

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

REUNION: THE APPROACH TO THE EASTERN CHURCHES.

BY THE REV. C. SYDNEY CARTER, D.D., F.R.Hist.S.,
Principal of Clifton Theological College.

TO-DAY, even more than when the words were penned six years ago, Christian people feel it is true that "the time has come for all separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church."¹

In face of the well-organised and world-wide attacks on Christianity itself and of the alarming spread of rival and competitive systems such as a semi-pagan Nationalism and Totalitarianism and materialistic and atheistic Communism, the suicidal policy of divisions and mutual denunciations, in the different sections of the one great Christian Army, are really inexcusable and intolerable. Surely all those who name the name of Christ and own Him as Lord and Saviour should be able to recognise each other as brethren and thus have some kind of "family" association or fellowship, even if on some important but subordinate matters they may hold different doctrines or varying opinions. Those who are able to accept—to get down to a closer definition—the general teaching expressed in the great Catholic Creeds of Christendom, should have sufficient in common to be able to show to the world that they can and do extend the right hand of fellowship to one another. The statement of that persecuted but enlightened and tolerant French Roman Catholic of the eighteenth century—Father Courayer—expresses the inner convictions of most churchmen to-day regarding those who are of another Christian fold: "Though separated from us, they are still our brethren, nor is anything foreign to us of that which is marked by the seal of Jesus Christ."²

The aim, therefore, as an outward expression of this sincere conviction, to get into closer contact and fellowship with our brethren of the Eastern Orthodox Churches is one which should strike a deep responsive chord in all our hearts. It is our clear duty as Christians to seek to understand more fully their doctrinal teaching and worship and to discover what measure of agreement exists and what amount of real fellowship it is possible to secure with them. It is with this laudable object that negotiations have been conducted by the Anglican Communion with the various branches of the Orthodox Church during recent years, and in particular that an Orthodox Delegation was welcomed by, and conferred with a Committee of the Lambeth Conference in 1930. This, and similar Conferences, took their origin from the great "Lambeth Appeal" of 1920. This "Appeal" was sent to the Eastern Orthodox Church and as a result

¹ Lambeth Conference Report, 1930, p. III.

² Quoted my *Reformation and Reunion*, p. 188.

the Patriarch of Constantinople, followed by the Patriarch of Jerusalem and Cyprus, made Declarations accepting the validity of Anglican Orders. In 1930 a most representative Delegation from the Orthodox Church was present at the Lambeth Conference and as a result of its discussions with the members of the Anglican sub-Committee, a Report on "the Unity of the Church" was published at the Conference. This sub-Committee also proposed that a joint Theological Committee should be appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and by the Œcumenical Patriarchal, to report both to the Lambeth Conference and to the Pro-Synod of the Holy Orthodox Church. This Proposal was accepted by the Lambeth Conference, and in Resolution 33 (b) the Archbishop of Canterbury was officially requested "to appoint representatives of the Anglican Communion and to invite the Œcumenical Patriarch to appoint representatives of the Patriarchs and Autocephalous Churches of the East to be a Doctrinal Commission which may . . . prepare a joint statement on the theological points about which there is difference and agreement between the Anglican and Eastern Churches." The Archbishop accordingly appointed representatives to the Joint Doctrinal Commission, and a very misleading "Agreement" was reported in October, 1931. The Archbishop then also nominated certain Anglican Representatives to meet representatives of the Rumanian Church at Bucarest in June, 1935. The Report of this Conference has recently been published, and the unanimous Agreements which have been reached demand very serious thought from Churchmen since they claim to express the Church of England teaching on the important subjects discussed at this Conference.

There is, in the first place, a certain apparent confusion and uncertainty as to the precise authority of this Commission to speak thus for the doctrinal position of the Anglican Communion, and especially for the Church of England. It should be carefully remembered that the Lambeth Conference is a voluntary body and only partially representative of the Anglican Communion as a whole, since the ordinary clergy and the laity have no representation on it. It is therefore more in the nature of an Anglican Debating Society, certainly of wide influence, and greatly respected. But it is not in any real sense a properly constituted legislative or executive Body competent to define doctrine or to make laws for the various branches of the Anglican Communion.

There is a clear recognition of this limited and unauthoritative status of the Conference in Resolution 33 (c) where it is stated that "The Conference, *not having been summoned* as a Synod to issue any statement professing to *define doctrine*, is unable to issue such a formal statement on the subjects referred to in the Résumé of the discussions between the Patriarch of Alexandria with the other Orthodox Representatives and Bishops of the Anglican Communion." Yet the conclusion of this Resolution endeavours to make a curious distinction between a "formal *doctrinal* statement" and the "acceptance of statements on doctrine," since inconsistently it actually endorses the *doctrinal* statements in this Résumé of the

Discussions between the Eastern Church delegates and the Anglican sub-Committee. Moreover, Resolution 33 (*b*) appears to contradict the clear statement of section (*c*) just quoted, since it requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint representatives of the Anglican Communion to join with representatives of the Orthodox Churches to constitute a “*Doctrinal Commission*” and prepare a joint statement on the “theological points of difference and agreement between the Anglican and Eastern Churches.”

It is rather difficult to comprehend how the Lambeth Conference can in one Resolution declare its want of authority to “define” Anglican *doctrine*, and in the next, authorise the appointment of representatives to form a “*Doctrinal Commission*” to declare and define Anglican Doctrine! But in any case the Anglican representatives on this Rumanian Commission have not been slow to exercise full powers for defining Anglican doctrine, which their originating authority declared to be beyond its province! For they speak dogmatically of the “doctrine of the Anglican Church” on such important subjects as the Thirty-Nine Articles, Holy Scripture and Tradition, Holy Eucharist, and the Divine Mysteries and Justification. They claim in conclusion to have “prepared a solid foundation for *dogmatic* agreement between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches” (Report, p. 12).

Before we deal with these actual “Dogmatic Agreements” it is well to notice that such claims and statements raise certain serious constitutional problems and issues which should not be passed over in silence. For—

(1) The sole originating authority for these Doctrinal Commissions is the Lambeth Conference which authorised the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint them.

(2) The Lambeth Conference has no authority to define doctrine even for the Anglican Communion, still less for the Church of England. In calling the First Lambeth Conference, Archbishop Longley in 1867 expressly stated that “it would not be competent to make declarations or lay down definitions on points of *doctrine*,” and Archbishop Tait confirmed this in 1875 by saying that no “questions of *doctrine* would be submitted for interpretation in any future Lambeth Conference.”¹ He added that Anglican doctrines were “contained in our Formularies.”

(3) The Doctrinal Formularies of the Church of England are—

(a) The Bible.

(b) The Thirty-Nine Articles drawn up by the Convocations of both Provinces for “the avoiding of Diversities of opinions and for the establishing of consent touching true Religion.”

(c) In a subordinate sense, the Homilies as authorised by these Articles.

(d) The Book of Common Prayer, in so far as a Book of Devotion is able to express and convey clear doctrinal statements.

Accordingly we find that Canon 51 of 1604 forbids any doctrine to be “published” disagreeing “from the Word of God or from

¹ See *Reformation and Reunion*, pp. 207-8.

any of the Articles of Religion, or from the Book of Common Prayer." Consequently any "Agreements" on doctrine arrived at by Commissions deriving their authority from the Lambeth Conference cannot claim to be regarded as Anglican teaching if they are in any way at variance with the doctrines "set forth" in these authorised Church of England formularies.

In view of these facts we will now consider in detail the doctrinal agreements which have been reached by this Bucarest Conference. We are at once confronted with the extraordinary assertion of the Anglican Delegates concerning the authority of the Thirty-Nine Articles which is of a most misleading and serious character, since it actually declares that "the doctrine of the Thirty-Nine Articles is authoritatively expressed in the Book of Common Prayer and that the meaning of the Thirty-Nine Articles must be interpreted in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer." And it adds that "the Thirty-Nine Articles are to be regarded as a document secondary to the Book of Common Prayer" (Report, p. 6).

It is well to notice that this curious declaration is taken verbatim from No. 10 of the *Résumé* of the Discussions between the Eastern Church representatives and the Anglican sub-Committee at the Lambeth Conference of 1930. And inasmuch as this *Résumé* was accepted then by the whole Lambeth Conference as "containing a sufficient account of the teaching and practice of the Church of England" (Resolution 33 (c)) its re-affirmation here becomes the more serious. That the Articles, as a statement of Anglican Doctrine, should be declared to be subordinate or "secondary" to the Prayer Book, is both unreasonable and impracticable. For the Prayer Book was compiled primarily as a Manual of devotion for Churchpeople and not as a clear, concise, comprehensive statement of doctrine, nor as a warning against error or "heresy." There are obviously many doctrinal questions which are not even referred to indirectly or by implication in the Prayer Book—such as the authority of General Councils or Tradition or the doctrine of Justification. While, except in the case of the Catechism, we cannot properly speak of the doctrine of the Church of England as being "set forth" in the Prayer Book. But this phrase is entirely accurate as regards the carefully worded statements of our authorised Confession of Faith. Moreover, the position that the Articles and not the Prayer Book are the authoritative primary standard of doctrine for the Church of England has been held by all leading Churchmen since the Reformation. Archbishop Parker regarded them as establishing a "unity of true doctrine".¹ Rogers, Archbishop Bancroft's Chaplain, in his *Commentary on the Articles*, declared definitely that "the doctrine of our Church is best known by the Thirty-Nine Articles . . . other doctrine than in the said Articles is contained our Church neither hath nor holdeth."²

Prominent Caroline and eighteenth-century divines all express

¹ *Correspondence*, p. 293.

² *Catholic Doctrine of C. of E.*, p. 29.

the same view, viz. that the Articles "are the constant and settled doctrine of our Church."¹

The importance of correcting this singularly erroneous statement about the Articles is very evident when we consider the Agreement at this Conference of Rumanians and Anglicans on "Holy Scripture and Tradition . . ." or in other words on the "Rule of Faith." The Articles, especially Articles VI-VIII, deal most unequivocally with this subject, but it is rather from inferences drawn from chance statements or liturgical phraseology that we find it dealt with in the Prayer Book. It is pre-eminently on this crucial point where this Report contradicts the clear position of the Anglican and other Reformed Churches, by its acceptance of the Rumanian Church's statement that "the Revelation of God is transmitted through the Holy Spirit *and the Holy Tradition*" (p. 8). We must not forget that this question was the great dividing line at the Reformation, since the Reformers maintained that everything necessary for salvation could be found in Holy Scripture, while the Romanists declared that Scripture needed to be supplemented and interpreted by Tradition. Our Anglican Reformers undoubtedly took the Reformed side on this question and enshrined it in our Articles and Prayer Book. And yet this Church of England Delegation now wishes to revert to the Roman and Unreformed position by declaring that we must listen, *as a part of the necessary Divine Revelation*, to the "truths which have been defined by Holy Councils or are taught by the Fathers" (p. 8).

Confining ourselves at first to the Prayer Book, we would ask how such a statement is consistent with the question to the Priest at Ordination—"Are you persuaded that the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently *all* Doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation in Jesus Christ, and are you determined *out of the said Scriptures* to teach nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which *you* shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by *the Scriptures*?" There is no hint here of Scriptural doctrine "necessary for salvation" having to be "completed, explained, interpreted and understood in the Holy Tradition" (p. 8). In fact in the Bishop's "Charge" to the priest, while there is much stress placed on "reading and learning the Scriptures," and on the doctrine and exhortation which they must "take out of Holy Scripture," there is *not one word* concerning the necessity of studying the "Holy Tradition" as defined by "Holy Councils" or as taught by the "Fathers."

When we turn to the Articles, we find in them no mention of Tradition in Article VI, while the 21st Article definitely asserts that these "Holy Councils" "have erred in things pertaining to God," and the 22nd Article, in effect, condemns the Seventh General Council of 787 in its authorisation of Image Worship, by its denunciation of the "Worship and Adoration of Images" and other kindred abuses like the Invocation of Saints, as "repugnant to the Word of God." Moreover, Article VIII bases the acceptance of the

¹ *Bishop Beveridge on the Articles*, vol. I, 9, 1840.

Catholic Creeds on Scripture and *not* on the "declaration of the Church in the Ecumenical Councils" as the Orthodox Church does.¹

This agreed statement concerning the "Rule of Faith" is specially harmful and misleading in view of the fact that the Eastern Church has already, in its "Declaration" of August, 1927, refused to conceive of a United Church in which some members would *not* accept the doctrine that "Apostolic tradition is the *necessary* completion of Holy Scripture."² Consequently if Doctrinal Agreement and Union with the Rumanian and other Eastern Churches is to be based on this serious obligatory addition to the present Anglican "Rule of Faith," of Scripture only, it would at once close the door on the promising and urgently needed Reunion Scheme now nearing completion in South India. In fact it would shut us off from all chance of fellowship and intercommunion with our Home Free Churches with whom racially, historically and doctrinally we have far more in common than with the foreign and little-known Eastern Churches.

This attempt to exalt the teaching of the Fathers or of Tradition on to a level with Holy Scripture was, we should remember, expressly condemned by our Reformers. Cranmer, while declaring that "the authority of the orthodox Fathers is by no means to be despised," adds "but that the Holy Scripture should be interpreted by their decisions we do not allow, for Holy Scripture ought to be to us both the rules and judges of all Christian doctrine."³ Hooker also states clearly that "Whatsoever to make up the doctrine of man's salvation is added, as in supply of Scripture's insufficiency, we reject it. Scripture purposing this, hath *perfectly* and fully done it."⁴ Bishop Jewel reaffirmed this position, and Archbishop Parker says: "Our Reformation detests the Romish errors . . . which make your Romish writers and popes to add, alter and diminish, nay also to dispense with the words that Christ Himself spake, as well as the writings of the Apostles."⁵

Bishop Jeremy Taylor declares: "We have no reason to rely upon Tradition for any part of our Faith," and he adds, positively, "that Scripture is the rule of our Faith is a main protestant doctrine and therefore certainly must not be quitted."⁶ Again we find that Bishop Sanderson in his "Preface" to our Prayer Book declares that "it contained nothing contrary to the Word of God." But he does not add nor "to the Tradition of the Church." He could scarcely have done so, since he taught that "the perfection and sufficiency of the Holy Scripture is a most sound and eminent truth and justly maintained in our own and other reformed Churches."⁷ Dean Jackson, whom Dr. Pusey eulogised as "one of the greatest minds our Church hath nurtured," speaks even more strongly, when

¹ See *Reformation and Reunion*, p. 122.

² Bell, *Documents of Christian Unity*, Second Series, p. 27.

³ *Reformatio Legum*, p. 7 (1850).

⁴ *Eccles. Polity*, II, ch. viii, p. 6.

⁵ *Correspondence*, p. 110.

⁶ Quoted *Reformation and Reunion*, p. 117.

⁷ Wordsworth, *Christian Institutes*, iv, 535-6 (1842).

he says that "the making of ecclesiastical tradition to be an integral part of the Canon of Faith, doth not only pollute but undermine the whole fabric of the holy, primitive and Catholic Faith."¹

But apart from such universal testimony of our leading divines on this question, we may ask where in any of the authoritative Formularies of the Church of England is the individual priest or layman ever told to rely on the teaching of the Church or on Catholic tradition for additional knowledge or for the correct interpretation of Scripture? With regard to the Agreed Statement on the "Holy Eucharist" we seek in vain for confirmation from either the Prayer Book or the Articles or Scripture, for most of the dogmatic assertions which it makes. For instance, where in Scripture can it be shown that Our Lord at the "Last Supper" "gave Himself to the Apostles in the form of bread and wine?" Again with reference to 3 (p. 7) where is there any language used in our Formularies which implies that in the Holy Eucharist "the Sacrifice on Calvary is perpetually presented in a bloodless fashion under the form of bread and wine through the consecrating priest, and through the work of the Holy Ghost *in order* that the fruits of the Sacrifice on the Cross may be partaken of by those who offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice?" Or what authority have we in the Prayer Book for saying that "in the Eucharist the bread and wine become *by consecration* the Body and Blood of our Lord?" Does not the language of the Prayer Book and Articles far more support the statement of Hooker, when he says, "I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ where the bread is His Body or the cup His blood but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them,"² when we recall the well-known injunction to the communicant—"Take and eat this and feed on Him *in thy heart* by faith." Our Consecration Prayer speaks of the one oblation which was *once* offered on the Cross, but it has no hint of the consecrating priest "perpetually presenting in the Holy Eucharist in a bloodless fashion the sacrifice of Calvary" *in order* that we may be "partakers of the fruits of the Sacrifice of the Cross." It merely prays that "we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood."

Again the assertion in No. 4 of the changing, or virtual transubstantiation, of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ through consecration, is a doctrine deliberately repudiated by all our leading divines till the Tractarian Movement, and it is certainly contradicted by the clear statements of Article XXVIII which declare that teaching of this character "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament," since "the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner . . . by faith." This teaching is confirmed by the Prayer Book rubric in the service for the Communion of the Sick, when the sick person is assured that his repentance and faith in Christ's death on the Cross, apart from his actual partaking of the elements, will secure for him the spiritual nourishment of the body and blood of

¹ *Works*, xii, pp. 168-9 (1844).

² *Eccles. Polity*, V, lxvii, 6.

Christ. But Article XXVIII says nothing at all of the effect on the elements of consecration. It is also difficult to see how this identification of the bread and wine with the Body and Blood of Christ as claimed in Nos. 4 and 5 (p. 7) can be reconciled with the definitions in the Catechism which clearly distinguish and separate them into "an outward part or sign of bread and wine" and "an inward part signified"—the "inward and spiritual grace" of the "Body and Blood of Christ." For this statement that the elements "remain the Body and Blood of our Lord as long as they exist" (No. 5) is also directly denied by one of the chief Revisers of our Prayer Book—Bishop Cosin. He declares that "though the bread and wine remain, yet the consecration, the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ *do not remain longer* than the holy action itself remains, for which the bread and wine were hallowed, and which being ended, return to their former use again."¹

No. 6—"Those who receive the Eucharistic bread and wine truly partake of the Body and Blood of our Lord"—is also directly contradicted by Article XXIX which declares definitely that "the wicked" partaking of the sacrament "*in no wise* are partakers of Christ." The Catechism also plainly implies that the inward thing signified—"the Body and Blood of Christ"—is only "taken and received by the *faithful*, in the Lord's Supper."

The agreed Statement on "Justification" that "man partakes of redeeming grace through faith *and good works*" is directly opposed to the clear language of St. Paul in Ephesians ii. 8, 9—"For by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: *Not of works*, lest any man should boast," and also to the statement of Article XI, based on this Scriptural teaching, viz. that "we are justified by Faith only, and not for our own works or deservings, through the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

The Statement concerning the "Divine Mysteries" on pp. 8-9 quotes the two Statements made at the Joint Doctrinal Commission, by the Orthodox and the Anglicans in October, 1931. It is most incorrect regarding Anglican teaching on the *number* of the Sacraments. Not only does the Anglican statement omit the disparaging mention of the "other five commonly called sacraments" of Article XXV as "not to be counted as sacraments of the Gospel, since they have no visible sign ordained of God," but it refrains from quoting the answer of the Catechism that Christ "ordained only two sacraments in His Church."

What is really serious about all these "Agreed Statements" on Doctrine, is the action taken by the Rumanian Commission based upon the erroneous assumption that this Anglican Delegation had actually defined Anglican Doctrine, instead of presenting a very grave misrepresentation of it. Consequently the Rumanian Commission's Declaration unanimously recommending the Holy Synod of the Rumanian Orthodox Church to recognise the validity of Anglican Orders is made under this very mistaken conception of the doctrinal teaching of the Church of England. For it was made,

¹ *Works*, V, p. 356.

as the Report states, because they had "considered the declarations of the Anglican Delegation on these questions (i.e. on Apostolic Succession, Holy Orders, Holy Eucharist, Holy Mysteries in general, Tradition and Justification) which declarations are in accordance with the Doctrine of the Orthodox Church" (p. 10).

We can rejoice in the fact that the Eastern Church, unlike the Roman, with its demand for unconditional submission and confession of "heresy," is willing to conduct negotiations with us on terms of equality. We also fully realise the necessity and value of the recognition of the validity of our Orders for the purpose of Christian Reunion. But we do not welcome such recognition if it is gained by a false representation of the theological position and teaching of the Anglican Church. We endorse to the full the wise words uttered by the Committee on the "Unity of the Church" of the Lambeth Conference of 1930, when it declared that "We cannot for the sake of union, *barter away our special heritage*, for we hold it in trust for the whole body of Christ" (p. 112). But we are equally sure that, if these "Agreed doctrinal Statements" at this Rumanian Conference are accepted as officially expressing the doctrinal position of the Church of England, the traditional teaching and position of our Reformed Church will have very largely been destroyed.

Very singularly, we are not informed what the "conclusions" of the Papers on Apostolic Succession and Holy Orders were, at this Conference, although they are referred to! But we gravely suspect that the Rumanians were led to the "conclusion" that the Tractarian view of Episcopacy was the *official* teaching of the Anglican Church, so that it could be supposed that Anglicans agreed with the Patriarch of Alexandria's Declaration that "the Church has no power to recognise Ordinations in Churches where the Apostolic Succession has been broken."¹ Such a view, of course, directly contradicts the traditional attitude and practice of our Reformed Church, since our Reformers and their successors sought for and enjoyed Fellowship and Intercommunion with other foreign Reformed Churches on the basis of a common Orthodox *Faith*, without any insistence on a uniform *Order* or polity. They lamented, indeed, as Bishop Hall did, the want of this latter bond, but they, like him, hold that "there was no essential difference between the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation." We "accord in every point of Christian doctrine without the least variation."² They participated with these non-episcopal Churches and brethren in "the Holy Supper of our Lord," as Du Moulin testified of the French Churches.

The negotiations of the past few years with the Eastern Churches and the "Old Catholics" reveal, however, a very serious effort to change the doctrinal orientation of the Church of England, and, as this Rumanian Report shows, to equate it with that of a Church which our Article XIX declares has "erred in matters of faith," although retaining the historic episcopal orders. For the purpose

¹ *The Christian East*, p. 34, Spring, 1931.

² *Works*, V, p. 56 (1811).

of Christian Unity, we are now being told that "Order" is of equal, if not of superior, importance to "Faith." For instance, to quote again from the Report on "the Unity of the Church" of the Lambeth Conference, we find in relation to the Free Church non-episcopal ministries the "general principle" emphasised, that "Intercommunion should be the *goal* rather than a means to the restoration of union."¹ This "principle" is, however, conveniently disregarded in the case of the "Old Catholics" because, presumably, they possess the historic Catholic "Order"! For although divergence "in doctrine and practice" created "impediments to Union," yet full Intercommunion has now been established with them "as a means to" and "not as 'the goal' for" "the restoration of Union"!

Such partial discrimination against orthodox non-episcopal Churches is of ominous significance. We cannot but think that the modern history of Christian Missions—e.g. in China—would, for instance, make it very difficult to define the special "gifts of Grace" which, it is asserted, "the Providence of God" has "associated with Episcopacy."² Equally with the framers of the Report on "the Unity of the Church" we feel the strong appeal of the "vision" of "a Church genuinely Catholic," "loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all who profess and call themselves Christians," but we feel that even the attainment of this longed-for goal, would be purchased at too great a price if it involved the "bartering away" of our vital "special heritage" of Scriptural Truth which the Reformation bequeathed to us.

¹ Lambeth Conference Report, p. 117.

² Lambeth Conference Report, p. 119.

CONCERNING THE MINISTRY. John Oman, D.D. *Student Christian Movement*. 7s. 6d.

An enthusiastic admirer of Bishop Pearson said of his minor works that "the dust of his writings is as fine gold." The same can with truth be said of the lighter production of Dr. John Oman's pen, of which the book before us is a specimen. Dr. Oman is one of the most distinguished of living theologians whose works judicious readers look for and treasure. *Concerning the Ministry* is a series of talks to his students on Saturday evenings and, though informal in character, there is behind these quite simple utterances the momentum and value of ripe scholarship, mature thought and keen observation; and the young clergyman who assimilates the teaching they contain will experience the benefit in all departments of his ministry. These pages are filled with wise and shrewd epigrams flavoured by a keen sense of humour, which could be quoted without limit did our space permit. It is perhaps better to leave readers to discover for themselves the wisdom contained in this practical and stimulating book.