

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

July, 1919.

THE MONTH.

OUR own words this month must be very few, as we are anxious to include in this number as many as possible of the very important papers read at the Cheltenham Conference held June 24-26. Owing to war conditions the Conference met last year in London, but this year under happier conditions a return is made to "the Garden Town," and, as we write, there is every prospect of a large attendance and a successful Conference. It is by the courtesy of the readers of the papers that we are able to publish those that appear this month within a few days, if not hours, of their delivery. "The Cheltenham Conference is," as the programme says, "definitely associated with the subject of Reunion"; and assuredly there never was a time when a courageous and frank treatment of the question was more called for than to-day. But it is not only of Reunion that this year's Conference speaks to us. Three other subjects of absolutely vital interest to the Church receive consideration, viz., Self-Government, Evangelistic Work, and Labour Problems, and we are thankful that they appeared on the Cheltenham programme, if only as a witness to the fact that Evangelical Churchmen are abreast of the times in which we live. The Conference opened on Tuesday evening, June 24, with a Public Meeting on Christian Unity, at which the speakers were the Bishop of Sodor and Man and two Free Churchmen, Dr. Guttery and Professor Vernon Bartlet. On Wednesday morning, June 25, after the Address by the President, the Rev. H. A. Wilson, papers on "The Basis of Reunion"

were read by the Bishop of Warrington, the Rev. J. R. Cohu and the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft. At the evening session, when Self-Government was under discussion, papers were read by the Rev. Alfred Fawkes and the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton. On Thursday, June 26, at the morning session, papers on Evangelistic Work were read by the Rev. C. W. Wilson and Canon Price Devereux; and at the afternoon session, when Labour was the subject, papers were read by the Rev. G. E. Ford and the Rev. Henry Edwards. The evening session was devoted to framing and adopting the Findings. We print this month the papers of Mr. Cohu, Mr. Pulvertaft, Mr. Fawkes, Mr. Boughton, and Mr. Ford. The rest of the papers, together with the Findings, we hope to print in the August number.

Dr. Forsyth, one of the most cultured and independent of thinkers in the Free Churches, has written a

**Dr. Forsyth's
Views.**

letter to *The Times* which shows very clearly the real seat of the difficulty in regard to Reunion :—

. . . Our rank and file, lay and ministerial, have been hardened against reunion by the insistence, in the interim report of the Archbishops' Committee, on the historic episcopate as an essential condition. They think that the chief reason for making a mere polity vital to Church unity is the belief that that polity alone validates a kind of Sacrament which it is a part of their call in the service of the Gospel to reject. They do not forget, either, that we at home, with all that English life and liberty owe to us, are repudiated, in order not to close the door for union with the Greek and Roman episcopates. . . . Meantime, I thought we might let things ripen in a semi-public way, and in a warm and peaceful atmosphere.

Then—alas, poor Falkland "ingeminating peace" and thrust on war!—the whole situation was altered by the launching of the Enabling Bill, which thrust between the two great parties to reunion another fundamental issue, and thrust it also into the full blaze of Parliamentary publicity and passion. It raised the whole question of our common State's relation to a particular Church which refused to recognize the other Churches and their ministry by any inter-communion. What was the effect of that likely to be on reunion? And the question of the State is one that we are willing to let slumber for the time in the interest and hope of a better understanding.

Then, to crown the disaster, out came the deliberate, honest, and uncompromising memorial of a number of influential High Churchmen, who were understood to be much interested in the Bill, and rigid on the Catholic conditions. The two things made a challenge to the Free and Evangelical Churches which, by translating reunion into absorption, has postponed it indefinitely. But whose fault is that? Meantime, let us turn to Federation with the more light and zeal. . . .



THE GREAT PRAYER :

SHORT CHAPTERS ON JOHN XVII.

BY THE BISHOP OF DURHAM.

II.

WE have given some thought to the Great Prayer in itself. It has been thought exercised in the simplest possible direction, following up the question of the mind, what are these words and sentences to us? Are they the creation, with or without elements of fact behind it, of the soul of the writer, or are they indeed authentic, a true report of the utterance of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, "in the night in which He was betrayed"? If they are of the former sort, they are beautiful, they are interesting, but they are after all only a man's best thought. They are no more a revelation of the eternal than the words, for example, of Augustine or of Dante. And indeed they have this actual drawback, that they are given us by the writer, deliberately, as the words of the Lord. If they are not such, was not the writer's own moral sense short of an absolute rightness? But if they are of the latter sort, they are words of heaven, they are the voice of eternal truth, they correspond at least as surely to ultimate reality as if they were, in the Hebrew phrase, a *Bath Kôl*, "a daughter of the Voice," an utterance articulated from the sky. We can live by them, we can die upon them, if they are this.

And we saw, I think rightly, that a majestic moral probability (I use that word with a sense of all the greatness which Bishop Butler has taught us to attach to its highest grades) is wholly for this second alternative. Quite apart from the Great Prayer, we may truly know, with a complete moral conviction, that He who is said to have spoken thus was none other than God made Man. That immovable belief is a lawful guarantee for the veracity of the only records of His incarnate work and word which can claim to have authenticity at all.

More than eighteen centuries of human experience have found these records to be things living and life-giving in human hearts, hallowed and lifted by them into character and action at once humble and victorious over evil. We approach them then with

reasons for an untroubled trust given us alike from their origin and from their historical working in the world.

So in this short chapter, and the few to follow it, let us, when we have stood awhile in reverent imagination, with John, beside the Intercessor, and gathered up His words to the Father, go apart with these words, and kneel to ponder them, and ask them what, being His indeed, they tell us of the eternal things.

Our first interrogation shall be about the THEISM of the Great Prayer. It was spoken as definitely as possible to a Hearer. Do its words to Him, many of them being words concerning Him, tell us anything of Him? This Supreme, to whom the Incarnate speaks, what do we gather about His being, His glory? If we can drink in with deliberate thought the view of GOD taken by this unique Intercessor, God and Man, one Christ, it will assuredly satisfy our deepest and our highest thought to take the same view ourselves, and to be at rest, seeing so "the vision of the Almighty."

It will be a solace and a strength untold to both the reason and the heart to do so. What thoughtful soul has never felt the shock and strain of the question, Is God fact indeed? It is a question around which mysteries innumerable gather, mental, moral. They are such that we may fairly say, in passing, that one deep witness to the supreme fact, to the fact of God, is borne in actual connexion with them. Such is the host of problems, some purely of theory, some formidably embodied in fact and act, which the quest after God can and does awaken, that the vast prevalence in humanity, in the universal human heart, of a belief in some sort theistic, however dim, however spoiled, powerfully suggests that that belief would not be what it is without a corresponding reality to generate it and to sustain it against such stress.

Is there an ultimate Existence, transcendent, supreme? Is that Existence at once infinite, "the Power that alone is great," and also personal—knowing, willing, loving? Is that Existence good, and is it love, when observable existence within us and around us is so vastly troubled with evil? We cannot wonder, looking at the mysteries involved, that not only open moral rebels but many a spirit which, on our human standards, is fine and true should think itself away from theism, and dream of an ultimate Somewhat preferable to it as a thing of faith.

"I felt an emotion of the soul beyond all definition; prayer is a

puny thing to it, and the word is a rude sign to the feeling ; but I know no other. . . . Holding out my hand for the sunbeams to touch it, prone on the sward in token of deep reverence, thus I prayed, that I might touch . . . the unutterable existence infinitely higher than deity."

The words are those of Richard Jefferies, in a passage powerfully descriptive of an intense and subtly possessing sense, felt in solitude on a south-country down, of the glory of nature. I think I can guess something of the attitude behind the words ; a feeling of the soul as if personality were limit, were imperfection, were almost the fount and origin of ill. Let me pass no harsh comment on the man who felt what those words try to express. But none the less, the words, if they correspond to reality, are infinitely sad. They mean that there exists no ultimate Friend for the groaning conscience, nor for the broken heart. They mean, what W. K. Clifford (my friend in our young Cambridge days) sadly said, when he turned away from Theism, and fought it with a lamentable hostility, that "we must do now without the great Companion."

From thoughts like these I for one find it a deep and unspeakable relief and solace to turn to the Great Prayer. Here is the Lord Jesus Christ, confessing His Theism. I know enough of Him, even historically, but spiritually also, with a knowledge which came to my spirit not of itself, to hold with humblest but most entire certainty that He is at once historical and eternal, human and divine. What He thought of God is for me final truth. I am sure that it is so, with the assurance to which that wise maxim eminently applies, "Let not what you know be ever disturbed in your mind by what you do not know." What He lets me know as His mind, that I reverently claim to know ; it is, as such, unshakable by the unknown.

Quite briefly then, what does He let us know here that He knows, about the supreme and sovereign Existence ? He knows that that Existence is not it, but He. The mortal man upon the green south down may think that he can deal with "an existence which is infinitely higher than deity." The Son of Man, in the night in which He was betrayed, looks up to the eternal height, and says, "FATHER." "Father, glorify Thy Son ; glorify Thou Him beside Thine own self," in Thy fellowship, on Thy seat ; "Now I come to Thee" ; "Holy Father, keep these men in Thy name" ; "Thou didst send Me into

the world ” ; “ Thou art in Me and I in Thee ” ; “ Father, I will that they be with Me where I am ” ; “ Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world ” ; “ O righteous Father, the world hath not known Thee, but I have known Thee ” ; “ I have made known to them Thy name and will make it known ” ; “ This is the life eternal, to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.”

These quotations, I need not say, do not cover all that the Great Prayer says about the Theism of the Intercessor. In fact, the entire sacred utterance in its every phrase, in its whole essence and idea, is a disclosure of the thought about God of this Friend and Lord of man. To Him, as much as to His mortal followers, that night as much as to us now, the “ heaven ” to which He “ lifted up His eyes ” was physically invisible. He, in this respect, as truly as ourselves today, “ walked by faith, not by sight,” yes, as “ leader and accomplisher of faith ” (Heb. xii. 2), that is, as the supreme *Believer*. But then, for Him, and in Him for us, that faith was verified in ways many and wonderful, above all by the victory over death which followed the Great Prayer by not more than some fifty or sixty hours. Through Him, in Him, as those whom He that night prayed for, (for we “ believe on Him through the word ” of His first messengers, and now especially through this record of His supplication,) we can, will, and do look up, as with His eyes. So looking, we behold this wonderful Supreme, who is invisible but real. Because of the Theism of His own Son, we look up to the uncreated glory, and know that within it abides and reigns not “ an existence infinitely higher than deity,” but Abba, Father. We know “ Him,” knowing “ Jesus Christ whom He hath sent.” He is no unknowable and unnamable First Cause, but “ the God and Father of ” that blessed Lord and Brother of our being. Across all mysteries, unshaken by the countless things unknown, we know Him, through the Christ’s knowledge, as Holy, Righteous. And we are sure, through the same knowledge, that this Infinite and Eternal, this Father who infinitely and eternally loves the Son, who is absolutely like Him, also “ loveth us, because we love the Son, and believe that He came forth from God.”

HANDLEY DUNELM.

(To be continued.)

STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

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

VII. MEDICINE AND FAITH.

Text.—"The sick who were cured honoured us with many honours; and they put on board such things as we needed" (Acts xxviii. 9, 10). [Book of the Month: VOCABULARY OF THE GREEK TEST.¹ = M.

Other reff. Ramsay's LUKE THE PHYSICIAN = LP. ST. PAUL THE TRAVELLER = PT. PICTURES OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH = PAC. EXPOS. GREEK TEST. = EGT. Elliott's N.T. COMMENTARY = EC. A. Maclaren's COLOSSIANS = C. Report of the Edinburgh Missionary Conference = EMC. Moffatt's NEW TEST. = MNT.]

"The most effective point which Harnack ("Luke the Physician" p. 15f) has gleaned after Hobart is his proof that Luke practised in Melita (Acts xxviii. 10, 'honoured us')." M. 289.

"Paul 'healed' Publius (Gk.), but Luke is not said to have 'healed' the invalids who came afterwards. They 'received medical treatment' (Gk.). In the strict sense the medical term means this, and the context and the whole situation demand this translation (though Luke uses the word elsewhere sometimes in the sense of 'cure')." LP. 17.

"Paul's healing power by prayer and faith not always exercised. Such power efficacious only in suitable circumstances; exercised on all and sundry begins to fail; when invalids came in numbers, medical advice employed, physician Luke became prominent. Hence the people honoured not 'Paul' but 'us' (LP. 16)."

(a) "An interesting example of meaning 'medical treatment' (B.C. 114) M. illustrates from several papyri; the writer states that he had been staying in the great temple of Isis for 'medical treatment' (M. 288)."

(b) A medical receipt of early i. A.D. "lay the man on his back and medically treat him" (M. 288).

(c) A petitioner asking immunity from some form of public service in ii. iii. A.D. on the ground "I am a doctor by profession,

¹ Pt. III by Prof. George Milligan, published by Hodder & Stoughton, 7s. 6d. A mine of wealth. No Greek Testament student can afford to neglect it.

and I have treated these very persons who have assigned me a public burden " to which the prefect replies " perhaps your treatment was wrong " (M. 288).

I. A POWERFUL ALLY FOR THE GOSPEL.

The preacher and the physician made an effective partnership. " Luke the physician took part in the treatment of these invalids, and shared in the honours that were bestowed on Paul " (PAC. 312). " It is possible that as we have here a verb which properly denotes medical treatment, medical skill was freely added by St. Luke and enhanced the debt which the sick owed " (Knowling in EGT. 542). We see the Maltese appreciativeness in their estimate of the two men. " It lies in the nature of the case that the honours took the form of gifts ; the very word was, indeed, specially applied, both in Greek and Latin, to the honorarium or fee paid to the physician " (EC. Acts 425). " The rest of the sick folk in the island came and got cured ; they made us rich presents, and furnished us when we set sail with all we needed " (Acts xxviii. 9, 10, MNT.).

II. A PROTECTIVE INFLUENCE FOR THE APOSTLE.

Col. iv. 14 may be rendered " Luke, my dear doctor." " Luke's first appearance in the Acts nearly coincides with an attack of Paul's constitutional malady, which gives probability to the suggestion that one reason for Luke's close attendance on the Apostle was the state of his health. Thus form and warmth of reference here explained " (C. 398). St. Paul follows the counsel of the son of Sirach :—" *Honour* a physician with the *honour* due unto him *for the uses* which ye may have of him " (Ecclus. xxxviii. 1). Probably a reminiscence of this passage in Acts xxviii. 9, 10. Five words italicised same Greek in both. Devotion of Luke touching. " Luke and Aristarchus must have gone as his slaves, actually passing as slaves " (PT. 316). Only condition they would be allowed on board.

III. A POSITIVE EXAMPLE FOR THE CHURCH TO-DAY.

Dr. Phillips Brooks has a striking sermon on Col. iv. 14 in which he sees the relation which should exist between Theology and Medicine, between work for the soul and work for the body, between Revelation and Science. This relation is intensified when medicine accompanies religious teaching. Ps. ciii. 3. " Medical Missions break down barriers ; attract reluctant and suspicious populations ; capture entire tribes ; give a practical demonstration of the Spirit of Christianity " (EMC. I. 313).

THE EPISCOPATE AND REUNION.

BY THE REV. J. R. COHU, M.A., Rector of Aston Clinton.

YOU have honoured me with an invitation to write a paper on :
(a) The Reform of the Episcopate ; (b) Variations within
the United Church.

In other words : Restore the Episcopate to its original constitutional form of New Testament or Reformation days ; so will you reunite the Churches, with their rich variety of religious experience, greatly to the benefit of the United Church and the promotion of the Kingdom of God. This question is not academic, far from it. Your committee has deliberately chosen, framed and worded the subject as above, because the fate of the whole movement for the reunion of the Churches hangs on the spirit in which we face these two topics of episcopal reform and varieties of religious experience. A brief survey of the present situation may make this plainer. In March, 1918, was issued the second Interim Report of a sub-committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order. This sub-committee was appointed partly by an Archbishop's Committee representing our Church, partly by Commissions of the English Free Churches, with a view to reunion. The question this sub-committee was asked to answer was this : " Is it possible for episcopal and non-episcopal Churches to heal their present unhappy divisions and re-unite as one organic Church without surrender of fundamental principles on either side ? " From the outset it was definitely, if tacitly, understood that our Church would hold out for episcopacy. Any break of continuity with the past in the form of a surrender of the historic episcopate, far from tending to reunion, would instantly split the Anglican Church in twain. Hence the sub-committee's answer : We believe that re-union is quite practicable if the non-episcopal Churches are ready to accept the bare fact of episcopacy without any theory as to its character. In plain English the proposal amounts to this : " We are of opinion that the Free Churches can accept the fact of episcopacy *without any surrender of principle* ; all details as to the nature and character of episcopal election, government and power may be left to a later stage of discussion." This is clearly implied by the Report's own words : " The acceptance of episcopacy on these terms should not involve

any Christian community in the necessity of disowning its past, but should enable all to maintain the continuity of their witness as heirs and trustees of types of Christian thought, life and order, not only of value to themselves, but of value to the Church as a whole."

This proposal the Free Churches are seriously considering, but they ask for clearer definition of terms. If I may use a homely phrase, no one likes to buy "a pig in a poke." They fully agree that all Churches must be prepared to make any sacrifice, short of surrender of principle, to promote organic unity. They rejoice at this serious and practicable effort to bridge the gap between them and us. They have no intrinsic objection to episcopal government in itself; it has largely ceased to be the Nonconformist bugbear it once was. Their own Free Church "superintendents," exercising "oversight" or supervision over local churches and ministers in given areas, are but "bishops" under another name. The Free Churches' difficulty does not lie in their being asked to "accept the fact of episcopacy," but in accepting it "without any theory as to its character." Their plea is, and it is a very just plea: "We are ready to meet you more than half-way; indeed, we are inclined to accept your terms, but we want to be quite clear as to their meaning. You ask us to accept the fact of episcopacy, *and not any theory of its character.*" But the "character of the episcopacy" is precisely the one point which is to us of vital moment. We want to know at the outset what is meant by "bishop," whether his power is constitutional or monarchical, whence his authority is derived, and on what basis it ultimately rests. We have no objection to a "bishop," *provided the bishop be representative and claim no divine right*, but on that proviso we take our stand and from that position we cannot budge one inch. Any kind of reunion between the Churches that has not fully faced and settled that vital question will be hollow and transient; if the "character of episcopacy" is left vague and undefined, the old mischief of our present unhappy divisions is sure to break out all over again over that very point. It is just because we are so anxious to promote the sacred cause of unity, to lay its foundation well and truly, that we want a perfectly clear understanding as to the meaning of the terms used. And for this purpose, even though the Interim Report rules it out of the present discussion, a full and frank discussion of the "character of the episcopacy" is essential.

This is a wise, brave and just plea which we must all endorse. Now what answer are we Anglicans going to give to the Free Church question: What do you mean by episcopacy? What they want to know and we have to tell them is somewhat of this nature: (1) Is the Bishop the representative of the Church, and does he derive all his rights and powers from its members; or does he exercise his authority by divine right, receiving that authority direct from heaven by official and uninterrupted transmission from God to Christ, from Christ to the Apostles, from the Apostles to the bishops their successors? (2) Are bishops the sole depositaries of the Spirit of God, its indispensable channels, so that no ministry or sacrament is valid except that of ministers ordained by a bishop through the laying on of hands? (3) Is the bishop of the *esse*, and not only of the *beneesse* of the Church, that is, is he necessary, not only for the effective well-being of the Church so that its work may be better done, but as essential to the very existence of the Church at all as the one channel through which the Church receives the Holy Spirit? Is "no bishop, no Church" a fact? Must we say that Presbyterian, Wesleyan, and Congregational Churches, having no bishops and therefore no channels of the Holy Spirit, lie outside Christ's Church, outside Christ, outside salvation; that they are in the sin of schism, foes to the mind and will of Christ, invalid in their ministry and sacraments, and that even to countenance their existence is a sin?

Within our own Church one large wing gives an emphatic Yes to these questions, another, an emphatic No. How decide between them? There is one final court of appeal for questions of fact. History and its verified facts. Rome does not like history: "The appeal from Tradition to History is treason to the Church" (Manning).

To sketch the origin, growth and development of episcopacy and Church Ministry in this paper is impossible. With Lightfoot, Hort, Gwatkin, etc., as guides, we just state the barest New Testament facts. We do not wish to squeeze the Church back into its New Testament cradle and ignore the value of later development, but our plea is that, in our search for a basis of reunion with Free Churches and our discussion with them, we must bear this in mind: Unless we are prepared to unchurch the Apostolic Church as "invalid," we must insist on nothing as *essential* to a Christian Church,

however expedient it may be, which is not found in the New Testament. The Apostolic Church gives us these as facts and principles.

NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH.

Organization. The New Testament stands for the principle that *no form of Church government and organization can claim Christ or the Apostles as its founders* (Hort). The needs of time, place and occasion decide, and it is as the Christian people or Church think best. There was little or no organization in the New Testament Church, and, as to it, Christ and the Apostles just gave broad guiding principles and expected the Christian people to apply them for themselves; e.g., Christ's: "Be ye not called Rabbi, for One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren," constitutes the Church a Brotherhood, where no one is above or below other, no one stands between a man and his God. The Apostles added: "Let all things be done decently and in order, and to the edification of the Church." The fact is Christ's return was daily expected. Preach Christ's kingdom, prepare for it, win men into it, was the Church's one aim. All else, organization included, was secondary. Converted souls, not machinery, mattered. Hence the Apostles' reply when urged to organize: "It is not reason that we should leave the Word of God and serve tables. Look ye out among you seven men of honest report . . . but we will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the Word."

Ministry. The New Testament has a *higher ministry for which the only ordination is that of the Spirit, and a lower ministry of administration to which men appoint.* It is quite true, as Hort says, that there was nothing like our own clergy and bishops;¹ they were not needed, for the congregation conducted its own services. Yet there were two ministries: (1) The "Ministry of the Word," or highly-prized preaching ministry; its ministers were "apostles, prophets, teachers," tied to no Church, not appointed by man, for theirs was a call and ordination of the Spirit, needing no human warrant, for it was patent to all. They were in no sense office-bearers; they were responsible to no congregation of Christians, burdened by no cares of office and no pastoral duties, simply mis-

¹ "Much profitless labour has been spent in trying to force the various terms of Paul's lists into meaning so many ecclesiastical offices. The feat is impossible . . . he is not speaking of Church-officers or posts at all, but of spiritual 'gifts' or functions open to the whole congregation."

sionaries spreading Christ's kingdom wherever the Spirit called ; (2) The "Ministry of Tables"—a quite subordinate ministry for the administrative work of the local Church, e.g., finance, charity, discipline, arbitration, hospitality—*did* consist of local officials like our churchwardens. They are called "presbyters" or "bishops" or "elders"—for they are one and the same—with "deacons" under them. So, though "bishops," "presbyters," "deacons" are in the New Testament, we must bear in mind that whereas they stand for a *threefold* ministry with us, it is a *twofold* ministry in the New Testament, for "bishop" and "presbyter" are identical.¹ It is from this lower ministry that our episcopacy has come. Lightfoot is right: "The episcopate was formed, *not* out of the Apostolic order, but out of the presbyteral by elevation." Yes, from the lowly lay elder, the nominee of the local congregation, will spring a priestly monarchical Cyprian, who will disown his humble presbyteral parentage and claim apostolic pedigree. We can see the first step on that road in the New Testament, in this way. Each local Church had many elders or bishops ; at their councils of elders they needed a chairman ; he would naturally at the Lord's Supper "break the bread" and "bless the cup," for this necessitated one man to do as Christ had done ; he was also responsible for the distribution, through the deacons, of the congregation's "offerings" for the poor. Thus, as (1) chairman of elders ; (2) almoner-in-chief ; (3) president at Communion, this president-presbyter was chief of his peers for the time being. This is the first stage on the road to the later bishop.

Congregationalism. Early Christians felt that *the authority given by Christ to His Church resided in the whole congregation*, and not in any officials. As Hort insists: "The ecclesia itself, i.e., the sum of all its adult members, is the primary body, the primary authority ; the very origin and fundamental nature of the ecclesia as a community of disciples *renders it impossible that the principle should become obsolete.*" In New Testament days the congregation had the first and last voice in all church matters.² Each local

¹ St. Paul only knows *two* orders, "bishops" and "deacons." Similarly 1 Timothy iii. 1-13 passes straight from the needful qualifications of bishops (=presbyters) to those of deacons.

² Of course, they gave due deference to Christ's own chosen missionaries, the highly-esteemed Apostles, but their authority was personal and moral, not official, and they counsel and advise, but never interfere except in cases of gross error or corporate disorder. They claim deference, but will not dictate. See 2 Corinthians i. 24 and 1 Peter v. 3.

Church was self-governing and brooked no outside interference. It was modern congregationalism and even more pronounced, for, the members of the congregation themselves did all the praying, praising, teaching, preaching, without any clergyman. They were democracies without a hierarchy, almost like Quakers to-day.

Laying on of hands in the New Testament carries with it no idea of transmission of the Holy Spirit (Swete, Hort, Plummer). In Acts xiii. 2, the Holy Ghost had *already* marked out Saul and Barnabas, and in Acts vi. the "seven" were *already* "full of the Holy Ghost" before the imposition of hands. It is a benedictory and symbolic act by way of public recognition of an antecedent divine call and qualification for office *already* imparted by the Holy Spirit. "Laying on of hands" could be done by representatives of the congregation or even ordinary members, e.g., Ananias of Damascus (Hort).

Variations within the Apostolic Church, enabling it to reach all types of men, were pronounced. Thus James, Peter, Paul, and their Churches, all loyal servants of Christ, differed on what each called "essentials," yet each gave other the right hand of fellowship and worked together as one united family in God.

Summary. The Apostolic Church was a Brotherhood knit together in unity of heart and spirit. All in it were priests and kings unto God (1 Peter ii. 5, 9), no man before or after other, all "brethren"; there were no clergy, and congregationalism ruled supreme. "Above all, there was no sacerdotal system" (Lightfoot), just as there was no sacrifice but the spiritual sacrifice of prayer, praise, and a holy life. There was a highly-esteemed ministry of the Word without any ordination but that of the Spirit; there was also a lower ministry of administration, man-made "bishops" or "presbyters," mere executive and disciplinary officials.

EVOLUTION OF EPISCOPACY (100-1900 A.D.).

By 100 A.D. enthusiasm was cooling, apostles gone, false teaching growing; the need of solidarity and orthodoxy was imperative and urgently called for strong "rulers and teachers."¹ The course to adopt was clear: strengthen the hands of the president-presbyter. Thus the lower ministry stepped into the place vacated by "apostles

¹ Already in 1 Timothy v. 17 an "elder" was doubly honoured if he had the "gift" of teaching. It was not essential to his office of elder, but if he had it he could exercise it like any other member of the congregation. After 100 A.D. it becomes a necessary qualification for office.

and prophets," by default, and became the governing authority. Wherever an eminent president-presbyter of strong personality arose, from being chief of the bishops (=presbyters), he soon became chief *over* the bishops, *the* Bishop, while the rest of the council of elders retained the original name of "presbyters." Already in 115 A.D. Ignatius so magnifies the bishop's office that Lightfoot calls his language all but "blasphemous and profane." With Cyprian (c. 250 A.D.) episcopacy takes a new, false, extravagant, disastrous form. Hitherto bishops had been constitutional and representative, deriving all their rights and powers from the consent of the Christian community and viewing themselves as priests only as chief representatives of a congregation of priests unto God. Cyprian repudiates the term "representative" and places the bishop above and outside all human origin altogether, even though he owed his election to men entirely. He makes him "bishop by divine right," a successor of the apostles, and himself an apostle, heir to all apostolic rights and powers, sole channel of the Spirit to the Church. Still worse, he makes the bishop absolving and sacrificing priest like a Jewish or heathen priest. Cyprian's Apostolic Succession (a monstrous historic fiction) and his sacerdotal priesthood (a heathen revival) have disastrously affected all subsequent Christianity and proved fatal to the peace and unity of Christ's Church. Henceforth, constitutional church-government is doomed, imperial episcopacy is born. In Cyprian's own day the mischief is still veiled, for even Cyprian is no "diocesan" prelate, though a prince of bishops in his day. A bishop's see was still, in name and fact, only a large parish; there were hundreds of small rural churches each with their bishop; many bishops were humble and lived by their trades as shepherds, weavers, potters, etc.; and all bishops were co-equal and independent. Rome soon stepped in and changed all that. All other apostolical successors soon had to bow to him who sat in Peter's chair in imperial Rome, the Head Apostle and High Priest, and, very soon, bishops' sees are great dioceses, they themselves princely feudal prelates, yet one and all vassals of a Papal Overlord, and Europe is groaning body and soul under sacerdotal tyranny and superstition. Then comes the Reformation with its clean sweep of Rome's lumber. How was it done? The Reformers adopted the one and only safe guide: "Follow the lead of the Apostolic Church and, without slavish copying of a by-gone

day or undue breach of continuity, be true to the principles of Christ and His Apostles ; where they give direct injunctions, obey ; where they leave it to the Church, guided by practical considerations of time, place or environment, to settle its own affairs, the same grounds of policy must be our guide." Thus in the matter of church-organization and ministry, neither our Lord nor the Twelve gave any direct commands, merely enunciated the ideals of "Brotherhood," of "doing all things decently and in order to the edification of the Church," and left the rest to the good sense of the congregation. Therefore, said the Reformers, in these matters expediency must be our guide so long as we remain true to the principles of Christ's religion. As to the Ministry the Reformers took their stand on these New Testament facts : (a) Presbyter and bishop are synonyms ; (b) "Laying on of hands" is benedictory and symbolic, not instrumental ; (c) ministers are the congregation's delegates and representatives ; (d) the placing of bishops above presbyters was for expediency ; has no sanction in Scripture and is certainly not by divine right, but as the Church likes.¹ For good reasons, England retained, the Continental Reformers rejected bishops ; yet the two kept in full communion. Regarding episcopacy as of the *bene esse*, not *esse*, of a Church, both sides would have endorsed Selden's words : "They are equally mad who say that bishops are so *jure divino* that they must be continued, or so anti-Christian that they must be put away. All is as the State (or Church) likes," i.e., now as in New Testament days, each national Church is, rightly, self-organizing as its members decide. Hence both an episcopal Anglican Church and Presbyterian Reformed Churches abroad looked upon each other as equally qualified to be fully recognized as part and parcel of the One Catholic Church. In England for 100 years after the Reformation Presbyterian ordination was recognized as quite valid and Presbyterian ministers were not only allowed to officiate but to hold benefices in¹ the Church of England without re-ordination, with the one stipulation of their subscribing to our Articles. About 1650, a change of attitude set in strongly with Usher's publication of Ignatius' Letters, which

¹ Cf. Hooker : "Let bishops use their authority with so much the greater humility and moderation as a sword which the Church hath power to take away from them" ; and he reminds bishops that they owe their position and office to Church-custom, not to our Lord's appointment (E.P. vii. 5, § 8).

supported Laud's views of the Divine Right of Bishops. From that day the bishop's office and authority have been magnified by a section now powerful in our Church. Patristic theology, with its exaltation of tradition, has proved a powerful ally to these claims. The movement culminated in the Tractarianism of the nineteenth century, and to-day it is at its meridian. Cyprian's Church, with its watchwords: "Apostolic Succession"; "the divine right of bishops"; "no salvation outside the Church"; "no bishop, no Church"; "put the Church (Tradition) before the Books,"—is now firmly planted in England.

Gladly would I have cut out these historical facts, but our whole case hangs on them. For reunion, both sides must put first things first, and only through gauging later developments by the standard of the Apostolic Church can we say what are "essentials" and what secondary. Again we repeat: We do not want to squeeze back the Church into its New Testament cradle or call the New Testament Church perfect. The Corinthian scandals prove it was not. Undoubtedly, the Spirit has inspired the Church from 100-1900 A.D., to develop very useful institutions, but ecclesiastical "will to power" has also led it to invent some very bad ones, e.g., Cyprianic sacerdotalism, branded by Lightfoot as subversive of the root-principle of Christianity. We are well aware that no age is tied down to a servile copy of the organization of previous days, be it New Testament, or Reformation or any other. In matters of organization from New Testament days onwards the question has been, not "What is commanded?" but "What is expedient?" Our Lord gave no commandment as to details; all the more are we bound by His direct injunction that His Church is to be a Brotherhood where all are spiritually equal brethren. Of course, rules and rulers are essential in any society, and spiritual equality does not exclude obedience to such rules and rulers as the Church through its members may set up in the interests of order and efficiency, but they must be constitutional rules and representative rulers; for, as Hort says: "The ecclesia itself, i.e., the sum of all its adult members, is and must be the primary body, the primary authority" (C.E. 229).

So when the Free Churches reply to the Interim Report: "You ask us to accept episcopacy, and not any theory of its character"; but the "character of episcopacy" is the very thing we want to

know; we have no intrinsic objection to episcopacy provided it be constitutional and representative; is yours that?" we can answer, with history to back us:—"You meet us more than half-way, for we own that episcopacy is not essential to a Church, but we prize it as of proved value, and as witnessing to the historic continuity of the Church. As to the 'character of episcopacy,' our Reformation Settlement knows none but a constitutional, representative, non-sacerdotal bishop. Since the Reformation the false Cyprianic view of episcopacy is again being foisted on our Church, and we repudiate it even as you do. One of our own bishops—the Bishop of Carlisle, rightly speaks of it in these words: 'Ignorantly intended (in 250 A.D.) to promote the unity of the Churches, the false and extravagant claims of the Cyprianic bishop have proved a prolific cause of their disunion; and until they are disclaimed and abandoned, the complete re-union of the Churches can never be achieved. Even if it could be achieved by such false persuasions, it would not be worth achieving, seeing that no fabric founded on falsities can be good or lovely or safe.' Your idea of a constitutional and representative bishop is ours and your reunion with us would vastly strengthen the hands of the many clergy and the vast majority of laymen in our Church who are eager to bring Reformation principles into line with the needs of the new age. As to episcopal 'laying on of hands' on your ministers it casts no slur of 'invalidity' on your orders; we recognize their validity; it is merely, as in New Testament days, a public recognition of a divine call for office already imparted by the Holy Spirit.¹ It happens to be the law of our Church, so 'episcopal ordination' is needed for legal recognition as a Church of England minister. But for this law and our deep-rooted objection to 'break of continuity,' many of us would gladly see restored the long-established practice of early Reformation days of allowing Presbyterian ministers to officiate, and even hold benefices in our Church without re-ordination. We do not call your Churches schismatic or your orders

¹ Cf. Bishop of Carlisle: "Manual transmission suited ages when other forms of transmission were scarcely conceivable, not ours when the manual transmission of spiritual gifts is as inconceivable to the modern mind as any other form of transmission was inconceivable to the patristic mind, compounded as it largely was of Jewish and pagan mentality" (*Hibbert Journal*, January, 1919—the quotation in the text (slightly adapted) is from same article).

invalid, or ask you to disown your past. A Church which is Christ's effective organ is His Church, and commands our recognition. 'By their fruits ye shall know them,' is Christ's and our test of a standing or falling Church, be it episcopal, Presbyterian, or Quaker."

Of the urgency of reunion there can be no two opinions. To say nothing of the scandal of our divisions which invites the sneer: "See how these Christians love one another!" or of its disastrous results for our work at home and especially in the mission-field—I want here rather to dwell on the strong plea for reunion suggested by your Committee's heading: "Variations within the United Church," to my mind a most convincing and inspiring plea. S. Paul evidently thought so too. Religious views are largely temperamental and, in his day as now, intellectual, or legal, or emotional ministries each had its followers. Men said: I am of Paul, I of Peter, I of James, I of Apollos. A shocked Paul tells them:—Don't do that! By all means avail yourselves of what best feeds your soul and opens your heart to Christ, but let there be no schism in the Body of Christ; let not the head say to the heart, or the hand to the foot, I have no need of thee. With our different temperaments, we cannot all see eye to eye, but with all our diversities it is one Spirit, one Lord, one and the same God working in us all. James and Peter and I agree to differ on some points, yet we work hand in hand in our Master's cause; do the same, but "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, let there be no divisions among you, but be ye perfectly joined together" in one mind and heart in your one Master's service.

S. Paul is quite right. Here we are Anglicans, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, Congregationalists; we do not all think exactly alike, and the Church, the Body of Christ, is all the richer and more effective for our variety of thought; it enables Christ through us to reach men of all temperaments; yet here we are spoiling it all by each seeking our own petty sectional aims instead of pooling our varied gifts in Christ's service. Each of us without the other is lacking, and by not working together we are terribly weakening the effectiveness of the Body of Christ and our own, while if the "whole Body of Christ were fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth," we should carry all before us and win the world for Christ.

As the *Church Gazette* for March puts it, the Church wants the

High Church spirit of reverence and continuity, and its corporate sense ; the Broad Church intellect and emphasis on the work of the Spirit ; the Evangelical value of the individual soul and spiritual fire ; the fervour, energy and organization of Wesleyanism ; the spiritual independence and equality of Congregationalists, etc. Each Church has its special gift, experience, testimony to offer ; they all come from the same divine source, and Christ wants them all, for they are not only of value to their own parts of the body but of great value to the whole. It was precisely the close knitting together of such different types as James, Peter, Paul, Apollos into one Apostolic Church that made it such a splendidly effective organ of Christ, winning Jew, Greek, Roman, men of every nation, into Christ's kingdom in one generation ; and none but a many-sided Church can do that. As I said a moment ago differences of religious outlook are largely temperamental. Some like a Church which tells them what to believe and what to do, others cannot be tied down to organization, creeds, or rites ; some love a liturgical service, others prefer the simple charismatic service of the early Church ; some prize the ministry of the Word, others prefer other means of grace ; some insist on the priesthood of the laity, others not.¹ Or look at human nature from another standpoint. Some men are, as we say, all heart, dominating life through the affections ; others make conduct and action three-fourths of life, and for them the will is supreme ; others again regard life as raised to its highest power through the intellect ; while others again look at everything from an aesthetic point of view, and prize the imagination. Now we want to reach them one and all, to gather into Christ's kingdom all these types and varieties of men, and, for that, the Church must

¹ Free churches originated precisely because the Church did not satisfy these various needs and many souls were starved. It was originally a much needed protest against the legalism, ecclesiasticism and secularism of a half-Laodicean Church ; a protest, too, against the people's "royal priesthood" being absorbed by officials ; a serious attempt to revive and reproduce the simplicity, freshness, enthusiasm, inspiration, "royal priesthood" of the Apostolic Church. There is no blinking the fact that the Free Churches have done an immense work for religion. They have fought and won the battle for toleration and for liberty of conscience, and they have not only stimulated the Churches to rivalry in good works but roused the Church of England out of her lethargy into full active life. But now they have achieved their object, why should our "unhappy divisions" continue ? Free Churches see as clearly as we do that divisions once essential for religious freedom are now a source of weakness and hurt the cause of Christ. "Christ is wounded in the house of His friends."

be many-sided. Like S. Paul, it must be "made all things to all men; that it may by all means save some"; there must be some "under the law, to reach those under the law"; some "without the law" (though loyal to the principles of Christ) to reach those "without the law." In plain English, the Church must have within her fold different groups of Christians each facing truth from different aspects, be it that of Peter, James, Paul, or Apollos, yet equally loyal to Christ's principles, and all knit together in unity of heart and spirit. Then we shall have the Body of Christ with all its parts—as distinct as ear, hand, eye, head, foot are to each other—all "fitly joined and compacted," and doing effectively its true work.

This is what reunion means, and can any sacrifice be too great for that, short of surrender of Christian principle? Is it feasible? Of course it is, if our heart is set on it, and if the spirit of good will to others is ours. The Bishop of Lichfield is right: "The reunion of the Churches will come along the road, not of compromise, but of comprehension, and the immediate need is, not that we should pretend to think alike—we don't and never shall—but that we should honestly try to understand and sympathize with one another." It is right that a man should contend earnestly for the truth as *he* sees it, but do let us be prepared to admit that others who "follow not after us," indeed, whose views "pass all our understanding," are also blest by the Holy Spirit and are living branches of the true Vine, real members of the Body of Christ. No two schools of religious thought among us to-day can ever be wider apart than were James and Paul who could not in the least understand each other's standpoint; none the less, each saw the blessing of God resting on the other's work, and, in the true Spirit of Christ, each heartily gave the other the right hand of fellowship. So with us. Some one has quaintly said: "The Catholic must learn to appreciate and value the Methodist prayer-meeting, the Methodist in his turn must appreciate and value the Catholic's reverence and adoration as he kneels at the altar." It is of no earthly use our *talking* of reunion till we are ready to respect other men's consciences, and not only fearlessly insist on what we find to be good and true for ourselves, but also honestly revere what others find to be good and true for them. Yes, let James and Paul clasp hands in right good-will and the whole problem of reunion is solved. We are trusting to-

day far too much in uniformity of organization and machinery, whereas what we need and God wants to see in us is unity of heart and spirit. No cunningly devised schemes and compromises in the way of organization will ever achieve true and abiding reunion, but Christ's spirit of life and love, prompting us to sink self-seeking partisanship for the good of Christ's cause, would give us reunion to-morrow.

My time and your patience are long since exhausted. To discuss the ways and means of reunion would take far too long, so I shall but name them. Perhaps it is as well, for personally I prefer the method, outlook and practice of our Reformers to all others, and plump for the third on the list, an unpopular view to-day. (1) *The Interim Report* with its call to the Free Churches: "accept the fact of episcopacy, and not any theory of its character." (2) *The Bishop of London's proposal* to our first cousins, the Wesleyans: Wesleyan presbyters {to take part in our ordination, a Bishop of ours in theirs. One or more of their superintendents would become bishops, so that Methodist ministers who wished to celebrate at our altars would be ordained by their own episcopate; those who did not so desire would yet be permitted to preach from our pulpits. There would be no absorption by us of Methodism; it would remain an order within the Church (cf. Jesuits in Roman) with its Conference and Class-meetings. The re-ordination of ministers would be without "any theory of the character of their previous orders." (No definite statement is yet made as to inter-communion.) (3) *Bishop of Carlisle's proposal*. It is practically the attitude adopted by our Church at the Reformation and for 100 years after. The suggestion is that there should be immediate "reunion, in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, without any attempt made to intervene in the organization, laws, or institutions of any of the uniting churches." As the Bishop of Carlisle adds, it must be done in the spirit of Ephesians iv. 1-6, or not at all. "Until we are prepared to curse only that which God has cursed, viz., sin, and to hold out the hand of co-equal fellowship to all whom God has blessed, no reunion of Churches worth having can either be attained or receive the divine benediction."

PRESENT POSSIBILITIES AND FUTURE STEPS TOWARDS UNITY.

BY THE REV. T. J. PULVERTAFT, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul at Kilburn.

THE time has come when in the interests of Unity ambiguities should cease and we should approach the question with clearness of vision and a determination to go straight to the heart of the problem. The theological as distinct from the ecclesiastical aspect demands insistence upon the claim that history cannot be thrown to the winds. We are faced by earnest and honest assertions that the twentieth century will not accept a Christianity that holds the miraculous element essential to its profession. For my part I can conceive of men who have been nurtured in Christian principles and have a profound devotion to our Blessed Lord as the Son of God maintaining their faith while rejecting or explaining away the miraculous in the Gospel. What a few have been able to attain in the stress of modern conceptions of nature and an exaggerated attachment to current hypotheses is a very different matter from acceptance of the historic Figure who is portrayed in the Gospel story. In the web of His life, the warp of His deeds and the woof of His words are so bound up with miracle that we cannot disentangle the natural from the supernatural element—I use the words in their plain sense—and the whole faith of the primitive Church as well as the Church throughout the ages has been based on a living Christ who rose from the dead. We cannot divorce our Faith from history. We are convinced that the sinless One was so unique among men that His deeds can only be described as miraculous, while really natural as being the works of One who was God incarnate, and it is impossible for us in the interests of unity without being false to the revelation of God and writing down the Apostolic Church as founding itself on a series of lies, to make concessions that will reduce our Faith to a series of propositions that cannot be squared with the contents of the only documents we have as the source of the life and teaching of the Son of God.

It may be that individuals will be ready to acknowledge His Divinity while rejecting the fact of His resurrection from the dead. I do not exclude them from brotherhood—that is their own affair,

not mine—but the basis of belief that will form the foundation of the great Church the future will see united in one by bonds of spirit and a common orientation of faith, must hold the ultimate fact of the Resurrection if it is not to perish through lack of faithfulness to its sources and belief in its history. Mithraism was the great rival of Christianity. It had its ennobling ideals and gripped some of the best minds of the early Christian ages. It broke down through an idealism divorced from fact—historic fact—and the doom, not the reconstruction, of Christianity will be pronounced by any acceptance of a creedless Christianity or a studied vagueness that is supposed to meet the requirements of a kaleidoscopic age. Creeds do not give spiritual life. They do not even guarantee moral consistency. A man may be as orthodox as the Devil and as wicked too. But Christian truth is a matter of the intellect as well as an emotion of the heart. We must know what we believe concerning Him who is our life. That knowledge is contained in the New Testament, and the evacuation of its plain meaning can only end in the overthrow in time of the faith we profess to hold.

On the other hand the institution that the Faith has created as a permanent home for its followers is of less importance than the Faith itself. Just as intellectual definitions are inferior to the Person of Christ, so the human instrumentality that constitutes the home of the faithful is inferior to the Christ Himself. The Church to be true to its function is a body founded on Christ that grows up into Christ its living Head. It is a means to an end—not an end in itself. If this be true concerning the Church, it is still more true concerning its organisation. Membership of the Church, for its vitality depends finally on no outward link uniting individuals with the body, but on personal living union with the Saviour Himself. Spiritual life is as great a reality as animal life. We are aware that we are alive as men. We must be equally alive to the fact that our spiritual life is a reality depending on our sharing the life of Christ. The way in which this knowledge comes into consciousness may elude definition—it is there when the soul of man rises above the temporal and homes itself in God. All who truly love and follow the Risen Christ are true sons of God—joint heirs with Jesus Christ. Collectively they constitute the Church of the living God, and all the organisation of the Church is a means for maintaining corporate life in an historical institution, and preventing it from becoming

inefficacious as an instrument for the extension of the Kingdom of God.

To-day we suffer from either an unstudied or a deliberate ambiguity in the use of the words Church, Ministry and Apostolic succession. I am not sure that we have not created a new ambiguity in the employment of the phrase Historic Episcopate. Until we have a definite and accepted interpretation of these phrases all thoughts of Christian Unity with any hope of permanence may be dismissed as a fatuous dream. We have schemes discussed that imply the Church of God to be definitely limited to an Institution that has a certain type of Ministry—commonly called the Church—with an impassable gulf between it and the laity. The Ministry is confined to men ordained by one of the orders of the ministry, and that order has its claim to superiority resting on a supposed historical transmission from age to age by a certain process of setting apart men for the Ministry. All who wish for unity must either now or in the future submit to that ideal, and we are told that unless those who submit to ordination acknowledge by their action the theory involved as true there is no room for them in the Church. That ideal is in no sense the ideal found in the New Testament or in primitive Christianity. The upholders of this theory have to face the awkward fact that in Egypt to the middle of the second century nothing was known of the alleged necessity of episcopal ordination for a valid exercise of the ministry. To-day it is forced on us by the experience of our home work and the triumphs of the mission field that the non-episcopal ministries and work are as richly blessed as those of episcopal Churches, and it is only a purblind logic that asserts we find ministries of grace valid for the members of the non-episcopalian Churches, and not valid for those who are privileged to be members of episcopal Churches. If the real test of Churchmanship be living union with the head of the Church, then the fact that a ministry is truly a ministry of grace involves that all who are brought under its influence and are participators of its worship—whether they be Episcopalians or non-Episcopalians—are in the way of receiving grace. The implication that a type of ministry honoured by God should be dishonoured by men, who in agreement with a supposed Christian principle abstain from participating in its sacraments, means that man sits in judgment and pronounces an adverse verdict on the work of God.

The sooner, therefore, we free ourselves of any superiority on account of our historical position as specially privileged recipients of the grace of God, the better for our Christian life. I cannot for one moment write down as spiritually inferior, or as organically spurious, the great non-episcopal Churches whose numbers far exceed those of the Church of England, and whose work has been signally honoured by God. I hold as firmly as any man the fact that until the unity of the Church was broken by the sins and failures of episcopal Christianity, Episcopacy was the prevailing form of Church government for more than a millennium—but it was not a millennium of healthy, spiritual development and moral progress, or justifiable institutional growth. The fifteenth century, with its united Western Church, is not a model to be aimed at by those who wish to follow the King and do His will. The verdict of the Council of Trent is sufficient proof of that. We must aim at a Flock with many Folds, not a Church with a number of Orders whose present state is in complete contrast with the spirit that gave rise to their existence. They may be, as they have been, institutionalised out of all relation to their aims and ideals.

In practice we must be prepared to admit the full validity for all Christendom of the Orders of men who are set apart for the ministry by the great non-episcopal Churches. Re-ordination will confer no new grace—will not regularise in the sight of God their ministry, although it may regularise it from the standpoint of individual communities—folds of the one flock. There is absolutely no hope or prospect of the non-episcopal Churches accepting re-ordination as a gift from God necessary for increased validity or Church Catholic regularity of their ministry. They know this, and while willing to accept the overseership of Bishops, they are not ready to accept the theory attached to Episcopacy without which Episcopacy is meaningless in the opinion of those who insist on the Church acting as if their view of Episcopacy is the only possible one. The day will come when that theory will be frankly abandoned, after undergoing many transformations in the desperation of its upholders to defend it in the light of modern knowledge. That day is not yet, and until it comes we must maintain our strong protest against the claims put forward in its support.

We have come to see that until the Table of the Lord is acknowledged to be the Table round which all His followers, irrespective of

their denominationalism, may freely gather, we cannot talk of Christian unity. Anything short of this is a caricature of the spirit of Christ. When the fruits of a godly life and the profession of a living faith in the Saviour are vouched for by a responsible Christian community, there is something almost blasphemous in man saying "The gift of the Holy Sacrament is not for you—it is only for those who accept it as exclusively theirs on whom episcopal hands have been laid." Surely such a doctrine and practice is nothing but a sin against the whole teaching of Him who said "do this in remembrance of Me!" If baptism can be administered by a layman, why should the Lord's Table be confined to those who have received episcopal confirmation, to those who have either been confirmed directly as in England, confirmed in bulk as in some continental countries, confirmed by a priest in infancy with the chrism consecrated by a priest? There is something repulsively magical in the contention that will admit the indirectly confirmed by the Bishop with the oil he has blessed, and will exclude men whose life and work are honoured by God and His Church.

The principle laid down will involve our not refusing to communicate at the Lord's Table when the consecration has been the act of a non-episcopally ordained man full of the Holy Ghost and of faith. To do this is not reason to our Church, which is one of many folds. Brotherliness demands it when occasion arises, and abstention from so doing partakes of Pharisaism when we look upon the position with the eyes of the New Testament saints. The Table of the Lord gives the great opportunity for showing our brotherhood. That opportunity must be reciprocal if it is to be in any sense real.

We in Cheltenham speak plainly, and the convictions of no one man govern the findings of the Conference. The hour has arrived for a step forward, and it is only in accord with the Findings of the past for us to declare that no ministry of grace blessed by God is not in accord with His will, that no ministry has any inherent superiority in His sight over other ministries of a different institutional type, that unity is not the child of a uniform Church government, and that the Table of the Lord is the place where the spirit of unity must be shown before any real federated institutional unity in one great Church with many folds and many forms of government faces the world that has to be won to God.

T. J. PULVERTAFT.

THE PROPOSED *COUP D'ÉTAT* IN THE CHURCH.

BY THE REV. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., Vicar of Ashby St. Ledgers and Honorary Chaplain to the Bishop of Hereford.

I. **O**N Easter Day, in common with other incumbents—some, no doubt, persons of distinction; others as obscure as myself—I received an Encyclical Letter entitled “The Easter Vestries and Self-Government for the Church.” There seemed no obvious connection between the two things; and the Encyclical was not from the Archbishops, or even from the Bishop of the Diocese. It was signed by the Dean of Lincoln, on behalf of the Church Reform League; by Lord Wolmer, on behalf of the Church Self-Government Association; and by Dr. Temple, on behalf of the Life and Liberty Movement. Of the two first of these societies I had never heard. The third has been too well advertised for this to be possible. *Quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?* But I confess that Wordsworth’s remark on Peter Bell occurred to me:

“ Full twenty times was Peter feared
For once that Peter was respected.”

“ An agitation,” says Bishop Thirlwall, “ is not harmless because it is futile and useless ”; and “ We should be on our guard against the illusions of phrases and names.”¹ Those distinguished men informed me that “ it was of the utmost importance that every possible step should be taken to make plain to Parliament the extent of the demand for the Enabling Bill throughout the Church ”; they hoped, therefore, “ that I would bring the matter before my Easter Vestry; with a Resolution urging that this Bill should be passed through Parliament at the earliest opportunity,” and that I would forward copies of this Resolution to our local M.P., to the Prime Minister, and to Mr. Bonar Law. Sensible as I was of the kindness of Dean Fry and Lord Wolmer and Dr. Temple in interesting themselves in so small a matter as the Easter Vestry of an obscure country parish, I did not see my way to acting upon their suggestion; nor did I trouble either our local M.P., or the Prime Minister, or Mr. Bonar Law with any correspondence on the matter. But, had I done so, as the Easter Vestry consisted of the Parish Clerk and two farmers—my good friends and churchwardens—who had never

¹ *Charges*. Vol. I, 50; Vol. II, 141.

heard of the Enabling Bill, and would have passed unanimously any resolution either for or against it which I had proposed to them, I doubt whether such a resolution would have been very satisfactory evidence of "the extent of the demand for this measure throughout the Church." How many agitations rest on slender foundations! Blow the trumpet in Zion; and if you blow it loud enough, your audience is assured. It is said that some 300 Members of Parliament have been prevailed upon to pledge themselves to the support of the Enabling Bill, and to the general programme of the Life and Liberty Movement. *Nimum ne crede colori*. Is it by the employment of such tactics, and on the strength of such "evidence," that the support of these simple-minded legislators has been secured?

2. It must have occurred to those who followed the proceedings of the Representative Church Council that, outside a very small circle, the proposals passed by that body for effecting what may be described as a *coup d'état* in the Church excited neither interest nor attention. Very few people had, or have, even so much as heard of the Representative Church Council. If you could get the average Englishman to understand what its proposals really are and really mean, he would, I think, turn and rend you. As it is, they would convey no idea to him; he knows nothing of, and cares less for, the whole thing. It is impossible to conceive a less representative body than this so-called Representative Church Council; there could be no greater mistake than to suppose that it has any general public opinion behind it, or that it expresses in any way the lay mind.

"The laymen who as a rule figure in these assemblies," says Dean Stanley, "do not represent the true lay mind of the Church, still less the lay intelligence of the country. They are often excellent men, given to good works. But they are usually the partisans of some special clerical school: they are, in short, clergymen under another form rather than the real laity themselves."¹

3. Not only is the country as a whole ignorant of and indifferent to these proposals: the minority, who are conversant with and interested in the questions involved, are acutely divided: anything less calculated to produce an atmosphere of peace than legislation on the lines contemplated cannot be conceived. The attitude of those who would describe themselves as "Catholics" is, in general, one of reserve. A self-governing Church, they think, might, as things are, restrain the Eucharistic developments to which they attach so much importance—Reservation, the rite of Benediction,

¹ *Essays on Church and State*, p. 350.

etc. ; the so-called " Spikes " are a minority though an active one : it might sanction the ministry of women, and admit Non-Conformists to our pulpits and to communion ; the proposed Parish Councils might prove recalcitrant—there is still a good deal of Protestant and even Puritan feeling in the country—and resent the reconstruction of our accustomed services on " Catholic " lines. While, as the Bishop of Oxford's resignation shows, the " Church Party " is profoundly exercised over the Franchise question, some going so far as to threaten a schism unless the communicant test is imposed. The Evangelicals are not enthusiastic. The Mass Vestments, they think, would be legalized—they certainly would ; mediæval beliefs and practices would be encouraged ; the Prayer Book would be revised in the direction of the First Book of 1549. Indeed, they are by no means sure that the reaction would stop here. If the *Jus Liturgicum* and the *Charisma Veritatis*—i.e. the power to regulate Public Worship and to decide controversies of faith—are attributed to the Bishops—who, as the *Challenge* tells us (November 3, 1916), " are either the organ of the Holy Spirit, or nothing "—one thing is certain : the Reformation Settlement is overthrown. Some Liberal, or Broad, Churchmen seem to believe that a certain magic attaches to a ballot box, and rise to the word Reform, like salmon to a fly. But, though these nibble at the bait, most are frankly hostile. With St. Gregory Nazianzen, they distrust Synods—" I have never yet seen a good end to any," says that Father ; in the recognition of the fundamental unity of Church and State they see the guarantee at once of the religious character of the State and of the reasonableness of religion ; and with regard to Ultramontanism, whether Roman, Anglican, or Puritan—for it can take all three shapes—their sentiments are those of Bishop Thirlwall (Charge, 1869) :

" I entirely dissent from these opinions. I have no sympathy with the motives of those who hold them. I believe that the kind of liberty which they desire would be a grinding tyranny, and the worst calamity that could befall the Church."

4. It is not necessary to recapitulate the proposals of the Representative Church Council. They were reported in *The Times* (February 26, 27, 28, and March 1) ; and the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State, on which they were based, is published by the S.P.C.K. (2s. 6d.). It is enough to say that the **Enabling Bill** is a scheme for organizing the Church of England as a

self-governing denomination within the State, and for taking away from the State the ecclesiastical responsibility which it has acknowledged since the Reformation. It is, therefore, a measure at once of Disestablishment and of Establishment. It disestablishes one Church—the Church of England as we have hitherto known it ; and it establishes another—a denominational Anglicanism based on the Oxford Movement. In such a religious body Evangelicals of accommodating temperament might enjoy a temporary and insecure toleration.

Res dura et regni novitas me talia cogunt
Moliri :

but they would eat the bread of affliction, and it would be severely rationed. While the position of Liberals, as the *Church Times* frankly tells them, “ would instantly become precarious ” (December 14, 1917). They would be taken, like the prophets of Baal, to the brook Kishon, under instructions that not one of them should escape. Can we wonder that they look askance at such “ Life ” and refuse such “ Liberty ” as one-sided ? or that, with the Bishop of Hereford, they are of opinion that the proposed Self-Government would “ become a natural and effective instrument for giving authoritative expression to those purely denominational ambitions which it is the salutary function of the State to restrain ” ?

5. The threat of spiritual tyranny is open. It is important, it is most important, to remember this. The Bishop of Oxford's *Memorandum* (Appendix viii. in the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State. S.P.C.K.) is sufficiently significant. But, in his thoughtful and candid book, *The Testing of Church Principles*,¹ Mr. Oliver Quick excludes all possibility of doubt as to what is contemplated :

“ The Church of England must reform herself as the representative of a whole ideal ; so that a certain position in doctrine corresponds to a certain method of worship, a certain system of government, and even a certain organization in finance. If the views of the different parties *at present* (note the time qualification) comprised within the Church are so divergent as to make impossible a unanimous reform of this type, then the will of the majority must be given some power to make itself effective, and *minorities must suffer more than they have done in the past*. The effect of freedom from State control would undoubtedly be to give the majority of real members of the Church more power than it has at present. It is this undeniable fact which to some minds constitutes the chief argument for the retention of State control, and to others makes the removal of this control the one essential preliminary to reform.”

¹ Murray. 1919. 5s.

The writer admits that there is "*real danger of a schism as the result of self-government.*" He is prepared, however, to risk this danger; and in his argument for the communicant, as opposed to the baptismal franchise, he tells us why:

"If we decide (he says) to include in an equal membership all those who have received Christian baptism, a majority of our nominal members will be composed of those who own no real or effective loyalty to our Church. The main objection to giving our franchise so wide a range is insufficiently understood. If once we recognize the class of people mentioned as members of our body, it will be, to say the least, *very difficult to refuse them the ministrations for which they ask*"—*i.e. marriage; the baptism of their children; and burial.* "On the other hand, to go on performing these ministrations for all comers, as is the general custom at present, would *endanger the whole principle of the reform which we contemplate.*"¹

To unchurch "*vast numbers of those who at present come to us for marriage, baptism, and burial*" is scarcely the way to make England Christian. "What portion have we in David?" *i.e.* what have we to do with a Church which leaves us unmarried, unburied and unbaptized? "To your tents, O Israel!" Such a Church would not remain long either endowed or established: "so Israel rebelled against the house of David unto this day." "The tenure of the ancient religious endowments of the nation cannot reasonably or rightly be conceded to a Church which has repudiated the condition of national establishment, and constituted itself as an independent denomination within the State."

6. When a sum works out to an absurd conclusion, we go back to see where the original error came in. In this case, it must be traced to certain assumptions on the part of the Archbishops' Committee of 1916 in which the conclusions which it was desired to draw were already contained. Such was the loosely and inaccurately conceived distinction between "Church" and "State"; such were the notions of "the spiritual independence of the Church"; of its "inherent authority"; of its "fundamental conception as a self-governing society"; of the "powers and functions inherent in the Episcopate," and the like. One is amazed that so palpable a series of fallacies and sophisms should have escaped detection. Nothing, indeed, could be more calculated to shake our faith in lay representation than the facility with which, on so important a body, and in such important subject matter, the lay representatives walked into the trap laid for them. Presumably they thought that the bishops and clergy knew their own business, and that non-experts

should follow their lead. If this was so, their moral virtues were so much in excess of their intellectual that both fell into the ditch. We have no use for lay representatives who play the part of the woman of Tekoah in this way. It is neither sense, nor reason, nor common honesty. A man is made a representative to use his own judgment, if he has any, not to be the mouthpiece of an ecclesiastical Joab in the background. "Thy servant Joab, he bade me; and he put all these words into the mouth of thine handmaid. To change the face of the matter hath thy servant Joab done this thing."

7. It was a great saying of Cromwell—"If any whosoever think the interests of Christians and the interests of the nation inconsistent, I wish my soul may never enter into their secret"; the abstract terms "Church" and "State," though their connotation differs, denote one and the same thing. For the same men and women who compose the State compose the Church also; the Church is the community viewed from the standpoint of religion, the State on its religious side. This is the teaching of Hooker: "There is not any man of the Church of England but the same is also a member of the Commonwealth; nor any man a member of the Commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England." The whole chapter (Book viii. ch. I) deserves careful study. The rival conception of the Church as a "Perfect Society," possessed by Divine institution of "the full legislative, administrative, and judicial powers which the effective realization of the authority to bind and loose implies"—the words are those of the Archbishops' Committee—is a figment of Ultramontane canonists. To find the Committee assuming it as self-evident takes one's breath away; the Syllabus of Pius IX asks no more. It is not Catholic; an important school of mediæval theologians, of whom Marsilius of Padua is an example, denied it as strenuously as any modern Protestant. And, theology apart, on the ground of politics—and of ethics, of which politics are part—a Church is an institution on too large a scale for its administration to be safely withdrawn from that of the community. This would be to imperil civil as well as religious liberty; we have a right to appeal for the co-operation of "our partners which are in the other ship"—those whom Stanley happily describes as "Nonconforming members and ministers of the Church of England"—in what is a common interest, and should be a common cause. It is not for Protestants to stand by and see Protestantism weakened;

it is not for Free Churchmen to look on when religious freedom is attacked. For this freedom is the reverse side of civil freedom ; the two are one.

8. It is argued that the situation has changed so greatly since the sixteenth century that Hooker's identification of the nation and its Church has ceased to hold. That the two are no longer co-extensive is true. Perhaps they never were so quite literally ; it is possible that Hooker and the mediæval thinkers whom he followed were describing rather an ideal than a real state of things. But their coincidence, if it is no longer material, may, and should be, moral. When Thiers said in 1870 that the Republic divided Frenchmen less than any other form of government—*c'est ce que nous divise le moins*—he did not mean that all Frenchmen were Republicans—they were not : what he meant was that the general sense of the country acquiesced in the republic, and that it would not have acquiesced in any other *régime*. I would say the same of the Church of England *as we have it*. It divides us less than any other Church ; and this is the justification of its legal position in the country. I should not say it of the denominational Anglicanism by which our Church Reformers propose to replace it. To establish this would be (1) to establish a sect—an obvious injustice to the sects left unestablished : and (2) the sect thus established would be one opposed both to the conscience of the community and to the mind of the age.

9. The strength of the Self-Government Movement is to be found in the fact that it commends itself to, or perhaps in some cases has been forced upon, so many of the permanent Church officials. The Archbishops, and (it is believed) the majority of the bishops, support it ; and, though their influence is, no doubt, a moderating one—the wise ruler guides forces which he cannot suppress—the official mind is opportunist, and follows rather than leads opinion. Now we owe officials, religious and civil, much ; they are indispensable ; they supply a centripetal force to the community without which its more volatile elements would scarcely cohere. But officials are apt to be obsessed by the idea of system ; to desire uniformity in a degree which is unattainable ; and to expect results from organization which it is not in its power to produce. It is for the more detached, the really lay, mind of the Church to correct this angle of vision. The reforms which are to be desired can be brought about without revolution ; the incapacity and unwillingness of

Parliament to deal with ecclesiastical anomalies has been exaggerated out of all relation to the facts. The House of Lords, e.g., lately assented to the Bishop of Norwich's useful Bill for the Union of Benefices (March, 1919); and one may refer in this connection to the Dilapidation Act (1871), the Glebe Lands Act (1888), the Clergy Discipline Act (1892), the Benefices Act, the Incumbents' Resignation Act, etc.; Parliament is ready—and, if more measures of the kind were brought before it, it would be readier—to deal with practical questions on practical lines. What it will not do, and rightly, is to treat with the Bishops on the assumption that the Church is what it is not—i.e. a society independent of the State, and *sui juris*: it will not alienate the patronage or abolish the appellate jurisdiction of the Crown; it will not leave “an insolent and aggressive faction” free to ride roughshod over sane and sober Churchmen, and to remodel the National Church on party lines. That what these people call “the Church” shall be “enabled” to do these things by its so-called “inherent authority” is in effect the claim put forward by the Archbishops' Committee and the Representative Church Council. It is a preposterous, an intolerable, and an impossible claim. The secular Press sees this, though the so-called religious journals characteristically do not. And the weighty words of *The Times* (February 22) should be remembered:

“We are driven to the conviction that Churchmen are in great danger of being committed unawares to a programme which may destroy the Establishment, and restrict liberty within the Church to the narrow limits of a party whose religious and doctrinal outlook most of them reject.”

10. After the Disestablishment of the Church of Ireland (1867), the wisest of English bishops, Bishop Thirlwall, warned us that our danger in this matter was not from without, but from within. It is so still. The cry, “Down with it, down with it!” comes from those of our own household: “We believe,” wrote the *Challenge* (April 18), “that immediate voluntary Disestablishment is a necessary corollary to Life and Liberty in the Church of Christ.” The disaster which Disestablishment, voluntary or involuntary, would involve is not (the Bishop reminds us) only or primarily a material one.

“It is not confined to the loss of our temporal position. If this were all, though I should think it an evil not likely to be counterbalanced by any advantage which it is reasonable to expect, still I should not contemplate it with despondency. I should be ready to hope that it might be over-ruled, so

as in the end to work for our good. But I cannot look forward with the same equanimity to the ulterior consequences of the event which present themselves to my mind as inevitable. For it seems to me hardly possible to doubt that the final result would be the disruption of the Church into two or three sects, one of which would, probably, sooner or later, be merged in the Church of Rome. There would be divers Anglican Churches, but no longer a Church of England. Who could pretend to forecast the effects of such a dismemberment on the Colonial Churches, or on our Foreign Missions? It is enough to say that it is the state to which our chief adversary, whom nothing can satisfy but our destruction, most eagerly desires, and is most actively labouring, to see us reduced" (Charge, 1869).

Superstition, and Scepticism—the shadow thrown by Superstition—these are the forces, the sinister forces, which stand to gain by the downfall of what Hooker describes as "the present state of the Church of God established amongst us," and by the defeat of "their careful endeavour which would have upheld the same."

Hoc Ithacus velit, et magno mercentur Atreidæ.

ALFRED FAWKES.

DEAN WACE AND THE ENABLING BILL.

The Dean of Canterbury, speaking in Convocation on a motion in support of the Enabling Bill, said the reason why, after very long thought and consideration, he felt obliged to speak against the proposal was that he felt convinced that, if the proposal was adopted, the Church would be entering upon a false step which must, sooner or later, lead to disestablishment. What was being done by the proposal was narrowing the basis upon which the Church of England now rested. It was certainly a great advantage, in avoiding that difficulty, that the Representative Church Council adopted the Baptismal as against the Confirmation franchise. That, at all events, opened the franchise to every Christian in the country, with one fatal exception, as it seemed to him. It was the Baptismal franchise coupled with a declaration that the person who claimed the vote did not belong to any other religious body in the country. That at once narrowed very seriously the basis upon which the Representative Assembly rested. He thought that he was right in saying that, speaking in round figures, the Nonconformist bodies contained at least half the number of Christians in this country. Taking the whole world, including America and the British Colonies, the number of communicants in the Anglican Church was four millions and the number of communicants in the Nonconformist Churches was twenty-one millions. He thought that that ought, to give a good deal of ground for consideration, and, he would even add, for anxiety. He could not help thinking that the narrowing of the basis to which he had referred amounted to diminishing the claim of the Church of England hereafter to be a National Church. The Dean of Christ Church had said some words upon that subject, but he had missed a point upon which great stress was laid by ancient divines, and that was that the Church of England was called "National" because it had behind it the whole national authority. When the fatal moment was arriving when the Nonconformists were beginning to be permanently divided from the Church of England, Stillingfleet laid particular stress upon the point that the National Church was a National Church which had the whole national authority. The Church, by adopting the present proposals, was moving away entirely from the position which Stillingfleet, one of the greatest names among English divines, the defender of Laud, and others, occupied.

THE FREEDOM OF THE CHURCH AND ESTABLISHMENT.

BY THE REV. C. H. K. BOUGHTON, B.D., Vicar of Calverley.

IT is a wise rule of interpretation that a text must always be studied in the light of its context. Probably few would be found among us to dispute the wisdom of this rule, and yet probably equally few have not at times succumbed to the temptation to break it. No doubt sometimes we have broken it consciously and playfully to score an easy debating point against an opponent. Sometimes, however, there is a deeper reason for the breakage. A text is something short, definite, easy to handle. A context is a larger thing, and much more difficult to grasp. To handle it truly requires in a reader a more determined effort of the will and a more delicate sympathy with what an author is trying to say through words which may be proving only half adequate to his meaning ; and there are few authors who have not suffered much from critics who would not rise to the effort which the context demanded.

I venture to suggest to you that my subject stands to the one which has just been discussed somewhat in the same relation as a context to its text. The proposals for Reform which make up the substance of the Enabling Bill now before Parliament are definite enough, and they have been discussed in the last twelve months with such persistent vigour that it is difficult to say anything fresh about them. Not so much has been said about Freedom and Establishment. These are larger words, much less well-defined, much more open to the danger of being used in different senses by different speakers, with the inevitable result of mere darkening of counsel. But yet it remains true that the scheme for the self-government of the Church cannot be fairly judged unless it is looked at in the light both of certain fundamental principles and also of that historical background which goes by the name of the Establishment ; and it is for that reason, I presume, that I have been asked to recall to your minds in such definite and simple terms as I can the meaning and consequences of Freedom and Establishment.

Let us look first at the meanings of Church and State in the abstract.

We must go back to the very beginnings of Church history as recorded in the Gospels. "Verily¹ I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Read in the light of Rabbinic phraseology, this saying of Christ means nothing if it does not mean that a power of self-determination and of self-government was meant by the Master to be possessed by the Church which He founded. Taken in conjunction with other relevant passages in the New Testament, it amply justifies the statement of the Selborne Committee. "It² does not seem to be open to question that the authority to bind or loose, with which the Church believed itself to be endowed from the beginning of its history, was interpreted as involving the possession of the full legislative and administrative and judicial powers which the effective realization of such an authority demanded. Behind such questions as those of the relations of the different elements of the Church to one another, of the relation of local churches to the whole Church, or of the limitation of the authority of even the whole Church in matters of doctrine, lay the idea of the Church as a self-governing Society, having authority over its members with divine sanction, having a divine claim to govern itself."

This Society was sent forth to be Christ's agent in the world, and was equipped for its work by the presence of the Holy Spirit. Among the many problems which speedily clamoured for solution was that of determining the right relationship between the Church and the world, between the Church as a Society and that other fundamental human society which we call the State. Two guiding principles are laid down in the New Testament towards a correct solution.

On the one hand the State itself can claim a certain Divine authority. St. Paul's³ saying, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God"; and St. Peter's echo⁴ of it, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake . . . for so is the will of God," are both based upon the example of Christ when He paid His temple tax⁵ and upon His precept when He bade

¹ St. Matt. xviii. 18.

² S.P.C.K. Report, p. 32.

³ Rom. xiii. 1.

⁴ 1 Pet. ii. 13, 15.

⁵ Matt. xvii. 24.

men "render ¹ therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's."

On the other hand, Christ intended the Church to be essentially an unworldly Society. "I pray ² not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." This unworldliness has at least two consequences. It means that sometimes there will be conflict between Church law and State law. The earliest illustration is St. Peter's bold answer to the veto of the Jewish rulers upon Christian preaching, "Whether it be right ³ in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye," and Church history is replete with others from the days of Roman imperial edicts down to the present time. The other consequence is that the sanctions of law in Church and State are different. The State relies ultimately upon physical force to secure that the will of the majority be carried out by the minority. The Church can properly secure its will by moral suasion alone: its only punishment for the brother who persists in defiance is excommunication. "Let him ⁴ be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." This principle has been almost forgotten through wide reaches of Church history, yet it has not been without its witnesses here and there. Tertullian was expressing what was probably the general view in his day when he ⁵ wrote, "It does not belong to religion to compel religion, which should be accepted voluntarily, not by force." Bishop William Warburton was to some extent a prophet of a new era when in the eighteenth century, in his book on *The Alliance between Church and State*, he reminded his contemporaries that the Church may not "engage the State to propagate the established religion by force," because Church and State are strictly different and independent powers. "Admit the religious society to be independent, and you invincibly destroy all pretence to coercive power, because coercive power introduces an *imperium in imperio*, which is removed only by destroying the independency. Admit again, that religious society has no coercive power, and you supersede all the State's claim of dependency, a claim solely founded on the evil of an *imperium in imperio*, which evil can arise no otherwise than by the Church's exercise of an inherent coercive power."⁶

¹ Matt. xxii. 21.

² St. John xvii. 15.

³ Acts iv. 19.

⁴ Matt. xviii. 17.

⁵ Quoted in S.P.C.K. Report, p. 246.

⁶ See Henson's *Church Problems*, 48.

Such being the natures of Church and State in themselves, it is obvious that the problem of conduct for individuals who happen to belong to both is a very intricate one, and that the problem of the due adjustment of their rival claims is one which requires the exercise of the very highest wisdom. Bishop Stubbs¹ once said: "It may be taken for granted that between the extreme claims made by the advocates of the two there can never be even an approximate reconciliation." But in a world which is only a little way on the road to becoming a Kingdom of Heaven extreme claims cannot be pressed. The practical statesman does not attempt to realize the ideal immediately. He is content if he can raise the actual but a step or two nearer the ideal without the risk of a later fall. His supreme aim is to obtain the most perfect accommodation of the highest forms of Church and State which the conditions of place and time allow.

At this point, then, we pass on to notice briefly three types of relationship between Church and State which have emerged in the course of history, and which I will venture to describe from the side of the State as respectively identification, toleration and preference. A consideration of these with their respective merits and demerits will put us into a position to understand more correctly the precise issue of the present day.

1. *Identification of Church and State.* The most perfect example of this that I know is the constitution established at Geneva by Calvin in the years immediately following 1536, of which John Knox wrote: "I neither fear nor shame to say that this is the most perfect school of Christ that ever was since the days of the Apostles." Here the Church was first to do its part by instruction and admonition and censure: in the background was to be the secular arm to suppress vice and produce uniformity by pains and penalties. The key to the position was the famous Consistory of six ministers and twelve elders which met every Thursday and regulated the whole public and private lives of the citizens.

It is to be feared that John Knox's opinion was coloured by the idea dominant in his age that religious persecution was perfectly lawful. To a modern mind, which on this point is surely truer to Christ's ideal, the Genevan system stands condemned because it confounded the civil and religious sanctions, and employed the secular arm in the wrong place. The public burning of Servetus for

¹ *Constitutional History* (1878), III. 288.

his scientific and theological opinions reminds one of the still more celebrated case of Galileo. Calvin did but make the mistake which practically the whole Church made from the age of Constantine the Great down to nearly modern times. Mr. Hobhouse's Bampton Lectures in 1909 on *The Church and the World in Idea and History* are a most illuminating collection of proofs of that statement. He shows us by abundant illustrations from the evangelistic work of the Church among the Barbarians and from its disciplinary proceedings among the heretics and schismatics of its own members that it was simply putting into practice in its turn that theory of State religion enforceable by law from which it had itself suffered so bitterly during the age of the Roman persecutions. The danger of persecution is a sufficient condemnation of any attempt to identify Church and State.

In England there is a still further reason against such identification. Hooker¹ indeed says: "With us one society is both the Church and the Commonwealth. . . . In a word, our estate is according to the pattern of God's own ancient elect people, which people was not part of them the Commonwealth and part of them the Church of God, but the self-same people whole and entire were both under one chief governor, on whose supreme authority they did all depend." There was probably a good deal of truth in this in those pre-Norman times when Church and State were practically one, and when Bishops and Ealdermen sat side by side in assemblies and tribunals and administered indiscriminately Canon and Civil Law. There was much less truth in it in Hooker's day; and in modern times when Nonconformity and Rationalism are firmly established among us it is only necessary to state the proposition to show its absurdity. Identification is impossible on numerical grounds.

The only other line of defence open to the advocate of identification is the philosophic one adopted by Gladstone in his early book (1838) on *The State in its Relations with the Church*, wherein he argued that the State is a moral personality, cognizant of religion and with a duty to propagate it. This view, though in some respects an ideal one, leads straight to persecution and was soon abandoned by its author.

2. *Toleration of all Churches by the State.* Constantine's Edict of Milan foreshadowed modern policy when it suggested that the Empire "should give to the Christians and to all a free power of

¹ *Ecc. Pol.* VIII. 1, 7.

following whatever religion any one has chosen." Broadly speaking, this is the position to-day in Ireland, the Colonies and the United States. In these countries no religious body is treated differently from the rest. They are all corporations within the State. Subject to certain limitations they possess powers of self-government. They may make their own laws, appoint their own officials and set up their own courts.

What it is important for us to notice about them is not so much their independence as their limitations, for this is the side to which too little heed is sometimes paid. These corporations are in many ways restricted by the State. No other alternative is conceivable. Back in the days of Henry VIII when agitation was on foot for the revision of the mediaeval Canon Law, a proviso was inserted in the Act of 1534 that the old Canons might still be deemed valid provided they were not "contrary aunt nor repugnant to the lawes, statutes and customes of this Realme nor to the damage or hurte of the Kynges prerogatyve Royall." In this respect the Church of England is in no whit less favourable a position than any corporation ecclesiastical or municipal in any country. Clearly all corporations must avoid opposition to State law or be prepared to take the consequences.

It is well to remind ourselves how closely the authority of the State sometimes presses. The State takes cognizance of matters affecting property and of relations of contract between the members of the Societies; it may even deal in doctrine. For instance, the doctrines of the Primitive Methodists are all detailed in a schedule to an Act of Parliament 34 and 35 Vict. c. 40 in just the same way as the Prayer Book is attached to the Act of Uniformity of 1662. As Mr. Montague Barlow¹ expressed it: "Every such voluntary religious society is certain to formulate its doctrines, to require rules of ritual and procedure. Times of trouble will come, various interpretations will be put on the rules, and back we must come to the secular courts again to interpret them. The secular courts protect rights to property, and property rights will and must be involved. Chapels are built, endowments left, lectureships founded, to maintain a certain type of doctrine; years will pass, and times change, a younger generation would emphasize some doctrines and dispense with others, the older members resist the innovation, and an action in Chancery becomes inevitable, and while directly deciding questions

¹ *Church and Faith*, p. 349.

of property the courts will be compelled to pronounce on matters of doctrine and faith. In a case debated for more than ten years in the courts during the early part of this [nineteenth] century, the point involved was whether the doctrine of the Trinity was an essential part of the Presbyterian creed, and Her Majesty's judges had to critically examine and pronounce on the first fourteen verses of the first chapter of Hebrews, and the effect of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds." Since Mr. Barlow wrote those words, we have seen other cases of the same kind.

It is worth while to notice also that the term Establishment is sometimes so defined that it covers the so-called Free Churches of this country. "Lord Mansfield,¹ in *Chamberlain of London v. Allen Edwards*, laid it down as the law of England that by the Toleration Act 'the Dissenter's way of worship was not only rendered innocent and lawful, but was established: it was put under the protection of the law.'" It is even open to argument whether the Free Churches are not established by the famous definition of Lord Selborne.² You will remember that he says: "The Establishment of the Church by law consists essentially in the incorporation of the law of the Church into that of the realm, as a branch of the general law of the realm, though limited as to the causes to which, and the persons to whom it applies; in the public recognition of its Courts and judges, as having proper legal jurisdiction: and in the enforcement of the sentences of those Courts, when duly pronounced according to law, by the civil power."

3. *Preference by the State for one Church.* Lord Selborne's definition forms a convenient transition to a brief consideration of the position of the Church of England. That position is well expressed in general terms by Bishop Collins in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.³ "Establishment implies the existence of some definite and distinctive relation between the State and a religious society . . . other than that which is shared in by other societies of the same general character. Of course, a certain relationship must needs exist between the State and every society, religious or secular, by virtue of the sovereignty of the State over each and all of its members. . . . With all this establishment has nothing to do. It is not concerned with what pertains to the religious society *quâ* society, or with what

¹ See *P. B. Dict.*, p. 318. ² *Defence of the Church of England*, p. 10.

³ Vol. IX. 787, Edit. 1911.

is common to all religious societies, but with what is exceptional. It denotes any special connection with the State, or privileges and responsibilities before the law, possessed by one religious society to the exclusion of others ; in a word, establishment is of the nature of a monopoly." There is no need to detail to this audience wherein exactly the Establishment of the Church of England consists. The facts are very lucidly set out in the well-known essays of Mr. Montague Barlow,¹ or the Bishop of Hereford,² or in the S.P.C.K. Selborne Report, Section 2 and Appendix 6. It is sufficient to say that there is a closer relationship between the State and the Church of England than between the State and any similar religious body, partly because the Prayer Book is a schedule to an Act of Parliament, but mainly because the Crown controls the executive of the Church by appointing to its higher offices, the legislation of the Church by dominating Convocation at every stage, and the Courts of the Church by the possession of the Privy Council Committee as the final Court of Appeal.

We have now reviewed, however roughly and hastily, three types of relationship between Church and State which have emerged in the course of history. We have also seen something of the ideal nature of the two organizations which have thus in less than their ideal form been combined. The actualities of the past, the possibilities of rising nearer to the ideal in the future, these must form the context of all our present-day discussions if they are to be fruitful of good. Those discussions turn mainly on the question of possible gain or loss in making any change in the present relations of the Church of England to the State. There are at any rate three points which need the most careful consideration.

First and foremost, what does the State gain by its close connection with us ? It was William Warburton³ who laid it down that "the Church shall apply its utmost influence in the service of the State." It was Lord Selborne⁴ who wrote : "The reasons for, and the advantages of, the Establishment (as distinguished from the endowments) of the Church have always appeared to me (as I believe they do to most Churchmen at the present day) to be stronger and greater on the side of the State than on that of the Church." What are these advantages ? Clearly they must be connected with the

¹ *Church and Faith*, 325 ff.

³ *Alliance*, Chapter iii.

² *Church Problems*, 32 ff.

⁴ *Defence*, p. 72.

Church's work in the formation of that high character in its citizens without which no State can long endure. We must not take too much comfort to ourselves from the fact that the Church has a territorial organization, and owns a responsibility towards all the inhabitants of the country. That is a great good, but it belongs rather to the sphere of Endowment than of Establishment, and I am trying to keep the two things separate. We must ask rather such questions as, What is the exact value to the State of the possession of an official religious organ, which has its Bishops in the House of Lords and crowns the King? What would England lose if she became in this respect similar to the United States? Was Archbishop Temple¹ right when he said, "I think Disestablishment will be a step down for the whole nation"?

The second point for consideration is the gain to the Church from its State control. How far, for instance, is it true that (to quote Lord Selborne² again) "it may, to say the least, be doubted whether a system of free election by capitular bodies, or even by all the clergy of a diocese, would work as smoothly and well, in the general run, and upon a large scale, as the system of nomination by the Crown does under the existing law." The appeal to the experience of the Irish Church is obvious, but the result of that appeal is much more obscure. I have several times tried to find out from Irishmen the effect of Irish Church Disestablishment, but have only succeeded in getting conflicting answers. Again, how much truth is there in the statement sometimes made that State control secures a wider liberty of thought, and delivers minorities from fear of oppression by a tyrannical majority?

On the other hand, we have to consider what the Church loses by its State connection. There is an impressive account of Church Bills which have been held up in Parliament in the Selborne Report. How many of them were worth passing? How much does it really matter that Convocation cannot pass any canon without tremendous difficulty, and that its legislation when enacted has no binding force at all upon the laity? Is it a weighty grievance that Convocation has been called with some justice "a noun of multitude, signifying many, but not signifying much"? How much should we gain if we were disestablished, or if the bonds of our Establishment were loosened so that we were put into a position analogous to that of the

¹ *Life*, II. 662.

² *Defence*, p. 77.

Established Church of Scotland? There is surely much food for reflection in the fact that Scotland can have all the advantages of an Established Church, whatsoever they may be, and yet that Church can put out the impressive declaration of spiritual liberty which is quoted on page 36 of the Selborne Report, from which I extract just one sentence, "The Church affirms that recognition by civil authority" . . . (does not give it) "any right of interference with the proceedings or judgments of the Church within the sphere of its spiritual government and jurisdiction."

These are the questions we have to answer, and it has been the purpose of this paper to prepare the way for that answer rather than to attempt the answer itself. But if I may close with an expression of personal opinion, I will admit that I cast envious eyes in the direction of Scotland; and though I know full well that Scotland is not England and that the constitution of one country cannot be simply transferred to the other, yet I do feel that the Established Church of Scotland affords a model we should do well to copy, and it is because the present Enabling Bill seeks to make our relations with the State somewhat more like the Scotch in their blending of freedom with control that I am prepared to give it my support.

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

BOOK NOTICES.

SOME MORAL DIFFICULTIES OF THE BIBLE. By H. E. Guillebaud, M.A.
London: *Robert Scott*. 2s. net.

The Bishop of Durham contributes a commendatory Introduction to this useful little manual, which, as he says, deals with "questions of gravest importance, alike to the thoughtful believer and to the candid enquirer." At the outset, the author discusses the subject of Inspiration. He states the difficulties that confront those who hold the theory of Verbal Inspiration and which make it exceedingly difficult to believe, but his remarks are characterized by a discreet moderation and he concludes by saying of this theory,—"I do not utterly exclude it; but I cannot pin myself to it here and now." In our present lectionary certain Old Testament chapters are read year by year that undoubtedly present difficulties to thoughtful minds and Mr. Guillebaud faces these without finching. How many of our people have been puzzled about the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, the lying spirit, and the words "I, Jehovah have deceived that Prophet"? These are among the difficulties dealt with, and while recognizing that there are many others, the writer confines himself to those which seem to be gravest, namely, passages which seem to attribute evil to God; but, as Dr. Moule says, he so uses the lamp of sanctified reason as to suggest to the reader how, in other cases, to use it for himself.

THE MESSAGE OF CHRIST CONCERNING LABOUR.

BY THE REV. G. E. FORD, B.A., Vicar of Bilston, Staffs.

AT the close of the second chapter of the Report of the Archbishops' Fifth Committee of Inquiry, entitled "Christianity and Industrial Problems," there is an Appended Note dealing briefly with certain objections to the application of Christian principles to industry. I do not propose to discuss the convincing answer which the Committee have given to these objections, but content myself with saying, by way of justifying our dealing with this subject to-day, that if Christ has given no message concerning labour, if Christianity embodies no fundamental principles by which we may be guided in dealing with that which is so essential and so predominant an element of human life, then the claim of Christ to be the Light of the world is not a true claim. He stands discredited. But if, as a matter of fact, there is in the life and in the teaching of Jesus Christ a real message concerning labour, it must be our duty to state it in the clearest and simplest terms, so that it may be understood by all men, and to preach it through good report and through evil report, as an essential part of Christ's Gospel of redemption and salvation. For if Jesus Christ is the manifestation of God to man, if His social position here on earth was of God's appointment, if His words were, as He claimed them to be, the express teaching of the Father, then the message concerning labour which is expressed in His circumstances of life and in His teaching must of necessity be applicable to industry at all times, and it will be at our most serious peril that we hesitate or refuse to make the application.

The Archbishops' Committee have accordingly put in the forefront of their admirable Report a statement, under thirteen heads, of Christian principles and their social application. Assuming that my hearers have already studied that Report, I do not intend to follow them in detail, but shall regard the subject from a slightly different angle, and shall try especially to emphasise one point on which, if I have rightly understood them, they do not appear to me to have laid sufficient stress.

There are three fundamental principles which sum up the message of Christ concerning labour ; the last of which is a necessary inference from the other two.

The first of these principles may be stated as follows :—

Because all men are brethren, children of the Heavenly Father, and because all Christian men are most intimately bound together in the fellowship of Christ's redemption, human labour, particularly in a Christian community, must be regarded in relation to those who labour, and not merely as a commodity to be bought and sold.

The importance of this principle cannot be exaggerated. The price of commodities in general is regulated by the Law of Supply and Demand. When the supply is small and the demand great, prices are high ; when there is little or no demand and a plentiful supply, prices are low. The rigid application of this law to the wages and general conditions of labour has been a fruitful source of cruel hardship to multitudes of men, women and children. In the exceedingly interesting and instructive chapter of their Report entitled "Some historical illustrations," the Archbishops' Committee have shown by what stages the relations between employer and employed became divorced from considerations of Christian principle and were subjected to this economic law ; they have also indicated some of the measures adopted by parliaments of the well-to-do to safeguard the interests of landowners and capitalists whilst denying to workmen the right of combination with a view to lightening their burdens ; and, saddest of all, they have given us samples of the way in which religion itself was degraded into a means of condoning and even justifying the hardships of the oppressed labourer.¹

To sum up their remarks on this head :—"Men took the world around them for granted, as we are doing in this our own age. They assumed that the proper thing was to accept that station in life unto which it had pleased God to call them. The Bible was taken as inculcating resignation in this world with the expectation of justice and recompense in the world to come ; and Christianity as not a standard by which to judge institutions, but as a Divine warrant for submission to them." "Paley," they tell us, "actually argued that the poor are better off than the rich, who lead a languid, satiated existence, whereas all the provision which a poor man's child requires

¹ Pp. 44-46.

is industry and innocence . . . 'frugality is itself a pleasure, and the necessary care and forecast to keep expenses level form an agreeable engagement of the thoughts.' "

Trades-unions, with the weapon of the strike in their hands, have gradually succeeded in counteracting the operation of the Law of Supply and Demand within certain limits ; but in the case of the unorganised trades, and especially in women's work, it has operated to bring wages down to the level of the bare cost of subsistence, and sometimes even below that level, with results that are too well known for me to need to dwell upon them here.

The disregard of the Christian principle of consideration for one another has resulted in a condition of chronic suspicion and strife between those whose true interests would best be served by mutual trust and hearty co-operation ; there has arisen the conviction that capital and labour are of necessity opposed to each other ; and the ideal that the worker has been led to set before himself is the abolition of the private ownership of capital and the reconstruction of Society upon the basis of collectivism, an ideal to be realised by force—either the power of the wage-earners exercised through their vote, or the brute force of revolution such as is now being manifested on the continent of Europe.

The question as to how this first Christian principle can be applied will be considered later.

The second principle is as follows :—

Because labour has been consecrated by Jesus Christ, who earned His living as a carpenter, Christian people should not tolerate the idea that the man who works with his hands belongs to a lower social grade than the professional man or the unemployed rich ; and that although absolute equality in all respects cannot prevail among men, yet all true men have an equal claim to the respect and esteem of all.

There is no question that at the present time Society is saturated with class prejudice, with pride of purse and with pride of position. One class looks down upon another, and the manual worker is looked down upon by all the rest. It is not in India alone that caste prevails.

If this were only a matter of sentiment it would even then be bad enough, for no man likes to be despised, and no Society is stable where there is the absence of goodwill and mutual respect. But the

practical results of this attitude are very real and very serious.

We know what it used to cost to feed our own family, even when everything of the nature of luxury was scrupulously avoided and our food was of the plainest ; and yet we used to acquiesce before the war in the pound a week wage for the labourer, on which he had to feed and clothe and house and warm his family, and we used even to think him improvident if he had not made provision for sickness and death by joining a club. We feel the need of having sufficient house room for ourselves, with adequate means of obtaining hot water for baths, and with proper sanitary arrangements ; and yet it has seemed to us a matter of course that the labourer should, in numberless cases, live in a back-to-back house, often consisting of only two very small rooms, affording bare shelter, with none of the conveniences which mean so much to us, and not even having separate sanitary accommodation for the household, nor access to such as there is except through the front door ! We have realised how priceless is the boon of having some security of income for ourselves ; and yet we have in no sense revolted at a condition of things in which hosts of men have had no regular employment, and those have been least certain of employment whose wages have been lowest. Pulpits and Ruri-decanal and Diocesan Conferences and Church Congresses and Convocations did not ring incessantly with the recital of these hardships of our brothers and sisters, and with passionate appeals for their amelioration. A voice here and there in the wilderness has been lifted up ; but, speaking generally, the promotion of more human conditions of life has not been manifestly the burning question ever at the front in our ecclesiastical deliberations. The Church, like the State, has tacitly acquiesced in these evils, and has only stirred uneasily when labour has been more restless than usual, and strikes have disturbed the calm surface of our daily life.

I do not say all this by way of blaming the Church, however much or little blame she may deserve ; but rather to emphasise the fact that we, like our forefathers, have taken things for granted and as inevitable which should all the time have been regarded as intolerable. And even now it has taken practically a declaration of war on the part of labour to move the nation to undertake some measures of reform.

What is the reason for this prolonged apathy? It is not that the national wealth has been insufficient for the task of paying just wages, providing proper housing, stamping out infectious diseases, like consumption, educating the nation's children up to a reasonable age and a proper standard. The war has shown us what enormous reservoirs of wealth the nation possessed and was ready to pour out in lavish abundance when national security was in danger. Nor can we say that men in general, or political and religious leaders in particular, have been lacking in humane feelings. Suffering in any part of the world which has been brought home to the heart and the imagination has never failed to elicit an instant response of generous and unstinted help. Then why have these social and industrial evils remained so long unalleviated?

I cannot help feeling that the fundamental reason is that deep down in the minds of the well-born and the well-to-do there has been the conviction that those who labour with their hands belong to a lower grade of humanity than they, and that an altogether lower scale of existence than is possible for themselves is therefore quite good enough for these; that music, art, refinement, literature, leisure are out of their line, extras with which they can very well dispense.

Although we are proud of our Christian calling, we have conveniently overlooked the fact that Jesus of Nazareth was a working carpenter, and that the most notable of His Apostles whom we revere as Saints were toiling fishermen who laboured, stripped to their skin, earning a hard living on the Sea of Galilee, belonging to a class whom many exceedingly worthy Christians would never dream of entertaining at their tables on terms of equal honour with themselves, however personally worthy they might be. The Divine example has been all the while before us; we have had the Christian principle to guide us; but deep-rooted prejudice, sometimes the inheritance of many generations, sometimes too easily acquired, has made us as really despise the Christ in the person of His fellow-workman as He was despised and rejected in the days of His flesh.

In Christ the middle walls of partition that separate men have potentially been broken down; but, actually, we are far from seeing them laid low. In St. Paul's day it was the dividing wall between Jew and Gentile that especially claimed attention; and throughout his Epistles, particularly in the Epistle to the Ephesians, we find

the Apostle striving with all his might to break down this wall, the foundation of which was religious exclusiveness. Two other walls of partition are to-day separating men, and even Christian men, with equal effectiveness ; and they are based upon racial prejudice—the colour bar—and class alienation, the setting apart of the manual labourer into a separate and socially inferior class of society. And just as even amongst the Apostles a St. Peter was to be found who by his conduct encouraged the alienation of Gentile from Jew, and thus helped to buttress up the wall that his fellow-apostle was striving to break down, so amongst even the clergy there will, I fear, be found those who by word and by example are helping to keep up these antagonisms, even though they have been abolished in Christ, “where there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman ; but Christ is all, and in all.”

What we need then to-day, with regard to this matter of class alienation, is that the ministers of Christ by their life and by their preaching should teach with all their power the truth of the equality of honour for all men whose conduct is honourable, wholly irrespective of the occupation by which they earn an honest living. One is reluctant to find any fault with the Report of the Archbishops' Committee, considering its generally admirable tone and the great value of its practical recommendations ; but one misses just this clear note of the fundamental equality of all genuine workers, of all true men. It speaks indeed of all necessary *work* as equally honourable ; it tells us that the true life of man is a life of brotherhood ; but whilst its effect will be to make Christian men feel that certain evils under which the industrial population have long laboured must speedily be removed, I doubt much whether it will make men and women of the so-called upper and middle classes any more disposed than they were before to regard and to treat their artisan fellow citizens and fellow Christians as worthy of equal respect and equal honour with themselves. But nothing less than this will suffice.

Of course one cannot with any comfort have at one's table, or even sitting at one's side in God's house, a man or woman who is unclean in person and offensive in smell ; one cannot associate on equal terms with people with whom one has practically nothing in common, who lack ideas and refinement, whose language is coarse,

whose manners are disagreeable ; but these things are but accidents —the result of the housing, the environment, the poverty, the limited education, the wretched traditions of these people ; they are in no sense a necessary outcome of their employment. In spite of bad housing, bad environment and all the rest there are to be found amongst the poorest members of our industrial population men and women who by innate refinement and by their outward conduct declare themselves to be as true and honourable gentlefolk as the noblest in the land ; and it is our duty so to remove the hindrances and to provide the means of uplifting, that in due time no man shall be able to blame his circumstances, but only himself, if he is found unworthy of the honour to which all should be equally entitled. A man's character and culture, not his employment, should determine his fitness to associate with others.

To emphasise this particular element of the industrial problem is not to be sentimental and unpractical. On the contrary, we may wisely leave it to those who possess large practical experience in industry to readjust wages and conditions of labour, and to the legislature, alarmed by the concerted action of workmen's unions, the task of housing, educational and other reforms ; but our special task as Christian teachers is to go deeper than this and to shape into the Christian mould the motives that result in conduct, the mental and spiritual attitude apart from which there can be no real and permanent uplifting, but only a victory here or there for the class that may be for the moment the stronger.

The present is a moment of golden opportunity. The risks we incur through class alienation are being terribly demonstrated in Russia, where class warfare of the most pitiless and atrocious description is still being waged, the natural result of the class alienation that has so long prevailed ; nor is it matter for surprise that the same root of bitterness in Germany and Austria is bearing the same terrible fruit. On the other hand, the war has proved to us how indispensable for the preservation of the nation and empire is the labourer in the field, the worker in the factory, the private soldier, drawn mainly from the ranks of the manual workers, and, last but not least, the working woman. All honour to the noble and the wealthy and the men of all the learned professions who have come forward to lead our armies, and many of them also to serve in the ranks. But equal honour, too, to the poor, the rough, the ignorant,

who, many of them from the meanest and the most wretched homes, have so well responded to the call of the nation's need, and in the trenches, in the workshops, on the sea have so nobly done their part in preserving the empire from destruction, and have in so many instances displayed such rare qualities of leadership. And the honour which the nation accords them must not be an empty breath of acclamation, but a genuine, heartfelt regard showing itself in a new opening up of opportunity for a full and wholesome life of culture as well as of duty, until the man who works with his hands shall have become as worthy of respect because of his character and attainments, and be as truly and as manifestly respected and socially honoured as the landowner or professional man or merchant.

If one result of the mutual suffering and mutual help occasioned by the recent war has been the drawing together of the allied nations in what we trust will prove to be an imperishable bond of mutual honour and mutual service, it is not too much to expect that the same causes will operate also in binding together in a similar bond the alienated classes within this nation. To promote this end by the consecration of our utmost energies to the task is, if I read rightly the signs of the times, the true Life and Liberty movement for the Church.

Devotion to this object has already drawn together the leaders of the Anglican, Baptist, Congregational, Presbyterian and Wesleyan bodies in the Manchester Diocese, and has led to their issuing a notable manifesto which *The Times* has printed under the significant title "Applied Christianity." A similar zeal for the proclamation and application of Christ's message, if it prevailed throughout the Christian Church in this land, would not only have the effect of paving the way for the great reforms that are needed, but would also re-act in unimagined benefit upon the Churches themselves. In making life worth living they themselves would live; in setting free the oppressed from their burdens, they would find the door thrown wide open for them to all the liberty for self-development they might need. And united concentration upon so glorious a work would save them from internal strife and from the injury which it involves.

The third principle arises naturally out of the two already discussed. It is as follows:—

The conditions of labour in a Christian State should be such

as will afford to those who labour the fullest opportunity for self-development, and for living a full and wholesome life.

Under the term conditions of labour, are included all such matters as wages, hours of work, workshop accommodation and sanitation, facilities for personal cleanliness, the physical health of the industrial population, and the like.

Wages should be adequate for the providing of a reasonable and happy life in which music, art and general culture should have a place. Hours of work must not be so prolonged as to shut off the worker from reasonable recreation and leisure. It must be rendered possible for workpeople to be clean in person and in clothing on their way to and from their work, and in their home. Dirty clothes and a dirty skin are a great hindrance to self-respect and the respect of others ; nor can a home be kept clean if its inmates are habitually dirty because of the work in which they are employed. The provision for the health of the people must no longer remain in its present imperfect and unsatisfactory condition. General Hospitals and Convalescent Homes must not be left for their support to casual gifts, and be forced to sweat their nursing staff in order to make ends meet. The treatment of that national scourge, consumption, must no longer be the partial, vexatious and wholly disappointing affair that it now is. Little children must no longer die from preventable causes as they die in multitudes now.

The question arises, How is all this work of reform to be accomplished ? Where is the wealth to be found from which to pay such wages and ensure such conditions of life ?

Wealth is the product of labour—labour of the mind, labour of the body. If all men who are able to serve their generation by doing some useful thing or by uttering some useful thought will devote themselves to the service that it is in their power to render, whether with or without remuneration, the nation's production and ministration will fully suffice for the nation's need. If, moreover, the vast amount of wealth that is wasted by all classes of society in excessive drinking, excessive smoking, and other forms of self-indulgence is diverted into useful channels, there will be still greater abundance to be devoted to the satisfying of legitimate needs. Investors will perhaps have to be contented with a smaller return, in some instances, in order that wages may be augmented ; and the sharks of society who by various forms of gambling, more or less thinly disguised as

business, plunder their fellows, themselves providing nothing, and rendering no service to the community for the money they get out of it, will have to be got rid of by drastic legislation.

When we ask the further question, By what process is the more equitable distribution of the products of labour to be ensured? two answers are suggested. The one is that the present individualistic basis of Society should be changed to the collectivist basis; the other, that new and more wholesome relations between employer and employed should be promoted. In a guarded statement in paragraph 132 of the Report the Committee say: "To some of us it appears that economic progress and efficiency can be secured only through the ultimate responsibility for decisions upon questions of industrial policy and organisation being, as now, in the hands of individuals who are unfettered by subordination to any superior authority; to others of us that an increasing responsibility for industrial organisation ought to be devolved upon the organised bodies of workers, as they become willing and fit to undertake it, *and that the future of the employer or manager is as one workman among other workmen, who will be, with them, a fellow servant of the community.*" In plain language, this latter ideal is collectivism, viz., that the State should be the only employer and the only owner of capital. The influence of the section of the Committee which advocates this ideal is, I think, apparent also in the summary of conclusions, where it is asserted that "the fundamental evil of modern industrialism is that it encourages competition for private gain instead of co-operation for public service."

To discuss the question of collectivism is outside the scope of this paper; but three things may perhaps profitably be said:

1. A sudden transformation of the economical basis of Society is bound to be fraught with serious risks. You may uproot a sapling and re-plant it to its advantage: but rarely can you do so with a forest tree. The present industrial system on the basis of individualism is the growth of ages.

2. When, for the purpose of some social re-organisation there is formed a combination of persons who have been forced to combine by pressure of circumstances from without, and which is not a natural development from within, the removal of that pressure is practically certain to be followed by a dissolution of the combination: for that very motive of self-advantage which formed the

combination for mutual defence will also cause a conflict to arise between the divergent interests of different groups, and separate individuals, within the confederacy as soon as the common danger has been removed which made those interests, for the time being, one.

3. It is only when the conscience of a nation is impressed with the need for a fundamental change in social relations, and all who are concerned work together for the desired reform, that such reformation is likely to be peaceful, permanent and beneficial.

For these reasons I do not see much promise of hope in the collectivist programme. There is, however, another movement on foot which does seem to have in it a large and hopeful prospect of amelioration. This movement, which is expressing itself in various methods, has for its main object the bringing together of employers and employed, either on a national scale, as in the Coal Commission for dealing with a special crisis, and in the National Alliance of Employers and Employed as a permanent organisation; or in separate industries and works. One distinctive feature which appears among these proposals, a thing strongly advocated in the Report of the Archbishops' Committee, is that representatives of the workmen in a particular industry should have a real share in the management. This is of supreme importance, for it will be a long step forward in the direction of social recognition of the workmen, and the rooting out of class alienation. When men are in the habit of sitting together in conference and getting to appreciate one another's intelligence, fair-mindedness and goodwill, class prejudice is choked out of existence. The workman will be found to be a true gentleman and will be treated accordingly. Here we are striking at the real root of the present evil, viz., the class alienation which engenders suspicion and foment's strife.

We are at the parting of the ways: things can no longer be as they have been. The question for us is, whether the new conditions are to be the outcome of class warfare, or whether they are to be the fruit of the recognition and application even at this the eleventh hour of the message of Christ. An immense responsibility rests upon the captains of industry and the labour leaders to take a wide view of the existing situation, and to devote their best efforts to the working out of practicable schemes of co-operation—a task that can be accomplished only by experts like themselves, but which even

they will not succeed in accomplishing unless they realise that it is not only a matter of wages and hours and conditions of work that is involved, but also the status of the worker. The day of absolute monarchy in the world of politics has passed away: no nation, or league of nations, will ever tolerate another Kaiser. In the world of industry likewise the day of absolutism is drawing to its close. The new régime must be that of constitutional government, the governed having their reasonable share in the task of governing, employed sharing with employers the privilege and the responsibility of directing the industry that shall benefit all.

G. E. FORD.

BOOK NOTICES.

SEED THOUGHTS. A Selection of Illustrations and Quotations from many sources. Arranged by J. Ellis. London: *Robert Scott*. 3s. net.

Mr. Ellis has established for himself quite a reputation as the compiler of aids for teachers and preachers. This, his latest volume, is given up entirely to short paragraphs gathered from many sources. Charles Kingsley, George Eliot, Stopford Brooke, Henry Ward Beecher, John Ruskin, C. H. Spurgeon, Alexander Maclaren, Bishop Westcott, F. W. Faber and a good many other writers, known and unknown, jostle each other in these pages, and those who can use books of this kind will find here an abundance of illustrative material. There is a subject-index which will facilitate reference.

* * * * *

A LITTLE BOOK FOR MOTHERS AND SONS. By Nora B. Thornhill. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 2s. 6d. net.

Short daily readings for seven weeks "for mothers and boys during the holidays." For each day there is a definite subject—bravery, kindness, obedience, self-control, etc., then short passages from Holy Scripture followed by the "talk." There are a great many telling illustrations drawn from a variety of sources, old legends, and stories of the Great War, together with many apt poetical quotations. Altogether we have in a small compass a large amount of helpful, sound, sane teaching.

* * * * *

ISOBEL'S WINNOWER. By A. D. Stewart. London: *Morgan & Scott*. 6s.

This volume gives a picture of a sick-room that radiates happiness and serves men and women with a thoughtfulness that is as helpful as it is unobtrusive. The book is never merely sentimental. It is inspired by a spirit that cannot fail to touch the hearts of its readers and will be prized by those who value healthy literature and a deep knowledge of the weaknesses of humanity and the power of the Saviour to heal them.

* * * * *

THE QUEST OF THE GOLDEN SPURS. By Shaun Mallory. London: *Jarrollds*. 6s. net.

This is a romantic tale that holds the imagination and interests the reader. Quaint in its setting it steadily develops and all ends happily.

* * * * *

JINNY THE CARRIER. By Israel Zangwill. London: *Heinemann*. 7s. net.

The author abandons Jews for open-air Christians who dwelt in Essex at a time when small sectaries attracted the minds of the people. The pictures of men and their doings are described with cleverness, and even when it seems that the long story will become wearisome, the author knows how to rivet attention by an unexpected incident or a clever epigram.