acknowledged the Bull, they were promptly outlawed—and gave way. Thus, all through, the State was insisting on its rights in the Church as a national Church and refusing to acknowledge the Papal claims. In 1399 Parliament even declared the Crown and realm so free that the Pope could not interfere with it. On the other hand, often enough when disputes arose between King and Pope, a compromise was reached whereby the Pope was allowed certain powers

¹ Report of Archbishops' Committee on Church and State (1916), p. 7.

² Report of Archbishops' Committee on Church and State (1916), p. 9.

in England, as in the controversy over investitures under Henry I : the Pope was to invest, but the bishop or abbot was to do homage to the King for his temporalities. And often weak kings, or those who wished for his support went further than that and allowed the Pope to wield large authority—one even going so far as to acknowledge that he held the realm as a fief from the Pope. But that was not usual. In the main a certain if precarious independence was maintained in theory if not always in fact, though by usage the Pope had certain rights. Thus Canon Dixon rightly sums up the position before the Reform when he says : “ What the Pope possessed in England was spiritual jurisdiction : he was the head of the spiritual jurisdiction of the realm, by the King’s consent, because he was the spiritual father of Christendom. But this jurisdiction was neither in word nor deed a supremacy rivalling that of the sovereign. . . . The jurisdiction of the Pope had been limited by one statute after another : and that part of it which had been allowed to remain (the appeal in purely spiritual things as matrimony, divorce, presentment and right of tithes) was matter of grant from the temporal power.” He adds a note : “ I question whether the word ‘ supremacy ’ is ever applied to the Papal jurisdiction in any of the documents of the age. Power, jurisdiction or authority are the names applied to it by those who lived under it and by those who abolished it. But to the royal prerogative the word ‘ supremacy ’ is constantly applied because supremacy was what the King had.”

Technically, what happened at first under Henry VIII was that all papal jurisdiction and power in the realm was by law abolished and the Royal Supremacy not created but reaffirmed. In 1532, under threat of action under the Statutes of Præmunire, the clergy agreed not to put in use any canons not sanctioned by the King, and agreed that the existing canons should be examined to see which were detrimental to the royal authority. In 1533, the Act in Restraint of Appeals definitely marked the break with Rome. Its language is interesting—there is no idea of the State starting a new church. It continues the old one, declaring it spiritually self-contained :¹ “ This realm of England is an empire . . . governed by one supreme head and king . . . the body spiritual having power, when any cause of the law divine happened to come in question or of spiritual learning, then it was declared interpreted and showed by that part of the said body politic called the spirituality, now being usually called the English Church which . . . hath been always thought and is also at this hour sufficient and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such doubts and to administer all such offices and duties as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain.” In 1534 came the Supreme Head Act—and again the language is interesting :² “ Albeit the king’s majesty justly and rightfully is and ought to be the supreme head of the Church in England, and

¹ Report of Archbishops’ Committee on Church and State (1916), p. 225.

² Report of Archbishops’ Committee on Church and State (1916), p. 227.

so is recognised by the clergy of this realm in their convocations, yet nevertheless for corroboration and confirmation thereof," etc., etc. Incidentally in the Act the saving clause *quantum per Christi legem licet* inserted by Convocation was omitted. The Act asserted that the King was to enjoy such jurisdiction and authority as belonged to his dignity with power to "visit reform and correct" all heresies and errors "which, by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought to be reformed or corrected."

In all that there is no suggestion of what is usually meant by a church "by law established," a phrase about which I should like to interpose a few words. I do not know when it first appeared, but I think that what has popularised its use and made it seem authoritative is its appearance in the English version of the Canons of 1604. But of those canons, it is the Latin not the English which is authoritative. In the Latin canons, the word translated "established" is not *fundatus*, but "*stabilitus*" or "*constitutus*," and in their context they mean not that the Church has been set up or constituted by law, but that its forms of liturgy and ceremonial, because of disputes, have been so settled, and its articles, only the last by Convocation. There is nothing in the Latin Canons of 1604 to support the popular idea of "by law established" and, to revert, there was nothing in the legislation under Henry VIII. The Church was thought of as continuing its previous existence—apostolic in the sense that it followed apostolic models, with the jurisdiction of the Pope abolished and that of the King reaffirmed. Moreover, throughout Henry tried to keep the Convocations alive as real legislating bodies and to work with and through them. If they were only to pass canons with his sanction, that was merely a return to the Conqueror's position. If he made his visitatorial powers a reality through his vicar-general—that, after all, was only the civil power intervening to carry out the laws of the Church which the church officers had neglected to execute. Until the *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum* was carried out—it never was effectively—the old canons were valid. The Act of the Six Articles was not an invasion of the Church's rights, but only an attempt by civil legislation to insist on the observation of certain rites and beliefs which were common to the English and Roman Church and which had not yet been repudiated by Convocation. Indeed, in the main, in spite of his tyrannical disposition, Henry does not seem to have wished for any change except the abolition of Papal jurisdiction. As Visitor, he issued injunctions—but surely that was within the scope of the language of the Act of Supremacy. He appointed Bishops—but in fact the kings had often done the same before. But I seriously doubt whether, on his own authority, he issued any doctrinal statements. Carnegie Simpson says he did put out "provisional articles of religion." If so, it was going beyond his visitatorial powers. But Simpson does not specify exactly what he means. The Ten Articles of 1536 were the first to appear, and it is very doubtful who drew them up. Certainly the King had some hand in them, but probably they were at least authorised

by the Upper House of Convocation ; anyhow, they were subscribed by many of the Bishops. Professor Powicke thinks the Bishops drew them up. The Institution of 1537—the Bishops' Book—was drawn up by the Bishops, a process Latimer found very irksome. The so-called King's Book—the Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man—of 1543 though put forward with the King's sanction, had been fully discussed by Convocation. I do not know of any other doctrinal statements in Henry's reign. It is true that the title "Supreme Head" without qualification appears ominous—and it is true that Henry did *personally* control and guide things in a way which was not consistent with the full liberty of the Church. But roughly the legal position was not that the Church became more the servant of the State than before, except that the strength of the backing drawn from connection with Rome was abolished. The usurped powers of the Pope were resumed by the King—a not intolerable position if the King's powers are regarded as merely visitatorial and not doctrinal. His power of veto over convocation and of nominating bishops are a different matter—but they were not an innovation.

Under Edward VI an entirely different state of affairs arose. The Council of Regency acted as though the royal supremacy was vested in its members and used their position to carry out their own sometimes extreme views without recognising the limitations which even Henry VIII had recognised. The Church was treated as though it was a mere department of the State, and its bishops as state officers—e.g. the Council decided that the authority of the bishops depended on Henry's authorisation and ceased with his death ; all bishops were therefore required to take out new commissions under the new King. And at once their powers were suspended that a royal visitation should take place, with a view to which injunctions were ordered. These in many ways went against what was the rule in Henry's day—and, in their innovations, far beyond merely visitatorial rules. The Council was trying to force reforms on the Church under the cloak of royal supremacy. By Act of Parliament, communion was ordered to be in both kinds in 1547. The Prayer Book of 1549 was authorised by Parliament, but probably not by Convocation—it is a much-disputed point. The Forty-two Articles of 1553 were issued by royal mandate, and again possibly without the assent of Convocation, though Cranmer was largely responsible for drawing them up. It is also uncertain whether Convocation ever passed the 1552 book. So what we get here is plainly an attempt to reduce the Church to a mere department of the State, with the Council and Parliament in control.

All that was completely upset by the reign of Mary, and when Elizabeth came to the throne, there was—or threatened to be—complete confusion, especially when the flood of those who had withdrawn to Switzerland began to pour back into England. The first thing was to secure some recognised authority—and the first act of the Parliament of 1559 (Elizabeth only succeeded in November, 1558) was the Supremacy Act, declaring the sovereign to be supreme

governor (not head) and requiring all ecclesiastical persons to acknowledge the Queen, on oath, to be "the only supreme governor of this realm in all spiritual and ecclesiastical causes or temporal." In the Royal Injunctions issued in the same year Elizabeth sought to quiet any scruples about the supremacy by carefully explaining that she did not "challenge authority and power of ministry of divine offices in the Church," but only to have "the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms . . . of what state, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be." Her policy has been summed up, I think accurately, as "to restore to the Church its comparative independence of action, reserving to herself, as supreme governor of the realm, a power of guidance of ecclesiastical affairs behind the scenes, while keeping clear of public responsibility for action taken by the Church."¹ It is true that the new Prayer Book was settled by Act of Parliament without consulting Convocation—for, of course the Marian Bishops would not accept it. But that was in 1559, and as Frere observes: "A religious revolution, like any other revolution, must risk technical irregularities and be content to do exceptional things in the confidence that the event will justify them." But thereafter on more than one occasion she checked, with a good deal of force, attempts of Parliament to interfere in doctrinal and ecclesiastical matters, declaring that such was not its province. True, there was an Act in 1571 ordering subscription to the Articles—but they were the Articles drawn up by Convocation in 1563. The Court of High Commission was established, but its functions, however severely carried out, were to see that the ecclesiastical laws were observed, not to frame them. There was also repressive legislation against those who would not conform—but then again the State was not dictating to the Church but trying to enforce its rules. On the other hand, when Parker wished her to authorise a book of discipline, Elizabeth made him put it out on his own authority, not hers—the Advertisements of 1566. And she did constantly, as Visitor, urge on the Bishops their duty to suppress irregularities, even suspending one archbishop who did not go so far as she thought right. Of course, she still had, like Henry, a veto on the decisions of Convocation, and it is difficult to know what would have happened if it had made a decision of which she disapproved. But after the first year of difficulty, the position was really more what it had been under Henry—the Church was not under parliamentary control but legislated for itself in Convocation. The Queen appointed the Bishops, she had and used visitatorial powers; but she did all she could to rouse the Church to act as a self-governing body through Convocation.

Into the troubled waters of the Stuart period we need not plunge, save to note that the Prayer Book of 1661 was the work of Convocation without serious alteration by Parliament.² But the situation began to change in the eighteenth century, and the idea of the

¹ Report of Archbishops' Committee on Church and State (1916), p. 230.

² Two unimportant changes were made in the House of Lords.

Church under its supreme governor as an entity independent of State control practically disappeared. There were two causes for this. First of all the rulers, from William onwards, with the exception of Anne, did not really take their position as Governor seriously and, moreover, the real power of the King in the country was slowly but surely passing to the legislature. Secondly, from 1717-1854 Convocation was never summoned. The result was that any legislation on Church affairs was by Parliament rather than the Church—a fact which has done much to confirm the popular interpretation of “by law established,” and, indeed, to give substance to it; but this was not the result of deliberate anti-church policy on the part of the State. Of such legislation, appearing to involve the control of the Church by Parliament, there was a good deal. “Such administrative machinery as the Church of England possesses has been built up by Parliament, and largely during the period 1818-1885” say Smith and Dibdin,¹ and they specify as follows: “The erection of new bishoprics; the creation of new, and the subdivision of old, parishes; the restraint of pluralities; the leasing and sale of glebe; the substitution of tithe rent charge for tithe in kind, and its redemption; the abolition of sinecures and the better employment of their endowments” and so on. Plainly, Parliament has taken a hand in purely ecclesiastical concerns. Moreover, it has even touched on matters which seem at any rate akin to discipline, if not even to doctrine. It is true that the last revision of the Prayer Book sanctioned by Parliament in 1870 was prepared by Convocation. Parliament has not laid down the law over the Church there or in the matter of the Articles. But in other ways Parliament has clearly interfered. The procedure in Church Courts is controlled by Act of Parliament, though they still deal with clerical offences. There is, however, now an appeal for them to the King’s Court. The civil consequences of excommunication have been abolished. The Clerical Disabilities Act of 1870, contrary to canon law, make it possible for a Priest to resign his Orders; in 1857 the remarriage of a divorced person according to the rites of the Church was allowed, and in the same year matrimonial and testamentary cases were removed from the Church Courts to specially constituted Civil Courts. Now all that has in fact made it appear as though the Church was simply a department of state controlled by Parliament. But it was, I think, not done deliberately. There was no attempt to change legally the position of the Church as under Elizabeth: but in the failure of the Church to act and legislate, because Convocation did not meet, Parliament stepped in.

With the resumption of Convocation, however, there has once more come forward the idea of the Church as a self-governing body, not a mere department of the State. This led to the Enabling Act which gives the Church a real legislating body better in a way than even Convocation, for the laity are represented in it. But that body, as we learned to our cost, only legislates subject to the approval

¹ Report of Archbishops’ Committee on Church and State (1916), p. 24.

and consent of Parliament. That is the present position. In a sense Parliament, the heir of the royal power in other spheres, has also obtained the equivalent of the kingly veto on Convocation—and of course the Prime Minister has much to do with the nomination of Bishops. But there is much more recognition of the Church as a self-governing society, and it is inconceivable that Parliament should now try to dictate to her any change in belief or practice. How far it may be possible, without disestablishment, to obtain further liberty for the Church it is difficult to estimate. At least she might be allowed to choose her own bishops and officers. It is not easy to see, however, in what way, so long as the Church is recognised by the State, she can have complete freedom to change rites or doctrines without the consent of Parliament—for if recognition is given by statute, the civil power must know exactly what is being recognised—and that means some authoritative, fixed standard, any change in which Parliament would have to agree to. Even in Scotland I imagine the State has the right to withdraw its recognition if it wants. But it does not seem to me that such control is too heavy a price to pay for state recognition—provided that it is exercised reasonably by Parliament. The difficulty over the revised Prayer Book, to my mind, was that while Parliament had clearly a legal right to do what it did, it had not a moral right. One can however hope that in time the legal right will be exercised, so to speak, morally, and the Church, while still established, will have effective freedom.

The course of public lectures in the University of Leeds on the Historical Background of Christianity by Dr. E. O. James, Professor of the History and Philosophy of Religion in the University of Leeds, has been issued by S.P.C.K. (4s. net). The author is complete master of his subject and gives a most clear and useful picture of the world and its thought during the great critical period of the spread of Christianity throughout the world, until it became the accepted religion of the Roman Empire. After a description of the Graeco-Roman world an account is given of the philosophic thought and the mystery religions which in some way prepared the world for the acceptance of the Christian faith. Then the Jewish background is considered, and the place of The Christ in His Fulness is presented. The views of St. Paul and the Apostolic Church are then considered with the rise of Hellenism and the special forms of Gentile Christianity. The closing chapters are on "Councils, Creeds, and Cults," and "Christian Civilisation." They illustrate the various phases and conflicts through which the Church passed until it arrived at its more or less settled position in the fourth century. A closing comparison with our own age is rather suggestive of a condition of decay and disintegration unless the spiritual foundation and Christian values are given their full significance.

THE VALUE OF THE NATIONAL CHURCH.

A TALK BY THE RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF NORWICH, K.C.V.O.

I ALWAYS call myself an English Churchman. I am not so very keen on the subject of Church and *State*; what I am keen on is the National Church of England. I am always rather afraid when people talk about Church and State, that they may have in their minds a State Church; and then may turn their eyes on Germany and begin to say things which are wholly irrelevant in England. It is rather the National Church than the State Church on which I would prefer to be allowed to speak. I am glad I am not going to be asked to talk upon the established Church. The word "established" I think does much harm in our consideration of the national Church. As a matter of fact it is not until the seventeenth century that you get the phrase, "established by law," and the phrase "established by law" has led to the misconception that the Church of England was originally set up by law. "Established by law" really means recognised by law as being already established. The Church was established in English life something like 800 years before the phrase was used. The Church has been an integral part of English life from the beginning. The position of the Church of England is therefore quite different from the Church in Ireland. People will sometimes speak as if the Church of England could be disestablished by repealing an Act of Parliament. That is not the case.

It is also forgotten that the disestablishment of the Church, if it ever came, would have to be the work of Parliament. You would have to pass an Act, not repealing an existing Act, but a new Act. The disestablishment of the Church would not be the work of the Church itself, but the work of Parliament. I like to look upon the nation and the Church as co-operating together. I like to set my ideals high. There are many people who talk about the divergences between Church and State; what I love to think of is the nation and the Church united hand in hand for promoting the Kingdom of God. It purifies our arguments and clarifies our vision if we think of the Church and State working together for God. Consequently it is very important that the nation should observe what is being done by the Church. The nation, as represented in Parliament and in other ways, is deeply concerned in the work of the Church. The nation, taking it at its best, is out for the welfare of all the citizens. When you come to such an important thing as, shall we say? the revision of the Prayer Book, it is, to my mind, not only the legal, but the moral duty of bodies representing the State, to say: "Now we want to look at the highest welfare of the citizens. We believe that forms of worship

influence conduct ; let us be sure that we make no change in forms of worship which might have, or could have, a mischievous effect upon the conduct and character of the nation." We cannot divide forms of worship from character and general welfare by a sharp line. There is an inter-connection between them, and those who are responsible for the welfare of the nation must take care that no unfortunate influence should come to operate upon the character of the nation in a way to affect the general welfare. That is the idea with which I start ; we have the nation and the Church working together for God. It is their privilege to advance the general welfare, and that means the work of God in the world.

When you come to what is the value of the national Church, perhaps I have already said all that I have to say. But I can divide it up into a good many different aspects. First of all I believe that it is to the fact that our Church is a national Church that we owe our parochial system. It appears to me that the disestablishment of the Church would immediately cripple that beneficent influence that has spread all over the country. People, of course, can be Christian men and women without belonging to the national Church, but our national Church gives a corporate consolidation to the Christian outlook of the nation : *that* would cease if the Church were disestablished.

We cannot separate disendowment from disestablishment. Disestablishment, to my mind, would be a tenfold worse disaster than disendowment, but if disendowment came the Church would first fail in its opportunities among the poorest people. Rich congregations, no doubt, could put up satisfactory stipends and make satisfactory arrangements, but you would find in a short time, outlying districts would be surrendered : that is a very big thing. For, at present, wherever you go in England, there is one man set down with his family in every parish or every two parishes, and no one can estimate all the steadiness, wholesomeness and uplifting power that has emanated through the ages from the parsonages throughout the whole length and breadth of our land. That kind of thing would be very much impaired.

We may pass to the influence of the parochial clergy upon those who are not members of the Church of England. The wise parish priest makes friends with his Free Church parishioners. Many of them are not Free Churchmen from an argumentative standpoint. We have to remember that some of the weaknesses of the Church of England 150 years ago were repaired by the Free Church bodies. These Nonconformist people talk of the village church as " our church " ; they look with no hostility on the Church of England, and we may be very thankful that they have not so logically and accurately read the Enabling Act as to see that they have no part or parcel with the Church. Though they are very properly excluded from the government of the Church, there is no hostility between the Nonconformists in the parishes, and the Church of England ; there is no hostility between Nonconformist leaders and the Church.

Fifty years ago they favoured disestablishment : but the Free

Church people to-day regard the Church of England as a, or the, main bulwark against paganism. They do not wish the Church of England to be brought down. They would say: "We are all Christian men, and we are all out together for the upholding of Christian standards, and we are grateful that you, with your great history behind you and your remarkable opportunities, are leading the way; and we wish you well." We thank them for their charity, and we believe that what they say is true.

One of the great privileges of our being a national Church is that we have our beautiful churches. I remember a discussion in the early days of my episcopate when it was said that our cathedrals were too beautiful and too precious possessions to be left to the chance good offices of Deans and Chapters and that they ought to be brought under the control of the Office of Works. There was a good deal said on the subject, and the Bishop of Bristol of those days took a leading part in opposing any proposal for a new kind of control. Since those days, much more attention has been paid to our cathedrals and parish churches, and in the last twenty-five years we have come to do our work very much better. Those beautiful buildings are ours; that is because we are a national Church. If the Church ceased to be national, I do not quite know what the ownership would be. There we have this great heritage in which our history is written in stone. If disestablishment came, and disendowment, we could not be at all certain that we should still continue our historic ownership.

If you ask most people what does the establishment of the Church of England mean, they would tell you the bishops sit in the House of Lords, which does represent a small percentage of the total value of the establishment of the national Church. I read once that this was a great disadvantage because it made the bishops worldly. When one sees how seldom they appear in the House I do not know that my brethren really have their heads turned to worldliness by being in the House of Lords. I am sure they are useful when they are present.

It makes the very greatest difference to us that so much of our public life is initiated and consecrated to God by prayer. I do not believe that the prayers of the House of Commons are a mere form, though some say the Members can pray at home or in the open air: that is one of the reasons given for people not going to church, because they say they can pray at home, though it needs an extraordinary power of concentration to get near to God out of doors or by yourself. Whenever the Assizes are held, the law and order and liberty and the administration of right for which our judges stand, are all dedicated to God by the opening service of the Assize: so is it with Parliament.

What about the consecration of our whole nationality in the coronation service? The whole Empire is really present in the Abbey when the Archbishop anoints and crowns the King to his office, and the Church, in the person of the Archbishop, welcomes the King to a divinely given office, which is day by day further

dedicated to God by our constant prayers for the King and his ministers. Public men and officers can and do pray at home. But this is no substitute for national recognition of God.

Archbishop Temple of Canterbury once said: "I think dis-establishment would be a step down for the whole nation." I have no doubt he was right. I believe it would be a step down for the whole Empire. (I refer to the coherence of the Church and Nation.) What would happen if the position of our national Church was impaired? What would happen if our national Church was changed into a shadow of its former self? Think how that would be received by the godless elements all over the world, in Europe and elsewhere. Among Churchmen, of course, it is the Roman Church which would stand to gain a very great deal. The Roman Catholic Church would say that it was still compact and stable, and that it still had a welcome for all those who would come into the true fold. They would say the Church of England had made it clear to the world, as it always had been to the Romans, that it was a mere sect, and that those who wanted to be in the tradition of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, must come and join the Church of Rome, and that there was no longer any rival that could pretend to offer a welcome to the devout.

It should also be remembered that we do not try to draw a line between the secular and the sacred. I believe we are right to do our recognised duties actuated by the highest devotion, and it would be a real misfortune for us to say: "On that side of the line I am a Christian, and on that side of the line I am a citizen." That division between the secular and the sacred would have a very bad effect on the individual outlook and upon both duty and worship.

It is our national Church that has a great deal to do with the coherence of our Empire. The Church of England is not established anywhere else outside England, but the Church in the Empire is in touch with the Church of England at home, and in many places you will find the Governor of a province who is glad to hear the views of the Anglican bishop on the chief questions, remembering that he speaks with authority because he is in touch with the bishops of this our national Church which is infusing the national life at home.

The Church and State report says very little about the obligations of the Church to the nation. There is nothing to complain of in this, for it was appointed to raise the issue from the other side. But it is because we have a national Church that the Church does still have an immense effect even upon those who are careless, and appear to take no interest in the ministrations of the Church. But think of Armistice Day, 1918; think of the King's Jubilee; think of the King's illness years ago and his death recently. Where do people turn? Immediately they flock to the churches. It is so, not only in national events, but in personal events. People who do not at other times come to church, do like to be married in church. They come to church when they are in sorrow. There

is the feeling that the Church is the friend of all when they want to be at their best, and it would be a dreadful misfortune if we stood down from that position. The Church is bound up with the deepest emotions of the lives of the people, and it would be a great pity if our Church became, perhaps academically more efficient, but a little body revolving around itself, instead of using the opportunity of consecrating the national life.

This is not a question of privilege. If it is, it is the privilege of service. You and I have a right in every home in the land. We may be welcome at the moment or not, but generally speaking, we are not intruders. What could be worse than to withdraw from people because they do not commonly use the ministrations of the Church? We do not want to deal with mere congregations. We want our Church to continue to be right in the middle of our national life, the Church and the nation each having its blessed hold upon one another.

It is because our Church is the national Church that one party in the Church is unable to dominate all the rest. It has been the case all the way through that as each party has tried to dominate the Church as a whole, the national Church and Government has had some say in the matter to prevent it; it is due to that that we have been kept together. If we ceased to be a national Church, and the Church was to be entirely guided by the Church Assembly as it at present exists, we might find that that generous tolerance and the remembrance that it takes all sorts of Churchmen to build up the Body of Christ, would be lost or impaired.

I will conclude by two extracts: one from a pamphlet by Chancellor Vaisey, who was one of the Commissioners who signed the Report: the other consisting of some words of our great philosopher, the Archbishop of Armagh, who writes:

There is no sign that the people of Great Britain, whether in communion with the Church of England or not, desire its disestablishment. The real question is this: Are Church and State to be driven into opposition by rash and ill-advised action? Remember that in great countries on the continent of Europe, not to look to more distant lands, Church and State are more or less in continual conflict, or in a condition of armed neutrality in relation to one another. The Church comes, in such circumstances, to be regarded by great numbers as a vast conspiracy against the liberties of the nation. That is a terrible state of things; and the freedom of England from that disastrous condition has been due to the fact that the English people, with their profound common sense, and their happy disregard of the abstract doctrines of the theorist, have always determined to be masters in their own house, and to have their own national Church as part of the whole economy of their national life. The real meaning of the Establishment of the Church of England is just that. It expresses the Christian Faith of the nation. It is the nation on the religious side. Some theorists, in order to throw discredit on all this, call it Erastian. Calling names is always a stupid form of argument. But Erastianism is really not the correct description. Call it organic, and the relation of Church and State in England becomes clear. The people of England inherited their Faith and inherited their Church as essentials of the national life, and there is no sign that they want to part with these great possessions. Recent events seem to prove quite clearly that the people, not merely of England, but of all Great

Britain, mean to preserve the Church, and to preserve it in such a way as may make it continue to be the true representative of the Faith of the nation.

Chancellor Vaisey has written:

What is really the gist of the matter is the undoubted fact that *no measure of disestablishment could possibly free the Church from the peril of such interference in the future.* Like every other institution, divine or human, in the land, it would continue just as before to be liable to be meddled with by the legislature in so far as public opinion or political expediency might from time to time require such a course to be adopted. No concordat can ever, in this world, be immutable. And a "disestablished" Church of England would continue, or at least ought to continue, to be far too potent a force in the life of the nation to warrant any hope that its affairs would ever be regarded as standing outside the province of permissible legislative interference. This is what the advocates of "disestablishment for the good of the Church" appear so frequently to overlook. The notion that establishment is equivalent to bondage, and disestablishment to freedom, does not really stand examination, and is a delusion. For it is inconceivable that the Church, no longer "established," would be allowed what is called a "free hand" to frame for all purposes and for ever its own future policy. Its adherence to or departure from the traditional lines of Catholic thought, and its insistence upon or minimization of its "Protestant" elements, would be not less jealously watched than at present, and if and when its tendencies should become out of harmony with public opinion, coercive measures would without question be brought to bear upon it. It is, however, important and only fair to remember that the State has rarely, if ever, since the Reformation attempted to dictate to the Church in matters of doctrine and practice, but has left it to the Church to initiate, reserving only the right to grant or withhold its sanction to what the Church has itself proposed. This can scarcely be counted a hardship when we reflect that there is no "free Church" in this country in which a novelty of doctrine or practice, not included, expressly or by implication, in its deed of trust, could be lawfully introduced without the sanction of Parliament; its introduction in the absence of such sanction would give a right of action enabling any dissentient member of that Church to prevent it.

I ask you to consider those words, and to see whether it would not be a disaster if, by trying in a spirit of logic to get those clear edges, which are so unusual in God's dealings, we destroyed a great co-operation and a great alliance. That is too weak a word. If you look back to early history, the Church was one before the nation was one, and they have grown up side by side. I prefer to think of them as interpenetrating, and as having inter-coherence with one another. I believe this is a time to take great trouble, to think and to change our thoughts into action. I believe that a nation has a life and a personality, and these must be developed on the noblest lines of progress. We must not try to remove the spiritual aspects of a nation's life. I cannot think it is possible to maintain that this relation between Church and State will be as effective to the highest good in one way as in another. We have a great heritage, and it is for us to guard it. We may get a self-centred and self-contained religious body, but when we have got that, I believe we shall have lost all.

THE LIFE AND GOVERNMENT OF THE NATIONAL CHURCH.

BY THE REV. T. W. GILBERT, D.D., Principal of St. John's Hall, Highbury.

IN arranging this subject the Committee no doubt had in mind the ideal and the actual, the ideal of what the life and government of the National Church ought to be, and what that life and government actually is. The subject, moreover, is inextricably bound up with the Church and State Report which is our main preoccupation at this Conference.

Perhaps our best starting-point is to see how the National Church acted at its inception, for the study of origins usually gives the clue to the after-history of any subject. Omitting the history of the British Church, whose story remains for us as yet only in broad outline, we can at all events get some leading ideas from the early Anglo-Saxon Church. Whether we take Ethelbert of Kent, Ine of Wessex, or Alfred later, we see certain salient facts. We find that through the agency of the King and his Witan, a definite Christian impress was laid upon a pagan people, or upon a people feeling its way from paganism. This impress is seen in the new value given to human personality, in a higher value given to human life, in the moralising of law, and in the general inculcation of principles which affected the lives of the individual Anglo-Saxons.

The same thing is seen from an examination of any of the national Church Councils of the period, such as Cloveshoe. An ideal standard of official life is held up for bishops and other clergy, whilst a high standard of morality is demanded from all in orders.

In its broad results, as J. R. Green and others point out, the National Church acting through King and Witan, through bishops and clergy, revolutionised the old pagan standard of life, and held up a new ideal for everyone.

No doubt such a task was relatively easy in a rude age, and amongst a pagan people, just as it is easy to see a revolution in life and conduct when Christian missionaries to-day have the joy of seeing heathen people converted to Christ. But the same truth holds good in the days after the Anglo-Saxon period. We can see it in the stand by individuals such as Lanfranc and Anselm against the grossness and immoralities of kings like William I and William Rufus, as in the vigorous protests of Grosseteste against the corruptions of the Papacy. We find it in the satires of Langland, Chaucer, and Wycliffe against the casuistry and immorality of the Friars. We see it in the rising standard of morality in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the principles of the Reformation are being worked out, just as we see it in the definite improvement in the whole outlook of national life, individual and social, which resulted from the Evangelical Revival.

Thus from the beginnings until the present era, the broad sweep

of our national life shows us a continual move forward, with many retrogressions at times, but a development from a rude and gross paganism to a civilisation which is trying, however imperfectly, to work its life on Christian principles. The mainspring and the driving force have been Christian principles enunciated by Kings or Archbishops, Councils or Bishops, prominent individuals or groups of individuals.

Closer examination no doubt will show that it was not always the Church as a whole which was responsible for the high standard which meant progress. The vigorous condemnation by Boniface, Alcuin and others of the scandalous lives of King, Bishops and monks, is sufficient indication of the lax morality of the Anglo-Saxon Church of the eighth century, and this type of condemnation can be found in varying forms up to the eighteenth century. In every organisation individuals will fall from the ideal, and every organisation seems at times to go back upon the aims of its founder. And this, unfortunately, is as true of our own National Church as of other churches. But admitting all such imperfections, the broad fact remains true that the National Church changed our ancestors from pagans to Christians, and has laid the impression of Christian ideals upon every aspect of our national life. It matters not what our definition of the National Church may be, whether we see our ideal in the Middle Ages, or in later days, the main truth remains.

There is nothing very striking in this, in fact it is merely stating an obvious truism. For the Church after all is composed of Christians, it is a body of people who profess to follow the example of Christ, it is a corporation of those who, as individuals as well as in their corporate capacity, are trying to bring the spirit of Christ into the affairs of everyday life. Their efforts may at times have been hampered by a restricted and perverted view of Christianity, and the page of its history is strewn with many a shameful story, but the ideal was ever there, and the progressive moving towards the ideal has meant a far more real Christianity, and a consequent greater influence on the national life.

No doubt we shall be conscious of a difference in the way in which the influence of the National Church is felt and exercised at different periods in her history. In pre-Conquest days the influence of a Christian King seems paramount as we notice the Christian tone of the laws he promulgates: in the Middle Ages the standard seems to be set by clergy and barons—though this may only be because they were the people of whom Chroniclers take most notice: in post-Reformation days the rank and file of the laity came into their own, and the influence of the ordinary man is seen in increasing importance from the sixteenth century onwards.

This enables us to see that the National Church touches the life of the nation in very different ways at different periods. Up to the days of the Norman Conquest there is a continuous effort through the agency of powerful Kings and Church leaders to stamp out heathen practices, and to inculcate Christian ideas in law and in life. In the Middle Ages, when the country is nominally Christian,

the Church and the Nation are simply two sides of the same medal, and it is often difficult to see whether it is the Church which is influencing the nation or whether the nation is influencing the Church. But in post-Reformation days the position becomes clearer. The rising standard of conduct is seen, not so much now in monarchs as in the saintly lives of different members of the Church, both clerical and lay. The ever-increasing knowledge of the Bible from the middle of the sixteenth century onwards inevitably makes itself felt. Christian principles were now more generally known, and they began to be more generally applied. The result was that a higher standard resulted in individual lives, and a higher sense of responsibility began to arise about matters which concerned the general life of the nation. Something of this latter may be seen for example in the great Poor Law Act of Elizabeth's reign, at the beginning of the post-Reformation period, just as it is noticed in the social legislation of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

But the driving force for such changes comes, as a rule, from below and not from above. It is not a body of officials driving a reluctant organisation along the path of progress. Just the reverse. It is the enlightened conscience of individuals, stirred to action by Christian principles, influencing their fellows and convincing them that changes are necessary—it is in this way that the great changes came.

Such a condition seems axiomatic, and yet to many people it is not so. It may be that the tendency to dictatorship and authoritarianism of to-day predisposes people to look for causes of influence always from those in authority. But this is certainly not true of the religious world since the days of the Reformation. For amongst the outstanding results of the Reformation was the realisation of the value of the individual in the sight of God. And if the individual had value in the sight of God, then he had value, or ought to have value, in the sight of his fellow-men. Therefore individual liberty, the right of the individual to think for himself, and to spread his views, are part of the Reformation heritage, and it is this individualism and this democracy which caused the expansion and the development of England from the sixteenth century onwards.

Hence whatever part Parliament or Convocations or Church Assembly may play in the life of the Church, and their part is important enough, yet the life of the Church is obviously the life of the individual members of it. Outstanding personalities may occasionally arise to influence their fellows, and official and representative assemblies may at times make proclamations which have their weight and influence, but in the last resort it is the individual members which make the Church, and the life of the individual members determines the value and influence of the Church.

All this has a direct bearing upon our view of the government of the Church. We are not here concerned with theories about Episcopacy or Presbyterianism or any other method of Church organisation. We accept *ex animo* the statement of our formularies that Episcopacy is traceable to Apostolic times, and we are content

with that. But whilst Episcopacy and the right of the individual to think for himself are not incompatible there is a real difference in value between the two. Episcopacy owes itself to a natural development in apostolic times, whilst the value of the individual in the sight of God is a fundamental point of the Christian revelation. If a balance must be struck between the two, then of necessity the value of the individual must come first.

The point is of considerable importance. Christianity is a revelation, and the revelation is contained in the Bible. We may reverence the Creeds, we may value the decrees of the early Church Councils, and we may look to the writings of the early Fathers or to the Reformers, but all these only have their authoritative value in so far as they are proven by the Bible. And in the interpretation of the Bible, and in assessing the value of creeds or Councils or Fathers, the average educated clergyman is as well qualified to do so as Pope or Archbishop, and the average educated layman may do so as well as Bishop, Priest or Deacon. There are no mysteries reserved for an ordained person or assembly of ordained persons which are not open to everyone else. The strength of the Christian faith is not because its secrets are for the learned, but because the faithful follower of Christ can test the truths of Christ for himself.

The Christian religion therefore puts the individual in a unique position. The sacredness of personality, the right to think for oneself, these are fundamental to the Christian revelation.

At first sight this seems to put a premium on individualism run mad, but there is no logical necessity for this. The ideal citizen of Aristotle found his place in a state which allowed the full development of the individual. The Monarchical State of our own England is working its way to the fuller development of the individual citizen within the framework of a constitution which is monarchical. If an ancient and a modern state, working on different lines, have not found it impossible to allow the fullest place for the individual citizen neither has the National Church.

The accuracy of this statement will at once be challenged. Men will think of the sufferings of the first band of men who pleaded for toleration in Elizabeth's reign, i.e., the Brownists or later Independents. They will think of the struggles of the seventeenth century when Episcopalians and Puritans of differing types showed each other little toleration. They will think of the very slow developments of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when toleration was grudgingly doled out to Nonconformists, to Quakers, Jews and Atheists.

This, however, is really part of a different question. Where a body of men, be they Independents or Presbyterians or Quakers, happen by circumstances over which they have no control, to be within the ranks of the National Church, they have two alternatives. They may attempt, as the Presbyterian Cartwright did in Elizabeth's reign, to convert their fellows to their own point of view. They may attempt, as did the Brownists who had conscientious scruples about the State connection with religion, to cut themselves

adrift from the National Church. The difficulty for Presbyterian and Brownists or Independents of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was that the vast majority of men felt that Church and State must be one, and it was because of this, that intolerance and persecution ensued.

We are faced, however, with a very different position to-day. Membership of the National Church is now not a matter of compulsion, but of free choice. We may be baptised therein as infants, but our free choice comes at Confirmation when we make our affirmation of faith in Christ and implicitly our adherence to the National Church. The Church to which we have given our adherence has fixed formularies, viz., in its Prayer Book and Articles, formularies which are to be interpreted by the teaching of those who drew them up. The Church in its corporate capacity claims "auctoritas," or moral authority, in matters of faith, as Article xx declares, with the limiting and interpreting explanation that the Church must not "ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written." The kind of auctoritas referred to can be seen in such examples as St. Paul's address to the Ephesian Elders (Acts xx. 31), his advice to Timothy (1 Tim vi. 20 ; 2 Tim ii. 2) and to Titus (i. 9). But at the same time St. Paul made it clear that he had no "dominion" or "lordship" over the faith of his converts (2 Cor. i. 24), and if he had not, neither has the Church over the individual to-day. The safeguard from any disastrous impasse is the appeal of both Church and individual to the Bible, as Article xx indicates.

Thus in principle the Church safeguards the right of the individual member, and gives full weight to the fundamental principle of the Christian faith, viz., the value of the individual in the sight of God. It thus safeguards liberty of conscience, it gives scope to prophesying, and it gives, or should give, equal rights to laity with clergy in matters of doctrine and worship. For there is a distinct fallacy in regarding the Church as composed of "Bishops with clergy and laity," just as much as if one described it as composed of "Laity with Clergy and Bishops."

This leads us to a brief consideration of the "government" of the Church.

The modern system of government assumed its early form in the thirteenth century when the representative system was hammered out for both Church and State. In this, just as in the origin of a national assembly, the Church led the way, but in the Model Parliament of 1295 both Church and Parliament achieved something like a National representative system. In this 1295 Parliament the nation was represented by Lords Spiritual and Temporal in the House of Lords, whilst in the House of Commons were found representatives of the boroughs and of counties. The Clergy representatives in Convocation met as a "House" of Parliament, and there is evidence that Convocation met in this way as a "House" of Parliament on various occasions in the early part of the fourteenth century. For all practical purposes, however, the nation has been

represented in Parliament from 1295 onwards. The passage of the centuries has modified the constitution in various ways, but the ever-widening of the franchise has gone to make Parliament more truly representative of the nation. Convocation, on the other hand, has not widened its franchise to the same extent as has the general Parliamentary system.

But putting on one side any general details, the government of the Church has been through Bishops, Clergy and Laity in Parliament and in Convocation. This has been the case from the thirteenth until the twentieth century when the Church Assembly was added to the machinery of government. The word "added" should be noted, for the Church Assembly was never intended to supplant Parliament. This was made explicit in the debates on the Enabling Bill as well as in the Enabling Bill itself.

Moreover, the Church Assembly cannot expect, at present at all events, to equal Parliament in prestige or influence. Parochial clergy who took their part in introducing Church Councils and Electoral Rolls to their people will know something of the difficulties they encountered in getting the new system into operation. It is too much to expect that in the space of a few years the Church Assembly can be truly representative or that it can be the true mouthpiece of the Church.

For the moment, therefore, it is perhaps not unfair to say that the government of the Church is in a fluid state, if not in a state of transition. We cannot look for government to the Bishops only. The Bishops have executive powers, but these powers and the general administration of the Episcopate seems to differ according to the personnel. The difference in the manner of administration to-day, as compared with that of twenty years ago, will be apparent to the most casual observer.

Nor can we look to the Houses of Convocation only, since they represent, and that inadequately, the ranks of the clergy alone.

The Church Assembly cannot be expected to assume the real place of government at present, for the reasons previously mentioned.

The only place where the average person can expect to see his religious interests safeguarded is in Parliament, and that body is hampered by the increasing pressure of general affairs, whilst moreover it has delegated the initiation of measures to the Church Assembly. Yet it is in Parliament where the traditional government of the Church is yet to be found, and that is where the average Churchman still looks for the safeguarding of his historic position in the national Church.

For the moment therefore the evolution of the government of the national Church seems incomplete, and in the determining of the course of that evolution the nation must have a voice for more reasons than one. The position of the King in relation to the National Church, is one matter for example which brings Parliament and nation into the discussion. For this involves the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement which laid down that the monarch

shall be a Protestant King of a Protestant nation and the official head of a Protestant National Church.

And if the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement calls the nation in Parliament to a watching brief, we must not overlook the fact that the Reformation itself was embodied in Acts of Parliament. The nation, through its parliamentary representatives, will in the last resort therefore have a voice in deciding the future of the Church.

The above survey therefore suggests such conclusions as the following :

(1) The "life" of the Church is not to be looked for primarily in officials or assemblies. The multiplication of officials and official bodies and the many official pronouncements and exhortations are not necessarily an indication of real life. Too often the increasing importance of officialdom is a mere effort to support organisation, and to lose sight of the man in the interest of the machine.

Therefore while the life of the Church may be reflected in Convocation, Church Assemblies, Diocesan Conferences and the like, the real life must be found in the parish and in the individual in the parish.

(2) The influence of such a life will be felt in its immediate surroundings, in home and at work as well as among those with whom the individual worships. The influence may make itself felt through the representative bodies of the Church, but it has an equal chance of making itself felt through other bodies. The pervasive influence of the English Churchman can therefore be found at work in all departments of the national life, and in a very real sense the national Church is making itself felt to-day through its individual members.

(3) Thus though there are very different conditions prevailing to-day in comparison with those in days gone by, yet the influence of the Church on the nation is in essence much the same as it has been since the days of the Reformation. It is impossible, therefore, to separate Church and State in a radical sense to-day, in the conditions existing in this country, though the incidence of the relations of Church and State may be different to what they were.

(4) Moreover, there is nothing contrary to Divine revelation in the present practical relations between Church and State in this country. These relations may seem illogical from a theoretic point of view, but they are grounded in our national history, and they have a value which is conceded even by those who have no connection with the National Church.

(5) If there is to be any change in the existing relations between Church and State, it will not come simply by resolving the National Church into a mere "sect." The latter result is looked for by few, and the consensus of opinion is against it. But if a change is to be attempted or forced, then the whole nation will be involved, since the ramifications of such a change will touch the whole structure of our national life.

THE CHURCH AND STATE REPORT AND EVIDENCE—I.

THE VEN. V. F. STORR, M.A., Archdeacon of Westminster.

LET me begin, before coming to the actual proposals in the Report of the Commission on Church and State, with a few general considerations.

(a) The composition of the Commission was obviously unfair. Only two Evangelicals were on it; and no representative of the opponents of Prayer Book revision. You will agree, I think, that as emanating from a body of that kind the Report is very temperate.

(b) We could get very little evidence in favour of Disestablishment, and, as you see, the Report wishes the Establishment to remain.

(c) We found no one—is there anyone?—to dispute the dictum laid down in the resolution which contained our terms of reference—“it is a fundamental principle that the Church . . . must in the last resort, *when its mind has been fully ascertained*, retain its inalienable right in loyalty to our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, to formulate its faith in Him, and to arrange the expression of that Holy Faith in its form of worship.”

Is there anyone who can dispute that, especially in view of the increasing tendency everywhere towards the secularisation of the modern state? Happily that process of secularisation has not gone so far in England as in other places; and I trust it will never go as far. But it will go far if Disestablishment should be the order of the day.

(d) Now in the dictum to which I have referred the crucial words are “*In the last resort, when its mind has been ascertained.*” And you will notice how again and again the Report implies that the Church’s mind has not yet been ascertained. Hence the Report deprecates any hasty action; insisting that time must be allowed for reaching, if possible, a common mind—in a word presents (as regards a large part of the proposals) an *ideal*, towards which we have to grow.

I would call your attention to page 65 in the Report. “To try to get an Act of this kind passed by Parliament, overriding the protests of a sincere and substantial minority of the Church is not a course that we can advise.”

I hope you will feel that the Commissioners were not animated by anything but the spirit of liberality, and a sincere desire to restore unity, if that is possible. It was the grave disunion of the Church which we had constantly before us.

(e) *Is unity possible?* Now here we come, of course, to the crux of the whole matter. I must state what I want to say briefly and succinctly.

There are two theologies fighting for the mastery in the Church of England. They cannot, when you get right down to rock bottom, be reconciled. Evangelicalism and Anglo-Catholicism can never come to agreement—except to differ. That is my profound belief.

Now what is to be done? How is the Evangelical to check the growth of Anglo-Catholicism? You don't stop it by girding at it. In the long run, truth wins by its own merit, and it may be that these movements have to work themselves out through a long process of time. I think there are signs that extreme Anglo-Catholicism has shot its bolt, and that a new synthesis in religion is arising which will take the best from both schools of thought.

Now I personally am prepared to see both theologies within the Church of England provided certain limits as regards order and ritual are reached and kept to. I cannot exclude from the Church of England men like Bishops King, Talbot and Gore. They have as much right to be there as we have.

If you want the Church of England brought back to Evangelicalism as a whole I can see no way of doing that, except by a slow process of education. If you can get this, then you will gradually see the colour and the representation in the Church Assembly and Convocation changed; and you will see the House of Laity more really representative of the mass of English laymen. It is not so representative. Archbishop Davidson said truly that it does not represent the average lay mind: but it does very fairly represent the mind of the *Churchgoing* layman who cares. (Perhaps Mr. Mitchell will deal with this question, on which the Commission spent much time.) I hope he will tell us how he proposes to make the House of Laity more representative.

I have been taken to task for an expression I used in an article in the *Church of England Newspaper* that the right method for Evangelicals to pursue at the present juncture was to try to "liberalise Catholicism."

That may mean one of two things; (1) It may mean coming to terms with it—let me say, for example, agreeing to Reservation within the strictly defined limits of the 1928 Book.

(2) Or it may mean, *pressing for recognition of the ideals for which we, in common with many Broad Churchmen, stand*—insisting that the Bishops shall sanction, let us say, Intercommunion with the Free Churches—a point on which many of us feel very strongly.

You liberalise Catholicism if within the Anglican Church you admit such a scheme as the South India Reunion scheme; or recognise that you have no right to fence off the Lord's Table from Free Churchmen. I know the South India scheme was put outside Anglicanism, but if it passes its repercussions will be great.

Now, *it has frankly to be admitted that the proposal in the Report for a Round Table Conference leans heavily in the direction of Anglo-Catholicism.* For the two subjects of the Conference are to be Reservation and alternative Communion Offices. The Evangelical, and I venture to think most lay people, don't want any change. Lord Davidson admitted that Parliament in rejecting the Revised

Prayer Book had rightly interpreted the mind of the mass of lay people.

If that Conference is held we ought to press that its terms of reference be widened so as to include the question of our relation to the Free Churches; and generally the issues of reunion and intercommunion.

And it is essential (and it was in the minds of the Commissioners) that the Conference should be *really representative*. The only way to get that is that each society should nominate its own representatives and that they should include laymen. If action is to be taken by those opposed to the Report I suggest that this should be one of the points stressed.

With regard to Reservation—I should personally (though it does not help me and I would rather not see it there) be prepared to concede it, if it could be kept within limits—for the sick; and if no kind of devotion attended it. Some people doubtless find help in feeling that the Reserved Sacrament is there. It is a kind of focus point for their devotions, just as men are helped by reading out of their mother's Bible, which becomes a sacred centre of association. If it could be treated as a kind of psychological focus point, it might perhaps be conceded. We have frankly to recognise differences of temperament; and differences of theological outlook.

But can you control Reservation? I doubt it; and the demand for it does not seem to me always quite honest.

The Bishops made a solemn public declaration that they would endeavour to restore order on the basis of the 1928 Book. And we had evidence from most of the dioceses that a considerable amount of order had been restored. But there are certain dioceses where no attempt has been made to keep Reservation within limits.

One has every sympathy with a Bishop who tries and fails; but none with one who, in defiance of his public promise, does not try.

(f) The last general remark I want to make is this—that *the Commission had to work within certain limits*, i.e. the Assembly Act in existence; and the Report of 1896 of the Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline.

Some of us may regret the definition of Church membership in the Assembly Act, by which the person has to say that he is not a member of any other religious body than Church of England. But can you at this time of day get that altered?

Most of us here probably are quite content with the Judicial Committee as the supreme court of appeal—but you have to remember that the Ecclesiastical Discipline Committee emphatically stated that a new court of appeal was needed, as the Judicial Committee had lost the confidence of a large number of Church people.

Many of us here are probably quite content with the old Prayer Book; but the Ecclesiastical Discipline Committee reported that the law of worship was too narrow for this generation. *And you don't touch the real problem if you press for a Revised Prayer Book on which all are agreed.* The real difficulty is over Holy Communion and Reservation.

I only mention all this to show that our Commission could not start with a clean sheet.

I come now to some points in the Report itself.

I think you will admit that we have pretty accurately and fairly analysed the causes of the present disorder.

(a) We have censured the Bishops (page 77). We have proposed a Court for trying them. We have pointed out how action or failure to act by an individual Bishop may seriously affect the whole question of order.

(b) We have dealt with "lawful authority"—a very important point.

(c) We have suggested a new Pastoral Tribunal. I believe that is very important and useful. I do think you want to get the ritual question out of the ordinary atmosphere of law courts.

And we have said that in case of a man refusing to obey deprivation should follow.

(d) Again, very important, page 89—we suggest increased power to Bishops to refuse institution.

(e) We do not interfere with prevailing method of appointing Bishops.

When you fairly weigh up all these recommendations you cannot, I think, deny that we have made some valuable suggestions which are in the direction of curbing Anglo-Catholicism.

The main proposal.

(a) *Spiritual Measures.* Professor Barker doubted if there were such. Surely there are—e.g. a new Lectionary; or special epistles or gospels; or Holy Communion. But I may be wrong in not being able to see how these are not purely spiritual.

(b) The laymen who certify—a mere detail. Others might be named.

(c) The *double* reference to Diocesan Conference ensures delay and illustrates the wish of the Commission to avoid haste.

(d) This proposal cannot become law without consent of Parliament. Unlikely Parliament would at present touch the Prayer Book again.

Also you may be perfectly sure that Parliament will ask—*Is the whole Church behind this proposal?* It would reject a sectional proposal.

I cannot myself see that there is anything to be frightened about in the proposals. I could not have signed the Report if it had not presented an ideal towards which we have to strive, if it had advocated immediate measures of a drastic kind.

I do not know whether it is the intention of the Archbishops to take any immediate steps to summon a Round Table Conference. In any case I hope they will wait till the Doctrinal Commission has reported next year.

Meanwhile I feel it to be urgently necessary that those who feel that the character of the Church of England is being imperilled by the growth of Anglo-Catholicism in the official circles of the Church (I don't think it is capturing the laymen), should without delay

take some action so as to show the authorities, before the Conference is called, that there are other claims to be considered beside those of Anglo-Catholicism. In particular I think it should be insisted that the Conference must be truly representative and that it should discuss other subjects than Reservation and alternative Communion services.

This is a practical issue. On the larger issue of the clash of spiritual movements I think we have to be patient, and to recognise that you can't quicken the pace of history. Tendencies have got to work themselves out. What the Reformation began in the sixteenth century moved on to a new phase in the seventeenth century when that elusive thing called Anglicanism was born. Much has happened since the seventeenth century and we simply can't stand exactly in the old paths. There is a widespread movement towards unity. What you may roughly call Catholicism is in the air everywhere. It shows itself, as Heiler points out, in a rise in the standard of worship in all countries, which cuts clean across all confessional divisions. All this we have to take into account. I am glad that God is in charge of the Church and not we. I am glad that Truth must in the long run win. I am also glad that I shall not be asked at the Judgment Day whether I wore a biretta.

Canon Peter Green's *This Our Pilgrimage* (Longmans, Green & Co., 2s. 6d. net) is one of his devotional books, drawn from a wide experience of life and a devoted ministry of many years, to which we have learnt to look for encouragement and inspiration. In this volume, the Canon takes a number of texts centring round some general theme, such as "No continuing city," "The Example of Christ," "Companions of the Way," and "Sunshine and Shadow," and applies them to his purpose. Canon Peter Green's devotional books are so well known and so much appreciated that it is not necessary to dwell upon their good qualities.

The Rev. Ernest G. Loosley, B.D., is a young Methodist Minister with somewhat original ideas. Influenced by Mr. A. A. Milne's well-known book he adopts as the title of a work dealing with the earliest days of the Church *When the Church Was Very Young* (Geo. Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 3s. 6d. net). It is full of interesting suggestive matter for those who know how to use it. The headings of the chapters indicate that when the Church was young, it had no Buildings, no Denominations, no Fixed Organisations, no New Testament, no Vocabulary of Its Own, no Dogmatic System, and no Sabbath Rest in the Gentile World.

II.

MR. ALBERT MITCHELL.

I AM grateful to Archdeacon Storr for his remarks about the one-sidedness of the Commission, as that relieves me of the necessity of speaking of it. . . .

It is very necessary when we are presented with this Report and evidence that we should make some attempt to study it as a whole; and to study it as a whole means studying it with the evidence, because the "history" of the Report is extremely inadequate. It is so inadequate that it cannot claim to be accurate. But the evidence in the second volume will, to a very great extent, correct the inadequacy and possible inaccuracies of the Report, if the evidence is intelligently read. I do venture to make claim that in my evidence quite a number of points are tackled that nobody else ventured to tackle, and as I sat in the witness chair for two and a half hours and not one of my historical facts was seriously challenged, either by the chairman or by any member of the Commission, I think I may say my evidence remains unanswered.

THE SPIRIT BEHIND THE REPORT.

We have to consider the spirit that is behind the Report. I have tried to get at the spirit behind the Report. I do honestly attempt to do what the Commission asks; take the Report as a whole, and not be unduly prejudiced by one point here or there.

Although the Report bases itself on the claim that it is an aspiring after *new life* in the Church, actually the spirit behind the Report is very evidently *discontent* with the present doctrinal standards of the Church. If we look at the Report, the first of the proposals obviously is this proposal for a round table conference. I am more afraid of that than of anything else; because in regard to all the other things there are so many obstacles to be surmounted before anything can come to pass, that I don't think the immediate danger or the immediate difficulty arises so much with regard to the later proposals. But I am very much afraid of this round table conference at this particular time. Strip from it everything else, and it is impossible to escape the conclusion that it is putting us once more into the exact position in which we were in the summer of 1928. The eight years which have passed since then are practically scrapped for the purpose of this matter. We are thrown once again into controversy on a very vital point. I don't for a single moment minimise either the importance or the difficulties of the question of Reservation, but that is not the worst point. Reservation is the fruit, but the alterations in the Consecration Prayer are the root. We are presented, if we contemplate such variations in the Consecration Prayer as impart into the most sacred part of the service a doctrine that is different from the doctrine of the present Consecration Prayer, with an apple of discord at once.

Reservation, important as it is, almost falls into insignificance beside that. But you cannot separate the two. The proposal is one and the same because the doctrinal implication behind the two things is the same. Is it not a fact that the doctrinal implication behind them is really an undoing of a vital principle of the Reformation?

VITAL MATTERS.

The Reformation in England centred, as regards the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, around two principles; first, the substitution of a Sacrament for a sacrifice—and I think we owe that trenchant phrase to that old stalwart, Bishop Edmund Knox—and secondly, the substitution of open Communion for the Mass. Our friends of the Anglo-Catholic school are quite frank in saying it is the Mass that matters. The Mass is not the Lord's Supper. The Mass is not the service of Holy Communion as it is in the Prayer Book. The Mass does imply such a conception of change having taken place in the sacred elements as makes them cease to be mere symbols or mere expressions, or even signs; but actually something changed into the actual Body and Blood of Christ. No Anglo-Catholic will dispute that that is the essence of the Mass. I don't think we can contemplate drawing into a round table conference with the suggestion implied that we are to be persuaded into accepting the sacrifice of the Mass in place of the open administration of the Sacrament. There may be a great deal in which we might welcome variety in regard to the administration of the Lord's Supper, such as a varied form for use when there is no Morning or Evening Prayer, incorporating the essentials of Morning or Evening Prayer. The principle of uniformity is not respected quite as much to-day as it was in the sixteenth century. But the essential thing is we cannot contemplate a round table conference called for the express purpose of inducing us to withdraw our objections upon which the Books of 1927-8 were legitimately defeated in the legislature. And yet the whole wording of the report suggests that that is the purpose. In looking at the round table conference, we are bound to look at it from the fact that it is only to be called practically for two purposes; and that we are up against. The phrase is a round table conference "or otherwise"; and it is quite obvious there was more than one mind behind the report. If the round table conference is simply a method of inducing us to shift from the position we took up as a matter of conscience in 1927-8, the position is impossible. There is also the incidental question of the representative character of the conference.

RELAXATION OF SAFEGUARDS.

It is also proposed that, in "spiritual" matters, the present safeguards should be relaxed as regards legislation. The Commission admits that the present system works well in all matters that are not controversial. The present system provides a safeguard for

minorities, and prevents a majority sweeping the Church. The change would be to sweep away this safeguard, and place the minority at the mercy of the majority. The State is the paternal authority, and the State—the King in Parliament exercising the royal supremacy—looks after the children and prevents the stronger and more insistent children having their own way at the expense of the weaker children. The present system does provide a protection for minorities, and ought there not to be a very great protection for minorities? All those who are loyally and reasonably attempting to serve God in the Church have vested interests in the Church.

I agree we have got to face the position that something other than that of which we approve must be recognised as having its place in the Church, but that is a different thing to altering the doctrinal standards of the Church.

I cannot conceive that this double reference to the diocesan conferences is either workable, reasonable, or possibly effective. It might be only a bare majority, or even a minority, that carried three-quarters of the diocesan conferences. How many of us are happy, either as to the intelligent working of the diocesan conferences, the attendance of the members, or the real work that is done? Most of the work is really done by a very small section of those who are entitled to come. Diocesan conferences are liable to be swept off their feet by gusts of emotion, and played upon sometimes as an instrument by the bishop. I don't think this legislation proposal is possible. But, even more, there is the constitutional matter. How can a measure that has never been submitted to Parliament have the force of an Act of Parliament; how is the measure to be submitted to the Crown for approval; are we to have a second legislature, and a second executive, so that either the Archbishops should directly submit to the King these measures which have not received the authority of Parliament? Or is the government of the day to be allowed to do this? If so, you are merely substituting control by Cabinet Council for control by Parliament. I cannot believe that the Commission can possibly have thought out the methods and incidence of its proposal.

DISCIPLINE.

With regard to the Courts, while I agree that in all probability the present appellate tribunal, the King in Council, is the best that can be devised for the ultimate appeal to the Crown for lack of justice in the Ecclesiastical Courts, yet I do think that the time is ready for great reforms in the procedure of the Ecclesiastical Courts. We are still working on outworn medieval procedure. We want to get rid of all the criminal character of the Church courts and substitute a simpler procedure like that in use in the Courts of Equity for obtaining the opinion of the Court on doubtful points of law.

With regard to the pastoral authority of the bishops, new

tribunals are proposed. If they are necessary they ought to be supported, but why cannot the bishops do all that they propose under their present powers? They probably could have done so if they had started twenty or thirty years ago. Still, if it is necessary we ought to concur.

I don't like the interim proposals; I don't like the method in which they are proposed to be effected by synodical declaration. We were reminded this morning that there ought not to be any difference between the authority of the bishops and clergy, and the authority of the laity, in dealing with questions of doctrine; and the synodical declaration to be made by Convocation and submitted to the Church Assembly for a sort of approval would bear the aspect of a clerically imposed law. If anything of the sort is to be done, why should it not be done in the way which the Bishop of Norwich proposed in his evidence?

There seems to have been a complete change of face on the subject of the appointment of bishops in the last ten or twelve years. I sat on the Committee on the appointment of bishops; I gave a minority report, as did others; and none of us were quite satisfied with anything proposed.

CANON LAW.

One very serious question is the reference to the codification and re-establishment, practically, of Canon Law. That seems to attract the "reformers" very much. Lord Hardwicke in a famous case decided that Canon Law did not bind the laity unless allowed by Parliament. It is also held by many that not having been allowed by the secular authority the Canons of 1604 do not bind the clergy beyond the generation that enacted them. In any case the Canons of 1604 were a quite honest attempt to codify such of the medieval Canon Law as had survived the Reformation. Not a very successful, but an honest attempt. I have seen a memorandum by a bishop, one of the most extreme Anglo-Catholics, who says there is probably no Canon Law that has authority in England at the present time. But there is a school in the Convocations, the most learned advocate of which is the present vice-chairman of the House of Clergy, which maintains that the whole of the medieval Canon Law may still be binding on the Church. I hold the contrary view. I served on the committee on the relations between Convocation and the Assembly, and the point was raised there, and that learned Canonist held very strongly that the Canon Law is still in vigour. If the Canon Law is codified and brought back, there may be no limits to the extent to which not only the laity but the clergy may be in danger of being burdened by medieval garments that we thought we had cast off. We have believed that the effect of Reformation legislation was to free us entirely from the whole of medieval Canon Law. If that is not so we don't know where we stand. There is no reason why, if we are to have the Law brought up to date, we should not start *de novo*.

PRINCIPLES IN ISSUE.

My purpose, of course, is rather to indicate the principles that lie behind the report and the dangers I can see lying therein. There are many points of detail, but if we talk too much in detail we fail to see the wood for the trees.

In summing up I would say we cannot accept the proposals for a round table conference without throwing our whole doctrinal position into the melting-pot. If we have a new court of appeal in place of the King in Council, we are losing probably the strongest protection of minorities that we now have; for Evangelicals, Liberals, Broad Churchmen and Anglo-Catholics have all, in turn, been saved from extinction by the greater tolerance of the King's courts. The pastoral authority of the bishops ought to be able to be exercised without further legislation. If interim proposals are to be made for relaxing the terms of subscription, it would be better done by a non-controversial agreed measure, rather than by a synodical declaration. And the proposed revival of Canon Law holds within itself far more dangers than at first sight appear.

I don't think the Anglo-Catholic section has an *equal right* in the Church with the Protestant section, because the Church has deliberately adopted the Reformation standpoint; but I agree that the happenings of the last century have given the Anglo-Catholics such a lodgment in the Church that it is idle for us to talk about expelling them. But there may be very real danger of the Evangelicals being expelled from the Church if the Anglo-Catholic dominance becomes more marked than it actually is.

As for liberalising Anglo-Catholicism, as suggested by the Archdeacon, I should quite agree that the ideal of Home reunion is of more vital importance and should precede any disturbance of the relations between Church and State. It is not the relations between Church and State that hinder reunion at all. It is not the method of the appointment of bishops, it is the character of the bishops who are appointed. The Non-conformists are up against the principle of episcopacy as it is insisted upon by the Anglo-Catholics. I do agree that if anything could be done, as the Archdeacon hopes, to bring the spirit that lies behind what he calls Catholicism more in touch with practical facts to-day, that might be of very great effect.

The Real Progress is the title of the Story of the Year 1935-6 of the work of the C.E.Z.M.S. in India, Ceylon, China and Singapore. It is a well-produced and well-illustrated volume of 110 pages, and contains interesting accounts of many encouraging incidents in the field.

tribunals are proposed. If they are necessary they ought to be supported, but why cannot the bishops do all that they propose under their present powers? They probably could have done so if they had started twenty or thirty years ago. Still, if it is necessary we ought to concur.

I don't like the interim proposals; I don't like the method in which they are proposed to be effected by synodical declaration. We were reminded this morning that there ought not to be any difference between the authority of the bishops and clergy, and the authority of the laity, in dealing with questions of doctrine; and the synodical declaration to be made by Convocation and submitted to the Church Assembly for a sort of approval would bear the aspect of a clerically imposed law. If anything of the sort is to be done, why should it not be done in the way which the Bishop of Norwich proposed in his evidence?

There seems to have been a complete change of face on the subject of the appointment of bishops in the last ten or twelve years. I sat on the Committee on the appointment of bishops; I gave a minority report, as did others; and none of us were quite satisfied with anything proposed.

CANON LAW.

One very serious question is the reference to the codification and re-establishment, practically, of Canon Law. That seems to attract the "reformers" very much. Lord Hardwicke in a famous case decided that Canon Law did not bind the laity unless allowed by Parliament. It is also held by many that not having been allowed by the secular authority the Canons of 1604 do not bind the clergy beyond the generation that enacted them. In any case the Canons of 1604 were a quite honest attempt to codify such of the medieval Canon Law as had survived the Reformation. Not a very successful, but an honest attempt. I have seen a memorandum by a bishop, one of the most extreme Anglo-Catholics, who says there is probably no Canon Law that has authority in England at the present time. But there is a school in the Convocations, the most learned advocate of which is the present vice-chairman of the House of Clergy, which maintains that the whole of the medieval Canon Law may still be binding on the Church. I hold the contrary view. I served on the committee on the relations between Convocation and the Assembly, and the point was raised there, and that learned Canonist held very strongly that the Canon Law is still in vigour. If the Canon Law is codified and brought back, there may be no limits to the extent to which not only the laity but the clergy may be in danger of being burdened by medieval garments that we thought we had cast off. We have believed that the effect of Reformation legislation was to free us entirely from the whole of medieval Canon Law. If that is not so we don't know where we stand. There is no reason why, if we are to have the Law brought up to date, we should not start *de novo*.

PRINCIPLES IN ISSUE.

My purpose, of course, is rather to indicate the principles that lie behind the report and the dangers I can see lying therein. There are many points of detail, but if we talk too much in detail we fail to see the wood for the trees.

In summing up I would say we cannot accept the proposals for a round table conference without throwing our whole doctrinal position into the melting-pot. If we have a new court of appeal in place of the King in Council, we are losing probably the strongest protection of minorities that we now have; for Evangelicals, Liberals, Broad Churchmen and Anglo-Catholics have all, in turn, been saved from extinction by the greater tolerance of the King's courts. The pastoral authority of the bishops ought to be able to be exercised without further legislation. If interim proposals are to be made for relaxing the terms of subscription, it would be better done by a non-controversial agreed measure, rather than by a synodical declaration. And the proposed revival of Canon Law holds within itself far more dangers than at first sight appear.

I don't think the Anglo-Catholic section has an *equal right* in the Church with the Protestant section, because the Church has deliberately adopted the Reformation standpoint; but I agree that the happenings of the last century have given the Anglo-Catholics such a lodgment in the Church that it is idle for us to talk about expelling them. But there may be very real danger of the Evangelicals being expelled from the Church if the Anglo-Catholic dominance becomes more marked than it actually is.

As for liberalising Anglo-Catholicism, as suggested by the Archdeacon, I should quite agree that the ideal of Home reunion is of more vital importance and should precede any disturbance of the relations between Church and State. It is not the relations between Church and State that hinder reunion at all. It is not the method of the appointment of bishops, it is the character of the bishops who are appointed. The Non-conformists are up against the principle of episcopacy as it is insisted upon by the Anglo-Catholics. I do agree that if anything could be done, as the Archdeacon hopes, to bring the spirit that lies behind what he calls Catholicism more in touch with practical facts to-day, that might be of very great effect.

The Real Progress is the title of the Story of the Year 1935-6 of the work of the C.E.Z.M.S. in India, Ceylon, China and Singapore. It is a well-produced and well-illustrated volume of 110 pages, and contains interesting accounts of many encouraging incidents in the field.

III.

THE HON. LANCELOT W. JOYNSON-HICKS.

I PROPOSE to call attention only to a few matters which strike one particularly from the point of view of a member of the House of Laity of the Church Assembly and to speak very briefly. We, of that House, have been discussed, and to some extent criticised, in the Report itself, and the Report indicates, what many speakers in the Church Assembly emphatically say—and it is difficult not to agree with them—that the House of Laity is not adequately representative of the laity in the Church of this country as a whole. If this be so it is the more important that the laity, both in the Church Assembly and outside, should grasp clearly the fundamental importance of the proposals of this Report, and how they are likely to affect, not only the Church as a whole, but particularly the laity who form no insignificant part of it.

In introducing the Report in the Church Assembly the Archbishop of York made what struck me as being a most remarkable statement. He denied that the rejection of the revised Prayer Book was the cause of the Commission being set up, though he admitted that in his view the Prayer Book controversy and its result emphasised the necessity for the Commission. He would not however go so far as to admit that the debate itself, and the rejection of the Prayer Book Measure by the House of Commons was the direct cause of the appointment of the Commission. There, I think, the majority of people will differ from the Archbishop.

Even a superficial reading of the Report shows so much reference to the Prayer Book debate and the effect of the House of Commons resolution, that it is impossible to avoid the feeling that whatever may have been in the minds of the Assembly when the Commission was appointed, there is no getting away from the fact that the members of the Commission themselves were very greatly influenced in the views they incorporated in the Report, by the Prayer Book Measure. In fact, they took it almost as their text and as the basis for the conclusions they had to formulate. The impression conveyed is that the Commission, in effect, said to itself: "We have got to try to find a way out of the position which is caused by the Prayer Book failure." In other words, they had to find a way round the House of Commons. It is scarcely open^r to doubt that that was the principal issue in the minds of the Commissioners, and the guiding thread running throughout the whole of their report.

It is worth while to consider the exact relationship which Parliament has had with the Church since the passing of the Church Assembly Act. Apart from the Prayer Book Measures it has only refused to pass two of the Measures sent up by the Assembly, that relating to the Diocese of Hereford and that about the City Churches. But upon these general Church opinion was acutely divided. It has never refused the various proposals agreed upon by the Church Assembly on which Church opinion has been substantially unanimous. One of the sentences used by the Arch-

bishop of York in his speech introducing the report was that the feeling of the Church must be practically unanimous; but he assumed that resolutions passed unanimously by the Assembly represented unanimity on the part of the Church, an assumption it would be difficult to verify.

Parliament itself has never, during this century, sought to set itself up in any despotic or tyrannical way over the Church. Rather, I prefer the phrase which Sir Thomas Inskip used when he referred to the Church and State as being partners. I think it is a very proper description. Some of you may well think that the State as representative of the laity, is rather what is known as a sleeping partner. I have heard the laity accused of being such in Church, but in their defence they are not always to be blamed for that. Anyhow, partners they are, and I think that the action of Parliament, in rejecting the Prayer Book Measure, was because it recognised that the other partner was seeking to impose its will over substantial minorities who were not in agreement with it. It was only then that Parliament took action, which many of us consider to have been of a very salutary nature. Even if the recommendations in this Report were adopted, it would still have been worth while for Parliament to have put a brake on the proposals so that the whole Church and the country might have a further opportunity of considering the matter. Another remark which the Archbishop of York made in the course of his speech, which was remarkable for the brilliant advocacy with which he put forward the case for receiving the Report, was that it is useless to reform the law courts till there was available a law of public worship which it was possible and desirable to enforce. Many of us consider there is such a law, but the Archbishop apparently is of opinion that there is not. Assuming that that point of view is correct we may at least suggest that if the ecclesiastical authorities since the passing of the Enabling Act, or better still, after the Royal Commission of 1906, had used such power and influence as they undoubtedly possess to restrain disorders within limits approximating to those in the Revised Prayer Book, their action would have contributed very greatly towards inspiring confidence in their willingness and their ability to see that the provisions of the new Book were obeyed. In addition to the strong disapproval of some parts of the 1928 Book, grave doubts were felt as to whether, if the Book passed into law, the Bishops could secure that the clergy would keep within its limits, and those doubts were a potent factor in the rejection of the Prayer Book Measure. There is no reason why the existing law should not have been put in force so as to limit the ritual excesses to the extent of the things permitted by the deposited Book. This was not, however, done and there seemed no solid reason to suppose that greater energy would be exerted for the enforcement of any new law regarding worship which that Book might embody.

A point of which the Archbishop of York made a great deal was what he described as the subjection of the Church in Spiritual matters to an authority other than ecclesiastical. To my mind, that expression in itself is a very doubtful one. Exactly what the

Archbishop means by it I find it difficult to gather. We are working under an arrangement devised in all its details by ecclesiastical authority and agreed to by Parliament without any attempt at alteration. Where is the "subjection" when Parliament merely acted as the Church authorities agreed it might properly do? Moreover, it will not do at this time of day to speak and act as if the words "spiritual," "ecclesiastical" and "clerical" were synonymous. There is no ground for the view that spiritual matters are more the concern of the Bishops and clergy than of the laity, nor that a body of men not ecclesiastically authorised is therefore and necessarily unspiritual. The laity, whether in Parliament or outside, have in the past had too strenuous a fight for a voice in matters of religion to surrender it to the Episcopate and the clerical order.

The Archbishop also says that the Report must stand as a whole. That is of course merely a tactical matter or a debating point. His Grace knows perfectly well that there are recommendations in the Report to which hardly anybody would take exception. There are certain excellent proposals with regard to Church courts which would be a very good thing to have in being, but the Archbishop says the Report as a whole: no reference to Church courts without the round table conference, nor without the abolition of the power of Parliament in connection with spiritual matters. The whole thing or nothing. We wonder whether he really does mean that. If he does and if this represents generally the official point of view as regards the Report, we cannot accept that position. It appears to say that if you won't have what you consider to be bad things, you won't have the good things. I hope he will abandon that position when the proposals of the Report come, if ever they do, into serious consideration.

Is it not time that the Bishops realised that there are certain things about which we Evangelicals never can and never will compromise? In opening this discussion I have tried to keep purely upon broad lines, and not gone into any questions of detail. I have left open for discussion, intentionally and purposely, a very wide field indeed. There is a great deal more to be said on the points I have raised, and there are the many points I have not touched upon at all. On this whole subject we must remember that it is less than ten years ago that we, as a Church, were riven by the conflict ensuing upon the Prayer Book controversy. The Church has not recovered from that conflict and we must bear in mind the disaster it would be if, from any ill-conceived or ill-executed plan or voice of ours, we were plunged again into similar strife. There is plenty of work for the Church to do, but it is quite impossible for that work to be properly carried on when the minds of people are being divided and exercised by the possibility of such revolutionary changes as are proposed in this Report. The work of the Church can only proceed beneficially if it proceeds harmoniously, and I do not believe that the proposals in this Report are such as can be considered conducive to any degree of harmony.

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE.

BY THE REV. T. G. MOHAN, M.A., Assistant Secretary,
Church Pastoral Aid Society.

IT is not intended that this closing paper should continue the discussion on the subjects that have been presented to us to-day, or that it should try to sum up the conclusions reached.

We are bidden now to consider the relationship between Church and people, for it is her success in winning the people which will ultimately determine the validity of the Church's claim to be called the National Church.

The Times Leader, which greeted the publication of the Church and State Report, closed with a commendation of the following remark made in evidence before the Commission by Sir Thomas Inskip :

"The present relations of Church and State are not such as to prevent the Church from doing the work which is at present being left undone."

The aim of this closing paper may well be to discover how far we are using the liberty which we do possess. If the Church is failing to accomplish the purpose for which she exists, is that failure due to hindrances over which we have no control or is the cause to be found within ourselves? Let us try to face the situation frankly, and if in doing so we seem to be too critical, let it not be thought that our criticism is directed against others, but rather that we seek to know the worst in ourselves so that we may discover the cause of our weaknesses and find the appropriate remedy.

In regard to freedom of thought and action, and the absence of open hostility, the Church has surely never enjoyed more freedom than she does to-day. And this freedom, combined with the immensely powerful and far-reaching opportunities afforded by the modern miracle of broadcasting, should enable her to reach the zenith of her influence upon the nation.

Yet we are assured that the Church has but little influence and that if she had more she would not know what to do with it. The Chaplain of All Souls, in one of a series of broadcast talks on the Established Church, said: "The first broad distinction between this generation and most that have gone before it is that the social and political importance of the Church (in its widest sense) has declined." The Principal of Mansfield College, using the term "Church" with a wider application, wrote in the *Spectator*: "Over most of what was once Christendom the Christian Church no longer enjoys even formal or conventional recognition of its ancient claims from society as a whole. Much of contemporary society is frankly pagan. . . . For the Church the distinction between Home and Foreign Missions is to-day little more than geographical," and Prebendary Cash in *The Responsibility of Success* writes: "In England paganism is making rapid strides, secular

and material standards of life invade the Church, the nation no longer looks to the Church for moral leadership."

If all this be true, the Church's influence upon the nation is not commensurate with her immense opportunities. Is this due to the interference of the State or is it because the Church, both in her relationship to the State and to the people, has lost that pastoral genius which is the bed-rock upon which her strength and influence depend, and for the exercise of which she has surpassing privileges and opportunities?

It cannot be said that recent incursions into the realm of politics have improved the relationship between the Church and the people, or increased the influence of the Church upon the nation.

Dr. Inge says: "The laity do not like the priest in politics, and the Churches against their will are being thrown back upon their real message and their own business."

If the Church's influence upon the nation as a whole is measured by her success in winning the people we can hardly have cause for unmixed satisfaction as we contemplate the result of our efforts. There is a great body of earnest, devoted clergy who are spending themselves without stint for their people, in quiet, unobtrusive service under appalling difficulties, and with many discouragements; and their influence is seen in the transformed lives of men and women whose names, though unknown to history, will be written in heaven. But we cannot be complacent when we are told that in London probably not much more than 10 per cent. of the population is regular in its attendance at public worship. In the provinces the percentage is higher, but 25 per cent. would be a generous estimate. In Sittingbourne, it is said, only 3 per cent. of the population goes to Church. "No one," says the Bishop-designate of Portsmouth, "can go about these new areas of population . . . without becoming more and more convinced that England is beginning to become a pagan country." The Bishop of Durham is convinced that "the great mass of English folk have no longer any effective contact with the Church of England, and that the parish churches are no longer used by the masses of parishioners. In 1634 there were probably more communicants than there were in 1934, though the population of England in the interval has multiplied ninefold."

Ignorance and superstition abound, and those who minister in the poorer parishes could supply many parallels to the story of the woman who had her child baptised to "ward off God."

Many of our young people, though better educated than their forefathers, are scarcely conversant with the main facts of the New Testament, and there is little hope that their children will know even as much. Seventy-five per cent. of the children in a Sunday School here in Oxford were stated to be without a Bible in their homes.

It would, however, be a mistake to regard the millions, who give no outward indication of religious convictions, as either hostile to religion, or impervious to its influence; but it has virtually no

place in their lives. The Archbishop of Canterbury speaking at the C.P.A.S. Centenary Meeting said: "There is a phrase often used which I think is most misleading—'the lapsed masses'—meaning that they have lapsed from religion. I do not think that is true. . . . Generally speaking, the bulk of our people have not lapsed from religion, they have never yet been won. When we try to win them we have good grounds for encouragement."

But perhaps an even more serious feature is what the Bishop of Leicester calls the sub-Christian life of many Church members. A very striking article in *Evangelical Christendom* described the impressions of the Bishop of Uganda after taking charge for three months of a parish in Westminster. He said: "One thing that has impressed me more than anything else, I think, is . . . the almost unspeakably profound ignorance of the elementary truths of the Christian faith among the boys and girls and the men and women of our own country and our own capital. I have been taking a Confirmation Class and quite literally I do not think one single member of that class would have a chance of coming forward for Confirmation in Uganda. The standard is different, and altogether different."

A serious consequence of this ignorance is that so many sincere and earnest Ordination Candidates are unable to give any reason for the faith that is in them. One often hears the excuse, "What can you expect of a boy of eighteen?" Having failed to teach him anything we accuse him of being too ignorant to learn. We expect boys at the age of eighteen to be sufficiently developed mentally to win scholarships at Oxford and Cambridge and to be sufficiently developed physically to achieve a measure of fame in athletics, yet we consider them hopelessly incapable of spiritual growth or doctrinal understanding, although they have probably passed the most impressionable age in their lives. If this were true it would surely be a strange blunder on the part of their Creator! The excuse is, like the schoolboy's definition of a lie, "a very present help in trouble." It is an indication of our own failure. Why, then, is the Church's influence so feeble and why are the results of her labour so disappointing?

Why have the sincere efforts of our parochial clergy left such a large number of our people untouched and an even larger number unimpressed? It is certainly *not* due to any hindrance imposed by the State.

We may comfort ourselves that it is due in part to the serious understaffing of many parishes throughout the country. This is particularly the case in those parishes which are unable to afford an adequate staff, and they are the parishes where the populations are large and the need most urgent. Our inability to keep pace with the rapid development of new housing areas, and the rivalry of the motor-car and the wireless, are creating a grave problem, and large areas of the country are lapsing into semi-heathendom. Hard-pressed incumbents are breaking down under the double burden; of a task beyond their powers, and of the despair which failure

breeds. But when we have made due allowance for the serious lack of workers, ordained and lay, we have not accounted for the *real causes* of our failure as Messengers, Watchmen and Stewards of the Lord.

Among several causes, three are of great importance: the neglect of pastoral visitation; the lowering of spiritual standards; and the lack of Gospel teaching and preaching.

How easily and quickly we have forgotten the solemn exhortation in the Service for the Ordering of Priests. "Wherefore consider with yourselves the end of your ministry . . . and see that you never cease your labour, your care and diligence, until you have done all that lieth in you, according to your bounden duty, to bring all such as are or shall be committed to your charge, unto that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there be no place left among you, either for error in religion, or for viciousness in life."

Has there not been a growing tendency to concentrate upon the few who may be reached through Church Services and to neglect the masses who are outside—to abandon the pastoral for the priestly functions? Men are not interested in priestly functions until they are first interested in religion, and to-day religion is to many quite irrelevant. Thus our appeal is seriously limited in its scope.

Canon Peter Green, speaking to Ordination Candidates at Durham, said: "Of all the titles which may be yours . . . the title I covet most for you is that of pastor." And again: "I am sure that pastoral work is the thing most needed and I sometimes fear it is the thing most neglected in the Church to-day."

Men to-day are often noted more for what they have done outside their parishes than for what they are doing within them. How many names will this generation add to the list of those whose title to fame is Pastoral? We cannot fail to be deeply impressed by the extraordinary piety and amazing zeal of the great men of the Evangelical Revival: Grimshaw of Haworth, whose people feared him more than a Justice of the Peace, and in whose Church Wesley found 1,000 communicants; Fletcher of Madeley, who never met his parishioners in the street or in their homes without talking to them about their souls; Berridge of Everton, who sometimes rode 100 miles in a day to preach and visit; Newton of Olney, who had a prayer meeting every Sunday at 6 a.m. and every Tuesday at 5 a.m. with a good average attendance. The diligence and zeal of these men for spiritual work make our present-day parochial activities appear very mundane and superficial.

We thankfully acknowledge that through the medium of the wireless a vast body of those who would normally be entirely cut off from all spiritual contacts have developed an affectionate familiarity for clergymen whom they have never seen. We have Scriptural authority for believing that the shepherd should know his own sheep by name, but to-day we have reversed the situation and the sheep know the shepherd by name, often by his Christian

name! Valuable as this may be it is far from the pastoral ideal of our Church. No one can take the place of the true pastor *in the parish* who lives among his people, sharing their joys and sorrows for his Master's sake.

The second cause of our failure is to be found in the invasion of worldliness and the use of unworthy expedients to win men and women to the Church. "It is a law that a religion which gains power by non-religious methods invariably uses it for non-religious purposes." The Puritans said of the Church, "She casteth forth her ice like morsels; Who is able to abide her frosts?", but this description is hardly justified to-day. The Church of this generation may be likened unto children sitting in the market place and saying, "we have piped unto you and ye have not danced." It is not the wolf, to-day, but the shepherd who is in sheep's clothing and the sheep are not impressed. Canon Joynt in his excellent book, *The Church's Real Work*, writes: "His shepherds are not called to amuse the flock by doubtful, if not positively sinful, expedients, on the plea of keeping them together. There are great fields of untainted recreation which they can recommend and encourage without turning the sheep of Christ into pastures where poisonous weeds predominate. Should these phrases offend . . . forgiveness is pleaded for them on the ground that among the Church's greatest perils to-day, the greatest is the eating out of her life by the world and its spirit, like the slow, silent destruction wrought by the death-watch beetle in some venerable temple of prayer."

The third cause of failure, and a serious one, is the lack of what used to be called Gospel-preaching to win men to Christ, and of doctrinal teaching for the edification and strengthening of the faithful. It is significant that the words "teaching" and "preaching" are rarely separated in the New Testament.

A leading article in *The Times* expressed the opinion that "The average citizen, if he goes to Church on Sunday . . . comes with some real spiritual hunger, but the hungry sheep look up and are not fed when from the pulpit their pastor offers them his not very well-informed reflections about India, disarmament and housing."

The Church's message to-day is so often a curious mixture of heroic futility and mawkish sentimentality. There is no message for the plain man who knows he is not a hero but knows he is a sinner. There is no assurance, no authority, no attempt to state what Scripture teaches, or what the Church believes—just the preacher's opinion! Arnold Lunn, before he left the English for the Roman Communion, asked, "Why should men go to Church to hear 'honesty is the best policy' set to music?"

We feel an obligation upon us to-day to prophesy smooth things; but Christ never taught us to believe that His message would meet with general acceptance, and He certainly gave us no authority to adjust His message in order to make it acceptable. He taught His disciples to expect persecution, hatred, and even death, and the reward of His own preaching was the Cross. The

Cross is the centre of everything outward and material in the Church's furniture, decoration, and ritual; but it has been effectively excluded from the pulpit. We have transferred the Sacrifice from the Cross to the Communion Service: but even so we cannot be logical. It is a strange inconsistency which in the Most Comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ can administer those precious symbols of the Passion of our Lord with the words "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee"; and then deny the efficacy of that Blood and, to the great pain and distress of many devout souls, do despite to that Holy Thing by pouring scorn upon "the Blood" as the means of our Redemption. To preach "beauty, truth, and goodness," without any reference to the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus, apart from which there can be no eternal values, is not Christianity: it may not be more than ethical paganism; as a means of Salvation it is only more pleasant and useful than lying on a bed of spikes or going on a pilgrimage to Mecca. Can we be surprised at the purely superficial adherence of so many Church members?

What then do we need to-day? Not deliverance from the shackles of state control, but a quickening of spiritual life; with Christ: not movements, or methods, or men, but Christ as the Centre! There are unmistakable signs of an awakened spiritual interest; the rising tide of evangelism, the emphasis on the need for the New Birth, campaigns of witness, and so on. But there is sometimes a fear lest these things are a phase which will pass without accomplishing any permanent results. If they merely become fashionable they will leave the Church empty, swept and garnished. The motive power of all these efforts must be not simply to stir the Church into renewed activity; but to bring every individual into a personal relationship to Jesus Christ as the only hope; to Christ, Who exemplifies in His Death the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God against sin and all its abominations, and the exceeding great love of God for the sinner while he was yet a sinner: to Christ, Who alone can give deliverance from the bondage of sin and from its eternal consequences; to Christ, Who only is able to transform frail men and women and make them more than conquerors; to Christ, Who can fill them with constraining love that they cannot but speak the things which they have seen and heard and experienced. When we determine to know nothing among men but Jesus Christ and Him Crucified the quickening will come; but it must begin in us. John Wesley said the clergy of his day had no more knowledge of saving souls than they had of catching whales. A High Dignitary of the Church says to-day, "You will never do anything with evangelism until the clergy themselves are converted," but, we may ask "Who is responsible for ordaining unconverted men?"

There are many earnest men to-day of whom it may be said as of the Parson in the *Canterbury Tales* :

"Christ's lore and His apostles twelve
He taught, but first he followed it himself."

If our faith is worth preserving it is worth teaching. And "seeing that we cannot by any other means compass the doing of so weighty a work, pertaining to the salvation of man, but with doctrine and exhortation taken out of the Holy Scriptures, and with a life agreeable to the same, let us draw all our cares and studies this way that we may wax riper and stronger in our ministry, and that we may be wholesome and godly examples and patterns for the people to follow." It may mean scrapping some of our too numerous organisations. The still small Voice is drowned by the noise of the machinery. The Bishop of Bristol says: "So much of our time is taken up with just keeping things going, raising the necessary funds, supervising parochial organisations and the rest, that the main purpose for which the Church exists is terribly apt to be crowded out, if it is not lost sight of altogether."

Evangelistic Campaigns must not be regarded as an end in themselves. Many campaigns reach the outsider only indirectly. There is a tendency to be intra-congregational. This work should not be confined to special occasions but should be the normal work of the parish. There is no work so lasting and so effective as the everyday work of the clergy and their staffs, year in and year out, among the people of their own parishes. There is a danger lest the eyes of missionary-hearted people, looking at the need afar off, should overlook the heathen at their own doors.

I would like to suggest that what we need to-day is a campaign of house-to-house evangelism aided by organised groups of people in every parish who will give up their time each week to go from door to door throughout their parishes bearing their witness and inviting the outsider to join their fellowship. This may not be so easy or so exciting as the conventional campaign of witness, but it would meet a long-felt need and might be spiritually healthier for those who adopted it. Such visiting could not be a substitute for the regular visitation of the incumbent, but if our people were set to work in this way to help others they would not expect so much nursing themselves and thus would set free the staff for more intensive pastoral work outside the congregation.

At the C.P.A.S. Youth Rally one of the speakers called for volunteers who would be willing to give one day, or part of a day, each week in a poor parish for any work that might be needed. The response has indicated a real opportunity along this line. Agencies such as the C.P.A.S. would gladly receive the names of leisured people who would be willing to go wherever the need is greatest.

In closing, may I venture to add one more cause of our weakness? May I say a lack of faith? Are we not told that "He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief?" But I am not so anxious to emphasise the lack of faith in the hearer which prevents the appreciation of the message, as the lack of faith in the instrument which may hinder the working out of the divine purposes through him. The apostles asked of the Lord the cause of their impotence. The Lord replied, "If ye have

faith as a grain of mustard seed . . . nothing shall be impossible unto you."

It is not a coincidence that we meet in Easter week. How glorious is our position having at our disposal all the power of a victorious Saviour Who by His death hath destroyed death, and by His rising to life again hath restored to us everlasting life. The world is sick and sad with its own muddlings and the hearts of men and women are hungry for a better way. We live in a day of wonderful opportunity. With the failure of human effort and the readiness to try God's way how unspeakably pitiful if the Church at this moment should be too weak herself to seize the chance of an eternity. The disciples after Calvary were not stronger or more assured than we are to-day, but after Easter and Pentecost they were transformed; defeat was turned into triumphant victory; men took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus; and it was all due, according to Peter, to the gift of the Holy Ghost.

Easter Day is behind us; we draw near to the Day of the Ascension. When Jesus is glorified the Gift of Pentecost can be poured out upon the Church, and a Church filled with the Holy Ghost could turn the world upside down to-day.

A Cambridge Bede Book, by Eric Milner-White, D.S.O., M.A., priest of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd, Fellow and Dean of King's College, Cambridge (Longmans, Green & Co., 5s. net), contains a series of seventy collects for moments of prayer and meditation. While the prayers are all new, the author says that "they tend to echo the writings of great English Christians from Richard Rolle and Mother Julian to Bishop Westcott and Robert Bridges. Above all, their inspiration derives from Andrewes, Donne, Traherne and Taylor." The writer says that he has found private use for them as "special intentions" at the daily eucharist, but that need not deter any from the use of some of the well-phrased petitions placed at the head of each page of this little book.

The Dean of Wells delivered a course of lectures in his cathedral on *The Inspiration of the Bible* (Oxford University Press, 3s. 6d. net). The object of the volume is "to dispel such notions as those of the Church-goers who still take the unintelligent, unimaginative, unhistorical view of the Bible which its American adherents have labelled *fundamentalist*. It is certain that a large section of the public, especially that portion of it which does not go to Church believes that fundamentalism is synonymous with orthodox Christianity and that if the clergy at least are not all fundamentalists they ought to be; and would be if they were more honest."

NOTE.—Owing to the space taken up by the papers read at the Oxford Conference, which we are sure our readers will appreciate, we are compelled to hold over a large number of reviews and Notes on Recent Books.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

RELIGION IN THE VICTORIAN ERA. By L. E. Elliott-Binns, D.D.
Lutterworth Press. 15s. net.

Two reigns have closed since the Victorian era, and it is an appropriate time for a general survey of the religious conditions and changes of the long reign of Queen Victoria of sixty-four years from 1837 to 1901. Dr. Elliott-Binns has already shown his gifts as a historical writer in dealing with medieval history, and he has now turned to the task, which is in some ways more difficult, of presenting a modern period. The period is not an easy one, as it presents many changes and many conflicting movements, but Dr. Elliott-Binns is to be congratulated on the skill with which he has interwoven the various threads and given us a picture that is, in the main, satisfactory. He shows an unusually extensive acquaintance with the literature bearing on the subject, and gives references for his authorities which will be specially gratifying to students. He acknowledges his debt to the biographies of the great men and women, and in dealing with many minds and many diverse points of view, he has left them as far as possible to express their opinions in their own words. He gives a brief opening account of the pre-Victorian era and its political conditions. It is difficult to realise the many restrictions prevailing in those days in matters of religion and politics. Evangelicalism was the most influential of Church parties in this pre-Victorian era, but its popularity had proved a danger and at the beginning of the reign of Victoria it had already lost some of its power. To make his picture complete the author has found it necessary to devote considerable space to the general social conditions; thus the early years were marked by a revolutionary spirit. In this country power was in the hands of the middle classes. Bishops were prelatial in their outlook. Nonconformity had grievances, and gave loud expression to them, while complaint is made that in 1856 only 6 per cent of the working men of England went to any place of worship in the country, and in the towns the figure was as low as 2 per cent. Three chapters illustrate the great changes that have taken place since the first decade of the period. One illustrates the changes in educational work, the second the religious changes involved in the Oxford Movement, and the third the alteration in the position of the Roman Church in England. Behind the events of history there is the thought inspiring them. Attention is given to the developments in philosophy and theology and to the conflict between religion and science due largely to the evolutionary theory, which also affected the conception of history. A specially interesting chapter deals with the revival and deepening of religion, and gives a sympathetic account of the work of Moody and Sankey. At the same time the Oxford Movement had reached its second phase, which was one of rigidity and ritual. The Gorham case illustrated its narrowness. Social problems naturally receive a considerable

share of attention in the later period, and the efforts of such organisations as the Christian Social Union proved the truth of the lesson which we are still slow to learn that "you cannot create a new world except by creating a new heart and a new purpose in common men." In a chapter on the Cambridge School an account is given of the three great leaders, Westcott, Lightfoot, and Hort, and many readers will find a fresh and not altogether as favourable an impression of them as has been entertained in the past. The development of education, after the enthusiasm of 1843, is traced with the growth of the national system which overshadowed in time the work of the Church in this respect. Chapters are devoted to the important aspects of the Press, Literature and Art. The developments of Worship are dealt with at length with the growth and excesses of ritual. The missionary work of all sections of the Christian communion receives its merited attention in a chapter on "The Call of the World." The closing chapters of this interesting volume tell of further social changes of the new methods which the age demanded, the work of the ministry and the movements towards reunion and federation. The work is a testimony to the patient research of the author and to his skill in using the mass of material at his disposal to the best advantage. It constitutes a useful handbook to the Victorian Age, and should provide a handy book of reference to the main facts of the time.

CHURCH AND STATE. A Review of the Report of the Commission on Church and State. By the Bishop of Norwich. *Eyre & Spottiswoode.* 2s. 6d. net.

The Bishop of Norwich has issued in book form his views of the Report of the Commission on Church and State. He has added the evidence which he gave before the Commission and a brief statement of "an interim policy." In the opening chapters he indicates the "background" of his evidence. He refers to the one-sided character of the Commission on which there was no member who voted against the revised Prayer Book, while there were four persons, including the Chairman, who actually voted for it in the Parliamentary lobbies. He deals with a number of other interesting points, including the position of the Established Church of Scotland which, as he points out, provides no analogy for England. He shows that the laity have no adequate voice in the government of the Church of England. He makes clear that the Free Churches are not absolutely without government control, and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council does not deal with spiritual issues; in fact, on one occasion, the doctrines of Mohammedanism had to be defined by it as its duty is to interpret conditions upon which a Trust is to be held. The dangers of Disestablishment are set out, and the impracticability of some of the recommendations of the Commission. In his Visitation Charge entitled *The Nation and the Nation's Worship*, from which an extract is given, he states his interim proposal. Briefly stated it is that the Prayer Book

measure should be divided into two parts—the controversial and the non-controversial, and that the former should receive synodical sanction and should be presented to Parliament for legal sanction. “A wise and careful measure would end the present irregular action of the Bishops by regular means.” Church and Nation would thus be brought into harmonious co-operation. The Bishop’s book is a useful guide to some of the main questions raised by the Commission’s Report and will be helpful to those desirous of knowing the significance of some of the recommendations.

MEDITATIONS ON THE CROSS. By Toyohiko Kagawa. Translated by Helen F. Topping and Marion R. Draper. *Student Christian Movement Press*. 5s. net.

Toyohiko Kagawa is one of the best-known Christian leaders from Japan. He has had an adventurous career. He has been described as the “Uncrowned King of the Poor” in Kobe, where he lived in the slums. He has been in prison as a dangerous Radical, but he is now consulted by the Government in matters of social reform. “When a new book by him is announced the book shops in Japan make agreements to release it at the same hour on the same day and long queues form to buy the first copies.” Several of his books have been translated into English, and readers in the West have found them both instructive and inspiring. In these *Meditations on the Cross* we have a most interesting illustration of the attitude of an Eastern mind towards the great central fact of the Crucifixion. In eighteen chapters he presents various aspects of the Cross and in each of them there is some suggestion, in many cases novel and arresting, and in other cases arising from its mode of presentation. In the opening chapter on the Secret of the Cross, the crises of Christ’s Life are indicated and His advancement to the Cross as the means of man’s redemption. This leads on to the consideration of the Cross in the consciousness of Jesus which contains notes on the Seven Words, and shows the Cross as the consummation of love. The Cross in the Mind of Christ, the Cross in the Fourth Gospel, the Cross in the thought of Paul, the Cross as revealed in Paul’s parables, are considered with the same illuminating touches and lead to the chapter which may be regarded as the central one of the book—The Cross as Truth. Here we are told the Cross is the secret of our Christianity. It completes the truth of natural law and has seven essential basic elements. These go to the heart of the matter and show the transforming power of Christ’s Sacrifice. In the chapter on the Cross and the Blood of Christ, this Japanese thinker states boldly Christ as man’s substitute; a fact which the scholars of the nineteenth century could not understand. The practical implications of the Cross are considered in several chapters, such as Loving God in Society, the Cross and Social life, the Cross and Ethical Life, the Cross and Religious Life, the Cross and Daily Life, and the Cross and Social Movements. In each of these with occasional illustrations from Japanese life

and history and other sources the meaning of the Cross is set out with clearness, and there is no hesitation in making it the centre from which proceeds the power of Christianity in its world-redeeming work. Those who read this book will not fail to find in it a new incentive to the understanding of the fullness of the meaning of the Death of Christ for mankind.

FOR PARSONS ONLY. A Study in the Cure of Souls. By T. S. Taylor, M.A., B.Litt. (Oxon.), Ward Chapel, Dundee. *Allenson & Co., Ltd.* 3s. 6d. net.

The minds of clergymen and ministers are occupied with many problems as to the present condition and future prospects of Christianity. One of their number, Mr. T. S. Taylor of Dundee, has undertaken the task of examining the whole subject, and has written a book, *For Parsons Only*, that should interest all who follow the clerical calling. Will there be such changes as will render a full-time ministry impossible? The different types of parsons are examined down to those who make a convention of unconventionality. The Church has become preoccupied with seeking to provide the bread which perisheth. This secularising process is the real threat to its existence, and men seem no longer even to understand what the witnessing to the things unseen means. Karl Barth has, in some measure, drawn the minds of men back to the real purpose of the Church, and has thus done good service. The burden of preaching hangs heavily on the parson, and the preacher's claims are not accepted. "The man outside the Church makes little of Apostolic Succession; though he may give an unregenerate chuckle when he reads that one Anglican wit justified it on the grounds that nothing but spiritual succession from Judas could explain a certain Bishop." He requires in the sermon the breath of true inspiration. This cannot be acquired: it is given. He deals with the problems raised by Nationalism, and how the preacher should deal with them. In a chapter on "Modern Psychology and the Ministry," he states the advantages and disadvantages of the New Psychology and the use that can be made of it in the cure of souls. The Parson stands alone and is expected to speak as a parson to men and not as a man to man. In an interesting chapter entitled "Man's Catholic Heart" he examines the case of Dr. Orchard joining the Church of Rome, and shows how ritual may lead to the formation of doctrine. When he says that the natural man is always a Catholic he means that the natural man wants religion but not very much of it. He avoids responsibility: he likes a guarantee that he is all right; "it is nice to salute the Christian Faith, and then go your way till the next time. Protestantism demands much more. "The Church of Rome recognises man's weakness, and manifests an uncanny skill in meeting it." Is there to be Revival or Reaction? This involves a discussion of the Group Movement. The closing chapter on "Keeping Faith" is an appeal to the ministers of this generation to stand fast and to strengthen the things that remain. The Clergy

will find this a stimulating discussion on some of the chief problems that are exercising their minds at the present time.

THE RENEWING GOSPEL. The Yale Lectures on Preaching. By the Rev. Walter Russell Bowie. *Charles Scribner's Sons, Ltd.* 6s.

Those who associate the Yale Lectures with a solid contribution to the art of preaching will not be disappointed on reading Dr. Bowie's latest work. He has brought to bear upon his task the wide scholarship, clear thinking and lucid illustration which are associated with the writer of *The Inescapable Christ* and a dozen other works. The present volume is an expansion of the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching, delivered at the Divinity School of Yale University in April, 1935. The writer has taken as his objective, not the writing of lectures on sermon construction or technique, but the harder task of working out in some measure the interpretation of the Gospel which the Christian preacher must needs be preaching at the present time. His contention is not that we need a new gospel, but rather an understanding of how endlessly an old gospel can reveal its new significance for us. Thus, the Christian inheritance is old, every generation ought to produce men and women who in imagination, in purpose, and in power are Christians of a new kind. Hence the title of the volume—*The Renewing Gospel*.

"It is the business of this book," writes Dr. Bowie, "to try to frame a gospel adapted to the needs of a generation which is beginning to believe that 'We build in vain unless the Lord build with us.' To the 'decent Godless people' we must bring a message that shall help them to recover consciousness of that which is divine."

This is a constructive book, full of help and abounding in illustrative examples, calculated to guide those who really want "to be helped to feel that life makes sense." For the general reader it will assuredly clarify many of the "hard places" in Christian belief. For ministers it is a revelation of the power that the pulpit may be in modern life.

There are seven direct, pertinent and affirmative chapters, each full of fresh ideas and inspiration: I. *The Preacher and the People*. II. *Some Blazes on the Theological Trail*. III. *The Jesus that Was and that Is*. IV. *Can We Trust the God of Jesus?* V. *Human Nature and the Spirit of Christ*. VI. *Christian Ideals confronting a Recalcitrant World*. VII. *When the New Prophets Come*.

The writer indicates the principal present-day tendencies with which the Christian Gospel must deal—e.g. the fatalistic idea of nature, the depreciation of human personality, and the habit of taking materialistic results as an estimate of success: and he shows how the Christian and the Christian message may surmount these obstacles. The preacher will be enriched by a study of this volume and better equipped thereby for the sacred task to which he has been called.

C. E. WILSON.

A YOUNG MAN'S RELIGION. By G. Stuart Worsley, A.L.C.D., C.F., Royal Army Chaplains Department. *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*. Paper, 2s.; cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

It is recognised that there is need to-day for simple statements of the fundamentals of the Christian faith in clear and definite terms such as can be easily understood by those who have no deep acquaintance with theological thought and terminology. Only those who have had some experience in conveying the truths of our faith to such people are fully qualified for the task. The author of this series of addresses has had the necessary experience in his work as an Army Chaplain. He rightly describes the addresses as "light and digestible, not being intended for theologians, but rather for young men and ordinary hard-working people who have to take their religious thinking in tablet form." In popular language the questions that are being constantly asked are considered, and many who have the task of addressing similar audiences will find considerable assistance in the suggestions they can obtain from Mr. Worsley. In a brief Foreword the Bishop of Croydon commends the addresses as showing a sympathetic understanding of what many of the younger generation are thinking and as giving a manly, straightforward presentation of the Christian message. There are thirty of the addresses and the titles of some of them indicate the ground which they cover. The first four deal with God: Is there a God? What is God like? Is He a Person? Are we shutting God Out? He proceeds to the question, What think ye of Christ? and uses the festivals of the Church as an opportunity of answering the question. Prayer, worship, sin, the Church, the Bible, Modern Science, pain and suffering, Confirmation are considered and suitable answers are given. The author has an attractive style and skill in using suitable illustrations.

SUCCESSFUL LIVING. By the Rev. E. N. Porter Goff, M.A., Vicar of Immanuel Church, Streatham. *Longmans, Green & Co.* 3s. 6d. net.

"The thesis of this book is that applied Christianity is the way to successful living." This is the author's description of his aim in his Preface. He seeks to help those who are finding life difficult to achieve the success that they are missing. The first question to be considered is "Has life any meaning?" and by the illustration of the jigsaw puzzle man's knowledge of the parts which appear so meaningless in themselves is shown to indicate that there is a complete picture of which for the time being we may be ignorant. "The Design for Living" is shown to be Christianity with its lessons of the Fatherhood of God and the supreme fact that God is Love. "Setting the Course" is the personal problem that each one has to face. "Going into Partnership" is a frank discussion in the modern manner of the sex problems connected with marriage, divorce and birth control. On these thorny subjects the Author has decided views which he does not hesitate to express, but some

of his readers will scarcely be able to follow his lead in every detail. The remaining four chapters are on Reckoning with Others, with Life, with Oneself, and with the Future. They embrace a wide variety of topics, and deal with many of the relationships of life. Mr. Goff has taken an active interest in the work of the League of Nations, and it is not unnatural to find that he deals at some length with international relationships and the problems connected with them. He holds that a Christian nation must concern itself with other nations' problems, "that is why a policy of national isolation is at once morally undesirable and politically impracticable." The closing chapter shows the influence that belief in a future life must have on present conduct. There is much of practical value in these chapters, and it is expressed in terms that are popular in these days, and that are current in wide circles which are anxious to make Christian tenets acceptable to the average man. Their value can only be judged by their success or failure.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION VERSUS THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE.

By Albert Eagle. Printed for Private Circulation. 5s. net.

The author of this book is Lecturer in Mathematics in the Victoria University of Manchester. He was also at one time Research Assistant to Sir J. J. Thomson at the Cavendish Laboratory. The book can be obtained from the author, post free, by sending 5s. to him at The University, Manchester, 13, or through all booksellers from Simpkin Marshall, Ltd. The purpose of the book is to show that a religious conception of the Universe can be harmonised with modern scientific knowledge. The author aims at curing his readers of all materialistic views of the universe and to give some views which leave room for God and immortality in spite of the teachings of many scientists. He considers that a moral and intellectual duty has been laid upon him to expose many of the ideas which have been popularised under what he calls for brevity, "Einsteinism." This book carries forward a stage further the argument expounded in Arthur Lynch's book, *Science, Leading and Misleading*, published by Murray in 1927. We anticipate that such books are gradually paving the way for the collapse of views which have contributed to the materialism of the present time and for the return of something more like the old religious views of the Universe.

A. W. P.

TEMPLES AND TREASURIES. By Helen Wodehouse. *Allen & Unwin.* 5s.

Publishers sometimes provoke us. Many of them review their own publications on the wrapper of the book. These publishers have done something better and it is something that we have dared to ask some publishers to do—they have written an introduction on the paper wrapper not to the book but to the authoress. They say as it were: "Meet Miss Wodehouse," and we, who have so often been introduced to someone with no more lengthy introduc-

tion than that, are glad to find that they go on to tell us *inter alia* that she is the present Mistress of Girton College, Cambridge. She has been Lecturer in Philosophy in the Birmingham University and Professor of Education in Bristol University. She was Principal of Bingley Training College, Yorkshire, and one of the Lay Sermons in this book was delivered on its twenty-first birthday. So we read the book and when we have read it we exclaim: "Pleased to meet you!" The first address is on "Finding God" and the last, a May Sermon, might be entitled: "Finding Happiness in the Will of God." All of them are the product of a well-informed woman's mind; a woman who is a devout believer. At the close of the book there is a poem which describes the experience of St. Ignatius of Antioch on his way to martyrdom.

W. W. P.

GOD AND THE COMMON LIFE. By Robert Lowry Culhoun. Pp. 303. *Scribners*. 8s. 6d. net.

Dr. Culhoun, Associate Professor of Historical Theology in Yale University, bases this volume on two fundamental questions: Are there in everyday life, now, intimations of the presence of the living God? If so, how shall we bring our thinking and living into line with the demands made by those intimations? Immediately arises the question of vocation and its relevance in the area of production and distribution of economic goods.

From this point he passes on to the question of the mind, the working of a well-ordered mind. It is individual and social. In the latter aspect it has its place in the world-order. The question: "What are our minds doing here at all?" leads us inevitably to the fact of God. There follow thoughtful and thought-provoking chapters on God and His creatures, the working of God, the way of man toward God and the way of God toward man, leading up to worship, revelation, co-operation with God, to the final sovereignty: "I am Alpha and Omega."

This striking volume is stimulating and challenging. It might have been more smoothly written, but force and power are there.

LOST PROPERTY. By Marjory B. Wright. *S.P.C.K.* Paper, 6d. net.

This little book has a thought-provoking title, and its contents will repay the time spent on studying them with a view to its use in Sunday School work. The six subjects are intended specially for a Lent course, but as they tell of things which are being "lost" every day in the year they are equally suitable for any other season. The lessons are based on things lost through the journey of life: temper; time; patience and so on. As most of the illustrations are Biblical ones they supply opportunities for combining the interest of a Bible narrative with a practical application of its teaching. Any of the subjects could usefully furnish material for a single lesson or short address.

E. F. T.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

7 WINE OFFICE COURT, LONDON, E.C.4.

Keswick Convention.—Arrangements have been made for a stall at the Convention again this year, and we hope that friends will make use of it and recommend it to others. Many new publications of the League will be on sale.

Church and State.—A booklet entitled *This Church and Realm of England*—an Examination of the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on the Relations of Church and State—has just been published. It consists of reprinted articles written at the request of the Editor of *The Record*, and has a Foreword by the Right Hon. Sir Thomas Inskip, K.C., M.P. The price is 3d.

The Bishop of Norwich has published a book based upon the Archbishops' Report, in which he sets forth a clear statement of the present position and an illuminating criticism of the Report. The book is issued at 2s. 6d., and copies can be obtained from the Book Room.

Betting and Gambling.—*Tips and Tipsters*, by the Rev. Canon Henry Frazer, of Liverpool, mentioned in the April CHURCHMAN, is ready, price 2d., or 1s. 6d. per dozen. It is hoped that the pamphlet will have a very wide circulation.

Eastward Position.—*Why I take the North Side at the Holy Communion* is the sixth pamphlet to be added to the *Church and Life Series* being published by the League. Eleven clergymen of the Church of England have contributed statements and Bishop E. A. Knox has written the Foreword. Those who want to be well informed on the question of the Eastward Position should study the booklet. The price is 3d.

"Sacrament and Presence."—A few years ago Canon Arthur J. Tait wrote a little book under this title, and it was issued at 2s. In order to give it a wider circulation the price has now been reduced to 1s., and copies are on sale in the Book Room. There are nine chapters dealing with the subject of "The Real Presence," and the book should be found helpful to theological students and others.

Evangelism.—A booklet entitled *Cottage Meetings*, an Aid to Evangelism, by the Rev. L. W. Jackson, B.A., has come into our hands, and copies are on sale in the Book Room at 3d. each. In it the following questions are asked and answered in regard to the work: (1) How should I go about it? (2) How should I prepare for it? (3) What are the advantages afforded by Cottage Meetings? We think the booklet will be found of practical value for use in both town and country parishes.

Pamphlet Racks.—Several enquiries have been received recently as to pamphlet racks. A new design, measuring 24 ins. by 20 ins. by 8 ins., is now on sale, in polished oak at 21s. ; if supplied with 100 assorted N.C.L. manuals, the cost is 5s. extra, to which also should be added 2s. 6d. to defray the cost of special packing and carriage. To those who already have racks in use we should like to send samples of the many new pamphlets recently issued by the N.C.L., with a view to copies being ordered for sale. Application should be made to the Book Room.

Second-hand Lesson Books.—Some copies of out-of-print Sunday School Lesson Books are on sale in the Book Room at 1s. net (postage 3d. per volume) :—*What Jesus said, God and Ourselves, Jesus Christ and Ourselves, God's Heroes, and Christianity as St. Peter Saw it* by the Rev. G. R. Balleine ; and *The Sunday Gospels, and Bible Stories* by the Rev. G. L. Richardson.

Reviews.—May we remind readers that all books mentioned in this issue of THE CHURCHMAN may be obtained from the Church Book Room.
