

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

April, 1925

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The February Session of the Church Assembly.

THE two principal subjects before the Church Assembly in February were Church Patronage and Clergy Pensions. The Clergy Pension scheme was adopted in spite of considerable opposition on the part of some of the clergy. The chief objections to the scheme are that only one out of every three of those who pay contributions will obtain any benefits owing to the age of retirement being fixed at seventy, that no provision is made in the scheme for widows and orphans, and that there will be no return of the premiums paid in case of death before the pension begins. We are able to give our readers in this number a full explanation of the Measure by Canon Davies, C.B.E., a member of the Committee which devoted considerable time to the drawing up of the scheme. Discussion of details is still actively going on, and it is possible that there may be some modifications when the Measure comes up for final settlement at the July Session. We sympathise with the difficulty expressed by some of the clergy, who say that they have already made their domestic budgets and pledged their incomes to the fullest extent. They have no margin for an additional tax, especially in view of the proposed charge for dilapidations, and the probable reduction of the tithe rate. A hope has been widely expressed that the Parochial Church Councils will see their way to relieve the clergy of some of these fresh burdens.

Church Patronage.

The discussion on Church Patronage arose out of the Second Report of the Committee appointed to deal with the subject. The

Committee gave some interesting figures regarding the distribution of patronage. There are about 13,775 livings in England. Of the 6,775 in official patronage, 900 rest with the Crown and its Ministers, 3,000 with the Archbishops and Bishops, 760 with Cathedral Chapters, 1,265 with the Incumbents of Mother Parishes, 850 are in University and College Patronage, and the remaining 7,000 are in Private Patronage including Patronage Trusts. The Committee did not make any suggestion of a fundamental change in the whole system. Their first aim was to secure the rights of parishioners. They regarded the demand of the laity to have a voice in the selection of their incumbent as a reasonable one, that ought to be satisfied. This in their opinion could best be done by an enlargement of the powers of the bishop, rather than by entrusting new powers to some other authority. Their second chief proposal was that a Diocesan Board of Patronage should be set up in each diocese, to consist of the Bishop, Archdeacon, Rural Dean, two beneficed clergymen, and four laymen elected by the Diocesan Conference. To these bodies various classes of livings should be transferred. They thought that the patronage of the bishops should be strengthened. One radical proposal to this end was that the principal incumbencies in the larger towns should be in their hands, so that they could more efficiently deal with the spiritual needs of their dioceses.

Episcopal Patronage.

This proposal and a similar one to reduce the patronage of incumbents of mother churches to seven, have been strenuously opposed by the Vicar of Halifax who is the patron of twenty-five livings in and around that town. The Nonconformists of the district have also issued a manifesto protesting against the proposal, as detrimental to local interests. They made the significant declaration that they regarded the work of the Nonconformist Churches as supplementary to the work of the Church of England.

Very strong opposition will also be offered by some of the important Evangelical Trusts. In a number of the larger towns throughout the country the patronage of the most important parishes is in their hands, for example—Bath, Plymouth, Cheltenham, Bradford, Hull, Beverley, Birmingham and Sheffield, and in each of these cases there would be no guarantee of the maintenance of the present teaching or ritual. Many believe that the patronage of the bishops

is already sufficiently large. It has been pointed out that they are already overworked, yet this proposal is to add to their responsibilities in one of the most difficult and delicate matters that can fall to the duty of any man or body of men. The Church at present seems bent on centralization, while every other organization in the country is recognizing the wisdom of decentralizing as much as possible.

Trust Patronage.

The Committee said that Trust Patronage caused them "exceptional difficulty," but they appeared to make some of the difficulty for themselves. Why, for instance, should such trusts "tend to accentuate partisanship"? Why is it a disadvantage to "stereotype particular views in particular parishes"? Is not the great demand at present for the maintenance of continuity in parishes, especially in those where illegal practices have been introduced? The Committee thought that "consideration for the wishes of the parishioners" was excluded under the Trust System. It is considered as much by Trustees as by any other class of patrons. This is really the weakest part of the Committee's Report, and it gives an impression that the members were actuated more by prevailing prejudices than by calm reason. The craze for centralization has made Trusts unpopular with the official Diocesan section. We are not surprised that Sir Thomas Inskip entered a protest against the Committee's view. He could not assent to the extension of episcopal patronage, for "evangelical clergy of perfect loyalty and integrity as well as ability are in many cases practically excluded from enjoying episcopal patronage." He expresses his belief that trust patronage has not "prevented in any way 'healthy development of thought,' and, on the whole, the continuity afforded by the exercise of trust patronage is very much welcomed by parishioners." This is a sufficient answer to the suggestion that Trustees are not free to appoint fit and proper persons.

The Powers of the Diocesan Patronage Boards.

When the Report was under discussion in the Church Assembly the Archbishop of York moved that two representatives of a vacant parish should be placed on the Diocesan Board of Patronage for the purpose of considering any nomination of a clerk to fill the

vacancy which the patron may make to the Bishop. After a discursive debate the proposal was carried. It was thought that this would give the laity a more effective voice in the choice of their incumbent, than if their interests were left altogether in the hands of the Bishop. The Archbishop also proposed that the name of the clergyman nominated to a parish by a patron shall be submitted to the Board of Patronage, and if the Board consider him "not fitted for the adequate discharge of the duties of the particular benefice" he shall not be presented. An appeal may be made to the Archbishop. If this is incorporated in the proposed measure it will be a serious limitation of the present powers of patrons, and may be strenuously resented. It was pointed out that it went a long way towards the abolition of patronage as it now existed in the Church. We have heard the question raised as to how the Prime Minister or the Lord Chancellor would act if their nominees or those of the Crown were rejected by the Board. Serious difficulties might arise in such a case. The desire for centralization is leading to some strange proposals, and will no doubt before long lead to some impossible situations not at present realized.

The Archbishop of Canterbury's Letter to the House of Clergy.

When the House of Clergy met to resume its consideration of the Revised Prayer-Book (Permissive Use) Measure, an important letter was read from the Archbishop of Canterbury. He regarded the position in the matter of rubrical reform as somewhat anxious, and went on to answer the criticism made by "inadequately informed people" on the ground of the dilatoriness of the procedure. He desired that delays should be reduced to a minimum, but efficiency was not to be sacrificed. He hoped the Bishops would have the necessary material placed before them before the close of the present year. The most significant portion of the letter was in the following paragraphs :

"There has, I think, been a certain tendency in our Assemblies, clerical and lay, to adopt during the last two years a notion that we have to construct an almost new Order of Common Prayer, and not merely to amend what is amiss or doubtful or obscure in the heritage we possess. Like other old men, I personally lean to the conservative side in matters liturgical, but I shall, of course, take the utmost care that what comes before the House of Bishops, if I am

still presiding over it, shall be considered with perfectly open mind.”

If the Archbishop's view of the extent of the revision had been borne in mind in recent years we should have been saved the drastic and revolutionary proposals which aim at turning our Prayer Book, and especially our Communion Service, into a Manual of Doctrine subversive of the teaching of our Church.

Saints' Days in the Calendar.

The House showed no disposition to alter the character of the changes which it is adopting. They tended as in the previous sessions to assimilate our teaching and ritual to those of the Church of Rome. When the Calendar came under review, it was proposed that a Commission should be appointed to make historical investigations concerning “the beatification and canonization of Saints.” As the Archdeacon of Macclesfield pointed out, these are distinctly Roman terms. It is well known that the Church of Rome has a prolonged system of investigation, and a well-defined process by which the honour of beatification is conferred upon some past worthy of that Church. This is followed by a similar process of inquiry before the higher honour of canonization is conferred. Fortunately the House of Clergy responded to the appeal to avoid terms so likely to be misunderstood, and finally agreed that the Archbishops should be requested to appoint a Commission to inquire as to the claims of each name proposed for addition to the Calendar. A further resolution made a distinction between names for which some liturgical observance should be provided, and the saints and worthies, and especially local saints for whose commemoration some provision might be made in cases, for example, where churches are dedicated to them. When the Calendar is finally arranged we hope the mistake will be avoided of introducing merely pre-Reformation names and ignoring great leaders of our Church such as Cranmer, and the others who were suggested by the House of Laity.

Corpus Christi.

One of the most retrograde decisions of the House was the adoption of the Thursday after Trinity Sunday as a day for the Commemoration of the Holy Sacrament. This is the date of the Corpus Christi Festival of the Church of Rome. No more striking example could be given of the Anglo-Catholic determination to fall

into line with that Church. No one could seriously regard the statement of Dr. Darwell Stone in making the proposal that the history of the festival did not justify the opinion that the observance was associated with one particular view of the Eucharist. The facts are that in 1215 the doctrine of transubstantiation was proclaimed at the Fourth Lateran Council. In 1230 Juliana, a nun of Liège, had a vision in which she saw a gap in the orb of the moon. By a special revelation she learnt that the gap signified a serious lack in the Church—the absence of a festival for the adoration of the Body of Christ in the Host. In 1264 Pope Urban IV sanctioned the feast. “The institution was,” says Dean Hook, “the natural result of the acceptance of the doctrine of transubstantiation.” It is impossible to dissociate the two. If the doctrine had not been accepted it is improbable that there would ever have been the Festival. By this decision the House of Clergy has gone far to associate our Church with the errors of Rome. When taken in conjunction with other decisions with similar tendencies, it can no longer be maintained that the Revision is producing no changes in the doctrine of our Church. The House of Bishops have a grave responsibility in this matter, and if they accept the proposal the consequences will be serious.

The Assumption of the Virgin, and All Souls' Day.

An attempt was made to introduce the distinctly Romish Festival of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary on August 15, but fortunately it was defeated by the large majority of 107 to 47. Again Dr. Darwell Stone was the mover of the resolution, and again the method of procedure was to avoid the distinctive Roman title and to call it “the Commemoration of the Falling Asleep of the Blessed Virgin Mary.” This proposal is most convincing evidence of the extent to which some of the Anglo-Catholic party desire to go in the Romeward direction.

Yet another instance of this was the adoption of the Roman festival of All Souls' Day. Its history is intimately associated with the Roman doctrine of Purgatory. The festival was instituted to pray for the release from torment of the souls there. When the doctrine was rejected at the Reformation the observance of the Day ceased with it. Canon H. A. Wilson described it as “an unscriptural doctrine and a horrible lie against the love of God. To observe

All Souls' Day almost amounted to a pronouncement as to the state of the departed." He also pointed out the result of these various changes. He said that already one half of the Church of England was completely out of communion with the other half, and that these were wedges driven in, dividing one section of the Church from the other more and more.

It is obvious as a result of these resolutions that some serious events are before our Church. The fateful decision must be made as to whether the Church of England is to be ranged with the Church of Rome or to retain its true place in the ranks of the Reformed Churches.

The Final Decision of the Bishops.

What will be the ultimate issue of the Revision? That is a question which many are asking. It is, of course, impossible to give any definite answer, and it may be foolish to attempt to do so. There are, however, several possibilities which it may be worth while to state briefly. The final form of the Revision rests with the Bishops, and there are several courses which they may adopt. They may accept the whole body of changes made by the House of Clergy, and these may receive the approval of the Conventions and the Church Assembly. If this should happen the whole subject will be debated in the House of Commons, and painful as it may be to Churchmen of all schools, Parliament will be asked to give its decision. The consequences may be a demand for disestablishment and this may ultimately lead to the disruption of the Church. As the Bishops will have these possibilities in their minds, they may determine that this course is at all costs to be avoided. They may endeavour to prepare some new form for the Communion Service, so as to avoid the necessity of the alternative Canons. In this case the Anglo-Catholics may not be satisfied with the proposed form, and may be strong enough to secure the rejection of the whole Revision scheme. This, in the view of many, would not be at all an unsatisfactory result.

A Probable Compromise.

There is, however, another course which may commend itself to the Bishops. It is known that some of their number are very strongly of opinion that every endeavour should be made to avoid the adoption of two or even more forms of the Prayer of Consecration, and desire that a Commission should be appointed to draw

up a form which will be generally acceptable. In order to allow of this being done, the Bishops may decide to exclude the Communion Service from the Revision, and to go on with those portions of the Prayer Book upon which there is a large measure of agreement. This compromise is more likely to give general satisfaction than any other policy that can be suggested. On very different grounds Churchmen widely separated in their views would be prepared to support the proposal, and it would at any rate put off for a time the consideration of the one question on which it seems impossible to attain unanimity.

Elections to the House of Laity.

The election of the new House of Laity will be held during the next two months. Some of the most important decisions in regard to the Revision of the Prayer Book will be made by the new House, it is therefore necessary that the laity of the Church should take care that the members shall represent their views. It has been generally felt that the House during the past five years has not represented the opinions of the great majority of Churchpeople. The members were elected more or less at haphazard. It was the first election, and the procedure was not well understood. The laity have now an opportunity of more careful selection of their representatives. The method of election is still not altogether satisfactory, as the voting rests with the members of the various Diocesan Conferences, and these have already been chosen. Yet with the exercise of care much can be done to secure the choice of those who will be faithful to the teaching of our Church, and will see that our Prayer Book is not mutilated. The views of candidates should be carefully ascertained, and no one should be elected who is not prepared to defend our Communion Service from the introduction of those features which are designed to assimilate it to the Roman Mass. It should be possible in every diocese to make out a list of suitable men and women whose loyalty to the teaching of the Church is assured, and to vote for them and for them only. Organized efforts are being made to secure the election of members who will favour the Romeward trend, and loyal Churchpeople must be prepared to defend the Church from the attacks that are being so vigorously made upon the purity of its teaching and the simplicity and dignity of its services.

THE NEED FOR EVANGELICAL UNITY.

BY CANON H. A. WILSON, M.A., Rector of Cheltenham.

EVERY thoughtful observer of the fortunes of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England to-day must agree that the Party stands at the cross-roads with an opportunity for usefulness unique in its history.

Again and again during the last few years leading men who would not class themselves as Evangelicals have made confident prophecies to the effect that Evangelicals might or could, and even would, lead the Church of England in the near future. The explanation of these favourable forecasts is quite simple.

In the first place there is to be noted the very remarkable change of attitude towards Evangelicals by the Church in general. The old scornful and patronizing talk is now never heard, at any rate in public. Time was when it was the mark of the "superior mind" to gird at Evangelicals as weak-kneed Churchmen and to lecture them for intellectual feebleness and mental incompetence. Those days have gone and a new respect has taken its place. In the National Assembly no speakers have a more attentive and respectful hearing than the recognized Evangelical spokesmen, and not a committee of the Assembly is ever formed without care being taken that the Evangelical point of view is well represented. Not infrequently a vacant bishopric is filled by a man who has more or less direct sympathy with Evangelicals. Too much stress may easily be laid upon the increase of Evangelically-minded Bishops in the Southern Province, since the price which has been paid for this is seen in the constitution of the Northern Province. Ten years ago there were six or seven definitely Evangelical Bishops in the York Upper House; to-day there are probably not three who would accept that designation.

The same studied respect is shown by the non-Evangelical Church newspapers. Occasionally the cloven hoof appears in the more extreme partisan papers, but only occasionally, and never elsewhere. This, then, is one of the explanations of the favourable prophecies delivered respecting the future of Evangelicalism in the Church:

it has won a definite place for itself in the councils of the Church.

In addition to this, these favourable prophecies are inspired by the recognition of two opposite sets of facts. Some section of the Church has got to lead. The Anglo-Catholics have failed to do so, and, on the other hand, there seems to be clear evidence that the general feeling of the mass of the populace is favourable to Evangelicalism. The former remark has been repeatedly made by detached observers, and it is true. The success of the Anglo-Catholic party up till twenty years ago was extraordinary. But the intervening period has revealed the inwardness of the movement, and the easy tolerance of the English Churchfolk has reached its limits. So long as the Anglo-Catholics appeared in the public eye as "persecuted High Churchmen," who only asked to be allowed to exist, they were assured of the sympathy and even active support of a large-hearted public. But the pose is now changed. "High Churchmanship" is repudiated, the Anglo-Catholic proclaims his power. He no longer asks for tolerance but arrogantly demands submission. He denies that the Church of England has an individuality of its own; its destiny is to be merged in the Church of Rome, and that destiny the Anglo-Catholic seeks to hasten. Assuming that they really believe the things they write, the Anglo-Catholics are the only people who do not know that their policy has failed. Except in clerical circles their influence is almost negligible. They have not "got" the laity.

Test the strength of the movement in this way: I suggest that the real test whether a person has embraced sincerely the Anglo-Catholic system is not attendance at an extreme Church, but the systematic use of the Confessional. I recall following an illuminating correspondence in a Church paper in which, one after the other, contributors wrote describing how they could get people to their services but not to Confession. And, moreover, they never will. The ordinary normal English people will never accept the Confessional system again, and that involves the final rejection of the so-called "Catholic" system, for the Confessional is the pivot of the whole scheme.

Anglo-Catholicism will never lead the religious life of the country. It may gain control of the Church of England—that possibility must not be overlooked—but if this should happen it will be because the Church of England will have shrunk into a quasi-Roman Catholic

sect which will luxuriate in a back-water while the main stream of national religion sweeps on unheeding.

Nor is there any likelihood of the Broad Church party leading the religious life of the country. From its very constitution it cannot become popular, in the best sense of the word. We may recognize, and even welcome, the thought-provoking power it possesses, its stimulating force, its challenge to recklessness, the check it imposes on unthinking dogmatism. But as a movement it seems to lack the power of arousing enthusiasm in the simple mind, to be devoid of those qualities which weld a party into a solid whole and to lack a policy which will thrill and inspire its followers.

The residuary legatees are, then, the Evangelicals. Can they seize the opportunity? Do they know the day of their visitation?

We have numbers, we have a policy and an objective, we have a message to thrill and to inspire the heart and to meet human needs. There is only one essential which we lack at the moment—unity. We are not at present united, and that will prove to be a fatal defect if it cannot be remedied.

One of the most serious reflections we can make in this connection is to note how in the past, again and again, Evangelicalism has missed its opportunity by internal dissensions. The disputes between the leading Continental reformers, sometimes on political questions, but mostly on doctrinal matters, limited and weakened the whole influence of the Reformation on the Continent of Europe. Similarly here at home. The narrow-mindedness and lack of sympathy shown by the orthodox and Protestant Churchmen to the Elizabethan Puritans produced Nonconformity, and the lack of foresight and the intolerance shown in the succeeding age converted Nonconformity into Dissent. So the religious life of England and the English-speaking world was split in two. Again, in the eighteenth century, the pitiful controversy about predestination divided Evangelicals into Arminians and Calvinists, produced a terrible cleavage in their ranks and destroyed the greater influence which they would have had as an united party.

It seems just now that the same calamity is in process of taking place. Unity is essential and unity is threatened. No one in touch with our internal politics will question this, but, in any case, the subject is too delicate for proofs of this statement to be ventilated here.

The questions upon which we differ among ourselves are very well known : the nature and character of the Authority of Scripture, what exactly is meant by " the inspiration of the Bible," and the doctrine of the Atonement.

I do not propose to attempt the discussion of even one of these very large questions, but one or two superficial observations may be made.

" Criticism " of the Bible is a fact which has got to be reckoned with. It is an elaborate and complicated matter of study, and the way in which minds of different types will react to it must inevitably vary. But, at the same time, it ought not to be difficult in a general way to draw a clear line between what is admissible and what is inadmissible. Believing criticism is one thing and unbelieving criticism a very different thing. In other words, the popular classification, critics and non-critics, is fatally wrong. " No one," wrote Professor Orr, " who studies the Old Testament in the light of modern knowledge can help being to some extent a Higher Critic." Our religion is an historical religion ; its foundations are rooted in history. Consequently, those historical facts must be open to examination. We cannot have it both ways : claim historicity and rule out historical examination. Probably no one desires to do so. The real issue does not lie between those who uncritically accept and those who criticize the content of Scripture, but between those who accept and those who deny that the Bible contains a supernatural revelation. Was the Jewish religion the result of the Holy Spirit taking under His tutelage, in an absolutely unique and unparalleled way, a " chosen people," developing and training them until they were equipped to receive the final revelation in the Person of Jesus Christ ? Or was it the outcome of a religious people evolving a lofty monotheism solely by the activity of their own unaided spiritual genius : was it the outcome of a merely natural process, like civilization, operating in another sphere of human experience ? The former is " believing criticism " and the latter " unbelieving." The former is probably helpful and illuminating : the latter is of only speculative interest and leads nowhere.

It is along some such line as this that a reconciliation might be made among ourselves. Personally, I have never met an Evangelical who would deny the Supernatural Character of the Biblical Revelation.

The doctrine of the Atonement is again a matter upon which there is much division among us. It is a commonplace that this doctrine has developed along three main lines: (1) the substitutionary view, (2) the moral influence view, and (3) the representative view. The centre of gravity of Christianity for Evangelicals has always been and must be the Cross, and here the Evangelicals of the eighteenth century were true to type. But because they preached the Atonement only in terms of the substitutionary view it should not be argued that a man is not a faithful Evangelical who stresses the other two views.

I believe here, again, an immense amount of misunderstanding exists among us. Every doctrine which lives, lives simply because of the truth it expresses. Now, the substitutionary view of the Atonement has lived because it embodies an eternal truth. The truth may require re-expression: it may have been crudely stated. But the very fact that this theory lives on—call it the substitutionary view, or the penal view, or the transactional view, or what you will—proves that it embodies truth. What is needed is a frank and open discussion of such a subject as this among Evangelicals, and it would almost certainly be found that the differences were of small importance. We do not altogether understand one another's mind.

What we need is a Conference that will face these matters and others like them. Not a Conference which seeks to frame an eirenicon in vague language and ambiguous terminology which anyone can accept, but a Conference which will boldly talk out these questions with a view to arriving at an understanding.

It is very largely suspicion which keeps us apart from one another, and that suspicion can only be dispersed by free and open discussion.

For this reason the Cheltenham Conference is taking the need for Evangelical Unity as its subject when next it meets in June next. In years gone by we have dealt with difficult subjects quite fearlessly. But no subject so difficult and delicate as this has ever been before us.

If we are used by God to heal the breach and unite our ranks in one fellowship we shall have done much for the whole religious life of the Church and the nation.

PRAYER BOOK REVISION IN THE HOUSE OF CLERGY.

BY THE VEN. ARCHDEACON THORPE, B.D.

THE work of Prayer Book Revision has now advanced so far that we are provided with definite material for serious consideration. The conclusion, so far, of the deliberations of the House of Clergy and the issue of the Amendments of the Drafting Committee (Clergy IA) place before us the materials which are almost certain to come before the House of Bishops without serious alteration. It is useful to remind ourselves that the results so far reached represent the conflux of two streams of thought and doctrine. The first of these may be described as the desire for Revision proper—that is, the bringing the language, phrases, and terms used in the Book of Common Prayer up to date by modernizing its language so that it may be the better understood of the people. Rubrics, too, that deal with a state of Society passed away, and Psalms, whose language and thought are regarded generally as not entirely harmonious with the spirit of the New Covenant, clearly call for adjustment. The expansion of our religious activities, necessitating the provision of other Services additional to those already provided, clearly points to the wisdom of adding Services for special occasions, such as Harvest Festivals, so that zeal and enthusiasm may be regulated by Church authority rather than left to the undisciplined fervour of individuals or groups.

Perhaps, also, a more frequent remembrance in our Services of the Church in Paradise, provided it were guarded from abuse and tainted associations, would not have aroused serious disagreement and would be regarded as within the confines of legitimate Revision.

But all along another school of thought has contributed a very definite element, constantly emerging in proposals and debates, and now clearly discernible in the conclusions reached. This school has seen in Revision an opportunity for obtaining a footing in the Liturgy for certain doctrines which they contend are there already, implicitly at least, but which they know are so seriously denied as to lay them open to the charge even of dishonesty in making the declarations they are required to make in order to stand in the

teaching ranks of the Church and enjoy its emoluments and opportunities. One cannot but sympathize with such men, for it is hateful to a Christian, and an English Christian especially, that any should assert that there are even colourable grounds for charging him with dishonesty in making, or dereliction in keeping, his contracts. Two things ought to be borne in mind respecting this section of the Church, unfortunately allowed to assume to itself the title of Anglo-Catholic. The first is that the whole question of Revision has come before us as the result of the Letters of Business partly issued because of illegalities, excesses, and doctrinal teachings which have been carried on by the extreme wing of that section and which the Royal Commission found "must be made to cease." The attempt to defeat the conclusions of the Royal Commission by actually introducing an alternative Prayer Book, to be made permissible and therefore legitimate, which allows sufficient justification for these practices and doctrines to be continued and extended, has caused most of the difficulties (not all) in the way of unanimous and agreed Revision.

It is notorious that this section do not seek support for their views in the well-known appeal of the Church of England to Holy Scripture and the primitive Church. Their appeal is a variation of that of the Roman Catholic Church to Scripture and tradition interpreted by an infallible Pope, but it is at the base the same in kind and it leads to somewhat similar conclusions. Their appeal is to Catholic traditions or "heritage"; Ancient Liturgies; present actual "opinion" and "practice" (sometimes described as "the facts of the situation"); and the principle of mutual concessions between "opinions." It is not, therefore, cause of surprise that in the most important matter—namely the Eucharistic office—the House of Clergy were unable to argue on an alternative Canon. The House was not agreed in doctrine, because its members are not agreed in the authority to which they appeal. They do not all agree with the doctrine expressed in the present Prayer Book for the same reason, and consequently they desire an office with which their doctrines will harmonize. Since the Reformation the appeal of the Church of England, with the consent and support of her greatest scholars, has been to Holy Scripture and the primitive Church. This no longer satisfies all, and the reversion of a section of her clergy to the mediæval position for the determining

sound doctrine now marks far and away the most serious thing in the Church of England.

Before the work of Revision was entered on three questions urgently demanded decision in view of prevalent teaching in the Church : 1. What is the true doctrine of the Eucharist ? 2. What is the doctrine of the Church of England ? 3. What is the authority to decide ? These questions have been carefully avoided in the House of Clergy, but they have yet to be faced and decided at whatever cost. Agreed Revision waits on that decision. And the merits of the present Canon in the Prayer Book were never considered, nor any cause shown why on account of its defects an alternative is needed.

Before considering a few points which illustrate the doctrinal departure of the Revision by the House of Clergy from Reformation doctrine, attention may be drawn to the very serious change involved in the provision of an alternative Prayer Book at all. Hitherto, whatever criticism it might be open to, the Prayer Book was the Common, or United Manual of Public Worship in the whole Church. Parties there have been all along since the Reformation, but the Prayer Book was used by all alike. It was above party. Its wonderful balance, in the Holy Communion office, was secured by the simple sequence of its parts, and, above all, by its close adherence to Holy Scripture. Nothing in it could be shown to be inconsistent with the First Great Communion in the Upper Room. It has been, therefore, capable of the same width of interpretation by individual minds and consciences as the New Testament, *but of nothing wider or later*. Indeed, to quote Dr. Bethune-Baker, "The fine religious sense of our Reformers served them so well that they gave us an order purged of every idea and suggestion that, judged by the standards of their time, could be regarded as irrational or superstitious, yet preserving all the ancient constituents and characteristics of the rite to which its efficiency, age after age, has been due."¹ If this present proposal, or any alternative Communion office, is set forth by authority, Common or United Prayer will no longer prevail. The parochial system will be ended in urban areas and discordant congregationalism take its place. In country parishes there may be a few cases where both offices will be used at different hours, but

¹ Church of England Handbooks, No. 14 : *The Meaning of the Order for Holy Communion*.

even then Common Worship will be no more. Judging by what we see around us, wherever the Incumbent is an Anglo-Catholic no tolerance will be shown, and the laity must accept what the priest provides or go elsewhere, which in many cases will mean nowhere, or to the Dissenting Chapel—as at present in so many cases. When people move from one place to another, they may find themselves in a parish where “continuity of doctrine and practice” has worked out in such a way as to offer them forms of worship they cannot use and which alienate them from public worship. And this will apply equally all round. What a contrast, to her disadvantage, will the Church of England present to the Roman Church here, with its one doctrine and one Service of the Mass, found by a devout Romanist wherever he goes. If ever there was an uncatholic proposal it is that in the same diocese there should be differing Eucharistic offices and their use dependent on the individual preference of priests. Those who advocate such an arrangement have other ends in view than conformity to historical precedent.

It was stated by clergy of quite opposite schools during the debates that they could perceive no doctrinal differences between the Prayer Book Canon and the alternatives now proposed. One wondered why it had not occurred to them to inquire how it has come to pass that a great many, and they not the least learned, of the clergy take a quite opposite view? The earnestness with which the leaders of the A.C. section of the House demanded nothing less than the “concessions” they had obtained in the Jerusalem Chamber certainly did not support that view. If words, and the order of words, mean anything it will not be seriously denied that words and ideas not at present in the P.B. office are in the alternative Canons; that these words have doctrinal significance or suggestion, and that the whole order has been orientated in the direction of the Roman Mass. The contention of this paper is that there are serious doctrinal differences, and that those differences are bound to have a serious bearing on the declarations to be made by the clergy on entering a new sphere of ministry, or on ordination. There is no need to labour the point that if the proposed alternatives are put forth by authority, whichever of them he may select to use, every clergyman will be bound by the doctrinal content of all three—that is, by the doctrine of the P.B. and that of the two alternatives. The Anglo-Catholic will perhaps have

little difficulty, inasmuch as he will regard the P.B. office as merely defective, and his intention in making his declaration will cover all that is implied or permitted in the alternative he chooses. But others will not be able to use his method with their judgments and consciences. Convinced that the alternatives to the P.B. office allow men to hold and teach (1) the wrong anaphora, or offering to the Father of the Consecrated Bread and Wine before being partaken of ; (2) the anamnesis, or memorial before the Father, wrongly asserted to have been willed by our Lord ; (3) and the invocation of the Holy Spirit to sanctify the consecrated bread and wine before partaking, involving a doctrine nowhere found in Holy Scripture and inconsistent with the nature and office of the Holy Spirit, they will be unable, as honest men, to make their declaration. In addition to these matters they will be faced with the Roman idea of Sacrifice, which, starting with the opening form of Preparation, where twice over in anthems the use of the term " the Altar of God " cannot fail to lead the unlearned to refer it to the Holy Table (the anthem is taken directly from the ordinary of the Roman Mass), runs like a thread through the whole service, being especially seen in the threefold reference to Sacrifice in the Consecration prayers. Supplemented by ceremonial, hymns and teaching, the first of these references to sacrifice will be identified with the Sacrifice of Christ in the bread and wine—the very essence of the Roman error—as now permitted, and so authorized, doctrine in the Church of England. That will be a burden too heavy for the Church to bear.

Another feature in the alternative Canon is the way in which the growing (but unscriptural and uncatholic) practice of Hearing Mass (or Non-Communicating attendance) is facilitated. The careful distinction between the Communicants and the people in the office, combined with pulpit and other teaching, will certainly assist in increasing the " devotional " use of the elements as distinguished from their only use as instituted by Christ—that they should be consumed by the worshippers.

In this connection the second of the General Rubrics at the end of the office is to be noted. " It is much to be wished that at every celebration of the Lord's Supper the worshippers present, not being reasonably hindered, will communicate with the Priest." This rubric is taken almost *verbatim* from the decrees of the Council of

Trent (Sess. xxii. cap. vi. *De Sacrif. Missae*). "The most holy synod could wish that in every Mass the faithful assisting would communicate, not only in spiritual affection, but also by the sacramental reception of the Eucharist, etc." "The Council had it in its power to provide an effectual remedy for the evils which had arisen from non-communicating attendance and private Masses. Nevertheless, it contented itself with a very faint expression of disapproval, and deliberately perpetuated the practice to which so many abuses, and so much error in doctrine, could trace their rise" (see Scudamore, *The Communion of the Laity*). By a similar faint and halting rubric the practice is now to be encouraged in the Church of England.¹ It is enough to make St. Chrysostom turn in his grave.

It is to be feared that some passages in the Revision will not enhance the reputation of the clergy with exegetical scholars. Some of the new Proper Prefaces, for instance, certainly put a great strain on intelligent thinking. For instance, those for the Feast of the Transfiguration and All Saints' Day. The former contains a most doubtful interpretation of the purpose of the Transfiguration ("that we might be transformed, etc."), and the latter an interpretation of Hebrews xii. 1, which cannot stand. But the worst example is found in the Proper Preface for the Consecration, or Anniversary, of a Church: "Who, though Thy Glory is in all the world and Thy greatness is unbounded, dost vouchsafe to hallow for Thy Name places meet for Thy worship." It is a confusion of thought to identify Christian Churches with the Temple. God did not hallow synagogues as He did the Temple. The Christian House of Worship is lineally descended from the synagogue—not from the Temple (Vitringa). We, not God, consecrate our Churches. The assertion of the new Preface is, moreover, in direct collision with our Lord's words to the woman of Samaria and with St. Stephen's speech (St. John iv. 20, 21, 24; Acts vii. 48, 49).

The increased attention fixed on the Virgin Mary in the Revision, and especially the introduction of her name in the Canon of the Eucharistic office is another sign, together with the introduction of days for the observance of such festivals as Corpus Christi and All Souls, showing in what direction the thoughts of the majority in the House of Clergy are turned. This fact is certainly causing High Churchmen to pause and think. Thus the Bishop of Pretoria,

¹ See Church of England Handbooks, No. 7: *Hearing Mass*.

writing in the *Church Times* in November last, and protesting against the suggestion of the introduction of the Festival of the Assumption, expresses his "growing concern at the drift of Anglo-Catholicism within the borders of the Church of England," which he definitely stated to be "towards Rome." "To subordinate," said the Bishop, "our Anglican *lex credendi* to the Roman *lex orandi* is to betray our trust and to sell the pass." The awful extravagances of Mariolatry in the Roman Communion surely ought to have imposed a greater restraint on the House of Clergy.

The duty of those who stand for the Church of England as at once Catholic and Reformed, is to pray that God's overruling guidance and Providence may save our Bishops from failing in their duty to the truth of Jesus Christ and endow them with a right judgment. And, moreover, to pray for themselves, that with courage, wisdom, charity, and insistence they take their share, however small it may be, in opening the eyes of the nation to the dangers that beset the Church of England, and through her the whole religious life of England.

Man and God, by Louisa C. Poore (Elliot Stock, 4s. 6d. net), has reached a second edition. It contains a statement of the beliefs of the writer and how they were attained.

The Roman Church and Heresy, by C. Poyntz Stewart, M.A. (C. J. Thynne and Jarvis, 2s. 6d. net), gives an account of the persecution of heretics, with special reference to the influence of the Vatican. The history contains translations of many passages from rare books and documents in French, Italian, and Latin. The Rev. Walter Limbrick writes a Foreword in which he deals with the present-day teaching of the Roman Church on persecution. A number of pictures of medals and of frescoes in the Vatican illustrate the connection of the papacy, and its interest in the persecution of the Huguenots.

The S.P.C.K. publishes *A Confirmation Book* for the use of catechists and godparents, by the Rev. Ambrose J. Wilson, D.D., Vicar of St. Mary's, Oldham (1s. 6d. net). It consists of Sixteen Instructions following the lines of the Catechism. It is full of sound advice, and in the main loyal in its teaching to our Church's standards, though not altogether with the Evangelical emphasis.

THE CLERGY PENSION SCHEME.

BY CANON F. C. DAVIES, M.A., C.B.E.

(Member of the Clergy Pensions Committee).

IT has been obvious for years that the failure of the Church of England to provide adequate pensions for her aged clergy is a blot on the administrative ability of a great National Church, and the more so since owing to the comparatively small remunerations these clergy as a rule receive, it has been impossible for them to provide for old age themselves. The result is that many are compelled to remain in their posts when quite incapable of carrying on the duties of the Ministry in an efficient manner. It is true that the Incumbents Resignation Act provides that an income of not more than one-third of the value of the living may be given them if a Commission appointed by the Bishop decides to do so ; but a man naturally hesitates to resign when he is not certain that he will get even this, and moreover, he knows that his successor will be financially hampered owing to the payment that has to be made to the retiring Incumbent.

It must also be remembered that no pension can be given under the Incumbents Resignation Act unless the Incumbent has been seven years at least in that living. Many a man therefore dare not at an advanced age take an easier post, since in the event of breaking down before another seven years have elapsed, he can receive nothing. All this tends to show that the present state of things cannot be defended.

One cannot speak too highly of the excellent effort which has been made by the Clergy Pensions Institution to meet the difficulty from a voluntary point of view. It has been able to supplement the annuity of £15 15s. at the age of 65, which each beneficiary has purchased for himself by the payment of a small annual premium, with the sum of £36 5s. This entitles the recipient to an annuity of £52 at the age of 65 ; to this the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have in most cases added another £75, thus making £127 per annum, a sum woefully insufficient to retire upon if nothing is taken out of the living. It will be seen, therefore, that this scheme, good as it is, does not adequately meet the situation.

When the Church Assembly was first constituted it was felt

necessary that something must be done to meet this crying need. A committee was therefore appointed to look into the matter and report. The first question that had to be decided was whether the system should be a compulsory one or not, and the Church Assembly decided that the principle of compulsory payments should be adopted. The second principle agreed on was that the richer livings should be asked to contribute up to a certain limit a larger proportion than the smaller ones for the same rate of pension, on the ground that those who are better off should help their poorer brethren.

The problem, however, to be faced was by no means an easy one. When we bear in mind that the average age of the clergy is 52, it will be clear to anyone with the slightest actuarial knowledge that the liabilities that would have to be met even for a pension of £200 paid at the age of 70 was an exceedingly heavy one.

The problem, however, was bravely attacked, with the result that after nearly thirty meetings of the committee a Clergy Pension measure was drafted and submitted to the Church Assembly in November, 1924, with the result that general approval was given, and a newly appointed committee instructed to consider any amendments that might be necessary, and report to the February, 1925, Session.

We will now endeavour to present the main features of the measure as placed before the November Session of the Church Assembly and the steps taken to meet the difficulties in the way.

It was soon found after consulting the actuary that to provide a pension of £200 at the age of 70 for all clergy now living would entail a liability which would be quite impossible to meet. After taking into consideration the resources which we might be able to rely upon it was found that the scheme would have to be limited to those under the age of 55 or possibly 56, and that all over that age would have to be left out of the measure, they of course making no contribution to the fund and remaining in exactly the same position with regard to the future as at the present time, viz. : If a clerk is over the fixed age on the appointed day, then his pension provision will be made up of :

(a) Not more than one-third of the income of the benefice, as provided in the Incumbents Resignation Act, 1871.

(b) Not more than £75 per annum under the regulations of

the scheme of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, which are still applicable in these cases.

(c) A grant from a voluntary fund raised and controlled by the pensions authority, the amount of such grant to depend on the success of the fund.

It will be seen, therefore, that when the present clergy over 56 pass away, the Incumbents Resignation Act will be entirely repealed, and, to quote the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury, "the scheme, if passed, would roll away a mischief, a harm which has been to my mind simply terrible for a great number of years past, viz. the principle that out of the income of the present Incumbent the pension of his predecessor had to be found."

We will now deal in detail with the condition under which a pension will be paid to those who on the appointed day are within the scope of the Act, viz. those who are then under the age of 56 years and are in the receipt of £100 per annum or over.

In the first place, he will be required to pay 3 per cent. on his official nett income, from £100 per annum up to £675, according to the following table :

CONTRIBUTION TABLE

COLUMNS 1 and 2 show the Amount of Assessable Clerical Income, exceeding and not exceeding respectively the amounts entered therein ; COLUMN 3 shows the amount of half-yearly contribution in each case.

				£ s. d.	
Exceeding £100 but not exceeding	£125	.	.	1	17 6
"	125	"	"	2	5 0
"	150	"	"	2	12 6
"	175	"	"	3	0 0
"	200	"	"	3	7 6
"	225	"	"	3	15 0
"	250	"	"	4	2 6
"	275	"	"	4	10 0
"	300	"	"	4	17 6
"	325	"	"	5	5 0
"	350	"	"	5	12 6
"	375	"	"	6	0 0
"	400	"	"	6	7 6
"	425	"	"	6	15 0
"	450	"	"	7	2 6
"	475	"	"	7	10 0
"	500	"	"	7	17 6
"	525	"	"	8	5 0

				£	s.	d.
Exceeding £550 but not exceeding £575				8	12	6
„ 575 „ „			600	9	0	0
„ 600 „ „			625	9	7	6
„ 625 „ „			650	9	15	0
„ 650 „ „			675	10	2	6
„ 675				10	10	0

Secondly, he must have served 40 years to obtain the full pension and at least 15 years to obtain any pension. The following table will explain the position :

PENSION TABLE

COLUMN 1 shows the qualifying period of pensionable service ; COLUMN 2, the rate of pension in cases where the pension is entered upon at or above the age of 70 ; COLUMN 3, the rate of pension on retirement by reason of permanent disability under the age of 70.

15 years	£	£	28 years	£	£
16 „	34	25	29 „	98	77
17 „	38	27	30 „	105	83
18 „	42	30	31 „	112	90
19 „	46	32	32 „	120	98
20 „	50	35	33 „	128	107
21 „	55	38	34 „	137	117
22 „	60	41	35 „	146	127
23 „	65	44	36 „	155	138
24 „	70	48	37 „	164	149
25 „	75	53	38 „	173	161
26 „	80	59	39 „	182	173
27 „	86	65	40 years (or over)	191	186
	92	71		200	200

If he retires before 70 he must be certified by medical examination to be unfit. In the event of a compulsory contributor who has paid contributions under the measure retiring before he has qualified for any pension, his contributions will be repaid to him with $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. simple interest.

We will now deal with the position of beneficiaries under the Clergy Pensions Institution.

The status of those members who are outside the measure owing to their age will be in no way prejudiced, their liabilities being a first charge on the Pension Fund ; the security behind them will be even greater than before.

With regard to those who come under the measure, they will

receive a pension at the age of 65 (if they retire) at the rate of not less than £52 per annum, and at 70 years at the rate of £225 per annum. In either case it must be remembered that they have only paid for an annuity of £15 15s. at the age of 65, the remainder coming out of the Augmentation Fund which has been subscribed.

It may be well next to consider the sources from which the funds will be raised. The first source is of course the 3 per cent. on the nett incomes of the clergy; by itself this would not be nearly sufficient to provide the required pensions, and thus further resources had to be found. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners will give a capital sum of £350,000, and in addition £100,000 will be available each year.

The whole of the assets of the Clergy Pensions Institution will be taken over, subject to the interests of the present beneficiaries being preserved, and also a certain proportion of the profits of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office.

The Church Assembly will be required in addition to provide, as a first charge on the Central Fund, a sum of £50,000. This will make the Pensions Fund actuarially solvent. But it is hoped that charitable contributions may eventually be forthcoming from many individual laymen, and there is no reason why the fund, if wisely managed, should not in twenty years' time or less, when the heavy liabilities of the older members ceases, be able to increase the pension to £250 or even £300 per annum.

It will be necessary now to deal with some of the criticisms that have been made on the measure. One of the most frequent is that it makes no provision for widows and orphans. The obvious answer to this is that to overload the measure at first would be gravely to jeopardize its passage into law, and moreover the difficulty of providing at the present juncture the extra fund would be insuperable. As time goes on this great need will undoubtedly have to be met, but we must go step by step.

A desire has also been very generally expressed that the contributions should be returnable if the pension is not claimed, on the ground that the widow would be worse off if the contributor died before claiming the pension. Anyone, however, with the slightest actuarial knowledge will realize that to do this either the pension would have to be largely reduced or the contributions increased.

If the contributions were returnable they would have to be at the rate of 6 per cent. instead of 3 per cent., or the pension would have to be reduced nearly 50 per cent. Either alternative would be destructive to the measure. The best solution of the problem for those who desire to provide for a widow and would be willing to pay at the rate of 6 per cent. is, that they should pay the extra 3 per cent. to a life Assurance Office and thus provide a sum at death that would be available for their dependants. It has been suggested that an option should be given by which a man might choose whether he should pay for returnable premium or not ; the difficulty here is again an actuarial one. It is easy enough to provide actuarially a system of returnable or non-returnable premium for the whole body of clergy, but if you give a choice, owing to the impossibility of knowing how many would avail themselves of returnable and how many of non-returnable premium, the actuarial problem would be an exceedingly difficult one and the whole basis of the present measure would have to be altered, and the opposition of other powerful interests in the Insurance world might be aroused. Surely under the circumstances it is better to pass the measure as it now stands and leave the individual to provide, if he so desire, by assurance against death for his dependants, and to endeavour by means of a Voluntary Fund to meet the needs of those who can only pay for the pension. There remain now to deal with only the inevitable hard cases, which we believe will be few. It is felt that these could be dealt with on their merits by Diocesan Pensions Funds, helped also by a Voluntary Fund started by the Pensions Authority, to which it is hoped substantial donations would be forthcoming by the laity.

We earnestly hope, moreover, that the clause in the measure which ensures that each Parish Church Council will be asked to pay the premium of its clergy will be responded to, and that thus the extra financial burden which so many clergy bear may be lifted from their shoulders ; this help should be the more readily forthcoming since the Parish would not be called upon to meet the greater burden which would be thrown upon it of helping the succeeding incumbent to pay the pension which, under the Incumbents Resignation Act, may be required to be paid to his predecessor.

There is another point of considerable importance which arises

in the case of those who may be working overseas, or in education or similar employments. They may remain in the scheme by continuing the payment of the premium on a voluntary basis by agreement with the Pensions Authority. Should they then come back into work either as Incumbents or Curates, the compulsory payment would, of course, again be resumed and their pension assured.

We may now sum up the main advantages of the measure. It will bring about the repeal of the Incumbents Resignation Act at once for all those under the appointed age, and substitute for the payment of a retiring Incumbent by his successor of a pension out of the living an assured pension from an independent source. It will enable an elderly man to accept an easier post without the haunting fear that if he has to retire before seven years have elapsed, he will have no claim under the Incumbents Resignation Act to any pension at all.

It will assure all who have served not less than 40 years upon attaining the age of 70, a pension of £200 should he wish to retire ; and to those who have served a less number of years, provided there be at least 15 years' service, a lesser pension calculated on actuarial lines at the age of 70.

In cases of disability the pension would be slightly less. In all cases there is a minimum limit of 15 years' service. The pension would be proportionate up to the cases in which 40 years have been served, when it would be the full amount, viz. £200 (*see* Tables). And it is framed on such sound actuarial lines that it is practically certain that by the time new ordinands have served 40 years, the pension will be substantially increased by the accruing surplus, which it is hoped may be sufficiently large to assist also the widows and orphans of the clergy and to provide other benefits under the scheme.

The measure may not at first accomplish all that we could desire, but it is a substantial step in the right direction, and will remove many anomalies which now exist, and place the position of those who come under the scheme when they grow old on a sounder basis.

Since writing the above, the measure has been before the February Session, the following slight amendments being agreed to :

(1) That men drawing pensions of £200 per annum might do a moderate amount of work and receive a moderate amount of remuneration with the sanction of the Bishop.

(2) A new sub-section to Clause 27 which reads as follows ;
 " Where an incumbent who has held his benefice at the date of the passing of this Measure claims upon resignation a pension under this Measure the pensions authority, if it shall be of opinion that according to the practice now prevailing he would have had a reasonable expectation of getting from his benefice a pension exceeding that which he would get under the Measure, may award him an increase of pension up to the amount of £100 per annum."

The New Art Library of Messrs. Seeley, Service & Co. provides a series of works on various phases of the practice of art by well-known and eminent representatives of the different sections treated. The latest volume—*Landscape Painting*—is by Adrian Stokes, R.A. (15s. net), and is a valuable addition to the series. It covers every aspect of the subject, and gives the student practical advice on those details of his work upon which true success depends. From his long and extensive experience of every variety of landscape he is able to give suggestions of great value as to the best methods of treatment. There is a wealth of illustration, and numerous diagrams and sketches by the author make the book specially useful to beginners.

Church and Chapel. What each may learn from the other, by one who has served both (S.P.C.K., 1s. net), is a series of papers " to show the working methods of the Church of England to the Nonconformist, and those of Nonconformity to the Churchman." There are many interesting facts and contrasts noted. On one point we must express our disagreement from the writer. He says: " Some churches have High Mass as the principal service of the day. To the Evangelical Protestant this is nothing but Romanism. But why should it be so regarded? Leave out the words High Mass; call it Holy Communion, or, if you like, ' Breaking of Bread.' Is it not the Lord's own service, and ought it not to be the principal service?" The writer is guilty of the common mistake of regarding a Holy Communion, mutilated by the omission of the central essential feature, the partaking of the elements, as " our Lord's own service." It is obviously nothing of the kind. It is the substitution of the idea of sacrifice for that of communion—the error which has led to the present divided condition of our Church.

A collection of short addresses by the Rev. Charles Brown, D.D., is published by the Religious Tract Society under the title *How the Kingdom Comes* (2s. 6d.). Many of them are answers to important questions, such as: Why should a man trust in God? Who knows what happens at death? What is my cross? They are full of thought, devotion, and spiritual suggestion.

CATHOLICITY AND COMPROMISE ;

OR

“ WHY CANNOT EVANGELICALS BE MORE TOLERANT ? ”

BY THE RIGHT REV. E. A. KNOX, D.D.

THE object of this article is to answer the question, “ Why cannot you Evangelicals display more liberality of mind ? You are not asked to give up the present Prayer Book, nor to read one service from the Revised Book. All that you are asked to do is to face facts. The so-called ‘ Catholic ’ revival has beyond all dispute established itself in the Church of England. It is only natural that this undeniable fact should be recognized in the formularies and public worship of the Church, that all suspicions of disloyalty should be frankly and courageously abandoned. Let those who differ be content to extend toleration to one another. On this condition anarchical extremists can be brought to order, peace and goodwill restored, and a reunited Church can go out to evangelize the world. In the name of charity and of brotherly kindness withdraw your opposition, and allow reality of worship to those who find that they cannot use the present Prayer Book sincerely and honestly in their devotions. In furtherance of this appeal brotherly conferences have been held in the House of Clergy between Evangelicals and High Churchmen : a spirit of conciliation has been exhibited on both sides : agreement on difficult questions has been reached. What then is the meaning of this stubborn opposition ? Do you wish to treat us for all ages to the unhappy narrowness of the sixteenth century ? May we not expect the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the twentieth century to meet the wants of the present day ? ”

It has been necessary to expand the question with which we started in order to present the issue, as fairly as we can, from the point of view of those who propound it. We live in an age of toleration, toleration which gathers more weight than we always realize from the forces of absolute religious indifference behind it. No appeal is less popular than the appeal to authority. Conformity to established usage is regarded almost as a sin, defiance of custom as a sign of enlightenment. The whole trend of public opinion is on the side of license, of experiment, of appeal to the

standard of practical results. In such an atmosphere defence of a Prayer Book that has been in use for centuries is no easy task. Yet we hope to show solid grounds for our attitude of resistance to proposed changes in the Communion service as the principal point at issue.

Our first answer will be this. The question put to us implies that alteration of services is a matter that concerns the clergy only; it leaves the laity altogether out of account. Nothing is more certain than that the whole demand for Revision of any doctrinal importance would fall to the ground, if the laity were given the power to decide which form of service they would prefer. When first the cry of "Life and Liberty" was sounded, a large part of its popularity was due to the hope which its advocates held out that the laity would have at least increased control of the choice of incumbent and of the ordering of services. The Parochial Church Council was to have powers which in point of fact have never been conferred upon it. It was suggested in the Church Assembly that these powers would be found in the Church Patronage Bill. But they are not there. The main feature of the Bill is the extent to which it transfers a considerable amount of lay patronage to Bishops, and increases the power of Bishops to object to nomination of incumbents on other grounds than those of ritual and doctrine.¹

It is by no mere oversight that these powers are refused to the laity. It is part of the so-called "Catholic" system. So far back as 1852 Archbishop Gray of Capetown, recording an interview with Dr. Pusey, tells us: "found him alarmed at the readiness with which the whole Church was disposed to give power on points of doctrine to laity. Found he did not agree with the view that their assent should be asked on points of doctrine: regarded ancient precedent as complimentary more than as involving privileges." It is to this deeply rooted principle that the laity have no right to be consulted on points of doctrine, rather than to mere self-will, that we may attribute the deliberate defiance of the wishes of congregations by many clergy in regard to ritual or ordering of services. The clergy as intermediaries between God and the laity impose on the latter such observances as God has ordered

¹ Some amendments, since these words were written, confer on the parishioners *qualified* powers of objection to proposed nominees for presentation.

for their benefit, through the Church, that is, through clerical tradition.

Now, whatever doubts may be raised as to the interpretation of our Formularies, one feature of the Reformation is beyond all question. It was a reversal of the relation between clergy and laity. The Book of Common Prayer was not forced on the laity by the clergy, but by the laity on the clergy. The Elizabethan Act of Uniformity abolished all previous uses, and ordered one use and one only throughout the Church. It was opposed by all the Bishops in the House of Lords and carried over their heads. Convocation was not consulted. Again, although the clergy were allowed to prepare the Prayer Book of 1662, Parliament, while accepting the book, was careful to express its right to have altered it. By authority of Parliament the revised book was once more imposed upon the clergy, and those who refused it were ejected. That relation of the two orders has already been seriously disturbed by the events of the last 50 years. It will be entirely destroyed when alternative uses are allowed. Practically, liberty of choice for the clergy will mean to the laity loss of the right, which they secured at the Reformation, to control absolutely the public worship of the Church. It is not mere narrow-mindedness, not illiberal dread of comprehensiveness, not mere conservative dislike of innovation that prompts opposition to the present proposals. They would have had a different reception, if they had been accompanied by provisions safeguarding the rights of the laity. But this does not mean that they would have been acceptable. They would, even so, have introduced strife and confusion into public worship, and "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the Churches." It is forgetfulness of this great principle that has gone so far to destroy the spiritual life of the nation, and to evacuate the great religious revival of the nineteenth century of the greater part of its value.

Our next objection to the contemplated doctrinal changes is that they must be regarded as a deliberate and far-reaching effort to obtain the sanction of the nation for the Counter-Reformation. This is so serious a charge that we must explain more exactly what we mean by it. What we definitely mean to assert is that there has long been a party within the Church whose deliberate policy and desire is to restore the Church of England to the Roman

obedience, and that Prayer Book revision is being used by them as an instrument for that purpose. What is far more serious is that, while the Bishops individually are, except perhaps in a few instances, not members of that party, nor committed to that policy, their failure to exercise the disciplinary powers that they possess has greatly facilitated its progress. That failure has made the complete success of the party appear to it to be only a question of time, if Parliamentary consent is given to the proposals relating to the Holy Communion. A brief examination of the recent history of our Church will abundantly establish this contention, though it will not be possible in the compass of a short article to indicate more than the outlines and chief stages of that history.

The first stage was the effort of Dr. Pusey to reduce to a minimum the more unpopular doctrines of the Church of Rome—unpopular, that is, to Englishmen. He appealed to Newman, to the Archbishop of Paris and to others, that the Church of Rome in the Vatican Council of 1870 should distinguish between doctrines commonly taught but not essential, and those that were absolutely binding on the conscience of believers. The latter, he hoped, might be accepted by Anglicans. He laboured also to obtain some new definition of transubstantiation. There were even suggestions that the Bishop of Brechin should be summoned to the Council, and that Pusey should go with him as his theologian. Rome with Manning as her prompter replied by adding to her creed the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. "Manning," says a historian of the Council, "was enamoured of the idea of authority as the slave is of liberty." The Pope became the Church.

After Dr. Pusey's death Lord Halifax eagerly promoted an attempt to obtain from Rome recognition of the validity of Anglican Orders. Rome replied with an unqualified negative. Anglican orders were pronounced invalid not on disputable historical grounds, but because it was obvious that we did not consecrate priests to offer the Mass. The two English Archbishops attempted to cover the retreat of this unhappy venture—but how? By quoting our Communion service as though the very changes now proposed to be introduced into the Canon were already there. It was a reply that carried conviction only to those who were already convinced. The idea that Rome would give us even such recognition as she accords to the orthodox Greek Church was dissipated.

Then followed the bitter outbursts of this party against the whole of the Reformation. The Church of England should repent of it in sackcloth and ashes. The Prayer Book which had been almost the idol of the old Tractarians was vilified. The most distinctively Roman usages, Reservation of the Sacrament for adoration, use of images and reverence to them, substitution of Mass for mattins, came quickly one upon another. The declaration against these practices in the Report of the Royal Commission of 1906 was treated with contempt. Even Bishop Gore denied the existence of any line of deep cleavage between our Church and the Roman.

On the other hand, it should be noted (1) that the promoters of this movement consider that the Appeal of the last Lambeth Conference sets them free to accept Roman Catholic orders while continuing to be clergy of our Church, and (2) that "conversations" with Roman Catholic authorities, sanctioned by the Archbishop of Canterbury and vigorously defended by several Bishops, have been conducted—with what precise object or result we do not yet know.

In this summary it has been impossible to do more than call attention to certain salient facts. The significance of those facts will be denied. The loyalty of the High Church party to our Church will be reaffirmed. The connivance of our Bishops with what would be regarded politically as a "conspiracy" will be indignantly repudiated—and that in all sincerity. But it is quite possible for a nation and its rulers—equally so for a Church and its authorities—to pursue a policy which plays into the hands of conspirators, while themselves ignorant of the conspiracy, or shutting their eyes to it. But they must not be surprised that those who regard the conspiracy as treacherous and disastrous obstinately oppose all that tends to favour it, and distrust promises of resistance hereafter at points where they see that resistance is untenable. Mr. Asquith, when he placed Trade Unions above the law, was really responsible for consequences which he neither desired nor foresaw.

Here we are brought to our third great ground of opposition to revision of the Communion service, that is, the solidarity of the so-called "Catholic" system. There is no question that the attraction of that system lies in certain features of religious life

which it seems to produce. We say "seems," because the features of saintly life, of self-sacrificing devotion, of unquestionable communion with God, and of fruitfulness in good works are not the monopoly of any one religious system. "The wind bloweth where it listeth," and the saints of God are drawn not only into communion with Him, but into communion with one another, and by such communion form distinctive types of piety, aiming each communion at its own ideal. The ideal of the "Catholic" system is "obedience to a divinely constituted and specifically identified authority." Obviously this ideal has attraction for those who occupy some position of authority in the hierarchy. A Catholic Bishop receives ready obedience from Catholic clergy, and Catholic clergy from the Catholic laity. The result is the formation of a compact body which has the same kind of advantages for aggression that discipline confers on an army. The defects of the Catholic system, when it secures obedience without either piety or morality, must be studied in countries where it is unchecked by Protestantism.

Catholic discipline, like army discipline, is not a body of rules or doctrines from which each soldier may pick and choose what is most to his taste. There may be times when the soldier is off duty, there may be for the Catholic beliefs and duties which are not *de fide*. But for both alike, on all points that are essential to his service, in army or in Church as the case may be, the system must be accepted as a whole. Partial obedience is mere mutiny. To what extent this is true is still imperfectly realized by those who call themselves Anglo-Catholics. We venture to present them with a reminder. In 1899 Archbishop Ireland had gone to Rome from America to explain to his Holiness the attitude of the American Bishops towards the Temporal Power of the Papacy, with the result that the Archbishop had to fly from Rome almost for his life, and to renounce absolutely all that he had hitherto tried to maintain. But this was not enough. The Jesuit review, *Civita Catholica*, pointed the moral as follows:

"The practical lesson all ought to draw from the Papal Encyclical is that Catholic principles do not change by lapse of time, or by difference of country, or through new discoveries, or from motives of expediency. They remain the principles that Christ taught, that the Church proclaimed, that the Popes and Councils defined, that the Saints held, and that the Doctors defended. They must

be taken as they are or left. Whoso accepts them in all their fulness and rigidity is Catholic ; whosoever hesitates, oscillates, adapts himself to his times or compromises, may call himself by what name he will, but before God and the Church he is a rebel and a traitor."

This position is not really as unreasonable as it sounds in our ears, if we are careful to remember that the Catholic type of piety depends on unquestioning self-surrender to authority. The authority which claims such self-surrender must claim to be Divine, and, so far as it is exercised, must partake of Divine immutability. Our so-called Anglo-Catholics would fain substitute for this immutable authority the idea of a corporate Catholic consciousness, which makes room for some flexibility. But even they maintain that "the value of religious experience is confined to those who accept at least the general outlines of the Catholic conception of religion : the experience of those who reject it is worthless precisely to the extent to which they reject it." From which naturally follows the assertion in the Jesuit organ quoted above.

Now what is at the base of these, to us, so monstrous pretensions ? It is neither more nor less than the belief that our Lord has constituted priests to offer the Mass. The whole Roman system is neither more nor less than the development of this one principle. We say the development—not necessarily the logical development. If it were a mere question of logic, syllogisms might be constructed, authorities selected, to show why we accept the Mass, and forbid adoration : why we permit, but do not enforce, auricular confession and so forth. The development is far more than a logical development. It is the extension of the principle of the obedience which the laity owe to the priesthood, on certain lines. The experience of centuries, exercised over vast masses of humanity, has shown these lines to be conducive to the type of religion at which the Catholic system aims. Our resistance to the Mass is not a mere question of temperament, of *dislike* of robes, or lights, or incense. It is a refusal to surrender to an authority which is not Divine the trust which God has committed to us. That trust is the rendering of direct and personal obedience to Himself, as He has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit speaking to us through the Scriptures. We believe that we cannot compromise over the Mass without betrayal of this trust. We

dare not allow a Priesthood of human appointment to take charge of our souls. For us our Blessed Lord is the one and only Priest of Divine appointment.

A final word must be said in reply to the question why a form of the Prayer of Consecration, not differing substantially from those in use in the Scottish Episcopal, U.S.A. Protestant Episcopal, and South African Churches has not wrought the damage among them that we fear in England. The answer is very simple. So long as there is no party in those Churches corresponding to our advanced party, or so long as that party, if it exists, is withheld by prudential considerations, the movement towards Roman obedience will not exist, or will be controlled. But, when circumstances permit that party to raise its head in any of those Churches, the presence in their Prayer Books of the prayer implying sacrifice through the consecrated elements, without communion or apart from it, will greatly facilitate their efforts. They will appear as the *party which is developing the true principles of the Church*. In England the possession of endowments makes the clergy independent, to a great extent, of the laity. Protected by their endowments and their privileges they can work for the recovery of what they call Catholic doctrine, and work all the more easily when Bishops preside at their congresses, walk in their open-air processions, and bless their crucifixes and images. There are words which the Bishop of Lichfield has sanctioned in the Lichfield Communicants' Manual, which in our Articles are condemned as "blasphemous." Those words are: "This sacrifice which in honour of Thy Name I have presented before Thee for the salvation of the faithful whether living or departed . . . and also for our sins and offences do Thou now most mercifully regard." The proposed changes in our Prayer of Consecration would secure at least some cover of sanction for these words by the authority of the Church. To obtain that cover is the reason the new form of prayer is desired. These are the special conditions of our Church which call for special watchfulness, and oblige all faithful Churchmen to resist to the uttermost any changes or alterations which would strengthen the hands of the Romanising party that is openly and avowedly remaining in the Church in order to undo altogether the work of the Reformation.

EVANGELICAL REACTIONS.

BY THE REV. CHARLES COURTENAY, M.A.

FEW religious schools of thought have the courage to face their problems. They are tempted either to treat them too lightly or to ignore them altogether.

I do not think that Evangelicals are less courageous than others, but even they are inclined at times to slip their heads in bags, and to wait until the clouds roll by. I am thinking especially of one problem which ought to press more heavily upon us than it does, the problem of our losses. Why do so many young people slip through our Evangelical meshes? Why do so many presumably steadier members of Evangelical churches cross the line to diametrically opposite ones? Probably our losses are not more heavy than those of other schools of thought, but why do they exist at all? It is such questions as these which are clamouring for an answer and, if possible, for remedial measures. I propose to offer in this article a small contribution to this problem. If we can discover any vulnerable points in our Evangelical equipment, we shall not lose but gain by facing them. If we have been handling souls wrongly, emphasising non-essentials, or violating common sense by our rules and methods, let us set to work to reform ourselves and our plans.

The simple problem before us, then, is how to find the leak, and, having found it, to stop it. But let us simplify the problem by eliminating a few clear facts about Evangelicals themselves. We must be careful to draw a sharp distinction between real and only seemingly Evangelicals. There are hangers-on in all groups, never really attached, but only swept along as light papers and dead leaves are swept after a rushing train. Nobody is surprised when these depart any more than we are surprised when great streams which leave the rocks intact sweep off the shell-fish. It is only a question of time and opportunity for these mere hangers-on to drop off and be swept away. Mere partisans, too, are bound to be untrustworthy. They have joined a side lightly and just as lightly they will desert it. A name has little adhesive power. A flag may be as easily lowered as raised. A cry often dies in the throat.

Evangelicals who only cling to one another are only as permanent as the ivy which clings only to ivy. But it is the men who cling to their Master who find themselves close to one another because they are close to Him. It is just the same when our Evangelical fires burn out, for then they act like light ashes and are blown away by any wind which prevails at the moment. Anything may happen to an extinct volcano and any rubbish may fill it. I am afraid that burnt-out Evangelicals mislead the critics and set them whooping unwisely. We do not anticipate that their new friends will make much of them when they discover how cold they are.

Neither must we overlook the fact that not all Evangelicals who leave the ranks of their old friends have altogether deserted Evangelical truth. Are there not Evangelical High Churchmen and Evangelical Broad Churchmen too? No man who has ever tasted Gospel truth can ever forget it, and however he may intermingle the Gospel with alien truth or untruth, he cannot eliminate the old pure strain from his pulpit song. And is it not a fact that Evangelical truth acts as a salt upon character and sermon to keep them fresh and stimulating? Their preaching would lose all effective appeal were it not for the Gospel love which went over with them when they recanted all else.

Having so far cleared the way, let us address ourselves freely to the sad problem of loss and defection. How are we to account for it? We shall find a part of the solution, I believe, in the title of this article, "Evangelical Reactions."

Reaction, as we all know, is a law of nature, and in the world of phenomena we see its action daily. That action and reaction are equal was one of the great laws which Newton set forth. If we apply this law to the sphere of Evangelical Christianity, which is our only pursuit now, we shall find how inevitable it is, given the necessary stimulus. We witness it only too disastrously in the sphere of Evangelical history. When the Early Church lost its first love its life slowly ebbed away, betraying its reaction by less simplicity and considerably more complexity. The prophet found himself edged out by the priest, and heresies grew like weeds. It is true there were great persons who seem to have escaped the infection, who went forth evangelising the world, and in an atmosphere of work maintained their simplicity, but the rank and file of ministers and people grew more and more rigid, ceremonious, and

literal. We are inheriting to-day the effects of that early reaction.

Reforming spirits rose here and there, and mystics burrowed through the literal to the spiritual, bringing back the old simplicity, but their tiny lights became suffocated by the pride and supernatural claims of the priesthood. The tide ran too strong towards sacerdotalism to be diverted by the tiny rivulets which flowed from the lowly and the spiritual. Then came that great revolt of eager souls who, pining for a simpler and more Scriptural faith and finding it in the neglected Bible, promoted the Reformation of glorious memory.

Of course, reaction came again, and the Counter-Reformation with its power of fire and sword appeared to throw all back again to its original darkness. But not really so. It winnowed the false from the true, and, like all persecutions, cleared the air. Moreover, it found itself winnowing its own ranks and purging away many of its own impurities. Much blood was spilt, and many fires were kindled, but the truth of God and His holy Gospel could not be bound. After the Puritans came the Restoration reaction with its flood of worldliness and irreligion. No change could have been more extreme than the substitution of a Charles Stuart for an Oliver Cromwell. It was as if the Augean stable, having been purified, reverted to its old state and worse. It was a filthy reaction, and the Court stank in the nostrils of all cleanly men.

When Wesley, Whitfield, and other eager spirits burst upon our beloved land and carried the forgotten Gospel to the slums and by-ways of town and country, the upheaval was glorious. Groveling men and women by the myriad sprang to their feet and gazed heavenwards. The eighteenth century was a dead century, and, needing much the evangelist and the prophet, it responded gallantly. Empty churches were filled again and vast crowds gathered in the early hours to hear the new, yet old, evangel. Upon the top of all this restoration to purer faith and holier living came the Tractarians, whose reaction is still felt in our Church and land. Judged by the standards of to-day, the Tractarian leaders were excellent men, men of God, sane and orthodox men whose work was to restore many forgotten practices and to check the disorderly elements which red-hot eagerness is apt to imbibe. They undoubtedly shifted the emphasis from Evangelicalism to sacerdotalism, but not so violently as the present Anglo-Catholics, who, could the Tractarian

fathers return to earth, would be promptly disowned by them as perilous Romanisers. It is true that some of the former who were extreme went over to Rome, but as honest men they saw no other alternative. It is left to the men of to-day to eat the bread of the English Church but to preach the doctrines and copy the practices of another and alien Church. But we do not need to fetch our illustrations from national Churches or international groups, for we see the same reactions in families. Evangelical homes do not often present an undivided Evangelical harvest. From the strict homes of many an Evangelical parentage wander forth the boys and girls to various goals, many of them, alas! non-Evangelical. Some go straight to the opposite camp and become disciples of Ritualism. Some wander further still, and seek their spiritual home in Rome itself. Not a few plunge into sheer worldliness and become prodigal sons and daughters. With an aching heart the parents see them scatter, and, throwing to the winds all their fervent instructions and warnings, side with error. We must not forget that these are one and all illustrating the power of reaction.

And so it is also in the personal life. Like nations and families, the units, too, are found recoiling from their positions into strange reactions. Who has not wondered when this man or that is suddenly missing from his accustomed place? No man to our minds was more firmly fixed as well as affectionately attached, and yet he is off at a tangent.

A Free Church minister, for instance, suddenly changes over and not only turns into a Churchman but an extreme Ritualist. A Quaker turns the same somersault and from a free lance becomes a devotee of Episcopalianism. Sacraments, priests, and State Church are swallowed at a gulp and without winking. An Evangelical clergyman, devout and thoughtful, fired by some clever Tractarian pamphlet, rushed away from his brethren, his congregation, and his tenets, and was swallowed up in the Roman Church almost before anybody suspected such a bolt. He came back into the Anglican fold, it is true, but later on he went back to the Roman fold and stayed there. Evidently reaction played its part in such a change, and will play it again. For where mental struggles are raging, with nobody to answer hard questions, and they are in despair of getting a sufficient solution, men are only too ready to throw up the sponge and join a Church which claims to be infallible and

will do all their thinking for them. Anything for peace, and by a natural reaction they exchange hard thinking for no thinking at all. It is the reaction of exhaustion and despair.

Let us now see if we can discover any of the causes of reaction. Violent reactions must surely come from violent causes, just as a pendulum swung far out of its natural and regular beat swings back with equal oscillation and reaction. And here, I think, we find the real reason for such reactions as we have been considering. They are all due to extremes. We note this action in the depression which follows extreme hilarity. Your very high-spirited man will be found in the depths of depression. We discover the opposite tendency in people returning from a funeral; their spirits unduly depressed or artificially made so are now unduly raised and keep pace with the trotting of the horses on the return journey after their dreary and unnatural walk thither. As a matter of fact, reaction is the nemesis of extremes.

But have Evangelicals ever gone to such extremes as to lead up to these sad reactions? I fear they have, and I shall seek to point out some of them. So far as Evangelicalism has been a positive creed and life it has done nothing but good, but when it passes over to negative positions and positions of denial and denunciation, reactions have undoubtedly been provoked. No man can take exception to a clear-cut creed. It is refreshing to find men and women knowing precisely what they do believe and to find them holding it warmly, living upon it, and speaking out for it. But when they begin to denounce, to pass harsh judgments, and to excommunicate, they show a less lovely mien. They then become intolerant and unkind.

It is in this region that reactions occur. Suppose I accuse those who differ from me of being in the gall of bitterness, of being outside the kingdom, wolves among the flock, so blackening their characters. It is probable that those whom I am instructing will meet one or two of these black characters and find them angelic in their temper and behaviour. In the violent reaction which ensues my curses will assuredly come home to roost, and faith in my judgment will be undermined. And the reaction will not stop there, for in their indignation they will probably go over body and soul to the defamed side. Can you wonder at it?

Suppose I violate the laws of charity, and in my exasperation

against what I conceive to be erroneous opinions say bitter things against those who I imagine hold them. Bitterness is never lovely, and if to my bitterness I add injustice as well, the reaction will inevitably come when I am discovered to be wrong in my imputations. We may correct in love, and say anything which is just when we say it tenderly, but when the personal note is struck and we assume an angry tone, we get only reactions for our pains. Controversy is like a serpent ; it is innocuous when the sting is extracted.

Suppose I am imperious and arrogant in my assumptions of truth and lay down the law with an air of infallibility ; even if I am right I provoke a reaction from those whose backs have been set up by my authoritative method. Ordinary listeners dislike dictation and command, and prefer to look into things for themselves to being ordered to believe because they are told to do so. After all, other people can think as well as I can, and perhaps better, and why should I ignore their minds and speak *ex cathedra* when they require enlightenment and reasons, and ought to have them ?

Now, I fear that we Evangelicals have laid ourselves open to this kind of reaction because we are prone in our very heat of spirit to try to sweep everybody along with us. We are so sure ourselves that we cannot imagine anybody doubting our contentions. I am not certain, too, that we have not made a sad mistake by aiming mainly at the emotions to the disregard of the reason. We may not ignore the emotions, for they are the driving power within the man, but before we can touch the feelings wisely we must lay a good foundation of truth and reason. Convince the minds of men, and we shall find the emotions laid open before us. To do otherwise is to stoke your furnace before you have replenished it with good fuel. Perhaps this is the reason that we sometimes alienate the wiser minds of the community. They ask for bread and we give them putty.

Suppose, again, with a whole peal of bells to ring, I strike one monotonous bell and give the people anything but melody. I may preach one favourite doctrine until the congregation feel as sick of it as the Israelites did of the manna. I have perhaps one favourite colour, and keep flashing it in the wearied eyes of my people, forgetting that there are six other brilliant hues which make up white light and all kinds of beautiful combinations. We cannot play tunes on one note, and we cannot satisfy souls with one doc-

trine, however prominent and vital. If I try to do it, I am in for a bad reaction, and the truth, as well as souls, will suffer. Is it not only too true that the new religions which rise up all around us to-day are the fruits of one-sidedness in preachers? In our one-eyed vision we have missed some complementary truths and have dropped out some important phases of truth, so that in the reaction which we have evoked others step in with the ignored view emphasised.

It is probable, too, that as an Evangelical I have unnecessarily narrowed my outlook and meddled with little things to the exclusion of the greater and the more massive. I may have fussed about minutiae when magnitudes and masses called for treatment. The bigger minds in our congregations resent this, and feel that the preacher ought to soar higher, drink deeper, and keep in touch with the larger movements of men's minds. They miss the scientific touch, the allusions to the great problems of life, and the assurance that their minister is abreast of the times. Of course, this may be overdone, the personal be overlooked in the general, and the Master be swept aside for the smaller masters of earthly religions. Still, our critics are right in the main, and unless we can respond to people's natural cravings, we may expect a reaction will lead them to weigh anchor and sail away to broader seas.

Suppose that I am over-cautious in my dealings with the world in which I live and in my anxiety to be right pass many innocent things and practices under condemnation. The old Pharisee gathered up his skirts when he passed a Publican for fear of contamination. There is a similar exercise of caution with many of us Evangelicals. We are mortally afraid of the world, and in our separation we scatter our labels about promiscuously and attach bad names to many innocent things. If in our lawful anxiety to be safe we draw the line too tight and become stricter than the occasion warrants, we are digging an ugly pit for ourselves and our young people. Many of these have been already precipitated into this chasm, and more will follow unless we adopt less dangerous definitions. 'Besides, is it not beginning at the wrong end, putting the world into forms rather than spirit, and making rules when we should be impressing principles? The Evangelical who bans all novels, all places of entertainment, all parties, is making too rigid and artificial lines, and sowing for a harvest which will not be exactly

what he expects or desires. Suppose, too, I indulge in a too free use of pious expressions and shibboleths supposed to be the notes of our Evangelical school. Originally they did their work because they were fresh and unworn. Now that they have become more or less a fashion and a fetish, they only provoke reactions of disgust and cavil. If I use these expressions to-day, I am not so wise or so pious as I think I am. They will never serve their old intention again, and the continued use of them will cause them to act as missiles to hurt and drive away the very souls we are trying to impress. Expressions are like clothes, they do excellently well so long as they are reasonably new, but when they begin to be threadbare and shabby they are good only to be given away or thrown away. A good many of our Evangelical reactions are due to these worn-out expressions.

I am not sure, too, but that we have irritated people unnecessarily by our aggressive methods. Zeal is splendid so long as it is discharged with wisdom and discretion. It is good to be faithful, but "let not their precious balm break my head." I am thinking of that ruder type of Evangelical who asks rude and abrupt questions of strangers in the street and demands an answer then and there. I am thinking, too, of those Evangelicals who go about like a black thundercloud, threatening judgments on all and sundry who do not think exactly as they do. Eager and hot-hearted Christians we all admire, but not when they blister. I am afraid they have bred more blasphemers than believers by such rough-and-ready methods.

Perhaps, too, we have been too individualistic. Not that we can do anything else than begin with the individual; not that we should ever forget the individual; not that we should leave our own individuality out, but that we should not press the individual to the exclusion of the many. Perhaps we have been looking a little askance at societies of men and women, and especially at that great society the Church of the Living God. I fear we have to our loss. We have been prone to miss much of the Communion of Saints. We have been more keen in winning the masses to Christ than in getting closer to those who already believe on His Name. The danger is not on one side only, for if there be a danger of forgetting the society in our love of the individual, we are none the less in danger of forgetting the individual in the society.

Perhaps many of us have been too ready to talk religion as if it were the hall-mark of reality, forgetting that talking, like walking, must have some objective. To talk for talking's sake is hardly wise and may be wasteful of good breath ; besides, there is so much to do that to spend our time in talking may steal it from working. Religious gossip is not so commendable as many think, and may easily weaken the fibre of our spiritual life. Forced conversations are unnatural. Reserve has its province as well as talk, and to hold the tongue may be as much a means of grace as even the best of talk. To meander away into mere talk about religion makes more for shallowness than depth. Besides, the reactions which wait upon garrulousness have to be taken into account.

A sad nemesis waits, too, on over-emotionalism. To make feelings the test of reality or of health is seriously to mislead souls. The physical is never a safe guide to reality of spiritual experience, although it is bound to be present in more or less force whenever the faith be keen and strong. This has been the danger which has menaced Missions and Conferences. The bait of keener feelings and deeper peace has been dangled before the minds and hearts of weary humanity, and so long as it is the main or only bait, the menace is great and imminent. Over-pressed emotions have not unfrequently passed into mental derangement, and the over-stressed souls who have not learned the ephemeral nature of feelings have recoiled so seriously as to lapse into sheer unbelief and worldliness. Such methods really tempt reactions and lead straight to them.

Some of the more extreme among the Evangelicals have much to answer for in the production of sad reactions. In a world of change they are all for stern conservatism. There is such a magic and glamour about the old ways and the old methods that to deviate a hair's-breadth from the past is to hover over the edge of the pit. No class of men and women do more to kill Evangelicalism than these. Barring the way to improvements in setting forth truth, in helping the spirit of devotional worship, and so setting up their own wills against the multitude, they cause such heartburnings among the younger Evangelicals that they desert the Evangelical ranks for the freer and more modern schools of religious thought. These are the men who saw in the sung *Amens*, the white surplice, and the chanted *Psalms* the thin edge of the wedge of pure Roman-

ism. Many of our young people have been driven out of the Evangelical fold by these tactics and ways.

The resistance also of many Evangelicals to modern thought has produced a reaction among the thoughtful. There are Diehards in the world of thought who lag behind the rest of the world and fight to the last ditch against any new scientific revelation. Evangelicals have not as a rule been keen to follow or accept modern interpretations of the universe. From the best of motives certainly, because they feared for the Ark of God, feared for the purity of their faith, feared for the integrity of their Holy Bible. But the faith and the Bible stand as firm and as true as ever, and we may boldly say that we hold a more intelligible Bible for the discoveries of learned men in the fields of science, archæology, and criticism. We have yielded much in the past to the contentions of investigators, and we have not lost, but gained, by our larger view of life and truth. But our unintelligent resistance has yielded a terrible aftermath, for those children of our faith who deserted us and our creed because of our resistance will probably never come back to us.

We have so far treated of the fact of reaction and of the causes of it. We have yet to gather the lessons of reaction, which we have hitherto only hinted at. And the first surely is that we should beware of extremes. Truth rarely lies in the extremities, and to push it to the extremest point is to land it on the very brink of danger. Extremes meet, we are told, and push on far enough to the East, you arrive at the West. A truth held fanatically is never held sanely. When the Spartans made helots drunk, they trusted that in the reaction caused by their example their own sons would be eminently sober, and so they became. Any view may be made absurd by over-emphasis, and the best of causes can be shipwrecked by avoiding the middle passage and sailing too near the other side. The *Via Media* is not always mere calculation, and is not always associated with a cool temper; it is an effort to steer a clear passage between Scylla and Charybdis.

A second lesson is surely a monitory one. We may trace extremes by their reactions. When we do not gain converts but lose them, when we see men and women revolting against our methods and manners, when instead of impressing we raise ridicule, we may be sure that this is a call to consideration. The offence of the Cross is a real one, and we shall surely experience it, but this does

not cover our own blameworthy crosses. We do not win by irritating, and if our people are irritated we may be the cause of it, and we must therefore take warning and amend. It may be human perversity, but then again it may be *our* perversity.

A third lesson lies upon the surface ; we shall escape a good deal of life's terrible reactions by attending to the spirit as the main preventive. It is not truth but the way in which we handle it that exacerbates and blisters. The man who can say hard things softly and handle crippled limbs tenderly is saved nearly all reactions of temper and groans. Roughness is fatal. We can say strong things lovingly and we can say soft things harshly. We have to learn how to lower the voice, how to throw gentleness into the features, and how to allow for the feelings of others. It is all a matter of love, and love comes not by command but by character ; it comes by the way of the Cross.

The last lesson I would advance is the necessity, not of being less and less Evangelical, but of becoming more and more so. Honesty and charity do not imply that we should moderate our convictions or proclaim them less boldly ; we may not play fast and loose with truth as we conceive it. To cool off for the sake of charity is to head straight to decay and ruin. What we must mitigate is our fierce tempers, our denial of good in others who differ from us, our intemperate denunciation of men rather than of untruths and errors. The side which keeps its temper best is almost always in the right, for why should men with a strong case lose it ? Positive truth positively expressed, an Evangelical life to follow it, and a Christ-like spirit pervading all, are the best for Evangelicals. Christ the perfect Way, the Cross the perfect medium, an open way for simple souls to approach the Mercy-seat, one clear condition of faith and repentance, the certainty of an immediate response from Him who never casts out, the possibility of knowing rather than of guessing, the personal assurance of reception and salvation, a Lord received by way of the heart rather than by the lips, and then a life lived out by faith in the Son of God in personal communion, joyous service, and much praise.

We must proclaim far and wide that a faith which is not Evangelical is not the faith demanded of all men ; all additions and accretions only dilute and adulterate the Gospel and throw up hindrances in the way of life.

THE PRINCIPLE UNDERLYING CATHOLICITY AND DEMOCRACY.

BY THE VEN. ARCHDEACON MACDERMOTT, M.A.

DEFINITIONS are dangerous things! We cannot get on without them, but we cannot be too careful in making definitions and in their use when made. An important point is that definitions limit the thing defined. The best and most permanent things elude complete definition. The moment you define and use precise terms in connection with things of the highest value, you begin to feel doubtful of your definition, for it has left out something, it has cabined and confined that which refuses to be thus imprisoned.

Faith, hope, love, joy, peace, sympathy and bliss—have you ever come across satisfactory definitions of any of these things? They are states to be experienced, values highly prized, eternal treasures which cannot be put within the compass of a definition. Their content is too large, too deep, too much involved in personality to be expressed by formal propositions.

There are terms, also, which evade definition owing to the history of the past, the association of the terms with certain events and with movements which have now taken another direction. In the course of time, a term may have come to connote something the very opposite to that which originally caused its use. Theological terms seem especially to have an unhappy knack of passing into common speech and then becoming so much altered in meaning that considerable confusion of thought arises when an expert uses the term correctly. The term "original sin" is an illustration of this change which occurs. Original sin is bound up with heredity, and does not refer to sin in the sense of wrong-doing on the part of the individual. Original sin is neither original, nor is it sin in the ordinary, everyday use of this term.

In politics, the labels distinguishing certain parties have become so misleading that you will find a Conservative backing measures which are intensely Radical, and Liberals applauding to the echo Socialistic schemes, while Socialists are acting in a wonderfully Conservative way!

I remember well a keen Conservative agent saying that he quite thought the time had come for the nationalisation of railways and coal-mines. I ventured to suggest that that was Socialism. He seemed surprised, but finally agreed that it really was, only he "had never thought of it like that!"

The fact is, labels are liable to get mixed and to be attached to the wrong parcels! It might help to mitigate much political asperity if there were more clear thinking, and if attention were paid to the things spoken of as well as to the terms by which they are expressed.

This applies to theological or religious argument with even greater force. Take the word "Catholic." What does it convey to different people?

When I was an Inspector of Schools, a favourite question of mine was: "Are you Catholics?" If the children heard this question for the first time, the answer was usually "No"! A reference to the Apostles' Creed and to the fact that they all professed their belief in the Holy Catholic Church soon led up to the acknowledgment that they were Catholics after all.

You will find adults who have used the Prayer Book from their childhood and yet have not realised that they belong to the Catholic Church! This is curious seeing how frequently they repeat the Catholic creeds, which mention the Holy Catholic Church to which they belong. They seem to forget that in the prayer for all conditions of men it says "we pray for the good estate of the *Catholic* Church."

It is a pity that the Preface to the Prayer Book is never read, especially that passage where it states that the reformers rejected all such alterations as were of dangerous consequence as secretly striking at some established doctrine; a laudable practice of the Church of England, or indeed of the whole *Catholic* Church of Christ.

Some time ago in the Church Assembly, one of the speakers frequently referred to "Catholics." At last, two or three members called out "Whom do you mean by Catholics?" There was a breathless pause. Then the speaker quietly replied, "All of you, of course." And a round of applause showed that the Assembly was quite alive to the importance of our claim to Catholicity.

But I have not yet put before you a definition of "Catholic,"

and I must do so if we are to be clear when we come to the principle underlying Catholicity.

The Epistles of St. James, St. Peter, St. Jude and St. John are called "Catholic" because they were for the *whole* Church, the Church in general, and not for local Churches or for particular persons only. The word Catholic is used of the Church in one of the Epistles of Ignatius of the second century (Smyrna 8), of the general resurrection in Justin Martyr (*dial.* 81), and in Theophilus (ad Autol. i. 13); how soon it found its way into the creed is not exactly known. "Catholic" means universal, for every one.

There is no antithesis between Catholic and "Christian." It is because the Church is Christian, or Christ-like, that it is Catholic.

We find that this meaning, viz. the inclusiveness of Christ's Church, was somewhat lost sight of from the fourth century onward, and wholeness, Catholicity of doctrine attracted more attention. This wholeness, or Catholicity of teaching, is defined by the formula of Vincent of Lerins, A.D. 434, viz. that is Catholic doctrine which has been taught everywhere, always, and by all. (*Quod ubique, quod semper, et quod ab omnibus.*)

I need hardly say that several doctrines are taught nowadays as Catholic which by no means can be so called if they are to square with the Vincentian rule.

I have said that "Christian" and "Catholic" are not exclusive terms, neither are they simply complementary. Christ was the first Catholic, so to be Christ-like implies that you are a Catholic. His appeal was and is a universal one. His Gospel was and is for all mankind. It was this which, partly, caused His crucifixion. Hardly anything so deeply moved the Jews as our Lord's statements which referred to the Kingdom being for the Gentiles. In the parable of the vineyard He speaks of His rejection by the Jews and then says that the lord of the vineyard shall give the vineyard to others. "And when they heard it, they said, God forbid" (St. Luke xx. 16).

In the parable of the great supper, when those that were bidden neglected the invitation, the master tells his servant to go out quickly into the streets and lanes and bring in the poor, the maimed, the halt and the blind, and then he is to go out into the highways and hedges and compel them to come in (St. Luke xiv.).

On another occasion, He says, "And they shall come from the

east and from the west and from the north and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God" (St. Luke xiii. 29).

"God so loved the *world*," that is Catholicity.

The Lord Jesus was known as being "no respecter of persons," i.e. He respected everybody—little children, harlots, publicans, outcasts as well as those who were commonly held as being respectable. His last command was that His apostles should make disciples of *all* the nations.

Peter, in the case of Cornelius and his company, once for all showed the Catholicity of Christianity. "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to Him" (Acts x. 34, 35).

There is to my mind nothing which is so convincing of the truth of the Incarnation as this Catholicity of Christ. If we are creatures of God, surely God cares for us *all*, and the Son of God, God Incarnate, must be equally Catholic in His love.

The Church of Christ is the organ which carries on His work, and, obviously, the Church must be Catholic if it be really and truly the body of which Christ is the Head. And whenever and wherever the Church erects barriers, ecclesiastical or doctrinal, shutting out those who believe in the Lord Jesus and love Him as their Saviour, there must always be the suspicion that the Church is losing Catholicity and becoming hardened by the baleful spirit of ecclesiasticism which caused the rejection of our Lord by the Jews. Our Lord pronounced "woe" unto those who offend His little ones, and "little ones" may refer not only to children, but to those who are simple-minded and unable to grasp theological niceties or to distinguish between doctrinal propositions. The Church has no call to place stumbling blocks in their path. The criterion of judgment given in St. Matthew xxv. is the way we have used or abused our talents, and the doing or not doing deeds of kindness, of love. Alas! the Church has been at times so uncatholic in spirit that its criterion has been as different as possible from Christ's. We may be sure that over and over again when the great Assize is sitting, the Church's judgment will be reversed and the first be last and the last first.

I now ask you to consider Democracy, and then in a few words

I will venture to suggest the one principle which seems to underlie both Catholicity and Democracy.

If "Catholic" is a word used with a variety of meaning, and frequently misused when applied to something which is quite opposed to Catholicity, so too does "Democrat" suffer in the same way. You may have heard men speak as if they favoured Democracy, whereas they are autocrats who veil their autocracy under beguiling terms which deceive the unwary and uneducated.

We want to be on our guard when the word "democracy" is too much to the fore.

The word "democracy" is taken from the Greek. In most Greek communities there were two marked divisions of the freemen: "the few," or rich, and the "many," or not-rich, between whom a fierce contest for political superiority was waged. The same state would be called an oligarchy or a democracy according as the one or the other party possessed the political superiority.

Aristotle defines a democracy to be when the freemen and those not the rich, being the majority, possess the sovereign power. In another passage he speaks of different kinds of democracy, and the first kind is characterized by equality; and the fundamental law of such a democracy declares that the "not-rich" have no more political power than the rich, neither body being supreme, but both equal, and all participating equally in political power.

Montesquieu in his *L'Esprit des Loix* says, when the body of the people is possessed of the supreme power it is called a democracy. He has an interesting passage in Book III where he says: "A very droll spectacle it was in the last century (the 17th) to behold the unavailing effort of the English towards the establishment of democracy. As they who had a share in the direction of public affairs were void of virtue; as their ambition was inflamed by the success of the most daring of their members (Cromwell); as the prevailing parties were successively animated by the spirit of faction, the government was continually changing; the people, amazed at so many revolutions, in vain attempted to erect a Commonwealth. At length when the country had undergone the most violent shocks, they were obliged to have recourse to the very government which they had so wantonly proscribed."

The principle of democracy is virtue. But when Montesquieu says this he is thinking of the quality necessary for the continu-

ance of democracy. Democracy has no superior and virtue must guide and rule the government. When virtue is banished, ambition invades the mind of those who are so disposed and avarice possesses the whole community. The object of their desires are changed ; what they were fond of before has become indifferent ; they were free while under the restraint of laws, but they would from now be free to act against law ; and as each citizen is like a slave who has run away from his master, that which was a maxim of equity he calls rigour ; that which was a rule of action he styles constraint ; and to precaution he gives the name of fear. Frugality is termed avarice. The members of the Commonwealth riot on the public spoils, and its strength is only the power of a few and the licence of many.

I must quote one passage because it is so full of wholesome warning for these days. In Book VIII Montesquieu says : “ The principle of democracy is corrupted not only when the spirit of equality is extinct but likewise when they fall into a state of extreme equality—or when each citizen would fain be upon a level with those whom he has chosen to command him. Then the people, incapable of bearing the very power they have delegated, want to manage everything themselves, to debate for the senate, to execute for the magistrates and to decide for the judges.

“ When this is the case, virtue can no longer subsist in the republic. The people are desirous of exercising the functions of the magistrates, who cease to be revered. The deliberations of the senate are slighted ; all respect is then laid aside for the senators and consequently for old age. If there is no respect for old age, there will be none presently for parents ; deference to husbands will be likewise thrown off and submission to masters. This licence will soon become general, and the trouble of command as fatiguing as that of obedience. Wives, children, servants will shake off all subjection. No longer will there be any such thing as manners, order, or virtue.”

I should like to see Montesquieu's examination of the advantages and disadvantages of democracy published broadcast. His views were based on history, which is the experience of nations, of men and women of the past. It is the acme of folly to try to live as if we were the first people to exist and to ignore the lessons obviously taught us by the experience of others.

Democracy is said to be government by the will of the people. What people? Does the ordinary average man know all about government and what, in the largest sense, best conduces to the welfare of the nation? Do you mean the majority of the people? Are we to suppose that if two or three average men have average, ordinary wisdom that two or three million men must have superior, extraordinary wisdom? As it has been put, does wisdom increase by the multiplication of noses!

Again, when we talk of the will of the people, which will do we mean? The Jewish people cried with respect to our Lord, "Let Him be crucified!" "His blood be on us and on our children"—we, the people, condemn Him and take the responsibility for all time! Pilate (who really knew better) in the end gave way to the will of the people. What a tragedy!

Is the voice of the people the voice of God? Think of what popular clamour has done in the past, and let us try to get clear ideas on the matter.

Surely there are times when we need leaders who will lead, persons who have personality; prophets with a message. The shallow opportunism which allows the tail to wag the body and not the body the tail, is bound in the long run to land a democracy into disastrous complications.

The predominance of the average mind is deadly, especially when expressed in state regulations. Dragooned from morn till eve, bound by the same restraints in all directions, the freedom allowed is the freedom to keep in step.

Is not democracy then a good thing? Of course it is. We are the most democratic people in the world. Rightly so. Our nation has gone through all the stages which seem inevitable to a proper development. An autocratic king; an all-powerful aristocracy; mob tyranny; sectional domination; suffering minorities—all these have struggled and competed and taken their turn. A compromise in the best sense of the term has resulted, we have a constitution not hand-made, but grown-up, an organism not simply an organisation. Nature itself is a compromise, a balance of opposites, an adaptation of one part to another, and we in England have, almost unconsciously, followed nature, our best guide, in our Constitution.

When people sneer at compromise I think they cannot have

studied any of the sciences which disclose to us the operations of nature.

With reverence, be it said, is not our Redemption a compromise? Justice and mercy; sin and a Saviour; Jesus Christ, God and man in one—sinners accounted righteous and reconciled by the blood of the Lamb of God. Is there no compromise in the scheme of salvation?

So far, I have not put into words the principle of Catholicity and Democracy. I think it is the same. Not that the Catholic Church is a democracy, it is rather a theocracy, for the kingdom of God implies the rule of God. The Church is the kingdom of God because in it God rules and it is out to spread the rule of God over all the world. Yet the principle underlying Catholicity and Democracy is one and the same: viz. every human soul is of distinctive and peculiar value and forms an integral part of the Cosmos; this is true of God's universe as a whole and of the State in particular. But this principle can be expressed more simply in two words—*everyone counts*.

Observe that this does not state that everyone counts as equal to others. That is the mistake so frequently made. This is no more true than it would be if it were said that we are all equal in height, strength or brain-power. We all have our betters—those who are our superiors in one way or another. To take a simple illustration: a committee is a democratic institution; but experience soon teaches that while every member of the Committee counts, they are by no means of equal value. Two or three members emerge from the rest and their influence carries more weight than that of the other members. There are the silent members who seldom speak. There is the loquacious member so fond of details who will tell us we have forgotten to dot our "i's" and cross our "t's." There are the average ordinary members who take their usual share. The members of the Committee, certainly, are not of equal value, but they all have this equality—each one counts and must not be ignored.

There are some things done in our country which are supposed to be democratic, but are not, for they are in the interest of a section of the community only. A violent and vociferous faction rides roughshod over the main body of the people, disregarding the principle that everybody counts.

But the Church should not throw stones! A curious and interesting parallel could be shown between the Catholic Church and a democracy in the faults of both. There is, e.g., a parallel between a modern strike and an interdict of the Middle Ages. The strike may arise from various causes, and it stops services which affect the community locally or universally. The interdict also arose from various causes, frequently to extort money from reluctant Church-people. It affected religious services for the community locally, or the whole kingdom.

A blackleg and a heretic. Think of the treatment of heretics in the past. A blackleg is a Labour heretic—hence his treatment by those who excommunicate him!

Church history is a wonderful corrective to the pride of a Catholic Churchman, and it should make us very patient and tolerant with the ills which beset our democracy. "Labour" is more considerate, more humane in its strikes and treatment of blacklegs than was the Church, with its interdicts and burnings and torturings of heretics!

Catholicity—the principle that everyone counts. What right has the Church of Christ to set up barriers which He did not erect? How dare we be exclusive when He was inclusive?

Is it not significant and full of salutary warning that the man born blind, who was excommunicated by the Jews, was sought for by Jesus and when He had found him out, He said unto him, Dost thou believe in the Son of God? He answered and said, Who is He, Lord, that I might believe on Him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen Him and it is He that talketh with thee. And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped Him (John ix. 35-38).

Excommunicated! Yet a special and most gracious revelation of our Lord to him—could there be a greater blessing?

Everyone counts with Jesus. He was and is the Catholic of Catholics. His Church is to show forth the Son of God who loves *all* mankind.

The Catholic Church and the democratic State have, then, this principle in common which should make them respect one another and help one another, viz. that everyone counts and everyone is the object of the love of God, which is inexhaustible, undaunted and eternal.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

THE interesting volume in the S.P.C.K. *Studies in Church History*, on Richard Baxter, Puritan and Mystic, by A. R. Ladell, M.A., with a preface by W. H. Frere, D.D., Bishop of Truro (5s. net), is full of surprises. It is first of all a surprise to find Richard Baxter, a Puritan leader, included in the series and introduced to us by the Bishop of Truro. Another surprise is the estimate which is given of Puritanism and its representative. The author tells us in his prefatory note that he has made an honest attempt to understand Puritanism, and as a result of his study "the aim of this essay is to show that the contempt commonly meted out to the great leaders of Puritanism is far less deserved than is usually supposed." Indeed his estimate is so favourable that he feels it necessary to safeguard himself against misunderstanding on the part of less tolerant Churchmen. He closes his preface with the words: "The writer feels that his own loyalty to the Church may be called in question by some conclusions reached in this study of Richard Baxter. Lest that should happen, he hastens to add that the following estimate of the great divine has not been prompted by any sympathy with his nonconformity. Any apparent nonconformist bias, apart from being entirely unintentional, can only be due to the writer's earnest desire to give every possible credit to the side which appeals to him least." I think that we may say that the best biographies are generally written by those who are in sympathy with the personalities of whom they write. Critical estimates have their value, but they are not always satisfactory as complete pictures. They may give us the sort of pleasure which we obtain from Mr. Lytton Strachey's merciless dissection of Cardinal Manning and some other Victorian celebrities, but no one will say that we get our highest pleasure from the laying bare of the weaknesses and foibles of an ambitious man, whose capacity for intrigue developed with his years. Mr. Ladell is fortunate in having as his subject a man with whom, although he must have been on many points out of sympathy, yet in spite of this won his admiration by his love of truth, his firmness, and sincerity. The Bishop of Truro in his somewhat enigmatical

preface finds in Baxter a "type of character with which the Church has again to reckon" to-day. "The motives and moral of his ministry touch closely many of the problems which confront the Church of England in this generation." We might probably put a different interpretation on these words from the Bishop, but we have no doubt that if the same love of truth and sincerity are characteristic of our day, the Church will win through to the unity and power which he desires. Another and much larger life of Baxter has recently appeared. Its author, Dr. Powicke, is a Non-conformist, and is connected with Kidderminster, the scene of Baxter's chief ministry. To him Baxter is a hero, yet he has severe criticisms to offer for many of his acts, and especially for his attitude towards Cromwell. It is interesting to contrast the two lines of approach to the same facts and the differences in the estimates reached.

On the whole Mr. Ladell gives a fair picture of Puritanism, but on one or two points regarding the position of the Church of England his language may be misleading. For instance, he says: "There never could be either mutual understanding or any form of agreement between those who stood for Puritanism and those who stood for Anglo-Catholicism." The term "Anglo-Catholicism" has such a very different meaning to-day that it may give a wrong impression of the English Church of the seventeenth century, to use it without more definite explanation of its connotation. Of course it is the nature of what makes "catholicism" which marks the difference of view. Mr. Ladell says that "Unhesitatingly the Church declared itself to be at one in fact and theory with the Catholic Church of Christ, though purged, on the one hand, of the superstitious encumbrances of the Church of Rome and safeguarded on the other from the presumptuous extravagances of the Church of Geneva." This, we may point out, if it is intended to represent the modern Anglo-Catholic view of the Church of Christ, is not the conception of Catholicism contained in the XXXIX Articles or represented in the teaching of the Reformers.

Of the vicissitudes of Baxter's life a graphic account is given. We must all sympathise with those who had to pass through the stormy days of the Civil War and the Commonwealth. The testing of character was severe from every point of view, whether on the

side of the successful or the defeated. It is much to say that in spite of constant physical suffering, Baxter's conduct wins so large a share of approval from successive generations. The secret of his life is well given in the sentence "Nicholas Ferrar may have equalled him in sincerity of conviction, George Herbert in piety, Lancelot Andrewes in his love for the souls of men; but Richard Baxter is greater than these by reason of his conception of the priceless worth of holiness to every man, and of his endeavour to give to all the treasure he so highly valued." He lives as the author of *The Saints' Everlasting Rest*, a book that has helped to form the English character, and has been one of the most powerful incentives to the spiritual life of many generations.

The Bishop of London's special book for Lent this year is *The Word and Work*, by G. A. Studdert Kennedy, M.A., M.C. (Longmans, Green & Co.). Mr. Kennedy's style as a preacher is so well known that it is scarcely necessary to try to describe it. He is associated with the work of the Industrial Christian Fellowship, and the application of Christian teaching to our social problems naturally holds a prominent place in his thought. He takes in these chapters the prologue to St. John's Gospel and applies its leading ideas to the interpretation of life. Many are questioning the meaning of the world of men and things. He is emphatic that "the world and the life of men in the world have a meaning and a purpose." The Incarnation is the only key to them, and the only true life is that lived in the light of it. "The ultimate environment of man is God." Personal responsibility gains fresh meaning from the fact. But first men must attain to and achieve internal harmony. This is the hall-mark of humanity. Life is a tragedy, and the Cross is the only interpretation of its meaning. A new order of Social life is demanded. This is "as much an essential part of the Christian life as prayer and communion with God." When the Sacrament of the Breaking of Bread is divorced from this, it is deprived of its true significance. "The whole of our Social Order is the Bread of the Altar which waits the act of the Christian community, who lift it up to God." These are some of the vigorous and suggestive thoughts in a book which is intended to give Christian people "a pain in the mind," and rouse them from apathy in regard to the full meaning of the Christian life.

Autobiographical accounts of conversion are seldom satisfactory. Even Newman's *Apologia pro sua Vita*, the best known and most cleverly written of all, leaves a sense of inadequacy as to the sufficiency of the reasons which led him to join the Church of Rome. Where a writer of Newman's capacity failed writers less gifted are not likely to prove successful. The fact is that we all travel by our own peculiar paths to our convictions, and however closely the psychological processes may resemble one another, even when dealing with the same or very similar material, there will always be wide varieties of religious experience. At the same time there is always a special interest in accounts of religious experiences and the self-revelation which they give. These are of practical usefulness to the clergy and to all who have to deal with the difficulties of enquirers. Mr. G. A. Ferguson has narrated his experiences in *How a Unitarian Found the Saviour Christ*. He tells "how a Unitarian minister found peace and intellectual satisfaction in the Church of England, having passed through Theosophy as a half-way house." In spite of much repetition, it is interesting, while it combines both the advantages and disadvantages of which we have spoken. We are not surprised that he finds the doctrine of the Real Presence a difficulty. We hope he will discover that it is no part of the teaching of our Church, and that he will be on his guard against the tendency in all who make the spiritual journey he has made to go to extremes.

To the books on Gambling recently written by Canon Peter Green, and the Rev. James Glass, the Archdeacon of Westminster has added another, but on quite different lines. He calls it *Gambling and Betting*.—A Short Study dealing with their origin and their relation to Morality and Religion (T. Clark, 1s. 6d. net.). After defining gambling, and noting its universality, he gives an account of the ends and origins of the practice. He notes that "since gambling is essentially an appeal to chance, or the element of the irrational and unknown in life, it follows that gambling belongs to the savage or uncivilised type of character." He deals with the various differences between gambling and skill in games and business, and exposes some of the specious reasoning put forward in its defence. The grounds on which gambling is to be condemned are set out clearly, especially its effect on character. He finally

shows that the only effective means of eliminating the gambling spirit is Religion. How gambling is organised may be gathered from the fact that there are estimated to be 30,000 bookmakers in England, and "every master-bookmaker lays claim to some district as his own, the working of this district he commits to his subordinates, who are variously men, women, and children. In these districts hardly a large factory or firm is left uncanvassed by the agents . . . they persuade men to risk their wages, and women to hazard their husband's earnings . . . they get hold of men who have temporary charge of money, and tempt them to embezzle it, they corrupt the weaker members of the police force. . . ." These facts show that "the whole gambling community constitutes a moral leprosy dangerous alike to the individual and the State."

A Layman's Book for Laymen on St. Paul would perhaps be the most appropriate description of *The Letters of Paul the Apostle*, by Henry Coates, F.S.A. Scot. (Robert Scott, 3s. 6d. net). The writer has had a long experience of Bible Class work, and is familiar with the type of thought and the aspects of a subject which would be likely to interest the average layman. He has written this account of the life of St. Paul and his writings from such a point of view, and I am sure the majority of his readers will find it, as I have found it, an exceedingly attractive and instructive volume. He deals "but lightly with the deeper doctrinal problems involved in the letters." His aim is something simpler. As Dr. James Moffatt expresses it in a brief foreword—for those who desire a simple and accurate idea of the subject, the author has made his points well. A brief account of St. Paul's life is followed by points of resemblance and contrast between him and his Master. The characteristics and contents of the letters occupy two chapters. Three on the personality of Paul as revealed in his letters follow; the remainder deal mainly with the individual letters, of each of which a useful summary and analysis are given. Laymen will gain just the vivid and complete impression of St. Paul as a man, a writer, and a missionary which they ought to have from these pages written as a labour of love by one whose devotion to his study is seen on every page.

Preachers will welcome the appearance of another part of *The Speaker's Bible* (Speaker's Bible Office, Aberdeen, Scotland. 10s. 6d. net). It contains the Book of Job and the first thirteen Psalms. The comprehensiveness of the treatment can be gathered from the extent of the space allotted to them—two hundred pages are given to Job and over one hundred to the Psalms, and these are quarto pages with double columns. The Book of Job deals with some of the great fundamental mysteries of life. Every age has to face them anew in the light of its own knowledge and experience. The treatment here is for us of the twentieth century. There are four essays on Resignation, the Battle of Life, Reverence, and Testing Truth. Among the titles of the sections which suggest subjects for sermons are the Ideal Man, the Ideal Home, Cynicism, Freewill, the Uses of Adversity, Broken Purposes, and God's Sovereignty. These are only a few of many that give suggestions for living messages. The help given by these volumes can only be tested by experience, but the illustrations and references alone make them worth having.

The introduction to the Book of Psalms gives useful information dealing with such difficulties as the "enemy" and "vindictive" psalms. There is the usual full list of commentaries and sermons on the various passages. When the preacher adds to the knowledge supplied by the material in this volume the personality which in Bishop Phillips Brooks' well-known definition of preaching is essential for a sermon he will be adequately equipped. G.F.I.

ROBERT SANDERSON (*S.P.C.K.*, 6s.), by the Rev. George Lewis, gives us a full picture of the life and teaching of one of the leading figures of the Church under Charles I, the Commonwealth and Charles II. To him we owe the Prayer Book preface, "It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England, etc.," and his great work on Conscience has had influence on thinkers. He was one of the very best Bishops of Lincoln, and though he occupied the See for only two years he showed himself to be a true Father in God to his clergy. His ecclesiastical position consistently maintained is expressed in his own words, "Episcopacy is grounded upon Scripture texts of greater pregnancy and clearness, and is attested by a fuller consent of antiquity to have been uniformly and universally observed throughout the whole Christian world, than the Lord's Day hath hitherto been shown to be." Mr. Lewis is evidently a strong admirer of his hero and we have found his book a valuable help in understanding the stormy times in which the able and conscientious Bishop lived.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE FOUR GOSPELS.—A Study of Origins. Treating of the Manuscript Tradition Sources, Authorship and Dates. By B. H. Streeter. *Macmillans*, 21s.

It is clear that we have not yet reached finality in the study of the Synoptic Problem. Most of us were taught that the sources of the First and Third Gospel were to be sought in the Gospel according to St. Mark, and an early collection of the sayings of our Lord called for convenience sake Q. It was argued that Q came into existence at a quite early date "as it was a sort of manual for converts of the ethical basis of Christian life." Whether St. Mark knew of it or not was an open question, but few critics failed to contend that it was well known to the writers of the First and Third Gospels, who used it largely in the composition of their work. And so it came to pass that many believed that the non-Marcan elements in the Synoptists were earlier in date than St. Mark and might almost be said to be the work of the decade after our Lord's death. It had been declared that the Synoptic problem had been solved, and Professor Burkitt, in his most suggestive volume "Christian Beginnings," regrets the lack of interest in historical studies. The supply of fresh material is not likely to continue indefinitely. The old interest is dying. "Too many people have come to believe that it doesn't matter; the unbelievers do not care to occupy themselves with these old tales now that their authority is discredited, and those who still believe in Religion tend more and more to rely on 'Experience,' on the experiences of Religion here and now. This is the case with Neo-Catholicism almost as much as with Methodism and other modern Protestant varieties of religion."

We are under the impression that the Synoptic problem is not solved. We are also convinced that the new book of Dr. Streeter has reopened it and will give students of the books that have most vital interest for Christianity their right place in theological thought. The Johannine problem is also discussed, and whether we agree or disagree with his conclusions he is always able to give good reasons for them. As an Introduction to New Testament criticism—Textual and Historical—this book is by far the most readable we have seen. It clothes the dry bones of scholarship with lucid English, and its author never loses sight of the reverence with which studies of the Gospel must be approached. He is fearless without being iconoclastic, and he is more eager to reach truth than to make a point. The layman who is ignorant of Greek can read with pleasure and profit the greater part of the book, and the advanced student will find Mr. Streeter able to solve some of his hard questions and at times to suggest lines of study that may be fruitful. We have thoroughly enjoyed the hours we have spent with his volume and are certain that no reader who has even a bowing acquaintance with New Testament studies will fail to benefit by its careful study.

The Text of the Gospels is not easily determined. The variants are many, but of no vital importance as regards the truth taught. The Revisers adopted practically the Westcott and Hort Text, which laid most weight upon the readings of two old Manuscripts, but since their day opinion has moved, and more weight is given to other manuscripts, and the Versions are considered a very valuable test of the original Text. It is very easy to conceive how a Version made long before the writing of a manuscript may give us a clue to the underlying text that was employed by the translator. In this way certain versions, which are considerably older than the earliest Greek Text, are most valuable. St. Luke tells us in the Preface to his Gospel that there were many sources which he might have used, and his work is a setting forth of the facts that he had investigated. Mr. Streeter holds that the different Gospels originated in different localities and were written in and for different Churches. They were all known at Rome before A.D. 155. The problem of Textual Criticism is to determine the original text of the Gospels, of Historical Criticism to find if possible their sources, to discover their authors and to display their interrelation.

On all these points Mr. Streeter has much to say that has not been said before. He believes that the most original portion of his work is the identification of the new Koredethi MS. Theta and its allies with the Text in use at Cæsarea about A.D. 230. He has practically proved this contention, and by so doing has given us a much broader basis for the reconstruction of the Text of the Gospels. We go a step further back and the readings in this MS. become more valuable. The elaborate tables given by Mr. Streeter show how the Text can be employed in checking the Revised Text. Origen used this Text and the famous scholar's acquaintance with it and reliance upon it is an event of first-rate importance in the history of the Gospel Text.

The discussion of the lost end of Mark is particularly full and interesting. He holds that it was lost very early and that the longer conclusion we have had its origin in Rome. Mr. Streeter contends that John XXI represents either the lost end of Mark or an oral tradition more or less its equivalent. He suggests that the appearance of our Lord by the Sea of Galilee was preceded by an appearance to Mary Magdalene, something like that recorded by John. He lays stress on the fact that in three of the Gospels our Lord's first appearance was to a woman, and that this was the tradition most probably in Antioch, Ephesus and Rome. It "must have gone back to great antiquity and have been regarded as authenticated by irrefutable authority. But if it originally stood in Mark, which in a point like this must be supposed to rest on Peter's own reminiscences, then there was the authority of Peter himself that he had in this matter been forestalled by a woman."

The treatment of the Fourth Gospel—its sources and authorship—is to us the most unsatisfactory portion of the book. He considers that the book belongs to the Library of Devotion rather than to the Historical side of Literature. The Synoptists write as

Jews wrote—the writer of the Fourth Gospel reflects the Greek practice with the important difference that he considers himself as a prophet inspired by the Spirit of Jesus, and that his work is not the fruit of his own intellect, but is in reality a result of the utterances of that Spirit. Mr. Streeter thinks that modern psychology in its treatment of the subject of mysticism may give us some guidance in arriving at the mental condition of the writer. In determining the character of the attitude of a writer to the Fourth Gospel we are accustomed to consider his treatment of the raising of Lazarus as crucial. Mr. Streeter holds that the author derived the story from an authority which he regarded “mistakenly or otherwise” as no less authentic than the Second Gospel.

He does not believe the author to have been the Apostle John, but a disciple who idealized the Apostle into the Beloved Disciple, and fixes the date of the Gospel—written as he says by John the Elder—A.D. 90–95, when he was about seventy years old. The general tendency of critics is in this direction, but during recent years there has been a reaction, and in the current *Church Quarterly Review* Dr. Rigg argues strongly in support of the Johannine authorship, and as is well known Bishop Gore and the late Canon Scott Holland also held this view. We are far from having heard the last word on this momentous question, and as “The Four Gospels” considerably confirms the early date and authority of the Synoptists as against earlier writers, so we believe the historians of the future will be found in favour of the Fourth Gospel being the work of the Apostle.

We have dealt cursorily with a work that will be our companion for many years. It contains within its covers material that cannot easily be found in any other book, and we know no better training for those who desire to face for themselves the problems raised than to follow the practical advice of Mr. Streeter and make their own analyses and then compare them with the results reached by our author. The trouble is worth taking, for the Text of the Gospels will be made part of the mental equipment of the student, and its influence will remain with him through life. A little first-hand investigation is worth a great deal more than the reading of the best books. No man who is not a professor can do all that has been accomplished by Mr. Streeter, but we can all do something that will familiarise us with methods that are as frequently praised as they are criticised without adequate equipment for either praise or blame. Mr. Streeter has given us a work that is at once a Textual and Historical introduction to the most important of all branches of historical enquiry. In more ways than one the old saying is true “*Bonus textuarius, bonus theologus.*”

THE INNER LIFE. Essays in Liberal Evangelicalism, by Members of the Church of England. *Hodder & Stoughton.* 6s.

Liberal Evangelicalism attracted much attention by the outspokenness of its contributors and by a certain temper that gave

expression to a feeling that their work was destructive as well as constructive. They wished to take from what they had inherited all that seemed to them out of touch with modern thought and knowledge. They realised that they had within them the seed of Truth which had germinated in a fashion somewhat different to its development in their ancestors. They were out for reconciliation with other schools of thought as well as for the assertion of their own principles, and here and there we noticed an effort to be less distinctive than they really are in order that they might be in touch with those who differed from them. There were sentences that seemed out of place in such a volume and the new series of papers by the same contributors, with omissions and additions, are from this point of view much more homogeneous. They are men of the Twentieth Century and share its marvellous advance of knowledge. They, like all writers who are not Encyclopædists, are at times under the influence of phrases that are not fully mastered and are likely to become intellectual tyrants to them, but taken as a whole the ring of these papers is truer to the best in the writers than the former volume was representative of their fundamental thought.

One of the papers will command universal assent among Evangelical Churchmen, and its appearance at this time will do much good. The Rev. G. H. Harris writes on "The Place and Purpose of the Holy Communion in the Christian Life." It accepts as axiomatic the definition of the Church that pervades the book: "The Fellowship of all those who are united in Christ: an organism with Christ as its centre which exhibits fruits of the Spirit." In this Fellowship the Holy Communion is the heart of corporate worship: it is the Church's highest act of Sacrifice, Thanksgiving and Adoration." In the interpretation of the meaning of the Sacrament "the evidence of the New Testament stands complete and final." "Unless sacramental language is used with full appreciation of its nature and limitations, there always results a dangerous confusion between the highest spiritual conceptions of Christianity and ideas which belong to the debased religions of far-off ages." Had those who are intent on introducing into our Church ideas that had their origin in the Dark Ages—we make no apology for using the words—remembered these two considerations we should have been saved much controversy and the advance of the Kingdom of God would have proceeded on very different lines. "The supreme motive in Christian worship is not man's need but God's nature. His beauty, truth and goodness, His Holiness and His Love." When man has this in mind and heart he will always find in the Divine response all that satisfies his needs. It is the meeting of spirit with Spirit, and this takes place as we draw near to His table. Those who love and trust Him feed on Him by Faith. The symbols disappear in the presence of the Lord in the heart, and man dwells in Christ and Christ in him. This is no reduced doctrine of the Holy Communion, for it is the teaching of the New Testament. It certainly is shorn of much that has been added

to the revelation made by God to us, but it sets forth the Divine provision for the needs of man and brings man and his Saviour face to face. This Essay is worth the whole price of the book, and ought to do much to steady thought and confirm Evangelicals in their hold upon truth.

In a volume that has contributors so diverse as Canon Storr and the Rev. F. W. Dwelly, Bishop Barnes and the Rev. G. C. L. Lunt, Dean Burroughs and Mrs. M. I. Rogers, dealing with problems on which equally good Evangelicals are by no means agreed—it we note that at times the writers do not agree with one another—it is impossible to say we accept as final much that is contained in the Essays. It seems to us that some of them hold a view of the Atonement which is not that of St. Paul, and we prefer St. Paul and the Gospels to modern ideas on this great central fact. But this cannot be said of all the writers, for there is as sound traditional and scriptural Evangelicalism in some of the Essays as can be found in the writings of their predecessors. The book deserves serious thought. It represents a vigorous school in our midst, and those who cannot place themselves in line with them owe it to the great principles we all have in common, to understand our differences and seek a reconciliation of them in love for the brethren.

A PORTRAITURE OF CHRIST. By Bernard Herklots, M.A. *Religious Tract Society.* 7s. 6d. net.

The appearance of a new Life of Christ is always sure of a welcome, because readers are glad of the opportunity of discovering fresh values in the character of their Master. The extraordinary appeal made by such books as Glover's *Jesus of History* is a striking testimony to the keenness with which men are ever on the look out for a reverent study of the life and character of our Lord. The work of Mr. Herklots, therefore, will at once command a ready circle of readers, and we should like to recommend the reading of the book for more than one reason. In the first place it is content to take the Gospel narratives at their face value, and there is a complete absence of that hypercritical spirit which delights ever to criticise, and forgets the spiritual value of the Bible. Then also we welcome the deeply spiritual tone which pervades the handling of the facts of our Lord's life, and which finds in them many lessons for our own day. Further, it is a great help to find some of the big subjects, such as the Atonement, dealt with so sympathetically and practically, and in a way which brings them home to our spiritual life.

There are some points in the book with which a critical reader might find fault. He might cavil at the somewhat sentimental atmosphere of a few of the early pages, and he might be inclined to question, in view of recent discoveries, the accuracy of such a statement as that Nazareth was a quiet village. The fact remains, however, that the work will prove of great value to all who are looking for a sympathetic treatment of the life of our Lord.

To avoid misunderstanding, it should be mentioned that the book is not a "life" of our Lord in the ordinary sense, though it covers most of the salient points in our Lord's life. It consists of 35 chapters, each complete in itself, dealing with such subjects as "The Birth of Christ," "The Mother of Christ," "The Wit of Christ," etc.

T. W. G.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY COMMUNION.

WHAT MEAN YE BY THIS SERVICE? Biblical and Anglican Teaching on the Holy Communion. By the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D., Rector of Bradfield, Berks. *The Church Book Room*. 1s. net paper, 2s. net cloth.

The eight chapters which make up this little book appeared originally as articles in *The Record*. We are not surprised that the author received many requests that he would gather them together and publish them in book form, and we are heartily glad that he has done so. There are very many pamphlets which set forth the Evangelical faith with regard to the Holy Communion, but we do not think there is any other so scholarly and at the same time so simple and interesting as Dr. Gilbert's *What mean ye by this Service?* and the Church Book Room is to be heartily congratulated on such a valuable addition to its publications.

The first chapter, "The Passover Background," by narrating succinctly the events in the life of our Lord and His disciples which immediately preceded the institution of the Holy Communion, gives us the "atmosphere" in which the institution was made and so brings out the naturalness—if we may use the word—of its being made just at this actual time and place. "As the Passover reminds you that God . . . helped your fathers in Egypt . . . so this meal will tell you that the love which takes Me to the Cross for you, that same love will abide for ever."

Dr. Gilbert goes, of course, much farther than this. The Passover, our Lord's self-humiliations and the coming Cross are the three notes of the early part of the proceedings in the Upper Room: but the coming Cross overshadows all else. The Holy Communion commemorates a new Covenant inaugurated by the death of Christ.

In the third chapter, "This do in remembrance of Me," the author rejects as quite insufficient the idea that our Lord was merely asking His disciples "to do this in order to keep his memory green." (We suggest that in a later edition these words might be phrased differently.) The parallelism with the Passover is still interestingly maintained. What was to be remembered was "the objective demonstration of Christ's saving power" which the disciples were presently to see on Calvary.

Dr. Gilbert dismisses the idea that in the Holy Communion we re-enact the Sacrifice, with the remark that it is outside the range of possibility. In view of modern developments of doctrine we should gladly have seen this emphasised. He does well to quote

Dr. Plummer's triumphant demolition of the claim that *ποιεῖν* can have a Sacrificial meaning: and the true explanation of the meaning of *καταγγέλλω* (1 Cor. xi. 26) is given. Considering the title chosen by the author it would not be out of place to note that in the Jewish Paschal ritual the *Haggadah* (the telling forth) is the name given to the answer which the President makes when some child present asks: "What mean ye by this Service?"

We wish that space had permitted Dr. Gilbert to dwell more fully on the interpretation of *ἔστί* ("this is my body"). The comparison with "this is the bread of affliction" is quite pertinent, but we believe that many communicants still stumble at the words, and we have known the difficulties of some removed by a study of the passages (collected and classified excellently by Marriott in his *Treatise on the Holy Eucharist*) in which *ἔστί* occurs.

The latter part of the book contains a very valuable statement of the Anglican belief with regard to the Holy Communion. The author's exposition is confirmed by extracts from Whitgift, Bullinger, Cranmer, Hooker, Jewel and Waterland which show the persistency of the Evangelical tradition as to what happens—or does not happen—to the bread and wine after Consecration. We welcome, too, the prominence given to the often-repeated saying of the Reformation writers, that "to eat is to believe," and especially to the quotation from William Tyndale who said (in the 16th, not in the 15th Century) that "to eat is to believe that His body was crucified for our sins and His blood shed for our sins." This is surely justified by our Lord's word FOR:—"Drink ye all of it, For . . ." and by 1 Cor. x. 16: words which disprove the merely "memorial" theory and which warranted the Early Church and our own in maintaining (see the Prayer of Humble Access) that the Holy Communion is "a means for the appropriation by sinful men of all that His sacrificial death has secured for them."

But here we ask one question. In a very beautiful passage (pp. 48 and 49) Dr. Gilbert says that the repentant and faithful communicant as he receives "the pledges of His love" is *pardoned, cleansed* and strengthened. Is it well to confine the pardoning and cleansing to this point of the Service? The Confession and Absolution come before the Reception, and there follows it the prayer that we may "obtain remission of our sins." Is it not better to say as our author does distinctly say elsewhere (in commenting on the almost terribly realistic quotation from Hooker) that in the Holy Communion we *realise* the benefits of Redemption? We need scarcely say that "the feeding upon Him," is duly emphasized.

We mention these points because we feel sure that there is a great future before this little book, whose size is altogether disproportionate to its value. We hope that it will form the subject of study for many study circles and that the clergy will draw the attention of thoughtful communicants to it.

W. H. F.

THE HOLY COMMUNION: A study in history and doctrine. By Albert Mitchell (Member of the Church Assembly). *The Church Book Room*. 1s. net.

Whatever Mr. Albert Mitchell writes on the present controversy is worth reading, not only because of his accurate knowledge and wide reading, but because of the spirit in which he approaches the subject. The little book before us consists of two parts, the first half being the substance of a paper read at a Conference of Churchmen on the Reformation Doctrine basis of Holy Communion, the second and rather larger half containing notes on the position of the minister at the Lord's table: the vesture of the minister: the Prayer of Humble Access and the Consecration and Reservation. Finally there is a longer note on "Principles and Definition."

A very brief enumeration of some of the points made by Mr. Mitchell in the first half of the book will show that he is dealing with his subject with a good deal of freshness. The Reformation had economic, political and moral causes, but they are all traceable to religion: the Reformation was a religious movement. The History of the English Church explains the fact that the English Reformation was so painfully focussed on the Holy Communion. (This thesis is excellently developed.) The Anglo-Saxon Church was much purer than the other Western Churches, and even after the Conquest the purer teaching lingered to emerge in the writings of Wycliffe. It was by the endurance even to death of the ordinary English lay folk that the foundation of the Reformed faith of our Church was cemented. The English Prayer Book was the expression of a positive faith already firmly held by English Church folk and not a new product of a handful of learned scholars. All this is convincingly developed and can be heartily commended to the careful reading of those who wish to know what the English Reformation really was. Mr. Mitchell has no apologies to make.

It is refreshing also to see what Mr. Mitchell says on the 1552 Prayer Book. Bishop Gardiner tried to read (and partially succeeded in the attempt) the *unreformed* doctrine into the 1549 book. "Every point in which he (Gardiner) claims to score was altered in the 1552 book." Mr. Mitchell lays special and needed emphasis on the removal of the Prayer of Humble Access to a position *before* the Consecration Prayer and protests against the present attempt to move it back to its 1549 position. In a fine concluding chapter we are shown how the Reformers were upholding vital truths of the Gospel obscured or practically denied by the Roman Ritual:—the Authority of Holy Scripture: the Completeness of the Redemptive Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross: the true doctrine of the Ascension (the Reformers saw that the doctrine of a carnal and local presence robbed the Church of the fulness of Christ's teaching, "It is expedient for you that I go away"): and the real purpose of the Blessed Sacrament.

Out of many quotations which we should like to make from this section we choose the following because we do not remember seeing the point so well put elsewhere: "They (the Reformers)

escaped from the Semi-Arianism that had honeycombed the mediæval Church, largely, I believe, through the false doctrine taught to the eye by the mediæval ritual (especially the back-to-people position of the ministering priest) of re-presentation to the Father of the Sacrifice of the Son, which practically divided the substance of the Godhead."

The "Additional Notes" are admirable summaries of the controversial points with which they respectively deal. Mr. Mitchell strongly dislikes the Eastward position and, as strongly, longs for the revival of the primitive use which "beyond controversy" was for the minister to stand behind the Lord's table facing the people. We commend to any of our readers who are willing to do an hour's hard mental work the note on the Ornaments Rubric, entirely agreeing, as we do, that "not one in a thousand of those who talk glibly about it has any substantial knowledge of the historical evidence or the legal issues." In 1903 *The Guardian* in some sixteen successive issues published a large number of letters on this subject by Canon McColl, Mr. Nunn and other redoubtable controversialists. It is interesting to the present writer to recall that careful study of these led him to precisely the same conclusion as that at which Mr. Mitchell arrives, viz.: that "if the 1662 so-called 'rubric' did restore the old vesture, it was only by a fluke and not of set purpose."

We unhesitatingly commend Mr. Mitchell's treatise as a storehouse of cogent weapons for those who wish to contend for the Evangelical position. Mr. Mitchell will never "let them down."

W. H. F.

THE STUDY OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR OF THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES. By De Lacy O'Leary, D.D., Lecturer in Aramaic, etc., Bristol University. *Kegan Paul*, 1923. 10s. 6d. (pp. xv + 280.)

It has always been one of the characteristics of the Church of the Reformation to promote the study of the Holy Scriptures, and not only so but in their original languages. The Roman Church may find the Vulgate translation of St. Jerome very satisfying; but the Church of England wants something even better. (It must not be forgotten that it was Jerome who invented Beelzebub in the New Testament. His *Greek* had Beelzebub.) And it is not only that Protestant Christians have always valued the study of the Bible; it is Protestants who realise that for the proper interpretation of the New Testament, and as a prophylactic against many of the grosser forms of ecclesiastical dogma, a right understanding of the *Old Testament* in particular is of primary and fundamental importance. It is significant that at the present day among the extreme Anglo-Catholics "not many mighty are called" to study the Old Testament at all. It is the great Free Church bodies, and to some extent the Evangelical wing of the Church of England, who are interested in pure scholarship—viz., the exact understanding of

Old Testament and New Testament ; without confusing its teaching with later accretions or even with legitimate developments of doctrine. The Evangelical School welcomes the production of books which shed a light upon Hebrew and Aramaic—Aramaic, not only because parts of Daniel and Ezra are extant only in that tongue, but because it was the language actually used by our divine Saviour and His disciples. The language called in the New Testament " Hebrew " is (except in the Apocalypse) *Aramaic*, the speech of the Hebrews at the time—the tongue that had spread all over Western Asia ; and of which so many specimens occur in place-names and in exact quotations of the words of Jesus Christ in the Gospels.

Dr. O'Leary's book opens with 22 pages of very readable Introduction upon what is meant by the " Semitic Languages." His divisions are convenient : (1) the languages of Babylonia and Assyria ; (2) of Canaan, including Hebrew and Phœnician ; (3) Aramaic ; (4) Arabic, and (5) Abyssinian (generally called " Ethiopic," the language of the " Enoch " quoted by St. Jude). All these Semitic tongues, though independent as English and Dutch, are so related philologically that such study of, e.g., Hebrew, is only imperfect and one-sided which is not reinforced by a knowledge of at least one other Semitic language. It is important to say that Aramaic and Hebrew are sister languages, neither one being derived from the other. One reads in a certain type of New Testament Introduction or Commentary that Aramaic was " popular Hebrew." From the philological point of view it would be just as accurate to call German " popular English."

And now for an account of the book before us. It is one of *Trübner's Oriental Series*, parallel with such volumes as Prof. Cowell's *Systems of Hindu Philosophy* and Dr. Edward Sachau's *India*, and indeed with Dr. O'Leary's own earlier contributions, *Arabic Thought and its place in History*, and *A Short History of the Fatimid Khalifate*. First of all Dr. O'Leary is to be congratulated upon producing the first comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages composed in English since the publication in 1890 by the late Prof. Robertson Smith of Prof. William Wright's Lectures at Cambridge on this subject. (William Wright is not to be confused with that redoubtable Protestant and widely-read Semitic scholar Dr. C. H. H. Wright, of Dublin.) William Wright marked, of course, a great advance in this country ; and it is unlikely that an English scholar will arise who will contribute so much in his generation to the comparative study of Semitic languages. Since then, however, on the Continent there has appeared Brockelmann's *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, edd. 1908 and 1913. Dr. O'Leary would not claim to class his volume with these monuments of Semitic research, but he can say that he has composed a treatise involving all the Semitic Languages—Wright's book incorporated Assyrian but sparingly—and with some of the omissions about *Nouns* in Wright now supplied. A characteristic also is the amazing number of Dr. O'Leary's

references to *dialects* within the main five groups of languages.

This is not the occasion to enter into discussion of details. As will be expected, the author makes quite a thorough use of North Semitic Inscriptions, e.g., Phœnician, Neo-punic, Nabataean. The treatment of the *imperfect tense in par.* 147 is concise and complete. We do not, however, notice a possible explanation of the *l* in the Talmudic form; it occurs early in the Jussive sense in the *Hadad* inscription, line 23 (a passage the author must have missed or he would not have said on page 245 line 2 "in *later* Aramaic"), and this fact surely may supply the reason why the *l* occurs later as an *imperfect* tense. Upon the perplexing problem of "internal passives" we should much like to have seen a considerable discussion. The facts are not quite completely stated on p. 234. (Contrast Wright, p. 225.) However, it is impossible for a writer on so vast a subject as the present one to deal with every department exhaustively within any reasonable compass of space.

Incidentally, we might say that in a future edition, if it is found possible to supply references to modern authorities it would greatly add to the value of the book. The Bibliography at the beginning is not in itself a sufficient guide in the matter. This is useful in informing the reader of grammars, etc., on the various languages discussed. In this respect, the claims might have been considered of such text-books as Levias' *Talmud Grammar*, Mercer's *Ethiopic Grammar* 1920 and *Assyrian Grammar* 1921. Since the publication of Dr. O'Leary's volume there has appeared Prof. Stevenson's *Aramaic Grammar*, an invaluable manual for those who do not read German.

In conclusion it is safe to prophesy that no new book on the philology of the Semitic languages of the size and comprehensiveness of the Rev. Dr. O'Leary's will appear in England at the modest cost of half-a-guinea within our generation.

R. S. C.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND ORIENTAL CIVILISATIONS. By Maurice T. Price, Ph.D. *Edward Evans & Sons, Ltd.*, Shanghai. 16s.

This book is the first of a series dealing with Christian Missions from the psychological point of view. It is a bulky work, covering, with its Appendices, Bibliography, and Index, 578 pages. Dr. Price has had some years of practical experience in the Mission Field, and is thus able to deal with the mass of testimony which he has received from various quarters in the light of his own personal knowledge. It is a sign of the times that Missions have assumed such importance that they may be taken as a field of study from the purely scientific point of view, quite apart from their intrinsic nature. Of course, it will be said that treatment of this kind is unsatisfying because incomplete. Vital religious experiences can never be adequately described *ab extra*. But it is all to the good that investigation from whatever point of view should be brought to bear upon missionary activity. Nothing can be lost by publicity. The up-to-date student will find a great deal of valuable material

but all who have given themselves to this study have realised how valuable is metre in supplementing the evidence of ancient Versions, etc., in the restoration of the true Hebrew text in a difficult passage.

Moreover, it helps in the discovery of liturgical and other conscious additions to a Psalm after it left the original author's pen. (Dr. Sugden has distinguished the additions he has discovered by the use of italics indented.) In this way the translator maintains the Davidic authorship of Psalm li. as a whole, exhibiting only the final two verses as a later addition.

As may easily be believed it is an extremely difficult task to render the exact content of a Hebrew Psalm when the translator is forced to cast his rendering into the mould of an English metrical, rhyming system. It seems almost impossible not to introduce some ideas absent from the original, e.g. Psalm xxix. 5, "Lebanon's *snows*." In Psalm xvi. 9*b*, the words "in the grave" have no equivalent in the Hebrew.

With considerable skill the translator has represented the peculiarity of *acrostic* Psalms. E.g., Psalm ix. 1—

1. A lways will I praise Jehovah,
A nd His wondrous works proclaim,
A ll my heart in thanks outpouring
A t the memory of His name.
2. B ackward Thou hast driven my foemen,

As yet no mention has been made in this review of the *Strophes*, which Dr. Sugden has taken pains to recover, and has shown by numeration, as in the example above "1" and "2." It would, however, have been a help if the familiar verse numbers could have been given as well. Finally it may be added that the reader who masters the modest Introduction and the various condensed notes (especially at the head of each Psalm) will have gone a long way towards recovering the probable literary history of the Psalter and the meanings of its various technical terms. R. S. C.

LITERARY GENIUS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By P. C. Sands, Headmaster of Pocklington School, and late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. *Clarendon Press*, 1924. 4s. 6*d*. (pp. 123.)

We should advise no teacher of the Bible in schools to do his work without seeing whether this book has anything to contribute by way of practical method or indeed fresh information. Certainly the author has worked hard at his subject in theory, and in his own classes, before venturing to offer the present volume to the public.

Most adults when they read the Old Testament, or hear it read, are conscious of its literary beauty. Children are sometimes *told* that a certain passage is in fine style, but Mr. Sands has so analysed the Old Testament, as to make evident *wherein* lies its high literary merit, what are its characteristics, and what are the devices (conscious or unconscious) used by the various sacred writers. More-

over, he enables his readers not only to appreciate the linguistic phenomena of a chapter, but (without commentary or text-book) to see the meaning of some of those passages which to the average reader are obscure, e.g., Habakkuk iii. (pp. 81-83), Psalm xviii. (pp. 63, 64), Job xxviii. (pp. 113, 114), Amos iii. (p. 19).

Indeed, throughout, Mr. Sands writes as a humble-minded enthusiast for the Old Testament as a sacred book. From the title one would hardly have expected a chapter to be included upon "The appearance of God." In this he finely shows the "mystery" attaching to each theophany. Incidentally he contrasts the sublime conception of God in Genesis i. with "the childish stories of eggs and hatchings of matter in other ancient theologies."

Mr. Sands divides his subject (in the form of "lessons") under such headings as The Art of Story-telling, Dramatic Power, Parable, Allegories, The Hebrew View of Nature, Irony. Under *Story-telling*, the author notes the characteristics of simplicity, vividness, absence of elaboration of character, scenery or dress, etc., and the use of dialogue and climaxes. Naturally as a classical scholar Mr. Sands displays side by side Old Testament and Homer to show how each excels in these points. Similarly, also, by parallel columns in the last chapter the author illustrates how the style of the Old Testament is continued into the New. Cf. Mark vi. 21-29 with 1 Samuel xxxi. 3-13 and Matthew xxi. 33-41 with Isaiah v. 1-5.

The "preparation" and "exercises" attached to each lesson will be found very suggestive for class use; and there is a good index. One could wish that this book might be used not only as a help in Bible lessons, but in those schools where there is no provision for Scripture teaching. It is unfair that the Bible should not be studied *at least* as literature. And, as Mr. Sands declares, "in studying style, it is quite certain that other values, spiritual and historical, will simultaneously gain increased recognition, and whatever powers of criticism are awakened in the pupils will certainly not be of the destructive kind" (p. 6). Good Protestants will appreciate the ode on the defeat of the Spanish Armada composed in conscious imitation of the style and phraseology of such passages as Judges v. and Habakkuk iii.

R. S. C.

PEDAGOGICS OF THE TALMUD AND THAT OF MODERN TIMES: A Comparative Study by Sir Hermann Gollancz, M.A., D.Litt., Rabbi. Humphrey Milford, *Oxford University Press*, 1924. 7s. 6d. (pp. 120.)

Dr. Gollancz held the chair of Hebrew at University College from 1902 until last year. His work is marked by that thoroughness characteristic of members of the Jewish race, combined with the accuracy of scientific method which we regard as modern and western. We have before us a great book by a great man.

The author in his Introductory Remarks calls attention to the fact that after the destruction of the Temple tremendous efforts were made by the Jews to educate their children in their ancestral

faith by means of schools. Wherever the Jew wandered, or was driven, he took with him the institution of the *school*. Indeed, in time it became a rule "that a Jew dare not reside in a place in which there was no proper provision for the education of the young" (p. 15). Thus, "the education of the individual formed, throughout the entire course of Jewish history, the only cure for the ills and horrors which seem to be the destiny of the Jewish people even unto this day" (p. 3). Happily the Jewish Elementary School had been established in every town throughout Israel a few years previous to the fall of Jerusalem (by Rabbi Joshua ben Gamla, A.D. 63-65).

We pass now to ancient Jewish principles and methods of education. Here is one example of a sound maxim not always observable in "Provided Schools" to-day. "To regard a good child as the model of perfection is as unfair and false as to consider a bad child incorrigible" (p. 53). How often do we see a promising child spoiled by being made to think too much of himself! Again in these days of overcrowded syllabuses and of brain cramming, Education Authorities might still learn something from the Talmudic maxims, "Grasp much and you will retain nothing," and "He who gathers knowledge by degrees, will increase it" (p. 55). Preachers may know the following device, but do all teachers? "Rabbah, before he began to teach his pupils, was in the habit of introducing his remarks with something bright and sparkling; by this means the scholars were put in a joyous mood. He then proceeded in all gravity to the subject of his discourse" (p. 56). A preceptor should never spare himself the tedium of drilling his lesson into the minds of his pupils—"Moses repeated to Aaron *four times* the explanation of the Torah (Law) which he had received from God" (p. 57). Pupils should do expression work. "He who does not repeat what he has learnt, is like one who sows but does not reap" (p. 58).

The close connection between education and religion was touched upon above. The Christian Church, likewise, has not, upon the whole, been slow to realise this. Nothing, however, comes near to the Jewish ideal. "Religious knowledge formed the centre round which all other subjects revolved. The Religion, derived from and built upon the Bible and the Talmud, served as the fount and origin of Jewish learning" (p. 60). All branches of worldly learning were bound up with the highest Wisdom. The satisfaction of the young person's spiritual yearnings and desires was the great object of education. Arithmetic, science, languages, are to be looked upon as means to a spiritual end. As may be expected the qualifications of the *teacher* were stringent. "The teacher is to be to the youth of the school a worthy priest of religion; but how can he be such, if he, e.g., openly acts contrary to the religion which he professes?" (p. 83). And "during the teaching he must be penetrated by the spirit of God" (p. 87).

It would not be fair to go on quoting. Teachers, especially those with antiquarian tastes, or who for any reason are interested

in the Jews and their history, would do well to consult this learned but simple treatise.

They would, it is believed, pick up many things concerning the art of teaching. They would also realise that even in the department of pedagogics "there is nothing new under the sun." The apparently novel maxim may have been invented by the Jewish Rabbis and used for the past one or two thousand years. Moreover the perusal of such a work as Rabbi Gollancz's makes us Christian clergy and teachers wonder whether we realise and use our opportunities with the young. The Old Covenant preceptors will stimulate us to earnestness.

R. S. C.

THE REVELATION OF GOD and other Sermons. By the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. *S.P.C.K.* 3s. 6d. (120 pp.)

The eleven sermons in this volume cover a variety of subjects, amongst them the Revelation of God in Nature, in Mankind, and in Christ. There are two sermons preached at St. Paul's, one entitled "Christ in Fiction," in which it is pointed out that no great writer, ancient or modern, has ever invented a speech for Christ, for the simple reason that they know not what to make Him say. Yet the Evangelists report His words at length. It is because they were recording actual facts. The discussion upon the Resurrection Body in a sermon preached at Eastbourne declares that there are two strains of New Testament teaching on this subject, viz. that contained in the Gospels, and that contained in the Epistles. There were two theories in the early Church—the Latin, expounded by Tertullian, and the Greek associated with Origen. At the Reformation the "English Church adopted a characteristic compromise." The preacher's own conclusion is: "The essential and characteristic element of the Christian doctrine is that body shall be the permanent accompaniment and expression of spirit; that it will be material then as now; and that while totally transfigured into a perfect instrument of the spirit, it will retain identity, in the sense of being a development out of elements which we now possess."

The last three sermons are concerned with ecclesiastical subjects. "Religion," says the preacher, "has two sides, the individual and the corporate." One of the defects of English religion is that "an Englishman's religion is individualist through and through. It is a private affair between himself and his Maker. As for a divine society on earth with a right to his allegiance, and authority to regulate his life—in his opinion no such thing exists: the idea is a sheer impertinence." Dr. Sparrow Simpson is an Anglo-Catholic and it is possible that his ideal of the Church is not acceptable to the average Englishman, who would find it difficult to harmonise the Anglo-Catholic conception of the Church with the teaching of the Articles and that of the great representative men of the Church of England from Reformation times onward. In the sermon entitled "Community Life in the English Church" the preacher says, "We have already lived to see unexpected things.

That a member of a Religious Order should have presided in our time over the See of Oxford, and another actually preside over that of Truro, that candidates for ordination should be trained in an Anglican Religious house, that professed Religious should instruct our congregations; these are indeed proofs of spiritual power in the English Church over which we should be thankful and rejoice." Again: "The revival of Religious Orders among us is one of the convincing proofs of the reality of the Anglican sacraments and the Catholicity of the English Church."

To us, on the other hand, the promotion of pronounced Sacerdotalists and the revival of Religious Orders are proofs not of spiritual power and the reality of Anglican sacraments, but of the danger we are in of losing spiritual power by the revival of medieval conceptions of the Church and Sacraments. H. D.

CHRISTIANITY AND HISTORY. By the Rev. F. W. Butler. S.P.C.K.
5s. net.

We approached this book expecting to find in it something similar to that which is in *Christianity in History* by Dr. Bartlet and Dr. Carlyle. Instead, however, of finding the subject treated in the more usual way of the examination of the development of Christianity after the coming of our Lord, we found quite a different treatment altogether. Mr. Butler's aim has rather been to find first of all a philosophical basis for belief in God, and then to show how the Old Testament prophets are in themselves a further buttress for philosophical belief, and how our Lord Himself is the crown and realisation of this belief.

The justification for the title of the book therefore lies in the fact that Mr. Butler shows us both from history and experience that Christianity is "the final religion." He proves both from the standpoint of philosophy and of history that the Christian view of God and of the world is the climax of ethical monotheism, the ultimate view which best stands the tests of unity, totality, and comprehensiveness (p. 153). The book is not always easy reading, but it is worthy of the consideration of those who desire a closely-reasoned attempt to uphold the view that Christianity possesses absolute validity, and it will convince the thoughtful reader that our Christian faith is the "final" religion because of the revelation of God seen in our Lord Jesus Christ. T. W. G.



CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82, VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

The Holy Communion Service.—Dr. Gilbert's articles which recently appeared in *The Record* on the Biblical and Anglican Teaching of the Holy Communion Service have been printed in book form with a few verbal alterations at 1s. net in paper cover and 2s. net in cloth. The book is specially useful in view of the discussions on Prayer Book Revision. A full review appears elsewhere in this number.

Biographies of the Reformers.—The Religious Tract Society has published new editions of *Hugh Latimer* and *William Tyndale* by Robert Demaus at 5s. net. Demaus wrote out of a full knowledge, and his task was a labour of love; hence it is but natural that his books should become standard authorities. Archdeacon Buckland, in his preface to *Hugh Latimer*, states that both this and his later book on *William Tyndale* were warmly commended by scholars when they were published in 1869 and 1871 respectively, and no English Lives have replaced them. The need to study with gratitude the lives of those who toiled and died to give English-speaking people the Word of God and pure Religion is very great, and it is hoped that these interesting and arresting biographies will be widely read now that they are again obtainable at a reasonable price. We trust that we may soon see a reprint of Lechler's *Wycliffe* which has been out of print for some time.

Short Biographies.—The R.T.S. has re-published a number of short Biographies in pamphlet form (size $4\frac{1}{2}'' \times 3''$) which will be found suitable for sale in our book-racks. They can be obtained at 1d. each net. The series include, Hugh Latimer, William Tyndale, Martin Luther, John Wycliffe, John Knox, John Wesley, David Livingstone, John Huss, Charles Simeon, Elizabeth Fry, Robert Morrison and John Bunyan.

Church Teaching.—A customer of the Church Book Room wrote the other day: "The general public are extremely ignorant of Church Teaching, even when truly interested, as the best books are little known. Would it not be possible for letters to appear in the papers from individual members of your Committee recommending *A Churchman and His Church* by Canon Barnes-Lawrence as a book of the hour?" This suggestion has been adopted in several instances. The book in question is entitled by the author *A Manual for Churchmen*, and contains popular addresses on the Church and the Bible, The Church, The Christian Ministry, Holy Baptism, Holy Communion, The Prayer Book, and The Relative importance of the Means of Grace. We give two instances of its value which came to our notice on its first publication during the Great War. A Chaplain at one of the London hospitals received a copy of the book. A few days later he came to the Church Book Room and stated that he had given it to a young officer in the hospital who had thought little of religion, and through reading it he hoped he had been definitely brought to God. On another occasion a Private appeared with nineteen shillings carefully wrapped up, entrusted to him by men who had read the book and wanted each a copy for himself. It is published at 1s. in paper cover and 2s. in cloth. (Postage 3d.)

Baptism.—A useful leaflet compiled by the Rev. B. Herklots, Vicar of St. George's, Leeds, entitled *A Talk About Your Baby's Baptism* has been re-issued in booklet form (1d. or 7s. per 100). As the title indicates it is designed first to assist those who feel serious difficulty on the question of the baptism of young children. Its form and style render it suitable for presentation to parents both before and at the time of the baptism of their children. It is written in the form of a letter and can be signed, if desired, by the Vicar of the parish. It may be of service to mention three other pamphlets on this subject, particularly *Infant Baptism* by Canon Barnes-Lawrence, which has now been issued at 6d. net. The Canon states in his preface: "The case, either for or against Infant Baptism, is a matter of inference and argument," and his excuse for writing on so important a matter lies in the fact that most of the books and tracts about it so far as they have come under his notice omit all reference to that Divine Covenant on which the argument really rests, and urge the practice on secondary grounds. The other two pamphlets by Bishop H. C. G. Moule and the Rev. H. G. Grey, late Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, deal with the whole question. They are published at 1d. each or 7s. per 100.

Islington Conference.—The papers read at the Islington Conference this year on *Evangelicals Facing Facts*, have now been published (1s. net). The pamphlet is particularly interesting and useful this year, as it contains the addresses given by representatives of various shades of opinion of the Evangelical Party on Prayer Book Revision.

Church Booklets.—Two booklets entitled (1) *Time to Think. For Invalids*, and (2) *Why Go To Church?* have been issued at 1d. each or 7s. per 100. The first contains some very helpful thoughts and has already been found to be of service to Clergy, District Visitors and others who wish for something of the kind to leave with sick people. The second booklet deals with a subject of great importance at the present time, and it is hoped will be found useful for general distribution.

Two other booklets in the series include *A Talk About Your Baby's Baptism*, which is referred to in a preceding paragraph, and *A Communicant's Manual*, by Canon C. W. Wilson, Vicar of Swansea. This is specially compiled for Communicants' Unions and contains objects, rules, and a Service. The booklets are tastefully got up and can be enclosed in a court-shaped envelope.

In response to many requests it is proposed to add to the series, *Conversion*, by Bishop H. C. G. Moule. This pamphlet has been out-of-print for some time and was originally written for the League as a Mission Leaflet. The Bishop treats the subject with a directness that makes his words an appeal suitable for the widest circulation.

