

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

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

# THE CHURCHMAN

August, 1918.

## The Month.

ELSEWHERE in our columns will be found three further papers read at the Cheltenham Conference in June last. The first four dealing with the respective points of the Lambeth Quadrilateral appeared last month. On the question of the Historic Episcopate two papers were read, the second being by Dr. Eugene Stock, and it is an especial pleasure to be able to print it in full this month, for there is probably no living man with a wider experience of all phases of the reunion question, and as a member of the "Faith and Order" Committee and in many other ways he has rendered solid service to the cause. The concluding addresses at the Conference dealt with the Possibilities of Reunion and were contributed by the Rev. George F. Irwin, whose brilliant paper written from the Episcopal Church point of view was full of courage and hope, and the Rev. Dr. Garvie, whose powerful speech (specially reported for the CHURCHMAN) gave a clear analysis of the whole position as viewed from the side of the Non-episcopal churches. It is easy, of course, to take an exaggerated view of the importance of a movement in which one is specially interested, but we do honestly believe that the Cheltenham Conference has rendered distinct service to the Church in calling attention to the question of reunion, in creating an atmosphere, and in indicating possible lines upon which closer relations between Episcopal and Non-episcopal churches, leading in God's good time to something in the nature of inter-communion, may be promoted. Evangelical Churchmen may well feel proud and encouraged that they have been enabled to frame a policy which, if followed in its entirety by the whole Church, would certainly take us a long way on the road towards the desired goal. Already there are signs that other

Churchmen are awakening to the importance of the question, and are discussing it in a broader and more large-hearted spirit than would have been the case even three years ago, and for this welcome change of attitude no small credit may belong to the Cheltenham Conference.

The attitude of rigid exclusiveness so long adopted **Lord Halifax's** towards this question by the extreme High Church **Speech.** party has thrown into all the stronger relief the remarkable speech made by Lord Halifax at the Annual Meeting of the English Church Union. He dealt with several important questions, and among them that of Reunion was given a foremost place—reunion, not with the Roman and Greek Churches alone, which in past years formed, and doubtless still forms, so large a part of his programme, but also with Non-episcopal churches. It was not so much what he said, as the spirit in which he said it, which made the speech so valuable. Thus in regard to the responsibility for divisions he asked, "Can any portion of Christendom close its eyes to the duty of repentance for the past, of making such amendment for that past as may be possible, or afford not to show the utmost charity and forbearance in regard to those from whom it may find itself in separation largely by its own fault?" Again, in regard to Home Reunion, he said, "We know what action on the part of Rome would attract us and prepare the way for reunion; it is precisely by similar action on our part that we may hope to attract those whom we wish to draw back into our own communion." Moreover, in regard to the work of grace in the heart, he said that "in whatever degree we see this Christian life being lived, there we may be certain God's grace has been given, and that as long as any soul faithfully corresponds with the grace given to it, that soul is living in God's favour, and that as such we have no need to be disquieted about its spiritual condition." We do not suppose that Lord Halifax has abandoned any one of his distinctive principles, but we seem to see in the words we have quoted something of a new spirit—more tolerant towards those who are separated from us and not alone towards those from whom we are separated—which should mean much whenever the time comes, as please God it will come, that the Episcopal and Non-episcopal churches may draw more closely together.

Still more striking, and, in its way, still more significant was the attitude towards Reunion shown by the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury at its sitting on July 10. Canon E. A. Burroughs, who, we are glad to see, is fast making a place for himself in the discussions of that venerable body, brought forward a resolution in these terms:—

“That this House, being convinced of the importance, especially at this time, of visible unity and united witness among all who acknowledge Christ as Lord, urges upon Churchmen, as a step towards ultimate reunion, the duty of seeking and welcoming opportunities of joint witness and joint action with those who, while not of the same communion with us, are engaged in the service of the Kingdom of God.” It was seconded by the Dean of Bristol. Exception was taken to the speeches in which it had been moved and seconded, but for the resolution itself a wonderful amount of sympathy was expressed. It is true that amendments were proposed, but then this was inevitable in such a composite body, and any one who has ever sat through a debate in the Lower House will know how keenly sensitive the members are to exactness of expression. Thus the Archdeacon of Berks was anxious to omit the reference to “visible unity,” and Canon Burroughs agreed to the omission, but he resisted an amendment proposed by the Bishop of Buckingham to insert the words “Such opportunities, etc., as are not in conflict with the principles of Catholic Faith and Order,” and, seeing that there might be twenty different interpretations of the phrase, the amendment was rejected by thirty-three to twenty-seven. An amendment to insert the words “so far as they are compatible with Church Order,” was, however, carried by thirty to twenty-nine, a majority of one. The resolution was then agreed to by fifty-four to three, and the fact may be regarded as a triumph.

In the course of the debate, several things were said which were noteworthy on their own account but more, perhaps, because of the position of those who said them. Thus the Dean of Bristol expressed the view that “the reunion of Christendom was at present visionary, but not Home reunion. He had talked with many soldiers who reproached the Church for its attitude, which imitated the spirit of Rome, ‘He followeth not us.’ But ‘the wind bloweth where it listeth,’ and

Convocation  
and Reunion.

Noteworthy  
Speeches.

not through keyholes of locked doors. If Catholic tradition is in conflict with charity it must give way. Otherwise we are the Separatists, we are the Pharisees, we are the schismatics." The Dean of Westminster said that "the first step must come from the side of the Church. Hers is the chief responsibility. But what should be aimed at is not little expedients, but a sweetening of public opinion." The Rev. R. J. E. Boggis said that "Christian divisions were a scandal to the world, which marvelled that disciples of Christ could not even unite in the Breaking of Bread. Corporate reunion seems far off, but we can prepare the way for it. At Barnstaple a number of useful conferences had been held. He would welcome interchange of pulpits if sanctioned by authority." Canon Markham observed that "the Church cannot now approach the people with the principle that 'schism is a sin.' He had recently offered the parish church at Grimsby for united prayer-meetings, the ministers of all denominations leading the devotions for half an hour each. The Roman Catholic priest had sent no reply to the invitation." Canon Markham admitted that he "might be asked to pay a return visit. Also, people would say, 'Then it does not matter where we worship.' But such risks must be faced." These were some of the encouraging things which were said, and the impression produced by the whole debate was one of real hopefulness.

Where, then, do we stand? The Cheltenham  
 Around a  
 Table. Conference has shown that a large number of Evangelicals are prepared to assent to a definite line of action, and it is believed that the "findings," or something very near to them, are assented to by a still larger number who were not definitely associated with the Conference. Then, we have the remarkable speech of Lord Halifax which must inevitably carry weight with another body of Churchmen. And, again, there is the resolution of the Lower House of Convocation, supported by many definite High Churchmen. It must not be supposed that, even taken together, these incidents show the general body of Churchmen to be agreed upon any definite course of action, but they are unmistakable indications of a sympathetic spirit towards the question of Home Reunion, such as the Church has not experienced for very many years. If, as the Dean of Westminster said, "we are not united amongst ourselves," and that "must come first," would

it not be possible, availing ourselves of such a measure of agreement as does exist, for Churchmen of various shades of opinion who have the sympathetic spirit to meet around a table and see if it is not possible to extend the area of agreement and to formulate some definite line of policy? This would be extremely helpful to the spiritual life of the Church; it would also be a measure of justice to the Non-episcopal churches for, as more than one distinguished Nonconformist has pointed out, the reunion they desire is not with a section, but with the whole Church:

The petition presented to the Upper House of the **Protest against Modernism.** Convocation of Canterbury on July 10 may be regarded as the earnest and considered protest of large numbers of clergy and laity, representative of almost every school of thought, against the Modernist interpretation of certain Articles of the Christian creed. The petition bore no fewer than 54,324 signatures, including many of the most distinguished Churchmen; and a petition in identical terms was presented at the same time to the Upper House of the Convocation of York with a large number of additional signatures. Bearing these figures in mind and weighing well the terms of the petition, it will be seen that a feeling of real distress is widely prevalent at what is held to be an attack on the Christian Creed. The petition recited "that grave disquiet, anxiety, and confusion of mind have been and are being caused to many of the faithful of the Province by the position maintained by divers clergy of the Church of England, to wit: That divers Articles of the Creed, and in particular those concerning the birth of our Blessed Lord Jesus Christ from a pure Virgin without any earthly father, and His bodily Resurrection, on the third day, are not revealed truths to be constantly held by all faithful Christians as matters of supernatural Faith set forth in the written Word of God and as part of a Christian man's duty to God, but are only religious opinions, not binding upon any man, whatsoever his order in the Church, but such as may be abandoned without blame." The petitioners accordingly prayed "most humbly and earnestly" that the House would use such means "by Synodical Act or otherwise" as to its wisdom might seem best and most fitting "to make plain to the glory of God and the good of souls, that all the said Articles are part of the revealed truth taught by the whole Catholic

Church of Christ, and as such to be held constantly by all faithful Christians." The exceeding plainness and moderation of the terms of the petition will command universal respect and admiration among all who hold to the literal interpretation of the Articles of the Creed. For ourselves we heartily welcome the petition, for, as we pointed out in a previous number, the growth of the Modernist interpretation of the Creed is causing widespread havoc among those who come under its influence. But welcome as such protests are, it is not by petitions that the evil will be most effectually met. What is needed is a regular and systematic campaign of instruction by means of sermons and lectures in order to strengthen, stablish and settle Christian souls in their most holy faith. The "teaching sermon" has gone out of fashion, but the trend of events demands its revival. Parochial clergy make a great mistake if they imagine that their people are unacquainted with these Modernist views. They meet with them in magazines, novels and other forms of popular reading, and they come across them in religious newspapers, religious pamphlets and religious books; and if they never, or only rarely, hear their parish clergyman put the positive side of these truths, some at least are apt to imagine that there is no answer to the Modernist, whereas there is a perfect answer if clergy will only take the trouble to study the question.

The Upper House of Convocation cannot be congratulated upon the way they dealt with the petition.

**The Bishop of Chelmsford's Speech.** The petitioners asked the Bishops to "use such means by Synodical Act or otherwise" to reassure the faithful, and all they received in reply was a resolution referring them to what the House did in the matter four years ago, and to the Archbishop's reply to the House of Laymen's resolution passed in February last. No doubt there were good reasons for not reopening the subject in its entirety, but we should have been glad if the House had passed a resolution more definite in its terms and more clearly in line with the admirable speech which the Bishop of Chelmsford made in presenting the petition. From that speech we quote the following opening passage :—

Those who present this Petition are in favour of honest research, but they wish to state clearly that, in their opinion, that which is revealed in Holy Scripture, definitely stated in the Creeds and thus accepted, not by a part of,

but by the whole Catholic Church, cannot be regarded as an open question. Such is more than a mere religious opinion. It is, and must be, regarded ever as a fact. The petitioners draw your Lordship's special attention to two Articles—those relating to our Lord's Birth and Resurrection. Their own view is that He was incarnate and that He is alive in spite of His Death, *but* also they hold that the Church definitely teaches that He *was* conceived by the Holy Ghost, *born* of the Virgin Mary, and that the third day He did actually rise from the dead. That there are difficulties connected with these assertions they admit, but these are those of the natural man. Your petitioners regard their religion as primarily one of Faith. They recite their Creed—the Belief founded upon the sure warranty of Holy Scripture. They recite their Belief with awe. They think that the words of St. Gregory of Nazianzus are not out of date, "Speculate not upon the Divine Generation, for it is not safe. The Doctrine is to be honoured silently. It is a good thing for thee to know the fact: the mode we cannot admit that even angels understand, much less thou."

They honestly believe that if the reliability of the narratives of the Miraculous Birth and of the Physical Resurrection be denied that such denial would undermine the Faith itself. They understand St. Paul's declaration to include such a view when he says, "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, your faith is vain." They contend that the facts as stated in the Gospels, affirmed in the Creeds, dealt with in the manner which they are by the great Apostle, cannot mean any other kind of resurrection than that which is so clearly defined by Article IV., "Christ did truly rise again from death and took again His body with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature." They hold that those words interpret the mind of the Church Catholic upon the words in the Creed, and that *no* other meaning can be put legitimately upon them than that of the Article quoted.

We are persuaded that that is the right line to take. A perfect cloud of contentious interpretations has been created, whereas the real issues are very simple. Our Lord was either born of a Virgin or He was not, and those who affect the Modernist position should answer this question definitely and straightly in one way or the other—for there is no middle course—and we should then know where they are. So, too, with the Resurrection, our Lord's body—the body which "was crucified, dead and buried" either rose from the tomb, leaving it empty, or it did not. Again there is no middle course, and Modernists ought to let us know definitely on which side they stand. Before they attempt to explain their views, let them deal honestly and straightly with the question of fact.

**Bishop Hen-** We cannot leave this subject without expressing  
**son's Position.** our deep regret that the Bishop of Hereford should have made the speech in Convocation attributed to him in the *Guardian* :—

The Bishop of Hereford said he had had some intention of moving that the discussion should be postponed until the next session. It seemed to him

a subject of such complexity and difficulty that it ought not to be discussed without very adequate notice. A matter of this kind, cutting so deeply into the most sacred interests of religion, could not decently be discussed without very adequate notice and preparation. The circumstances in which the subject had been introduced to the House were so extraordinary that common equity required he should have been given ample notice before what was nothing more nor less than a gross repeated attack should have been made against himself.

The Bishop of Chelmsford protested that he had not the slightest idea of attacking the Bishop of Hereford in any way whatever.

The Bishop of Hereford said he did not wish to dissociate himself from Dr. Sanday and from all those divines and thinkers who had devoted their lives to the study of these sacred and difficult questions, and whose contributions to the discussion were of the utmost value to the cause of religion, and demanded, not the denunciation of the Bishop of Chelmsford, but the generous acknowledgment of that House. It was clearly undesirable that discussion should continue, and he acquiesced in the Bishop of Chelmsford's speech passing without criticism. He accepted no responsibility for the resolution passed on the former occasion, and he retained full liberty in the future to bring such contributions as he desired to the discussion.

It would be a good thing if some personal friend, to whom he would listen, would point out to the Bishop of Hereford how gravely he is prejudicing his position by always assuming that actions such as the Bishop of Chelmsford on this, and the Bishop of Oxford on a previous occasion, felt it necessary to take, are directed against himself. Apart from every other consideration the attitude he takes up tends to keep alive the feeling of bitterness aroused by the controversy over his consecration which ought by this time to have been laid to rest.



[Cheltenham Conference Paper.]

## The Historic Episcopate.

By EUGENE STOCK, D.C.L.

THE phrase "Historic Episcopate" has come into prominence through its standing for one of the conditions of connexion with the Anglican Communion, that is, the group of four conditions originally suggested by my late friend, Dr. Huntington, of Grace Church, New York, adopted by the American Protestant Episcopal Church, and accepted by the Lambeth Conference of 1888. I have always thought that the word "Historic" ought to be applied to all the four conditions. They are in fact the Historic Canon of Scripture, the Historic Creeds (two, not three), the Historic Sacraments (two, not seven), and the Historic Episcopate. Of these four, only one, the Sacraments, is plainly the command of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is permissible, I suppose, to regard any one of the other three, or all of the three, as fulfilling His Divine purpose; but certainly the records do not tell us so. So far as we can see, they grew up gradually in the Church, more or less quickly. The Historic Episcopate certainly preceded the other two. It confessedly existed in the second century, while the others were not settled till a century or two later.

Historically, therefore, the Episcopate is, as regards age, the second of the four. Does this involve its being of the *esse* of the Church of Christ? Personally I think not. I imagine that if the whole of Christendom were re-united, the united Church could, if the whole body felt it necessary or desirable, modify or change whatever was not a direct command of our Lord, without forfeiting its position as the Visible Catholic Church of Christ. Still, if any one infers from this statement that the Church, thus united, could reasonably abolish bishops, he must be prepared to allow similar liberty in adding as well as abolishing, and the adding might be to the Creeds or the Canon of Scripture. These, however, are wild imaginations, and I only use them to illustrate the practical necessity of the Episcopate. But this in no way involves a particular theory of the Episcopate, such as involves a mechanical succession and transmission of authority. The whole of our difficulty arises from that unwarrantable theory.

I myself, in the Faith and Order Committee, suggested another

illustration. I ventured to urge that while the Episcopate is truly historic as coming down to us through so many centuries, yet, if all the bishops in Diocletian's time had perished in the persecution, the Church might have started afresh and consecrated new bishops ; and again, if in Queen Elizabeth's time all the English bishops had chosen to remain in what was then in fact the Roman schism, the clergy and lay members of the English Church might have met and solemnly appointed and set apart fresh bishops ; in short, that the use of the word " historic " did not necessarily involve a " succession " so mechanical that the grace of God could be interrupted by any such unforeseen calamity. Of course the word " historic " itself conveys no such meaning. It clearly only means the actual Episcopal Order of past history. When we speak of our historic British Constitution, we mean that it is not a brand-new invention of modern politics, but has come down to us through historic ages, in Tennysonian language, " from precedent to precedent." The Jerusalem Chamber, in which the United Conference on Faith and Order holds its meetings, is spoken of as " that historic room." There is no dangerous secret in the word historic.

But when we discuss the question whether the Historic Episcopate is of the *esse*, not of any Church in any circumstances, but of the Anglican Communion in existing circumstances, I for one have sufficient reverence for history to think that if thirteen centuries do not settle that point, I do not know what can settle anything. And all that the Quadrilateral affirms is that the acceptance of the Historic Episcopate is a condition of admission to the Anglican Communion ; that is, the Anglican Communion as it exists at present. I have never been able to see how this can be disputed.

I may now be asked: What do I mean by the Anglican Communion? It is curious how vague and uncertain many Evangelical Churchmen are on this subject. Pardon me, therefore, if I answer a question which ought not to need an answer. I mean the aggregate composed of the Church of England, and the Branches abroad of the Church of England, and the independent or semi-independent Churches in recognized communion with the Church of England.

(1) There are three such Churches wholly independent, viz. the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Church of Ireland, and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

(2) Four Churches partially independent, in our great self-govern-

ing Dominions, viz., the Canadian Church, the Australian Church, the New Zealand Church, the South African Church. With these may be grouped a fifth, which has a peculiar status of its own, the Church in the West Indies.

(3) The Church of England in India, which is in a partial sense an Established Church connected with the State, and has certain special conditions. With it may be grouped Ceylon, where the Church has been disestablished, yet is under the Bishop of Calcutta as Metropolitan.

(4) The Church of England and its Branches in the Crown Colonies and British Protectorates, including some Branches with local semi-independent constitutions like Uganda, but all under the Archbishop of Canterbury as practically their Metropolitan.

(5) Branches of the English Church in Foreign States, China, Japan, Persia, Madagascar, South America. With this may be grouped the see of Jerusalem, with jurisdiction partly in the foreign country of Palestine, partly in the Colony of Cyprus, partly in the Protectorates of Egypt and the Sudan.

All these together form the Anglican Communion. It is not a Federation of Churches, seeing that it has no definite rules defining their mutual relations, and no single supreme government. But it is a group of Churches and Branches of Churches which in actual fact are closely linked together.

Observe what the essential uniting fact is. It is not that they are all one Church, as regards constitution and government. The Church of Ireland, for instance, is not in any sense under the British Parliament, as our English Church is. It has modified its Prayer-book, and arranged the patronage of its parishes and the appointment of its bishops, without our having any right to interfere. And so with some of the other Churches. The uniting fact, practically, is this, that any clergyman of any of these Churches or Branches of Churches can minister fully in the church buildings of any other. Subject to certain permits of a simple character, any of you could go away for your holiday, leaving your parish in the full charge of an Irish or American or Canadian or Chinese or Indian or Negro clergyman; or you could take one as your curate; or he could succeed you as vicar. And observe that this is also the case with a clergyman of the Scottish Episcopal Church, notwithstanding the fact that from the Establishment point of view, that Church is only

a dissenting body ; while, on the other hand, you could not employ, or engage as curate, or be succeeded as vicar, by a clergyman of the Established Church of Scotland, which is Presbyterian. Establishment has nothing to do with the question. But the Historic Episcopate, together with the three other conditions of the Quadrilateral, and with substantially the same Prayer-book, has everything to do with it. And what the Quadrilateral says to any Church which is not now in the Anglican Communion is this :—If you wish to join us in the full sense, that is, if you wish to have the privileges of the Anglican Communion, you must accept the four historic conditions, of which the Episcopate is one. Is that unreasonable ? I just now added the condition of a substantially similar Prayer-book, including the Articles—which is an important addition as a challenge to Rome ; yet the Articles themselves as they stand are not, as such, indispensable, for the Irish and American Churches, and I suppose the Scottish Church also, have them only in a modified form. You will observe that I am offering no opinion as to what ought to be the case ; I am simply stating facts.

What shall we call the mutual relations of the Churches of the Anglican Communion ? It is not in any single case Federal Union. For on the one hand, as I have already said, there is no central supreme authority over those of the Churches that are independent ; and on the other hand, those that are still merely outlying Branches of the Church of England have not the liberty of semi-independent bodies even if federated. We may use the phrase Inter-Communion ; only then we must remember that there may be a lower kind of Inter-Communion. Suppose the Church of England and the Presbyterian Church or Churches of Scotland were to make a formal agreement that the members of either were welcome to the Lord's Supper as administered by the other, not as an occasional or casual concession, but as a normal and recognized right, and also to agree on entire freedom in regard to exchange of pulpits, that would be a measure of Inter-Communion. But it would be a long way short of the Union already described. It would not make a Presbyterian eligible for an English vicarage or curacy. It would be better expressed by the word " alliance."

We need to cultivate accuracy in our use of terms ; and if in this paper I am faulty in that respect I shall be glad to be corrected. We are wont to talk rather glibly of unity, uniformity, union, inter-

communion, reunion, to say nothing of federation or alliance. Just consider these words. Unity is not an external but a spiritual thing, which all true Christians have, or could have, with one another, whatever Church they belong to. I say "could have," if they wished it, only sometimes they do not wish it. Why do they not wish for it? Because they want uniformity,—not as regards church worship and government, but as regards doctrine. Truth, indeed, is essential as a basis for real unity; but it must be fundamental truth, and with all reasonable allowance for diversity of view resulting from temperament, or education, or environment. In the eighteenth century, for instance, Toplady would have insisted on the doctrine that Christ died only for the elect, as fundamental, while Fletcher would have insisted that universal redemption (as distinct from universal salvation) was fundamental. That tremendous question, and the other points of the predestinarian controversy, do not trouble us now; but other shibboleths do, which I refrain from referring to lest I should cause division. We are, however, all agreed in deprecating uniformity in externals and secondary matters, and certainly any attempt to impose it would be an absolute bar to Reunion. If I may use a musical illustration, we do not want all the instruments to strike the same note in *unison*; but we do want them to strike notes that produce *harmony*. Reunion, again, must for practical purposes be distinguished from Union. Reunion would bind together those who were once united but are now separated, and would have Union as its result. But if some other body also joined them which had not been united with them before, that would be Union but not Reunion. I submit that it is very necessary to obviate misunderstanding by carefully distinguishing between the different phrases, and even between different meanings of the same phrase, as in the case of Inter-communion.

I want also to draw another important distinction, namely, between Churches in different countries, and the Church in a single country. Although I hold that the real ultimate ideal would be one Catholic or Universal Church for the world, in accordance with what was surely the original purpose, yet it is obvious that the attainment of such an ideal is in any case far distant, even if it can be hoped for in this dispensation at all. In the meanwhile, we might aim at Federation or Inter-communion between the Church of England and Churches in other lands. We might, for instance, have Federation

or Inter-communion in some form, without the uniting influence of the Historic Episcopate, with a Presbyterian Church like that of Holland, and certainly with the Church of Scotland, though according to its Moderator's recent address in the crypt of St. Paul's that Church is really moving towards readiness for a still closer union. But in any one country there should, ideally, be one Church, and so far as England is concerned, our aim should be for nothing less. It was so in Queen Elizabeth's day. The Puritans were not a separate Church; they were the Evangelicals of the Church of England; and barring the comparatively few who clung to the Roman schism, there was one Church for the country. That it is not so now is largely the Church's fault; and I fully believe that, in the gracious providence of God, the result of the separations has been in more ways than one an illustration of His power to turn curses into blessings. Nevertheless, the disadvantages are far greater than the advantages; and we ought all to pray and labour for the real and complete Reunion of those thus separated.

This brings us at once face to face with Episcopacy, and practically with the Historic Episcopate. Any really united Church must either have bishops or not have bishops; and the simple question is, Which is it to be? It is provoking to see how this plain question is constantly evaded by Evangelical controversialists. If they said plainly, We want no bishops, we should understand them. If they said, bishops, being not of the *essè* of the Church, we may drop them altogether, that, too, would be intelligible. But they will not go so far as this, and I really believe that they do not wish to abolish Episcopacy. But if so, why not recognize the fact that if there is to be one Church, the question has to be settled one way or the other? And then, if the decision is frankly accepted that bishops there must be and will be, the way is open for the fullest consideration of the further question, How can the Anglican Episcopate be so reformed or modified as to be suitable for a United Church and acceptable to its members generally? It is of course easy to throw the cold water of unsympathetic criticism upon those who do try to solve this problem, but it brings us "no forrarder," and meanwhile we Evangelicals are missing the chances of exercising the influence that rightly belongs to us.

The principal obstacle to Reunion in the past has been that many Evangelical Churchmen, and most Nonconformists, have not seen

the need for it, indeed have doubted whether it is desirable. They have been content with the spiritual unity which they can have without union. While upholding the most true doctrine of the spiritual and in a sense invisible Church which is "the blessed company of all faithful people," but which the world cannot perceive, they have failed to acknowledge the fact that a Visible Church is needed which the world *can* see. *This* is the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Creeds, and this is necessarily meant when we are discussing questions, not of spiritual fellowship, but of Ministry and Ministrations and Administration. But our Nonconformist brethren have their eyes open now; at least the chief leaders among them,—no doubt it will take time to convince the rank and file. That distinguished Free Church divine, Professor H. T. Andrews, for instance, in an article in the *Contemporary Review* of April last on "The Catholic Ideal," acknowledges that, to use his own words, "the *disjecta membra* of which modern Christendom consists do not afford Christ an adequate organ with which to work upon the world"; and he adds, "From the sixteenth to the nineteenth century the Churches in England were for the most part engaged in formulating division; to-day for the most part they are trying to find the formula for unity. The centripetal forces are at last beginning to conquer the centrifugal."

At the same time, the best and most thoughtful High Churchmen—again the leaders if not the rank and file—are perceiving that if the Episcopate is to be included in any scheme of Reunion, no particular view of its origin, authority, necessity, is to be required of those who join the United Church. Why then should Evangelical Churchmen stand aloof, contenting themselves with proposals for exchange of pulpits, which is a very small part of the problem, and shaking their heads over the utterances of individual High Churchmen? High Churchmen have a right to their opinions, as we have a right to ours; but why should we hinder the cause of Reunion by seeming to admit that Reunion involves our adoption of their views?

At this point let me refer to the Reports of the Sub-Committee of the United Conference on Faith and Order, of which I was, to my own surprise, and in my absence, appointed a member. These Reports, let me say, although so short, were no hastily drawn papers. They were the fruit of repeated and prolonged discussions. Nor were they a despairing effort to combine, somehow or other, hope-

lessly divided opinions. In point of fact, there was from the first a remarkable agreement as to what would have to be said, but the greatest care and thought as to the exact language to be employed. The desire of all, throughout, was, if I may use a notable expression, uttered, not in the Conference or the Sub-Committee, but in India a few years ago by the present Bishop of Bombay, "Not compromise for the sake of peace, but comprehension for the sake of truth." The first Report, issued two years ago, included a "Statement of Agreement on Matters of Faith," a "Statement of Agreement on Matters of Order," and a "Statement of Differences on Matters of Order requiring further Study and Discussion." With the first Statement we are not directly concerned to-day. The second Statement expressed a "common conviction" (1) that it was "the purpose of our Lord that believers in Him should be, as in the beginning they were, one Visible Society," (2) that He ordained two Sacraments "as not only declaratory symbols but also effective channels of His grace and gifts," (3) that He conferred on the Church "a Ministry of manifold gifts and functions." The third Statement mentioned the still existing differences touching (1) "the nature of the Visible Society," (2) the conditions of validity of the Sacraments, (3) the source of ministerial authority. (You will understand that I have condensed these statements into the fewest words.) This Report was "generally approved" by the United Conference as a whole, a body three times larger than the Sub-Committee and comprising men of the most diverse views, say from Mr. Athelstan Riley to Dr. Hodgkin the Quaker. But it was published with only the signatures of the ten members of the Sub-Committee, to avoid the necessity of the whole Conference going through it word by word. The Sub-Committee (reinforced by four more members) was then requested to resume its work and discuss the differences.

The result of the further discussions is the Second Report, which has been supposed to be confined to the question of the Episcopate, but which really touches the whole problem of Reunion. Here again I am bound to testify that from the first there was scarcely any doubt expressed that, as a simple matter of fact, the Episcopate was a *sine qua non* if an United Church was to be projected; and, on the other hand, that the Episcopate must be what for brevity I may call of a primitive and not a medieval character. You must not indulge in imaginary pictures of a High Church bishop

browbeating puzzled Nonconformists, or of valiant Free Churchmen dragging from reluctant bishops admissions that Nonconformity has some small modicum of good in it. One who like myself sat through many long days of most kindly and generous conversation from both sides can only smile at such absurd ideas. Most truly does the Report use these words: "What we desire is not grudging concession"—that is on either side,—“but a willing acceptance, for the common enrichment of the united Church, of the wealth distinctive of each body, Episcopal and Non-Episcopal.” No Christian community is to “disown its past.” All should “maintain the continuity of their witness and influence as heirs and trustees of types of Christian thought, life, and order, not only of value to themselves, but of value to the Church as a whole.” Each should “bring its own distinctive contribution, not only to the common life of the Church, but also to its methods of organization,” so that “all that is true in the experience and testimony of the uniting Communion would be conserved to the Church.” For instance, “the legitimate freedom of prophetic ministry should be carefully preserved”; and “many customs and institutions” “developed in separate communities” would be “preserved within the larger unity of which they have come to form a part.” While the Church’s “visible unity” “could only be fully realized through community of worship, faith, and order, including common participation in the Lord’s Supper,” this would be “quite compatible with a rich diversity in life and worship.” I confess frankly that when I read over again all these noble words, I am pained at the cold criticism with which some Evangelicals have received them.

Then, as regards the Episcopate itself, one “necessary condition” is that it shall “re-assume a constitutional form,” as regards the methods both of election and of government, according to “primitive ideal and practice”; and another is “that acceptance of the fact of Episcopacy” is to be asked for, and “not any theory as to its character.” Naturally the Report does not go into details. Even the United Conference itself has no authority to settle anything. Its task is purely preparatory, and, to use the Sub-Committee’s word, “exploratory”; to find where there is agreement or disagreement, and help to create an atmosphere of goodwill. Here, in an assembly of Evangelical Churchmen, one may freely admit that there would be dangers in any proposed changes. That is

inevitable. But dangers should not frighten us from courageous action if the action is right. It may fairly be said, for example, that under a system of election we should not get nine or ten Evangelical Diocesan Bishops in England as we have now. On the other hand, we have no security now that this happy state of things will continue; while in an United Church, containing the thousands of fine laymen now separated from us, the voting would be very different from what it would be in our present circumstances. But we ought not to be unduly influenced by party considerations; and I for one would gladly pay a high price for real Reunion. On one point I earnestly deprecate premature discussion—the ordination and status of the ministers of different Churches. Let us pray and strive to foster a healing atmosphere of hope and goodwill; and whenever the great day seems to be approaching—if ever it does—there will be such an overwhelming enthusiasm at the prospect of a really United Church, such an outburst of holy sympathy, such an overpowering sense of Divine guidance and favour, that all sides will be keen to emulate each other in the generosity of their concessions. I believe that a reasonable solution of the ordination question can be found. I could imagine more than one myself. But I decline to submit them now to the cold criticism of partisans. No, we must have the atmosphere first, and then the Lord Himself will show us the way. Personally I should rejoice to see the godly, learned, and able Free Church leaders, with whom I have sat in frank brotherly Christian converse for so many long days, consecrated themselves *per saltum* to be Bishops of the United Church.

I have treated this subject mainly in its bearing on our Home Church. I cannot forget the sight that meets my eyes continually in my own town of Bournemouth. In its central square I can stand at a certain point and count five spires forming almost a circle round me, all pointing heavenward, but representing five Christian communions, each connected with other congregations in the same town, and with hundreds of other congregations all over the country; yet all five entirely independent of each other. They are Anglican, Roman, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Methodist. Several other equally separate bodies would be met within half a mile, but it is the five spires that impress me. I bethink myself of the city of Corinth. I read the indignant words in which St. Paul rebuked the Church parties there. I remember that they were parties within

the one Church ; and I wonder what he would have said if they had set up rival synagogues around the principal square of the city. I cast no blame on any one for the position at Bournemouth ; but I ask if it is not worth effort and sacrifice to remedy.

There is one serious obstacle to Home Reunion which I dare not pass over. That is Establishment. On the face of it, that seems an obstacle quite insuperable. We may depend upon it that our Nonconformist brethren take for granted that the United Church would not be under Parliamentary control. We see the difficulty of the question in Scotland, where the two great Presbyterian Churches, absolutely identical in both Faith and Order, have now for some years been trying to find a compromise between the strong views and feelings of both sides on that great question with a view to reunion. If they succeed, as I hope they will, they may give us also the clue to the solution. I hope also that the Free Churches in England may presently unite together as one great Church on Mr. Shakespeare's plan. They seem rapidly ripening for it ; and I believe such an union would help and not hinder their reunion with us.

But after all, the question is not one of Home Reunion only. We have the world of nations to think of. It is in the mission field that the problem is most urgent. What was it that led to the Kikuyu scheme ? Simply the divisions of Christendom. The Church in Uganda itself had no part in it, and no need for it, because in Uganda there is, apart from the Roman Mission, only one Church, and, being one, it is a powerful barrier against advancing Mohammedanism. But in British East Africa there are eight or ten independent Missions, all relatively weak as against Islam because working separately. They have their spiritual fellowship, but that is not enough. The true remedy would be one Church. But the Missions represent our home divisions, and have no authority to found an united Church. So they, at least some of them, drew up the Kikuyu scheme as a partial remedy, just as Cheltenham last year aimed at a partial remedy in its " Findings." But Kikuyu did better than Cheltenham, for it did not profess that its scheme was the goal. It knew that the true goal was one Church for British East Africa, and Bishops Peel and Willis expressly avowed their loyalty in any case to the Lambeth Quadrilateral with its Historic Episcopate. Some Evangelicals at home have made Kikuyu a battle-cry without seeing

what Kikuyu really stood for, and thereby have much embittered the controversy. Not so that brilliant Scotsman, Dr. Norman Maclean, who was himself present at the Kikuyu Conference, and had also visited Uganda. In his fascinating book, *Africa in Transformation*, he regards the C.M.S. system of Church Councils as virtually Presbyterian, and declares that part of the secret of success in Uganda is the combination of that system with Episcopacy. "A Church," he says, "that has the democratic power which Presbyterianism can give, and has also the initiative and unity which the Historic Episcopate gives, is the ideal Church for Africa." I might say much about India and China and Japan, but I must refrain. But oh! for a truce to our minor controversies, and for a broad and generous outlook over the whole wide world!

Yes, broad and generous, whether in the Home or the Foreign field. There must be no Act of Uniformity. We must learn to recognize the indisputable fact that it has not pleased God to make us all alike. A real Church for us all must be very inclusive and very elastic. It must be wider, and not narrower, than the Church of England is to-day. This is an absolute essential. We should have to tolerate extempore prayer in our public services wherever it was desired. Dr. Scott Lidgett would continue his Methodist class-meetings; Dr. Meyer's conscience about Infant Baptism would have to be respected; Dr. Horton would not be compelled to wear a surplice. But then, bear in mind, Dr. Horton would refuse to forbid High Churchmen to wear what vestments they like, on the ground that all distinctive robes in church are equally needless and equally innocent. Yes, the price of our welcomed union with our Nonconformist brethren would be the toleration of many High Church usages which we dislike. Even in doctrine there would be large recognition of the diversities of the human mind. I assume loyalty to the great facts of Christianity as distinct from theories about them. I assume a common acceptance of the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the Mediation, of the co-equal Son of God,—of the Gift of the Holy Ghost as the Divine Agent in Conversion, Regeneration, Sanctification,—of the supreme authority of Holy Scripture. But that would leave plenty of room for differences and for controversies. For instance, most Nonconformists take more modern views on the Bible than most Evangelical Churchmen. And on the Anglican side, Evangelicals and High Churchmen and Broad

Churchmen would still maintain their own respective views ; while each section would acknowledge the right of the others to a place in the Church Catholic. Perfect union cannot be looked for in this dispensation, any more than any other kind of perfection. But, at least, one Visible Catholic Church would with unequalled force invite the world to believe in the Divine Mission of our Lord Jesus Christ ; and that is what He prayed for.

Perhaps I may be reminded that I have left out of view more than half Christendom. Yes, I have, in order to be practical. But all Christendom should be at the back of our minds. If ever the Roman Church could be won to indispensable reform, it would be by the influence of a great united Protestant Church more truly Catholic than itself. It is, I am sure, a mistake to suppose that Protestant Reunion would hinder the larger Reunion of Christendom. On the contrary, it is the only means of obtaining such a consummation.

It may be that our Blessed Lord's early Return may render all these plans and aspirations out of date. It may be that the supreme consummation is nearer than we think. For my own part, I have learned from Professor Hogg, of Madras, what Dr. Campbell Morgan at a recent Advent Testimony meeting beautifully set forth, that "Divine determinations have nothing to do with human dates" ; that "God is long-suffering, and He waits, not for a fixed date, but for a fulfilled purpose" ; that the great Day might have been at any time in the history of the Church if the Church had fulfilled its commission ; that the Lord's appeal, "What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch," had a real message to every generation. Therefore, it may now be very near. But this in no way affects our duty to this dispensation, so long as the dispensation lasts. I myself shall probably see no further step. An octogenarian can count upon no earthly future. And if I could only see my Evangelical brethren casting aside old prejudices and joining heart and soul in the Reunion Movement, I could now sing a thankful *Nunc Dimittis*.



[*Cheltenham Conference Paper.*]

## The Possibilities of Reunion.<sup>1</sup>

By the Rev. GEORGE F. IRWIN, B.D., Vicar of Wallington,  
Surrey.

SOME of our friends thought that the Findings of last year's Conference were premature, and in some points inexpedient if not actually erroneous. The experience of twelve months has shown that our boldness was largely justified. We may not take all the credit to ourselves for the very satisfactory advances that have been made, but we may fairly claim that we have shown the way to a definiteness of statement and clearness in the declaration of principles that have been productive of good results. During the year various conferences, official and unofficial, public and private, have met to consider questions connected with reunion, and statements of great value have been issued. I have an impression that in some cases Churchmen have been encouraged to go farther perhaps than they would otherwise have gone from the mere fact that they would not be regarded as extremists because the Cheltenham Conference had already gone farther. I think we need not doubt that members of the Non-Episcopal Churches have been encouraged to associate themselves with members of the Church of England in the consideration of the subject by the frank recognition at our last Conference of their membership of the Church of Christ, of their ministries as ministries of grace equally with our own, and of our desire for intercommunion and the interchange of pulpits. These have all been movements in the right direction, and we look forward this year to an advance that will be as clearly marked as that of the last year.

We do not look for an immediate solution of the many difficult problems of reunion. We recognize the practical difficulties that must arise at every stage. But we are glad that we are no longer met on every occasion with appeals for delay and exhortations to postpone any definite action. We are satisfied that there is on every side a growing desire for the removal of our divisions, that there is in high quarters a "passion for reunion." And we believe that to men of good will on all sides there are no impossibilities. The ultimate

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read at the Open Session of the Conference at which visitors were present; it was therefore of a more general character than those that were intended to deal with specific points in the Lambeth Quadrilateral.

consummation may take a long period for its achievement. We look for no sudden results. We believe we are on the right lines. We pray for and trust in the guidance of the Holy Spirit. We feel that unity is demanded for the sake of our Empire, much more for the sake of Christianity throughout the world, and most of all for the sake of our common Master, whose work can only be carried on ineffectively as long as His Church is divided, as it is, at home and abroad.

Our Conference can contribute, and is, I believe, contributing, suggestions of value both in regard to the principles that are involved and the practical questions that must necessarily arise.

The principles involved have already been considered at the sessions of our Conference.

As Churchmen we accept the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion in 1888, which have since become generally known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral. For clearness we may quote it at length. It was adopted "as supplying the basis on which approach might under God's blessing be made towards reunion" :—

(1) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as "containing all things necessary to salvation" and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

(2) The Apostles' Creed as the baptismal symbol, and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

(3) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

(4) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.

To these was added a statement worthy of notice on account of its wording.

"The Committee believe that upon some such basis as this, with large freedom of variation on secondary points of doctrine, worship, and discipline, and without interference with existing conditions of property and endowment, it might be possible, under God's gracious providence, for a United Church, including at least the chief of the Christian Communions of our people, to rest."

Two Lambeth Conferences have been held since then, and while

the quadrilateral basis has been maintained, progress has been made in the examination of some of the practical aspects of its interpretation. In 1897 the Conference passed from the stage of "holding itself in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with other Christian Communities," and reported "that the time has now arrived in which the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion should not merely make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with representatives of other Christian Communities in the English-speaking races, but should themselves originate such conferences and especially arrange for representative meetings for united humiliation and intercession."

This progress was continued at the 1908 Conference. Some of the practical aspects of reunion were more definitely considered, especially in regard to the Moravian and the Presbyterian Churches. In the Encyclical letter of that year reference is made to the fact that they tried "to indicate some lines of definite practical approach."

"Wherever we have had reason to think that such an advance would be welcomed, we have gone far to meet our brethren." But before the consummation of Corporate Reunion is reached, they recognize that there must come a period of preparation, and this preparation must be by co-operation in moral and social endeavour and in promoting the spiritual interests of mankind, by brotherly intercourse, by knowledge of one another's beliefs and practices, and by the increase of mutual understanding and appreciation.

There is much that I should like to quote, but the general aim of that Conference is summed up in the sentence: "We must constantly desire not compromise, but comprehension; not uniformity, but unity."

These points are sufficient to show that the Cheltenham Conference is endeavouring to act in the spirit of the last Lambeth Conference, and to carry out its intention.

Ten years have passed. Conditions have altered. New considerations have arisen. We now urge with all our power an even closer examination of the possibilities of reunion, and press for some more definite approach to the removal of the difficulties in the way. Another Lambeth Conference is due. We do not know when it will be possible to hold it, but we want the Bishops to meet with a mandate from our own Communion, and the assurance of welcome co-

operation from the Non-Episcopal Churches, so that they may carry a stage further the valuable work they have already done.

With a view to assist that purpose we make some suggestions, that we trust will be found of value in the consideration of the questions involved.

It is clear to us all, I think, that reunion at present would be quite possible—as far as principles are concerned—for all the Communities that accept the first three conditions of the Lambeth Quadrilateral—that is the great majority of the Orthodox Churches in the country.

Allowing for considerable varieties of interpretation—as wide even as those that exist within our own Communion—they present no obstacle.

The only one that presents any real obstacle is that regarding the Historic Episcopate, and on it our discussion must of necessity centre.

The simplest solutions of the problem would be either for us of the Anglican Communion to recognize freely and fully all the duly constituted ministries of the Non-Episcopal Churches, and to act upon that recognition, or on the other hand for the ministers of the Non-Episcopal Churches to receive Episcopal ordination.

Neither of these solutions is apparently possible. We as Churchmen are pledged to the Historic Episcopate. We recognize with the Lambeth Conference the position that our Church holds between “the ancient historical Churches” and the more modern Communions. We bear in mind the ultimate reunion of the whole of Christendom, although at present it is impracticable as regards the Roman and Eastern Communions.

We are frankly more concerned to secure Home Reunion. This at least seems to be within measurable distance.

On the other hand, we dare not demand of the ministers of Non-Episcopal Churches submission to Episcopal ordination. If it were freely and voluntarily offered we should welcome it as a solution of the great difficulty of the situation. But if they thought that such a step implied on their part a doubt of their own ministries, and meant turning their back upon their teaching and their office, they would naturally never consent, nor should we have a right to suggest it.

We want to find, then, some method by which the Historic Episcopate can be retained, some means by which those Communions

which have hitherto not had it, can be brought into relationship with it, without any sacrifice of principle on their part. We want some plan by which a bridge can be built across the period of transition when some form of episcopal ministry will be the normal condition of a great re-united Church—a Church wide enough to include the varieties of religious experience and practice found in all our Communions.

In the first place this implies the question: Can the Historic Episcopate be rendered acceptable to the Non-Episcopal Churches, and still retain its character as a distinctive order—or at least office?

Personally, I believe much can be done by a re-interpretation of Episcopacy in the light of the New Testament and of the primitive Church. There are many features of Episcopacy to-day that are stereotyped and are yet no part of its essential characteristics. If we can constitute Episcopacy again according to the conception of the New Testament and remove these excrescent theories, much will be gained. The very expression Apostolic Succession will gain a new and a truer meaning, and will be dissociated from any theory of the transmission of grace. The Episcopal order and its succession in primitive days were a means of securing the continuity of true teaching. Episcopacy was, “the recognized organ of the unity and continuity of the Church.”

Dr. Sanday surprised some of us a short time ago by declaring that a new book about to appear would re-establish the old view of Apostolic Succession. The book has appeared, *Essays on the Early History of the Church and Ministry*. I have read it carefully, but I cannot gather that any new facts have been added to those which have been known to students for years. It is admitted that those upon which Bishop Lightfoot built are sound. The only important addition to our knowledge since his day is the discovery of the *Didache*, and it certainly does not support the mediæval theory of Episcopacy. Dean Robinson acknowledges that “Subsequent research has left his [Lightfoot’s] position as strong as ever . . . We can hardly say that new facts have come to light which require that his interpretation should be modified.”

The theories, therefore, that rest upon these facts have no stronger foundation than they had before, and we have just as strong a case as ever for our interpretation of the essentials of the episcopal office, and our theory of Episcopacy.

But fortunately we are not deeply concerned with any theories of Episcopacy. I have introduced the point to show that we are not blind to the significance that is attached to them.

I do not know how far the recently issued Second Interim Report of the Sub-Committee in connection with the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order represents the Non-Episcopal Communities. If it is accepted by them, it marks the most important stage yet reached, for the Committee accept as one of "the necessary conditions of any possibility of reunion," (1) "That continuity with the Historic Episcopate should be effectively preserved." They say that "members of the Episcopal Churches ought not to be expected to abandon it in assenting to any basis of reunion."

They add a reminder on the lines I have just indicated of "the primitive ideal and practice of Episcopacy," and also add: "That acceptance of the fact of Episcopacy, and not of any theory as to its character, should be all that is asked for. We think that this may be the more easily taken for granted as acceptance, for any such theory is not now required of ministers of the Church of England." Some of us in the ministry of the Church of England are probably nearer to our Non-Episcopal brethren in our theory than to the advanced section of our own Church. It would, no doubt, be necessary, before any arrangement for corporate reunion could be made, to discuss the exact functions which it may be agreed to recognize as belonging to the Episcopate, but we think this can be left for the future.

As Churchmen we heartily acquiesce in the further statement that "the acceptance of Episcopacy on these terms should not involve any Christian community in the necessity of disowning its past, but should enable all to maintain the continuity of their witness and influence as heirs and trustees of types of Christian thought, life, and order, not only of value to themselves, but of value to the Church as a whole."

If these principles are accepted we have, I think, advanced a long way towards making reunion possible. I do not know whether I am expected—or whether it is advisable—to go further. There are some minds of the definitely practical kind that will ask: What is the next step? How is effect to be given to the desire for reunion in practical proposals? I admit these questions are difficult to answer, but there is no question of a way being found if the desire is

sufficiently strong. In Scotland, the General Assemblies of the Established Church and the United Free Church have been able to appoint committees to consider the terms of reunion. I do not know that there is any authoritative body in the Church of England that could adopt a similar course in regard to the other Churches in this country.

But there are various ways in which the changes could be carried out.

We have already co-operation in social work, and we recognize the value of that association, though it is far from meeting all that is required.

The interchange of pulpits is a step that is being pressed, and in which we may soon see considerable progress.

The presence of members of the Non-Episcopal Churches at our Communion ought not to present any difficulties. It may even be claimed that they have a right to communicate in the National Church.

For Churchmen to communicate in the Free Churches presents another set of problems, but no obstacle ought to be raised by other sections of Churchmen if those among us who believe in the Non-Episcopal ministries of grace join with our brethren in their Communions.

But neither interchange of pulpits nor of Communion is sufficient.

Any scheme of federation must find a place for the various Churches as a whole in the united Church. It has been suggested that each Church might be regarded in much the same light as some of the orders are in the Roman Communion, and that the Non-Episcopal ministries should be regarded as of a "prophetic character." They would thus bring their special gifts into the common treasure-house of the Church. This would not be satisfactory as a permanent condition. It *might* be a first step, but it must be regarded as one of a temporary character, suitable for a period of transition during which the nature of Episcopal functions was being settled.

The ultimate aim must be for such an arrangement regarding the ministry as will give all the requisite status of the recognized ministerial orders. Some of us would be glad at once to recognize frankly the Non-Episcopal orders, as was done in the days succeeding the Reformation. Some temporary measures will be necessary until a scheme can be evolved in which the place of the Episcopate will be

clearly settled, and its functions defined. The method of bridging that period is a subject for consideration and discussion.

After all, if we have unity in the acceptance of the Holy Scriptures, in belief in the two Creeds, in the use of the two Sacraments, are not the points that unite us far greater than those that divide? Shall we be kept apart from one another by differences of Church government and organization?

Can we not rely upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit? If to meet the needs of days of old He guided the Church to the adoption of the Episcopal system, may we not trust Him now to guide us to such an adaptation of it to the needs of our own time as shall unite all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity into one great united comprehensive Church.



[*Cheltenham Conference Address.*]

## The Possibilities of Re-Union.<sup>1</sup>

### II

BY THE REV. A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.

I DO not wish to traverse the same ground as you, Mr. Chairman, have done, but in speaking I desire to offer some considerations of wider range as bearing on the possibilities of reunion. Nearly forty years ago, when quite a youth, I heard Dr. Stoughton, a noted Church historian, and, I understand, a personal friend of Dean Stanley, declare that unity was by way of the Cross, and after these forty years I want to echo his saying : Unity is by way of the Cross. And that in two senses. In the first place, in the measure in which Christians realize their common experience of redemption through Christ Jesus the Lord, in that measure will they be drawn nearer to one another. It is the common Christian experience that must be the basis of any reunion of the Christian church, and the more intense and real and dominant that Christian experience is in all our thinking and willing, the nearer will that reunion be for us. And so the first condition of the possibility of reunion is a more vital and vigorous Christian experience in all the ministers and members of the church of Jesus Christ. As we are drawn nearer to Christ we are drawn nearer to one another.

It seems to me, further, that reunion is by way of the Cross in this other sense also, that we must be prepared to crucify a good many things to which we attach a good deal of importance now if we are to have reunion. We must take up the Cross and follow Jesus Christ, and be prepared to surrender many things that may be of value to us now, but are not essential for us. To make a surrender of anything essential is sin. We dare not surrender a conviction or a principle that is rooted in our personal relation to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, but, on the other hand, it is sin to use as a reason against reunion anything that is not rooted in our relation to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. What unites us must be in Him ; nothing has a right to divide us that is not in Him also ; and therefore we are to be prepared to crucify our preferences and prejudices, our traditions and conventions, our memories and

<sup>1</sup> Specially reported for THE CHURCHMAN.

associations; and, after all, if we closely scrutinize our denominational loyalty, we must admit that there is a good deal in it which, quite legitimate in itself, becomes illegitimate as soon as it is made a reason against fulfilling the duty of drawing nearer to our fellow-Christians. It is natural that we should prefer the mode of worship in which we have been brought up, natural that we should cling to memories and associations of the place of worship where we usually attend, natural that we should prize as our Christian brethren more highly those with whom we are thrown into close contact because of common service in one branch of the Church of Jesus Christ. But all these things, legitimate as they are in their own place, become illegitimate if they are used as an excuse for indifference to the wider obligation of the union of all the Christian churches. It may be that an ardent denominationalism is one of the things that will need to be crucified if we are to get nearer Christ and the fulfilment of His desire.

A second condition of the possibility of reunion, I think, is that our conscience should become more sensitive than it has ever yet been to the scandal and injury of our divisions as regards the witness and work of the Christian church in the world. I meet earnest brethren, Christian brethren, who are doing their own work faithfully and efficiently, and they say, "What is the use of all this talk about reunion? Let us just go on doing our work, even if we do it separately." But these brethren need to have their consciences quickened and their eyes opened. The Christian church is not doing its mission work in the world, not delivering its message as effectively to men as that message ought to be delivered, so long as it is sundered by unnecessary divisions. We realize, those of us who in any measure recognize the immeasurable obligations that are laid upon the Christian church, that the Christian church is not doing half the work it ought to do because it has not got the strength to put into that work—a strength that would come to it very much more fully if it were much more united than it is.

What has greatly helped the movement towards reunion of recent years is that Conference of ever blessed memory—the Edinburgh Missionary Conference. I have met only one man who came back from that Conference rather despondent; I will not mention his name, but his reason for despondency was that the High Churchmen had had too predominant a place in the Conference. Happily, few

people were affected in that way. Almost everybody I met felt that that Conference was probably more important—certainly as we look back upon it much more important—than some of the Councils that theological students have to bother themselves about, often feeling as they do that it is labour in vain. The foreign missionary enterprise is calling for union, and if we could get the Christian church enthusiastic about the foreign missionary enterprise it would be more enthusiastic about the reunion of Christendom.

Then, again, there is social reform. Some of us find it possible to co-operate with Anglicans, Roman Catholics, and Jews in regard to social reform. One of my most prized fellow-workers in the cause of social reform is a Jewish rabbi, and he and I have come to respect one another because we have that common interest. Then—what we ought to have known before, but the war by concentrating our manhood where we could make some adequate inquiry regarding religious conditions has brought it home to us, so that what we ought to have known we discovered with a painful surprise—this country of ours is not as Christian as we thought it was. We are aware and are proud of the brave and strong qualities of our people, but we recognize also that vital godliness, a personal experience of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, is comparatively uncommon, and the Christian churches have to ask themselves how it is that so great multitudes of the manhood of the nation have not the sign manual of the Lord Jesus Christ on the thought and the life. We want to make this country through and through Christian, and if we realize the measure in which it is not Christian we shall be brought into that condition of desire for the reunion of Christendom which will make attainable what seem to be impossibilities, and lead us to venture on what may well appear beyond human strength and courage to accomplish.

Then I turn to a consideration which may seem to some of you altogether out of place. A great many people, even in the Christian ministry, have a very low estimate of scholars. To be a professor is to be—as regards all practical work—an inefficient; to be a principal—well, that is to be beyond all hope! I have been told again and again, with some degree of surprise, that I could be understood when I preached! It is taken for granted that the principal of a college could never be understood. But I have known persons of less exalted stations who could not be understood when they

preached. I think the discussions have brought home to us the fact that scholarship is not an enemy but an ally of this movement for Christian reunion. The results of scholarship, instead of making reunion more difficult, are likely to make it easier. Let us recognize that those who, by their past history, by all their associations and traditions, still cling to views of the Christian ministry and Episcopacy that may seem to be a barrier to reunion are men of honest mind. If scholarship is distinctly moving in the direction in which according to the indications given at our Conference it is moving, then we may hope that scholarship will do a great deal to remove one of the chief obstacles to Christian reunion.

There is one thing that scholarship as applied to history will do for us ; it will show us the relativity of all things historical. There is nothing in history that has any absolute value. We recognize that in history there is a divine providence, but it is a divine providence that is not omnipotently compelling human activity ; it is a divine providence that allows itself to be confined and limited and thwarted and delayed by human purpose and human endeavour and human neglect. Therefore when we look on any historical development of the past we may look for the kernel of divine providence, but we will always find a good deal of the husk of human failure and error connected even with the work of divine providence in human history. What has emerged in history may again be submerged in history. We have no right to affirm that because a thing is historical therefore it is right and obligatory. It is not enough to say that the Episcopate is historical to justify the Episcopate. Because it is historical and has emerged in history, it is possible that it may be submerged in history. What has come into existence may go out of existence in the historical realm. If we recognize that in spite of all the human operations in history there has been a divine presence and direction, then we also learn that while there is a relativity of all things historical there may be universal and permanent values that come to man from God along the channels of history. The divine revelation and the human redemption have emerged in history, but not one of us believes that they are going to be submerged in history. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. The eternal may express itself through the temporal, and what we have to do, with our scholarship joined to moral and spiritual insight, is to detach the temporal from the eternal

and let the temporal go, but keep fast hold of the eternal that has come to us through the temporal.

Apply that principle to the Episcopacy. You cannot claim for the Episcopacy an absolute validity, but you may claim for it a relative value, and I think that most of you brethren are not inclined to go any further than that. I suppose you are all prepared to recognize that a condition of affairs might arise in human history in which another form of government of the Christian church might commend itself to the common Christian reason and conscience which might supersede Episcopacy, and the Christian church might be refusing to follow the divine leading if it clung to Episcopacy. The Old Testament is full of lessons for us in that respect. Some of the opponents of Jeremiah brought up against him certain teachings of Isaiah about the inviolability of Jerusalem. Now the teachings of Isaiah were valid for the time of Isaiah, and the time of Jeremiah needed another message. And so we have to recognize that there are eternal values, but those eternal values come to us in temporal forms, and that for those temporal forms we must not make the same claims as we make for the eternal values.

As a signatory to the document which has been again and again referred to at this Conference, I need not tell you that I believe that under the present historical conditions, as far as I know and understand them, the Episcopate will have a place in any reunion of Christendom, but only if it is relieved of those accretions that belong not to the divine providence in the Church, but to human imperfection. And if we could get the institution detached altogether from theories of the institution that have been attached to it, I am quite sure a great deal of the difficulty that non-Episcopal communions feel about accepting Episcopacy would be removed. Not only so, but we should be able so to reform Episcopacy as to adapt it more effectively to do the work in the Christian church that Episcopacy is called to do. The bishop is to be the "father in God." Well, now, the bishop's family, under the conditions of modern episcopacy, is far too big a family for any finite bishop to compass; it would require an infinite bishop to deal with all the individuals with whom he has to deal, and to deal with all the interests with which he is expected to deal; and so we must realize that if we detach from the institution a theory which, so to speak, makes sacrosanct the institution as it exists we make ourselves free to modify that

institution to make it more effective than it has ever yet been for the very purposes for which we believe, under existing conditions, it to be a desirable form of church government.

It is only my desire for Christian reunion that has led me to turn aside from my particular interests and to follow the path which leads up to these historical questions. What has particularly attracted me has been Christian theology in the distinctive sense of the term, not so much the polity or ritual of the church as the creed of the church. Now, it seems to me, there is a movement as regards Christian theology which also indicates a condition favourable to reunion. Our theology is getting simpler. We are throwing over a great deal of useless cargo, and I think we will go all the faster towards our haven if we throw over some of that cargo. I was reading a short time ago a most interesting small book published by a French naval chaplain in which he commends French Protestantism to the French nation, and there he indicates this movement to which I wish to turn your attention. He states that we may say that there have been in the past three main types of Christian theology, the dogmatic, the ecclesiastical, and the biblical. The dogmatic is represented by the Orthodox Greek church, the church so to speak, which formulated belief into dogmas, which had to be accepted by all the ministers of the church. Then we have the ecclesiastical or Roman Catholic type; in this case there is not so much the formulation of dogma as a continuous tutelage of people and ministry by ecclesiastical authority. Think of the difference between these two great doctrines, the doctrine of the incarnation and the doctrine of the atonement. There is a dogma of the incarnation, but there is not a dogma of the atonement. The doctrine of the atonement has never been dogmatically formulated in the same way as the doctrine of the incarnation has been. The Roman Catholic church does not so much formulate doctrine in dogma because it wants to keep its hand always, so to speak, at the helm, to be always telling the reason and conscience of clergy and laity alike what the church teaches as true. There is not the same degree of reliance on formulated doctrine in the shape of dogma. At the Reformation, while the dogma of the undivided church was taken up, and a great deal in the teaching of the Roman Catholic church was still maintained, the cry of the reformers was "Back to the Bible," but we were reminded by Dr. Harden in his paper at this Con-

ference that it was the Protestant scholasticism which was responsible for the doctrine of the Holy Scripture that the great reformers themselves never held. There were theories of inspiration formulated by the smaller men of the second generation that the big men of the first generation of Protestantism would never have thought of formulating. I am glad to think that the Quadrilateral says that the Bible contains all that is necessary. There is a great difference between saying that the Bible *is* the Word of God, and that the Bible *contains* the Word of God. The Bible is a casket, a precious casket, but what we want is the jewel in the casket, although in many parts the casket itself is absolutely transparent so that the richness of the jewel shines through.

So there is a movement in Christian theology towards discovering the Gospel in the Bible, not depreciating the Bible, but, so to speak, appreciating more highly the Gospel in the Bible. We have to recognize surely the relative values. I may offend some here, but I have never been able to nourish my soul on the genealogical lists in Chronicles in the way that I have been able to nourish my soul on John xiv. and xvii. There is something like relativity even in the Bible. It is a divine gift, but it comes to us through human hands, and we have more and more to concentrate upon the Gospel in the Bible. We are following Christ there. He rebuked the bibliolaters of His own time by saying, "Ye search the Scriptures because ye think that in them ye have eternal life, and these are they which bear witness of Me; and ye will not come to Me that ye might have life." It is Christ and the revelation of God in the redemption of man in Christ that is the living heart of the Bible, and the Bible lives in relation to that, its living heart. That does not depreciate a bit the rest of the Bible, only it teaches us to observe some proportion in the way in which we insist on this or that which may be contained in the Bible. I think we want that quite frankly recognized. I make no objection to any brother holding as rigid a theory of inspiration as he pleases. Let him follow the Spirit that inspired the Scriptures in the view of the inspiration of the Scriptures he has got; do not let him impose his theory of inspiration upon me if that same Spirit has led me to modify that view. I think the best thing for reunion is absolute honesty on all sides. I stand here as one who has welcomed and heartily welcomed modern biblical scholarship, and at the same time I can testify to this, that the Bible has more

moral value, more spiritual significance, is more charged with the energy of the Spirit of God for me to-day than it ever was before.

Some people think that the object of theology is to make faith difficult. Well, there are theologians who do make faith difficult. There are theological books that make theology a mystery to be understood not even by the writers of the theological books themselves. I admit that there are theological questions that only theologians can discuss. I try to be as humble as I can—it takes all the grace I have got to be humble—when a man of science who gives odd moments amid other pursuits to theology tells me what I am to teach as a theologian. There are developments and applications of Christian theology that only the expert theologian can deal with in an effective way. There are people who get brilliant ideas, but if they knew a little more they would discover that their idea was not original at all, that it had been exploded long ago as a human error. There is a science of theology, and it requires very rigid discipline of mind for a man to deal effectively with that science. But it is not on theology as a science that Christendom is going to be reunited; it is within the Gospel that we come together. The more I study theology the simpler grows my faith, the more childlike becomes my attitude towards the great realities of revelation and redemption. Guthrie, the Scottish preacher, when he was dying, asked for a bairn's hymn that he might rest his heart on it, and, after all, face to face with the reality of death, or face to face with the awful realities of life that are meeting us just now, the simplicities of the Christian Gospel will count for most to us. My great teacher, Dr. Fairbairn, once told one of his students that there are two kinds of simplicity, the simplicity of ignorance and the simplicity of culture. The simplicity of ignorance abounds, and is not fully conscious of itself; the simplicity of culture is not so common, and yet there is a simplicity of culture, when a man has so thought his way through the great problems of theology that they become transparent and the great realities shine through and bring light upon every dark path.

Therefore I do believe that this movement towards the centre, the simplifying of theology, is a great help towards reunion. We shall want fewer articles in our creeds, only we must believe those articles which are in our creed with a measure of intelligence and a passion of conviction such as we cannot possibly spread over a

multitude of articles. Who could be enthusiastic about the Westminster Confession of Faith? I cannot sustain my enthusiasm through Thirty-nine Articles. I concentrate my enthusiasm upon a few great verities of the Father God, the Saviour Christ, and the cleansing, renewing, and perfecting Spirit of God. As far as I am concerned, all the creed I want is the Apostolic Benediction. Exegetically interpreted with honesty and sincerity, I believe you would get in that everything that is really needed, and the other creeds are explications of the Apostolic Benediction. The advantage of the Apostolic Benediction is this, that it does not come as a burden to thought, it comes as a blessing to the soul, and our creed ought to be not a burden to us but a blessing. The more we concentrate our creed on the essential verities, the divine realities, the more will that creed be a blessing to us, and not, as creeds often have been in the past, a burden.

The last thing I have to say is this: however simple our creed may be, we must interpret it. I do not suggest that we are not to be constantly using our minds in applying those great verities, in seeing them in all their manifold relations, but, as has been indicated in this brief discussion, what we want is as large a liberty as possible of interpretation, so long as the articles of faith are held honestly and presented distinctly. It is not uniformity that is wanted; it is diversity in unity. It is a good thing for the Christian church that there has been diversity in unity. May I give you an illustration? We take the Nicene creed. There is the term *ὁμοούσιον*. Now brethren, have you made up your mind whether you take that term in the sense in which Athanasius used it or in the sense in which the Cappadocians used it? They did not all use it in the same sense. When you speak of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, three Persons, do you use the word "Person" in the modern sense of an individual, or do you use it in the sense in which Nestorius used it, which amounted to little more than a rôle or part, or do you use it in the intermediate sense which afterwards came to be regarded as the orthodox method of interpreting? We may have a creed, but because words carry various meanings with them, various shades of meaning, we will never be able to compel everybody accepting the same creed to attach exactly the same meaning to every word in that creed. Yet there may be a real unity, because, after all, what is the end of a creed? The end of a creed is not theological instruc-

tion, but personal experience. If a creed expresses, however imperfectly, what God in Christ is to me, and if it helps me in confessing what God in Christ is to me to gain still more out of that gracious and blessed relationship, the end of a creed is fulfilled. It is a pity we have so long disputed about metaphysics, where we will not agree whereas we could agree if we only laid the emphasis upon the experience of which the metaphysics is but an endeavour—and sometimes a futile endeavour—to give an adequate account. The church of the future will gather around the Lord Jesus Christ. Some will be content with a very few articles of faith ; others may feel that they want to take the truth as it is in Jesus and apply it in ever-widening range until they bring under the light of that truth the whole range of human knowledge.

That one face, far from vanish, rather grows,  
Or decomposes but to recompose,  
Becomes my universe that feels and knows.

## Studies in the Gospel of St. John.

### V.

#### THE TWO-FOLD ISSUE (CHAPS. xviii.-xxi.).

FROM the private and personal talks with the disciples we turn to the closing chapters in which the two movements of faith and unbelief find their crown and completion. Chapters xviii.-xx. seem at first to be merely historical, as though the inner thought had been set aside for simple narrative. But this is only apparent, for, although the characteristic words Life, Light and Glory are not found, and even other words which were formerly emphatic lose a good deal of their characteristic significance, yet the glory of our Lord shines at every point, and in dying and rising from the dead, life, light and love are abundantly evident. The one thought that runs through the whole section is the two-fold issue of unbelief and faith. In chapters xviii. and xix. the emphasis is placed on unbelief with only a slight reference to belief, while in chapter xx. belief is seen at its full height. All through the section the Father is glorifying the Son (xii. 31-33; xvii. 1). Thus the record is not merely historical and external but expressive of the manifestations of our Lord's love in word and deed. From beginning to end He is the Divine Redeemer, and what is now recorded is seen to be absolutely consistent with all that precedes. The supreme test is triumphantly endured, and in regard has a perfect unity in the uniqueness of His sufferings followed by the uniqueness of His victory.

#### I. THE CULMINATION OF UNBELIEF (chaps. xviii., xix.).

1. *The Betrayal* (chap. xviii. 1-11). In this story we are impressed with our Lord's calm dignity, and the two lines of man's sin and God's plan are kept in view throughout.

#### 2. *The Trial* (chaps. xviii. 12-xix. 16).

(a) Ecclesiastical (xviii. 12-27). This Jewish trial is twofold, and again the majesty of the Sufferer is seen. With this is included the denials of Peter, revealing his unfaithfulness as against the faithfulness of John. Then, too, we cannot help observing unscrupulous unbelief set on murder contrasted with the calmness of Christ in reply and His love in protecting His disciples.

(b) Civil (xviii. 28-xix. 16). This trial before the Roman Governor is, in many respects, the most noteworthy feature of this section, especially in its revelation of Pilate's character. The narrative is far fuller than those of the Synoptic Gospels. Four charges were laid against Christ. (1) That he was a malefactor (v. 30); (2) that He made Himself a king (verses 33-37); (3) that He claimed to be the son of God (xix. 7); (4) that He had spoken against Cæsar (xix. 12). It has been pointed out that the scene before Pilate is sub-divided into a series of seven acts or sections. The events occur alternately from the outside to the inside of the Pretorium! Outside (xviii. 28-32); inside (33-38); outside (38-40); inside (xix. 1-4); outside (5-7); inside (8-11); outside (12-16) (Whitelaw, *The Gospel of St. John*, p. 383). A close study of the material as here given reveals in a most remarkable way the character of Pilate, and the narrative is made all the more impressive by the sevenfold "therefore" in xix. 1-21. The contrasts seen here are between the unbelief of the Jews, the vacillation of the Governor, and the glory of our Lord in His words and silence, His calmness and patience.

3. *The Crucifixion* (xix. 17-42). Much at this point is omitted by John, and yet he gives his own incidents. We see the culmination of everything in the sacrificial death of Christ. And in addition to the actual crucifixion (17-22) we have the two groups, consisting of four enemies and four friends (23-27); the two words (28-30); and the two requests (31-42). The love of Christ continues to the end (xiii. 1) and the love of His followers grows stronger in the darkest hour as believers come forth to pay the last offices of respect and affection.

## II. THE CULMINATION OF FAITH (chap. xx.).

Now in marked contrast we see the climax of belief as the former chapters revealed the climax of unbelief. It is a revelation of the glory of Christ in His new and victorious life, and a selection of facts is made to prove this.

1. *The revelation of the fact of resurrection* (verses 1-10). Peter and John saw the empty tomb and the grave cloths, and John was the first to arrive at belief in what had taken place. He saw the cloths "rolled round" in the exact shape of the body as it had lain

in the tomb, and the position of these cloths led John to believe that his Master had been raised from the dead.

2. *The revelation of the Person raised* (verses 11-25).

(a) The revelation to an individual (verses 11-18). This was a manifestation to love, and Mary's sorrow was turned into adoring faith. (b) The revelation to the community (verses 19-23). This was a manifestation to fear, for the Ten were enabled to obtain peace and joy through the appearance of their Master.

3. *The revelation of Person and fact* (verses 24-29). This was a manifestation to doubt, and shows how the last among the Eleven came to believe and utter the supreme declaration "my Lord and my God." Thus, while Thomas went down the lowest, he rose to the highest and "my Lord and my God" is the crown and culmination of the Gospel to which the Author has intended to lead up from the very commencement. The disciples through their experience of their Master came at last to believe not only that He was the Word made flesh (i. 14), but that He was the Word in the beginning, with God and God (i. 1). Thus the Gospel may be said at the end to return to its beginning, and everything that is between is said to be understood in the light of the opening and the close.

The final statement of the purpose of the Gospel is here given to which reference has already been made in detail (xx. 30, 31), and in these verses we find all the characteristic and significant words, phrases and ideas of the entire Gospel.

### III. THE EPILOGUE (chap. xxi.)

This is usually thought to be an appendix, but it is an appropriate close to the Gospel. As the Prologue dealt with the pre-Incarnate Christ (i. 1-18); as the Gospel itself is the record of the Incarnate Christ (i. 19-xx. 29); so we may think of this Epilogue as giving us the picture of the post-Incarnate Christ, and in this, the interpretation of His Personality as realized throughout the entire Christian dispensation. This record very appropriately shows how the scattered disciples were gathered again, and how their Lord was related to them and they to their Lord. Thus, while the material is entirely historical, there is no doubt that the chapter is full of deep spiritual meaning.

1. *The Lord and the Church* (verses 1-14). The thought is that of *Work*. At first the disciples, seven in number, representing the

whole Church, go forth to work of their own will and pleasure, but when they fail they learn to obey their Master and thereby obtain their reward. Work for God must always be marked by faithfulness to our Lord's directions or else failure is inevitable. When we thus carry out His directions we shall find Him by and by on the eternal shore preparing us a welcome (verses 12-14).

2. *The Lord and the Christian* (verses 15-19). The thought is that of *Witnessing*. The disciple is reinstated and his new work is allotted to him.

3. *The Lord and the Future* (verses 20-23). The thought is that of *Waiting*. The statement about St. John was misunderstood and was, therefore, corrected; while the thoughts of the followers of Christ were directed to that "blessed hope," His glorious appearing.

The Gospel closes with the personal attestation, identifying the writer of it (verses 24, 25). And so the end matches the beginning, and the same ideas are found here as in the Prologue. Just as that spoke of His pre-Incarnate work, so this tells of His post-resurrection work. Just as that recorded His rejection, so that tells of His reception. Just as that narrated His First Coming, so this anticipates His Second Coming.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

(*To be concluded.*)



## The Church and Home Evangelization.<sup>1</sup>

OF vital issues associated with the Church life evangelization must be primary. In the forefront of her task is this work; it is pre-eminently her vocation. Whatever else she may do, this she dare not leave undone; it is the *raison d'être* of her existence. She must, as one has said, either evangelize or fossilize. The recently issued report of the Archbishops' Committee on Evangelization shows that the leaders of the Church have awakened to the fact that Evangelization is not one of many vital issues, but the vital necessity, urgent beyond all others. Before I quote a few of many passages from this excellent and most welcome production, may I say its publication just at this juncture has made my task to-day at once more difficult, and at the same time easier. More difficult since it is practically impossible to say anything that is not dealt with there more fully and more forcibly; easier, since it gives me the restful consciousness of knowing that any shortcomings in this paper will be more than atoned for there. Whilst its contents are humiliating, and must send every man who has the honour of his Lord at heart to his knees, in penitence, as he learns how far the clergy have by their insincerity, unreality, remoteness, and effeminacy alienated masses of the people from Christ, yet its new ideals, new hopes, new possibilities challenge and inspire us. But this by way of parenthesis.

Let me turn to give you one or two emphatic utterances as to the need, vital and paramount, of evangelization:—"Ours is the golden age of evangelistic opportunity. . . . The evangelization of England must pass from the margin to the centre of the mind of the Church. The return of our armies to civil life increases immeasurably the urgency of the evangelistic situation. We now know (as result of experience gained in the National Mission), not only that we of the Church have an imperative duty to our country, but what that duty is. It is to evangelize." At the moment we will not stay to ask in detail what has led to this conclusion. It is the finding, the considered and measured verdict of a committee, acting in the capacity of both judge and jury, which has carefully sifted the evidence brought before it from every part of the country

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at the Southport Conference.

and every party in the Church. In arriving at this decision they are deciding simply to place once again "first things first," giving to the proclamation of the evangel the place it occupied in the Early Church. It is an open confession that much of our present-day weakness is due to secondary things having been allowed to usurp the place which alone should be occupied by the Gospel. The first message of the ministry of Jesus was an "evangel," broad in its scope, and beneficent in its purpose. "The spirit of the Lord is upon me because He hath anointed me to evangelize [proclaim good tidings] to the poor. . . ." His final words concern the evangel, "Go ye into all the world evangelizing." St. Paul speaks for the Early Church, and for our own, when he says, "Woe is unto me, if I do not evangelize." And now as the committee has looked into the heart of the nation's life, through the eyes of leaders keen to discern the facts, they have decided that the one essential thing is to revert to the apostolic order, and put evangelization in the first place.

But what is meant by evangelization? First let me give you the definition of the report: "To evangelize is so to present Christ Jesus in the power of the Holy Spirit, that men shall come to put their trust in God through Him, to accept Him as their Saviour, and serve Him as their King in the fellowship of His Church." This wise and wide definition of a task sublime, but by no means simple, is in harmony with the thoughtful words of Mr. J. H. Oldham. In his book, *The World and the Gospel*, he answers the question, "What do we mean by preaching the Gospel?" by replying, "The evangelization of the world is sometimes regarded as primarily a matter of preaching, and it has been assumed that if a sufficient number of preachers could be provided to cover the entire geographical area of the mission field the world would be evangelized." But this view is too simple. It takes for granted that words have a meaning apart from the context of life. And then he asks—and here he comes very close to the question before us now: Is the Gospel preached to the dwellers in our slums, even though in every street there is a church or mission hall where Sunday by Sunday it is faithfully proclaimed? The conditions of their lives may so completely obscure the love of God that this essential core of the Christian message has for them no conceivable meaning. If the Gospel is to reach through these adverse conditions, it must

be not in word only, but in power. If it is to penetrate, it must not only be preached, it must be presented—the whole life of the Christian community must be behind the spoken word—and it must be applied fearlessly, not only to get through the conditions and reach one soul here and there, but to get rid of the conditions wherein souls are bound. This aspect of the Evangel has been, I venture to think, overlooked. The Gospel is not only a power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, it is also the power of God unto destruction to everything that hindereth. We must set no limits to the Evangel's effectiveness, we have not evangelized the slum when we have passed through singing a hymn and issuing an invitation. We must evangelize the slum out of existence. The slum has been described as "The negation of God erected into a system." It is concrete Atheism, more adversely effective than all the Hyde Park orators; and, like the concrete blockhouse of the German defence system, it must be shattered to pieces before those who are captives behind its lines can be liberated. In Burke's fine phrase, "The evil must not only be detected, it must be destroyed." We must cease to regard attacks upon social wrongs as side issues. The evangelized men and women of our congregations are to be engineers in the army of Jesus Christ. Who has not read of the brave men at La Cateau who gave their lives to shatter bridges that might be of value to the foe, and Christian soldiers likewise who are in possession of the Gospel, must, even at the cost of life, be prepared to shatter, by the application of the Gospel, every bridge which gives the enemy easy access to the souls of men.

This leads me to say that one of the first essentials of effective home evangelization is an honest facing of the facts, a careful and accurate diagnosis of the situation with which we are called to deal. First we see a large tract, which I thought might be described not unkindly as veneered Paganism. This statement from Mr. Masterman's *Condition of England* justifies that description. Amongst industrial people the prophecy of Taine, thirty years ago, would appear to be fulfilling itself to-day! "By an insensible and slow backward movement, the great rural mass, like the great urban mass, is gradually going back to Paganism." Your own experience must confirm this. Take any street in any ordinary town or city or parish, and I ask, could more than one in ten give intelligent answers to some of the simplest questions of the Christian faith?

There is appalling ignorance, and with it a languid indifference. They take their religion lightly, and are much inclined to believe that it will all come right in the end. Both amongst the cultured and industrial classes the great majority are out of touch with organized religion. They have no conscious fellowship with Jesus Christ. Prayer, if used at all, is frequently nothing more than a superstitious relic. They never enter the house of God. Respectability is mistaken for religion; civilization for Christianity.

When we pass within the church, two or three tracts meet us and fill us with dismay. The first of these we meet with is vain professionalism. It constitutes a very real hindrance to the cause of Christ. "The real cause of the weakness of the spiritual force and moral witness of the Church seems to us to be the widespread failure of church people to exhibit in their lives the power of Christ working through them and in them to cleanse and set free and uplift." And if we proceed to ask why do they not exhibit this life, the answer is an obvious one—They do not possess it. A vague profession of a creed, but no vital possession of Christ. They attend regularly the church, they do not contend valiantly for its Lord. They are the bane of the Christian Church; its bad advertisements.

There is a further tract within the Church, which may be summed up as "vapid piety." Nothing virile or strong; it sings but does not serve; more exercised with services than with service. And these disquieting features both without and within the church have, from some points of view, been accentuated by the experience of the past four years.

At the same time, we must faithfully recognize that the effect of the war has not been wholly antagonistic to the cause of Christ. The fires through which the nation has passed have destroyed in large measure the "materialistic conception of life," have separated the dross from the gold, have rendered molten and impressionable many hardened hearts; and the illuminating flames that have leapt up from the fires have revealed to the world how inadequate is civilization to make the ideal man or meet his deepest needs. This is at once our responsibility and opportunity, in this day, when the destiny of nations, the ideals of life, the hearts of men are molten in the crucible to stamp them with the image of the invisible God, which is Christ Jesus.

There is only one way ; that is, Evangelize. The nation and the Church have need of many things. There are new demands, new desires, new dreams, but what they require above all else is life, life, life—something eternal—something vital. The needs we have cursorily glanced at in our national life will only be met with the life-giving evangel. Evangelism, it has been said, is not a programme, but a principle. Not a method of work, it is a spirit—the spirit which permeates, animates, and fructifies all work. It is that animating spirit, that principle of life, of life abundant, which centres in Jesus Christ, which alone can radically alter the indifference outside the Church, and the indolence within it. England, thou hast a name that thou livest ; thou art called a Christian country ; in great measure thou art dead. The evangel alone can with its creative force make you worthy of the name. The utterance of the evangel is vital also to the life of the Church. It is the circulation of its life blood. The whole body will be healthy in proportion as the Gospel courses through its veins. The out-poured blood of the Redeemer in all its full and sacred significance, in its widest implication and application, is the life blood of the Church. That message of redemption is the evangel. And the utterance of this evangel is, let me repeat, vital in its issue. Without it there will come paralysis ; with it, every organ in the body will worthily perform its appointed function. It will be the driving force of the Church's brain ; it will improve her thought. Theologians will think again in the terms of the Cross. It will give new vision to the Church's eye, a deeper insight into the needs of men. It will peer beneath the surface of things, and a penetrating foresight which will discern the demands of the future. It will give new strength to the Church's arm, whereby she will address herself fearlessly to new tasks. It will give quick movement to the Church's feet ; she will move no longer with hesitating, halting gait, but as the bearer of glad tidings will speed forth on her benign mission. The whole body will be re-vivified, re-vitalized, when the evangel enters into and out from the very heart of the Church. For this and many other reasons which I cannot enter into the place of evangelization must be primary—always first.

How shall we proclaim this evangel ? is our next question. How shall we present it—in sermon, in services, in service ?

First, in the sermon. Where shall we place the emphasis ?

What shall be the nature of the appeal? Shall we call men as sinners to embrace salvation, or shall we invite them as soldiers to engage in service? We are told men to-day have little sense of sin, the fear of wrath to come has ceased to weigh with them, and consequently it will be unwise, unprofitable, a beating of the air to repeat the old message. Change your emphasis they say. Call men to a great campaign. Inspire them with the vision of a gigantic task in which they may play a soldier's part, a warfare which demands their best and their all, and to that they will give a respectful hearing and a glad response. It is the alternative between the call to safety and the call to service. I venture to express my view with all humility, that in the Archbishops' Committee's report and in books like *The Church in the Furnace*, these have been regarded too emphatically as separate and in some measure contrary. But can they be separated if a full evangel is proclaimed? The appeal to service ought not to supplant the call to safety, but to supplement it. The evangel of the great Apostle St. Paul was vast enough to embrace both. It was the "Gospel of the glory of Jesus Christ," and as Dr. Denney points out, commenting on this expression in the 2nd Epistle to Corinthians, it is the evangel not only of a crucified Saviour, but also of an enthroned and glorified Lord, and the full evangelistic appeal must enshrine the implications of both. It is my own conviction it will add nothing of permanent value to the fighting force of the army of Jesus Christ to ignore the fact of sin. There is no short cut to the Lord's battlefield. The health of the soldier is the measure of his fighting value. He must pass the health test before he can be drafted to the front. A weak, anæmic, consumptive soldier might in the moment of fierce conflict jeopardize the whole of his platoon, he might involve a regiment in disaster. So for service in the army of Jesus Christ, salvation, which means spiritual health, is an essential and primary requisite. At the same time it must be granted that in the past a full-orbed evangel has not been proclaimed. We have emphasized safety almost to the exclusion of service. We have allured men to a sheltered peace, we have not urged them to a strenuous war. In strident tones we have called them to seek the shelter of a "dug-out"; we have disguised from them the necessity of "going over the top." The offer of a "divinely prepared dug-out," whose walls are salvation, is a blessed part of

the evangel—a shelter from all the devastating force of the penalty and power of sin. And into it, all down the centuries, tired, wounded, broken sinners have crept in glad joy. But the “going over the top” is another equally blessed part of the full evangel. “If any man will come after Me, let him take up his Cross and follow Me.” We have wronged men by suggesting the “dug-out” as the end. We have deprived them of the inspiration of a noble venture in a glorious campaign, and resting in their sheltered seclusion they have become weak and insipid, listless and useless. They have missed the bracing tonic of hazarding their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus. In our proclamation of the glorious evangel which centres in and radiates from Calvary, we have stopped too abruptly at what the Cross gives, instead of proceeding to show what it demands. If this message is the vital one of life, and life more abundant, then are we not compelled to ask that the life born at the Cross shall henceforward bear the marks of the Cross? A far too large proportion of the army of the Church of God is lounging in “rest camps,” when it is desperately needed in the firing line. We dare not minimize the forces of evil arrayed against us. A new offensive is called for. Therefore we must without delay, worthily and adequately, present a full evangel in the sermon. This will both call out men from sin to their Saviour, and call up men for service to their King; for whilst the “Gospel of the Kingdom is the objective of the Church’s life, its dynamic and mainspring is the Gospel of salvation.”

Two further observations concerning the sermon. Its message must be related to the needs of our own day. It must be brought to bear upon every perplexing problem created by the war, and upon every aspiration in the Labour world. And again, the message must be illumined with present-day knowledge. A renowned preacher said recently “the great need of the present time is to take our commonplaces, and burnish them until they shine with a new lustre.” Must we not confess that our presentation to men of the evangel has oft-times been commonplace? The thought, the phraseology, the illustrations are so timeworn, dust-laden, and dull, that the gold of the Gospel is obscured within its setting. The secretary of the Student Christian Movement says: “It would probably be easier to present Christianity in the colleges if the majority of students had heard very many fewer sermons than

they have." This is a very serious indictment of present-day preaching. There lies behind it the suggestion that the sermons are so out of touch with the modern mind as to be ineffective in their appeal to the educated and thoughtful laity. A veteran amongst evangelical mission preachers, and one greatly used to the conversion of souls, launches his attack against what he describes as the "almost absurdly conservative attitude towards even the most obvious and reasonable criticism." May we not use as bur-nishing materials for our "commonplaces" the rich store placed in our hand by many modern writers, the reverent and constructive criticism of spiritually-minded teachers, men well abreast of their time in scientific and philosophic thought, and some of the dulness will pass, and the message will shine with a new radiance. The vital thing is that we do present the Gospel. No two men ever presented the Gospel in exactly the same way. Luther differed from Calvin, Whitfield from Wesley, Moody from Drummond, Spurgeon from Liddon, yet one and all proclaimed the evangel. The external presentation varied according to personal idiosyncracies and the current thought of their day; but within the wrapping men found the unsearchable riches of Christ.

If home evangelization is not to be stultified more elasticity must be allowed in the Church services. Authority should be given for a mission service at least once a month. Suitable forms of service capable of adaptation to varying needs should be issued. Open-air services must take a more important place in our activities. The open-air meeting must cease to be the practising ground of incompetent speakers. We must get rid of the idea that anything is good enough for the open air. If we are to come out into the open, the open must have the best. Our ideal for the open-air service—and I know how difficult the ideal may be of achievement—should be the best organization, best singing, and best speaking the parish is capable of. I speak in general, and with no disparagement of the earnest zeal of open-air workers of the past when I say the out-of-door witness of the Church has oft-times been calculated to do more harm than good; a display of weakness rather than a demonstration of power.

I pass hurriedly and abruptly to my third point: "The Presentation of the Message in Service." And I shall content myself with saying a brief word with reference to one aspect only of ser-

vice, and that is visitors. Pray and visit ; pray and visit, is the secret of evangelistic work, according to one experienced missionary. It is not true to fact to say the house-going parson makes a church-going people ; but it is, I venture to think, true that the secret of home evangelization will be the evangelization of the home. If this is to be done effectively it must not be left entirely to the clergy or the official staff ; the laity must co-operate. Parishes for this purpose might well be divided up into allotments, and consecrated men and women asked to give of their time and strength to dig up the hard soil, sow the seed of God's word, water by prayer, gather out the weeds, and tend with loving, patient, fostering care their holding. This devoted service, well planned and patiently persisted in, would go far to transform many of the waste places of our land into veritable gardens of the Lord.

I have spoken of the place of evangelization and the Church programme. I have spoken of the presentation of that evangel. May I conclude with an altogether too brief word as to the preparation for the task ?

"The supreme evangelistic need of the Church is reality in its members." Wherever we turn in current literature this is the ever recurring note—a demand for reality, and especially in the life and witness of the ministry. It is the call that comes from the soldiers at the front and at home, from the students of our Colleges, from the social leaders in the Labour world. Reality, a manifestation that we believe the things we say we believe. "What the Church needs is not more of us, but a better brand of us." If we are to proclaim the message of God we must be men of God. This implies intense personal conviction concerning the reality of our message. Is the evangel still to our own hearts, as Tennyson once described it, "Old news, new news, and good news." Old yet ever new. As fresh to-day and as forceful as that day long ago it may be when we first saw the Lord. Does the love of Christ still constrain us, or have we forgotten our first love ? When Christina Rossetti sings :—

"None other Lamb, none other name,  
None other hope in heaven or earth or sea,  
None other hiding place from guilt and shame,  
None beside Thee,"

does she express your conviction and mine ? If the disappointments, the difficulties, the doubts have caused the fires to burn

low and then down let us pray the Holy Spirit to fan them to a flame again. God waits to evangelize England through men who say, "I believe and therefore will I speak." I believe that Christ has never met the century to which He is not equal, that there is no problem but has its solution in Him, though dimly how we may descry it; no heartache He cannot soothe, no fetter He cannot break, no sin He cannot pardon. And if this intense conviction is never to lose its freshness it must be accompanied by intimate communion. We must live with God if we are to live for God. We must listen to Him if we are to be like Him. We must be like Him if we are to testify of Him. We who bear the message of the Cross must bear the marks of the Lord Jesus. Communion is the prelude to commission. He appointed twelve that they should be "with Him," and then that He should send them forth. Whilst the secret of "going forth" is the Divine presence, the secret of retaining the presence is the "going forth." "Go ye into all the world and evangelize, and lo I am with you all the days." Deliberately we have focussed our attention on "home" evangelization, but let me say as a closing word we shall only accomplish it in evangelizing the world. Varying slightly Mr. Temple's words, we may say, "It will be easier to evangelize the world and England than England without the world." As we consecrate ourselves to the bigger task we shall accomplish the smaller task to which we have confined our thoughts this morning. So shall arise a fairer England, a land wherein dwelleth righteousness; a land worthy of the love of God and Christ, worthy of the sacrifice of the lads at the front; England amongst the nations, a city set on a hill, whose light spreads to the dark places of the earth.

T. SHERWOOD JONES.



## Reviews of Books.

### PROF. GWATKIN'S CHURCH HISTORY.

CHURCH AND STATE IN ENGLAND TO THE DEATH OF QUEEN ANNE. By the late Prof. H. M. Gwatkin. *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 15s. net.

Prof. Gwatkin's reputation as a historian is of the highest, and it is well maintained in this volume, published after his death. The world of scholarship has hardly realized as yet the great loss it has suffered by the lamented death of the great Cambridge historian.

This volume of thirty chapters was the work of many years. The writing was done at intervals, and each section seems to have been completed and laid aside before the next was begun. The book, as it is printed, represents almost exactly Dr. Gwatkin's manuscript. A few dates that he left blank have been filled in, and a few obvious lapses of the pen have been corrected. But otherwise, everything stands just as he left it. So far as it had gone, the volume was practically ready for publication; and no attempts have been made to supply omissions or to modify in any way the assertions and judgments of so distinguished a scholar.

The work cannot be regarded as a text-book for beginners. It assumes a certain knowledge of history. It omits matters which it would be necessary for beginners to know; and it offers much that they would not require.

It is rather a scholar's survey of the history. We have in it a review of men, movements, and events by one of whose competence there cannot possibly be the slightest doubt. For Gwatkin was a man of immense erudition and a master of sound, sane, shrewd and discerning historical judgment. And this volume is Gwatkin at his best.

The title given to the book—"Church and State"—seems hardly a satisfactory one. But it is useful, at any rate, in drawing attention to Dr. Gwatkin's insistence upon the reciprocal influence of Church and State. All who knew him as a lecturer will remember how constantly he insisted on bringing Church affairs into connexion with the general history of the time.

The interest with which he is able to invest the history is remarkable. His lectures used to be lively; and this volume is not less so. The style is terse and epigrammatic. Gwatkin was nearly always of compelling interest, rarely dry, full of humour. His book forms delightful and fascinating reading.

His verdicts upon movements are given with full knowledge and in trenchant words that speak for themselves. Of the Hildebrandines, he writes:—

"Two views of Church and the World have been contending ever since the Apostolic age. According to the one, the Church seeks peace with the powers that be, and recognizes the State as ordained of God, and a fellow-helper in the work of righteousness. On the other, the Church is at war with the powers that be and sees nothing in the State but a diabolical device for the promotion of wickedness. . . . Hard and narrow, as the Hildebrandines were, they had a noble ideal before them. Little could they foresee that the victory of the Church would prove even more corrupting than the rampant anarchy of the tenth century."

Of the Renaissance:—

"Greece had risen indeed from the dead, but not with the New Testament in her hand, for the spirit of the Renaissance in its early stages was frankly pagan. . . . The spirit of the Renaissance in its later stages is best seen in the polished satire of More's *Utopia* in 1515 and in the bitter satire of Erasmus in his *Praise of Folly* in 1511. But they quailed before the dangers of an

effective reformation. After all, they were men of Meroz. Colet died before the Reformation reached England, Erasmus refused to take a side, and the tolerant More of the *Utopia* became a bitter persecutor. He had seen the light, and turned his back upon it."

Of the Commonwealth :—

"The Commonwealth was a noble failure. The vision of the Puritans was of a new and better England, with despotism and popery rooted out, the wrongs of the poor redressed, and above all righteousness and true religion maintained in the land. But they failed because they trusted an arm of flesh ; England was too good to be ruled by the sword, not good enough to appreciate the lofty aims of the Commonwealth."

Superb character sketching appears throughout the volume. Of Thomas Cromwell he writes :—

"Utterly unscrupulous, utterly merciless, he was frankly a disciple of Machiavelli, with the Turk for his model of an English king."

Of Henry VIII :—

"Surely great he was—great in character and power, great in selfishness and crime, a great and terrible king, if ever there was one. . . . His statesmanship was far from wholly selfish, and it was clear-sighted enough to guide his country safely through the greatest of the revolutions it had seen since the Norman Conquest."

Of Cranmer :—

"Cranmer was by nature a student, with great learning and exquisite taste—as witness his work in the stately cadences of the Common Prayer. His character was blameless, his temper gentle and forgiving. . . . Refined and sensitive he was ; but it is a brutal error to call him cowardly, for no man of his time gave so many proofs of his courage."

Of Elizabeth :—

"Sense of truth she had none : where diplomatic lies were wanted, she lied shamelessly. Nor did she ever show signs of personal religion. She belonged to the Renaissance rather than to the Reformation. . . . The little tricks in her private chapel were passing farces, æsthetic or political, and show no real hankering after the old ritual."

Similar brilliant character sketches are given of Charles I, Laud, Cromwell, and a host of others ; but space will not allow us to give more.

Gwatkin does not hide his views of the Protestant character of the English Church. He states that "Protestantism" is "not a negative word" . . . and is "not necessarily a witness against something else." He explains the 1549 "deprecatory use" of the title Mass. He defends the destruction of "monuments of superstition." On the Ornaments Rubric (to a discussion of which he devotes no less than five pages) he writes :—

"Certain it is that the vestments disappeared at once after 1559, and were not revived till nearly three hundred years later. There is not a single clear and authentic instance of their use. 'The surplice' was enforced, and the surplice only."

Of the bearing of the Preface to the Ordinal on Non-Episcopal ministries, he writes :—

"It contains nothing inconsistent with the belief that non-episcopal ministrations are perfectly valid in their own Churches. This was indeed notoriously the belief of the Reformers who drew it up, and of some of the Carolines (e.g., Cosin) who revised it."

It is rather a pity that the book has not come to us free from minor blemishes. It is unfortunately clear that, in his later years, Gwatkin did not, in some respects (e.g., concerning the origin of the parish), keep full pace with modern research. There are some slight slips which might well

have been corrected. Why is St. Patrick's grandfather called "Politus"? Again, did not the Bishops' Book of 1537 cover *seven* sacraments and not three as Gwatkin suggests? The extreme brevity of the work, also, tends to lay the writer open to misconception. Thus, Gwatkin states that, when Charles made his dash into England in 1651, "nobody joined him." This may be comparatively true; for there were but few Englishmen who were ready to share the fortunes of the invader. Yet it needs to be remembered that the Earl of Derby left the Isle of Man and raised some soldiers in Lancashire.

However, these are but spots on the sun. The book is a great book. No Churchman should be without it. It is deeply to be regretted that it ends with Queen Anne. How we would have liked to have the judgment of Gwatkin's masterly mind upon the Evangelical Revival and the Oxford Movement!

As a historian Gwatkin reminds us most of Macaulay. His style is not dissimilar, with its sharp, short sentences, though there is not quite the perfect workmanship of Macaulay. In the history there appear the same confident, almost infallible tone, the same unhesitating judgment upon men and movements, and—though in a much less degree—the same tendency to blacken the black and to whiten the white.

W. D. S.

### THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY.

ESSAYS ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY.

Edited by Dr. H. D. Swete. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 12s. net.

In *Watchman! What of the Night?* the Rev. R. H. Malden writes:—"The ministry is not to the Church what the Nile is to Egypt: the one source of life and fertility in what would otherwise be arid waste, receiving nothing from the country through which it passes. This is the objection to the Tractarian theory of "Apostolic Succession." That theory was evolved to defend the system of the Church in days when it was very imperfectly understood by many who ought to have been its champions. But apart from the fact that we know of historical objections to it which the Tractarians did not, we cannot accept it, because it proves too much. It makes the Ministry a self-contained unit in which the laity can have no part at all. It destroys the priesthood of the laity altogether." We may add that the main objection in the eyes of scientific observers who simply put in accurate shape the observations of all who have eyes to see is that the development of Christianity in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries proves conclusively that grace is not tied or limited by the possession of a "regular" ministry, and that the non-episcopal Churches can point to progress and advance greater in proportion and volume to their condition one hundred years ago than that to the credit of the Anglican Communion. This fact has staggered the position of those who are bound to rigorist views of a certain type of ministry, and the pragmatic test "it works" can be applied to forms of Church organization in a way it cannot be used on matters of fundamental ethics and doctrine. There seems to the plain man the greatest difference between truth and organization. The latter is only valuable in so far as it subserves the spread of truth and it requires overwhelming proof to establish the exclusive claim that one form of organization alone expresses the mind of God.

When men of the outstanding importance of Drs. Mason, Armitage Robison, Frere, Turner and Brightman and the Archbishop of Dublin under the Editorship of the late Dr. Swete devote themselves to the study of an historical problem even if it has a doctrinal character that may be coloured

by prepossessions, the results of their inquiry demands respectful consideration. All write with competent scholarship, but even the best of scholars make mistakes. They admit that the New Testament gives no decisive answer to the problems propounded, and although Dr. Bernard supported by Dr. Brightman maintains that in Clement of Rome we see a differentiation between the functions of Bishop and Presbyter, we do not think that this will be the conclusion of any unbiassed mind that works over the Epistle. We have done this and have failed to reach their conclusion. The facts practically remain as they left the hands of Dr. Lightfoot, but the writers of this volume who discuss the period dealt with by the late Bishop of Durham do not agree with his inferences from the facts. It is true that the discovery of the *Didache* cuts at the root of a great many of the contentions put forward concerning the primitive authority of a specially ordained and episcopally ordained ministry. Dr. Lightfoot did not know of this volume or rather "tract," and the Dean of Wells devotes himself to discrediting its evidence and strives to show that it is the outstanding proof of the existence of a backwater in the Church. No man is more careful than the Dean in his inquiries, but we do not think that he has shown himself at his best by his attack on the charismatic ministry as made in Germany. Many wrong theories and more wrong actions have come to us from our enemy, but we think that it did not need Dr. Harnack to conclude from the *Didache* that in the time of its publication there existed a ministry that owed its influence to the free action of the Spirit of God in the hearts of the men who practised it. The very fact that it was necessary to discern between true and false prophets is the best proof of its spread, and the common-sense tests applied by the writer shows that he had a keen sense of the importance of distinguishing between the genuine "prophet" and the man who traded on a gift he did not possess.

After carefully reading all that this book contains we cannot avoid concluding that its writers read into primitive episcopacy much of a later growth. We are convinced that by the operation of the Spirit of God a form of Church Government was evolved in the Church that was the best suited for the maintenance of its unity and the propagation of the Gospel. Episcopacy of a monarchical type grew naturally. It alone in its regularly traced succession of governors could be appealed to as the test of succession in the common faith when heresy and schism threatened to disrupt the Church. In the Providence of God, it has done a splendid service to the Church—the Body of Christ, but it is one thing to acknowledge this service and to rejoice in our possession of the Episcopate, and a very different thing to maintain that only those Churches that possess the three orders are legitimate Churches of Christ. We see that the stress of controversy laid increasingly more and more responsibility on the Bishops. That led them to exaggerate their own importance. It also was the source of the theory of Apostolic Succession, and we notice more than once a tendency to discount the testimony of Jerome because of his "presbyterian tendencies." The discussion on heretical and schismatic baptism sheds much light on the entire development of organization, and if it were not for the differences that existed between the importance of the whole and the individual, we do not think that the judgment of the "Church" would have settled down after Cyprian to the theory that is now so prevalent. Much happened between the Ascension of our Lord and the Cyprianic theory to account for the latter view, and Dr. Bernard is a sound witness when he tells us that "the writings of Cyprian are practical and devotional rather than theological. And the African Church was very stiff and unyielding in Cyprian's day and that of his predecessors." Surely this is sufficient to show that those who adopt the Cyprianic view are in grave

danger of sinning against the law of charity and of placing on men burdens God has not placed.

We hope that the volume will be carefully studied, and we believe that those who read it most carefully will not be among the most enthusiastic advocates of its conclusions.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF STOPFORD BROOKE. By Lawrence Pearsall Jacks, M.A., Hon. LL.D., D.D., Principal of Manchester College, Oxford. London: *John Murray*. 2 volumes. Price 15s. net.

It does not always, or perhaps often happen that the reviewer of such a work as this has many personal recollections stirred in his breast. But it so happens that this delightful memoir has fallen into the hands of one whose grandmother was for many years a member of Dr. Richard Brooke's congregation at the Mariners' Church, Kingstown, and who therefore knew Stopford Brooke when he was yet a boy. This "Life and Letters," however, did more than this—it revived pleasant memories of the genial, courteous and versatile Irishman, who in his old age delighted to talk of the home of his childhood and of these and others who long since fell asleep as he himself has done since then.

The generation is fast passing away that remembers the days when Stopford Brooke was one of London's leading preachers. For many years he crowded Bloomsbury Chapel to the doors, drawing together a large congregation of cultured and influential persons. Some of them hardly came in touch with the preacher under whom they "sat," but to many of them he became an intimate personal friend.

The religious world has almost forgotten now the sensation that was produced when Brooke announced that he had decided to sever his connection with the Church of England, even though the severance was not wholly unexpected by those who knew him best. But even then "there was no violent breach with the past," and as Bloomsbury Chapel was a proprietary place of worship (and at that time there were many such in the metropolis and elsewhere), his ministry there was continued without interruption. We are told that only a few persons withdrew from the congregation and that their places were quickly filled by others. Mr. Brooke continued to use a liturgical form of service—in fact, the prayer-book service—shorn of all references to the miraculous birth, and we are reminded that he compiled a hymn book containing many of the old favourites and enriched by compositions of his own. Though he occasionally preached in Unitarian Chapels, Mr. Brooke never seems to have connected himself with dissent, and indeed it is clear that he was not by instinct or taste a Nonconformist—dissent possessed no attraction for him, and no attack upon the Church of England did he ever make. However we may deplore his denial of what we believe to be a verity, we cannot but admire his courage and the sacrifice he made for conscientious reasons. How much that sacrifice cost him we shall never know, but there can be little doubt that sooner or later he would have secured high preferment in the Church. He himself had no such expectation. In one of his letters he says: "I do not expect to be promoted. They look upon me as a dangerous person who speaks his mind, and to do that is the greatest crime of which a man can be guilty in this age . . . yet I cannot act otherwise. I should fall into self-contempt, and then it would be all over with me." Nevertheless, he enjoyed a large measure of popularity, and in a letter to his brother he gives us a graphic and humorous account of his preaching before the Queen (Victoria), and of his subsequent dinner with the Royal party.

It is not surprising to learn that he felt the isolation into which his seces-

sion brought him. He would have been less than human had it not been so, but it is pathetic to read of his listening to the service in Westminster Abbey "outside" and feeling that there was another and real sense in which he was "outside," and he confesses to a feeling of regret that he will not be asked to preach there again.

It is not too much to say that Stopford Brooke stands out as one of the foremost men of letters of his day. His introduction to English Literature had a phenomenally large circulation and is still the leading textbook. In these volumes are evidences of his friendship with all the leading literary men of the day. Here, too, are his impressions upon all sorts of subjects. As for instance on the Gramophone, which he described as "a vile concoction of the scientific people!" He asks, "Why cannot they let us alone? Why will they produce the human voice, and if they do it, why should they choose music hall songs for reproduction?" (II. 503). Here are abundant evidences of his acute powers of observation and love of nature. As one turns over these pages one wonders whether there is not some truth in the recently expressed opinion that letter-writing is almost a defunct art. But then there are few who possess such a graphic, picturesque style and whose pen moves with such ease as Mr. Brooke's! He lived into a ripe old age and on January 1, 1916, was able to say: "I hope I shall outlive the year. I still enjoy life, and one does not leave present joy with a light heart." His hope was not realized, for he passed away on March 18 of that year. That reminds us that he lived to see the war well under way, and there are references to it in some of his last letters. In one of these, written to his sister, he says: "We are old, but there is youth in us when we think of, and love, the child who was born to live and die for us. And may He be with you and Diamond all the day and for ever." We may fitly close with this quotation, as serving to show how he never lost his love for our Lord even though he found himself unable to accept all the statements of the orthodox creed.

Dr. Jacks (Mr. Brooke's son-in-law) has performed his task, as might be expected, with considerable judgment, skill and literary ability, and has given us a memoir eminently readable and enriched with numerous portraits of Mr. Brooke and members of the family. It will long survive to keep in remembrance a brilliant, forceful and pleasing personality. S. R. CAMBIE.

#### THE LIMITS OF LIBERTY.

THE FAITH OF A MODERN CHURCHMAN. By Canon M. G. Glazebrook. London: *John Murray*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

THE DECLARATION OF ASSENT. By the Bishop of Gloucester. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s. net.

Canon Glazebrook contributes the First Volume of "The Modern Churchman's Library," which has as its motto "by identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance." When Erasmus wrote these words he had good grounds for so doing, and in every age of the Church it is possible to find leading ecclesiastics who so misunderstand the increase of knowledge, that they find relief for their ignorance in branding with harsh epithets those who accept newly-discovered truth. On the other hand all who proclaim new knowledge are not always prophets of the true, for the history of theology contains as many graves of untrue speculations as monuments of theological misunderstandings of uncorrelated truth. The essentials of modernity are not as trustworthy as the essentials of religion—for the thought of an age is very apt to be seen out of perspective, and men adopt what is false because it is new and pronounce essential what is in reality only the ephemeral gloss of incomplete deduction.

Canon Glazebrook says in this volume much that is instructive and always writes with reverence. In the purely philosophical and what we may describe as the historical criticism of post-evangelical history he will command the approval of many readers who are glad to see him dissect so conclusively the claims of the sacerdotal theorists who confuse the late accretions of Christian tradition with the primitive faith. When, however, he deals with the miracles of the Gospel narrative and the Creeds, we feel that he makes concessions to a false modernity, and in his endeavour to win the support of young men and others to Christ, he sacrifices the very foundation facts of Christianity. He has no wish to read "nots" into the Creeds, he will not, however, pronounce as heretics those who cannot affirm the facts of the Virgin Birth and the physical resurrection of our Lord. For him the evidence is not sufficiently strong to compel belief, and therefore he pleads for a reverent agnosticism that awaits fuller knowledge before pronouncing a final verdict. We all have known men who are believers in our Lord's Divinity that hold this point of view, but the question is, can such men truly and honestly be the authorized expositors of the Faith of a Church that affirms them? We reject for ourselves their contention, and we feel that the general public cannot but look with bewilderment on men reciting from the prayer desk "I believe" and in the pulpit declaring that they do not affirm what they profess to believe.

The Bishop of Gloucester in his brief book discusses this and cognate matters in his informing and in many respects illuminating narrative of the history and import of the Declaration of Assent made by the Clergy on their ordination. He writes:—"I would not willingly wound any man; nor have I any desire to see undue limitations imposed upon the "liberty of prophesying." But I believe that loyalty to the faith and interests of the Church demand openness and plainness of speech on this matter, and I cannot conceal my conviction that there is a serious danger of lowering the standard of clerical veracity and sincerity, if good men try to persuade themselves that to attach novel and non-natural interpretations to time-honoured phrases hitherto always understood in their plain and natural meaning is not incompatible with an honest acceptance of the formularies to which they have publicly given their adherence." This clear statement of the duty of clerical veracity corresponds with the expectations of the average honest man.

Dr. Gibson also deals with the various attempts made to misinterpret and repeal by so doing the rubrics of the Prayer Book by those who have their faces turned Romewards. His remarks are to the point and are supported by the plain meaning of the Rubrics. When, however, he argues that the Bishops are "lawful authority" for practically rendering nugatory the directions of the Prayer Book, we find him employing arguments that we cannot adopt without feeling that casuistry is the last resort of men who are driven into a tight corner by their inability to control the lawlessness of those they are supposed to discipline. "*Necessitas non habet leges*" is the only practical rule of action in many cases, and we are afraid that the tendency to construe *necessitas* into meaning that such occasions exist every time the Holy Communion is celebrated, is not confined to the lawless Presbyters but to Bishops hard set to reconcile the duty of enforcing obedience to the law of the Church and the desire to live peaceably with their clergy. Both these volumes deserve discriminating study, for they have been written by men who have thought long of the matters treated and say the best that can be said in support of positions that are as common as they seem to us, to be plainly out of accord with the teaching and law of the Church.

## AUCKLAND CASTLE.

AUCKLAND CASTLE. By the Bishop of Durham. London: S.P.C.K. Price 1s. 6d. net.

Dr. Handley Moule set himself a "vacation exercise" and has written a delightful little history of the stately house that has for fifteen years been his home. In 1832 Bishop Van Mildert made over the magnificent town residence of the Bishops of Durham—the Castle—to the newly-formed University, and since then Auckland Castle has been the one residence of the Bishops—"the noble and beautiful inheritor of a tradition of ages," for as we are reminded: "Auckland and the Bishops have had to do with each other for nearly half the length of the Christian era." The Bishop tells us that he has placed around the walls of the Hall some Latin verses of which he has given us, on the title-page, a translation:

The house, O Christ, is Thine; be Thou of all its life the guide;  
Peace-giving Lord, at hearth and board be present and preside,  
And near our bed, unsleeping Friend, through every watch abide,

and that in the Dining Room over the chief group of Episcopal portraits, he has placed the words of Hebrew vii. 24, in Latin:—suggested by "the long succession of mortal pastors"—"But Christ because He continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood."

We are conducted in these pages round the house, and into and around its chief glory, the Chapel, formerly the Banqueting Hall, designed by Bishop Pudsey, and completed before his death in 1197, and the Bishop tells the story of its adaptation to its present use by Bishop Cosin, the learned divine who came to the see after the Restoration.

There are some touching personal references, and the concluding words are characteristic and worthy of transcription. "While we of Auckland Castle worship in this beloved Chapel, the Blessed of many ages, even to our own most recent years, are, by one symbol or another, assembled around us, 'a cloud of witnesses' to Him over whom death has no more dominion, and who is our life, and the Life, for ever, of the spirits of the just. He lives indeed; and it is promised that, in no figurative glory, and it may be before very long, He will re-appear."

## THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED: A REVISED TRANSLATION. New Edition. London: S.P.C.K. Price 3d. net.

The Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference in 1908 passed a resolution to the effect that the Archbishop be requested to take steps to secure a new translation, based on the best Latin text. In March of the following year the Archbishop addressed a letter to a Committee which already existed and to which he added the late Bishop (Robertson) of Exeter. A good many will feel, with the Archbishop, that "the mere translation into English of the *Quicumque Vult* provides no remedy, directly or indirectly, for the difficulties which surround the question of the public use of the document in the Church," an opinion which he says he has never concealed. However, here is the result of the labours of a Committee of competent scholars. Instead of "confounding" we have "confusing the persons." "Immensus" is rendered "infinite" instead of "incomprehensible." "They are not," in several verses, gives place to "there are not." "Less than the Father" takes the place of "Inferior to the Father" and "reasoning" that of "reasonable." Other minor changes are without significance. The Committee have wisely separated the Creed itself from the setting by a double spacing

between verses two and three, and before the last, while the use of capitals for the word "Furthermore" (v. 29) marks the second division. But this translation seems to leave us exactly where we were before. It certainly does not solve the difficulty which the Archbishop refers to in his letter. So long as we are compelled to state that those who do not appreciate all the subtle niceties of theological controversy "will *without doubt* perish everlastingly," so long this venerable Confession of Faith will suffer. If the verses which the revisers have isolated were removed, the minatory clauses would disappear: so, too, in a large measure would the difficulty vanish with them.

---

### THE FAMILY ALTAR.

THE STARTING PLACE OF THE DAY. By Sir Joseph P. Maclay, Bart. London: *Marshall Brothers*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

Sir Joseph Maclay, who, by the way, is Controller of Shipping, has compiled a manual of Family Prayers, written by "prominent Christian workers," and in the preface he puts in an earnest and needful plea on behalf of the Family Altar. The prayers are arranged for a month—a plan which necessitates the ignoring of the days of the week and leaves us for example, without such special prayers as are suitable for use on Sunday, morning and evening. Then we look in vain for prayers for special occasions and we might have expected to find some prayers for war time in a book appearing at such a time as this. But at the same time it must be allowed that the prayers are reverent, simple and comprehensive without being too long. At the end of the book is an outline scheme for Bible reading for a year. This will no doubt be found helpful by many, although we think Churchpeople would find it more helpful to follow the lectionary and read at least some portion of the appointed lessons for the day. If this were done, the Sunday lessons would not seem, as they must often do, to be isolated passages, chosen without any definite purpose. Saving these criticisms we welcome this book as an indication of a growing tendency to revive a practice which is not so common as it once was:

S. R. C.

---

### PREBENDARY WEBSTER'S NEW VOLUME.

SPIRITUAL CHURCHMANSHIP. By Prebendary F. S. Webster. London: *Marshall Brothers*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

The Rector of All Souls', Langham Place, is well-known as an exponent of Evangelical truth, whose utterances are always characterized by a directness and earnestness which command attention, and anything from his pen is sure to secure many readers. We could wish there were more truth in Mr. Webster's statement, that "when Christ is preached in all the winning power of his death upon the Cross for our redemption . . . theological or ecclesiastical differences are overcome by the strong spiritual affinity which binds them to Christ." We fear it is not always so.

As indicated by the title, we have here Churchmanship set forth in relation to Spiritual force, and as we might expect, with loyalty to the formularies of our Church, as for example, where in the third chapter, he deals with the subject of Baptism. We find here, too, what we so often miss in modern preaching, even from Evangelical pulpits, the definite, confident note of expectation of the personal return of the Saviour—a subject which Mr. Webster observes "is fifty times more prominent than the Holy Communion in the writings of the New Testament."

This little book will no doubt prove a real source of illumination and inspiration to all into whose hands it falls.

S. R. C.

## S.P.C.K. VOLUMES.

DAWN IN PALESTINE. By William Canton. London: *S.P.C.K.* 1s. 3d. net.

With an excellent portrait of General Sir Edmund H. H. Allenby as a frontispiece and a photograph of his official entry into Jerusalem on another page, Mr. Canton gives us an outline of Palestinian history (to quote from Lord Bryce's preface) from the days of the ancient Hebrew Monarchy, down through the times of the Persian rulers, of the Selucid successors of Alexander and of the Romans to the Mohammedan invasion of the seventh century A.D., when Syria and Egypt were lost to Christendom. The recovery of the country by the Crusaders at the end of the eleventh century, and the destruction of their short-lived kingdom by a second Moslem conquest in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, was followed early in the sixteenth by the establishment of Turkish power under Sultan Selim I., after which there is little to tell till we reach the days of the famous expedition of Napoleon in 1799, when his failure to capture the fortress of Acre put an end to his schemes of Eastern adventure. There is also a graphic picture of the country and its present inhabitants. The future of Palestine is beset with difficulties, some of which Lord Bryce refers to at the close of his preface, but there is no doubt that Palestine has come to the Dawn of a new day and the eyes of Christian people are turned in the direction of the land "whence have come influences than which none have done more to mould the thought and life of mankind." It is significant that, in an advertisement, Messrs. Cook announce tours in Palestine "immediately after the War!" Naturally the book includes an appeal for the Syria and Palestine Relief Fund, for the people still suffer at the hands of the "unutterable Turk."

FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD IN PRAYER. By Rev. P. J. Richardson, M.A. London: *S.P.C.K.* 2s. net.

In his Preface the author says:—"God has been calling us to increasing and more earnest prayer for ourselves, and to more urgent intercession on behalf of others; and there are many in whose thought and life prayer is taking a larger place than it has had in times past, and who need and claim some plain and practical teaching about prayer, and how they may pray so as to glorify God, and obtain blessings from Him." There are twenty-one short chapters besides the Preface and Conclusion. The writer, who is well versed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and knows how to apply them, has evidently proved the power of prayer in his own experience, and found it a delight. The advice he gives is pre-eminently practical and to the point. We agree with almost everything which he writes, and think no one can study the little volume before us without learning much that is helpful and stimulating. There is a deep spiritual ring about the whole, which ought to be a help to many, and when we are told that it "is sent forth in the hope, and with the prayer, that it may be useful to some who are wishing and endeavouring to pray more, and to pray more effectually," we feel sure that the author's hope will be realized.

PLAIN INSTRUCTIONS IN THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. By Rev. Marcell W. T. Conran. London: *S.P.C.K.* 1s. net.

This collection of short instructions is prefaced by an introductory letter addressed to those who use the Chaplet of Prayer which is an adaptation of the devotion of the Rosary. Mr. Conran referring to the Institution of the Holy Communion, says:—"On that holy night Christ took the bread, etc." Again he speaks of it as "the night before Christ suffered." We can hardly imagine a member of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, knowingly and

intentionally advancing an argument for Evening Communion, but perhaps he never thought of that! But he tells us that our Church "at the Reformation took for its standard the faith which we get in the Bible and in the early Church," and he adds—"let us hold on to it, neither adding to nor taking from it." That is exactly what Evangelical Churchmen stand for. Perhaps we are getting to understand each other better since the war broke out. Without, of course, endorsing everything in these pages, we thank Mr. Conran for these simple instructions.

PUBLIC SCHOOL RELIGION. By Rev. Lionel Ford. London: S.P.C.K.  
3*d.* net.

The Headmaster of Harrow has obvious qualifications for the not very pleasant task of reviewing the religion of our Public Schools. He claims that more is being done than is sometimes supposed, and that there is far "freer religious intercourse between masters and boys to-day than ever before," and that "if Prayer and Worship languish it is but a reflex of the great world outside." This is probably true, and no doubt the Public Schools get more blame than they deserve. There is a large amount of sanctified common-sense in these sixteen pages, as for example, where Mr. Ford observes that "Confirmation is not always the best psychological moment" for what are called "straight talks" on moral questions, which then "come to be regarded as an inevitable infliction incidental to being confirmed," but he outlines "a presentation of the call of Christ" to be set before the candidates. We commend this suggestive pamphlet to the attention of parents and teachers.

NOTES ON THE TABLE OF LESSONS FOR HOLY DAYS. By Edward Russel Bernard, M.A., Chaplain-in-ordinary to the King. London: S.P.C.K.  
1*s.* net.

Canon Bernard has in these pages given us brief, scholarly and suggestivel notes on the lessons for Holy Days in the new Lectionary which has been published by the S.P.C.K. but which has not yet, of course, received sanction. One can only hope that he will give us similar notes on the new lessons for Sundays. The Report of the Committee which had this important work in hand foreshadowed "brief introductions" to the lessons. Such might be very helpful, and Canon Bernard disavows any intention of anticipating these, and he has "intentionally avoided the homiletical element," merely showing the appropriateness of the selected portions and furnishing exegetical notes.

THE MESSAGE OF THE CHRISTIAN SEASONS. By the Rev. W. J. Carey, M.A., R.N. London: S.P.C.K.

Mr. Carey has given us a very useful little book, published at sixpence, containing short, simple but at the same time vigorous and up-to-date expositions of the significance of the Christian seasons. They form a complete statement of the leading doctrines of our faith and are well suited for distribution among candidates for Confirmation and other young people under instruction—indeed, as we are so apt to take too much for granted, it is probable that many older folk in our congregations would find here much to inform, inspire and encourage them in the way of Godliness.