

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

October, 1918.

The Month.

**Facing the
Winter.** WITH the coming of October, the holiday season may be said to be at an end, and we are all preparing to face the winter which, by common consent, threatens to be one of no ordinary difficulty. It is not, however, of the material side of the problem we are thinking so much as of the spiritual side, and of the way parish work will be carried on. Usually by this time clergy have their programmes all carefully mapped out for the ensuing six months, and everything arranged down to the last button. But in only a very few cases has such a thing been possible this year, for the hindrances are many. With parish halls commandeered; with assistant clergy, and not a few incumbents, gone as Chaplains to the Forces; with lay workers gone—the men to the Army and the women to munition factories or to the land or to some other department of National Service, those who remain at home find it difficult to “carry on,” and we imagine the obstacles will increase as the weeks go by. Yet there never was a time when energetic work in the parishes was more needed than at the present time. Hearts made sad by bereavement long for consolation, and in no way can this be more effectually supplied than by the faithful visitation of the parish clergyman, who brings with him the comforting influences of true religion; young people require more, rather than less, attention, discipline and instruction; parishioners who, in the past, have found help and inspiration in one or other of the many social and religious meetings which rightly have a place in the organisation of every well-worked parish, need as never before the stimulating influence of fellowship and brotherhood; and those attending our services look forward with greater intensity than ever to the uplifting power of bright and hearty services and spiritually-minded sermons. But how can these things be under present conditions? It is impossible to offer any

detailed suggestions as the circumstances of different parishes vary so greatly, but as a general principle it may safely be said that clergy who find themselves handicapped by depleted staffs will do well to concentrate attention upon things that really matter. Especially is it important that services and sermons should be kept up to a high level, so that those who attend public worship shall be really helped and edified. The place occupied by the sermon was never more important than it is to-day. Men and women come to Church hungering and thirsting after that which will minister to their souls' deepest interests, and they are grievously disappointed if they look up and are not fed. They feel their need of the Gospel ; they desire instruction in the Christian faith ; they are asking the way to Zion with their faces thitherward. Clergy who recognise this characteristic of the times will find no higher scope for their energies than seeking humbly, sincerely and determinedly to satisfy these needs. The preacher who resolutely purposes that he will make a special effort during the next six months to interpret the mind and heart of God to his people will have no cause for regret if some other branches of his work suffer. But need these other branches be altogether abandoned ? Some curtailment there must be, but with careful organisation the more important of them may be kept going. It would be a sorry business if the effective witness of the Church were not maintained towards both those who already value its ministrations, and those who have yet to be won for Christ and His Church.

In one of those Saturday articles in *The Times* which so many have come to look for eagerly every week, the "Correspondent" dealt recently with the question of Reading the Lessons, and offered, as usual, some shrewd observations and not a little wise counsel. Although it is not easy to assent to all his propositions, his plea for clear and intelligent reading of the Lessons will be readily approved by congregations. "Too often," the writer says, "the Word of God is made of non-effect by careless, indistinct, or perfunctory reading of the Lessons in church. Whoever undertakes this important ministry, whether priest or layman, must train himself so to read the Bible that its message may be readily understood, and thus minister grace to those who hear." It is good to find in *The Times* the Bible spoken

of as "the Word of God" and the reading of the Lessons referred to as an "important ministry." Not always is its importance realised, yet there are chapters—such for instance as that magnificent eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans—which, when read with sympathy and with the note of personal experience, are as impressive and as powerful as any sermon. Do clergy or lay-readers sufficiently realise their responsibility in this respect? Do they appreciate how keenly congregations are vexed and disappointed when the Lessons are carelessly or ineffectively read? To be able publicly to read the Word of God so that its message appeals to the heart is, no doubt, a gift which not every one possesses, but with care, and by prayer, the capacity for good reading of the Scriptures can be acquired. The ordinary rules of elocution are not always applicable. The Bible is a book by itself; it cannot be read publicly in the same way, for example, as one would recite a play of Shakespeare's or a chapter by Dickens. Who cannot recall the reading of Lessons which has been absolutely spoilt by the reader indulging in tricks of elocution under the altogether mistaken notion that they enhance the effect of the reading? The more clearly and the more simply the Lessons are read the better. But it is, of course, of the essence of good reading of the Lessons that the reader understands what he is reading, that he believes it to be the Word of God, and that he has within him that which responds to it as a matter of personal experience.

"Life and Liberty" The "Life and Liberty" Movement is taking hold of the imagination of many Churchmen of all schools of thought, but in spite of meetings, conventions and conferences there still seems to be in some quarters some uncertainty, first as to what the movement really means and second, whether the programme, as far as it is understood, is really practical politics. In what way it differs from the Church Reform League or the Church Self-Government Association is not readily apparent. The Archbishop of York has been appealed to by some clergy to say what he thinks of the movement, and his reply is marked by that vagueness so characteristic of the bishops when they wish to avoid giving a definite opinion. He certainly says he is "in full sympathy with its main purpose and desire," but for the rest he indulges in a number of well-meaning platitudes.

It would be wrong, however, to blame the Archbishop for his caution. There are some grave questions upon which it is desirable to know the mind of the leaders of the movement before it is right or wise to pronounce definitely upon it. What, for instance, is their real attitude towards disestablishment? What, again, is their attitude towards "the Romeward drift" within the Church of England?

The new Report of the National Church League has just been issued, and with it is sent out the following important letter from the President, the Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Clarke, K.C. :—

I take the opportunity of the issue of the Annual Report to members of the National Church League to call your attention to the gravely important character of the task which lies immediately before us, and to ask for all the help which you can give towards accomplishing it. The crisis with which our Church is now faced is not less serious than that through which the nation had been passing during four years of war. An active and aggressive faction is making every effort to dominate the Church and to impose upon it ideals alien to its whole character. Should they succeed every trace of the Reformation will ultimately be obliterated. By a policy of resistance to all law, ecclesiastical or civil, they have reduced the episcopate to a condition of impotence, until, in the vain hope of securing peace by compromise, the Bishops in Convocation are now taking steps which will concede in principle practically all that is demanded.

The preoccupation of the people of the country with matters concerning the war, and the absence of so large a proportion of the members of our congregations, have been skilfully used to press forward this Romish propaganda until it now demands the most prompt and energetic action if it is to be successfully resisted.

The Annual Report and the papers enclosed with it indicate something of what the League has done, and is doing. Its most important work is that of education—the exposition and defence of the principles of the Reformation, so that the nature of the assaults upon them may be understood. And next to this comes organisation—the bringing together for common action Churchmen who, while desirous of all necessary reforms in the methods and machinery of the Church, are determined to resist all efforts to undermine and Romanise Church doctrine.

The war has rendered it very difficult to maintain our work, especially during the last two years, and we are faced with a large deficit at a time when the cost of the means by which it is carried on has more than doubled. At least £2,000 will be needed to clear our accounts and to provide for the work immediately before us, and I confidently appeal to every member of the League for contributions towards this.

We are certain that so weighty and impressive an appeal will meet with a gracious response. The address of the National Church League is 6 Grosvenor Mansions, 82 Victoria Street, S.W.1.

The Church of England and Nonconformity.¹

THE Joint Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, appointed, as will be remembered, to prepare for a World Conference on Faith and Order, issued in about the year 1912 a tract bearing the arresting title, "Unity or Union: Which?" A consideration of the suggested difference between these two words may well form a convenient and helpful starting point for our discussion. The writer of the tract asserted that the two words stand for two different principles, of which he gave illustrations. Branches broken from a tree will die. This illustrates the principle that in the higher orders of being unity is essential to life. Two men working together can cut down a tree faster than one man can cut it down alone. This shows that in practical matters union brings strength. Take again the two words friendship and partnership. Friendship means sharing all the chief things in life for the pure joy of sharing them. It exists because love seeks an object that it may live, because "he who loves not lives not." Partnership, on the other hand, means co-operation with other people for the sake of getting something done in a speedy and successful way. Nothing need be shared by partners except their labour and their profits. Partnership is union for strength; friendship is unity for life.

THE FUNDAMENTAL UNITY.

Let us accept this distinction as sufficiently accurate for our present purpose, and ask ourselves whether it is unity or union which we are seeking in relation to our fellow-Christians. I suggest that we already possess a real, if only imperfectly realized, unity, and that what we want is union. We possess unity. All who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity are already at unity in Him. He is the Vine, we are the branches. He Himself told us that except we abide in Him we have no life in us, and we can bear no fruit. It will be freely and gladly admitted that in all branches of the visible Church there are those in countless numbers who plainly and manifestly have eternal life and are bearing the fruit of the Holy Spirit. Hence they are living branches of the True Vine, and in Him they

¹ A paper read at the Southport Conference.

are one. The great motto text which always hangs over the door of the tents at the Keswick Convention is literally true, "All one in Christ Jesus."

But this real spiritual unity is only imperfectly realized. We need to realize it more fully, to insist loudly on its genuineness, and to press it to practical service. Because we possess unity, there is the hopeful possibility of going on to create union, if we so wish. It is easy for friends to become partners. Those who share a unity in Christ should be in the right frame of mind to discuss proposals for union; and, as we are coming to perceive more and more, the temper of mind in which people of different views approach each other is the all-important thing. Where there is a desire to sympathize, to understand, to appreciate the valuable elements in the position of one from whom you differ, much can be done. Where, on the other hand, there is a spirit of latent antagonism, a desire to score debating points at your opponent's expense, any sort of conference with a view to *rapprochement* is practically useless. In the political world, alike to our astonishment and thankfulness, very much has been done during the last four years in the way of concerted action for great national ends. But why has this been possible? Just because in face of a grave national danger Englishmen have realized their fundamental unity. The spirit of controversy has, to some extent at least, been laid aside, and there has been a general desire to speed the passage of necessary legislation even when it has not been altogether palatable. What has been done in the State should surely be done much more readily and widely in the Church, because our unity, if we would but realize it, is the deepest unity of all. Romans, Easterns, Anglicans, Free Churchmen of every variety, we are all one by faith in our common Saviour and Lord. We are one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church. Do we then, as a matter of fact, desire to make our fundamental unity a foundation for union? How keenly do we desire this? What precisely do we mean by union?

THE DESIRE FOR UNION.

The answer to the first and second questions is easier than the answer to the third. There is a growing desire for union between the different sections of Christ's Church. Not all sections have the desire in the same degree. It is most pronounced in the Protestant denominations—episcopal and non-episcopal—of Britain and

America. Next in sympathy, probably, is the Russian Orthodox Church. Next would come the remoter divisions of the Eastern Church; and last of all, only just awakening in some dim way from her self-satisfied slumber, the Roman Communion. Moreover, within the Protestant Churches the desire varies greatly in strength. It is a desire most keenly felt among the leaders, among the most spiritually minded, only filtering slowly down to the rank and file. But on the whole it is an increasing desire, and the manifest signs of its presence and working are growing. The war has done something to make it grow faster. The English Joint Committee on Faith and Order, in their second interim report "Towards Christian Unity" issued in April, 1918 (it will be convenient to quote these two important reports under this title), write that "the conflict among Christian nations has brought home to us with a greater poignancy the disastrous results of the divisions which prevail among Christians, inasmuch as they have hindered that growth of mutual understanding which it should be the function of the Church to foster, and because a Church which is divided cannot speak effectively to a divided world."

UNION OR FEDERATION ?

We pass on then to handle the more thorny question, "What do we mean by the union which we are beginning to seek?" Do we mean that the different denominations are to be merged into one denomination, or do we mean that they are merely to be federated, while retaining their independence and their differences?

Now there is no doubt what the writers of "Towards Christian Unity" desire. In their statement in 1916 they agree "That it is the purpose of our Lord that believers in Him should be, as in the beginning they were, one visible society—His body with many members—which in every age and place should maintain the communion of saints in the unity of the Spirit and should be capable of a common witness and a common activity." In the 1918 statement, after repeating the phrase "one visible society," they add: "The visible unity of the Body of Christ is not adequately expressed in the co-operation of the Christian Churches for moral influence and social service, though such co-operation might with great advantage be carried much farther than it is at present: it could only be fully realized through community of worship, faith, and

order, including common participation in the Lord's Supper. This would be quite compatible with a rich diversity of life and worship."

We shall return to discuss some details about this splendid vision in a few moments. Meanwhile we must notice that it is not a vision which attracts everybody. There are those who frankly prefer Federation because they feel that a rich diversity of life and worship is not enough. They want also a rich diversity, or at any rate some diversity, of order, to suit the different temperaments to be found among Christian men. A representative of this point of view may be found in Dr. Griffith Jones, President of the Congregational Union, who, in a postscript to his Presidential address delivered in May of this year, criticized the statements just quoted. He said that he found it difficult to see why uniformity of organic type should be more desirable in the spiritual world than in natural life, where the life-principle realizes itself in a myriad ways. He added: "I think that the Free Church signatories to the report should tell us what it is they have really assented to. . . . While we are earnestly anxious for closer relations with our sister Churches, we are in no way likely, now or at any future time, to sign away our birthright of freedom and autonomy for the sake of comprehension in a visible body."

Now it is incumbent upon us to make up our minds which of these two ideals we want to see eventually realized. Do we want the "one visible society," embracing types of mind and worship within a broad community of order? This is the principle upon which the Church of England is constructed to-day. Or do we want a Federation of differently organized societies? This is practically the principle of the Congregational Union.

It cannot be questioned that Federation upon a large scale would be a great advance upon the existing state of things. How great may well be realized by a use of the imagination to picture on a yet vaster scale the possible scope of such a document as the recent Report—I give it its full title—"Report of Conference of Representatives of the Evangelical Free Churches on Closer Co-operation of the Churches." This document contains first a "Declaratory Statement of Common Faith and Practice," signed by Professor P. Carnegie Simpson. Next comes a draft constitution of a proposed Federal Union between the Free Churches, signed by Dr. Scott Lidgett. The main objects of the union are declared to be the

expression of the essential unity in Christ of the Evangelical Free Churches, and the co-ordination of their activities and resources so as to promote most effectively the extension of Christ's Kingdom. The basis of the union is to be the Evangelical Faith and the autonomy of the Federating Churches. Hints as to the effect of such Federation are given in two subsequent sections upon Evangelization and the Ministry. In regard to Evangelization, information as to the actual distribution of Free Churches in rural and urban areas is to be obtained so as to consider whether something can be done to deal with the existing overlapping. It is suggested that some of the present churches might be turned into buildings for work of a social and institutional kind. Moreover, for the future Free Churches are only to be planted in new areas after common consultation, a hint being apparently taken from the comity so generally observed in the Mission Field. In regard to the Ministry, something like identity of procedure in ordination is in view, and a Committee is "to collect all the facts concerning the methods by which ministers are now recognized in each of the Federating Churches, and to report what, in their judgment, should be the conditions requiring to be fulfilled by ministers of any of the Federating Churches prior to their ministry being recognized by all the others." So far as I have observed, this scheme of Federation has been accepted by the Baptist and Congregational Unions, but rejected by the Presbyterian Synod, the difficulty in the last case being apparently the question of the recognition of non-Presbyterian Orders.

But would such Federation be satisfactory, if it could be so handled as to bring the Episcopal Churches within it? Personally I am inclined to doubt it. I doubt if the Church of England could at the present moment be brought within it without the risk of being broken up. I am not sure that waste and overlapping would be effectually prevented. Still less do I feel sure that Federation is the wiser course when we remember that the ultimate goal is to re-establish union between all the Churches all over the world. There may very probably be utility in establishing a kind of Federation—such as was suggested at Kikuyu—as a temporary measure, but I believe we shall be doing the wisest thing if we direct our main efforts towards paving the way for the more immediately difficult but ultimately more satisfactory goal of the one visible society, embracing its "diversity of life and worship" within a large "com-

munity of worship, faith and order," as proposed by the authors of the two reports, "Towards Christian Unity." We may just notice in passing that this seems to be the ambition of the leaders of the most brilliantly hopeful reunion movement of the day, I mean the movement to form one Church of Scotland. Nine years of negotiations have brought the two great Scottish Churches very close to complete union, and seers like Dr. James Cooper are now casting their eyes towards the Episcopal Churches of Scotland and England as well.

THE STARTING POINT.

Assuming then that we hold up as our ideal the "one visible society," where are we to begin operations and what are the terms? The first question is easy to answer. Rome is impossible at present. The Eastern Church is not impossible, but difficult. There is general agreement that the right starting point is within the bounds of Protestantism. And although we watch with intense interest the movement in America engineered by the Protestant Episcopal Church, yet it is practical politics to direct our attention almost wholly to British Nonconformity. Here let me answer a question which some people delight to ask: Which of all the multitudinous sects which flourish in our midst do you include? I would suggest the large and well established non-Episcopal Communion: the Presbyterians, the Baptists and Congregationalists, and the three groups of Wesley's followers, the Wesleyans, the Primitive Methodists, and the United Methodists. The rest may for the present be left out of count.

What, then, are to be the terms of union? Here, of course, we come to the very heart of the subject, and questions arise which are infinitely too big to be handled in a single paper. I can only touch on some of them briefly, and my object will be more to raise questions which will have to be answered than to lay down dogmatic and final positions. I suppose, however, that as Anglicans we may sum up the terms in the Lambeth Quadrilateral, i.e. the Two Testaments, the Two Creeds, the Two Sacraments, and the Historic Episcopate "locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church."

THE BIBLE AND THE SACRAMENTS.

Now happily no question arises on the most fundamental point

of all, the Two Testaments. Everywhere in Protestantism the Bible is regarded as the final testing ground of doctrine, and the principle underlying Article VI finds general acceptance. Neither is there any real difficulty over the Two Sacraments. It was agreed in the 1916 "Towards Christian Unity" Report that "our Lord ordained, in addition to the preaching of His Gospel, the Sacraments of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper, as not only declaratory symbols, but also effective channels of His grace and gifts for the salvation and sanctification of men, and that these Sacraments being essentially social ordinances were intended to affirm the obligation of corporate fellowship as well as individual confession of Him." Similarly in the purely Nonconformist "Declaratory Statement of Common Faith and Practice," to which I referred just now, it is said that "The Sacraments—Baptism and the Lord's Supper—are instituted by Christ, Who is Himself certainly and really present in His own ordinances (though not bodily in the elements thereof), and are signs and seals of His Gospel not to be separated therefrom. They confirm the promises and gifts of salvation, and, when rightly used by believers with faith and prayer, are, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, true means of grace." No true Anglican could want a better sentence than that.

THE CREEDS.

There is a little more difficulty over the Creeds, not indeed over their substance, but over their use. In regard to substance, the "Declaratory Statement" asserts that "the Evangelical Free Churches of England claim and cherish their place as inheritors, along with others, of the historic faith of Christendom, which found expression in the Œcumenical Creeds of the early and undivided Church." But there is at present a real difference over the use of the Creeds. The Church of England requires an acceptance of the Apostles' Creed from all candidates for Baptism. The credal requirements for the Ministry are greater still. The Presbyterians share with the Church of England the use of fixed forms of belief. On the other hand, some of the Nonconformist bodies have inherited a deep-rooted antipathy to fixed forms. They do not mind issuing from time to time Declarations of Belief, but they insist strongly that these are declarations and are neither essentially permanent nor are they to be used as tests for other men. The Congregational procedure is typical of this point of view. Most ministers would say

to an applicant for membership that while there was no credal test, yet there must be a tacit understanding as to personal faith in the Saviour for the forgiveness of sin and eternal life. Similarly, when a man is being ordained, he makes a statement of his beliefs, and the presence at his Ordination of the Principal of the College from which he comes is held to be a guarantee that he is loyal to the central and fundamental points in the Evangelical Faith. The upholders of Creeds maintain that a simple fixed form of words does not put a bar in the way of varieties of belief in less essential matters—there are differences among us Anglicans, for instance, on the question between the symbolical and literal interpretation of such clauses in the Apostles' Creed as the Descent into Hell, and the Session at God's right hand of the exalted Saviour, to say nothing of the more burning matters of the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection of Christ's Body—they would also maintain that a venerable form of words is a valuable aid to the preservation of continuity. The no-Creed men, on the other hand, cannot escape from the belief that a fixed form has a cramping effect—whether it be in Creeds or Prayers—and they also stoutly maintain that Creeds are not essential to the preservation of the substance of the Faith. Indeed, some of them would say that the Faith is much better preserved by the Holy Spirit without assistance from a Creed.

This difference between the two sides, while acute at present, will probably tend to lessen with the growth of mutual understanding, and it would not, perhaps, be too venturesome to prophesy that when the "one visible society," or a stage towards it, comes into being, the acceptance of at any rate the Apostles' Creed, liberally interpreted, will be found to be a condition of membership.

EPISCOPACY.

The big difficulty is over the matter of Episcopacy. But while we must not minimize the difficulty, we may, thank God, speak of it in language of the utmost hopefulness.

Let us look at it first from our point of view. We cannot give up Episcopacy. We believe that it is a form of government which can be shown by the most searching historical criticism to have existed in the Church from the end of the first century, even if we do not use the Prayer Book phrase "from the time of the Apostles." We know that it is a form of government still prevalent over the

greater part of the Catholic Church, and to give it up would be to sacrifice our hopes of the ultimate reunion of all Christendom. We believe also that all experience goes to show its practical utility. On the other hand, to use a phrase which brings comfort to the Nonconformist mind, we want Episcopacy and not Prelacy. We want a constitutional Episcopacy. It has been said by Dr. Selbie of Mansfield College that Episcopacy represents the monarchial ideal of Church government, as Presbyterianism represents the oligarchical and Congregationalism the democratic. We want an Episcopacy which freely welcomes and takes up into itself the undoubtedly valuable elements in other systems of government. The Bishop must not be a feudal autocrat. He must be a Senior Presbyter, sitting in the chair of the Presbyteral Body, and exercising his functions with their counsel and consent. The Church of England has never lost one important piece of testimony to the desirability of this. I mean the too little emphasized fact that the Bishop cannot ordain presbyters except in conjunction with presbyters. Similarly it is desirable that, as in early Church days, so now the laity should have an effective voice both in the selection of their Bishop and in the determination of his administrative acts. I would also strongly welcome the re-establishment of a real, i.e., permanent, diaconate, whereby provision might be made for the due recognition and use of the spiritual ministrations of the laity. Such an Episcopacy would not slam the door in the face of the Roman and Eastern Churches, and it would be shorn of most of the features which have caused the non-Episcopal communions to grow up. It would permit them to feel that in accepting a modified Episcopacy they were not turning their backs upon their own history.

Now look at the Nonconformist side. When Dr. Dale of Birmingham wrote in 1884 his "Manual of Congregational Principles," he proved to his own satisfaction and presumably to the satisfaction of the Congregationalists of his day, that the New Testament Polity was congregational and that modern Congregationalism is in all essential features identical with it. Now—in May, 1918—we have had the interesting spectacle of a great Congregational leader like Dr. Forsyth getting up in the session of the Congregational Union and declaring that Congregationalism came into existence as a result of a double fallacy, that the New Testament Church Polity was sacrosanct, and that it was the polity of the Independent

Church. Such a man still clings to the ideal of spiritual freedom, but he wants the freedom of the Great Congregation, not of the local one. He sees that pure local autonomy is impossible, spiritually and practically. To quote his own words: "They must construe their autonomy by unity, and not unity by autonomy, and submit their autonomy to the spirit of the whole Church." This change of front is momentous. Of course non-Episcopalians almost all reject absolutely the High Anglican doctrine of apostolical succession. Some of them inquire also from us Evangelicals why, if we reject that doctrine ourselves, we still cling to the fact of Episcopacy as the necessary and exclusive form of government. But, in spite of the inevitable diversities and cross-currents of opinion, there is just as steady a trend towards a modified Episcopacy among non-Episcopalians as—I think it is true to say—there is a trend away from prelatical Episcopacy amongst us Anglicans. There is a large amount of suspicion of Episcopacy left, even among Presbyterians; but the old direct hostility is dying away, and I believe it would not be far from the truth to say that educated Nonconformist opinion could be summed up in some such sentence as this: "We are not unwilling to accept a modified constitutional Episcopacy if it is made perfectly clear that certain theories of the transmission of grace are ruled out, and if the valuable elements in our own Polities are somehow preserved." Meanwhile we note two things.

On the practical side there is a good deal of Episcopacy-under-other-names among the non-Episcopalians. There are the Moderators or Presidents of the General Assemblies. I believe also that the Baptists and Congregationalists have administrative districts which might just as well be called Dioceses. The Wesleyans have their circuits and larger co-ordinated areas.

On the theoretical side we have the far-reaching admissions of the recent report "Towards Christian Unity." The distinguished Nonconformists who sign that report expressly admit that Episcopacy in the greater part of Christendom is "the recognized organ of the unity and continuity of the Church," and that Episcopalians "ought not to be expected to abandon it in assenting to any basis of reunion." On the other hand, the Episcopalians realize that the Holy Spirit has worked through other forms of government for converting sinners and perfecting saints.

RECOGNITION AND INTERCOMMUNION.

I have deliberately kept myself to what seem to me to be the main issues at the risk of leaving myself little space to deal with two other points which have been much discussed lately. I ought, perhaps, just to touch on them. There is the question of Recognition of Nonconformist Orders. We are becoming agreed to recognize their spiritual validity. There is absolutely no hope of getting one step further until we have frankly accepted that. What it behoves us to do is to accept the spiritual validity and then enter into discussion about regularity. The Nonconformists are quite conscious that while we on our side have, perhaps, been too stiff in insisting on order, they have been much too slack about it, and they are anxious to mend their ways. There are three important points to be borne in mind in dealing with Ordination. There is Vocation, which is inward, the work of the Holy Ghost. There is Recognition of Vocation by the Church. About these two points we are all agreed. The difference arises on the third point, the commission given by the existing Ministry with some ceremony deliberately pointing out him to whom the commission is given. What we want to do here is to discuss the precise value and meaning of the ancient rite of Imposition of Hands, and to ask ourselves in response to what conditions in ordained and ordainers the grace of ordination is given.

There ought not to be any insuperable difficulty in the way of reaching an agreement on this third point, and in discussing ways and means we shall remember that two helpful suggestions have been made. One is that recourse should be had to the historical practice of *per saltum* Ordinations to the Episcopate. The other is Bishop John Wordsworth's idea of joint Ordinations, whereby, for instance, an Anglican presbyter should be ordained by an Anglican Bishop and Presbyters and by some non-Episcopal ministers, and vice versa.

The other point is Intercommunion. This really depends on the recognition of ministry. If the ministry is recognized, the so-called validity of Communion goes with it. The Nonconformists attach great value to Intercommunion as a test of our real desire for a reunion which shall be something more worth having than mere absorption. I think that we on our side must try to get it as soon as possible. But it must be on the scale of the whole Church. It must be duly authorized by the whole Bench of Bishops. Inter-

communion of a local or party kind appears to me to be not only useless, but even likely to be harmful in the long run. We must try the sometimes very successful policy of "squeezing the Bishops" with the nippers of historical facts and practical present needs.

CONCLUSION.

Let me, in conclusion, raise the question, "What can we do immediately towards realizing the great end we have in view?" and suggest two lines of answer. The first answer is that we should press very hard the method of Conferences. I do not mean meetings of those who agree for the purpose of listening to papers to support their argument. I mean real discussion Conferences between those who do not agree with a view to a clear and frank interchange of views. Nonconformists, Evangelicals and High Churchmen all want to be there. Half our troubles are due to sheer ignorance and misunderstanding of each other's positions, and only Conferences can clear the mists away. If ever the great World Conference on Faith and Order meets, the way will have been prepared by many Conferences on a lesser scale.

But in a Conference all depends on atmosphere, on the vividness of the sense of friendship and fellowship in the one Body of Christ. How shall this atmosphere be created? I think the answer is, By common work for the Kingdom of God. We have all been stirred recently by reading the Archbishops' Committee's Report on the Evangelistic work of the Church. We see afresh a vision of the call to evangelize our Fatherland. It is a task too great for the Anglican Church alone. We must deliberately share it with the Nonconformists. Let there be common action for this purpose, common action based upon common counsel. Why should there not be local Councils of the Churches, finding out the weak spots and strengthening them, and organizing a great concerted Forward Movement, inspired by common Prayer? Such a joint effort for the Master's Kingdom would bring an abundant reflex blessing. It would deepen our sense of inner unity, and make the difficulties which withstand union begin to vanish away. May God in His mercy hasten the Day when the scandal of our divisions shall cease, and His Church stand before the world as one great Brotherhood holding out the one Gospel of Salvation for all mankind.

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

The Training of Candidates for Holy Orders.¹

III.

AT THE NEWER UNIVERSITIES: (b) LONDON.

THE immediate influence of London University on the training of the Clergy has developed greatly in recent years. While the University goes back to 1836, it was for many years simply an examining body, having its home in London, but with no special concern for London education rather than for that of any other part of the country or indeed of the Empire. And fear of sectarianism limited its theological side to two "Scriptural Examinations," each of four papers only, open only to those who had already taken the London B.A.

But since the reconstruction of the University in 1900 its theological side has greatly developed. No restriction has been placed on the admission to its examinations of students from all parts; these are now called external students. If any man already in Holy Orders, but without a degree, is anxious to obtain one, the London course is obvious, no residence being required. And quite recently a theological subject has been included among alternative subjects for the B.A. examination, thus meeting the interests of theological students. It may be added that if a man of fair education or ability, who does not see his way to enter another residential university, thinks of taking Holy Orders, his best preliminary step is to take the London matriculation examination (or some other exempting from it). Not only is this the first step towards taking a degree, but success in this examination affords clear proof of the student's ability and industry. Principals of theological colleges will welcome such men, who will have no difficulty in obtaining bursaries and exhibitions if needed.

But by this reconstruction special recognition has been given by the University to the various colleges and institutions of the London district, whether incorporated in the University or recognized as schools of the University, or having recognized teachers. Students of the University in such institutions, under tuition thus

¹ Previous articles in this series appeared in the *CHURCHMAN* for May (I, At the Older Universities, by Dr. Tait) and June (II, At the Newer Universities, (a) Durham, by Dr. Dawson Walker).

recognized, are called internal students. At the same time the Theological Faculty was first established. This is distinctly interdenominational, the schools of the University in this Faculty being Hackney and New College (Congregational), Regent's Park (Baptist), Richmond (Wesleyan), besides King's College and St. John's Hall (Church of England). And the members of the Faculty and of the Board of Theological Studies consists mainly of the staff of these colleges, the proportion of Anglicans being roughly two out of five. All members have from the beginning worked harmoniously together, without sectarian differences. Nonconformists speak with great admiration of the work of the first chairman, Dr. Robertson, then Principal of King's College, afterwards Bishop of Exeter.¹

The great feature of the University on this side is the degree of B.D., which is not, as in most other universities, open only to those who have already taken a degree in Arts, but independent. The course extends for three years, and includes two examinations. The Final includes papers on Old Testament (with Hebrew), New Testament (Greek), Biblical and Historical Theology, Church History, and Philosophical Introduction to Theology, besides optional subjects. The standard is high, as with London degrees generally. There is a further examination for Honours in Theology; here the student specializes in some one subject, but may take another next year. To complete the account of the theological side of the University, there is a little known "Examination for Certificate of Religious Knowledge," open to all without matriculation, intended especially for teachers in secondary schools who desire to attain some qualification for taking the Scripture lesson. All University examinations are open to both sexes equally.

But the great bulk of theological students at both the Anglican colleges in London have hitherto not gone in for the London University course. This is largely due to the high standard maintained in the examinations; but partly also to the fact that some of the subjects are different from those of the ordinary Bishop's examination or the "Preliminary," while Bishops usually insist on these examinations quite irrespectively of how well a student may have passed University theological examinations of at least

¹ For history of the Faculty, see Prof. S. W. Green's *Introduction to London Theological Studies* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1911).

equal stiffness. It would be well if Bishops recognized these as exempting from their own except in certain subjects. The proportion of B.D. candidates in these colleges to the total number of students there has never been more than 10 per cent. It is hoped that in future this proportion may increase. More importance is now being attached to the possession of a degree, and here is a course ready to hand. It is hoped also that a larger number of students will have already passed the London Matriculation or the Intermediate ; such might be helped to take their B.A. with theological subjects. The importance of having an educated ministry is increasing.

At present the bulk of the students at King's College (Theological Faculty) read for the Associateship ("A.K.C."); these at St. John's Hall for the "Preliminary" or for the Durham Licence in Theology ("L.Th."). Till recently the two colleges were sharply distinguished in the matter of residence. St. John's Hall is almost exclusively residential ; King's College was till recently entirely non-residential. This has, from the student's point of view, the great advantage of economy, as he can live at home ; but has obvious disadvantages as regards all training other than that given by lectures. This need has, however, been largely met recently by the opening of a hostel in Vincent Square, Westminster, with accommodation for sixty students. It may be added that at King's there are *evening* theological classes, in which a student employed in the day-time may take a large part, not the whole, of his theological course, having to give up his employment only for the final period of preparation. Some of the best students have come through these classes.

King's is probably the largest theological college in the country ; it claims, like the S.P.G., to be as broad as the Church itself, and has always had some distinguished men on its staff. St. John's is of course like the C.M.S., distinctively Evangelical.

It is hoped that in the future there will be a larger number of men at these colleges reading for London degrees, and a larger proportion of men already possessing degrees, whether of London or elsewhere. In its libraries and institutions London possesses unique opportunities for post-graduate study and research. As it is, a fair proportion of students taking the London B.D. go on after ordination to specialize for B.D. Honours. Again, London

offers unique opportunities for the study of Pastoral Theology. It is here possible to observe religious work of all kinds, and among all classes of society. Under wise direction it might be possible for every student to obtain a systematic insight into the problems and opportunities of the Pastoral office.

I would say finally that the idea of the Bishops that a five years' course of preparation for Holy Orders (three years for a degree, and two years final theological and devotional training) should be the normal one, can be adapted to London only if applying merely to students entering at the usual age, not to older men; and even in this case only if much larger benefactions or grants from Church funds are made towards their maintenance. Otherwise two serious risks are run, greatly outweighing the advantage of a larger number of clergy having University degrees: (1) Many older men, or married men, who would make most useful clergymen, will be likely to give up all idea of taking Holy Orders. (2) The *theological* course will be likely to be cut short, coming as it does at the end, rather than the *general* course. There will be risk of having fewer clergy, more degrees, but less theology.

One idea is that, whereas at present the normal course for non-graduates is of three years—one preliminary year followed by two years' study of theology, while men of superior education may be excused the preliminary year—it would be a great gain if the study of theology could be extended over three years, the final year after the conclusion of the ordinary course being spent in the study of some branch of theology under the direction of a professor, this study taking the form of guided reading rather than of lectures. But the feasibility of even this in the case of many students is open to doubt.

HAROLD SMITH.



An Exposition of Isaiah xxiv-xxvii.

V.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST (CHAP. XXVI. 17-20).

WE admire the genius of historian or of poet whose patient research and powers of intuition and of sympathy make the dead past live again, and who, in their pages, speak to us with the voices that are gone. This fine quality of the human spirit, wherever it exists, is the workmanship and the gift of God. It may well be that the prophet Isaiah, who was both poet and historian of his times, was naturally so endowed, and therefore providentially fitted to receive and to record a revelation of the future. With the prophet, revelation of the future takes the place of the historian's observation or research, and his natural powers of intuition and of sympathy are so quickened, so purified, so possessed by the Spirit of God, as to enable him to exhibit in the highest degree, and with the most perfect accuracy, the features of the time of which he is speaking. As it has been beautifully said, "Herein they were not like harps or lutes, but they felt, they felt the power and strength of their own words. When they spoke of our peace, every corner of their hearts was filled with joy. When they prophesied of mournings, lamentations, and woes, to fall upon us, they wept in the bitterness and indignation of spirit, the arm of the Lord being mighty and strong upon them."¹

So we have heard our prophet speaking with the voice of the men of that far-off world to be, identified already with their experiences, chastened with their chastening, confessing with their confession, for he felt the power and strength of the revelation made through him.

But a nearer, though still distant, future is also revealed to the prophet's sight, a cycle of human experiences to take place before that supreme and final visitation which shames the adversaries of Jehovah, and makes the inhabitants of the world to become His people. And with these two, in the swiftly changing moods of the human spirit, the prophet is identified.

Like as a woman with child, that draweth near the time of her delivery, is in pain and crieth out in her pangs, so we have been before Thee, O Jehovah. We

¹ Hooker, *Sermon on St. Jude* 17-21.

have been with child, we have been in pain, we have as it were brought forth wind; we have not wrought any deliverance in the earth; neither have the inhabitants of the world fallen.

Who are these people? They are evidently some whose aim is to effect deliverance in the earth. They hope for the fall of the inhabitants of the world. They suffer agonies of pain in their endeavour. They have brought forth something indeed, but not what they had hoped. Their whole effort has been before Jehovah, but it has ended in wind.

Who can these be but the Church of Christ? This is the only Society the world has ever seen whose declared aim has been the deliverance of the earth. These are the only people who summon every knee to bow to their Lord and God. This is the only faith that claims to overcome the world. This is the mother that holds in her womb the kingdom of God.

And if so, these words contain a revelation that a time will come in the history of the Church of Christ when her long travail shall seem to have been in vain. Christianity will seem to have failed, not only in the scornful phrase of the outsider, but also in the sinking heart of the Christian. Have the powers of the age to come, borne in the Church's womb through two millenniums of this present age, brought forth but wind? Even so, the earth is not delivered, the man of the world ¹ remains erect.

But hark! another Voice is speaking through the prophet, a Voice also of that time, but the Voice now of the Lord of the Church, answering the cry of His people—

Thy dead shall live; My dead bodies shall arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs,² and the earth shall cast forth the dead.

Thy dead, O My people,³ shall live. Their lives and deaths in the world have not been in vain. They shall all live again, and see the world delivered, and the adversaries of their Lord fallen. Your dead bodies are My dead bodies. They shall arise and stand with Me upon the earth. Awake, ye that dwell in the dust, awake and sing. As when the tender grass springs out of the earth through

¹ The phrase *inhabitant of the world or earth* throughout all this context seems to denote men of the world as distinguished from *the people* of God. So also frequently in the Book of Revelation, e.g. vi. 10; xi. 10; xiii. 8; xiii. 12, 14; xvii. 2; xvii. 8.

² Or *light*.

³ Cf. just below, *Come, My people, enter thou. . . .*

clear shining after rain ; or as in the light of the morning, when the sun ariseth, a morning without clouds, dewdrops sparkle on the green, and the slumbering grasses raise their heads to the light — so ye My people who sleep in the dust shall arise and sing, when the Morning comes, and it is near ; the earth shall cast forth the dead.

This is " the first resurrection," ² and blessed and holy is he who has part in it.³

Let us now recall that later Word of the Lord, also occasioned by a present sorrow of His Church.

" We would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them that fall asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as the rest, who have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with Him *when the kingdom comes*. For this we say unto you by the Word of the Lord, that we that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep. For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first ; then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." ⁴

Be of good cheer, O travailing people ; thy dead shall live, thy living shall be changed, together they shall be caught up to meet Me in the air ; thy chambers are prepared, the many mansions made ready.

Come, My people—quick and raised together—enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee ; hide thyself for a little moment until the indignation be overpast.

Your work of testimony and travail is over, and shall not be in vain, your Lord Himself will carry it to completion. You shall be sheltered for a little moment till the indignation is overpast, and then shall see His glory.

¹ 2 Sam. xxiii. 4.

² Rev. xx. 6.

³ The phrases *to arise from the dead, the resurrection from the dead*, and the like, which occur some fifty times in the N.T., except when they are applied to the miracles of raising to life again or of spiritual conversion, are used *only* of the resurrection of our Lord and of those who sleep in Him. See e.g. Luke xx. 35 ; Phil. iii. 11. The general resurrection is spoken of as *the resurrection of the dead*.

⁴ 1 Thess. iv. 13-18.

Who would not share in the travail pains that he may hereafter share the glory? Who would not fall asleep in Jesus to be one of Jehovah's bodies? Who would not be awake in that glorious morning of the world?

"But take heed to yourselves, lest haply your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and that day come on you suddenly as a snare; for so shall it come upon all them that dwell on the face of all the earth. But watch ye at every season, making supplication, that ye may prevail to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man." ¹

A VINEYARD KEPT BY JEHOVAH (CHAPS. XXVI. 21-XXVII. 5).

The voices of the future are now hushed, and the stream of prediction flows once more in explanation of their closing accents. "Hide thyself for a little moment," the Voice had said, "until the indignation be overpast."

For, behold, Jehovah cometh forth out of His place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity; the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain.

In an earlier communication to the prophet Jehovah had declared His intention to "be still, and behold in His dwelling place" while the blaspheming Assyrian power grew to maturity, but that before the grape-harvest, when the blossom is over and the flower becomes a ripening grape, He would intervene with His sickle and scatter both sprigs and spreading branches on the earth.² So through all our ages of earth's growing iniquity Jehovah has been still, beholding from His place, but now, "behold, Jehovah cometh forth out of His place to punish," not one nation only, but "the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity."

"The transgression of the earth,"³ "the sin of the world,"⁴ who can measure or recount it? But "the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain."

Here the Lord, through His prophet, seems to make the first primeval sin the representative of the whole dark catalogue of crime. "Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him. And Jehovah said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother? And he said, I know not; am I my brother's keeper? And He said, What

¹ Luke xxii. 34-36.

² xviii. 4.

³ xxiv. 20.

⁴ John i. 29.

hast thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto Me from the ground, which hath opened its mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand." ¹ "Cain slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his works were evil, and his brother's righteous." ² And this is the story of the sin of the world,³ while Jehovah has not yet come forth out of His place. But, behold, Jehovah cometh "with ten thousands of His holy ones, to execute judgment upon all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their works of ungodliness which they have ungodly wrought, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken again Him." ⁴

But behind the dark phenomenon of human sin stands the more sombre figure of the great Adversary. "Cain was of the Evil One." ⁵ He is the begetter of the liars and murderers of the earth.⁶ *He* is the sower of tares in the field of the world. *He* is the enemy of the Son of Man.⁷ And shall he escape in that day when Jehovah comes out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity and earth discloses her slain? He shall not escape.

In that day Jehovah with his hard and great and strong sword will punish leviathan the swift⁸ serpent, and leviathan the crooked⁹ serpent.

The reference of these words cannot be mistaken. Leviathan is indeed the Hebrew name for the crocodile, although not restricted to that reptile.¹⁰ But here Leviathan is the serpent; and this, as well as the whole context, plainly marks the word here as symbolic of the Old Serpent, which is the Devil or Satan. The magnificent description in the Book of Job,¹¹ where Jehovah depicts the invincibility of Leviathan—

If one lay at him with the sword, it cannot avail;
Nor the spear, the dart, nor the pointed shaft—

gives special significance to the "hard and great and strong sword" of Jehovah Himself, which will at last avail to punish this "strong man armed," this "Prince of this world," this "King over all the sons of pride." ¹²

It may well be that the prophet here, under the Divine guidance,

¹ Gen. iv. 8-10.

² 1 John iii. 12.

³ John iii. 19.

⁴ Jude 14, 15.

⁵ 1 John iii. 12.

⁶ John viii. 44.

⁷ Matt. xiii. 39.

⁸ Or, *gliding*; or, *fleeing*.

⁹ Or, *winding*.

¹⁰ Ps. civ. 26.

¹¹ Job xli.

¹² Ib. v. 34.

takes the great serpentine constellations of the sky as figures of the Captain of "the host of the height on high,"¹ who shall be punished in that day. The "swift" or "fleeing" or "gliding serpent" is most descriptive of the long-drawn-out constellation of Hydra, the Water-snake, which stretched itself for one hundred and five degrees along the primitive celestial equator; while "the crooked" or "winding serpent" vividly pictures the Dragon, coiled about the poles of the ecliptic and equator.² These are apt emblems of "the principalities and powers, the world-rulers of this (present) darkness, the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places,"³ whose malign influence, under their leader, ever thwarts the laws and the statutes and the covenant of God, and plunges men again and again into iniquity. Jehovah with His hard and great and strong sword shall punish him in that day. "I saw an angel coming down out of heaven, having the key of the abyss and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the Dragon, the Old Serpent, which is the Devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years, and cast him into the abyss, and shut it, and sealed it over him, that he should deceive the nations no more, until the thousand years should be finished."⁴

And He will slay the monster that is in the sea.

This is an additional circumstance of that day. If we have interpreted rightly, the emblems of the Evil One are taken from the sky, while this emblem is taken from the earth and sea. Leviathan is the Old Serpent on high, this is the monster that is in the sea. Leviathan, moreover, is punished, while the monster is slain. So that an additional, and in certain respects contrasted circumstance seems to be indicated.

Now in a later prophecy through Isaiah the Egyptian power which enslaved Israel is termed "the monster,"⁵ while in Daniel's prophetic visions gigantic forms of living creatures rising from the sea are symbolic of great world-powers,⁶ and in this sense then we take the expression here. The prophet has already told us that in that day Jehovah will punish not only the host of the height on

¹ xxiv. 21.

² See Maunder, *Astronomy of the Bible*, Ch. v. In Job xxvi. 13, "the swift serpent" evidently denotes a constellation.

³ Eph. vi. 12.

⁴ Rev. xx. 1-3.

⁵ li. 9; cf. Ezek. xxix. 3; Ps. lxxiv. 13.

⁶ Dan. vii. 3, 17, "four kings" = four kingdoms, see v. 23; and so Rev. xiii. 1, cf. ib. xvii. 15.

high, but also "the kings of the earth upon the earth." In that passage indeed their punishments are not distinguished, but in the present passage the spirit-power is "punished," while the world-power is "slain," a distinction which must, we think, be intentional. For in the later revelation the Seer saw "the beast and the kings of the earth and their armies" engulfed in the lake of fire, but Satan cast into the abyss. There was an end of one upon the earth, but the other must after the thousand years be loosed for a little time.¹ So Isaiah proclaims that the serpent is punished and the sea-monster slain.

And now once more through the prophet speaks the Voice of God—

In that day: A vineyard of wine, sing ye unto it. I Jehovah am its keeper, I will water it every moment; lest any hurt it, I will keep it night and day. Wrath is not in Me; would that the briers and thorns were against Me in battle: I would march upon them, I would burn them together. Or else let him take hold of My strength, that he may make peace with Me; yea, let him make peace with Me.

The indignation is overpast, the usurping Prince of this world is banished, Jehovah reigns in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem; all nations serve Him, and all nations enjoy His care. The whole world, and no longer one nation,² is the Vineyard of Jehovah. The whole world is a vineyard of wine, yielding its full and finest fruit.

"I Jehovah am its keeper." Jehovah God planted a garden of old in the earth, and there He put the man whom He had formed to dress it and to keep it, but Paradise was lost. Now, says the voice of promise, I Jehovah am its keeper; I will water it every moment; lest any hurt it, I will keep it night and day. No invading spirit of evil shall enter this vineyard now, no cumbering brier and thorn shall again be tolerated within it, when Jehovah is the keeper.

"Wrath is not in Me," says the Divine Speaker; for the ground is no more cursed for man's sake, the sweat and toil of labour is relieved, the sorrow of conception is removed, the age-long conflict with the Adversary passed and gone; Divine blessing rests on all, as at the first creation. "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."³ Creation has waited for the manifestation of

¹ Rev. xix. 19-xx. 3.

² v. 1-7.

³ Gen. i. 28.

the sons of God, and is delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God.¹

But while the earth is renewed, and the tempter banished, and men are blessed, evil is not at an end. Briers and thorns may appear, even in this Vineyard of Jehovah. But He Who is the vineyard's Keeper has no fear. Let them appear; they shall not take root, they shall not mar the soil. "Would that the briers and thorns were against Me in battle!" It is not as in the old days when Jehovah kept still in His place, and the earth brought forth her thorns and thistles unchecked, and the ungodly were as thorn thickets that could not be taken with the hand, but the man that touched them must be armed with iron and the staff of a spear.² Now the Keeper of the Vineyard is present, and mighty and alert. He will march against them Himself, He will burn them at once and together; "or else let him," the incipient solitary rebel, "let him take hold of My strength," abandoning his futile opposition and clasping My almighty power to save even him, "that he may make peace with Me; yea, let him make peace with Me."

A vineyard of red wine indeed; sing ye to it! sing ye to it!

Let the peoples praise Thee, O God;
 Let all the peoples praise Thee.
 O let the nations be glad and sing for joy;
 For thou wilt judge the peoples with equity,
 And govern the nations upon earth.
 Let the peoples praise Thee, O God;
 Let all the peoples praise thee.³
 The earth hath yielded its increase;
 God, even our own God, will bless us;
 And all the ends of the earth shall fear Him.³

W. S. MOULE.

(To be concluded.)

¹ Rom. viii. 19-23.

² 2 Sam. xxiii. 6, 7.

³ Psalm vi. 7.



The Office of Lay Reader.¹

III.

THE QUESTION OF LEGAL STATUS.

AT a Conference on the work of Lay Readers in our Church, which was held in the Church House, Westminster, in the summer of 1913, I read by request a paper on the legal aspect of that work. On that occasion I prefaced my remarks by observing that the subject involved the consideration of some obscure and doubtful questions, and that it was not the practice of lawyers to pronounce a definite opinion on knotty points of law unless they were called upon to do so judicially or upon being professionally consulted. I therefore begged that any views which I might express should be taken as put forth tentatively by way of suggestion rather than as, in any sense, authoritative and final. I feel bound to make the same reservation at the outset of the present article.

If I were asked to state concisely what is the legal status at present possessed by lay readers in the Church of England, I should be inclined to say that, as regards their ecclesiastical powers and duties, they have no actual legal status. That is to say, their rights and powers and functions are, in the eye of the law, the same as those of the ordinary layman. At the same time the *Guardian* of June 7, 1917, records that on the previous Saturday (June 2), in a test case brought by the military authorities at Camberley, the magistrates decided that a diocesan reader was exempt from the provisions of the Military Service Act as being "a regular minister of a religious denomination." The only mention of readers in *The Laws of England* is in the following terms—

"The office of lay reader to assist the parochial clergy in their spiritual ministrations has of late years been revived in the Church. The functions of lay readers are defined by regulations of the Archbishops and Bishops issued in October, 1905, but they have otherwise no legal status". (Vol. 28, *ii*. Ecclesiastical Law. Part II, Sect. 6, subsect. 8, p. 480.)

We shall discuss later on the precise effect of the Regulations of October, 1905. I will here only point out that these Regulations

¹ Previous articles in this series appeared in the *CHURCHMAN* of May (I, History and Present-Day Use, by Mr. W. A. Kelk) and June (II, Some Reminiscences, by Dr. Eugene Stock).

confer no rights and impose no duties upon lay readers which could be enforced by or against them in any ecclesiastical or civil court otherwise than in their character of simple laymen. When, therefore, the question is asked what are the strictly legal powers of lay readers as regards conducting or taking part in services either in consecrated buildings or elsewhere, and particularly as regards assisting in the administration of Holy Communion, the answer is to be found in ascertaining what are the legal powers of laymen in general in reference to these matters. This was in fact the view taken by the Joint Committee of the two Houses of the Canterbury Convocation appointed in 1903 to consider the question of restoring an Order of Readers or Sub-deacons in the Church. In their Report issued in the following year, when they deal with the legal aspect of the matter and particularly with the question whether the rubrics in the Prayer Book, either in its earlier or in its present form, and the Act of Uniformity of 1662, impose restrictions on lay readers officiating in the services of the Church, they refer to the opinion given by Sir Arthur Charles in 1884 on the powers of laymen generally in this respect. That eminent ecclesiastical lawyer expressed his views on the subject as follows —

“ Whilst I think that, having regard to the Twenty-third Article of Religion, the Canons of 1604, and the Preface to the Form of Making, Ordaining and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, laymen cannot lawfully publicly preach or minister the Sacraments, I am of opinion that they may lawfully, in a consecrated building, say the Litany or any other part of Morning and Evening Prayer which is not expressly directed to be said by a priest, provided they are authorized to do so by the incumbent and Bishop. It is true that the word ‘minister’ undoubtedly means ordained minister (*Kemp v. Wickes*, 3 Phillimore’s Reports 276; *Mastin v. Escott*, 2 Curteis’s Reports 692; *Escott v. Mastin*, 4 Moore Privy Council Cases 104) and that the rubrics in many instances expressly direct that the ‘minister’ shall say this or that particular portion of the service; but these rubrics are, in my opinion, directory only, and do not exclude properly authorised laymen from saying such portions, as well as those portions where there is no express rubrical direction.”

The Joint Committee of Convocation, while admitting that there was some difficulty in dealing with the question, affirmed their general agreement with this opinion, so far as respects the saying by a layman of the Litany and other parts of Morning and Evening Prayer not expressly directed to be said by a priest. But it may be observed that Sir Arthur Charles makes no reference to the Act of Uniformity of 1662. Section 2 of that statute directs that morning and evening

prayer shall upon every Lord's day and upon all other days and occasions, and at the times appointed, be openly and solemnly read by every minister and curate in all churches, chapels, and other places of public worship. The Joint Committee rightly drew attention to this enactment, and it led them to the conclusion that where a minister belonging to a parish was present, he ought to read the whole of the service and not leave any part to a lay reader, to whom permission could only legally be given to read when the proper minister was absent, except in case of necessity, such as the blindness or infirmity of the proper minister.

The Act of Uniformity of 1662 was passed, as every one knows, in order to preclude ministers not episcopally ordained from officiating in the Church. But in its terms it equally excluded the lay readers, who during the preceding hundred years had filled gaps in the parochial ministrations which were occasioned by a deficiency in the number of the clergy. The duties of these readers were carefully defined by archiepiscopal and episcopal authority in the early years of Elizabeth's reign. They were required to promise that they would not preach or interpret, but only read that which was appointed by public authority; that they would not administer the sacraments or other public rites of the Church, but would bury the dead and purify women after childbirth; that upon due notice they would give place to a learned minister, if appointed on the presentation of the patron of the parish; that they would only read in poor parishes destitute of incumbents, except in case of sickness or other good cause allowed by the ordinary. And they were to be maintained by a small stipend provided out of the revenues of the benefice where they served, and not by the labours of their hands. These regulations have clearly no force in the present day. The whole series, and particularly the powers of the readers as to conducting funerals and churchings, are contrary to the provisions of the Act of Uniformity of 1662, and were therefore abrogated by it. Nevertheless, the ministrations of lay readers appear in some remote parts of the country to have survived the Act and to have been continued until towards the close of the eighteenth century. In Burns' *Ecclesiastical Law*, published in 1760, it is stated that "in this Kingdom in churches or chapels, where is only a very small endowment and no clergyman will take upon him the charge or cure thereof, it hath been usual to admit readers to the end that divine service in such places

might not altogether be neglected." And in a judgment in the case of *Martyn v. Hind* (2 Cowper's Reports 437), delivered as late as 1776, Lord Mansfield said, "I have been informed that in the Welsh dioceses, where there is no endowment worth the while of a clergyman to accept (and in Chester there are many such), many persons officiate as readers in opposition to clergymen," meaning thereby, as distinguished from clergymen. If he had been asked his opinion on the legality of the practice, he would probably have replied that it was not strictly legal, but could be justified on the principle that necessity knows no law.

The Report of the Joint Committee of the Canterbury Convocation in 1904 was followed by the passing of resolutions on the subject by the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation and the House of Laymen in both Provinces; and in pursuance of these resolutions the Archbishops and Bishops of the two Provinces drew up in October, 1905, a set of Regulations respecting Readers and other Lay officers, in which the powers and duties of Diocesan Readers, Parochial Readers, Catechists, and Evangelists or Trained Readers are carefully defined. Under these Regulations: (1) A Parochial Reader may be licensed (a) to visit the sick and read and pray with them, to take services in Sunday School and elsewhere, and generally to give such assistance to the incumbent as he may lawfully direct; (b) in unconsecrated buildings used for public worship (i) to read such services as may be approved by the Bishop; and (ii) to expound the Scriptures and give addresses; and (c) in consecrated buildings (i) to read such portions of the order of Morning and Evening Prayer and Litany as may be specified in his licence (which must not be those specifically ordered to be read by a priest or minister, except the lessons, but may include the Litany up to the Lord's Prayer and any of the occasional prayers or thanksgivings, the Prayer of St. Chrysostom, and 2 Cor. xiii. 14), (ii) to read selected and approved homilies or sermons, and (iii) to catechize children outside the appointed services of the Church. (2) A Diocesan Reader may be commissioned to perform all the duties of a Parochial Reader with the addition of such leave to give addresses in consecrated buildings as the Bishop of the diocese may lawfully grant, provided that such addresses may not be delivered during any of the appointed services of the Church. These Regulations obviously purported to be in the nature of by-laws, directing and controlling legal functions which were assumed to be

already in existence. They were not and did not pretend to be legislative enactments making legal what was not legal before. Our prelates had no power to frame any such enactments, and they did not profess to do so ; for, as we have seen, they limited the general assistance which a reader might give to an incumbent to what the incumbent might lawfully direct, and they restricted the Bishop's permission to a diocesan reader to give addresses in consecrated buildings to such permission as the Bishop might lawfully grant. In order, therefore, to ascertain the actual legal status of our lay readers, we must investigate the law as it stands independently of the Regulations. And there are three points to which our inquiry may be usefully directed, namely, as to their legal status in respect of (1) conducting or assisting in the regular appointed services of the Church, other than Holy Communion ; (2) preaching in consecrated buildings ; and (3) assisting in the Communion Office.

As regards (1) we note that in the rubrics in the Prayer Book nothing is laid down as to the person or persons by whom the *Venite* and the other Canticles, the Psalms, the Collects, and the following prayers to the end of the morning and evening services, and the prayers and thanksgivings upon several occasions, and the Litany down to the Lord's Prayer, are to be said. It is the invariable practice for the Canticles and Psalms either to be sung throughout by the choir and congregation or to be repeated in alternate verses by the minister and people ; and if this is lawful, it must clearly be equally lawful for a single layman to read the odd verses. The Joint Convocation Committee cite in their Report several instances of the practice of the Litany down to the Lord's Prayer being chanted throughout by singing clerks, instead of the minister taking the leading part. As regards the lessons, it is, as we know, quite usual for a layman to read them. In the Regulations of 1905 it seems to be considered that the rubrics direct that they shall be read by the minister. This is not exactly the case. "The minister" is to say, before and after every lesson, "Here beginneth, etc.," and "Here endeth, etc." But the actual reader is referred to as "he that readeth,"—apparently in contrast to, or at any rate not necessarily the same as the minister.¹ I believe that in some few places this

¹ In 1896, in answer to an inquiry addressed to him on the subject by a vicar in the diocese of York, the late Lord Grimthorpe replied as follows in his usual trenchant style : "Dear sir, the only answer I can give you is that the

distinction is actually observed ; but the instances of its being adhered to are extremely rare. In fact, as regards the person to officiate, the rubrics generally are in practice treated, to use Sir Arthur Charles's expression, as directory rather than as mandatory. There is no scruple about a deacon saying, in Morning and Evening Prayer and the Litany, the portions assigned by them to a priest, with the one single exception of the Absolution ; and if a deacon may say these portions, there appears to be no conclusive reason, so far as the rubrics are concerned, why a layman may not also say them when no ordained minister is present. The Regulations, however, clearly contemplate readers, who are licensed to do so, relieving the clergy by sharing with them the recital of the prayers, and this in some dioceses is actually done. But, as already stated, the Joint Convocation Committee considered that this would be illegal as an infraction of the requirement of the Act of Uniformity of 1662, that Morning and Evening Prayer shall always be said by ministers and curates. The question is arguable whether this view is correct, or whether the enactment is satisfied by their saying such portions of the services as in the rubrics are expressly directed to be said by the priest or minister, provided that the rest is duly said by some other authorized person or persons. In practice, as has been already observed, the enactment is never construed as requiring the officiating minister to repeat the whole of the Canticles and Psalms.

It will be remembered that Sir Arthur Charles, in his Opinion, referred to the Twenty-third Article, the Canons of 1604, and the Preface to the Ordinals as bearing upon the law on the subject. The Twenty-third Article and some of the canons relate to the second head of our inquiry. But the Fifteenth Canon directs that the Litany shall be said or sung by the parsons, vicars, ministers, or curates in all cathedral, collegiate, and parish churches and chapels. It is notorious that many of the canons have fallen into desuetude, and are more honoured in the breach than in the observance ; and it may be open to question how

Archbishop has no more power to prohibit a layman whom an incumbent asks to read the lessons than to prohibit a particular singer or reader of the Psalms, except that if either of them does so in such a way as to disturb or offend the congregation, he could be stopped, *i.e.* monished not to do so, with costs, by a prosecution in the ecclesiastical court. The notice of the older Prayer-Books was altered in 1662 from 'the minister' to 'he that readeth,' obviously to allow what had long been the practice in sundry places or, if not, to allow it for the future."

far this canon precludes ministers in the present day from allowing the first part of the Litany to be said or sung by unordained persons. At any rate if the strict view of this canon, and of the enactment in the Act of Uniformity above referred to, is to be accepted as correct the breach of the law in departing from it is committed by the clergyman who makes default in performing his prescribed duty rather than by the layman whom he permits to relieve him of it. The passage in the Preface to the Ordination Services which touches upon the matter is that which declares that no one shall be suffered to execute any of the functions of a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon except he be duly ordained. This prohibition throws no light on what are to be considered the exclusive functions of persons in Holy Orders.

On (2) the power of laymen generally to preach in consecrated buildings, Sir Arthur Charles apparently considered the Twenty-third Article of Religion to be conclusive against it. That Article is as follows—

“ It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or ministering the Sacraments to the congregation before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.”

The Article, we observe, does not define the manner of calling and sending preachers, but only describes the persons by whom they are to be commissioned. It would seem, therefore, that our Bishops, who answer that description, do not transgress its provisions when they entrust to certain lay readers the office of public preaching. The Regulations of 1905 prescribed that they should not deliver addresses in consecrated buildings during any of the appointed services of the Church. In some dioceses, including that of London, this restriction is construed as not precluding diocesan readers from giving addresses at the close of Matins or Evensong, since there is no intimation in the Prayer Book that a sermon then preached is a part of those services. But other Bishops consider that readers are debarred from preaching at that time as much as between the Nicene Creed and the offertory sentences in the Communion Office.

(3) The Article also bears upon the third head of our inquiry—the status of readers as to assisting in the Communion Office. The only question that could arise as to this would be respecting their

powers to read the Epistle and administer the Cup. According to the rubrics the second of these functions is to be performed by a minister, but the Epistle is expressly directed to be read by the priest. Yet in practice it is often read by a deacon ; and it may be argued that if this is lawful in spite of the rubric, there is no conclusive reason why both functions should not be exercised by a duly authorized layman. On the propriety or expediency of this, opinions may differ ; but readers clearly cannot at present perform either of these duties, since they are not included among those specified in the Regulations of 1905.

A review of the legal status of readers would be incomplete without a notice of the procedure by which they may be protected in the lawful discharge of their duties, or corrected if they exceed or abuse their powers. A reader can only exercise his functions with the consent of the incumbent of the parish ; but, having obtained that consent, he is entitled to the same protection from molestation in the rightful performance of his duties as can be claimed by an ordained minister. Any one who interfered with him would be guilty of " brawling." On the other hand, he would himself be liable to be convicted of that offence if he persisted in attempting to act without the consent and contrary to the directions of the incumbent. The procedure would not be so simple if having the consent of the incumbent he were to exceed or abuse the powers entrusted to him by the commission or licence of the Bishop. In that case his commission or licence would naturally be revoked, so that his status as a reader would cease. But in the present state of our Church discipline it is difficult to see to what further penalty or disability he would become liable except possibly a monition with costs, in the Ecclesiastical Court, as mentioned by Lord Grimthorpe in his letter on the reading of the lessons by a layman set out in the note above. The law would probably rather be put in force against the incumbent who was a party to his wrong-doing.

The present Bishop of Worcester in his *Lay Work and the Office of Reader*, which was published in 1904 (before the Report of the Joint Committee of the Canterbury Convocation), sets out the opinion of Sir Arthur Charles to which attention has been called, and adds, " I do not propose to discuss this legal question ; it would be quite unprofitable. A settlement is impossible without reference to the courts." With the Bishop's last sentence we must perforce

agree. At the same time, it will also, I think, be generally agreed that in existing circumstances a reference to the courts for such a settlement is neither probable nor desirable. For the present our readers, both diocesan and parochial, may well be content to rest, with a good conscience and a mind at ease, on the *quasi*-legal or *extra*-legal status accorded to them by the Regulations of 1905. When the Church acquires the powers of self-government for which we are striving, they will, no doubt, be placed on a more correct theoretical basis. Meantime one substantial improvement might with advantage be made in the situation. The Regulations are variously interpreted in different dioceses, so that the powers and functions of the readers are not the same throughout the country. It would be well if all our Bishops would put the same wide and liberal construction on the Regulations as, with such conspicuous benefit to the Church, has been adopted in the diocese of London.

P. V. SMITH.



The Possibilities of Reunion.¹

THE conscience of Christendom is rapidly becoming quickened to realize that the grievous divisions in the visible Church constitute one of the chief barriers to the victorious sovereignty of Christ in the kingdom of the world. But not only is the conscience of the Church awakening, but the world, too, is realizing more and more the shock of the sundered Church, and it is becoming increasingly clear that there must be Reunion if there is to be continued power to speak in Christ's name with any hope that the world will give heed.

I believe our own Church occupies a unique position in the matter of the "Possibilities of Reunion," for, with all her faults, she has retained through the centuries the fundamentally catholic bases without the exclusive claims of Rome, or the formalism and superstitions of the Greek Church.

However little our own sympathies may lean that way, no efforts at Reunion can be considered complete which do not take into account the Churches of the West and the East as well as the non-episcopal Churches.

What, then, are the Possibilities of Reunion with the Greek and the Latin Churches?

We are frequently warned by those in our Church, whose eyes turn almost exclusively to these ancient Catholic Churches, that any hasty steps towards Reunion with non-episcopal bodies will hopelessly ruin any chance of Reunion with East and West, and therefore thwart the efforts at Reunion itself. A very brief consideration will suffice to show how little this need weigh with us. I am not sufficiently conversant with the present position of negotiations with the Greek Church to speak with confidence of the absence of any possibility of Reunion here. It is by no means so hopeless as with that of the West, for the Greek Church does not, or at any rate till the issue of the Vatican decrees did not, regard herself as constituting the universal Church. After those decrees were

¹ A Paper read at the Annual Gathering of Clergy and Laity at Eastbourne, June 17, 1918.

promulgated, some on her behalf claimed that "the true faith survives in Russia only. In the West it is utterly lost." "We," they said, "are orthodox and there is nothing for others to do but to become orthodox also."

We shall see later that she does not, however, slam the door and bar it against us.

The Western Church.

This is precisely what the Roman Church has done, and it is simply self-blinding to allow hopes of Reunion with Rome to limit our freedom to act in the direction of mutual approach with the non-episcopal bodies. However exclusive in action Rome had been up to 1870, no doctrinal ground sufficient for continued and necessary separation existed, but the Papal decrees of July 18, 1870, effectually slammed and barred the door.

Not content with such primacy as the prestige of the metropolitan see would naturally have given her, she made then impossible claims which must constitute, as long as they stand unaltered, an impassable barrier to any Reunion. Her position is expressed by one of her writers to be this:

"The Church's call, whether to individuals or communities, is a summons not to treat but to surrender. She sits as judge in her own controversy, and the only plea she admits is a *confiteor*, the only prayer she listens to is a *miserere*."

A fictitious infallibility compels her, on principle, always to drag her errors after her like a ball fastened to her heel. She shows not the slightest official desire for Reunion upon any terms short of absolute absorption. The foolish attempt made by Lord Halifax and others, in 1896, to obtain her recognition for Anglican Orders was met with an absolute rebuff. She will not allow her members to unite even in prayer about Reunion. The "Association of Anglicans and Romans to Promote Union by use of Intercessory Prayer" was interdicted.

Any who differ from her claims are ruthlessly expelled, no matter how great their scholarship or devout their lives—witness such men as Döllinger, Tyrrell and St. George Mivart.

The only hope in this direction is the slow penetration of truth—the work of the Holy Spirit of God. The whole Papal claim is a house built on sand. The artificial edifice of Roman absolutism.

cannot but fall in process of time. The War may help much towards this, for, despite the Pope's Apologia, the world has been shocked by his failure to face clear moral issues no matter what the cost to his hopes of temporal power might be. As has been well said, "In the way of peace nothing is possible except to men of good will," and such good will being absent there is no possibility of Reunion with Rome.

We turn, therefore, to the *Non-Episcopal Churches*, assured that there is no occasion for delayed action in any hope of Reunion in the direction just considered. Indeed, I do not doubt that a really strong united Protestant Church, including the non-episcopal communities, will be in a better position to meet the inflated claims of a church which seems to have so great a position through her marvellous discipline and unity, when we arrive at that stage. In support of this, one may quote a Dean of the Russian Orthodox Church, "As one of a Church outside the Anglican or Protestant Churches, I certainly feel that the first step at this moment, towards realizing the purposes of 'the Conference of Faith and Order' is really to embrace your Protestant Churches all together. You may not be able at once to get into full sympathy, but all could be brought into such relations that every Christian can pray in comfort with his brother. If you cannot do *that*, how can you expect to reconcile such differences as exist with the Eastern Orthodox or the Roman Catholic Church? How can they be approached, or very well answer to your call?"

It is important at the outset to clear our minds as to what we mean by "Unity."

One of the objections made to the attempt is that Reunion means Compromise, and compromise means arriving at the "least common denominator," and that this reduces the "basis of Union" to a point so insignificant that the result is not worth the effort. Many important joint conferences recently held have made it abundantly clear that not compromise but "essentials" are the crux. Neither is it uniformity which is desired. Life is complex. Human nature is infinitely varied. Uniformity is poverty. "There are diversities of gifts but the same Spirit, diversities of administrations but the same Lord, diversities of workings but the same God, Who worketh all things in all. All these worketh the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will." It is, therefore,

neither possible nor desirable that there should be one uniform system either of government or worship.

Nor can Union be of the nature of a *clever scheme* to mask differences. No cast-iron scheme will suffice for a living Church. "It is a vital process, not," as one has said, "Company-promoting." A unity of life—the life of the spirit and not of organization, although outward and visible evidence of unity there must be as showing the "unity of spirit" which must underly all. There must be emphasis on the points of agreement and careful study of those of difference. There can be no forced unity, but only one which carries with it the free consent of the members. In this connexion, we, of the Church of England, ought never to forget how seriously sundered¹ within the outwardly united body we are ourselves. The schismatic spirit within a single organization may well be a more evil force and a worse sin than any separations without.

A bright day seems to be dawning in the healing of the divisions in non-episcopal bodies themselves. For the lack of unity in these bodies has hitherto formed an added barrier to any reunion with ourselves. A partial federation of the Free Churches took place in 1896, and this was further cemented in 1910. A most important conference was held in 1915, followed by an historic gathering at Bradford in 1916. Interchange of pulpits, prevention of overlapping, especially in villages, etc., have resulted. In Canada, proposals for organic union between Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational bodies have been considered. In Scotland, the two great Presbyterian Churches amalgamated in 1900, and there is now a very hopeful movement towards union of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and the Established Church of Scotland. All this is to the good and clears the ground for union with the Church of England.

Having agreed, if we do, that there is no need or desire for a uniform organization, it becomes necessary to examine the present grounds of agreement and to resolve clearly the issues between us.

- In seeking a basis of essentials on which to build, it is most hopeful that the "*Lambeth Quadrilateral*" should prove so wonderfully a common ground of agreement. There is real agreement on the first three, namely, (a) the scriptures, (b) the two sacraments, (c) the two creeds.

The *Episcopacy* proves the first real difficulty. In view of the recent Cheltenham and Oxford Conferences it is hardly necessary for me to enter with any fulness into the question of the episcopacy. The battle will be fought not around the episcopacy as such, but about *theories* of the episcopacy. It may be at once acknowledged that the non-episcopal churches do not any longer object to the episcopacy as of admitted value, but not as essential to the being of a church, and it would be well to recognize that any such insistence on our part will close the door to Reunion as effectively as Rome does. Dr. Gore, voicing the Anglo-Catholic view in his brochure issued after Kikuyu, claims that "A Bishop is necessary to the existence of a church, and therefore is of the 'esse' and not merely the 'bene esse.'"

Upon such a difference hangs, of course, the validity of the ministry and sacraments in non-episcopal bodies. It is wrong to argue as he does, that if the episcopacy is not necessary it is a mischievous ornament which ought to have been repudiated in the Church of England long ago. The theory of "Apostolic Succession" giving a prescriptive and exclusive power as a channel of grace can no longer be held. Even Dean Robinson, in his sermon before the Lambeth Conference, said, "We can and ought to recognize that where the first three conditions (i.e., of the Lambeth Quadrilateral) are fulfilled, and where there is an ordered ministry, guarded by the solemn imposition of hands, there our differences are not so much matters of faith as matters of discipline, and ought with humility and patience to be capable of adjustment."

As a matter of fact our Church has never in her formularies refused to recognize the gifts of the Spirit without episcopal channels. Nor indeed can we, in face of obvious facts, deny the evidences of the Holy Spirit working in non-episcopal bodies. Dr. Pusey himself admitted this. There is, therefore, no need for any definition of the episcopacy. If, however, the episcopacy is to be accepted, as it evidently may well be, by non-episcopal churches it must be a *reformed* episcopacy in several ways:

(1) It must be divested of every shred of prelacy. The Bishop must be a "primus inter pares," ruling as chairman of brother priests and the priesthood of the laity.

(2) It must be freed from the serious injury of State appointment. In the first place the Bishop was the elected representative

of the Christian community, and the Christian community must resume the power of choice. It is futile to claim, as we Evangelicals especially are wont to do, that the present system has worked very well on the whole, and has given us a wide selection of men of ability, and sheltered us from the unrestrained control of a party. This may be so, but the method is indefensible for all that, and liberty must be attained in this, even at the cost of the "establishment" if need be.

The method by which episcopacy will be accepted by non-episcopal bodies has yet to be worked out, but at present there appears no likelihood of consent to *re-ordination*. It is held, and I think rightly, that such a demand is not warranted by either scripture or history. There should be no difficulty, however, in combining the episcopal, presbyterian and even congregational principles in one act of ordination for future ordinations, leaving a generation of non-episcopally ordained men to die out by flux of time.

Dr. Garvie (a prominent Nonconformist leader) says: "While the demand for Ordination of the Ministry by laying-on-of-hands is legitimate, and in future in a Reunited Church, the presence of the Bishop along with Presbyters might be properly insisted on, the validity of the orders of men now in the ministry should not be challenged, and a common consecration of all ministers might introduce the new order of human penitence and faith and bring a Pentecostal filling of the Spirit."

It is vain to suppose that such a condition will be lightly accepted. Dr. Gore stands by his utterance at the Church Congress at Cambridge in 1910, and he speaks for a powerful section of our Church: "That the Anglican Communion would certainly be rent in twain on the day on which any non-episcopally ordained minister was formally allowed within our communion to celebrate the Eucharist." If the reason for this is that *Grace* and not merely *Order* is involved, then the validity of the orders of Ministers who have not been episcopally ordained is challenged indeed denied, whether we attach any definition to episcopacy or not. Though it is easy to bring evidence to show that episcopacy cannot rightly be held to occupy such a position in the Church of England—*vide* Bishop Lightfoot, Hooker, Cosin and others, yet in healing one breach there is great risk at present of making another. This

may be inevitable as many think, but if so, let it be on clearly defined and safely founded grounds.

Turning now to the still more difficult crux of *Intercommunion*, we must all realize that not only *without* but also *within* our communion, that sacrament which was intended by our Lord to be a sacrament of demonstration of unity, has become the high ground of keenest division. To be quite candid, I am conscious of a wider gulf between myself and those who hold a materially localized presence of our Lord in the elements by the consecrating act of a priest, than between myself and those who in the simplest way divide bread and drink water in a non-liturgical service, conducted by a minister non-episcopally ordained. The mere fact that we all are members of one Church does not secure the least real union between myself and those, for example, who in London the other day, in endeavouring to foist the Service of Benediction on the Church, claimed that it must be done without any secrecy, as "the Lord was in the 'monstrance,' secrecy would be an insult to Him."

Intercommunion includes reciprocal acceptance. Take the case first of permission for and invitation of those of other communions to attend the Lord's Table in our Church. *Confirmation* at present *appears* to block the way. I say appears because there is a strong difference of opinion as to the extent of reference of the Rubric inserted in 1662. The contention with which most of us would agree, that this was intended only to refer to the Church's own children, being come to years of discretion, has the weighty support of such men as Archbishops Tait, Benson, and Temple, and Dr. Creighton.

The *Communion Office* itself defines the mystical body of Christ as "the blessed company of all faithful people." In face, too, of the careful, if clumsy, expression of the XIXth Article: "The Visible Church is a congregation of faithful men in which the pure word of God is preached and the Sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same"—in view of this liberal and broad comprehensiveness no Church, however valuing for itself a certain rule as "convenient to be observed," should exclude from participation in this sacrament adult and duly accredited members of the Christian Churches who have conformed to the rule prevail-

ing in their own body. The removal of this obstacle would, however, be only one side, and not the most serious of the difficulty. It is not reasonable to expect that the non-episcopal bodies should be content to be received at our tables. "Kikuyu" did not go much further and yet the confirmation of the Kikuyu proposals will rend the Church as at present minded. There can be no doubt that the Lambeth Conference due this year would have confirmed them had the war permitted it to be held, and you are familiar with the threats of rending of the Church that have been liberally thrown out. Intercommunion must, however, be *reciprocal*. It has become clear through the close study given to this question that the time is not ripe for such a step, for any movement in the direction of Intercommunion must be with the *corporate* consent of the bodies concerned to be of any real value. As Canon Burroughs says, "Measures of intercommunion which wantonly blurred the trace of nature in the existing denominational articulation of the Church would not be in the true line of progress."

The utmost that the present stage of thought permits would be to claim a guarded right of intercommunion with non-episcopal Churches, enough to show we do not regard our Sacraments as of different value or validity just because we preserve episcopal orders, but not enough to encourage a dangerous and sterile promiscuity. Special occasions, like the conclusion of the Revision of the Bible in the past, or January 6 in the present, would offer sufficient demonstration to the world of a corporate intercommunion; and for the rest, reception at each other's sacrament of qualified persons of other bodies.

Possibilities of Reunion, then, centre round the following important points:

(1) *The Universal Acceptance of an Episcopacy* reformed, purified, and appointed by the Church herself, and this with no insistence upon any *theory of necessity* as channel of Grace. Less than this we cannot accept, and more than this non-episcopal bodies will not.

(2) *No retrospective act casting reflection* on the validity of Orders of existing ministers would be acceptable, the utmost possible being an all-inclusive act of re-consecration. This probably cannot be obtained, so that future ordination, with Bishops and Presbyters co-operating, with an awkward intervening period of confusion, is the only practical possibility.

(3) *Intercommunion of an absolutely reciprocal character*, at present unattainable as a *regular* practice, but possible for exceptional occasions. Towards these ends certain immediately fruitful efforts are not only possible but absolutely demanded by the hour.

(1st) *Intercession, especially united*. Prayer together for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, for the spirit of penitence for a common sin, for more love, would be like a mighty magnet drawing us together because mutually drawing near to the one Lord and Saviour.

(2nd) *Study together*, in groups widely distributed, of the points at issue. The Conferences already held have hastened the day of Reunion appreciably.

(3rd) *Increase of Common Action* on all opportunities.

(4th) *Saturation with the idea of Unity* till its beauty and power obsess us.

(5th) *Limited and occasional acts of Intercommunion*, but not by local Kikuyus independently organized in face of authority; and

Lastly, but most essentially, a *greater devotion to our common Lord and Master*.

I cannot close without suggesting that we help these possibilities by keeping ever before our minds the dream of a United Church. Visualize what it would mean. Think of its influence, each contributing some treasure to its store. How mighty would be its power as a force for righteousness in the world! The comparison of such a dream with the reality that faces us to-day is enough to kindle in our hearts a passion to see in our day the answer to our Lord's Prayer that "they may be one that the world may believe."

GEO. M. HANKS.



Food for the Body and Food for the Soul.

[An Exposition and Study containing Some Thoughts suggested by the War. St. Mark v. 43: "And commanded that something should be given her to eat."]

AS we read the four Gospels nothing strikes us more than the individuality of the writers. We have four portraits painted by four loving hands of Him Who was "fairer than the children of men." Each artist paints his picture from the aspect which most strikes his mind, and catches the expression which he most loves. St. Mark, the amanuensis of St. Peter, has a noticeable love for the objective, the circumstantial. I will give two instances. When he is describing the temptation of our Lord, he alone adds a graphic touch which brings before us the desolation of the scene: "He was with the wild beasts." When he describes the blessing of the little children by our Lord, he alone gives the inimitable touch so dear to the parental heart: "He took them up in His arms." The restoration to life of the daughter of Jairus is recorded by three Evangelists. It is characteristic of St. Mark that he does not forget to notice that Christ "commanded that something should be given her to eat."

I imagine that those of us who have found our days too short for our appointed tasks, and have been occupied with the great concerns of life, think with regret of the omission of little things: a letter has been unanswered, or a kind word of sympathy with a sorrowing friend or acquaintance has been unspoken. The happiness of life largely consists in attention to little things. How often husband and wife, after years of wedded life, forget those little acts of attention which they were delighted to give before marriage, and yet these acts are links in a golden chain, binding heart to heart in abiding love. God is a God of little things as well as of great. The creed of the Stoics was: "Magna Dii curant parva negligent"—"The gods care for great things, but are oblivious of small things." Our Lord has told us that a sparrow does not fall to the ground without our Father's knowledge. Christ never forgot a little thing. The daughter of Jairus was a young and growing girl, and weak after her sickness. Christ knew what she needed, and that, amid

the excitement of her resurrection, this would be forgotten, and so He thoughtfully "commanded that something should be given her to eat." It was no marvel that our Lord should raise this girl to life, it was the natural consequence of His Deity; but we read with admiration that afterwards He took care to see that she had the nourishment which she so much needed. I would say in passing that St. Mark alone gives us the exact words spoken by Jesus, "Talitha Cumi." They hide a precious meaning from the English reader. Scholars tell us that the Aramaic word "Talitha"—"little girl"—is an expression of great tenderness and of peculiar endearment.

There is one lesson which we ought to learn from the fact that God is a God of little things as well as of great. I think that I speak the experience of most Christians when I say that we carry our great troubles at once to "the Throne of grace," but not our little ones. Hence it is that our small anxieties, perplexities and worries interfere so much with the peace of the soul. The Christian who fully realizes that God is interested in and cares for the least concerns of our daily life is kept in peace. His soul is like some small lake or tarn in the moors which, protected by sheltering hills from every passing wind, reflects on its unruffled surface the turquoise sky above. "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee." I have written at length on the question of little things suggested by the text. I would refer to another point before calling attention to more important matters in connexion with the tragic and terrible war in which [we are] engaged. I desire, in teaching the Word of God, to gather up the fragments that fall from the Master's table—the small morsels of Divine bread—that nothing be lost. We live in days of attack on the supernatural. It is well, therefore, to notice that a miracle was never wrought except for a moral purpose, and everywhere we see economy of power. Does Christ feed the 5,000 with five loaves and two fishes? The bread is distributed by human hands, and the fragments are collected to be the after-food of the Twelve. Does He speak the omnipotent words "Talitha Cumi"? He commands others to give her to eat. "It is one of the manifest laws in the Divine economy that miraculous operations in extraordinary circumstances are never intended to supersede human efforts in ordinary ones."

FOOD FOR THE BODY.

Many as are the teachings of the text, the truest is that God supplies the wants and necessities of the life which He gives : that, wherever He bestows life, He is careful to add that which the life needs for its development and perfection. No sooner did Christ give life to the daughter of Jairus than He made provision for its sustenance. I would suggest a line of thought which has, during the present stress, impressed my own mind. Chrysostom said long ago : " God has given the universe in the place of a Book." I turn to the records of Creation, and I see a great law at work. Lapse of time is unknown to the Eternal. I go back countless centuries before the advent of the human race. I ascend some Silurian hill, and, to quote the words of the late President of the Royal Astronomical Society, preached before the University of Cambridge, I see that " there are no cattle grazing upon a thousand hills—and why? God has not yet clothed those hills with grass, and the law of nature is everywhere true, that God provides for the life which He gives. . . . Once more we listen. We hear the sound of insect life, but the forests are tuneless of the glad songs of birds—and why? As yet ' the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind ' are not created." I come to an epoch in Creation with which we are more familiar—the last creative period before the advent of man, the crown and climax of animate nature—and there for the first time we find the corn plant, by which we mean all such cereals as wheat and rice, which were to sustain the countless millions of the human family when God should breathe into man the breath of life. Everywhere we see in the records of Creation an illustration of the words of the text in the thoughtful supply of God for the support of the life which He alone can give. These records seem to me to illuminate our Lord's Sermon on the Mount. In addressing the multitude gathered on the slopes of Hattin, He is evidently speaking to many who were anxious about the necessities of life. The words were spoken for the comfort of men in every age.

The working classes of this country, speaking generally, have never been so prosperous, in spite of dearness of food, as during the present war. On the other hand, there is another class to whom failing investments, heavy taxation and the price and scarcity of food, have brought the gravest anxiety. I single out the poorer

clergy, to whom the increased value of tithes has brought no relief, and ministers of other denominations. They are finding the greatest difficulty in obtaining for their families the barest necessities of life. Parents in these and other ranks of life are painfully anxious about the present and future welfare of their children. It may be that they are even tempted, like the Israelites in the wilderness, to murmur and say : " Can He give bread also, and provide flesh for His people ? " The loving and compassionate words spoken by Christ nearly 2,000 years ago were intended for us to-day. " Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things." Jehovah Jireh !

Every bush and tufted tree
Warbles sweet philosophy.
Mortals, fly from doubt and sorrow,
God provideth for the morrow.

When our Lord ascended all power was given to Him not only in heaven but on earth. He is the appointed Controller of Food. The God-man, Who miraculously fed the 5,000 lest they should faint by the way, has influenced by His Spirit the people of the United States, by a noble self-sacrifice, to supply the food without which England would, like Serbia and Armenia, have been more or less a famine-stricken country. In spite of national sins, of which we have heard too little, God has been very gracious and merciful to the British Isles. Would that, with united voice, we offered thanksgiving and praise, and presented vows to the Throne of grace of sacrifice, duty and service.

AN ANALOGY.

Pascal spoke as a true philosopher when he said : " Nature, after all, is only another form of grace." In drawing the following analogy we are travelling on safe ground. It was drawn by Christ Himself. " I am the bread of life : he that cometh to Me shall never hunger ; " and again, " I am the living bread : if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever." In speaking of the analogy of grace, I see the principle to which I have already referred manifested in the sphere of religion, and observe a close analogy between physical and spiritual life. The God of Grace has made a rich provision for the sustenance of the life of the soul, the life which He alone can give. The Day of Pentecost was the actual if not

potential birthday of the Church. Then the Holy Ghost came down, the Lord and Giver of life. For the support of spiritual life provision had already been made in three ways—a Divine Revelation, the Institution of the Lord's Supper, and a Gospel Ministry.

FOOD FOR THE SOUL.

Before the birth of the Church on the Day of Pentecost, the Old Testament canon was complete. Speaking of this Testament our Lord said: "Search the Scriptures—they testify of Me." As every road in the Roman Empire led to the golden milestone in the Forum of the Imperial City, so all parts of these Scriptures led to Christ. I can only speak of one phase of the Bible. I desire to say a few words to those who are bereaved by the war of beloved relatives who have perished on the battlefield. Divine revelation is a faith delivered once for all, but it is not delivered once for all to human consciousness. Portions of it, to use the expression of Coleridge, have not "found" the reader, i.e., they have not come with power to his mind and heart. In days of prosperity he is more or less oblivious of the many passages which have been given in Divine compassion to ameliorate the sorrows of mankind. The traveller by train may know that there is a lighted lamp in the carriage, but he does not realize its comfort until he is plunged into the darkness of the tunnel. I appeal to sorrowing ones, and ask: In searching the Scriptures, have you not found that, as Jesus, the living Word, was a "man of sorrows," so the written Word is "acquainted with grief." It has a panacea for every trouble. As you read under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, has not Jesus, the Good Samaritan, drawn near and poured the wine and oil of His tenderness and love into your wounded heart? "His love is better than wine." Mrs. Browning, when writing of Nature, says:

"Meek leaves drop yearly from the forest trees
To show above the unwasted stars."

Is this not true in the analogy of grace. In the night of your sorrow have not the stars of promises appeared to your view which you never saw before? Has not your spiritual horizon been extended? Have not heaven and the thought of reunion with loved ones who have made the great sacrifice shone out more clear and distinct than in previous days! Sanctified sorrow leads to a land

of broad spaces and fair visions. As, with tear-dimmed eyes you kneel in prayer, the pillar of the cloud will kindle up into the pillar of fire, and you will find, as time rolls on, that patient acquiescence with our Heavenly Father's will leads to a rich aftermath of joy. To the end of time the Bible will meet the moral and religious requirements of each succeeding age, and will be the precious food which will sustain, nourish and strengthen the spiritual life of the saints of God.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The institution of the Lord's Supper is a second instance of the analogy between the law of grace and the great law of nature of which I have spoken. Before the Day of Pentecost our Lord Himself instituted a sacrament which was to sustain and nourish the life of the new-born Church. I must be brief. The Lord's Supper was instituted to be a commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross "offered once for all," and at the same time to be a distinct channel of grace. As certainly as Christ was visibly present in the upper room, so certainly to the eye of faith His presence is seen in this blessed Sacrament. Faith sees the great High Priest breaking the bread and giving the cup, and knows that the officiating minister is only His representative. In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is a real Presence, not in the elements, nor accompanying the elements, but in the heart of the faithful recipient, who spiritually eats the Body of Christ and drinks His Blood. I would guard against an error. In doing this I will not strain the sacred narrative of which my text forms a part, but simply use it as an illustration of an important truth. Our Lord first utters the life-giving words "Talitha Cumi," and then commands that something should be given her to eat. The Lord's Supper was not instituted to give spiritual life, but to sustain it when it is given. I cannot forbear to express my thankfulness that the Zwinglian view of the Sacrament which so largely prevailed in a previous generation among the Evangelical clergy has almost entirely passed away. To-day, in most of our Churches, at least in town populations, the Holy Communion forms an integral part of our Sunday services, and, like the members of the early Church on each Lord's day, many have the opportunity and privilege of partaking of the Eucharistic Feast to the strengthening and refreshing of their souls.

A GOSPEL MINISTRY.

The third provision for the life of the Church was made, as in the case of the two other provisions, before Pentecost. Christ gave His commission to preach the Gospel not only to the Apostles, but to a divinely appointed Ministry to the end of time. The order of the commission to St. Peter is worthy of notice. Our Lord says first, "Feed My lambs," and then "Feed My sheep." This order speaks of His tender love to little children, and it seems also to speak of the great importance which He attached to the religious education of the young in the future history of the Church and the world. We confess with deep humiliation that the Church of God has failed to reach the masses—in other words, that "Christianity is not in possession" in England to-day. We ask why? Among many reasons, I mention one which especially refers to the Church of England. Owing to the continuous migration of the population from country villages and small towns to our cities and other great centres of industry, a multitude of great parishes have been created. As a consequence, the clergy have been very largely understaffed. House-to-house visitation has been impossible. The shepherds have been so occupied in making stakes and hurdles for the fold that they have had little time to fulfil their special commission to feed His sheep. A lack of witness-bearing on the part of individual Christians, so conspicuous a feature of the early Church, and a chief cause of its rapid expansion, has been and is a cause of failure. I must add a want of Christian charity among men of different schools of thought in the Church of England and outside its borders. I single out what I believe to be the chief reason—present-day preaching.

During the last few years I have heard many sermons and read others. I speak with pain when I say that very few preachers gave prominence to the great central truth of the Christian faith—the Atonement. In most instances the need of conversion was entirely ignored, whilst the doctrine of justification by faith—the doctrine of a "standing or falling Church"—was non-existent. In some cases Christ was preached, but not Christ crucified. Our Lord's words are true for all time. "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me. This He said, signifying what death He should die." What brought about the great Evangelical Revival? The answer is, The fearless denunciation of sin and its fatal consequences,

and the equally fearless proclamation of redeeming love, the free, full and absolute forgiveness of sin, and deliverance from its power by the cleansing blood of the Lamb. We believe that, at the close of this war, there will be such an opportunity for the revival of religion by the aid of the Holy Spirit, such as we have never known before. Our chaplains tell us that many of our soldiers and sailors have for the first time, amid the horrors of war, realized the importance of eternal things; many of the bereaved, who hitherto have led worldly lives, are hungering for consolation, whilst many others, who beforetime rejected with scorn the doctrine of substitution, have, in the vicarious suffering of our troops, who have covered themselves with imperishable glory, gained some glimpses of the vicarious sufferings of the Son of God Who, in His incarnation, "appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." What is to be the message of the Church? It can only be one—Christ the food of perishing souls, Christ crucified, Christ risen, Christ ascended, Christ interceding, Christ returning to establish upon a new earth a Kingdom wherein righteousness and peace will be eternally united. Above all, there must be united earnest prayer for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The Day of Pentecost was preceded, shall I not say brought about, by the fervent, continuous, united and believing prayers of the infant Church. I close my remarks with the words of the late Professor Swete: "The risen Lord Himself, sent into the world by the Father, now in His turn sends His Church. But He does not send her unequipped. He had been conceived by the Holy Spirit, and before the Ministry baptized with the Spirit; in the power of the Spirit He had entered upon the work which had now been accomplished. If the Church was to carry on His mission, she also must be born of the Spirit, baptized with the Spirit, inspired by the Spirit, and thus enabled to do her part in the regeneration of the world."

"SENEX."

Reviews of Books.

DR. HENSON'S SERMONS.

CHRISTIAN LIBERTY and other sermons, 1916-1917. Herbert Hensley Henson, D.D., Bishop of Hereford. London: *Macmillan & Co., Ltd.* 6s. net.

Many readers will turn from the preface to the appendix before perusing the sermons. In the former the author defends his appointment to the see of Hereford against the attacks of the E.C.U., and in the latter he prints the correspondence between the Bishop of London and himself on his engagement to preach in the City Temple, March 25, 1917. Dr. Henson is possessed of determination and courage: he does not tread the well-worn path of a majority: he displays originality and zeal. Such a man will always have opponents. But the opposition of the E.C.U., so ill-timed in its outbreak, and supported by such unfairness of quotation, was so full of obvious rancour that the Bishop would have done better to ignore it. The rejoinder to the Bishop of London is an ample vindication of the author's rights; but a personal note was unavoidable, and publication should have been suspended until the particular topic had become one of merely historical interest. The sermons too are disappointing. Twenty-three, preached in twenty months, are typical of the author's pulpit ministrations. But they are little more than the platitudes of a liberal mind, stated in pleasing diction. References to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity are scarce. Their popularity can be understood; but for the most part they strike us as opportunities lost.

AN UNPROVOKED ATTACK

THE MAKING OF GODS. By the Rev. Henry P. Denison, M.A. London: *Robert Scott.* 3s. 6d. net.

Prebendary Denison has his knife into Protestantism, which he has the temerity to describe as "Luther's somewhat immoral and fickle idol"! He must have almost exhausted his stock of adjectives in these pages. By way of example, he speaks of undenominationalism as "a feeble, fatuous and smirking idol." Under the heading "Degradation" he charges what he is pleased to call the "Lutheran revolt" with belittling the Incarnation, neglecting worship and lowering moral and spiritual standards. These are indeed grave charges. He asks in one place "What are the fruits of that especial quality that differentiates Protestantism from universal Christendom?" We remember that Dr. Hensley Henson argued in his *Godly Union and Concord* that Christianity had been as fruitful outside Episcopalian Churches as within them, and it will go hard with Mr. Denison to prove that this is not true. He will have to cultivate the fine art of treating the opinions of those from whom he differs with more respect—mere vituperation is unconvincing and irritating. There are surely enough idolatries about, against which Mr. Denison might have directed his attack without expending his energy and ability in attacking Protestantism and bringing charges against it which can easily be rebutted.

CHINESE MISSIONS.

A THOUSAND MILES OF MIRACLE IN CHINA. By Archibald E. Glover, M.A. (Oxon), of the China Inland Mission. With map and 36 photos. Glasgow: *Pickering & Inglis.* 2s. 6d. net.

In this, Mr. Glover's thrilling narrative—an uplifting record of God's delivering power—reaches its ninth edition, completing 17,000. If there are

really any, and it is said there are, persons who persist in asserting that missionaries have a "good time," we can only hope that this illuminating and uplifting volume will find its way into their hands. It constitutes a record that must be without parallel in the history of modern missions, and it forms, at the same time, a most valuable contribution to Chinese literature and history. Viewed as a personal narrative it reveals two devoted servants of God, whose faith never wavered, even in times of the most pathetic suffering. A cordial welcome to this reprint and the best wishes for its usefulness.

OTHER VOLUMES.

QUEENS: A BOOK FOR GIRLS ABOUT THEMSELVES. By Violet Trench. London: *Elliott Stock*. 1s. 6d. net.

Since the publication of Rev. George Everard's *Bright and Fair* we do not remember having seen such a delightful little book as this. In four chapters the authoress has very tactfully dealt with almost every conceivable aspect of the life of opening womanhood. As an illustration of the need for prayer and in connexion with some observations on *The Queen's Garden*, she quotes Mr. Rudyard Kipling's pleasing lines:—

Oh, Adam was a gardener, and God who made him sees
That half a proper gardener's work is done upon his knees,
So when your work is finished you can fold your hands and pray
For the Glory of the Garden that it may not pass away!
And the Glory of the Garden it shall never pass away.

Just the book to put into the hands of a young girl leaving school or about to be confirmed. We very warmly commend it.

THE PACIFIST LIE. By Captain E. J. Solano. London: *John Murray*. 1s. 6d. net.

A vigorous statement of the case for sailors and soldiers against the conscientious objectors. The unfortunate thing is that books like this are too seldom read by the persons whose questions they answer and whose position they challenge. Captain Solano sees how the "red sacrament of war" plays its awful and splendid part in the ascent of man, but with something of the inspiration of a prophet he perceives, too, a time when "the highest human ideals, including peace among nations, will be realized." He shows that the position of the conscientious objector is absolutely indefensible, even in the light of such principles as those of democratic government. The reader will find in these pages many arguments wherewith he can assail the citadel of the pacifist foe.

LIFE BY HIS DEATH. By the Rev. Bernard M. Hancock. London: *S.P.C.K.* 1s. net.

A little book of practical meditations on the Cross of Jesus, based upon the Office for the Visitation of the Sick, and the author expresses, in a *Note* the hope that it may be used not only by the clergy, but also by the laity—"not only the sick, but also the whole." We think, after reading these meditations through, that probably Mr. Hancock's "hope" will be realized: it would certainly seem to be justifiable.

LIFE LINES. By the Rev. R. A. Lash, M.A. London: *S.P.C.K.* 1s. net.

The Chaplain of the *Arethusa* has given us, out of the ripeness of his experience among sailors, a small manual specially arranged for their use. It is well got up and is eminently suited to its purpose. It consists of but 31 pages and is thus easily carried in the pocket.