

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

June, 1919.

THE MONTH.

To enter upon a criticism of the May Meetings is regarded by many almost as sacrilege, a kind of laying violent hands upon the Ark, and yet there are one or two points in connection with some of those just held that require the frankest treatment. In the first place, we fear that the general level of the May Meeting speaking this year has been very far below that of twenty or even ten years ago. In those days the May Meeting of a society was a great function: the best possible speakers were invited, and the occasion was used not only for rehearsing what God had done for the Society during the year that was passed, but also for stimulating friends and supporters to further effort and further sacrifice by presenting at least some idea of the greatness of that need. This gave point and purpose to the gathering. This year, however, there has seemed to be a tendency to regard the May Meeting as a somewhat conventional assembly, as a something to be got through somehow and, therefore, anyhow. It aimed at nothing and, consequently, it achieved nothing. Now this is a very serious matter, and if nothing is done to arrest the decline it will not be long before the end of the May Meeting, as a living force and power in our midst, comes into sight. Too much thought and care cannot be given by Committees and secretaries to the choice of speakers. The dominating view seems now to be that only "safe" men, men who can be relied upon to say the "correct" thing, should be chosen; whereas we need for the May Meeting platform men of courage, men of freedom, men of vision, men, in fact, with a message. There are such men—aye, and women, too—to be found even in these days of conventionality and compromise, and we should like to see them made more use of. Another point: the May Meeting speaker, whatever

his position, ought to see to it that his message has a particular and definite relationship to the work of the Society or organisation in whose behalf he is called upon to speak. Once more: a May Meeting speaker's address should be quite fresh and adequately prepared. On more than one occasion, of late, we have heard speeches which had a very suspicious resemblance to old sermons and addresses hurriedly furbished up for the occasion and joined to the immediate purpose of the Meeting by the feeblest of links. We offer these observations in no spirit of captiousness, but rather because we believe so thoroughly and so soundly in the usefulness and effectiveness of the May Meetings as a force in the religious life of to-day, that we view with the deepest regret anything that might tend to militate against the strength and reality of their witness.

The Bishops are far from speaking with one voice on the Reunion question, but it is to be noted with thankfulness that the number of those who favour the large-hearted, broad-minded view is steadily increasing. The Bishop of Birmingham has corrected the idea that he is opposed to the interchange of pulpits: all that he objects to is that there should be no settled rule on the subject, and his hope is that the Bishops will be able to issue some united declaration. This fact should assure us of the Bishop of Birmingham's friendliness; but he goes further, for, in reference to the Peace celebrations, he says:—"I cannot help wishing that there were some means provided, on such national occasions, for all Christians to join in the most sacred and uniting of all our services, the Blessed Sacrament of our Lord's Body and Blood." With this statement may be joined one by Bishop Jayne, late of Chester, who took the opportunity in his farewell letter to his diocese to deal at some length with the general question, and referred especially to the Kikuyu United Communion. Quoting a passage from Tait's *Life* concerning the Inaugural Revisers' Communion, he said:—"I maintained at the time of the original Kikuyu Controversy, and still more firmly hold in the light of our enlarged missionary experience, and the lessons of the war, that these words apply with even greater force to the gathering at Kikuyu, from so wide an area and under such careful conditions and qualifications required of the devoted labourers in the Lord's

harvest who were assembled. It may be that light will be vouchsafed from such quarters for guiding us in instances of exceptional inter-denominational Communion. Speaking for myself, had I been within range of the original Kikuyu Communion, I should gladly and thankfully have availed myself of the great privilege due, I am convinced, to the prompting of the Holy Spirit of God." Such an avowal is most encouraging; we cannot, at this moment, recall that any other diocesan bishop has spoken out quite so clearly and directly upon that question.

But against these utterances must be set others, **Bishop Gore's Inquiries.** of a less favourable character. The Bishop of Oxford is convinced that the interchange of pulpits would not promote but defeat the ends of religious unity. The Bishop is believed to be keen on unity as he understands it; what then is his policy? He makes the following contribution to the discussion:—

I am persuaded that we shall make no way towards religious unity unless we accept the fact that we ought to be united in one visible body and that we are in fact divided in this world: that the question is—Are our divisions due, or how far are they due, to things in our judgment essential or to things relatively indifferent? That is, each corporate fragment of Christendom must ask itself what is the essential Gospel, whether of idea or fact or sacramental rite, which every official messenger of the Church must be prepared to proclaim and which the Church corporately must regard it as its religious duty to maintain at all costs. Then we shall know how we stand.

But is it not rather late in the day to propound such questions? Is it really true that we do not even yet know "how we stand"? Cannot the Bishop tell us his views on intercommunion? He presented a certain Memorial to Convocation a few weeks ago; he was present at the first meeting held to draw up the document; cannot he tell us plainly whether or not he agrees with its terms?

The Memorial to which we refer was signed by **The Memorial to Convocation.** fourteen representative clergymen of the "extreme" party, including Dr. Darwell Stone, who acted as Chairman of the Memorialists. It contained the following among other conclusions at which the signatories who met at Pusey House, Oxford, had arrived:—

1. No concession, even of a temporary character, can be made with regard to any matter of principle.

2. We ought not to take part in united services either in our places of worship or in those of the non-Episcopal bodies.

3. It is not possible for us in any circumstances to preach or minister in the places of worship belonging to non-Episcopal bodies, at any of their services, though we may, at their invitation, expound our beliefs to them subject to the consent of the Bishop and the parish priest.

4. There are no circumstances in which we can invite members of non-Episcopal bodies to minister or preach in our Churches.

5. It is not permissible to admit members of non-Episcopal bodies to Communion, except in the case of a dying person who has expressed a desire for reconciliation with the Church.

6. Obstacles to Reunion, in addition to the question of Orders, include :

(i.) Any serious divergence of belief on central doctrines of the Christian Faith, or as to the nature of the Church and Sacraments.

(ii.) Any serious divergence as to the administration of the Sacraments.

(iii.) An unwillingness to assent to any form of Creed.

The signatories commended these conclusions to the "careful consideration" of the Upper House of Convocation. It is extraordinary that at this time of day a body of Church of England clergymen can be found to put their signatures to such a document as that.

The Dean of Canterbury, when speaking at the
 Dean Wace's
 Answer. Annual Meeting of the National Church League on
 May 13, referred to the Memorial in scathing terms, and no more effective comment could be made upon it than is contained in his speech. He said that "a number of conclusions were embodied in the petition, and included among them was one of the most shocking statements he remembered reading in modern times. The petitioners stated that 'It is not permissible to admit members of non-Episcopal bodies to Communion except in the case of a dying person who has expressed a desire for reconciliation with the Church.' That was a perfectly terrible statement, and put forward by men who are desirous of reunion and discussing methods by which it would be brought about. . . . What we wanted above all things was not interchange of pulpits—that seemed to him a trifle—but intercommunion. To approach the great Nonconformist bodies on the supposition that you cannot recognise the validity of Holy Communion which was not celebrated by an episcopally ordained minister was to dissipate all thoughts of reunion."

THE GREAT PRAYER :

SHORT CHAPTERS ON JOHN XVII.

BY THE BISHOP OF DURHAM.

I.

THE seventeenth chapter of St. John is one of the special sanctuaries of the Bible. It might almost bear the title of the Holy of Holies of the divine Book. We could not indeed call it so without reserve ; we could not place any Scripture on a higher spiritual plane than the records of the Nativity, of the Passion, of the Resurrection. But among the Scriptures which are utterances rather than records of event, this must take a place of hallowed pre-eminence. It is an utterance of truth, of truths, supremely great, high as the heaven of heaven, deep as the eternal love of God. It is an utterance direct from the lips of the all-blessed Lord Himself and addressed immediately to His Father ; overheard by His disciples ; full of them as to its import ; but spoken only to the heart of paternal Deity. And it was uttered thus by the Lord Jesus on the very verge of His approach to the altar of Calvary, when our High Priest gave Himself for us, our covenant Victim, in the unfathomable suffering which was to be for ever the basis and warrant of His intercessions for us and His blessings showered from the throne of grace upon us. It is thus rightly called, not seldom, the High Priestly Prayer. It was so uttered as to be listened to by sinful men, on purpose, can we doubt it ? to let us know once for all what should be, in essence, the spirit, the aim, the love, of the intercessory work, upon the eternal throne itself, by the side of the Father, of Jesus Christ the righteous and the glorified.

So let us approach the prayer, let us, as it were, enter it, as those who are admitted to the Holiest ; with a reverence beyond words, with a sense most tender of the awe of the Presence. Only let us remember, as believers, that we are here on lawful as well as holy ground. We are not sinning the sin of Uzzah, or of Uzziah. We are children of the New Covenant. Such is our High Priest, so glorious is the virtue of His sacrificial and mediatory work, that He does not, like Aaron, enter for us where we ourselves dare

not go. Wonderful Friend, He has so joined us to Himself that where He is welcome we are welcome too. "We have boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus"; we "draw nigh, with a true heart, in full assurance of faith." Humbled in the dust, but knowing Him whom we have believed and that we are in faith one with Him, we will listen close at hand to our supreme Priest praying, with no more misgiving as to our liberty than John himself had when these words passed through his ears into his soul to abide there for ever.

So listening, we will cherish a thankful assurance that we are indeed dealing with a record absolutely trustworthy. We will take up sentences and paragraphs as the veritable speech of the Lord Jesus Christ, and let them work as such on our faith, hope, and love. They come to us, from the side of chronology, from a long way off, from a moment nearly nineteen hundred years away. And they were written down, as we have them here, long years, perhaps seventy or eighty, after they were uttered. But do not let this come between us and the assurance that they are the veritable words of the Son of Man and that, as such, "they are spirit, they are life." The nineteen hundred years, in such a matter, are of no account. *Littera scripta manet*, above time. It is so with any literature. The verse of Virgil is precisely as much alive in its intellectual and emotional power to-day as it was when it came first from his large, lofty, pensive, tender soul. And as to those seventy or eighty years, which might reasonably be thought to bring a more genuine difficulty, I venture with conviction to say that we need have no misgiving. The question whether the aged John can be thought to have reported his Lord with faultless accuracy, recalling that already remote utterance of the night of the betrayal, has answers full of reassurance, both in the way of nature and in that of grace. In nature, it is a frequent experience of advanced life, not least of very far advanced life, to recollect not only incidents but even chance words and phrases of the earliest days of youth far better than those of yesterday; a phenomenon no doubt not accidental but arising from the human constitution. In grace, in the great and special grace which we call inspiration, when God in His providence commissioned men to be the authentic messengers of His Son to men, we may amply feel sure of His power, even without His leaving for a moment the settled lines (we call

them laws) of His contact with man's inner being, to raise into abnormal action that recollecting faculty. Is it not a highly probable inference from psychological observation that our personal being, speaking briefly, has two regions, the conscious and the subconscious? These, if I understand aright, are regarded as distinct indeed but not isolated; the contents (if I may use the word) of the subconscious are continually working up into the conscious. In particular (so a mass of curious evidence appears to show), the subconscious region receives and, vastly more readily and fixedly than the conscious, retains the impressions made every moment by things around, words included. Under special conditions it can let these work upward into expression in ways transcending all normal memory. The uneducated maidservant, in a well-known case, under delirium in hospital, repeated correctly long passages of the Hebrew Bible; she had heard them recited by her clerical master as he paced a corridor near the kitchen. Some thoughtful inquirers are prepared to say that the underworld of our being retains literally *all* experienced impressions.

Has this nothing to say as to the possibility of exact records of long-past utterances, where such records, in the wisdom of God, were to prove of supreme value for man? If a morbid state of brain could open the way for the untaught maid to the exact repetition of a long chain of verbal sounds unintelligible to her, it is abundantly sure that the will of his holy Maker could open the way for an old apostle, under conditions of perfect sanity of thought, to recall the *ipsissima verba* which, seventy years before, had been dropt into his subconscious treasury by the lips of his blessed Lord.

And if it be said that this is at best only a conjecture, on which it is at least a doubtful thing to build, I venture to reply that the circumstances of the holy history give a reasonableness, a profoundly befitting character, to the conjecture, such as to give it a true sustaining power. To me the whole question of the credibility or not of the supernatural, the miraculous, in the primeval days of the Faith is profoundly affected by the supreme and central fact of the Incarnation. It is historically provable that from the very dawn of the life of the Church the belief was equally sure and calm that Jesus of Nazareth, truly Man, was also truly God, Lord of life and death, Giver of grace, rightful Object of absolute love

and trust. And the majestic sanity of the morals which sprung, adult and perfect, from that faith is spiritual warrant for its truth. Well, if indeed God "took man upon Him to deliver him," if that infinite miracle was indeed as much history as mystery, is it not reason rather than assumption, or presumption, to expect to find the supreme mind and will working wonderfully, abnormally, not against nature but above it, in the surroundings, so to speak, of the transcendent fact? It has pleased God to give us in a Book the record of His preparation for that fact, of the occurrence of that fact, and of the development and exposition of the significance of that fact in the unique first days. And I hold that it is not an idle guess but a deliverance of reverent and sober reason to conclude that in that record alike of actions and of utterances surrounding Incarnation and the Incarnate, we should look for the wholly trustworthy rather than for mistakes of memory, wandering lights of legend, or foreign matter introduced by unauthorized imagination or unauthorized thought.

To me it seems adequate, as I read this chapter of St. John, to recollect that it is manifestly given to me as what asks to be believed; that it professes to come through the venerable Intimate of the Christ; that it is attached by links as tender and as strong as can be to the fact and glory of Incarnate God. And so I read it with the reverent persuasion that the highest will has guided this record of His words into an entire veracity.

HANDLEY DUNELM.

(To be continued.)



CHRISTIANITY AND INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS.¹

BY THE REV. E. A. DUNN, Vicar of Harlesden, N.W.

AT one period of the War Mr. Lloyd George said that many of our greatest efforts in it were just a little too late. They were magnificent enterprises, thoughtfully planned, bravely carried out, but—too late! One is at first tempted to use the same words of the Report of the Archbishops' Fifth Committee of Inquiry—Christianity and Industrial Problems. The words "At first" are used advisedly, for an expression of genuine repentance is never too late, and though the past cannot be undone, and though lost opportunities will never present themselves again, yet it is not too late even now to do something which to some small extent may atone for the past, prove the sincerity of that repentance, and help to usher in the new era which is slowly but surely coming. But at the same time we might almost weep to think of the ground lost which might have marked the position of the Church if only the Report had been published twenty years ago or even ten. Now it will be claimed by most of those Trade Unionists who may trouble to read it, that it is practically an instalment of the Labour Party's programme and is set forth at a time when after work, suffering, persecution, organization and publicity, the Trade Unions have secured a partial recognition of the just demands of labour and the Church comes in, as so often, nearly at the last ready to give its blessing to the victors when the battle is well-nigh over and the victory nearly won. If the Church had presented such a report when Trade Unionism was fighting with its back to the wall, it might have had the honour of being regarded for all time as the

¹ With this article we conclude the review of the Reports of the Archbishops' Committees of Inquiry. The Committee on "Christianity and Industrial Problems" was the last of the five. Its members were the Bishop of Winchester (Chairman), the Master of Balliol, Mr. H. Barran, Rev. G. K. A. Bell, Lord Henry Bentinck, M.P., Mr. S. Bostock, Mr. W. C. Bridgeman, M.P., Miss Irene Cox, Mr. M. J. R. Dunstan, Mr. W. A. Durnford, Mr. F. W. Gilbertson, Col. Hesketh, Mr. W. L. Hichens, Mr. F. Hughes, Rev. R. R. Hyde, Mr. H. E. Kemp, Mr. G. Lansbury, Bishop of Lichfield, Canon Lovett, Mr. Albert Mansbridge, Bishop of Oxford, Bishop of Peterborough, Mr. R. H. Tawney, Mr. Christopher Turnor, Miss Constance Smith, Dean of York, and Rev. J. B. Seaton (Secretary). The Report is published by the S.P.C.K. at one shilling net.

defender of the poor and the champion of the worker's liberty. It would have commanded the admiration and called forth the love of the toiling millions of our land, whereas now she can be but an ally who comes in, to give timely help, it is true, but help which would have been worth so much more a little earlier in the struggle.

Having said all this, it must be admitted that there is scarce one word of adverse criticism which can be levelled at the report itself. The subject has been handled in a masterly way and considered in all its bearings. In a mere pamphlet of 147 pages a real classic has been presented which, looked at from either a literary or a practical point of view, forms a valuable contribution to social economics. It is well set out, easy to read, and conveniently arranged for reference and may be regarded as far and away the best of the five reports issued by the Archbishops' Committees. Nor must we forget that perhaps its chief value lies in the fact that it may be read and considered and its teaching absorbed by those who would give no attention to it were it published under any other auspices.

The Report claims that the principles it expounds and the demands which it makes are nothing else but the doctrines of Christianity applied to modern social conditions. If this claim should command a wide recognition it is probable that it might help to usher in speedily and peacefully that revolution which is certainly coming, but which may otherwise be attended with much suffering and distress ere its objects are attained.

I.

The principal conclusions of the Report are as follows:—

The teaching of Christianity must be applied to social relationships as well as to individual conduct. And forasmuch as the existing industrial system makes it "exceedingly difficult to carry out the principles of Christianity," a fundamental change in the spirit of the system is necessary.

Instead of co-operation there is merciless competition which causes the workers to be regarded as mere machines and allows them not the smallest control over the conditions under which they earn their livelihood, gives no sense of responsibility for the results of their industry, and evokes no human interest on the part of the worker. At the expense of the community output is limited, prices

are raised, and quality deteriorated. Preventable poverty exists side by side with excessive riches. The livelihood of the workers is very often precarious and uncertain, and a spirit of antagonism is fostered between the parties engaged in industry.

The fact is that a wrong ideal has been set up. Men regard the acquisition of riches as a laudable object in life, whereas the New Testament teaches that the possession of more than a small quantity of material wealth is a hindrance and not a help to the Christian life, and those who do possess riches must regard them not as a possession but as a stewardship. The true ideal is that of "Social Service" based on the effort of every individual to discharge his duty to his neighbour and to the community; and industry must be regarded in this light and judged by moral not material standards.

The New Testament teaches that every soul is of infinite and equal value, but in modern industry human beings are regarded more as "means" than an end. We cannot, however, blame individuals for evils which many of them deplore and are powerless to alter. The general character of the present industrial system is wrong. Workers are still too often liable to be treated as "cogs in the industrial mechanism."

The welfare of human beings, including not merely material comfort but scope for initiative and opportunities of self-development through education and labour, together with freedom to take part in the control of industrial organization and direction of economic conditions and policy, must be the first condition of any industry carried on by Christians.

The Church cannot pretend to solve economic problems, but it can insist that it is the duty of Christians to solve them and should appeal to principle.

If the New Testament lays an emphasis on individuality it is counterbalanced by the emphasis it lays upon the fact that Christians are members of a society. The ethical spirit of the New Testament is co-operative rather than competitive, and Christians should aim at giving rather than getting. Society may have to choose between being Christian and being rich, and if it is argued that loss of fortune might deprive the community of a stimulus, this might be more than made up by the impetus given to labour by the recognition of its just claims.

The New Testament teaches that Christians have a corporate responsibility for seeing that all members of society have the opportunity of a good life. The Church therefore must make its voice heard and must awaken the consciences of men with respect to the thousands of children and young persons who suffer from preventable ailments which undermine their physique and impair their education and are stunted both in body and mind by work in industry which is both excessive and premature. Many hundred thousand workers, all paid wages which make a life of honourable independence very difficult and labour for hours which leave but the scantiest leisure for rest or recreation. Nearly one-tenth of the whole population are housed under conditions which do not, indeed, prevent the growth of noble character—for nothing can do that—but make the words “lead us not into temptation” a perpetual mockery.

The Report illustrates its contentions from the history and teaching of the past, and shows that in most periods Christianity has been considered to have a social as well as a personal application.

“The Gospel spiritualizes the irresistible impulse which draws man to man and raises the connexion of human beings from a convention to a moral obligation.”

How then did the present state of affairs come into being? By the middle of the seventeenth century several causes had combined to depose, first religious and then moral considerations from their position of theoretical pre-eminence as the standards by which economic transactions were to be tried. Impersonal methods of economic organization, the growth of foreign trade and of the money market, capitalist agriculture and capitalist industry, made it difficult to treat economic life as amenable to the simple moral criteria of charitable and covetous dealing which could be applied when merchant and customer were neighbours and master and servant lived in the same house. As these conditions spread, economic conduct is no longer regarded as laudable or blameworthy, for men are no longer responsible for it. They are like men thrusting one another in a throng, or like the wheels of a clock in which “the first wheel, being stirred, drives the next, and that the third, till the last moves the instrument that strikes the clock.” The Church, no longer an intellectual leader, had no alternative theory to present.

So gradually things went from bad to worse and little protest was evoked. Lord Shaftesbury's account of the struggle in his day to obtain factory legislation is well known: "Out of Parliament there was in society every form of good-natured and compassionate contempt. In the provinces the anger and irritation of the opponents was almost fearful. . . . In very few instances did any mill-owner appear on the platform with me; in still fewer the ministers of any religious denomination." Thus it came about that the new economic world born of industrial and agricultural revolutions was not merely dominated by exclusively economic ideas, but that these ideas represented a very narrow and one-sided part of economics, and were unconsciously a mere reflection of a short-sighted view of their interests taken by the ruling class of landlords and manufacturers.

How could the age tolerate these abuses which are sickening even to read of? How could men who were really religious, men sincerely patriotic and personally benevolent, how could men even of common sense defend as a quite natural state of things such facts as children of six kept at work in factories from 5 a.m. to 9 p.m., girls under eight crawling through coal seams eighteen inches high, boys of four sent up flues seven inches square in "a country renowned for its humanity"? The answer given in the Report to this question contains several considerations. Perhaps the one we shall best lay to heart is this: "Men took the world around them for granted, as we are doing in this our own age. They assumed that the proper thing was to accept that station in life unto which it had pleased God to call them."

"In the fifty years which laid the foundation of modern England the influence of the Church as a witness to social righteousness was, it is hardly an exaggeration to say, almost negligible." This is sad reading, but in face of the evidence it cannot be denied.

Now, however, if it cannot be said that the Christian conscience is awake to social duty, there is nevertheless hope for better things. At least there is a movement away from selfish individualism, a consciousness that a religion which is "drenched with self-regard" cannot be a genuine Christianity, a growing conviction that the one purpose worth striving after is the Kingdom of God, and that no religion of life, least of all the sphere of human industry, can be excluded from His sovereignty.

Lord Shaftesbury has been dead more than thirty years, and we must beware of taking to ourselves credit for his good deeds. Nevertheless we may remember them as a contribution of a Churchman towards the solution of the problem. Frederick Denison Maurice and Charles Kingsley, Westcott and Scott Holland are well-known names chronicled in the Report. The Christian Social Union and the Church Socialist League are not forgotten, and resolutions of the Pan-Anglican Synod in 1888 and the attention given to social subjects at the Pan-Anglican Conference in 1908 is also noted, and it is declared that, at least in recent years, the Bishops who are members of the House of Lords have no need to be ashamed of their notes.

As to this present time, the stern teaching of the War has undoubtedly had a tremendous effect in awakening the Social Conscience. We know our past failure in witness and in service : even now it is too much to say that English Christendom as a whole is prepared to work Christ's principles out to their full conclusion or to make the sacrifices which they require. But there is a dawn of hope, and the next generation may see a better day.

II.

In an article like this it is impossible to deal in detail with the chapter on "Urban Life and Industry," or even to quote from what it has to say upon the evil of insecurity and unemployment ; the antagonism between employer and employed ; co-operation for public service ; the establishment of a living wage ; adequate leisure ; the protection of children and young people ; association of workers and employers ; the industrial employment of women ; the need of a new attitude towards profits ; the development of Local Government ; housing ; and the Parish Priest. All these are dealt with in a masterly way, nor is the chapter on Education less important. Would that the Report could be circulated by the thousand after it had first been (dare we say the word ?) popularized ! We can think of nothing more calculated both to effect the object for which the Report was written and also to draw the hearts of the people towards the Church under the auspices of which such a book has been issued, than that it should be re-written in a style calculated to cause it to be read not only by students and those interested either in social reform or the attitude of the

Church towards it, but also by the "man in the street." This is not to be taken as an adverse criticism of it as it stands. For the purpose for which it was published it is admirable in every way.

It will be gathered that the Report confesses the failure of the Church in the past to preserve the principles of Christianity in the social and economic world. What can we do now to remedy the past and to prove the reality of our repentance?

A New Ideal. When the War first broke out there were thousands of our finest young men who at once volunteered for service. They knew their response would mean hardship, suffering, and probably death. They had little to gain for themselves and much to lose by joining the Army. Yet, moved by a great passion, they gave themselves. This is evidence of what man can and will do when moved by a great purpose. We must call them again to an adventure far greater than the War. Ours is to be a great campaign against dirt and squalor, poverty, crime, disease, death and injustice. If the position is clearly explained and if there be no uncertain sound about the call, there is every reason to believe that the manhood of the nation will respond. It will only do so, however, in proportion as we are successful in casting down the money god. Parents and friends are apt to advise children to choose their vocation with regard to the amount of money which it is likely to bring to them. "There is no money in that" is the discouraging remark frequently made to the young when they discuss plans for their future. For Heaven's sake let us root out teaching of that sort and show that there is something higher in life than the acquisition of wealth. There are thousands of avenues for social service along which our lads and girls may go to build a better England. But let us be insistent in placing before them the need and the opportunity. Let us see that they are inspired not to amass fortunes but to improve the world, even if it means much self-sacrifice to do so. They must be prepared for suffering and self-denial in this the great adventure. Children are never too young for this idea to be implanted in them. And so, when in their childhood's days they come and ask us what they shall be, let us reply to the effect that whatever vocation they may eventually choose they must do so with a view to the service of the community. They must follow in the steps of the Son of Man Who

came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many.

The Gospel of Giving. An ideal like this cannot be realized without a proper recognition of the responsibility of each individual towards the State. Truly the Christian is a citizen of the world, and his idea of brotherhood is not confined to his own nation; but nevertheless, just as the homes of the people are the stones of which the foundation of the State is built, so the State is the foundation on which the edifice of world unity is built, and we must do all we can to bring about a sense of duty towards the State. The sacrifice of the individual may not effect the greatest good unless it is made with a view to what is best for the community, and no proper expenditure of strength, time or money must be thought too great for the attainment of our ideal.

It is to be feared that many of the War bonuses were paid to employees because in some cases employers who would only too gladly have appropriated extra profits, finding this to be to some extent impossible, gave sometimes large sums to those who worked for them because alternatively the money would have come into the possession of the State, and it almost seemed as if they would rather anything than that. We need not envy anybody who received a larger share than usual of the profits of the businesses they helped to carry on, but we may well say that when the State was needing and asking for every penny, much was being diverted into wrong channels by those who considered that they were securing their own interests best by putting it in the pockets of those associated with them rather than parting with it for the general interests of the community. Unless we teach the coming generation better things something similar may continue, and money needed for social reconstruction come into possession of individuals which ought in all fairness to go to the State for the good of all.

Christian people, too, might set a better example than they do in their attitude towards taxation. We know that public expenditure cannot be too carefully watched. There are some who seem to lose all sense of responsibility when dealing with monies other than their own. Yet it must be clearly understood that if there is to be the establishment of a living wage, the sweeping away of the slums, the proper housing of the people, a higher standard of living and a proper system of education, it can only be at the cost of

immense sums of money which must be provided by the community, and, moreover, since the only wealth we have is the wealth we produce, the wealth must be produced before it can be provided for the objects mentioned. The houses unfit for human habitation to which attention has been drawn by the visit of Her Majesty the Queen to Bethnal Green were condemned more than twelve years ago. But it was said that nothing further could be done because the responsible authority, having spent already a large sum on clearing another area, could not afford to do more for a long period to come. Yet we know now that the money could have been provided over and over again, and nobody would have been the worse but rather all the better for it. It is a shame to us to sit down in comfort while such places remain as a blot upon our civilization. We must teach and preach that sacrifices greater than any we made in war-time must be cheerfully borne till these difficulties are surmounted and these evils done away. The only remedy seems to be in the way of the development of schemes for local government and housing. This is a costly process which must be watched with all care and undertaken with due regard to economy, but without grudging a penny required for any necessary reform. How strange it is that a man who will voluntarily give a cheque for some philanthropic purpose will grudge the addition of a penny rate, though the latter is often more necessary than the former.

Education. The "Fisher Bill" is intended to be regarded only as a stepping-stone to higher things. The Church may do much to secure its smooth working by pointing out the future prospect to those parents who are inclined to grumble at the raising of the school-leaving age, or to those employers who raised their voices against the abolition of cheap child labour—a system more expensive in the long run than any which insists upon a sound education during the years at which boys and girls are most susceptible to it. Parents must be taught—as the Report reminds us—to make sacrifices in order that their children may the longer enjoy the advantages of education, and during the years of transition we must be prepared to support measures by which parents may if necessary be subsidized in order that they may be enabled to properly feed and clothe the children throughout extended years of school life. In the matter of education, at all events, there should be equality of opportunity for all, yet "figures supplied by the

Board of Education to the Royal Commission on the Civil Service show that of the children who every year leave the elementary schools of England less than 5 per cent. enter secondary schools, *and that probably far less than 1 per cent. ultimately pass to the universities.*

The Church, too, can use its influence to stir up local education authorities to take such steps as shall obtain the maximum benefit out of the facilities provided by the Bill.

Many and bitter have been the controversies with respect to religious education. Some extremists have indeed contended for instruction in the narrow tenets of their own particular school of thought ; but most of those who object to " simple Bible teaching " do so, not because they have any doubt as to the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, but because they do not wish the Bible to be taught as if it were merely literature in the same way as instruction is given in the writings of Shakespeare and Milton, without reference to its inherent claim to divine authority. Surely the remedy for this lies with the Church, not only in the provision of training colleges, but also by appealing to the best and most devoted of her sons and daughters to consider teaching as a vocation, and to point out that with the teacher rests the secret, not only of England's greatness and prosperity, but of preparation for the Kingdom of Christ. With the teacher is the responsibility for the training of those who are to be the future leaders of democracy. Could the Church engage in any greater work than the selection and training of those to whom such a responsibility is to be committed ? Proud indeed may be the pastor who, pointing to the list of those he has presented for Confirmation, can number amongst them many who are teachers in schools and colleges, and how wide the sphere of his influence ! Perhaps in view of its great importance this question might be added to the numerous queries already to be found on the official forms issued to the Clergy from time to time. How many of your Confirmation candidates are likely to enter the teaching profession ? One thing is certain—that on the closeness of the union between religion and education depends the solution of the industrial problem. Without the principles of Christianity we may despair of the large spirit of generosity which shall prompt the people hitherto recognized as the governing classes to give up many of their privileges and to recognize the justice of labour's

claim ; and on the other hand we may despair of maintaining the spirit of moderation which shall be prepared to obtain that justice by constitutional means, and in a temper which recognizes that society cannot be revolutionized hurriedly without bringing to birth evils as great as those which we are striving to overcome.

If it is important that the Church should induce the most earnest of her sons and daughters to become teachers, it is even more important that she should secure recruits for the ministry who shall inspire those who thus teach the young. And it is most necessary that the Clergy should be drawn from all classes. Not only that we may be freed from the reproach of having a class ministry, but in order that in the ranks of our pastors may be those who know from experience what the lives and conditions of working people are. Where amongst our Clergy can we find men with the ability of the best of our labour leaders or with the gifts and personality which would make them an effectual counter influence to the wrong sort of agitator ? Where indeed ?

The fate of Germany may well remind us of the futility of education without religion. We have only to look around us to see that divorced from spiritual ideals the worker may use leisure for licentiousness, the most comfortable home may be a chamber of horrors, the highly educated may become a soulless repository of learning, and the "cultured" may become a clever scoundrel. Whilst we agitate for the removal of injustice and demand for every man the right to live, we must not become simply advocates for social revolution. The time is ripe for a great evangelistic campaign, for to secure the establishment of Christ's Kingdom nothing can avail without a spiritual appeal. We should do well to bind the "Christianity and Industrial Problems" tightly to the "Evangelistic Work of the Church."

Meanwhile, too, the everyday work of the Churches may have its influence upon the spirit of the times. Let us at least dispense with snobbery and social distinctions. Among the faithful, whose numbers are all too few, let us be done with pride and prejudice and lay to heart the striking words of the Report, "The Church must not merely talk about brotherhood ; it must be a brotherhood."

E. A. DUNN.

“THE PRINCIPAL SERVICE.”¹

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

BY a number of Church people during recent years the service of Holy Communion has been called “the Principal Service,” and on this account it has been urged that, in the words of a resolution of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, “no arrangements for worship should be regarded as satisfactory which do not provide for a celebration of Holy Communion as the principal Sunday service at a time when the greatest number can be expected to communicate.” To the same effect the Holy Communion has been called “the Lord’s Own Service,” and for this reason it is maintained that it ought to have precedence of all other services. These contentions involve so much that is important in regard to doctrine that they call for the most careful consideration by all “sober and conscientious sons of the Church of England.”

It is known that in the early Church, at least from the middle of the second century, the Lord’s Supper was the chief public service of the Church, though it must never be forgotten that the ancient liturgies which give various forms of this service cannot be dated earlier than the fifth century. Our Prayer Book similarly shows the prominence and importance of the Holy Communion service in the worship of the Church, and no one wishes to set aside the Holy Communion or relegate it to a place which is not warranted by the Prayer Book.

It would seem that at the Reformation, Morning Prayer was originally separated from Holy Communion by an interval, but it was not long before the service of Morning Prayer, Litany and Holy Communion were said altogether, and this continuity became the almost universal rule until recent days. The difficulty was that, while naturally providing for every aspect of worship, this blending of three separate offices made the service unduly long, and the result has been an increasing tendency to have the service of Holy

¹ An advance copy of an additional chapter which will appear in a new edition of *The Catholic Faith* about to be published by Longmans, Green & Co., and the Church Book Room, 82 Victoria Street, London, S.W. 1, price 1s. 6d. net.

Communion alone at an earlier hour, and then to have Morning Prayer with the Litany on some Sundays, with the omission of the Litany when the Holy Communion service is taken at mid-day. The proposal to have the Lord's Supper at an hour when the greatest number can be expected to communicate is apparently intended to refer to the time at which Morning Prayer has hitherto been taken, namely, at eleven o'clock. But there are some real difficulties in the way and one or two quite serious objections. The result would be, in many cases, the virtual omission, if not the suppression, of Morning Prayer, and thereby the large majority of people would cease to have some of the most vital elements of worship brought before them. It would mean the omission of the Psalms and also of the lessons, especially from the Old Testament, for no one could say that the portions of Scripture appointed for "Epistles and Gospels" would be an adequate substitute for the lessons read at Morning Prayer. Not only would the Old Testament be omitted altogether, except in one solitary instance, but there would be no consecutive teaching week by week.

There is a much more serious objection to the proposal which desires the Holy Communion service held at the time at which Morning Prayer is now taken. It would bring about and perhaps necessitate the attendance of many people at the Holy Communion without communicating. This practice would be entirely opposed to one of the fundamental principles of the Reformation, as set forth in our Prayer Book. Attendance without communicating is clearly opposed to Scripture, where every instance of the Lord's Supper includes participation. The same is true of the Church of England practice, for it can be shown beyond all question that our Church has always discountenanced attendance without communicating. Up to 1662 the people were exhorted to avoid remaining without participation, and the omission of this exhortation in the last revision of the Prayer Book is known to be due to the fact that the practice had died out, for the revisers of that Prayer Book spoke very definitely against any one staying without communicating. In addition to this, leading authorities at Oxford and Cambridge have shown that the practice is not only against Scripture, but is not warranted by the practice of the primitive Church, still less by anything in the Church of England. Similar views have been expressed by some of the most representative Churchmen of what

may be called the High Church school during the last half century.¹

It has often been pointed out that one of the purposes of the Reformation was to "turn the Mass into a Communion," but if the proposal now discussed were to become law, it would have the precisely contrary effect of turning the Communion into the Mass, and, as such, would be against the plainest teachings of the Prayer Book and the whole history of the Church of England for nearly three hundred years. It is clear from the Rubrics in the Prayer Book service that non-communicants are to withdraw before the actual Celebration, and the natural place for this is at the close of the Church Militant Prayer.

It is impossible to ignore the fact that those who are in favour of making the Holy Communion what they call "The Principal Service" really desire to substitute for Morning Prayer a service at which only a small number of those present will communicate. But, as already seen, the essential point in our Lord's Institution of the Sacrament is the eating and drinking of the elements, and only those who actually participate have any real right to be present. The thought that presence without participation carries with it some spiritual benefit is nothing else than a re-introduction of the teaching associated with the Roman Catholic Mass, which was deliberately set aside at the Reformation, as is now seen in the Prayer Book. And so, however apparently natural and even simple may be the thought of the Lord's Supper as "The Principal Service," it cannot be overlooked that the present proposal would mean a gathering of people, many of whom would not actually communicate.

In regard to the description of the Holy Communion as "The Lord's Own Service," it has often been pointed out that, while the Lord's Supper is a Divine Institution, the service itself is no more so than any other service, because it is a matter of ecclesiastical arrangement. Thus the Epistles and Gospels are in no sense more sacred than the lessons from Scripture at Morning Prayer, and the hymns of praise in the Communion Office are in no sense different from those in the Morning and Evening Prayer. It is, therefore, really fallacious to speak of the Holy Communion as "The Lord's

¹ See discussions in *English Church Teaching*, p. 141; *Communion of the Laity* (Scudamore); *Two Studies in the Book of Common Prayer* (Bishop Drury); *The Principal Service* (Streatfeild); *Non-communicating Attendance* (Lias) in the *Prayer Book Dictionary*.

Own Service," because it tends to make a distinction which is unauthorized by Holy Scripture. General services of prayer and praise, the preaching and hearing of the Word, are enjoined in many parts of the Bible as the ordinary means of grace by which we may approach God at all times. But this appeal for prayer, thanksgiving, and attention to the Word of God is emphasized without any mention of the Holy Communion.

And so, whether we speak of the Holy Communion as "The Principal Service" or as "The Lord's Own Service," there is a danger of inaccuracy and misconception. The Holy Communion can be rightly regarded as the main public service of our Church for those who are spiritually qualified, but it is this, notwithstanding the precise time of observance or whether the communicants are few or many. The supreme requirement is spiritual preparation as laid down by our Catechism and Ante-Communion Service, and the question of large attendance ought never to be allowed to enter in. Even a few communicants properly prepared along the lines of repentance, faith and love, as required in our Prayer Book, would be far truer to Scripture and to the essential meaning of the Holy Communion as taught by our Church than the largest congregations of people who, for one reason or another, do not participate. Our Church is specially careful to emphasize the true Scriptural use of Holy Communion, and those who, following the Prayer Book, desire to adhere to its Scriptural teaching will have no difficulty in observing our Lord's command regularly, earnestly and heartily, whatever may be the time fixed for the Communion, or however many or few may be present to communicate.

STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

BY THE REV. HARRINGTON C. LEES, M.A.

VI. INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS AND COMPENSATIONS.

Texts.—"Whoso moveth stones shall be hurt therewith; and he that cleaveth wood is endangered thereby" (Eccles. x. 9, R.V.). "Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find Me; cleave the wood, and I am there" ("Saying of Jesus," in the papyri).

[Book of the Month: A NEGLECTED SACRAMENT.¹=M. Other
 ref., Grenfell and Hunt's "Sayings of Our Lord"=G.
 Smith's "Unwritten Sayings of Our Lord"=S. Deissmann's
 "Light from the East"=D. Mason's "The Truants"=T.
 Glover's "Verification of the Christian Tradition"=V.]

Here are two texts which throw light on one another: each looks at the danger of accident in daily toil. One written by a Hebrew philosopher. One "spoken by Jesus," recorded outside the Gospels, and discovered on papyrus in Egypt in 1896. The first sounds cynical and pessimistic. The second, if the full restoration be correct, is a reassurance to the workmen. "Jesus saith: Wheresoever they may be, they are not without God; and where there is one alone, even thus I am with him. Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find Me; cleave the wood, and I am there" (S. 88). It has been considered that the words may allude to sacrificial worship (cf. 1 Kings xviii. 32, 33). More probably they refer to the sacrifice involved in dangerous work.

I. A REMINDER OF DAILY DANGER.

The "Preacher" seems filled with foreboding. Work often means wounds. "Who remove stones, bruise their fingers" (Herbert, *Jacula Prudentum*, quoted S. 93). "The quarryman must fear the flying splinters of stone; the labourer who lifts a heavy piece of rock may crush his foot if he lets it fall" (M. 79). "Ordinary honest labour must pay its due of misfortune in this sad world" (M. 80). Is it worth while to go on working? Yes. Doing your duty develops character. "On the Dogger Bank men risk their lives daily to put a few boxes of fish on board a cutter. Take your risk half-heartedly, and your boat's swamped. Take it with all your heart, and there are the fish-boxes to your credit" (T. ch. xiii.). Not a question of hire, but morale. Risk can make work heroic, and workmen into warriors.

2. A PROMISE OF DAILY DISCOVERY.

Lord Kelvin says the verge of a difficulty is the edge of a discovery. "Just in proportion as the industries of a nation broaden and develop, does the character of its citizens gain strength, and

¹ By Dr. J. Hope Moulton: pub. by the Epworth Press. Interesting studies and addresses by an accomplished student of the Bible who was never dull.

their brains and muscles skill and power" (Wiley). Do your work heartily as unto the Lord and not unto men, and you will find not only perils, but the Presence. "It is fairly certain that the 'Saying' offers a general parallel to Matthew xviii. 20" (G. 13). "Our Saying stood in this connexion in the 'Diatessaron' of Tatian" (S. 89). "Jesus lifted stones and cleft wood in the builder's workshop at Nazareth for more than twenty years out of His short life, to show that honest toil brought something else besides danger, that the stone could become a Bethel, and the wood an altar which raiseth the consecrated soul 'Nearer, my God, to Thee'" (M. 83). "He is present not only where two or three are gathered together in the exercises of prayer and praise, but in the employments of the quarryman and the woodman" (S. 90, 91). This has a reflex effect upon the efficiency of the whole man. "Conversion has often meant, and means still, a clearing of brain which involves an extraordinarily heightened effectiveness in buying and selling, making and planting" (V. 176). God is proved in difficulties and discovered in drudgery. "In the noise of my kitchen I possess God as if I were at the Sacrament," says Brother Lawrence (Convers. iv.).

3. A PLEDGE OF DAILY DELIVERANCE.

"A remarkable parallel in the Gospel of Thomas, ch. x. The boy Jesus heals a woodcutter whose axe had fallen and severely injured his foot, and dismisses him with the words, "Arise now: split the pieces of wood and remember Me": suggests that the Saying is a word of consolation for those engaged in dangerous work" (D. 33). "It is natural for us to conjecture that the new Saying was introduced as in Sermon on Mount. 'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time' (we may suppose Him saying), 'He that moveth stones shall be hurt therewith, and he that cleaveth wood is endangered thereby.' But I say unto you, Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find ME; cleave the wood, and there am I" (M. 38). "A gracious word for all who never know, when they go forth to their day's toil, what may befall them ere the day is done" (S. 94, 95).

"Where the many toil together, there am I among My own;
Where the tired workman sleepeth, there am I with him alone.
Nevermore thou needest seek Me; I am with thee everywhere;
Raise the stone, and thou shalt find Me; cleave the wood, and I
am there."

—H. van Dyke.

THE PROBLEM OF UNION AND FREEDOM IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

BY JOHN R. CLARK HALL, M.A.

THE recent world-war has given an enormous impetus to the movement towards reunion which had, for some years before it broke out, been steadily growing in force among Christian people. The line between the Christian and the non-Christian was becoming blurred, when suddenly the war gave it a sharper edge, and made us feel that we must take sides more definitely, and prepare for a serious struggle, in which it will be urgently necessary that we should be a united and a disciplined force.

In this article I propose to consider, from the point of view of a lay Churchman, the question of the reunion of the various Christian sects and confessions, and (more especially) of unity and liberty within the Church of England. For we must admit at the outset, that our own Church is anything but a united body.

Whatever minor lines of cleavage there may be, Church people are clearly divisible into four great classes. These are—

1. *The Ministerialists*,¹ who stand firmly by the Reformation Settlement and the Thirty-nine Articles, and repudiate the doctrine of a sacrificing priesthood. Their general outlook is towards the Free Churches, and many of them think that the Sacerdotalists have no business in the Church of England as at present constituted.

2. *The Sacerdotalists*,¹ who insist strongly on the sacrificial character of the priesthood, and believe, implicitly or avowedly, in the infallibility of the Catholic Church, which they regard as including the Roman, Greek and Anglican Churches, and no other. Their outlook is towards Rome, and their whole history is that of a movement in the direction of Roman Catholicism.

3. *The Moderates*. A great many of the clergy and laity must be classed under this head. So far as they think at all, they must necessarily be Sacerdotalists or non-Sacerdotalists (i.e. Ministerial-

¹ I have chosen these names for the two outstanding parties in the Church because those generally current are either faulty as definitions (e.g. both parties claim to be Evangelical and Catholic) or more or less opprobrious. I hope the term Sacerdotalist will not be considered offensive—I do not intend it to be; and it is the one used by Bishop King of Lincoln to characterize his position.

ists), but they try not to think, and their position is illogical. They are often admirable Christians—like many members of the two preceding classes—but their Churchmanship is not full-blooded enough. In practice they are a help to whatever party is in power at the moment.

4. *The Indifferents.* I am afraid this is the largest class of all. They are a drawback to any spiritual community. If they show any leanings at all, they too are disposed to support the party in power, from sheer laziness. They should be the first people to be evangelized, and they would probably be the most difficult.

We may leave the last two classes out of account for the purposes of our inquiry, since they may, as we have seen, be grouped potentially with the other two. Their importance lies, not in their views, but in their numbers. Thus we have to consider how far the Ministerialists and Sacerdotalists, who are nominally members of one religious body, can be brought closer together, or if nothing can be done in that direction what can be done in order to give them more freedom within the imperium of the Anglican Church.

There are two great obstacles to real union, the most serious being the violent incompatibility of the views held by the two parties. Let any outsider take up and read such a book as Vernon Staley's *Catholic Church*, and follow on with (say) Barnes-Lawrence's *A Churchman and his Church*, and I venture to say that he will ask how on earth the writers can be members of the same religious denomination, or rather, what can be the rules of a religious body which admits persons of such discordant views among its official teachers. One is not surprised after that to find another of the officials saying "I attended recently a conference of theological teachers representing different denominations—Baptist, Congregationalist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Anglican, etc.—and I firmly believe that the differences between the Anglican representatives there were greater than those exhibited by the representatives of all the other bodies."¹ He goes on to say that from one point of view that is not a bad thing, and that it shows how comprehensive the English Church is.

No doubt. In a way we are all aiming at more comprehensiveness; but the problem is to attain it without surrendering precious

¹ Rev. H. D. A. Major, *What is the Christian Religion?* National Mission Papers on Christian Faith and Practice, No. 252.

freedom, the problem being especially difficult when we try to comprehend downright opposites, and to put divergent doctrines into practice in the conduct of public worship and the education of the young.

High Churchmen often try to disarm us by saying that they only differ from us on minor points, and exhort us to consider the important doctrines which we hold in common,—the divinity of Our Lord, the Atonement, the Resurrection, and so forth. Now it is quite true that there are these common dogmas, and that they are the foundation truths of our religion, and it may be observed by the way that they are held by many sects outside the Anglican Church, so that if they furnish a reason for unity within the Church, they supply an equally good one for union with the other denominations. The difficulty which exists does not arise on account of such dogmas, however, but on account of the very points which are here assumed to be less vital; and it arises because the Sacerdotalist party insist on considering them as of the first importance. It was in defence of these, and not of the foundation truths of Christianity, that Maconochie and Tooth went to prison. The party has never offered to give up one of them for the sake of peace and harmony in the Church.

Here we are met by the second difficulty. The idea that the Catholic Church is infallible not only leads Sacerdotalists to attach enormous importance to Catholic practice, but to be intolerant of anything else. Toleration indeed becomes a wrong, aggressiveness a duty, and compromise an impossibility. They are, of course, not the only people in the Church who consider themselves infallible, but the point is that in their case it is an essential part of their creed. In the unceasing warfare which they have carried on against us in the Church for the last half century, I can recollect nothing but advance on their part towards the usages and ritual of the Roman Church, and retreat or concession on ours. The campaign has been continued even in war time. The battle for the "six points" has been won, the crusade against Evening Communion has been so far successful that the Bishop of Gibraltar can refuse sanction to it in a case where practical need was alleged, on the ground that it has "become the badge of a party," and we may look forward to the time when some other Bishop will deprecate mattins at eleven on the ground that it has "become the badge of a party." Then,

besides the movement in favour of making the Eucharist the principal service, we have a determined attempt to alter the Communion Service and to legalize reservation. Many of the Bishops themselves, like his Lordship of Gibraltar, give us no quarter.

It will be seen from what has gone before that our Church has two features which militate greatly against closer internal union—an over-comprehensiveness which includes opposites, and a theory of wide embrace side by side with much narrowness in practice.

I once heard a Sacerdotalist Archdeacon say that if only we could get rid of the extremists, all would be well. But who are the extremists? Are we, who used to constitute the Church of England in 1800, to be classed as extremists now? Are others, who would have been classed as extremists in 1850, to be classed as moderates now? If so, may not the extremists of to-day claim that they may be the moderates of to-morrow? This plan, to be effective, would have to provide for the exclusion of the whole Ministerialist party, or, alternatively, of the whole Sacerdotalist party, from the Church, and this seems to have passed beyond the range of practical politics.

Some years ago I suggested another remedy, or perhaps I should say palliative, for the present distress. It was that the clergy should lay themselves out to provide services acceptable to both parties in the Church, if requested to do so by a reasonable number of their parishioners, say by having an early morning Eucharist with the fullest ceremonial allowed by the law, and a simple Communion Service in the evening. I was not particularly surprised when I found that Sacerdotalist clergymen would have none of it, but I must own to being disappointed when a Ministerialist Vicar said that it would be an outrage to his conscience to adopt such a plan, although I proposed to him that he might explain to his congregation periodically, from the pulpit, that he did not regard the ritual as having any doctrinal significance, but observed it in deference to the wishes of certain members of his flock.

The truth is that this and the preceding idea are somewhat on the principle of the bed of Procrustes. The Archdeacon's bed is too small, and mine too large, for a great many of the Anglican clergy, and something else must be thought of.

There is another method which finds favour with the higher dignitaries of the Church. It is to rope into Boards and Committees members of all parties, in the hope that they will understand each

other's position better and so draw closer together. As to this I will state what my own experience has been. For many years I had kept myself as much as possible to my own parish and parish church, at which the services were as much to my liking as I could reasonably expect any services to be. I have a great dislike of religious controversy—polemics so often mean war against a man's own soul—and avoided it by shutting my eyes as far as I could to what went on around me. But one day the Bishop of the diocese issued an urgent appeal to us not to be parochial, but diocesan, and the result of it was that when I was proposed as a member of the Diocesan Board of Finance I felt that I ought not to refuse to act. Now this Board, on which I have served ever since its creation, has on it a large majority of Sacerdotalists, and I must say that it has been a real pleasure to me to sit on it. The members are honourable gentlemen, evidently anxious to do their best for the Church without reference to party, and the discussions are characterized by courtesy and good temper, but I have not been able to detect any sign that unity within the Church has been brought nearer by their working in common. The reason that we have been able to get on so well together is that questions of doctrine have been tabooed, or perhaps it would be more correct to say that they are outside our sphere. We are really administrators of a trust, and there is no reason why our work should not be perfectly well done by a reputable firm of solicitors consisting of a Roman Catholic, a Baptist and an Agnostic. The only difference between us and such a firm is that they would be working for reward and that we give our services for the glory of God and the good of our Church. When we get to other bodies, such as Diocesan Boards of Missions, where questions of doctrine may come up, there is electricity in the air, and conflict is only avoided, if it is avoided, by the exercise of much tact. The differences are not lessened a bit, but they are often kept below the surface. The more level-headed members of the Ministerialist minority will not unfrequently allow a piece of Sacerdotalist aggressiveness to pass unchallenged, partly because they are a minority and partly because they hesitate to stir up religious controversy, but it must not be supposed that because they are silent they do not feel the position keenly and even bitterly.

Some people appear to think that the new constitution proposed by the Archbishop's Committee on Church and State will put every-

thing right. Now it seems to me desirable, in spite of Colonel Seton Churchill's criticisms in the *Nineteenth Century* of September, 1917, that there should be a constitution on the general lines indicated in the Committee's Report. If, as is probable, it has the effect of increasing the power of the ruling party, that will be unfortunate for us, but it is not a sufficient reason for opposing a reform which is urgently needed on general grounds. One thing is fairly certain: party differences are not less likely to be absent from the various Councils proposed to be set up, than they have been from Parliament and Convocation, and we need not therefore consider them further in relation to the special object of this paper. We may at the same time admit that, quite apart from their primary use, all these official Church bodies—Convocations, Conferences, Councils, Boards and Committees and so forth—are of value in teaching us lessons of self-control, and in increasing our personal regard for one another, so that our sorrow at some of the things done is not accompanied by anger, and whatever bitterness we feel tends to become more and more impersonal.

If it is agreed that perfect solidarity in the Church is not within the range of practical politics, the next question to be considered is what can be done to improve the position in face of a united and determined enemy. There is the policy of drift, favoured in the past by so many of our bishops, and the closely allied but more substantive policy of shouting with the largest crowd, which is favoured by the Bishop of Oxford now that his crowd is the largest, or at least the most powerful. Both these policies are calculated at the present time to weaken the Ministerialist party and to force out of our Protestant Church the Protestants still remaining in it. Most fatal of all is it to shut our eyes to "our unhappy divisions," which are admitted by Ministerialists and Sacerdotalists alike to be the chief cause of the paralysis from which the Church is suffering. The evidence that they exist and are a source of grievous weakness is overwhelming.

I will give a few instances from my own observation and experience to show how detrimental to the interests of the Church as a whole the present state of affairs is. Take, for example, our Diocesan Board of Finance. Certain parishes—a small minority—have steadily refused to come into the scheme, and there is a tendency on the part of the majority to look upon them as the Trades Unions

look upon blacklegs, and to brand the whole lot as melanoscele. Fortunately the Bishop, who is a fair-minded man, expressly stipulated at the outset that no parish was to be made to suffer because it chose to stand outside the scheme, and attacks at meetings of the Board have been nipped in the bud. But the objections of the unwilling parishes, and of the very large number of churchpeople in willing parishes of a Ministerial type who decline to put money into the coffers of the Board of Finance, are more or less ignored, and it is worth while to consider what they are.

First and foremost is the unwillingness to pay for the dissemination of doctrines in which they do not believe. I must say that the regulations of our own Board of Finance do meet this objection as far as is possible with the present composition of the Church, as all subscribers are perfectly free to assign their contribution to any one of the objects to which the fund is devoted. But all the bodies which have charge of these objects are under the control of the Sacerdotalists—that is, they are in a majority on every one of the managing authorities. By far the most important of these authorities is, from all accounts, perfectly fair, in the allocation of its funds, and gives no preference to any party; but it has—or used before the War to have—an official organ, paid for out of the funds of the Society, in which a series of articles was allowed to appear in praise of the highest Anglican Catholicism, and even of the Roman variety.¹

Again, we have within a stone's throw of the church which I attend, on one side an important residential Diocesan Institution for Church workers, and on the other a Presbyterian Church. The next nearest Anglican churches outside the parish are a comparatively moderate Sacerdotalist one and another which is so extreme that a Roman Catholic friend of mine told me recently that the "Mass" as celebrated there was only distinguishable from that of the Romish Church in some very unimportant respects. The residents in the Institution in question ignore their parish church as completely as they do the Presbyterian Church hard by, and attend the other two churches which I have mentioned, and yet, by direction of the last Diocesan Conference, the Board of Finance is to provide a substantial sum for the upkeep of the Institution and our parish is, of course,

¹ The official organ of the Diocese itself seems to be edited on the quiet assumption that the Sacerdotalist party is the Church. References to the Mass, for instance, are allowed to go in uncensored.

asked to provide its quota. Nearly two-thirds of the money raised by our Board goes to the Society which has to pay out this sum, and it is hardly to be wondered at under the circumstances that the work of the Board has not aroused much enthusiasm amongst our parishioners, and that the response to appeals for money has not been encouraging.

I am not sure whether any of the Diocesan Boards have made it a rule not to give financial support to any parishes where the incumbents break the law of the Church, but I know there are many churchpeople who decline to have anything to do with diocesan finance schemes when such a rule is not in force. Others point out that however liberal the constitution may be, and however impartially demands upon the funds may be dealt with, it is practically impossible to be sure that the moneys of Ministerialist lay folk will not go to help Sacerdotalist objects. Conversely, I have heard that in one diocese the evangelical parishes get more out of the diocesan fund than they pay into it,—which is just as bad. No wonder that people prefer to give their money to evangelical societies and ensure that every penny—no more and no less—is expended on objects of which they approve.

Outside the sphere of finance, the Bishops, with few exceptions, have much to answer for in connection with the existing disunion. They, or their predecessors, are responsible for allowing the excessive latitude which is at the root of all the trouble, and they constantly arouse the distrust of Ministerialist Churchmen by the way in which they exercise their patronage. There seems to be an unaccountable bias, even among comparatively moderate prelates, in favour of the Sacerdotalists. Many of us, although strongly opposed to private patronage in theory, are advocates of it in practice for that reason. For the same cause there is a reluctance on the part of some Ministerialists to agree to and support the creation of new dioceses for which there is urgent need.

All these things, and many others, interfere with the harmonious working of the Church as a whole. It is no use to cry peace when there is no peace; and although there is a natural tendency to do so among those elements in the Church which are having things their own way, steps have recently been taken by those in authority which involve a recognition of the fact that we are a divided house. Such are the issue, in connection with the National Mission, of four

separate series of papers on Christian Faith and Order by different schools of thought. These, which can easily be grouped under the heads of Ministerialist, Sacerdotalist and Moderate, are frankly antagonistic on several important points, notwithstanding that the controlling Committee, with some lack of humour, asked the writers to exclude controversy. Such, also, is the movement in favour of an alternative form of service for the Holy Communion.

Unofficial indications of the same cleavage are the existence of important rival Societies and newspapers representing the two schools of thought and each claiming that they stand for correct Churchmanship. There is, moreover, a *Tourist's Guide* for the Sacerdotalist, which tells him which churches to attend and which to avoid, and a *Ritualistic Clergy List* for Ministerialists, in which, by the way, one is somewhat surprised to find men stamped as Sacerdotalists who have adopted the Eastward Position.

And now as to remedies. The most obvious and logical would be so to reform the Church as to turn one or other of the incompatible parties out of it. But this would involve martyrdom, and although it is true that the blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church, it is also true that martyrdom is the trump-card of the fanatic.

Then there is the suggestion (made in the *Hibbert Journal* of January, 1910) that the Church should resolve itself by fission into two independent churches of equal standing, but it was not favourably received, and since it was put forward it has occurred to me that there is a more excellent way, by which the unity of the Church might be preserved, while a large measure of freedom would be secured to its members.

In Bishop Creighton's *Life*, he is reported to have said (vol. ii. p. 177) that "The restoration of the unity of Christendom will be, not by affirming any one of the existing systems as universal, but by a federation," and I believe the principle to be a sound one. What I would suggest is that federation should begin within the Church; that is, that the Ministerialist and Sacerdotalist sections should be treated, within the Church, as federated units in somewhat the same way as (say) the Baptist and Presbyterian Churches would have to be treated if there were federation among the Free Churches. A good deal could be done in this direction without any alteration of the law; for instance—

1. In each diocese an Assistant or Suffragan Bishop might be

appointed to represent the Ministerialist and Sacerdotalist schools respectively.

2. Each parish in the diocese would have the right to determine whether it wished to be classed as Ministerialist or Sacerdotalist, and would be under the control of the Bishop representing that side of the Church. Here it may be observed that, as stated by the Bishop of Zanzibar at the recent Kikuyu Conference, it is not essential that a bishop should have exclusive control over a specific area.

3. The Diocesan Bishop would supervise all parishes not wishing to fall into either of the two preceding classes, and would rank as superior over the two junior bishops, who would act under his directions in all matters affecting the diocese as a whole. He would be the connecting link—the pontifex, the bridge-builder—between the two sides of the Church in his diocese, and might arbitrate in the event of any dispute, but ordinarily he would leave all questions relating to the distinctive doctrines of the two parties to the Assistant Bishops.

4. The Diocesan Bishop would delegate his powers of patronage as regards Ministerial and Sacerdotalist parishes to the Assistant Bishops, reserving to himself a right of veto.

5. There would be three separate funds, supervised by three Committees of the Diocesan Board of Finance, which would still continue and would hold somewhat the same position as a Board of Mission does in relation to the various Missionary Societies.¹

6. Similarly, there would be separate Councils for each of the three sections of the Church, and a General Assembly for the whole, on which each section would have equal powers. Nothing affecting any particular section would be done by the General Assembly without the consent of that section.

This last provision is very important. The dictum of Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman that "minorities must suffer," bad enough in politics, is unbearable in religion. The truth—or at least the complete truth—does not always reside with the majority, otherwise we should all have to be Roman Catholics. Majorities can usually take care of themselves pretty well, and it should be a primary

¹ A very similar suggestion to this was actually made by Mr. Andrew Williamson at the London Diocesan Conference when the Board of Finance for that diocese was being set up.

function of all Parliaments, Convocations and such-like bodies, to see that the minorities have fairplay.

7. Aggressiveness on the part of either section of the Church in relation to the other to be discouraged by every possible means. Each party may say "Codlin's the friend" if it likes, but it must never add "not Short." Best of all if it would say, "Short is a real friend too. Ask for his programme and see which you like best. But do think for yourselves."

8. Nothing to be done separately which could be done jointly with advantage, and by agreement.

This is a very sketchy outline, and is capable of being filled in, or modified in many ways. It is however submitted, with the respect which is due from a layman whose occupations and training only allow him to be an amateur, to those who have been able by their position, as clergy or otherwise, to give more time and expert knowledge to the subject, as a basis for a concordat within the Church of England, and for union or reunion with other churches outside it.

The scheme could be greatly improved as regards our own Church by some alterations in the law, but even with things as they stand, I suggest that it would be of great advantage.

Some time ago the Bishop of Zanzibar asked, very naturally, what the Church of England stood for. The Bishops of that Church have never ventured to give an answer. Although they talk much of unity, they are either not united themselves as to what the answer should be, or feel unable to draft one which would not estrange large numbers of the faithful. Under the proposed scheme there would be a general declaration by the Diocesan Bishops, which should be drawn as widely as possible, so that it would require little or no modification when an outside Church wished to join the Federation, and separate statements by the Ministerialist and Sacerdotalist authorities as to what would be required as a condition of membership of each of those branches of the Church.

The energy and money spent on internal controversy would be diverted to substantive religious work, and it would be possible to do away with such Societies as the English Church Union, Church Association and National Church League,—perhaps even to bury Mr. Kensit.

The Diocesan Bishops, all of whom have far too much to do, and

whose work suffers in consequence, would be materially relieved, and would no longer have to ride round the circus with their feet on two not over-quiet horses.

One of the most serious grievances at present felt by Ministerialist Churchmen, especially in country districts, arises from the way in which they have been deprived of the kind of ministrations and services which they would have desired, not only by the action of private patrons, but of partisan Societies and even of Diocesan Bishops. Something might be done by agreement to meet this grievance, but not more under the scheme than could be done already if Bishops and parochial clergy were willing, and it could only be completely removed by a drastic alteration of the law. The enormous powers of incumbents over their parishes would have to be curtailed, so as to allow of the compulsory formation of new ecclesiastical districts wherever a sufficient number of Ministerialists or Sacerdotalists required it, and could make adequate provision for their endowment, whether permanently or for a good number of years.¹ Such districts, as well as ancient parishes, should be capable of being dissolved or altered much more easily than under the existing law, and generally there should be far more flexibility in dealing with these matters than we now have.

Again, there might be an extension of the system of proprietary or private chapels. If it is admitted, as seems to be the case, that "the parochial system has broken down," there need be no hesitation about getting rid of the clerical privileges which are its worst appanage, and there is no question but that the inclusion of the Free Churches in our federation will involve a sweeping rearrangement and to a great extent an abolition, of the territorial principle.

Provided those churches accepted the principle of episcopacy, to which they need not attach any particular theory, here is a framework into which they could be fitted, and, if it is successful in its operation within our Church, a pattern which they might be attracted to follow. At present, instead of being an encouragement to them, we are a warning, as a very thoughtful Nonconformist once said to me.

With such freedom as is outlined here, there need be no limit to the comprehensiveness of the Catholic Church, provided its members

¹ The Church Services (Wales) Act, 1863, is the nearest approach to a precedent for such a step, and might be referred to with advantage.

agreed to recognize the unique deity of Our Blessed Lord, and the paramount authority of Holy Scripture.

The proviso would exclude no important sect which claimed to be a Christian Church except the Unitarians. None who love the Lord Jesus Christ in incorruption, and who accept from the heart His atoning sacrifice and His supreme lordship, would be outside the pale of the United Church,—or United States of Churches,—and if I read St. Paul aright, none ought to be. In that view none of the various sects and confessions, Catholic and Nonconformist, ought to be accused of rending Christ's holy coat, because they merely impose vestments of various kinds upon it.

The various non-Anglican Churches in each diocese or kindred area, would be arranged in separate groups with a "pontifex" representing the highest common measure of agreement between the Churches in that group, and answering to our (reformed) diocesan bishop.

No doubt the Universal Church which is thus contemplated should have power to refuse the admission of any particular body into the federation, or it might become the home of all sorts of fantastic beliefs, and the entry of some communities would certainly lead to the exit of others, so that the Church would lose on the roundabouts what it gained on the swings. Apart from this it might perhaps be made a general rule that no Church should be federated which had not been in existence as a separate corporation for at least fifty years.

Everything in this world is relative ; God alone is absolute. So we must recollect that no scheme that can be devised will give us absolute freedom or absolute unity. And not only are freedom and unity relative, but they are related to each other in such wise that, as a rule, the more you have of the one the less you have of the other, so that the problem of securing the maximum amount of each in the Universal Church of the future is one which will require very delicate adjustment. By not going far into details, I have no doubt avoided pitfalls, but it is my conviction that with sincerity and patience, with brotherly love, and prayerful reliance on the Spirit of God, a settlement could be arrived at on the lines I have suggested, to the glory of the Ineffable Name.

JOHN R. CLARK HALL.

BLESSED BE VAGUENESS.

BY THE REV. CHARLES COURTENAY, M.A., Chaplain of
Holy Trinity, Rome.

(Concluded from p. 272.)

V.

THE *Bible* has its problems many, problems which always wait upon necessary vagueness.

Until I know more fully the Divine methods, and know better the Divine reasons, I am content to hold fast to my Bible as the very message of my God. If the Holy Book has a power which no other book in the world approaches, if its virtues reach down into my inner depths, if it transfigures my soul, and sweeps away with its revelations the scudding mists of life, I am content not to know everything about its difficulties, assured that I need not know, and can wait for their solutions. For all its vagueness, it works. Good motives spring out of its pages, and, under its influences, life is consolidated securely. I would rather be a humble reader and believer than sit over it as its dissector, cutting away its life. The frozen beings who let their doubts run wild about its truth, and exhale icy breaths upon the warm believing world, are too stiff and hard for warm-blooded souls who have found their icy natures dissolved by its heat and radiance. Any theory which makes a man the less devout and Christian than he was stands condemned. The great Father, Whose great Heart beats under its lines, must needs by His greatness give us a book full of hard problems and vague mysteries.

VI.

So, too, are the *great doctrines of our faith* fringed with vaguenesses. The facts are clear enough, and there is always light enough in them to walk by, but human reason does not always secure a fitting answer to its queries. Yet none of its difficulties are unreasonable to faith, and intuition is never shocked by them. It is to the busy logician who wants to get to their roots that they present ungainly proportions. But why worry about the roots if the flowers which spring from them smell sweet, and if their fruit provides us with sufficient and appetizing food?

And here we discover the reason of the cleavages in the churches. It is not the practical Christians who ever quarrel ; it is only the theologians who, keen in forming dogmatic systems and rounding off their creeds, have forced truths into strange and needless moulds. It was when men began to define and explain and give reasons that they spoiled the Church's unity. Vagueness they would not have at any price, and, to disperse it, they trod a road which led them straight upon controversial trouble. Any reason, it seems, was better than none, even a bad one. And so schisms grew and still flourish in our unhappy midst. But vagueness, after all, was better.

What endless battles are being fought on the question of *the Church* in men's efforts to produce a scheme which shall be of crystal clearness. The Church, as a congregation of faithful men scattered over the wide world, holding fast to one Lord, accepting His provision of the Word and the Sacraments, and partaking of them with thankful hearts, we can all clearly understand. We have no quarrels here, nor can have.

But there were vague spots in the definition which must be mended and elaborated and extended. It was not a sufficiently sharp weapon, it seems, against those who differed from the generality. And so busy men tinkered at the idea until it was cleared of every possible ambiguity, and stood at last the finished, well-rounded system that we are familiar with in the Church of Rome. It must be visible ; it must possess one head—one Pope of Rome ; its members must believe all that that Church asserts. And so clear is everything that half or more of Christendom find themselves suspended in mid air, churchless and hopeless. The vagueness is all gone, and so is a good deal of Christendom. Better vagueness, all honest men will say, than this false, absurd, and impossible position.

VII.

And, just as the ingenuities of men have made such narrow grooves that nobody can move comfortably in them except those reduced by the system to its own patent proportions, so have the *means of approach* into the Church been reduced and systematized.

The *Sacraments* as spiritual means of grace for spiritual people are not hard to understand, and if there remain some vaguenesses about them they are not material in themselves. But it seems these

must go too. And so they have become materialized by many, and, according to them, are not only means of grace but the grace itself in the mere operation. Baptism necessarily confers life, and to be baptized is to need no more the spirit of life but simply the revival of a buried life. It is a miraculous operation, secured by the intervention of a priest, apart from any inner disposition or fitness before or after. Better the vagueness which leaves much open, and, insisting on the change of position of the baptized, puts upon him the duty of being what he is put in the way of being, a true child of God by faith in Christ Jesus. Ecclesiastical fictions are not always Divine facts, and to assure an unconverted soul that because he is baptized he necessarily has life is to lead him to a false position, to harden him into a groundless assurance concerning his destiny, and thus cut off the chance of saving him eternally. Materialism has always been the foe of spirituality, and in salvation by ordinances men are materializing what must essentially be spiritual or nothing. It is in *the Lord's Supper* that we find this extrusion of vagueness so peculiarly disastrous, rending as it has the Church in twain.

The original idea that in the Holy Communion we feasted at the Lord's Table, and feasted on Christ in our hearts by faith, were really strengthened and uplifted by the sacred food, were really brought in living contact with Christ Himself in Whom we were trusting, and was clear enough for simple Christians. But it must be made clearer, and be improved out of all recognition, and be buried under human explanations until our feast of communion has become a battle-ground. And with the elaboration of the sacrament have come in such other aspects as have destroyed the whole ordinance to simple folk. Now the symbols are no longer a sign but the reality itself. The symbols disappear, and in their place is found by a sort of magical exchange the very Body and Blood of the Lord. Or the symbols are covered and overwhelmed by the associated Body and Blood. And so He is to be looked for, not in the faithful hearts of the communicants, but upon the so-called altar, there to be worshipped and adored. Instead of a feast to be taken, it is a sacrifice to be offered. And it scarcely matters whether men partake or not, mostly, they had better not, just look on and worship. Blessed be vagueness, we say, than this elaboration all human and man-invented. Better not to know than to know thus materially what is false.

VIII.

The atonement, too, with all its precious burden of fruit and blessing, has become the battle-ground of warring theologians.

And yet, with the simple facts before us, we thought we had knowledge enough for practical blessing. We have the facts clearly enough, that Christ died for us, that on the ground of that death all who come find forgiveness and life, and that He bridged the gulf and made a way for every sinner who chooses to trust and cling to Him. And some of us have crossed by the new and living way, and found ourselves at home with God. What more do we want? But by some, yea many, more was demanded, namely, an elaborate philosophy of the cross, a satisfactory theory of the atonement, a reasoned apology for the inner and Divine methods. In the face of such theories, so human and unsatisfactory, and seeing how every such theory only leads to conflict in which the cross gets trodden out, we say, blessed be vagueness, a thousand-fold more blessed.

On the subject of *the after life*, too, vagueness exists in plenty, and dark places abound. It has been left purposely vague, we think. It is better not to know.

But men have thought otherwise, and have been at great pains to fill up the gaps, making a system of the life beyond which has been woven out of their own imaginations from beginning to end. Ingenious very, and false very. And one invention has led to another until there has been blown out that bladder-like scheme of purgatory with its accompanying notions of masses for the dead and priestly efforts to shorten the time. And now all is clear about the other side, and there are no dark shadows, and men can make merchandise of its deliverances, and feather their own nests with the spoil. But vagueness is better than these monstrous concoctions, and these will-o'-the-wisp lights which are manifest signs of the marshes and corruptions from which they spring.

This impatience of vagueness breaks out in many other directions, and the many *schools of prophecy* are tokens of men's interest in it and sometimes of their vagaries and guesses. Not, of course, that all schools of prophetic thought stand upon the same level, for there are sane schools and insane ones, systems which have solid Scripture at their back, and systems which are the fruits of tortured texts and imaginary interpretations.

But blessed be vagueness here, too, because it is better to hold fast to the great fact of a Second Coming with its few great attendant facts. That Christ is coming is the joy of the whole Church, and the goal to which their eyes are cast day by day. But times and seasons, order, and fillings up which a complete system demands, as some think, only evoke controversy. To remain in the vague may seem to the enthusiastic exponents woeful and wilful neglect, but it is after all the surer side.

IX.

This discontent with vagueness is the cause of some of the new systems of the day which, but for the prevailing vagueness on certain great tracts of life, would have had no temptation to emerge.

Christian Science is one of them. It has produced a gospel for the body, and has added a series of comments upon it which are said to be of inspired or semi-inspired origin. At any rate, Mrs. Eddy's interpretation of the Bible is set alongside the Word of God, and is perhaps read more by her followers. It is a deliberate attempt to dissolve the vaguenesses of revelation by metaphysics which no metaphysician can understand. And with it is mingled a great deal of positive truth which is certainly divine truth. But this gospel of rest and fearlessness and prayer and faith is the common property of all Christendom. There is no vagueness in these because they are God's revealed truth. But all else, such as the illusions of pain and sickness and death, is all her own invention and more than doubtful. Had all this been left vague, Christian Science would have been common Christian heritage, as much ours as theirs. The best of Christian Science we all have as Christians; the worst of it we do not want; we prefer vagueness.

Theosophy, too, is an effort to make clear what has purposely been left vague.

The constitution of man's nature, and the nature of man's future, have been left unexplained except in a general way, just enough for man's practical use, and no more. Here was the opportunity for man's invention, and so, from the old Gnostics and early heretics down to Madame Blavatsky's theosophy, the world has been treated to an elaborate expansion of man's nature which is startling in its ingenuities. Its wonderful psychology, showing such evolutions as man had never conceived possible, and reaching out into spheres hitherto undreamed of and into ages upon ages, fairly makes the

mind reel under its complexities. It is rather too clear for our acceptance. It is too well thought out. It knows too much about the invisible world and the distant future and the careers of men after death. Moreover, it is an unpleasant echo of systems which have been tried in other forms and failed hopelessly. It is claimed not to be anti-Christian or anti-anything, but, if Christianity can lose all its specific contents and remain Christian, then we may call it a supplement to the Christian faith. But let us be under no delusion about it. It trundles its balls through our Christian facts and doctrines, until scarcely one of them is left standing. Indeed, it is anti-Christian to the core. Blessed rather be vagueness than these false lights with their faulty origin and sham science, empty promises, and impossible positions.

All these revolts against Christian vagueness are just samples which all Church History gives us, for every heresy is an attempt to clear up dark places and fill up the gaps. Not content to wait and trust, men have rushed at conclusions which the Christian Church has been obliged to denounce. Any solution seemed to them better than none. And so they have filled up the Great Master's canvas wherever blank spaces were found with grotesque and impossible objects which go far to spoil the whole picture. And the impatient lovers of novelty, of whom there are too many abroad, have accepted and acclaimed their inventions.

They have not understood that vagueness in the religious sphere is a frequent necessity, like the dim glass with which we survey the sun, like the reserve which every good teacher practises in the lower forms of his school, like the teaching of the letters of the alphabet one by one before the forming of the words—in short, the simple before the complex.

X.

I am well aware that thus to elevate vagueness to a blessed position requires some qualification. My last words must deal with the *dangers* attendant upon vagueness and the cases where it may be dispersed.

We must never forget that vagueness is in us, and not in the truths themselves. It is all in our own limitations. To the Divine Intelligence all is clear.

And let us not forget either that vagueness is no final state, only temporary. "Now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face

to face." Our present vagueness is as a morning twilight on the way to daylight and sunshine. When the child becomes a man the child's dullness of apprehension will pass away in the larger life.

It is wise, too, to understand that vagueness in the great religious spheres extends not to what has to be done in practical life, but only to its origins and roots of meaning. The pathways for the soul's movements are as plain and clear as the roads along which our daily steps are taken. For he who is willing to take one step at a time may be sure that that step is open to him. But we may not see far into the spiritual future.

It is also clear that to qualify for much light we must use the light we have. He who acts in the vague twilight will find less vagueness for the action. Mists go when we boldly plunge into them. It is those who wait for full daylight in life who stand still and weep.

If we can but remember such facts and truths we shall not be so foolish as to take up impossible positions and thus run into great peril.

Thus, some will glorify vagueness as a final state and refuse the light, because vagueness seems better. They will wilfully suffocate their own understandings, and put out their own eyes in order to glorify their blindness. Not thus do we act as intelligent people. Vagueness is excellent when it is all the knowledge we have, but when more can be ascertained we do wrong to rest in it. God never gave us minds to reduce them to nothingness, nor to hand them over to others, be they churches or systems. They are for use, not for foolish submission.

It is a peril, too, when we are tempted to think more of the halo than of the sun. In inferior photographic lenses, while the centre is true, the edges are useless, because of their distortions. Such edges certainly yield bright prismatic colours, and they may appeal to the eye as extremely beautiful, but they spoil the picture on the negative when the open aperture is used. In early days men had to put up with them because the better lenses were not invented. But there is no excuse for them now. And so it is with the vague in life and religion; it is to be accepted only so long as it is necessary.

One would have expected that with such prevailing and necessary vagueness in life, and especially in religious life, that the spirit of sweet charity would have reigned. But we do not find it so.

Vagueness and dimness are the seats of controversy and conflict. It is one of the great perils of the vague that it leaves so much more room for differing opinions. And so we find that the greater the nebulosity which surrounds a truth, the more arrogant are those who gaze upon it. Where the least light is vouchsafed there men become most assured and positive. There is no controversy about the bright centres of truth, but about the edges of it. In that undefined region where eyesight fails and wise men keep silent there the ignorant will shout the loudest. And there, too, the eye gazes longest, as if there truth gave its greatest lustre. Why do not men see that where the full revelation has not been granted there silence is the better course, and that in the undefined regions of truth and life vagueness should be left vague, instead of seeking to tease something out of it which it was never intended to yield?

But, while we are to respect the vague, and speak kindly of its messages, we must not deny the chance to penetrate it by stronger powers. There was vagueness enough in the heavens aforesaid when only the naked eye gazed into their starry spaces. Men were content then not to know. But, with a telescope turned towards these dim depths, lo! the vague became clear. And so, when God heightens our inner powers, or sends a man with eyes keener than our own, we shall find resolved much of the vagueness of life. But there will still be vagueness, as there are still stars yet unrevealed in the heavens.

To love vagueness for itself is sheer obscurantism. To abide in vagueness when fresh revelations come is sheer folly. To shut our eyes to the light is irreligious. And to ban a thinker in the supposed interests of vagueness is to ban the oculist who is able to excise your cataract for you.

It may seem as if by expressing the dangers which await vagueness I am moderating and diminishing my praises of it. Not at all. It is still blessed in its own sphere, and amidst the dimness which God seems to have permitted and enjoined. But beyond that sphere it is more blessed to be clear. It serves its purpose when we are in our pupilage, and so long as we can bear no more light upon our weak eyes, but as the eyes grow stronger the need for vagueness passes away.

OUR LORD'S STATE OF HUMILIATION.

BY THE REV. JOHN R. PALMER, LITT.D.

III.

(Concluding Article.)

THE following are among the principal expositions of *ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν* :—

(a) "Instead of taking to Himself He put away and put off from Himself."—*Dean Vaughan*.

(b) "Emptied Himself of the *μορφή θεοῦ*—the glory which He had with the Father (St. John xvii. 5)—by taking the form of a servant."—*Dean Alford*.

(c) "*Emptied, stripped Himself*, of the insignia of majesty. . . . He divested Himself of the glories, the *prerogatives*, of Deity. This He did by taking upon Him the form of a servant."—*Bp. Lightfoot*.

(d) "Emptied Himself from the state of being equal with God."—*Concil. Antioch* (3rd cent.), i. p. 848, Labb. quoted by *Bp. Christopher Wordsworth*.

(e) "He emptied Himself of His own Divine glory, and willingly took the form of a servant."

(f) *Dean Payne Smith* commenting on Is. liii. 2, says :—"As regards His *Divine* nature Christ 'emptied Himself,' *laying it entirely aside* (Phil. ii. 7 in the Greek); and as regards His human nature He descended into the lower ranks of society, and bore man's name and lot in *all its humility*. 'He took the form of a slave.'"

(*Commentary*. Prophetical Books, Isaiah to Malachi. S.P.C.K., 1880.)

We cannot, however, see how the words "He *emptied* Himself of His Divine glory" can be made to mean merely "He *veiled* it." And certainly St. Augustine's words, "Taking what He took, He kept what He was," appear to fall short of Lightfoot's exposition, and of the words of the Council of Antioch (quoted above), which together express, perhaps, as nearly as possible the inner reality of our Lord's *κένωσις*.

In view of His Mission, and in actual preparation to undertake it, He *counted not* that a prize *to be retained*, which *per se* was such (ver. 6), and so "He emptied Himself," refusing no stage of His

profound Humiliation, not even "the likeness of *sinful flesh*" (Rom. viii. 3), and "the Death of the Cross" (Phil. ii. 8). He stooped below the angels that He might in Himself raise *man*—who was naturally lower than they—above their nature (Ps. viii. 4, 5; Heb. ii. 9; Eph. i. 19–21; iv. 10). Hence our blessed Lord's experience, however mysterious, is represented in Scripture as nothing less than a great reality, which is involved in the force of the Greek *ἐκένωσεν* and the Vulgate "exinanivit."

A word or two on His "being found in fashion as a man" (Phil. ii. 8). Apart from their general or primary sense, how much is involved in these few words, read in the light of the events of His sacred life, and as they are unfolded in the Gospel record. It is not said that He was "found" *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ* (ver. 6), in that state He was only known to the Eternal Father, and to the Holy Spirit, and to angels. But by man—the object of His Redeeming Love—He was "*found in fashion as a man.*" What infinite condescension is here portrayed! He, who had lain in the bosom of the Father from all eternity, was "found," in time, by man, and for man's salvation. And yet never as a *mere* man, however pure and however holy. He was "found"—during His earthly sojourn, and notwithstanding the reality of His "state of Humiliation," Exinanition, *κένωσις*—the *God-Man*. The revelation of these deeply mysterious truths, in their mutual relationship, sets forth the Infinite Love which constituted the one basis of Atonement in "the counsels" of the ever Blessed Trinity (Eph. i. 11; Ps. xl. 7, 8; Heb. ix. 14; St. John iii. 16, 17; 1 John iii. 1). The depth of our Lord's condescension was the measure of the love of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost for a lost and ruined race.

Our blessed Lord was "found in fashion as a man." He was "found" as such by men in general. All who had any dealings with Him or who crossed His earthly path, recognised in Him One, who not only appeared in "the *form* of a servant," and graciously condescended to do the work of one (cf. St. Matt. xx. 28; and *μορφῇ*, Phil. ii. 7), who was not only "made in the *similitude* (*ὁμοίωμα*) of men" in general, but was "found," in all the circumstances and tender relationships of life, in outward guise, in manner of speech, and in look, "*as a Man.*" He not only took upon Himself our nature but humbled Himself still further in that nature (Rom. xv. 3). He, pre-eminently, was *the One* who "sought not His own," but

“humbled Himself” (1 Cor. xiii. 5 ; Phil. ii. 8), “regarding not His equality with God as giving Him an unbounded power of self-aggrandisement, but on the contrary emptying Himself of all by a voluntary self-incorporation with the creature . . . in its uttermost abasement of shame and suffering.”

In His Childhood, Youth, and Manhood, as well as during the active exercise of His Ministry, whether casually met with, or in His daily intercourse with His Mother and brethren, or “found” in the precise meaning of the Greek word so translated (*εὑρεθεῖς*), after “previous search or enquiry,” He was seen and known “as man.” Yet, we repeat, He was never “found” as a mere man. His enemies testified of Him : “Never man spake like this man” (St. John viii. 46). “He taught as one having authority and not as the Scribes” (St. Matt. vii. 29). And if we read the latter part of that wonderful first chapter of St. John’s Gospel, beginning at the 35th verse, are we not struck by this two-fold aspect of our blessed Lord—the tender, winning humanness, combined with a dignity, a majesty, and a consciousness of future glory, which ever characterized the God-Man? “What seek ye?” “Come and see”; “Thou shalt be called Cephas”; “Follow Me”; “Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile”; “*Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee*”; “*Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man*”; these are His utterances to Andrew and Peter, to Philip and Nathanael. The key-note of these verses (35-51), too, is “found,” so far as the first communications of these disciples with one another, about our Lord, are concerned.

Not only by Jews was He “found as a man,” but also by Gentile proselytes, by the Greeks, for instance, who came up to the feast of the Passover at the end of His Ministry, and who, addressing Philip, said, “Sir, we would see *Jesus*” (St. John xii. 20-22). To them He unfolds the main results of the Redemption which He was about to effect, and that not only was “the middle wall of partition” between them and the commonwealth of Israel about to be “broken down” (Eph. ii. 12-15), but that His “lifting up from the earth” should be the means of “drawing *all* men unto Him” (St. John xii. 32). As Stier well remarks, by the way: “These men from the *West* represent, at the end of

Christ's life, what the wise men from the *East* represented at its beginning ; but those come to the cross of the King, even as these to His manger."

Again, not only by men, but also in a sense by *angels*, was He "found in fashion as a *man*," when they announced His birth to the shepherds (St. Luke ii.), directed His flight into Egypt (St. Matt. ii. 13-15), ministered unto Him at the end of His Wilderness Temptation (St. Matt. iv. 11 ; St. Mark i. 13), "strengthened Him" in the Garden of Agony (St. Luke xxii. 43).

How striking is the union of the perfectly Human and the essentially Divine in our blessed Lord, as it is portrayed in the pages of the New Testament! How graciously adapted to the needs of man, who never could have gazed on Uncreated Light (1 Tim. vi. 16), was the Divine provision of the Incarnation (St. John i. 7-10 ; xii. 35, 36 ; 2 Cor. iv. 6). What has been said of the natural vision is applicable also here. "In order to secure the greatest power of vision the light must be accommodated to the eye. The brightest light will not necessarily enable every man to see the best. Adaptation to the organ is a greater requisite in the medium of vision than intrinsic brightness." As Keble beautifully writes :—

"The Son of God in radiance beam'd
Too bright for us to scan,
But we may face the rays that stream'd
From the mild Son of Man."
—*The Christian Year*. Quinquagesima Sunday.

(vii.) *Heb.* ii. 18. Alford speaks of "the power of sympathy which He has acquired by personal experience of our sufferings." He says, "As GOD, He knows what is in us : but as MAN, He feels it also. And by this, wonderful as it may seem, He has acquired a *fresh* power, that of sympathy with us, and *in consequence, of helping us.*" And Wordsworth similarly writes : "He has gained *new* powers by *suffering*. By His Passion He has acquired *Compassion*. We are sure that *He, who suffered so much, feels with us, and for us, in our sufferings.*" Cf. *Is.* lxiii. 9 ; xlvi. 10.

Surely the view of these eminent commentators is far more in agreement with the teaching of the Inspired Word than that is which ascribes our Lord's capacity to sympathise with, and help His people, to His Divinity alone. With reference to our Lord having

acquired "fresh" or "new power by suffering," see also *Owen*, on Heb. iv. 15.

(viii.) *Heb.* iv. 15. Here Alford rightly refuses to "confine" *πειρασμένον* to "sufferings on account of sin," and says of such a view that it "would altogether deprive it of the meaning *tempted*, 'solicited towards, but short of sin.'" And, again, he says, "very many Commentators take the words (of this verse) to imply, that He was tempted in all other points, but not in sin: 'sin only excepted' . . . But the words certainly do not lead to any such interpretation. They would rather in this case be, *εἰ μὴ καθ' ἁμαρτίαν*, or *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* would stand *before καθ' ὁμοίωσιν*."

The first view is opposed to the true nature of our Lord's Temptation, the last, to its essential likeness to the temptations of His people. And if either view were the true one, the loss to us would be infinite. Cf. *Rom.* viii. 3. On this the above writer remarks: "He had a nature *like sinful human nature*, so that He was subject to our sensuous incitements, but in Him they broke not out into sin."

(ix.) *Heb.* v. 8. On this passage Alford says: "Although He was a Son, He learned His obedience, *not from this relation*, but from His *sufferings*. . . . His special obedience, that course of submission by which He became perfected as our High Priest, was gone through in *Time*, and matter of *acquisition* for Him, and *practice*, by suffering."

And this experience may be said to have been closed at the Resurrection, not before. See *Rom.* vi. 4, viii. 11.

Wordsworth observes: "He *learnt obedience by experience* of what He Himself suffered *as Man* . . . by this learning He was *perfected and glorified* and became the Author of everlasting salvation. . . . *We must not weaken this saying*, but rather we may thankfully accept it, in *all its mysterious fulness*, etc."

We have now seen that the profound reality of our blessed Lord's Humiliation is a truth revealed in many parts of Holy Scripture, and that it is revealed concurrently with other truths which have exclusive reference to His true and proper Divinity. So that in His unique Personality the words of the Prophet might have been uttered by His, as by no other lips: "To whom will ye liken Me, or shall I be equal?" (*Isa.* xi. 25).

But it is not pretended that any acquaintance with the *letter* of Holy Scripture can ever afford one who is desirous of attaining a

deeper knowledge of the glory of our Lord's Person the same advantages as are available in the study of the *inner* meaning of God's Word, and *heart-converse with the Lord Himself*. And in this study and converse loyalty to Truth does not require that we should be "in bondage to the fear of transgressing the legitimate boundaries of freedom and of reverence." The Divinity of our blessed Lord is clearly revealed in Holy Scripture, and as one of the great foundation truths of Christianity it is enshrined in the Creeds of the Catholic Faith. The acceptance of His equally true and proper Humanity is necessary to a right faith in the perfection of the Incarnation and the reality of the Atonement. He is presented to us in the outward surroundings of His earthly life from Bethlehem to Calvary as perfectly Human. And even in closest connection with His own declaration of His future glory, and in reply to one who addressed Him as "the Son of GOD, the King of Israel," the title which He chose for Himself was none other than "*the Son of Man*" (St. John i. 49-51). Shall we not then exclaim:—

"For ever be Thy name adored
For this true humanness—our Brother, Saviour, Lord!"

But it is earnestly hoped that no statement, however brief, may be found in the present article which is calculated to cause unnecessary pain to any true-hearted follower of our common Lord. It is a comfort to know that "it is the same Spirit which has embodied truth in the Bible that infuses the love of truth into the Christian, and no magnetism gives more assurance of its reality in material things than such sympathy gives in spiritual, that the sincere seeker shall ultimately find all such truth in the Bible as there is a moral fitness, or necessity, that he should possess."

"And as Thou, to make us Thine,
Stoop'd a mortal man to be,
Fill us with Thy life divine,
Lift our life in love to Thee."

On the reality of our Lord's *κένωσις*, see Dr. Mill's Sermons No. V., especially pp. 113, 122, where he speaks of it as "that voluntary emptying Himself of the Divinity," and as His "exinani- tion of the Divinity."

JOHN R. PALMER.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

A CUDDESDON TEXT-BOOK.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By E. J. Bicknell. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 21s. net.

Mr. Bicknell is Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon College, and this valuable and comprehensive volume is an enlargement of lectures delivered to his pupils. It is something more than an Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles—it is a handbook of Theology dealing with all the outstanding historical and theological problems of the day. No one can complain that according to Mr. Bicknell the Articles are mere doctrinal controversial formulae, that must be explained in their historical setting with a view to determining the plain literal meaning of every word. They are much more than this. “Creeds and Articles are theological statements of belief. Both alike have been employed as tests. Both are attempts to preserve truth in all its fullness. But while Creeds are a necessity, ‘in a world where all expression of spirit is through body,’ Articles are a consequence, ‘not of the Church’s existence but of the Church’s failure.’” But cannot the same be said of the Nicene and the Athanasian Creed? Did they not originate in consequence of the Church’s failure to maintain whole and undefiled the faith as revealed in the Gospel? We cannot draw the hard and fast distinction here attempted on the authority of Moberly even if we do not attribute to every line of the XXXIX Articles the weight and authority given rightly to the Articles of the Creeds.

Most readers will be delighted by the fair-mindedness of Mr. Bicknell. We disagree with much of what he says on controverted points, but we always find him ready to see the other side, and if he does not give to it the weight it ought to possess he is not blind to the strength of the position. Unlike so many writers of the High Church School he does not anathematize even by implication those who differ from him. He is, however, so attached to his own views that he fails to see that the case against some of them is not to-day capable of being accepted as axiomatic by even leading English theologians. For example, he discusses with marked impartiality the existence and the grounds for their perpetuation of the Nonconformist Churches. He tells us that in different places and at different times vital truths of the Christian faith have become obscured or neglected, “whether it be the need of personal conversion, or the spiritual independence of the Church, or the right place of the Sacraments.” “Only a claim to absolute holiness which the Church of England certainly cannot make could justify a rigid and superior attitude to Nonconformity.” He concludes, however, with the statement, “Every single Christian community was either founded by an Apostle or goes back to one so founded. The Ministry of the Church hands down the commission given to the Apostles. Thus so far as she is faithful to her mission the Church is Apostolic in her aim, her teaching and her ministry. She fails to be Apostolic when she ceases to represent Christ.” With the exception of the dogmatic statement of Apostolic succession of the generally understood type this represents the conviction of most Protestant Christians. He has knowledge of what is implied, for he says “the real line of division depends very largely upon the different conceptions of the outward to the inward.”

We are glad to find in a book coming from Cuddesdon the strong words, "The popular antithesis of Catholic and Protestant is absurd. All true protest against error is based on a knowledge and love of truth. A Catholic love of truth is bound to protest against all error that limits or denies the truth. In a sinful world every man should wish to be at once both a Catholic and Protestant."

When we study his teaching on the Sacrament of the death of Christ we find the ordinary High Anglican view that the Sacraments are the extension of the Incarnation. He writes, "If we say that Christ is present 'in' the sacrament, we use 'in' metaphorically, as when we say that Christ abides in the Christian and the Christian in Christ. Whenever we study the relation between spirit and matter, whether between God and the world, or our souls or our bodies, our reason and our imagination are always baffled. We can only speak in symbolical language borrowed from space." He condemns the view that the gift promised in the Holy Eucharist is in any sense dependent on faith. "Rather the gift is there, objectively; those who approach with faith discern and appropriate it, those who have no faith are, as it were, blind to the gift, and fail to claim it." He places less than his usual weight on the words of the Article, "And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith."

We have said enough to show our appreciation of a work that will be helpful to all students of theology. We know of no work on the Articles so full of present-day references or so likely to provoke thought on right lines on such subjects as Modernism and the historical articles of the Creed. Mr. Bicknell writes with delightful clarity and never loses his temper. He adopts an attitude on crucial points that is not always ours, but in the main few Evangelicals will quarrel with his treatment of root problems. He has no sympathy with Romanisers and condemns Adoration and Exposition, speaks forcibly against Invocation and has made plain that he has a place in the Church of England as a loyal son. If all High Churchmen were like him there would be no crisis in the Church as far as Roman error is concerned.

DR. PLUMMER'S THESSALONIANS.

A COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

By the Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D. London: *Robert Scott*. 6s. net.

Those who have used Dr. Plummer's earlier Commentaries will know what to expect from his pen. He is employing his well-earned leisure in providing the very kind of Commentary most needed by students. In this volume the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians is treated with all the writer's accustomed and welcome scholarship, clearness and force. After twenty-three pages of helpful guidance in all matters of introduction, come notes on passages, phrases and words, and Dr. Plummer's thorough knowledge of Greek is here put at the disposal of his readers. It is natural to turn to the great passage in the second chapter to learn Dr. Plummer's view, which is that the Restrainer is the Roman Empire. This is an interpretation which, though familiar, is not without its serious, perhaps insuperable, difficulties, even though every other view is set aside as "almost a waste of time" (p. 60). It is curious that, with Dr. Plummer's marvellous acquaintance of the Greek tongue, he has not given more attention to the pretty obvious idea that the Greek verb *κατέχειν* needs an object, especially as the Roman Empire has long ago disappeared. But whether we agree with the author or not, he makes his readers think, and this in a Commentary is surely to be "counted for righteousness." He is to be thanked for and readers are to be congratulated on so valuable an addition to our stock of

first-rate New Testament Commentaries. It is perhaps too much to hope, though it is natural to indulge the wish, that Dr. Plummer should cover all those Epistles of St. Paul which Lightfoot left untouched. In particular, and notwithstanding the available material, it would be a great delight to see something from his pen on the Epistle to the Romans.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

DEVOTIONAL ADDRESSES.

SAINTHOOD, RETREAT ADDRESSES. By Rev. Jesse Brett, L.Th. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 4s. 6d. net.

Mr. Brett reminds us in his preface that the times call for great earnestness and definiteness of spiritual life in all Christians, and that in the addresses "an attempt has been made to meet some of the needs from a Catholic standpoint." We have such expressions as "the order of Catholic life," "a Catholic ideal," "the vastness of Catholic life," until we wonder what meaning the author would have us to attach to the word Catholic. Is there any word in connexion with our religion that has been more misused than this? If we remember rightly it was the late Archdeacon Sinclair who in one of his charges dealt forcibly with this misuse. What warrant has Mr. Brett for saying that the prayers of departed saints "for us are in the terms of the magnificent wholeness of the purpose of God through man." How does he know they pray for us? They may, but we do not know. Again, he speaks of our asking their prayers, presumably by petitions addressed to them, but there is no authority for this in Holy Scripture. Different schools of thought have their modes of expression. That being so we are apt to be prejudiced against those who differ from us. Mr. Brett might dislike the language of Keswick. But we gratefully recognize that he may reach some who are used to the teaching of the more advanced Anglican party and may lead them to a holier life in Christ. Perhaps, after all, it is more a matter of expression than anything else, and there is much in these pages that is calculated to develop Sainthood.

THE INCREASE OF GOD. By Rev. A. H. McNeile, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 3s. 6d. net.

This little book deserves the warm commendation the Bishop of London accords it in his preface. We say this without of course pledging ourselves to approve of everything Dr. McNeile says. • For instance, on the subject of "Parties" he has a chapter which seems to have delighted the heart of the Bishop of London! Very often those who condemn what they call the "party spirit" are themselves the most violent partisans. It is the other man's "party-spirit," not their own, that they condemn. It is the old story—"Orthodoxy is my 'doxy,' heterodoxy is your 'doxy'!" We believe Dr. McNeile is correct in saying that St. Paul would not wish us to scrap our differences if he were here. But on the whole we very much prefer this book on Christian growth to Mr. Brett's, even though we may be reminded that comparisons are odious.

OTHER VOLUMES.

FAERIE TALES FROM BIBLE STORY. By a Country Clergyman. London: *Elliot Stock.* 5s. net.

"A Country Clergyman" is indeed a versatile person. He has published a Hebrew Grammar and Lexicon, written at least one Novel as well as some theological works of distinct value, and has here gathered together some Faerie Tales from the Bible and other sources, telling them in a way

that shows that his versatility includes a knowledge of the child-mind. This is just the book for which many parents are constantly looking.

* * * * *

WHAT HAPPENS AT DEATH. Shall we know ourselves and others in the Hereafter? By a Country Clergyman. London: *Elliot Stock*. 3s. net.

Another volume from the same busy pen, and one worthy to take its place alongside, if not in front of, a good many that have been written to comfort stricken souls in dark days. The writer states the case for identification in the future life with lucidity and force and with an all too rare fidelity to what is written in *The Book*, speaks of the Better Country and the problem of pain and suffering. He gives some remarkable instances of Faith Healing, and by no means the least useful section of the book is the final essay on Prayer.

* * * * *

THE CHILDREN IN CHURCH. Twenty-five addresses to Young People. By the Rev. H. J. Essex, M.A., Chaplain of the Bethany Orphanage, Bournemouth. London: *Robert Scott*. 3s. net.

As the Curate said of the egg at the Episcopal breakfast-table—"Parts are excellent," so we may say of this collection of sermons preached to children. Though carefully phrased there are indications here and there of the ecclesiastical position of the preacher, but at the same time there is a great deal that is suggestive and the language is simple and homely and the illustrations telling.

* * * * *

Prebendary Fox has done good service in reprinting a letter of Richard Cecil—one of the most spiritually minded of the eighteenth-century Evangelicals—bearing on the question of peace. The "Peace" to which the letter refers was probably that made with Russia after the battle of Copenhagen in 1801, and Cecil's letter bases upon it some choice thoughts concerning "the peace proclaimed from above through a Redeemer, sung by angels at His birth, purchased by His death, and by which He opened the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers." At a time when we are expecting the signing of the Peace Treaty which is to end the Great War, the republication of Cecil's letter is specially opportune. It is issued as a neat pamphlet, *A Word on the Peace*, by Mr. C. J. Thynne, price 2d. Some of Cecil's wise "Sayings" are given as an appendix.

* * * * *

It is by no means easy to write a serviceable history which will fix and retain the attention of young children, and at the same time inform and amuse them. Such a task demands at once a mastery of the subject and a working knowledge of a child's mentality, two qualities not always found combined in the same writer. Miss Florence L. Bowman has both qualifications in ample measure, and in her *BRITAIN IN THE MIDDLE AGES* (*Cambridge University Press*, 3s. net) has produced an admirable little work. No picturesque detail which might add to the interest of the narrative is omitted, and it is hardly too much to say that the history reads like a good story well told. The story of King Alfred and of his interviews with Asser and again the battle of Hastings lend themselves to the authoress' method, and are narrated with spirit and good dramatic effect. The account of the making of a knight is also excellent. The period treated ends with the discovery of America by Columbus.

* * * * *

The stream of poetry by soldiers of the great war continues to flow. The *SONGS OF LIFE AND LOVE* (*Arthur H. Stockwell*), by Edward Leader, late of the Coldstream Guards, are immature as might be anticipated by the announcement that all except seven were written before the author joined the Army in his eighteenth year. Many of them, however, are very spirited, and the volume as a whole shows promise of riper and more considered work.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W. 1.

LAST month a reference was made in these notes to the increasing activity of those who advocate systematic Confession to a Priest before Communion, and a small guide on the subject was recommended, viz. **Confession.** *The Confessional*, by Canon Meyrick (3d. net). The subject is so important that opportunity is taken this month to draw attention to more exhaustive books by well-known writers.

The object of this book is strictly defined in its sub-title, *The Teaching of the Church of England as Interpreted and Illustrated by the Writings of the Reformers of the Sixteenth Century*. Bishop Drury does not touch upon Confession or Absolution in the Primitive, Mediæval or Modern Church except when it is necessary for the main purpose which he has in view, which is to illustrate the formularies of our Church from the writings of men who were most concerned in compiling them. The first chapter deals with the Reformer's appeal to Scripture, the next two are concerned with their appeal to history, while the fourth takes us to the Church formularies. It shows what the Reformers did as well as what they said, and the various records of the sixteenth century which bear on this matter are passed under review from King Henry's book against Luther to the various revisions of the Prayer Book in the time of Queen Elizabeth. The book is a valuable and scholarly one. It is clear and convincing. It is unfortunate that it is out of print, and only a few copies remain at 2s. 6d. net.

The late Bishop of Chester published in 1912 a very important and remarkable pamphlet entitled *Anglican Pronouncements upon Auricular Confession Fasting Communion, and some other points of disquietude* (1s. net). The Bishop, as every one knows, is distinguished for very great learning, and the quotations from the writings of decided High Churchmen which he has given in this book are of decided value. The Bishop's own words regarding a movement going on in the Church of England now are as follows: "It is my own profound conviction that the issue between the Church of Rome and the Church of England—in so far as we are not yet ashamed of the Reformation, or ungrateful for the emancipation then at a great cost obtained—is 'the supreme quarrel of all.' I am publishing this pamphlet to help in showing the true drift and significance of certain retrograde, mediævalizing tendencies which have for years been industriously at work among us, and serve, not so much (to borrow Pope Pius IXth's metaphor) as a bell inviting the faithful to enter the Church of Rome, but as a door through which Roman practices, methods and opinions are being introduced and domiciled within our own borders, often by men from whom it is a grief to be compelled to differ, on the mere authority of a wilful eclecticism."

The treatise of Hooker on Confession and Absolution is an important addition to the literature on this subject. A certain school of thought are glad to quote Hooker against Puritan extremes, but they are careful to

ignore his weighty and powerful refutation of Romish errors. Hooker's teaching on this question is above partisanship. It is partly **The Sixth Book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity.** Biblical and partly ecclesiastical, and while retaining many of the old formulæ, he weighs them carefully and distinguishes things that differ. We commend a carefully edited edition by the Rev. J. Harding (1s. net). This volume, which contains an historical introduction, analysis and appendices, forms the Sixth book of the Ecclesiastical Polity.

This is a book for parents to have and to read, who find any influence brought to bear upon their children in the direction of the Confessional.

As the price is 1s. net the outlay is not excessive. The first chapter is entitled "The Position To-day." The second chapter is an inquiry as to what authority exists in Scripture for the practice. The third chapter is devoted to prove that the authority is not English but Roman, and explains the stages in the Reformed Prayer Books and the teaching of our present Book. The last three chapters are concerned with the moral aspects of the matter. "What effect has the Confessional on the lives of those who resort to it?" "What is the result, so far as the confessor himself is concerned?" "What is its influence upon the penitent of either sex?" These are important questions, and fathers and mothers will do well to study with special care the startling facts which Mr. Buckland brings to light.

Of the smaller Manuals for general distribution, the following can be recommended:—*Confession* by Prebendary Eardley Wilmot in the Mission Series published by the National Church League (price 1d. each or 5s. per 100 net). This Manual is intended for general distribution and the meaning and principles of Confession is considered. Firstly, confession to God, and secondly, to one another. The teaching of the Church is carefully and clearly stated. *Confession According to the Bible and the Prayer Book* by the Bishop of Sodor and Man, in the English Church Manual Series (1d. net), contains a useful summary of the chief facts in the history of the Church regarding the questions concerned in the practice of confession. A close survey is made of the teaching of the Prayer Book and the teaching of the Articles and Homilies. Dangers are pointed out, and some needed warnings are included. *Shall I go to Confession?* by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. (½d. each or 4s. per 100 net), is also suitable for wide distribution. Dr. Griffith Thomas has arranged the pamphlet in the form of asking three important questions. "What do we mean by Confession?" and he enlarges upon the answer to this under these headings, (1) Personal Confession of Sin to God; (2) Public Confession of Sins before the Church; (3) Reciprocal Confession of Sins among Christians. He then asks his second question, "Is there no Other Confession of Sins Taught in Holy Scripture?" Under this heading he asks, "What other kind of confession is meant by this question? Does it refer to auricular confession to a priest?" The final question is, "Why is the Bible View of Confession sufficient for all Spiritual Needs?" Number seven of the National Church League Church Leaflet Series also deals with Confession (½d. or 3s. per 100). This leaflet speaks of and gives extracts from the various Ritualistic Manuals which have been issued on the subject. There is a useful extract from the Irish Prayer Book, and special emphasis is laid on the changes in the various revisions of the Prayer Book showing that they were indicative of opposition to all kinds of private confession.