
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1920.

THE MONTH.

Mansfield Conference Report.

JUST too late for reference last month, there was issued the official copy of the Resolutions passed at the Joint Conference of Church of England clergy and Nonconformist ministers, held at Mansfield College, Oxford, on January 7, 8 and 9, and these have since aroused widespread attention. For convenience of discussion we give them in full as follows :—

We are in entire accord in our common recognition of the fact that the denominations to which we severally belong are equally, as corporate groups, within the one Church of Christ ; and that the efficacy of their ministrations is verified in the history of the Church. We believe that all dealings between them should be conducted on the basis of this recognition, which is fundamental to any approach towards the realisation of the Reunited Church, for which we long and labour and pray.

We agree that, in order to give outward and visible expression to this principle of recognition, the approach should be made along the following lines, as parts of one scheme :—

1. Interchange of pulpits, under due authority.
2. Subject to the same authority, mutual admission to the Lord's Table.
3. Acceptance by ministers serving in any one denomination, who may desire it, of such authorisation as shall enable them to minister fully and freely in the churches of other denominations ; it being clearly stated that the purpose of this authorisation is as above set forth, and that it is not to be taken as reordination, or as repudiation of their previous status as Ministers in the Church Catholic of Christ.

Taken in their natural meaning these resolutions seemed to carry us a very long way towards reunion, and we confess to having rubbed our eyes in amazement when we saw in the list of signatures attached the name of more than one prominent advocate of the sacerdotal character of the Christian ministry. It was soon seen, however, that these resolutions are to be specially interpreted. Their true inwardness is explained from the Church of England side in the covering letter to the Archbishops and Bishops, signed by Canon Burroughs, Dr. A. J. Carlyle, Canon A. W. Robinson,

Canon Temple and the Bishop of Warrington. In this they made "certain observations" as follows:—

A conference similar, though not identical, in its membership had met the previous year, and had arrived at resolutions, among which was the following:

"(iv.) We recognise, with the Sub-Committee on 'Faith and Order,' in its second interim report, the place which a reformed Episcopacy must hold in the ultimate constitution of the Reunited Church; and we do not doubt that the Spirit of God will lead the Churches of Christ, if resolved on reunion, to such a constitution as will also fully conserve the essential values of the other historical types of Church Policy, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Methodist."

Although we were not formally committed to the resolutions of the earlier conference, it was made abundantly clear in our discussions that we were heartily at one in the conviction that the Reunited Church must be episcopal, and this fact should be kept in mind when the following resolutions are being considered.

Further, it is to be remembered that, after two days of conference and prayer, men came to something of a common mind, and that phrases tend to receive from the circumstances of their origin a colour which they may fail to carry to other minds. Great care, however, was taken in the choice of words, and the terms used must be understood as meaning only what they actually say.

Once more, it was necessary to find words that could be used equally of all the different groups affected. The phrase "due authority," for example, signifies the authority held by the denomination concerned to be the proper one for action in any given case. In the last clause the authorisation required to enable any man to exercise in the ministry freely and fully in our own part of the Church would be found, as we are persuaded, to be the imposition of the Bishop's hands.

Read in conjunction with this letter the Resolutions do not carry us quite as far as we thought. It would seem to be clear—if we may put the matter bluntly—that Nonconformists are not to be allowed "to minister fully and freely" in our churches unless and until they have been episcopally ordained. It is a triumph for episcopacy, but what do the Nonconformists who signed the Resolutions—such as Dr. Forsyth, Dr. Garvie, Dr. Anderson Scott, and Dr. Selbie—say to it? And how far does it really take us towards Reunion?

"Parts of one Scheme."

Moreover, the recommendations as to interchange of pulpits, mutual admission to the Lord's Table, and the interchange of ministrations, are not to be taken separately, but "as parts of one scheme," and so literally is this to be interpreted that Canon Lacey, who signed the Resolutions, finds it convenient to attack one of his co-signatories, Bishop Welldon, for inviting Dr. Jowett to preach in Durham Cathedral,

even though the invitation was given and accepted before the Conference took place.' But much must be excused to Canon Lacey, for he has had to endure the frowns of the *Church Times*, if not of the whole Anglo-Catholic party. He has explained his position in two letters to the *Church Times* which may, perhaps, help him with its readers, but they offer no sort of consolation or encouragement to those who hope and—in spite of every indication to the contrary—believe that the Churches are surely, if slowly, coming to realise a larger measure of unity. In his first letter (February 27) he states that as he "had a hand in drafting," the resolution, he may claim with some confidence to know what it means. This, then, is his interpretation :—

Letters which are coming to me betray a fundamental misapprehension of its purpose. It is not an interim compromise. It contemplates a completely reunited Church, and has reference to nothing short of that consummation. It is an attempt to set out, in language familiar to those who are least in touch with the Catholic tradition, some necessary conditions of that complete reunion for which we hope and pray. I told the Conference plainly that we older men must not expect to see it bear fruit in our day ; we must ask God to show us His work, and our children His glory.

His second letter is still more illuminating. A joint letter had appeared complaining that the Resolution "seems to embody the 'Kikuyu' position in an extended and intensified form," but Canon Lacey rejects that view. He writes :—

The Mansfield College Resolution has nothing in common with Kikuyu ; it is not a working compromise for our present state of disunion. I myself certainly could not put my hand to the Kikuyu compromise, nor even to the alternative scheme proposed by the Bishop of Zanzibar.

Your own studiously fair comment calls for one correction. In drafting the Resolution we were careful not to give the various "denominations" or "corporate groups" the style of "Churches," for it was based on the expressed belief that there is in the implied sense only one Church. Neither did we suggest that the Church is one denomination or corporate group along with others. A diocesan bishop does not as such belong to any one group. You and I would say that he is the rightful pastor of all groups in the diocese, and that the one effective way of union is to bring all groups under his pastoral care. Much persuasion will be required to effect this, but a beginning is made. The groups are at present in schism, as you say ; the one object of the Conference was to bring that state of schism to an end.

I do not wonder that questions are asked about the ambiguous "authorisation." Questions were asked in the Conference, and were answered. So far as we are concerned, authorisation to minister in the congregation can be given only by imposition of the hands of a bishop with appropriate prayer. We should regard this as ordination. Others might regard it as a ratification of their former status. This divergence of view cannot be helped. It could not be helped in the case of Palmer of Magdalen when he was ordained at Rome. Firmly convinced that he was already a deacon validly

ordained, he nevertheless submitted to the rite of ordination, in what precise aspect I do not know, with a full explanation of his own position. English bishops may have to deal with analogous cases. The one thing that such an act must not be called is "reordination." I urged this at the Conference, giving reasons. Properly understood, reordination is impossible; a man is either ordained or not ordained; if he is not ordained, he obviously cannot be reordained. The Resolution, therefore, ruled out this word.

We hope we do Canon Lacey no injustice when we say that the only possible interpretation we can put upon his letter is that the policy he favours is "reunion by absorption." Again we ask, What do the Nonconformist signatories say to it? If Canon Lacey's interpretation of the Mansfield Conference Resolutions be correct, we do not appreciate their value as a practical contribution towards the solution of the Reunion problem. They have made an already difficult position still more confused.

More Practical Resolutions.

We confess our own preference for the Resolutions on Intercommunion adopted by a Conference of Evangelical clergy held in London in January. They are much more practical; they are not hedged about with "ifs" and "buts"; they are simple, direct and effective. We quote them as follows:—

1. We desire to express our conviction that it is our duty to admit to Holy Communion baptized and communicant members of other Christian Churches which accept the first three conditions of the Lambeth Statement (1888) who may desire to communicate with us, and upon that conviction we feel bound to act.

2. We believe that there is no ground in principle why such action, in similar circumstances, should not be reciprocal.

3. We see no objection in principle to solemn acts of intercommunion with the members of such Churches upon National and other special occasions, as expressions of the unity that underlies our present divisions.

4. We further believe that the time has come when authority should be given for such reciprocal action with these Churches.

NOTE 1.—We wish to make it clear that the above resolutions do not deal with the question of the interchange of ministrations between episcopally ordained ministers and those not episcopally ordained.

NOTE 2.—In regard to the first resolution above, we desire to express our regret at those cases of exclusion from the Holy Communion which have occurred from time to time, and which in our judgment form a grievous stumbling-block to Reunion.

These Resolutions when they were sent to the Bishops bore the signatures of 156 clergy, and as they have now been opened to signature by Evangelical clergy generally there is reason to believe that the number will be very largely increased. The Resolutions

were forwarded to the Bishops with a covering letter signed by the Bishop of Warrington, Prebendary Sharpe, and the Rev. A. F. Alston, who wrote :—

> They (the signatories) feel that there has been so much talk about Reunion that unless some action is taken there will be grave danger lest the Church of England should be accused of insincerity in the matter. Attention should perhaps be called to the fact that the first resolution, which speaks of immediate action, only makes clear and explicit that which has been the practice of most if not all the signatories for a considerable period ; they believe that this practice has continuous precedents in the history of the Church for the past three hundred years ; nor is it contrary to the principle laid down in the pronouncement of the Archbishop of Canterbury, on the "Kikuyu" case, published Easter, 1915. The steps advocated in the other resolutions have no such authority and, consequently, it is respectfully asked that authority should be given.

Changes in the Communion Service.

We revert to the question of Changes in the Communion Service in order to rectify an omission in last month's Notes. When writing we had not heard of the voting in the Lower House of the York Convocation upon the Report of the Archbishops' Conference. It now appears that in spite of Dr. Frere's earnest advocacy there was not much enthusiasm for the proposals suggested by the Archbishops' Conference. An amendment moved by the Archdeacon of Chester to amend the wording of the Epiklesis clause so as to avoid the use of the same phraseology in reference to persons and things had much support, but was eventually lost, as was also an amendment by Canon Thorpe, substituting another form of words. In the end Dr. Frere's resolution, seconded by the Bishop of Beverley, proposing the adoption of the Report embodying the Conference proposals, was only just carried, the figures being, it is believed, 41 to 38. The position, therefore, is now this : in the Southern Province, while in the Upper House the proposals were agreed to by 17 votes to 2, in the Lower House they were only accepted by 62 to 54 ; in the Northern Province, they only escaped rejection in the Upper House by the Archbishop's casting vote ; and in the Lower House by the very narrow majority of three. We are thus very far from an agreed settlement, and in these circumstances it is permissible to hope that the Archbishop of Canterbury's declared personal preference, that there should be no alteration, may prevail. We are very glad of this opportunity of printing in our pages a revised report of the Bishop of Manchester's speech

in the Upper House of the York Convocation, together with some useful additions.

Marriage and Home Life.

The discussion now proceeding over proposals for increased facilities for divorce ought to inspire Churchpeople with the desire to do everything they possibly can to exalt the dignity and sacredness of the marriage relationship, and to safeguard the indissolubility of the marriage contract. The subject received considerable attention at the recent Congress of the Northern Congress of Evangelical Churchmen held in Manchester, and as a result of the discussion a Manifesto has since been issued by the Federation in the following terms :—

"At the recent Congress of the Northern Federation and Union of Evangelical Churchmen, held in Manchester, a prominent position was given to the consideration of home and home life.

"Abundant evidence was forthcoming that home life is in special danger to-day, because of the lack of discipline and the loss of restraint, and because of the many false views which now obtain on the question of marriage. We therefore feel impelled to urge our fellow-Churchmen to guard the rite of holy matrimony with increased jealousy ; to impress on all classes its sacred nature ; to insist on its permanent character ; and to speak unsparingly of the wrongness and hideousness of divorce and separations.

"We are persuaded that to do this is after the mind of Christ, and that any interference with the sanctity of the marriage tie must prove fatal to the cause of true religion as well as disastrous to our national welfare, and will be fraught with much misery for women and children, whose happiness and comfort are dependent on the inviolability of the marriage bond."

We note with interest that the *Church Times* associates itself "heartily" with the Manifesto. There are occasions when all sections of the Church of England can act most happily together, as, for instance, when Church Schools and afterwards the Church in Wales were attacked ; and we venture to think that the present onslaught on the marriage law of the country is a call to Churchpeople of all groups and sections to unite in its defence.

CHANGES IN THE COMMUNION SERVICE.[1]

BY THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER.

THE duty of the Convocation, and particularly of this House, to maintain the purity of our Book of Common Prayer is at no point more incumbent than at this part of the service of Holy Communion now under our consideration. Not only is the service itself associated with our own deepest spiritual experiences, but it is both by its character and its history for the Church of England holy ground, a service for which the greatest of all her sacrifices have been made. For the sake of this service she endured a great breach in the continuity of her life, breaking away from medieval traditions to return to simple obedience to her Lord's command. For the sake of this service also she dissociated herself in a measure from other Churches of the Reformation, being determined that her children should receive nothing less than her Lord had provided for them in that Sacrament.

The service, while departing boldly from contemporary forms that it might be a real Communion service, yet bears manifest trace of scholarly care and learning in its construction. The more closely it is examined the more remarkable is its liturgical exactness for its own purposes. It is also, with the exception of the brief-lived service of the First Prayer Book and sundry quite slight alterations, the one Communion office of our Church from the days at least of Queen Elizabeth's accession. The alterations have been very few and very trifling. Our own House also, when it came to this point in the work of Prayer Book Revision, called a halt and determined to make no changes in the very portions with which we are dealing to-day.

AN EARNEST CAUTION.

These words are not a mere preface. They are an earnest caution against making changes for the sake of change. If I am rightly informed the proposals before us did not come from the quarter from which they might have been expected to come, but

[1] The substance of a speech delivered by the Bishop of Manchester in the Upper House of the Convocation of York on Wednesday, February 11, 1920, on the proposed changes in the Communion Service agreed upon by a majority at the Conference called by the Archbishops.

from persons who had no real desire for them, who would have preferred to leave our book as it stands, but were moved to suggest changes that they disliked out of a spirit of compromise. They feared, above everything else, the imputation of a *non possumus* attitude. They tried to go as far as they could in the direction of the rejected proposals of the Canterbury Convocation without sacrifice of their own convictions. The spirit, as an exhibition of brotherly spirit, was laudable, but the result has not proved worthy of that great office which they were handling. I can compare it with nothing so aptly as with St. Peter's Church, Cornhill, where Sir Gilbert Scott was given a free hand to restore a masterpiece of Sir Christopher Wren. Those who know the church will remember the lamentable result—the Gothic patches barbarously affixed to a pure classical style. So these amiable and well-meaning revisers have added to a prayer of incomparable dignity and beauty, breathing the very spirit of our Lord on the great Paschal night, tags and fragments of early Church orders which either mean more than they say, or else in this connexion have very little meaning at all. Against all such work as this, I submit that the only right attitude to maintain is the *non possumus* attitude. Let me justify, if I can, this very severe condemnation of the Report.

The Displacements.

I will deal very briefly with all that lies outside the Prayer of Consecration. The one redeeming feature of the Report is that it leaves the so-called Prayer of Oblation in its proper place. The proposal to remove it was a liturgical blunder, condemned by thoroughly competent liturgical authorities. It is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving offered by those who have received the Body and Blood of Christ in faithful obedience to His command. To offer the thanksgiving before the reception was wholly out of place.

But while this displacement is rejected, two others are introduced.

First, the Prayer of Humble Access is placed after the Comfortable Words. The absolved and comforted penitent is thus reminded of his unworthiness just at the moment when his grateful heart is prepared to rise to the Lord Who has forgiven him, and through the same Lord to enter into the holiest and to join in the

angelic hymn. It was a far truer liturgical instinct that placed the worshipper with Isaiah in the act of humiliation after and not before the entry into the glories of the sanctuary on high. This displacement is sheer loss, and not compensated for by passing directly from the "Ter Sanctus" to the Prayer of Consecration.

Secondly, the displacement of the Lord's Prayer and attaching of it to the Prayer of Consecration is contrary to the genius of our Church. As in Holy Baptism and in Confirmation, the children's prayer has its proper place immediately after the reception of heavenly gifts. When consecration of the Elements has to be repeated it will be manifestly out of place, and will probably be omitted. But it owed its position in some old liturgies as part of the Consecration Prayer to the idea that it was by the Lord's Prayer that consecration of the Elements was effected, a conception probably due to a misinterpretation of a well-known passage of Justin Martyr. Our Reformers did well in giving to it its present position. Who has not felt the appropriateness of being recalled from the lofty mysteries of Communion with God by the simple words that he learned at his mother's knee?

Two Principles.

Before examining the proposed additions to the Prayer of Consecration I suggest for your consideration two principles which in the examination of such prayers appear to me to be axiomatic.

1. The words to be considered must be weighed, not by themselves but in relation to the place which it is intended to assign to them. Let me take a very simple but very direct instance—*viz.*, the words "remembering before Thee." They are words often used in prayers of commendation, daily we remember before God our friends, relatives, and others for whom we would intercede. In a conversation about the words the Bishop of Ripon remarked that "all our prayers are before God." All this is very true, but it has no bearing at all on the introduction of this particular phrase at this particular point in the Prayer of Consecration. Similarly, the alleged lack of reference to the Holy Spirit in the Communion Office, if established, would have nothing to do with the Invocation of the Holy Spirit at this point in the Consecration Prayer. No liturgical student could accept any such explanation of the words were they introduced.

2. The second principle of interpretation which I would urge is this: That words in a liturgy must be considered in relation to the history connected with them. We cannot say to ourselves, for instance, that we should like to introduce a thanksgiving in connexion with the Act of Consecration, as though we were the first persons to whom the idea had occurred. Still less can we introduce a highly significant form of thanksgiving, and by merely shutting our eyes to the past divest it of all its antecedent history. Of prayers, as of ceremonies, the very just remark made by the Bishop of Ripon in his most useful book on Elevation [1] is true:

"A ceremony which has been used for many centuries and has been associated with widely different ideas must be regarded in the light not only *of what it is now intended to suggest by those who adopt it*, but of the meaning and influence which it has had in the past, and which it is therefore likely to have in the *popular* mind in the present day."

NOTE.—The italics are the author's.

These forcible words are quite as true of prayers as of ceremonies.

This point is convenient also for dealing with the objection that misuse or abuse of prayer or ceremony does not necessarily involve its disuse altogether. A sound liturgical principle, no doubt, but double-edged in considering the revival of a prayer or ceremony. For, if such a prayer has in the past been connected with erroneous teaching, and at the time of its proposed revival the same erroneous teaching is being sedulously propagated, we are forced by this principle to consider the use which is likely to be made of the prayer; whether its revival will not be construed as encouragement of the false teaching, whether its words and phrases are not likely to be misconceived. We cannot, in fact, revise our liturgy in entire disregard of the existence of a school within the Church which interpolates the Communion Office with the Mass. I greatly doubt if the moderate Non-jurors, if they were with us now, would not be the foremost antagonists of the suggested changes.

THE PROPOSED CHANGES.

The Report sums up the proposed changes thus:—

(1) An act of remembrance—Anamnesis.

[1] Drury, *On Elevation in the Eucharist*, p. 4.

(2) A thanksgiving.

(3) An invocation of the Holy Spirit—Epiklesis.

The distinction between the act of remembrance and the thanksgiving hardly seems to be well supported in such authorities as I have been able to consult. The act of remembrance is usually associated with a thanksgiving for the Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and Second Coming of our Lord, and that for a sufficient reason which will presently appear.

The term *Anamnesis* is an allusion to the words of our Lord, "Do this in *remembrance* (anamnesin) of Me." Out of those words misinterpreted, as we contend, undoubtedly grew all the great edifice of sacrificial teaching which now finds its expression in the Roman Mass and the liturgies of the East. Though the word itself, with hardly any exceptions, means simply remembrance, and is constantly used of remembrance of sins, and although there is a wholly distinct word to signify "memorial sacrifice," yet we cannot—having regard to its history—introduce an Anamnesis at this point and say that it has no significance of memorial sacrifice. Curiously enough, there is but little reference in our ordinary text-books to this liturgical use. In this sense it is not to be found in the indices of Procter and Frere, of Scudamore, of Brightman's Collections of Eastern Liturgies, nor in the Prayer-Book Dictionary. The only clear definition of it that I have been able to find is in Cabrol's great encyclopædia, the *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie et de Liturgie*. There it is defined as follows: "The purpose of the Anamnesis is to present the Body and Blood of Christ to the Father. The Son is sacrificed and offered to the Father, and the Spirit comes to sanctify, and perfect the sanctification of, the sacrifice." This definition of the purpose of the Anamnesis and the history of its development are supported by a wealth of quotations from early liturgies. But the article in question does not "base the Anamnesis on its supposed existence in all primitive liturgies; in fact, it is not to be found in the liturgies of Cyril, Athanasius, and Augustine." The support for it, if anywhere, is in the construction placed on the words of our Lord, as reported by St. Luke and amplified by St. Paul.

Their Liturgical History.

From these considerations it must appear that we are not at liberty to construe the words which we propose to restore in a

sense of our own. The "remembrance" is a memorial sacrifice, the thanksgiving describes and characterize the sacrifice so offered. The words have a liturgical history of which we cannot deprive them, and the bare fact that no mention is made of a sacrifice does not deprive them of that meaning. They indicate a definite stage in the prayer which has its well-known significance, and that significance is not limited, as in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI, by insertion of the words, "The memorial which Thy Blessed Son hath willed to be made." That restriction, for what it was worth, has been removed, and we must plainly answer this question: "If we did not intend a sacrifice, why did we introduce words which have always had a sacrificial meaning? And if we did intend a sacrifice, why did we not plainly say whether we meant a memorial or a propitiatory sacrifice; and further, if we intended a memorial sacrifice, was it a sacrifice by a priest on our behalf offering to God the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ our Lord?" The amiable desire to meet half-way those who asked for the expression of a memorial sacrifice without saying it in so many words has led us into a position open to the gravest misconstruction.

But we must look beyond the prayer to the ritual which may be used to interpret it. We must remember that there is now no prohibition of elevation of the Sacrament in our Prayer Book. If, then, we restore the words which are historically connected with elevation for the purpose of adoration, what can we expect but that such elevation will be practised and will be defended on the ground that these words have been inserted? At present such elevations and signals for adoration are comparatively uncommon among officiating clergy. But we must expect the revival of the prayer to revive the ceremonial, and the revival of these two to be used to sanction doctrine hard to distinguish from transubstantiation.

The Epiklesis.

I pass to the Epiklesis.

We may dismiss at once all the less definite uses of the term, and all discussion as to their antiquity. What is proposed for our use is an invocation of the Holy Spirit, as Lord and giver of life, upon the worshippers and upon the elements. It is important to note this, because the vaguer forms are often quoted in defence of the use of this particular form. But the fact remains

that this particular form is admittedly an innovation which cannot be attested earlier than the middle of the fourth century, that it has its own history, carries its own doctrinal significance, and must be treated on its own merits.

In establishment of the late date of invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements, let me adduce an argument which I find quite conclusive. I do not rest simply upon the absence of proof of such invocation, since the passage from Irenæus on which an earlier origin was based has proved to be a forgery. But I rest on this: "One Father after another in the Pneumatomachian controversy enumerates in detail and explains the sanctifying operations of the Holy Ghost in the Church in proof and as evidence of his co-equal godhead. Whilst in these elaborate reviews Holy Baptism and its formulæ are advanced again and again, no appeal is made to, nor a word said about, any invocation of the Holy Ghost in the Eucharist, though the opening for it occurs again and again." (E. Bishop, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1909).

Unknown till the Fourth Century.

Hence it seems clear that the invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements was still unknown or little known as late as the second half of the fourth century. As soon as it appears it is connected with new teaching as to the effect of consecration upon the elements. Dr. Swete, in his article on "Eucharistic Belief in the Second and Third Centuries," maintains that "in these two centuries the general belief of the Catholic Church had not gone beyond a simple identification of the Bread and Wine with the Body and Blood of Christ; the reality alike of the earthly elements and of the heavenly gifts is recognized." By identification Dr. Swete clearly does not mean identification effected by change of the elements, natural or supernatural, but by use of terms interchangeably without indicating any transition from one state of being to another. He goes on to say: "In the ante-Nicene monuments there is a singular absence of any reference to adoration of Christ in the elements." He also points out the inconsistency of such adoration with the keeping of the consecrated bread in houses for daily use, a practice not uncommon at that time. But with the fourth century a very rapid development of Eucharistic belief began in the East. Cyril, of Jerusalem, in the middle of that

century, furnishes us with the earliest documentary evidence of an invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements. He also uses "the word 'change' or 'convert' to denote the effect produced upon the elements by consecration, and he illustrates it from the change of water into wine in the miracle of Cana in Galilee. This sanctification and change is effected by the Holy Spirit" (Srawley on the Eucharist, *Hastings' Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*).

Momentous Consequences.

The consequences of this innovation were momentous. Hitherto the invocation had been an invocation of the Word, either of the Second Person in the Blessed Trinity or the words that He had used. For sanctification by the Word there was Scriptural authority, even for the sanctification of material objects. "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be sanctified with thanksgiving. For it is sanctified by the Word of God and by prayer" (1 Tim. iv. 4, 5). But invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements used in the Lord's Supper at once suggested an operation of the Holy Spirit analogous to that by which the Incarnation was wrought and so imparted to those elements a wholly new character. The change was manifested with special clearness in the Syriac Church, where such words as these occur in the Liturgy of Narsai: "Entreat earnestly and make supplication to the God of all in this hour, which is full of fear and trembling." Not that this inculcation of fear and trembling is peculiar to the Syriac Liturgy. It is found in Cyril of Jerusalem and in St. John Chrysostom. It marks a new conception whereby in the popular mind the Sacrament of love becomes invested with sentiments of fear and dread—elements the very reverse of those to which our Office gives prominence when it speaks of holy mysteries "instituted and ordained as pledges of His love, to our great and endless comfort," or again, "Take this holy Sacrament to your comfort."

I submit that this invocation cannot be officially adopted by our Church, even as an alternative, without involving (1) an assimilation of our Eucharistic doctrine to that of the East, (2) our whole relation to the Western Communion. On each of these two points I must dwell, however briefly.

Assimilation to Doctrine of Eastern Church.

(1) *The assimilation of our Eucharistic doctrine to that of the East.* It is true, no doubt, that the Easterns repudiate the doctrine of Transubstantiation. But they do so, not because they doubt a very complete change in the elements, but because they do not commit themselves to the method by which the change is effected. As to their belief, it is expressed thus in the official Declaration of the Greek Church (1679): "By the power of the Holy Spirit, supernaturally and ineffably, the bread is changed into that very proper body of the Saviour Christ, really, truly, and properly; and the wine into His living Blood. Which mystery both is, and is called worship, and in it, as is worthy of God, is worshipped the deified Body of the Saviour Christ, and is offered as a sacrifice for all orthodox Christians quick and dead" (Covell's *Account of the Greek Church*, p. 44). Similarly, in response to a request for the modern Eucharistic belief of the Greek Church, I received from our Archimandrite in Manchester—a learned representative of his Church—among other extracts the following from the Professor of Theology in the University of Athens, 1912: "If you ask for the way how [the Sacrament] takes place it is enough for you to hear that it takes place through the Holy Ghost in exactly the same way as our Lord became flesh from the Holy Virgin through the Holy Ghost." Further, he quotes with approval Kritopoulos: "The consecrated Bread and what is in the Cup are really and undoubtedly the Body and Blood of Christ. But the way of the change remains for us unknown and inexplicable." It is true that the Greeks are becoming increasingly careful not to commit themselves as to the manner of the change of the elements, but that a change takes place they do not doubt, nor do they hesitate to compare it with the change wrought by the Incarnation. Such teaching carries us a very long way beyond the Prayer Book.

The East and the West.

(2) *Our whole relation to the Western Communion is affected.* As between East and West the question of the moment of consecration is of very serious import. Let me quote the words of Mr. E. Bishop: "The exhaustion of the historical question leaves us face to face with the difficulty mentioned at the start of our discussion—namely, that of the two great traditional Christian com-

munions (he meant the Eastern and Latin Churches) one says that by the completion of the recital of Institution the Bread and Wine have become the Body and Blood of our Lord, the other says that they are only Bread and Wine still. . . . This is practical matter among all the people, and vital in the religious worship of every individual person belonging to these Communions. Nor does it seem that the contradictory assertions can be resolved into a common affirmation, but by way of retractation on the one part or the other, explicit or implied, such as cannot but become notorious among the people, etc." (*Journal of Theological Studies*). Mr. Bishop, was, of course, fully aware that the Greek Church believed that by invocation of the Holy Spirit the bread and wine became the Body and Blood of Christ, but from the Greek position it followed that in the Western Church, which does not use this invocation, the change never took place. What is it then? In face of this very acute controversy we adopt the Eastern usage. To the Latin Church we appear to cast doubt, not only on all their consecration, but also on our own in the past. We lay ourselves open to the imputation that having been rebuffed by the Latin Church as to the validity of our orders and Sacraments we are seeking to rectify them by overtures to the East—an appearance of which their skilled proselytizers will not fail to make use. It is, in fact, in this stage of history a very serious step to produce the impression—and we must do so if we are credited with a modicum of learning—the impression that we are plunging into the controversy as to the moment of consecration in the Eucharist. No impression could be more unfortunate or more injurious to our Church in her world-wide relations, often in countries where the strife between East and West is still quite acute. This is not the path along which we shall find that mediating position of which our divines have sometimes dreamed.

The Alternative Use.

In conclusion, let me say a word about the argument that we must make room for different schools of thought in the Church of England. It is, indeed, a difficult position in which we find ourselves—the position, namely, that a type of service which is helpful to one half, let us say, of our worshippers is equally a hindrance to the other half. If it could be secured that each portion should

receive and have a right to that form of ministry which best fostered its piety, toleration of both would be comparatively simple. But that which happens is that members of either school are liable to be refused that which helps them, and to impose in their turn upon the others what they find hard to endure. In this state of confusion to provide alternative services only multiplies difficulties, since we cannot secure how or where either service shall be used, and are not really helped by the prospect of a congregational plebiscite. Even under that minorities will suffer, and we cannot fall back on Mr. Birrell's dictum: "It is the badge of their tribe." How or by what means we shall eventually secure a large and genuine measure of comprising within one Church diverse forms and types of piety awaits the consideration of our National Assembly. But these tamperings with the office of Holy Communion threaten to create a breach which may easily become past healing. As it is we have a service which, by admission of the Bishop of Ripon, is "a complete representation of what our Lord is recorded to have said and done in the same night that He was betrayed" (*Drury on Elevation*, p. 181). We recite what He said and did in a most solemn prayer of invocation. We proceed to obey His command. We believe that we receive what He provided, and that we do, as He commanded, proclaim the Lord's death till He come. We omit all questions, speculations, interpretations of His action round which controversies have gathered. It is conceivable that in this way drawing us to Himself He will keep us in that unity which He willed. But alternative services, in our Church as it is to-day, cannot fail to become badges of distinction and encouragements to disruption. In this matter let us determine, as did the Bishops at the last revision, to leave all unchanged.

* * * * *

A few words on the debate itself may be useful by way of conclusion.

The Bishop of Ripon in proposing the change relied chiefly on the authority of Waterland, and on Waterland's contention that the Communion Service is a memorial sacrifice. The Bishop did not quote any passage from Waterland suggesting that our service should be altered in order to bring out this aspect. The fact is that when Waterland speaks of the Eucharist as a Gospel sacrifice, he is careful to explain in what sense he uses the words: "The Eucharist

is a Gospel sacrifice, not the material symbols, but the service consisting of prayer, praise, contrite hearts, self-humiliation, etc. As for any sacrifice of ours, it lies entirely in the *service* we perform, and in the qualifications or dispositions which we bring, which are all so much spiritual oblation, or spiritual sacrifice and nothing else." On the other hand it is quite clear that the *anamnesis* in the Canon of the Mass is something else, and something quite different. It is the "presentation of the Body and Blood of Christ to the Father." Nor do we get rid of this association by varying the words of the Mass. The mischief is in the introduction of words which can be interpreted in the sense of the Mass by those who will so interpret them, and the making room for ceremonies of crossing and elevation, which will give emphasis to that meaning.

In the course of the debate two main objections were taken to my argument.

1. That I had relied too much on sequence of time as proving effect from a cause. It was argued that though false teaching synchronized with the use of the Epiklesis, it did not follow that it resulted from use of the Epiklesis. But it can be shown abundantly that the stereotyping of a materialistic change of the elements took root in the Eastern and especially in the Syriac Church far earlier than in the Western. Even in the eleventh century the Western Church was not fully committed to any doctrine of Transubstantiation. Controversy raged on the doctrine even in that century. Such controversy could not have arisen had the Mass contained the invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements with the view of imparting to them some life which was not in them before.

2. It was argued that the element of "awe" and "dread" was due simply to Oriental temperament, and to an exaggerated expression of emotion. But the distance between Greece and Italy, between Greek temperament and Italian temperament is not so great that it will account for the marked element of terror which appear in Eastern Liturgies. It would probably be far more true to say that the element of terror came into the Holy Communion from the Pagan mystic religions, and that it established itself in that service far sooner in the East than in the West. Also that the idea of the Holy Spirit "hovering over" the "Bread and Wine" that they might undergo a change could probably be traced to the mystery religions, if more was known about them.

E. A. MANCHESTER.

MEMORIES OF CANON CHRISTOPHER

By the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.

Note.—*The inception of these recollections was due to the thought that the various stories told from time to time by Canon Christopher ought to be preserved, because they were too good to be lost. Then came the further idea of compiling a Memoir which would be at once of interest to the Canon's friends and also of service to the cause of Evangelical Churchmanship for which he lived. No one would claim for Canon Christopher any outstanding greatness of personality or wide influence in the world at large, but both the singular goodness of his character and the fact of his representative position in Oxford seemed worthy of being embodied in a brief account. This then is the twofold purpose: to give some idea of the man's beautiful personality and some conception of the Evangelical and Protestant Churchmanship which he embodied and furthered during his long life. As everything else has been made subsidiary to this double object, it has been necessary to rule out many details of Canon Christopher's life and testimonies to him which his friends would naturally and rightly like to see recorded. These had to be sacrificed to wider interests. As I do not possess any experience of writing Biography, I cannot tell how far I may have succeeded in accomplishing my desire; but at least I can say I have tried to depict the personal life and strenuous work of one whose Curate it was my privilege to be, and for whose memory I have the tenderest and most thankful affection.*

I. EARLY LIFE.

ALFRED MILLARD WILLIAM CHRISTOPHER, familiarly known in later years as Canon Christopher, was born on August 20th, 1820, being the twelfth of fourteen children, twelve of whom grew up, though only four lived to old age.

His father's only sister, the wife of the late Mr. Millard, of Downend, Gloucestershire, had no children, and soon after the birth of her nephew, Leonard (afterwards Major-General Christopher), she carried off the eighteen months old Alfred to her own home and brought him up till he was nearly fourteen years of age. During that time he did not go to any boarding-school, and only for the last six months attended a day school. Mr. Millard was fond of mathematics, and it may be mentioned here that the Millard Lectureship and Scholarship at Trinity College, Oxford, were founded by his legacy to the College for the promotion of Mathematical Science. The uncle's taste for mathematics may be said to have influenced the whole course of his nephew's life. At eleven years

of age he was greatly interested to find that he could understand Euclid, and very soon Euclid and Algebra became a delight to him. One of his morning pleasures was to race his uncle in doing algebraical problems. The result was that when he went to school for the first time, at the age of fourteen, he gradually worked his way to the top of the school in mathematics, and a Cambridge examiner recommended that he should be sent to Cambridge, whither he subsequently went.

It will be remembered by the friends of the late Canon how fond he was of tracing the guiding hand of God in his own and other people's lives. Indeed, this was one of his strongest characteristics, and exemplified his remarkable faith in the loving Fatherhood of God. The very words and tones of strong conviction of the dear old Saint of God come back, as he recounted how the Cambridge mathematical course led to his being appointed Principal of the Martiniére, Calcutta, in 1844, and that from this had come, step by step, all his other appointments, including his long tenure of St. Aldate's, Oxford. We shall see that this was really the case. He delighted to trace all his positions in life in the Providence of God to what he quaintly described as his Uncle Millard's partiality for mathematics.

Young Christopher's childhood was a singular one. He was absolutely without companions, and had no play simply because there was no one to play with him. This led to his living very much upon his imagination. The most interesting reading to a young boy is the history of wars and battles, and everything Alfred Christopher could lay hold of upon this subject was a real delight to him. The histories of Hume and Smollett were among his treasures, and a history of the American War of Independence was another favourite. A book which greatly fed his desire to be a soldier was "The Life of John Ship," who, as an orphan in a parish workhouse, entered the army as a drummer boy, became a sergeant and led four "Forlorn Hopes" at the first and unsuccessful siege of Bhurtpore. Ship received a commission for his bravery and became a Lieutenant. The boy found this true narrative written by Ship himself of enthralling interest and imagined himself engaged in all kinds of military situations with hairbreadth escapes. Doubtless heredity played no little part in this fascination, for stories of fighting, in both Army and Navy, were strongly represented in his ancestry. His family

continued this fine martial succession. His younger son (Alfred Seton) became Captain of the Seaforth Highlanders.

When he was thirteen and a half he went as a day scholar for a few months to a small school in Downend and worked away with interest at Cæsar's "Gallic War," a subject which suited his "warlike" tastes. After this short experience of day-school life, he then went to the home of his parents at Chiswick, and from thence was sent in July, 1834, to a boarding-school. This was a large private school of more than sixty boys kept by a Mr. John Barton at Hall Place, Bexley, Kent. In due time Christopher's mathematics carried him to the top of this school. A love of cricket acquired at this time led on to his being one of the Cambridge University "Eleven" in 1843. He always said he would never have been in the Cambridge Eleven but for an incident which occurred during his school days at Hall Place. A certain number of the boys were allowed to go to Chislehurst to see a match between the Kent Eleven and All England. Christopher had never before seen a round-arm ball delivered and watched with delight for the first time the formidable round-arm bowling of Alfred Mynn and the splendid batting of Fuller and Pilch.

At this match the Hall Place boys met the pupils of a private school at Blackheath whose master played in some of the All England matches under the assumed name of "Felix." In training his boys, he applied the idea of the catapult for playing well-pitched balls. His machine could not make the ball "break", but the "pitch" was perfect, and his school Eleven were so well trained by him that they habitually beat all the private schools in the neighbourhood. Accordingly, when they challenged the boys of Christopher's school to play a match, it seemed a forlorn hope to think that the latter could beat such a trained eleven. But the Hall Place boys pluckily accepted the challenge and it was arranged that the Blackheath boys should go to Hall Place in three weeks' time. Christopher, thereupon, set to work to practise round-arm bowling. At that time it was not lawful for the elbow to be raised above the shoulder in delivering a ball and it required usually very long practice not to bowl "wide." The eventful day came, and it appeared a foregone conclusion that the trained Eleven would give the Hall Place a thorough beating. But young Christopher began to bowl well, and when he took one wicket, that gave him confidence and he soon

bowled another. Indeed, he took three wickets in three successive balls, and clean bowled seven batsmen in the first innings. The result had better be told by the Canon himself:

> It is as true as anything I ever wrote in my life, but it will require unbounded confidence in my truthfulness to believe it, that this redoubtable, trained, scientific Eleven only got one run off the bat in the first innings and the Hall Place boys won the match.

In the return match at Blackheath, however, science and experience asserted their claim, and Hall Place was beaten.

The Canon could only remember one schoolfellow who became eminent. That was Louis Desanges, the well-known artist and portrait painter, who painted a succession of interesting pictures illustrative of the deeds of those who have won the Victoria Cross. Desanges always gained the first place in drawing and Christopher the second.

Another incident of his boyhood connected with his elder sister Isabella may be recorded in his own words:

> The second (Isabella) of my seven sisters who all lived to grow up was a living evidence of Christianity to me as a boy and a young man. She devotedly nursed our dear mother night and day during a painful illness, ten years in length, when it seemed as if she was rarely out of our mother's bedroom except to get something for her. And yet when our dear mother "fell asleep," she thought she had not done all she might have done for her. She fell into a state of morbid despair. She was the most holy one of the family, in the eyes of her brothers and sisters, yet she thought she could not be saved. I was her young brother of sixteen years of age who knew but little of the Bible. I had only one qualification for helping her, which was this: I felt certain that if anything could help her, it must be in the Bible, for she would care for no book of less authority. So I began to search the Scriptures. I thought there was a great possibility of finding something that would help to comfort and encourage her in "the Book of the Prophet Isaiah." So I began to read the first chapter of that Book. When I came to the 18th verse, "Come now and let us reason together," saith the Lord, "though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow, though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." I started up and ran upstairs to my dear sister, who was ill in bed as a result of her morbid state. I felt that this was a text suited for a great sinner, which was what my dear sister thought herself to be, though all her family knew her to be a great saint. I repeated this one verse over and over again. My most effective sermon was all text and nothing in addition to it.
>
> In her 95th year I asked her, "What was the text which restored you, through the Spirit Who used it, to peace, health and usefulness?" She repeated Isaiah 1. 18. [She said "That text was thumped into my heart all night as I lay awake." I had really forgotten what the text was, but I think I never can forget my sister's answer to my question.

Through the efforts of this sister, Isabella, Christopher became a pupil with the Rev. Charles James Goodhart, then Incumbent of

St. Mary's Episcopal Chapel, Reading, in after years the Minister of Park Chapel, Chelsea, and Secretary of the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews, and later still, the Rector of Wetherden, Suffolk, where he lived to a great age. Mr. Goodhart had graduated from Trinity College, Cambridge, as a Wrangler in 1826 and was also in the Second Class of the Classical Tripos. His ministry was of a deeply spiritual and thoroughly Scriptural character, and though Christopher was with him as a pupil only for the short time of three months, the influence was abiding. Goodhart was the one who impressed him for life in favour of Evangelical principles as at once Scriptural and truly representative of the Church of England.

This conviction of the truth of Mr. Goodhart's sermons does not mean that he was converted by them, but it was impossible not to see the gracious Providence of God in setting before his eyes in his sister Isabella what he often called "a living evidence of the truth of Christianity." He was able to trace all her devotion to their parents, and all her unselfish love to her brothers and sisters to her Christian principles, and this biased the youth strongly in favour of those Evangelical doctrines which he knew were at the root of the holiness of her character and the usefulness of her life. Humanly speaking, he could never have known Mr. Goodhart but for her, and perhaps if he had not come under the unfluence of that Scriptural teaching, he might not have been so ready, when a freshman, to accept the invitation of another freshman to go with him to the Sunday evening meeting of undergraduates held by Mr. (afterwards Canon) Carus, from whom he received the same teaching which had so impressed him in Mr. Goodhart's sermons and conversation.

Although necessarily anticipating events of many years later, perhaps it may be added here that during Mr. Christopher's first twelve years as Rector of St. Aldate's, Oxford, Mr. Goodhart was a welcome speaker year by year to undergraduates at Mr. Christopher's weekly meetings and also a preacher in St. Aldate's Church. Later on it fell to Canon Christopher's lot to visit his old tutor on his deathbed, and to read the funeral service in Wetherden Church, Suffolk.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

(To be continued.)

THE MOSAIC TABERNACLE.

By the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D.,
Rector of Kinnitty, King's County, Ireland.

(*Concluded from p. 148 of* The Churchman *for March.*)

WE shall now proceed to evidence of an internal character. In the Pentateuch itself the Tabernacle is mentioned some eighty times. That witness we shall not call yet, but shall proceed to the testimony of the historical books following the Pentateuch.

Hear the evidence of 1 Kings viii. 4: "And they brought up the ark of Jehovah, and the *tent of meeting* (*'ohel mo'ed*), and all the holy vessels that were in the tent: even these did the priests and Levites bring up." The "tent of meeting" was the usual name for the Tabernacle, which is also called *mishkan* or dwelling-place. In the passage before us we read that this tabernacle was brought up to Jerusalem, and deposited in the Temple of Solomon. Wellhausen says he will not accept that evidence, as the passage is an "interpolation." Well, here it is in the Hebrew text, and also in the Greek translation, the Septuagint. How came it into both, if it has no right to be in either? A counsel is not permitted to call in question a man's signature in a document fatal to his client's case unless he can show grounds for believing it to be forged. Here the counsels against the passage are disagreed. Some hold the passage to be interpolated, e.g. Wellhausen and Chapman; but Driver says "the notice, if authentic, cannot refer to P.'s Tent of Meeting." The passage "is the work of a writer who may have preserved a true tradition with regard to the tent erected by David, but may have referred it erroneously to the Tent of Meeting of P."[1] This can only mean that the evidence of this writer, so damaging to the case of the Critics, must either be false, or be construed as meaning quite a different thing from what the man said. Suppose a murder case turned upon the evidence of a witness—charged himself with perjury—and the counsel for the defence said he would object to his evidence on the grounds of his perjury, unless he was understood by the jury to give evidence in favour of his client!

We shall now have the evidence of 1 Kings iii. 4: "And the

[1] *Exodus*, p. 429.

king went up to Gibeon to sacrifice there, for that was the great high place. A thousand burnt offerings did Solomon offer upon that altar." The reason for this is given in v. 2—"because there was no house built for the name of the Lord until those days." This was before the Temple was finished. And when Solomon was there the Lord appeared unto him in a dream (v. 5). Now why did Solomon go to Gibeon to offer sacrifice? Why was it called a *great* high place? Why was the theophany of Jehovah described as taking place there, by a scribe who wrote after the erection of the Temple, and to whom a high place must have been anathema, unless there was something extraordinarily holy about the place, something that distinguished it from all the other high places in the land? The Critics can give no answer. But those who believe that the Tabernacle existed before the Temple can answer that the Tabernacle was at Gibeon. And this is what the Chronicler says, 2 Chronicles, i. 3.[1] In 1 Chronicles, xxi. 29, we read: "the tabernacle (*mishkan*) of Jehovah, which Moses made in the wilderness, and the altar of burnt offering, were at that time in the high place at Gibeon." Chronicles is assigned by many Critics, Driver and others, to a date shortly after 332 B.C. (See *Introduction*, p. 486.) But this late date does not condemn the evidence. Think what a useful witness it would have been for the Critics had it said: "there was no tabernacle at Gibeon." Wellhausen, with De Wette and others, belittled this evidence of the Chronicler, whom he accused of making his authorities say what he pleased,[2] because it was against them. But Dillman, another Critic, affirmed that "the Chronicler has worked according to sources, and there can be no talk, with regard to him, of fabrications or misrepresentations of the history." Does not the fact that the Chronicler largely agrees with Samuel and Kings show that when he wrote there was no variant tradition worthy of notice, and that Samuel and Kings, generally speaking, held the field. This is an independent witness of the fact that the Mosaic Tabernacle must have preceded the Temple of Solomon, and that there was no contrary tradition in vogue about it, as there would have been had the priestly writers, who are alleged to have invented the Tabernacle, really invented it. And assuming for the moment

[1] "So Solomon . . . went to the high place that was at Gibeon; for there was the tent of meeting of God which Moses had made in the wilderness" (*'ohel mo'ed*).

[2] *Proleg.*, Eng. Trans. p. 49.

that they did invent it, how could they have hindered this fact becoming known through some private channel, when success had crowned the enterprise of the conspirators, and becoming *a rival tradition*. How could they have foreseen that nothing would ever leak out about it? How could they have stopped all such leaks? For if they had any fears of this sort, it would have been wiser not to have attempted the fraud than to risk discrediting their order for ever by failing to cover up all their tracks. And if there was anything to leak out, we may be sure it would have done so, for the secrets of every conspiracy have been revealed soon or late. The fact that history has nothing to tell about this conspiracy, that not the faintest trace of it was ever discovered, is a wonder if such a conspiracy ever existed. The fact remains then that the Chronicler who, according to the Critics, wrote after this wonderful conspiracy had carried through its literary and legal, historical and ecclesiastical reconstruction, has nothing to say upon such points at variance with what had been previously said by the writers of Samuel and Kings, confessedly compiled before this reconstruction took place. This is very strong evidence that no such reconstruction ever took place.

We shall summon still earlier witnesses for the historical character of the Tabernacle. In Joshua xviii. 1, we have: "And the whole congregation of the children of Israel assembled themselves together at Shiloh, and set up the tent of meeting there." The Hebrew word, "they set up" (*yashkinu*) is from the verb (*Shakhan*) from which is also taken the substantive *mishkan*, the other name for the Tabernacle.[1] It is the same verb that is used in Deuteronomy xii. 11; Nehemiah i. 9; Jeremiah vii. 12, of the place which God has chosen "*to cause His name to dwell there*," and signifies a more permanent erection than could be made in the days of the wanderings. In Joshua xix. 51, we have the distributions made by lot by Eleazar and Joshua, "in Shiloh before the Lord at the door (lit. opening) of the tent of meeting (*pethaḥ 'ohel mo'ed*). In Judges xviii. 31, we have a reference to an image worshipped in Dan "all the time that the house of God was at Shiloh" (*beth-ha Elohim*). Here the taber-

[1] *mishkan ha'edah* (מִשְׁכַּן הָעֵדָה) is the full title in Exod. xxxviii. 21. In Exod. xl. 29 we have "the tabernacle of the tent of meeting" (*mishkan 'ohel-mo'ed*). שְׁכֵן (*shekhen*) is used in Deut. xii. 5, of the Lord's habitation. It is from the same verb as *mishkan* (tabernacle).

nacle is called the "House of God." In 1 Samuel ii. 22, we have a reference to "the women that did service at the door (opening)" of the tent of meeting. This refers us back to Exodus xxxviii. 8: "the serving women which served at the door (opening) of the tent of meeting" (*pethaḥ 'ohel mo'ed*). On this passage Driver wrote:[1] "1 Sam. ii. 22b implies, indeed, that the Shiloh sanctuary was the Tent of Meeting of P. (cf. Exodus, xxxviii, 8, 'door,' also, is here, lit., *opening*): but this half-verse is not in the LXX, and its contradiction of i. 9, iii. 3, 5, in describing as a 'tent' what those verses describe as a 'temple' or 'house,' leaves no reasonable doubt that it is a gloss not yet found in the MSS. used by the LXX translators."

This objection of Driver to my witness is founded on evidence of a sort, but it is questionable if that evidence does not tell against himself. The passage is not found in the Vatican copy of the LXX, but it is found in another copy of the LXX, e.g. the Alexandrine, and is given in Grabe's edition of the LXX.

Is there any reason why the LXX should have omitted it? Yes, it is a passage that does not reflect credit on the priests. Is there any reason why it should have been inserted as a gloss in the Hebrew text by the priestly writers, who had such entire charge of the literary reconstructions and ecclesiastical alterations after the Return? Most certainly not, as it relates conduct unworthy of men, not to say of priests. Then why did they not erase it from the Hebrew text? Because they dared not tamper with the Hebrew text, but the Septuagint translators were in a position to pass it over; they were not bound to translate it.

Is not the evidence offered by Driver against his own case? Would not any sensible judge pronounce it so? Would he not think it more probable that an unpleasant episode should have been passed over by the LXX translators, than that it should have been invented after that translation was made by a scribe of the second century, and inserted by him in all the manuscripts then to be found of the Hebrew Bible? Fancy this scribe going round all the synagogues of the land, and other places where these sacred MSS. were kept, with his pen, and being allowed by the priests to insert this offensive clause of nine words, which would be most difficult of insertion!

[1] *Exodus*, p. 428.

It is also to be noticed that there is a reference in Exodus xxxviii. 8, to the women " at the door of the tent."

This half-verse in question, then, would not be regarded as a gloss by any judge in any court. It describes the sin which brought its own punishment upon the guilty ones. And so there can be no further question that the Shiloh sanctuary is the old Tent of Meeting, as far as this passage is concerned.

The Critics, however, argue that this sanctuary at Shiloh cannot be the Tent of Meeting or Tabernacle because of the names applied to it. It is called in 1 Samuel i. 7, 24, iii. 15, " the house of the Lord," it is twice called the temple (*hêkal*). 1 Samuel i. 9 describes Eli sitting at the doorpost (*mezoozah*) of the Temple, and in 1 Samuel iii. 5 Samuel lies down to sleep in the *hêkal* of the Lord. Now, according to the Scriptures, the Temple of Solomon was modelled after the Tabernacle. And we find in 1 Kings vi. 5, the *hêkal* or temple distinguished from the *debhir* or oracle, that is, the Holy Place distinguished from the Holy of Holies. Therefore, it would be quite appropriate for Eli to sit at the entrance of the Holy Place, for Hannah to make her offering there, and for Samuel to sleep there. But such an expression as *hêkal*, or temple—Fuerst gives meaning " splendid house," citing Amos viii. 13—would be suitable to the magnificent structure described in Exodus xxxv.–xxxvi. It is also called " the house of the Lord " in an independent document (Judges xviii. 31).

Driver, however, objects to the mention of post and doors, *dalthoth* (1 Sam. iii. 15), in connection with the Tent of Meeting, which is described as having an opening, *pethaḥ* (Ex. xxxviii. 8). This objection is easily answered. The tent must have had some kind of opening. And if the Tabernacle had five pillars of acacia or shittim wood for the hangings over the Tabernacle door (Exod. xxxvi. 36 f.), why should not one of these pillars (*'ammud*) act as a doorpost (*mezoozah*)? Why should not an " opening " have " doors " here as well as in 1 Kings vi. 31: " And for the *opening* (*pethaḥ*) of the oracle he made doors (*dalthoth*)." It is most probable that the lower portion of the structure was made as solid as possible The statement in the Mishna is that this portion was " of stone."[1]

Driver, however, said " the sanctuary at which Eli is here mentioned as being the priest cannot be the Tent of Meeting, whether of

[1] Conder's *Tent-work in Palestine*, Vol. 2, p. 84.

J.E. or P. In other respects Samuel in the duties discharged by him reminds us strongly of Joshua in E. (Ex. xxxiii. 11) : the Levites and priests of P. are conspicuous by their absence." [1]

Let us hear his reasons :—

(1) It is a *hêkal* or temple, and has a more imposing entrance than a mere " opening," such as the " opening " of the tent in Exodus xxvi. 36 ; xxxiii. 8.

We have already disposed of this statement, and unless one is able to produce a plan of this sanctuary, the objection should not be allowed.

(2) " Joshua remained in the Tent of Meeting. Samuel remained in the Tabernacle of Shiloh. Therefore their duties were similar." Take a modern parallel. A servant of X remains indoors. A servant of Y does the same. Therefore X's servant " in the duties discharged by him reminds us strongly " of Y's servant. It turns out, however, on investigation, that X's servant is a carpenter and Y's is a cook !

(3) In answer to the statement that the priests and Levites of P. were absent, we say that Eli and his sons, Hophni and Phinehas and doubtless many other priests—were there. There too was the altar on which sacrifices were offered. There too was the priestly ephod. There too the priests burned incense. There too, the " lamp of God " was left burning at night. There too the people went up to offer the meal-offering and the sacrifice, and the priests received the burnt-offerings. Now where are all these things instituted ? Marginal references back to Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers are to the very portions assigned by the Critics to P. ! Consequently the Tabernacle mentioned here must be the Tabernacle of P.

To call another witness in favour of the Tabernacle :—In 2 Samuel vii. 6, there is a reference to this Tabernacle showing its priority to the Temple. " Thus saith the Lord, Shalt thou build me an house to dwell in ? For I have not dwelt in an house since the day that I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt, even unto this day, but have walked in a tent and a tabernacle." (Here we have the *'ohel mo'ed* and the *mishkan.*) Is this passage a gloss ?

In Jeremiah vii. 12–14 we read :—

" But go ye up now unto my place which is at Shiloh, where I caused my name to dwell at the first,[2] and see what I did to it for the

[1] *Exodus*, p. 428.

[2] *Shikkanthi* ; Piel of *Shakkan* (שָׁכַן), whence *mishkan* (מִשְׁכָּן) tabernacle.

wickedness of my people Israel. Therefore will I do unto the house which is called by my name, wherein ye trust, and unto the place which I gave to you, and to your fathers, as I have done to Shiloh."

In Jeremiah xxvi. 6 we have another reference :—" Then will I make this house like Shiloh, and will make this city a curse to all nations of the earth."

Are these references glosses or interpolations made by redactors or editors, and if so, why are they in the LXX ? Was the prophecy of Jeremiah not written before the Exile, and if so, is it not a complete refutation of the Critical theory that the Temple preceded the Tabernacle, and that the latter was the invention of the priestly party ?

In Psalm lxxviii. 60, " He forsook the tabernacle (*mishkan*) of Shiloh, the tent (*'ohel*) which he placed [1] among men." If the Tabernacle came after the Temple, what was the sense of the people being warned in these three passages that the fate of the Tabernacle of Shiloh would overtake the Temple unless they repented ?

Again, after the ruin of Shiloh, we have in 1 Samuel xxi. and xxii. references to Nob. There must have been a sanctuary of some kind there, for there the shewbread and an ephod was kept (1 Samuel xxi. 1–6). There too was the tent (*'ohel*) in which David had placed the sword of Goliath (1 Samuel xvii. 54). There too were the priests, so that it was called " the city of the priests " (1 Samuel xxii. 18, 19). Of these Doeg the Edomite slew eighty-five " that did wear a linen ephod," but Abiathar escaped to David.

Here we have P.'s regulations as in the case of the Tabernacle of Shiloh. Consequently the Tabernacle here was also the Tabernacle of P. In a following paper I hope to discuss the evidence of the ark and David's tent of meeting, and to examine into the case of what I hold to be the provisional tent of Moses on which the Higher Critics base their argument.

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.

[1] שִׁכֵּן (*Shikken*).

" When was it built ?," The question at once occurs to the mind when visiting a cathedral or other old building. The patient study of a delightful little manual, *Back to the Old Stone's Age*, by Captain G. Christian Neech, A.I.F. (*Robert Scott*, 2*s*.), will enable the reader to answer the question for himself. The characteristics of the different styles of architecture are simply and faithfully described.

BISHOP HALL.

By the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A.

IT would be difficult to find a more representative Churchman of the earlier Caroline period than the man who was eulogised by his contemporaries as "our English Seneca," and who, with his consuming love of truth, his zeal, sympathy and genuine humility, was admittedly the most popular bishop of his day. It would be a great loss if mere lapse of time should lead the present or future generations of Churchmen to forget to honour and venerate the memory of one who was justly renowned, not only for his ability and moderation, but also for his pre-eminent piety, and whose devotional writings were in constant use and were highly esteemed both by Churchmen and Dissenters for quite two centuries.

Joseph Hall was born on July 1, 1574, at Ashby-de-la-Zouch, his father holding an important and responsible position under the third Earl of Huntingdon. Both his parents were devout, godly people. His mother was a great sufferer, and her fortitude, patience and resignation made a lasting impression on her young son. Years after, Hall confesses the great debt he owed to her influence and training. "How often," he declares, "have I blessed the memory of those Divine passages of experimental divinity, which I have heard from her mouth. . . . I can hardly take off my pen from so exemplary a subject, her life and death were saint like."

Although his parents had early devoted him to the sacred ministry of the Church, young Joseph, not being the eldest son, had great difficulty in obtaining a College career. It was only through the special and unselfish solicitation of an elder brother that his father determined to risk the expense of sending him to Cambridge. He went up in 1589 to the recently founded College of Emmanuel, of which the learned and celebrated Puritan divine, Dr. Laurence Chaderton, was Master, and to which, a little later, came John Harvard the founder of Harvard University. Hall always held the memory of Chaderton, his College Master, in the highest esteem and affection. In 1592 he took his B.A. degree and three years later his M.A. and was chosen Fellow of his College the same year. He was soon after appointed Rhetoric Lecturer in the Public Schools, a post he retained till his ordination in 1597. It was about this time that Hall commenced his active literary career by publishing

several books of Satires, which were soon widely known and greatly esteemed. Pope afterwards declared them to be " the best poetry and the truest satire in the English language." In 1601 Hall, through the influence of Lady Drury, was preferred to the country living of Hawstead, near Bury St. Edmunds in Suffolk. Two years later he married, and during his incumbency here he built a new parsonage house. In 1605 Hall paid a visit to the Continent, going to Spa on the invitation of Sir Edmund Bacon, the grandson of the famous Lord Chancellor. Hall rejoiced in this opportunity of obtaining first-hand knowledge of the religious condition of countries under the domination of the Papal Church, and most of his strictures and criticisms of the Roman system were based on the observations and experiences gained from this visit.

As the income from his small country cure did not provide him with a " living wage," in 1608 Hall accepted the living of Waltham. His ability as a preacher soon attracted public notice and he was appointed Chaplain to Henry, Prince of Wales, to whom, before his early death, he became greatly attached. In 1612 Hall was appointed Prebendary of Willenhall in the Collegiate Church of Wolverhampton, and four years later he, accepted the deanery of Worcester; but in 1625 he refused the see of Gloucester, although two years after he accepted that of Exeter. To appreciate fully the careful and independent attitude which Hall adopted on Church questions we have to bear in mind the peculiarly serious and stirring times in which his long life was passed. It was an age of the keenest religious and ecclesiastical strife and controversy. At his birth the Elizabethan religious settlement was only fifteen years old, and most of the great champions of the Reformed Faith who had escaped the fury of the Marian persecution were still living. The influence of Calvin was still predominant in all the Reformed Churches, his doctrinal system was universally accepted as orthodox by English Churchmen, while the Puritans were making a determined attempt to substitute the Genevan discipline and polity for the Episcopal. It was not till 1594, the year before Hall took his M.A., that the first book of Hooker's masterly and famous *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* was published in defence of the Anglican Reformation settlement. Just at the time Hall matriculated at Cambridge the infamous " Martin Marprelate " libels were being circulated. It was not till he had finished his academical career that the new Arminian

" heresies " began to disturb the peace of the Church and that Barret and Peter Baro were censured by the University for daring to disagree with some of the extreme Calvinistic tenets expressed in the *Lambeth Articles* of 1595, which Archbishop Whitgift actually declared to be " sound doctrine and universally professed in the Church of England and agreeable to the Articles of Religion established by authority." As a lad Hall must have heard of the plots and conspiracies to dethrone Elizabeth, while the formidable Armada was destroyed only the year before he went up to Cambridge and the Gunpowder Plot frustrated the year he made his trip to the Continent.

In 1618 Hall was chosen by King James as one of the four celebrated divines to represent the English Church at the Synod of Dort called to crush the new Arminian " heresies " in Holland. They were instructed to use moderation, but to " favour no innovations in doctrine, and to conform to the Confessions of the neighbouring Reformed Churches." Hall preached before the Synod, but serious sickness compelled him to leave before its deliberations were concluded. He however fully approved of its decisions and highly valued the medal which was presented to him as a memento of the Conference. Writing years after to Bishop Davenant, a brother delegate to the Synod, he appeals to him to bear testimony that, although " sickness bereaved him of the honours of a conclusive subscription," he had been " equally vehement " with the rest in " crying down the unreasonableness " of the Arminian doctrines. But although Hall never seriously departed from the Calvinism of his early training, he was most moderate in his views and used all his great ability and influence to allay the fierce and unseemly disputes which were raging at this period between the protagonists of the Calvinist and Arminian parties. In 1622 he published his *Via Media*, pleading with the contending Churchmen to cease their unprofitable and dangerous strife and confine their definite teaching " to those moderate bounds which the Church of England guided by the Scriptures hath expressly set " or to those points on which both sides were fully agreed. A few years later he sent a letter to Crocius, the Divinity Professor at Bremen, enunciating his nine deliberate conclusions on the five disputed points of Arminianism, containing weighty and reasonable scriptural expositions of his very moderate Calvinistic opinions.

The Gunpowder Plot, the assassination of Henry IV of France, and the proposed Spanish marriage for Prince Charles brought into prominence the Roman controversy, in which Hall took no insignificant a part. Bishop Andrewes had already entered the lists against Cardinal Bellarmine, and Hall came forward with his *Serious Dissuasive from Popery* and in 1609 with his *The Peace of Rome* and in 1611 his *No Peace with Rome*. Although admitting Rome to be a truly visible Church yet Hall contended that by her errors and novelties she was heretical and unsound, while her doctrine of transubstantiation destroyed the verity of Our Lord's human nature. Some of his strictures sound to our modern ears harsh and uncharitable, yet Hall was conspicuous at the time for the mildness and moderateness of his views. Speaking of his continental experiences, he declares, "I call God to witness that I could not find any true life of religion amongst them that would be Catholics. . . . I speak of the lively practice of piety. What have they amongst them but a very outside of Christianity, a mere formality of devotion? What papist in all Christendom hath ever been heard to pray daily with his family or to sing a psalm at home? Who ever saw God's day kept in any city, village, household, under the jurisdiction of Rome? Who sees not how foul sins pass for venial, and how easily venial sins pass their satisfaction; for which a cross or a drop of holy water is sufficient amends?" Hall follows his learned contemporary, Dean Field, in laying down the marks or "notes" of a true Church as "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism." "That Church," he affirms, "which holds those Christian articles, both in terms and necessary consequences, however it doth vary in theological conclusions is *Columba una*," although he admits that its unity may be sadly troubled by the theological or ecclesiastical distinctions between Lutheranism, Arminianism, Calvinism or Separatism. In his doctrine of the Eucharist, Hall adhered closely to the teaching of Cranmer, Ridley and Hooker, denying a corporal, carnal or oral Presence in the elements. "The feeding upon Christ," he declares, is "but a comfortable application of Christ and His benefits to our souls." "Christ is only present and received in a spiritual manner so as nothing is objected to our senses but the elements, nothing but Christ to our faith."

Hall, like the Reformers and their successors, recognised and fully realised the value of the essential unity and common interest which

bound all the Reformed Churches together in spite of the want of Episcopacy in some, the importance of which, as will be noticed shortly, he was the last to minimise. Writing to his friend, the celebrated Huguenot divine, Peter du Moulin (who was afterwards made a Prebendary of Canterbury), concerning the assassination of Henry IV, he emphasises the real and necessary union between the Reformed Churches of England and France. "Your dangers and fears and griefs have been ours; all the salt water that runs betwixt us cannot wash off our interest in all your common causes."

In October, 1610, the consecration as bishops of three Scotch presbyters had restored episcopal government to the Church of Scotland, but the unwise attempt of Charles I and Archbishop Laud to force an unwelcome Liturgy on the Scots in 1637 led to the defiant action of the National Assembly in 1639 by which Episcopacy was entirely abolished. This rebellious act aroused Hall's indignation against the Scots, and he proposed to Laud the holding of a Synod of the three kingdoms to arrive at a peaceful religious settlement and thus confute the headstrong Scotch Presbyterians. The Archbishop, however, considered this suggestion impracticable and instead urged Hall himself to write a confutation of the ecclesiastical position of the Scotch clergy. Hall acceded to this request and published his famous *Episcopacy by Divine right asserted.* As early as 1610, in a controversy with the Brownists, Hall, in common with the Elizabethan bishops, had treated Episcopacy as an allowable form of Church government based on expediency, and as having been regarded historically "as a perpetual ordinance of superiority"; but in this new tract he makes somewhat "higher" and more definite claims. Disregarding the ground of expediency he asserts that the universal practice of the sub-Apostolic Church is the surest commentary that the Apostles must have recommended Episcopacy and therefore it was of Divine inspiration and intended to be perpetual. The weak point in this contention is that the initial inference is too large. The most we can assert from the early prevalence of Episcopacy is, as Professor Gwatkin so well expressed it, that the Apostles could never have left a command *against* episcopal government, while the most recent scholarship and research has failed to overthrow Bishop Lightfoot's conclusion that Episcopacy was a natural development based on expediency and circumstances connected with better ecclesiastical organisation. The Scotch Presbyterians

had rejected Episcopacy as actually unlawful according to "Christ's ordinance." Hall in this treatise had, with Hooker, only asserted the general Caroline position that Presbyterian government was valid only when Episcopacy could not be had, and had moreover not defined it as a distinct order. These and other minor points, such as calling the Pope Antichrist, encountered Laud's censure, and Hall was compelled to tune his statements to suit the Archbishop's views before his tract was published in 1640. On the assembling of the Long Parliament, Hall, with an unfettered hand, continued his defence of Episcopacy in the "Smectymnuan" controversy, and urged his views with such moderation that Neal is probably right in declaring that "the controversy might have been compromised if the rest of the clergy had been of the same spirit and temper as Bishop Hall" (*Hist. of Puritans*, vol. ii., p. 354). Preaching before the King in 1641 Hall pleads for a reasonable middle position between the hostile parties, although he anticipates that as a "neuter" he is likely to please no one. His appeal sounds singularly modern. "This man is right," ye say, "that man is not right"; "this sound, that rotten." "And how so, dear Christians? What! for ceremonies and circumstances, for rochets or rounds or squares? Let me tell you he is right that hath a heart to his God, what forms soever he is for: The kingdom of God doth not stand in meats and drinks, in stuffs, or colours, or fashions, in noises or gestures, it stands in holiness and righteousness, in godliness and charity, in peace and obedience; and if we have happily attained unto these, God doth not stand upon trifles and niceties of indifferences; and why should we?" (Lewis, *Life of Hall*, p. 344). Again in 1644 after the Scotch had forced the Solemn League and Covenant on the English Parliament, Hall addressed the Westminster Assembly of Divines, urging the adoption of a primitive and reduced Episcopacy where no episcopal censures could be exercised without the concurrence of the presbytery. "The most perfect reformation," he declared, "might consist with Episcopacy." Perhaps his charity and moderation are best set forth in his little tract *The Peacemaker*, which he addressed to his clergy after his enforced retirement to Higham in 1645, to allay if possible the fierceness of the religious disputations of the opposing parties. "Blessed be God," he declared, "there is no difference in any essential matter between the Church of England and her sisters of

the Reformation. . . . The only difference is in the form of outward administration, wherein also we are so far agreed as that we all profess this form not to be essential to the being of a Church though much importing the well or better being of it according to our several apprehensions thereof ; and that we do all retain a reverence and loving opinion of each other in our own several ways, not seeing any reason why so poor a diversity should work any alienation of affection in us one toward another" (*Works*, v., p. 56, 1811). At first sight this view may seem inconsistent with *Episcopacy by Divine Right*, but in his *Humble Remonstrance* Hall had explained his use of that term, "When we speak of a Divine Right, we mean not an express law of God requiring it upon the absolute necessity of a being of a Church, what hindrance soever may interpose ; but a Divine institution warranting it where it is and requiring it where it may be had." It was on this ground that Hall condemned the Scotch and English Presbyterians for their desire to neglect or even condemn Episcopacy where "it could be had." The necessity of separation from the corrupt Roman Church had compelled the foreign Reformed Churches to forsake Episcopacy. "The neighbour Churches," he declares, "would most gladly embrace this our form of government, which differs little from their own save in the perpetuity of their προστασια or Moderatorship," and so he concludes "We can at once tenderly respect them and justly censure you."

Soon after the meeting of the Long Parliament, Hall with eleven other bishops was impeached for treason for signing the episcopal "Protest" against Acts passed in Parliament during the Bishops' absence for fear of the violence of the mob. Although the Bishops were eventually let off with a heavy fine, Hall spent several weeks as a prisoner in the Tower. On his release he went to take up his duties in his new see of Norwich, to which he had just been translated. He laboured peacefully with his usual zeal for about two years, when the Parliament commenced a period of harsh persecution for the Church clergy. Hall has graphically related the insults, hardships and sufferings which he had to endure, in his *Hard Measure*. By the ordinance of Sequestration in March, 1643, all his real and personal property was seized, "not leaving so much as a dozen of trenchers or my children's pictures." Fortunately an unknown pious gentlewoman bought in the Bishop's goods

and presented them to him. An allowance of £400 a year, as at first arranged, was afterwards refused him, and it was with difficulty that even a fifth of his income was granted for his wife and family. The Bishop's only source of income at this time was limited to fees for ordinations and institutions. But after the imposition of the "Covenant" Hall was charged with violating it by his ordinations, and soon after both he and his family were peremptorily ordered to quit the episcopal palace, while his Cathedral was defaced and despoiled by a furious mob of fanatics. He retired to a private house in a suburb of the city where he resided until his death in 1656. In 1652 he lost his wife, who had been the faithful and greatly beloved companion of his labours for forty-eight years, while four of his children predeceased him. His eldest son, Robert, managed to retain his country living throughout the troubles of the Commonwealth period, while George, another son, became Bishop of Chester after the Restoration. Towards the end of his life Hall was a constant sufferer, but he managed to preach occasionally, and although stripped of his wealth and left with only a very meagre subsistence, he continued his charitable habits by distributing weekly gifts to the poor widows in his parish.

While Hall felt impelled by the troubles and distractions of the times to take his part in polemical and controversial writings, he always rejoiced far more in the theological and devotional treatises on which he was constantly engaged from almost the very commencement of his long ministry, and which were highly valued, both at the time and for long after. One of his last productions, *In the Night*, breathes a most beautiful and helpful spirit in recounting his own personal losses and afflictions for the encouragement of others similarly tried. A good evidence of the depth of Hall's affection for his Mother Church is the fact that his very last Meditation, at the very close of his life, was called forth by the sad and apparently hopeless condition and prospect of the Church. In the *Holy Order of Mourners in Sion*, the aged Bishop suggested the formation of a spiritual Society to pray and fast regularly for the relief of the necessities and calamities of the distressed National Church. Fuller, in his *Worthies*, aptly sums up Hall's gifts as a writer, as being "not ill at Controversies, more happy at Comments, very good in his Characters, better in his Sermons, best of all in his Meditations."

C. SYDNEY CARTER.

STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

By the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A.

III. CALVARY AND GOOD FRIDAY.

Text.—"Obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the Cross" (Phil. ii. 8, R.V.).

[Book of the Month: Dr. Plummer's Commentary on Philippians[1] = P. Other refs.: David Smith's Art., "Crucifixion" in *Hastings' Dict. Christ and Gospels* = DCG. Stalker's *Trial and Death of Christ* = S. Hutton's *On Accepting Ourselves* = H. Denney's *Death of Christ* = D. Lightfoot's *Philippians* = L.]

"The more one dwells in the New Testament, and tries to find the point of view from which to reduce it to unity, the more is he convinced that the Atonement is the key to Christianity as a whole" (D. 333). So Passiontide finds us thinking of the Cross of Christ. St. Paul, in the Philippian Epistle, is impressed with the significance of it, as marking the depth to which Christ was willing to descend for love of us and obedience to His Father. It "*included, went as far as, death*" (Phil. ii. 8), and see also Heb. xii. 4, 2 Macc. xiii. 14. (P. 47).

"*And not merely death.*" "This is implied in the '*yea.*' The prayers in Gethsemane may be in St. Paul's mind. Crucifixion was a death of extreme suffering and shame; being nailed to a tree like vermin. Christ had assumed the nature of a slave to God; and crucifixion was the death of a slave to man (Gal. v. 11; Heb. xii. 2), a death excruciating and accursed (Gal. iii. 13). The Apostle may be suggesting that, willing as he was to share his Master's sufferings and death, yet as a Roman citizen he could not be crucified, and members of the Roman colony at Philippi would appreciate this privilege and privation. Cicero, *Pro Rabirio*, v. 10, points out how impossible such a death was for a Roman" (P. 47). So let us think of—

I. The Nature of Christ. The theology of the passage is

[1] Published by Robert Scott, 7*s.* 6*d.* net. Sane, strong, fresh, like all Dr. Plummer's work. Companion volume to two on Thessalonians previously noticed in this column.

very important. St. Paul is in no doubt as to the true Deity of Christ. In ch. i. 2 he has made this plain by implication. Jesus is "Lord." This marks "the transfer of the Greek equivalent of the ineffable 'Jehovah' to Jesus Christ as His usual title. St. Paul rarely uses it of the Father, but constantly of the Messiah. In these four chapters it is thus used fourteen times" (P. 6).

Then in vers. 6, 7, 8, the phrases "*form of God*," "*form of a bond-servant*," "*fashion as a man*" "imply respectively the true divine nature of our Lord, the true human nature, and the externals of the human nature" (L. 133). "Attempts to explain the union of Godhead and Manhood are inevitably failures" (P. 44). But we welcome the facts, without attempting to explain them.

II. THE HUMILIATION OF CHRIST. We note, without commenting on, the accumulation of statements in vers. 6, 7, 8. There is not space here to deal with them, and even so, "the exact meaning is beyond us" (P. 44). But He "*became obedient*," that is "*obedient to God*. '*To God*' is implied in verse 9. He became so by a life of absolutely perfect obedience in all things (Heb. v. 8), '*Obedient unto death*' (A. V.) is misleading, as if the obedience was rendered to Death. And He *became* obedient by *learning* to be so through the things which He suffered (Heb. v. 8)" (P. 47). And His obedience flinched not at death. It went further, it embraced shame as well as death. Crucifixion was by the "Romans reserved for slaves (whence it was called *servile supplicium*), the worst sort of criminals such as *robbers* (Sen. Ep. vii. Cf. Matt. xxvii. 38), and provincials" (DCG. 397). "Cicero, who was well acquainted with it, says: 'It was the most cruel and shameful of all punishments.' 'Let it never,' he adds, 'come near the body of a Roman citizen; nay, not even near his thoughts or eyes or ears.' It was the punishment reserved for slaves and revolutionaries, whose end was intended to be marked by special infamy" (S. 156). "It identified Him utterly with sinners, making Him a sharer in the worst extremity of their condition" (DCG. 398). It reminds them also of their share in bringing it about. Sin crucified Christ once, but it crucifies Him often. "Face to face with the actual physical sufferings of Jesus, God, I doubt not, intends us to see that the sins which we commit, the careless lives we lead, the things we do and say and think in any spirit except in love, all these things go out from us and infect the world. They mass and congregate into

principalities and powers of evil, into living centres of cruel or malicious influence, to smite and wound and scoff at and outrage and slay God's innocent ones still in this great world" (H. 169–70).

III. THE VICTORY OF CHRIST. What took place in the unseen is not here expressed. But there is first implied the victory of "His resurrection which reversed every doom of every kind of death, and thus annulled the hopelessness which must settle down on every one who thinks out seriously what is involved in the universal empire of death. It was by the faith in the Resurrection that mankind was enabled to renew its youth" (P. 74–5).

"'*Therefore*' *in consequence of His humiliation.* The '*also*' of verse 9 implies that God *on His side responds,* in accordance with the principle that he who humbles himself is exalted; Mt. xxiii. 12; Lk. xiv. 11, xviii. 14; cf. Jas. iv. 6; 1 Pet. v. 5" (P. 47). "'*Him*' is emphatic by position, as is natural in a statement of reciprocity; he emptied *Himself,* and God exalted *Him*" (P. 48). "*Supremely exalted him.*" An instance of "St. Paul's fondness for words compounded with *hyper*" (P. 48). The Resurrection finds its true culmination in the Ascension, as the Crucifixion finds its compensation. "This more than cancels the emptying and humiliating" (P. 48).

And so God "*conferred*" (P. 48) upon Him "*the Name,* which is probably '*Lord*' as the equivalent of '*Jehovah*' in O.T." (P. 48); in order that "in the Name of Jesus—every knee should bow." "'The Name *which belongs to Jesus*' is the meaning" (P. 48). And "The Name" does not probably mean "*Jesus,*" but "*Lord,*" because in verse 10 it "must mean the same as in verse 9" (P. 48), and Jesus is a human and not a supreme name: "many persons have been called Jesus" (P. 48). "The passage is often strangely misunderstood, as ordering the custom of bowing the head when the name of Jesus is mentioned" (P. 48). "The meaning is that every being should pay the utmost respect to the majesty of the incarnate and glorified Son" (P. 48–9). And further that they should "*freely confess,* or 'joyfully proclaim.' All that confess of necessity means is 'openly declare'; but LXX usage gives the verb the notion of praise or thanksgiving, and that idea is very appropriate here" (P. 49).

Jesus Christ "*is Lord*": "Emphatic by position" (P. 49). He is winning in the world, because he is crowned there in Heaven.

"Crucifixion was an extremely common form of punishment in the ancient world; but 'the cross of the God-Man has put an end to the punishment of the cross'" (S. 156).

IV. His Commission. (a) *This must be preached, and taught, as a message.* Even "leaving out of account its importance to the sinner, the supreme interest of the doctrine of the Atonement is, of course, its interest for the evangelist; without a firm grasp of it he can do nothing whatever, in his vocation. But what is central in religion must be central also in all reflection upon it, and the theologian no less than the evangelist must give this great truth its proper place in his mind" (D. 312).

(b) *This must be grasped and lived as an experience.* See Phil. iii. 10, where "St. Paul is giving his own spiritual experiences, and hence the order of the clauses. Christ's sufferings preceded His resurrection; but St. Paul recognized the risen Christ before he participated in His sufferings" (P. 75). See "Acts ix. 16. The fellowship includes the internal conflict with temptation as well as the external conflict with persecutors" (P. 75).

And Mr. Chesterton's "King Alfred" challenging the hordes of heathen Danes sings of the unfailing confidence in the Victory of the Cross even in moments of seeming defeat:—

"That on you is fallen the shadow,
And not upon the Name;
That though we scatter and though we fly,
And you hang over us like the sky,
You are more tired of victory,
Than we are tired of shame."

LECTURES ON THE INCARNATION.

The Incarnation of God. By the Rev. E. L. Strong, M.A., Priest of the Oxford Mission Brotherhood of the Epiphany, Calcutta. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 5s. net.

These lectures, seven in number, were delivered to the Oxford Mission Sisterhood of the Epiphany, at Barisal, E. Bengal, during the last few years, and are printed at the urgent request of those who heard them. The writer deals with the great verities of the Christian faith which have the Incarnation for centre. The volume suggests the idea that the writer has attempted a task beyond his powers; the lectures are scrappy and thin, the style "chatty," and the bias strongly "Catholic"—and a perusal of it makes the reader think that the good "sisters" of the Epiphany, by their importunity, have not greatly added to the valuable literature upon this important subject.

THE NEED FOR RE-ASSERTING THE ENGLISH CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.[1]

By the Rev. W. Emery Barnes, D.D., Hon. Chaplain and Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge, Hulsean Professor of Divinity.

IN the last two chapters of the Book of the Revelation St. John writes of a City which "comes down out of heaven from God." A description at the same time so simple and so august baffles at first the intelligence of the reader. He does not realize the fact that this City is set up on earth, nor the further fact that it has to do with the earth as it is. Yet St. John connects the City in decisive words with human history, both past and present. The names of the tribes of Israel, God's ancient people, are inscribed upon its gates, and the kings of the nations bring their glory into it. To the nations of the world it is a beacon and a guide; they walk in its light. In it the kings of the earth acknowledge an authority higher than their own; they pay it homage; they bring their glory into it.

This is a splendid picture of the work and of the glory of the Universal Church, the Church which has the uncontested right to call herself Catholic. Her Catholicity is marked by a characteristic which had never marked any city which St. John had known. Her gates are open without any thought of shutting. The nations pour into the City without hindrance.

St. John has given us an Ideal of the Catholic Church which is higher than any which is now realized among us. On the other hand, it does stand in harmony with some of the great facts of Christian life to-day. One in particular should be emphasized. The City of God—the Universal Church as St. John saw it—is a mistress which claim he homage of the nations and in turn confers benefits upon them. The nations as nations and their rulers with them have a great part to play in the Kingdom of God.

If we ask, *How are nations to do this*, surely history, and pre-eminently the history of our own country, supplies the answer. Nations serve the Catholic and Universal Church by means of National Churches. These as parts make up the whole, as many

[1] From *Religious Reconstruction after the War* (Robert Scott, 2s. 6d. net.)

regiments make up one army. In a truly National Church we learn the Catholic spirit, and so we are taught to confess with full understanding, *I believe in the Holy Catholic Church.*

The nations and all the gifts that each particular nation can bring are needed for the Universal City of God. But the gifts are not material gifts—not tribute, nor revenues—rather they are moral and spiritual gifts which can only be rendered by Frenchmen as Frenchmen, by Russians as Russians, by Englishmen as Englishmen. National Churches, as far as they are true to their character, gather tribute of these national virtues and national talents, and so pour them into the Treasury of the Universal Church. The fervid and yet logical piety of the Frenchman, the mystic strength of the Russian, the plain, practical religion of the Englishman—these separate gifts are nursed by the Church of each land. Christ is well served in each of these; it is not His pleasure to lose *one*. The great *Fact* of Nationality is to be accepted in the sphere of Religion as well as in other important spheres. God made all nations of one blood, but He made them—nations!

The spiritual capacities of Englishmen are to be drawn out for the service of the Master by the action of a National Church, a true Church of England which consists of Englishmen, understands Englishmen, and appeals to Englishmen. Through such a Church alone can the Universal Church gather the full tribute of our nation for Christ.

The Universal Church then delegates to the Church of England the duty of gathering all that is distinctly English into the service of the King of the Church. How must the English Church perform her task? How must she foster the plain, practical religion which is to be hoped for in our countrymen?

(1) By a great appeal to the understanding and to the affection of our fellow-countrymen. The Church of England must persuade and win Englishmen. To a certain extent it is done. It is needless to point to our Bible and Prayer Book in the Mother Tongue. But perhaps it is not as fully recognized that even before the Reformation many books of devotion were in circulation *in English*. The principle of our Church from long ago has been to sing God's *praises with understanding* and to interpret what is read from the Scriptures.

But it is useless to try to live in the past. Language changes, meanings of words change, modes of thought change. Neither the English Bible nor the English Prayer Book can safely remain word for word as they were in past generations. It is a principle of our Church to revise, as need arises, not only her translation of the Scriptures, but also the text of her Prayer Book. Many a word in a Collect which was vivid and full of colour in the seventeenth century is *dull* if not *dead* to many of our people to-day. Again certain forms of devotion in the Prayer Book have lost much of their power of appeal, while other forms which are *not* in the Prayer Book have proved their value to meet the religious needs which are felt to-day. The Church of England must do her utmost to teach all Englishmen to pray in words which they understand, and in words which when they are understood are powerful in appeal to those who speak our tongue. Prayer Book Revision is a first need among us in order that simpler souls may not go untaught by the Church how to pray. But in addition to an official revision of the standard text of the Prayer Book some provision must be made for elasticity in the use of the services thus revised. The amount and the kind of change in the jealously-guarded text of the Book which are likely to be generally accepted are not likely in the least to be sufficient and suitable to meet the needs of mission buildings in Lambeth or Bethnal Green, and in some of our neglected rural districts. There is a great opportunity for wise bishops and for wise clergy who will carefully consider the case of many English congregations which would hardly be reckoned Christian when judged by the more careful judgment of the Mission Field. The Act of Uniformity is no boon to them; they need not to be driven, but to be led gently to Prayer Book worship.

(2) And secondly, the Church of England ought to strive to make her appeal to *all* religious Englishmen. Her mission is given her by the Universal Church—or rather by the Lord of the Universal Church. Her duty is to make her appeal as wide as the Gospel of Christ. She must realize that the Church exists for men, and not men for the Church. She must be tolerant—and more than tolerant—towards differences of opinion and of practice among her members. The Church of England belongs to a race which is devoted to Freedom; which has done service to the world in the name of Freedom; which has been knit to the Gospel by the promise

of spiritual Freedom. But Freedom presupposes many differences; free minds will not all take the same mould; and English minds by long enjoyment of freedom have learnt to tolerate one another's differences in secular things. The Church of England must be content to minister to free men; she must be content to suggest and to teach where others perhaps would command and compel. If the reproach be levelled at her that she becomes all things to all men, well, that reproach was levelled at the greatest of all evangelists (St. Paul).

She must listen in particular to the voice of the free men of Greater Britain. The Church of England is not confined to the English land: indeed, her strength lies largely in the vigorous branches which she has sent forth beyond the seas. The younger English peoples have "ten parts" in the Church. The claim must be allowed, and the needs and views of Dominions and Colonies must be allowed full weight. It is due to them for the rich and varied experience which they have enjoyed, which we cannot claim at home. One very important subject may be mentioned here as an illustration. From Canada and from Australia comes a strong voice in favour of Re-union in Church fellowship among men of the same blood and of the same language. This voice is truly English. It is our national good sense which cries out that no unreal barriers shall be allowed to separate Christian from Christian. In cases in which Re-union is too difficult, or at any rate premature, the claim is raised for Co-operation at least between one body and another. The Kikuyu Conference of June, 1913, together with much for which it stood, has receded to the back of our minds owing to the pressure of an almost world-wide war. But *Kikuyu* must not be forgotten. The problems remain and the English love of comprehension and toleration remains. Our Church must justify its English character by returning to the task of removing all that perpetuates avoidable causes of division.

It is, for instance, to be remembered that our Church is committed neither by her history, nor by her ordinal, nor by her formulas to any rigid theory which forbids co-operation with non-Episcopal bodies. Rigidity is not a principle of the English Church, although it is not seldom exemplified in individual English Churchmen. We are not bound, for instance, by any principle to unchurch the Presbyterian kirk whether we meet her in Great Britain or

beyond the seas. Nor ought the phrase "Catholic Practice," so easily flung in defiance and so loosely used, to keep us from all acts of help and inter-communion. To take one case only which the war has brought once more to the front with urgency. English generosity, no less than Christian charity, constrains us to lend our sacred buildings, where need exists, to other religious bodies. The fact that the English Church has never lost the ancient custom of consecrating her churches does not run counter to the charitable practice of lending churches from time to time for Presbyterian or Wesleyan worship. We do not depreciate the supreme value of the Book of Common Prayer by providing a temporary roof for those who prefer *extempore* prayer. Such action is not to be ascribed to mere careless good nature. Charity is a principle of Christianity, and *therefore* of the Church of England.

On the other hand, the Church of England must conform to the English love of order. Perhaps she has been fairly successful in answering to this condition in the past. Certainly our public worship has been orderly—even to stateliness. And this quality we certainly ought to strive to the utmost to retain. At times we are tempted to depart from it. We see some of our countrymen attracted to services conducted at white heat, when all orderliness is lost in fervour, or apparent fervour. For a time and in certain circles such services have great success. But they can be only exceptional in the general scheme of the worship of the Church. The heart that cries out for the Living God has indeed its moments of almost childlike familiarity, but in the main it feels that worship means falling low on our knees in humility and in awe. Most souls experience the need of guidance and of teaching how to approach the Lord of All; the cry, *Teach us to pray*, rises again and again in the human heart, and the words which our Prayer Book gives us are felt to answer to our need.

But order in the sphere of the Christian life is a still more important matter even than order in worship. The Church of England shows those who look to her how to guide their lives. Baptism first—in infancy—at the earliest possible date, that Christ's claim upon each one of us may be acknowledged as soon as possible. With Baptism goes the appointment of sponsors, of persons who are responsible that the babe who has been baptised into Christ shall learn of Christ. And after Baptism—*Confirmation*. Those

who have received Christ's blessing in unconsciousness must receive it again in full consciousness—and at the impressionable time of life—if possible, just when a general sense of responsibility is beginning to grow. The girl who is beginning to help her mother, because she realizes that the mother needs her help, the boy who is beginning to think *either* that he must earn, *or* that he must decide on some occupation which will keep him longer at his books—these are they who should be encouraged and urged to come to Confirmation. And after Confirmation then the steady regular use of the Holy Communion to keep us in mind of our need of help in the spiritual life and to furnish us with that help monthly (it may be) or weekly —the bread which the Lord Jesus still gives us in remembrance of that great day when He gave Himself once for all. And then joined with this supreme blessing the solemn thanksgiving, the *Eucharist*, for this wonderful provision which Christ continually makes for us.

On this orderly scheme of Christian life the Church of England has hitherto insisted and will surely continue to insist. No doubt it has been severely criticized by many Englishmen and even by many of the deeply religious of our countrymen. But here we must face the difficulties of the situation, and decide to the best of our power between the claims of two conflicting principles—Freedom on one side, Order on the other. The State has had to face the same problem, and on the whole has dealt with it successfully. The Church need not despair. The Church must still cling to her scheme of Christian life—Baptism, Catechism, Confirmation, Holy Communion with all her strength. But two precautions must be taken. First, the scheme must be administered in its fulness heartily by men who realize that each ordinance is a strand in a cord of love by which the Master is drawing and holding us to Himself. Here we have not bare forms, not things of the letter, but sacraments, spiritual instruments. Only make clear to Englishmen that your talk of an ordered life within the Church means this and they will cease to be hostile to it. The Church must use her order simply as a spiritual force, and she will have power with our countrymen.

But again. This order is offered; it is not imposed. Spiritual things cannot be dispensed with the rigidity with which the things of the world are sometimes administered. The Church of England

must see with the eye of Christ and accept the fact that some deeply religious men will always, through misunderstanding or through misfortune, stand outside her order. And then there comes upon the Church the Lord's command *not* to forbid the spiritual work of such men. Least of all can the English Church do it, since she is bound by all her history and by her native soil to the principle of Freedom both in Church and State.

The experience of our State may be used for the guidance of our Church. A National Church must not only teach her own people, but also *learn from them.* Just as the State is not too proud to learn, but moulds and re-makes its institutions from generation to generation as it learns from movements among its own people of the needs and capacities of its own people, so it must be with the Church of England. She has to look not only to the splendid heritage of the past, but also to the needs and opportunities of the present. She lives not for herself, but in order to present to Christ all that is best and most characteristic in the English people. Her ideal should be that of the sympathetic teacher who realizes that his pupils are growing up, and so need room and freedom. And behind all the sympathy and readiness to meet every spiritual aspiration, even if its appearance be strange, must be the firm conviction that Jesus Christ in His saving and sanctifying power is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE.

A volume which puts into shape for easy reference the facts about the five Lambeth Conferences which have already been held and the text of their Resolutions and Reports is obviously of very genuine service to the Church at the present time when we expect to see the assembling at Lambeth of a great company of Bishops drawn from all parts of the world. Such a volume is *The Five Lambeth Conferences* (*S.P.C.K.*, 12*s.* 6*d.* net). It has been compiled by Miss Honor Thomas, under the direction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and a careful study of its pages will keep readers abreast of what was said and done at the previous Conferences and enable them to approach with well-stored minds whatever may be the outcome of the Conference to be held in July next. It is interesting to notice that the Archbishop of Canterbury has been intimately associated with three of these five decennial Conferences. In 1888, when Dean of Windsor, he acted as General Secretary, in 1897 he sat as Bishop of Winchester and acted with Bishop Kennion as Episcopal Secretary; and in 1908 he presided as Archbishop of Canterbury. The numbers attending the Conference have been progressive. They were, in 1867, 76; in 1878, 100; in 1888, 145; in 1897, 194; and in 1908, 242.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE ATONEMENT.

THE IDEA OF THE ATONEMENT IN CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. By the Very Rev. H. Rashdall. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 15*s.*

THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT. By the Rev. L. W. Grensted. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 9*s.* 6*d.*

The doctrine of the Atonement is again occupying its traditional place in Christian Theology. The war and the mystery of death and suffering have brought it into prominence. Rose water views of sin have been weighed in the balance and have been found wanting, and we now see that the fact of sin is something that blackens human life and carries with it inevitable results. We can no longer make light of sin as a human occurrence—for whoever be responsible for the awful upheaval of the year 1914 its consequences are written wide over Europe, and for that matter over Asia and the United States; and human sin has dislocated the whole of ordered life and made man suffer, and, it may be said, wince, as he seldom has suffered. Is there no atonement for sin, and is sin as sin—the individual sin of the plain man—something that alienates him from God and needs the provision of a Saviour? Can man rise by his own effort to the knowledge of God, and by his own response to the love of God obtain remission of sins and newness of life?

The traditional answer of the New Testament cannot be doubted. The Christianity of to-day is as a whole the Christianity of St. Paul. The views of that master builder on the revelation he received are the accepted message of the Gospel. He would himself have been the last to assert that there is any vital difference between his message and that which he received. In the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel the Cross has a place of eminence, and St. Paul's work was the translation of its meaning into a doctrine of salvation, which as far as we can discover is the doctrine of the primitive Church. No one can doubt that the Cross as expounded by the great Apostle has a Godward as well as a manward aspect. Sin needed a Saviour and St. John supports his contention when he says "He is the propitiation for our sins." Dr. Rashdall does not deny this to be the case. He is faced by the facts of the New Testament. He has to account for the words "a ransom for many" and the teaching of St. Paul and the Synoptics on the interpretation of the Death of Christ in the Lord's Supper. He does so by contending that there are strong reasons for disputing the genuineness of the "ransom" passage and in favour of accepting the conclusion that the words of institution in the Lord's Supper have been added to in the course of years. He holds that there is no ground to believe His death "for the remission of sins" found any place in our Lord's thoughts.

But, it will be said, the Acts of the Apostles as well as the epistles of St. Paul show that the Church from the beginning believed in the Death of Christ as a Sacrifice of an objective character for the sin of man. This does not dismay. Dr. Rashdall for he contends that—

"The one certain datum for our enquiry is the fact that by the date of St. Paul's conversion, which may have occurred at any time between a year and six or seven years after the crucifixion, the Church or certain circles of it had come to believe that Christ died for our sins. It is natural to conjecture that it was in the more Hellenized atmosphere of Antioch or Cæsarea or Damascus that this doctrine had been elaborated, while the Church of Jerusalem—or those who regarded James as their leader—adhered to the more simple doctrine

that for admission to the Kingdom nothing was required but repentance—a repentance which, however, some of them, at least, interpreted as involving and including obedience to the Jewish law."

There is something paradoxical in this contention. The Jews of all people were the most ready to accept a sacrificial view of life. The Cross was to the Jew a stumbling block, for they could not believe that the death of a man who had been condemned of blasphemy could possibly be the Divinely ordained means of atonement. It was foolishness to the Greeks in spite of Dr. Kirsopp Jake's view, which is evidently endorsed by Dr. Rashdall, that the doctrine of the death of Christ was more congenial to them. Where is the proof of this ? Do we not find everywhere in Gentile assaults on Christianity the ridicule of the Cross as a distinguishing feature ? The so-called silence of St. Stephen is explained by the readiness of his audience to accept sacrifice for sin as an essential to salvation, and it must be remarked that the apologia was cut short. Do not the last words of Stephen point to the fact of sin as needing salvation—atonement ? " Lord, lay not this sin to their charge ! " We take the liberty of saying they explain what lay behind his address and read almost like a refutation in advance of an interpretation now sought to be put upon its truncated form.

Dr. Rashdall has written what is probably one of the most learned and able books on the Atonement in existence. He holds definitely that the idea of sacrifice has been read into the death of Christ by His followers and in consequence he has to re-write Christian theology from that point of view. No thoughtful man with the New Testament before him doubts that the moral —ethical—or subjective view of the Atonement is an aspect that is present in the Sacred writings. " The love of Christ constraineth us." The voluntary surrender of Himself to death draws men to Him. There is a great example in the Cross, but there is much more, and we cannot explain Gethsemane by example. The bitterness of the cup—the Garden agony and the whole setting of that memorable episode—shows that in the Cross there is much more than an example of the love of God manifesting itself for man's salvation. Dr. Rashdall errs through his obsession by a modernism that can only see one side of life and must perforce bring everything into agreement with that aspect of modern thought. He accepts Abelard and Peter Lombard as the chief exponents of his point of view and quotes more than once the words of Peter, " So great a pledge of love having been given to us we too are moved and kindled to love a God who did such great things for us ; and by this we are justified, that is, being loosened from our sins we are made just. The death of Christ therefore justifies us, inasmuch as through it charity is excited in our hearts."

Mr. Grensted in his *History of The Doctrine of the Atonement* gives us an excellent Handbook to the study of the subject. He has had much experience as a lecturer and knows the value of providing the student with the original texts of his translations. We turn to the pages dealing with Peter Lombard and we find in the main his account of his teaching in accord with that given by Dr. Rashdall. This is to be expected, for Dr. Rashdall is at pains to be accurate, and apart from what we consider his paradoxical attitude, his work is a mine of valuable historical and theological knowledge. Peter Lombard, writes Mr. Grensted, is " singularly lacking in any appreciation of the Godward aspect of the Atonement, and as a result we have the curious and practically unique phenomenon of a theologian who tried to hold both a manward and a devilward reference to Christ's passion without attaching any great importance to its Godward side." Peter Lombard wrote, " God did not begin to love us when we were reconciled by the blood of His Son, but before the world, before

we were anything." He felt the difficulty of the view that maintained the Atonement was a transaction with the devil and abandoned it in effect when he laid such stress on the moral view.

Mr. Grensted is himself a follower of Dr. Moberley, whose ruling thought he clearly expounds, but this does not imply that he is not studiously fair in his short descriptions of the many ancient and modern theories he discusses. The outstanding merit of the book is its fairness. We have checked his expositions and have found them accurate. He has filled a gap in the literature of students and we can most heartily commend his historical pages. No one reading them can fail to feel perplexities involved in an effort to bring into one formula a statement of the implications of the Fact that has brought salvation to the world. We know very little. To frame a self-contained, full and universally satisfactory theory of the Atonement requires knowledge of God that is beyond our present grasp. Knowledge of man and sin that we cannot attain, as well as a complete power of interpreting the deep things of God, is needed. These cannot be ours until we know as we are known. One thing is certain. If the New Testament be a trustworthy record of the life, teaching and death of Christ, the Atonement wrought on Calvary was objective—a sacrifice for the remission of sins. It has its manward side, as it deals with man who needs a Saviour; it has its Godward side, for it reveals sin in all its hideousness and its need of remission. Man from the beginning has reconciled in practice the difficulties of theory by flying to the Cross for salvation and has found to his great and lasting comfort that " the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin."

CANON GLAZEBROOK'S REPLY.

THE LETTER AND THE SPIRIT. By the Rev. M. G. Glazebrook, D.D. London: *John Murray*. 5s.

Canon Glazebrook replies in this volume to the Bishop of Ely's " Belief and Creed," and we regret the tone in many passages of a very able defence of a position which in our view cannot be sustained by those who wish to stand in the footprints of our Lord and the Apostles. We believe that the letter must always yield to the Spirit. But there are facts that have been the manifestation of the Power which gives life to the Spirit, and because we hold that the miraculous elements in our religion are an essential part of its revelation we cannot abandon them.

Canon Glazebrook makes some good points against the Bishop in his discussion of the teaching of St. Paul. It is true that the mind of the Apostle as it grew in knowledge and experience expanded. There is nothing in the New Testament to force us to conceive as static the mind of the Apostle. It is, however, equally true that on all essentials St. Paul held from the beginning the fact that Christ rose from the dead the third day and that His Resurrection was a Resurrection of the Body. It may be possible to contend that Greek-speaking Jews used words such as " to be raised " and " to rise again " as descriptive not of a resurrection of the body, but the preservation of the Spirit and its emancipation from Sheol. We cannot dispute possibilities and probabilities of this kind. They are however beside the question. We do not think that any ordinary reader of the Greek or English New Testament can avoid arriving at the conclusion that the writers meant that our Lord's Body rose from the dead and that the tomb on the third day was empty through the emergence of His Body in some supernatural manner.

It is not hard to find conflicting views on the nature of our Lord resurrection Body. What we know little or nothing about, can form the ground of much speculation, but conflicting views on these points are very different from denials

of the Easter message "He is not here—He is risen." The Easter faith—"Jesus Lives" is inseparable from the Easter message for believers in historical Christianity. We are told that the phrase "historical facts" is ambiguous. Anything may be ambiguous if a reader so wishes, but for us there is no ambiguity whatever in the historical facts "born of the Virgin Mary," "the third day He rose again from the dead." We are in favour of the fullest and frankest enquiry and believe that as a result the Gospel has nothing to lose.

ARCHDEACON JOYNT'S NEW BOOK.

GOALS AND SYMBOLS. By the Ven. R. C. Joynt, M.A., Archdeacon of Kingston-on-Thames. London: *S.P.C.K.*, 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Here are forty short addresses or chapters divided between goals and symbols. Of the former we have repentance, faith, obedience, prayer, etc., among the goals indicated—"accessible enough if we take and follow the path which leads to them"—while the secret of attainment is revealed by the symbols, the Redeemer, the Master, the Physician, the Potter, the Gardener, the Vine, etc. Printing to-day is costly, time is precious and elaborate theological treatises are ruled out, but Archdeacon Joynt has packed into these pages, with no unnecessary verbiage, a large amount of suggestive matter. For devotional reading nothing could be better, and preachers, young and old, will do well to look through these pregnant pages to see how much can be got into a small compass since the demand of the time is for short discourses.

ESSAYS IN RECONSTRUCTION.

THE RESTORATION OF THE KINGDOM. By Margaret Avery, F. M. Headley, Henry Strawson and H. L. Hubbard. London: *Headley Bros.* 2*s.* net.

These five essays in Religious Reconstruction are the result of a Conference at Ashford at which the writers, two Anglicans, a Wesleyan and a Friend, "met and prayed and talked together." The Editor claims in his Introduction that theirs is "the enthusiasm of youth which sees visions and sets its hand to the plough of high adventure." The essays are "modernist" rather than "traditionalist," but the writers, whilst preserving independence, are all convinced that "the Gospel of Jesus Christ can alone solve the world's agony." Their aspiration is towards the Reunion of Christendom, but the difficulties are frankly recognized, and one of the writers expresses the view that united services and exchange of pulpits are "undesirable and even harmful at the present juncture." But we are anticipating.

The first essay treats of "The Church and the Age," and is by the Rev. H. Strawson. He examines both in the light of present-day conditions, and comes to the conclusion that each needs the other. Incidentally he notes that "unfortunately every attempt at theological restatement, in which due regard is paid to modern discovery, has hitherto failed to grip the imagination of the age." We cannot see that this is unfortunate; nor do we agree that the writings of Sir Oliver Lodge, Sir A. Conan Doyle and Mr. H. G. Wells even when "properly interpreted" are "a support to the Church." The second essay deals with "The Common Heritage" of the Churches which the writer, the Rev. H. L. Hubbard, claims is "more extensive than a casual observer would expect," and he pleads that "our vocation to-day is to bring to the birth a Church truly Catholic."

The remaining essays are less general in character. Mr. Headley gives a most interesting account of worship and ministry in the Society of Friends which will be quite new to many readers; Miss Avery in an essay on "The Ministry of Women" frankly pleads for their admission to the priesthood.

MISSIONARY BOOKS.

Foreign Missionary work has a literature of its own, and it is encouraging to note the growing number of books of a lighter kind dealing with the question which cannot fail to arrest the attention of the reader whether young or old.

In *Jungle Depths*, by Alice Maude Carvell (R.T.S., 3*s.* 6*d.* net), we have a collection of thrilling stories from the diary of a missionary working in the wild Mikir Hills of Assam, North-east India. They reveal the conditions under which the missionary lives; they tell us much of the habits and customs of the people, but best of all, they show us the triumphs of God's grace. Incidentally a glowing tribute is paid to the value of the help afforded to missionary enterprise by the R.T.S. The prints from photographs add charm to the volume.

Missionary stories for children are always welcome, and speaking generally, they were never more interesting and attractive than those issued at the present time.

More Battlefields of the Cross, by E. B. Trist (Mrs. W. C. Piercy), which comes to us from the S.P.C.K. (3*s.* 6*d.* net) treats of the fields "in the British Empire and elsewhere," notably Australia, New Zealand, Africa, North and South America and the West Indies and the North Polar Regions. The narrative is brightly and pleasantly written, thoroughly informative and with a good story or two thrown in. The pictures are excellent. From the S.P.C.K. come also *African Scout Stories*, by Robert Keable and E. G. Sedding (2*s.* net); and *Mxambi, the Feaster*, by Godfrey Calloway (2*s.* 6*d.* net).

The literature issued by the C.M.S. has always a fascination of its own, and the latest additions to C.M.S. stories are really delightful. *Chinese Pie* (C.M.S. Book Room, 1*s.* net) has three laughing boys with their chopsticks on the cover, and one is at once anxious to look inside. There we find many more pictures and a happy collection of stories and articles by people who have lived in China. *Kato's Prayer*, by Margaret L. G. Guillebaud (6*d.* net), is a charming African story and has two outline pictures for young people to fill in with crayon or otherwise. The coloured picture on the cover represents an African village.

OTHER VOLUMES.

There are few subjects upon which even otherwise well-instructed Christians have such hazy notions as upon "the things which must shortly come to pass." Yet the study is one of profound importance, and those desiring to enter upon it cannot do better than take as their guide *Light on the Judgment: Past, Present and Future*, by the Rev. W. H. Whalley, of Gloucester. (*C. J. Thynne*, 3*s.* 6*d.*) (The volume may also be obtained from the author, 27, Brunswick Square, Gloucester, postage 3*d.*) We by no means commit ourselves to his conclusions, but this we do say, that few books are better fitted to help the reader searching after truth, because of the great variety and extent of its references to the Word of God. As Mr. Luce says in his Foreword, "From Eden to the Great White Throne [Mr. Whalley] sets before us a panorama of God's dealings with men in retributive judgment." The book is not to be an end in itself: the purpose of the writer being "rather to stimulate under the guidance of the Holy Spirit those who desire to gain a deeper knowledge of the ways of God in 'Judgment'"; and it is this fact which makes it the more valuable.

Russia is largely an enigma to English people, but *The Bolshevik Adventure*, by John Pollock (*Constable & Co., Ltd.*, 7*s.* 6*d.* net), should serve to enlighten their minds upon the causes of the conditions now existing there. It is a record of the writer's experiences from the time he went to Russia in March, 1915, to do relief work among the refugees from the area of the war, till his return in May, 1919, and a very thrilling record it is. He would have "every patriotic British citizen and every honest thinking man begin

and end his day, begin and end every important piece of business, with the words '*Down with the Bolsheviks*,'" and his volume gives good reasons why they should. We note that in his very interesting "Introductory Letter" to Major Robert M. Johnston he hazards the prophecy, "Russia will recover sooner from the effects of the war than any other European nation, and will in our lifetime probably become the richest and most powerful in the world, not excepting the United States."

Mr. Arthur Mercer's "Booklets," first produced "for Officers and others," have had a tremendous circulation, and it is good to know that the cessation of the war has not meant the stoppage of these most excellent publications. Another—No. 10—has been added to the list and, entitled *Truth and Error*, it contains a chart showing what God has said on seven fundamentals—God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, Sin, Atonement, Salvation and Retribution—and what the leaders of Christian Science, Spiritualism, Russellism, Theosophy, Mormonism, Seventh Day Adventism and Modern Theology are now saying about them. It has been most carefully compiled—the quotations being taken from standard writings of these sects—and the "get-up" of the papers is simple and attractive. It meets a deep need, and as it costs only a penny it ought to be very widely circulated. Although only issued last November it is now in its third edition, and 45,000 copies have been sold.

The name of the Rev. S. Harvey Gem is well known to our readers, and his contributions to our pages are ever a source of delight. We give a hearty welcome to his volume, *Parochial Occasions* (*Robert Scott*, 3*s*. 6*d*. net), which contains fifteen addresses for special occasions. The idea is an excellent one, for clergy and speakers are always on the look out for some fresh thought or new idea that will help them to deal effectively with special subjects, and in this respect these pages are fruitful indeed. Whether the "parochial occasion" is the dedication of Church Bells, or a Cottage Gardens Show, or a Choir Festival, Mr. Harvey Gem has much to say that is pointed and practical. As a practised writer his style is graceful and easy, and this volume, whether used as a pulpit help or for more general purposes, will give great pleasure.

We gladly call attention to the new impression of the Archbishop of Sydney's manual, *Confirmation*. It was written in 1909, and appeared as one of the English Church Manuals, being No. 20 in the series. It is in three parts. Part I has four chapters—What is Confirmation, Why should I be Confirmed, The Age for Confirmation, Method of Preparation. Part II has ten chapters dealing with Baptism, Christian Self-Control, The Devil, Christian Self-Control, The World and the Flesh, Origin of Creeds, Creation, Redemption, Sanctification, Obedience, Prayer, Holy Communion. Part III has three chapters—The Confirmation Service, Life after Confirmation, A Daily Prayer for Confirmation Candidates. The Usefulness of such a manual is apparent to all. It is issued by the Church Book Room at 2*d*. net.

There are many verse writers, but few poets. We class the Rev. A. H. Lash among the poets, and his little volume *Things Unseen and other Sacred Poems* (*Robert Scott*, 3*s*. 6*d*. net) will prove an inspiration to many. There are just over 100 pieces in this collection. Rich in spiritual value, each one has a message to the soul of the believer. We quote the closing stanza of a beautiful poem on Psalm cxlvi. 8, "The Lord loveth the righteous":—

> "Then am I righteous? Clothed in spotless dress,
> The wedding-garment of my Risen Lord.
> Made perfect in my Saviour's righteousness
> I rest contented in His changeless Word.
> 'The Lord my Substitute!' for this great Name
> This glorious title and its prize I claim."

The home is the best place for teaching religion, and parents are always glad to be told of books that will help them in their task. *Stories from the Acts of the Apostles*, by Winifred S. Bowen-Colthurst (*S.P.C.K.*, 2*s*. 6*d*. net) is admirably adapted for children. It is simply and sympathetically written

and will be enjoyed most by young children between the ages of six and ten. A smaller volume, *The Children's Little Book of Psalms and Lessons*, by Beatrice Leaby, S.Th. (*S.P.C.K.*) will also be found useful, the writer fully recognizing "the precious task of guiding the early steps of Christ's little ones."

Every parish ought to have its Prayer Meeting, and clergy who have not yet started one, as well as clergy who have done so and are anxious to make it a more powerful agency, will do well to obtain Mr. J. T. Budd's little book, *Are Prayer Meetings a Failure?* (*Robert Scott*, 1s. net). It is the work of one who writes with knowledge and experience, and the many suggestions he offers for the preparation and the conduct of the Prayer Meeting will be found most useful. He knows how truly valuable the Prayer Meeting may become, and he is anxious that others should know it too. The little book is heartily commended by the Bishop of Chelmsford.

Argument from analogy is rarely ever effective, and the little volume of "a signaller's addresses," entitled *Through*, by Edward Vernon, M.A. (*Robert Scott*, 3s. net), does not strike us as a very happy composition. The author starts from the conviction that the Church's main duty is to teach what she honestly believes "without pandering to orthodoxy," and therefore his object has been in these pages "to present the more salient features of the Christian faith in common-sense language and with the aid of the signalling analogy." His intention is good, but from our point of view his conclusions are defective.

We have also received: *The Vicar*, by Mary Agnes Plowman (*W. & G. Foyle*, 1s. 6d. net), a pretty little story; *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse*, translated by C. B. Jordan from the Spanish of V. B. Ibranez (*Constable & Co., Ltd.*, 6s. net)—a war story, the sales of which in America have reached a quarter of a million; *An Helpmeet*, by Hannah Needham (*W. & G. Foyle*, 6s. net)—a collection of human word-pictures of everyday village life, showing that "woman can truly rule only when she truly serves"; *The Prodigal Son*, by the Rev. C. D. Paterson (*Robert Scott*, 2s. net)—a course of six sermons; *A Little Flower of Paradise*, by Kathleen's Aunt (*Marshall Bros., Ltd.*, 3s. 6d. net)—a pathetic memoir of a sweet little child; *The Wayward Muse*, by Arthur Golland (*Elliot Stock*, 3s. 6d. net)—a collection of verses grave and gay; *If Jesus did not die upon the Cross*, by E. B. Docker (*Robert Scott*, 2s. 6d. net)—described as "a study in evidence."

PAMPHLETS.

The S.P.C.K. is issuing a new series of pamphlets—"Biblical Studies." Among those we have received are *Christ's Perpetual Intercession*, by Dr. Sparrow Simpson (4d. net); and *The Testimony of Josephus to Jesus Christ*, by Dr. Emery Barnes (4d. net).

Further additions to "Life and Liberty" pamphlets (S.P.C.K.) are *The Charter of the Laity* (4d. net) and *A Nation's Trust* (½d. or 4s. per 100).

A good defence against the growth of a wrong spirit of Pacifism is contained in *The Fighting Spirit of Christianity*, by the Rev. H. Woodward (*Robert Scott*, 2s. net), whose arguments are sound, reasonable and just.

In *Nonconformists in Anglican Pulpits* (*S.P.C.K.*, 4d. net) Dr. Sparrow Simpson sets out his well-known objections.

The cheap reprint of the Report of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Committee on *The Ministry of Women* (*S.P.C.K.*, 6d. net) will be widely welcomed, for the more generally the Report is studied the better will the issues be understood.

Lt.-Col. A. H. D. Riach's pamphlet, *Beginnings* (*Marshall Bros.*, 1s.), is a thoughtful and careful criticism of the doctrine of Evolution.

In *Four Chapters on the Second Advent* (*Robert Scott*, 1s.) the Rev. C. J. Moore discusses some of the last things.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

Holy Communion.

A NEW edition of Canon Barnes-Lawrence's little book *The Holy Communion, Its Purpose and Privilege*, has just been issued at 1*s.* 3*d.* net, paper cover; 1*s.* 9*d.* net, limp cloth; and 2*s.* net, cloth gilt. The book has been thoroughly revised, and it will, we think, be found to be the kind of book for clergy to give to Confirmation candidates and to the more intelligent communicants in their congregations. It is thoroughly devotional in tone, and quite simple in treatment. Five different aspects of the Holy Communion are dealt with: Its retrospective character as a Feast of Remembrance: the look back. Its reminder that the Lord, the Living Bread which came down from Heaven, has now returned thither: the look up. Its social aspect: the look around. Its intimation of the Lord's return: the look forward. Its demand for inward preparation: the look within. At the end of the book are a few notes of an explanatory kind in reference to current misconceptions of the nature of this Sacrament, and it would indeed be difficult to find in the same compass a more lucid, accurate and convincing statement of the Scriptural teaching of the Church of England in regard to the points dealt with than these notes contain.

The Enabling Act.

A new pamphlet has just been issued by the CHURCH BOOK ROOM entitled *The Enabling Act and the Constitution of the National Assembly of the Church of England*, with Notes, Introduction, and Ladder of Lay Representation, price 6*d.* net. The Notes, Introduction and Ladder of Lay Representation, by Albert Mitchell, will be found of very considerable service to clergy, churchwardens, and to elected bodies under the Act. The notes answer many queries which have been found matters of difficulty to those who have been engaged in the preparation of the new Parochial Rolls, etc. In addition to this pamphlet, the Church Book Room has published a leaflet for general distribution entitled, *The New Constitution of the Church of England*; and a pamphlet which has had a very large circulation entitled, *The Ladder of Lay Representation in the Councils of the Church of England*. These are both by Mr. Mitchell, and are sold at 2*s.* per 100, post free. It has also issued *Forms of Declaration as to Qualification*, with or without a form for non-resident electors; the same printed for the card index system; *Parochial Voting Paper* with spaces for 20 or 40 names ruled with space for voting, and with declaration as to voting; *Notice of Parochial Meeting*; *Electoral Roll Sheets* ruled and headed for placing at church doors; *Electoral Roll Books* ruled and headed in the same manner, and also in the form of Index volumes.

Confirmation.

Confirmation, by the Archbishop of Sydney, in the English Church Manual Series, has had to be reprinted, and is now published with a cover at 2*d.* net. The pamphlet is one which is particularly useful for distribution before Confirmation, as it answers many questions of difficulty and gives in a clear manner teaching as to what Confirmation is. Chapters are devoted to the best method of Preparation, Baptism, Christian Self-control, the Origin of Creeds, Obedience, Prayer, Holy Communion, Confirmation Day, and Life after Confirmation.

Some difficulty has been experienced since the publication of the Arch-

deacon of Sydney's book, *The Church and the Plain Man*, in obtaining copies of the book, but we are glad to say that they are now on sale in England, price 6*s*. net. The book consists of lectures delivered at St. Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne, in October, 1917. No subject is more alive than the apparent impotence of organised Christianity to touch the daily life of the people at large. There is a vast disparity between active and passive Church membership. Yet there is little organised attack upon Christianity, and there are many signs of a widespread Christianised sentiment that stands apart from organised religion. In these lectures the alleged causes of this indifference are examined in the light of a historical survey of modern civilisation, drawing out the dominance of the economic interest with its cult of comfort reacting upon the Church. An attempt is then made to estimate the actual resources of the Church with a view to offering certain practical suggestions. Points of contact between the Church and the people are indicated, and the main conclusion is that they offer special opportunities for extending the Kingdom of God. While there is room for repentance there is also ground of hope in facing the problems of reconstruction.

The Moorhouse Lectures, 1917.

Miss E. M. Knox, Principal of Havergal College, Toronto, has compiled a little book of prayers for girls entitled *A Girl's Week of Prayer*, an edition of which has been published in Canada. The Prayers, with thoughts and phrases interwoven from varying sources, have been written in view of the difficulties to-day, and with a special longing after reality. As Miss Knox says in her introduction, "We are realising better than ever that if we would pray effectively we must think effectively, and that Prayer is *not* a magic charm, *not* a mere grasping after the good things of life, *not* a shirking of the ill, but something far grander, far nobler." Two Prayers are given for every morning and evening of the week, with some special Prayers at the end for special occasions. The book is published at 4*d*. net.

A Girl's Prayer Book.

A book entitled *Daily Prayers for Boys* (4*d*. net) has also been issued in the form of a little Manual of less than thirty pages. It contains short and simple prayers for every night and morning in one week, and for special occasions. The language is simple and just that in which a healthy minded English lad would express himself in prayer. It is the work of a clergyman in the Church of England, and his introduction is, we think, admirable. We are not sure whether many boys would adopt such a careful system of self-examination as the author recommends, but the suggestion is good. The little book is particularly suitable as a gift to senior choir boys, members of the Church Lads' Brigade, and indeed to all boys of all classes between the ages of 10 and 16 years.

Prayers for Boys.

Attention may again be drawn at this season to the late Bishop of Newcastle's (Dr. Straton) book, *Thoughts for Communicants*, 9*d*. net. This is a guide and companion to the Holy Table especially for the use and help of those recently confirmed. The book contains six chapters: The first on the relationship between the Passover and the Lord's Supper; the second, on the union between Christ and Christians; the third, on the spirit of the Communicant; the fourth, on the strengthening and refreshing of the soul; the fifth, on St. Paul's warning; the sixth gives the Communion Service in full, with appropriate references.

Thoughts for Communicants.