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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1924

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Recent Sessions of the Church Assembly.

THE November Sessions of the Houses of Clergy and Laity of the Church Assembly were anticipated with interest. They were to deal with the most important part of the Prayer Book revision proposals—the changes in the Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion. There was considerable speculation as to the results of their deliberations. Several courses were open to them. Sir Thomas Inskip and Mr. Albert Mitchell, in the House of Laity, and Canon Grose Hodge and Prebendary Sharpe, in the House of Clergy, were to move that the Communion Service should be omitted from the revision scheme. The English Church Union representatives were to endeavour to secure the adoption of the "Green Book" form. Representatives of the anonymous company of compilers of the "Grey Book" were to propose the form in that book. There was also the official form in N.A. 84 to which general approval had already been given. There was the form in the "Orange Book," and there was a possibility that the form in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI might be brought forward, as the Archbishop of York had pronounced himself in favour of it. There was plenty of scope for intelligent anticipation as to the course likely to be adopted.

Decisions on the Communion Service.

All such anticipations were doomed to disappointment. It is difficult to state the significance of the conclusions reached. Judging from the statements of members of both Houses, from letters in the Press, and from the leading articles in the Church papers, diverse opinions are held as to the effects of the resolutions passed.

As far as we can gather, the following are the facts of the case. Both Houses refused to omit the Communion Service from the revision. The House of Laity decided after long discussion that an alternative Prayer Book should not be permitted, but that variations should be allowed in the present form. When the time came to consider these permissible variations they decided to postpone the discussion of them until they had an opportunity of consultation with the House of Clergy. In this latter House a further stage was reached. Informal conferences of the representatives of the variously coloured books were held, apart from the formal sessions. As a result it was decided at first that one alternative form of the Prayer of Consecration should be allowed. A little later when it became evident that the alternative likely to be put forward would not be acceptable to a considerable number of the members, it was decided that a second alternative should be allowed. These forms, representing practically the Green Book and the Grey Book—with some modifications—have been printed in the Church papers. The official form in N.A. 84 has thus for the present been ignored, and the suggestion as to the First Prayer Book of Edward VI has not been considered.

The Significance of the New Forms.

It is to be remembered that these decisions are by no means final. The whole subject will be reopened—probably at the February sessions. The House of Laity has still to express its views. Mr. Albert Mitchell, one of its leading members, is of opinion that there is a fundamental divergence between the two Houses. The House of Laity, he thinks, is aiming at the maintenance of our present form as the norm with a variation on the lines of N.A. 84, while the House of Clergy appears to desire a new Book as the norm "with the retention of the old Book as a safety-valve for Evangelical *Clergy*." He regards both of the new forms provisionally accepted as "doctrinally defective and liturgically inept," and inferior to our present Order in doctrinal explicitness, literary diction and liturgical effectiveness. The Dean of Canterbury opposed the adoption of either of the new forms. He regarded them as placing on record the fact that the Church of England is divided by a deep cleavage. They make a fundamental difference in the doctrine of the Church of England. In an article in *The*

Record the Dean explained his view at greater length. He showed that the words in the Green Book form, " bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ " . . . would justify the claim of a Romanizing priest to treat the consecrated Elements as being, for him and his people, the actual Body and Blood of our Lord, and worthy of adoration accordingly. and that the expression to make " with these holy gifts the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make " involves a cardinal point in the Romanizing doctrine. He adds that " the Roman doctrine of the Eucharist has now effected an official lodgment in the ramparts of the English Church." Of the Prayer of Consecration in the Grey Book he says it is " a lamentable enfeeblement of the simple, profound, and evangelical character of our present Prayers of Consecration and Oblation." It weakens " the stress laid in our present canon on the Death and Passion of our Lord as the one supreme object of this Sacrament."

Future Steps.

As to future developments, it is difficult to predict the ultimate decision as to the Communion Service. The discussion will no doubt be resumed in February—the important question of Reservation has also still to be considered. It is very doubtful if both the Houses will complete their debates until the Summer Session in July. Representatives of the Houses of Clergy and Laity are then to meet to endeavour to produce a synthesis of their reports. If this is presented to the Assembly next November, the Bishops will then have to consider it. They will then have to issue the final revision scheme. It is just possible that this may be presented in February, 1925. The Convocations will then have to pronounce judgment on it. They will be permitted either to accept it or reject it, but they will not be allowed to make any alterations in it. The Church Assembly—possibly voting by Houses—will then give their final opinion on it, and if adopted it will be sent forward to the Ecclesiastical Committee. By that time the present House of Laity will be approaching the time of its dissolution. It was elected on a temporary basis. The new House will be elected on the new franchise based on the numbers on the Electoral Rolls

in each diocese. It is doubtful whether the House at that stage will consider itself the proper body to deal with so important a matter in view of the change in the character of the election.

A Severe Test for the Church Assembly.

This question of the character of the Houses raises another point of interest. It has been very difficult to follow the course of the discussion—especially in the House of Clergy. Some strong opinions have been expressed on the method of conducting the debate. Prayer Book revision was a very important subject for the Assembly in its early years to settle, before its order of procedure had been tested and it had settled down to smooth working. The Bishop of Norwich in an important article in *The Times* pointed out some of the difficulties of the position. He said that the Assembly had only been in existence four or five years. Officially it is the organ of the Church of England. "But however well it may have already filled its part, it naturally has not by the present time attained such a full and widespread recognition as to carry with it the understanding support of the generality of the members of the Church; there is very much that is good and saintly, Christian and Church-loving, which is still outside its range. The responsibility of revising the Prayer Book now rests on its young shoulders; are they strong enough, are they broad enough for the burden?" Many others are asking the same questions. Doubts are freely expressed as to the capacity of the Houses at this early stage to deal with such serious problems affecting the whole future of religion in this country. Judging from the proceedings so far, it is not without reason that these questions are being asked.

"Failure in Statesmanship."

The Bishop of Gloucester has raised the same question in another form in a letter to *The Times*. Like the Bishop of Norwich, he deprecates alternative forms in the Communion Service. He feels, as many of us do, that there is no general demand for revision. There is certainly no desire for drastic changes in the Communion Service, especially after the Shorter Exhortation. All that is required is a change in a few simple verbal expressions. The Bishop is emphatic in his view. He says: "It is difficult to

conceive a more complete failure in statesmanship than the proposal to stereotype the two parties in the Church of England by allowing disunion in exactly the service in which most of all we should be united." He desires that we should "definitely refuse to acquiesce in any proposal to allow alternative forms for the Holy Communion." He proposes that a carefully chosen Committee representative of the more sober members of the different parties should meet and agree on a common form of service. Our readers will remember that the late Bishop of Chelmsford proposed that such a gathering should go into retreat and endeavour by prayer and waiting on the Holy Spirit to arrive at an agreed conclusion. We fear, however, that Bishop Knox's criticism of the proposal still holds good: "More prayer, more love may yet work wonders for us. Far be it from me to underrate the power of prayer and love. But it is only honest to point out that even prayer and love cannot make twice two five. If the Roman Mass is truth, the Protestant denial of the Mass is error. The counter-Reformation party are determined to restore the Mass." Argument and discussion are not likely to be more effective in bringing unity than prayer and love.

Evangelical Statesmanship

If there has been a failure of statesmanship on the part of the whole Assembly, what shall we say of the statesmanship of the Evangelical representatives? They were in a difficult position. They desired to secure the omission of the Communion Service from the revision. In this they were defeated. They were then faced in the House of Clergy with the question of an alternative form—practically that in the Green Book, to which they strongly objected. When the second alternative—that of the Grey Book—was proposed, some of them decided that as a tactical move it was better to have the two forms—one of them less objectionable than the other—than to have only one. Opinion is divided as to whether this was the most statesmanlike attitude.

The primary duty of Evangelicals is to assert the principles for which they stand. They maintain certain truths from which they cannot consistently depart. These must at all costs be represented in the Prayer Book. When these are secured, their further action must depend upon the view they take of the Church as a whole.

If any of them are prepared to admit that the Anglo-Catholics, no matter how far they may go in the Romeward direction, are entitled to a place in our Church, then it seems to us the only logical attitude to adopt is to say that the Anglo-Catholics are to be allowed to draw up any form of service that they may desire and they are to be allowed to use it without let or hindrance. The Church of England will then speak as it has never spoken before, with a Protestant voice and a Roman voice, and they will contradict each other until one or other finally prevails.

But there are very few Evangelicals who will adopt this view. The great majority hold that there must be a limit placed on the toleration of the Romanizing extremists. There are a number of Anglo-Catholics who are prepared to adopt the same attitude. They say that the extreme section that looks to Rome for its authority in matters of doctrine and ceremonial ought not to remain in the Church of England. If this is so, can it be discovered where the line is to be drawn? The Anglo-Catholics have never made any serious attempt to answer the question. If they can be brought to do so, then Evangelicals might well consult with the more moderate section to see if any *modus vivendi* could be discovered, but Evangelicals must make their own position quite clear.

A Firm Policy.

They must maintain that there can be no change in the Prayer of Consecration that alters the present teaching of the Prayer Book. The idea of sacrifice must not be allowed to displace the idea of Communion. They will be in a strong position to maintain, if no change of doctrine is desired, that it is wiser to retain our present form than to strive to draw up an alternative, that may lead to erroneous teaching or stereotype disunion. They will be in a strong position in adopting this course, for the divisions among the Anglo-Catholics are becoming more marked every day. As a recent instance we may mention Mr. F. C. Eeles' book, *Prayer Book Revision and Christian Reunion.* No Protestant could denounce more vigorously the form in the Green Book than he does. He examines it in detail and pronounces it Roman of the worst type—an abject imitation of the worst forms of Roman liturgical abuses. When such divergences of view are evident among Anglo-

Catholics, it is advisable for Evangelical Churchmen to pursue a vigorous policy in favour of maintaining our present form intact. This will meet with the approval of thousands of Churchmen to whom the present Office is filled with treasured spiritual associations.

On this, as on other matters, it is the wisest course to stand firm. Lord Phillimore's declaration in the House of Laity, that if his party were allowed the use of the vestments he would be prepared to go on with the present form in our Prayer Book, shows the advisability of doing nothing to compromise the position on vesture. The argument that the Ornaments Rubric allows the vestments at present, is one that is safely used by the Anglo-Catholics outside the Church Courts. They know that they dare not use it within the reach of legal argument. Churchmen of a future generation will thank the Evangelicals for their firmness on these points in the present distress. If we yield they will condemn our weakness and our folly. We look to the House of Laity to give vigorous expression to the old truths for which the Church of England stands.

"Reservation."

The proposal for the Reservation of the elements for the Communion of the Sick, as it appears in N.A. 84, will come before the House of Laity in the early part of next session, and is certain to provoke a very full debate. An attempt was made last session to force a decision on the question before the actual proposal was reached. Lord Phillimore proposed to leave out the rubric, which orders that any of the consecrated Bread and Wine remaining over shall be consumed "except so far as is otherwise provided in the Order for the Communion of the Sick," and to substitute the following: "According to long existing custom in the Catholic Church, the Priest may reserve so much of the Consecrated Gifts as may be required for the Communion of the Sick, and others who could not be present at the celebration in Church." It will be observed that this clause goes far beyond the proposal of N.A. 84, and it was urged upon the House with firm persistence. It was ultimately withdrawn, but only after an assurance from the Chairman that the extension to "others who could not be present at the celebration in Church" might be raised when the Clause dealing with

Reservation was reached. The House, therefore, will be faced with a proposal to allow Reservation not only for the sick, but also for others. Another point that will require careful watching—if the practice be allowed at all—is the manner of Reservation, and the place where the reserved elements shall be kept. It will be remembered that the proposal of N.A. 84 has some severely limiting words: "so that they be not used for any other purpose whatsoever." The intention of these words is perfectly plain; but whilst some of the Anglo-Catholic representatives in the House professed their readiness to rule out the service of "Devotions" before the Reserved Sacrament, they made it quite clear that they desired that the reserved elements should not be hidden away. (The actual phrase used was "To lock them up in a cupboard in the Vestry would not do at all.") Herein lies the real danger: if the elements be reserved in the open church, or in a side chapel, to which people have access, it will be impossible to safeguard the practice from abuse.

Unqualified Opposition.

The only course open to Evangelicals is to offer to the proposal for Reservation the most unqualified opposition, and the House of Laity will do well to follow the lead of the five lay members of the Revision Committee of the Assembly who appended to the Report a Note expressing their absolute dissent on this question from the conclusions arrived at by their colleagues. In view of the forthcoming discussions we quote its terms:—

"We regret that we are unable to concur with the majority of the Committee in approving of the proposed new rubrics to the Order for the Communion of the Sick (numbered 145 in the Schedule to the Report), which contemplate reservation of a part of the consecrated bread and wine and (in the event indicated) 'further provision to meet the needs of the sick and dying.' Notwithstanding the care with which these rubrics have been settled, we do not think that it is possible adequately to safeguard the practice from abuse. We do not admit that the practice of reservation is either primitive or catholic; and we believe that the teaching associated with it is not conformable to Holy Scripture."

It is much to be hoped that stress will be laid upon these closing words—"the teaching associated with it is not conformable to Holy Scripture"—for that is the one ground of appeal that Anglo-Catholics are quite unable to meet. They are not very happy

when challenged to bring forward evidence of "primitive" use; they generally fall back on Justin Martyr, forgetting or ignoring the fact that the use he sanctioned was concurrent administration —a very different thing from Reservation; and, if when they make play with the word "catholic," they are more at home with themselves, they utterly fail to convince others that the practice is "catholic" in any genuine sense of that much misunderstood term. But, "What saith the Scriptures?"—that after all is the supreme question, and the answer to it is paramount with Evangelicals. They believe it to be impossible to find a single passage of Scripture which, fairly and reasonably interpreted, can be held to justify the practice of Reservation. They believe the statement in Article XXVIII, "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved," to be absolutely true, and they base their opposition to the practice upon the teaching of Holy Scripture.

The Alleged "Necessity."

It is alleged by the supporters of Reservation that the practice is necessary to the efficient working of large and poor parishes. We must confess, however, that we have very little patience with such an argument, for it is common knowledge that there are many hundreds of large and poor parishes which, to put it mildly, are worked quite as efficiently as any of those which are in the hands of the Anglo-Catholic party, and that no such "necessity" is felt and the clergy would emphatically repudiate the suggestion. As a piece of evidence in this direction we may refer to the important letter in *The Times* of November 15 last, signed by upwards of seventy Evangelical Incumbents, holding parishes in all parts of England, in which it was stated, with the utmost precision, that the signatories "have never found any need" for Reservation for the Communion of the Sick, and expressing the view that the practice "would undoubtedly tend to Adoration of the Elements." This is practical testimony of the most valuable kind, and it will carry weight with all three Houses of the Assembly when the question comes before them.

The Real Reason.

The real reason why Anglo-Catholic clergy desire Reservation comes under quite a different category altogether. It is not

concerned with the people, but with priests who object to celebrate in the manner prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer after they have broken their fast. The whole matter is bound up with the question of fasting communion. The writer was present at the Lambeth "Hearing" before the two Archbishops in July, 1899, when the question of Reservation was under consideration, and he well recalls the impression made on his mind by the vigorous cross-examination of the Rev. Edgar Lee, one of the clergy concerned. It was clear both from the tone and the substance of that clergyman's replies that the real reason why he practised Reservation was a personal one. We have just looked up the report of his evidence, and it is very instructive. We quote the following passages :—

Q.—Have you found in your ministrations in your parish a great need for the Reserved Sacrament amongst your people?

A.—We have always communicated them in that way, since the first nine months of my incumbency.

Q.—Have you found that that way of communicating them was necessary, rather than what has been called the Clinical celebration?

A.—It was absolutely necessary in my case, because I object to being called to celebrate the Holy Eucharist after my luncheon. For my own sake I should consider it necessary.

Q.—Supposing a parishioner asked you for a celebration in his room with the whole service in the afternoon, would you raise any objection to the service?

A.—It would be a very severe strain to me, and I can only say what my brother priests have said to-day, that, personally, if I had not the Reserved Sacrament, and there was such a case as you mentioned, I would rather celebrate for him than allow him to die without the Holy Communion.

Q.—Have you had many cases in your experience of such extreme urgency that there would not have been time for the Clinical celebration?

A.—There have been cases, but not a great number.

Q.—Have you ever on any occasion had recourse to what has been called the Rubric of Spiritual Communion?

A.—Never.

Q.—Am I right in saying that the real difficulty, and the most serious difficulty, with reference to this matter, is the question of fasting?

A.—That is one very great difficulty.

Q.—Does not that lie at the bottom of the whole thing?

A.—Not at the bottom of the whole thing.

Q.—Very near the bottom?

A.—It is very important indeed.

A New Movement.

The new "Movement for the Defence of the Fundamental Doctrine of the Church of England" has our warmest sympathy. The Manifesto issued in October last referred to the strenuous efforts now being made "definitely to repudiate those main principles which were enunciated at the Reformation, and which since then have been accepted as the fundamental doctrine of the Church of England." It expressed the belief "that the mass of the clergy and laity are loyal to those principles, and desire to maintain them. But they have a wholesome dread of attaching themselves to any party, and, since they possess no rallying point, they are at present inarticulate."

Disclaiming any desire to form a new party in the Church, the signatories said they felt "that means must be devised to enable the majority of English Churchpeople to give effective expression to their convictions," and they believed that this result "can best be attained by an organized movement for the Defence of the Fundamental Doctrine of the Church of England." It was hoped that such a movement would "bring together those who, while cherishing that liberty which has been so marked a feature of the English Church, are nevertheless anxious to maintain its fundamental doctrine." To this Manifesto a remarkable list of signatures was attached, including six Professors at Cambridge University. We understand that many further signatures have since been received, and that communications in regard to the Movement should be addressed to the Archdeacon of Chester, 5 Abbey Street, Chester.

The Archbishop Explains.

Some remarks made by the Archbishop of Canterbury at his Diocesan Conference regarding the power of the Bishop to authorize deviations from the law caused much uneasiness, and the Bishop of Durham brought the matter to his Grace's attention. It now appears that the Archbishop's words were misunderstood. He was referring to the fact that the promise to obey the rubrics is accompanied by a clause allowing "lawful authority" to order (*i.e.*, arrange or sanction) such deviation as may be necessary or obviously expedient. In his reply to the Bishop of Durham he wrote :—

> You and I and every Bishop constantly permit, tacitly or overtly, in the "ordering" of Divine service certain deviations, and it is surely untrue to say that the incumbent is violating the solemn undertaking whenever in the Office of Holy Communion he leaves out the warning notice or the long exhortation, or when in some other service he departs in accordance with custom in some slight and reasonable way from the exact rubrical direction as printed. Of course the Bishop must not abuse the power thus placed in his hands, and the notion that these particular words in the Declaration leave the Bishop free to act as he pleases with the

Prayer Book would be, in my judgment, absurdly untenable. We have a right, as Bishops, to call upon any man who is not doing so to obey the rubrics quite literally as they stand. Of course we do not do this, and the man thus deviating (I am speaking, as I pointed out at the time, of non-controversial matters) deviates with the knowledge that he does so with the sanction of "lawful authority." What I wanted to make clear, and I think I did make clear, is that we are not in our ordinary service doing something which we have definitely undertaken not to do. To stretch what I then said into the region of controversial and defiant disobedience to the Prayer Book is to import quite a new meaning into what was taking place or being discussed, and I do not think that anyone misunderstood what I said.

"The Churchman."

We are exceedingly glad to be able to announce that with this issue the CHURCHMAN is reduced in price. It is now published at eighteenpence, instead of half-a-crown a quarter, and the yearly subscription post free is six shillings, instead of ten shillings. The CHURCHMAN is the only magazine of its kind that stands definitely for Evangelical principles, and it was felt that, in the interests of the cause, its circulation should be as large as possible. We have been greatly encouraged to know that the change has been warmly welcomed by many who, although in full sympathy with the purpose and policy of the magazine, were unable to become subscribers. The reduction has brought it within their reach; they are becoming subscribers, and several have promised to bring it to the notice of their friends. Thus we start our new volume under the happiest circumstances, and we venture to ask every subscriber to co-operate with us to the extent of obtaining at least one more. The wider the circulation, the greater will be the influence of the magazine, and these are times when it is of great moment that the widest possible support should be secured for the maintenance unimpaired of the great heritage which has come down to us. The Reformation position of the Church of England is being distinctly challenged even in the councils of the Church, and unless a great effort is made in its defence it is not difficult to see that the whole character of the Church of England will speedily be altered. Mere denunciation of Anglo-Catholic ways will not carry us very far; the need is for an educated and intelligent apprehension of the facts of the case, and it is the aim of the CHURCHMAN so to assist in the formation of a sound public opinion, based upon knowledge, that there shall be a strengthening of the determination to hold fast to the great Protestant and Evangelical truths enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer. We appeal with confidence to our friends for an enlargement of their interest and support in this great enterprise.

REUNION AND REVISION.

By "Onlooker."

IT is characteristic of propagandists to believe they faithfully represent great ideals, when in fact they are not only missing their real lesson but are following entirely different conceptions. It was never easier to go wrong than at a time like the present, when clear thinking is essential. Conflicting ideals held honestly seem to be identical because they have, it would seem, the same end in view. The end may appear to be identical when it is different in all respects. Our contemporary atmosphere is full of, as it were, waves of different length, which can only be separated by receivers tuned to them. All give sound and sense to the hearer, who imagines he is dealing with the only wave that utilizes the ether. The sound and sense he learns, is the exact contradictory of the sound and sense received by another "listener in," whose apparatus is tuned to a different wave length. Both "listen in," both utilize the same ether and both hear something entirely different. So it is with Reunion. Some look upon the word as synonymous with absorption. They have a vision of Home Reunion in which the Church of England, as the National Church, will by its comprehensiveness absorb all Reformed Churches, whereas if there be one thing more certain than another, it is the abandonment of this ideal by the Lambeth Conference. Others look forward to Reunion under a reformed papacy in which the Bishop of Rome will be *primus inter pares* embracing under his world presidency the Churches of the East and the Church of England which have preserved the succession. In the presence of the august greatness of this unity of the Catholic Churches the non-Episcopal Churches will be forced to come in, receive the Catholic Episcopate with its doctrinal accompaniments and take their place under the hierarchal discipline of the Great Church. This ideal is not contemplated by the Lambeth Fathers, whose scheme is very different, and yet it is considered to be the "Reunion" of the Appeal.

Political ideals react on ecclesiastical policy. The late Dr. J. Neville Figgis did more than any of his contemporaries to familiarize Church thinkers with a certain view of the place of the Church

in the State, which remodels the accepted theory "as to recognize fully and frankly not only with regard to the Established Church, but with regard to all other Churches and corporate bodies, that the great unity of the State and its authority can include and recognize a great variety of relatively free corporations exercising in their own spheres authority over their members, while they yield all of recognition and obedience to the State which comprises and in its own general sphere rules them all." These words of Bishop Gore summarize the theory that to a large extent expressed itself in the Enabling Act and lies behind the relation of the Church Assembly to the State. The Lambeth Conference met when the Home Bishops at any rate were familiar with this view of a Sovereign State recognizing and giving freedom to the several corporations within itself, which demands for itself allegiance in all that belongs to Cæsar and permits the several Groups to determine for themselves what they exact from their members with regard to the things of God. When once this is grasped it will be seen that the Lambeth Ideal of the Great Church is very largely conditioned by this new conception of the State.

The Vision which rises before us is that of a Church genuinely catholic, loyal to all Truth and fathering into its fellowship all "who profess and call themselves Christians," within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled. The semi-official exposition of the way in which the scheme works out is to be found in "Lambeth and Reunion" by the Bishops of Peterborough, Zanzibar and Hereford. "The suggestion therein made is that within the reunited Catholic Church there would be different Groups each continuing within reasonable limits its own method of worship and devotion and even in some degree its own ways of government." A College of Bishops representing the different Groups would deal only with questions affecting the fellowship as a whole. "About this there must be no misunderstanding. The Anglican Church would continue to govern itself as it does at present. No Bishop from another Group would sit in its

Convocations or its Synods. For the purpose of the whole fellowship a new Synod or College of Bishops would be created on which would sit bishops of all Groups. This new Synod would have no authority to impose its will on any one Group. At the best it could only withdraw its fellowship from a Group that became obstinately forgetful of its neighbours' consciences." It will be seen that absorption is the very last thing outlined by the Lambeth Appeal and that the underlying conception is very similar to that of the political theory of Figgis as expounded, and in our opinion accurately expounded, by Bishop Gore. There is, of course, a great difference between a Church with Churches within it and a State containing Ecclesiastical Groups within it, but the fundamental ideal is the same. All that concerns the units as members of the whole in both cases, is under the control of the central authority. What they enjoy in common as members of the community is regulated by the central authority—all that concerns them as members of the several Groups is regulated by the Group authorities who can act with the utmost freedom so long as they show respect to the consciences of their neighbours.

Closely associated with this plan is the idea that Episcopal jurisdiction is over persons rather than over places—with the jurisdiction limited to those inhabiting certain places. We believe that on the Continent of Europe the Bishops of Gibraltar and Northern Europe have their jurisdiction limited to the congregations in the various centres, and it is well known that a former Bishop of Gibraltar was a strong advocate of what he called the Catholic view of jurisdiction—not over territories but over the Christian individuals in these territories. By the acceptance of this principle many vexed questions of polity are solved, e.g. the claim of the American Church to consecrate Bishops over districts that have had Roman Catholic Bishops for centuries. The whole question of intrusion is settled as far as the Anglican Communion is concerned, whereas Rome holds that all such Bishops are "mere laymen." It is plain that the whole Lambeth scheme demands personal jurisdiction within well defined Groups possessing their own individual characteristics and preserving them as their special contribution to the fullness of the City of God.

An entirely different ideal has taken possession of many minds within the Church, who hold, as the Church of England is Catholic

and reflects Catholicity, it is necessary in the interests of Reunion and Catholicity that it should possess within itself as recognizable those essential qualities that mark off from one another the Groups with which she will be in communion. On one side, as she wills to be in unity with Rome, she must have in her services that which will prove to the Romans her close kinship with them, and on the other hand, as she looks forward to union with the East, she must have special Eastern characteristics. In order to make good the efforts for Home Reunion she must have the *differentiæ*—to use a logical term—of non-Episcopal Christendom displayed in her worship and organization. Again and again these views have been expressed on platforms. Very often it is asserted—"We all stand for Reunion. Well—when Reunion comes we shall find ourselves in communion with Churches that have much we do not like, why then should we object to the incorporation in our Prayer Book of what our brethren hold?" It is to be noted that the alternative Canons suggested by the Conference of members of the House of Clergy and generally approved by that House are described as "Western" and "Eastern" in type. One of the speakers in the debate said he had in view reunion with the Nonconformists in supporting the change he wished made. It is not too much to say that there is a latent and frequently openly expressed view that the Church of England in her formularies and worship should have all the marks of Catholicity present in all parts of the Reunited Church, and should have expression given to characteristics of Roman, Eastern and non-Episcopal Reformed Christianity. Speakers imagine that by so doing they are advancing the cause of Reunion, and think also not in terms of fellowship with Group Churches but with an eye on the absorption of other Churches in Anglicanism. We have detected the strong survival of the territorial idea of jurisdiction side by side with advocacy of the Lambeth Appeal.

It is clear that two consequences will follow if the present proposals of three consecration prayers with different doctrinal connotations be adopted. In the first place there will be three uses for the administration of Holy Communion—the Cranmer use, that is interpreted by the doctrinal standards of his day and is specially based on Holy Scripture—the Western use, that proclaims its kinship to the Canon of the Mass, and a so-called Eastern use, which

is in reality quite a new use based on a conception of God and Revelation that is considered by many to be Marcionite in its discriminative selection of Scriptural teaching. Round each of these will cluster interpretations that will tend to crystallize and move more and more in the direction of their parent stocks. We shall have definite Groups within the Church hardening as the years pass into practically different schools that will come less in contact with one another, and although we shall not have different Bishops within the same Diocese, yet it is possible to see the creation of new types of suffragans who will be delegated the charge of the Cranmer Group, the Roman Group, and the Modern Group. This is simply a further extension of the Figgis theory within the Church of England, and for our part it is not as far fetched as the acceptance of the theory by Parliament and the Lambeth Conference would have seemed a quarter of a century ago to the average English Churchman. Ruling ideas have a way of asserting themselves in every department of life, and just as the style of an historic building is reflected in every house within miles of its site—so the idea that governs a great conception finds its outlet in every part of the community that accepts it.

Recent proposals cannot but prevent Home Reunion taking place within a reasonable time. The negotiations have broken down on the claims of the Episcopate—not on their local or prelatical character—but on the sacerdotal conception that lies behind them. There is not the least doubt in the minds of Nonconformists that the Green Book Canon means the establishment within the Church of England, as part of its formularies, of doctrine rejected by the Church in common with them for centuries. They see in it the restoration of the Mass with its attendant consequences. They may not be skilled in their tracking of the subtle differences between the "Real Presence" Consubstantiation or Transubstantiation, but they know that by a priestly act changes of an ineffable character are declared to be made, by virtue of his being in the succession, and by this means alone this miracle is effected. They consider the development of the sacrifice of the Mass illegitimate and see it in the words "we do celebrate and make here, before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make." They are convinced of the inevitability of adoration of the reserved elements and say they cannot possibly

entertain the idea of Reunion with a Church that has deliberately altered its formularies so as to bring them into correspondence with what they conceive to be the worst errors of Rome. They are fully alive to the misinterpretation of the Lambeth Appeal, and looking back over the past see the certainty of the demand on the part of those who have been responsible for the acceptance of the mediæval conceptions which have been generally approved by the House of Clergy, that their views must prevail throughout the Church. An object lesson of the very worst type has been given to our Nonconformist brethren and, if the changes be adopted by the Church Assembly, Home Reunion will fall to the ground and the hopes that have been cherished will perish.

Two proofs of this among many published opinions may be quoted. Dr. W. B. Selbie was convener of the Mansfield Conferences which did much to clear the ground for the consideration of Reunion. In *The Lambeth Joint Report on Church Unity: A Discussion*," he says, " Another thing troubling the minds of Free Churchmen is as to whether the future Church is to be really Protestant or to be Catholic. Now here I am treading on very delicate ground. But we as outsiders cannot help seeing a great deal of what is going on in the Anglican Church at present. We realize the tremendous struggle that is going on between Anglo-Catholicism, on the one hand, and Protestant Anglicanism, whether of the Evangelical or the Liberal type, on the other, and we are wondering very much which party is going to win, because that is going to make an immense difference to our attitude to any future reunion. If the Anglo-Catholic view of Church tradition and of orders and of episcopacy is to prevail, it is quite unthinkable that either we, or indeed the Liberals or Evangelicals within the Church, will ever be able to come to anything like an agreement. There will have to be a definite understanding, and I am bound to say that so far matters of that kind have been avoided and slurred over; and before we can get very much further there must be frank understanding on questions of that sort." Prof. W. M. Clow, one of the ablest of non-Episcopal writers, speaking of the " Grey Book " proposals says that if they are recognized " few can hope for either union or fellowship between the Churches." And if this be true of what is called the " Grey Book," what must be said about the mediæval ritual of the " Green Book " ?

In an age when it is above all things necessary to maintain truth and drive out pragmatic expediency from the Churches, it is a plain duty to examine very carefully the truth and justice of all claims made. It is not sufficient to contend that because men cannot be happy in worshipping God unless they revert to mediævalism, mediævalism should be restored. We are inheritors of a great tradition. Purity is preferable to peace—for without purity there cannot be permanent peace. We dare not sacrifice the faith of the Gospel for what is deemed necessary for the "happy worship" of men. There has been a great deal too much of "what will satisfy and cause least trouble"—supported by a theory wrongly applied within the National Church—with the implication that no responsibility rests on members of one Group for the actions of another Group. Such a view cannot be held when we are members one of another and are bound to grow up into Christ our living Head. Unity is the will of God, but it must be inward unity expressing itself in outward union. Prayer Book Revision on the lines that have recently developed will retard instead of promoting union, for they show a desire to abandon truth for peace, an entrenchment of error within our Service Book, a hardening into Groups of those who will use the various uses, and an acceptance of an ecclesiastical theory as well as theological principles that will deter non-Episcopalians from seeing and feeling the drawing-power of the Lambeth Appeal.

The Addresses delivered at the 1923 Conference of the World's Evangelical Alliance and contained in the volume *Christian Unity and the Gospel* (Hodder & Stoughton, 5s.) are of varied character. They are spoken from the hearts of men who have a message to deliver, and when we say that they contain an Article on "The Gospels" by Dean Wace, the last platform speech by Dr. Watts-Ditchfield on "The Modernist Error," a speech by Dr. Carnegie Simpson on "The Revelation in Christ" and "The Imperative Appeal for Christian Unity" by Bishop Welldon, we have given an idea of the variety of its contents. The sermons by Dean Burroughs and the Rev. F. C. Spurr are well worthy of close study, and the book as a whole is a reminder that essential unity can exist in spite of varying emphasis on parts of revealed truth and a different approach to the study of grave problems. We thoroughly endorse the words of the Preface: "The Congress was remarkable as a demonstration of Christian Unity, and this volume is offered to the public as an interpretation of true Unity, and of the Gospel of Christ on which it depends."

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND ITS PRESENT-DAY MESSAGE ON ETERNAL LIFE.

By the Rev. W. H. Rigg, D.D., Vicar of Beverley Minster.

THE authorship of the Fourth Gospel is not a matter of indifference. Some who consider that the Evangelist was an unknown writer of the beginning of the second century, standing in no direct or even indirect relationship to the Lord when He was on earth, insist upon the immense value of his book for a true interpretation of His Person and Work. This seems to us to prepare the way for that perilous divorce of the Jesus of history from the Christ of experience which is so fatal, alike on the grounds of Christian faith and Christian unity. We confess that we are amongst those who with Dr. Garvie "cannot understand how it can be of no interest to Christian piety whether Jesus was or was not as the gospel represents Him, whether He spoke, did and suffered as He is represented."[1] On the other hand, it does not come amiss to put on one side from time to time the problems of authorship and to take the gospel at its own valuation. Its primary purpose was to strengthen the belief that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that, believing, its readers might have life through His name (St. John xx. 31). The author may have had other objects in view which do not appear on the surface, but we are on firm ground when we take his declared intention in all seriousness, and mainly consider his gospel from that point of view. We propose, therefore, to take his leading idea of "Life," and see its bearing on the subject of Immortality as we view it to-day.

The late Dr. Swete said that "eternal Life, one of the watchwords of the Fourth Gospel, is connected in Chapter iii with faith in Jesus; in Chapter vi it is seen to come from eating His flesh and drinking His blood; in Chapters x and xvii it is represented as His direct gift." In Chapter iv "it is viewed as the result of the life of the Spirit in man, the issue and consummation of spiritual life, differing from it not in kind, but only in permanence and in maturity."[2]

[1] *The Beloved Disciple*, p. 237.
[2] *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament* (London: Macmillan, 1910), p. 138.

Christ gives life to the world (vi. 27, 33)—Nothing in truth can exist apart from Him, for all things, that is all that was, is, and will be, became. Through His agency, and apart from Him, there became not even one single thing that hath been made. In Him was Life (i. 3, 4). Not only was He the Giver of Life (v. 21), but He was and is the Life, Life itself (i. 4; v. 26; vi. 35, 48; xi. 25; xiv. 6; cf. 1 John v. 11, 12). In consequence the gift of life is not to be regarded as something detached from Him as when a person makes over a garden by deed of gift which, once made, the recipient may enjoy to its fullest extent without bestowing even a thought upon the giver. The Giver and the Gift are both inseparable,[1] the Father who is always regarded as the Fountain of Life (v. 21, 26; xvii. 2; 1 John v. 11, 20; cf. the unique phrase, the Living Father, vi. 57) imparting that Life to the Son, and through Him, whose very Life it is, to the Believer, so that "He that hath the Son hath life and he that hath not life" (1 John v. 12). This Life which our Lord brings is continuous, "Because I live, ye also shall live" (xiv. 19), and it is eternal (iii. 15, 16, 36; iv. 36; v. 24; vi. 27, 40, 47, 51, 54, 58, 68; viii. 51; x. 28; xi. 25; xvii. 3). It is a present fact which the believer may have here and now, and has not to wait for till after death, "He that believeth in or trusteth in the Son hath (ἔχει, here now) eternal Life" (iii. 36). "Verily, verily I say unto you that he who heareth My word and believeth on Him that sent Me hath (ἔχει) eternal Life (v. 24). "This is the will of Him that sent Me that every one who beholdeth the Son and believeth on Him, may have (ἔχῃ, here and now) eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day" (vi. 40). "I give to them eternal life" (not as A.V. "I will give," x. 28). "And this is (ἐστιν) life eternal that they may know (come to know by experience) Thee, the only true God, and Him whom Thou hast sent" (xvii. 3). The possessor of eternal life passes out of the sphere of judgment (iii. 18; v. 24). He tastes of death but he does not behold it in the sense of becoming thoroughly acquainted with it (viii. 51, 52; cf. 1 John iii. 14). The great change then in a man's life does not take place at death, but at the moment when he becomes partaker of eternal life, and this happens under

[1] Feine, *Theologie des neuen Testaments* (Zweite Auflage, Leipzig, J. C. Hinrich), p. 569, considers that it is a peculiarity of Johannine thought that the gifts which Christ brings are not to be regarded so much as something offered by Christ as that Christ embodies them in His own person. St. Paul certainly held it as well (Col. iii. 3, 4).

present conditions. It is an Eternal Now reaching out into the Future (iv. 14; v. 25, 28; vi. 27, 51; xiv. 19).[1] "Death," that which we call death, physical death, is but an episode in the believer's career, it brings to light the reality which is already his. He becomes more fully aware of the riches of Christ which he already has begun to enjoy. The limitations which are inseparable from the earthly existence disappear, the fuller vision will have come (1 John iii. 2, 3).

Let us now consider the help which this view of "Eternal Life" gives us to-day, confronted as we are with the old question as to whether there is a life after death or not.

Science as it is ordinarily understood is neither for nor against Immortality, or, if the expression is to be preferred, "the survival after death." This need occasion no surprise, for the world which Science considers does not comprise the whole of experience. Certain aspects of reality are selected, and are made the subject matter of investigation, the results of which have been most wonderfully productive, they cannot be neglected. Science is mistress in her own house, but the danger arises when she strays beyond her own province and forgets her own limitations. The world she surveys is a world that has certain features left out of it, and therefore her abstract nature must be taken into account. There are data of experience which do not come within her scope. Take

[1] Scott, *The Fourth Gospel* (2nd ed., Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1908) p. 248 ff, says that death "denotes not so much a single event as the whole exclusion from the higher life." The natural man, who has not participated in the change effected by the new birth, is in a state of "death." "He that believeth on Me is passed" (already in that very act) "from death unto life" (v. 24). Scott goes on to say, "There are passages in which John might appear to depart deliberately from his view of life as present, and to fall back on a primitive eschatological view" (v. 28; vi. 39, 40, 44, 54), but as against Spitta, *das Johannes-Evangelium* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1919), pp. xix, xxii, xxiii, pp. 121, 151, 157, and Wendt, *die Schichten im vierten Evangelium* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1911), p. 23, p. 126 ff, he rightly retains them as part of the original gospel. But Scott considers these verses "as reflecting a popular dogma which was not wholly consonant with the writer's own thought, although he desired to allow due place to it . . ." "He" (i.e. the Evangelist) "accepts the popular belief in a resurrection at the last day, but he empties it of the significance which had attached to it in earlier Christian thought." We consider that Scott goes too far in this respect. With Von Hügel, *Eternal Life*, p. 78 (2nd ed. rev., Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1913), we prefer to say, "It is in the less characteristic passages of these writings that we get the very valuable, strictly necessary, compensatory movement, and insistence upon the future, the bodily resurrection and the increase of the soul's stability and joy in the beyond."

two such simple little sentences as the following: "This flower is white," "This flower is beautiful." The first sentence is a statement of fact, whiteness has been predicated of a particular flower, a connection is stated between a certain object, flower, and the quality, whiteness. On the other hand when the assertion is made that a particular flower is beautiful, a standard or norm is thereby introduced. The person making the statement has in his own mind the idea of beauty, a standard, and in his judgment this particular flower conforms to it. Not merely has a statement of fact been made, but a judgment of value has been passed.

Now science calls nothing common or unclean. A Cæsar Borgia is as much a fact of existence as is St. Francis of Assisi, for both of them she has neither praise nor blame. The survival of the fittest, keeping to the scientific plane, means not the survival of the morally fit, but of those who do survive.[1] But Goodness, Truth and Beauty are also a part of experience. The Ideals which loom before us, and are also an integral part of the nature with which we are endowed, do of themselves confess the fact that "He hath made us and not we ourselves" as undeniably as the heavens above and the solid earth below. Right or wrong remain the same, it is true, whether there is a future existence or not, but their importance and significance for us as individuals may be diminished or increased according as they are believed to be eternal or otherwise. Character may be compared to a house which a man builds to live in; if it is to be of a temporary nature then he may be content with a bungalow consisting merely of disused railway carriages, but if it is to last for an indefinite period, then the materials of which it is composed must be the best he can procure.

Assuming then that the world in which we live is not indifferent to morality, that it is of the very nature of things, justice being an essential element in the making and order of the Universe, the demand for the assurance of immortality is a most reasonable one.

First from the point of view of justice. No human good is complete unless there is a union of virtue and happiness and well

[1] Dean Inge in his *Outspoken Essays*, First Series (London, Longmans, Green & Co., p. 24), says, "Science declared that, the survival of 'the fittest' was a law of Nature, though Nature has condemned the majestic animals of the Saurian era, and has carefully preserved the bug, the louse, and the spirochæta pallida.

"We din'd as a rule on each other
What matter: the toughest survived."

being. The facts of experience at most prove that there is a tendency in this direction. But the happiness that is implicit in goodness is very far from always being made explicit. Men like Caiaphas do succeed in getting their way, and from motives of political expediency bring about the death of innocent persons (St. John xi. 50). Justice, even the most cheerful optimist must be forced to admit, is very far from being realized in this world. Granted that the Soul of the World is just, then an opportunity must be given in some further stage of existence for the claims of justice to be vindicated and fully met.

Secondly, this world is insufficient for the realization of our ideals. The greater a man is, the more is he haunted by a sense of his own incompleteness. The seeker after truth becomes more and more aware of his own ignorance, the little he knows in comparison with what may be known. Perfection is like some distant mountain peak with the snows of the Eternal ever resting upon it. In the morning of life it seems so near, but as the shadows lengthen, it appears more and more inaccessible, and, when the night comes, the pilgrim feels that he is farther away from the fulfilment of the ideals for which he strove than when he first set out to reach them. But a universe which puts before us tasks incapable of fulfilment or, when we seem on the way to their accomplishment, permits death to come along and reduce them to nothingness, whatever else it is, is not a moral universe. Immortality is the triumph of goodness. It is the promise that our ideals shall be realized. We shall not be put to permanent and intellectual confusion. The "ought to be" and the "is," which now stand out in such glaring contrast, shall one day join hands and dwell together in Zion. The immense capacities which lie within us shall have ample room for expression and development.

But when the transition from ethics to religion is made[1] Immortality is transformed from a great hope into a glorious certainty. The Being whom Jesus revealed is the Father of all men. With Christ the certainty of the future life rested on the Being and Nature of God Himself and His absolute consciousness of the union between Himself and His Father and those whom the Father

[1] Cf. Prof. J. B. Pratt, *The Religious Consciousness* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923), p. 10. "Religion, if taken seriously and rationally, will be deeply moral; but it is not morality."

had given Him (St. John xvii. 2). "If ye then being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in Heaven give good things to them that ask Him" is the splendid argument of religious experience. As Christ declared "God is not a God of the dead but of the living."

The feeling of incompleteness once more makes its appearance. The Saints and Martyrs are the first to confess that, under our present earthly conditions, our communion with God is imperfect. Long ago Mother Julian exclaimed, "I saw Him and sought Him, I had Him and I wanted Him." The spiritual life, from one point of view, is a present possession, but from another it is an earnest or a prophecy of better things to come. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is (1 John iii. 2, 3).

But the spiritual life as a present possession is a guarantee of its own continuance after death. There are moments in the lives of most of us when we realize the presence of God to such an overpowering extent that death seems merely an episode in the great Drama of Life. A life in communion with God is of such an indissoluble character that, though the waves of time may beat against it, they cannot destroy it. The abiding Presence of the Incarnate Son of God within us (St. John vi. 51, 53; xv. 4, 5) a vital, realized union, is an assurance, nay, the assurance of our Immortality.

We are confronted to-day with Spiritism, or what is commonly called Spiritualism. What is the attitude that should be adopted towards it? Frankly, we consider that psychical phenomena should be submitted to most rigorous investigation at the hands of those competent to undertake that difficult task. The Society of Psychical Research should continue its operations. But dabbling with Spiritism seems to us to be dangerous, just as the same may be said of psycho-analysis and hypnotic treatment. Joubert's dictum is very true, "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing." An open mind should be kept on the subject. But it is not the Scientists whom we are prepared to listen to so much as the Psychologists. And we should never be surprised to find that they would be able to explain the so-called communications from the other world as being due to psychological laws, of the existence of which Mankind is for the most part totally unaware.

Immortality on Spiritistic lines need have no ethical significance, nor is it necessarily religious.

At the most Spiritism may be called the back door into the next world, therefore those who would enter that way may expect to find themselves in the scullery. If in reply to this, the assertion is made that the ordinary proofs of the existence of the future life do not convince a large number of people, our reply is that the Fourth Gospel was written to enable us to realize the value and meaning of eternal Life. Did we but pursue the methods to be found in that Gospel, we should become partakers of eternal Life, and knowing its secrets be assured that He who came to give Life and Life in abundance will be true to His word, "In My Father's house are many mansions; I go to prepare a place for you," "Because I live, ye shall live also." He who has imbibed the Johannine spirit will not of necessity condemn Spiritism, but will humbly claim that he has found a more excellent way.

American books are dear, and the Ingersoll Lecture, *The Christian Faith and Eternal Life*, by George E. Horr Offord (Humphrey Milford, 4*s*. 6*d*.), may seem excessively so at the price of four and sixpence. Judged by the number of words it is; but tested by its argument and matter it is by no means expensive, for unlike many Transatlantic volumes it contains no padding. Every word tells and its suggestiveness is only equalled by its logic and breadth of vision. It is one of the most satisfactory works on Immortality we have read and shows how the Christian Faith as to eternal life is woven of many strands which make a very strong rope. The current beliefs in Palestine are sketched, and we see how our Lord accepted the Pharisaic tradition and also emphasized the Sadducean doctrine that resurrection is not resuscitation. He laid down three leading truths: God's faithfulness to His own children, God as the Heavenly Father, and the Kingdom of God. The contrast between the Greek view and that of our Lord is well brought out, and we have a strong vindication of the "empty tomb" as the basis of the belief of the primitive Church. "The conviction of the Christian Church upon this evidence" (the sense experience of witnesses corroborated by the vision of St. Paul) "and this conviction" (of the resurrection) "is an historical phenomenon that remains insoluble to the most acid criticism." We have been much impressed by the masterly way in which the whole case is presented, and by the cautious fairness of the argument put forth by this singularly able author.

THE PRINCIPLES OF COMMON WORSHIP.

By the Rev. Norman H. Clarke, M.A., Vicar of Farsley, Leeds.

THE various forms which the demand for the revision of the Book of Common Prayer has taken and the variety of the attempts to produce a satisfactory revision seem to point to a certain haziness in the idea of what the word "worship" connotes. We need, then, to try and arrive at an exact definition of our terms, and it is extraordinarily difficult to express our ideas cogently. We have to guard against "too much stiffness in refusing and too much easiness in admitting" terms which our upbringing or our prejudices suggest. Any man can formulate his own definition of worship if he has regard only to his own approach to God: it is something quite different to compress into a few words the meaning of the term as it is variously applied by men of varied training and outlook. In one place the writer has seen worship defined as "a religious service," in another "adoration paid to God." In each case the suggestion was offered by a man of culture and experience, yet we should all feel that neither includes, at any rate with sufficient exactitude, all that we understand by the term in the particular connexion in which it is found at the head of this paper. Whatever the definition at which lexicographers may ultimately arrive, we can start from the point that worship is, originally, "worth-ship." Admittedly the meaning may easily have been modified by the passage of time, but the root idea of the word must always remain. As applied to God, then, worship involves a recognition of the "worth," the worthiness, of God. This seems to limit the area from which worshippers can be drawn. It appears that only the converted and the definite seekers after God can, strictly speaking, worship Him. Something of the kind was apparently in the mind of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews when he said (xi. 6): "He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." Many of those who join in the services of the Church are not, then, worshippers, for each congregation contains some who have not a

personal experience of God and, probably, some who come to Church rather because it is customary than because of any desire to render homage to their Creator. In considering the principles which should govern our common worship, it seems necessary to bear this in mind.

Worship may be said to include matter, form and act. For example, the "matter" might be praise or prayer, adoration or confession; the "form" would include the style in which the worshipper addressed himself to God, and may be illustrated by the difference between a collect from the Prayer Book and the *ex tempore* prayer with which, say, a Sunday-school teachers' meeting is opened. The term "act" would refer, among other things, to the posture of the worshipper: for example, standing or sitting while the choir renders an anthem. It is worth noting here that there is no justification for uniformity of practice during the singing of an anthem. Some anthems are acts of praise, and standing is the appropriate attitude, as it is with those which are prayers, since kneeling would be impossible; but some are meditations, principally on passages of Scripture, and for these sitting is more suitable, just as the congregation sits while the lessons are being read. In attempting to arrive at the principles of common worship, it will probably be best to keep these three points in the background, regarding them as giving tone to all else, rather than to use them as headings under which the subject should be considered. The writer proposes to take the two words "common" and "worship," and treat of them as representing the man-ward and the God-ward sides of the public approach to God, which for the time he takes as a working definition of worship.

I

First, then, we deal with the man-ward side of our worship, that is, we think of the worshippers. The word "common" implies a group. Our daily services cease to be Common Prayer when the priest recites the office alone. In any group there is diversity of temperament, and we have come to learn in recent years that the form, at least, of our worship is largely a matter of temperament. The writer knows of an Anglo-Catholic who refuses to have an ornament of any kind in his Church, and on the other hand he is personally acquainted with a convinced Evangelical whose conduct

of public worship has more than once led the brethren to question his soundness in the faith! The first desideratum on the part of the worshippers is that they should recognize the existence of this diversity. And it is not only a matter of temperament, but also of something more vital. There is diversity of religious experience. A congregation may, and probably will, include boys and girls in the year before their confirmation, young communicants (and no one can pretend that, however careful the instruction, all those who pass out of our Confirmation classes have reached even approximately the same spiritual height), communicants of many years' standing, who presumably have grown in grace and in the knowledge of their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and the casual visitor who has possibly not darkened a church door since the last Harvest Festival. Whatever may be the faults of our services or of those who conduct them, there is no doubt at all that the average church-goer makes little or no allowance for this diversity; indeed, it is more than likely that he has never thought of it. Before our worship can be truly common it will have to be generally recognized. Each member of the congregation must be brought to see that not all the others have his particular needs, nor have all precisely the same subjects for thanksgiving as move him on Sunday morning. We need to guard against the complete absorption of the individual in the congregation, which would tend to make worship a mechanical priestly rite, but on the other hand we need to develop a corporate consciousness.

This diversity of worshippers in any one service makes intelligibility a cardinal principle of public worship. Intelligibility governs the choice of language for our public prayers in two ways. In the first place it involves the use of the "vulgar tongue," and this was considered of sufficient importance at the time of the Reformation for it to find a place in our Articles of Religion. Obviously, if all are to join intelligently in the worship of the Church (and a service ceases to be worship if it is not intelligently rendered—1 Cor. xiv. 15), the act of worship in which they are participating must be in a language which all understand. The principle, however, goes farther. Not only must a known tongue be used, but a known form of that tongue. Shakespearean English may be more resonant and more dignified than that of the twentieth century, but that is no reason at all for employing it in twentieth-

century services unless the average worshipper can follow it without having to determine the meaning of a particular word from its context: this detracts his attention from the prayer itself to the form in which the prayer is offered. Intelligibility, then, necessitates simplicity, but simplicity does not involve looseness or anything approaching slang. The highest form of worship is worthy of the best language of which the worshipper is capable. It does mean that we shall cease to ask God to prevent us when we want Him to go before us: it will rule out for many congregations such descriptions of God as omniscient. In this connexion we see the value of alternative prayers for the same object: one should be suitable to an educated congregation, and the other to a typically working-class one, for it is almost as bad to pray in a form much below people's intelligence as in a form above it—it encourages the feeling that anything is good enough for God. Simplicity will also determine the form of our public prayers. The preambles to our collects are most valuable and, as Bishop Barry remarks, an almost complete statement of Christian doctrine might be drawn from them, but when we get away from the collects for Holy Days to prayers in some of the Occasional Offices, some of the opening addresses to God are too involved for ordinary use. In the first prayer in the Baptismal Office almost half is occupied with the address; similarly the preamble to the collect in the Burial Service is too long: at these and other occasional services there are people who may not be accustomed to liturgical services, and there are usually some who, while used to ordinary Church services, are not able to pray intelligently when there is such an interval between the opening of the prayer and the actual petition. It would be better in the address to direct attention to some one relevant incident or fact, as in the third collect at Morning Prayer, than to attempt to produce a cumulative effect and in the attempt allow the worshipper's mind to wander. Further, if our prayers are to be understood by those who use them, they must proceed from stage to stage by a natural transition. The prayers in our Book of Common Prayer are mostly admirable examples of this, although they were compiled before the scientific study of psychology, but the *ex tempore* prayers which one sometimes hears, obviously composed on the spur of the moment, frequently jump from subject to subject without any warning to the others present (who are

supposed to be joining silently in the petitions) so that the hearers have scarcely realized what they are supposed to be praying for when another subject is brought before them. If the "bull" may be forgiven, *ex tempore* prayers for use at a meeting or an informal service should be written out beforehand. Closely allied to this, and still under the heading of intelligibility, is definiteness, both in choice of phrases and in aim. One of the defects of much modern worship is that it leads nowhere: we are no nearer God at the end of the service than we were at the beginning of it, and this is not all due to the worshipper's being too subjective and having been put off by some, to others, trivial incident. We can apply a simple test to ourselves—what is the effect on us of a service when there is no sermon? The question is best asked of a service other than the Holy Communion, for custom has there inured us to the absence of the sermon. Apart from the question of answers to our prayers, are we more fully in harmony with God than we were when the service began? Now, if our worship is to be definite, if it is to draw us nearer to God, it must be according to the will of God. It is in this connexion that the reading of the Scriptures is of service, for no day need pass without our learning something more of God's will from the reading of His Word. We might almost count the "lessons" a necessity of public worship on these grounds, but the existence of the Litany as a separate service which, no one doubts, may be one of the most real of our acts of public worship, forbids us to insist on the reading of the Bible as a fundamental. The exact place of the lesson is, however, worth investigating. Though we may be used to hearing the Litany by itself, it was originally intended to be said only after Morning Prayer, and this seems to point to the fact that the compilers of our present Prayer Book considered the reading of some part of the Bible as a necessary part of all public worship. Whether or not this was for instructional purposes at a time when the average worshipper was extraordinarily ignorant of Holy Scripture is a debatable point.

We can pass now to the second principle of common worship which arises out of the word "common," and that is comprehensiveness. The service in which so many are to join must meet the needs of all types, though it cannot meet those of all individuals, and of all occasions. It is scarcely necessary to deal with this part of our subject, for the principle is generally recognized, and this

recognition is largely responsible for whatever demand there is from the ordinary worshipper for the revision of the Prayer Book. It has been urged, earlier in this paper, that alternative prayers for the same object suitable to the different types of congregation with which we are all familiar, should be provided within the one Prayer Book. They should be printed together, with the usual "Or This" before the second of them, or the Church will lay itself open to the charge of condescension: nothing would be more likely to estrange the working-classes than to have a special Prayer Book or a special appendix to the Prayer Book for them, and their resentment would be justified. On the other hand, it would probably be best to print all the prayers for use on special occasions together, preferably at the end of the book, where they may most easily be found by the average man or woman who wants to follow what the minister is saying, and to find it before he has finished the prayer. Within each type there are individuals with needs or desires which they want to lay before God, and it is worth making some sacrifice to enable them to do this. The method is simple, though it needs care in its application. Periods of silence should be observed. We approach towards these in the biddings which have become common before the Prayer for the Church Militant, but there is no reason why the custom should be limited to that occasion, and a too common fault is that while subjects for intercession are suggested, very little, if any, time is given the individual to bring them before God. If the bidding is to be followed by audible prayer, a short space of time should intervene in which the members of the congregation may concentrate their thoughts. But there is real opportunity for the use of a bidding without audible prayer. If it is asked: Why have a bidding at all in this case? the answer is that we are considering common worship, and that presupposes a concentration of thought on the part of the whole congregation on one object at one time. "Let us pray for those who have burdens to carry," or some such call to concentration, gives each individual an opportunity to lay his own needs, or those of others for whom he specially wants to pray, before God; while it does not destroy the "common" element in worship, for all are concerned with the same general subject. So we might pray for "those who are sick and those who mourn," and each person present could bring the whole of his intercessory power to bear for those for whom he wanted

to pray when he entered church, or, if there were no such, he would link himself with his fellow-intercessors in their petitions. Those who have tried this method speak highly of its value to themselves, and have received the thanks of members of their congregations for their departure from more traditional ways. It appears to the writer that only by a recognition of this principle of comprehensiveness can we secure the outpouring and the opening of the individual heart which is essential to true worship. There must be responsiveness, or the service becomes the mere repetition of an office, whether a congregation is present or not, and to repeat an office is not, in itself, an act of worship any more than the reception of the Bread and Wine at the Holy Communion is in itself to partake of the Body and Blood of Christ.

II

We pass now to the consideration of our principles under the head of the word "worship," and we treat this as indicating the God-ward side of our approach to Him. If we demand intelligibility and comprehensiveness in our worship, what does God expect in order that we may worship Him in spirit and in truth? Worship is a recognition of worth-ship, so we arrive at once at the principle that our worship must be Scriptural. As has been already remarked, our worship, if it is to be acceptable, must be according to the will of God, and this is revealed in the Bible. The principle enunciated in our Article (VI) about things necessary to salvation applies with equal force to worship. But the term scriptural, as any period of Church history abundantly shows, is liable both to misunderstanding and abuse. In the particular connexion before us now, it must not be interpreted in such a sense as to demand textual proof for every phrase or action, nor on the other hand is the existence of some form of worship in the Bible an argument for our still worshipping in precisely the same manner in the twentieth century. The Bible is undoubtedly a manual of faith, but it is certainly not a manual of worship. The faith is one for all time: it is the faith once for all delivered to the saints; but modes of worship will differ from age to age as man's æsthetic sense changes and as the interpretation of the once-given faith develops. Further, modes of worship will vary according to nationality, because national temperament is distinctive, and the form of our worship is largely a question of

temperament. It is the inalienable right of a national Church to prescribe its own ceremonial, and so to introduce a distinctively national order into its services. We are told, with a certain amount of justification, that the order of our prayers, or, rather, the particular place which a prayer occupies in relation to other prayers (e.g. the Prayer of Humble Access and the Prayer of Oblation in the Communion Office) may have a doctrinal significance, but the principle of Scripturalness will cover this. It demands that there shall be no part of our worship, whether word or deed, which is contrary to the teaching of Holy Scripture interpreted in the light of the life of our Lord Jesus Christ. To define it thus negatively leaves considerable room for variation, but at the same time guards against excess: the last phrase of the definition, for example, denies the right to import the Jewish ritual into our Christian worship. The conformity of our worship to Scripture will rule out all that is meaningless or unworthy, for the Scriptural ideal is " in spirit and in truth," and while " in spirit " is our Lord's protest against the limitation of worship to any particular place, be it Temple or Church, " in truth " is similarly His protest against ignorant forms of worship in so far as they are due to wilful blindness, or the refusal to use the light already received in one's approach to God, or the unwillingness to seek further light and incorporate freshly assimilated truth into prayer and praise.

If we are to worship God acceptably, it is clear that we must bear in mind what we know of His Nature: it is doubtful whether in these days we take sufficient account of God's majesty and holiness. It is altogether right that, as Christians, we should lay chief stress on the Fatherhood of God, but this carries no obligation to exclude the thought of His Kingship, and there is real danger to-day of our losing sight of the awe-inspiring Nature of God. This is shown by the absence of any sense of sin among those outside the churches, and of its seriousness by many of those within. The prevalent idea is that God is very kind; in fact, too kind to expect people in the modern world to live truly Christian lives if they find it hard to overcome temptation. No one thinking along these lines is in the right attitude for worship, and this conception of God is a travesty. This being so, we need to insist more forcibly than we have done on the recognition of God's holiness in our public worship. The experience of Isaiah, of the publican in the

parable, and of many other Biblical characters, besides that of men and women of later date, goes to prove that a realization of our own unworthiness and sinfulness is intimately connected (either as cause or effect) with a realization of the holiness of God. Hence arises the fundamental importance of the penitential parts of common worship, and anything which tends to weaken them should be strenuously resisted. Apart from other considerations, the proposals to shorten the Ten Commandments at Celebrations of the Holy Communion should be carefully examined on these grounds. There cannot be any vital objection to omitting parts of a few verses in Exodus for public reading on specific occasions, merely on the ground of the omission, so long as we divide up paragraphs in the Gospel story and omit part from the lesson. But if the shortening of the Commandments is going to produce the impression that the Church is adopting the average view of God, then it is a bad thing, and whether it is legalized or not (as an alternative) we ought not, for the present, to adopt it. The vital importance of the penitential parts of our services will determine their place in the service in relation to petition and praise. There is a great deal to be said for keeping the confession of sin and the absolution in their present place as an introduction to the rest of the service both at Morning and Evening Prayer and at the Holy Communion, and if penitence is necessary as a preliminary to the reception of the Bread and Wine, it is equally necessary as a preliminary to the daily services, though the point seems to have been overlooked in the discussion of the subject provoked by the various proposals for the revision of the Prayer Book. To insist on penitence in the one case while regarding it as optional in the other, or to insist that the penitence must be deeper in one case than in the other, is to relegate one service to a position of real inferiority. If sin is a turning of the back on the love of God, then confession of sin must come before petition or praise, for it is the act of turning round to the Father again, and, to continue the metaphor, we must face Him before we speak to Him. And if it be urged that many worshippers do not feel in the mood to confess their sins at the opening of the service, it is an argument for strengthening the Exhortation, not for removing the penitential introduction. It seems necessary to say this because there is a more or less widespread feeling that Morning Prayer should begin at " O Lord, open

Thou our lips," whether or not it is to be immediately followed by Holy Communion.

The recognition of the holiness and majesty of God calls forth not only penitence but also praise and adoration, and no act of worship can be regarded as complete which omits these. It is interesting to note that in the Litany, which is pre-eminently the penitential service, the *Gloria* is introduced, and while we may be able to account for its presence in the particular place where it occurs, it is a moot point how many modern liturgists would have put it there—perhaps its place may be due after all to nothing more than the recognition of praise and adoration as an integral part of all worship. This part of common worship may be expressed in two ways, in the "matter" or in the "form" of the service. The *Gloria Patri* and the *Gloria in Excelsis* are two obvious examples of this acknowledgment of God for what He is in Himself rather than for what He is in relation to His creatures. There is a wonderful instance of it in David's parting message (1 Chron. xxix. 10–16), and again in Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the Temple (1 Kings viii. 23 ff.), while it was the same spirit which prompted him to such liberal offerings as are recorded in 1 Kings viii. 62 ff. The same spirit may be expressed in the manner in which the service is rendered: a dignified service is in itself an act of praise, and conversely a slipshod service is an act of dishonour to God. We may be sure that anything which adds reverence to our worship is acceptable to God as an expression of our recognition of His holiness and majesty.

There remains one other principle of our common worship, considered in its God-ward aspect, and that is the recognition of the Fatherhood of God. This is the distinctively Christian part of our worship, because God's Fatherhood is the distinctive point of our Lord's revelation of Him. It will permeate all the rest of our worship, so that there will be no confession of sin which does not base itself on the love of the Father, no petition which fails to take account of the fact that the Father is always more ready to hear than we to pray and is wont to give far more than we desire or deserve, no praise that thinks of God as a far-off monarch and does not remember that He is the Father of those who would offer Him the best sacrifice of which they are capable, unworthy though they know it to be. Because God is Father no act of worship is

complete which does not include petition. He delights to hear the requests of His children; it is His joy that they should bring all their needs to Him. Because God is Father we have boldness, freedom of speech, as we draw near to the throne of grace, and it matters not with what burden or what overflowing joy we come to public worship, the remembrance of God's Fatherhood will determine its spirit. But it will also include a thankful recognition of the redemptive work of Christ through whom alone we have access and to whom we would unite ourselves as we approach the God and Father of us all. It is on the foundation which He has laid by His atoning life and death that we stand: it is because He has opened the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers that we draw near, and we shall remember this with thanksgiving, for thanksgiving is the other side of petition, and our sense of dependence on the Father will prompt us continually to thank Him for our creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life; but above all for His inestimable love in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ.

In *Put Forth by the Moon*, by Hubert L. Simpson (Hodder & Stoughton, 7*s.* 6*d.*), the writer preaches to the untheologically minded, but he deals with problems that interest theologians and presents them with a rare felicity of exposition and a burning earnestness that recall the Robertson addresses, which are as fresh to-day as when they were preached. He takes an out-of-the-way text and without straining its meaning proves its applicability to contemporary life. He makes his reader sit up and think, and if his pulpit manner be at all equal to his literary skill he cannot fail to make a deep impression. The twenty sermons, dealing with such questions as Michal putting the image to bed, Samson and the Gaza temple, and "Another Name," all have their message, and we confess that when we began to read the book we had no idea that we should spend so many hours consecutively with its discourses. The truth is old truth—the manner of exposition is new. The illustrations are unhackneyed and suggestive; the underlying note is evangelical, and if at times we disagree with the line taken—why, this only proves the preacher thinks for himself and is not the slave of any school of exposition.

INDIAN THOUGHT AND CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION.

By the Rev. P. Gonzalez Bridge, Acting Principal of St. John's College, Calcutta.

THE late Bishop Westcott is credited with the remark that we stand as yet in need of an exhaustive commentary on St. John's Gospel, and the learned prelate was hoping that an Indian Christian would Christianize some of the wonderfully inspiring teaching of the Gita (the Lord's Song) and fill up this lamentable gap. Of late years there has been a considerable increase in the output and circulation of Indian and other Eastern literature, owing mainly to the strenuous efforts of missionary organizations, helped no doubt to a very large extent by cultural societies; and many who have come into contact with Eastern ideas and Eastern outlook on the problem of existence begin to feel that the Bishop was right, and that the East has a most valuable message for the West. We would do well and would learn most valuable lessons if, under the guidance of a seer like Rabindranath Tagore, we endeavour to penetrate into the somewhat mysterious teaching of the East. Perhaps these lessons, new to many of us, would put fresh life into the bones of a Western world, wellnigh dead to spiritual values and all but crushed under the heavy weight of ponderous machinery. The phraseology is doubtless strange, and we have to confess that more than ever we did put aside such fascinating books as Tagore's *Sadhana*; but the results should stimulate us to put forth an extra amount of intellectual energy. Perhaps the very novel form in which Eastern ideas are presented to us may prove both an incentive and an inspiration to many, enticing them to reflect upon religious problems, which are, after all, the most vital of all.

Let it be stated at the very outset that Indian thought supplies us with a solution to the problems of existence, which, though tentative, as finality in this case seems to be baffling us still, appears to us to be more akin to Christian ideas than most of our Western thinking is. Doubtless some of the Upanishadic ideas and many of the expressions so familiar to Indian seers could be construed

as to give a hopelessly pessimistic outlook on life; and one does frequently meet with expressions which seem to point to a total extinction of personality and individuality on reaching life's goal, Brahma. But Tagore reminds us of the fact that "man is never literal in the expression of his ideas, except in matters most trivial." And do not Western mystics and poets use language which, if taken literally, could be interpreted as implying annihilation of man's personality in his union with God? The average Western thinker can, without difficulty, see clearly from the pinnacle of his isolation the disastrous consequences a monistic basis of life leads to. The force of his logical argumentation drives his opponent to obliterate distinction, to squash differences, and to do away with one of the most cherished of Western notions of individuality, which is no doubt a veritable *impasse*. But the Eastern thinker, on the other hand, sees, with no less lucidity, the appalling consequences of a dualistic position with all the suspicion and hatred it engenders and with all the desire for personal aggrandisement to the detriment of our fellow-men that it fosters. But we must not anticipate our line of argument.

We pass first of all to put before the reader what we consider to be extremely suggestive thoughts concerning our relation to the universe and to nature around us. A religiously minded person, in thinking out the mystery of existence, and his or her place in the world, is sooner or later confronted with a bewildering problem, the problem of harmonizing the material with the spiritual, the temporal with the eternal, the self, the individual, with the non-self, the universe at large and other intelligent beings. And in the presence of these two seemingly opposite beings, the thinking person will be forced to pronounce on their relative values. For it seems inevitable that a theoretical valuation should precede our moral decision of identifying ourselves with either of them. Now, most of our Western thought starts from a peremptory dualistic position, which sets two classes of things one against the other. The temporal is conceived as in opposition to the eternal; the individual is viewed in constant conflict with the universe to maintain his claims; man is imagined as wrestling with the hidden forces of nature, and the material is held to be alienated from the spiritual. Do not certain sets of words we delight in using suggest this alienation? Man strives to wrest out of nature

the secrets she is supposed to guard jealously from man. We are proud of our scientific conquests, of extending our possessions, unmindful of the fact that our possessions are our limitations, of enlarging the range of our dominions, and of asserting, more or less to our satisfaction, our fictitious rights to supremacy over the rest of the world of nature. A natural sequel to this attitude of mind is an over-developed instinct of pugnacity. Ample scope is furthermore supplied to our self-assertiveness. This dualism secures for us likewise recognition, a hankering after which seems to form part of our Western character. No wonder that real Christianity, apart from formal and traditional religious practices disfiguring themselves under that name, has not permeated more deeply the social life of the West and has not influenced more powerfully its mental outlook. The West, after centuries of Christianity, still clings pertinaciously to the idea that accumulated wealth is a mark of superiority. Our possessions and our treasures are held to be distinctive criterion of greatness, in spite of Christ's injunction to the contrary.

The main feature, on the other hand, of Indian thought is the essential harmony between man's spirit and the universe, between the individual and nature. India has ever upheld that a kind of kinship spreads throughout the whole realm of existence, linking up everything in an intimate consortium of beings. India knows nothing of mutual jealousies and of irreconcilable enmities between man and nature. The Indian thinkers do discern diverse strata in the scale of beings, but do not discern alienation between them. "The fundamental unity of creation was not simply a philosophical speculation for India," writes Tagore, "it was her life-object, this great harmony in feeling and in action." The Indian seer's aim has always been to see God through the veil of finite existences, to salute Him in everything in the world and bow before Him everywhere. Bishop Lightfoot pays a very warm tribute of admiration to Cleanthes' hymn, a Christian hymn penned by a heathen seer. In it Cleanthes salutes God as "the Father of all, which is above all, and through all and in you all." And do not those beautiful lines of the Apocrypha contain the same inspiring truth :

> Lift up the stone and you will find me,
> Cleave the wood and there I am.

In consequence of this, we do not find in Indian thought those ideas of conflict and struggle with the cosmos which we notice to figure so prominently in our Western vocabulary. The Westerner sees in the phenomena of nature only instruments for his own aggrandisement. The sight of a cascade sends through his nervous system a most pleasing sensation of anticipated wealth. The water will easily be transformed by his magic power into electricity, and this into wealth; while the Indian sees in its crystalline purity a symbol and a sacrament of God. Obsessed with the idea of his own aggrandisement, the Westerner is bound to miss the inward meaning and the deep significance of natural phenomena. He will read in them only that which furthers his own selfish ends and what secures the gratification of his personal desires. No wonder, then, if the Westerner has no ears to hear the message that the soft breezes of the spring morning bring to him, nor eyes to see God's beauty in the multi-coloured hues of the meadows. No, he has an eye on business, which is a different way of saying that he has an eye on *himself*. "When we look at the world," writes Tagore, "through the veil of our desires we make it small and narrow and fail to perceive its full truth. Of course it is obvious that the world serves us and fulfils our needs, but our relation to it does not end there. We are bound to it with a deeper and truer bond than that of necessity. Our soul is drawn to it; our love of life is really our wish to continue our relation with this great world. This relation is one of love . . . this world is our compeer, nay, we are one with it. Through our progress in science, the wholeness of the world and our oneness with it is becoming clearer to our mind." (*Sadhana*, p. 112.) And in the same chapter he tacitly answers the objection of those who would be scandalized at the insinuation of *oneness* with the world and the Supreme Spirit. "In love all the contradictions of existence merge themselves and are lost. Only in love are unity and duality not at variance. Love must be one and two at the same time." "In this wonderful festival of creation, this great ceremony of self-sacrifice of God, the lover constantly gives himself up to gain himself in love. Indeed, love is what brings together and inseparably connects both the act of abandoning and that of receiving." And out of such premises, the conclusion would naturally flow that "wherever there is a bit of colour, a note of song, a grace

of form, there comes *the call for our love.*" And the essential condition to hear the call of love and to answer it is readiness not to get, but to give, not to enlarge the self in its distinctness and isolation, but to enlarge it by fusion with a larger self.

It is pleasing to see a distinguished Western scholar giving expression to the same views. Sir Oliver Lodge says in his *Man and the Universe,* in this connection : " Realize that you are part of a great orderly and mutually helpful cosmos—that you are not stranded or isolated in a foreign universe, but that you are part of it and closely akin to it—and your sense of sympathy will be enlarged, your power of free communication will be opened, and the heartfelt aspiration and communion and petition that we call prayer will come as easily and as naturally as converse with those human friends and relations whose visible bodily presence gladdens and enriches your present life." (*Man and the Universe,* p. 80.)

The great scientist is right. There is only one key which will open to us far and wide this mysterious nature, and that key is Sympathy. If we knock at her doors with the armed fist of a warrior, anxious to plunder and eager to carry away rich booty, Nature is sure to redouble her efforts in concealing from us her secrets.

To realize the importance of this attitude of mind towards the non-living world, we would do well to consider that it is bound to influence our thinking both in regard to our social relationships and our religious life. For once we have established ourselves successfully on a pedestal of glory, constituting ourselves as centres of reference of the material world, isolating ourselves from the same, and finally building up a castle of refuge against the onslaughts of a relentless enemy, it will inevitably prove extremely difficult not to extend the same treatment to our fellow-men. With the self looming so large in our own lives, everything around us is bound to lose importance. After falling into the habit of looking at everything as means to an end, it will not be at all easy to make an exception in favour of man, one out of many objects of the visible world. Western ethics, one would be inclined to admit, had reached their culmination in that austere maxim of a severe master, Kant. The dignity of a rational nature is such that it should never be distorted and made into means to something else : it is an end in itself. The faultless dialectical reasoning

of the author of the *Critique* will doubtless carry conviction to the mind, but unfortunately in questions of morals the theoretical argumentation is not enough; and one would doubt if Kant's maxim supplies the *driving* force as well, the controlling and motive power to action.

Tagore, as an exponent of Indian thought, in spite of expressions which might be construed as pantheistic, is human. Analysing the basis of our social relationships, he goes to the root of the matter when he says: "When we know him [man] as a spirit, we know him *as our own.* [Italics ours.] We at once feel that cruelty to him is cruelty to ourselves, to make him small is stealing from our own humanity, and in seeking to make use of him solely for personal profit we merely gain in money or comfort what we pay for in truth." And in other places he deplores the various forms of cannibalism that have existed and darkened our civilization, foretelling also its own destruction. "Civilization can never sustain itself upon cannibalism of any form." "It is *self-deception* on a large scale. Our desires blind us to the *truth* that there is in man, and this is the greatest wrong done by ourselves to our *own* soul. It deadens our consciousness, and is but a gradual method of spiritual suicide. It produces ugly sores in the body of civilization, gives rise to its hovels and brothels, its vindictive penal codes, its cruel prison systems, its organized method of exploiting foreign races to the extent of permanently injuring them by depriving them of the discipline of self-government and means of self-defence." (*Sadhana*, p. 109, and *passim.*)

The famous words of the Stoic emperor convey the same idea: "For we are made for co-operation, like feet, like hands, like eyelids, like the rows of the upper and lower teeth." "So too a man when he is separated from another man has fallen off from the whole social community." Now, when Tagore emphasizes the fact of our oneness with our fellow-men, and ultimately with the Supreme Spirit, we are apt to dismiss him summarily with the remark that he is tainted with Pantheism. It is not our intention to discuss the grounds of this condemnation, we are more concerned with living ideas than with dead nomenclatures, but is not St. John's argument for brotherly love identical in spirit, though perhaps raised to a higher plane? This we find condensed in his first Epistle, chapter iv. 20: "If a man say, I love God, and

hateth his brother, he is a liar ; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen ? " St. John tacitly assumes that man is, if we may be allowed to put it so, the visible aspect God, and from such premise the conclusion is most forcibly drawn that hatred of the visible manifestation of God is quite incompatible with sincere and honest love of the invisible God. Only on the strength of *Diiestis* St. John's argument can be cogent at all.

Then finally in the attempt to throw new light on the supreme paradox of all religious experiences, one is bound to admit that Indian thought supplies us with a basis of explanation suggestive of the Christian interpretation. Bishop Temple has well said that the main business of all religions is to transform us out of selfishness into love. The mystery of the Cross has to some extent to be reproduced in the lives and experiences of every believer. The wisdom of the ages incarnate in our Lord and Master has said it and there is no room for doubtful questioning. We can save our life only by throwing it away ; the road to life is death to oneself. Not getting, but giving absolutely and completely is the way to riches and wealth. What is the appeal of Western thought to draw us out of our selfishness and to transform us into love ? Modern psychology is perplexed with the problem, and is struggling to find a telling message.

In our humble opinion Barry touches the central point when he writes : " The self-centred life is never unified ; it is ever fightings without and fears within." We cannot identify ourselves with a higher purpose, a nobler ideal, unless we convince ourselves of utter insufficiency. To know the limitations of ourselves and to cease seeking ourselves, are identical. " The chick knows when it breaks through the self-centred isolation of its egg that the hard shell which covered it so long was not really a part of its life." And how this unification of all our efforts is to be accomplished, Barry explains as follows : " And because, as Christians hold, that the Master is the revelation of the soul of the world, his life will be completed and made his own in growing correspondence and accord with the will that rules the universe. He has found the truth, and the truth will make him free."

Tagore in his teaching starts from a similar assumption. Life, for the Upanishadic seers, is immense. In consequence to realize

oneself is essential to " cross the limiting barriers of the individual, to become more than man, to become one with the all." " In order to be fully conscious of the reality of the all, man has to be free himself from the bonds of personal desires." This discipline we have to go through to prepare ourselves for our social duties—for sharing the burdens of our fellow-beings. Every endeavour to attain a larger life requires of man " to gain by giving away, and not to be greedy. And then to expand gradually the consciousness of one's unity with all is the striving of humanity." A self-centred life separates itself from the all-pervading life of the universe. No member in our physical bodies can grow if it wilfully cuts itself away from the life-giving centre; and the same is true in the great republic of spirits.

Two ideas seem to be central in St. John's Gospel, the oneness of Christ with His Father and the revelation of God through His Incarnate Son. Both of these ideas are emphasized over and over again throughout the Gospel. And it is very significant that these very same ideas seem to dominate the ancient thought of India as interpreted to us by Tagore. Who were the rishis? The rishis were those who having reached the supreme God from all sides had found abiding peace, had become united with all, had entered into the life of the universe. " If man apprehends God," says a seer of the Upanishads, " he becomes God." " The deepest and most earnest prayer," says Tagore, " that has ever risen from the human heart has been uttered in our ancient tongue: *O Thou self-revealing one, reveal Thyself in me.*" (*Sadhana*, p. 37.)

The ancient Upanishadic seer was anxious to be made a channel for God's manifestation, a reflection of His attribute and the mirror of His glory. But we have in Christ the fulfilment of that earnest desire. On the eve of His passion, Christ uttered that wonderful prayer that has been preserved for us by St. John. In it, not boastfully, but out of the conviction of his own consciousness, Christ tells us that He has accomplished that for which the Upanishadic seer prayed: " I have glorified Thee on earth . . . I have manifested Thy name. I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest Me." This surely is the mission and purpose in life of every one of us, to let the eternal light in us shine through us; not to hinder the manifestation of the Eternal Spirit through us. Was not this the supreme purpose of the Incarnation? And we,

also, who are in smaller measure, infinitely smaller measure than Christ was, the temple and abode of God, should aim at that same thing. Oh, if at the end of our days we could say as truly as Jesus said, "I have manifested Thy name"—"O Thou self-revealing One, Thou hast revealed Thyself in me"!

It has been pointed out (cf. McKenzie's *Hindu Ethics*) that the distinctive feature of Hindu mysticism is that it aims at unity, oneness with the Supreme Spirit, while the true Christian mystic aims not at unity but at union. The fact is that when we attempt to describe in precise philosophical language what actually takes place in that supreme moment when it is given us to apprehend God, to see Him face to face, we have to resort to analogical terms which fail to express exactly the meaning. Thomas Aquinas maintains that in the act of apprehension the intellect and the species *intelligibilis* become more intimately one than *materia* and *forma* become one in constituting actually existing things. Christ Incarnate is still to-day a mystery; for the simple reason that the human mind fails to grasp how the union of the divine and the human could be accomplished without resulting into a unity. And until we explain the mystery of the God-Man in Jesus Christ, we shall not be any nearer to the solution of the problem of our ultimate union in God. The Western clings tenaciously to his own personality and individuality and in consequence discountenances anything that is likely to suppress it or destroy it; the Eastern, on the other hand, seems to hold unconsciously what we might call a depreciated opinion of himself, and is in consequence more ready *to lose himself*, to die to himself, in order to attain Life.

MODERNISM AND CHRISTOLOGY.

By the Rev. H. Lawrence Phillips, M.A., Rector of Poole.

THE term Modernism was first of all applied to the attempt associated with the names of Loisy, Tyrrell, and Duchesne, made within the Roman Church to bring her teaching and the expression of her doctrine more into touch with modern thought and the fuller knowledge possessed by our day and generation. The movement was a comparatively short-lived one, and (as might be expected) was soon condemned by the Papacy; and some of its leaders resisting, were crushed.

In the freer atmosphere of the Anglican Communion an attempt professedly similar in character is being made, and has received rather more attention from the outside world than perhaps might have been expected, because of the utterances, published broadcast, of its more extreme leaders. The movement deserves consideration and notice, and its demands must be weighed and judged. Rome has settled the question by the voice of authority; we cannot, and perhaps happily so. The movement must pass through the furnace of criticism with us, and the only answer we can give will be the outcome of that criticism. Reason and scholarship must answer, rejecting or accepting the positions taken up in the name of reason and scholarship. The demand that is made by Modernism is that as "Christian theology is the science of Christianity . . . it needs a developing theology . . . and will therefore require from time to time a re-expression of truths, none the less true because they are old, or because they must be regarded in connection with other truths, newly or differently discerned."[1] Or, put in another way by Canon Glazebrook: "The more thoughtful part of the English-speaking world, dissatisfied with the traditional Christology, which dates from the fourth century, is groping anxiously for some more adequate expression of that faith in Jesus Christ which it shares with fifty past generations."[2] With these demands it is not necessary for us to quarrel, but we are bound to inquire, firstly, whether it is necessary that they should be made, and in the next place whether

[1] Caillard, *A Living Christianity*, p. 2.
[2] *Modern Churchman* (Sept. 1921), p. 201.

the answers given by the Modernists are sufficient, for we have the feeling that whatever, if any, their failings may be, the ancient creeds do supply an adequate answer.

I suppose that we are all prepared to accept the position that each generation must have Christ interpreted to them in the language it can understand and in the light of the full knowledge we possess. Our concern is that the truths and ideas preserved in the language we use concerning the Christ shall be perfect. Our quarrel with the Modernist is that his explanations do not preserve those truths, or, at least, are so stated as to seriously imperil them.

Let us bear in mind what is to be explained. It is the Person and Work of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Incarnation and the Atonement. What we demand is that any explanation which is given shall be adequate to explain these two great truths. The Incarnation is the centre of the world's history, and at the heart of the Incarnation lies the Atonement. As Dr. Headlam has said: "If you cut out the idea of the Atonement from the Gospel narrative, you are depriving it of everything which gives it real and logical consistency."[1] For an adequate explanation of the Incarnation, nothing but a declaration that in Christ dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily suffices. That He is God in all that constitutes and is essential to the Divine nature, I quote Dr. Ottley: "The Incarnation was no mere presence of God in a man, no mere mode of mystical indwelling, no mere moral relationship, such as may subsist among friends. It was a real, permanent, indissoluble union of two perfect natures, divine and human; an assumption of manhood into personal unity with a divine being, so that the Godhead employs the manhood as an organ, and wears it as a vesture, so that all the acts and efficacy of the human nature properly belong to the Godhead."[2] And similarly, for an explanation of the truth of the Incarnation, we need the acceptance of the full belief of the true human nature of our Lord in all that constitutes and is essential to human nature.

What are we offered in the place of this? We are asked, by Mr. Major, Editor of the *Modern Churchman*, if we will "accept the affirmation 'God was in Christ' with the practical recognition in daily life that 'Jesus is Lord' as constituting the irreducible

[1] *Three Sermons on the Atonement*, p. 7.
[2] Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 464, Art. "Incarnation."

minimum for Modernist membership in the Church and in the teaching and ministerial offices." [1] I venture to think that the Unitarian can go as far as this without straining his conscience, and that such a creed is an inadequate statement of the facts and truths of Christ, but I am sure that many Modernists, to speak quite fairly, would say, "this is indeed the minimum." [2]

Concerning the reality of the human nature there is no dispute. It is, in their anxiety to make this plain, that the truth of His divine nature suffers. As Mr. Emmet said at the Cambridge Conference: "Drs. Lake and Foakes-Jackson appear to give us the picture of a very commonplace and uninspiring prophet, differing from the prophet of the Liberal Protestant, in that He only taught much what other people had already taught, except for a few original remarks which were either quite untrue or quite unpractical." [3] And his words of criticism are quite justified when he says: "Such a view explains neither the figure of Jesus as given us in the Gospels, nor the impact of Jesus on His age." "We want to be shown," says Canon Scott Holland in criticizing an earlier book of Dr. Kirsopp Lake, "why a certain Personality was overwhelmingly paramount, and we are told that it wasn't." [4]

With others their belief in the divinity of our Lord would seem to rest upon the fact that all human nature has in it something of the divine, though in Christ this was perfectly manifest. They almost speak as if God was evolved from humanity. Or, to put it in another way, they seem to hover on the verge of a declaration that in all men there is something akin to God. And that in Jesus Christ, the perfect man, there is the fullness of this God-likeness, and His claim to be divine rests upon this fact, and not upon the truth that the divine, eternally existing God assumes human nature in the Incarnation. "The primary and fundamental condition is the fact that the being of God and the being of man are indissolubly interrelated." [5] "Man is not merely the creature and plaything of God; that there is a certain community of nature between God and man, that all human minds are reproductions

[1] Editor, *Modern Churchman* (Sept. 1921), p. 200.
[2] See e.g. Rashdall, *Jesus Human and Divine.*
[3] *Modern Churchman*, p. 216. The Conference as a whole seem to have agreed to Mr. Emmet's condemnation of the learned doctors.
[4] *Creeds and Critics*, p. 29.
[5] Dr. Bethune Baker, *Modern Churchman*, pp. 292, 299.

'in limited modes' . . . of the Divine Mind, that in all the human thinking there is a reproduction of the Divine thought, and above all, that in the highest ideals which the human conscience recognizes there is a revelation of the ideal eternally present in the Divine Mind—these are the presuppositions under which alone any real meaning can be given to the doctrine "—of the Incarnation.[1] Dr. Rashdall, indeed, sees the possibility of the danger of this line of thought, and safeguards the statement by reminding us that, however, "there is much in human nature which is not divine at all."[2] And the line of thought does need safeguarding, for that way pantheism lies, and I venture to think it provides us with very insecure ground upon which to build the truth of the essential divinity of Christ. That rests upon other fuller and more secure foundations.

We may admit what is said concerning the "ideal eternally present in the Divine Mind" to be correct, but must not the same statement be made concerning all created things? The universe potentially exists eternally in the Divine Mind, and only in time comes into being, but having been created, in neither its whole or parts do we identify it with the Creator, for though Immanent, He is yet Transcendent. Man is, indeed, we may believe, an "ideal eternally present in the Divine Mind," but not to be thought of, therefore, as Divine or part of the Divine, when as created he takes his place in the universe, other than as we so think of the rest of the universe.[3] The Christian faith is not that the ideal human becomes Incarnate in Christ, but that God, in Whom that ideal is eternally present, became so Incarnate. Timeless in His eternal reality as God, in time He comes in the reality of Manhood to be the perfect revelation of God, and the full satisfaction for our sins. So John's words in Revelation xiii. 8, "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," may be borne in mind in their connection.

Let me remind you that the sources of our Christology are primarily the Holy Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments. I would emphasize this point, for the Old Testament receives rather less than the attention it deserves in this connection, but without the Old Testament much of our Lord's personality would

[1] *Jesus Human and Divine*, pp. 17, 18.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 19.
[3] Cf. A. Fawkes, *Studies in Modernism*. "Christ was perfectly human, not in spite of His being, but precisely because He was divine."

be unintelligible, and the process of God's revelation obscure. I do not at this point lay stress upon Messianic prophecy and so on, but rather upon the history of the development of God's revelation so clearly pointed out by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, i. 1: "God, Who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by *a Son*." But here we are rather in difficulties with our Modernist friends, and fail to find a common ground of agreement. For them the criticism of the Old Testament has reached the point of "assured results." What these are definitely it is difficult to find out, and seem to vary from time to time, but meanwhile, by processes which do not always commend themselves as scientific, by ignoring the arguments of conservative scholars, by concealing the many times they have had to retrace their steps, they would tell us that our argument, such as it is, when drawn from the Old Testament, must be very much modified by critical conclusions. With regard to the New Testament we are in a similar state. Mr. Major tells us: "Unless, therefore, those who discuss together the theme of 'Christ and the Creeds' have adopted *modern methods* in the study of the New Testament (we do not say *recent conclusions*), no possible agreement can be reached and little good can be done by the discussion." [1] But is not this to claim judgment before trial? The modern methods may not be accepted by us, for the simple reason that we do not feel them to be true or scientific. We seem to be invited to a duel without the choice of weapons or ground. Our opponents choose the weapons that please them, and (shall I say it?) take up their position with their back to the sun! Take as an example of modern methods: "The New Testament remains only the expression of what Jesus had come to mean for the Christians of the first century A.D., and therefore cannot be a final Christology." [2] Do we accept that? Or shall we say with Loisy: "There does not remain in the Gospel but an echo only, necessarily weakened and rather confused, of the word of Jesus." [3] And, of course, where the Synoptics are treated in this fashion the Fourth Gospel is also barred as a source of historical evidence.

[1] *Modern Churchman*, p. 194.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 306. Rev. R. G. Parsons.
[3] Quoted by Fawkes, *Studies in Modernism*, p. 296.

But the wonder of the Gospels remains. And it is this. Presenting, as they do, a Personality unique among the sons of men, they yet are perfectly free from excess, they preserve a balance, and in a marvellous manner give us the picture of the Christ in Whom the writers recognize the twofold nature at once, human and divine. This carries with it the evidence of historical truth. Let me illustrate what I mean by calling to your mind the picture presented by the miracle of quelling the storm on the lake. There you have the Master, physically exhausted and worn by His labours, asleep on the pillow; a perfectly human picture in all its details. Then at the fearful cry of the disciples, the awakening and the "Peace be still," and the great calm as nature obeys its Lord's command. Can you think that such a picture of the human weakness and Divine power could have been painted without a model? Either the humanity or divinity must have been out of proportion if this were the outcome and expression of "what Jesus had come to mean for the Christians of the first century." You only need to read the Apocryphal Gospels to see what an imaginary Christ is supposed to do.

The history of Christology is the history of the endeavour to preserve this balance, and orthodoxy has corresponded to the success of that endeavour. Heresy has meant its disturbance, and either, by the disturbance of that balance in the one direction or the other, has imperilled the verities of both natures. And I venture to think that the recognition of the reality of the human nature has depended very much upon the proper recognition of the divine. Had Arius triumphed, for instance, the perfectly true and human figure of the Christ would have disappeared from the Church's sight, and I venture to think that the same peril to the human nature of the Christ exists to-day in some of the semi-Arian presentations of His personality.

That our Lord's was a human life in all its perfection and fullness is plainly stated in the Gospels. He lives and speaks and suffers as one Who, indeed, in the days of His flesh, "learned obedience by the things He suffered." And I think the fullness and reality of His human nature is most manifest by the life of prayer which He lived. For prayer is the expression of the sense of human need and weakness, and of our reliance upon divine strength. That He prayed, I venture to think, makes certain the fact that

He met and overcame all the temptations of our nature by those helps and aids that God in His power bestows in answer to the cry of human weakness. Only with Him the strength perfectly asked and given was perfectly used, and thus, though "tempted in all points like us, as we are," He was "yet without sin."

Of course, when we come to examine the conditions of that life, of "that mystery of Godliness," we are naturally face to face with difficulties which are apparently insurmountable. To the idea of God belongs that of omnipotence, omniscience, and the unceasing, eternal, limitless energy which, bringing all things into being, preserves them in being. To the idea of man there belong contrasts and opposites. To him belong limitations of time and space and understanding. It is of the nature of the sacrifice of love that He accepted these, and whatever else may be understood by His self-emptying (κενωσις), the fact of His acceptance of those limitations must be recognized. Says Van Oosterzee: "The Son of God, become truly man, in this condition reveals also His divine attributes only in a human, that is to say, relative and finite, manner. The personal possession of those attributes remains unchanged, just as really as He remains the Logos; but the manifestation and exercise thereof is to a great extent modified, when He Who was in the form of God, in the Incarnation voluntarily divested Himself of that which belonged to Him. In a very sound sense can we thus speak of the self-limitation of the eternal Logos, in consequence of which He, once become man, manifests His glory upon earth, not in an absolute and adequate form, but in a relative and approximate one. The Son of God in Himself was undoubtedly omniscient and omnipotent; but the incarnate Son of God shows clearly enough that He does not, in point of fact, know every contingent circumstance, and that He is limited in a peculiar manner, not, indeed, in the possession of that miraculous power, but yet in the employment thereof." [1]

It is necessary, as I have said, to bear this fact of the self-limitation of the Christ in mind, but it is also well to bear in mind, in view of many questions that arise, another fact, and it is this. By the coming of the Christ a new and unique personality is manifested among the sons of men in that He is perfectly sinless. What the effect of a sinless personality may be upon the perception and

[1] *Christian Dogmatism*, p. 514.

knowledge of truth it is difficult for us to say, but I venture to think that the effect is not small, and that the very free statements that have been made concerning our blessed Lord's limitation of knowledge to the exact limits of that of His own day need to be carefully scrutinized.

Bearing in mind the conditions of our Lord's earthly life, Dean Rashdall's statement that He did not claim divinity for Himself [1] is rather beside the mark. In the nature of those conditions it would be impossible to conceive Him in the process of the revelation of God to say baldly, "I am God." But that claim is implicit in all His utterances. "Ye have heard that it was said of them of old time . . . but I say unto you." Here is a consciousness of authority that goes far beyond the human, and I would ask you to bear in mind that the words quoted were spoken in connection with the moral law, the "Ten Commandments." Again, what are we to make of His words, "All things are delivered unto Me of My Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." [2] Surely this suggests a "consciousness of unique relation towards God," and not merely "the attitude which He wished that all men should adopt towards God," [3] as Dr. Rashdall puts it. In the same way I venture to question whether by applying the term "Son of God" to Himself it is right to say, as Dean Rashdall does, "to Jewish ears this does not imply Godhead." [4] If I read my Gospels aright, the condemnation of our Lord was only achieved by His enemies when the High Priest put the question, "Art Thou the Christ, the Son of the blessed?" and upon our Lord's confession, "I am," He was condemned for blasphemy. Why, unless they recognized a claim to Deity? The force of this fact seems to be unrecognized by the Modernist.[5] I cannot think that we are far from the truth when we say that He claimed to be God, and died because of that claim.

The question arises, admitting the perfection of the human personality and the divine in the one Christ, how can we explain the union without losing something of the perfection of one or

[1] *Jesus Human and Divine*, pp. 11 and 37. [2] Matt. xi. 27.
[3] *Jesus Human and Divine.*
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
[5] Cf. Peake's *Commentary*, p. 698. But see also *Modern Churchman*, (Sept. 1921), p. 305.

the other of the personalities? I believe that it is a question rather to be asked than answered, and that ultimately it is a truth rather for humble faith than for intellectual understanding, and, in this respect, like to the question of the unity in the Godhead. *That* we cannot understand or give any explanation of, yet we accept it, forced to this by demands stronger than those of our intelligence; the demands of the spiritual nature. And in like measure to explain the perfect union of the two perfect natures is beyond us, but the same demand is felt, strong and insistent, of a spiritual need; the craving of our humanity for union with God, which can only find its satisfaction in the belief that our nature has been assumed by God and linked with His in perfect unity, and through oneness with Christ we are one with God.

There is, indeed, a suggestion put forth by one of the later Greek writers, and stated with much force by Dr. Relton in his *Studies in Christology*, that seems to shed some light upon the problem. I think that it may be briefly summed up thus. In the Godhead there is that which corresponds to our humanity in the image of which man is made. This includes, of course, since it is the perfect humanity, all that we understand by personality. As the greater contains the less, so the personality of the Godhead contains the personality of the manhood, and so they may be conceived of as distinct, yet one. Christ in His Incarnation manifests that which is truly human in God, and the Incarnation expresses not all of the thought of God, but a truth of His eternal being.

Here, of course, we are struggling in the dark waters of speculative thought, but I venture to think that some gleam of light is cast across those waters by the suggestion.

But to refuse to accept because we cannot explain is a mistake which we only seem to make in dealing with religious beliefs, but I think that the recognition of the limitation of human intelligence is the highest wisdom with respect to them. To imagine that human intelligence must be satisfied before any truth can be accepted, and to attempt to explain the mysteries of the Kingdom of God in terms of human reason only, used to be called rationalism, and I am afraid that of some modernism it may be said that the "new modernism is but the old rationalism," however short or long it may be written. Listen to these words: "The

extreme rationalistic school represents, of course, a deliberate predetermination to reduce every doctrine of revelation, and every element of religious life as exhibited in the Scriptures, within the limits of natural knowledge." [1] These words seem a very up-to-date description of the Modernist position. They were spoken over forty years ago by a Bampton lecturer, still, we are glad to say, living, and as strong a champion now as then for the faith. I speak of the venerable Dean Wace, whose words they were.

The reasoning of Modernism we may find ourselves sometimes unable to controvert, but its explanations, felt to be inadequate to the faith and experience of the Christian believer, will be surely refuted by that spiritual discernment which is the gift of the indwelling Spirit. It is said that these questions cannot be settled by the old Christian in her cottage with her Bible on her knees. Perhaps this is so of questions of pure scholarship. But the question is not only, or even mainly, that. It is a question that is in the realm of spiritual writers, and here the old lady in the cottage is the equal, and sometimes the superior, of the scholar in his study. Religion is a matter of experience, and the living union of the believing soul with the Christ produces such a result that any explanation of His effect upon the soul is inadequate unless it recognizes in the fullest and most explicit manner in Him a personality perfectly human and perfectly divine, that does not see in Him the fullness of humanity and the fullness of the Godhead.

I have left myself but little space to speak of the Atonement. Properly speaking, I suppose it may be said to be outside the limits of my subject. Yet I feel that a Christology that omits the Atonement is very imperfect. Canon Barnes preached the closing sermon at the Cambridge Conference, and a very beautiful sermon it was. He said: "I am an Evangelical; I cannot call myself a Modernist." He felt, I should imagine, a little doubtful as to some of the things said there. "One or two of the speakers," as he put it, "in discussing subjects where language cannot adequately express feeling, have seemed to doubt whether the Jesus of history was the unique Person in Whom St. Paul and St. John saw the only-begotten Son." May it not be that this is the cause why that Conference seemed, to quote him again, "to avoid

[1] *The Foundation of Faith*, p. 14.

questions concerning reconciliation, redemption, salvation. I regret," he says, "the omission because such matters are central in Christian experience." Thus speaks not only the scholar, but also the believer, and such a statement is welcome from such a source. The Atonement is, indeed, vital in any Christian scheme of belief. The Modernist is often fond of quoting St. Paul's words in 2 Cor. v. 19, "God was in Christ," but they do not complete so often the words of St. Paul, "reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." The words are vital. If in the first part of the sentence we see the statement of the Incarnation, in the second part there is the statement of its purpose. They cannot be separated. The method of reconciliation was the Cross; the efficacy of it depended upon the reality of the twofold nature of the Christ, human and divine. You cannot explain the Atonement by separating its syllables and speaking of it as, at-one-ment or mind. That explains the effect and not the cause. You cannot abolish the craving for such an act of God's love as the Atonement is by denying the fact of sin. Human nature will still feel the sting of conscience and impatiently reject such a superficial view of life and cry out rather with a saint and apostle, "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" [1] and will only find peace as with him it can go on to say, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

The charge of the immoral nature of the doctrine which has been urged by some will be seen to fall when we realize that it is "God in Christ" Who bears the load of our sins upon the Cross. "It is His love which is embodied in the sacrifice." [2] God, against Whom we have sinned, takes our nature that He Himself may bear the burden of its sins; and the one perfect sacrifice owes its efficacy to the perfect union of the human and divine in Christ. Again, reason may ask, "How can these things be?" and find no answer, for here, as in the Incarnation, we try in vain to plumb the depths of God's eternal love.

I have done, feeling that I have dealt very inadequately with the subject. I can only plead the limits of human understanding —and especially my own—and pray that the Lord and Master of our souls may guide us by His Spirit to the fuller knowledge which we crave of "the truth as it is in Jesus."

[1] Rom. vii. 24, 25. [2] *Creeds and Critics*, p. 53.

THE *SPECTATOR* A SINCERE CHRISTIAN.

II

[*The following is the second of the two articles by the late* REV. G. S. STREATFEILD, *on "The 'Spectator' a Sincere Christian," the first of which appeared in the last number of the* CHURCHMAN.]

ADDISON has many wise and weighty things to say about death and immortality.

He relates a story from pagan mythology (No. 483) of a mother making request to Juno that she would bestow upon her two sons the greatest boon that it is possible for the gods to confer. The goddess consented, and the next morning both were found dead. To regard this as a boon might be consonant with heathen sentiment, but is in direct contradiction, Addison would maintain, to Christian ideals. It may be observed that he assumes rather than attempts to prove man's immortality.

No. 575. A lewd young fellow seeing an aged hermit go by him barefoot, "Father" says he, "you are in a very miserable condition if there is not another world?" "My son," said the hermit, "but what is thy condition if there is?" Man is a creature designed for two different states of being, or rather two different lives. His first life is short and transient; his second permanent and lasting. The question we are all concerned in is this: in which of these two lives is our chief interest to make ourselves happy? . . . We make provisions for this life as though it were never to have an end, and for the other life as though it were never to have a beginning. . . . Nothing can be a greater disgrace to reason than that men who are persuaded of these two different states of being should be perpetually employed in providing for a life of three score years and ten, and neglecting to make provision for that which after many myriads of years will be still new and still beginning. (*Addison.*)

In a paper contributed by Mr. Henry Grove[1] to the *Spectator* (No. 626) an ingenious argument is maintained that man's love of novelty is a powerful evidence of his immortality. Man is never satisfied with what he has; he always craves something fresh:

To me it seems impossible that a reasonable creature should rest absolutely satisfied in any acquisition whatever without

[1] A learned and liberal-minded non-conformist. He contributed four papers to the eighth volume of the *Spectator*, Nos. 588, 601, 626, 635. No. 635 was republished by Dr. Gibson, Bishop of London. No. 626 was greatly admired by Dr. Johnson.

endeavouring farther; for after its highest improvements, the mind hath an idea of the infinity of things still behind worth knowing, to the knowledge of which therefore it cannot be indifferent; as by climbing up a hill in the midst of a wide plain a man hath his prospect enlarged, and, together with that, the bounds of his desires. Upon this account, I cannot think he detracts from the state of the blessed, who conceives them to be perpetually employed in fresh searches into nature, and to eternity advancing into the fathomless depths of the divine perfections. . . . To add no more—is not this fondness for novelty, which makes us out of conceit with all we already have, a convincing proof of a future state? Either man was made in vain, or this is not the only world for which he was made: for there cannot be a greater instance of vanity than that to which man is liable, to be deluded from the cradle to the grave with fleeting shadows of happiness. His pleasures, and those not inconsiderable neither, die in the possession, and fresh enjoyments do not rise fast enough to fill up half his life with satisfaction. When I see persons sick of themselves any longer than they are called away by something that is of force to chain down the present thought; when I see them hurry from country to town, and then from town back again into the country, continually shifting postures, and placing life in all the different lights they can think of, "Surely" say I to myself, "life is vain, and the man beyond expression stupid or prejudiced, who from the variety of life cannot gather that he is designed for immortality?"

Akin to the foregoing argument from the love of novelty is Addison's suggestion in No. 413 that man's delight in that which is eternal or limitless is closely connected with his thirst for the living God.

One of the final causes of our delight in anything that is great may be this. The Supreme Author of our being has so formed the soul of man, that nothing but himself can be its last, adequate and proper happiness. Because, therefore a great part of our happiness must arise from the contemplation of his being, that he might give our souls a just relish of such a contemplation, he has made them naturally to delight in the apprehension of what is great or unlimited. Our admiration, which is a very pleasing motion of the mind, immediately rises at the consideration of any object that takes up a great deal of room in the fancy, and by consequence will improve into the highest pitch of astonishment and devotion when we contemplate his nature, that is neither circumscribed by time nor place, nor to be comprehended by the largest capacity of a created being.

Addison meditates with great delight upon the immortality of the soul. With this confession he begins one of his finest essays, No. 111. In this, as in many of his papers, he maintains that faith

in immortality is the basis of morality. One argument for belief in immortality he pursues at some length, namely, the possibilities of progress found in God's rational creatures:

How can it enter into the thoughts of man that the soul, which is capable of such immense perfections, and of receiving new improvements to all eternity, shall fall away into nothing almost as soon as it is created? Are such abilities made for no purpose? A brute arrives at a point of perfection that he can never pass; in a few years he has all the endowments he is capable of; and were he to live ten thousand more, would be the same thing he is at present. Were a human soul thus at a stand in her accomplishments, were her faculties to be full blown, and incapable of farther enlargements, I could imagine it might fall away insensibly, and drop at once into a state of annihilation. But can we believe a thinking being, that is in a perpetual progress of improvements, and travelling on from perfection to perfection, after having just looked abroad into the works of its Creator, and made a few discoveries of His infinite goodness, wisdom, and power, must perish at her first setting out, and in the very beginning of her inquiries. . . . A man can never have taken in his full measure of knowledge, has not time to subdue his passions, establish his soul in virtue, and come up to the perfection of his nature, before he is hurried off the stage. Would an infinitely wise Being make such glorious creatures for so mean a purpose? Can He delight in the production of such abortive intelligences, such short-lived reasonable beings? Would He give us talents that are not to be exerted? capacities that are never to be gratified? How can we find that wisdom which shines through all His works in the formation of man, without looking on this world as only a nursery for the next? . . . There is not in my opinion a more pleasing and triumphant consideration in religion than this of the perpetual progress which the soul makes towards the perfection of its nature, without ever arriving at a period in it. (*Addison.*)

In No. 628, *Spectator* gives us the noble soliloquy on the subject of immortality from the lips of Cato in Addison's own tragedy.[1] In No. 537 we find the translation of a very fine passage from Cicero's *De Senectute* on the same great theme.

On the connection between faith and morality *Spectator's* mind is very clear; and this, as coming from one who has been characterized as "the foremost moralist of his day,"[2] is significant.

No. 459. If we look into the more serious part of mankind we find many who lay so great a stress upon faith that they neglect morality; and many who build so much upon morality, that they

[1] *Cato's Soliloquy*; Act V, Sc. i. Cato solus, sitting in a thoughtful posture: in his hand Plato's book on the immortality of the soul.

[2] Lecky *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 99.

do not pay a due regard to faith. The perfect man should be defective in neither of these particulars. . . . One (conclusion) I am sure is so obvious that he cannot miss it, namely, that a man cannot be perfect in his scheme of morality who does not strengthen and support it with the Christian faith.

Compare with the foregoing No. 465. "There is nothing which strengthens faith more than morality. Faith and morality naturally produce each other." This No. of the *Spectator* deals with the best methods of strengthening faith. The whole essay is extremely edifying. In the following words the writer may seem to urge a counsel of perfection, but, coming from such a mind as Addison's, it is well worth attention.

Those who delight in reading books of controversy, which are written on both sides of the question on points of faith, do very seldom arrive at a fixed and settled habit of it. They are one day entirely convinced of its important truths, and the next meet with something that shakes and disturbs them. The doubt which was laid revives again, and shows itself in new difficulties, and that generally for this reason, because the mind, which is perpetually lost in controversies and disputes, is apt to forget the reasons which had once set it at rest, and to be disquieted with any former perplexity, when it appears in a new shape, or is started by a different hand. As nothing is more laudable than an inquiry after truth, so nothing is more irrational than to pass away our whole lives, without determining ourselves one way or other in those points which are of the last importance to us. There are indeed many things from which we may withhold our assent; but in cases by which we are to regulate our lives, it is the greatest absurdity to be wavering and unsettled without closing with that side which appears the most safe and the most probable. The first rule, therefore, which I shall lay down, is this, that when by reading or discourse we find ourselves thoroughly convinced of the truth of any article, and of the reasonableness of our belief in it, we should never after suffer ourselves to call it in question. We may perhaps forget the arguments which occasioned our conviction; but we ought to remember the strength they had with us, and therefore still to retain the conviction that they once produced. The writer illustrates his point by the story of Bishop Latimer at the Conference of Divines, who left the argumentative part of the discussion to younger disputants, who were in full possession of their parts. As for himself he only repeated to his adversaries the articles in which he firmly believed, and in the profession of which he was determined to die. It is in this manner that the mathematician proceeds upon propositions which he has once demonstrated; and though the demonstration may have slipped out of his memory, he builds upon the truth, because he knows it was demonstrated. This rule is

absolutely necessary for weaker minds, and in some measure for men of the greatest abilities; but to these last I would propose, in the second place, that they should lay up in their memories, and always keep by them in readiness, those arguments which appear to them of the greatest strength, and which cannot be got over by all the doubts and cavils of infidelity. . . . There is still another method, which is more persuasive than any of the former; and that is an habitual adoration of the Supreme Being, as well in constant acts of mental worship, as in outward forms. The devout man does not only believe, but feels there is a Deity. He has actual sensations of Him; his experience concurs with his reason; he sees Him more and more in all his intercourses with Him, and even in this life almost loses his faith in conviction. (*Addison.*)

To this essay is appended the fine hymn beginning,

"The spacious firmament on high."

513. The Saturday paper of October 18, 1712, contains reflections on death, purporting to come from the pen of his "worthy friend the clergyman." After quoting, at some length, from Dr. Sherlock's[1] treatise on Death, he continues:

Let a man's innocence be what it will, let his virtues rise to the highest pitch of perfection attainable in this life, there will still be in him so many secret sins, so many human frailties, so many offences of ignorance, passion and prejudice, so many unguarded words and thoughts, and in short, so many defects in his best actions, that, without the advantages of such an expiation and atonement as Christianity has revealed to us, it is impossible that he should be cleared before his Sovereign Judge, or that he should be able to "stand in His sight."

The paper ends with a hymn composed during illness:

"When rising from the bed of death."

289. Again, in No. 289, we have reflections on death. I give two extracts.

Upon taking my seat in a Coffee-house I often draw the eyes of the whole room upon me, when in the hottest seasons of news, and at a time perhaps that the Dutch mail is just come in, they hear me ask the coffeeman for his last week's bill of mortality.[2] I find that I have been sometimes taken on this occasion for a parish sexton, sometimes for an undertaker, and sometimes for a doctor of physic.

[1] William Sherlock, 1641–1707. Dean of St. Paul's, author of *Practical Discourse concerning Death.*

[2] Bills of mortality, containing the weekly number of christenings and deaths, with the cause, were first compiled by the London Company of Parish Clerks (for 109 parishes) after the Plague in 1592. The age at death was not given until 1728. Bills of mortality were superseded in 1836 by the official records of the Registrar-General (H.M.).

In this, however, I am guided by the spirit of a philosopher, as I take occasion from hence to reflect upon the regular increase and diminution of mankind, and consider the several various ways through which we pass from life to eternity. I am very well pleased with these weekly admonitions, that bring into my mind such thoughts as ought to be the daily entertainment of every reasonable creature; and can consider with pleasure to myself, by which of those deliverances, or as we commonly call them, distempers, I may possibly make my escape out of this world of sorrows into that condition of existence, wherein I hope to be happier than it is possible for me at present to conceive. . . . The truth of it is there is nothing in history which is so improving to the reader as those accounts which we meet with of the deaths of eminent persons, and of their behaviour in that dreadful season. I may also add, that there are no parts of history which affect and please the reader in so sensible a manner. The reason I take to be this, because there is no other single circumstance in the study of any person, which can possibly be the case of every one who reads it. A battle or a triumph are conjunctures in which not one man in a million is likely to be engaged; but when we see a person at the point of death, we cannot forbear being attentive to every thing he says or does, because we are sure that some time or other we shall be ourselves in the same melancholy circumstances. The general, the statesman, or the philosopher, are perhaps characters which we may never act in, but the dying man is one whom sooner or later, we shall certainly resemble. (*Addison.*)

In No. 90 Addison starts the Platonic conception of future retribution.

There is not in my opinion a consideration more effectual to extinguish inordinate desires in the soul of man than the notions of Plato and his followers upon that subject. They tell us that every passion which has been contracted by the soul during her residence in the body remains with her in a separate state; and that the soul in the body, or out of the body, differs no more than the man does from himself when he is in his house, or in the open air. When therefore the obscene passions in particular have once taken root, and spread themselves in the soul, they cleave to her inseparably, and remain in her for ever, after the body is cast off and thrown aside. As an argument to confirm this their doctrine, they observe that a lewd youth who goes on in a continued course of voluptuousness, advances by degrees into a libidinous old man; and that the passion survives in the mind when it is altogether dead in the body; nay, that the desire grows more violent, and (like all other habits) gathers strength by age, at the same time that it has no power of executing its own purposes. If, say they, the soul is most subject to these passions at a time when it has the least instigations from the body, we may well suppose she will still retain them, when she is entirely divested of it. The very

substance of the soul is festered with them, the gangrene is gone too far to be ever cured; the inflammation will rage to all eternity.

In this, then (says the Platonist) consists the punishment of a voluptuous man after his death. He is tormented with desires which it is impossible for him to gratify, solicited by a passion that has neither objects nor organs adapted to it. He lives in a state of invincible desire and impotence, and always burns in the pursuit of what he always despairs to possess. It is for this reason (says Plato) that the souls of the dead appear frequently in cemeteries and hover about the places where their bodies are buried, as still hankering after their old brutal pleasures, and desiring again to enter the body that gave them the opportunity of fulfilling them. Some of our most eminent divines have made use of this Platonic notion, so far as it regards the subsistence of our passions after death, with great beauty and strength of reason. (*Addison.*)

In No. 447 Addison returns to this solemn truth that as a man sows he must expect to reap.

In short, Heaven is not to be looked upon only as a reward, but as the natural effect of a religious life.

On the other hand, those evil spirits, who, by long custom, have contracted in the body habits of lust and sensuality, malice, and revenge, an aversion to everything that is good, just, or laudable, are naturally seasoned and prepared for pain and misery. Their torments have already taken root in them; they cannot be happy when divested of the body, unless we may suppose that Providence will in a manner create them anew, and work a miracle in the rectification of their faculties. They may, indeed, taste a kind of malignant pleasure in those actions to which they are accustomed, whilst in this life; but when they are removed from all those objects which are here to gratify them, they will naturally become their own tormentors, and cherish in themselves those painful habits of mind which are called in scripture phrase, "the worm which never dies." (*Addison.*)

No. 543, dealing with the proof of God's wisdom in creation, is a very fine piece of writing. It is of course framed on the obsolete lines of Paley's *Natural Theology*, but Addison wrote thirty years before Lamarck was born, and a hundred and fifty years before *The Origin of Species* saw the light. The following extracts will give some idea of the argument:

Those who were skilled in anatomy among the ancients, concluded from the outward and inward make of an human body, that it was the work of a Being transcendently wise and powerful. As the world grew more enlightened in this art, their discoveries gave them fresh opportunities of admiring the conduct of Providence in the formation of an human body. Galen was converted by his dis-

sections, and could not but own a Supreme Being upon a survey of this His handywork. There were, indeed, many parts of which the old anatomists did not know the certain use; but as they saw that most of those which they examined were adapted with admirable art to their several functions, they did not question but those, whose uses they could not determine, were contrived with the same wisdom for respective ends and purposes. . . . The body of an animal is an object adequate to our senses. It is a particular system of Providence that lies in a narrow compass. The eye is able to command it, and by successive inquiries can search into all its parts. Could the body of the whole earth, or indeed the whole universe, be thus submitted to the examination of our senses, were it not too big and disproportioned for our inquiries, too unwieldy for the management of the eye and hand, there is no question but it would appear to us as curious and well contrived a frame as that of an human body. We would see the same concatenation and subserviency, the same necessity and usefulness, the same beauty and harmony, in all and every of its parts, as what we discover in the body of every single animal.

The more extended our reason is and the more able to grapple with immense objects, the greater still are those discoveries which it makes of wisdom and providence in the works of the creation. A Sir Isaac Newton, who stands up as the miracle of the present age, can look through a whole planetary system; consider it in its weight, number and measure;[1] and draw from it as many demonstrations of infinite power and wisdom as a more confined understanding is able to deduce from the system of an human body. (*Addison.*)

Addison's grandest and maturest thoughts of God are perhaps contained in No. 565, which he heads with Dryden's paraphrase of Georg. IV, 221:

> " For God the whole created mass inspires
> Thro' heav'n and earth and ocean's depths: He throws
> His influence round, and kindles as He goes."

From the thought of man's insignificance, which he expresses in the words of the Psalmist (Ps. viii. 3, 4), he turns to that of the infinity of God.

If we consider Him in His omnipresence, His being passes through, actuates, and supports the whole frame of nature. His creation, and every part of it, is full of Him. There is nothing He

[1] We may find in these words the tacit acceptance of the theory of gravitation. This great discovery of Newton was not universally accepted in Addison's time. It was even disputed by Leibnitz. See Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. iii, p. 6.

See Article in CHURCHMAN of January and April last, " Addison as a Student of Nature."

has made that is either so distant, so little, or so inconsiderable, which He does not essentially inhabit. His substance is within the substance of every being, whether material or immaterial, and as intimately present to it as that being is to itself. It would be an imperfection in Him, were He able to remove out of one place into another, or to withdraw Himself from any thing that He has created, or from any part of that space which is diffused and spread abroad to infinity. In short, to speak of Him in the language of the old philosopher, He is a Being whose centre is everywhere, and His circumference nowhere.[1]

In the second place, He is omniscient as well as omnipresent. His omniscience indeed necessarily and naturally flows from His omnipresence; He cannot but be conscious of every motion that arises in the whole material world, which He thus essentially pervades and of every thought that is stirring in the intellectual world, to every part of which He is thus intimately united. Several moralists have considered the creation as the temple of God which He has built with His own hands, and which is filled with His presence. Others have considered infinite space as the receptacle, or rather the habitation of the Almighty; but the noblest and most exalted way of considering this infinite space is that of Sir Isaac Newton, who calls it the sensorium of the Godhead. Brutes and men have their sensoriola or little sensoriums, by which they apprehend the presence, and perceive the actions of a few objects that lie contiguous to them. Their knowledge and observation turn within a very narrow circle. But as God Almighty cannot but perceive and know everything in which He resides, infinite space gives infinite room to infinite knowledge, and is, as it were, an organ to omniscience. (*Addison.*)

Addison follows up these thoughts on this profound and mysterious subject in No. 590. Here he deals with the conception of eternity and with the Being of God in relation to it. His words are full of wisdom, and have as much meaning for us to-day as for those who first read them; though we venture to think (and the thought is suggested by the author himself) that it was but a limited company of Addison's original readers, who could have intelligently entered into the full meaning of his language. The following extract will give some idea of the nature and value of this disquisition.

Having thus considered that eternity which is past, according to the best idea we can frame of it, I shall now draw up those several articles on this subject, which are dictated to us by the light of reason, and which may be looked upon as the creed of a philosopher in this great point.

[1] One is reminded of Tennyson's *Higher Pantheism.*

First, it is certain that no being could have made itself; for, if so, it must have acted before it was, which is a contradiction.

Secondly, that therefore some being must have existed from all eternity.

Thirdly, that whatever exists after the manner of created beings, or according to any notions we have of existence, could not have existed from eternity.

Fourthly, that this Eternal Being must therefore be the great Author of nature, "The Ancient of Days," who, being at an infinite distance in His perfections from all finite and created beings, exists in a quite different manner from them, and in a manner of which they can have no idea.

I know that several of the schoolmen, who would not be thought ignorant of anything, have pretended to explain the manner of God's existence, by telling us that He comprehends infinite duration in every moment; that eternity is with Him a *punctum stans*, a fixed point; or, which is as good sense, an infinite instant; that nothing with reference to his existence, is either past or to come; to which the ingenious Mr. Cowley alludes in his description of heaven.

> "Nothing is there to come, and nothing past,
> But an eternal *now* does always last." [1]

For my own part, I look upon these propositions as words that have no ideas annexed to them; and think men had better own their ignorance, than advance doctrines by which they mean nothing, and which, indeed, are self-contradictory. We cannot be too modest in our disquisitions, when we meditate on Him, who is environed with so much glory and perfection, who is the source of being, the fountain of all that existence, which we and His whole creation derive from Him. Let us, therefore, with the utmost humility acknowledge, that, as some being must necessarily have existed from eternity, so this Being does exist after an incomprehensible manner, since it is impossible for a being to have existed from eternity after our manner or notions of existence. . . . In the first revelation which He makes of His own being, He entitles Himself, "I AM THAT I AM"; and when Moses desires to know what name he shall give Him in his embassy to Pharaoh, he bids him say, that "I AM hath sent me unto you." Our great Creator, by this revelation of Himself, does in a manner exclude everything else from a real existence, and distinguishes Himself from His creatures as the only being which truly and really exists. The ancient Platonic notion, which was drawn from speculations of eternity, wonderfully agrees with this revelation which God has made of Himself. (*Addison.*)

[1] From Cowley's epic poem, *Davideis*.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

I HAVE had the opportunity lately of looking over the book-shelves of a number of Evangelical clergymen in various parts of the country, and I have been struck by the fact that the great majority of new books, especially those calculated to help in the preparation of sermons, have been by ministers of one or other of the Free Churches. Why is this? Why are there not a number of the Evangelical clergy writing similar books? May it not be that the attention of our Evangelical leaders is at present being diverted from such subjects—their natural and more obvious interests—to the liturgiological problems raised by the discussion of Prayer Book revision in the Church Assembly? This is not a sphere in which Evangelical Churchmen are naturally at home. It draws them away from the great moral issues, and the great fundamental facts of the faith, which are after all their great concern. These are the subjects in which congregations require to be instructed, and it is a distinct loss that our younger Evangelical men of ability are not devoting themselves to the production of a first-class literature dealing with them.

While we express this regret we must also say that they are fortunate in having their needs so well supplied in books of this kind by men of scholarship, thought and spirituality among the Nonconformists. Half a dozen names come at once to mind as the authors of books that have inspired hosts of sermons. Foremost among them we place here the name of Dr. Robert F. Horton, the well-known Congregational minister of Hampstead. His latest book is *The Mystical Quest of Christ* (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 10*s.* 6*d.* net). It will be found a treasure house of thought and suggestion by any preacher who is fortunate enough to be the possessor of it. It has a peculiar quality of its own. It is difficult to describe it. There is first of all the intense sense of reality and earnestness without which the most brilliant writing fails. Then there is the scholarly yet simple penetration into the heart of things that is characteristic of the great thinker. It is a book altogether on the supreme place of Christian values. Yet he does not put it in that way. He seeks out the Christian rule of life, the great

master principle—it is Christ-likeness. But this is not the asceticism of a Thomas à Kempis. The fundamental fact which constitutes Christ-likeness is that " He gave Himself without reserve and without cessation to the service of others."

We must fail to do justice to the volume because we have not space in which to show the many ways of applying the principle or of indicating the wealth of enriching illustration used to interpret it. A youth is choosing a calling, here is the primary opportunity of applying it, " For others " is the motto of the best life. It is the Master motive that can transform the Business World. M. Coué's well-known formula becomes in regard to it, " Day by day, in every way, Christ takes more complete possession of me." Applied to the Clerical profession it is a searching test. Self-seeking, self-indulgence, self-absorption fly before it. Fletcher of Madeley is drawn with sympathetic skill as an almost ideal representative. We cannot resist quoting a different phase—" Dr. Gott had written a book for the clergy, in which he discountenanced all co-operation with Nonconformists, but in the books recommended as essential were Dale's *Atonement* and his *Ephesians*." In the second part, " The Christian Decalogue," an even wider scope is given to the application of the principle. Ten rules are suggested, and they open out " a new vision of what Christianity means, and a new plan of putting it into execution." The titles of some of the chapters suggest the lines of thought—" Extending the Kingdom," " All Nations dear to God," " Forgiveness of Injuries," " The Esteem of the Poor." The third part is " The Method," and is of equal value with the other two. Here again the latest results of scientific and philosophical advance are pressed into Christian service. Auto-suggestion has its lessons for Christian practice. Meditation, Habituation, Association, are all applied to the same end. The true value of Mysticism is indicated, and in a comprehensive summary Christ is set forth as the one explanation of man's life on this planet, the world's one hope, and its only lasting joy. It is a volume of inspiring and refreshing essays, strengthening to faith, and stimulating to increased efforts in a victorious cause.

" The Living Church Series " (James Clarke & Co.), edited by Prof. J. E. M'Fadyen, promises to provide a number of books on subjects of vital interest. They are intended to show that the Church is

as capable to-day as ever in the past of dealing with the great problems of life, to instruct, and to influence every department of thought and activity. The first three volumes issued show that the series will fully justify its aim. The name of Dr. W. M. Clow, Principal of United Free Church, Glasgow, is already well known. His books on Christian doctrine and practice, such as *The Cross in Christian Experience, The Day of the Cross, The Secret of the Lord,* are on our shelves. We do not often find members of the non-Episcopal Churches writing on the Sacraments, and are consequently more than usually interested in Dr. Clow's contribution to the series, *The Church and the Sacraments.* His treatment of the subject shows at once that he is acquainted with the various shades of interpretation represented in all sections of the Church, while he does not disguise the necessity of writing from his own carefully considered and well-defined standpoint. He bases his argument on " the primary and fundamental importance, both historical and doctrinal, of the New Testament. Pre-eminence has been given to the interpretation of the mind of Christ and of His words and deeds as recorded by His Apostles." The introductory portion discusses the Sacramental principle and the doctrine of Christian Sacraments, the development of the Sacraments of Roman Catholicism, and the return to the New Testament. The second part is devoted to the origin, development and significance of Christian Baptism. His conclusion is that it is not a bare sign, nor a regenerating ceremonial. " It seals the work of the Spirit of God, and bestows a further enduement of His consecrating power."

In dealing with the Holy Communion he lays down the principle that there are two and only two ruling doctrines. These he describes as the " symbolic " and the " incarnative." Zwingli, Calvin and Luther in varying degrees represent the former. Its characteristic feature is that the bread and wine remain bread and wine. The second is the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and of this he says, " No one with the New Testament in his hands, can be persuaded that such a doctrine has any warrant in its statements."

It is a temptation to quote at length some of the impressive statements by which he enforces the conclusions drawn from these premises, and the historical evidence showing the development of the theory of sacrifice to replace the fact of communion, but we must be content to refer the reader to the book itself. It is satis-

factory to find a Presbyterian leader so much at one with Evangelical Churchmen in his teaching on the whole subject.

The second of the series is *The Church and the Creeds*, by David Lamont, B.D., Minister of Park United Free Church, Helensburgh. A brief historical account of some representative symbols, from the earliest of the creeds of Christendom—the Old Roman Creed—to the sixteenth-century creeds of the Protestant Churches, is made the basis of an examination of the character and purpose of all such summaries of our faith. He emphasizes the necessity of a creed "because the Gospel of Jesus Christ makes its appeal to men through their minds," but the form is to be distinguished from the essence. It is startling to find the opinion expressed that "the Apostles' Creed parts company with the New Testament emphasis." He sets out a form for modern use with a view to the "recovery of the full apostolic emphasis." In view of the proposals for the union of all the Churches, such a form must be considered, while it is to be borne in mind that its purpose is to be the confession of an individual belief, rather than the declaration of the full faith of the whole Church. We have given a very inadequate idea of the wealth of thought displayed in this suggestive volume, or of the extent of the author's learning and the strength of his orthodoxy. It is worth reading simply to pick out such a telling expression as "Love is enthroned in the heart of truth."

The third of the series is *The Church at Prayer and the World Outside*, by Prof. Percy Dearmer, D.D. As Professor of Art in King's College, London, it is natural that the æsthetic aspect of worship should appeal strongly to him. He is already known as a writer on Ceremonial, and in seeking to make "the man outside" into a Churchgoer he is interested in the form of service most likely to attract him. The methods suggested are intellectual, psychic, and æsthetic. The creeds are not essential. Their recitations is an obstacle and not a help. The Churches are half-paralysed by cant phrases. The precarious condition of organized Christianity at the present day is due in large measure to bad art. The exclusion from worship of certain forms of beauty has been one of the weakest spots in Protestantism. Thus his criticism runs, and in the historical section it is extended to all the causes that produced the deteriora-

tion from the earliest worship of the Christian Church, as the nearest approach to the mind of Jesus Christ, till at last "the Mass has ceased to be a Communion, and has become a miracle . . . to the average man it is little more than a pious spectacle." The whole subject is considered with freshness and an evident desire to find the true solution of neglect of worship so as to inaugurate a new era of revived religion.

If anyone desires to see how an Anglo-Catholic treats the history of Religion during the last 350 years he should read Dr. Leighton Pullan's Bampton lectures—*Religion since the Reformation* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 12*s.* 6*d.* net). With ingenious dexterity he is able, from his extensive knowledge of the period, to select details that can either exalt his idea of Catholicism or depreciate Protestantism. Indulgences, for instance, are condemned, but he asserts that their consequences were not as bad as the Antinomianism produced by Luther's doctrine of justification by faith. The volume only professes to be a series of sketches. It is not chronologically arranged. It passes from Religion in Great Britain from 1550 to 1689, to the Roman Catholic Church from 1700 to 1854, and from Religion in Great Britain and America from 1689 to 1815 to Aspects of Lutheranism and Calvinism since 1700. A sympathetic survey is given of the Eastern Orthodox Church. The last lecture, on Aspects of Christian Thought since 1815, is one of the most interesting, as it deals with the period of the Tractarian Movement, and the later developments in the Church of Rome. His closing paragraphs are a vigorous denunciation of Modernism.

In *The First Six Centuries* (2*s.* 6*d.*), by F. W. Vroom, D.D., Archdeacon of Nova Scotia, S.P.C.K. issues a brief and useful series of sketches from Early Church History. They are intended primarily for teachers, but the general reader will find them not merely instructive, but interesting reading. The personalities of the period stand out with clearness, and the events associated with them bring into their proper places the persecutions, the Councils, and the development of teaching and organization. The general result is a well-defined picture, though there are statements with which we cannot agree, such as "that the Church of England repeatedly appeals to the teaching and practice of the early undivided Church."

In *Problems of the New Testament* (Oxford University Press, 6*s.* 6*d.* net), the Rev. R. H. Malden gives a brief and clear account of the various books, and discusses the modern views of their date and authorship. A brief introduction to each of the Epistles gives adequate help to the understanding of the contents. He is doubtful as to the authorship of the first and fourth Gospels, but he is satisfied as to the completeness of the account given of our Lord's person and work.

G. F. I.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

MINISTERIAL COMMISSION.

MINISTERIAL COMMISSION. By the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A., Litt.D. London: *Longmans Green & Co.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Small books are sometimes of first-rate importance to the average reader. When great problems are being discussed it is advantageous to have brought together the most valuable utterances of the men who know most, and to have the grounds of their argument put forward concisely and pointedly.

The whole subject of Reunion turns on two points: doctrine and order. As far as essential doctrine is concerned, the National and Free Church representatives found themselves at one when they in conference debated the proposals of Lambeth. When they came to order, it was at once seen that organization was to many a matter of great doctrinal moment and to others simply machinery adapted by God to do the best possible for the advancement of His Kingdom, whose subjects are men and women saved by the death of His Son. What is Ministerial Commission?—on what does it depend? and is it in the mind of God as shown in His revealed will confined in its valid exercise to one form of the Christian Ministry? Is there associated with its valid possession a sacerdotal function that can only be transmitted in one way—through Episcopal organization by the laying on of the hands of the Bishop on those who receive the priesthood? Bound up with Episcopacy is a theory of the Church, of Soteriology and of the Sacraments, that practically covers the whole ground of Christianity in action within the Body of Christ, and therefore the matter cannot be dismissed as of secondary importance to doctrinal soundness by those who look upon the Succession as a matter of life and death to the valid exercise of the ministry of grace.

Dr. Carter helps us to see where the truth lies by his frank and candid examination of scriptural and historical facts. He writes with competent knowledge of what is involved, and the Bishop of Chelmsford tells us in the foreword "Dr. Carter has

reached certain conclusions, and I believe that, broadly speaking, his conclusions are justified, though it must not be understood that I endorse them all, but conclusions at this moment are not of so great importance as the presentation of the historical facts, and it is because Dr. Carter sets these facts before us, clearly and shortly, that I venture to commend his little book to the study of my brother Churchmen." The facts asserted by Dr. Carter are well documented, and the conclusions he draws from them can be judged by the candid reader as well as by the skilled historian. It may be that some will draw contradictory conclusions in consequence of their ecclesiastical presuppositions, but we venture to say that candid students of history are approximating more to the view that " the Christian Ministry was gradually evolved in response to fresh needs which came with new conditions, as the Church grew in numbers and enlarged its geographical boundaries." It is important to remember that " the only priests under the Gospel designated as such in the New Testament are the saints, the members of the Christian brotherhood." When once these root facts, maintained and demonstrated by Bishop Lightfoot, are grasped, the key to the unlocking of primitive Church History is in the hands of the student.

Dr. Carter divides his inquiry into four parts, dealing respectively with Ministerial Commission viewed in the light of " The New Testament," " The Early Church," " The Reformed Churches," and " The Present Day." On all these subjects he presents a condensed but sufficient setting forth of the evidence and traces the growth of sacerdotal conceptions of the ministry. We are inclined to forget that the Church consists of men and women, and although grace may refine the heart, human ambitions and desires play a great part in its development. " The will to power " is as old as humanity, and the desire to possess special caste or class privileges has always manifested itself.

The Hebrew Church had priests, the pagan nations in which the Church had to struggle for its life and expansion had priests, and it was the simplest of mental and emotional processes to transfer to Christianity what was found outside the teaching of our Lord and His apostles. On account of the rightful claims of Christianity to be the final religion and the revelation of the mind of God, sanctions were sought for conceptions that were foreign to the whole spirit of the Gospel. Exclusiveness is dear to humanity and it is impossible to assert exclusiveness for any section without having behind it a theory that will commend it to those who are not within the exclusive ranks. Cyprian was the creator of the exclusive idea of the consecrated Bishop, and yet we know that up to A.D. 250 in Alexandria the presbyters of Alexandria appointed after election one of their own number to be Bishop without special ordination. This crucial instance has to be faced by all advocates of Apostolic Succession, for it is absurd to think that so great a Church as the Alexandrian was without the full sacramental grace possessed by the other early Churches. We may place, as we do, the highest

value on Episcopacy as the best form of Church government and the historic form in the Church—meaning by historic the most ancient and the widest diffused—without laying claim to its being *jure divino* the only form that assures to a Church and its ministers the plenitude of ministerial commission. As far as we can see, it is the conflict of doctrine on this point that is the greatest obstacle to Home Reunion—we may go further and say the Reunion of Anglo-Saxon Christendom—and Dr. Carter has as his main object the placing in right perspective the claims of Episcopacy.

The review of the position at the present day in this book is fair and comprehensive. Since it was written we have had the Anglican and Free Church statements set forth by the Church of England and Free Church representatives on the Joint Conference that considered the Lambeth Appeal. The Anglican members declare: "It seems to us in accordance with the Lambeth Appeal to say we are prepared to say that the ministries which we have in view in this Memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's word and administer the sacraments Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's word and sacraments in the universal Church." This is an epoch-making utterance and will be the starting-point of conversations and practical steps that can only end in the closer approximation of the Churches of the Reformation. Those who wish to see the grounds on which this conclusion is reached will find them set forth in *Ministerial Commission*, which we heartily commend to all interested in one of the greatest problems of contemporary Christendom.

AN ALTERNATIVE COMMUNION SERVICE.

SPIRITUAL OBJECTIONS TO THE ALTERNATIVE COMMUNION SERVICE. By the Right Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D. London: *Skeffington & Co.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

It is said we are living in an age of liturgiology. Certainly the study of liturgies has taken possession of a number of very earnest minds who believe that they have evolved a science of liturgiology. It is true that the history and the growth of liturgies have been traced with a painstaking skill that has not been equalled in the past, but we have yet to discover a science that lays down definite unalterable principles applicable to the growth of a liturgy in accordance with a fixed type. To us, liturgies developed in accordance with the needs of Christian people, and these needs were governed by theological conceptions which were prevalent in the day of their compilation. It is essential that the truth or otherwise of these conceptions should be first established before we assert that a certain type is the only type possible in accordance with the revelation of God in Christ. The corruption of ideals finds expressions in liturgies as well as in theological documents, for there is a very close relation between "lex orandi" and "lex credendi."

In the Church of England we have a Liturgy which is avowedly Scriptural and appeals to Holy Scripture for its confirmation. It strives to be true in its Service of Communion to the teaching of our Lord and His primitive Church. Naturally it contains large portions of the Western Rite which it superseded in England, but it purges that Rite of what is superstitious and an accretion on the Faith of the Gospel. It has its doctrine of sacrifice, its setting forth of what communion implies, and its thanksgiving. Dr. Knox shows that in the institution of the Sacrament of the death of Christ "Our Lord gave to His disciples in this action His own self to be truly incorporated with their inmost selves as the bread and wine are incorporated with him who consumes them. But what have we here except justification by faith in sacramental form? That self-identification with Christ of which we were speaking in the last chapter is here set forth before our eyes in the form of a sacrament. 'Here is My crucified self, crucified for you. Make it your own, your true self. Accept it, for all the prayers and penances in the world cannot win it for you. Accept it; be crucified with Me to the world and to your old self. Accept it, and be raised with Me from the dead. Accept it, and with Me ascend, and sit with Me in the Heavenly places.'" If this be the central idea of the Lord's Supper, and we believe that it is, the Service must make it plain to all who partake of the Supper, and who with our Prayer Book in hand can doubt this?

Dr. Knox with his customary lucidity and directness sets forward the growth of quite a different view of the Sacrament in the Church. He deals with the Caroline divines who in his opinion, in the exigencies of controversy, laid stress upon a sacrifice offered by a communicating congregation when the Communion was the central act of the whole service. "Yet the time came when almost by a leap, as it were, the High Churchmen found themselves being led on by zealous priests to whom the act of consecration by the officiating priest was the central point of the service, and adoration of the consecrated elements was manifested and even inculcated as obligatory." The change is before our eyes and it is the desire of a section of the Church to embody this change—unscriptural and opposed to the teaching of the Primitive Church in an alternative liturgy. Dr. Knox writes powerfully, and will carry with him his readers when he says, "The attempts to confine that Presence"—the Presence of our Lord—"to the use of the elements for communion only have not carried conviction. It is not likely that they should, seeing that when the Sacrifice is offered as the great and principal service of the morning, the communion of the congregation is not desired. We have seen that for the last three-quarters of a century there has been a steady tendency to assimilate English Eucharistic doctrine and ritual with the Roman. The proposed alternative Prayer Book will facilitate this assimilation. It allows, almost encourages, the offering of Eucharistic sacrifice by a non-communicating congregation. It allows and will probably, in time, encourage the use of 'tabernacles' for the

reserved host. It does not forbid the outward marks of Eucharistic adoration. It so rearranges the prayer of consecration as to suggest offering of the consecrated elements and the impetratory, propitiatory power of the consecrated host." This was written with the prayer of N.A. 84 in mind, but it is even more forcibly directed against the teaching of the modified Green Book Canon, "generally approved" by the House of Clergy. We hope that all who are interested in Prayer Book revision will obtain and meditate upon the serious statements made by Bishop Knox, who deserves our warmest thanks for bringing the whole discussion to the higher plane of the domain of the Spirit. After all, we must worship in spirit and in truth if we are to obey the teaching of our Redeemer.

DOCUMENTS FOR STUDENTS.

FEDERAL AND UNIFIED CONSTITUTIONS: A Collection of Constitutional Documents for the Use of Students. By A. P. Newton, M.A., D.Lit., B.Sc., F.S.A. London: *Longmans Green & Co.* 15*s.*

Professor Newton, Rhodes Professor of Imperial History in the University of London, has compiled this series of documents primarily for the use of students in the Honours School in History at London who are working on the special subject, "The Unification of South Africa." Obviously, it will be a great advantage to them to have these documentary sources of modern constitutional history brought together in so convenient a form. The book will, however, be of interest and value to many besides the special class of students the author has particularly in view; and it comes appropriately at a time when constitutions are being newly made or re-cast over a great part of Europe. The documents range over a wide area of both time and space, as they begin with the Perpetual League between the three Swiss Forest communities, 1291, and come down to the constitution of the German Republic, 1919; while they include the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Federation, and the Constitution of the United States of America; the Acts of Parliament successively establishing forms of government for New Zealand (1852), Nova Scotia, Canada, Australia and South Africa, and it is interesting to note the larger measure of freedom from Imperial control as time goes on, for an interval of half a century lies between these separate Acts; the Constitution of the Brazilian Republic and much other "source" material of the same kind. It would have been interesting if some of the other European constitutions arising from the post-war settlement, besides the German, could have been included, but limitations of space no doubt stood in the way. Professor Newton has written a useful historical introduction of forty pages, in which he shows briefly the lines along which the idea of constitutional government has developed especially in the British Colonial Empire.

The volume is well printed; references are given that the reader may consult the original documents; and, we may add, there is a good index. Students, and indeed all who are interested in this particular branch of historical knowledge, will find the book of permanent value.

THE PRELUDE TO THE REFORMATION.

THE PRELUDE TO THE REFORMATION: A Study of English Church Life from the days of Wycliffe to the breach with Rome. By R. S. Arrowsmith, M.A., Rector of Seale, Surrey. London: *S.P.C.K.* 8*s.* net.

Students and others interested in history have much reason to be grateful to the S.P.C.K. for the valuable series of books, pamphlets and documents on historical subjects which it has published, in most cases at a very reasonable cost, during the last few years. Mr. Arrowsmith's *Prelude to the Reformation*, which is one of the latest of these, well deserves attention. It is very interestingly written and in the space of little more than two hundred pages gives some of the results of a long and careful study of the three centuries of English Church life immediately before the Reformation. A book of this kind, drawing its information from reliable contemporary documents and making use of the latest research, has long been wanted. We think that Mr. Arrowsmith has met the need. He writes in an impartial spirit and can sympathize even where he has to condemn. He fully recognizes the good which is to be found amid much that was thoroughly bad. This naturally invites the reader's confidence, while the very full references given enable him to test the accuracy of the author's statements. No proper estimate of the Reformation is possible without a knowledge of the conditions which preceded it. The better the Middle Ages are known the more fully is the Reformation seen to be justified, and much necessary knowledge will be found in this book. The chapters on the religious houses show clearly enough the causes which led to their downfall. The dissolution of the monasteries may have been accompanied with harshness in many cases, some of the charges may have been exaggerated, but an impartial survey of the evidence as it has come down to us leaves little ground for questioning the wisdom or the substantial justice of the step. We hope that this book will be widely read. It would make an excellent textbook for theological colleges and for the upper forms in schools, and we cordially commend it to the ordinary reader who wishes to know something of the causes which led to one of the greatest movements in the history of Christendom.

The "Thirteen Little Booklets" issued by Mr. Arthur Mercer, "Rozel," Wimbledon (on thin paper with tinted covers and monogram, one penny each), have now reached two million copies.

BISHOP HENSON'S NEW BOOK.

IN DEFENCE OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH. By the Right Rev. H. Hensley Henson, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. London: *Hodder & Stoughton.* 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

"If the foundation of the Church is the first cause of thankfulness, the Reformation of the Church must be the second." This passage, quoted from Bishop Lightfoot, appears on the title page of the Bishop of Durham's new book, and it indicates its general line. The purpose of the volume is defence—defence of the English Church, as purified at the Reformation, against the attempts now being made to destroy its distinctive characteristics. Except for the introduction, there is nothing new in the book. It consists of the two letters the Bishop addressed to the *Morning Post* in relation to the Anglo-Catholic Congress, and of sermons and addresses preached in Westminster Abbey and elsewhere bearing on the general character of the Church of England. But the Introduction is a noteworthy piece of work, and, even if it stood alone, would attract attention.

The Bishop examines the Anglo-Catholic demand as set out in its official papers, and sums it up thus: "It is that the entire Reformation settlement embodied in the legal Establishment of the Church of England shall be cancelled, and English clergymen left free to adopt as much of it as they like, or to repudiate the whole of it, at their unfettered discretion. The legal subscriptions of the clergy are to be recognized as binding them to nothing at all."

The position of the Bishops is also closely examined, and it is clear that Dr. Henson is sensible of the difficulties which attend it. "If he (the Bishop) attempt to enforce the law, he may be ruined by the cost of deliberately protracted litigation: if, yielding to necessity, he hold his hand, he will be represented as in some sense authorizing the illegalities he is unable to restrain. It is difficult to imagine a more cynical course than that which *first* organizes the financial ruin of the conscientious Bishop, and *then*, when his disciplinary action has been paralysed, exploits the Bishop's inability to prosecute in order to pretend episcopal sanction for lawlessness. No feature of the Anglo-Catholic propaganda appears to me more repulsive than this claim to have received episcopal authority." He concludes that Anglo-Catholics in demanding that their dogmatic basis shall be acknowledged as a legitimate reading of Anglican formularies "are asking something which *none* of the bishops can concede without unfaithfulness to his public duty, and which *few, if any*, of them can yield without also doing violence to their personal convictions."

Reviewing the possible consequences of the policy of Anglo-Catholics securing the sanction of the Anglican authorities, he predicts Disestablishment, Disendowment (the loss of an annual income of perhaps as much as £4,000,000), and the break-up of the Church of England.

But the real question which the Anglo-Catholics have raised is: "Is the Church of England to continue?" and the Bishop of Durham, in answering it, shows us the Church of England as it is presented in its legal standards, in its general tradition, and in its great divines from Jewel and Hooker to Lightfoot and Westcott. The contrast he draws between the Church of England system and the "alien system" of the Anglo-Catholics is most striking, and he urges that it is "our duty to save the Church of England from the strange transformation at the hands of its own members, which, if it proceed much further, will leave it nothing Anglican but the name."

The Bishop's wise and weighty words will carry great influence, especially with the laity; and, whether his hope of an effective union of the Evangelical and liberal elements be realized or not, he will have done good service by insisting upon the paramount obligation resting upon all Churchpeople of acting "in defence of the English Church" against all who would destroy its Reformed faith and worship.

A FORGOTTEN INCIDENT.

In an article on Prayer Book Revision in the current number of the *Church Quarterly Review*, the Dean of Canterbury recalls the almost forgotten Round Table Conference at Fulham in 1899, held to consider the differences in the Church respecting the Holy Communion. Those who thus were in conference were "a dozen of the most representative Churchmen of the day," but "in the end they found themselves obliged to report to the Bishop that they had not been able to come to an agreement on the critical questions; and . . . the Bishop at once replied that he had not expected it." The Dean recalls also that when Mr. Dimock expressed the view that "the formularies of the Church of England had been drawn *ex industria*—even, he said, with excess of caution—to exclude views of the Real Presence, such as had been stated by the late Mr. Bennett, and as were, in some degree at least, represented at the Conference by Dr. Gore," Dr. Sanday and Dr. Gore protested and urged that the Conference should repudiate such a view. But the Conference agreed that it was no part of its function to pronounce such a judgment as a body. Dr. Wace thinks it is "an instructive incident that a discussion by an extremely learned and competent body of Churchmen should have nearly ended in disruption," and he points out that the expression of such an opinion by Mr. Dimock and his refusal to withdraw it "is strong evidence of the earnest determination with which, when the crisis arises, the opposition to the high 'Catholic' view will be asserted by the Evangelical clergy and laity." The Dean pleads for "a revival of the sense that the formularies and the history of the Church of England do embody a standard and an ideal which are perfectly distinct and well established."

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1

Prayer Book Teaching.—The series of booklets published under the general title of Prayer Book Teaching has been added to since the last issue of THE CHURCHMAN by four numbers, bringing the series up to 17. The Rev. George F. Irwin, B.D., contributes one on *The Ministry of the Church*, and gives a very clear and concise answer to the question, "What is the teaching of the Prayer Book as to the nature and purpose of the Ministry of the Church?" The Rev. C. Sydney Carter in his booklet *Christian Priesthood* shows how the failure to realize the great difference between the Jewish and Christian priesthood in the Middle Ages led to the dangerous and unscriptural claims for the Christian Ministry in the Middle Ages, and finally to "Anglo-Catholic" teaching of to-day. He ends by a section on the positive teaching of our Church on this matter. Mr. Carter has also written a second manual, *The Christian Church: Its Development, Corruption and Renewal.* In this he traces the growth and development of the Christian Faith through the early organization of the Church, the growth of Papal claims, mediæval abuses, the Renaissance and the Reformation to the present day. Finally the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D., gives us *A Short History of the Prayer Book.* He points out that the Prayer Book in its present form is the outcome of a long history, and he gives a very useful and complete, though short, account of the various uses and variations of services before the Reformation, the influence making for an English Book of Common Prayer, and the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552, 1559, 1604, and 1662.

Ministerial Commission.—A new book by the Rev. C. Sydney Carter has just been published, entitled *Ministerial Commission*, and it has had the advantage of a preface by the Bishop of Chelmsford. The author discusses the founding of the Christian Church and the growth of an organized ministry in New Testament times. The nature of this ministry is carefully examined in the light of the most recent research and scholarship. The development in the organization and government of the Church during the third century are fully set forth, and the author gives a fairly full account of the principles guiding the Reformers in their attitude towards Ministerial Commission as necessary for the well-being of the Christian Church. In a concluding chapter the author summarizes the views of Ministerial Commission held during the crucial periods of Church History, and notices the attempts made in modern times to heal the divisions of Christendom, and especially the present attitude of the Roman and Eastern Churches on the question. The problem and prospects of Reunion in the Homeland and in the Mission Field amongst the various Reformed Communions are carefully considered and estimated, especially in the light of the recent "Lambeth Appeal." It is a clear, comprehensive and concise account of a pressing and highly important subject. The book is published at 2*s.* 6*d.* net, and is particularly valuable in view of the Prayer Book revision discussions.

Communicants' Unions.—A little Manual for Communicants' Unions has just been compiled by Canon Cecil W. Wilson, Vicar of Swansea (price 1*d.*, or 7*s.* per 100). The Manual gives particulars of Membership of the

Union, its objects and rules, a Service for meetings of the Union and admission of Members. There has been a difficulty in finding suitable forms for use in connection with such Unions in the past, and it is hoped that the present little Manual will supply a need.

Alternative Communion Service.—Bishop E. A. Knox has recently published a new book entitled *Spiritual Objections to the Proposed Alternative Communion Service* (price 3*s.* 6*d.* in cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.* paper cover), in view of the National Assembly meeting this month. The Bishop states :—

" It is commonly supposed that the Church of England allows, though it does not teach, a doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice securely resting on the doctrine of the early Fathers. The object of this book is to show that any idea of Eucharistic sacrifice implying a continuation, or continued presentation, of the Sacrifice on the Cross involves (1) a defective idea of the complete reconciliation of God with us, and (2) the necessity of a Divinely appointed Priesthood, to offer to God the elements of bread and wine changed by consecration into the Body and Blood of Christ. The failure of the attempt of the Caroline divines to establish their teaching as distinct from the Roman doctrines which they repudiated is explained, as well as the reasons why the teaching of the Tractarians has passed of necessity into that of the Anglo-Catholics.

" The proposed alternative Communion Service is shown not to be faithful even to the standard of English teaching which it professes to maintain, and to be not an alternative with that of the Prayer Book, but fundamentally opposed to it in its conception of our relation to God. The whole question is reasoned on spiritual grounds, with an earnest desire to avoid mere party cries or watchwords. The appeal is to devout and sober-minded Church-people, and exhibits to them the reasons why Archbishop Laud and his followers prepared the way for the confusion in which the Church of England is at present entangled."

Has Man a Future Life?—Colonel Seton Churchill has just issued a pamphlet entitled, *Has Man a Future Life? What is Its Nature?* (2*d.*) Many readers of THE CHURCHMAN will be familiar with the previous writings of the author and will look for the fresh and attractive style which is peculiarly his. Such pamphlets as *Is there a Prayer-Answering God?*, *The Road that Led me to Christ*, and *Purity of Life*, have been found of the greatest service by workers and district visitors, and particularly in work among men and boys. The present pamphlet is full of interest and should be a help to many.
