

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

August, 1916.

The Month.

Church
and State.

QUITE the most important event of the month from the point of view of the Church of England is the publication of the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on the Relations of Church and State. We have given elsewhere (pp. 533-537) the official summary of the Report, but no abstract, however carefully prepared, can give any adequate idea of the wonderfully wide range of the volume or of its absorbing interest. The Report itself occupies only 67 of the 304 pages which go to make up the book, and, while the recommendations of the Committee are of the very first importance, the various Memoranda and Appendices are also deserving of the closest study. It may be questioned whether anywhere else can be found such clear and explicit statements of the constitution of Colonial and other Churches in communion with the Church of England as are given in this volume. Among the Memoranda are illuminating contributions from Bishop Browne on Church and State in English History; the Bishop of Oxford on "The Fundamental Idea of the Spiritual Independence of the Church"; Dr. Frere on "Canonical Legislation," to which an effective reply "Note" of 14 pages is supplied by Sir Lewis Dibdin; and by Lord Hugh Cecil, Lord Parmoor, and the Bishop of Oxford on "The Position of the Incumbent of a Parish in relation to the Parochial Church Council." These various Memoranda show that, while the members of the Committee are unanimous in signing the Report, there is a wide difference of opinion among some of them in relation to very important questions which cannot be ignored in estimating the value of the Report and its chances of being adopted by Parliament. The scheme recommended by the Committee for giving self-government to the Church is most ably worked out,

and if it were accepted by Parliament would go a long way towards relieving the Church of the disability under which it now labours in regard to ecclesiastical legislation. But the freedom of the Church to manage its own affairs may be too dearly purchased, and we cannot help feeling that if this scheme were to become effective the laity would lose whatever guarantee they now possess against the inroads of clericalism. As things now are the position is safeguarded, at least ostensibly, by the supremacy of Parliament in ecclesiastical affairs, but when once this scheme is adopted, the real power will pass into the hands of the Church Council which is to receive statutory authority. It is true that the Council will contain a House of Laity, but unless the members of it are chosen more largely from the general body of the laity than is the case with the present Provincial Houses of Laymen, the Lay House may easily become even more ecclesiastical than the Clerical Houses. Much would depend, of course, upon the strength of the organization the various parties in the Church were able to bring to bear upon the lay elections, and it may be hoped that those who should be responsible for work of this kind will seriously consider how far they are, or will be, prepared to deal with a situation which will need their best efforts.

But while writing thus we should be sorry if it were thought that we are hostile to the scheme. We recognize that it would materially ease the position of the Church in many respects ; it would give the Church room for expansion ; it would enable the Church more speedily to reform abuses ; it would help the Church to become more and more, in fact as well as in name, the National Church because it would be the Church of the English people. Our one anxiety is lest advantage should be taken of the liberty thus conferred to change the essential character of the Church of England. The Bishop of Manchester has warned us of the " Romeward Drift," and it would be the merest affectation to ignore the fact that there is a strong party within the Church of England which is bent upon using every opportunity of more closely assimilating the services and practices of the Church of England to those of the Church of Rome. Frankly our fear is that this party may gain very considerable tactical advantage under this scheme. If, however, the true characteristics of the Church of England, as Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, Protestant, could be

effectually safeguarded, we should rejoice to see this scheme in action. We do not regard as of any serious value in this respect, the provision made for the examination by an Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council of proposals agreed to by the Church Council, or for laying such proposals on the Table of both Houses of Parliament for forty days. These are formalities rather than safeguards; when once a measure has passed the Church Council it will probably be proof against material alteration. Whatever loyal Churchmen desire to do to protect the Reformed position of the Church of England will have to be done while the measure is before the Church Council. Hence the great importance of seeing to it that that body is loyally representative of the Church as a whole and not of one particular party in it. The formation of Parochial Church Councils with statutory powers is also an innovation of great moment, but it is one which, we believe, is well calculated, if adequately and efficiently carried through, to strengthen the parochial life of the Church of England.

Will
Parliament
Consent? The main problem to face is whether there is any likelihood of Parliament accepting the scheme which has been drawn up with so much care and ability by the Archbishops' Committee. Upon this point we cannot do better than quote the words with which Sir Lewis Dibdin concludes his Note on Dr. Frere's Memorandum on Canonical Legislation. He says that the practical importance of the historical question with which Dr. Frere's Memorandum and his Note alike deal, in connection with the work of the Committee, is very great. Dr. Frere writes: "At the present time there is a fresh opportunity for the Church to recover its powers of legislation and its authority over its own members"; and it is on this context that he seeks to show that Parliamentary dominance over Church legislation is after all a modern affair, dating in its fulness only from the eighteenth century, and belonging to a "New Georgian Settlement" rather than to "the Reformation Settlement." Sir Lewis Dibdin proceeds:—

It is essential that we should face facts. If I am right they do not support Dr. Frere's contention. Probably the Committee are unanimous in desiring to see the Church allowed to make its own laws without undue interference from Parliament. We want not only to end the mischievous paralysis of legislation from which the Church has suffered now for many years, but also that its law-making should be in more suitable hands than those of an always reluctant and often hostile House of Commons. Schemes have been put before us, and we have generally approved them, which, if adopted, would

at least have the effect of securing for the Church of England a large measure of autonomy and of preventing the House of Commons from exercising its present limitless powers of discussing and obstructing ecclesiastical Bills. And yet the Church is to remain established. That is an underlying condition to which I think nearly all the members of the Committee attach importance. We must recognize that the success of this plan is absolutely dependent on its approval by the House of Commons, and Dr. Frere advises us that "a Church that wishes to remain established had far better take a bold line than a timid one." I am not concerned to question this, but I deprecate a neglect or even an underestimate of the real difficulties of our enterprise. We have seen how extraordinarily jealous the House of Commons has always shown itself of anything like independent legislative action by the Church. In recent years, while it has shown no disposition to pass ecclesiastical Acts, it has retained all its old unwillingness to surrender its legislative power over the Established Church. Yet Parliament is to be asked to give up authority which it has exercised not merely since the beginning of the eighteenth century but ever since the Papal supremacy was abrogated, and to do this without disturbing the official recognition of the Church which we call establishment. Whether the ascendancy of Parliament in Church matters was or was not at any time defensible, it was clearly part of a system which presupposed a friendly partnership between Church and State as of two bodies united by identity of religious belief. Whatever were the difficulties and anomalies which the adoption of this theory produced in the past, and they were neither few nor small, they have been immensely increased by the gradual development of the State into a body which is external to any form of religion, not necessarily hostile to the Church, but at the best neutral as between all Churches. It would be very reckless to force on a crisis which otherwise may not come for many years, perhaps never, but it is desirable that we should appreciate the formidable character of the concession which is to be sought from Parliament. It is even open to question whether, by clinging to establishment while we ask for autonomy, we may not be giving too much regard to what Churchmen desire, and too little to what a State, organized on the new footing I have described, can grant.

This is the crux of the whole question, and we think that the general view of Churchmen will be that it would be better to bear the ills inflicted upon us by the present system—and they are grievous enough—than run the risk of bringing on a disestablishment crisis.

The Some Evangelical Churchmen have been in conference at Cheltenham under the presidency of the new Rector, the Rev. H. A. Wilson. The questions dealt with were those which are engaging the serious attention of Churchmen at the present time—the National Mission, the doctrinal aspect of the Atonement, the practice of Reservation, the Communion Office, the Principal Service, Sacramental Confession, Prayer-Book Revision, and Reunion. The following Conclusions of the Conference have been published:—

1. We warmly welcome the proposed National Mission as an opportunity

which, with God's blessing, should lead to a great and widespread revival of the spiritual life of the nation. In that Mission personal conversion should be sought, and the direct claims of God upon the individual soul, as well as upon the nation at large, should be pressed. To this end the standard of spiritual life in the Church itself must first be raised. We need a greater sense of the necessity for our souls' health of the regular devotional reading and careful study of the Word of God ; a greater realization of the obligation as well as the power of prayer ; and above all a fuller recognition and deeper experience of the work of the Holy Ghost, if the blessing we long for is to come.

2. We emphasize the completeness and finality of the Atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ upon the Cross : " Who made there (by His one oblation of Himself, once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world."

Arising out of this fundamental truth, we reaffirm and endorse the teaching of Articles xxviii. and xxxi. and the other formularies of our Church that in the Holy Communion there is no sacrifice for sins, nor any localized and objective presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, but that " the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith."

3. We view the practice of the Reservation of the elements as being directly contrary to the plain direction of the Articles and the Rubrics, and as tending to a dangerous revival of superstition. We do not consider that a case has been made out for the plea of necessity, and we are convinced that all genuine difficulties can be met by shortened forms of Holy Communion for the sick.

4. In other respects we are, under present circumstances, strongly opposed to any alteration of the office for Holy Communion or its rubrics, especially in any such manner as would affect its doctrinal character, whether by the authorization of special vestments or otherwise.

5. We rejoice in any legitimate means by which the whole body of believers may be brought to a fuller use of the means of grace by partaking of Holy Communion, but we are of opinion that this will not be attained by any rearrangements which, under the plea of making the Holy Communion " the principal service on the Lord's Day," will involve or facilitate the attendance of those who do not communicate. Any such arrangement would in our view be inconsistent with the character of Holy Communion and would approximate towards the celebration of the Mass. We cannot accept the plea that such an alteration will be called for by our soldiers on their return from the war, since the testimony of devout officers and of clergy who have laboured extensively among the troops goes to show that the men will rather demand simple congregational services in which they can fully join.

6. We desire that every encouragement and all reasonable opportunity should be given by the clergy to those who desire to obtain spiritual guidance, help and counsel to meet exceptional needs, and especially in cases where the sense of sin and of personal unworthiness is keeping them away from the Lord's Table ; yet in view of the character of the revisions through which the Prayer Book has passed, we cannot regard the Exhortation in the Communion Office as making any provision for sacramental confession ; and we deprecate most strongly the practice of habitual confession as a regular or compulsory discipline for communicants.

7. With regard to the Prayer Book in general we would welcome any revision which would make it better understood of the people, simplify its order, provide more variety in its lectionary, psalms and canticles, and enrich it with services adapted for occasions and requirements which have arisen

since its compilation ; but we insist that such revision should in all cases be consistent with its present teaching, founded as that teaching is upon the warrant of Holy Scripture.

8. The question of the relation of the Church of England to other Christian bodies has engaged our serious attention. We recognize the help which successive Lambeth Conferences have given towards defining such relationships, and welcome the strong encouragement which has come from the pronouncement of the Archbishop of Canterbury in regard to what is known as *Kikuyu*. To the findings of that pronouncement we heartily assent. We look forward to the time when the ties between ourselves and those who at home are our Nonconforming brethren may be drawn closer, while we recognize that their separation from our Church involves grave difficulties which will require most careful consideration in any movements towards reunion.

These Conclusions have been numerously signed by Evangelical clergy and laity, and signatures are still being received, we understand, by the Rector of Cheltenham. The document has obviously been most carefully prepared, and if it were signed by Evangelical clergy and laity as a body, and not merely by a few men, however representative they may be, it would gain immensely in importance as a considered Statement of the Evangelical Position on these great Church questions.

The Rev. W. J. L. Sheppard, a well-known Missioner and Rector of St. Thomas's, Birmingham, has devised a substitute for the Confessional, a substitute for the Confessional, and outlined his plan before a Conference of Clergy in Birmingham in a paper which has since been published in the *Church Family Newspaper*. He insists upon the primary importance of personal dealing with souls, and points out that the after-service, pastoral visitation and general invitations to personal interviews are not sufficient. He holds that what is needed is a regular method of carrying on this important part of a clergyman's work, and this, he says, is afforded by the institution, on the lines laid down in the Prayer Book, of what he has called "The Consultational." He thus explains its practical working :—

A regular time is fixed in each week—in working-class parishes in the evening—lasting perhaps an hour or an hour and a half ; at this time, although the church may always be open for private prayer, people are specially urged to come to the church for prayer, either privately or in groups ; during this same time the incumbent is announced as being in the vestry, ready and anxious to help any one who needs any kind of spiritual counsel or assistance ; a large notice, placed in some prominent part of the church, indicates whether he is engaged or not ; one of the assistant clergy, or a deaconess, should always be in the church itself for this same period, to conduct prayer groups or to give any information required. Somehow the church thus forms a kind of half-

way house to the Consultational ; people who would never come to see their clergy otherwise come to the church and pray, and then find the courage to pass into the vestry. There the interviews are of all kinds, and by no means confined to those burdened with sin or seeking salvation ; spiritual difficulties of many varieties are brought to the clergy, and a close personal touch established with many people which previously seemed impossible to obtain. The Consultational should be regularly announced every Sunday among the Notices.

Mr. Sheppard claims that while the Consultational has some points in common with the Confessional it has more points of difference. It is not for regular use, is in no sense obligatory, does not entail a suggestive interrogation respecting sin or details of sin, and does not include any formal confession to a priest. It differs also in its results :—

The tendency to moral and spiritual weakness, which follows from the constant reliance on a spiritual director, is not produced by the Consultational. Instead of teaching the person to rely on continual penance and absolution at regular periods, which so often means constant falls into sin in the intervals between such periods, the Consultational teaches not only the certainty of forgiveness, but also the possibility of overcoming sin through the indwelling Christ and the power of the Holy Spirit, thus producing a strong Christian character instead of one that is weak.

We do not doubt the excellence of the motive which has prompted this suggestion, although we are a little tired of hearing about the all-importance of having a policy which is not negative but positive and constructive. It is rather late in the day to seek a substitute for the Confessional, nor are we sure that one is needed. We believe that the most successful spiritual work, hitherto, has come from the faithful preaching of the Gospel in the pulpit, in full assurance of faith that the Holy Spirit of God will bring the message home with power to individual souls. Of course every clergyman ought to be at the service of any of his people who may need spiritual counsel and advice, but the time when that is most needed and can most effectively be given is immediately after the Gospel message has been delivered. What would be the position of one whose soul was deeply moved by a sermon on a Sunday evening and was anxious for further help if he or she had to wait for it until (say) the following Saturday, when the Vicar would be sitting in the " Consultational " ? It is more than possible that in the meantime the first impression would have passed away and the soul would have grown cold, and perhaps indifferent. And it is possible that the Consultational might become a mere formality, quite as much as is the Confessional to-day.

The Ministry of Women. The soul of Mr. Athelstan Riley is much perturbed because he hears that on July 3 the Council of the National Mission on the motion of Miss Royden, passed the following resolution:—"To urge upon the bishops the importance of giving definite directions as to the best ways of using the services and receiving the message of women-speakers, whether in church or elsewhere." We confess we are surprised at this news, because we did not think the Council was possessed of a progressive spirit. Perhaps it would not have been passed if Mr. Riley had been there, for he says:—"Unfortunately some of us who would have raised the strongest possible protest against committing the Church of England to such a breach, not only of Catholic order, but of the Apostolic doctrine and fellowship, were unable to be present." But they are making "representations," and he trusts that those who, in consequence of the resolution, may be tempted to withdraw from participation in the Mission will pause, until the result is known. We hope the Council will stand firm—although we have not much faith that they will do so—for it is time that the Women's Question were fairly and frankly faced. Women are ordained to the order of Deaconess; they sing in our church choirs; they address meetings from the platforms of our great Societies; they conduct Missions in Parish Halls, etc.: why, then, may they not be allowed sometimes to deliver their message in church? Not, of course, at an ordinary service, but at one of those special services which now are becoming so common. We may be told that St. Paul's ruling as laid down in 1 Corinthians xiv. 34 settles the question; but does it? Is there any reason to suppose that he was doing anything more than laying down a special injunction for the particular circumstances with which he was confronted? Is it in the least clear that he was giving expression to a fundamental principle which should govern the ministry of the Church for all time? We find it difficult to believe it. When we remember the marked blessing which attends the ministry of women in other denominations (e.g. the Booths in the Salvation Army), we are sometimes tempted to wonder whether the Church of England has always done quite wisely in making so little use of the great spiritual powers and influence women undoubtedly possess. Most emphatically we do *not* wish to see them conducting the public worship of the Church, but, short of that, why restrict their service?

The "Exceptional Case" of Cornelius.

THE reception of Cornelius and his friends into the Christian Church was possibly the most important event in its history after it had once started on its career of world-conquest. This may seem a strong statement ; and certain references in the writings of recent Commentators may seem to contradict such a view. So Professor Ramsay writes twice as follows :—"The main question was not yet definitely settled ; only *an exceptional case* was condoned and accepted " ; and (with reference to Titus, whose circumstances are compared to those of Cornelius) "once more they seem to have acquiesced in *an exceptional case*, as they did in that of Cornelius."¹ Similarly Professor Knowling—"The case of Cornelius had been acquiesced in, *but it was exceptional.*"²

It is important to note that such references, especially in their context (which we have not space to quote), do not of necessity imply that these learned expositors believe the case of Cornelius was actually a mere exception. It is quite possible that they may only be speaking of the attitude of the circumcision party towards it—of the Judaistic claim which was in all probability made, that it was an exception and not a precedent. If so, one may indeed be permitted to wish that they had made their meaning less open to doubt ; but for reasons presently to be stated, it would seem difficult to believe they would maintain such a Jewish claim to be valid. A passage from an older Commentary may exactly supply the link we need. The late Dean Plumptre suggested that to the objectors "it may have seemed *the exception that proved the rule.*" They may have felt that signs and wonders were evidence that God had in such cases dispensed with His own law, or that while it was right to receive men to baptism under such conditions, circumcision must follow, as being an "everlasting covenant."³

Some such position is quite likely to have been adopted by the Judaistic party. There is nothing whatever to be said from

¹ "St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen," Sixth Edition, pp. 44, 58. The italics in this and the succeeding quotations are of course ours.

² "Expositor's Greek Testament," on Acts xv. 1.

³ Dean Plumptre in Bishop Ellicott's "Commentary for English Readers," on Acts xv. 1.

Scripture, however, for the view that Cornelius could be regarded as an exceptional case, even without its possible Jewish additions on the lines suggested just above. And as it is a matter which does not merely concern a long dead controversy, but is vital to the whole Christian position, it is well worth our attention. The following grounds are suggested as indicating that the case of Cornelius was not merely not exceptional, but was positively pivotal to the whole course of Church History.

1. St. Luke framed the Acts upon an obvious system. Certain events are selected for record to the exclusion of all others. And they are selected upon a principle. No one has shown more conclusively than Professor Ramsay how acute is Luke's historical sense, and how skilful (if one may use the word of an inspired writing) is his selection of such events. Generally they are typical of other events that must continually have occurred in many places; and always they have some bearing on the development of the Divine plan for world-evangelization. And St. Luke is never prolix. Where he is unexpectedly lengthy, as, e.g., in the record of Stephen's speech, everything is found on examination to be exactly adapted for its purpose. And when so much has to be omitted, he certainly has no room for needless repetitions.

Now consider the account of Cornelius. It is unique in the whole book in these respects. Not only does it, with its sequel, occupy more than a chapter and a half, or sixty-six verses in all, but the decisive vision in the matter of clean and unclean is positively twice told in full, besides an allusion in x. 28. There are only two instances (unless we add the case of Stephen, another great crisis, just mentioned) which really compare with this. The account of St. Paul's trials and journeyings occupies much more space: but after all they formed a long series of events and occupied a considerable time, whereas the case of Cornelius was a single occurrence; though we are not going to under-estimate the significance of xxi. 17—xxviii. 31. The conversion of St. Paul, again, is thrice told, as against the double account of St. Peter's vision: and that conversion was another great turning-point. It is perhaps difficult to say whether the conversion of St. Paul or of Cornelius was the more important, because each was of supreme importance in its own sphere, and because they belong to different sides of the same great development. Acts ix. brings on the scene the Apostle of

the Gentiles : Acts x. shows us their first-fruits. At all events St. Luke, with his careful historic sense, may fairly be said to assign to Cornelius a position of unique prominence.

2. Nor does his conversion stand in isolation : it is related to a chain of events. We might, indeed, make that chain a long one, by including all the closely woven events of the whole book. But we will take five links now, of which Cornelius is the second. Before him comes the Ethiopian, and afterwards the converts at the greater Antioch, the Roman governor at Paphos, and the separation from the Jews at Antioch in Pisidia. It seems at first tempting to take the first three alone, as marking respectively the baptism of the first full proselyte connected with a heathen country,¹ the first of the class known as *σεβόμενοι*, and the first downright heathen (reading "*Ἑλληνας* with R.V. in xi. 20). But it is by no means certain that the reading in the last case should not be *Ἑλληνιστὰς* after all : Professor Knowling makes out a strong case for it in his critical note. And even if *Ἑλληνας* be right, it need not mean representatives of the outer circle of heathendom. Such converts might well be of the "God-fearing" class like Cornelius. And, in fact, this seems to be the general view. If we were to argue that the narrative implies a new stage of progress, and therefore makes it probable they were heathen of the outer circle, it would not be sufficient. For it may have been intended merely to describe the constitution of the Church of Antioch in view of its importance in future developments.² There is also a difficulty about the Ethiopian. While Ramsay seems sure he was a regular proselyte, Lightfoot and Knowling (quoting also apparently Hort) think he belonged to the same class as Cornelius, and they support their conclusion by reasoning which appears at least to demand recognition.³ So that it is quite possible that all three of the first links we have mentioned relate to *σεβόμενοι*, and that the first convert from the outer heathen world was Sergius Paulus in Cyprus. In

¹ In any event Nicolas had been received before (vi. 5) ; and perhaps a full proselyte was not so widely separated from a born Jew as to demand special recognition of the class. See, however, Schürer, "History of Jewish People," ii. ii. 326, as to the gulf between them. And the baptism of a proselyte from distant heathenism might be considered to possess a significance not attaching to that of a proselyte connected with the Church at Jerusalem, like Nicolas.

² See Knowling, "Expos. G.T." *in loc.*

³ Ramsay, "St. Paul," p. 377 (cp. 375) ; Lightfoot "Ep. to Gal." pp. 300-1 ; Knowling, "Expos. G.T." Acts viii. 27.

fact, the prominence given to this event confirms the probability that the converts at Antioch were of the "God-fearing" class. At the same time no great controversy would be stirred, perhaps, by a single convert, even though a distinguished one, in Cyprus: and the real climax probably comes in our fifth link (xiii. 46), when at Pisidian Antioch St. Paul boldly declares to the opposing Jews, "Lo, we turn^s to the Gentiles" (τὰ ἔθνη).

These conclusions, to which we seem to have been driven, may appear to affect adversely any inference as to the prominence of Cornelius in the chain of events. If we could be sure that he and his company were the first of the *σεβόμενοι* to be received into the Church, it would make their baptism more obviously significant; for, as uncircumcised, they would stand in relation to the covenant in the same position as the outer heathen themselves. But in any event their case would be the first one likely to stir controversy. The Ethiopian, if he belonged to the same class, was far away—perhaps sowing the seed of the Church in distant Africa.¹ And if the climax did not come till later—whether at Antioch (where it certainly came to a head in xv. 1, 2, if it did not first arise in xi. 20), or in Cyprus, or in Pisidia—the Rubicon was crossed with the admission of uncircumcised persons. If one might argue *a priori*, the fitness of things might seem to require that Cornelius and his friends were actually the first of these. But if we are forced to conclude that the Ethiopian preceded them—which perhaps after all we are not—then the special emphasis laid on Cornelius must signify that this at any rate marked *the real crisis*.

3. Certain isolated expressions confirm this. "They that were of the circumcision" criticized Peter, who convinced them by relating exactly what had happened at Cæsarea. And what were their words on that occasion? "They held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God *also to the Gentiles* granted repentance unto life" (xi. 18). τοῖς ἔθνεσιν—not τοῖς σεβομένοις τὸν θεόν: and the *καὶ* intensifies the surprise expressed. Plainly they at first accepted—and to all appearances joyfully and thankfully accepted—the position as we have represented it. And this may seem, at first sight, to contradict the theory that even the Judaizers could argue that it was an exceptional case. But we must re-

¹ See Knowling, "Expos. G.T." Acts xi. 3, for other reasons which may have distinguished Cornelius from the Ethiopian.

member that *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς* in Acts xi. 2 may not involve quite the same sinister meaning as it bears in Gal. ii. 12.¹ Moreover, others may have refused to accept their verdict; or they themselves may subsequently have been argued out of it; or as we saw before, they may have supposed circumcision would follow. At any rate the first Jewish opinion was that the marvellous fact had been duly certified in this notable case—salvation for *the Gentiles*, the word being general and inclusive, even if it was tacitly assumed there would be more or less observance of the law. That is to say, Cornelius was regarded as *the critical Gentile precedent*.

Again, at the Jerusalem Council St. Peter clearly had Cornelius in mind, as a crucial case; and apparently St. James alluded to it in that light in his decisive address (xv. 7-8, 14). And both of them, like the Jews in chap. xi., employ the word *ἔθνη*.²

The only apparent difficulty is the extraordinary behaviour of Peter at Antioch after all the convincing evidence of the vision at Joppa and the "second Pentecost" at Cæsarea. All that need be said, however, is that such conduct was all too typical of Peter! As we have his fellow-apostle's strong condemnation of his action, it serves in reality yet further to confirm the main conclusion.

And, as we have ventured to use the term "second Pentecost" with reference to the great events at Cæsarea, it may be said in conclusion that, while there is no direct Scriptural sanction for such a term, the phrase "as on us at the beginning" (xi. 15; cp. 17) is strongly suggestive. Pentecost, of course, was a supreme event which in one sense was incapable of repetition; but it may well have been the Divine purpose to manifest before unimpeachable witnesses (and especially before the leading apostle of the circumcision) that the Holy Ghost had now been given to Gentiles as before to Jews, and that they were intended to understand this as the beginning of a new stage in the Divine plan, for which the chief instrument was by Divine providence, yet unknown to them, forthcoming in the converted Saul.

¹ See Knowing's note, "Expos. G.T.," Acts xi. 2.

² It seems incredible, partly for this very reason, that Peter laid it down in x. 35 (as Ramsay says in "St. Paul," p. 43) that Cornelius was accepted because he was one of the *φοβούμενοι* or *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν*. It is true that he had not then had the final evidence of the gift of the Holy Ghost; but he was speaking as the inspired messenger of God's will. At any rate the more general word used in Acts xv. without any limitation at a time of such crisis shows what his mature view of the case was.

Whether, therefore, the circumcision party tried to argue that Cornelius was an exception or not, nothing is plainer than that Scripture is framed with the very purpose of making that view untenable. And this, as we noted, is no mere matter of dry-as-dust controversy. It vitally concerns us all. For the reception of the Holy Ghost by that little company at Caesarea long ago is the charter for all ages of Christian liberty as against the fetters of ceremonial bondage.

W. S. HOOTON.



The Book of Revelation: its Symbols and their Meaning.

(Being a continuation of the article on PROPHECY which appeared in the *CHURCHMAN* for April.)

THIS book is not so difficult to interpret as the world supposes. Otherwise the "blessing" pronounced on those who "read" and those who "listen to" this last "testimony of Jesus" would be a mockery. And if we attend to Irenaeus'¹ golden rule that prophecy is not intended to ante-date history but only to *unfold the meaning of events after they have occurred*, then we stand on this great vantage-ground over all Christians who have gone before us—namely, that we have lived to see the unfolding of events which for them were dark but for us have received a final accomplishment. Each succeeding generation of expositors from the second century onward has added to the interpretation of the symbols of this Book; so that we "to whom the ends of the ages have come," may enter into their labours and even reconcile their apparent contradictions in the light of a broader historical perspective.²

¹ IREN. IV. c. xxvi. *πᾶσα γὰρ προφητεία πρὸ τῆς ἐκβάσεως ἀνιγμα ἐστὶ καὶ ἀντιλογία τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. δταν δ' ἔλθῃ ὁ Καίρος καὶ ἀπορῆ τὸ προφητευθὲν τότε τῆς ἀκριβεστάτης ἐπέτυχεν ἐξηγήσεως.* ("Every prophecy before its accomplishment is a riddle and a contradiction to man. But when the hour comes and the event prophesied takes place, then it ever meets with its most perfect explanation.") He quotes in proof Jer. xxiii. 20; Dan. xii. 4. 9.

² The history of the INTERPRETATION of this Book may be briefly summarized. HIPPOLYTUS, about the year 200, set the lines of interpretation—especially developing the idea of Anti-Christ (whose symbol "666" probably spelt out *Latinus*) and the wilderness period of the true Church lasting 1,260 years. In the fourth century the Donatist TICHONIUS, with the approval of Augustine, framed the standard commentary—especially by his use of symbols, e.g. the prophetic "day" for a year. About 900 (?) BERENGAUD started the present more regular chronological scheme of interpretation. But about 1200 the Abbot JOACHIM initiated a new era, being one of the first to complete the hint dropped by the Fathers that it would be members of the professing Christian Church who would consummate the apostasy. He drew the further inference (following Gregory I and Theodoret) that the Papacy, by its claim of a "universal pontiff" "snatching at the seat of empire in the Church" (*ἀρπάξεν τὴν προεδρείαν*), was the Anti-Christ. In the seventeenth century MEDS became the author of the universally accepted Protestant exposition of the Apocalypse, which culminated in the standard commentaries of BENJEL and AUBERLEN in Germany (1740 and 1854), of ELLIOTT in England (*Horae Apocalypticæ*, 1851-1862), and of BARNES in America (Commentary, 1851). The argument of all these writers is to the effect that St. John furnishes in this Book a continuous prophecy of the fortunes of the Christian Church from his own times to the end of time.

[The most remarkable instance of direct prophecy which this system of interpretation has hitherto furnished is that of a Scotch layman, Robert Fleming, who in 1701 fixed strikingly approximate dates for the fall of the

We have first to inquire into the *nature* of this Book, which is not so much a prophecy as an APOCALYPSE. What is the difference between an Apocalypse and pure prophecy? A *prophet* is one who HEARS the word of God as it strikes his inner *ear* (Isa. l. 4). An *Apocalypticist* is one who SEES it exhibited in action before his mental *eye* (Ezek. i. 1; Rev. xxii. 8).¹

Consequently there is this difference in the PRESENTATION of prophecy and an Apocalypse. A prophet living in the *present* employs current historical FACTS as types of still greater events to come. An apocalyptic seer living in the *future* employs SYMBOLS as being the most appropriate representation of things not seen as yet and of which no idea can be formed before the event has occurred which the symbol serves to illustrate. Thus Daniel, foreseeing the Anti-Christ (c. xii.), delineates *the future sufferings of Israel for three and a half literal years* (or more strictly "1,290 days") and foretells their restoration in 1,335 days. This was actually accomplished four hundred years later in the times of the Maccabees, when ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES persecuted the Church. But Daniel's prediction had a wider significance. The last days of the Jewish theocracy before the Messiah's *first* coming were a TYPE of the last days of the Christian Church before Messiah's *Second* Coming. Hence, by taking Ezekiel's apocalyptic symbol of "a day for a year" (Ezek. iv. 4), Daniel further foretells 1,260 *years of suffering for the true Israel, the Christian Church*, which would not enjoy the dawn of her millennial reign of peace till the 1,335th *year* of the setting up of Anti-Christ's kingdom. Prophecy, then, is spiritual insight into the present and foresight for the future. But Apocalypse is a VISION of the world's LAST THINGS. Prophecy deals with events in the world of sense. But an apocalypse deals with the history of the world presented in cycles or eras.²

Holy Roman Empire (which took place in 1806), for the loss of the Pope's temporal power (1870), and for the failure of the Turkish power in Europe (1916). These coincidences are acknowledged in the "Speaker's Commentary," which is still the standard work in English.]

¹ Aquinas, the prince of metaphysicians, has accurately divided the several kinds of prophetic revelation into the Sensible, the Imaginative and the Intuitive. "*De Veritate*" Q. xii. a. 7. Cp. Philo "*de plant Noë* t. i., p. 333. The Apocalypse comes under the Imaginative.

² Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, were strictly *prophets*. Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah were apocalyptic *seers*. Under the New Testament St. Paul was a prophet, St. John a seer. Daniel speaks of both forms: "vision *and* prophecy" (ix. 23).

We have now to consider the time and mode of apocalyptic presentation. The TIME of Daniel's visions and that of St. John's Revelation was singularly opportune. Both seers stood on the verge of a departing era. Daniel was a captive in Babylon, St. John in Patmos, during the decline of the Babylonian and Roman empires. To both of them as men "greatly beloved" One like unto the Son of Man appeared with comfort for that dark hour. To DANIEL He showed the passing of four world-wide empires—those of Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome—in the last of which (as even Josephus and his contemporaries interpreted the vision) Messiah was to set up the beginning of His Kingdom. Beyond this Daniel could not see. "The words were sealed unto the time of the end" (Dan. xii. 9).

At this point St. JOHN, who had lived to see the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy, takes up the thread. He warns the Church that *there is to be no fifth monarchy* before Christ comes. The Roman Empire was to continue. It was indeed to be overwhelmed by a flood of barbarians, but was nevertheless to rise again out of the flood and to carry on her imperial mission under Christian forms and titles. The ten kingdoms subdued by Caesar should coalesce to form the empire of Charlemagne. And just as Caesar was to his empire not only Emperor (*Princeps*) but PRIEST (*Pontifex*), so the "Beast" or secular empire formed out of the "Sea" of Nations should be assisted by a SACERDOTAL POWER arising out of the Territory thus formed (a "Beast" from the "Earth") which should *revive* by its claims to divine power THE IMAGE OF CAESAR'S KINGDOM. In other words, to the title of "OUR LORD AND GOD" (*Deus*) the Emperor Domitian¹ was to succeed "OUR LORD GOD (*Deus*) THE POPE."² For

¹ Suetonius, "Domitian," c. 13.

² Pope John XXII's "Extravagants," tit. xiv. Comment, note K. [ed. Lyons 1584; ed. Paris 1826]. That the Pope was God ("Deus") just as the Roman emperors claimed to be GOD, is a well-known claim in Gratian's decretals. The first claims to infallibility were made in the fifth century by Pope Gelasius, who excommunicated the Greek emperor. By the eighth century the Popes declared themselves above human laws and empowered to confirm kings in their temporalities. By the ninth century the Pope claimed to be VICE-CHRIST (Harduin, vi. 184) and "King of Kings." From the tenth century they as regularly styled themselves "Lord" and "God" and "Christ" as they were met by the charge of "Anti-Christ" sitting in the temple of God. [Arnulph of Orleans at Rheims synod in 991 A.D. is the earliest instance cited by Gieseler, ii. 81.] In our own day Leo XIII and Pius X spoke of themselves as "holding the place of Almighty God on earth" and as being "Jesus Christ hidden under fleshly form" (Leo's Synodical Letter, 1890: Mgr. Bonguard's "Le Christianisme et le temps présent").

1,260 "days" of years—sometimes varied by the symbol of "forty-two months" or "a time," two "times and half a time"—this anti-Christian world-power was to continue under the form and with the claims of *Catholic Christendom* "having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof." At the end of those days the Beast and his abettor, the False Prophet, which killed the Evangelical "witnesses" to the Truth, should be given to the burning flame and cast into the Lake of Fire. Such was to be the end of a system of spiritual sorcery which combined the sacramental principle of corrupt *Judaism* with the intellectual errors of the *Greek* philosophy and of *Persian* theosophy. Popery is not merely the resuscitation of Paganism under Christian forms. It is the joint result of the most artful balancing of those three rival creeds of heathendom which contended for the mastery of the human heart at the greatest crisis of human history. We have lived to see the partial fulfilment of all these predictions.

To find out the CHRONOLOGY of the Apocalyptic calendar we have only to consult the Fathers of the Church. With one consent they all apply to the Beast of Revelation St. Paul's description of the Man of Sin "sitting in the temple of God" (or the Christian Church) "and showing himself off to be God" (2 Thess. ii.). St. Paul, they all assert, gives us here the TIME of the setting up of Anti-Christ's Kingdom. It will be when "he who now letteth is taken out of the way": and this they interpret of the Roman Emperor. In other words, *When Rome falls Anti-Christ shall assume the vacant seat of empire.*¹ IT WAS IN THE FIFTH CENTURY THAT THE ROMAN EMPIRE FELL. In that very hour the Pope usurped

¹ TERTULLIAN, "Apol." 32 ([anti-Christum] "Romani imperii commeatu retardari"); CYPRIAN, *Ep.* 56: "occasum saeculi atque Anti-Christi tempus appropinquasse," *Ep.* 68 "Deficiente jam mundo atque appropinquante Anti-Christo"; CYRIL, "Catech. Lect." xv (ὅταν πληρωθῶσιν οἱ καιροὶ τῆς τῶν Ῥωμαίων βασιλείας); CHRYSOSTOM, *Hom.* iv. in 2 Thess. ii. (ἡ ἀρχὴ ἢ Ῥωμαίων, ὅταν ἀρῆθῃ ἐκ μέσου τότε ἐκείνος [ὁ Ἀντιχριστός] ἔξει; JEROME in 2 Thess. ii. ("Romanum imperium nisi hoc destructum fuerit sublatumque e medio . . . Anti-Christus non ante venierit"). Anti-Christ—he actually warns us—will even "change and add to the sacraments of the Church." Elsewhere he says: "The Roman world rushes to destruction. The hindrance in Anti-Christ's way is removing and we heed it not" (*Ep.* 35 ad Heliod., 91 ad Ageruch.). AUGUSTINE, LACTANTIUS, THEODORET repeat the same ideas. GREGORY I's challenge as to the future *papal* "Anti-Christ" as claiming UNIVERSAL EPISCOPATE is well-known, *Lib.* vi. *Ep.* 30 (to the emperor Maurice); *Lib.* iv. *ep.* 38 ("Rex superbiae prope est et . . . sacerdotum . . . praeparatur exercitus"); *lib.* vi. *ep.* 28 ("Propinqua jam esse Anti-Christi a tempora"). These are all contemporaneous testimonies! And they all quote this view of St. Paul's meaning as an established tradition.

the place of the Emperor and even claimed ere long to allot to princes their temporal dominions. The right was thus acknowledged by the Popes themselves :

“ Into thy hands ” [Christ is made to say to Pope Victor II] “ I have given the keys of My entire Catholic Church and over her I have placed thee as My proxy (*mihi vicarium*) And if that be too small I have moreover given thee the kingdoms (*monarchias*). Yea, AS THE EMPEROR IS TAKEN OUT OF THE WAY (*sublato rege de medio*) I have allowed thee the direction of the whole Roman Empire in his absence.”¹

Such is the origin of that formidable ecclesiastical power which, as its clients never fail to claim, was the creator of the political institutions of modern Europe. Thus was the image of Caesar’s empire “ revived.”

For 1,260 years its political power is predestined to run, for 1,290 its ecclesiastical. If we select some date like 550² in the obscure records of the sixth century we can see how at the end of 1,260 years St. John’s prophecy has been fulfilled. Napoleon in 1806 shattered for ever the Holy Roman Empire. In 1870 the Papacy lost its temporal power. And if Mahometanism is the Eastern “ false prophet ”—the Anti-Christ of the Eastern Churches—then the sands of that apostasy set up in 622 must shortly run out also. It is of interest to note that at this moment we see these three powers in combination—Feudalism, the Papacy and Mahometanism—all retrograde tyrannies claiming absolute power over the human mind, making together their last stand against Liberty on earth. The Book of Revelation foretells their final doom.

We have finally to consider the **MODE** of presenting the visions of the Apocalypse. The system of symbols is based on that of Ezekiel, Daniel and Zechariah, especially the last. The four horns (or empires) of ZECHARIAH destroyed by the four smiths ; the two olive-trees representing Church and State in the persons of Joshua and Zerubbabel and standing by the seven-branched chandelier of gold ; the emblematic stone engraved with the seven eyes of the Holy Spirit ; the flying scroll whose measurement, founded on that of Moses’ tabernacle and Solomon’s temple, typified the Jewish theocracy ; the leaven of Lawlessness, which starts from Babylon to gradually corrupt the Church of God ; the four chariots

¹ Hallam, “ Middle Ages,” ii. 275 note, 5th ed.

² That is, some date between 533 when Justinian’s decree recognised the Pope as legally “ head of all the Churches,” and 606, when the Emperor Phocas acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope and two years later commemorated it on a column. 1,260 years from 606 A.D. brings us nearly to 1870, the year of the loss of Temporal Power !

and horses symbolic of the four empires of Daniel; these are all more or less reproduced in the symbols of the Apocalypse. *And SYMBOL must of necessity be the universal language of prophetic vision.* WORDS are confined to the special connotation of the age and country that produces them; whereas the language of VISION belongs to all future time, as it has to be understood by people of every age and country. The Bible, since it is the word of the everlasting God, must be written in the language not only of men but of universal man.

And here is one of the difficulties of this Book to a Western mind. *The symbols are not consistent, as in modern Art, in forming a picture.* They are held together only by the IDEAS or actuating principles for which they stand. Thus the twelve foundations of the New Jerusalem are represented as consisting of twelve different stones, yet each is at the same time of pearl throughout. In the same way the glassy sea before the Throne is "mingled with fire" (xv. 2; xxi. 21); for it is only through much *tribulation* that we enter the Kingdom of God. Numerals in like manner typify RELATIONSHIPS. Thus 2 is the number of *witness*; 3 of the *divine perfections*; 4 of *Nature*; 7 (=3+4) of *creaturely completeness* 6 (=7-1) of the *Devil's* hindering the divine 7; 3½ of *persecution*; (it is 7 cut short by diabolical malice); 8 (=7+1) is the symbol of *resurrection*; 10 (=6+4) of *worldly* perfection; 12 (=4×3) of *Churchly* completedness. Hence "666" symbolically *represents* to the EYE the Trinity of Evil (Satan's number triply strong), while at the same time it spells out to the "mind that hath wisdom" the word LATEINOS ("Latin").

If we analyse the BOOK as a whole we shall find that it divides itself into four sets of sevens:—

1. The SEVEN CHURCHES, types of all the stages of Churchly experience.¹
2. The SEVEN SEALS, typifying the Church's secret fortunes.
3. The SEVEN TRUMPETS of doom against the Roman Empire.
4. The SEVEN VIALS of God's wrath against a guilty Christendom.

¹ The Church of EPHESUS is the sub-apostolic Church, anxiously "orthodox" indeed (ii. 2), but with a loss of the fine edge of evangelical feeling (ii. 4). The Church of LAODICEA is the Church of these latter days, self-satisfied and indifferent ("lukewarm"). Gibbon so truly complained of "the gentlemanly indifference of the Church of England" in his day and of "the fat slumbers of the Church." The "ten days' tribulation" (ii. 10) is Diocletian's ten years' persecution.

On a closer examination the Book breaks into two almost equal halves. The first half up to chapter xii. represents the Church's conflict with Anti-Christ represented by the *heathen* LATIN EMPIRE. The second half from chapter xii. onward represents the Church's conflict with Anti-Christ as represented by the heathen Roman imperial principle *in the Church itself*—the LATIN CHURCH.

PART I (cc. iv.-xi.).

THE CHURCH *v.* THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

[c. iv.] In opposition to Caesar's throne on earth there is seen a throne set in heaven displaying the awful purity of God's holiness (white as the *diamond*), of His justice (red as *jasper*), and of His mercy (green like the *emerald*); while the "rainbow round the Throne" represents the harmony of all His attributes. The four forms of creaturely activity under His throne represent the forces of Nature under Providence. The twelve Patriarchs and twelve Apostles are the ministers of His revelation in His CHURCH on earth, whose Future only the God-Man, co-regent on the eternal throne, can unseal.

THE SEVEN SEALS.

[c. vi.] The first FOUR SEALS represent the early *victories* of the Roman Empire succeeded by the sword of *war*, which brings in its train *famine* and *pestilence*. These dreadful symptoms of a falling Empire the heathens attributed to the jealousy of their gods. And their suspicions led [under the FIFTH SEAL] to the persecution of the Christian Church but could not stay the collapse of the Roman Empire, which the SIXTH SEAL represents as the end of that era, an end described in language typical of the close of the world's own history at the end of all time.

[c. vii.] During that awful hour of temptation the Christian Church is preserved and sanctified by the "seal" or inward witness of the Holy Ghost. Fathers of the Church are specially raised up in that terrible fourth century—men like Cyprian, Origen, Chrysostom, Athanasius, Jerome, above all Augustine—as witnesses to the truth of the Gospel. During that "half-hour's" breathing-space of time the storm-clouds of barbarians, ready to burst upon the fairest provinces of civilization, are held back (vii. 1) by the prayers of the Church for the Empire (viii. 3).

THE SEVEN TRUMPETS.

[c. viii. 6 seq.] At length the Church's prayers for the Empire are rejected and the sentence of doom falls. The blast of the FIRST FOUR TRUMPETS of warning to the Roman Jericho announce a hail-storm¹ of GOTHs led by Alaric to scenes of blood and fire. Genseric follows with his VANDALS in navies which destroy the Roman marine and turn the Mediterranean into a sea of blood. Attila the HUN next "urges" (as Gibbon says) "the rapid downfall of the Empire" across "the whole breadth of Europe . . . from the Euxine to the Adriatic." Finally Odoacer, the VISIGOTH, in 476 ascended the imperial throne "and *extinguished* the Western Empire."

[c. ix.] Nor was the Eastern Church forgotten on the day of reckoning. Her image-worship and invocation of saints² provoked—as not only the Koran but our own Homilies remind us—the sword of MAHOMET. For 150 years ("days") the *Saracen* armies, inflamed against Christendom by the intoxicating fumes of this new fanatic superstition and equipped for the contest with flowing locks, yellow turbans and steel-cuirasses, ravaged the East, till, tired of "150 years" of war, the Saracens settled down to the arts of peace. On the founding of Bagdad as their new seat of empire the *Turkish cavalry* next espoused the Mahometan cause and, for the first time in the history of war, armed themselves with ARTILLERY breathing the new invention of gunpowder. Thus they captured Constantinople in 1453. [Such is the meaning of the FIFTH AND SIXTH TRUMPETS !]

[c. x.] It is well known that the capture of Constantinople, by dispersing the Greeks westward, led to the revival of letters and the rediscovery of the Greek New Testament. With the republication of the New Testament (x. 11) the figure of CHRIST HIMSELF was restored to the Church (x. 1-3), and the Church herself was re-discovered in her true proportions (xi. 1-4). At the REFORMATION

¹ Claudian—a contemporary—refers to this Gothic invasion as a northern hail-storm (*grandinis ritu*, "De Bell. Get." c. v. 173). Cp. Horace, C. IV. v. 173, for the appropriateness of St. John's imagery.

² The second Council of Nicea in 787, in publicly sanctioning the Church's worship of idols and (what is the same thing) the invocation of departed saints, actually uses St. John's words, *προσκυρῆν τὰ δαιμόνια* ! [Bishops who propose to revive this pagan practice should remember that it originally brought about the Mahometan woe.]

takes place a new-birth of Christianity, and a distinction is henceforth made between the visible and the invisible Church—between the genuine and the professing Christendom.

PART II (cc. xii.–xx.).

THE TRUE CHURCH *v.* THE FALSE CHURCH.

[c. xii.] The conflict between the true and the false Church occupies the second half of the Apocalypse. This second part goes back to the beginnings of this spiritual conflict, and expands into more detail hints from the first part of the Book. The conflict on its earthly side began with CONSTANTINE. When the Empire became professedly Christian the Devil, unable to drown the Church under the flood of barbarian invasion, leavened the Church itself with the heathen principle left over from the Roman Empire before Constantine. The Roman Empire thus revived under the staggering blow of the Teutonic invasion (xiii. 3) and found a help meet for it in the baptized paganism of that *false Christian Church* (xiii. 11) which proclaims that outside the "Latin" pale ("666") there is no salvation. This Catholic Christendom stirs up wars with the help of the secular arm—Charlemagne, Charles V, Louis XIV, Napoleon—against the true Church of Christ, which for "1,260 years"—that is, through the whole of the Feudal Period—goes into hiding and lives a wilderness life of secret spiritual sustenance unknown to the world. But the day of retribution comes (xiv. 8) and only serves to hasten on the day of judgment for a world that refuses the Gospel (xiv. 14–18) and for a Church that will not be reformed.

THE SEVEN PLAGUES.

[cc. xv., xvi.] This day of judgment is heralded by SEVEN PLAGUES inflicted, in answer to the prayers of the saints, on *apostate Christendom*. The *first plague* upon the Church's temporal power was the Black Death in the days of Wiclif, which destroyed from one-fourth to one-seventh of Europe and gave the first stroke to the papal doctrine. The *second plague* destroyed in the times of the Tudors the papal navies and trade-routes to America provided by the Empire of Spain, the "eldest daughter of the Church." The *third plague* ruined the Empire of Louis XIV and the Bourbons by the victories of Cromwell and William III, of Marlborough and Chatham, and shook the stronghold of the Papacy in its secular

capacity. The *fourth plague* was brought about by the anti-papal wars of the French Revolution ending in Napoleon's conquests, which destroyed "the seat of the Beast" (the Holy Roman Empire) at Jena and Austerlitz. "Roll up the map of Europe!" exclaimed Pitt on hearing the news. The *fifth vial* saw the attempt to rehabilitate the feudal cause by means of the Catholic Revival; which has brought about under the *sixth seal*, the present war with its fearful surprises (xvi. 15).¹ This war is the last effort of medievalism allied with the Turkish "false prophet" against the forces that make for liberty.² The *seventh seal* will usher in the last stage of this world's history.

[cc. xvii., xviii.] The nature of Catholic Christendom is explained to St. John on the eve of its overthrow. The seven forms of Roman government named by Livy and by Tacitus³ shall culminate in the military empire (*imperium*) of the Caesars. And this, even when it passes into a Christian form, shall remain the same in principle to the end. Being heathen in principle it has the same ambition for world dominion, and rouses the whole world to battle against the Evangelical principle in Christianity. The ten kingdoms of Europe, once conquered by Caesar, support its claims for a time; but in the end they will despoil the Papacy of her temporal power (xvii. 16, 17) and will at length compass her downfall (c. xviii.). In 1870 Italy led the way. France, Spain, Portugal and other Catholic countries are slowly following her noble example.

[c. xix.] Not till the downfall of papalized Christendom shall the true Church of Christ triumph over her enemies and (c. xx.) enjoy her thousand years of **VISIBLE TRIUMPH**. Then shall the Last Trumpet blow (xx. 11-15) and, after one final conflict, the new heaven and earth shall for ever come in (xxi., xxii.).

A. H. T. CLARKE.

¹ This war, as a combination of the Emperor, the Pope and the Turk, was directly prophesied in fulfilment of the Sixth Vial by Elliott, Barnes and Lange from 40 to 60 years ago, and indirectly by Swete, in their commentaries.

² The word **AR-MAGEDDON** need excite no surprise. It is only the Greek form of the Hebrew words *Har* ("mountain") and *Megiddo*. Mount Tabor is the single mountain that dominates the great plain of Megiddo, or valley of Jezreel, which is watered by the tributaries of the Kishon and forms the great cockpit of Palestine. Here took place Israel's greatest battles against anti-Christian forces, e.g. against Jabin, Midian, Philistia, Moab and Pharaoh-Necho (Judges v. 19, vii. 22; 1 Sam. xxxi. 1; 2 Chr. xx. 26; xxxv. 22).

³ Livy, VI. 1; Tacitus, A. I. c. 81.

Non-communicating Attendance: ¹

IS IT A PRIMITIVE CUSTOM ?

ONE of the greatest historical scholars of his day, Bishop Creighton, in a charge delivered to the London clergy on February 1, 1900, laid down as one of the cardinal points of the Reformation in England, "The restoration of the primitive conception of Holy Communion for the mediæval conception of the Mass,"² and he declared that "the object of 'turning the Mass into a Communion' was avowedly pursued by our Reformers in the later years of Henry VIII. When the first Prayer Book of Edward VI was issued, it was at once felt that this was its aim."³

Now this assertion of the Bishop's is doubtless correct. Yet it is a fact that "the mediæval conception" of which he speaks found no support whatever in the mediæval office books. They know nothing of that which constitutes the essence of "the mediæval conception," namely, the possibility of worshipping without communicating, of receiving grace from hearing the service without receiving the holy Food. Actually there is more support in the first English Prayer Book than in them, for this conception. It is true that it is extremely slight, but as it has been used a good many times in support of the reintroduction of non-communicating attendance, it is as well to cite it. In the 1549 book *apparently* those who were not going to communicate were allowed to remain in the nave, although they were ordered to depart out of "the quire." But "the ministers and clerks," if, even, they did not intend to communicate, were allowed to remain in "the quire."⁴ This rubric was omitted in 1552, and in the exhortation to be read in case of neglect, "gazers and lookers on them that do communicate" are solemnly bidden to depart.⁵ Thus it was not until 1552 that the English Prayer Book was made to breathe the spirit, in this particular, of the mediæval services.

For it is the spirit of the Liturgical Books of the pre-Reformation

¹ A Paper read to a meeting of Evangelical incumbents at Birmingham.

² "The Church and the Nation" (Longmans), p. 300 (and cf. Staley's "The Catholic Religion," 4th ed., p. 253).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 303.

⁴ "The Two Liturgies, etc." (Parker Society), p. 85 (and cf. Blunt's Annotated B.C.P., p. 382).

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 272-3.

period. A careful reading of the ordinary of the Mass in the Use of Sarum shows very clearly that the Service is for those who communicate, and for them alone.

For instance, in the Sarum Canon, which is identical with the Roman, the Priest prays that these gifts may "be borne by the hands of Thy holy angel to Thy altar on high, in the presence of Thy divine majesty, that as many of us as shall by partaking at this Altar receive the most sacred body and blood of Thy Son may be fulfilled with all heavenly benediction and grace."¹ It will be noticed that the plea for the acceptance of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is urged that those who partake may indeed receive the holy Gift. For those who do not partake, there is no petition made.

Turning to the proper services of the Sarum rite, the evidence is clearer still. Collects, secretæ, post-communions, all go to swell the evidence as to the intention of the service. Quoting at random in illustration of this, take Post-Communion, St. Anne's day (July 26), "As we receive, O Lord, the longed-for sacrament of the heavenly table, etc,"² or, Post-Communion, St. Sampson's day (July 28), "O God, who hast satisfied us with Thy holy gifts, etc."³ Or, Secret, St. Romanus' day (Aug. 9), "Cleanse us by these heavenly mysteries."⁴ Or, Post-Communion, St. Edward the Confessor's day (Oct. 13), "Having been filled with the banquet of life-giving food, etc."⁵ Or, Post-Communion on St. Linus' day (Nov. 26), "We have received, O Lord, this heavenly sacrament, etc."⁶ Perhaps the most striking example is to be found in the office for St. Thomas of Canterbury (Dec. 29). In the Secret "the gift of the saving offering" is recalled, while in the Post-Communion the plea is urged "through these holy gifts which we have received."⁷ I call this striking in view of the period when it was compiled, namely after 1170 A.D.

But does the Use of Sarum represent correctly the primitive idea of the Church as shown in her earliest liturgies? Bishop Gore declares that it does. He says, "With one consent the Church in her prayers of consecration has prayed that the elements of

¹ Canon F. E. Warren's "The Sarum Missal in English," p. 47 of Part I.

² *Ibid.*, pt. ii, p. 426.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 429.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 457.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 532.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 587.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pt. 1, p. 114.

bread and wine may by the power of God be made or declared Christ's body and blood *for a certain purpose, viz.,* 'in order that those receiving them may be confirmed to holiness; may obtain remission of sins and . . . eternal life,' 'for the remission of sins and eternal life to them that receive,' . . . 'that it may be a legitimate eucharist for all those who receive it.' The same restricted intention is constantly and almost without exception illustrated in the language of the fathers."¹ If we accept the Rev. Vernon Staley's declaration that, "the early Liturgies possess an authority second only to the Holy Scriptures"² then the conclusion is plain that non-communicating attendance is outside, and must be outside the toleration of the Christian Church. For what right have people to be present who take no part, and can take no part in the prayers of the Service. And it is established that the Eucharistic prayers are only for those communicating. The old divisions of the Service bear their testimony to this. There were "the Mass of the Catechumens" and "the Mass of the Faithful." St. Ambrose in a letter to his sister told her how the soldiers came to prepare the seat of Theodosius in Milan Cathedral just after the Bishop had dismissed the catechumens.^{3 4}

In the compilation of about the same period⁵ known as "The Apostolic Constitutions" there is embedded what is called "The Clementine Liturgy." This is claimed to possess "the main features and order of the Christian Liturgy in the earliest complete form in which it has come down to us."⁶ This Liturgy has the two divisions named above. At the close of the first all but the faithful were dismissed, each class, beginning with the Catechumens and ending with the penitents, having their special prayer of dismissal. Deacons then guard the doors. In the second part, what in later terminology is called "the Canon," we meet the same fact as in the Sarum and Roman. There is no prayer for any present who are not going to communicate. The blessing is asked for those "who partake thereof."⁷ While what we should call a Rubric prescribes that after the ministers, deaconesses, virgins, widows, children, *all* the people

¹ "The Body of Christ," 1st ed., p. 135.

² "The Catholic Religion," 4th ed., p. 213.

³ Dean Luckcock's "The Divine Liturgy," p. 25.

⁴ 388 A.D.

⁵ F. E. Warren's "Ante-Nicene Liturgy," p. 255.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 277.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 300.

are to receive. And when "all, both men and women, have received" the Deacons are to take up what remains and bear it to the sacristy.¹

But there are three additional sources from which arguments may be drawn.

I. There are numbers of small things which point to the practice of the Church. One is her care in sending to those absent through sickness, or some urgent cause, portions of the Consecrated Elements. Justin Martyn in the First Apology, *cap.* lxvii. speaks of this custom.² Can we suppose that with an anxiety that each member absent should receive the Sacrament, there should be a toleration of members present not receiving? Another is the custom on the Station Days (Wednesday and Friday) of postponing the Eucharist until the ninth hour, when the fast was over.³ The reason was that as Canon Warren in his "Liturgy of Ante-Nicene Church" shows from an incident connected with Tertullian, it was thought that receiving the Eucharist broke the fast.⁴ Although Dean Luckock in his "The Divine Liturgy" states that the 3 p.m. Celebrations on such days were "to avoid anything so festal till the day was far advanced"⁵ yet the Dean's gloss is hardly tenable. The reason given by Canon Warren rests on too secure a foundation. And the conclusion is obvious that *Celebrations were for Communion*. Tertullian actually advised scrupulous folks who did not wish to eat because of the fast, to reserve their portion of the Consecrated Elements for reception at home.⁶ He says, "Thus by receiving and reserving the Lord's Body both ends are secured, the participation in the sacrifice and the fulfilment of your service."⁷ Surely his words are conclusive. Only those who receive participate in the Sacrifice.

We have not time to indicate more of these small things, but must turn to the second additional source.

II. Attempts to prevent the rise of the practice. It appears, so far as one can judge, and the evidence serves, that the practice of non-communicating attendance began in the fourth century. In the year 341 A.D. a Council of Antioch decreed against it.⁸ While

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 304.

² *Ibid.*, p. 53.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁴ P. 126.

⁵ Footnote on p. 14.

⁶ Warren, p. 126.

⁷ Gore, "The Body of Christ," p. 307.

⁸ Waterland on The Eucharist, Oxford ed., 1880, p. 375.

St. Chrysostom at a later date sharply reproved those guilty of such a practice, at Constantinople. "In vain," he said, "stand we at the altar, none come to receive. I speak not barely to persuade you to receive, but to make yourselves worthy. You are not worthy [you will say] of the sacrifice, or not fit to receive? Then neither are you worthy of the prayer: do you not hear the Deacon, when he stands up and proclaims, As many among you as are under penance, withdraw? All that do not communicate are supposed to be under penance. If you are of the number of the penitents, you must not receive: for he that does not receive is under penance. Why does [the Deacon] say, All ye that cannot pray, depart? And why do you, after that, impudently stay? You are not one of those, you will say, but of those who may receive . . . Every one that does not partake of the mysteries is shameless and impudent to stand by all the while."¹ This homily of St. Chrysostom's surely proves two things: (1) That there was an innovation in the practice he was attacking. (2) That there was the same care in excluding from the Christian assembly at the time of Communion all not entitled to communicate as we find at a much earlier date. We cannot imagine that the patriarch was denouncing a primitive and accepted custom of the church. The importance of the saint's words is clearly felt when we read Bishop Gore's "The Body of Christ." More than once the Bishop refers to them—although he only actually quotes one short sentence from them—and while he seems to attempt to limit their application somewhat, at the same time he concedes the doctrinal reason for their enforcement. He says, "We can never allow ourselves to use language which implies that those who do not communicate can really take part in the sacrifice, or that 'non-communicating attendance' is the *normal* Christian act, without giving currency to a view of sacrifice which is less than Christian. That the sacrifice is completed in communion is the effective witness of all the liturgies."² Or again, the Bishop says, "It cannot be said too strongly that any practice which divorces eucharistic worship and sacrifice from communion, or which rests content at the 'high service' with the communion of the priest alone, really represents a seriously defective theology"³

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 379-80. Cf. Gore's "The Body of Christ," pp. 196-7, 307, 202-3.

² Gore, p. 203.

³ Gore, p. 276.

III. The direction of the early Church's intention. In the Western Church, side by side with non-communicating attendance, has grown up a worship of our Blessed Lord as objectively present in the Holy Eucharist, under the forms of bread and wine. A Flemish preacher preaching on Corpus Christi day thus put it, "We must distinguish in this white species which the priest reaches out to us the great God, who has drawn heaven and earth out of nothing . . . we must acknowledge in this holy Host the only begotten Son of God."¹ No wonder is it that he also says, "We should esteem it a holy duty to adore Jesus in His Blessed Sacrament . . . especially when He is exposed in His Blessed Sacrament on the altar,"² i.e. at the Celebration. Now of this worship the Eastern Church knows nothing unto this day. That it is set forth as *the* thing which a person present but not communicating at a Celebration is to do, I need not labour to prove. We may well hesitate concerning it when we note that it is unknown in the conservative East. But we have another reason for hesitating. Dr. Liddon said quite truly, "Certainly, in the greatest public act of Christian worship, the Eucharist, the rule was, as defined at Carthage, to address prayer to the Father . . . The rule did not govern ancient Christian practice in respect of non-Eucharistic prayer."³ In speaking of the Eucharistic collects in our present Prayer Book, Bishop Barry said, "The collect is rarely addressed to our Lord; mostly, *after the ancient practice*, to God the Father through Him."⁴ And Bishop Gore is still more explicit. He says, "In modern books of popular devotion, such as proceed from circles in which the doctrine of the real presence is accepted, a prominent feature is the stress laid on the worship of Christ, as, in virtue of consecration, made present upon the altar, as upon a throne. Thus going to the eucharist (apart from the question of communion) is spoken of as going to meet Jesus. He is said to be 'coming' in the earlier part of the service; after consecration He has 'come,' and the faithful must devoutly adore Him. . . . Now it is an admitted fact that this worship of Jesus in the sacrament is absent from the liturgies, almost entirely. Where it exists, and so far as it exists, (1) it certainly represents no original feature; (2) it generally does

¹ "Sermons from the Flemish," *vol. Latria*, p. 306.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 332-3.

³ Liddon's "The Divinity of our Lord," 18th ed., p. 539.

⁴ Barry's "The Teacher's Prayer Book," p. 576. |

not correspond to the requirement of modern sacramental worship. . . . In the liturgies . . . we have the highest expression of Christian worship—the worship of the thrice holy, Father, Son and Spirit, one God, and the worship of the Father, through the Son by the Spirit. . . . But there is no separate worship of the incarnate Christ as specially present on the altar in virtue of consecration. The idea of Jesus coming to be amongst us on His altar throne and of our coming to meet Him (otherwise than in receiving Him) is conspicuously absent. The mind of the ancient church in general is represented in the canon of the African Council, ‘When we stand at the altar, let the prayer always be directed to the Father.’”¹

Yet another and very significant authority may be quoted to show that the early Church knew nothing of this worship of Jesus in the Holy Eucharist.

Dr. Rock had claimed that the ancient liturgies were for Eucharistic adoration of the Body and Blood of Christ.² But other liturgical scholars had resisted the claim. Mr. Keble in his book “Eucharistic Adoration” is forced to join them. He says, “The only plausible objection that I know of to the foregoing statement arises from the omission of the subject in the primitive liturgies, which are almost or altogether silent as to any worship of Christ’s Body and Blood after consecration. We find in them neither any form of prayer addressed in special to His holy humanity so present, nor any rubric enjoining adoration inward or outward.”³

Now I think that we can truly say, in conclusion—

1. The Celebration of the Eucharist in the primitive Church was for those communicating alone.
2. Non-communicating attendance is something foreign altogether to the early conception of the Service.
3. The early Church knew nothing of the worship of Jesus in the Sacrament which is defined as the object of non-communicating attendance in the Western Church.
4. It is impossible “to put aside subsidiary questions such as ‘non-communicating attendance’ . . . and consider only the one

¹ Gore, pp. 99, 100, 102-3.

² Cf. Dr. Rock’s “Hierurgia,” p. 92 (2nd ed.), quoted in Mr. Dimock’s “On Eucharistic Worship” (1876), p. 225.

³ “Eucharistic Adoration,” p. 126, Oxford, 1867, quoted in Mr. Dimock’s “On Eucharistic Worship,” p. 225.

thing, 'that the Eucharist should be made the central Sunday service.'" For "non-communicating attendance" involves such a revolution in the nature of the Service as to put it amongst those things which, to use Bishop Gore's words, "ought to raise in all minds a deep questioning of the authority of the Church to innovate so freely upon [Christ's] intention."¹

There I leave the question.

ARTHUR E. MOYS.

¹ Gore, p. 139.



John Hooper, Bishop and Martyr.

IT would not be far wrong to say that to the present generation of Churchmen the writings of the great fathers of the English Reformation are sealed books. They may occasionally be found as ornaments to their library shelves, but they are seldom, if ever, opened. There can be no question as to the serious loss which this culpable neglect entails, for not only were our Reformers well versed in Patristic learning, but there is scarcely a point in our modern controversial theology which they have not anticipated and thoroughly sifted. We can find answers in their writings to almost any supposed new theory or opinion which confronts us to-day.

Certainly one of the most important, and probably one of the most influential, of our English Reformers was the martyr, John Hooper, who was for two years bishop of the sees of Gloucester and Worcester. Not only was he a zealous and able scholar, a profound theologian, and a most powerful and popular preacher, but his strenuous and apostolic labours in his dioceses furnished a wholesome and conspicuous example in a degenerate and worldly period of a truly pious and primitive bishop. His career is too well known to need much notice. He was born in Somersetshire towards the close of the fifteenth century, and was the son of wealthy parents. He graduated at Merton College in 1518, and soon after entered a Cistercian monastery, but probably about 1535 applied for a licence to change the monastic life, for about this time he revisited Oxford to continue his studies. His father was a zealous follower of the mediæval system, and young Hooper also seems at first to have fully supported the "old" religion, since he tells us that he had after arriving at manhood "begun to blaspheme God by impious worship and all manner of idolatry, following the evil ways of my forefathers" (Orig. Letters, 34). He was evidently, however, attracted by the "New Learning" and the Reforming movement, as he tells us that his conversion was entirely due to the study of the writings of Zwingle and the commentaries of Bullinger, while he was chaplain to Sir Thomas Arundel. His subsequent zeal for Reforming opinions soon compelled him to retire from Oxford, and also incurred for him the personal animosity of Bishop Gardiner. On the passing of the Act of Six Articles, Hooper was compelled to fly to the Continent, and

while there he married a Belgian lady of noble birth. Returning to England for financial assistance, he experienced great difficulty in escaping abroad again, but finally arrived at Zurich in March, 1547. Here he was hospitably entertained by Henry Bullinger, the celebrated pastor of the Reformed Church, and during his two years' stay at Zurich diligently studied Hebrew. He became greatly attached to Bullinger, who was godfather to his eldest child, and was also intimate with Bucer, Alasco, and other foreign Reformers. But on the accession of Edward VI he resolved, although reluctantly, to return to his native country and help forward the work of Reform. He arrived in England in May, 1549, and was appointed chaplain to the Protector Somerset. He at once devoted himself to the work of instructing the people, and he vigorously denounced the corruptions and abuses of the Church. He lectured twice a day in London to enormous congregations. So great was his eloquence that even his Romish adversary, Dr. Smith, declared that "he was so admired by the people that they held him for a prophet, nay, they looked upon him as some deity" (Later Writings, p. x). The king greatly admired him, and he was ordered to preach before the Court once a week in Lent. He soon engaged in violent controversy with Bishops Bonner and Gardiner, and humorously declared that should the former be "restored to his office and episcopal function, I shall, I doubt not, be restored to my country and my Father which is in heaven."

Nominated to the see of Gloucester in 1550, he strongly objected to the oath by the saints required in the new Ordinal, and also refused to be consecrated in the episcopal vestments, which he regarded as "plainly impious." Owing to his persistent opposition the oath was dispensed with, but Hooper still remained obstinate regarding the vestments, and a bitter and unedifying dispute ensued between him and Cranmer and Ridley on the subject. Cranmer sought the advice of Bucer, the foreign Reformer, and both Bucer and Peter Martyr advised Hooper to submit to the vestments as to "things indifferent." Alasco and Micronius, however, encouraged him in his opposition. It was not until Hooper had been imprisoned in the Fleet that he was at last persuaded to yield, and he was consecrated in March, 1551. He commenced visiting and preaching throughout his diocese so vigorously as to endanger his health. On the accession of Mary he refused to escape. "Once," he says,

“ I did flee, and took me to my feet, but now because I am called to this place and vocation I am thoroughly persuaded to tarry, and to live and die with my sheep ” (Foxe, “ Acts and Monuments,” vi. 645). Hooper was very soon deprived of his sees on account of his marriage and his denial of the corporal Presence in the Eucharist. His grievous imprisonment, his sufferings and constancy at his terrible martyrdom at Gloucester are too well known to be more than mentioned.

Even this short recital of his career is sufficient to show what a considerable influence Hooper must have exerted on the course of the Reformation in England. He was, as we have seen, directly instrumental in the removal of the objectionable oath in the new Ordinal, while his important position as the most prominent and popular Court preacher enabled him to exercise a very great influence in favour of the overthrow of all the superstitious forms and ceremonies, which he vigorously denounced. The king, he says, kept him in London “ to advance the kingdom of Christ ” (Orig. Letters, p. 79), and it was probably due in no small measure to his fearless exhortations that fresh Visitation Articles were issued in 1549 strictly forbidding the maintenance of images, altar lights, holy water, candles, or any “ counterfeiting of the Popish Mass.” In his Lenten sermons before the king upon Jonas, in 1550, Hooper had earnestly pleaded for the removal of altars from the churches, on the ground that the only three kinds of sacrifices lawful for Christian men were thanksgiving, almsgiving and bodily mortification, none of which needed any material altar. “ It were well then,” he urges, “ that it might please the magistrate to turn the altars into tables according to the first institution of Christ, to take away the false persuasion of the people they have of sacrifices to be done upon altars, for as long as the altars remain, both the ignorant people and the ignorant and evil persuaded priest will dream always of sacrifice ” (Early Writings, p. 488). Barely six months later (Nov. 23, 1550) an Order in Council directed the substitution of Communion tables for altars in all churches! Hooper had at the same time pleaded for the removal of chancels as “ separating the congregation of Christ one from the other,” and the failure to attain this object both then and a little later on affords us the true interpretation of the order in our “ Ornaments Rubric ” that “ the Chancels shall *remain*, as they have done in times past.”

There is also little doubt that the further revision of the Prayer Book of 1549. was due in a large measure to Hooper's strong opposition to many things contained in it. He had told Bullinger that it "was very defective and of doubtful construction, and in many respects indeed manifestly impious," and had declared that "if it be not corrected, I neither can nor will communicate with the Church in the administration of the Lord's Supper" (O.L., p. 79).

Hooper's aim was, as Burcher told Bullinger, "to effect an entire purification of the Church from the very foundation" (O.L., 674), and in his strenuous opposition to the episcopal vestments, and indeed to all special "habits" for the clergy, he was the father and pioneer of the party of advanced, or, as they were soon called, "Puritan" Reformers. But although he differed thus on minor matters of ritual and ceremony, he was entirely in harmony with the other leading Reformers on vital and fundamental matters of doctrine. Hooper in common with all the Reformers was most insistent on the right of the individual believer to appeal to the Holy Scriptures as the touchstone of Truth and as the final authority on matters of Faith and doctrine. We can understand better the strong assertion of the supremacy of Holy Scripture throughout our Articles (notably in Articles 6 and 20) when we remember that it had been anticipated by his very definite teaching: "Remember, Christian reader, that the gift of interpretation of the Scriptures is the light of the Holy Ghost given unto the humble and penitent person that seeketh it only to honour God, and not unto those persons that acclaim it by title or place, because he is a bishop, or followed by succession Peter or Paul. . . . Remember, therefore, to examine all kind of doctrine by the Word of God; for such as preach it aright hath their infirmities and ignorancy" (Early Writings, p. 85).

In his "Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith," the phraseology of which displays a remarkable similarity to the wording of our Articles, Hooper puts the supremacy of the Scriptures still more clearly: "I believe that the same Word of God is of far greater authority than the Church, the which Word only doth sufficiently show and teach us all those things that in any wise concern our salvation . . . the same Word of God is the true pattern and perfect rule, after which all faithful people ought to govern and order their lives" (Later Writings, p. 43). Hooper, while

stoutly denying the catholicity of the Roman Church, firmly believed in one Catholic and Universal Church, "an holy congregation and assembly of all faithful believers," but declared this Church to be "invisible to the eye of man and only known to God, and is not set, compassed and limited within a certain place or bounds, but is scattered and spread throughout all the world." "It is the body of Christ, wherein there is never a rotten, corrupt, or infected member." It is "like unto the ark of Noah, within which is safety and life," "the which true Church is maintained and upholden by the Spirit of Christ, is ruled and governed by His holy Word, and is nourished and fed with His holy Sacraments" (L.W., p. 42). There is a remarkable similarity in this definition with that given by (Bishop) Horn in 1558, as the spokesman of the Reformed at the Westminster Disputation, when he declared, "By the Catholic Church we understand not the Romish Church . . . but that which St. Augustine and other fathers affirm ought to be sought in the holy Scripture, and which is governed and led by the Spirit of Christ" (Cardwell, "Hist. of Conferences," p. 56).

Hooper, however, carefully differentiated between this Universal and the Visible Church, "the congregation of the good and wicked" (L.W., p. 41), a distinction which was also probably in the minds of our Reformers in the wording of our Article 19. Hooper concurs with Ridley in defining the marks or "notes" of the true Church of Christ as "the Word, the Sacraments, and discipline" (L.W., 43), the latter "note" being also included in the description given of the Church in the Homily for Whit-Sunday (second part). But on another occasion Hooper declares that "this commonwealth of the true Church is known by these two marks, the pure preaching of the Gospel, and the right use of the Sacraments. Such as teach the people to know the Church by these signs, the traditions of men, and the succession of bishops, teach wrong" (E.W., pp. 81-2).

When we turn to his Sacramental views we find that they are almost identical with the teaching of Cranmer and Ridley, while he rejoices that they are in perfect accord with the opinions of the Swiss Reformers. "I believe," he says in his Confession of Faith, "that the holy supper of the Lord is not a sacrifice, but only a remembrance and commemoration of the holy sacrifice of Jesus Christ" (L.W., p. 32). Although a Zwinglian, Hooper did not regard the Sacraments as mere "signs," as Zwingle's teaching is so often misrepresented

to mean. "Which sacrament," Hooper says of the Eucharist, "is not a bare sign and token of His death only, as many men imagine . . . but I put as much difference between the Sacraments of Christ, and all other signs and tokens not appointed for Sacraments, as I do between the seal of a prince annexed unto a writing or charter . . . and the king's arms painted in a glass window. . . . As the writings sealed doth confirm and declare the right of the owner unto all the world, so doth the Sacraments confirm the assurance of everlasting life unto the faithful, and declareth the same unto all the world" (E.W., p. 191). Probably no better explanation of the meaning of the Lord's Supper can be found in a few words than that which Hooper gave in a letter to Martin Bucer while at Zurich in 1548. "The holy supper," he says, "is not a bare sign, neither in it is the true and natural body of Christ corporally exhibited to men in any supernatural or heavenly manner . . . the holy supper is a testimony of grace and a mystery of our redemption, in which God bears witness to the benefits bestowed upon us by Christ, not that the remission of sins, which in believers ought to precede all use of the sacraments, is there applied; nor that the true body of Christ, which is in heaven and not on earth, is exhibited together with the bread; but that it may confirm that faith which I have in the death and passion of that body which was alive, died and rose again." "The minister gives what is in his power, namely the bread and wine, and not the body of Christ, nor is it exhibited by the minister, and eaten by the communicant, otherwise than in the word preached, read or meditated upon. And to eat the body of Christ is nothing else than to believe, as He himself teaches in the sixth of John. . . . It is necessary therefore, to bring Christ to the Sacraments by faith, and not to look for Him there. And thus the promise of grace is received by faith, as are also the Sacraments, of which faith they are the testimonies and seals" (O.L., p. 47).

A special interest attaches to Hooper as being one of, if not the first, English Churchman to come into close personal touch with the foreign Reformers. He owed, as we have seen, his conversion to the Reformed Faith to reading the works of Zwingle and Bullinger, and he had already visited Zurich in the reign of Henry VIII. His sojourn there from 1547-9 and the very close friendship he enjoyed with Bullinger, Gualter, Alasco and others of the leading Swiss

Reformers laid the foundation for that full intercourse and fellowship which was maintained later between the chief Elizabethan divines and their Swiss brethren. Hooper led the way in accepting Bullinger as his spiritual father and preceptor, and like the later Elizabethan bishops he maintained a close correspondence with him after his return to England in 1549. As early as 1546 Hooper wrote to Bullinger, "Suffer me, I pray you, to be numbered amongst those who truly and from the heart admire the majesty of your religion," and after his two years' residence in Zurich he was so thorough in his admiration for the great Swiss pastor, and for the purity and simplicity of the Reformed worship there, that the return to England was a real blow to him. "I have often," he writes later, "grieved over my departure from you" (O.L., p. 67). On his way home he wrote to his beloved teacher, "Take in good part my services, which I owe and shall owe you as a father and a most esteemed master as long as I live." He begs for copies of Bullinger's commentaries, because he "knows that they are all pure in doctrine, learned and holy" (O.L., p. 70), and he declares that if he "is able to effect anything," and his "slender powers are of any benefit to the Church of Christ," "I confess, and by the blessing of God will confess as long as I live, that I owe it to yourself and my masters and brethren at Zurich" (O.L., p. 73).

There is little doubt that by his diligent preaching and teaching Hooper was very largely the means of moulding the religious views of the English Reformers into a full accord with those of their Swiss brethren. He often rejoices to tell Bullinger that all the Reformers in England are embracing the Swiss views on the Lord's Supper. Although Cranmer's change of opinion on the Eucharist was probably due to the influence of Ridley, there is little doubt that Hooper considered that he was also in a good measure responsible for it. In 1549 he writes, "The Archbishop of Canterbury entertains right views as to the nature of Christ's presence in the Supper, and is now very friendly towards myself" (O.L., p. 71). "His sentiments respecting the Eucharist are pure, religious, and similar to yours in Switzerland" (*ibid.*). Cranmer had already entertained a warm regard for Bucer and Martyr, and had invited them to fill important posts in England, but it was apparently solely due to Hooper's influence that he became friendly with Bullinger. In 1549, when Hooper gave Cranmer a letter from Bullinger, he records, "When I

gave your letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury he did not vouchsafe a single word respecting either yourself or your most godly Church" (O.L., p. 64). And again a year later he refers to the subject to show the change which had meanwhile taken place, "The Archbishop of Canterbury, to say the truth, neither took much notice of your letter nor of your learned present, but now, as I hope, Master Bullinger and Canterbury entertain the same opinion" (O.L., p. 77). In 1551, he is able to write, "My lord of Canterbury, who is in truth a great admirer of you, when I received your last letter in his palace and acquainted him with its contents, could hardly refrain from tears when he understood your feelings in regard to the king and to the kingdom and also the perseverance of your Church in these most lamentable times. He made most honourable mention both of yourself and of your profound erudition. You have no one, I am sure, among your dearest friends who is more interested about you, and who loves you in Christ more ardently than he does" (O.L., p. 93).

Hooper must have many times during his stay abroad joined in fellowship round the Lord's Table with his Swiss brethren. He speaks of their mode of administering the Lord's Supper "as most simple" and also "most pure" (O.L., 56), and we do well to remember that the Church of Zurich was not episcopal in government. Moreover, it does not appear that Bullinger, its chief pastor, had ever received episcopal ordination, but simply the call, which he records, to the pastoral office by a Reformed synod presided over by Zwingle (Bullinger's "Decades" v, p. x). We have therefore here probably a practical illustration that Hooper did not regard episcopal ordination as a necessary mark of the "right use of ecclesiastical discipline." He, as well as the later Marian exiles, would certainly not have regarded participation in a "united" Communion service or the reception of the Sacrament in a non-episcopal Church as "subversive of Church order," or "inconsistent with the principles" of the Reformed Church of England (Report of the Consultative Committee on the Kikuyu Federation Scheme).

C. SYDNEY CARTER.



The Changed Relations of Science and Religion : Peace after Warfare.

THE Archbishop of York, when preaching at Sheffield during a meeting of the British Association in 1910, thus referred to the long-standing conflict between religion and science ; a conflict which, he said, had been exceptionally conspicuous in the middle of the nineteenth century. " But of late years . . . another spirit had been working, and though those who might be called the camp-followers of science and religion are apt to break out into quarrels . . . the truest and best men on either side are conscious that there is a call for truce—a truce of God, a truce to adjust misunderstandings, to retreat from rash and hasty claims, to think out their own positions more clearly, and to understand the positions of those who seemed to differ from them with greater sympathy." ¹ It was a noble aspiration, and the realizing of it has, I trust, been brought nearer by that awful crisis in the history of our nation, through which we are now passing.

But why were science and religion ever at war ? There seems, at first sight, no valid ground for a contest, because of the wide difference between their methods and fields of work. Science arrives at its conclusions by inductive reasoning from careful observations : religion, as expressed in dogmatic statements, by deductive reasoning from information, which has been, or is supposed to have been, revealed. Thus the sphere of science is that which we can discover for ourselves ; the sphere of religion that which is not thus discoverable. But in practice the two often overlap. There is a borderland in their provinces, on which each has rights, like those of nations on the high seas. Hence it is always possible for either to advance indefensible claims, and disputes to arise, which are really groundless.

It must, however, be admitted that the champions of religion have too often been the aggressors, or, at any rate, have defended a popular belief, the accuracy of which has been impugned on scientific grounds, with weapons drawn from a theological armoury. The form of the earth may serve as an instance. Nineteen centuries ago people generally believed it to be a disc, with the ocean flowing round its margin. When doubts on this matter began to be ex-

¹ Printed in *The Guardian* Sept. 9, 1910.

pressed, fathers of the Church defended the popular notion with texts drawn from the Old Testament, some even going so far as to express doubts whether a man could be saved who believed in the rotundity of the earth. So persistently was the old error defended by churchmen, that they did not abandon it till about four centuries ago, some time after circumnavigation had proved the world to be a globe.

Astronomers fared no better than geographers. The authors of the Old Testament shared the popular, and very natural, belief that the sun went round the earth. When Kopernik, about the year 1543, proved this to be erroneous, the authorities of the Roman Church denounced his book and all who accepted his arguments. They persecuted Galileo and Kepler, the latter only three centuries ago, and the leaders of the Reformation were not less loud in their outcry.

Students of chemistry and physics ran the risk of being charged with sorcery, while those of anatomy and medicine fared no better. Tertullian denounced surgery, Augustine the practice of dissection for the discovery of disease. In later times Popes forbade clergy and monks, the only educated class of those days, to practise medicine, and even excluded books on that subject from the libraries of convents. Early in the eighteenth century inoculation for small pox was condemned by theologians of the Sorbonne and by Protestants in England, and more recently—not a hundred and twenty years ago—Jenner's discovery of the protective effect of vaccination was denounced as bidding defiance to Heaven itself—even to the will of God. Nay, within the memory of some still living, the use of anæsthetics received a similar welcome in pulpit after pulpit. This last effort, however, to arrest scientific progress by religious prejudice soon died of its own absurdity.

The conflicts of religion and science as to the history of the earth and its living tenants are so recent that some still survive, who took part in the war. Geologists were denounced because they found it impossible, after careful study of the Great Stone Book of Nature, to accept the opening chapters of Genesis as literal history. Charles Darwin's noted work on the Origin of Species, published in 1859, was vituperated, from pulpit and platform, in tracts and newspapers, for maintaining that plants and animals, whether living or extinct, have been the result of gradual change instead of special creation.

Yet now evolution is recognized, in a far wider field than that of biology and geology, as God's mode of working in the world of matter and of life. Yet it is only fifty-two years since an attempt was made by the leaders of the two great parties in the Church of England to force its members to declare war against science by committing themselves to the statement that their Church maintained "without reserve or qualification, the inspiration and Divine authority of the whole canonical scriptures, as not only containing, but being, the Word of God."¹

This brief summary of the warfare of science and religion shows that, however unwelcome the conclusion may be to the representation of the latter, they have generally been proved to be in the wrong, and have, throughout, assumed an authority to which they had no rightful claim, for they did not possess the knowledge which alone could enable them to pronounce a decision. Neither personal piety, nor any ecclesiastical position can supply the place of that knowledge which comes from a study of the subject. The opinion of the most expert maker of microscopes would be worthless on a question in astronomy, or that of an eminent mathematician on the meaning of a difficult passage in the Hebrew Bible. As the old saying goes, there is no royal road to learning, yet those who supposed themselves to be champions of religion have acted as if they believed that membership of a church brought with it knowledge of things other than spiritual.²

I do not say that the faults have been all on one side. Students of science have sometimes trespassed on the province of religion and have even rivalled the dogmatism of their opponents. But they have done it less frequently and with more excuse. It is but human nature to retort upon the assaults of ignorance and prejudice and to repel an aggression by an invasion. We must also admit that, in past time, some students of science have perverted to evil ends their knowledge of alchemy and medicine, and others, in later years, have proclaimed an aggressive agnosticism or declared that nothing can be true which cannot be tested in a laboratory. But

¹ From a document, often called The Oxford Declaration, circulated among the clergy early in 1864.

² The past conflicts of the representatives of religion and of science are described in greater detail by Dr. A. D. White (then Principal of Cornell University) in his valuable book "The Warfare of Science." My copy is the second edition (1877), but a much enlarged one has since been published. See also "The Present Relations of Religion and Science" (by myself), chapter vii.

we may claim that, in most cases, knowledge with a belief in religion has been on one side, on the other belief without knowledge. There is another difference, not to the credit of the latter party. Students of science may make mistakes, even in their own field of work, but these are frankly acknowledged when the error is discovered. That, too often, is not the practice of the champions of religion. Instead of confessing themselves to have been wrong, they quietly abandon a position when it proves to be untenable, and retreat upon another, which has also in its turn to be evacuated, and yet continue to maintain the aspect of infallibility. It may be good generalship, but is it honest? Does it not look like caring less for truth than for the interests of a party?

The root of the evil, at least to a large extent, is the failure to recognize that a process of evolution is at work in religion no less than in the realm of nature and in all human institutions. But evolution implies a progress by an absorption of the new and an elimination of the old and outworn; it means growth, not merely by increase of size, but by development of the constituent organisms that they may better respond to the calls which are made upon them. The Apostle's words, "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things," should be no less true of a state or of a church than of an individual. In the last case no one would dispute them; we should ridicule the man who took delight in the games of his childhood, but we do not so readily accept them in that of a state, perhaps because the development is measured by decades or even generations rather than by years, so that the ruling party is slow to recognize that the laws and customs which may have been suitable for a past age may cease to be so, or may even be harmful in the present one. But if this be true in politics, it is still more so in religion. It may, however, be urged that the latter rests on a revelation, with which we must not tamper and which we cannot hope to improve. Here, however, we must always remember that a revelation is very rarely proclaimed by the trumpet not of Sinai, but is conveyed through some human instrument. Thoughtful men recognize more clearly the significance of a truth or the tendency of the Divine guidance; they become more capable of widening the scope of a commandment, of converting a limited precept into a general principle. The Old Testament teaches this lesson; "line

upon line, here a little and there a little." Its earlier books reflect the crude ideas of the Mosaic dispensation. The mechanical efficacy of sacrifices, suited to a people still liable to be perverted by heathen neighbours, gradually gives way to the certainty that a broken and contrite heart is the sacrifice really acceptable to God. The advance was but slow. The nation, again and again, even up to the fall of Jerusalem, turned aside to idolatry and the worship of false gods. To most of them Jehovah was hardly more than a tribal deity; not till the days of the captivity did they grasp the great truth that there was no other God than one, and that a graven image was no better than a block of stone or wood, not worthy of reverence even as a symbol of some aspect of the Divine power.

This is not surprising, for the spirit of idolatry still lingers in more than one branch of the Christian Church. But in it also an evolution is perceptible, notwithstanding the long and often successful struggle of the spirit of Judaism. Slowly, but surely, many social evils, which once passed almost unnoticed, have been recognized. For instance, Christian nations not only tolerated but actually defended slavery as an institution; they allowed the highborn or the rich to oppress the poor, and even now, if we substitute a majority for an autocrat, many, especially professional politicians, care more whether a measure will be popular than whether it is just or right.

But to such tendencies, atavistic as they would be called in science, its spirit is hostile, and that is why its students have been persecuted by those who supposed themselves to be defenders of religion. But these had begun to recognize their mistake even before Europe was convulsed by the present war. What, we may well ask, will be its effects in those happier days when God has once more given us the blessings of peace? Shall we find that religious bickerings, as will too probably be the case with political, have only been stilled for a time by the sense of a common peril, or will this war have done much to change a truce into a lasting peace?

I hope, indeed expect, that it will be the latter, for at least three reasons. This is one. War, as perhaps nothing else can do, brings us face to face with realities. The efforts for self-preservation, the life-and-death struggle, whether of men or of nations, scatter conventions to the winds and prove with irrefutable logic that deeds are more potent than words, and phrases, without an adequate backing of facts, are as futile now as they were in the days of the Scribe and

the Pharisee. In the time of peace, professional politicians and well-meaning sentimentalists had persuaded the populace to shut its eyes to unpleasant facts and to stop its ears to the warnings of those who could read the signs of the times. With the first shot fired the cloud-castle, built up with the resolutions of delegates and the votes of those who believed the millenium had begun, tumbled down in ruin, like the walls of Jericho, and left its ill-prepared inmates face to face with an enemy inspired by the primitive passions of rapine and murder.

A second reason is that war, while emphasizing the necessity of discipline and the distinctions between those who can lead and those who must be led, has broken down, among those fighting for a common cause, such conventional distinctions as have no better foundation than the accident of birth or the inheritance of wealth. To share hardships and face dangers is the strongest bond of union, and I believe it will be long before those who have fought side by side in the trenches or encountered the perils of the sea will distract or despise one another as was often done in the wantonness, which was a fungoid growth of peace and prosperity. If anything can make our nation dwell in unity at home, it will be this war, which may teach us the possibility of differing without bitterness on religious no less than on political questions.

The third reason is that war has shown that no little unity underlay apparently wide divisions. Not only have the aristocrat and the democrat fought side by side on the battle-field, but also religious discords have been minimized as they never were before. The ministers of different Christian bodies—Anglican, Nonconformist, even Roman Catholic, generally the most rigid and exclusive in his definition of a church, have joined in prayer, have afforded opportunities for worship, have recognized that their differences were slight compared with their unity in love for Christ and a desire to extend His Kingdom. In the hour of danger, in the time of suffering, in the shadow of death, men are drawn together by the sense of a common cause, a common loyalty to one Master, be this as patriots or as Christians.

The war, I say, has done much to heal our unhappy divisions, but will they break out again at home, when there is once more peace abroad? Let us hope, let us pray, that they will not. In everyday life to have been associated in work for some common cause draws together

political opponents and softens asperities by showing them that their differences very frequently relate, not to the end which is sought, but to the way of reaching it. So also in disputes about questions in religion. Though it may sometimes be necessary to resist teaching which limits the mercies of God, virtually denies His love towards man, or insists on the vital importance of forms and ceremonies—to resist it, as Paul did Peter at Antioch, because it would substitute the bondage of the Law for the liberty of Christ; yet while so resisting, while Protestant against error, however insidious, we must never forget that we are servants of one Master, brethren in Christ. It is for us, members of the Church of England, which in former days too often took the lead in the exclusion of others, frankly to confess past mistakes, and endeavour to win back those sundered from us by recognizing that they also are fellow-soldiers in the army of Christ, and by admitting that, while we hold our own to be “the more excellent way,” we do not assert it to be the only one across the wilderness of life to the Heavenly City.

This war will not obliterate real distinctions between man and man—distinctions of education, intellect, and disposition—but it should lead—God grant it will lead—to a better understanding between class and class, between Churchman and Nonconformist, between all sorts and conditions of men.

I began by quoting words spoken by the Archbishop of York, more than five years ago; let me conclude with some others which are about as many weeks old: “Two years ago we seemed within measurable distance of civil war, the last word of an educated democracy. After fifty years of education, drink was slaying its thousands and lust its tens of thousands: the authority of the home was going to pieces; young men and women were gaining a reputation for a very dangerous kind of impudence and levity. We had come to an end of our boasted nineteenth-century civilization. We must begin to rebuild the life of the English people. In England to-day we saw abroad a spirit of fellowship, of sacrifice and self-discipline, sure signs of the redemption and rebuilding to come.”¹

T. G. BONNEY.

¹ *Guardian*, March 2, 1916 (at Burnley).



The Missionary World.

EVEN through the tremendous pressure of war news, paragraphs on the internal politics of China continue to find place in the daily press. The sudden death of the first great President at the moment when the eight southern provinces had revolted from his rule, and the appointment of a new President, General Li Yüan Hung—a man who is reported to be entirely honest and free from any bias against Christianity—are among the great events of the world. The problems before the new ruler are overwhelming, and there is need for earnest prayer that the forces of order may prevail while an adequate constitution is being established. The Wesleyan *Foreign Field* has an excellent paper on the whole situation, by the Rev. G. S. Warren, with a map showing the rebel provinces and the order in which they broke away. Another illuminating paper on China is that by the veteran Dr. Arthur H. Smith in the *International Review of Missions*. He records a chapter of missionary experience covering four and forty years, and closes with a survey of the present conditions in China, part of which we quote.

“We have entered upon a new China in which, within the memory of men now living, there has been more change than there has been in all the ages. . . . The Christian Church has trained many pupils who have proved wayward . . . the new liberty tends to degenerate into licence, and the safeguards which Chinese society has always thrown round women . . . are melting like mud walls in a flood. . . . Unrest in China and dissatisfaction with world conditions are reflected . . . in Chinese schools, Christian as well as other. But these phenomena and others like them represent but a single phase. New and skilled Christian workers . . . though in numbers painfully inadequate, are constantly coming forward. The Chinese Church . . . is struggling to take many of the heavy burdens which have hitherto been borne by foreigners only. . . . The conception of social service has sunk deep into the Chinese consciousness. . . . The student body of China has been made accessible, and tens of thousands of them are now studying the Scriptures. Merchants, scholars and officials are increasingly friendly to the Christian Church. . . . Christians in high places are no longer rare. China, ‘the enigma of history,’ is and probably long will be the greatest mission field in the world. In no other has there been greater changes. In no other is there more hope for the future.”

* * * * *

To the general public “Swanwick” stands for a Derbyshire village difficult of access and noted for large coalpits. To a large and growing number of religious agencies “Swanwick” means the place where their special conference or convention is held, a place

which for the time being is their own. Hence, according to the standing of the questioner, "Have you been to Swanwick?" may refer to the Central Board of Missions Convention, or the Summer School of the London Jews' Society, or the Conference of C.M.S. Missionaries, or the Wesleyan Laymen's Convention, or a Conference or Bible School of the Student Christian Movement, or any one of a score of other meetings. Of all the Swanwick gatherings none has a wider significance than the Conference of Representatives of British Missionary Societies (an outcome of the World Missionary Conference of 1910), which met there again this year from June 21-23. Several addresses of quite outstanding value were given—notably those by the Rev. W. Temple and Mr. J. H. Oldham—but the special feature of the conference was the way in which such questions as Christian literature in the mission field, medical education in China, and the evangelization of the Moslem world proved capable of co-operative treatment. Several important committees, not only broadly representative of British missionary interests but also linked through the Continuation Committee with international work, were appointed, and promise to render efficient service to the missionary societies.

* * * * *

The brief weeks of the summer holiday offer busy men an opportunity for refreshing not only tired bodies but wearied and depleted minds. It is therefore of high importance that books selected for reading, in addition to any merely light recreative literature, should have true significance and be closely related to the actual conditions which will confront us on our return to work. An ideal book for such holiday reading is *The World and the Gospel*, by Mr. J. H. Oldham, secretary of the Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference. Simply but quite fearlessly the great fundamental questions which the title suggests, and which have been brought into prominence by the war, are discussed and illustrated from a wide range of knowledge and of thought. Those who preach or teach about foreign missions will find that this small volume sets their work in a new and almost startling light. The familiar teachings of the Christian Gospel and the well-known bases of the missionary enterprise are restated with force and freshness, in full view of the unparalleled changes which are taking place throughout the world to-day. The book, which has been issued

by the United Council for Missionary Education, costs 2s., and can be had from the larger missionary societies or through any bookseller.

* * * * *

It is not our custom in these pages to chronicle the home-call of missionary leaders, but the death of Ralph Wardlaw Thompson, for over thirty years the great foreign secretary of the London Missionary Society, cannot be passed by. It seems but a few short weeks since the writer sat with him in a quiet interval after lunch in a city restaurant and marvelled at the blending of youth and age, of adventure and calmness in his outlook on the missionary world. His day of active work was over and he knew it, but men still turned to him for guidance and inspiration because of the far-reaching vision and ordered thought which were his to the last. A fine survey of his character and work, written by one of his colleagues, appears in the July number of the *L.M.S. Chronicle*. From it we learn that Dr. Wardlaw Thompson is seen at his best in his letters. May we venture to urge that these be given as quickly and as fully as may be to the Church? At the present juncture few books would meet a greater need than a frank exposition of the life of a great missionary secretary who rose to the full measure of his task both in personal and in administrative work. Dr. Wardlaw Thompson never belonged only to the L.M.S.; we are therefore full of hope that the society may still see its way to share with others the fruitage of his thought and life.

* * * * *

The table of contents of the July number of *The East and The West* gives promise of a number of unusual interest. Several of the articles, however, are rather disappointing in view either of their title or of the author's name. The opening paper by an Irish Presbyterian missionary, Dr. Margaret Stevenson, on "Original Investigation in the Mission Field," is highly suggestive, and will no doubt be brought to the notice of the outgoing missionaries at the vacation course of the Board of Study for Missionary Preparation, now in session at Oxford. A sympathetic and well-informed article on "Russian Missions and Missionaries in Siberia," by a Roman Catholic writer, should be read in conjunction with an able account of "The Conversion of Russia," by the Editor of *The East and The West*, which appears in the *International Review of*

Missions. Canon Robinson also contributes to his own periodical another interesting study on the conversion of Europe, dealing this time with Ulfilas and the Goths.

* * * * *

By means of a map of admirable clearness and some eighteen pages of descriptive text, Mr. W. J. W. Roome, whose name is closely associated with the evangelization of Africa, illustrates, in the *International Review of Missions*, certain strategic lines along which Christian missions have already developed in Africa, especially in relation to the advance of Islam. He shows the advance up the Niger reaching out through the Sudan towards stations on the Nile, with a great stretch of territory still unoccupied; and the advance up the Congo which, except for a gap of about 300 miles already prospected for mission stations, makes a chain right across Africa, joining up with the C.M.S. stations on the Upper Nile. Mr. Roome traces the parts of this strategic line where Islam is already strongly in evidence, and the parts where Islam is still almost unknown. His article, based on personal investigation carried out in several journeys to Africa, is of great value to all who desire a broad and accurate knowledge of African missions in relation to Islam.

* * * * *

The *Moslem World* for July contains an article also by Mr. Roome, based on a recent journey to Africa, dealing with "Islam on the Congo." In the same issue there is a most interesting paper giving a translation of a report issued by a Mohammedan Conference which met at Peking in January, 1916, attended by about 300 Ahungs (Mullahs) from the northern provinces of China. The conference had no political object but was designed simply for the strengthening of the Mohammedans as a religious body; the members decided to prepare treatises to enlighten Mohammedans—a long list of selected subjects is given; to translate their scriptures; to improve their grammar schools and normal schools; and to emphasize the importance of lectures as a means of increasing the knowledge of the people. The conference is to hold regular meetings once a month, and a great council twice a year. A business office has been opened in Peking, the telephone number of which is given.

* * * * *

The news from the Syrian mission field given in the monthly

organ of the Friends Foreign Mission Association and supported in its general outline by telegrams in the daily press adds one more to the tragic sufferings of the war. The Turks have thrown a cordon round Mount Lebanon, and the Christian community there are being starved. Remittances sent by emigrants in America through the American Mission have now to be deposited at the Ottoman Bank, which has been ordered not to effect payment for one year and then only in government paper. There is widespread distress also throughout Syria and Palestine. The Americans are doing their utmost to secure liberty for the distribution of relief, but up to the date of writing their efforts have failed.

* * * * *

An article in the *International Review of Missions* on "The Home Base of Missions in Norway," by the Rev. Lars Dahle, secretary of the Norwegian Missionary Society and a well-remembered speaker at the World Missionary Conference, gives, in addition to a study of organization and relationships, a most attractive picture of the methods of raising funds for foreign missions. Large donors are not numerous in Norway, the greater part of the income is raised by local associations—one-half coming from the women's associations—which cover the country and which stimulate the interest of the people. In the poorer country districts where money is very scarce the people devise all sorts of ingenious means for supporting the cause they love. Some grow flowers and sell them, people with a large family and little money send their children to the forest to gather berries for sale, fishermen set aside one of their nets for the mission and give the value of all the fish caught in it. In country districts a farmer often allots a piece of land—it is called after some favourite mission station—others give the necessary manure, the young men till it, plant it, and harvest the crop, which is sold for the benefit of the mission. Where sheep breeding is common, a lamb is often set apart; it wears a collar marked "Mission," and in due time is sold and the proceeds given for the work. Mr. Dahle quotes the case of a very poor cottager in the far north who one year had no money with which to pay his annual subscription. So he went into the forest, cut down a great tree, made some good chopping blocks, put them in his boat and rowed alone to a place ten miles off, where he sold the blocks, and the mission got its money as usual.

Archbishops' Committee on Church and State.¹

AUTHORISED SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS OF THE REPORT

THE Committee was appointed by the two Archbishops in response to the following resolution of the Representative Church Council passed in July, 1913: "That there is in principle no inconsistency between a national recognition of religion and the spiritual independence of the Church, and this Council requests the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to consider the advisability of appointing a Committee to inquire what changes are advisable in order to secure in the relations of Church and State a fuller expression of the spiritual independence of the Church as well as of the national recognition of religion."

The members of the Committee are as follows: The Earl of Selborne, K.G. (Chairman), the Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P., the Rt. Rev. Bishop Browne, D.D. (late Bishop of Bristol), Lord Hugh Cecil, M.P., Sir Foster Cunliffe, Bart., Sir Lewis Dibdin, D.C.L., the Duke of Devonshire, K.G., Mr. Douglas Eyre, the Rev. W. H. Frere, D.D., the Rev. H. Gee, D.D., Mr. H. E. Kemp, the Bishop of Liverpool, the Rev. J. V. Macmillan, Mr. Albert Mansbridge (Secretary of the Workers' Education Association), the Rev. Canon Masterman, the Bishop of Oxford, Lord Parmoor, Mr. A. L. Smith (Master of Balliol College, Oxford), the Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, the Rev. William Temple, the Rev. F. S. Guy Warman (Principal of St. Aidan's Theological College), Sir Robert Williams, Bart., M.P., and Viscount Wolmer, M.P. The late Sir William Anson was also a member of the Committee, as were Mr. H. J. Torr and the Hon. Edward Wood, M.P., who resigned on account of military duties. It will be noticed that the Committee is representative of all shades of opinion in the Church.

The Report is signed unanimously, subject only to certain reservations by three members. The essential proposal is that the Representative Church Council (reformed as hereinafter described, and under the title of "Church Council") should receive statutory recognition and be given real legislative powers in Church matters, subject to a Parliamentary veto.

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH COUNCIL.

The Council shall consist (as the Representative Church Council does at present) of three Houses: Bishops, Clergy, and Laity. The House of Bishops shall be composed (as at present) of all the Diocesan Bishops.

The House of Clergy shall not be the same as the present Lower Houses of Convocation, but shall be composed as follows—

- (a) The Archdeacons.
- (b) Two representatives from each Archdeaconry, elected by all priests, beneficed and unbeneficed, holding office in the Archdeaconry.
- (c) One representative from each Cathedral Chapter, who may be the Dean, or any other person elected by the Chapter.

The effect of this will be to give the representatives of the parochial clergy a majority in the House of Clergy.

¹ *Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State.* London, S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. net.

The House of Laity shall be composed as follows :—

The existing franchise of the Representative Church Council is retained.¹ Every parish (or group of parishes) shall elect its Parochial Church Council, which shall in turn elect representatives to the Ruridecanal Conference, and to the Diocesan Conference.² Each Diocesan Conference elects to the House of Laity in proportion to the population of the Diocese.

Special provision is made for the representation of Labour (wage earners) and for University representation in Diocesan Conferences.

A measure shall not be deemed to be passed by the Church Council unless it secures a majority of votes in each House.

Special provision is recommended to protect the powers of the Episcopate in regard to all questions of doctrine.

METHOD OF LEGISLATION

Any measure that is passed by the Church Council shall lie upon the tables of both Houses of Parliament for forty days. To assist Parliament in the exercise of its powers over ecclesiastical legislation the constitution of a Special Committee of the Privy Council (to be known as the Ecclesiastical Committee) is recommended. This Committee, after consultation, if necessary, with a Committee of the Church Council (called the "Legislative Committee"), is to draft an advisory report to the Crown on the measure, such report to be laid before Parliament with the measure.

This report is intended to show the effect of the measure in question, what alterations in existing Acts of Parliament its enactment would entail, and whether there is any objection from the point of view of the State to its passage. If the report is favourable to the measure it shall automatically be presented for the Royal Assent on the expiry of forty days, unless either House of Parliament by resolution direct to the contrary.

If the report is not favourable it shall not be presented for the Royal Assent unless both Houses of Parliament by resolution order that it shall be so presented.

Any measure on receiving the Royal Assent shall acquire the force of an Act of Parliament.

Thus the Church, which is at present bound hand and foot by Acts of Parliament, many of them passed hundreds of years ago, would be given power to make such reforms as the circumstances of the times require, subject to the tacit acquiescence of Parliament advised by an expert body.

By this means the present impasse in ecclesiastical reform, caused by the overburdened condition of Parliament and its unsuitability as an ecclesiastical legislature, would be remedied.

The Report also recommends that the present powers of the Convocations in regard to the promulgation of Canons should be transferred to the Church Council, and that Parochial Church Councils should receive statutory recognition and be given important powers in all Church parochial affairs except those connected with doctrine.

¹ Qualified electors are all persons above twenty-one years of age, who are (1) actual Communicants or (2) have been baptized and confirmed, and are admissible to Holy Communion, and who do not belong to any religious body not in Communion with the Church of England. The purpose of this provision is to avoid making the Act of Communion a qualifying test.

² Unless the Diocesan Conference shall provide for election by the Ruridecanal Conference.

METHOD OF SECURING THESE REFORMS.

The Report recommends that the new Constitution of the Church Council should be framed by the existing Representative Church Council. The new Constitution so framed would be embodied in a Report to the Crown by both Convocations, which would be laid before Parliament. An Enabling Bill would then have to be introduced giving Statutory recognition to the new Constitution and setting up the Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council for advisory purposes. When this Bill was passed the reform would be accomplished. Thus the Report insists that the Church itself shall frame its own constitution and that Parliament shall be asked to accept it, while reserving to itself the power of vetoing any measure that may detrimentally affect the interests of the State. In short, the freedom both of the Church and of the State are safeguarded.

In addition to these concrete proposals the Report contains a mass of information of much interest.

The historical connexion between Church and State in England is carefully traced both in the Report and in the Appendices.

A valuable Summary of the Constitutions of every branch of the Anglican Communion in the world is given in an Appendix.

A description of the Constitution of the Established Church of Scotland and of the present Scottish Ecclesiastical situation is set forth as bearing intimately on the general problem of Church and State.

Finally the future of Parochial Church Councils is discussed at length, as are many other subjects that bear directly or indirectly on the main question.

NOTES

(A) DIFFERENCES IN THE CONSTITUTION OF PROPOSED "CHURCH COUNCIL" AND OF THE EXISTING "REPRESENTATIVE CHURCH COUNCIL."

The existing Representative Church Council has been criticized on the ground that it is not properly representative of the mind of the Church. In so far as the criticism is at all true, this is mainly due to the fact that laymen are unwilling to devote time and attention to a body that has no powers, but is merely a debating society.

The fact that the proposed Church Council would have real powers would remove this defect.

But there are also important differences in constitution. In the Representative Church Council the House of Clergy is composed of the Lower Houses of the two Convocations. In these (especially in the Canterbury Lower House of Convocation) the *ex officio* element largely predominates, and it is therefore said that they are not representative of the opinion of the clergy as a whole. In the proposed Church Council the House of Clergy would contain a majority of representatives of the parochial clergy.

As regards the House of Laity the franchise is the same, but the fact that the Church Council, and also the Parochial Church Councils, would have real powers would make lay representation a more effective reality. It has also been said that the system of indirect election, while suitable to a Church assembly in other respects, leaves certain elements, notably the Labour element and the Scholastic element, inadequately represented. The proposals for special representation of these elements in Diocesan Conferences would go far to remove this criticism from the Church Council.

(B) ON THE PROPOSED ECCLESIASTICAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

The proposed Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council must be clearly distinguished from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council whose judgments have aroused the hostility of a large section of the Church. The objection to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has been that it is a lay court professing to determine Ecclesiastical questions.

The proposed Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council would not speak in the name of the Church at all. It would be merely a body called in to advise Parliament in its relations towards the Church. It would consist of about twenty-five members, a large proportion of whom would be lawyers, since the main function of the Committee would be to advise Parliament of the legal effects of any proposed measure.

It would also contain other members whose opinion would be of value to Parliament on questions of policy.

This Committee would in no way limit the spiritual independence of the Church. It would have no veto itself; it could only advise Parliament.

Its existence can be justified on the ground that since no matter of Church reform can be effected without repealing certain Acts of Parliament, and since Parliament is to be asked to agree to these reforms without a Committee stage of a Bill, it is only reasonable that Parliament should be assisted by an expert report on what the exact consequences of any reforming measure would, in fact, be.

(C) ON THE PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCILS.

The recommendations of the Report concerning Parochial Church Councils will be found on pages 46-48, and should be studied in full.

They propose, among other things, that Parochial Church Councils should conduct the finance of each parish, should have power to hold property or levy a voluntary Church rate, should assume the present powers of the vestry, should be the normal channel of communication between the parish and the Bishop, and should be entitled to make representations concerning the appointment of any new incumbent.

In parishes of less than 300 population, it is proposed that the meeting of all qualified electors should constitute the Parochial Church Council.

The Report recommends that these powers should not be embodied in the new Constitution of the Church Council, but that the Church Council, after having obtained its constitution and powers, should, without delay, confer these powers on Parochial Church Councils.

Thus, in order not to overload the Enabling Bill, the Report recommends that Parochial Church Councils should be constituted and given electoral powers in the Church Council constitution, but that their administrative powers should subsequently be conferred by the Church Council itself.

For electoral purposes it is recommended that small parishes might conveniently be grouped together.

It is further recommended that normally each Parochial Church Council should elect one representative to the Diocesan Conference, but that in very large dioceses it might still be necessary for election to the Diocesan Conference to be from the Ruri-decanal Conferences.

(D) IMPORTANCE OF THE PROPOSALS.

The importance of the proposals lies in the fact that they would constitute for the first time a recognized organization by which the whole mind of the Church, clerical and lay, could be effectively expressed.

It is plain that Parliament, a political assembly consisting of members of all religions and of none, is quite unfitted to legislate in the name of the Church.

The scheme recommended provides machinery by which the Church could propose measures of self-reform which would be passed by the acquiescence of Parliament.

At present, owing to the overburdened condition of Parliament, it is practically impossible to secure the passage of any Church Bill without the active participation of the Government in power, because a single dissentient M.P. can obstruct the passage of any single Bill (although it may command the assent of every other member in the House) for which Government time has not been allotted. As Government time is always precious, this is not readily forthcoming.

Under the proposed scheme obstruction is impossible, only a direct vote of either House could prevent the Church from carrying a measure of reform, and there is no reason to suppose that this most legitimate power would be exercised capriciously.

Should the recommendations of the Archbishops' Committee, therefore, be enacted, it can confidently be predicted that an era of important ecclesiastical reform would be inaugurated.



Notices of Books.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF JESUS. By G. H. Box, M.A., Lecturer in Rabbinical Hebrew, King's College, London; Hon. Canon of St. Albans. With a foreword by the Lord Bishop of London. London: *Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons*. Price 5s. net.

The startling plea put forward by Dr. Sanday and others in behalf of a "symbolical" interpretation of the Creeds will cause many to welcome heartily a full and concise treatment of the great subject of the Virgin Birth by one eminently qualified for the task. Canon Box's sub-title conveniently summarizes the contents of his book. It is "a critical examination of the Gospel narratives of the Nativity, and other New Testament and early Christian evidence, and the alleged influence of heathen ideas." The Bishop of London rightly describes it as "a very clear and scholarly book," which will, he thinks, "carry conviction to the unprejudiced mind." Again and again the author demonstrates how prejudiced and uncritical the critics of the Gospel narratives, and those who have suggested grotesque sources for those narratives, prove themselves to be in the light of critical examination of their own theories. For he approaches the subject from the critic's point of view. In fact, he goes further in this respect than many of us will be prepared to follow him. For example, it is much against the grain to read that the angelic appearances may lawfully be regarded as subjective. Though the reality of the inward communications thus represented is insisted upon, our own view is that the suggestion is in the nature of a surrender to the enemy—and a painfully unnecessary surrender too. Why should not the greatest events in the world's history—nay, in the history of the universe—be accompanied by unwonted manifestations? We feel that remarks about disentangling facts and beliefs from their decorative embroidery are not only mischievous but needless; and we fear they are tainted by the all too common nervousness with regard to the miraculous. However, Canon Box's attitude in this respect will at any rate deprive his opponents of any ground for accusing him of the blindness and prejudice which they are wont to lay at the door of orthodoxy. It is his own "firm conviction" that the essential truthfulness of the narratives "only shines forth with added lustre as they emerge from their fiery ordeal to which they have been subjected."

The examination of the opening chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke is very thorough and convincing. In this section we may perhaps single out for special mention the valuable refutation of attacks on the genuineness of Luke i. 34, 35, the interesting comments on *Ναζωπαῖος* and *ἀνατολή* and the examination of alleged historical difficulties in Luke ii. 1, sqq. The silence of St. Mark, St. John and St. Paul is effectively dealt with. And the Jewish Christian origin of the history is clearly proved, the alleged pagan parallels being quite ruled out of court. There are two Appendices dealing with Jewish matters, and also a series of Appended Notes, among which are interesting textual discussions on Matthew i. 16 and on John i. 13. In connexion with these notes the author thanks Professor H. J. White.

The most striking chapter is perhaps the concluding one. Canon Box enforces in the strongest possible terms the vital connexion between the fact of the Virgin Birth and the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation. Dr. Sanday's position is shown to amount to a surrender of the Gospel account as history. While individual believers, safeguarded by long experience of the atmosphere of the full Catholic teaching, might (the author thinks) be able to rest in their position, it would be "disastrous" for the Church to adopt

such an attitude. "Sooner or later, the results would inevitably work themselves out in a 'reduced' Christology, and a 'reduced' Christianity." And the truth of this final conclusion is enforced by a foot-note embodying a quotation from another writer, showing that historically the "half-way position" has never been able to maintain itself. The disciples of those schools which have adopted it abroad have mostly ended either in an acknowledgment of the Virgin Birth on in "pure humanitarianism."

UNLIKELY MINISTRIES OF GOD. By J. Stuart Holden, D.D. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 1s.

Four addresses delivered at Keswick last summer by Dr. Stuart Holden which are intended to bring comfort and light to any who are in distress or darkness during this time of war. Those who are tempted to doubt the love of God, those who have lost their dear ones or their possessions, those who cannot understand or whose future life seems aimless and impoverished, are all alike bidden to meditate upon the unexpected and unlikely ministries of God which Dr. Holden calls the ministries of (1) Darkness, (2) Withdrawal, (3) Delay, and (4) Contradiction. The message of the little book is simple, and is simply told. It is true to the Bible and true to the deeper experience of those who have learnt somewhat in the school of discipline. It is full of comfort to anxious, weary and nigh-unto-despairing souls in days when the light of life seems to go out and the Lord's hand to be shortened. There are helpful little poems scattered throughout the book, which is quite a suitable one to give to any friends who "want to trust in God what time they are afraid."

GLEIG'S WONDERFUL BOOK CONCERNING THE MOST WONDERFUL BOOK IN THE WORLD. Introduction by Sylvanus Stall, D.D. London: *Vir Publishing Company.*

It was a little surprise to discover that this book, issued by an American firm, is a reprint of a work published many years ago and written by the Rev. George R. Gleig, formerly Chaplain-General, a post which he held from 1844 to 1875. Before taking Holy Orders he was in the Army. It is indeed well that the book should be brought out of an undeserved oblivion. Its 710 closely packed pages takes us right through the Bible, with helpful explanations and illuminating "side-lights." It is a pity the chapters are not broken up into paragraphs—the general appearance of the volume is a little bewildering. The price too—7s. net—hardly gives it a chance of competing with such handbooks as Dr. Green's revision of Angus. Still we welcome a book devout and scholarly in tone and written in an easy, pleasant style, calculated to appeal to the general reader.

THE DIVINE PROGRAMME: SUGGESTIONS FOR ITS STUDY. By the Rev. Canon R. B. Girdlestone, M.A. London: *Chas J. Thynne.* Price 1s. net.

This little volume forms number three of the "Aids to Prophetic Study" put forth by the Prophecy Investigation Society. Thus besides being the work of Canon Girdlestone—no slight recommendation—it is also issued under the auspices and sponsorship of a Society of which he is a prominent and well-known member. His plan, the author tells us in his preface, "is to survey the Biblical predictions as a whole so as to detect their method, leaving each student to work out his own conclusions." This plan is adhered to in the treatise and many valuable suggestions for study are thrown out. The Divine Programme, centring, as is so well pointed out, in the person of the Saviour, is traced alike in the Old and the New Testament. The Chronological

Notes on Daniel alone present an analysis of that important book which occupies more than twenty-seven pages. Twenty pages are devoted to the Apocalypse, in explaining which the writer follows the historical method of interpretation.

"The day will come," we read, "when the Gospel promised to Abraham shall have reached the end of the earth. Then Jerusalem will become once more the head-quarters of Truth, and the Leader's feet will once more stand on the Mount of Olives." "'We see not yet all things put under Him,' but we see the first-fruits of victory, and we have the promise."

Those who wish to have a bird's-eye view of the whole range of Scripture condensed into a small compass will do well to procure and to read carefully this inexpensive and pre-eminently readable little volume.

FOR LITTLE PILGRIMS ON LIFE'S WAY. By Belle House. *Sherrat and Hughes*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

Forty-four chapters or papers, dealing with thirty-three subjects, written, as we should think, by a mother or at least by a lady who is fond of children. They abound in parables, telling stories, and illustrations, and besides the children for whom the book is primarily intended we would suggest that it might be a valuable help to those who have to give addresses to children and young people generally. We would not commit ourselves to every position taken up by the writer, but Sunday School Teachers and others who instruct our young people must be very dense if unable to find in these pages material to help them. The papers are brief and to the point. In particular we would commend the chapter entitled, "Soldiers of Jesus" page 23, as being not merely very apt and suggestive, but specially appropriate to the present time when soldiers are so much in evidence and bulk so largely in every one's thoughts.

The Churches and the Armies.

The new number of *The Times* "History of the War" (Part 100, issued July 18) should make a special appeal to religious people, inasmuch as it gives an account of the work of the Chaplains in the Armies. Like everything that comes from *The Times* office it is remarkably comprehensive in its survey. We are shown in turn the work of the Chaplains of the Church of England, the Presbyterian Churches, the Wesleyan Church, the Roman Catholic Church, the United Board (representing the Baptist, Congregationalist, Primitive Methodist and United Methodist Churches) and the Jews, and when these are considered together we see how splendidly the various religious bodies of the country have worked to promote the highest interests of the soldiers at home and at the various fronts abroad. But this is not all. As befits a "History," reference is made to the various discussions which have taken place during the last two years concerning the position of clergy and ministers in relation to combatant service and other kindred topics. The narrative is lightened up by many a telling story and the illustrations are excellent. Attention is called to the spirit of unity which has everywhere prevailed. We are told that the war has had a wonderfully unifying influence upon the various religious bodies of the country. Distinctive principles were not interfered with, but common work for a common purpose produced a common unity which before that memorable fourth day of August, 1914, would have been deemed unthinkable. Is that "common unity" to vanish into thin air after the war is over? We hope not. This is a question outside the purview of *The Times* writer, but it is one to which the Churches themselves cannot remain indifferent.

Publications of the Month.

[Insertion under this heading neither precludes nor guarantees a further notice.]

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

THE SOUL WINNER AND SOUL WINNING. By the Rev. J. W. Kemp. (*Oliphants, Ltd.* 1s. net.) A very suggestive little work for all Christian workers, and of special value in view of the National Mission.

CHRIST IN HOLY SCRIPTURE. By the Rev. F. L. Denman, with Foreword by Prebendary Fox. (*Oliphants, Ltd.* 1s. 6d. net.) A most carefully prepared and illuminating volume designed to show that the Lord Jesus Christ is to be found in His Personal Presence and Power throughout the whole of the Old Testament. Never was the need for this truth to be clearly emphasized more urgent than it is to-day.

BOOKLETS FOR THE DAY.—(1) "Not Against Flesh and Blood" (by Principal Alexander Whyte, D.D.); (2) "The Way Home from the Homeland" (by Dan. Crawford); (3) "The Forgotten Friend" (by Bessie Porter Head); (4) "When the Boys Come Home" (by Lettice Bell); (5) "The Supreme Need" (by the Rev. Andrew Murray, D.D.); (6) "The Shining Path" (by the Rev. J. H. Townsend, D.D.); and (7) "The Invincible Love" (by the Rev. J. P. Lilley, D.D.). These booklets meet a real need. They are essentially "for the day," and the anxieties of the present time are interpreted in the light of the revelation of God's love and God's Will. Published by *Oliphants, Ltd.*, each at 6d. net, they should be in great request. Large print and tasteful arrangement add to the attractiveness of these excellent booklets.

HIDDEN PICTURES. By Ada R. Habershon. (*Oliphants, Ltd.* 3s. 6d. net.) St. Augustine's famous lines:—

"The New is in the Old concealed,
The Old is by the New revealed,"

furnish the key to this remarkably useful book. Old Testament stories or pictures are outlined, and their spiritual meaning interpreted in the light of the New. The author's prayer is that these "hidden pictures" may lead some needy souls to the feet of the Saviour. Bible Class and other teachers will find this work a treasure.

THE DYNAMIC OF FAITH. By Paget Wilkes. (*Oliphants, Ltd.* 2s. 6d. net.) In an age of unbelief which marks the Church as well as the world this volume is especially precious. It helps the Christian to see that "all things are possible to him that believeth," and Mr. Wilkes' stimulating pages are calculated to bring many souls to the realization of the fullest Christian life. The Rev. Barclay F. Buxton contributes an Introduction.

THE DYNAMIC OF ALL-PRAYER. By G. Granger Fleming. (*Oliphants, Ltd.* 2s. 6d. net.) Dr. Andrew Murray in an Introduction to this volume says he believes it has been given the author of God so to state the case for Prayer as will open the eyes of many to a new vision of its place and power in God's great scheme of redemption. These pages are full of uplifting thoughts.

THE WITNESS OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE. By the Rt. Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter, D.D. (*Williams and Norgate.* 2s. 6d. net.) The Donnellan Lectures delivered before the University of Dublin in 1914 and in Westminster Abbey during Lent, 1916.

LET GOD ARISE. By the Rev. S. C. Carpenter. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 1s. net.) A little volume dealing with the challenge of the National Mission to Catholic Churchmen. "It is certain," we read in the chapter on the Parish Priest, "that the Archbishop is a shrewd man, who knows his facts. He knows very well that most of the clergy would, if pressed, describe themselves as Catholics, and that many of them would never for a moment consent to be called by any other name; he knows that to a great many of us 'it is the Mass that matters.' He knows that we believe in the im-

mense importance, some would say the all-but necessity, of Penance and Absolution. We interpret the Christian Faith in those terms. Our Christianity is largely these two things. The Jesus only, Whom we preach, is Jesus enthroned upon the Altar, and Jesus absolving at the Mercy-Seat. 'Conversion to the Sacraments,' as Walter Carey says. He knows all that, and the order is, 'Go forward, and the Lord be with you.'" He may know, but is the author's inference correct?

CONFIRMATION. By the Rev. H. V. Bickersteth. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 2s. net.) A course of ten lessons for candidates, with a sermon on Confirmation. The Bishop of Crediton warmly commends them in a Foreword.

THE SPIRIT OF CHRISTIANITY. By Frederic Seebohm. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 1s. 3d. net.) An essay on the Christian hypothesis written more than forty years ago and now published for the first time four years after the author's death.

A SKETCH OF AMOS AND HOSEA: THEIR MESSAGE AND THEIR TIMES. By the Rev. A. Tweedie, B.D. (*W. Blackwood and Sons.* 2s. 6d. net.)

MYERS' "ST. PAUL." Edited with Introduction and Notes by E. J. Watson. (*Simpkin, Marshall and Co.* 2s. 6d. net.) A welcome edition of F. W. H. Myers' immortal lines. The Notes are excellent.

THE PATIENCE OF GOD. By the Rev. E. A. Burroughs. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 6d. net.) Two thought-compelling addresses in preparation for the National Mission.

SPIRITUAL SACRIFICE: being the Moorhouse Lectures for 1915. By the Rev. J. Stephen Hart. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 4s. 6d. net.) The author has "come to believe not only that the oblation of the consecrated elements is the accidentally born child of Latin ignorance, but also that all Western doctrines of the Atonement are vitiated by the acceptance of an equally illegitimate Latin assumption, that the death of Christ is humanity's expiatory gift to God."

BIBLE BATTLES. By Lettice Bell. (*Oliphants, Ltd.* 3s. 6d. net.) A most interesting volume for young people from a truly gifted pen. Joshua's battles, Gideon's battles and Saul's battles are vividly described in simple language that all can understand.

INTERCESSION. By the Rev. Walter Lock, D.D. (*S.P.C.K.* 2d. net.) A sermon preached at Westminster Abbey.

TWELVE SHORT MEDITATIONS FOR INTERCESSION SERVICES. By the Rev. A. A. David, D.D. (*S.P.C.K.* 6d. net.) A short series of devotional readings of great beauty. The artistic arrangement of the pamphlet is most striking. Printed in beautiful type on a delicate grey paper, with one of the choicest designs of the Italo-Gothic period on the cover, it is as quiet and restful to the eye as Dr. David's meditations are to the spirit.

THE LAYMAN AND COMMON PRAYER. (*C. J. Thynne.* 9d. net.) The official report of the addresses at the Conference of London Lay Churchmen in January last.

PLATO AND CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. W. Temple. (*Macmillan and Co.* 2s. net.) Three Lectures.

REVELATION AND THE LIFE TO COME. (*G. P. Putnam's Sons.* 6s. net.)

SOME TRUTHS OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD. By the Rev. D. C. Owen. (*Robert Scott.* 2s. 6d. net.) A thoughtful and suggestive volume, written under the impulse of personal preparation for a Parochial Mission. Its application to the work of preparation for the National effort is obvious. The ideas running through the book, linking the chapters together, are the love of God for man and the love of man for his fellows.

FIVE ADDRESSES TO THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF ST. ALBANS. By the Rt. Rev. Edgar Jacob, D.D. (*S.P.C.K.* 6d.) The Bishop's counsel on the National Mission is wise and helpful. Here is one passage which is worth much: "Until we recover or win the Sunday as the Lord's Day we shall be utterly hampered in our resistance to national personal sins."

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN. By the Bishop of Norwich. (*S.P.C.K.* 1s. 3d. net.) A Biblical study in six chapters dealing respectively with "Universal Brotherhood," "Brothers in the Old Testament," "Our Sonship to God,"

"Union in Christ," "Christian Brotherhood" and "The Church and the Sacraments."

THE NATIONAL MISSION. By the Rev. M. W. T. Conran, S.S.J.E., C.F. (S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d. net.) A volume designed to show how the Mission may be conducted on a basis of "Calling upon the Name of the Lord." With Notes on Fifteen Addresses on the Mysteries of Our Lord's Life, together with Instructions for use in the Mission. The Bishop of London gives it his blessing.

MISSIONARY.

CHILDREN OF SOUTH AMERICA. By Katherine A. Hodge. (*Olipphants, Ltd.* 1s. 6d. net.) All too little interest is taken in South America as a mission field, and we trust that Mrs. Hodge's vivid and penetrating stories will receive wide attention. It has eight illustrations in colour, and is a welcome addition to Oliphants' "Other Lands" Series.

THE WORLD AND THE GOSPEL. By J. H. Oldham. (*C.M.S. House.* 2s. net.) A volume for Mission Study Circles by one of the greatest living authorities on the science of missions.

TALKS ON AFRICAN VILLAGES. By F. D. Walker. (*C.M.S. House.* 7d. net.) A book for leaders of missionary classes of children from 8 to 12 years old.

MISSIONARY TRACTS FOR THE TIMES. No. 5, "The Church the Organ of Redemption" (by the Rev. Tissington Tatlow); No. 6, "Australian Missions and the War" (by Bishop White, of Willochra); No. 7, "The Supply of Clergy" (by the Bishop of Lebombo); No. 8, "A Missionary-Hearted Church" (by the Rev. J. O. F. Murray, D.D.). Published for the Central Board of Missions by the S.P.C.K., 1d. each.

GENERAL.

DISCOVERY, OR THE SPIRIT AND SERVICE OF SCIENCE. By R. A. Gregory. (*Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* 5s. net.) The main purposes of this volume are "to promote a more sympathetic attitude towards those who are engaged in the pursuit of scientific truth and to remove the widespread misconception which prevails as to the meaning and influence of science."

BURIED ALIVE. By Arnold Bennett; and **SOME IRISH YESTERDAYS,** by E. E. Somerville and Martin Ross. (*T. Nelson and Sons.*) Two volumes in the ever popular "Sevenpenny Series."

UNGAVA. By R. M. Ballantyne; and **THE STARLING,** by Norman Macleod. (*T. Nelson and Sons.*) Two notable additions to Nelson's "Sevenpenny Classics."

SPIRIT INTERCOURSE: ITS THEORY AND PRACTICE. By J. Hewat McKenzie. (*Simpkin, Marshall and Co.* 2s. 6d. net.) Contains "the latest evidence of psychic science on the soul death and the hereafter." But we are not impressed by it.

WAR AND THE WEIRD. By A. F. Phillips and R. T. Hopkins. (*Simpkin, Marshall and Co.* 1s. net.) The earlier chapters deal with the Angels at Mons, the white comrade and kindred topics; the later give five sketches exposing the brutality of the Huns.

FOLK OF THE FURROW. By Christopher Holdenby, with Introduction by Sir Horace Plunkett. (*T. Nelson and Sons.* 1s. net.) Another delightful volume of Nelson's Shilling Library.

IN THE TRENCHES AND OTHER POEMS. By Thomas Tiplady. (*W. F. Booker,* 1s. net.)

ZIONISM AND THE JEWISH FUTURE. By various writers. Edited by H. Sacher. (*John Murray.* 2s. 6d. net.)

BALLADS AND ADDRESSES. By J. E. Patterson. (*Simpkin, Marshall and Co.* 3s. 6d. net.)

THE SOLDIER'S COMPANION: MESSAGES OF HOPE, COMFORT AND LOVE. (*Olipphants, Ltd.* 1s.) A beautiful compilation which cannot fail to lift the soldier's thoughts heavenward.

PERIODICALS.

THE HIBBERT JOURNAL. (*Williams and Norgate*. 10s. per annum.) The July issue has the following articles: A Discourse on War (the late Stopford A. Brooke). The Spiritual Alliance of Russia and England (Harold Begbie). German War Sermons (A. Shadwell). Education: 1. Education and Humanism (Professor A. Darroch); 2. The Educational Opportunity (J. A. R. Marriott). The Problem of Conscience (Principal W. B. Selbie). The Christian Ideal and its Realization (Principal A. E. Garvie). Race Suicide (the Countess of Warwick). A Modern Confession of Faith on Jesus Christ (Rev. Ambrose W. Vernon, D.D.). Shakespere, the Englishman (Professor W. Macneile Dixon). The Perfection of Christianity—a Jewish Comment (C. G. Montefiore). Jewish Mysticism (the Chief Rabbi). A Defence of Scientific Materialism (Hugh Elliot).

THE ENGLISH CHURCH REVIEW. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 6d.) The July issue has Notes and Criticisms and the following articles: The Church of England and the Coming National Mission (Rev. F. M. Etherington). Christianity, Individual and Corporate (the Editor). Saint Thomas Aquinas (Rev. E. Beresford Cooke). Dissatisfaction with the Communion Service. The Five Wounds of our Saviour in His Sacramental Life—I. (Rev. H. U. Whelpton). Psichari and Péguy: A Study in French Catholicism (Rev. G. C. Rawlinson.)

THE IRISH CHURCH QUARTERLY (*Hodges Figgis and Co., Ltd.* 1s. 6d.) has in its July issue papers on "Idealism and Realism" (Bishop of London); "St. Paul's Quotations from Epimenides" (Rev. Dr. Lawlor); "The Late Rebellion" (Canon Trisbrain); "The Prayers of the Ancient Church for the Faithful Departed" (Rev. G. F. Hamilton); "The Eschatology of the Gospels" (Rev. R. S. Hipwell). The Bishop of Down's paper is in the nature of a reply to a review of his Donnellan Lectures, by Mr. Rogers. One passage may be quoted:—

"As regards the relation of the human soul to God, he (Mr. Rogers) describes the view which I set forth in the following terms: "Our nature, existence and reality consist in the fact that we are elements in His (God's) conscious experience." This I do not hold; nor do I think there is any passage in the Lectures which could reasonably be held to assert it. In two ways I ventured to approach the great question. First, I pointed out that the world as we know it exists only as involved in conscious experience; and that, therefore, believing, as we must, that the world exists independently of each particular human thinker, we are forced to postulate the existence of a great Universal Experience. Thus, the fact of the Personality of God is established. He is the subject of the Universal Experience. Secondly, each finite human experience involves a partial apprehension of the Universal Experience; that is, each human individual has a share in the Universal Life. In some sense therefore God is all-inclusive in relation to the whole multitude of finite persons. Since the world of His Experience includes all our partial experiences, He must, in some sense, include us. The question is, in what sense? That is a question, I hold, which cannot be fully answered. Only a partial answer can be given. And the reason is clear. It is because God, in His ultimate Nature, is higher in the scale of reality than we are. Thus we reach the strange conclusion that God is both Personal in the highest sense and Super-personal. This appears to be contradictory, but it is not so; because we are dealing with a reality higher than ourselves. The final step is beyond us. The dial of our thought has reached its limit.

[Mrs. Carr, Holbrook Hall, Derby, has copies of *The Churchman* for the years 1912, 1913, 1914, and 1915 complete; for 1911 with July, September and October missing; and for 1916, the first six copies of the year complete. These she will send to any one who would like to have them for the cost of carriage.]