

CHURCH AND STATE.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHBISHOPS' COMMISSION.

BY "BETA."

THE report of the Archbishops' Commission on the relations between Church and State, a commission appointed in pursuance of a resolution passed by the Church Assembly six years ago, is at last issued in two parts. The first contains the report and appendices, the second gives the evidence of the witnesses with one or two other documents. More will be said of each: at the moment attention should be drawn to the cost of these two volumes. Volume I is priced two shillings and sixpence; the volume of evidence, in some ways the more interesting of the two, is priced seven shillings and sixpence. It is obvious that a very small number of Churchmen will be able and willing to pay this price.

The wisdom of appointing such a commission at this particular time is widely open to question. The leaders of the Church are, almost with one voice, urging the need of Evangelism to bring back into the Churches the countless thousands who have lost touch. Leaders in religious life are insisting that the present day of opportunity for evangelism may speedily pass away. Wisdom would suggest that the whole energy of the Church should be passionately engaged in what is its supreme task. Instead of that, this commission was appointed to give time and thought to the preparation of a report which, unless it is stillborn, will divert attention from the main task, will necessitate platform campaigns, and may easily divide by still deeper chasms a Church whose need is unity. The plea made by some witnesses that the spiritual work of the Church is handicapped and hindered by the unsatisfactory relations between the Church and State has a decidedly unreal sound. There is nothing in these relations to prevent or hinder the Church's workers from giving themselves utterly and wholeheartedly to the cause of evangelism. Those who plead urgency for this particular matter on the ground that the present relations between Church and State impose an intolerable burden upon conscience present themselves in a strange light. The Archdeacon of Stafford, using what will strike most people as extravagant language, declares the acceptance of the present relations to be "disloyalty to our Lord. . . . The Church, by allowing the State to have the last word in these matters, is involving herself in the 'greater sin' which Caiaphas committed when he delivered our Lord to Pilate." The man in the street, if he ever reads this evidence, might well ask why the Archdeacon sought orders in the Established Church and more recently accepted high office in the same.

The truth is (and the report does not attempt to conceal the fact) that, while the relations between Church and State have been the

basis of conflict of thought and opinion throughout the ages, there would not have been appointed this commission to enquire and report had Parliament not twice rejected the proposed new Prayer Book. The action of Parliament, welcomed, we believe, by the bulk of English Churchmen, was held by the majority in the National Assembly to be an intolerable invasion of the right of the Church to decide for itself spiritual issues. Inspired by Archbishop Davidson's statement, made with the concurrence of the whole body of the Diocesan Bishops, that in the last resort the Church must retain its right to formulate its faith and to arrange its form of worship, the Commission was appointed. The occasion of the appointment was not wisely chosen. The book rejected by Parliament has to-day few friends. Parliament showed itself on that occasion wiser than those who would have forced the book through. The appointment of this Commission, if such a Commission were necessary, should not have followed so closely on the events of 1920, 1927 and 1928.

A great blunder was made in the selection of those who should sit on the Commission. Obviously not by accident, any person who in the Assembly gave his vote against the new Prayer Book was excluded. The Bishop of Norwich, invited to give evidence, made a courteous protest against such exclusion, adding: "It does not take many words to express my view, but I wish to state emphatically that it appears fair to consider that the direct connection existing between this Commission and the rejection of the new Prayer Book made it very desirable that in the personnel of the Commission one or two persons known to have been against the new Prayer Book should have been included, just as at least four persons who actually voted in favour of it have been included." If the aim was an unanimous report, it succeeded.

The Commission held seventeen sessions and took evidence from twenty-one individuals and from the Church Association, the Church Self-Government League, the English Church Union, the Modern Churchmen's Union, the National Church League and the Westminster Group. Of the individuals five gave evidence concerning the Church in India, South Africa, Canada, Ireland, and Wales. Three others represented Non-conformist Churches. The Bishops of Birmingham and of Durham, invited to give evidence, declined. The letters in which they declined the invitation are printed at the end of the second volume. The Bishop of Birmingham regarded the appointment of the Commission as a mistake: "I think that no changes in the present relations of Church and State are desirable. I therefore feel that the appointment of the Commission was a mistake. What is needed at the present time is that new proposals for Prayer Book revision should be put before Parliament. These should be similar to those submitted in 1927, 1928, save that they should not include changes which were then rightly regarded as concessions to unsound sacramental doctrine."

The Bishop of Durham's letter is equally definite though in the opposite direction. He stated that he had already in writings made

his position perfectly well known. Further, "If I seemed to allow that an adequate reform of the existing Establishment is really within the sphere of practical politics, I should be gravely misleading English Churchmen. In the circumstances of our modern world, I do not think that the maintenance of the Establishment is a legitimate object of Anglican effort. . . . The wide and widening discord between the Church and the Nation makes Establishment on the English model unreal, arbitrary and spiritually paralysing. . . . In casting about for proposals of legal and constitutional change which shall transform the existing Establishment, I apprehend that the Commission can but be constructing theoretical schemes, and, so far as any practical result is concerned, will be 'ploughing the sand.'"

So the Commission set itself, under the limitations already suggested, to a task of extreme difficulty and delicacy, predoomed, many thought, to failure. There is abundant evidence of careful thought and many pens in the production of the report which is now given to the world.

Now to return in mere detail to the first volume. The short opening chapter ("The Nature of the Problem") states briefly the problem, old as Christendom itself, of adjusting the relationship between Church and State: the Church, "the Body of Christ, the organ of the will of the Divine Lord. . . . Yet in the eyes of the State . . . a voluntary society." The problem, it is pointed out, is somewhat different in this present day. It is to-day "rather the problem of adjusting the respective claims of what should be two organs of the community, engaged in a common spiritual task."

There follows an historical introduction, divided into two parts, sketching the history of the relation of Church and State in this country (α) from the earliest times to 1906, (β) from 1906 to 1928. It was probably inevitable that the earlier section of this chapter should be so general in its statements as to be of limited value to one who would be accurately informed of the effects upon Church life of the movements in the earlier part of the twentieth century. The later section is necessarily written from the point of view of one who regarded the rejection by Parliament of the new Prayer Book as a disaster. When the writer departs from the statement of actual fact his opinions are not too reliable. Is there any solid foundation for the expressed belief that order could have been restored by means of the Revised Prayer Book? This was the precise point made by the Archdeacon of Westminster when the Bishop of Norwich was giving evidence. "We (the A.E.G.M.) supported the book of 1928 solely and only because we trusted the Bishops to restore order on the basis of it. We are waiting with great anxiety, as you have just said, to find the method of a bishop that is restoring order on the basis of that 1928 book. There is growing anxiety lest we have been deceived, and that is growing in the Church very largely. I am in favour of the Prayer Book of 1928, and I want the limits of it kept. But time is slipping by and the success of the Prayer Book of 1928, as far as I understand,

is not striking." The writer of the report, while defending the action of the Bishops in agreeing not to interfere with clergy whose deviations from the Book of Common Prayer were within the limits set by the 1928 Prayer Book, draws attention to the difficult legal and moral situation in which this action placed men who had taken oaths to use in public prayer, etc., no other form than that prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer. It would have given a truer picture if he had noted the generally accepted belief that Parliament would have passed without demur all the proposed changes except those touching the Communion Office.

The third chapter, setting forth the present position, is almost entirely given over to a dissertation on the meaning which should be attached to the word "laity." Does it exclude those who belong to some body definitely separated from the Church? Or, in the case of the established Church, are all Christian subjects members of the Church in the sense that they have the right to control doctrine and ritual? The decision is given that only those who are, and claim to be, members of the Church of England and are not members of any religious body separated from it, can expect to be represented on the councils of the Church. This is preparatory to an attempt to meet the common objection that the House of Laity is not representative of lay opinion in the Church of England, and to a refusal to admit that Parliament can in any true sense be regarded as the "authorised mouthpiece" of the Church of England. Whatever may be said about the latter, there will remain with many a deep persuasion that the House of Laity is not representative. The fault does not lie with the leaders of the Church. No doubt honest attempts were made to ensure its representative character, but it does not adequately represent.

Still before the actual proposals are two chapters, closely associated, dealing with disestablishment and the Scottish solution. The obvious escape from the difficulties connected with the present relations between Church and State is, it is pointed out, disestablishment, which would give the Church complete freedom to develop on its own lines and to order its own affairs. "Some of us deliberately consider that disestablishment should be preferred to an indefinite continuance of the present relationship between Church and State." The pros and cons are canvassed. The bulk of evidence given by witnesses was emphatically against disestablishment. The national recognition of Christianity counts for much, particularly under present conditions in the world generally. Moreover, the Commission is fully alive to the fact that the Church cannot disestablish itself; it can only ask to be disestablished. If it were granted, the State could make its own conditions. Questions of the possession of ancient churches and cathedrals would arise; the Church as owner of property would find it necessary to keep within strictly defined limits; it could easily find itself more strictly hedged in and confined as regards formularies and doctrines. Moreover, Parliament, in all probability, would insist on accompanying disestablishment by disendowment, either total or in part. The

work of the Church at home and overseas would thereby suffer a grievous blow. So the Commission decides: "Disestablishment is not to be desired, if other means can be devised of securing for the Church that freedom of action in things spiritual which is indispensable to the exercise of its functions as a spiritual society." Does that mean that failure to carry the present proposals would be followed by a request to Parliament that the Church should be disestablished? If that is the intention, we would venture a prophecy that in so doing the leaders of the Church would meet with whole-hearted opposition on the part of the laity.

Setting aside, for the moment, thoughts of disestablishment, the possibility of a solution such as the Church of Scotland found, in 1921, is considered. It was claimed that the working of the Act showed that "there is in principle no inconsistency between a national recognition of religion and the spiritual independence of the Church." Any idea that a similar solution could be found for the Church of England was quickly set on one side. The history of the two Churches has moved on entirely differing lines. Moreover, in Scotland there is little difference of opinion in doctrine and ritual. The Commission recognises the seeming impossibility of securing in the Church of England any agreed statement of fundamental doctrines. Yet the Church of Scotland Act remains for the Commission a standing evidence that spiritual freedom of the Church and Establishment are not incompatible.

Having made the way clear, the Commission states in forty pages its proposals for securing spiritual freedom to the Church of England, in its own peculiar conditions. The proposals are divided into legislative, judicial (regarding courts and restoration of discipline), an interim proposal to qualify the Declaration of Assent, and subsidiary proposals regarding the Appointment of Bishops, the Law of Marriage and the Canon Law.

The proposals are prefaced by a condition which is worth quoting in full:

"Before setting out our recommendations, we desire to state that in our opinion the two great obstacles are:

(1) The disagreement within the Church itself on certain vital matters, notably on the use and limits of Reservation, and on the permissible deviations from the Order of Holy Communion contained in the Book of Common Prayer;

(2) the want of effective guarantees that discipline will be secured and maintained in the future.

We believe that the successful framing and enactment of any new legislative machinery for spiritual measures must depend on satisfactory treatment of both these points; and we believe that they should be approached concurrently.

The foundation of our enquiry is the 'inalienable right' of the Church, 'when its mind has been fully ascertained,' to formulate its faith in Christ and to arrange the expression of that Holy Faith in its form of worship, and we make certain proposals for securing

the proper exercise of that right. But we recognise that these proposals cannot be carried out until a new and determined effort has been made to secure agreement between men and women of different schools of thought within the Church on those matters, in particular, which were mainly responsible for the rejection of the Prayer Book Measures of 1927 and 1928.

Our first recommendation, therefore, is that the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, by summoning a Round Table Conference, or otherwise, should make every effort forthwith to secure an agreement between representatives of the various schools of thought, especially—

- (a) on the permissible deviations from the Order of Holy Communion contained in the Prayer Book of 1662; and
- (b) on the use and limits of Reservation."

The language is, purposely (?), vague. What is to be inferred from the phrase "or otherwise"? What is meant by "a sufficient measure of agreement"? Evangelicals will watch with anxiety plans made to carry out this recommendation. Already people are asking "How will the representatives be chosen?" For the agreement to be of any value it must be made by a thoroughly representative body. Of necessity those who were opposed to the proposals in the Deposited Book will need to be adequately represented. In such a case, what prospect is there of agreement? The convinced Anglo-Catholic will feel it a matter of conscience to insist on a freedom which the Evangelical is convinced is contrary to truth and to the standard of doctrine which he believes is the precious heritage of English Churchmen. If there is any prospect of a successful issue to such a Conference, why did it not precede the presentation to Parliament of the Deposited Book? Wisdom would have dictated it and much time, valuable for other purposes, might have been saved. On the face of it, the report will perish in this preface.

Given agreement, legislative proposals follow. It is not considered necessary to depart from the procedure provided by the Enabling Act, as far as ordinary administrative measures are concerned. As regards spiritual measures (those touching doctrinal formulæ or the Services or Ceremonies of the Church, or the administration of the Sacraments) it is proposed to ask the State for new powers. In deciding whether any particular Measure is a Spiritual Measure or not the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Lord Chancellor and the Speaker of the House of Commons by their unanimous decision shall decide.

That decision given, it is proposed to proceed on lines indicated by a Suggested Draft Bill:

" 1. Any measure passed by the Church Assembly in accordance with Article 14 of the Constitution, as to which—

(i) the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Lord Chancellor and the Speaker of the House of Commons shall certify

their unanimous opinion that it relates substantially to the spiritual concerns of the Church of England and that any civil or secular interests affected thereby may be regarded as negligible ;

- (ii) the Archbishops of Canterbury and York shall certify—
- (a) that it has been approved by resolutions passed by the Convocations of Canterbury and York ;
 - (b) that it has been twice approved by resolutions passed by the Diocesan Conferences of not less than three-quarters of the dioceses within the provinces of Canterbury and York, that is to say once before and once after the revision of the Measure by the several Houses of the Church Assembly ;
 - (c) that in their opinion it is neither contrary to nor indicative of any departure from the fundamental doctrines and principles of the Church of England, as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and the Book of Common Prayer ;

may forthwith be presented to His Majesty for the Royal Assent."

Were such a bill desirable, the Commission realises that it is not for to-morrow, nor for the next day. "It may take some time," we suggest "a very long time," to obtain such general agreement among Churchmen as would justify an approach of this kind to Parliament, and to override the protests of a sincere and substantial majority is not a course that the Commission can advise.

In the proposed bill some points immediately demand attention. It would be possible to proceed on narrow majorities in three-quarters of the diocesan conferences and substantial majorities against the measure in the remaining quarter. If this kind of legislation had been in operation in 1928 presumably the Archbishops would have given the Prayer Book Measure the certificate required in ii (c). But the Book was rejected on the very deep conviction that it did involve a departure from fundamental doctrine. With regard to the concurrence of the Lord Chancellor and the Speaker, representing the House of Lords and the House of Commons, what is to prevent both of them being atheists? What then becomes of the present outcry on those very lines, against the control of Parliament? Does the King act except on the advice of his ministers? If he is to have power to refuse his consent, very considerable difficulties could ensue. Or is he to give his assent without question?

The Commission has certainly done its best to safeguard the interests of minorities and to avoid anything in the nature of ill-considered and hasty legislation, but we doubt whether their best is sufficiently good to commend itself to the laity of the Church.

Should such legislative powers be granted by Parliament the first use to be made of them would be the passing of a measure giving effect to the agreement which the Commission hopes may result from the Round Table Conference, previously suggested, with regard to the Order of Holy Communion and the question of Reservation.

Only when the law is made less rigid, consequently more accept-

able to the consciences of Churchmen and more capable of enforcement, can the Ecclesiastical Courts be reformed, says the report. Provision having been made for the amendment of the law the report turns to judicial proposals. In an interesting chapter it details the various attempts that have been made since 1883 to deal with Ecclesiastical discipline and the Ecclesiastical Courts. In an appendix is given the report of a Commission of the Church Assembly, presided over by the present Archbishop of Canterbury, as lately as 1926. The present Commission limited its consideration to questions of doctrine, ritual and ceremony and did not adopt the recommendations in the 1926 report. It is proposed to take steps to reform, as far as they deal with questions of ritual, doctrine and ceremonial, the constitution and procedure of the Diocesan and Provincial Courts, by associating the bishop with his chancellor and by making it impossible for a bishop to disclaim responsibility for a decision of his chancellor. In Provincial Courts the Archbishop may delegate his power as judge to the official principal with whom the Archbishop may, in cases involving heresy or breach of ritual, associate not more than five theological assessors to sit with him.

The main objection has, of course, always been against the constitution of the Final Court of Appeal. Since 1832 the final appeal in ecclesiastical cases has been the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. No general objection has been made to the jurisdiction of the Privy Council in cases involving misconduct and neglect of duty. Objection has been directed to its jurisdiction in matters involving doctrine, ritual and ceremony. The proposals made in 1926 are rejected as not providing a satisfactory solution. It is now proposed that the Crown should appoint members of a special Court of Final Appeal from a panel nominated by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York with the approval of the Convocations. The panel would consist of (α) men of high judicial experience, and (β) bishops, clergy and laity specially qualified. For any particular case the Lord Chancellor would choose two from each of the two lists and a presiding judge from the first list. The qualifications for admission to the second list are not clear and the constitution of the court for any given case is somewhat vague. In any case it leaves room for considerable abuse and has no very great advantage over the present system.

A considerable innovation is suggested in the establishment of what the report calls "Pastoral Tribunals," to deal with complaints lodged by interested and responsible persons and touching ritual, doctrine and ceremonies. To check frivolous or vexatious complaints a power of veto is to be given to the Chancellor of the diocese. The bishop sitting in open court would censure or admonish rather than judicially give sentence. From this court should be appeal or reference to a provincial tribunal which again would issue directions but have no power to impose penalty. The Commission is bold to hope that by some such means the pastoral authority of the bishop, now largely lapsed, would be restored. If, the report pleads, the bishop is to be held responsible for order and discipline

in his diocese, he must be given power to enforce it. That such a scheme would be effective is open to doubt. These who set themselves to disregard the directions of their bishop are hardly likely to be brought to obedience in this way. There is a very much more effective way, but the report was hardly likely to suggest it.

One other judicial proposal appears, but it can hardly be of general interest. Persuaded that it would be invidious to propose measures to deal with disobedient and offending clergy and to say nothing about the means to deal with an individual bishop who needed correction, detailed proposals are made for a tribunal to meet the case.

The proposed legislation and the establishment of new courts will be a lengthy proceeding. Yet, says the report, there are matters that ought not to be deferred. Chief among these is the ever-recurring question of the flagrant breaking of the oath taken by clergy to use no other service than that prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer "except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." Legal judgments have denied to bishops the right to order any changes "in the form prescribed" by the Book of Common Prayer. Yet clergy and bishops are constantly and persistently making such changes. As a temporary measure it is proposed that the two Convocations should, with the approval of the Church Assembly, formally adopt a Synodical Declaration as follows :

"Whereas the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline of 1906 stated that . . .

We therefore, having regard to the spiritual welfare of the Church and to the difficulties bequeathed to us by history, solemnly declare that by making the Declaration of Assent any bishop, priest or deacon must be deemed to have subjected himself to the obligation to adhere to the Book of Common Prayer except so far as any deviation from it may be enjoined or sanctioned by the Bishop of the Diocese acting within and subject to the following requirements :

(a) The services of the Book of Common Prayer should always be regarded as the normal standard of worship.

(b) No deviation from this standard should be authorised unless in the opinion of the Convocations it was neither contrary to nor indicative of any departure from the fundamental doctrines of the Church of England as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer.

(c) No deviation should be sanctioned by any bishop except with the approval of, or in conformity to principles laid down by the Convocations with the approval of the Church Assembly.

(d) No deviation should be brought into use in any parish without the good will of the people."

If we read aright, the proposal is, without seeking Parliamentary authority, to give to the bishops power to authorise, under the above-mentioned safeguards, special services. Under that power the services contained in the 1928 Prayer Book could undoubtedly

be authorised. That way of surmounting the difficulty caused by its rejection in Parliament is just as lawless as the thought it is framed to correct. If it is possible to go to work in this way why trouble Parliament at all? In any case, the safeguard contained in (d) is not of very great value, and is likely to lead to wrangling, dispute, and ill-will.

The remainder of the report touches lightly upon several subjects. Of the Law of Marriage "we think that the Church should be free to determine the conditions upon which persons may be married with the Church's rite, or, after a marriage which from the Church's standpoint is irregular, may be admitted to Holy Communion," but no further recommendations are made "as the whole question has lately been considered by Joint Committees of the two Convocations, which have now made their report."

The question of such a revision of the Canon law as would bring it up to date, is raised, but the Commission did not feel able to undertake the necessary detailed and exhaustive investigation. It recommends that an authoritative commission should be set up to decide what Canon Law is still operative; what is the authority of the operative Canon Law, and what is the obligation of the clergy when Canon Law and Statutory Law diverge.

The remaining proposal concerns the appointment of bishops. The report gives, but hardly credits, the suggestion that the bishops fail to obtain universal respect for their authority because a certain section regards their appointment on the recommendation of the Prime Minister as not being of a sufficiently spiritual character.

The evidence of witnesses on this particular investigation is illuminating. Whatever objection there may be in theory to the present mode of appointment it seems to be generally agreed that the effect is to give a bench of bishops unsurpassed in ability and influence by any appointed in other ways. Emphasis was laid on what is an undoubted fact, that election by synod has not proved an unmixed blessing. The temptation to lobby and canvass is too great. Frequently two strong men of diverse sympathies have such equal support that their appointment is rendered impossible. Frequently the result is the election of a third person of no particular colour or force.

The Bishop of London in the course of his evidence on this subject gave voice to a sentence which perhaps he would modify on second thoughts. Speaking of popular election he said: "Curiously enough the layman generally goes for a strong evangelical and the clergy for a strong High Churchman, and the weaker candidate is elected for the sake of peace. That is the result of popular election as I have seen it in some parts of the world." Here he certainly gives support to the contention frequently urged that Anglo-Catholicism is not a lay movement, but decidedly clerical; that the lay people given freedom of choice would welcome an evangelical ministry.

In the whole discussion there was a suspicion of something unreal. It would be interesting to know how often the Prime

Minister has insisted on appointing his own particular candidate. It is known that there have been particular instances, but one suspects that in recent years at all events the Prime Minister has always sought advice from the leaders of the Church. It is not surprising under these circumstances that the Commission does not recommend any great change. It does object to the existing practice as to the *cong  d' lire* : it proclaims that the practice is indefensible, seeing that the Chapter is charged with the right and duty of electing a bishop and at the same time is informed that it must elect a certain person under penalties of *pr munire*.

It is recommended that in future the Chapter should have an absolute right to reject the nominee of the Crown, but not the right to choose for itself. One nominee being rejected the Crown would then be asked to make a further nomination. Should agreement be found impossible the Crown would in the last resort appoint by letters patent. It similarly recommends that the Archbishop should, if he thought it right to do so, refuse consecration without being subject to penalties.

The Commission appointed by the Church Assembly which reported in 1929 suggested that the Prime Minister before submitting any recommendations to the King, in respect to the appointment of a bishop, should consult an advisory committee without in any way derogating from his own ultimate responsibility. This the present Commission rejects on the grounds that if the Prime Minister is to retain the right to recommend his nominee for a vacant bishopric, it is better that he should have the sole responsibility for so doing. We do not think that much weight can be given to the suggestion that if under such a system an unsuitable appointment was made no one would be able to fix responsibility for it.

The last chapter in the body of the book, with the exception of a summary of the recommendations, is a "conclusion." In it the Commission asks that the report should be studied, not piecemeal, but as a whole, suggesting that unless this is done there is a tendency to forget the larger background of the report and so to lose the significance of the parts. This suggestion that the historical section of the report should be carefully studied can be addressed only to a limited class. As might be expected there is an appeal for agreement within the Church on the limits of toleration, particularly with regard to the order of Holy Communion and Reservation. The complaint of evangelicals is that they have been barely tolerated. Sir Thomas Inskip in his evidence before the Commission did not hesitate to speak his mind about the official neglect of, and even contempt of, those of the clergy who hold definite views of a protestant and evangelical character, a neglect which he declares is not creditable to our official patrons. He points out that "extreme anglo-catholics receive a great deal of preferment ; extreme protestants receive none. It is a lamentable weakness of the Church that with all the fair words that are used about the place of evangelicals in the Church, they should be almost scornfully neglected, so far as the higher preferments are concerned."

The opinion which Sir Thomas Inskip voices is held by a great many. The bishops must not be surprised if under these circumstances evangelicals regard with some suspicion these appeals for unity.

At the end of the book are appendices, chiefly reports or extracts from reports. One, however, is of particular value. It is a reprint of a paper which appeared in the historical section of the report of the Committee on Church and State in 1916. It was prepared at the request of the Committee by Sir Lewis Dibdin and Mr. A. L. Smith, late master of Balliol. The Commission adopts it without assuming responsibility for its details.

Such in broad outline is the report which has been in preparation for five years. It will be carefully studied, in detail, in conferences and in other gatherings. The Commission has done its work well, but it is embarking the Church upon a somewhat thorny path. We repeat that we consider the times unpropitious, that the energies of the Church should be given to more vital work, and that the effect of an attempt to carry these proposals will militate against the unity for which the Commission pleads.

Messrs. Thynne & Co. issue a charming book entitled *David ; The Messianic King*, by Helen N. Lawson (2s. net). The book is dedicated to all young people and in affectionate remembrance of her father, who was an Honorary Canon of Peterborough and a diocesan Inspector of Schools. Much of it was written by him and all of it was inspired by his teaching. Much of it is in the words of Scripture with connecting links between the various passages. It is all admirably arranged, and put into the hands of young people it will give them the story of David's life in a charmingly attractive fashion.

The Evangelical Quarterly, Jan., 1936. The Contents list gives the following : *Calvin, Institutio 1536-1936*, Rev. N. MacLean Watt, D.D., LL.D. ; *Must we relegate Deuteronomy to the Reign of Josiah?*, Rev. W. D. Monro, M.A. ; *Modern Dispensationalism and the Doctrine of the Unity of Scripture*, Rev. Prof. Oswald T. Allis, D.D., D.Litt. ; *The Revival of Calvinism*, Rev. John Victor, B.D., Ph.D. ; *Calvin and Missions*, Rev. C. E. Edwards ; *Selections from Kierkegaard*, Rev. W. T. Rivière ; *The Faith of Abraham*, Rev. Principal D. M. McIntyre, D.D. ; *L'Idée de Modération dans la Pensée de Calvin*, Prof. Dr. Léon Wencelius. Book Reviews. Periodical Literature. The articles on The Revival of Calvinism and on Calvin and Missions are of great interest. There is an appreciative review of Dr. C. Sydney Carter's recent book *The Reformation and Reunion*. Altogether, a very good number of this excellent magazine.