

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 Advertiser.

JULY, 1929.

Yesterday

The starving, naked children
of the Near East,

To-day

have become clothed, trained
and earning their own living.

There remain

many still too young to face the world. Also a
large number of blind, paralysed or otherwise
decrepit orphans.

Please do not turn a deaf ear to their cry.

Special help is also asked for the Aged blind and
otherwise helpless Widows, that their last days may
be peaceful. The only Home in Syria is entirely
supported by our Funds and a large number of
aged, decrepit widows scattered throughout Turkey
are also provided for.

Armenian Massacre Relief

At the office of
Bible Lands Missions' Aid Society.

S. W. GENTLE-CAKETT,
Hon. Relief Commissioner.

HARRY FEAR, Esq., J.P.,
Hon. Treasurer.

**76^P STRAND,
LONDON, W.C.2.**

1828—1928

A WONDERFUL CENTURY OF RELIGIOUS JOURNALISM!

For the past 100 years

The Record

the Weekly Evangelical Church Newspaper with a "record" history behind it, but with always a modern message, has kept readers in touch with passing events.

Principal Contents include

Leading Articles and Notes on Current Events, Diocesan and Parochial News, Correspondence, Literary News and Reviews, Sermons, Speeches and Reports of Meetings, Topics and Men, Round my Garden, the Home Column, Children's Column and—All the Church News of the Week.

SMALL ADVERTISEMENTS.

20 words 1s. 9d. and 1d. per word after.

Many testimonials from delighted clients may be inspected at the office.

EVERY THURSDAY PRICE TWOPENCE

The Publisher of **THE RECORD**, 2 and 3 Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, E.C.4, will gladly send a copy of the current issue free to all applicants mentioning *The Churchman*.

MANUALS FOR COMMUNICANTS.

HELPS TO THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. A Manual for Communicants, with the Communion Service. By Rev. T. W. GILBERT, D.D. Cloth gilt, 1s. 6d.; cloth, 1s. Paper cover, 6d.

"There are always new manuals appearing addressed to Confirmees and Communicants, but it is a long time since we saw one so excellent in every respect. It is loyal to the Church of England and to Scripture; there is clear statement of Evangelical Doctrine and a deep spiritual tone."—*The Life of Faith*.

AT THE LORD'S TABLE. A Manual for Communicants, with the Communion Service. By the BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD. Cloth gilt, 1s. 6d.; cloth, 1s.

"Gifted with a special sympathy with young people and a power of understanding their outlook, Bishop Wilson is ideally qualified to write a manual for young communicants. . . . The correct balance of doctrine is maintained, as well as the true Prayer Book teaching. . . . The manual is one which the clergy will be glad to place in the hands of the newly confirmed, and they can do so with confidence."—*The Churchman*.

MY FIRST COMMUNION. A simple explanation of the Sacrament and the office of the Holy Communion, together with the Communion Service. By Rev. A. R. RUNNELS-MOSS, M.A., with a Preface by Bishop E. A. KNOX. Cloth gilt, 1s. 3d. Cloth, 1s. Third Edition.

"I cannot doubt that this manual will find an extensive circulation, since it is both instructive and inspiring, and I have much pleasure in commending it to the notice of Evangelical clergy for the use of their communicants."—*Bishop Knox*.

THE HOLY COMMUNION. Its Institution, Purpose, Privilege. By Canon A. E. BARNES-LAWRENCE. Cloth gilt, 2s.; cloth limp, 1s.; paper cover, 9d. Third Edition.

"This is a very precious little book . . . one that could be placed in the hands of Confirmation candidates and young communicants, with great advantage to their souls' health. We have pleasure in recommending it most strongly."—*The Record*.

THE CHURCH BOOK ROOM,

DEAN WACE HOUSE, WINE OFFICE COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

Telegraphic Address: "LITURGICAL, FLEET, LONDON."

Telephone No.: CENTRAL 9203.

Telephone: 0602 HOLBORN



DE & RAVENSCROFT

Founded in the Reign of William and Mary, 1689.



By Appointments.

**CLERICAL
TAILORS**

CASSOCKS, SURPLICES, HOODS.

93 & 94 CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.2.

Spanish & Portuguese Church Aid Society,

CHURCH HOUSE, DEAN'S YARD, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1

Chairman of Committee . . . W. H. Patchell, Esq.

THE SPANISH & PORTUGUESE CHURCH AID SOCIETY endeavours to help the work of the native Evangelical Churches, whose members are unable to accept the unlawful terms of Communion imposed by the Church of Rome. Their work is self-denying and progressive. In town and country they have congregations and schools, and conduct Mission Services. Never at any time were the countries so open to their efforts, and they report sympathy where they formerly met open opposition and persecution. Spain and Portugal were for centuries closed to the circulation of the Scriptures. Through the influence of the printed page and faithful Evangelistic efforts the Churches have come into existence, and all who have visited them testify to their zeal and devotion.

CONTRIBUTIONS, which are urgently needed, will be gratefully received by W. J. MacANDREW, Esq., Hon. Finance Secretary; or by the Rev. THOS. J. PULVERTAFT, Editorial and Consulting Sec., Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.1.

The
Church of England Zenana Missionary Society

(FOUNDED 1880)

is endeavouring to raise a

JUBILEE THANKOFFERING FUND

of

£25,000

in gratitude for

FIFTY YEARS OF WORK

in Evangelising the

Women and Children of

India and Ceylon, China and Singapore,

to be allocated as follows:

For needed additional annual income to maintain existing work	£7,000
„ paying off deficit of last two years	10,000
„ purchase of freehold headquarters premises (thus saving large annual rental)	8,000
	<u>£25,000</u>

Will you send a JUBILEE Thankoffering to
 The Financial Secretary, C.E.Z.M.S.,
 27 Chancery Lane, London, W.C.2.

PAMPHLETS ON REUNION.

Intercommunion. By the REV. J. P. S. R. GIBSON, M.A.,
 Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge. 2d. net.

The Ministry of the Church. By the REV. GEORGE F. IRWIN,
 M.A., B.D., Vicar of Wandsworth. 2d. net.

The Confirmation Rubric: Whom does it bind? By the
 REV. H. M. GWATKIN, D.D. Second Edition. 2d.

Steps Towards Reunion. By BISHOPS W. G. PEEL and J. J.
 WILLIS. 1s. net.

Kikuyu Tracts. 1d. each.

“**THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE.**” By BISHOP H. C. G. MOULE.

THE MINISTRY AND UNITY. By the BISHOP OF MANCHESTER.

EPISCOPACY IN SCRIPTURE. By the REV. H. M. GWATKIN,
 D.D.

EPISCOPACY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the REV.
 H. M. GWATKIN, D.D.

WHAT IS THE CHURCH? By ARCHBISHOP D'ARCY.

CO-OPERATION AT THE HOME BASE. By the REV. H. U.
 WEITBRECHT STANTON, D.D.

To be obtained from:

THE CHURCH BOOK ROOM,

DEAN WACE HOUSE, WINE OFFICE COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
NOTES AND COMMENTS	165
"Lambeth and Reunion." Cheltenham Conference Findings. The Practical Aspect. The South India Proposals. "The Roman Question." The Meaning of Canonical Obedience. Editorial Note.	
LAMBETH AND REUNION. Cheltenham Conference Papers :	
INAUGURAL ADDRESS. By the Rev. C. M. Chavasse, M.C., M.A.	169
LAMBETH 1920 AND AFTER. By the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft, M.A.	174
THE FREE CHURCHES AND LAMBETH. By the Rev. W. Y. Fullerton, D.D.	181
THE CHURCH AND ITS MINISTRY. By the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A.	188
CONSTITUTIONAL EPISCOPACY. By the Ven. W. L. Paige Cox, Archdeacon of Chester	195
PRACTICAL STEPS TOWARDS REUNION. By the Rev. G. F. Graham Brown, M.A.	200
PROPOSED SCHEMES FOR REUNION. By the Rt. Rev. The Bishop of Fukien	209
INTER-COMMUNION. By the Rev. J. Paul S. R. Gibson, M.A.	216
AKHNATON. By G. C. Parkhurst Baxter	222
BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS. By G. F. I.	232
REVIEWS OF BOOKS	239
The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge. The Church and the State. Christian Unity: Its History, Challenge. The Word of God and the Word of Man. The Celtic Church in England: After the Synod of Whitby. The Albigensian Heresy, Vol. II: Its Suppression by Crusade and Inquisition. Romanesque France. A History of Christian Missions in China. Education for Tolerance. Where We Stand To-day.	

All articles appearing in THE CHURCHMAN are the copyright of the Proprietors, and must not be reprinted without permission.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF CHAS. J. THYNNE & JARVIS, LTD.

- THE LIGHT OF THE MORNING.** A book for growing-up and grown-up girls. By Miss E. G. R. SWAIN. Second and Cheaper Edition. Cloth, gold lettered, 3/6 net. A delightful book making a splendid appeal. Miss Swain's experience with girls specially equips her for the task she has undertaken of presenting the principles of Christianity in a most attractive and deeply spiritual manner.
- FOXES BOOK OF MARTYRS.** Cobbin's Edition unabridged. With Introduction and Essay by Rev. C. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D. 15 Illustrations and Vignette Title, 1013 pages, 8vo. Cloth, gold lettered, 6/- . Half leather, 8/- net.
- DONE AND DARED IN OLD FRANCE.** A tale of the persecutions following the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By DEBORAH ALCOCK. Fourth Impression. Cloth, gold lettered, 2/6 net.
- WHERE GO THE DEAD ?** Flashlights and Certainties. By Rev. C. W. HALE AMOS, M.A. (Cantab. Hons.), D.D. Crown 8vo, cloth, gold lettering, 3/6 net. A scholarly contribution to the all-important subject of the Hereafter. The Flashlights on personal immortality are used to show the need and reasonableness of a trustworthy Revelation and the certainties of revealed Truth to lead to Him who said: "I am the Resurrection and the Life." Not the least amongst the aims of the author is to show that what is termed "TRADITIONAL ORTHODOXY" is second to none in the support it receives from Holy Scripture, Reason and Experience alike.
- THE SPIRIT AND THE CHURCHES.** "What the Spirit saith unto the Churches" in our day. Report of the 102nd Islington Clerical Conference, January 8, 1929. President: Preby. H. W. HINDE, M.A. Speakers: Revs. E. F. E. WIGRAM, C. H. K. BOUGHTON, T. J. PULVERTAFT, Archdeacon J. H. TEORPE, G. T. MANLEY, J. P. THORNTON-DUESBERY and S. M. WARNER. Crown 8vo. Stiff paper cover, 1/- net. Boards, 1/6 net. Notable utterances on the desire for Re-Union and Fellowship.
- CHRISTIANITY: ITS TRIALS AND TRIUMPHS.** By ERNEST PHILLIPS. A short history of Christianity from the first century to the twentieth. With Foreword by Rev. F. B. MEYER, D.D. Crown 8vo. Clothette boards, 2/6 net. Cloth, gold lettering, 3/6 net. The story of Christianity given in a small compass. A most readable and valuable book of reference.

Catalogues Post Free.

London: CHAS. J. THYNNE & JARVIS, LTD., Whitefriars St., Fleet St., E.C.4

RECUMBENT WORSHIPPERS

Surely one of the most unique congregations, meeting at regular intervals in England for worship, is that which gathers in the chapel of the British Home and Hospital for Incurables at Streatham. Some of the congregation, with the aid of the staff, take their seats in the pews. Others, totally helpless, are wheeled into their places on invalids' couches. They, perforce, are *recumbent* worshippers.

This Institution, which is for **Middle Class People Only**, is maintained by the gifts of the kindhearted.

Will you send much-needed help (say a £1 note) as a thank-offering for the health you enjoy.

British Home & Hospital for Incurables

STREATHAM, LONDON, S.W.16. (Founded 1861)

Patron: H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES.

Patroness: H.R.H. THE DUCHESS OF YORK.

Edgar Penman, Secretary.

Office: 72 Cheapside, London, E.C.2.

THE COLONIAL & CONTINENTAL CHURCH SOCIETY

The outlying regions of the Empire are calling for the blessings of the Gospel

The witness of the settlers is the most effective weapon in the Missionary Campaign. Without it, a great deal of the Church's Missionary Activity is wasted

New areas are being opened month by month. **Help to lay foundations that will abide**

Men and means are urgently needed. Make your offer of service or support to

The Secretary,

9, SERJEANTS' INN, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

THE CHURCHMAN

July, 1929.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

"Lambeth and Reunion."

THE subject considered at this year's Cheltenham Conference —"Lambeth and Reunion"—is one of special importance and urgency. When the Bishops meet next year for the Lambeth Conference the subject of Reunion will come before them in the practical form of the proposals put forward for the union of the Churches in South India. Great issues will then have to be decided, and on the decisions made will depend the future of the Anglican Communion, not only in the Mission field, but throughout the world. We are glad to be able to give our readers the chief papers read at the Cheltenham Conference held last April at St. Peter's Hall, as they contain a clear statement of the whole question as viewed by Evangelical Churchpeople. It is important that the position of Evangelical Churchmen on the problem should be clearly stated, in view of much that is being said against the reunion proposals, and the Cheltenham papers provide the required statement. The Conference had the advantage of a valuable explanation of the Free Church point of view from the Rev. Dr. Fullerton, one of the Secretaries of the Baptist Missionary Society. His frank statements must be carefully weighed in any endeavour to seek closer relationship with the non-Episcopal Churches at home. The paper of the Principal of Ridley Hall on Inter-Communion also deserves special attention as indicating a line of approach to unity which is being increasingly recognized as the method most in accord with the mind of Christ, and as best calculated to lead to the desired consummation.

Cheltenham Conference Findings.

For purposes of reference we give the Findings which were agreed upon at the final Session of the Conference.

I. The Conference recognizes with thankfulness the growing desire among Christian people for closer fellowship and inter-communication, leading to reunion, and believing that this is in accord-

ance with the will of God earnestly prays that efforts to this end may be welcomed by the Lambeth Conference.

2. In all schemes for reunion Holy Scripture should be accepted as the final authority in regard to faith and practice, and the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as the summary of Catholic doctrine.

3. On a review of the present condition of the Christian world the Conference is convinced that approaches towards reunion between reformed and unreformed Churches are impracticable and undesirable, and that efforts should be concentrated on reunion between the Anglican Communion and other Reformed Churches.

4. It is the duty of English Churchmen to aim at developing the character of their Church with a view to including the recognized members of the orthodox non-Episcopal Churches.

5. The duly accredited Ministers of these non-Episcopal Churches should be recognized as exercising a full and valid ministry of the Word and Sacraments.

6. Seeing that the principle of a Constitutional Episcopacy is generally accepted, it is essential that no dogma of Apostolic Succession should be associated with Episcopacy, and that the Constitutional Episcopate should have its decisions endorsed by the clergy and laity before they are promulgated.

7. The Conference heartily welcomes the principles adopted at the Seventh Bangalore Conference for reunion in South India.

8. The most effective means for promoting organic union between the Anglican Communion and the non-Episcopal Churches is by intercommunion expressed in reciprocal fellowship at the Lord's Table. The Conference would urge on the Lambeth Conference the necessity of actively furthering this purpose.

9. The Conference earnestly appeals to all Clergymen in sympathy with these Findings to interest and instruct their congregations in the need and urgency of reunion of the Churches at home and overseas.

The Practical Aspect.

These Findings of the Conference have been criticized as not embracing the full problem as it concerns the whole of Christendom. The answer is obvious. It may be given in some words which the Bishop of Bombay is reported to have used recently : " Unless I am blind and deaf, and incapable of discerning the signs of the times, it is with some Protestant Churches that God is offering us the first partial Reunion. I am content to be guided by the principle of the Open Door." We can afford to ignore the sneers of a section of Churchmen at " Pan-Protestantism." These Churchmen will only secure their desired union with Rome by an absolute submission to the claims of the Pope, and no loyal English Churchman can contemplate reunion with an unreformed Roman Communion. Those who speak of reunion with non-Episcopal Churches as contravening " the principles of Catholic Order " will have to make quite clear what Catholic Order is and how it is contemplated to contravene it. The acceptance of the fact of Episcopacy does not necessarily involve

the acceptance of any theory of Apostolic Succession, and more particularly it does not involve the acceptance of the theory which has grown up with the Tractarian Movement. Free Churchmen have acknowledged their readiness to accept a Constitutional Episcopacy, and no one can require of them the acceptance of any particular theory of Episcopacy, any more than at the present time any special theory is required of those who are recognized as Evangelical Churchmen.

The South India Proposals.

The Bishop of Lichfield dealt with the subject of Reunion recently in his Diocesan Magazine. He pointed out that much depends upon the spirit in which the question of Reunion is approached. There can be, he said, no sort of unity unless we seek for the spirit of brotherly love, which is in perfect harmony with the spirit of loyalty to truth. He went on to point out the different spirit which is abroad. "On the one hand there are those who write about a 'Lambeth plot'—presumably a plot to give away our Catholic heritage. This may be smart journalism, but smart journalism is a poor accompaniment to the prayer in the upper room." He referred to those who on the other side regard all "who are not content with a merely Protestant union" as being "Roman at heart." We have not seen any statement of this kind—possibly because we do not understand what is meant by "a merely Protestant union." We can, however, join with the Bishop in deprecating the controversial spirit introduced into the discussion by those who see danger to what they call their Catholic heritage in the South India Scheme. The Bishop's own view is given in this sympathetic reference to "the very remarkable scheme for reunion in South India"; he says of it: "My own study of it shows me that there are difficult and doubtful points, but I cannot see that there is anything in it which (rightly understood) compromises Catholic Order, or is likely to hinder a wider reunion when the time for it is ripe." We look to the Lambeth Conference to give a warm welcome to a movement full of promise for the future of Christianity.

"The Roman Question."

There has been much rejoicing in Roman Catholic circles over the settlement of "the Roman Question" by Signor Mussolini. The terms of the peace which close the rupture of nearly sixty years standing between the Quirinal and the Vatican have been duly ratified on both sides. But there are already signs that the relationship between Church and State will not be as harmonious as Roman Catholics have anticipated. The Head of the Fascist Party has declared his views on the position of the Roman Church in no uncertain terms, and the Pope has replied in equally vigorous language. He regrets that "the serene joy" with which the agreement between them had been received should be so soon "profoundly and sadly disturbed." He describes his bitter disappointment. He did not "expect heretical and worse than heretical expressions on the very

existence of Christianity and Catholicism." The Duce's remarks that Italian Catholicism has for some time not been fruitful, and that intellectual production in this field is to be looked for elsewhere, caused the Pope special annoyance. The Pope emphasizes his claim that he impersonates and exercises the sovereignty of the Church by Divine Mandate, and refuses to tolerate the idea that liberty of discussion is to be allowed. It is obvious from this breach in the harmony at the outset that the new status of the Vatican will not be free from disagreements with the secular authorities. What wider entanglements in international affairs may arise it is impossible yet to say.

The Meaning of Canonical Obedience

The diocese of London has given a striking example of the spirit which actuates the extreme section of the Anglo-Catholics. The Bishop laid down some very moderate restrictions on the practice of Reservation. A small body of extreme clergy refused to be bound by those restrictions. Their contention was that their duty to the whole Catholic Church, their inherent rights as priests, and the method of appointments to the Episcopate, absolved them from Canonical obedience in this matter to their own Bishop. The Bishop pointed out to them that they accepted the offices which they hold in the Church knowing the conditions under which they were to be held, and that it was too late when they were placed in important positions on such definite understandings to turn round and say that they repudiate the obligation which they solemnly took with their eyes open. He adds: "I feel sure that the conscience of the laity of the Church will not support you in that contention." The question which lay people are asking, is, What interpretation do these clerics put upon the oaths which they have taken? At his Diocesan Conference the Bishop referred again to the matter. It raised, he said, the whole question of Canonical obedience. Nothing could be clearer than the wording of the oath. The laity feel that if a clergyman finds himself in a position where he cannot conscientiously fulfil an obligation into which he has entered, the only course open is to resign, and to retire from the position. That is the honest course pursued in any other calling. It is not too much to expect the Clergy to observe the simple rules of honest action.

Editorial Note.

We are able in this number to give the chief papers read at the recent Cheltenham Conference on "Lambeth and Reunion." They form a useful record of the views expressed at an important gathering. Mr. G. C. Parkhurst Baxter's Study of Akhnaton deals with a unique and interesting movement in the life of ancient Egypt. The Reviews of Books give, we hope, some guidance on a number of the most useful recent publications. We regret that we have not been able to refer to as many as we should like to have brought to the notice of our readers. Some have been held over to our next issue.

THE CHELTENHAM CONFERENCE

HELD AT

ST. PETER'S HOUSE, OXFORD,**APRIL 10, 11, 12, 1929.***Subject:* **LAMBETH AND REUNION****INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY THE REV. C. M. CHAVASSE, M.C., M.A.,
Principal of St. Peter's House.**

MY dear brethren, to welcome you here at St. Peter's is like seeing a dream beginning to come true; and I hope with all my heart that this gathering is an earnest of that Evangelical influence which this place shall exert increasingly throughout the whole Church.

Of course I welcome this Conference as an opportunity of propaganda on behalf of St. Peter's itself, about which I am kindly allowed to say one word. I hope that you who have come will see, and be conquered—and will return to your various spheres of influence resolved to back up one of the greatest ventures to which Evangelicals have ever put their hands. To this end you will find some literature at the back of the Hall, and I feel confident that many of you will be ready to distribute appeals or to give me names to whom they may be sent. There must also be many Churches who for the next few years would give St. Peter's a collection—perhaps on St. Peter's Day—and there may be some of you who would invite me to your Parish or neighbourhood to address meetings on behalf of the Hall.

But a greater reason for satisfaction is the one I have already mentioned. It has always been the intention that St. Peter's should provide, not simply an academy for undergraduates, but a great rallying ground for the Evangelical School. And by your presence to-day in a Hall from which the workmen have hardly been banished, you will know that we are eager to fulfil such obligations expected of us.

And then, more than all, I have always prayed that St. Peter's might prove to be a great practical scheme which should re-unite the scattered forces of the Evangelical party. We are here to discuss Reunion. We need Reunion in our own ranks. And the project of St. Peter's should be a great means thereto.

REUNION.

This brings me to the subject of our Conference, and I rejoice that the matter which first gathered us in this Hall should be that of Reunion. It is certainly a controversial question; yet it presents us with a living, positive, and burning cause we are bound to advance.

We are tired of being thrust on the defensive, and of being forced

to play the dangerous rôle of "Protestant" in a negative sense only.

The great successes of the Anglo-Catholic School have been very largely due to the fact that they have possessed a cause to forward, not only to defend. And it was because the Evangelical School arose with a positive message and doctrine and policy that its advance was so amazing in its first happy and persecuted years.

Please God! we may recapture something of that early fervour by rallying now to this definite objective of Reunion.

How refreshing it is to turn from the barren arena of Prayer Book controversy to this inspiring challenge of Reunion! And do we realize that Reunion with the sister Churches of the Reformation must precede any satisfactory revision of our liturgy or formularies? For only so can the Protestant convictions of the Nation make themselves effective in a National Church; which is otherwise in danger of becoming an Ecclesiastical sect, out of touch with the true sentiment of the country.

With regard to Reunion—two introductory questions arise which, perhaps, a Chairman's address is called upon to outline. They are (1) Is Reunion the Will of God? (2) If so, what is the main road towards Reunion?

(1) IS REUNION THE WILL OF GOD?

There is no doubt that Our Lord intended for the world a Church which should be an Organic Unity.

There are His words in the xth of St. John: "There shall be one Flock, One Shepherd." Again in His great High Priestly Prayer in the xviith of St. John He prays that the Church may be as One as the Holy Trinity itself. And St. Paul, interpreting His mind, constantly refers to the Church as One Body composed of many members. Such language entirely disposes of that weak and sentimental blindness which would ignore practical dis-union because of a supposed invisible unity behind, and which see in a friendly federation of different Churches the goal at which God would have us make. But do we only believe in a "Holy Federation" when we speak of the unity of the Sacred Trinity? And should not we describe a human body of federated members as suffering from the paralysis of locomotorataxia? The Unity of the Church must be of the same nature as that of the Godhead or of the human body. And if this is the Will of God—then Reunion must be our aim, if we would not be guilty of the sin of schism.

What then is the Unity which is here depicted for us? It is not uniformity, but rather the Oneness of harmony from variety.

I am increasingly struck by the few principles which govern the whole range of life, and I would almost say that the "Almightiness" of God lies in His supreme "Simplicity."

Thus we are told that the Universe at large or the atom in detail are the same in structure; that the Universe with its revolving constellations is only an atom magnified to infinity; and that each atom with its whirling electrons is a microscopic Universe. But

more than this (as our Lord's Parables would show) not only does the same law run through all nature, but nature itself is sacramental; the outward sign of identical laws which govern the spiritual life.

And if this be true, then nothing is more certain than that what I might call the "Family Principle" is the Divinely appointed Unity both for heaven and earth. In nature, as we have seen, the unit is not the solitary atom, but the atom which is a "family" of electrons revolving round one centre; a principle which is carried throughout the whole Universe. Or again the unit of the body is not any one member, but a variety of organs all making up one whole. But the unity of the Body is a parable of the structure of Society. Therefore in Society the unity is not the man or woman or child, considered separately, but the union of all three in one family—which we might term the social atom. And then, even as human Fatherhood (according to Our Lord) is God's divinely appointed picture of Himself, so the Family is the symbol of the Unity of the Godhead—Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Three Persons and One God—from Whom every family in heaven and earth derives its origin.

The family principle then is the very nature of the Godhead. It is His divinely appointed structure for every form of life; and I believe that it is what Our Lord meant when He came preaching the Kingdom of Heaven; namely that in proportion as the family principle obtains in industry, in Society, and in our International relationships—so does this world become conformed to the Kingdom of God. Therefore was the Church appointed by Christ to be at once the example to the world of this family principle, and the means of attaining thereto; only we have frustrated God's plan by reason of our unhappy Divisions.

(2) THE MAIN ROAD TOWARDS REUNION.

So in the second place we are constrained to ask along what line must we work for Reunion and so seek to fulfil the will of God?

Now the family principle, as we have seen, is a unity that is composed of variety, and indeed consequent upon variety. Just as the different members of a family bring each one their unique contribution, and so make up one whole—so unity in the Church can only be obtained by safeguarding those varied truths for which the divided Churches stand.

Our divisions in the past have been occasioned by authority seeking to impose one outlook upon all, and of seeking to effect a universal uniformity of order and belief for all temperaments, ages and races. If therefore Reunion is to come, it can only be secured by each communion being very jealous to conserve the truths emphasized by the rest. The denominations of Christendom owe their existence to the determination of safeguarding some particular truth which at the time of their schism was in danger of being lost. If therefore the Church is to be one, it must possess the various contributions thus preserved; and so, for example, the rule of

Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and Congregationalism must all find their place in any scheme of Reunion ; thus giving to Bishops, to Clergy and to the Laity, their rightful share in the government of the One Church.

This family principle of respect for variety is now generally recognized (if not wholly acted upon) owing to the rise of democracy, and the establishment of the rights of national consciousness which the Great War sealed in blood. Caesarism and Papalism have gone as a means to world-wide unity, with their policy of the dragooning of all by superimposed power. Instead, the movement is upwards from below. Individual character and temperament and tradition must first assert themselves, or they have nothing to contribute to the whole. And then they must voluntarily lose themselves by merging themselves in the larger whole, or they withhold their offering. Our Lord, I believe, laid down this principle in the xth of St. John when He declared that He had power over His own life, and that possessing this power He laid down His life of Himself. Both in civics and in religion we have for long centuries been contending for this, the right of individual character, and to this end have perforce smashed gorgeous dreams of World Empire and a Catholic Church. The time has now come when from the rich contributions of nations and Churches we must build up one family, and the Church must show the way to a world that is already united economically and geographically. From this principle of safeguarding variety, and from the history of the schisms of the past, we may, I believe, trace out a practical road for Reunion. The path is to retrace our steps, and one by one to join up the schisms in the reverse order in which they arose historically ; that is, the schisms last made will be the first healed. In this way the smallest ruptures, and thus the easiest reknit, will be the first objective of reunion. The practical result will be the creation of great National Churches, which thus become the expressions of national character, and are therefore in a strong and proper position to negotiate one with another. Nothing is more enthralling at the present moment than to watch the erection of such National Churches in India and China, and it would be a flagrant denial of the purposes of God, to ignore national temperament as the building medium of that rich and wide City of God into which all the glory of the nations flow.

At the present time Reunion has already begun most auspiciously, not only in India and China, but in our own land with Presbyterian Reunion in Scotland, and the union of the Wesleyan and Methodist Communions.

It will thus become the first duty of the Church of England to retrace her steps 200 years and to join up with this Wesleyan-Methodist Church ; for there is nothing in the world which divides us from them save the wicked fact of our separate existence. Such a step would undoubtedly pave the way for the formation of a great Anglo-Saxon Church, which would discover deep and strong affinities with Churches on the Continent, and would also link up with Missionary Churches all over the world.

Then, and not till then, we should be in a position to approach the Orthodox and Roman Communions. The Greek Church would undoubtedly, in such an event, be willing to give us their venerable traditions in return for our spiritual life. But all overtures at present to the Greek Church are really a red herring to divert attention from Reunion at home, and reminds me of that cheap and snobbish socialism one sometimes meets which prates impractically about the masses while behaving offensively to members of its own household. But what about the Roman Catholic Church? One thing only is clear, namely, that Rome must come to terms, not with the individual Churches of the Reformation, but with the Reformation itself. Rome, no doubt, cherishes the hope of swallowing the Reformation Churches one by one, but on the family principle she must alter her whole conception of what constitutes the Church, and this she will only do if confronted with a Protestant Church greater than herself. It may be objected that such a policy of an Anglo-Saxon Church would mean schism in our own Church. It may be so, and the possibility must be faced. But better far to lose some devout and honoured members of the Church of England whose affinities are really Roman, than to miss the opportunity of joining hands with the multitudes of our non-conforming brethren, whose characteristics are essentially Protestant and English.

This is really the issue at Lambeth next year. Meanwhile, the Holy Spirit is driving us on, and by Missionary claims abroad and by spontaneous acts of fellowship and inter-communion at home, a passion for Reunion is being engendered, to deny which would be to resist the Holy Ghost.

Lambeth in 1930 will have to make decisions comparable in their gravity and their nature to those of the First Council of Jerusalem, when the middle wall of partition was broken down between Jew and Gentile. May God guide and empower His Church once more to do the right without fear of consequence!

The Purpose of God in the Life of the World (Student Christian Movement, 2s. 6d. net) contains some of the addresses delivered at a Conference on International and Missionary Questions held in Liverpool in January of the present year. The volume has special value as a survey of the World's need and the present condition of religious life. The writers are all men of wide experience whose words have special weight. They include the Rev. E. Shillito, the Rev. R. T. Hall, the Rev. F. R. Barry, Canon Raven, Dr. Kor, the Archbishop of York, the Master of Balliol, Mr. J. H. Oldham and the Bishop of Liverpool. These addresses should serve their purpose of leading to a fuller understanding of God's purpose for mankind and to a large increase of zeal and devotion to the carrying out of all that is devout. Over 2,000 students were present at the Conference representing many parts of the world. The inspiration and possibilities of such a gathering of younger people open a vision of Christian advance which we hope will be realized.

CHELTENHAM CONFERENCE PAPERS.

LAMBETH 1920 AND AFTER.

BY THE REV. THOS. J. PULVERTAFT, M.A.,
Vicar of St. Paul's-at-Kilburn.

LAMBETH 1920 can only be understood by what went before the Conference. The Conference did not meet to face conditions that had not been determined by the past. Reunion was not a subject suddenly flung into the arena of controversy. The situation was created by events that had deeply moved the civil and the ecclesiastical world. The War brought with it a keen realization of the brotherhood of man. The fellowship of the trenches made those who took part in it realize that there is much more in human brotherhood than they had previously recognized. Men are brethren, irrespective of social and educational conditions, in a manner that shows there is nothing truly great in man, but what is common to the race. And this yearning for a permanent manifestation of brotherhood found expression in many post-war organizations that had taken shape in the months between November, 1918, and July, 1920. Apart altogether from any ecclesiastical yearning there was a conviction that it was necessary for the well-being of humanity, to make all those within the range of our individual influence show more brotherliness, one to another, and thereby keep alive the comradeship that had left so deep a mark on the demobilized soldiers.

Kikuyu had brought Reunion into the field of practical politics, or if it is preferred, had driven reunion from the academic discussion by experts into the open forum of the Christian world. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Davidson) in his pamphlet "Kikuyu," after reviewing all the circumstances, gave as his verdict on the proceedings that culminated in the United Communion Service "Not Guilty, but don't do it again." The great protagonist of Catholicism as he saw it, Frank Weston, was looked forward to as the *enfant terrible* of the Conference. He had become the *malleus hereticorum* and had called into being the weapon of excommunication against those who differed from him. All admired his enthusiasm, his devotion and his passion for the salvation of his Africans. But united with this was a rigid Catholicity that proclaimed as plainly as it could be proclaimed, "No Bishop: No Church." Would he break up the Conference and carry with him a large section of the Bishops? This was the question on the lips of scores of the Diocesans who assembled. To their surprise he showed himself a thorough-going advocate of Reunion on his own terms, and even a more determined opponent of Modernism than he was a hostile critic of Kikuyu in its ecclesiastical aspect. He had written, "At Kikuyu, Modernist views were a far greater hindrance to Reunion

than mine." The Conference saw in him more the apostle of Orthodoxy than the enemy of Reunion.

To its surprise the Conference heard from him on the second day of its meeting a speech which determined the character of the Lambeth Appeal. "Each diocese should be a family, a real unit, and all dioceses should constitute a real unity. The unity we desire to see is one of organic life centred in an authority expressed in a College of Bishops, linked with the past and pointing to the future. Such a unity would be very different from the uniformity which England had tried and failed to maintain for four centuries, and very different from the federation of jealous and competing sects who favoured Kikuyu." Rome had set the example by her Uniate Churches, and no other solution was possible. The outlook of the Bishop was approved by the Conference, and the Appeal may be truly said to represent the ideals that inspired the attitude of the Bishop of Zanzibar at Kikuyu. This may seem a strange saying, but it is broadly true, when we see the interpretation given to the Appeal in the Episcopal pamphlet, "Lambeth and Reunion," written by Bishops Linton Smith, Woods and Weston. The chapter on "The Bishop" contains the following sentences: "Groups we must have, because we are human and human nature is what it is. But organic unity we must also have, because we are God's children and God is One. This unity can only be secured by the restoration of the bishop's office everywhere, and by the reformation of all of us who are bishops." "In conclusion, we desire to put on record that the Conference is not content that men should be consecrated bishops without a whole-hearted acceptance of the underlying meaning of episcopacy." And there is no doubt what this implies, for it has been plainly stated in this composite pamphlet. "This office has been kept filled down the ages, in an unbroken succession. The Church's rule has always been that no one can hold the office who has not been appointed to it by the laying-on of the hands of some already holding it. . . . A further claim made in the Appeal for the bishop is, that he is the appointed person to administer that apostolic rite of the laying-on of hands, to which is attached a pledge of grace, as also to preside over or make arrangements for the Eucharistic worship in the one family of God." Here we see the restrictive meaning given to the ominous words, "The commission of Christ," on which so much has depended.

When the Appeal appeared, great was the enthusiasm of those who saw in it a splendid vision of the Great Church coming into being. Bishops expounded it as the ground on which Home Reunion could be brought about, and the Resolutions that seemed to many to stereotype existing conditions with their limitations on Intercommunion were explained as domestic instructions for the Anglican faithful. They were variously interpreted even on such a subject as the exchange of pulpits, and in consequence of the invitation a year later, given by the Bishop of Manchester to Nonconformist ministers to preach in the Cathedral, Dr. Weston withdrew from all connection with Lambeth because, in his opinion,

York and Canterbury were ignoring the restrictions and provisos which governed the scheme. Was it any wonder that here at home Lambeth was understood as the individual predilections of the interpreters desired?

Dr. Fullerton will deal with Lambeth 1920, and Home Reunion, and therefore I shall say no more on this aspect of Lambeth, being content to point out that a fundamental ambiguity lay at the root of the Appeal and Resolutions, which in the end paralysed every effort to bring about a Concordat between the National and the Free Churches.

A Greek delegation was present at Lambeth. Its presence there gave the Bishops the opportunity of discussing with eminent personages the attitude of the Greek Church. The utmost friendliness prevailed, but the Greeks never communicated with the English Bishops. There was brotherhood without participation of the Lord's Supper, and fraternization with the Orthodox thus begun paved the way for closer relations afterwards. The Appeal was sent to the Heads of the Orthodox Church and the delegation to Lambeth drew up a Report which was presented to the Holy Synod. The Report spoke in glowing terms of the desire for Unity, and emphasized the sacred duty that lay upon the Orthodox to continue doing all that could be done to make easy the way for such a God-pleasing work of union. A Committee of the English Church Union prepared a declaration of Faith, which was signed by Bishop Gore and 3,714 priests. This declaration maintained the unity of the Faith held by the Anglican and the Eastern Churches, which holds the Seven Rites commonly called Sacraments to be Sacraments; Apostolic Succession which confers on priests the power to offer the unbloody sacrifice of the Eucharist for the living and the dead and to absolve sacramentally sinners who repent and confess their sins. "We affirm that, by consecration in the Eucharist, the bread and wine, being blessed by the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit, are changed and become the true body and the true blood of Christ, and as such are given to and received by the faithful. We hold, therefore, that Christ thus present is to be adored." "We agree with the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church that honour should be given to the holy and ever Virgin Mother of God and the Saints departed; that there is a legitimate use of sacred images; and that alike in our public and in our private prayers, we should ask for the benefit of the intercession of the Saints." "As for the XXXIX Articles, they are of secondary importance, and have to be interpreted in accordance with the faith of that Universal Church of which the English Church is but a part."

The Bishop of Durham, in a fiery article in the *Edinburgh Review* of April, 1923, wrote, "That Declaration is not only destitute of any authority, but it conflicts sharply with the official doctrinal standards of the Church of England. . . . The Synod of Constantinople was deliberately misled by the Anglo-Catholic statement of doctrine. The whole spirit and drift of that statement are quite

out of harmony with the English formularies." At any rate, the Eastern Churches who have pronounced on the question of Anglican Orders declare that as before the Orthodox Church "the ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal Confession of bishops, priests, and deacons possess the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them from the Orthodox point of view for the recognition of the 'Charisma' of the priesthood derived from Apostolic Succession."

The Greek Churches were represented at the Lausanne Conference on "Faith and Order." As the discussions proceeded there was a growing approximation of attitude between the majority of the Anglican representatives and those from the Orthodox Churches. Dr. Gore was the protagonist of this approximation. It is unnecessary to add that at Lausanne there was no united Communion, and it was plain to all that a union between the Greek and the Non-Episcopal Churches is impossible as long as the Greeks maintain their rigid attitude. But the attitude of the Greeks to the Church of England is of more immediate importance, and the address by the Metropolitan of Thyateira at the Cheltenham Church Congress leaves us in no doubt as to the present position of the Orthodox Church. Referring to the Lausanne Conference, he said that the Anglican view, as long as it kept on Catholic lines, found its chief supporters at Lausanne in the Orthodox delegation. The Orthodox refused all compromise, as did the Patriarchal delegation in London, because the proposed terms of agreement were so wide as not to be consistent with principles which the Orthodox Church considers to be fundamental. In making clear the attitude of the Orthodox to the Anglican Church, the Archbishop said: "Why should we not think that a time is coming when the Catholic nucleus which always existed in the Anglican Church should not prevail over the whole body, so that it would appear in that form which would make reunion with our Orthodox Church possible. Meanwhile the duty of the Orthodox is not to break the definite bond which binds us to the Anglican Communion, but to help in such an evolution, through friendly intercourse and in a spirit of peaceful discussion." Probably it is in furtherance of this spirit that the Archbishop of Canterbury this month is paying official visits to Eastern Patriarchs.

It is all bewildering. How many Churchmen have any idea what the Orthodox Church stands for? I have quoted the English Church Union declaration, and anyone who reads it will wonder how far it is in agreement with the well-known Lambeth Quadrilateral which forms the basis of the Lambeth Appeal. No one who knows the history and tradition as well as the Formularies of the Church of England can find a place for many of the assertions of the Declaration within the four corners of the Formularies. The Declaration asserts that the very things in Mediæval Catholicity, that were swept out of the Church at the Reformation, are part of its belief, and if that be so, it is no wonder that Easterns should view with pleasure the "Catholic nucleus prevailing in the Anglican

Church." It can only do so by changing the whole character of our Church, and it is indeed one of the strangest of phenomena to find a Church approaching the Free Churches on one side with a statement that is an entirely different standard of doctrine to that presented to the Orthodox Churches. We have heard much of a Bridge Church—with one end of the Bridge resting on the land of error and the other on the land of truth. No wonder, with the conflict of ideals and teaching before him, Professor Heiler, who is generally supposed to have been the inventor of the term, has repudiated its application to the Church of England. He says that at Lausanne it was clearly revealed as being quite impossible as a Bridge Church, "its importance lies in the fact that it is the guardian of a fine type of ritualism and piety, and not in its organization." And now we find that the Church of Sweden, which glories in its Protestantism and calls Morning Prayer High Mass, is claiming to be the Bridge Church, for it is in communion with the Church of England on the one hand, and with the Lutheran Non-Episcopal Church on the other. No wonder Bishop Weston opposed the Lambeth Resolutions on the Swedish Church.

And passing by the Old Catholic Church which, although a most interesting Church, is not of major importance in the spiritual life of Holland or of Germany and Switzerland, we come to the great Roman Church—union with which is the ideal of so many who wish for Catholic Reunion. In "Lambeth and Reunion" the writers express their willingness for the sake of "Union all round" to accept Roman Consecration. We are not now concerned with the extraordinary parallel they give for this submission—the humiliation of our Lord. Only men blind to the plain meaning of the Humiliation of the Saviour can have put forward this argument, if they know anything of the Roman teaching and understand their own repudiation of that teaching as Bishops of the Anglican Communion. Advocates for a certain course of action, when they are enthusiasts, generally run blindfolded or in blinkers to the goal they have set before themselves. The Lambeth Appeal was sent to the Archbishop of Westminster and the Cardinal Secretary of State in Rome. No reply from Cardinal Bourne has been published, and the Secretary of State replied that he had the honour of presenting it to the Pope. The English Roman Hierarchy showed no undue zeal to respond to the Appeal, and Lord Halifax, with his impetuous zeal, undamped by his Canterbury experience with Archbishop Benson, saw in Cardinal Mercier one who might be prevailed upon to discuss the subject with him and a number of other Churchmen more or less in sympathy with his views. He obtained an introduction from Archbishop Davidson, and in a semi-official manner conversations between representatives of Rome and Canterbury were entered upon. I have no interest in discussing the exact amount of responsibility attaching to the conversations as official. They ended, as we all know, after the death of the patriot Cardinal, and the report published led to a repudiation of the action of the representatives of the Church of

England by a very large number of English Churchmen. The Conversations have passed into history. The Roman Catholic Church permitted observers to attend the Faith and Order Conference in Lausanne. Evidently the Roman Hierarchy in England did not view with any great pleasure the change of venue of Reunion Conversations from England to Belgium. Loyalty to the Pope kept them silent, but it was natural that they should believe themselves better fitted to form right opinions on the Church of England than even the most eminent of Foreign Cardinals. The Report of the Conversations was published after considerable delay, and it undoubtedly had considerable influence on English public opinion. Some of the friends of Archbishop Davidson say that he allowed the conversations to proceed, as he knew that they would end in failure and thereby would prevent any repetition of the attempt. This is unfair to the Archbishop, who acted as he acted owing to the pressure of Anglo-Catholic opinion which he did not wish to alienate, and his Grace may have had memories of Bishop Weston's repudiation of National Churches and his dream of a Catholic Church to which all nations may belong—a right vision if based on right thought. The Reply to the Malines Conference came quickly from the Pope. In his Encyclical *Mortalium animos* issued in January, 1928, Pius XI writes: "All who are truly Christ's believe, for example, the Conception of the Mother of God without stain of original sin with the same faith as they believe the mystery of the August Trinity, and the Incarnation of our Lord just as they do the infallible teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, according to the sense in which it was defined by the Œcumenical Council of the Vatican." "It is clear why this Apostolic See has never allowed its subjects to take part in the assemblies of non-Catholics; for the union of Christians can only be promoted by promoting the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it, for in the past they have unhappily left it." "In this one Church of Christ no man can be or remain who does not accept, recognize and obey the authority and supremacy of Peter and his legitimate successors. . . . Let them return to their common Father, who, forgetting the insults previously heaped on the Apostolic See, will receive them in the most loving fashion." "Submit and unite" is the motto of the Roman Church, which may change but cannot reform itself. An infallible Church can only reform by committing suicide, and all who believe that union with Rome can be obtained at any price short of absolute submission to its dogmas and discipline, live in a fool's paradise and follow a will o' the wisp. It is vain for the Orthodox Archbishop of Thyateira to declare: "We do not believe that the Vatican, on seeing that the union of other Churches is drawing near, will be able to persist in this irreconcilability and repeat the *non possumus* to the invitations of the other Churches. The hour will come, and the Pope will then be contented with the honours and privileges which all of us are quite ready to render him." The Church of England cannot unite with the Orthodox

Churches until "the Catholic nucleus" possesses the whole Church, and this, please God, it will never do, as the Church of England has no intention of abandoning its primitive Catholicity for Mediæval Catholicity. The Roman Church persists, and will persist, in its attitude as long as it clings to the traditions and autocracy. God can work wonders, and if Rome repents of its errors and faces towards the light, no one will rejoice more than the Protestants of the Church of England. Humanly speaking, we see no sign of this. The more the events that have occurred since Lambeth in connection with the Union of our Church with the unreformed Churches are studied, the more we are convinced that such Union can only take place by excluding once and for all any hope of our union with Reformed Christendom.

The situation is clear. Rome will not consider Union except at the cost of absolute submission. The Orthodox East only thinks of Union when the so-called Catholic nucleus has gained possession of the whole Church, and the better the East is known the less desirable is union with it in its unreformed state. It is a Church without missions, a Church without progress, and a Church that has indeed suffered persecution and at the same time has been persecuting, even in our own age. The Lambeth Appeal has awakened sympathy among those who craved in their distressful condition our sympathy. The biographer of Bishop Weston tells us that the scheme was his. "It was indeed a good scheme, but those who assented to it had not thought out all its implications, and those to whom it was sent had not seen the vision." We believe that we see the Vision of a Reunited Christendom with the Great Shepherd of the Sheep as its Chief Pastor; we see Him worshipped by those who share a common experience of redemption through His Death; we see them knit together in the Sacrament of Unity and His flock ministered to by those called by Him to His service holding the truth in love and the unity of One Spirit. Unity does not depend on organization, and when men recognize that they share the one Lord, the one Faith and the one Baptism, looking unto Him as their Head, founded on Him as their solid base, they will put everything in its proper place and manifest to the world that they are one Body in Christ.

THE FREE CHURCHES AND LAMBETH.

BY THE REV. W. Y. FULLERTON, D.D.,

Consultant Secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society.

MY presence here is itself a symbol of the happier relations that have been established by the Lambeth overture to all Christian churches. I am to speak of the attitude of the Free Churches, but it is a spontaneous action on your part to invite me ; I have no authority. I am not delegated to the service, and anything I say, while it may represent the attitude of many Nonconformists, is to be received merely as my personal opinion. All I have to say may fitly be grouped around three words—Retrospect, Circumspect, and Prospect. And I myself must be circumspect all the time.

I. RETROSPECT.

The "Appeal to all Christian People," issued by the Bishops in August, 1920, went straight to our hearts. Like them, "we acknowledge all who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership of the Universal Church of Christ which is His Body." Most of us would go even beyond that and acknowledge believers who, for some sufficient reason, have not been baptized with water, as also belonging to the Universal Church.

We also join the Bishops when they affirm that "God wills fellowship," and that such fellowship shall embrace all "who profess and call themselves Christians," "within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common and made serviceable to the whole body of Christ."

And, further, that "the spiritual leadership of the Catholic Church in days to come, for which the world is patiently waiting, depends upon the readiness with which each group is prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of a common fellowship, a common ministry, and a common service to the world." And we all stand ready "to make the effort to meet the demands of a new age with a new outlook."

We are also prepared to endorse the statement that the causes of division "lie deep in the past, and are by no means simple or wholly blameworthy." We would, indeed, go further and say that on our part they were often not only not blameworthy, but were absolutely praiseworthy: yet in spite of that we are prepared to express penitence so far as our spirit has been alien to the mind of God. Indeed, when the then Archbishop of York visited the Baptist Union and expressed penitence on his side, in reply I was bold to declare that we were not to be outdone, and publicly expressed penitence for anything in our witness that had been, or is, unworthy of the Holy Gospel we profess. And I do so, unofficially, again.

Officially, on September 28, 1920, the Free Churches acknowledged the overture of the Bishops, reciprocated the brotherly and eirenical spirit which characterized it, and "eagerly welcomed everything in the proposals which would further religious intercourse among the Churches."

On May 22, 1921, a reasoned reply was given again "expressing our desire for fellowship," and we must add that we desire, with sincere longing, as the supreme expression of Christian fellowship, the meeting together in the Holy Communion of that Table, which, we must ever remind ourselves, does not belong to any of our Churches, but is His, where He alone presides and to which He alone invites.

The answer emphasized that the essentials of the Church are in the Gospel, not in organization. "The former is that by which the Church *is*: the latter is something which the Church *has*, and, of course, the more perfectly she has it the better."

At its annual assembly in September, 1921, the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, at the suggestion of the Bishops, appointed some representatives to confer with the two Archbishops and with other members of the Church of England whom they may appoint. In May, 1922, the report of that Conference was presented, and in September, 1922, the answer of the Federal Council was given, and certain questions were asked which necessitated further negotiation.

In July, 1923, a joint conference was held, and the Church of England representatives presented a memorandum in which it was admitted that Free Church ministries are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church, but that no one could be authorized to exercise his ministry in the Church of England who had not been episcopally ordained.

The Federal Council of the Free Churches on September 18, 1923, regretted that the recognition of Free Church ministries was not followed by any appropriate action, that the plan the memorandum proposed for full ministry in the Anglican Church is precisely that plan which would be followed, and which is followed, in the case of persons possessing no kind of ministry, namely, episcopal ordination.

The Joint Conference on July 11, 1924, issued a further memorandum on the subject of a Constitutional Episcopate: and on September 16, 1924, the Federal Council suggested that it was not in the interests of the unity movement that the conferences should be indefinitely prolonged: adding the remark that the discussions will always lack something of reality when unaccompanied by acts of more definite unity in Christian worship.

On June 19, 1925, both sides expressed the hope that if the Conferences were suspended they should not be regarded as concluded: and there the matter rests. Whether they will ever be resumed depends almost entirely on the overture that may be made from the Anglican side.

It should be remembered that the decisions of the Federal Council of Free Churches must be passed back to the various churches it

represents. Each denomination is called upon to make its own rejoinder. It may suffice to instance the reply given by the Assembly of the Baptist Union on May 4, 1926. After acknowledgment of the courtesy and lofty purpose of the Lambeth Appeal, the reply sets out the faith of the Baptist Church, and then comes a significant paragraph.

"In general, the place given to Sacraments by the Lambeth Appeal would, it appears, exclude from the Universal Church of our Lord bodies of devoted Christians with whom we enjoy fellowship, and to this exclusion we cannot consent."

And in conclusion it asserts: "It will be gathered from this reply that union of such a kind as the Bishops have contemplated is not possible for us. We would say this not only with the frankness which we believe is the highest courtesy among Christian brethren, but with the assurance of our regret that the way in which they would have us go with them is not open."

But another more hopeful paragraph is added. "We believe that the time has come when the Churches of Christ should unite their forces to meet the need of the world. We therefore are prepared to join the Church of England in exploring the possibility of a federation of equal and autonomous Churches in which the several parts of the Church of Christ would co-operate in bringing before men the will and claims of our Lord."

That ends the Retrospect so far as it is possible for us to-day.

II. CIRCUMSPECT.

Three years have passed, but events have moved, and in the words of Lord Grey, it is necessary for us not only to have opinions, but to have all along "the mind of the event."

Our Retrospect ended with some suggestion of a federation of the Churches, but in the last meeting of the Committee of Faith and Order at Geneva one delegate expressed himself as delighted that the word federation was not so much as mentioned. Well, let us see how far the idea of Union has progressed since the Lambeth proposals were made.

In Canada a great movement has brought Presbyterians, Methodists and Congregationalists together, but a considerable number of Presbyterians still hold aloof, and the title chosen by the bodies uniting—"The United Church of Canada"—has given some umbrage to the Anglican Churches in Canada, who think that the title "The Church of Canada," united or otherwise, should have been reserved for them, just as in Ireland, on disestablishment, the Episcopalians adopted the title "The Church of Ireland," ignoring the fact that they were outnumbered by the Presbyterians.

In Scotland a great plan of Union between the Church of Scotland, which of course is Presbyterian, and the United Free Church of Scotland will probably be consummated next month. But here again there will be a dissentient minority, who will stand out because of their objection to any form of State control. Their spokesman says: "We refuse to partake in a favoured position which is not

shared by all Churches alike." "We cannot," they say, "we cannot regard the glossing over of incompatible contradictories as the way in which to build or unite character. It is not good grafting. It is a futile thing to bind Churches together with only a twist of thread or a dash of mortar. That can do nothing but tend to diminish hope of a living and a fruitful stem."

In Great Britain the union of all the Methodist Churches is in sight, and it seems likely to be complete. All Christian people will rejoice when these Societies, which had a common origin, merge their forces in one great witness for Christ, and will congratulate those responsible, in its various divisions, for their patience and unwavering purpose to accomplish their aim.

In England there have been some suggestions of Union between Congregationalists and Presbyterians, but no official action on either side. Suggestions, too, have been made for Union between Baptists and Congregationalists, again with no official sanction, and with much less probability of action.

It is, perhaps, on the Mission field that the problem of Unity is likely, if ever, to be solved. The South India United Church will lead the way: all ministries being accepted as valid at the moment, and future ministers to be Episcopally ordained. It will be an interesting experiment, though North India is scarcely likely to be so complaisant, and the Anglo-Catholic party in the Church of England profess to be outraged by the thought that even for an interim period, a non-episcopal minister can be recognized to the priestly office. The *Church Times* goes so far as to say that it means "that there is no essential difference between the episcopally ordained priest and the commissioned minister." In this Free Churchmen will agree. An interesting situation will also arise when the South Indian Church finds itself in communion with the Episcopal Church in England and with the Non-Episcopal Churches in America.

In China there is also a United Church in embryo, though at the moment it seems to be more concerned with organization and property than with spiritual essentials. But it is not improbable that light on the intricate problem will come to us from the Far East.

III. PROSPECT.

What, then, of the future? It cannot be overlooked that the recent discussion and decision as to the Prayer Book has vitally altered the position as compared with that of 1920, and rendered it much more difficult. Free Churchmen took their part in the proposals for change, as they felt it to be a matter of national as well as of ecclesiastical importance, and their attitude to Union has distinctly hardened since the Sacerdotal aim within the Church of England has become so evident and pronounced.

It may, I hope, be said without even the appearance of rudeness, in a Conference of this nature, or indeed anywhere else, that the Free Churches are not prepared to recognize what most of them regard as the figment of Apostolic Succession. As far as Scripture is con-

cerned, Dean Alford appears to be quite justified in saying that the 33rd verse of the last chapter of Luke's Gospel makes an end of it. The two from Emmaus found in Jerusalem the eleven gathered together "and them that were with them," and it was to all of these that the Commission, and the Spirit to fulfil it, were given. These were not, therefore, exclusive Apostolic gifts, and even if they had been, it is impossible to trace an unbroken chain of succession. Most Free Churchmen do not believe that the Apostles had any successors, nor do they believe that either Nature or Grace is a closed order. We stand for the Freedom of God in both realms: He is not confined within what our observation has learnt of the Laws of Nature, nor within any Sacerdotal realm of Grace. The Free Churches insist that God is free: they believe, of course, that He is the author of order and not of confusion, but the ministries by which He works are the outcome of the living present and not of the dead past.

The question is vital when it affects the effective ministry of the Church and excludes those who are presumed not to be in the succession.

I may here interject that Karl Barth, who has "captured the attention of the Churches of Europe, both in the Protestant and, to an important degree, in the Catholic areas," as his translator assures us, says, in speaking of the Churches, that the people are "often put off, to be sure: for the time being: even when they do not find what they are seeking, they are touched, delighted and gratified by the forms of their worship." "Catholicism, for instance, illustrates on a grand scale how, if need be, people can be put off, lulled to sleep, and made to forget their real want of being entertained in a manner both felicitous, and, for the time being, final. But let us not deceive ourselves: *we* are not Catholic nor are our congregations. With us, in spite of all appearances of retrogression, the situation has advanced to a point where the dispensing of even the best chosen narcotics can only partly, or only for a little time, succeed."

When we are asked to accept the Historic Episcopate as a condition precedent to Union we want to know exactly what it means. We have been told that in the United Church there must be an Episcopal element, and to this we make no objection. In some of our Churches already we have Superintendents of districts, but an adverb was deliberately inserted in the Lambeth discussions that "similarly" there must be the presbyteral and congregational elements. *Similarly*. One element is not to override either of the others. It must be possible to say that in a United Church there shall be the Presbyteral and Congregational elements "similarly" to the Episcopal. That is a point the Bishops, when they meet next year, will have to settle, if any further advance is to be made. It is decisive.

It is necessary also to remember three other things. First, that Free Churches cannot unite with a Church that continues to be a State Church. The Archbishop of Canterbury said quite reasonably

that, considering "the immense changes that have passed over both the life of the nation and of the Church, the relations of Church and State which reflected the conditions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries cannot remain unchanged." It must also be borne in mind that the methods of Scotland are not an example for England, where the factors are much more varied.

Then it cannot be expected that the Free Churches of this country can join a Church which desires to hold itself open to join the Churches of the East, if that means that the Free Churches must renounce their fellowship with the thirty-three millions of non-Episcopal Free Churchmen in America, and millions more in other parts of the world.

And though no question of principle can be settled by an appeal to numbers, it should be remembered that there are less than two millions of Protestant Episcopalians in America. So there can be no question of the less absorbing the greater. And on this side of the Atlantic the matter cannot be determined for England alone. The United Church of Scotland will also have to be considered.

While on the question of numbers it is worthy of notice as an indication of vitality that while, during the century ending 1925, Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox and Protestants generally have each increased less than 200 per cent., much less, the Baptists have increased 2,216 per cent. This statement has recently been published and vouched for by a recognized statistician, Dr. E. P. Alldredge, of Nashville, Tennessee, who gives the actual figures. It almost looks as if the trend is not towards Episcopacy.

Lord Selborne, as lately as March 29, gives in *The Times* some extracts from a manifesto published by seven candidates for election as Proctors to Convocation, in which occurs this sentence: "Just as the British Empire is in a real sense a preliminary sketch of the future federation of the world, a veritable League of Nations in miniature, so we believe the Anglican Communion may yet demonstrate the possibility of a wider reunion of Christendom." On which it may be remarked that perhaps the League of Nations itself may demonstrate the sort of Union that may be thinkable, and possible, and workable.

For after all that is the real test of Union. Can we work together? It is of no use to say that we can unite in social and public efforts—that is possible even with infidels. As religious and Christian bodies we must be able to unite, if at all, in religious and Christian exercises. If not in these we had better frankly confess that we exist apart. It may quite plainly be said that the Free Churches would rather be opposed than tolerated. For co-operation or for controversy we must meet on equal terms, and quite gladly we recognize that this is the temper that is manifested in many quarters.

Well, then, let us begin. If we wait till every possible question is answered we will wait until some uprising of the people will give a practical settlement, which may possibly be the casting of all of us aside. For there are questions before us for which there is no answer.

Job could not be satisfied with the answers any of his friends gave to his question, but when he saw the Lord he was satisfied, not that even then he gained the answer to his question—a higher grace was given to him—he lost the question.

When, after the Civil War in America, where the North had been opposed to the South, was over, the Episcopal Churches met in common session, a proposal was made that before advancing any further, the questions that had separated them should be discussed and settled. But a wise old delegate proposed as an amendment that these questions should be postponed until they had considered the work and witness of the Church. To this the whole Assembly assented: they went on with their proper business, and the discussion of the differences between North and South still stands adjourned. If the questions were now raised the present generation would not even know what they were talking about.

So, with thankful acknowledgment of your courtesy and your patience, my last word is—"Let us begin."

AUTHORITY IN CHURCH AND STATE. By Philip S. Belasco. *George Allen & Unwin, 1928. (Pp. 326.) 12s. 6d.*

The foreword which Dr. Gooch supplies to this book is in itself a judicious review of the main doctrines which Dr. Belasco puts forward. The author deals with the problem of Authority in Church and State from the Quaker point of view. He is more concerned with the relation of the individual to society than with the various ecclesiastical conceptions of Authority. He considers the individual conscience as supreme, and any form of social coercion as immoral. The first part of the book gives an excellent account of the political ideas of the Quakers of the seventeenth century. Then follows a valuable survey of the working of authority in Church and State, particularly during that century. This leads the author to an able defence of William Penn, a statesman who has not yet received his due from the historians. Penn's support of the Catholic James II is shown to be a logical issue of his professed principles. Dr. Belasco ends with the significant conclusion: "The Church, if it lives, has silently admitted no rights outside the minds of men: when it has power and authority it has followed the laws of their existence. The Church, as well as the State, therefore, finds strength and not weakness in the personal interests or creative ideas of her members: they are acquisitions necessary for the life of both." There is a good index to the book, and the many references in the footnotes bear witness to the author's wide reading. In a book of general excellence, occasional lapses of style may be pardoned.

G. H. W.

THE CHURCH AND ITS MINISTRY.

BY THE REV. C. SYDNEY CARTER, Principal of
B.C.M. College, Clifton.

TO deal adequately with a subject like this would necessitate the compilation of a large book and not a short paper of about twenty minutes' duration. I take it, however, that the intended scope of this paper is a short statement of the nature and essentials of the Church and its ministry in special relation to the prominent and pressing problem of Christian Reunion and inter-communion.

I have first of all to make a small apology or explanation. It would have been practically impossible for me to have got together these rather elementary and familiar thoughts on this subject (by which I hope to stir up your minds by way of remembrance), during what has been an exceptionally heavy term, just ended, had I not trenched largely on what I had previously thought out and put together in my little book on "Ministerial Commission." I have therefore not hesitated to use arguments and extracts from that freely.

Let me say at once that I shall deal with this question, as I feel sure you would wish me to do, on the Catholic principle, asserted by our Church, of an *appeal to the teaching of the Word of God*, illustrated, as this Appeal is, in the practice and teaching of the Primitive Church.

There is little doubt that in the intention of its Founder the Christian Society or Church was designed to be a *World-wide Fellowship*. It is also true to say that to-day if this Divine Catholic Society is to be properly effective in the World, it must be a *vitally UNITED Fellowship*. This has recently been concisely expressed by Mr. Basil Mathews: "To get a world-wide voice, to exercise a world influence, the Christian forces must share a world fellowship."¹ This is practically translating into modern language Our Lord's Prayer, "That they may be one—that the *world* may believe that Thou didst send Me" (John xvii. 21). How then are we to define the membership and extent of this World-wide Fellowship—the Catholic Church? I think we may shortly define it in a sentence, as "*all those who BELIEVE in Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour.*" But this does not carry us far enough, because we then want to know how we are to distinguish such as a Visible Society of "believers." For an answer to this question we must at once turn to the origins of the Church in the New Testament. Although I shall have a word to say later concerning the invisible aspect of the Church, for practical purposes we can only deal with a *visible* Society, and such a Visible Fellowship must have some outward signs or marks or conditions of membership just as every secular

¹ *Roads to the City of God*, p. 100.

society has. In the New Testament we may set forth these distinguishing marks under three heads :

(1) Baptism into the name of the Trinity, according to the command of Christ.

(2) The Breaking of bread and the Prayers.

(3) Profession of Apostolic doctrine.

Or to put it more concisely, the only essential conditions of membership in the early Christian Society were repentance and faith in the Risen Christ, of which the outward rite of Baptism was the witness, while the Breaking of Bread, in remembrance of His death and Passion, was the special ritual and the common symbolical bond of union.

We may safely say that wherever these conditions obtained in the New Testament times, *there* was a true branch of the Christian Fellowship, which was destined to be world-wide. Certainly there is little doubt, from a study of the New Testament and the early Christian centuries, that only those who had evidenced their belief in Christ as Saviour and Lord, by accepting the separating rite of Baptism, were regarded as members of the Visible Christian Fellowship. I am bound to confess that I do not see how it is possible to-day, on true Catholic principles, to regard unbaptized people, however sincere may be their profession of Faith in Christ, as members of the Universal Visible Church of Christ. For the practical purpose of the Visible Christian Society, Baptism is the necessary determining mark of membership. Other "notes" or marks may be devised, such as signing a roll of membership, or wearing a special uniform, but they cannot be accepted, because they are not divinely ordered or Scriptural; and thus they are, even if unintentionally, a breach of true Catholic order and orthodoxy. But this is not to say that the outward rite of Baptism is always essential to salvation. Such a statement could not be justified from the general teaching of the New Testament. For instance, St. John tells us that those "who *believe* on the name of the Son of God" "may know they have eternal life" (1 John v. 13). But it does mean that Baptism is practically essential for membership in the Visible Church, and that those Christians who neglect it can only be regarded as belonging to that indeterminate, and, therefore, to that extent, "invisible," Society or Church of believers, which our post-Communion Prayer describes as the "blessed company of all faithful people"—"the mystical Body of Christ."

I would like to say here that the term "invisible" Church, so frequently ridiculed, is not only implied by the language of our Liturgy and Articles (XIX and XXVI), but is also a strictly Scriptural deduction. For in the New Testament the baptism *by water* is only the attestation *to man* of the presumed essential inward baptism of "the Spirit," by which all true believers are made members of the "one Body" (1 Cor. xii. 13). And this "one Body" must have an *invisible* aspect, since only God can truly know those who have "the Spirit of Christ," and are therefore "His" (Rom. viii. 7). The one Catholic Church therefore, viewed in its *invisible* aspect,

consists, as St. Paul says, of "the whole family in heaven and earth" (Ephes. iii. 15). In its *visible* aspect it embraces all baptized Christians, but many of these may not belong to Christ's true Body for "they are not all Israel which are of Israel" (Rom. ix. 6). Hooker, you will recall, emphasized this important distinction in his insistent differentiation of the "true and mingled body of Christ," while Thomas Rogers (Archbishop Bancroft's chaplain) puts it most clearly when he describes the "invisible" members of the Church, as all the elect in heaven and on earth, who are invisible because "their faith and conscience toward God is not perfectly known to us." And he calls the "visible" members, those "both for and against God," who "have made no manifest or open rebellion against the gospel of Christ."¹ Luther also regarded the Church under the two aspects of "visible" and "invisible," and Dean Field makes a similar careful distinction, "We say there is a visible and invisible Church, not meaning to make two distinct churches, but to distinguish the divers considerations of the same church, which though it be visible in respect of the profession of supernatural verities revealed in Christ . . . yet in respect of those most precious effects and happy benefits of saving grace, wherein only the elect do communicate, it is invisible, known only to God" (*On the Church*, Bk. I, ch. X, p. 31).

But important as this distinction is, in considering the Universal Christian Fellowship to-day, we can only deal with its *visible* aspect, and the chief thing to notice is that the Visible Church now differs from that in New Testament times not even mainly in the fact that it is "made up of many communions, and organized in various modes," but especially because these different societies have often *no fellowship with each other*, and alas! in fact sometimes excommunicate one another.

In Apostolic times *the unity of the Visible Christian Society was apparent and real* since a corporate life was maintained by the *fullest fellowship* between all societies of believers who acknowledged the "One Lord, the one Faith, and the one Baptism" (Ephes. iv. 3-7). All the Christians claimed fellowship with all "who in every place called upon the name of Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. i. 2). "The whole Society was in fact a brotherhood based on the one hope of salvation through the one Lord."² But we should remember that the ties which connected the various societies of Christians were *spiritual*. There was *very little outward unity of organization* between the different local Churches. On a different plane the link which bound them together was similar to that uniting the various sections of the British Empire to-day—a spiritual bond arising from a common honour of, and allegiance to, one visible or supreme Head. It was the "One Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism" which bound them together. As Professor Gwatkin says, "even during the second century every Church was independent of the rest and free to serve Christ in its own way, if only it did serve Christ" (*E.C.H.*, I., 301).

¹ *Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England*, pp. 164-5.

² *Ministerial Commission*, p. 83.

It is also important to remember what Bishop Headlam has reminded us of, that "the Universal Church or ecclesia was not formed out of Churches but out of individual Christians, a person was not made by Baptism a member of the local Church, but of the Church of God" (*Doct. of the Church*, p. 78). To-day also, strictly speaking, the Universal Church is formed from all the *baptized* Christians, but where we differ from Apostolic and primitive times, is that this sign of membership does not now, as it did then, constitute a common right to union and brotherhood, exemplified by the common participation in the one distinctive sacred Feast. It is this *marred* and broken Fellowship which is the scandal and shame of Christianity to-day, and which we are bound, as disciples of the One Lord, to do all we can to restore. And may I say here that it is because the Catholic Church originated and developed in this way, that it seems to be seriously mis-stating and confusing the problem of Christian Unity to lay down an unqualified assertion that "the Catholic Church in England consists of all the baptized in England," explained by the further statement that "the Church of England is the Catholic Church in England *and none other is.*" If both these statements are correct then we have no problem of Christian Reunion to solve in England, since there can be no other Christian Society of baptized to unite with, and the English non-episcopal ministries are in effect, if not in intention, excluded as ministries of the Catholic Church, since they are certainly not "ministries" of the Church of England. But on the other hand, while it is correct to state that the section or branch of the Catholic Church in England is comprised of all the baptized Christians, it is simply a denial of plain facts to declare that all *these* Christians belong to or acknowledge the authority and discipline of the visible Society called the "Church of England." It may be legally correct to say that every baptized Christian has a potential right to membership in the National Church, but we must not forget that he also has a clear legal right to neglect or renounce that membership and join in full communion with another Christian Society differently organized. This right was given him by the Toleration Act, which Lord Chief Justice Mansfield declared, in a legal Judgment (in the eighteenth century), had given Nonconformity an "established" position in England. Baptized members of legally established orthodox Free Churches are therefore, by the fact of their baptism, equally members of the Catholic Church with Anglicans. It is not therefore, I venture to suggest, so much the fact of two or more differently organized churches in one district, country or city, which contradicts Apostolic standards, since there may well have been two distinct societies or "churches" of believers meeting in different "houses" in one city, in the early days. The type of worship also may well have differed slightly, and the organization in those times was not apparently identical everywhere. One Society was governed by a Council of elders, another church by an Apostolic delegate like Timothy or Titus, while yet another had a sort of President or bishop like St. James at Jerusalem. But the crucial

point was that there was the fullest *fellowship* between these various Societies. Because they all professed the "Apostolic doctrine," their members would, when, like the itinerant prophets, they were visiting another Society, naturally join in "the Breaking of Bread and the Prayers"—the common bond of union and fellowship. *The Church then*, though scattered in different countries and amongst different races, *was one*, and this unity was outward and *visible* and the marks of the Fellowship depended not on uniformity of worship, government or Order, but on *Faith*.

And this leads me to say a word on the **MINISTRY** of the Church. A careful study of the New Testament, and especially of the Pastoral Epistles, abundantly proves that the unity and grace of the Christian Fellowship was not dependent on any definite or prescribed form of Ministry. In fact there is scarcely a trace of *Ministry*, in the exclusive or technical sense, in the New Testament. All believers were "ministers," and although they received "diversities of gifts," "the manifestation of the Spirit was given to every man for the common profit" (1 Cor. xii. 7). Each set himself "to minister to the saints" (1 Cor. xvi. 15) as a "good steward" of the special gift or grace which he had received. There was no modern essential distinction between the "layman" and the "priest," and when the body of believers found it necessary normally to delegate certain functions to special officers, the Christian presbyter or elder was never regarded as inheriting the functions of the Jewish priesthood.

Again, there is nothing to indicate or even to suggest that the "Breaking of Bread" was always presided over by an Apostle or a Prophet or even by a presbyter or bishop. Setting apart or "ordination" to a function of ministry was, when conferred, usually performed by these officers, or also by Teachers, but even the outward symbolical act of laying on of hands was not universally observed (see Acts i. 26, xii. 2 and xiv. 23).

Churches, like that at Antioch, were apparently founded possessing distinctive officers, without any Apostolic commission or connection. The mark of their genuineness or orthodoxy was simply that the members possessed "the grace of God" (Acts xi. 23). Barnabas accepted this necessary qualification as sufficient. In fact the all-important thing to notice in the ministry of Apostolic days is the *call*—the realized "gift of Christ" (Ephes. iv. 7), and not the official recognition or confirmation of it, whatever form this might take.

We may safely say that the much later theory—that an Apostolic episcopal Ministry was *essential* to the unity of the Catholic Society, finds no support whatever from New Testament teaching or practice. How then are we to explain the emphasis placed on episcopacy by such early Fathers as Ignatius and Irenæus? In a sentence, we might reply that in the experience and development of the Church episcopal government was found to be the best and safest method not only of shepherding and guiding the Church, but also of preserving Apostolic teaching. The Epistle of Clement of

Rome furnishes us with the most natural explanation or suggestion of a prudential government of this character. The "other approved men" whom Clement declares "the Apostles appointed," would be the presbyters or bishops in the churches, who were naturally the best taught in Apostolic traditions and practices, and therefore the best exponents of the Apostolic Gospel and doctrine. When by the exigency of circumstances monarchical episcopacy developed, the chief presbyter, now called bishop, was naturally regarded and appealed to as the guardian of the Apostolic Faith. It is surely in this way that Irenæus appeals to a succession of bishops as a guarantee of orthodoxy, against Gnostic claims; not because of any special grace vouchsafed to them for the purpose at their ordination, but because being in historical official connection with the Apostles, they would be the most likely faithfully to have preserved Apostolic Truth. As Tertullian expressed it, "We have communion with the Apostolic churches because we have no *doctrine* differing from them."¹ The test of orthodoxy was in fact *doctrine*, and not a particular Apostolic *Ministry*. Tertullian makes this point quite clear, when he says, "By this test the heretics shall be tried by those churches, which although they can produce *no apostle or disciple of the apostles as their author*, as being of much later origin, and such indeed are daily formed, yet agreeing *in the same faith*, are considered as not less Apostolical on account of the consanguinity of *doctrine*."² Or as Jerome similarly expressed it a little later, "The Church does not depend upon walls but upon the truth. The Church is there where the *true faith is*."

We should also remember that this appeal to bishops as the guardians of orthodoxy was rendered necessary because the Church as a body had not yet formulated its summary of Apostolic teaching, which the rise of heresy soon after necessitated. We may say therefore that the *Creeeds*—these summaries of Apostolic Faith—now supersede the function of the bishop as the correct interpreter of Catholic teaching. It follows that on the *New Testament* principles of "The Church and its Ministry," every existing branch of the Christian Society, whatever its form of Ministry, can easily be tested as to its orthodoxy (and thus as to its claim to be a part of the Universal Fellowship), by its acceptance of the *Catholic Creeeds of the Church*. But this rule should not be interpreted as condoning or justifying every schism from historic Catholic Churches, started on trifling or frivolous grounds, but simply as a safe and sufficient principle, to guide us in the presence of our existing divisions, as to what are the *essentials* with regard to the Church and the Ministry for restoring the broken Fellowship of Christendom. What we have to deal with to-day are not outworn and indefensible theories, but the fact of well organized and historic orthodox Christian Societies, whose saintly members testify abundantly to their vital connection with the living Head of the One Church by the real "fruits of the Spirit," evidenced in their lives, but who yet are

¹ *De Præscriptione Hereticorum*, ch. xxi. p. 207.

² *Ibid.*, p. 32.

separated by artificial and unnatural barriers from real and corporate fellowship with other members of the Catholic Church. Brethren, those who possess the "One Spirit" and "confess Christ's Holy Name" *ought and must live in visible unity and fellowship*. And to restore this proper and primitive condition of Church life is the most urgent and pressing problem for Christians to-day.

In our own Communion we have made a hopeful and promising start towards this goal, not only by the historic "Lambeth Appeal," but by the official statement issued in July 1923 by the Anglican representatives of a Joint Conference on the "Status of the existing Free Church Ministry." This frank declaration definitely asserted that "ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church." Such a statement is certainly true to primitive and Scriptural standards. The Anglican representatives, however, practically modified this frank admission by adding that the rule requiring episcopal Ordination laid down in the "Preface to the Ordinal," "embodies principles to which the Anglican Church has *throughout its history* adhered," and therefore must continue to require. But, as the Free Church leaders pertinently replied, such a statement is *historically incorrect*, and certainly a Church which received in the seventeenth century non-episcopal ministers from foreign Reformed Churches, without losing its Catholic character and position, can, if it so wills, practically recognize similar non-episcopal ministries in the twentieth century. We cannot believe that in the sincere and earnest quest for Unity such an artificial, non-scriptural, non-*historical* barrier will be long suffered to bar the way to the visible restoration of the broken Fellowship between different branches of Reformed Christendom. We at least should do our utmost to avert such an unnecessary and unjustifiable delay.

RULES OF THE ROAD. Being Talks to Boys who are in their first year at a Public School, by J. S. N. Sewell, Principal of Greenan, Dunmurry. *S.P.C.K.* 3s. 6d. net.

The Archbishop of Armagh commends this attractive volume for boys, as it puts the great essentials with a directness and simplicity which could not be surpassed. The subjects are well chosen, and they are treated with the teacher's expert skill which impresses the lessons by apt illustration. The addresses are admirable.

CONSTITUTIONAL EPISCOPACY.

BY THE VEN. W. L. PAIGE COX, Archdeacon of Chester.

We are indebted to "The Record" for this summary of the paper on Constitutional Episcopacy read by Archdeacon Paige Cox to the Cheltenham Conference. The full text of the paper will, we believe, appear at a later date in one of the monthly Reviews.

IT is stated in the Ordinal—towards the end of the Prayer Book—that "from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests and Deacons." Our three-fold ministry is in succession to the three-fold ministry of which we read in the New Testament. Apostolic Succession, rightly understood, implies this three-fold inheritance from the Apostles' time, and not merely a continuity of bishops with the Apostles. But the bishops do in some sense correspond to the apostles of the New Testament. It will be admitted that, however the episcopate came into being, the holders of the office did succeed in due course to some of the functions of the Apostolate. They had not the same spiritual authority in having been directly appointed by Christ Himself, and they were not spiritually endowed to the same degree—no one would put the most Christlike of the bishops on the same plane as a St. Peter, a St. John, or a St. Paul; moreover, the bishops from the first were local officials, which the Apostles were not. But we do find the bishops from the early days exercising the same function as the Apostles in leading the Church, in ordaining deacons and presbyters, and in laying on of hands in other Church ordinances. If we liken the bishops to the Apostles in respect of their exercise of such functions, we may not, if we are loyal to New Testament principles and precedent, assign to them an authority which the Apostles themselves did not claim. The Apostolic rule of the Church was essentially constitutional, as we should now put it. The evidence of the New Testament on this point is as clear as it is arresting. When a new Apostle had to be chosen in the place of the traitor, Judas, it was to the general body of "the three hundred and twenty brethren" that the rest of the Apostles appealed to make the appointment, under Divine guidance. So, when the need had become apparent of a special order of ministers to look after the distribution of alms, the initiative came from the Apostles; but they requested the brethren to choose the men of the new order, though it was they who laid hands upon them. In no matter of importance were the Apostles minded to act irresponsibly, nor were they allowed to act irresponsibly. When St. Peter admitted Gentiles into the Church his action was challenged by the general body of Christians in Jerusalem, and the Apostle admitted their right to challenge it (Acts xi. 1, 2). When an important question of discipline arose at Corinth the matter was dealt with by the whole Church, though under St. Paul's direction. At

the council held at Jerusalem, as described in Acts xv., the Apostles and elders deliberated over the business, St. Peter and St. James exercising a leading influence, and the decision was announced in the name of "the Apostles and the elders with the whole Church." It is not a little remarkable, in view of later developments, that in the narrative leading up to the holding of this council, when the arrival of St. Paul and St. Barnabas at Jerusalem is mentioned, we are told that "they were received of the Church and the Apostles and elders"—not the Apostles, elders and brethren.

In the course of the centuries there have been, in various ways and from various causes, striking and prolonged deviations from these precedents in regard to the balance of authority in the Christian Church. We are concerned here and now with recent occurrences in the Church of England. When the National Assembly of the Church of England was constituted the New Testament precedents were obviously kept in view. The Assembly was to consist of three Houses, of bishops, clergy and laity, with co-ordinate powers. The Assembly was to be "free to discuss any proposal concerning the Church of England and to make provision thereof, and where such provision required Parliamentary sanction the authority of Parliament was to be sought in such manner as should be prescribed by statute"; "provided that any measure touching doctrinal formula or the services or ceremonies of the Church of England or the administration of the Sacraments or sacred rites thereof shall be debated and voted upon by each of the three Houses sitting separately, and shall then be either accepted or rejected by the Assembly in the terms in which it is finally proposed by the House of Bishops."

It might have been thought that the establishment of the Church Assembly would have placed the authority of the Episcopate on a constitutional basis. But in practice things have not so turned out, particularly in reference to the Prayer Book.

It was said by Archbishop Davidson in commending the Deposited Book to the House of Lords, "The Book is not the Book of the bishops: it is the Book of the Church, drawn up by laity and clergy, and finally approved, amended, and put into its ultimate shape, with such additions and omissions as were thought desirable, by the bishops. But the Book is substantially a Book with which the bishops have no more to do than the clergy and laity in the Assembly." It is just those "additions and omissions" referred to by the Archbishop which have made the difference, and have turned the Deposited Book in its latest form into the Book of the majority of the bishops, and not of the whole Assembly. When the Book was finally considered by the House of Clergy before it was submitted to the bishops they passed a resolution respectfully requesting the bishops to consider the question of revising the form of Invocation in the new Prayer of Consecration. The majority of the bishops, however, did not see their way to comply with this request. We have lately been told by Dr. Vernon Bartlet that the alternative canon "would add an insuperable hindrance to reunion

for evangelical nonconformists." The majority of the bishops are responsible for this.

The bishops naturally lay stress on the assent of the Church Assembly to their final proposals. It was a much less marked assent at the second time of asking than at the first, barely more than half the members of the Assembly voting on the side of the bishops. But how was this assent gained as far as it was given? It has been avowed by not a few since that they voted as they did from a desire to support the bishops and not from personal conviction. The assent on the part of the laity as well as the clergy was very far from being unfettered. It was given under tremendous pressure of archiepiscopal and episcopal entreaty. The assent to the Deposited Book given at the Diocesan Conferences has been still more markedly a constrained assent.

Since the second rejection of the Deposited Book by Parliament the archbishops and the majority of the bishops have tested the opinion of the clergy and laity as to the policy of making a guarded use of the rejected Book, even of the controverted portion of it on account of which it was rejected. That move on the part of the bishops has proved a disastrous mistake. It has provoked opposition and censure from many who had previously supported them, and has unquestionably weakened the moral prestige of the bishops throughout the country.

The majority of the bishops are beginning to see that their recent line of action is "inconsistent with the constitutional relations of Church and State in England," and so we are having in some quarters threats of an agitation for disestablishment, and in other quarters foreshadowings of a movement to deprive Parliament of its power of rejecting such Measures as the Prayer Book Measure. Attention is meanwhile being directed to the Established Church of Scotland, the ordinary decisions of whose General Assembly do not require the sanction of Parliament. The plea apparently is that, in this respect, the Church of England, as an established Church, should be placed on the same relative footing as the Church of Scotland. The general character, history and circumstances of the two Churches are so dissimilar that a parallel cannot be drawn between them as regards their relations with the State. The laity of the Established Church of Scotland have what is practically a predominant influence in their Church through the place they occupy in its councils and through their election of their ministers, so that they are well able to look after their own interests in all matters pertaining to doctrine and worship. In contrast with this it is being more and more noticed that even in the House of Laity in the Church Assembly the laity have not full and direct representation. Sir Lewis Dibdin, who deferred to the bishops when they put forward the Deposited Book, but has dissented strongly from their subsequent policy in reference to Parliament, has said, "That we in the Church Assembly represent the laity as a whole is simply not a fact." Reviewing the actual condition of things in the Church Assembly it is perfectly true to say that Parliament is more fully

and exactly representative of the rank and file of Churchpeople than is the House of Laity.

As things are at present, disestablishment would mean the removal of the one effective check on the autocratic action of the bishops. But for that check, it would be possible for a passing majority of bishops to change the Church's doctrine and ritual at will. The danger in that direction would be all the greater owing to the drift of late towards the increase of the power of the bishops in the administration of patronage. Concurrently with all this it has been significant of late that a good many bishops have taken to wearing ornate official clothing and jewellery—copes and mitres and pectoral crosses. It is averred, no doubt, that these gorgeous adornments worn nowadays by some of the bishops are symbols of their spiritual powers and functions in various particulars. Yes, but is not that really an indictment of the new fashion? Does it not tend to assert a difference in spiritual endowment and capability between the bishop and the rest of the clergy as well as the mass of the laity? It is assumed, for instance, by some of our bishops that they have the power—an undefined and indeed incomprehensible power—to "bless" places and things, something which goes beyond the accustomed dedication, with thanksgiving, of material gifts to be used in the worship of God. We read of no such power in the New Testament.

There never was a time in the history of the Church when it was less justifiable and less advisable to exalt the episcopate unduly and for the bishops to assume powers which under proper regulation pertain to the whole body.

It goes without saying that from the point of view of reunion with our Nonconformist brethren, the policy of episcopal encroachment on lawful prerogative is fatal. On all hands the more thoughtful and learned of Nonconformists are becoming ready to admit that episcopacy is the only possible form of Government for a reunited Church. It has the precedent of the centuries behind it and it makes for unity and good order. But it is only a constitutional episcopacy that they will accept. The bishops of the Anglican Communion assembled at the Lambeth Conference of 1920 clearly saw this, and in the "Appeal to all Christian People," which they issued then, they made it manifest that in proposing reunion on episcopal lines it was nothing but constitutional episcopacy that they had in mind. Their words are these, and it is on the note thus struck that I would close.

"We do not call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those communions which do not possess the episcopate. On the contrary we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. But we submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim which we make on behalf of the episcopate. Moreover, we would urge that it is now, and will be in the future, the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church. But we

greatly desire that the office of a bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner. Nay, more, we eagerly look forward to the day when through its acceptance in a united Church we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body in the apostolic right of the laying on of hands, and in the joy and fellowship of a Eucharist in which as one Family we may together, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the one Lord our worship and service."

Mr. Douglas Edwardes describes his book, *The Shining Mystery of Jesus* (Longman, Green & Co., 6s. net), as "a frank appeal to the Gospels, and in no sense whatever a substitute for them. It is written in the confidence that the truth which is there so vividly presented will attest itself afresh to straightforward inquirers, more or less adrift, like all of us, upon this strange sea of human life on which we are *nolens volens* embarked." The Bishop of Manchester in his Introduction emphasizes this special feature of the volume. It is "admirably planned to bring its readers back from the superficial 'humanitarian' accounts of our Lord to the stupendous fact to which the evidence, scientifically considered, really points. . . . He helps us to look with the eyes and hear with the ears of the first disciples. . . ." The author claims that "the Gospels authenticate themselves," and he shows by an examination of the personality of Christ as shown in them that nothing less than the old faith of the Church will satisfy, and that at the heart of the Christian Gospel "stands the Cross of Jesus Christ." This is one of the books which meet the modern need of showing the true value of Christian doctrine, without using the technical language of theology which repels the ordinary thinker without ecclesiastical leanings.

The Religious Tract Society are the publishers of a series of addresses for boys and girls by the Rev. W. J. Henderson, LL.D., entitled *The Pattern Boyhood* (2s. net). Among the subjects are Giant Slaying, Friendship, Self-Reliance, Service. They are short treatments of great themes clearly and effectively expressed.

The R.T.S. also publishes *Gathered Grain*, a book for the Women's Meeting, by Edna V. Rowlingson, B.A., 2s. 6d. net. The author's aim is "to provide hints and suggestions of workable value to those who labour in that fruitful field—The Women's Meeting." Those who are responsible for such meetings will find in these chapters ample material for lessons suitable for helping the members to a better understanding of life's privileges and duties. The wealth of illustration adds to the effectiveness of the instruction.

PRACTICAL STEPS TOWARDS REUNION.

BY THE REV. G. F. GRAHAM BROWN, M.A., Principal of
Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.

I

IN this paper the meaning attached to the word "Reunion" is :—the achievement of an organic comprehension of ecclesiastical organizations, considered externally, into one outward, visible and united society. At present this society is not co-extensive with any single institution, nor will it be obtained by a combine into which churches may be stampeded by desire to perpetuate a given institutional type. "Unity," on the other hand, consists in an invisible yet unbreakable fellowship of spirit with spirit which already exists among disciples of our Lord and is independent of organic union, but can only be consummated in the realization of that union. Without this organic union complete fellowship in Christ is impossible. The relation of spirit and form is undeniable. What we are reacts on our spirit, and if, in spirit, the Church is one, this inward unity requires some outward form of expression.

Only a world-wide Church can effectively bear witness to the world, and be the agent in the establishment of Christ's Kingdom. To those outside, as well as those inside the Churches, the devastating disasters of disunion have become a scandal. Christians claim to be at one on all fundamental spiritual issues ; each in turn mourn their unhappy divisions, and confess that these not only contradict the Gospel, which they proclaim, but militate against its work of redeeming love. Paradoxically enough, Christians on matters other than ecclesiastical come together, and even try to persuade those engaged, for instance, in the industrial struggle known as the General Strike, in 1926, to compose their differences, and live at peace with one another, and in the name of unity, and for the benefit of the nation as a whole, to be willing to sacrifice even economic principles. Those who seek reunion without, should indeed practise unity within.

II

What is the fundamental cause of this lack of union but that surely those who call themselves Christians value more highly

something other than love of God and love of one's neighbour. They prefer the outward maintenance of their familiar institutional life to the practice of the Christian principles they profess. They have substituted orthodoxy for love—which at the outset is very much less expensive. They have attributed sovereignty to a certain interpretation of spiritual facts, and have dethroned the very spiritual facts which they try to interpret. For instance, in the early stages of nearly every approach towards Reunion, the achievement of some kind of institutional uniformity has been required. What this means is, that the unity of the Church is supposed to depend upon, and reside in, uniformity of its institutional life. The hollowness of this is seen if we try to couple the command to love one another with regulations laying down the exact form of words we are to employ in expressing our love. The demand for institutional uniformity is the hall-mark of an impersonal ideal. This is a sub-Christian conception, for the Kingdom of Heaven is based on the perfect recognition of personality in Fellowship, and men have always sought an ordered liberty in which they can fully express their God-given personality. God's gift of grace to man is not a thing which can be transmitted by impersonal and institutional media only, but is a personal loving relationship of God with man and rests on the personal activity of the Godhead, to which man, through faith, actively responds. If the figure of the Church as the Bride of Christ be a true one, the union as implied is a personal union. Therefore, the first practical step towards Reunion is the restoration of the personal relationship revealed by our Lord and the subordination to this of the material and institutional life.

Reunion may be had for the asking. The asking is determined by the uncompromising desire on the part of all Christian people to find their way to that place where our Lord can give the answer to his own prayer, "that they may all be one : even as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us ; that the world may believe that Thou didst send Me." This is the prayer not merely of an ordinary intercessor, but it is the royal fiat of a sovereign, whose purpose is being all in all fulfilled, and this purpose is that the unity should be sufficiently apparent to the world, that the world will be convinced that God had sent Him.

From our definition of Reunion, we must obviously have in mind the coming together of the episcopal and the non-episcopal bodies, and exclude none who claim to belong to the Christian society, and so we must consider the Latin, the Orthodox, the Presbyterian, and the Free Churches, in suggesting practical steps towards Reunion.

Every ordained minister in that section of the Church of God known as the Church of England, is irrevocably committed to foster the spirit of Reunion by these words in the Ordering of Priests to which he subscribes : " Will you maintain and set forward as much as lieth in you, quietness, peace and love, among all Christian people,

and especially among them that are or shall be committed to your charge?" Here is indeed a solemn charge to keep. Why does Reunion tarry? It is not because we fail to realize that divisions lead to unholy rivalry, bitterness of soul, waste, loss of direct moral and spiritual influence over the forces of change. On the contrary, we believe that Reunion is desirable, and possible, and is the ideal to which all should work, but there seems to be lacking the right attitude of mind, a feeling that all attempts at Reunion are impracticable.

III

So far as modern theological research is concerned, there is a definite advance towards the solution of the difficulties confronting Reunion. It is no longer held that in the primitive period the belief of the Church was uniformly expressed. To a greater degree than now, there was a unity of spiritual life, but in matters of doctrine there were divergent explanations: for instance, there are at least six interpretations in the writings of the New Testament of the meaning of "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures." Secondly, there was no uniform government of the Church handed down by the Apostles, as far as our records enable us to discover. About the year 100 A.D. there seem to have been localized forms of episcopacy-congregationalism, presbyterianism, and a leadership at Jerusalem through the next of kin. There was intercommunion, and all who confessed the Name and were baptized were in the Body of Christ. "The apostolic ministry was transmitted in divers modes, but these seem to have been recognized everywhere as a valid ministry." No two more practical steps towards Reunion could be taken than the acceptance of these results of historic investigation—the one in the realm of faith, in that the Church never has been one in doctrinal interpretation, but that there is a common life with Christ in God which transcends all creeds but acknowledges their witness to the Faith; the other in the realm of order, that is, that Church Order was one of divine expediency rather than of direct divine tradition. There was a fellowship of disciples out of which there emerged a Church before any of the polities of Order had come into existence. Thirdly, difference in custom and usage have always been acknowledged. Where ritual definitely implies doctrine then it should be allowed the same latitude as the doctrine. Whatever the special form or practice may be—whether it is the sacramental system, the prayer meeting or the fellowship of silence—if it possesses the value attributed to it, then it will survive and will be taken into the life not only of a local Church but of the Church Universal. There is even now a great interchange of material for public worship, and the use of the work by men from any one church by those of every church is an indication of Catholicity of thought which is a prelude to Reunion. Fourthly, the responsibility of the Church to make secular

things sacred shows that the Gospel applies to all life, to collective society as well as the individual. The problems of to-day are world-wide, and if the Church is really to play its part it will need to become not only supra-national but universal, and the economic, industrial, political situations require the help of one undivided Church for their solution. At present, for instance, the Church seems to be incapable of giving instruction to Christians in China which is at all relevant to building up a Christian civilization on the apparent ruins of present Chinese culture. The union of the Churches will come when not only each individual, but each Church, is willing to sacrifice its treasured traditions in doctrine, polity, ritual and social status, the familiar institutional life, to the practice and demands of the Christian principles which are professed.

IV

Throughout the ages, there have been Christian men and women to whom the divisions of Christendom were a scandal, as an injury to the highest interests of mankind, and an offence against the love of Christ Himself. Never before have the unity movements been greater. We have had a world-wide international Missionary Conference at Jerusalem, we have interdenominational and international co-operation societies, world-wide Church federations, organic unions, unity within bodies having the same general doctrine and polity, the modern rise of national churches, Catholic and Evangelical efforts at rapprochement. But from all these the Latin Church abstains: it has one clear-cut remedy for this lack of reunion. That is submission: there is no negotiation. Any other official means of approach appears to involve "the principle of barter and exchange in doctrinal matters," which "however attractive it may seem in English ears, is positively blasphemous to those who believe that no one has a right to tamper with the deposit of revealed truth."

Whatever may be the official attitude of the Latin Church, yet there are increasing numbers of its thoughtful lay members who are really perturbed at the spirit of devastating isolation which underlies her attitude, and who individually are wondering whether the dogmas are so inexorable as to warrant some of the statements contained in the "Encyclical Letter on fostering true religious Union," issued on January 6, 1928, by Pius XI. This letter was addressed to the Clergy in peace and communion with the Apostolic See. It commands the faithful to have no part or lot in the false efforts after Reunion, and exhorts all to enter the one true Church, i.e., the Latin. This letter was put forth after the Conversations at Malines, and anticipated the published report on these, and seems to be the official Latin pronouncement on them as well as on the Conferences at Stockholm and Lausanne. The stubbornness of

this letter is a sign not of strength but of weakness. Readers of Von Hügel's letters realize that the Vatican maintains this aloofness by enforcing the severest limitations on its thinkers and scholars. It fails to see its incompleteness, and refuses to acknowledge that those who differ have maintained or voiced values which it has not been able so far to express. More than ever it is becoming clear that the theories of authority, of irresistible grace, and infallibility, on which the Latin system is based, are untenable in the light of the facts of to-day. Further, its interpretation of history and of the development of the Church and of dogma are in themselves inadequate, and fail to do justice to the eternal principle of the holiness and the love of God.

That the Latins are willing to hold out their hands despite much evidence to the contrary can be seen in some of their relations to the Eastern Orthodox Church. During the war, for instance, Benedict XV established the Sacred Congregation *Pro Ecclesia Orientali*; he himself became President of the congregation, and no longer are the Orthodox subject, along with unbelievers and heretics, to the Inquisition; they are not spoken of as heretics to be converted but as *fratres dissidentes* to be reconciled. Further, an Oriental Institute has been founded so that Latins and *dissidentes* of every rite and language may attend lectures, and learn of one another. The monastery of Amay-sur-Meuse has been set apart by the Benedictines for the training of the monks of Union. Further, we read in *Rerum Orientalium*, September 8, 1928, that what stands in the way of dioceses, for example in Transjordanian, eager for union (i.e., with the Latins) is the lack of Latin priests who will adopt Oriental rites. "To ask the Eastern Churches to adopt the Latin rite would be inconceivable. That priests of the Latin rite should undertake the introduction of the new elements which union with Rome involves would be impossible." In his Encyclical Letter *Ecclesiam Dei*, November 12, 1923, Pope Pius XI indicated a strong yearning on the part of the Latin Church for the return of the Churches of the East to the fold of the true Church; he asked them to lay aside ancient prejudices, and "not to blame the Church of Rome for the faults of individuals." The general principle which applies to the treatment of the Orthodox, holds also for the other Churches in the East. Actually, each of these Churches has practised excommunication of the other, in fact every communion is under the ban of one or other—either it went out on the threat of excommunication, or was put out. All Christendom must learn to trust one another, and to treat one another's churches as far as possible as they desire to be treated and to have their own church treated.

The mutual rapprochement between the Churches of Eastern Christendom with the Church of England has been fostered by each in turn since the seventeenth century. However true may be the remark of the historian S. R. Green, "the Church of England as we know it to-day is the work of a Greek monk," the situation has been clarified as a result of the formation of the Anglican and

Eastern Orthodox Churches Union, and the appointment by Archbishop Davidson, on the resolution of Lambeth 1908, of a permanent committee to take cognizance of the relations of the Church of England with the Eastern Church. A momentous step was taken when the "Declaration of Faith," prepared and published by the English Church Union in 1922, and signed by 3,715 Anglicans, was presented to "His Holiness the Œcumenical Patriarch and the Holy Synod of the Great Church at Constantinople." In August of the same year, the Patriarch issued an encyclical, stating that English ordinations were regarded as possessing the same validity as that possessed by the Roman, Old Catholic and Armenian Churches, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the orthodox point of view for the recognition of the "charisma" of the priesthood derived from the Apostolic succession. The pan-Orthodox Council has yet to meet, and deliver its opinion regarding the orders of the Church of England. The statement at the Cheltenham Church Congress by the Most Rev. Archbishop Germanos, Metropolitan of Thyateira, has been bitterly criticized by some lay members of the Orthodox faith. "Why should we not think," he said, "that a time is coming when the Catholic nucleus which always existed in the Anglican Church should not prevail over the whole body, so that it should appear in that form which would make reunion with our Orthodox Church possible? Meanwhile, the duty of the Orthodox is not to break the definite bond which binds us to the Anglican Communion, but to help in such an evolution through friendly intercourse and in a spirit of peaceful discussion."

The Committee of Anglicans and Free Churchmen, which was appointed by the Conference held at Lambeth to consider the issues of the Lambeth Appeal, has issued its final report. Dr. Scott Lidgett says: "All the influences which operated in 1920 continue to weigh, and they should constrain us steadfastly to persevere in pursuit of Reunion whatever may be the difficulties that confront us, or the delays that must inevitably take place before these difficulties are overcome. The crux in the conversations, which were in no sense negotiations, was the position of the non-episcopally ordained ministers in the re-united Church, and of their celebrating Holy Communion in Anglican Churches."

V

The practical steps towards Reunion may be considered along the following lines:—

1. The will to union: this involves the hating of those attitudes which create discord; the forsaking of non-essential and secondary positions; and the embracing of the undying passion for the comprehensive outward union of Christendom.

2. The acceptance of the spiritual truths of the Faith—Incarnation, Atonement, Trinity, and to such truths as the Nicene Creed bears witness, and the final authority in matters of faith being the Holy Spirit interpreting the witness of the Bible to Christ and to God whom He revealed.

3. The vision of the Christian Church really establishing the Kingdom of God on earth : this may mean a federal union as a step towards organic union, i.e., of one united corporate body : the main point is the recognition of every regular minister of an accredited Church as a minister of the Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church ; the welcoming of members of the Churches who have a regular ministry to communion at the Lord's Table ; the acceptance of one another's members truly as members of the Church of God ; the acknowledgment of a historical episcopate which will be constitutional and representative.

4. The Church of England should be the Church of the English people, and I would venture to say that the Church of Great Britain and Ireland should be the Church of all its inhabitants. Here arise two matters of importance : the first concerns ourselves ; while Truth must triumph no one section of the Church of England, nor for that matter any of the Churches in England, has a full understanding of Truth, and it seems like sheer insincerity unworthy of the name we bear, to pray at one moment for unity and union with non-episcopal churches and at the next, to regard with equanimity, if not to perpetuate, the unhappy divisions which are still present in our communion ; the second also concerns ourselves and is the question of the Establishment ; it seems clear that the issue of spiritual autonomy must be reopened, for it is a tenet common to Presbyterians, Wesleyan Methodists, Congregationalists and Baptists.

5. As soon as the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland have become united and the plans for the union of Methodists have become effective : the implications are far-reaching and world-wide, and will need the most thorough inquiry.

6. The union movements in South India and Persia especially should be given every consideration ; here these have emerged and have not been forced from outside, and have no ulterior motive such as recognition of orders by the Latins and Greeks. Care must be taken that these movements should not separate themselves from the parent churches. The effect on the home base of the co-operating churches is immeasurable, and we call on Lambeth definitely to support these schemes in such details as are known to us at present.

7. In the meantime there should be a thorough study of the papers at Stockholm and Lausanne. There the problems are clearly stated and a mutual understanding of the difficulties involved would bring members of all churches together, and thus there might emerge a conception of the Church-to-be. The suggestion is fruitful that the Anglican Church is a possible bridge church with the Orthodox, and through the Swedish Lutheran Church with Lutheranism, and

through the Evangelicals with a hoped-for reunion with Wesleyan Methodism and thus with the Free Churches.

8. The demand for Intercommunion is increasing and ought to be encouraged, especially where it is the spontaneous desire of those who have assembled for some special work to express their union with Christ and fellowship one with another. Such laws and instructions in the Church of England which refer to the Rubric at the close of the Confirmation Service do not preclude Christians of other sections of the Church of God from sharing in our service of Holy Communion. On the other hand it was put forward at Lambeth Conference, 1920, that "it should be regarded as a general rule that Anglican communicants should receive the Holy Communion only at the hand of members of their own church or of churches in communion therewith."

In suggesting these practical steps towards Reunion, we become cognizant of other relevant and vital issues, to which answers have yet to be found, and so it is essential that we have not only an open mind, tolerant, not indifferent, but also to have the spirit of Christ. We begin to realize that others have a right to opinions which for us are highly disagreeable. Nevertheless, the great requirement is this right spirit. We need the spirit of courage, and of sound judgment, the preparedness to study, the desire to see the condition of the world as God sees it, the determination to establish the Kingdom of God, the willingness to use every approach to unity as generally consistent with the emerging conception of the Church. We need to co-operate in matters which do not concern differences, to share in the communion of great things, the study of theology, the use of devotional literature, hymns, sermons, books, liturgies, communion in prayer and worship. Out of this will emerge a new Church; it will have the energy, power and liberty of Protestantism, the stability, humility and order of Latin and Eastern Christianity, but it will be neither. The spirit of unity must have a body, and it will be found in the Church that is to come, where Grace is spiritually transmitted and orderly appointed.

The world situation, as was portrayed at the Jerusalem Conference, 1928, only reinforces the demand for Reunion. The trilogy of the world, the flesh and the devil were combined under the head of Secularism. Now there is a facile meaning for this word; but the inner meaning is this, that anything which is disintegrated, which is consciously divorced from the whole of life, which is deprived of its true function, no matter whether it be politics, education, religion, is Secularism, and will fail from inanition; and the demand is for the wholeness of life, which is given through the personality and message of Jesus Christ Himself, and is intrinsically self-authenticating to the human soul and to the collective body of believers. The Spirit of Christ requires an ever-growing body through which to express Himself. No one section can cut itself off without reinforcing the ranks of Secularism, nor can it refuse to co-operate in establishing the all-embracing body of Christ without preparing its own obsequies. We need to return to

the personal principles of our Faith and live and work at peace ; out of this co-operation will emerge a new Church in which there will be orders capable of embracing and expressing every point of view of the mind of Christ in His people. Let us remember St. Paul's view : " Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it ; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word. That He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing ; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

A book of missionary interest which no one should fail to read is Mr. Wilson Cash's *Persia Old and New*. (C.M.S., 1s. net.) Mr. Cash recently paid a visit to Persia and he has given an informing record of his experiences and a brief but fascinating account of Persia and the mission work which has been carried on there for many years. Most of us are familiar with the visit and translation work of Henry Martyn. There have been many vicissitudes since those early days and there are still many difficulties to be faced by the band of workers who are labouring heroically. What Mr. Cash saw, he tells us, filled him with admiration for that splendid band of missionaries, old and young, who to-day are the worthy successors of those who laid the foundation upon which they build. The outlook, he adds, is promising, although there are threats of danger from Bolshevism and Secularism. There is a strong movement for reunion in Persia and negotiations are already far advanced between the Presbyterians and our own people. The Lambeth Conference will have a grave responsibility in making a decision on these reunion movements. Mr. Cash expresses the views of the people thus : " The Persians to whom I spoke were quite definite in their ideals about the Church. They did not want a Church of England in Persia. They were building up a Persian Church on Persian lines to express Persian Christian thought and culture, and while they accepted episcopacy as the right method of church policy they were emphatic in their demands that it should be a constitutional episcopacy and that the government of the Church should be in their own hands."

H. R. Allenson, Ltd., issues a volume of *Twenty-five Talks with Boys and Girls*, by the late Rev. George H. Morrison, D.D., of Wellington Church, Glasgow (3s. 6d.). Dr. Morrison's characteristics as a preacher are too well known to need commendation. These addresses, prepared for publication by his widow, are examples of his gift of dealing with great subjects with simplicity, and yet with beauty of language and illustration.

PROPOSED SCHEMES FOR REUNION.

BY THE RIGHT REVEREND THE BISHOP OF FUKIEN.

JUST at the time when I was asked to write this paper I was reading through, not for the first nor yet for the second time, Dickens's wonderful novel *Bleak House*, and I came to a passage which so exactly sums up the situation as I see it that I make no apology for quoting it in full. Little Jo lay dying and the good doctor Woodcourt was attending him and asked him :

" Jo, did you ever know a prayer ? "

" Never know'd nothink, sir. "

" Not so much as one short prayer ? "

" No, sir, nothink at all. Mr. Chadbands he was a-prayin' wunst at Mr. Sangsby's and I heerd him, but he sounded as if he was a-speakin' to hisself and not to me. He prayed a lot, but I couldn't make out nothink on it. Different times there was other gen'l'men came down Tom All Alone's a-prayin', but they all mostly said as the t'other ones prayed wrong, and all mostly sounded to be a-prayin' to theirselves or a-passin' blame on the t'others, and not a-talkin' to us. We never knowd nothink. I never know'd what it was all about. "

This really well represents what is happening to-day throughout Christendom. The divisions, controversies and mutual recriminations are so sadly weakening the message of the Gospel which we are attempting to preach to the World, that it fails to reach those to whom it is sent. So serious has the situation become that it is no wonder that now at last some have been aroused to the danger and have determined to get rid of the divisions at any cost. Consequently we hear of Conferences being called together for mutual counsel and discussion, and we even find actual schemes for Union Churches developing in many places.

The subject assigned to me is " Proposed Schemes for Reunion. " I accepted the invitation to write this paper on the distinct understanding that I was not likely to commend these schemes in general nor any one of them in particular to the members of this Conference. There have been many such proposed Unions, for example the United Church of Canada, the South India United Church, the United Church of South Africa and the recently inaugurated Church of Christ in China. All such schemes have many points in common, and I am sure that most of the members of the Conference will be familiar with the details of at least one of them and probably more than one. So far as our own communion is concerned, the one which seems to be most hopeful of success is the South India United Church, where representatives of the Anglican Church have actually been negotiating with a view to joining as an integral part of the United Church.

The China scheme known as the Church of Christ in China is practically an amalgamation of the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches alone. This Union is a development of an earlier movement between these two communions which had been in existence

for some years. The great wave of Nationalist feeling which swept over the country from end to end during the last few years, and which did affect, to some extent, even the Church, is partly responsible for bringing the matter to a head just at the present time.

The movement has been ascribed to a growing impatience on the part of Chinese Christians with the divisions in the Church which they call our Western divisions, and which they declare have no meaning for them. I must honestly say that I have met with few such expressions of impatience from Chinese Christian leaders, and I think that the impatience is really to be found exactly where it might be expected, namely, in the hearts of the missionaries, and it is *their* enthusiasm which has infected the minds of some of the Chinese Christians. Such expressions of impatience with our Western divisions as one has heard or seen in print seem to be more the reflection of the opinions of China's foreign Missionary friends, than to be any spontaneous or deep-rooted feeling of their own. The Chinese with whom I have frequently discussed this and kindred matters seem quite ready to grasp the facts: (a) that the Church which Western missionaries have been instrumental in founding in China is not the Church of the Apostles' days, nor the Church of the time of St. Augustine, it is the Church of the present day, it is the only Church they had to offer and is therefore the only Church that China could accept; (b) that China cannot, as it were, go back and pick it up at some earlier point in its history; (c) that it does not really matter where the events happened which produced our present divisions, the divisions now exist in the Church as part of its very fabric and are as universal as the Church, and (d) that, as China gradually accepts Christianity, she must make her own contribution to it, and, above all, must do her utmost to co-operate with Christians throughout the world in attempting to heal up the divisions in the Church which she recognizes to be the cause of so much weakness.

The particular Union scheme of which I am now speaking, namely, the Church of Christ in China, was consummated much too rapidly for the Chinese branch of the Anglican Communion—the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui—to have any part in it. The Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui is organized nationally, that is to say, each of the eleven dioceses sends representatives to a General Synod which meets once in three years. Now the Church of Christ in China was organized between two meetings of the General Synod, and thus there was really no opportunity for the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui to consider the matter in Synod or officially to join the preliminary negotiations. I do not mean to imply that had the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui had the opportunity she would certainly have joined in the negotiations, nor to suggest that she bears any grudge against the originators of this scheme, for we realize, in the first place, that it is a union between Protestant communions already very closely related, and, secondly, that it was but the ratification of an experiment between these particular communions initiated some years previously. At the same time it must be

recognized that if this movement is, as it appears to be, an attempt to form a basis upon which all the Protestant communions in China may unite to form one united Protestant Church of China, then the fact of this smaller union having actually been consummated will complicate any future negotiations with those communions which are as yet excluded from it but which may hereafter wish to cooperate.

But I must express the anxiety I feel, an anxiety albeit which does not seem to be generally felt, that a very serious danger lurks in the proposed organization of Union Churches on national or regional lines and that such a proceeding is likely to lead to divisions in Christendom even more disastrous than those we have at present.

Our divisions into what are called denominations are very much to be deplored, but nevertheless the denominations as we have them now have one strong point, namely, that they do go round the world. However unravelled the strands of the Church's witness have become those strands have preserved that indispensable characteristic of a Christian Church—they have kept their international character, or, better, their supra-national character.

If, in order to secure Unity, it should be found necessary to cut across the unravelled strands, then the result would be that we should, as it were, substitute for our present horizontal division by denominations a vertical division by nations or regions. The hope underlying this process doubtless is that, when the principle has been applied in many different parts of the world, and a number of national or regional churches formed, it will be comparatively easy to draw these national churches together and a World-wide United Church will be the ultimate outcome.

It may well be questioned whether it would ever be possible to achieve a permanent and stable coherence between the units cooperating in any such national or regional united Church. History does not inspire one with much hope; but even if this were found possible, the problem of uniting together a number of such national or regional churches would be infinitely greater, and thus we should be brought no nearer to the goal of a reunited Christendom, but should find ourselves encumbered with denominations at least as numerous as before and far more difficult to unite. For it must not be imagined that the national or regional churches so formed would be identical or even similar in character, in doctrine or in practice. The several regions contain quite different groups of denominations, and it is unthinkable that those different groups when combined should result in identical combinations. Let us use an illustration. Suppose we represent the denominations by the letters of the alphabet; in region No. 1 we have A, B, C, and D denominations, and in region No. 2 we have A, C, E, and G denominations; it is impossible that the combination ABCD should be identical with the combination ACEG. In region No. 3 we may find quite a different group of denominations, say, C, F, I, and L, which have only C in common with the first two. Here again we

must expect a combination having characteristics differing considerably from the former two. The illustration may seem to exaggerate the problem somewhat; nevertheless it serves to show how little we can count on being able to draw together into one great United Church, the national or regional churches after such have been formed. When we add to this the difficulties arising from differences in racial characteristics, national histories and national customs we shall surely begin to realize that to achieve a reunited Christendom through this means is a forlorn hope.

I must go on to mention some of the *dangers* which I see in regional unions.

First there is the obvious danger that the Church will cease to be the link binding together believers in Jesus Christ of different races and colours, the several parts of it will rather become conformed to the regions where they exist and will inevitably fail to bear witness, to as full an extent as previously, to the world-wide fellowship of the disciples of Christ. The Church ought to be, and has surely hitherto been on the whole, a powerful agency for the prevention of war, but if the division of the Church by nations were to become a fact, it is to be feared that, in the event of war, or even during international disputes which tend to lead to war, such churches could hardly fail to fall into the snare of becoming an instrument for the furtherance of national interests or for the denouncing of national enemies. It may well be argued that even with our present divisions we did not wholly escape that snare; well, then, all the less hope if the churches' denominational boundaries were to be made coincident with those of the nations.

Secondly. This process of cutting across the ravelled strands is a process of disintegration, and when a process of disintegration has once begun it is very liable to go on. For example, we already hear rumours of plans for the formation of a Nanking United Church and a Hangchow United Church. Nanking and Hangchow are mere *cities* in China, but if once the process of cutting across the strands begins there can be little doubt that we shall immediately be faced with the problem of *Local Unions*. This is a perfectly natural development. To use again the illustration given above, let us suppose the national united Church of China to consist of a combination of denominations A to Z. Whereas Hangchow finds itself with only A, B, X, and Y, the Christians there will naturally think that they can form a church more congenial to themselves than the National Church, and having no traditions to bind them in loyalty to the National Church they will not hesitate to cut themselves off from it and form a local union, and thus the process of disintegration once begun will tend to continue unchecked until the church is split up into numerous local unions each independent of the rest and all of them failing sadly to bear any witness to the universal fellowship of believers in Christ.

You will very naturally say to me, "What hope is there then of ever securing Unity? Conferences have been held after years of preparation and at immense expense and have yielded but little

result. It is plain that if we are to trust to conferences and conversations alone, unity can only be achieved, if ever, after a lapse of very many years *and the matter is urgent*. The Communion are too large now and the differences too numerous for any satisfactory result to be obtained by conference in the near future, and now you warn us that schemes for national or regional unions are likely to lead us at last into an error that will be worse than the first. Have you any proposal to make which will give us any hope of reaching our goal?" I must say in answer to this challenge that the only hope I see is by way of *Intercommunion*. It does not come within the scope of this paper to speak of Intercommunion, that subject is being dealt with by others, suffice it to say that I believe that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is our Sacrament of unity, that it was given because our Lord foresaw the danger of disunion (as His High-Priestly prayer plainly shows) and was intended to be a means of preserving unity among His disciples *or of recovering it if lost*, and was never meant to be regarded, as it now so commonly is, as a mere sign of restored fellowship.

Doctor Norman Leys in his book *Kenya* makes the statement, "Protestant missions in Kenya would be happy to unite if the churches at home would allow them." This is a serious indictment of the home churches and one that ought to give them furiously to think. There seems to be a tendency in the home churches nowadays to shift the responsibility for reunion on to the mission-field; perhaps, as a missionary, I may be excused if I do my bit towards shifting it back again. The home Church's constant cry is "We are waiting for a lead from the mission-field," but this cry does not ring true. Barriers have been set up or have grown up which separate us from the other communions, and the home churches say that they wait for a lead from the mission-field to show how these barriers may be surmounted, and all the while the home churches do nothing to remove the barriers, and indeed continue to regard them as indispensable. The churches in the mission-field may surely be excused for feeling anxious lest, in the event of their repudiating any of these barriers, they would be treated as excommunicate by the home churches. Thus we have a vicious circle. The home churches wait for a lead from the mission-field, while the mission-field cannot move until the home churches have at least declared themselves as to their attitude towards these barriers. I fear lest the home churches be at last confounded by their own complacency and that they will one day wake up to find their daughter churches separated from them in a way that they will not scruple to describe as schismatic. Personally I believe that, unless the Anglican Communion is prepared to recognize the sister communions at least up to the point of intercommunion, her very existence in what are now known as mission lands is in danger. To the native churches in those lands, so far as my observation goes, the restrictions which have been placed upon intercommunion are simply meaningless. Intercommunion is practised in many places, but it is with an uncomfortable feeling that it contravenes

some regulation and would render those who practise it liable to the displeasure of the Mother Church.

As an illustration of the kind of barriers to which I have referred, may I make a few quotations from the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference of 1920.

1. The Bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who . . . shall *countenance the irregularity* of admitting to communion the baptized but unconfirmed communicants of the non-episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme.

2. [The conference] cannot approve of general schemes of intercommunion or exchange of pulpits.

3. It should be regarded as the general rule of the Church that Anglican communicants should receive Holy Communion only at the hands of ministers of their own church or of churches in communion therewith.

(The italics are mine.)

These resolutions have not, it is true, the binding force of laws, moreover they are carefully worded so as to avoid the appearance of setting up insurmountable barriers. Nevertheless, in view of the claim that Lambeth Conference makes for loyal obedience to its decisions, these resolutions do seem to many to impose real restrictions. I quote the following from the encyclical letter :

[Lambeth Conference] does not claim to exercise any powers of control or command. It stands for the far more Spiritual, more Christian principle of loyalty to the [Anglican] Fellowship. The churches represented in it are indeed independent, but independent with the Christian freedom which recognizes the restraints of truth and of love. They are not free to deny the truth. They are not free to ignore the fellowship.

Lambeth Conference is not a legislative assembly, it is merely a meeting for discussion, its findings have not the binding force of laws, though they have acquired considerable force throughout the Anglican Communion owing to the widely representative character of its personnel. It is very doubtful whether the Lambeth Conference would ever dare to take action amounting to the recognition of a national or regional united church, however carefully the terms of union had been drawn up. This would seem to it to be dangerously like legislation and any such action on the part of Lambeth Conference would be strongly resented throughout the Anglican Communion. But even if the home church finds it difficult to make changes itself, at least the conference can rescind its own former action, it can withdraw advice it has given in the past or take such other suitable action as shall set the daughter churches free to welcome to their altars recognized communicants of the other great communions and to accept similar hospitality from them.

May we not safely assume that such friendly action on the part of our communion and the greater intimacy which would result from it would lead to that mutual understanding and love which is the only sound and lasting basis of unity.

It is quite possible that each communion thinks that its own service is in some way superior to that of the other communions—more primitive, more catholic, more helpful or perhaps essentially different in some important respect—yet there is one thing of which

we may be sure, namely, that what each communion calls its "Holy Communion" is the service of all others through which God's blessing and help are received; it is here that the Spiritual life is most surely renewed and sustained. These are our best blessings; are they not, then, the very things that we should be most ready to share with others? and should we not also be ready to partake of their deepest and most inspiring Spiritual experiences whom we willingly and rightly acknowledge to be our brethren in Christ?

THE COMING OF THE CHURCH. By J. R. Coates. *Student Christian Movement*, 1929. (Pp. 96.) 3s.

We wish Mr. Coates had written at greater length. As it is, his 96 pages contain more stimulating thoughts and penetrating observations than many more pretentious volumes. Originally given in the form of addresses to missionaries in China in 1926, the volume bears evidence of a combination of scientific method in Biblical Criticism with a love for the Sacred Scriptures. "It takes the whole Bible to present the fact of Christ. . . . Christ means Israel, and Church History includes Moses and the prophets," says Mr. Coates, and he rightly traces the roots of the Church to Judaism. He sees underlying the ideas "Messiah," "Suffering Servant," "Covenant-People," "Light of the World," "Son of Man," an ideal Israel, whose true nature Christ was "to bring into being." This Christ did in founding the Church, a society which, according to the author, "can do what it likes with its traditional institutions." While we do not agree with all that he says on this point, we would underline his opinion that "the Church will achieve effective unity, and become actually Catholic only as it achieves and fulfils its calling to be the agent of world-redemption."

G. H. W.

THE BIRTH OF CONSCIENCE. By Constance L. Maynard. *Religious Tract Society*, 1928. (Pp. 78.) 2s.

The reading of this well-written study gave us much pleasure. The author finds three witnesses to the first dawn of Conscience—the records of primitive man, the mental history of each individual, and the Book of Genesis. A study of the Temptation and Fall of Man leads Miss Maynard to look upon Conscience as a faculty capable of growing, serving us best when it is subject to divine control and inspiration. Not the least pleasing feature of the book is the inclusion of very happily chosen verses (some her own) at the end of each chapter. We feel sure that Miss Maynard could give us a beautiful translation of Victor Hugo's lines on Conscience in his study of Cain in *La Légende des Siècles*.

G. H. W.

INTER-COMMUNION.

BY THE REV. J. PAUL S. R. GIBSON, M.A.,
Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

IT is a great joy for one who has been closely watching the progress of Inter-Communion during the last fifteen years to be asked to address the Cheltenham Conference, that has always shown such great sympathy for the idea of reunion. Moreover, it is especially pleasing to speak at a time when those who have eyes to see realize that the great tide of Inter-Communion has begun to flow, and that by the Grace of God this barrier which has in the past proved one of the greatest bulwarks against the possibility of reunion is about to be swept away.

In connection with the whole question it is right that we should first of all come to a clear understanding as to what we believe was the *object* of our Lord in instituting this Sacrament. It we hold that it was to be the crown of an already consummated spiritual, emotional and intellectual unity, then naturally we shall feel that the time is not yet ripe for acts of Inter-Communion; but if we are convinced, as I feel we must be, that our Lord instituted the rite as a *means to attain* that which could be attained in no other way, then with humility we shall confess that for centuries we have been trying to reach His goal by devious paths of our own, and neglected to follow His clear leading. I have worked this point out in an article in *THE CHURCHMAN* for January, 1929, which is being reprinted in pamphlet form. I need only here sum up by saying that the state of mind of the disciples at the Last Supper, if we think it out, will be seen to be one of trepidation and excitement and mutual suspicion, and rivalry, and that this was the cause of their sitting down to the Supper with unwashed feet. This led our Lord to do for them what they would have done for themselves had one of their number been ready in Eastern-wise to see that a bucket of water was at the door for them to cleanse their feet before entering after their walk. The shared bread and wine were, among other things, to bring them once again into the spirit of fellowship through the spirit of sacrifice.

I take it then that we start from the basis of the Holy Communion being a means to an end, the means appointed by our Lord to draw disintegrating Christians together. Before proceeding, I would make another point clear.

A quarter of a century ago, Free Churchmen, with a wonderful Christian charity, were willing to accept invitations to our Celebrations without asking us back to theirs, because they felt that if they came to us we should, by a natural Christian process, be led to communicate with them in their churches. Experience has shown that they were wrong, and they are now naturally hesitating to accept our invitations, unless in them is implied the willingness to accept an invitation in return. I feel that they are right, and

therefore in speaking of Inter-Communion I shall assume that we mean, not only receiving Free Churchmen at our celebrations, but being ready to communicate in their churches. For those who seek authority for such action, Bishop Linton, of Persia, rightly points out that it is fully implied by the recognition by Lambeth 1920 of the spiritual reality of non-Episcopal ministries not only of the Word but of the Sacraments. One other point I would mention. Inter-Communion may mean a mutual and joint *reception*, or it may mean a joint *administration*. Spiritually, I believe both these to be in the same plane, and that they could on spiritual grounds be treated as one, but the question of joint administration does not lead one any farther in spiritual principles, and is open to the serious practical objection that it introduces new problems of the Ministry and Church Order. I look forward to the day of joint administrations, but do not feel that anything will be gained by pressing for these at this point. When mutual reception is largely recognized, then we may move on to joint administrations, but in the meanwhile many may be alienated by the second who are yet growingly prepared to accept the first. This is a point in which we must remember those who move more slowly, and, while I always rejoice to hear of joint administrations having taken place, I do not propose in this lecture to press for this form of Inter-Communion, nor will I refer to it again.

In dealing with the whole problem, there are certain facts which I would like to lay before you :—

(1) I accept the fact that our Lord instituted a rite at the Last Supper, and that the disciples understood Him correctly when they reproduced it in memory of Him.

(2) That at the institution there was no mention of any Ministry, and that no orders were given about administration. This entirely agrees with our Lord's general habit of mind. For Him fact always transcended form, and was greater than interpretation. Questions of ministry and order cannot therefore be fundamental.

(3) In the course of time there arose within the Church a sacerdotal Ministry, which replaced the words of our Lord "where two or three are gathered together, there am I in the midst of them," with the words "where there is no Bishop, there is no Church." The Church of England has never been party to such a sacerdotal destruction of the simple Christian faith. Nowhere in the Articles, whether we look at those which deal especially with the Church, Numbers 19, 20 and 36, or with those that deal with the Sacraments, Numbers 25, 27 and 28, do we find a single word that would make one believe that a Bishop is *necessary* for the existence of the Christian Church.

(4) I would bring to your memory the facts at the Reformation, and how, as Mr. Carter points out in his book, *The Anglican Via Media*, ministers of the Reformed Church without episcopal ordination were licensed to celebrate the Offices and administer the Sacraments without further ordination (pages 96 and 97), and that Bishop Cosin urged the English refugees in France to join in Com-

munion with the French Reformed Church. He himself communicated at Charenton. The retention of Bishops at the Reformation depended on the attitude of the Bishops—not on their necessity to the Church.

(5) The next fact that we have to face is the rise of the whole problem in the mission field. Here in England Christians can normally find a church of their own for Communion, and this has blinded men to the need for Christian unity in face of growing secularism, but in the mission field, especially through the working of the comity of missions by which only one Church works in a given area, it constantly arises that when a convert leaves one district for another, he comes into the sphere of an entirely different Christian Church. The problem has thus become acute. (Kikuyu, S.I.U.C., Persia, China, Bishop Hind in Fukien.) From the end of last century discussions and conferences have taken place in order to try and reach some agreement, and a great step forward is reached when the Lambeth Conference in its Report, page 135, states that they do not for a moment question the spiritual reality of the Ministries of those Communion which do not possess the Episcopate. On the contrary, they say, we thankfully acknowledge that these Ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. All such theories are abundantly substantiated by the spiritual results that have been reached by those who, obeying our Lord's command, have not hesitated to enter into the privilege and inspiration of Inter-Communion. Whether we think of Grindelwald in earlier days, or, more recently, the wonderful Communion Service held by the Jerusalem Conference on Easter Day, or the Bishop of Liverpool's invitation to the whole Student Movement Quadrennial Conference at the beginning of this year, or of the special blessing of unanimity at the Y.W.C.A. Conference at Budapest, or whether we think of the long-tested experiment at Peradeniya, where Inter-Communion brought such an abundant blessing, in every case we are presented with a sudden and continued outburst of spiritual power, a drawing together of men not only in spirit but in mind and will. A new atmosphere is created in which things happen which normally are regarded as impossible. The long experience in this matter of the Bishop of Fukien is of extraordinary weight and value, and I trust as he is present he will tell us first hand of his experience.

In contradistinction to these experiences, which have vindicated our Lord's method for attaining unity, we turn to what the Bishop of Bradford rightly calls the tragedy of Lausanne. There, as Mr. Pulvertaft said, Lausanne opened with a vision which day by day got more completely obscured, whereas Jerusalem ended with a brightness and a glory which was the outcome of a growing insight into the mind of our Lord.

From the spiritual standpoint there is no problem at all. Those who obey find ample proof that our Lord chose not only a good but the only method which would draw all men unto Himself.

There are, however, certain problems which may arise in men's

minds with regard to practical matters. The first of these is the meaning of the Confirmation rubric that "there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed." I cannot do better than give you the conclusions marshalled in convincing style by Dr. Gwatkin, in his Kikuyu Tract of 1914, on this subject :—

In the first place, we find prefixed to the Prayer Book this declaration : "In these our doings we condemn no other nations nor prescribe anything but to our own people only." That the rubric has this sentence in mind is substantiated by the words used being, not "except he be confirmed," but "until such time as he be confirmed"; this latter is the correct form of words if we are thinking of our own people only. Dr. Gwatkin then mentioned that the rubric was framed in 1549 and 1552, except for the last sentence, at a time when the reformers not only received unconfirmed foreigners to Communion, but had no scruples, when abroad, at taking the stronger step of receiving Communion themselves in Calvinistic Churches, and though the present form of the rubric dates from 1662, we must remember that "Cosin was a typical Caroline, and he was not the only one who joined without scruple in the Communion of the French Protestants at Charenton." But the most convincing argument of all is, perhaps, that for many years nonconformists occasionally came to the Communion, and were even expected to do so. This action of theirs led to occasional Conformity Bills during a struggle which lasted for nearly twenty years in the early 18th century, and even these Bills do not dispute the nonconformists' right to Communion, and Dr. Gwatkin remarks : "Strange to say, nobody seems to have discovered that all this trouble might have been avoided by simply carrying out the rubric"! The point is that the rubric was never understood in the sense of excluding nonconformists till long after the rise of Tractarianism. Archbishops Tait, Maclagan and Benson, Bishops Creighton, Stubbs and Wordsworth all rejected the new Tractarian interpretation. As Bishop Wordsworth said, "It is the Lord's Table, not ours." The Confirmation rubric can only prove a difficulty to those who are already convinced and intend to give no weight either to history or to free Christian thinking. The attitude of Dr. Gwatkin is confirmed by Resolution 12, C. 2, of the Lambeth Conference, 1920.

A second difficulty often mentioned is that of the priest's vows that he will only take services according to the Anglican use, and it is because of this that I hesitate to plunge for joint administration of Holy Communion, but there is not anything to prevent a priest celebrating an Anglican service and communicating nonconformists, nor is there anything to prevent his receiving Holy Communion himself at a service conducted by a Free Churchman. It might possibly be replied that the statement in the Lambeth Resolutions 12, B. 2, made this impossible, and that statement is : "and that it should be regarded as the *general* rule of the Church that Anglican communicants should receive Holy Communion only

at the hands of ministers of their own Church or Churches in communion therewith"; but I have myself been told by the Bishop, who insisted on the introduction of the word "general," that the word was introduced with the express object of preventing the rule from becoming universal, as he was thinking of special cases in his own missionary diocese, where it was necessary for some of his Anglican flock, if they wished to receive Communion at all, to receive it from the hands of non-episcopally ordained men. We see, then, that the so-called practical, official difficulties do not really exist, and difficulties that remain must find their cause in our own hearts. These difficulties may take the form of fear of new custom, and lack of precedent, for we know how terribly bound we become by the things to which we are used, and how hard it is to do some new thing; or it may be a subconscious pride of Churchmanship and a desire to hold on to that which gives us prestige; but if all personal difficulties are overcome, and all fear of the criticism of those who object to what we do is destroyed, then we may boldly go forward in this matter. I would quote to you from the words of the Bishop of Bradford in his anniversary sermon of the Church Missionary Society in 1928: "Can we not go boldly forward, with Inter-Communion first, where the spirit of unity is evident. . . . I wonder whether it is not just here that we might find a new starting-point for that fresh adventure to which it seems God is calling us, and go boldly forward to Inter-Communion, not careful over-much about offending others if we are clear that God's Will may be done along the line of Christ's own example."

I would close with a few practical suggestions with regard to immediate action. Acts of Inter-Communion must be the result of a certain Christian fellowship, being in Christ together, even though it may be far from complete unanimity in any particular direction, emotional, intellectual or doctrinal. And I would here throw out the suggestion that we have in *our common failure* a real call to corporate action. We are all genuinely trying to mould our churches after a supposed Christ pattern and we have failed. Surely this in itself is enough to draw us together to the Sacrament of the Cross. Dwelling on our contributions may lead to pride and exclusiveness, a true sense of humiliation will draw us together. Mere formal and unprepared general schemes of Inter-Communion are not likely to be helpful; the most profitable times for such acts would therefore be when small groups have met together for fellowship and discussion and even controversy. At such times a joint act of Communion will prove of tremendous power in drawing minds, wills and hearts together. The act of partaking in common need not mean any special unanimity of interpretation of doctrine (in passing let us note how differences of interpretation of the Incarnation, for instance, do not separate us nor, *within our Church*, those *re* the Holy Communion) or corporate preference for certain forms of ceremony (which appertain to custom and inherited prejudice), they are of the accidents, not the substance, but is a witness to the near fellowship which exists in

Christ Jesus, despite these very differences of form and thought. We have in Cambridge such Inter-Communion now year by year in a Society composed of groups of men from all the Theological Colleges. Such acts do not imply carelessness concerning, or loose attachment to, our own branch of the Church. Other opportunities for acts of Inter-Communion are special national days, when Christians naturally are gathered together. A United Communion, say on New Year's Day, or Empire Day, or Armistice Day, is a thing which all of us should work for, and if such services take place before Lambeth 1930, it will enable the Bishops to discuss problems of Reunion, not *in vacuo*, but on the basis of the expressed will of the Churches and the proved experiences of spiritual blessing. Another method is the increased use of the general invitation in all our Churches, especially in one-church areas, in chaplaincies, in camps and Conferences, to all those who are regular communicants of their own Churches to join with us in this great act of fellowship in Our Lord's Life and Death; but I would press the thought with which I began, that where such invitation is given it must, if it is to be of any Christian value, include a stated or implied willingness to communicate at the churches of those whom you thus invite. It was with great joy that I heard the other day that the members who compose a Cathedral Chapter unofficially gave an invitation to nonconformist ministers to attend an Anglican Celebration, and themselves later accepted the invitation to receive at a Free Church in their turn. It is by such acts as these, fearless, bold, expectant, and perhaps above all obedient to the command of Our Lord, that this great barrier to true understanding and fellowship will be once and for all banished from our Christian thinking, and I look forward to the day, not so far ahead, when such questions will seem as irrelevant to the Christians of the time as that which loomed so important in the eyes of the nascent Church at Jerusalem, namely, whether or not one could even think of entering the Christian brotherhood without first having gone through a form of surgical operation!

But this demands individual action (the time is not yet ripe for officially approved acts)—prayerfully, fearlessly, obedient to a heavenly vision. My final word is a plea for actual Inter-Communion, whenever the occasion arises—and our eyes must be open to see opportunities—even at real cost to ourselves. For a long time our courtesy in withholding from such action on account of those who conscientiously object, has now been interpreted as weakness due to lack of conviction. We can respect their aloofness but can no longer allow it to deter us. Let us, in the Bishop of Bradford's words already quoted, "be not careful over-much of offending others." While naturally this is the last thing we seek to do, if we are clear that God's will may be done by following Christ's own example, our duty is to follow the truth and not be led even by an old established rut that goes in another direction.

AKHNATON.

THE MAN AND HIS VISION.

BY G. C. PARKHURST BAXTER.

I DO not pretend in this paper to aspire to do other than collect in a short essay the leading thoughts and material which have been placed on record and have inspired those writers who have delved into the past and added to our knowledge of the aims, the purpose, the achievements and the failures of a King of Egypt of the long ago. A man who has been described as one of the most interesting characters ever known, who, in an age of superstition and in a land where the grossest polytheism reigned absolutely supreme, evolved a monotheistic religion second only to Christianity itself in purity of tone. The first human being to understand rightly the meaning of divinity and when the world reverberated with the noise of War to preach the first known doctrine of peace.

Amenophis IV, later known as Akhnaton, was Pharaoh of Egypt for seventeen years (1375-1358 B.C.), some thirteen hundred years before the birth of Christ, three centuries before the age of David and Solomon, and many a year before the preaching of Moses. He was the ninth King of the Eighteenth Dynasty which took possession of the throne of Egypt in the year 1580 B.C., over 1,300 years after the building of the great pyramids and some 2,000 years after the beginning of the dynastic history of the Nile Valley. His predecessors raised the prestige of Egypt to a point never attained before or since, and it reached its zenith in the reign of the sixth King of the dynasty, Thutmosis III, who conducted campaign after campaign in Syria and every year returned to Thebes, his capital, laden with the spoils of Asia. His son, Amenophis II, carried on these conquests and was succeeded by his son, Thutmosis IV, who was then eighteen years of age. During this King's reign the beginnings are to be observed of certain religious movements which became more apparent in the time of his son, Amenophis III, and of his grandson, Akhnaton.

Egypt had, at the time when Amenophis III ascended the throne, existed as a civilized nation for over 2,000 years, during the whole of which period religious beliefs had been developing and were now so engrained in the hearts of the people that changes, however slight, assumed revolutionary proportions, and at this time the old gods of Egypt were at the height of their power.

Of these gods, Amon, the presiding deity of Thebes, was the most powerful. Originally the tribal god of the Thebans, he had risen to the state god of the country when Thebes became the capital of Egypt.

The Sun God, Ra, originally the deity of Heliopolis near Cairo, had been the state god in earlier times and the priests of Amon

contrived to identify the two deities under the name "Amon-Ra, King of the Gods."

The Goddess Mut, "The Mother," was the consort of Amon. By Amon she had a son, Khonsu, who formed the third member of the Theban trinity. He was the God of the Moon. In Upper Egypt, Osiris, Isis and Horus formed a trinity. At Memphis the tribal god was the little dwarf Ptah, the European Vulcan, the blacksmith, the artificer and the potter of the gods. In this city also, as in many other districts of Egypt, there was the Sacred Bull here called Apis, who was worshipped with divine honours and was regarded as an aspect of Ptah. During a visit I paid to Egypt last year I spent a day at Sakkara (all too short a time) and was immensely struck with the Apis tombs which were excavated by Mariette Pasha in 1850. They are underground tombs and were rifled by the many invaders who conquered Egypt. But you can now see the empty stone sarcophagi with their heavy lids slightly moved by the ancient robbers who carried off the precious contents. There are in all twenty-four sarcophagi of colossal dimensions, but only two or three bear any inscriptions which can be inspected by the aid of candle or torchlight. It is a mystery how the old Egyptians managed to place these gigantic coffins of basalt and granite in these gloomy galleries that run into the bowels of the Libyan desert. They are ranged on the two sides of a gallery and one immense coffin is wedged in the entrance as if the workmen were stopped in placing it. There is very little room to pass by and later on one sees the empty chamber in which this coffin should have been placed.

In addition to these gods there were many other tribal and other deities which need not be referred to in this paper.

To administer to these hosts of heaven there had of necessity to be a vast number of priests. At Thebes the priesthood of Amon formed an organization of such power and wealth that the actions of the Pharaoh had largely come to be controlled by it. The High Priest of Amon-Ra was one of the most important personages in the land. He was usually Grand Vizier also and thus combined the highest civil appointment with the highest sacerdotal office. The priesthood of Ra at Heliopolis was also of great, though less importance. The High Priest of Ptah at Memphis was called the "Great Master Artificer," but he and the many other high priests of the various gods did not rank with the two great leaders of the Amon and Ra priesthoods.

When Thutmosis IV ascended the throne the Heliopolitan priesthood was chafing against the power of Amon and was striving to restore the fallen prestige of its own god Ra, who of late had had to play an annoying second to the Theban god. The King did not altogether approve of the political character of the Amon priesthood, but his brief reign only marks the indecisive beginnings of the struggle between Amon and Ra which culminated in the early years of the reign of his grandson Akhnaton.

Akhnaton succeeded to the throne at the age of twelve or thir-

teen under the name given him at his birth, Amenophis, and like his ancestors he was called "Beloved of Amon, Lord of Heaven." Apparently to counterbalance this one finds the surprising title:—

HIGH PRIEST OF RA-HORAKHTI, REJOICING IN THE HORIZON
IN HIS NAME "HEAT-WHICH-IS-IN-ATON."

It is obvious that a boy of twelve or thirteen could not himself have claimed the office of High Priest. His mother, Queen Tiy, and her advisors must have deliberately endowed the young King with the office in order to set the seal on the fate of Amon. In order to appreciate this attitude the condition of things at the Court must be considered. Egypt was still at the height of its power, the Kings of Syria and Palestine were tributaries to the young Pharaoh, the princes of the sea-coast cities sent their yearly impost, Sinai and the Red Sea coast as far south as Somaliland were included in the Pharaoh's dominions. The wealth of Egypt was enormous. The splendour and gaiety of the Court remind us of the tales from the Arabian Nights. The tendency was to break away from the hardier traditions of an earlier age. But while the Court amused themselves in sumptuous fashion the God Amon and his representatives towered over them like some sombre bogie, holding them to a religion which they considered obsolete, claiming also political power and a share of the royal wealth. The Queen Mother, of Syrian blood, was also no doubt influenced by Syrian thought, and Weigall tells us that the name Aton perhaps had some remote Syrian connection and was introduced into Egypt for the first time during her reign.

During the first years of the reign of Akhnaton he was entirely under the regency of his mother, and it was not till he was in his seventeenth or eighteenth year that his exalted monotheism became really apparent. While he was still a mere boy he was studying religious problems with zeal and with more than the usual amount of boyish understanding. He must have been precocious and clever, with a mind that worked swiftly, and he possessed a determined will, very definite religious convictions, and a fearless nature. He did not lightly brook opposition and he believed sincerely in the truth and honesty of his motives and actions. He seems also to have devoted a considerable amount of time and thought to the changes which were taking place, and there were no doubt many passages of arms between the High Priest of Amon-Ra and the royal High Priest of the sun. It is however clear that he lacked a practical knowledge of men and things. He never realized the true nature of the duties which, as King, he owed to his country and people, and he never understood the realities of life. The Court officials blindly followed him, and, thus encouraged, the King and his mother developed their speculations and drew into their circle of followers some of the greatest nobles of the land. The expected break with the priesthood of Amon was not long in coming, and in the sixth year of his reign the King abandoned Thebes, thus reducing it to the status of a provincial town. He changed his name from Amenophis, "The

Peace-of-Amon," to Akhnaton, "Aton-is-satisfied," and built a new city, "The City of the Horizon." Later he ordered the very name of Amon to be obliterated everywhere.

The creed of Akhnaton may be summed up thus:—

The earlier Egyptians worshipped the great Sun God Ra. Akhnaton brought Divinity into his worship. He worshipped Aton, the physical body of the Sun, whom he regarded as the source and mainstay of all created things, animate and inanimate, as the Lord and Giver of Life, the Bestower of Mercy, the Father of the Fatherless. All His attributes were symbolized in the sun. Its rising and setting signified Darkness and Light. Its power as the creative force in nature—Resurrection. It evolved mankind from the lower life and implanted the spirit of divinity in him through the creator of all things created. The sun was God created, His Symbol, His manifestation, in other words heat and light formed his God. Akhnaton taught his people to address Aton as their "Father which art in Heaven," to worship *in Truth* simply and without an excess of ceremonial. The True God had no form. No graven image was to be made of him. The most ancient symbol of the Sun God was a pyramid, and as a falcon, the figure of that bird was also used to designate him. These, however, were intelligible only in Egypt, and Akhnaton had a broader arena in view—The New Symbol of the religion was the sun's disc from the circumference of which there extended downward numerous rays each ending in a hand bestowing life on men and animals and on the earth itself. The idea of this many-armed and many-handed god was probably of Aryan origin, and after the King's death was not perpetuated in Egypt. It was a masterly symbol suggesting a power arising from its celestial source and putting its hand upon the world and the affairs of men. But this Symbol was not to be worshipped.

Never before had man conceived a formless deity, a god who was not endowed with the five human senses. The Hebrew patriarchs believed God to be capable of walking in a Garden in the cool of the evening, to have made man in His own image. Akhnaton proclaimed God to be a life-giving intangible essence; the living Aton the power which produced and sustained the energy and movement of the sun, whose flaming glory was the most practical symbol of the Godhead. But always Akhnaton strove to teach that beyond this visible or understandable expression of divinity there was a power more remote than the sun and acting through the sun. And though so remote the Aton was the tender loving Father of all men—ever present and ever mindful of his creatures. "There dropped not a sigh from the lips of a babe that the intangible Aton did not hear; no lamb bleated for its mother but the remote Aton hastened to soothe it. He was the loving Father and Mother of all that he had made, who brought up millions by his bounty." In Dmitri Merezhovsky's *Akhmaton* he gives the following as the creed of the King:

"Words of wisdom of King Akhnaton Uaenra Neferheperura—Sun's joy. Sun's beautiful essence. Sun's only Son—heard and written down by Dio, daughter of Aridoel, a Cretan, priestess of the Great Mother.

The King says :

'Aton, the face of god, the disc of the sun, is the visible image of the invisible God. To reveal to men the hidden one is everything.

My grandfather, Prince Tutmose, was hunting once in the desert of the Pyramids ; he was tired, lay down and dropped asleep at the foot of the great Sphinx which, in those days, was buried in the sands. The Sphinx appeared to him in a dream and said, " I am your father, Aton ; I will make you king if you dig me out of the sands." The prince did so, and I am doing so, too ; I dig the living God out of the dead sands—dead hearts.'

The King says :

'There are three substances in God : Zatut—Rays ; Neferu—Beauty ; Marita—Love ; the Disc of the Sun, Light and Warmth ; Father, Son, Mother.'

'The symbol of Aton, the disc of the sun with three rays like hands, stretched downwards is clear to all men—to the wise and to the children.'

'The remedy from death is not ointments for the dead, balsam, salt, resin or saltpetre, but mercy and love. Have mercy upon one another, O people, have mercy upon one another, and you shall never see death !'

The King said to the malefactor who attempted his life, Issachar the Israelite : 'Your God sacrifices all to Himself, and mine sacrifices Himself for all.'

The King says :

'The way they break granite in the quarries of Egypt is this : they make a hole in the stone, drive a wooden wedge into it, moisten it with water, and the wood, as it swells out, breaks the stone. I, too, am such a wedge.'

'The Egyptians have an image of Osiris-Set, god-devil, with two heads, on one body, as it were, twins grown together. I want to cut them in two.'

'The deadness of Egypt is the perfect equilibrium of the scales. I want to disturb it.'

'How little I have done ! I have lifted the coffin-lid over Egypt and I know, when I am gone, the lid will be shut down again. But the signal has been given to future ages !'

'When I was about eight I saw one day the soldiers piling up before the King, my father, the cut-off hands of enemies killed in battle, and I fainted with the smell of corruption. When I think of war I always recall this smell.'

'On the wall of the Charuk palace, near Thebes, where I spent my childhood, there was a mural painting of a naval battle between the Cretans and the Egyptians ; the enemies' ships were going down, the men drowning and the Egyptians were stretching out to them poles, sticks, oars, saving their enemies. I remember someone laughed looking at the painting : "One wouldn't find such fools anywhere except in Egypt !" I did not know what to answer and perhaps I do not know now, but I am glad to be living in the land of such fools !'

'The greatest of the kings of Egypt, Amenemhet, had it written on his tomb :

"In my reign men lived in peace and mercy
Arrows and swords lay idle in my reign."

'"The god rejoices when he goes into battle and sees blood," is said in the inscription of King Tutmose the Third, the Conqueror, to the god Amon. Amon is the god of war, Aton the god of peace. One must choose between them. I have chosen.'

'There will be war so long as there are many peoples and many gods ; but when there is one God and one mankind, there will be peace.'

'We Egyptians despise the Jews, but maybe they know more about the Son than we do : we say about Him "He was" and they say "He is to come,"'

The King said to me alone and told me not to repeat it to anyone :

'I am the joy of the Sun, Akhnaton ? No, not joy as yet, but sorrow ; not the light, but the shadow of the sun that is to rise—the Son !''

In *The Life and Times of Akhnaton*, by Arthur Weigall, late

Inspector-General of Antiquities to the Egyptian Government and whose book I have used largely in preparing this paper, we have what is known as the longer Hymn to Aton. It is too long to quote in full, but Weigall gives a parallel of this hymn to Psalm civ., and this I quote with some slight additions. This hymn was found in the tomb of Ai, a priest of Aton and the successor of Tutankhamen and the Throne of Egypt. I have departed from Weigall's version in one or two instances and have given that adopted by Sir E. A. Wallis Budge in his book *Tutankhamen*.

AKHNATON.

The earth is in darkness in the form of death. Every lion emergeth forth from his lair; all the creeping things bite. Darkness reigns.

Bright is the earth when Thou risest in the horizon. . . . The darkness is banished. . . . Their arms uplifted in adoration to Thy dawning. Then in all the world they do their work.

All cattle rest upon the herbage, all trees and plants flourish; the feathered fowl fly about their marshes. Their wings uplifted in adoration to Thee. All the sheep dance upon their feet.

The ships sail up-stream and down-stream alike. . . .
The fish in the river leap up before Thee.
And Thy rays are in the midst of the Great Sea.

How manifold are all Thy works!
They are hidden from before us,
O Thou Sole God, whose powers no other possesseth.

Thou didst create the earth according to Thy desire.

Men, all cattle large and small,
All that are upon the earth,
That go about upon their feet;
All that are on high,
That fly with their wings.

Thou has set a Nile in Heaven
That it may fall for them
Making floods upon the mountains;
And watering their fields.
How excellent are Thy designs,
O Lord of Eternity!
The Nile in Heaven is for the strangers,
And for the cattle of every land.

PSALM CIV.

Thou makest darkness, and it is night, wherein all the beasts of the forest do creep forth. The young lions roar after their prey, and seek their meat from God.

The sun ariseth, they get them away, and lay them down in their dens. Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labour until the evening.

The trees of the Lord are full of sap . . . where the birds make their nests. The high hills are a refuge for the wild goats.

Yonder is the sea great and wide wherein are . . . both small and great beasts. There go the ships . . .

O Lord, how manifold are Thy works! In wisdom hast Thou made them all. The earth is full of Thy riches.

He watereth the hills from above. The earth is filled with the fruit of Thy works. He bringeth forth grass for the cattle and green herb for the service of men.

AKHNATON.

Thou makest the seasons in order to
create all Thy works ;
Winter bringeth them coolness
And the heat the summer bringeth ;
Thou hast made the distant heaven
In order to rise therein ;
In order to behold all that Thou didst
make.
Dawning, shining afar off and return-
ing.

PSALM CIV.

He appointed the moon for certain
seasons and the sun knoweth his
going-down.

In face of this remarkable similarity one can hardly doubt but that the Psalmist had this poem in mind when he wrote the civ. Psalm or, as Weigall suggests, both might have been derived from some common Syrian source. Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, however, states that when we examine the specimens of the hymns which embody the "teaching" of Akhnaton, and which are found written on the walls of the tombs at Tel-el-Amarna, we find that there is in them hardly an idea that is not derived from the older religious works of Egypt. Against this, we have the fact that Akhnaton believed himself to be the only man to whom God had revealed Himself, that he never admits that he was in any way taught to regard God as he did, that he always speaks of himself, and is spoken of, as the originator and teacher of the faith, and that he insists that the ideas expressed in the hymn were entirely his own. The Aton religion was never spoken of by any other name than "The Teaching" and the King himself is indicated as the "Teacher" of the new creed.

This royal hymn doubtless formed an excerpt or a series of fragments excerpted from the ritual of Aton as it was celebrated from day to day in the great Temple at Amarna. In this great hymn the universalism of Empire finds full expression, and the royal author sweeps his eye from the far-off cataracts of the Nile to the remotest lands of Syria. It is clear he was projecting a world religion. He bases the universal sway of God upon His Fatherly care of all men alike, irrespective of race or nationality, and he calls Aton the father and mother of all that he has made. But it should be noted that there is nothing spiritual in the fragments of the hymn which have been discovered, and no expression of any consciousness of sin. Strong emphasis is shown in praising the life-giving heat of the eternal, almighty and self-producing Aton as the source of material well-being, happiness and pleasure. They contain no petition for spiritual wisdom and no allusions to the hereafter.

In the thirteenth year of the reign the City of the Horizon was now a place of surpassing beauty. A great temple had been built to Aton, contrasting strikingly with the buildings in which Amon had been worshipped. There vast halls were lit by minute windows and a dim uncertainty hovered round the worshipper. Such temples lent themselves to mystery. But in Akhnaton's temple each court was open to the full blaze of the sun. There was, there could be,

no mystery. Akhnaton had no interest in incantations and mysteries. Boldly he looked to God as a child to its father, and having solved what he regarded as the riddle of life there was to him room for nothing but an open, fearless adoration of the Creator of all things. He was the sworn enemy of the table-turners of his day, and the tricks of priestcraft and stage effects were anathema to his mind.

The art of the age was unavoidably affected by this extraordinary revolution of thought, and the King's interest in the new Art is evident. Bek, his chief sculptor, appended to his title the words "Whom his majesty himself taught." The artists of the Court were taught to make the chisel and the brush tell the story of what they actually saw. The result was a simple and beautiful realism. They caught the instantaneous postures of animal-life, the coursing hound, the fleeing game. I was specially struck myself with the life-like hunting scenes and the wonderful colouring which can be seen in some of the tombs and in the Museum at Cairo, and this revolution in art has been most unexpectedly revealed to us in all its wondrous beauty and freedom in the tomb of Tutankhamen. Some of the finest pieces found among the sumptuous furniture of Akhnaton's son-in-law were made at Amarna and carried back thence by Tutankhamen to Thebes on his return there.

About this time Akhnaton seems to have experienced his first real sorrow in the death of his second daughter in her ninth year, and he was beginning to find that his doctrines were not being accepted in Egypt as he had hoped. There was hardly a man he could trust to continue in the faith should he himself die. The Empire he had dreamed of, bound together in the common worship of Aton, was fast fading out of sight. Quarrels arose in the outlying parts of the Empire. The hold of Egypt on Western Asia was weakening rapidly, and when the kings who were allies of the King of Egypt and his vassal governors in Syria and Palestine learned that Akhnaton had "turned priest" they made haste to take advantage of the situation. He had the power to let loose upon Asia an army which would have silenced all insult, but he either did not find such a step consistent with his principles or he was too weak or too indolent. Pathetic letters were sent to him for aid and were disregarded, though he must have known the inevitable result.

Akhnaton was succeeded by his son-in-law, Sakara, who had married the Princess Meritaten. His reign was short and unimportant, but he seems to have been a loyal supporter of his father-in-law. He was succeeded by Tutankhamen, who married Aukhsenpaaten, the third daughter of Akhnaton, and who was a follower of Aton, and when he ascended the throne he was called Tutankhaten, i.e. "living image of Aton." At first he tried to perpetuate the cult of Aton, but finding he could not resist the power of the priesthood of Amon-Ra he removed his court to Thebes and substituted the name of Amon for that of Aton in his own name and that of his wife. In the fourth or sixth year of his reign he restored the worship of Amon and order again prevailed in Egypt. When

or how he died is not known. He was succeeded by Ai who apparently was associated with Tutankhamen as co-regent, for the names of both were found stamped on bands of leather in a tomb in western Thebes. He was originally a follower of Aton and even tried, after he became king, to continue the building of a temple to Aton at Thebes. It is possible that this caused his downfall, for he only reigned from three to five years. He was succeeded by Heremheb, a military commander who seems to have been a kinsman of Amenhotep III, and who was nominated to the throne by the priests of Amon.

We are indebted to the famous tables of Tel-el-Amarna for an accurate account of the last days of Akhnaton and the conditions in the East, found a few years ago by a native woman at Tel-el-Amarna, which is built on the site of the City of the Horizon. They are made of wet clay and stamped in cuneiform or the Babylonian writing. Some are in the Museum of Cairo, some in the Museums of England, France, and Germany, but as a result of rough handling in transit a number were reduced to powder.

Also in the Museum of Cairo is the door of a little private chapel from a house at El Amarna. On both sides is seen Akhnaton followed by the Queen and one of their daughters making offerings and libations to the solar discs. In front is a very fine head, in hard sandstone, of a princess, showing the extreme exaggeration of the back of the head, which is peculiar to Akhnaton's reign. Colossal statues of the King are also in the galleries of the Museum. These originally formed part of a series of such statues, which leaned against the pillars round the peristyle Court in the Temple to Aton in the City of the Horizon. A peculiar characteristic of these statues shows the King wearing the royal helmet which encased the back of his head to conceal the disease from which he suffered (Hydrocephalus). So anxious was he to conceal this affliction that he had his wife and daughters represented with their skulls deformed in the same way as though it were a mark of beauty.

Another interesting exhibit is the lid of the coffin originally made for Queen Tiy, which was afterwards modified to serve for her son. It strongly resembles the larger coffin of Tutankhamen, made of wood with a thin coating of gold, ornamented with red and light and dark blue glass. The gold mask and the King's name have all been torn off, doubtless as an act of vengeance by the priests of Amon.

Why did Akhnaton's attempt fail? For two reasons:—

1. It lacked the spirit of compromise with the Established Religion. That the Sun God should be worshipped under a new name and a new form was in itself nothing, but that Amon should be suppressed, his temples remain idle, and his name erased was another matter. The hymns to Aton suggest that Akhnaton and his followers conceived an image of him in their minds and worshipped him inwardly. But the abstract conception of thinking was wholly inconceivable to the average Egyptian, who only understood things in a concrete form. It was probably some conception

of this kind that made the cult of Aton so unpopular among the Egyptians and caused its downfall.

2. The new religion was of a purely contemplative character, absorbing its votaries to the exclusion of all other employments, whether political or diplomatic. While Akhnaton and his Court were singing hymns to the Sun an Empire was being lost to Egypt in Asia, and we have but to read the decrees of Heremheb, the first King of the restored religion, to realize the extent to which Egypt had become disorganized. These decrees consist of a remarkable series of highly specialized laws directed against the practice of extortion from the poor by fiscal and other officials, and very severe penalties were imposed on such cases being proved.

The foregoing short description of the life, religion and times of the "Heretic King" is submitted in the hope that it may interest those to whom he is but a name, and may lead them to the study of one of the most absorbing periods of Egyptian history, particularly at the present time, when the world is so largely interested in the wonderful discoveries in ancient art and sculpture found in the tomb of Tutankhamen. Many of the problems of our own time seem to be but a replica of the troubles experienced in that remote age. I am largely indebted to the writings of Sir E. A. Wallis Budge and Mr. Arthur Weigall, and to the writers in Vols. I and II of the Cambridge Ancient History in compiling this paper. I commend these books to those of my readers who wish to study this most engrossing subject for themselves.

STORIES FOR THE LITTLE PEOPLE. By Deaconess B. Oakley, Principal of the Church Sisters' Training Centre, and Deaconess Ethel Luke, Tutor. (*Home Words Publishing Co., 2s. 6d. net.*)

The importance of Sunday School is now as widely recognized as the necessity of the best methods of equipment for teachers. In this series of Sunday School Lessons for children from four to seven years of age, two experts in educational work collaborated. The result is a book of the utmost value for teachers in junior schools. The subjects show a wide range and are well chosen. They include some of the chief of our Lord's parables, a number of incidents in our Lord's Life specially suitable for the instruction of children, important events in the Acts of the Apostles, and a number of stories from the Book the Apostles used. There are also special lessons for other Sundays. The lessons are arranged on the most approved modern lines and in the hands of intelligent teachers will provide all that is needed to make the instruction attractive to the classes. This handbook is sure to have a wide circulation.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

THE life of Christ seems to have an irresistible attraction for many widely differing types of writers. In recent times there have been a number of endeavours on the part of authors who would not be definitely classed as religious specialists to portray the life of Jesus as it makes its appeal to them. Of these, *The Life of Jesus* by Emil Ludwig, *The Life of Christ* by Papini, and *Jesus, Man of Genius* by Mr. Middleton Murry are the best known. A learned Jewish writer, Joseph Klausner, has also written a life of Jesus of Nazareth from his special point of view. Other books dealing with the life of our Lord, of recent date, are *The Man Nobody Knows* and *The Man Himself*. All these serve to show the deep interest there is in the presentation of the Life and Character of Jesus.

Of books written from a definitely Christian point of view there is also a great variety. All of them have been written to help in the interpretation of Christ to Christian people and all have served useful purposes. We may go back to the most popular of them all, *The Life of Christ* by Dean Farrar. It had an enormous circulation and the fascination of its style gave it an influence which has not even yet passed away. Less well known perhaps, but of great use and interest to students, was Dr. Cunningham Geikie's *The Life and Words of Christ*. It ran through many editions and was highly appreciated for its accuracy and scholarship. The book which won for itself a unique position was, however, Dr. Alfred Edersheim's *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. The author's massive learning, his acquaintance with Jewish life and the literature of the Jewish people gave his work an outstanding position which it still retains. No volumes on the life of our Lord have probably been so frequently consulted by preachers and teachers as Dr. Edersheim's exhaustive treatise. Of the latest books which seek to popularize the New Testament narrative none has been so widely and deservedly recognized as Archdeacon Paterson Smyth's *A People's Life of Christ*. With a special gift for popular exposition which he has shown in many works on various religious subjects the Archdeacon has told with effective simplicity the story of the life of Jesus. Since its first appearance in 1921 it has been reprinted at least twenty-five times. This is no small tribute to its usefulness.

We turn from these to two of the latest portrayals of our Lord's life and teaching. One is by an American writer whose name has become widely known in England through an earlier work, *The Inescapable Christ*, which had the advantage of a commendatory preface by Dean Inge. Dr. Walter Russell Bowie, the Rector of Grace Church, New York, calls his volume *The Master: A Life of Jesus Christ* (John Murray, 7s. 6d. net). The tendency to-day is to present the life of Jesus from the viewpoint of its human development. Many feel that in this way a better grasp of its essential elements can be obtained than if the life were approached from

a supernatural or doctrinal side. Dr. Bowie is an example of this tendency. His purpose is expressed in a note on the jacket of the volume in these words: "Dr. Bowie gives us the human story of the Personality whose surpassing power lies in no miraculous unlikeness to the life He seemed to share, but in something profoundly at one with the most native intuitions of the human mind and soul."

This treatment has many advantages and it helps to a realization of aspects of the life of Jesus which have at times been too much neglected. At the same time it has disadvantages which are difficult to avoid. It seems to be impossible on these lines to give such a presentation as will bring out the full power of our Lord as His divine being made itself felt upon the people with whom He was most intimately associated. It also leaves an impression at times that the author is minimizing some of the most important features in the New Testament picture. Dr. Bowie's method is attractive and stimulating. It presents many points of the old story in new light and helps to a better understanding of some of the difficult passages. He carries his readers along with the charm of his sympathy and of his style, but when he comes to crucial matters such as the miraculous we feel that he has left us somewhat in the air. Some of the miracles are to be explained as natural occurrences which the spectators may have misunderstood, or of which a wrong report may have got abroad. Others are minimized in other ways, yet we cannot help feeling that the life of Christ without the miraculous element is not in full accord with the New Testament record. A friend who is no mean critic tells me that he always judges every treatment of our Lord's Life in this respect by the way in which the raising of Lazarus is dealt with. It is significant that Dr. Bowie does not mention the event. While we make every allowance for the literalness of our matter-of-fact western minds which are apt to lead us astray on many points, we cannot regard an appeal to the poetical nature of Christ's utterances as an adequate explanation of some of the difficulties.

The other life of Christ comes from S.P.C.K. It is called *The Wonderful Story: A Life of Jesus for the Children of the Church* (5s. net), by the Rev. G. R. Oakley. It may frankly be said that this is not a book which would have been issued by S.P.C.K. even a few years ago. Its purpose is to present Christ as the Teacher of the most distinctive features of the Anglo-Catholic conception of Christianity. It is a party book of an extreme type into which doctrine is dragged with more violence than discretion. Early in the narrative we get an inkling of what is coming when we are told that our Lord by placing His hands on the man's eyes whose sight He was restoring was teaching us the value of Sacraments. When we turn to the account of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, the simplicity of its ceremonies is denied. "This feast at which our Lord ordained the Holy Eucharist was by no means a 'simple meal.' It was accompanied by elaborate ceremonies." Here are some points of teaching which follow. "When Jesus said 'Do

this ' He used words which were often used, in the Greek Old Testament which the Jews used, for 'celebrate this' or 'offer this.' I can only refer my readers to Dr. T. K. Abbott's scholarly pamphlet "Do this in Remembrance of Me: Should it be 'Offer This'?" for the complete refutation of this statement. The statement that "the word He used for remembrance in every other place where it occurs means a memorial before God and not just a means of reminding men is also shown to be without foundation in the same pamphlet. While his further statements that there is a sacrifice offered on the altar, and that "the consecrated Bread and Wine are Christ's Body and Blood, and that where they are there He, in His whole person, must be, as really as God was present in Jesus as He lay in the crib or in His mother's arms . . . therefore we bow the knee before His Sacramental Presence and worship and adore Him" are the crudities of expression which cause offence to most sensible Christians who are anxious for the maintenance of truth and at the same time desire to advance the unity of Christendom.

It is the fashion with a number of writers to-day to affect an air of superiority towards the products in literature and art of the Victorian Age. It is difficult to refrain at times from surmising what the attitude of the next age will be towards the works of these writers of the Georgian age who have such a high conception of their own gifts. Few of them seem able to impress their contemporaries as novelists like Dickens and Thackeray, poets like Tennyson and Browning, and painters like Watts or Turner impressed the people of the nineteenth century.

It is refreshing to turn from such writings to a book with the outlook of Mr. D. C. Somervell's *English Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (Methuen & Co., 6s. net). Here we find a thoroughly interesting account of the intellectual movements of the century, and a just appreciation of the merits and demerits of its prominent characters. It was a great age and Mr. Somervell adequately summarizes its characteristics. "The Victorians lived in an age of absolutely unprecedented development. Population was growing as it had never grown before, and from the 'forties onward, wealth grew faster than population. Within the lifetime of a single man we passed from general illiteracy to general education: from rotten-boroughs to democratic suffrage, from stage coaches to railways and telegraphs, from—is it necessary to extend the catalogue? It was inevitable that those who lived in such an age should be at once bewildered and exhilarated. They felt that they were living in an epoch which, whatever else might be said of it, was certainly of unique significance. The Victorian Englishman felt that he was a member of the greatest nation in the world at the most important epoch of human history, and that he must rise to the occasion." In contrast with this the Georgian is living in "an age of disillusionment" with all its disadvantages, and he

must be pardoned if he is a little envious of the spacious days which he has just missed.

Mr. Somervell divides the century into three portions, and gives a very appreciative estimate of the characteristics of each. In the first third we find the old Tory Orthodoxy of Burke and Scott, the religion and philanthropy of the Evangelicals, the varieties of radicalism ranging from Paine and Godwin to Mill and Brougham. Five poets of the Romantic Movement are included in the period. The second period, comprising the middle third of the century, includes the Benthamite-Liberal orthodoxy, Evangelicalism and its rivals, the scientific movement and some Victorian men of letters. The last third is treated under the headings Imperialism, Collectivism and Socialism and Some Aspects of Modernity. From these titles it will be seen that a comprehensive survey is taken of the intellectual movements of the century. Fair treatment is in the main meted out to every one, and there is an air of detachment which adds to the sense of appreciation of sympathy with some phases and of criticism of others.

We are naturally most closely interested in Mr. Somervell's treatment of the Evangelicals, and he is on the whole very fair to them. He gives them full credit for their enthusiasm in philanthropic reform, although he cannot resist a sly dig at some of their limitations in the earliest period. Evangelicalism, he says, was a greater force than Benthamism, for it moulded the character of the nation. He quotes with approval Halévy's statement: "Men of letters disliked the Evangelicals for their narrow Puritanism, men of science for their intellectual feebleness. Nevertheless, during the nineteenth century, Evangelical religion was the moral cement of English Society. It was the influence of the Evangelicals which invested the British aristocracy with an almost Stoic dignity, restrained the plutocrats newly risen from the masses from vulgar ostentation and debauchery, and placed over the proletariat a select body of workmen enamoured of virtue and capable of self-restraint." If Evangelicalism was the principal ingredient in "Victorianism," it is agreed that "Victorianism" cannot be dismissed with contempt. It is regrettable that he sees nothing in the "No-Popery" cry but narrow prejudice. The Protestantism of England is based on something more substantial than that. It is not without reason that the English people reject "the Mass in Masquerade" and regard Puseyism and its offshoots as something more disastrous in character than a mere appeal to "the vocational pride of the clergy." He gives an accurate estimate of the recent rejection of the revised Prayer Book. "The contrast between the powerful majorities that accepted that Book in the Church Assembly and the resolute and successful opposition of a large section of the House of Commons illustrates the fact that the Anglo-Catholic movement, though it dominates the Church, has not overcome the traditional Protestantism of the nation."

Mr. Somervell has made a survey of a wide range of interests and has set them in admirable perspective. He has a real interest

in religion and its influence upon the life and character of the nation, and for that reason if for no other, his account of the thought of the nineteenth century will be found a fascinating volume by churchpeople.

The papers read at the Cheltenham Church Congress have been issued in volume form by Mr. John Murray under the title *The Anglican Communion: Past, Present and Future*, edited by the Bishop of Chelmsford (7s. 6d. net). They constitute a body of representative opinions on the history and doctrine of our Church which cannot be ignored by any student of its development and teaching. Regret has been expressed on various sides that some of the views represented should have been allowed to be put forward on a Church Congress platform. But there is no point in disguising the fact that the views expressed are held by some sections of the Church, and no one was in a position to act as censor and to lay down the limits of comprehensiveness. Such a volume as this gives an opportunity of seeing the best that can be said for opinions that may be regarded on one hand or the other as scarcely within the wide bounds of Anglican doctrine. It is not possible here to enter upon an examination of the widely differing conceptions of the Church, its nature, its ministry, its teaching and its future which are developed in this Report. The volume deserves careful study, and will be a book of reference for a considerable time to come. It might well be used as a basis of study in clerical study circles. At a time when many are endeavouring to soften sectional differences, some of the lines converging towards agreement might be discovered among these documents, while some of the theories put forward will undoubtedly be found to render any approach to unity impracticable.

The case for the Evangelical Movement was stated by the Rev. C. M. Chavasse with great force and clearness. He showed that where the Evangelical stream has not flowed strongly there has been darkness and death. In spite of many efforts on the part of the higher authorities to crush the Evangelicals they had made contributions to English religious life which in Lecky's words "compare with the first days of Christianity." He paid a tribute to the educational work carried on by the National Church League and the "Groups Movement" and pointed out the virility of Evangelicalism and the value of its contribution to the future of religion. Canon H. A. Wilson presented the Evangelical view of "The Anglican Interpretation of the Christian Faith." He emphasized the significance of the term "Reformed" as applied to our Church. While it implied liberty of thought and freedom of expression it also imposed limitations. By requiring that nothing contrary to the teaching of Scripture shall be allowed, our Church has attained a solidity and stability in its position which is unshakable.

The papers, by representatives of the various churches, were illustrative of important phases of the movement towards reunion,

and serve to show the difficulties which have to be surmounted. This volume stands by itself among the Reports of Church Congress. It is an important contribution to the study of Anglicanism in its present-day aspects.

The life of Bishop Bompas—the great pioneer Bishop of the remote North-West of Canada—has been told by many writers. One of the best known is Archdeacon Cody's thrilling narrative of the dangers and difficulties of the Bishop's adventurous undertakings which he gives in the volume *An Apostle of the North*. A memoir of the Bishop's wife, the devoted companion of his labours, has now been written by Mrs. S. A. Archer and bears the appropriate title, *A Heroine of the North* (S.P.C.K., 5s. net). It ranks among the inspiring stories of missionary enterprise and adventure. Mrs. Bompas was the daughter of a London doctor who on his early retirement took up his residence at Castlemare on the beautiful hills above the Bay of Naples. Here amid surroundings of natural beauty Charlotte Selina Cox spent the most impressionable years of her youth. The art of Italy appealed to her strongly. She became a gifted musician, and had a strongly developed appreciation of the wonders of art in Rome and Florence. She also developed her gifts as a writer and produced a number of tales and magazine articles. She had a perfect mastery of the Italian language and even in old age she carried her Dante in her pocket. In the year 1873 William Carpenter Bompas came back from Canada to be consecrated the first Bishop of Athabasca and in the following year he married Miss Cox. It is difficult to imagine a more marked contrast than that of her early life in the midst of Italian art and refinement and the hardships and privations of her life in the Yukon. The volume contains a large number of extracts from her journal and letters which give vivid impressions of the daily hopes and disappointments of their life among primitive and degraded Indians.

The record of the journey to the distant diocese shows the difficulties which had to be encountered in those early times. Days were spent in open boats with the sun beating down upon their heads and innumerable swarms of mosquitoes causing intolerable irritation. This was followed by the intense cold of winter. Sometimes the provisions ran short and they had to depend on the uncertain produce of the rabbit-snares and the fishing-net. Their constant ration was moose-deer meat. "It looks for all the world like a heap of dirty rough shoe-leather. This we have boiled for breakfast, dinner and tea." The isolation was a severe trial. Letters from England sometimes arrived a year after they were posted. The Bishop was often away on long journeys, and her loneliness was intense. Yet she threw herself heartily into the work and was happy in seeing the results of her labours in the lives of the young people in whose education she took a large share. Bishop Bompas died suddenly at Carcross, one of his chief mission stations, in the year 1906, and was succeeded by Bishop Stringer, who contributes an interesting preface to this record of a beautiful

life. Mrs. Bompas survived till 1917. She settled down in the Province of Quebec where she died at the age of 87. Up to the end she took a keen interest in the work in the North West and frequently spoke on behalf of it.

C.M.S. Story of the Year 1928-9 has been issued under the title *The Search* (C.M.S., 1s. net). It is similar in character to the stories issued each year for the last four years and will be found equal in information and interest. The title is suggested by the fact we find ourselves to-day in "a seeking world. We are in the midst of a mighty renaissance, world-wide, all-embracing, and the spirit of seeking is abroad as never before, untrammelled and free." The record reveals the nature of the search in the various parts of the world where the Society is at work. The search for personality in West Africa; the search for wholeness of life in East Africa; the search for leadership in India and the search for a dynamic in Japan are some of the features of the work. A vivid impression is left on the mind of the greatness of the opportunity presented to the Christian Church to-day as well as of the inadequacy of the response. The mass movements in India and the demand for education by the tribes of Africa are a call which ought not to go unheeded. The dangers to the future of Christianity are touchingly revealed by the words of an African Christian who realized the peril of heredity. "The grace of God may be in the heart, but grandfather is in the bones." Another fact to be seriously reckoned with is indicated in the words: "Frantic attempts (which are sometimes successful) are made to convert Christians to Hinduism and Islam, and both religions can boast of Christians among their converts." The maps with which the accounts of the missions are accompanied are very useful. They help to give a more complete impression of the conditions of life and work. Many in addition to those interested in C.M.S. will do well to read this inspiring and yet in parts depressing record.

Mary of York, Orange and England is the title of Miss Marjorie Bowen's new work on the life of Queen Mary II, which the Bodley Head will publish shortly.

Miss Bowen has collected some intimate and hitherto unpublished data and letters dealing with the Stewart Queen. The book is to be illustrated and, as before with Miss Bowen's work, with some interesting and unusual pictures, including a reproduction of the famous "Queen Mary" crystal ring which has only just come to light after being lost for so many years. Both Mary and her sister, Queen Anne, were brought up in the Old Palace at Richmond, little of which now remains.

G. F. I.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

CHRISTIANITY AND MODERN KNOWLEDGE.

THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN KNOWLEDGE. *Blackie & Son.* 25s.

This is a valuable book in spite of the fact that its Editor is anonymous and thereby, in the opinion of many, it loses that prestige which attaches to a work under the control of a well-known name. No one, however, who has read the book can doubt the competence of the man who has brought the materials together and has given them their unity. We shall be surprised if it has not a circulation as large as that of its companion volume on "Evolution" which is widely quoted as authoritative on the subjects with which it deals. Our religion is the most important of our possessions, and it is well that from time to time the bearing of modern light on its content should be set before the public. We may have our doubts on the finality of the conclusions, for all knowledge is relative and the certainties of yesterday become the buried theories of to-day, but this does not imply that all advance is untrue, and that everything old is of necessity open to question. We are convinced that the foundations of our Faith stand secure, and are not afraid of the results that follow from the discovery of what was hidden from our fathers.

The book which is encyclopædic in its range is divided into five parts: The world into which Christ was born, The Life of Christ and the Early Records of it, The Early Church, From the Fourth Century to the End of the Reformation, and After the Reformation. When we mention that among the contributors are Mr. Cyril Bailey and Dr. Edwyn Bevan, Sir Gilbert Murray and Sir Frederick G. Kenyon, Professors Moffatt, Burkitt and Milligan, Drs. Anderson Scott and Herbert Workman, Professor Webb and the Archbishop of York, we guarantee its scholarship. And yet at times we are disappointed, for we cannot but think that Dr. Temple has not done himself or his readers justice in his somewhat scrappy sketch on Social and Christian Ethics of to-day, or that Mr. Ogg has quite grasped the relation between Port Royal and the Roman and Reformed Churches. Dr. Anderson Scott, while saying much that needed saying, will not carry every one with him, when he concludes his study of New Testament Theology with the words, "A crisis of judgment and a visible Parousia still remained part of Paul's anticipation. John completed the discovery of Paul. The whole future was already present. Eternal life was here and now only capable of indefinite development. Judgment had already begun; it was continuous. And the return of Christ had already taken place, He had returned as the Spirit." We do not so read our New Testament and have not seen any grounds for disbelieving that the Lord will come again.

Students will find the book an invaluable supplement to Bible

Dictionaries in its full treatment of many questions of present-day importance, and they will be surprised to find how little ground some of the most positive assertions of innovators have behind them. On the other hand, it is a pity that the chief Article on "The Life of Jesus" should have been written so avowedly under the influence of the Schweitzer school and should confine itself to the Gospel according to St. Mark. The Life is reverent and from one point of view is helpful, for it shows how our Lord stands alone among the sons of men and concludes by quoting Renan and adds: "Jesus Himself once described His mission as that of a man lighting a fire, and whatever course He may have taken in doing it, it is at least certain that His Fire has burned for nineteen centuries and that it is still alight. The way that Fire was lit finds its justification in the history of the Fire." Our Lord is much more to us than the Man who came down from Heaven to give men the Divine Fire and the honest reader of the Life of Jesus cannot avoid coming to that conclusion. We cannot accept the rationalization of the miraculous element in the Gospel story. Our author truly says, "The Gospel wonder-tales, we are told, produced astonishment, but the effect was transitory: the 'Feeding of the Five Thousand' did not make the disciples less anxious when they were short of provisions in their boat. But neither Simon Peter nor Saul of Tarsus seem to have had any further doubts when once they had been persuaded that Jesus had appeared to them alive." Because they had no doubts when convinced that Jesus Christ was God Incarnate—proved by His death and resurrection—does not make their belief in the miracles something illusory. They were men who had not fully faced the mystery of God becoming Man and in their despair forgot the past. They were "new creations" when once they had understood Who the Lord is and what He had done for them. In spite of a good deal calling for criticism we believe that the book as a whole will have influence for the enlightenment of many who have come to believe that an age of Science has no place for the Gospel of man's Redemption. The maps and illustrations are excellent and illuminate the text.

THE CHURCH AND THE STATE.

THE CHURCH AND THE STATE. By P. Carnegie Simpson, D.D.
James Clarke & Co. 6s.

Dr. Carnegie Simpson is an authority on this subject. He has written the life of Dr. Rainy, who more than any man was responsible for the union of the United Presbyterian and the Free Churches of Scotland, when the whole question of the relation between Church and State came under review. He knows that the great man who did so much for Scotland fell into the mistake of supposing that the union of the Churches in the ecclesiastical sphere would carry with it the union of property, and shared the full measure of disappointment when the House of Lords made its famous decision. Dr. Simpson is an admirer of the Scottish Establishment and has very little that is

good to say of the English Establishment. He strives to be fair, but when he deals with English conditions we think we discover a not unnatural bias, that forbids his grasping as a whole the real benefits that exist to Church and State through the conditions under which our Church is established. We all agree in upholding general principles, but the application of the principles which we accept very often leads to conflicts that cannot easily be reconciled with a universal application of these principles individually.

Dr. Simpson sketches the story of the relations between Church and State from New Testament times to the present day. The trouble with Christianity arose through its being a missionary religion and unyielding in its refusal to come to terms with polytheism in any shape or form. The Christian was prepared to die for his Divine Friend and for his soul's fatherland. The Empire had become irremediably weak and the Church had an irrepressible energy. An alliance between the two was brought about by Constantine, and the Church became, to a very large extent, the Church of the Roman State. "The Church had gained peace with the State; but the State had obtained the patronage of the Church." Is this quite fair? Words have varied in their meaning and the Church never became under Constantine the feudatory—to use a later phrase—of the State. The Church was protected against secular attacks and persecution, the concepts of the time were very different to those we now have, and imperial favour went a long way in determining internal policy on such questions as heretical teaching. The Church was ready to accept the favour. The time came when the established Church became the inheritor of the imperial prestige, and with the ideals of a secular imperium ruling the minds of its Popes we come to the developed papacy, which founded its secular claims on a reading of history which found expression in the famous "forged Decretals."

We cannot follow Dr. Simpson through his account of the growth of the Papacy and of the rise of the Reformation, which its imperious claims called into being. He can be trusted as an historian, and he writes the literal truth when he says, "It was not by force either of intellectual argument or of arms that the papal claim to absolute and universal supremacy dominated Europe. It was because the Pope could, literally, put the fear of death—death and hell—upon the world." We fail to read the past aright if we do not grasp this fact—a fact alien to the minds of modern men who can hardly conceive what it means. Those familiar with medieval art and sculpture have some idea of its hold and the terrors it inspired. Reformation came and the Reformers were children of their age, although they broke with the Papacy. There was only slow growth in many directions of what is called tolerance—to many of us a hateful word, as it is associated with inferiority and superiority complexes. Liberty was only slowly grasped, and we believe that a good many of our troubles to-day are conditioned by a failure to discriminate between Liberty and Tolerance. And this is specially so in the relation between Church and State, for men seem to think that because the

Modern State gives liberty of conscience and the full exercise of religious worship, the Church has the right to have within its own limits an equal liberty for all sorts and conditions of worship and ideals. All is relative, and there is a social anarchy that the State will not endure and a religious anarchy which the Church must exclude from its borders.

But we must pass on to the discussion of present conditions. Dr. Simpson rightly contends that the Church of England by promoting, accepting and acting upon the Enabling Act "agrees that the State's decision is determinative and supreme." He tells us that in England the Anglo-Catholic has found or has taken liberty to teach the doctrines and follow the practices he desired, and that Anglo-Catholicism "has succeeded more than fairly well in working the existing ecclesiastical system of the Church of England on Anglo-Catholic lines." He does not raise the question whether or not this has been done legally or illegally, but he notes the fact. The rejection of the Prayer Book by Parliament was an erastian act. Is an act to be considered erastian—with all the obloquy associated with the word in its present connotation—when the Church deliberately put forward and supported a measure that contained this provision? Dr. Simpson does not see that the essential differences between the history of the English Church and that of Scotland are its constitution and place in the life of the people. He fails to notice that weakness and accommodation have brought the chaos in the Church into existence and that revived claims, inconceivable in Scotland, have made the Bishops take steps in opposition to the will of the people and the formularies of the Church, and thereby have established for themselves an *imperium in imperio*, which it is the purpose of the Establishment in England to control. Right at the root of the present troubles in our Church lies the *sacerdotium* of the Ministry whose assertion made the Medieval Church what it was, and whose revival in England is the cause of that alienation between the thoughts of the majority of the Anglo-Catholic Clergy, who influence the Bishops, and the worshippers of God in the English nation. What has happened in England could not occur in Scotland, and the operation of the principle of Establishment is conditioned by the nature of the Church of England and the difference of the possible claims made by the ministry in both lands. We have read the book with much interest, and believe that it will be frequently referred to in the coming months. We regret that it bears signs of hasty proof-reading.

CHRISTIAN UNITY.

CHRISTIAN UNITY: ITS HISTORY, CHALLENGE. By the Rev. G. J. Slosser. *Kegan Paul*. 21s.

Mr. Slosser deserves our gratitude for bringing together a great number of facts and documents which cannot easily be traced in any of the many works recently published on Christian Unity. The book's sweep is world-wide, and its story begins at Pentecost.

Closely printed and arranged so that reference is easy, we hope to make constant use of the volume during the many discussions that will arise during the coming months. As far as the documents are concerned, Mr. Slosser can be implicitly trusted—he quotes, as far as we have been able to test him, accurately,—but when he comes to figures, then we recommend our readers to ignore them altogether, for in almost every case we have found them disagree with information we have been accustomed to look upon as fairly accurate, for this is the best we can say of any ecclesiastical statistics that have come under our notice. Mr. Slosser errs on account of his ignorance of the different bases of computation adopted by the Churches, by confusing communicants with adherents, and by using partial sources of information. It is a great pity that so valuable a book should be so misleading in its statistics. When we mention that he gives the number of Hindus in India as 21,223,432 and of Mahomedans as 8,516,016, we have said sufficient to justify our criticism, which if challenged we are, of course, prepared to substantiate.

But figures are of minor importance, and it is a great boon to have a full survey of the whole ground, and at the same time illustrative documents quoted which enable the reader to see at once why schemes of reunion have been frustrated, and why the unity of the Church has been broken. Is Mr. Slosser right when he comments on Baxter's well-known saying that a Universal Council would be worse than a hundred murders? Some undoubtedly hold that such a gathering would be an unmixed evil, but many Protestants believe that out of such a gathering good would result. And Mr. Slosser probably would not quarrel with this way of putting it.

The one gathering of recent years that was as Ecumenical as circumstances permitted was that of Lausanne, and here Mr. Slosser writes with authority. In *THE CHURCHMAN* we have had Lausanne described, and it is interesting to notice that the conclusions drawn by Mr. Slosser are almost identical with those of our contributor. He writes, "The Report on 'The Unity of Christendom and the Relation thereto of the Existing Churches' was confronted by determined opposition on the part of some of the Anglo-Catholics, although Dr. D'Arcy, the Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland in the absence of Archbishop Söderblom, the Chairman of the Section which formulated this Report—presented it with the hearty backing of Dr. Headlam, the Lord Bishop of Gloucester. After a sharp debate (the only instance of the Conference when a really hostile spirit was shown, and that by opponents to the Report) the Report was received to be transmitted at once to the Continuation Committee for any action they might decide to take within the scope and purpose of the Conference. . . . It was the attitude of a very few ill-advised Catholics, acting as individuals, towards this last Report which has been the occasion of the most severe condemnations by Evangelicals of all schools, episcopal or otherwise. Coming as it did with the most prominent Anglicans and other

Catholic leaders in its favour, this unwise opposition worked a great harm to the cause of those who showed the hostility. The Report, if it had been received (and there were probably not more than fifteen of the whole Conference who would have voted against it), would have been an exceedingly cautious and wise move towards the spirit and methods of Copec and Stockholm, with practically the same credal and polity basis as that suggested by the famous Lambeth Quadrilateral. The net result was the widening of the gulf between the Evangelical Catholics and the Sacramental Catholics, and the absence of the spirit of unity within these two respective groups, especially within the Evangelical Catholic group." It is well to have these facts on record when the question of the South Indian Church is under discussion. The men who wrecked the hope of Lausanne are the men who oppose the efforts to secure Unity in South India.

KARL BARTH'S THEOLOGY.

THE WORD OF GOD AND THE WORD OF MAN. By Karl Barth.
Hodder & Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

Karl Barth has great influence in Germany. Whether the attraction his theology has will remain is open to question, for much of it is apocalyptic—the outcome of the titanic struggle which absorbed German minds. The volume before us is not a formal treatise, as it consists of series of addresses delivered over a period of years. They are not chronologically arranged, and their disconnected character makes it hard for readers to grasp his thought as a whole. They will see in his outlook memories of Calvinism—not on the predestination side—but on the much greater questions of the Church and of the sovereignty of God, they will be struck by the absence of anything approaching Ritschlianism and will be impressed by his insistence on the objectivity of Revelation, and the permanency of Biblical teaching. We have very much of a return to the Hebrew point of view as opposed to that set forth by modern psychology and echoed by theologians. God, for Herr Barth, is the great Reality, Who has revealed Himself in His Son, and we must ever conceive of Him as not only the Wholly Other, but as One Who can be known through His Son.

He asks, "Is our own basically a *theologia crucis*? This, it seems to me, is the question of destiny which our Protestant Churches face to-day; and to-day, in bitter truth we have occasion to observe what the cross is. We need to-day ministers who take their work *seriously*; but this seriousness must concern itself for the *inwardness* of the Church, and in no sense for the Church itself. The ministers who are concerned for the Church are no longer equal to the almost infinite seriousness of our present condition. We need ministers who are efficient, but not necessarily efficient in business. Ministration of the word is not *administration*, however smoothly it may go. . . . We need ministers who are *devout*—provided devotion means obedience to the call, Follow Me, which may perhaps

lead us away from everything that the conservative or the liberal call devotion."

This is the core of his practical teaching, and he is much more concerned with practical application of Christian truth than with theological discussion. He is a theologian and a stiff theological thinker too, but even more than being a man who thinks about God, he is one who has felt God working in his own heart and wishes to bring others to know God. We must submit to the authority of God. The Reformers did the work they did because they submitted their doctrine to the authority of God. "They had the courage to allow so accidental, human and contingent a thing as the Bible to become a serious witness of the revelation of God, to allow a book which was in itself profane to become Holy Scripture. 'Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto Him for righteousness.' So, and not otherwise, the doctrine, the message, the preaching arose." The book is a call for definiteness, for certainty, for giving glory to God. It makes the reader think, and what is more it leads him to think of God.

THE CELTIC CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

THE CELTIC CHURCH IN ENGLAND. AFTER THE SYNOD OF WHITBY.

By John L. Gough Meissner. *Martin Hopkinson*. 10s. 6d.

There are still corners of ecclesiastical history that require to be tidied by men who have eyes for truth and minds not afraid to look in untrodden ways for facts. Mr. Meissner has effectively disposed of the contention that immediately after the Synod of Whitby all Celtic influence ended and the Roman settlement made by the Greek Theodore became universally accepted. Mr. Meissner has made a careful examination of all the sources and makes it clear that Bede with all his excellent qualities was not impartial concerning the Celtic Church, for his affections were centred elsewhere. We congratulate this young Irish scholar on the completeness of his proof and on the vivid picture he has given us of English life, and of the learning and influence of the Irish Church.

It may seem that the traces that remain were not of very great importance. Less insistence upon Clerical Celibacy, joint Monasteries under Abbesses and the persistence of the custom of Bishops who ordained without being attached to Dioceses, may seem small matters, but in an age that fought hard about the type of tonsure, they meant much. Their continuance was a proof of the hold the Celtic outlook had upon the hearts of the people, and there seems little doubt as to the penetrative influence of the type of Church work maintained by Irish missionaries and those brought under them. In time it disappeared and the Roman customs prevailed, but the fact that it persisted so long does much to prove the claim of the historians who contend that the conversion of England was due more to Irish Missionaries than to the Augustine mission.

At the time under review in this work Ireland was the great

centre of culture in the West. Nowhere else could men find the same level of culture. As Sir Henry Howarth wrote, "We need not wonder at Irish influence in England when we realize the position occupied by that country during this period, and when we find so large a proportion of men who loom large during these centuries, either born or educated in Ireland or by teachers under Irish influence." One of the merits of Mr. Meissner is that he shows clearly that scholarship and devotion to truth carry with them a prestige that cannot be resisted and win attention even from those who might otherwise be hostile. It is pleasant to note that Mr. Meissner is still a young man and that the way he has opened is preparatory to wider studies in Church History. We thank him for what he has already given us and shall look forward to his future work with great interest.

CRUSADE AND INQUISITION.

THE ALBIGENSIAN HERESY. Vol. II. ITS SUPPRESSION BY CRUSADE AND INQUISITION. By H. J. Warner. *S.P.C.K.* 6s.

In a former volume Mr. Warner gave a full account of the teaching of the Albigenses and vindicated it against the worst charges made by the Papal Church. We are not now concerned with its creed, which was to a very large extent due to its out-and-out opposition to the social and religious corruption of contemporary Romanism. It taught much that we repudiate and had the most intimate political relations with contending nobles of the time. Much of its troubles was due to its affiliations with politics of the period, and the picture of the universal good-will that existed in the Middle Ages has light thrown upon it in the pages of Mr. Warner's extremely interesting and well-written work. Innocent III, a man of blameless life, became Pope in 1198, and in his inauguration sermon he said, "Ye see what manner of servant that is whom the Lord has set over His people; no other than the vicegerent of Christ, the successor of Peter. He is the mediator between God and man, below God, above man, less than God, more than man, He judges all, is judged of none." This is the key to the spirit of the times, and it was this man who proclaimed a crusade and summoned the King of France to lead it against the Count of Toulouse and the Southern heretics. The story of this Crusade with its violence and massacres is told by Mr. Warner. Church and temporal power joined hand in hand and the Church gained the upper hand and the Crusaders despoiled and dispossessed the ancient ruling families of the South. The black Dominicans were there to preach. The Fourth Lateran Council compelled all secular Princes to exterminate all heretics in their respective territories. And we see in these pages what extermination meant.

Then the Inquisition, which was successful in suppressing the Albigensian heresy, was refurbished from the armouries of the State and shaped and sharpened by the Church for its own ends. "Under

the Roman system the accused was innocent until proved guilty ; under the Church system the accused was guilty until proved innocent." This system spread all over Roman Catholicism with the exception of England, for the Inquisition that practised in England came later and was the Spanish form under Queen Mary. It is well that English Churchmen should read the whole story. Its character may be judged from the Montpellier pronouncement : "Our Pope does not kill, but orders someone to be killed. It is the law that kills those whom the Pope allows to be killed." The Bull addressed to the Preaching Orders gave them power to proceed against heretical clerks without appeal. As Mr. Warner says, "The Church disarmed her enemies by compelling them to hear and not to argue ; and by making it criminal for any layman to possess any part of the Bible in the vernacular, the heretics were dependent solely upon memory in the conduct of their services, the instruction of their members and the propagation of their religion. . . . The Catholic persecution of heresy, too, was more comprehensive and incisive in the thirteenth and following centuries than the Pagan persecution of the Catholic Church in the first centuries ; it punished the dead as well as the living, and the innocent descendants as well as the 'guilty' parents. Giving to Faith in Pauline theology the concrete sense of Creed, Innocent III maintained that 'he who takes away faith takes away life, for the just lives by faith.'" We have said enough to prove the interest and importance of this book, which shows us how the teaching of the Saviour can be perverted by men and how an ecclesiastical system can be false to the whole example of its early days. And we must remember the words of Dr. Coulton, "During at least seven centuries, Rome has consistently asserted, *in principle*, a disciplinary and punitive power over all baptized Christians. She only ceased to assert this in practice when she found herself deprived of the necessary physical force." When the Penal Laws—which we condemn in their unchristian severity in so far as they claimed to be Christian in any sense—are being denounced, it must never be forgotten that they were enacted against a politico-religious system that made the claim Dr. Coulton states and put it in practice in Southern France.

ROMANESQUE FRANCE.

ROMANESQUE FRANCE. By Violet R. Markham, C.H. *John Murray*. 18s.

Regrets are often vain, and, when reading this charming, delightfully written and at times discursively illuminating book, we have wished that when we visited many of the places named it had been in our hands. Our eyes would have seen much that we had missed, and our visits would have become storied memories due to the captivating way in which Miss Markham gives her information. Stay-at-homes will enjoy what Miss Markham has written, for her book is an account of history in stone and she never once loses

sight of the human factors in what has been erected or sculptured. She gives it all in a setting of its times and, as she says, "an old building is more than a mass of brick and stone, however carefully assembled. Though architecture works through the most static of mediums, it is nevertheless the most vital and organic of the arts. It is the great script of the human race, a testimony mute but eloquent to man's exaltations, agonies, and unconquerable mind. To read its message aright is to enter into the very soul of history, and history so viewed is no mere record of things dead and gone, but a living experience of which we ourselves are the product." In every page of her book Miss Markham makes us feel this, and we see in stone the tale of progress and retrocession, the hopes symbolized and the disappointments expressed of the striving of man after what is beyond him.

We are amazed by the variety of influences at work and the range of twelfth-century art. We note an extraordinary interaction of art. The Book of Kells—a book so beautiful that it has been reputed to have been written either by angels or by a quill from an angel's wing—shows signs of Coptic influence, and from Ireland that influence spread to the Continent. We see how unjust many of the accusations against Protestants in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as unique vandals of Church architecture are, for the same things were done in lands where Romanism remained supreme. Negligence is as great an enemy of survival as wilful damage, and both have been at work. We read something of symbolism and see how delusive the supposed science is, and when there is doubt we can only say "much can be said on both sides." The fantasies of human imagination have not necessarily a religious meaning because they find expression in a Cathedral or great Church. "I find it impossible to believe that every fantastic group of mythical men and beasts has a moral meaning. Great art will never submit to the trammels of an exacting symbolism." And our own studies have led us to believe that contemporary art is not by any means a safe guide to contemporary customs or even dress. This is too often forgotten by men in search of proof of a thesis.

We have said enough to show the wealth of the contents of a book which is at once a treasure-house of beauty and a store-house of history. No reader with human instincts can read the terrible story of the Albigenses, as told by Miss Markham, without a shudder. Miss Markham tells us that in hunting down Catharist heresy, the Church stamped out more than an eccentric faith. "It destroyed a culture that would have enriched and dignified the sum total of human life and experience." She asks us to refrain from judging these men as monsters, for they acted in accordance with the standards of their own time. Quite true. But they did so in the Name of One whose Spirit they trampled under foot. But we do not pursue this subject, and conclude by advising all who visit France and all who are interested in the progress of humanity to buy, or borrow, and at any rate to read, one of the most illuminating books on archæology that has ever come into our hands.

CHINESE MISSIONS.

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS IN CHINA. By Kenneth Scott Latourette. S.P.C.K. 21s.

No student of Missionary History can afford to be without this encyclopædic volume which is a monument of wide reading and careful research. No document appears to be considered too obscure for notice, and every effort has been made to verify the facts and check the information supplied. And a full reference is given for every statement made. On the contrast and points of agreement between Chinese and Christian religious ideas we have a full history, as far as space permits, of the impingement of Christian Missions on China from the date of the Nestorian contact to the present day. The story is told without any striving after effect, and somehow it captivates the reader and leads him on from chapter to chapter without making any apparent effort to constrain attention. The story is marvellous and tells of success and disappointment. Nestorianism appears to have had no permanent influence on Chinese life and thought in spite of its existence for two and a half centuries.

Roman Catholicism followed the Nestorians under the Mongols, but also collapsed. "With the expulsion of the Mongols Christianity disappeared from the horizon of the Chinese even more completely than it had after the fall of the T'ang. No non-Chinese Christian Communities survived on the northern marches, ready to make their influence felt under more favourable circumstances. If Christianity were ever to become a permanent and influential factor in Chinese life, it could only be through movements much more powerful than any that had so far appeared." Roman Catholic Missions were reopened under the Portuguese and the great name of Xavier appears, and we learn from Mr. Latourette the tale of the chequered movements of the Jesuits and the great controversy of the Rites, which ended by Papal decisions that sacrificed numbers to vitality. No one reading the narrative can withhold respect for the action of the Papal as against the Jesuit policy. In the careful statistical chapter it is stated that in 1924 there were 2,244,366 Roman Catholic Chinese with 553,201 catechumens. The body of the Church is drawn from the humbler classes, but its education is improving.

When we turn to Protestant Missions we are in the presence, as in the case of the Roman Missions, of changing attitudes on the part of the Chinese Government, and it is said that they were at times at least more favourably regarded by the Chinese authorities, as they did not interfere so much in law suits and their numbers were not so great. They have had to pass through much persecution from time to time, and the number of their members was in 1920 806,926 as compared with 654,658 three years before. Owing to the disturbed state of the country there has been no recent attempt to calculate the number of Protestant Christians. But figures are only an index of growth and vitality, not growth and vitality themselves, and the thrilling pages devoted to the many-

sided work of Protestant Missions prove the zeal and high character of those engaged in them. We have word pictures of leaders, and much space is devoted to the enigmatic General Feng, who remains as great a puzzle as ever to those who seek to understand him. But then China as a whole is now an incalculable country, whose fate deeply concerns us at home as citizens and as Christians. The book cheers and humbles, and we are indeed grateful to its author for enabling us to know facts that will help us to visualize more clearly what God has done and what God is calling his Church to do in that great country.

SIBYLS AND SEERS. By Edwyn Bevan. *George Allen & Unwin*, 1928. (Pp. 189.) 7s. 6d.

From the days when we first read *Jerusalem under the High-Priests* until the appearance of *Hellenism and Christianity*, and the masterly contribution, *The Environment, Social, Political, Intellectual and Religious, of Israel from Maccabees to our Lord*, in the new S.P.C.K. Commentary on Holy Scripture, we have welcomed everything published by Dr. Bevan, the Lecturer on Hellenistic History and Literature at King's College, London. This latest work of his, a survey of some ancient theories of revelation and inspiration, embodies lectures given in 1927 at Oxford on the Speaker's Foundation for Biblical Studies. The book, especially in view of the renewed interest in Spiritism, will stimulate thought whatever the reader's attitude to the phenomena investigated under this heading. The author describes some of the ways in which the ancient world believed that knowledge of the spirit, or communications from the spirit-world, might be obtained. In the chapter "Travellers beyond the Bourne," he surveys with wide range of illustration the beliefs that beings of this world might visit the spirit-world, and return to report. The remaining chapters, dealing with epiphanies of gods and appearances of ghosts, the ideas of the voice and letter from heaven, and with inspiration in its two forms of Sibylline ecstasy and of dream-vision, are equally interesting. Dr. Bevan shows how some of the ancient theories of inspiration were carried on with modifications in the Christian Church.

G. H. W.

STUDIES IN ISLAM. By the Rev. Canon Sell, D.D. *Church Missionary Society*, 1928. (Pp. 266.) 6s.

Canon Sell's first book, *The Faith of Islam*, was published in 1880, and since then he has continued to write on this subject with an intimate acquaintance with the spirit of Islam, and with an equally profound knowledge of its history. He is one of our greatest living authorities on Islam, and since 1865 has been in close touch with the mission field. With a dozen or more authoritative books to his name, he has served his Church and generation well. This new volume—not his latest, for following close upon

it comes *Islam in Spain* (C.M.S. 3s.)—gives us studies of Mysticism in Islam, the Shi'ahs, the Fatimid Khalifate, Babiism, The Darwishes, and The Qur'an. We found the first and the last two chapters particularly interesting, and all were such as we have learned to expect from Dr. Sell. Those whose knowledge of Islam is slight, will feel compelled by these studies to read further, and no one would be more gratified at this than the learned author himself.

G. H. W.

THE MAKING OF LUKE-ACTS. By Henry J. Cadbury. *Macmillan*, 1928. 12s. 6d.

"To recover some features of the writer's character, to visualize the other factors which went into his noteworthy undertaking, to illustrate from his contemporaries the method of composition that he employed, and so to give as clear, comprehensive and realistic a picture as possible of the whole literary process that produced Luke and Acts." Such is Dr. Cadbury's aim in giving us this most readable and illuminating study of the writings which he, convinced of their unity, calls *Luke-Acts*. This new volume is not an introduction, an apology or a commentary, and the purpose of our review is not merely to commend it to professed scholars—they cannot fail to appreciate its scholarship and originality—but to persuade the general reader to buy the book and to read it. He will be rewarded. Whether the book is examining the materials used, or the common literary methods of the time, or discussing the personality and purpose of the author, the reader finds himself carried irresistibly along. Although Dr. Cadbury has some views which do not commend themselves to the majority of scholars (the use of medical language by the writer; the authorship of the "We-sections" in Acts; the question of a Proto-Luke, etc.), yet his wide knowledge of the literature of the subject, and of the nature of the problems involved, not to mention his reliable judgment, preclude undue dogmatism.

G. H. W.

EDUCATION FOR TOLERANCE. By John E. J. Fanshawe. *New York: Offices of Independent Education, West 17th Street. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., Ltd. 2s. 6d. net.*

This treatise makes for peace and aims at the promotion of a better understanding between England and America. The writer is nothing if he is not frank, and he admits that there is no love lost between England and America. He tells us that when serving as Intelligence Officer at Long Island at the time of the signing of the Armistice he interviewed several hundred men who "almost without exception denounced Great Britain most unmercifully, and said in effect that if they ever went to war again it would be to fight the British." He admits, however, that none of them could give any good reason for this attitude. In another place we are told that "never before in Great Britain has there been so much

resentment toward America as exists at the present time . . . unfortunately we are distinctly unpopular with the rank and file of the British people as they are with us." He certainly does not spare his own fellow-countrymen in this trenchant essay and he takes "the average American traveller" severely to task for his vulgarity—for his lack of reverence for the shrines that have come down to us from antiquity—for his swagger and "we won the war" air and for his lavish display of the almighty American dollar. He boldly accuses the American of worshipping money and adds: "He has not had the time to civilize himself completely." This is refreshing candour, and it is to be hoped that his very downright appeal to the Britisher and the American will bear fruit, for, as he says, "co-operation and understanding are necessary not only for their own salvation, but for that of the world," seeing that in their hands "is placed the destiny of future civilization. It is some satisfaction to know that this candid discussion is being widely read in the States and its appearance here cannot but be productive of better feeling and fraternal relations between the two nations.

S. R. C.

A COLLECTION OF SACRED POEMS. Vol. IV. By E. Leifchild Hurrell. London: *Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd.* Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

Miss Hurrell's output is tremendous! This is the fourth volume of her poems. They are saturated through and through with Holy Scripture. Many of them are of very considerable merit and some of them fasten attention on obscure passages. Mr. Wilkinson, of the Mildmay Mission to the Jews, contributes an appreciative foreword, commending them for their "very direct and faithful message"—praise they very well deserve.

WHERE WE STAND TO-DAY. By Thomas Bolton. London: *Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd.* 4s. net.

This is an application of Biblical Chronology (based on the late Mr. Anstey's elaborate system and data) to the study of unfulfilled prophecy, the argument being supported by diagrams prepared by the author with manifest care and skill. The argument is, however, based upon the assumption that 2 Peter iii. 8 is to be taken literally, and that the prophetic and historic "day" is a thousand years; so that the six days of creation, in Genesis i., represent six thousand years. Without this assumption Mr. Bolton's argument collapses. There can be no doubt that there lies behind these elaborate, intricate calculations an enormous amount of patient labour, and that the treatise deserves—as the author asks for it—to "be received in such a spirit of charity and patience as befits a Christian attitude to any loyal attempt to help forward the interested study of the Word of God." A very reasonable plea.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

DEAN WACE HOUSE, WINE OFFICE COURT,
FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

Cranmer.—A second edition of *A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine and Use of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, by Archbishop Cranmer, with a preface by the Very Rev. Henry Wace, D.D., has been published by Messrs. Thynne & Jarvis (4s. net). This book has been out of print for some years and the new issue brings Cranmer's famous work again within the reach of many who have not access to the other editions of his writings. This volume has the great advantage of a preface by Dr. Wace, and we specially call attention to the emphasis which the Dean lays upon Cranmer's argument that Transubstantiation is but a particular form of the error which is at the root of the mischief. The dividing line between ourselves and the Church of Rome is any doctrine of a local presence of Christ's Body and Blood resident in the Consecrated Elements. This popular reprint should be of the greatest service to students, and we strongly recommend our readers to procure and study it.

The Black Death.—Dr. G. G. Coulton has recently published in Benn's Sixpenny Library an extraordinarily interesting and illuminating pamphlet entitled *The Black Death*. In it he gives a short account of the origin and spread of the Plague; its influence and effect on clergy and people and particularly its influence upon the Reformation. Quoting the monastic chronicler Knighton, he says that the ravages of the plague created a difficulty in getting suitable priests, and that the Lollards "multiplied exceedingly like budding plants and filled the whole realm everywhere."

The Inquisition.—A second essay by Dr. Coulton is also issued in the same series entitled *The Inquisition*. Dr. Coulton writes with unique authority, and his words may be accepted without any feeling that he is making out a case for Protestantism. He lets facts speak for themselves, and traces the historical causes of the mediæval Inquisition. He points out that the Inquisition was an elaborate institution for the punishment and suppression of unpopular opinions, and shows that under this system intolerance progressed in a marked degree. He describes the cruelties inflicted by a ruthless persecution "in obedience to the decrees of the Holy Roman Church, which have prescribed that heretics should be excluded from the Society of God and of Holy Church and of all Catholics and should be everywhere condemned and prosecuted." The great advantage derived from the study of this little book is the clarifying of the idea so widely current that the Church was as merciful as the State was cruel. The Church would not shed one drop of blood, and it therefore handed its victims over to the Civil Power to be put to death. The chapter on Death and Torture gives some striking instances that the Church did have some share in the death sentence. The Civil powers were not really the judges. The right to consider questions of heresy was formally denied them.

The Prayer Book Crisis.—Special mention was made at the Annual Meetings of the National Church League of the usefulness and large circula-

tion of *The Prayer Book Crisis* (2s. 6d. net), by Sir William Joynson-Hicks, three editions, numbering 15,000 copies in all, having been sold. This timely work comprises a concise history of our present Prayer Book, a sketch of the events which led up to its threatened supersession, and an examination of its proposed successor. It is by no means out of date, and those who have not yet procured a copy are urged to do so while there are still some obtainable.

Amy Le Feuvre.—The children of to-day have lost a friend in the lamented death of Amy Le Feuvre, whose books for children have been the stand-by of many a Sunday School Superintendent in selecting prizes. We are glad to note that the R.T.S., who have published so many of the works of this author, are gradually reducing them in price so as to make them more universally used. Particularly we welcome the new 2s. 6d. series, which contains such books as *The Chateau by the Lake*.

Sunday School Lessons.—In the early autumn a new series of Lessons by Deaconesses Oakley and Ethel Luke, entitled *More Stories for the Little People*, will be published (1s. 6d.). Coloured Text-Cards (4½" by 3¼") to illustrate the Lessons, together with album, can be supplied at 1s. 2d. per child, for a year. Those who have not obtained a copy of the first series, *Stories for the Little People* (1s. 6d. net), are urged to do so at once. Reprints of the Rev. G. R. Balleine's books, *The Young Churchman* and *Heroes and Holy Days* (2s. each), will also be published.

Reunion.—In view of the Cheltenham Conference recently held at Oxford on "Lambeth and Reunion" the following pamphlets may be of interest: *Steps towards Reunion*, by Bishops W. G. Peel and J. J. Willis (1s.); *Intercommunion*, by the Rev. J. P. S. R. Gibson (2d.); *The Confirmation Rubric: Whom Does It Bind?* by the Rev. H. M. Gwatkin, D.D. (2d.); *The Malines Conference*, by the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft (3d.); and the following Kikuyu Tracts: "*That They All may be One*," by Dr. Moule, late Bishop of Durham; *The Ministry and Unity*, by the Bishop of Manchester; *Episcopacy in Scripture and Episcopacy in the Church of England*, by the Rev. H. M. Gwatkin, D.D.; *What is the Church?* by Archbishop D'Arcy, and *Co-operation at the Home Base*, by the Rev. H. U. Weitbrecht Stanton, D.D. These tracts are published at 1d. each.

A valuable book on the subject is *Documents on Christian Unity* (7s. 6d.), by Dr. G. K. A. Bell, Bishop of Chichester.

P.C. Councils.—A Parochial Electors Roll Book, containing 100 pages and with an alphabetical index cut through, has just been published by the Church Book Room at 3s. 6d. (postage 6d.).

Pamphlets.—Enquiries often reach us for booklets for distribution in hospitals and nursing homes. *Time to Think* (1d.) was specially issued by the Book Room for this purpose, and the R.T.S. also have a very helpful booklet entitled *Thy Rod and Thy Staff* (2d.). *My Weekly Message* (2d.), by Deaconess Oakley and Deaconess Luke, recently issued by the Book Room, can be recommended for giving to children. We have just received a copy of a splendid Manual of Preparation for Holy Communion entitled *The Heart Uplifted* (3d.). It is written by the Rev. E. A. Dunn, Vicar of St. Luke's, Nottingham, and will be welcomed by clergy in town and country for distribution to Confirmation Candidates.