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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1930.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Lambeth Conference.

THE Report of the Lambeth Conference with the Encyclical Letter of the Bishops was issued with admirable promptitude soon after the last meeting of the Conference. The Encyclical Letter presents a useful summary of the general results of the Conference as represented by the seventy-five resolutions passed by the Full Sessions of the Bishops. The Reports of the various Committees are useful as showing some of the phases of thought developed in the course of the discussions. The whole document deserves careful study on the part of churchpeople, as an important statement by the leaders of the Anglican Communion throughout the world on some of the most pressing problems of our time. Christianity has to face new situations, new conditions of life, new aspects of thought and new developments in every sphere. The Report of the Lambeth Conference, although it has no legislative authority, must have a special value as representing in large measure the attitude of the Anglican portion of the Christian world on subjects of universal interest. The Bishops cannot have expected that their decisions would be received with absolute unanimity. There is evidence that there was considerable diversity of opinion in the Conference itself on a number of important matters. It is therefore not surprising that each section of the Church has found much in the Report which it has received with great satisfaction, while there has also been much which raises great doubts and will give rise to keen discussion during the coming months. On the whole the Bishops have reason to be satisfied with the reception which the Report has received. With the exception of a few of the daily papers, there has been a desire to give the Report a fair examination, although at the same time it is realized that it will not arouse the enthusiasm or prove as inspiring as the Report of the Conference of 1920.

The Christian Doctrine of God.

The Report of the Committee on the Christian Doctrine of God is an important pronouncement. All religion depends ultimately on an adequate conception of God, and the Report helps to remove

some of the defective ideas which are entertained at the present time even in circles otherwise well educated and receptive of developments of thought in other spheres. The Committee was under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of Armagh, and with his guidance and leadership the depths of the mysteries of God's relationship to man are dealt with in a clear, courageous manner, which must serve to stimulate thoughtful minds to fresh efforts to bring their thoughts of God into more adequate relationship to the whole circle of knowledge. All truth proceeds from God and there must be an ultimate harmony in all the sources of knowledge and discovery, however much at any time they may seem to differ. The Christian conception of God has its own special characteristics. It differs from those of other religions and has as its central elements the revelation of God in Jesus Christ and the fact of the Cross. No conception of God can be adequate which falls short of the perfection of the Son, and " the principle of the Cross " is seen in the fact that " Christ taught that in love God rules the world. Through suffering for righteousness' sake men become the instruments of God's love, as it seeks the salvation of mankind. . . . The Cross sums up the struggle of love against evil throughout the ages." Such central facts as these are made the basis of an appeal for fresh study and a better understanding of the whole relationship of God to mankind in all the various activities and conditions of the human race. The whole of life is claimed by Jesus " as the sphere of Divine activity." An enlargement of the mind towards God is needed. The mental inertia of those who cannot or will not bring their minds into the service of their religion has to be overcome. The result will be a renewed relationship to God in the life of prayer, and this will lead to a new intensity of worship. The Bishops have set before us in this report a series of facts which constitute the foundation of Christianity, and on the realization of them depends the future of the Christian Faith.

The Unity of the Church.

There are matters of grave importance in several of the other reports with which it is impossible to deal here. We have been able to give our readers in this number the benefit of the thought of one of the most acute observers and best instructed writers connected with the Church press on the Conference, in an article which we commend to the careful attention of our readers. Our purpose in these editorial comments is to draw attention to a few features of outstanding interest in the Report, and to indicate their bearing upon the future of the Church. We therefore turn to the Report of the Committee on " The Unity of the Church " as dealing with the subject in which the majority of our readers have a special interest. It was the work of the similar Committee in 1920 which raised new hopes and brought new conceptions of a united Church to a world just recovering from the chaos of a world war. The Appeal to all Christian People issued then by the Bishops stirred the hearts of Christians in every section of the Church—even, we

may say, in the Roman Communion. There has been deep disappointment in the hearts of many churchpeople that, amid all the movements towards unity which have taken place, the Anglican Communion has not been in the foremost position, and has not given effect to the principles enumerated so clearly at the Conference of 1920. In regard to the ministry, the one stumbling-block in the way to complete reunion on these principles is reiterated with emphasis in the Report of the Committee this year when it says: "we emphatically declare that we do not call in question the spiritual reality of the ministries now exercised in non-Episcopal communions." The explanation given of what is involved in the acceptance of the Historic Episcopate leads us to hope that the terms of the Committee's statements will be carefully observed, for it brings us back to the conceptions of "the earliest times" of the Church, and to the original conception of episcopacy. It says: "The Historic Episcopate as we understand it goes behind the perversions of history to the original conception of the Apostolic Ministry." No one, whether of our own Communion or of the non-Episcopal Churches, can ask more than this, that we should maintain "the original conception of the Apostolical Ministry."

The South India Scheme.

The chief interest of the Conference for many centred in the treatment of the scheme for unity in South India. The Conference gave approval to its contents in terms which are satisfactory to the representatives of the Anglican Communion immediately concerned with the proposals. The details of the scheme and all that is involved in the consequences of its acceptance have become clear through the statements of the Report and the explanations which have been given of them by Bishop Azariah and other representatives of our Church in South India. It is now realized that South India, when the union scheme is carried through, will no longer contain a branch of the Anglican Communion, but will be constituted into a Province of the Universal Church. This, it is made clear, does not mean the setting up of a new Schism, for the various Churches uniting will be in communion with their mother Churches throughout the world. This is the method which has been adopted to avoid obvious difficulties connected with the acceptance of an episcopal form of constitution. It will take some time to realize all that is involved in these new conditions, and more especially in the conditions which will exist at the end of thirty years, when the ministry of this new province will be one with the fully constituted Historic Episcopate. We can foresee some necessary changes in the conception of Episcopacy, and some modifications in the attitude of the non-Episcopal Churches towards the idea of Episcopacy. There are many difficulties and considerable dangers, but we believe that in the interests of that unity which we believe to be in accordance with the mind of Christ, there will develop a conception of the episcopal office more in harmony with that of the Primitive Church. The Reunion Scheme in South India,

and the similar schemes in Persia, China and elsewhere, will have reactions which it is difficult for us in our present circumstances to realize, but we trust that, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, there will be development towards a fuller and better condition of the Church, and as the Church was guided in early days to the form of government most suited to its needs, so it may be again. But we must pray that it may be saved from those perversions which seem so easy when human weakness, pride and ambition frustrate the Divine plan.

Nonconformists and the Lambeth Report.

It is a matter for deep regret that there is considerable dissatisfaction on the part of a number of the leaders of the Evangelical Free Churches with the Conference Report on Unity. It is possible that this dissatisfaction may raise obstacles in the way of carrying out the South India Scheme of Reunion. The dissatisfaction is aroused by the fact that in the Report, as a prominent Free Church leader says, "marked prominence is given to the prospects of closer relationships with the Eastern Orthodox and the old Catholic Communions. It is clear that it is in this direction, rather than in the direction of the evangelical reformed churches that Lambeth is looking with hope as regards union." There is some justice in the complaint that prominence is given to conferences between the representatives of the Orthodox Churches and those of our own Church, while there is little reference to the prolonged conversations which took place between the leaders of the Free Churches and the representatives of our own Communion. We shall have more to say on the statements made on behalf of our Church to the representatives of the Orthodox Churches and the old Catholic Churches, as they contain a number of features which require very careful examination. We can only hope that the attitude attributed by Free Churchmen to the Bishops does not represent the real facts of the situation, and that any such onesided bias on their part was altogether unintentional and undesigned. We trust that it arose from the unbalanced pressure of many conflicting interests necessarily connected with the drawing up of documents in any deliberative assembly. Evangelical churchpeople are keenly concerned that there should be no misunderstanding on the part of Free Churchmen of their desire of Evangelicals for closer association with them, and we believe that this desire is shared by the majority of the Bishops of our Communion throughout the world.

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE: DOCTRINE AND REUNION.

WE have been told that the Prayer Book controversies were not so much as mentioned at the Lambeth Conference—either in private conversation or in public debate. By something that seems to be almost miraculous the most outstanding event in the recent history of the Church of England would appear to have passed into oblivion. The Records of the Conference prove that it had been mentioned, for one of the additional prayers is quoted in full and anyone familiar with the contents of the Deposited Book and the discussions associated with it, will find that the Deposited Book has been accepted as the official exposition of the doctrine of the Church of England by the Lambeth Conference. This is of course in keeping with the declaration in the Preface (1928): "If the minds of any be troubled because we have allowed another Order of Holy Communion as well as the old, and have made further provision for the communion of the sick, let them not think that we mean thereby any change of doctrine or intend that the Sacrament be used otherwise than our Lord appointed." Most churchfolk are aware that whatever the intention of the Bishops may have been the Divinity Professors of the University of Cambridge—not to mention other prominent theologians—maintained that a change of doctrine had been made. But we cannot expect the Episcopate to hold that the Professors and those who think with them are right, and thereby admit their own Preface to be wrong.

Action by consultative bodies is determined by principles. Behind Reports, Resolutions and Encyclical there is a collective mind that adopts certain bases, even when it has secured unanimity by a process of compromise. The Indian Church Scheme has been blessed by providing for a great experiment which for the time being puts the new Province in the Universal Church—when it comes into being—out of communion with the Anglican Communion, or perhaps it may be more accurate to say makes the new Church an autocephalous Church with some of its Clergy and members in personal communion with the Anglican Communion, and others cannot be so considered, although in India they are in communion with one another. Making all allowance for the dread of schism which haunted the minds of many Anglican Bishops, this does not seem a very brave decision. It was, however, all that could be hoped for from the Bishops in Conference who were faced by the fact that the Union is inevitable, and to make any pronouncement that would oppose barriers would in the long run do more harm than good to the Anglican Communion.

The New Province in the Universal Church will have characteristics of its own and its influence on the future development of Reunion movements at home and abroad may be the reverse of

what the Lambeth Conference desired. We are convinced that the Church will in time be ministered to by men in Episcopal Orders, but we do not believe that the theory and outlook of the Lambeth Bishops who made this conclusion inevitable will be adopted by the United Church.

" In the experience of many of us this heritage of Faith and Order seems to be one and indivisible, and to have its roots in the redemptive method of God in the Incarnation. To those who share that view the historic Order and the prominence of sacramental worship which commonly accompanies it stand for and bear constant witness to the God-given element in the Christian life, which is prior to and independent of all subjective feeling on our part. But whether or not we find Faith and Order thus welded together in our experience, we are all united in thankfulness for the heritage that is ours; and for it we are bound to stand."

We all agree with the last sentence and have to maintain our historic Episcopate as the oldest and best accredited continuous method of Church Government, but we fail to see that it has its root with the Faith of the Church in the redemptive method of the Incarnation. Bishops who hold this view cannot possibly consider the non-Episcopally ordained Ministries as " real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church." We are aware how this statement, although signed by Drs. Davidson and Lang, Drs. Talbot and Frere, has been attacked by the assailants of the South Indian Scheme. It had been urged by leading Nonconformist Divines on the large Committee of the Lambeth Conference (The Unity of the Church), and it is passed over in silence by the Committee which affirms the ambiguous statement in " The Appeal to all Christian people " (1920). If anything the difficulties in the way of Intercommunion of individuals are made greater in 1930 than they were in 1920, and we have instead the exhortation to co-operation in Evangelism with Christians of other communions. We are grateful for this, but can only regret that when souls are won for Christ they will remain without the privilege of Inter-communion, when they become attached to Anglican and Non-Anglican Churches. For we do not envisage co-operative Evangelism on the part of Anglicans and Orthodox or Old Catholics. At the best the Evangelized can only expect, if they have become members of other Churches than the Anglican, a discriminating hospitality at the Table of the Lord in the Anglican Churches. This is the penalty paid for not being members of Churches that have the Apostolic Succession.

If there is a drawing back from the steps forward made since 1920 with reference to the Non-Episcopal Churches there has been a great advance in connection with the Old Catholic and Orthodox Churches. We are told that when the Archbishop of Utrecht was asked to consecrate Señor Cabrera in Spain, he refused because, " among other reasons, Cabrera and his friends had adopted as their doctrinal basis the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England " (Moss, *The Old Catholic Churches and Reunion*, p. 33), and in the Résumé of the Discussions between Anglican and Ortho-

dox Bishops it is stated that the Anglican Bishops declared " that the doctrine of the Anglican Church is authoritatively expressed in the Book of Common Prayer, and that the meaning of the XXXIX Articles must be interpreted in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer." This at once raises the question whether Articles drawn up as a Theological statement of belief are to be jettisoned, when they are in conflict with certain interpretations of the devotional words in the Formularies used in public service.

The Conference passed a Resolution that there is nothing in the Declaration of Utrecht, i.e. in the Old Catholic Declaration of Doctrine made in 1889 which is inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of England. The Old Catholics owe their Episcopal Organization to the Church in Holland, and the members of the Episcopal Body are bound by a compact with the Utrecht Church not to consecrate other Bishops without its consent. It is true that in Switzerland the orientation of the Old Catholic Church is more reformed than that of Holland. The schism between the Old Catholics occurred after the Council in Trent—the formal separation from Rome was a slow process—and the outlawing of the Old Catholics was signalized by their being the only non-Anglican Bishops who were not invited to the Vatican Council in 1869. In the early part of the nineteenth century efforts were made to receive the Old Catholics of Holland into communion with Rome on condition that they surrendered their opposition to the Bull that condemned the supposed Five Propositions of Jansen. They refused to do this for the Archbishop declared he could not find the condemned opinions in Jansen's works. They were quite willing to condemn the Five propositions and to promise future obedience, but they could not say the propositions represented the teaching of Jansen. Later in 1854 the Pope issued his declaration that the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary should be held as necessary to salvation. The Old Catholic Bishops rejected this dogma and appealed to a General Council. In 1889 the Old Catholic Bishops, five in number, issued the declaration which re-affirms their rejection of certain Bulls and later Roman Pronouncements and refused to accept the decrees of the Council of Trent in matters of discipline, " and as for the dogmatic decisions of that Council, we accept them only so far as they are in harmony with the teaching of the primitive Church." They accept the Œcumenical Councils of the undivided Church of the first thousand years.

The teaching on the Eucharist is set forth in Clause 6:

" Considering that the Holy Eucharist has always been the true central point of Catholic worship, we consider it our duty to declare that we maintain with perfect fidelity the ancient Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, by believing that we receive the Body and the Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ under the species of bread and wine. The Eucharistic celebration in the Church is neither the continual repetition nor a renewal of the expiatory sacrifice which Jesus offered once for all upon the Cross; but it is a sacrifice because it is the perpetual commemoration of the sacrifice offered upon the Cross, and it is the act by which we represent upon earth

and appropriate to ourselves the one offering which Jesus Christ makes in Heaven, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews ix. 11, 12, for the salvation of redeemed humanity, by appearing for us in the presence of God (Heb. ix. 24). The character of the Holy Eucharist being thus understood, it is, at the same time, a sacrificial feast, by means of which the faithful in receiving the Body and Blood of our Saviour, enter into communion with one another (1 Cor. i. 17)."

We are not now concerned with the latter part of the declaration on the Sacrifice, but we are bound to examine what the reception of the Body and Blood means. The words " under the species of Bread and Wine " are the words that have been the storm centre of the Prayer Book controversy and it is necessary to see what it means in practice in Utrecht. " The Archbishop of Utrecht stated that it was the custom of the Old Catholic Church to communicate in one kind only, but any communicant could request Communion in both kinds." How far this is accurate may be judged from the fact that everywhere, except in Holland, Communion is given in both kinds and " the custom of the Old Catholic Church mentioned in the Lambeth Conference Report refers to Holland only." It seems to us that there was insufficient care, or knowledge shown by the Bishops who inquired into the subject. With some exceptions, insignificant from a doctrinal standpoint, the Liturgy used in Holland is that of the Roman Mass. The Sacramental Elements are reserved for the sick, and in Holland Benediction is given with the ciborium containing the Reserved Host. We can only judge a statement by the practices associated with it, and certainly Benediction is not a custom of the Church of the first thousand years!

When we pass from the Old Catholics to the Orthodox Church we have references to Sacramental teaching which display the ascendancy in the minds of the Bishops of the leading teaching that led to the rejection of the Deposited Book by Parliament.

In the Résumé of the Discussions between the Orthodox and the English Bishops we have the following paragraph:

" It was stated by the Anglican Bishops that in the Sacrament of the Eucharist ' the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper ' and that ' the Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner,' and that after Communion the consecrated elements remaining are regarded sacramentally as the Body and Blood of Christ; further, that the Anglican Church teaches the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice as explained in the answer of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Pope Leo XIII on Anglican Ordinations; and also that in the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice the Anglican Church prays that ' by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion ' as including the whole company of faithful people living and departed."

On the last sentence we have only to remark that the Prayer of Oblation in the Book of Common Prayer is a Post-Communion Prayer, that all reference to a Eucharistic offering for the dead is excluded in the Book of Common Prayer and that the exegesis of the Prayer given by the Anglican Bishops finds no support in the

Prayer Book of the Church of England. It may be supported by references to the Deposited Book and is an additional proof of the dangers which that Book opened before the National Church.

We are, however, concerned with the quotation from the Twenty-eighth Article. We suppose that on the principle that the Articles are to be interpreted by the Prayer Book it is right to quote a sentence from an Article and to omit the following sentence when it is one that may place the commentator on the doctrine supposed to be taught, in a perplexing position. "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 is faith." We believe that the Church of Ireland Bishops were summoned to attend the Lambeth Conference and that they remembered the words of the Revisers' Preface to the Irish Book of Common Prayer:

"As concerning the Holy Communion, some of our brethren were at first earnest that we should remove from the Prayer Book certain expressions which they thought might seem to lend some pretext for the teaching of doctrine, concerning the Presence of Christ in that Sacrament, repugnant to that set forth in the Articles of Religion, wherein it is expressly declared that the Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and that the means whereby it is therein received and eaten is Faith; but upon a full and impartial review, we have not found in the Formularies any just warrant for such teaching."

We wonder whether the words "Church of England" and "Anglican Bishops" contained in the Resolutions are intended to draw a distinction between the teaching of the Church of England, i.e. of the Deposited Book, and those branches of the Anglican Communion that still hold by the doctrine of the Book of Common Prayer?

We also should be glad of references in the Formularies in support of the dogmatic assertion that "after Communion the consecrated elements remaining are regarded sacramentally as the Body and Blood of Christ." We have failed to find any such reference in the Prayer Book or Articles. The one reference in the Book of Common Prayer is to their reverent consumption and this commands the Priest and the Communicants reverently to eat and drink the same. The Elements have been consecrated to a holy use and that use is concluded when they have been employed in feeding the souls of the faithful who have with faith received them. It is true that the Deposited Book takes a different view of the Elements and we have seen that the Old Catholics employ them in the service of Benediction. The endeavour to explain the Anglican doctrine in terms that satisfy the Greeks is based not on a frank study of the Formularies and Articles of the Church of England, but on a study based on the Deposited Book. No clearer proof can be given of the declaration of the Cambridge Professors that there is a change of doctrine in that much discussed Book, and we fear that the Lambeth Conference cannot in its efforts to foster closer relations with Old Catholics and Orthodox, be excused from using that Book as the exposition of the

teaching of the Church of England. We shall see during the coming months what this means and how far the Greek conception of Economy in expounding the Protestantism of the Church of England is warranted by facts. Economy is defined as a " technical term representing administrative action to meet a temporary situation without prejudice to any principle of ecclesiastical order." Something more than ecclesiastical order is at stake—what we find is something more than a temporary departure from rule. We have a doctrinal interpretation which cannot be supported by the formularies of the Book of Common Prayer and by the Thirty-nine Articles. The exposition given is opposed to the plain teaching of these documents and is not to be slurred by the contention that " it is quite true—and we should all agree—that the full meaning of the Holy Communion is only attained with the reception, and that is as carefully guarded in the Orthodox Church as in our own." This is not, we may say, with all respect, the issue at stake, for would not Roman Catholics agree also? What we have in mind is the absolute statement that to assert we receive " the Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ under the species of bread and wine " is " not inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of England." This is a matter of first-rate importance. No wonder the Conference does not look back upon the Reformation as determining the character of our Church as compared and contrasted with that of the Unreformed Churches.

It is obvious to anyone reading the Lambeth Documents that there has been a distinct hardening of the views of the Conference in its attitude to Non-Episcopal Churches through its emphasis on the Historic Episcopate as rooted in the Incarnation, for it is plain that whatever the Bishops may think on this subject, the Bishops who hold this view succeeded in causing the Conference to adopt its attitude. We recall that the Report of the Sub-Committee of the Conference of 1888 contained the passage:

" It would be difficult for us to enter into more intimate relations with that (the Orthodox) Church so long as it retains the use of icons, the invocation of Saints, and the cultus of the Blessed Virgin; although it is but fair to state that the Greeks, in sanctioning the use of pictorial representations for the purpose of promoting devotion, expressly disclaim the sin of idolatry, which they conceive would attach to the bowing down before sculptured or molten images. Moreover the decrees of the second Council of Nicæa, sanctioning the use of icons, were framed in a spirit of reaction against the rationalizing measures, as they were regarded, of the iconoclastic Emperors. The Greeks might be reminded that the decrees of that Council, having been deliberately rejected seven years afterwards by the Council of Frankfort, and not having been accepted by the Latin Church till after the lapse of two centuries, and then only under Papal influence, cannot be regarded as binding upon the Church."

Has there been any change in the Orthodox Church since these words were written? As far as we are aware there has been no theological change but some of the Greek Churches have followed the lead of the Commission of the Holy Synod of Constantinople, which reported in 1922 that on Orthodox principles Anglican Orders presented the same features which had led the Orthodox

Churches to accept Roman Catholic, Coptic, Jacobite, Armenian and Assyrian Orders. At the Cheltenham Church Congress in 1928 Archbishop Germanos who, on behalf of the Orthodox Bishops, signed the Résumé of Discussions with the Anglican Bishops, said: "Why should we not think that a time is coming when the Catholic nucleus which always existed in the Anglican Church should not prevail over the whole body, so that it would appear in that form which would make reunion with our Orthodox Church possible? Meanwhile, the duty of the Orthodox is not to break the definite bond which binds us to the Anglican Communion, but to help in such an evolution, through friendly intercourse and in a spirit of friendly discussion." At the Lausanne Conference (1927) the same Bishop speaking for his brethren said: "We cannot conceive how agreement can be made possible between two conceptions which agree that the existence of the ministry of the Church is by the will of Christ, but differ as to whether that ministry was instituted by Christ Himself in its three degrees of bishop, priest and deacon. In the same way we judge there to be no practical value in an agreed formula as to the necessity of Sacraments in the Church when there is a fundamental difference between the Churches not only in regard to their number but also as to their general significance, as to their essential nature and as to their particular effects. This being so, we cannot entertain the idea of a reunion which is confined to a few common points of verbal agreement; for according to the Orthodox Church, where the totality of faith is absent there can be no *communio in sacris*."

We have quoted these passages in order that the situation may be made plain. The Conference of 1930 has given an interpretation of the terms of Reunion based on the acceptance of a certain view of Ordination and the totality of the faith which satisfies the Old Catholics of Utrecht and the Orthodox Churches. The keystone of the agreement is the Apostolic Succession. We cannot get away from it in the Lambeth Reports. It is the central point, and as long as this is the case and Churches depend for their reality in the sight of God and man on the possession of this Succession, carrying with it the acceptance of teaching such as we have outlined, we can see little hope of Home Reunion between the National Church and the great Non-Episcopal Churches. We believe that this conclusion does not express the mind of the people of the Church of England, and the duty is laid upon all those who value Faith above everything else and Fellowship in Christ in Truth as the foundation of Christian Brotherhood, to work even more resolutely for the drawing closer together those who never should have been separated in the bonds of holy love and reverence for Truth. We are glad when barriers between Churches are thrown down, but this ought not to involve our erecting barriers between us and our Sister Churches of the Reformation. And we fear that the Lambeth Conference has done this and has compromised the Reformed and Protestant character of the Church of England, whose Bishops had the leadership in the Conference.

THE HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN LUTHER'S DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND CALVIN'S.

By the Right Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D. (formerly Bishop of Manchester).

The Pre-Reformation Church in England.

THERE is a popular belief, sedulously promoted by some English Churchmen, that the Church of England, even before the Reformation, had claimed and insisted upon its independence of the Papacy, and that the Reformation was no more than the effective assertion of this independence. The substratum of fact beneath this popular belief is that English monarchs from Henry II onwards had fought against the growing power of the Papacy and its ever-increasing stranglehold upon the laity, a hold maintained by the twofold grasp of absorption of wealth and administration of the Roman Canon Law. The defeat of Henry II by Becket "led to the enforcement of practically the whole body of Canon Law in England," [1] and the sonorous "*Libera sit Ecclesia Anglicana*" of Magna Charta meant liberty from the Crown at the expense of subservience to the Pope. The Pope's interest in the war against King John was not purely unselfish. Steadily Papal aggrandizement increased in spite of the Statutes of Mortmain and Provisors. While English wealth was drained by Provisions of Bishoprics and livings for foreigners, while appeals to Rome increased the expense of litigation beyond endurance, the Statute *de Heretico comburendo* laid the life of every English subject who dared to question Church doctrine at the mercy (and oh! what mercy it was!) of ecclesiastical Courts—Courts which recognized none of the legal rights most dear to an Englishman, especially the right of trial by his Peers. The Church of England was no independent spiritual body protecting English interests, but a drain by which English wealth passed to Rome or Avignon, and the administrator of a legal system which was alien to English notions of justice.

Nature is said to grow poisons and their antidotes side by side. The same intercommunication of *personnel* and thought which assisted Papal domination in England contributed also to the spread of anti-Papal teaching at home and abroad. The doctrines of Wycliffe found their way to Bohemia; Colet and Erasmus dined together in the Hall of Magdalen College, Oxford (for Universities were a great international union of scholars, facilitated by the common use of Latin among all educated men); and the doctrines of Luther found their way readily to England. Henry VIII's refutation of Luther gave the Reformer all the notoriety that an expensive

[1] Pollard's *Wolsey*, p. 356, note 5.

advertisement in the popular press would confer on a "best seller" to-day. England was at once drawn into the vortex of the Reformation movement.

The Lutheran Doctrine of the Church.

Our concern here is not with Luther's doctrines generally, but with his doctrine of the Church. This doctrine has two forms—one before, the other after, the Peasant War.

(1) *Before the Peasant War.*

Confronted with a Church in which the spiritual hierarchy, defined by claim of Apostolic succession and submission to the Papacy, was so self-sufficient that the laity were almost a superfluity, and had no right or duty but that of obedience, Luther began by insisting on the doctrine of the Church as the mystical Body of Christ. "In virtue of their common faith in the Word and their mutual and active love, believers form a spiritual community or people."[1] This community is the very opposite of the Papal. Being based on faith in the Word, it is essentially spiritual and invisible. Yet it is not so distinguished from the visible as to be another Church. The invisible and visible are one Church considered in two aspects, the unbelieving adherents being tolerated after the fashion of the mixed multitude in the camp of Israel.

This Society is theoretically free from State Control, though willing to accept the co-operation of the State. But it is a Society without rules except such as may be derived from the Word and the administration of the Sacraments. The Canon Law Luther detested. He called it the work of the Devil, and burnt a copy of it along with the Papal Bull. Nor would he have anything to do with the Common Law, or with any form of law having State sanction behind it. His belief was that law was made only for the lawless and evildoers, and that as the progress of the Gospel enlightened the world, law would become unnecessary.

(2) *After the Peasant War.*

Unfortunately these hopes were shattered by the Peasants' Revolt (1520–5). Luther was confronted with horrible lawlessness. He gave up his original ideal of a self-governing Christian community on somewhat democratic lines, and called upon the territorial Princes to undertake the reformation, each within his own domain. Without altogether abandoning the distinction between the temporal and spiritual spheres, he preached the Divine right of the secular authority, and to him the secular authority was the princely authority. Accordingly, in 1527 the Elector of Saxony appointed four visitors, giving them instructions and commands for their guidance. He disclaimed indeed the right to teach or exercise spiritual rule, but he gave Church Orders, which formed alike a directory of spiritual worship and a scheme of educational reform. Luther protested, but he had nothing better to offer. He

[1] MacKinnon's *Luther*, Vol. III, p. 281.

was no ecclesiastical statesman. As Dollinger said: "He was the founder of a religion rather than of a Church." His ideal was that of the pastor going out to preach the Word and drawing to himself converts so truly converted as to need no laws. Government he left in the hands of the State.

Luther's Doctrines in England—William Tyndale.

Luther's doctrines on the State reached England through William Tyndale, memorable for all time as the translator of the Bible into English, to whom we are indebted for no small portion of our Authorized Version. Tyndale wrote a book on *Obedience*, which so captivated Henry VIII, that he declared that a copy of it should be in the hands of every monarch. "The King," said Tyndale, "is in the room of God, and his law is God's law; and one King, one law, is God's ordinance in every realm." Thus there was no room for the priests' several kingdom; and "if the King executed those whom he judged not by his own law, he did so to his own damnation." Henry VIII, as has been said, was captivated by the book, and its inspiration may be traced in every Act of Parliament that led up to the Royal Supremacy. "Whereas," wrote Brynklow in 1543 of Tyndale and other Protestants, "the King before was but the shadow of a King, or at the most but half a King, now he doth wholly reign through their preaching, writing, and suffering."[1] It must be borne in mind that Tyndale was no asserter of the rights of Parliament. His *Obedience* was not a plea for liberty, but for power in the hands of Princes to suppress false doctrine and the Church of Rome. On the relation between Church and State he was Lutheran to the core, Lutheran, that is, in the style of Luther after the Peasant War. He had the same belief that the knowledge of the Word would make an end of all false doctrine, and that it was the duty of each King in his own kingdom to suppress all teaching contrary to that Word.

The fruit of these theories was the Tudor Church of England; Anglo-Catholic (to use modern terminology) under Henry VIII, Protestant under Edward VI, Papal under Philip and Mary, and once more Protestant under Elizabeth, but Protestant under new conditions which were due mainly to Calvin's doctrine of the Church.

How strangely might the course of British history have been altered, if John Knox had accepted the Bishopric of Rochester offered to him by Edward VI. He would presumably have been burnt with the other martyr Bishops by Mary. The Reformation, if it had reached Scotland at all, would have reached it under other influences. Or, even more probably, Mary Queen of Scots might have dethroned Elizabeth and established the Counter Reformation under a united England and Scotland. It has been said that John Knox played Lenin to Calvin's Marx—an unpleasant saying, but so far true that Knox gave practical effect in Scotland on a national scale to the doctrines of Calvin, tested hitherto only in small cantons, and found for those doctrines a home of the greatest importance at a

[1] Pollard's *Wolsey*, p. 359.

momentous historical crisis. Without Calvin's doctrine of Church and State it is hard to see how the modern political world could have come into existence. Luther threw his weight into the scale of absolutism; Calvin into that of ordered freedom. Yet, paradoxical as it sounds, Luther was all for freedom, Calvin for the strictest discipline.

Calvin's Doctrine of the Church.

In the *Institutes* Calvin says of the Church:

"First of all we believe in the Holy Catholic Church, that is, the whole number of the elect—whether angels or men—and among men—whether dead or living; and among the living—in whatever country they are found, and among whatever nations they are scattered. And this Church or society has Christ as its Lord, its chief and its Prince." . . .

And again:

"It is important that they recognize only one King, the Saviour Christ, and that they be governed only by the law of Christ, that is, by the holy truths of the Gospel."

Christocracy the Key to Calvin's Church Doctrine.

Christocracy is the inflexible and central note of the Church; all forms of authority which obscure the Kingship of Christ, or intervene between Him and the government of His Church, are absolutely excluded from the Church of Calvin. Of course the question rises whether the Church so ruled is simply the Church of the elect, known only to God, or is there any visible and external Church? What, for instance, has Calvin to say to Bellarmine, who holds that "the Church is an assembly of men as visible and palpable as the Kingdom of France, or the Republic of Venice, not asking of its members any internal qualifications, but only the external features of profession of the faith and participation in the Sacraments"? Has Calvinism any external and visible Church? Calvin's answer is this.

"Personally each of the elect may be sure of his own election. Of others he cannot judge since the number of the elect is known only to God. But the Lord, seeing that it is expedient that we should know who are His children, has so accommodated Himself to our capacity that in place of the certitude of faith He has given us the judgement of charity, according to which we can recognize as members of One Church all those who by profession of faith, by example of good life, and by participation of the Sacraments confess the same God and the same Christ that we confess."

While, therefore, the elect form a mystical body known only to God, the assembly of the faithful is an earthly organization, submitted to our senses, circumscribed in space, established in a place.

Divergence Between Lutheran and Calvinistic Church Doctrines.

Up to this point there is no great divergence between Luther and Calvin, except that as yet Calvin seeks no aid from the State. How, then, does he secure order and good living in the Church? Entirely by discipline and the cure of souls, which are so indispensable that

the Church can no more exist without them than the body can exist without nerves and sinews. Here is the fundamental difference between the Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches. When Lutheran Hamburg complained that it had a parish with 30,000 souls, the Faculty of Theology at Leipzig replied that Jonah in Nineveh had 120,000 souls assigned to him, and that he could not possibly have looked after each of his hearers. The Lutheran parish is a geographical area in which a pastor preaches and administers the Sacraments. The Calvinistic Church is an organism constituted by watchful discipline and mutual responsibility of the members for the spiritual welfare of the whole.

This note of distinction between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches is so important that an extract from Köstlin, the biographer of Luther, will be useful to corroborate what has been already said. The Reformed, that is the Calvinistic, Churches, says Köstlin, surpass the Lutheran in this, that

" in order to be reckoned a community of the faithful and elect, (a Church) must have the assurance that the institutions of salvation and means of grace are acting well, are penetrating the life of the community, are exercising their influence on unbelievers. This assurance of the reality of saving action which the Lutheran faith assigns to the spontaneous influence of the Spirit of the Word, the Reformed obtain by the exercise of discipline, which, by the fact that it is exercised, guarantees that the Word and Sacraments have the effect necessary for salvation—namely, sanctification. The importance of the Church for the Reformed consists not only in its being the organ of the Word of Salvation, but in its striving to maintain salvation on earth in the forms of an organized society. . . . The exercise of discipline is an essential element in the cure of souls. . . . Domiciliary visitation presents itself in a form quite different from the Lutheran. For the visitor the visit is obligatory : his conscience is troubled with remorse if he neglects a home, a soul. . . . This strong insistence on the duty of exercising surveillance over each one, the preoccupation, not only with religious needs, but with the whole manner of life, this examination of its attitude not only to the religious society, but to society in general in all its domains—all this, making part of the cure of souls, penetrates the life of the faithful in a way quite different from that of the Lutheran Church. . . . And so, on the Reformed soil there was developed in the community not only a Christian sentiment, but an ecclesiastical sentiment, a sentiment of ecclesiastical duties, of solidarity of the members, entirely different from that which is in Lutheran regions."

Calvinistic Church Organization.

The Church of Calvin is an organized community, not organized after the Papal fashion of a hierarchy, a sacred caste, ruling an obedient laity, but on the basis of a society of equals charged with a variety of duties. In the Church of Calvin there is no essential distinction between clergy and laity. There is a complete equality between all members of the Church, but the discipline of the Church calls for ministers of the Word and Sacraments, elders or rulers associated with ministers in surveillance of morals, doctors or teachers responsible for education, and deacons who have the care of the poor. These various duties are charges from God : those who have a charge receive it from God. Nevertheless, charges are

regulated by the community, and it is the community that elects by its vote the persons invested with a charge.

"Ideally," says Calvin, "it is the vote of all which designates either pastors or elders. Thus we have an independent society, self-governed, of which the most essential character is the combination of the right of God, the authority of God with the action of all members of the society all equal one with the other." [1]

Calvin's Doctrine of Political Authority.

Next to Calvin's conception of the organized community of equals co-operating for the sanctification of the whole we may rank, for its fruitfulness and historical importance, his doctrine of authority. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were groping after unity of government which should supersede the medieval medley of custom, and variety of independent authorities, a unity which should give expression and force of action to the growing spirit of nationalism. They were feeling their way towards the State which should break down the world of privileged classes, and bring all the nation under the rule of positive law. They were seeking for a "King of kings and Lord of lords" other than the Pope, and the idea of rule, based on Divine authority other than that of the medieval Empire and Papacy, was the great object of their political quest. The Tudor and Stuart monarchies met this demand with the conception of a hereditary monarchy owning the kingdom as a property, which could be disposed of by will, provided always that the legitimate heir could be ascertained—a loophole of which Parliaments and lawyers were eager to avail themselves. But the legitimate heir being found, it was his duty as well as his right to maintain the true faith and to make all provision for the national security. The Divine right of the Tudor monarch left very little room for ecclesiastical or civic right not derived from the crown and revocable at its will. In the search for an authority which should repel the Pope and suppress popular risings, England was threatened with an absolutism such as was actually established in France and Spain.

Calvin's political principles are the corollary of his theological and ecclesiastical, and the whole system is completely thought out, and so thought out as to have had the utmost historical importance. For in the end ideas rule the world. The theology, then, of Calvin

"levels all earthly sovereignties, places sovereign and peasant on the level of sinners, who can only be saved by the sovereign and unmerited grace of God. This grace may give to the peasant a position superior to all hereditary titles. On the other hand, the Prince called by God to his office has a position which no earthly title could give him." [2]

This call may take the shape of a Parliamentary recognition of his title. It may justify the rule of a Cromwell, a Charles II, or a William III. The authority of a Sovereign is Divine, his designation to the throne is popular.

[1] Doumergue's *Calvin*, V, p. 389.
[2] Doumergue's *Calvin*, V, p. 387.

Illustrations from Calvin's Writings.

Two notable passages from Calvin's own writings will confirm the foregoing paragraph, and establish clearly his conception of the relations between Church and State. Calvin asks: "Why did God establish magistrates and police? First, that we might live, as St. Paul says, 'in all piety.' What does piety mean? It is the honour of God, the extension of one pure and holy religion. Thus magistrates are warranted in using the sword against those who are troubling the Church, all heretics and propagators of false and erroneous opinions, and those fanatics who have such an idea of the Holy Spirit that they give license and impunity to those who try to upset the truth, to those who dissolve the unity of the faith and the peace of the Church, so that they are manifestly fighting against God, and are evidently incited thereto by the Devil. For we hold that it is the Holy Spirit Who declares by the mouth of St. Paul that God commands magistrates to maintain pure religion. . . . (If they destroy God's order), are they worthy to be exalted? Who is the mortal being who could dare to attribute to himself that he is in the place of God, in the seat consecrated to His Majesty? See, it is God Who puts this honour on creatures, Who stretches out His hand and says to them, I would have you to be My lieutenant." (Sermon on 1 Timothy, ii. 2.) At first sight, and standing by itself, this passage seems to place the magistrate in a position similar to the Lutheran. He is to maintain true religion and to suppress heresy. The difference lies in this—that in Luther's Church the minister is subordinate to the magistrate, in Calvin's the magistrate is partner with the minister in a holy alliance, as the following words abundantly indicate:

"Let us take note that God governs all earthly governments, in such wise that it is His Will that there should be Kings, princes, magistrates and men pre-eminent by their dignity, who preside over others and bear the sword for use as God has ordained. On the other hand, let us know that He has constituted in His Church a spiritual government, that of preaching the Word, to which all ought to submit, and against which no rebellion is tolerated. All men of whatever condition they be ought to allow themselves to be ruled as sheep by the shepherd, hearing His voice alone, and following wherever He calls them. These two orders constituted by God are not repugnant one against the other, as fire and water, which are contrary to each other, but they are two things so conjoined that, if one be removed, the other suffers, just as if one injures one eye the other is affected to the quick by the blow, and so are all other members of the body: just as if one arm is cut off, the other suffers much, and is not by itself sufficient for the work of both. It was then an excellent social order when Saul co-operated with Samuel, prophet of God and teacher, to set before him the doctrine of salvation; and on the contrary, when he separated and started to do anything by himself, all that he did was unfortunate and detestable." [1]

Calvin on the Ministry.

It is evident that in Calvin's Church the ministry are not subjects of the civil authority, but a check upon it. Indeed, Calvin can

[1] Calvin, *Homilies on 1 Samuel.*

surprise us by the exalted terms in which he speaks of the ministry:

"Behold the power ecclesiastical plainly set forth which is given to pastors of the Church, by which they are constituted administrators. Boldly they dare anything, and constrain every form of glory, might, and worldly dignity to obey and yield to the majesty of God. By the Word they have authority over the whole world, overthrow the rule of Satan, feed the sheep and slay the wolves: by their teaching and exhortation lead the docile; constrain and bind those who rebel and are obstinate: bind, loose, and destroy, but all by the Word of God."

What, we ask in astonishment, is the difference between this and the Papal claim of the sovereignty of the ecclesiastical over the civil power? The difference is this: that the ministers are (1) elected by the whole Church, not appointed by the clergy; and (2) that they are limited by the Word of God, by which the people and the elders especially are able to test the ministry, and to call to account ministers who are not true to the Word. The Divine authority of the ministry, great as it undoubtedly is, has behind it the election of the congregation and the Will of God expressed in His Word—to which Word the whole congregation has free access.

Summary.

Here, then, is the contrast between the Lutheran and the Calvinistic conceptions of the Church. The Church of Luther takes shelter from Rome under the wing of the civil power, and accepts from that power instruction as to administration and order of worship, trusting to the Word and Sacraments to maintain spiritual life: the Calvinistic Church is a spiritual and highly organized, rigorously self-disciplined democracy, co-operating with the civil power, resisting its encroachments, and vigilantly keeping the civil power up to the mark in the discharge of its duty.

Historical Results.

In the middle of the sixteenth century, or to be more exact, in the years 1559 and 1560, by God's good providence, it fell to the lot of the English and Scottish nations, in rejecting the Papacy, to make choice between these two forms of Protestant Church Government. England chose the Lutheran, Scotland the Calvinistic ideal. John Knox, by his "Blast against the monstrous Regimen of Women," had "banged the door" against his promotion to any bishopric in England. Nor did he covet any one of them. By his ministry to the English Church of exiles at Frankfort, he had sown seed which bore fruit in the Puritan efforts to control the Royal Supremacy by action of Parliament. Though England was not prepared to accept the Calvinistic Church Discipline, and entirely refused Christocracy by submitting to the Royal Supremacy, it did, more or less consciously, drink in from the Puritans the doctrine that the law of God, the supreme principle of right and wrong, was a law to which kings must yield obedience. It is not suggested, of course, that no other influence was at work than that of Calvin. Any such suggestion

would be wholly untrue. But it is suggested that Puritan principles directly derived from Calvin, and maintained in the form of a passionate demand for purity of worship and discipline accordant with the Word of God, were a most important contributory factor to the resistance of England against absolutism.

The story of John Knox and his work in Scotland is too familiar in its outlines to need repetition here. But the outlines give a very imperfect conception of the strength of the principle that underlay the Calvinistic model. The astute and prolonged machinations of King James VI and the heavy hand of his son, Charles I, the oppression of the English Commonwealth, the barbarities of Lauderdale, Turner and Dalziel, the persuasive accommodation of the saintly Leighton—all broke in vain against the immutable principles that Christ only is Head of the Church, and Christ only the Lord of conscience. Principles, however, need a convinced, resolute, and organized body of men to maintain them. That organization was found in the educated democracy of the Church of Scotland: educated on very narrow lines, if you will, and yet where in the world is a book to be found that contains such an education as is to be found within the covers of the Bible? When Archbishop Leighton sent a picked commission to examine the Covenanters and discover, if possible, the secret of their tenacious resistance, his Commissioners came back amazed at the learning and reasoning skill of the peasantry, whom they had examined, and their defence of the principle of resistance to unlawful authority. We are proud to-day of our sound Biblical interpretation and of the historic insight on which it rests. But, when all is said and done, the Old Testament does not speak to us, the characters of the Old Testament do not live to us, the law of God in the Old Testament does not bind our consciences, as it bound the consciences and spoke with a living voice to the burghers and cotters of seventeenth-century Scotland. Calvin remains yet a Prince, if not the Prince of Commentators on the Bible, because he always looked for the Spirit in the Word, and the strength of his Church lay in the fact that it rested not on a dead tradition, but on a living Word, and that Word the Word of God. In spite of all the mistakes, the blunders, the cruelties and crimes, and even the hypocrisies that marred the development of the idea, was there ever a loftier conception of Church and State than that which bound a nation in a solemn Covenant with Jehovah?

MALTA.

By the Rev. Thos. J. Pulvertaft, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's-at-Kilburn.

MALTA holds a position of strategic importance in the Mediterranean. It lies fifty-eight miles from Sicily and about 180 from the African coast. It possesses an important dockyard and arsenal and is the headquarters of the Mediterranean Fleet. The island, which is in area about ninety-two square miles, is the centre of a group of isles the largest of which is Gozo, with an area of twenty-four square miles, and it is highly cultivated. Its chief industry outside agriculture is shipping, and before the great decadence in the lace trade some 6,000 of its people were engaged in its manufacture. The population of the group is between 230,000 and 250,000, and the religion of the inhabitants has been and is Roman Catholic.

To understand the religious condition of the island, it is necessary to remember that no Protestant place of worship exists among the native Maltese, and that the Chaplains who minister to the soldiers and sailors confine their work to the men and their families under their immediate care. The Roman Church claims to exercise spiritual authority to the exclusion of all other forms of religious worship among the native population. Her claims are parallel to those she put forward in Spain when the Spanish Constitution gave a certain measure of tolerance to non-Roman Catholic Christians. At that time the Pope (Pius IX) wrote to the Archbishop of Toledo that the Constitution violated every obligation of truth and of the Catholic Faith. "It annuls illegally the Concordat between the Holy See and the Spanish Nation, exposes the State to the charge of wrong, and opens a door to error, error which is a precursor to a long succession of ruinous evils to the nation so long and true a lover of Catholic unity." In 1906 when Lord Elgin (Colonial Secretary) wrote to the Governor of Malta declaring the undoubted right of all persons in the island to the exercise of religious liberty, the then Archbishop—Bishop of Malta—wrote: "I can but signify my deep displeasure and that of all my diocesans at the sanction of liberty of religious worship in these Islands." Rome claims to be supreme, and what is more, declares herself not to be a Foreign Power. "Wherever there are Catholics, wherever there is a Catholic state or a Catholic people the Holy See is not a 'foreign power,' as its counsels and interventions are never political but essentially religious."

When in 1911 the right of self-government was given to Malta, as a British Colony, with foreign relations reserved to the Imperial Parliament, the Maltese hierarchy desired and pressed for the declaration in the Constitution that the Religion of the Maltese is Roman Catholic. The Home Government refused to insert this statement, and the first Act of the Maltese Legislature was to make

this declaration on its own part—which it had a perfect right to do —but it could not interfere with the direct assertion of Religious Liberty in the Constitution which states, " (1) All persons inhabiting the Colony shall have full liberty of conscience and the free exercise of their respective modes of religious worship ; (2) No person shall be subjected to any disability or excluded from holding any office by reason of his religious profession." On its being pointed out that no provision was made in the Constitution for the establishment of Civil Marriage in a Colony where Rome asserted the sole right to regulate marriage among the Maltese, in accordance with the Tridentine legislation, it was maintained that when occasion arose the situation would be faced.

The attitude of Rome may be judged by the remonstrance addressed by Cardinal Gasparri to the British Minister at the Vatican on February 23, 1929, because the Governor received three visiting Anglican Bishops in his official Residence, " once that of the Grand Master of the Order of Malta, associated with so many glorious records touching the Catholic Religion, but offensive also to the convictions and sentiments of the great majority of the Maltese who are fervent in their profession of the Catholic Religion ; for they constitute a formal and official favouring of the Anglican Creed." In a note to the Vatican White Book we learn that oral explanations were given by the Minister and the British Government and made known to the Holy See, that the visit was official and that it was an act of simple courtesy to receive them. It really is hard to reconcile anything like religious liberty with the view of the Vatican Authorities, that the Representative of His Majesty in Malta is unable to receive in his official Home visiting Bishops and permit them to hold there Conferences with the local Churchmen. Even in Spain we have not heard of any such protest being made when his Majesty's Minister permits a Bible Society Meeting to be held in the Embassy. Rome attempts in Malta what she has not dared to do in Spain, for she knows that even reactionary Spanish Governments would not venture to lodge her protest with the British Foreign Office.

A Roman Catholic Friar, the Rev. P. Guido Micallef, was against his will ordered to leave Malta for Italy. The Maltese Government, fully cognizant of all the facts, declared in the local Parliament : " If an alien like Father Carta would be able to send a Maltese subject into exile, public order would be imperilled." Rome viewed the matter as grave, for it impeded " the free exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in matters pertaining to the religious life of a friar." In plain English, this means the assertion of the right to override the liberty of the subject and to make the will of the Vatican prevail against the constitutionally exercised freedom of a British subject. It is the claim that the Vatican is not a Foreign Power but a supreme Power, when what it considers religious interests, i.e. its own interests, are at stake, and all other interests must yield to the demands of Rome.

The British Minister to the Vatican placed the matter on its right footing when he declared that the command of a foreigner

that a British subject should leave British territory had placed His Majesty's government in a position of embarrassment. The Government had no desire to discuss this particular case or to interfere in the internal disciplinary affairs of monastic orders. It looked upon the case as a symptom of the unsatisfactory state of affairs in Malta, and asked that the Vatican should consider sending an Apostolic visitor to the island to investigate the whole questions of the relations of the ecclesiastical authorities in Malta to the political Government, " having regard to the importance of avoiding friction in the future of the intervention of Maltese priests in politics." He added that he had learned that the Holy See wishes " to discourage political agitation by priests. The disregard of this rule, and the intense participation by Maltese priests in local politics, it is considered lie at the root of the present trouble." The Vatican determined that a Delegate Apostolic—which meant a very high official of considerable importance, should be sent to Malta, and chose Monsignor Robinson, Archbishop of Tyana—" who must certainly be a *persona grata* to the British Government." The British Government approved most cordially of the nomination and on April 3, 1929, Monsignor Robinson arrived in Malta.

On May 29, 1929, the Governor of Malta wrote to the Colonial Office reporting that Monsignor Robinson had made his investigation and anticipated a happy solution of the matters in dispute. The settlement of the question would be in the form of a " Concordat or Protocol which would necessarily be respected by both parties." On June 27 the Foreign Secretary informed by telegram Sir Robert Graham that Lord Strickland would arrive in Rome on July 5 and asked Mr. Chilton, the Minister at the Vatican, to arrange an interview with the Cardinal Secretary of State on either July 5 or 6. On July 2 the Cardinal Secretary wrote to Mr. Chilton saying that he had written to the Bishops of Malta and Gozo saying that Lord Strickland is not *persona grata* to the Holy See, and suggesting that the matter should be brought to the notice of the Imperial Government, which in view of the harm that Lord Strickland's activities occasion will no doubt " adopt such measures as they (the Imperial Government) may consider necessary to prevent such subversive activity, or at least to divorce their responsibility from that of Lord Strickland." Enclosed in this letter were a *Résumé* of an Aide Memoire addressed by eye-witnesses to the Holy See on activities of Lord Strickland, and a letter dated June 30, addressed to the Maltese Bishops approving their attitude and stating that in spite of all insistence the Pope had refused to receive Lord Strickland—a reference to an episode in 1928.

It is necessary to glance at the internal politics of Malta. The island contains a larger number of clergy in proportion to population than any other area in Europe. Eighty per cent of its people speak Maltese only, and some 10 per cent speak Italian as a second language. There has been a long controversy concerning the necessity of making Italian culture the basis of the intellectual development of the island. Language has always been either an element of

political propaganda or oppression, and the Strickland Ministry believe that British culture should be maintained in Malta. For reasons that can readily be understood comparatively little has been said of this aspect of the question, but readers of the Maltese Press know how much it figures in local politics. Lord Strickland is a Roman Catholic, all his Ministers are Roman Catholics, and Lord Strickland in a statement made in reply to the Cardinal Secretary's note wrote on July 6: "Educated Catholics who take an Oath of Office and loyalty to the King, and who are responsible to their electors, cannot conscientiously surrender political authority in civil matters to any bishop under threats of hostility at elections and mixing up of religion with politics. There cannot be two Governments in Malta."

It is unnecessary to go into the charges and counter-charges in the long documents published in the Blue and White Books. It is evident that in the discussions of the proposed Concordat the two parties were so totally opposed to one another that they either genuinely or wilfully, through obsession, misunderstood one another. The closed mind was in evidence from the beginning as far as the Apostolic Delegate was concerned. He stood for the supremacy of the Roman Church, whereas in his opinion Lord Strickland wishes at all costs "to make the Church subservient to the State and to reduce the bishops and priests to the position of mere employees of the Government." "Lord Strickland cleverly endeavours to dispel all suspicion of antagonism against the Church, and to this end disguises his attitude against it, asserting that he is acting against the clergy in the interests of religion and of the Church, making pretence of protecting the Catholics of Malta against the intrigues and interference of foreign ecclesiastics: a pretext this, very much like the assertions of Luther at the time of the so-called Reformation." This sounds like an echo of the words of the Archbishop—Bishop of Malta—written in August, 1928: "The danger that is threatening is nothing less than the loss of the Faith, which for almost twenty centuries has constituted the greatest glory of our country, and which has also been a cause of infernal envy." Notwithstanding this Pastoral in November, 1928, the Cardinal Secretary wrote to Lord Strickland with reference to the "refused" interview referred to in his letter to the Archbishop of Malta, "the Holy Father has not refused the desired audience, but for very grave reasons has simply considered that it may be put off to a more opportune moment, also in order that it may take place in the form due to the high office held by Your Excellency. And it is in this sense that we will make it our early duty to inform the English Government." This certainly is diplomacy with a vengeance. Lord Strickland was informed that the interview was delayed in order that greater honour might be paid to him—the Bishop of Malta was told that in spite of all pressure the interview was refused because he was not acceptable to the Vatican.

When the British Government received the astounding suggestion that, in virtue of the civil tyranny and religious persecution of the

Maltese Ministry, the activities of the Ministry should be restrained and its policy disavowed, the British Government replied on August 8 deploring the character of the request and the charges made. In a reply two days after receiving the remonstrance of the Imperial Government, the Vatican wriggles in explaining the contrast between the Secretary of State's letter to Lord Strickland and his words to the Archbishop—Bishop of Malta—and declares its inability to continue conversations or conclude a concordat " so long as it is not persuaded that Lord Strickland intends to respect the rights of the Church and to practise a proper regard towards the local ecclesiastical authorities."

The triennial General Election drew near and efforts were made to avoid trouble arising from the interference of the Maltese ecclesiastics in political controversy. The Minister at the Vatican after reviewing his conversations and negotiations was forced to say that there is no hope of the Vatican instructing the Bishops not to intervene or of negotiating a concordat while Lord Strickland is Premier. On May 1, 1930, the Maltese Bishops issued a Pastoral in which the Maltese as Catholics were told that to vote for Lord Strickland or his candidates, to present themselves as candidates in support of Lord Strickland and not to vote for the candidates who would offer greater guarantees both for religious and social welfare, would be a grave sin. " In order then to prevent abuses in the reception and administration of the Sacraments, we remind our priests that they are strictly forbidden to administer the Sacraments to the obstinate who refuse to obey these instructions." Even before the publication of the Pastoral the Parish Priests refused absolution to the Stricklanders and told them they were bound to obey orders. The orders were issued, according to the evidence, so that those Roman Catholics who wished to make their Easter Communion, were denied absolution on the sole ground that they were Stricklanders!

On May 9 the British Minister in a note to the Cardinal Secretary of State said, " These acts seem to His Majesty's Government in the highest degree reprehensible and protest against them in the most emphatic manner. To this protest they can only add a renewed expression of their regret that the Holy See has been unable either to countermand the directions issued by the Maltese hierarchy or to seek, in co-operation with His Majesty's Government, some means by which the interests of Church and State can be brought into lasting harmony." The Elections were suspended, and on May 16 another note was handed to the Vatican in which a Memorandum issued on May 7 by the Vatican, is described as not putting " an accurate construction on their intentions and proposals, or that indeed in several passages it reflects correctly the upshot of the communications which have been exchanged between them and the Holy See."

The Vatican issued a long reply and the Maltese Bishops a Memorandum in which they refer to the duty of the Governor to obey the Law which declares the " Roman Catholic Religion to be

the recognized Religion of Malta." After a further exchange of notes the British Legation on May 30 handed a note to the Cardinal Secretary, which complains of fine distinctions drawn by the Vatican's representatives, which do not in any way affect the case on which the protest of His Majesty's Government is based, and concludes by stating boldly that the resumption of negotiations is rendered impossible " by attaching a condition as to the personality of the Head of the Maltese Administration, which constitutes nothing less than a claim to interfere in the domestic affairs of a British Colony." The Vatican replied that it had declared itself ready for negotiations on August 10, 1929, and that it then also stated that " it was not possible to begin these negotiations as long as the cause of the trouble persisted." " The Holy See opposed the work of Lord Strickland not on account of political reasons, but solely because of his attitude towards religion." The attitude of the Vatican can best be understood from a paragraph which shows the medieval mentality of the Curia : " Such a defence of the Catholic Faith in Malta can be considered by the Government of His Majesty as an improper political interference even less, because this same Government of His Majesty from the beginning of its possession of the island gave the Maltese people the most ample assurances that the Catholic religion would be protected and defended." Clerical absolutism has always endeavoured to assert itself in Malta and it is precisely because this absolutism comes into conflict with the rights of citizens to exercise freely their political privileges and responsibilities that this Maltese trouble has arisen. We have an object lesson of the demands of Rome which cannot fail to influence public opinion in this country. As yet Rome has hesitated to apply the principles of absolutism to the affairs of Great Britain, but it is because she knows she has not the power to do so. She hopes that in Malta, Government will be made impossible unless her will prevails and the Government of England goes to Canossa.

But Lord Passfield has declared in the House of Lords, " We have retained the noble Lord, Lord Strickland and his colleagues in office, we have saved their position. We have not allowed them to be eliminated : we are not in any sense giving way to the demand of the Vatican that Lord Strickland and his colleagues should be removed, and we have no intention of doing so." The Vatican had asked for his elimination ! And this is described as non-political intervention when a Prime Minister is constitutionally in office. It is the old claim to appoint and dethrone Kings. Pope Boniface of the fourteenth century makes his appearance in the twentieth century in the spirit of his pronouncement that " to be subject to the Roman Pontiff is for every human creature a necessity of salvation." Monsignor Robinson says if the English Government understood the damage Strickland is doing in Malta it could " decline all responsibility for the line of politics pursued by Lord Strickland, or oblige him to modify the same, or, if that be not considered possible, to find some means of eliminating him peacefully from the political field in Malta ! " And this is non-interference.

AN ABBOT'S CONVERSION.

By H. P. Palmer.

JOHN, Abbot of St. Albans from 1195 to 1214, was lying on his death-bed. He had already been anointed with the holy oil and was calmly waiting for the end which, as a student of medicine, he knew to be close at hand. While he lay thus, he was disturbed by the sudden entry into his chamber of William Trumpington and two other brethren of the Abbey. They began immediately to harangue the dying Abbot. Was it not pitiful, they inquired, that the Abbots of St. Albans should have the power of sending brethren to distant Cells, away from their beloved monastery, there often to close their days in anguish of heart? Had not the Abbot himself said that such a usage was a travesty of justice? Would he not now sign a charter by which the brethren should for ever be protected from this abuse—never again forced to leave the Abbey against their will?

Words were followed by action. One of the three monks, Alexander of Appleton, brought forth a charter complete in all its details and asked the Abbot if he might read it before presenting it to him for sealing. The charter guaranteed the brethren from expulsion to the Cells, or Priories belonging to the Abbey, for all future time. The Abbot's only reply was to heave a deep groan and turn away his face. The light of his life was fast flickering away; though conscious of what was passing, he could not speak. Yet once more he tried to indicate his refusal by turning away with a heavy sigh from his tormentors. But this, the only protest now possible, was treated with contempt. Alexander of Appleton angrily spread forth the charter and brought out wax and the abbatial seal. With the exclamation "Silence gives consent," he then himself sealed the document with the Abbot's seal.

The Abbot breathed his last on the following day, and his seal, as was customary, was broken in pieces. Alexander rode off quickly to London to see Stephen Langton, the Archbishop. The purpose of his visit was to request the Archbishop to confirm the charter by the impress of his own seal. Langton and Alexander were intimate friends, so the latter's task was easy. No shadow of suspicion of fraud crossed Langton's mind. Believing that the seal had been placed on the charter by the Abbot himself, he confirmed it as requested. There seemed now little prospect that the fraud and forgery would ever be detected.

Abbot John had passed "from exile to his heart's true home, from stormy seas to port," and a new ruler must be chosen without delay. But there could be no election until the King's licence to elect was obtained. William Trumpington, one of the three monks who had procured the forged charter, and another monk, were therefore sent to Poitou, where John happened to be, to ask for

this licence. They saw the King as he was in the last days of his life—prematurely aged, white-haired, worn with care, dissipation and evil passions. On receiving the petition, John reflected that until the new Abbot was appointed, he himself would enjoy the abbatial income. He therefore refused to accede to the petition until his return to London. By this delay he enjoyed a substantial increase to his revenue for more than three months.

Sir William Trumpington was cousin of the monk who had been prominent in the conspiracy to obtain the charter and who had afterwards interviewed the King. Though Sir William had never approached his cousin on the subject, he resolved to win for him the King's support by means of his relative, the Earl of Winchester. Sir William's plan succeeded, and John promised to favour Trumpington's election.

The monks of St. Albans heard of the royal design. They knew that if Trumpington were not elected, the King would exercise his veto on their choice and throw the monastery into chaos. Uninfluenced by John's interference, they would probably have elected the Prior, who was a man of remarkable attainments. Knowing the King's wishes, they decided to elect Trumpington, especially as he seemed likely to be an easy ruler and to monastic frailties "a little kind."

Trumpington then became Abbot John's successor by the unanimous vote of the twelve monks appointed to represent the whole body in electing an Abbot. The new Abbot was in the prime of life, strong, athletic, of commanding presence and with a countenance of singular beauty. No one who had seen him could readily forget him. When, however, he was presented to the King in London, John feigned ignorance of his person and demanded who he was. When he had been informed, he exclaimed with a laugh, "The very man I wanted. You did not wish to disappoint me. I hope the new Abbot may walk in the steps of his cousin." Then the King kissed Trumpington and showed by every look and gesture how pleased he was with the choice. He had little to be pleased with in anything else, for he was girt around with a ring of enemies.

Trumpington soon created surprise and disappointment in the minds of the monks. They had imagined that they would find in him a lenient master, but it was soon clear that he would "bear, like the Turk, no brother near the throne" and would sweep away from his path, by dismissal to one of the Cells, any monk of talent who seemed to threaten his supremacy. There was no society which he courted less than that of the monks. He greatly preferred to move freely in the secular world, to entertain laymen and to receive their hospitality. Though attentive to his religious duties, he loved to breathe a freer atmosphere than that of the cloister with "its wise saws and modern instances." But the Abbot's worst offence in the eyes of the brethren was the breaking of the charter of which he had been one of the principal contrivers and by which they hoped to be shielded from the caprices, vagaries

and tyranny of the Abbots. Yet it was soon evident by his conduct that to Trumpington the charter was already but "a scrap of paper." The brethren were dismayed to find that the man who had sold his honour once, was ready to sell it again. The Abbey soon seethed with sullenness and sedition. The brethren gathered into groups, and freely canvassed the conduct of the Abbot. They would not endure it. They would "screw their courage to the sticking place." They would be bold and resolute. They would flout the Abbot in the Chapter-house. Walter of Rheims voiced the opinion of the more moderate, when he said: "Let us bear these affronts patiently and rebuke him in a spirit of gentleness, in the hope that he may see the error of his ways. If he is proof against this clemency, let us take a sterner line." At the meeting of the Chapter which followed these discussions, the Abbot found himself the object of a caustic criticism in which it seems probable that the Prior took part. The Abbot was charged with the offences already mentioned, but it was the breach of the charter which was the ground selected for the main attack. The Abbot's conduct was denounced as disgraceful. He was charged with an impudent defiance of the plain meaning of language—with a shameless betrayal of his troth.

The Abbot glowered upon the Prior with a malignant expression on his face, which boded no good to its object. Then, in a moment, his countenance cleared. Looking calmly at the eighty or hundred monks who sat round him, he declared that if he had carelessly caused offence, he would amend his conduct and defer to the wishes of the Convent. Not only so, but in replying to Alexander of Langley, the Abbot reiterated this pledge and added: "God forbid that I, the principal author of the charter, should act in opposition to it."

The meeting broke up and the monks left the Chapter-house for the cloister, believing that the Abbot would be as good as his word. They forgot the warning of one of the sweet singers whose hymns they had chanted so often against "trust in princes or in any child of man."

Incredible as it may seem, within a month of obtaining a pledge which men who did not pretend to the sanctity of an Abbot would have regarded as sacred, the monks were startled to discover that another of their number had been sentenced to exile in one of the Cells. The unhappy brother, who was thus treated, was broken-hearted. He wept—he entreated. Kneeling at the Abbot's feet, with hands clasped and with tears streaming down his cheeks, he begged for mercy and implored that he might not leave the Abbey, which was his home and the seat of all his affections. But, as Churchill once said of James II, marble was not more adamantine than the heart of the Abbot. The monk was compelled to leave all that he loved on earth and to go to a distant monastery, which for him was a house of bondage. There he died in great anguish of mind.

The banishment of this brother was followed within a few days

by that of another. "Moreover," says Matthew Paris, who was the chronicler of this period, "the Abbot did not condescend to amend the abuses which he had promised to correct."

The quarrel between the Abbot and the monks was openly renewed at another Chapter-house meeting. The Abbot, on entering, was at once exposed to a violent onset from his subordinates. The scene must indeed have been an animated one and well worthy of a sketch from the pencil of Matthew Paris himself. The Abbot stood at bay while the monks, one after the other, launched their missiles and impeached his justice, his veracity and his fidelity to his promises. As the indictment proceeded and the charges were relentlessly pressed home, the Abbot showed by many outward and visible signs how furious he was. His colour changed, he gnashed his teeth and his whole body was arched and convulsed with the passion which surged in his heart. Nevertheless he made a prompt reply, which was clear, cold, bitter and unexpected. Ignoring lesser plaints, he dealt only with the burning question of his repudiation of the charter. "I know," he said, "that I took immense trouble in the composition of the charter about which you revile me, and in making it effective. But I did not then realize what I was doing. So now I will break my own work in pieces. What I confirmed I will make of none effect. I know now what formerly I was ignorant of." A monk called Almaric retorted in low tones: "That is true—you are now aware that you are Abbot, a fact which you were ignorant of before." This remark was distasteful to Trumpington and was avenged later.

As the monks rallied from the stupefaction caused by the bombshell thrown by their superior into their midst, murmurs of disapproval were heard which irritated the Abbot. With the apparently innocent but significant words, "We will take counsel on this matter," he dismissed the monks and broke up the meeting.

Nicholas of Tusculum, Cardinal and Papal Legate, was a familiar figure in England towards the end of John's reign. It was he who removed the Interdict from the country, who fixed the punishment of Oxford citizens guilty of the murder of clerks and scholars and who deposed Norreys, the infamous Abbot of Evesham. To him Trumpington went for advice and support, perhaps even before the meeting of the Chapter, at which he had assumed so bold an attitude. He told Nicholas the story of the manufacture and wrongful sealing of the charter. Whether he imparted his own share in this scandalous affair to the Legate is uncertain. Unquestionably Nicholas was fully acquainted by the Abbot with the mutinous spirit of the monks. He was sympathetic and an effective plan of action was agreed on. The brethren may have been surprised and perhaps apprehensive when the Legate, doubtless attended by his usual brilliant retinue of knights, abbots and secular clergy, came to St. Albans Abbey. He soon explained the object of his visit. He wished to meet the Abbot and the brethren in the Chapter-house and discuss ecclesiastical business. After a little casual conversation, the Legate blandly remarked: "I hear that a new charter

has been executed in this house; kindly let me have a copy for examination." The charter was found and reluctantly handed to the Legate. As he perused it, his brow darkened and, when at last he had reached the end, he exclaimed scoffingly: "What a scandal we have here! Are you mad, brethren? Do you wish to renounce the obedience which you have promised and vowed to God?" The Legate followed this speech by an action which must have struck dismay into the minds of the terrified monks. He tore the charter into shreds with his teeth and flung the seals unbroken into the midst of the Chapter-house. "Cursed," he cried, "are those by whom such stratagems are employed in monasteries." The effect of the Legate's words and action was electrical. The boldest monks were quelled. "Almaric had no satirical speech to utter. Alexander of Langley's rhetoric was silent. Walter of Standuna's threats were unuttered. The haughtiness of John of Seddeford was brought low. All the enemies of the Abbot bit the dust."

No one dared to breathe a dissentient word, far less to declare that the stinging words of the prophet, "Thou art the man," might justly be said to the Abbot. Here before them was the *alter ego* of the Vicar of Christ, one with power to bind and to loose—able with a blast of his displeasure to cause a disaffected monk to spend the rest of his days in penitence and grief.

The Legate rose, dismissed the Chapter and left the Chapter-house. Even as he passed out, he turned a menacing finger at the monks and charged the Abbot, if there were any murmuring, to invoke his assistance. His warning was a work of supererogation.

The Abbot had triumphed, he was now master of the situation and proceeded to act with ruthless vigour. Reimund, the Prior of the Abbey, is described as the greatest man of the Benedictine Order living at that time. This aged monk was a scholar and had slowly and painfully collected that costly luxury, a small library of books. His devotion to literature was only second to his love for the Abbey which he faithfully served. It was this excellent person who was first selected for exile to Tynemouth Priory, the most distant and the most unpopular of the Cells. The Abbot disliked the Prior both because he had opposed him and because he was the idol of the monastery. It was, too, on the Machiavellian principle that the overthrow of the greater strikes terror into the rest, that the Abbot thus brought down the grey hairs of the Prior with sorrow to the grave. Similar harshness was shown in the case of three other monks. Among these was Almaric, who had uttered a bitter taunt at the first Chapter meeting.

Alexander of Langley, who had assisted the Abbot in procuring the charter and had afterwards demanded its fulfilment, must have dreaded the same fate. It happened, however, that the headship of the Cell of Wymondham fell vacant and the Patron, the Earl of Arundel, requested the Abbot that Alexander might be appointed as its Prior. The Abbot feared to offend the Earl, and Alexander was despatched to Wymondham. He was a man of singular natural gifts which he had improved by cultivation.

So elegant was his Latin that he was capable of inditing a fine piece of composition in that language to the Pontiff himself. His penmanship was remarkable for its clearness and beauty. He seems to have devoted all the time which he could spare from his routine duties to the study of literature. No sooner had Alexander reached Wymondham than he showed signs of mental disorder, brought about, it was believed, by an overwrought brain. He was recalled in consequence to the Abbey. When he was restored to his accustomed surroundings, his health improved. He now became the Abbot's secretary and keeper of his seal. Unfortunately bad symptoms returned and he was sent from the Abbot's apartments to sit with the other brethren in the cloisters. He soon grew worse and his disorder assumed an exaggerated form of megalomania. The treatment adopted by the Abbot affords a striking instance of the cruel methods then followed in dealing with mental disorders. The patient was flogged "to the abundant effusion of blood." He was then sent to the Cell of Bynham, where, by the orders of the Abbot, he was fettered and kept rigidly shut up. How long the unhappy man languished in his dungeon we do not know, but, when he died, he was buried, still wearing his fetters.

* * * * *

The Abbot had so far distinguished himself by unscrupulousness, perfidy, harshness and a determination to move steadily forward in the path of despotism. But a great change was at hand. As time passed, the nobler features of the Abbot's character developed, while the baser fell away.

> "Consideration, like an angel came
> And whipped the offending Adam out of him,
> Leaving his body as a paradise
> To envelope and contain celestial spirits."

By love unfeigned, by devotion to duty, by sincere and unostentatious piety he atoned, at least in some measure, for the crimes, errors and excesses of which he had been guilty.

The Abbot must have rejoiced in heart when his painful struggle with the monks was followed by a journey to Rome, and by his presence at the fourth Lateran Council. At this great assembly of the clergy held in the Lateran Basilica, four hundred bishops, eight hundred abbots and priors, besides deputies of several princes, were present. Sitting under the presidency of Innocent III, who was the master spirit of the age, the Council resolved to initiate a great Crusade. It also made additions to the Canon Law, and concerned itself with the suppression of heresy. It is to be feared that the continuance of the savage onslaught on the Albigenses was the means chosen by the Council of separating the wheat from the tares. By the "merciless atrocity" of this war the Albigensian heresy was destroyed, "and with that heresy, the prosperity, the civilization, the literature, the national existence of what was once the most opulent and enlightened part of the great European family."

The Abbot, on receiving an invitation from the Pope to be

present at this Council, decided to spare no expense in furnishing himself with a retinue which would give security to his person and add lustre to his position. Moreover, two of the monks accompanied him as his secretaries. One of them is described as familiar with the Papal Court and also as learned in grammar, logic, medicine and civil and canon law. The chronicler slyly adds that the morals of this brother were not equal to his learning. The Abbot of Westminster and the Abbot of St. Albans, the latter of whom ranked above all the English abbots, made the long and arduous journey to Rome together. The massing of their retinues was of material importance in reducing the perils of travel which in those days of brigandage were so alarming. Among the spiritual questions discussed by the Lateran Council was that of the Service of the Mass, with the result that many ceremonies which had become customary were swept away. It was in the course of these deliberations that the Abbot of St. Albans made a dramatic intervention. Standing in the midst of the Council, and after a few well-chosen opening remarks, he asked a very pertinent question. It was always usual, he said, in " the Secret of the Mass " to invoke the aid and protection of certain recognized saints. Now, he continued, certain monastic houses possessed and guarded in their churches the bodies of their patron saints. The brethren of such houses would rejoice to know that they might ask for the suffrages of these saints at the proper place in the Mass. The Pope reassured the Abbot by himself answering his question in the affirmative. Innocent was much struck by the Abbot's speech and asked privately who he was. He expressed admiration of his style and manner, remarkable in so young a man, and of his wisdom in proposing his question. Innocent's commendation was praise indeed, and the Abbot was congratulated by the English bishops and abbots present at the Council.

The Abbot soon had an opportunity of seeing Innocent in a less favourable light. When the work of the Council was over and he entered the Pope's chamber to receive his benediction before leaving for England, he failed to offer the customary present. Innocent at once flamed into passion. " Are you not," said he, " the Abbot of St. Albans, who have received so many privileges from the Holy See ? Is it decent that a man of your position should go away without making a gift to me, the Pope ? " The Abbot was abashed and offered fifty marks, a sum which Innocent rejected with scorn. He turned upon the Abbot and scolded him more sharply than before. The Abbot then promised to pay a hundred marks. Not until he had offered this sum at the Pope's feet through one of his friends, did he receive the Papal benediction and permission to depart. The money was borrowed at a high rate of interest from Roman usurers.

Early in the reign of Henry III, the Abbot resolved on a personal visitation of the Cells of the Abbey. These Cells were monasteries of varying size situated in different parts of the country and under the jurisdiction of the Abbot. St. Albans' Abbey

possessed Cells as far distant from one another as Tynemouth in Northumberland, Bynham and Wymondham in Norfolk, and Hatfield and Hertford in Hertfordshire. As has already been seen, the Cells were of inestimable value in the view of the Abbots as the one means of banishing monks whom they disliked from the Abbey. On the other hand, the distance of the Abbey from some of the Cells made their superintendence by the Abbot impossible. The Priors too often exploited the revenues in their own interests. Moreover, Cells not unfrequently rebelled against the parent Abbey and bribed neighbouring landlords for their armed support. Indeed, the Abbots of St. Albans were sometimes constrained to request the Crown to send knights and soldiers to put down these rebellions.

Trumpington, when he left the Abbey on his pilgrimage to the Cells, is described as active in body, alert in mind and in the prime of life. He and the mounted monks and men-at-arms who accompanied him paused on their journey to Tynemouth to visit the Cell of Belvoir in Leicestershire. Roger of Wendover, the famous chronicler, was the Prior of this monastery. The Abbot discovered that he had squandered the revenues of his Priory. He was in consequence relieved of his responsibilities on the Abbot's return to St. Albans.

On his arrival at the ancient port of Tynemouth, the Abbot was met by the Prior, the monks and the tenants of the Priory, and by the "honourable men" of the district. The latter had ridden over from miles round to greet the Abbot. So large was this "muster of the clans" that they were likened by observers to a great army. Great preparations had been made by the Prior on behalf of the Abbot, and the swarm of guests was entertained by the latter at his own table. It was, perhaps for the first time in their lives, that, sitting at that hospitable board, northerners and southerners met together. They regarded one another almost as foreigners. Their dialects were mutually incomprehensible. To the northerner the speech of the southerner was a meaningless patois: to the southerner that of the northerner a harsh, dissonant jargon to which it was painful to listen. Yet it may be imagined that their determined efforts to overcome this difficulty and to be on friendly terms increased the gaiety and hilarity of the party. All was:

> "Quips and cranks and wanton wiles,
> Nods and becks and wreathed smiles,
> Sport that wrinkled care derides
> And laughter holding both his sides."

Not long after this banquet, the tenants of the Priory lands did homage to the Abbot as their feudal lord. He kept open house during his stay: no one made excuse and his table was always furnished with guests. The Priory of Tynemouth had been for many years under the firm and beneficent sway of Ralph Gubiun "of blessed memory." For some time age and increasing infirmities had inclined the Prior to resign official cares and responsibilities. Now, he thought, his chance had come. His superior

was in his house. To him he would resign his sacred trust. Prostrating himself at the feet of the Abbot, the Prior begged him to set him free. "My lord," he cried, "let me your son depart in peace, for my end is near. I would fain make ready with tears and compunction of heart." The Abbot gently raised and encouraged the failing Prior. "Hold on," he said, "for a little while, till I can provide for the future." The Prior complied with the Abbot's wish.

The Abbot's sojourn at Tynemouth Priory had brought him nothing but credit and popularity. It must therefore have been with extreme reluctance that he started on a long journey through Durham, York and Lincoln, and at last reached the Cell of Wymondham, in Norfolk. There he was confronted with the unpleasant news that the Prior was in the habit of embezzling valuables belonging to the Priory and storing them in a hermitage, which he destined as the home of his declining years. As the chronicler puts it: "He thirsted after the property of others and was like a nomad dwelling in tents who on the morrow of each day folds them and departs elsewhere."

When the Abbot had returned to St. Albans, he deposed this unjust steward. The hermit's successor disappointed expectations; but at last Thomas the Physician, a man of the highest qualifications, was appointed. Thomas was the brother of the Earl of Arundel, the patron of the Priory, and had accompanied his father, the late Earl, on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. The Earl had died there, and his son Thomas had discharged the sacred duty of bringing home his father's remains and burying them at Wymondham. Such a man as Thomas the Physician, of high birth and almost certainly a graduate in medicine either at the University of Oxford or at that of Paris, and yet devoting himself to monastic life, seems worthy of at least a passing notice.

From Wymondham the Abbot went to Hatfield. On inquiring into the state of the Priory, he was almost overwhelmed by the volume of testimony against the Prior. Following his usual practice, the Abbot deferred deposition of the offender until his own return to St. Albans.

It is very unlikely that when the Abbot bade farewell to Ralph Gubiun, the aged and beloved Prior of Tynemouth, he ever expected to see him again. It must therefore have been with the utmost astonishment that he was greeted with the news that Gubiun had travelled the long distance from Tynemouth to St. Albans on business of great moment. The Prior explained that he had been harassed beyond endurance by the extortions of Simon of Tynemouth, who claimed the right in perpetuity of sending two boarders to be maintained by the Cell at Tynemouth. Simon claimed that these "corrodies"—as they were called—had been granted by a former Abbot of St. Albans. The Prior had contested the claim, and the Court to which he had appealed had decided that the dispute should be settled by a duel between Simon and a champion selected by the Prior. A champion of unusual prowess had been chosen by the Prior and had come with him to St. Albans. Simon

had also arrived and seemed quite ready for the fray. The details of the combat which followed, and probably took place under the eyes of the Abbot, would be interesting. Yet all we know is that Gubiun's champion deceived his hopes and that victory fell to the more puissant arm of Simon of Tynemouth. The Prior was overcome with grief and vexation, for Simon's success meant nothing less than that the Priory would be saddled for ever with the maintenance and the presence of unwelcome guests. Gubiun felt that he had come to the end of his tether. He made up his mind to resign his office and, if possible, never to enter within the walls of the Priory again. He went into the Chapter-house to seek his liberty from the Abbot. "My lord," said Gubiun, "if you remember, you said to me at Tynemouth, 'Hold on a little while!' I have held on, but now it is enough; let me go because I am old." The Abbot replied by again imploring him to remain in his Priory, where his presence was indispensable, and concluded by saying, "Hold on still." The Prior's answer was a yet more urgent prayer for release, and indeed he showed such symptoms of distress that the Abbot accepted his resignation. Gubiun never returned to Tynemouth, but, as long as he lived, was the Abbot's chief counsellor, resided with him, and was his guest and "table companion."

The early years of Trumpington's abbacy had been spoilt by the internecine strife which raged in the kingdom. The quarrel between King John and Pope Innocent III had the ultimate effect of dividing the country into two hostile camps. On the one side were John, "than whom no greater tyrant ever arose among the sons of men," and John's adherents. On the other side were the Dauphin, who had been invited to become King, and the many barons who supported him. The appalling situation which arose has been described by the graphic pen of Matthew Paris: "Father strove to destroy father, brother to destroy brother, neighbour to destroy neighbour. And all this they did by plunder, extermination, burning, spoiling, disherison, torture, murder." Nor did the terror cease even after John's death, but continued until the Dauphin was driven from the kingdom.

The monasteries suffered severely in the course of this desperate contest. They were crushed equally and impartially by both parties. They possessed no effective means of defence against the marauding barons and freebooters who plundered and pillaged them without mercy. The resources of St. Albans Abbey were depleted by the havoc made on the monastic estates, and the payment of blackmail was the only means of saving the Abbey buildings from destruction by fire and the monks from extermination.

The Abbot remained calm and courageous in the midst of this terror, and distinguished himself by boldly refusing to become the liegeman of the Dauphin, even though he was surrounding the Abbey with an army.

When at last the blessings of peace returned the Abbot endeavoured to improve the financial position of the Abbey by adding to its lands and rents. He devoted his attention also to the improve-

ment of the Abbey Church, which was suffering greatly from past neglect. The aisles were roofed with oak. The tower was heightened and covered with lead, while eight pilasters enriched its appearance. The western front was completed and all decaying work removed. A new chapel dedicated to St. Cuthbert was erected. Moreover, the Abbot presented to the church an exquisite Mariola, or statue of the Blessed Virgin, marvellously graven by the cunning hand of Walter of Colchester. Before this gracious figure was a large wax candle that was always lighted at the greater feasts, when it was decked with flowers by the brethren. The Abbot found his architects and advisers in two monks of the Abbey, Matthew of Cambridge and Walter of Colchester, whose names will always be freshly remembered. The Abbot presented books to the aumbry or cupboard, which was the predecessor of the library, and succeeded in obtaining relics of repute then believed to be authentic. To the worthy performance of the divine offices he greatly contributed both by precept and by pious example. The Abbot's character completely changed for the better in his treatment of the monks. The man who had been so jealous and so tetchy became their best friend and the watchful guardian of their interests. He studied their welfare and their comfort with unfailing solicitude. New cloisters in a sunny position were as welcome as improved dormitory accommodation. Moreover, the Abbot was anxious that wherever the brethren might be they should enjoy the refinements of life. It was with this true intent for their delight that he purchased and fitted at great expense a handsome house in London, which became the monastic hostel. It possessed a chapel, chambers and orchard, a stable, a court-house and a garden. This hostel was always in readiness for guests, and was a kind of " House Beautiful " for the monks. The table of the brethren was improved by the Abbot's prudent purchase of a house at Yarmouth, where herrings and other fish could be cured and stored " to the inestimable benefit of the house of St. Alban." It was fortunate for the Abbey and for the reputation of the Abbot that after the earlier period of his rule to the date of his death, his conduct was unimpeachable; and indeed hostile criticism was hushed and was succeeded by universal praise. In none of the many details of his office was he found wanting, and he must rank as among the greatest and best of the long line of abbots.

The Abbot's departure from the world was soft and gentle; he faded peacefully away with his mind at peace.

He died loved by all, revered alike by the brethren of the Abbey and by the poor of the town of St. Albans, whose sorrows and needs were never unalleviated as long as he lived. While he still lay unburied, the Masses of the monks were broken by sobs and tears.

The remarkable change in this Abbot's character, which was a true conversion and made of him a saint, is best explained by the apostolic words, " We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren."

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

By the Rev. A. J. Macdonald, D.D., Rector of St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, Fleet Street.

IT is a mistake to suppose that Christian worship has developed from the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that the central feature of worship has always been the celebration of the Eucharist. We read in the Acts that in the interval between the Resurrection and Pentecost the apostles went daily to the Temple for prayer, that is to say they continued to observe the ancient Jewish hours of prayer; and if we read later, that they broke bread together on the first day of the week, and broke it "at home"; this is not evidence that the old habits of prayer, fostered by Temple and synagogue worship, were allowed to be displaced. The Eucharist in its earlier stages was a fellowship-meal, accompanied by prayers and praises, intended to conserve the social character of the Last Supper, although hallowed by a marked religious tendency. It was the Agape. In the second century, owing partly to the difficulty of catering for the growing Christian communities, the Agape fell into disuse, and the Eucharist or service of Holy Communion lost much of its original social character, and became solely an act of religious worship. This Eucharist for many decades was celebrated not more than once a week, and a survival of this practice is clearly traced in the habits of the Egyptian ascetics of the fourth and fifth centuries who did not come together for Holy Communion more than once, or sometimes twice a week.

Christian worship in its origin was non-liturgical, non-eucharistic. It sprang from the Jewish observance of regular hours of prayer at stated times of the day. Peter and John went up into the Temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour. At Joppa Peter "went up on the housetop to pray, about the ninth hour." The *Didache* provides for prayer three times a day. Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian refer to the third, sixth and ninth hours as times of prayer. By the middle of the third century, in the days of Cyprian, these three hours of prayer were designated the "Apostolical hours," although probably in that era prayer was offered at home, or wherever the worshipper happened to be, and not necessarily or usually in church. Yet it is difficult to conceive that he would have prayed anywhere else if he lived near a church.

The institution of the "Vigils" or night services, by Tertullian's time at the latest, in obedience to the Advent instructions of the Lord, fostered the practice of regular habits of prayer and worship. The *Canons of Hippolytus* show that by the beginning of the third century an attempt was being made in Rome to regulate the hours and the practice of prayer in the churches. The *Apostolical Constitutions* show that a similar attempt was being made in Egypt and

the East in the third and fourth centuries, while at Jerusalem, the Spanish lady Etheria found four daily services or hours of prayer observed—Mattins, Sext, None and Vespers. In Lent Terce was added. Basil of Cæsarea opened the churches of his diocese for the night services. At Constantinople, the capital of the East Roman Empire, where pagan and secular influences were active, prayer and worship played a less prominent part in Christian life. Like ourselves, the people went to church only once a week, as Chrysostom complained.

Gradually the daily practice of non-liturgical or non-eucharistic worship became confined to the Christian ascetics; and in the hermit settlements of Egypt and in the cœnobitic communities of Asia Minor the observance of the daily hours of prayer was not only followed but developed into a wonderful system, which involved not only prayer but the reading of Scriptures, Old and New, and the recitation of psalms. But here also the development of daily worship proceeded slowly. Cassian records that the Egyptian monks met together only twice daily, at dawn and at Vespers, a custom which lasted down to the fifth century. In Syria and the East the monks observed the three ancient "Apostolic hours." Development in the West proceeded more rapidly, and in the Western monastic houses of Cassian's day no less than seven hours of prayer were observed: Nocturns, Mattins and Lauds at night; at daybreak Prime, followed by Terce, None and Vespers, all, be it observed, quite independent of eucharistic worship, and forming the most important part of the life of prayer and worship of the primitive Western monastic communities. It is unnecessary to trace further the influence of the monasteries upon the development of Christian worship. The great Rule of Benedict of Nursia (sixth century), revived by Benedict of Aniane (eighth century), became the foundation of all later European monasticism, and is to be found in operation among Cluniacs, Cistercians, Carthusians and their offshoots alike. The Rule of Benedict did not establish the hours for prayer and chanting and Bible-reading. It only added to the ancient order the office of Compline. Its great contribution to the Rule was the introduction of definite periods of manual labour and cloister study. Even the chanting of the psalms, which under the influence of the Gregorian tones became so popular in the monastery and cathedral, was originally an introduction from the East where, according to Socrates, antiphonal singing dated back to the time of Ignatius. Basil found it in Cappadocia. It seems to have been introduced into the West at Milan, where it was prevalent in the time of Ambrose, and Augustine found it in use at Rome and in Africa. Previous to his era the psalms had been recited in the West, with a slight intonation of the voice, a system said to have been invented by Athanasius.

Under the influence of Cæsarius of Arles and other Gallic bishops the round of daily services was established in the secular or non-monastic churches of Gaul, and from the fifth century in Rome daily musical or antiphonally sung services were established, and the

Roman offices of the next two centuries formed the foundation for the English Breviaries of the Middle Ages, ousting, after the mission of Augustine to Kent, the older Gallican usage which had been maintained there. In the north of England the Celtic method—largely Eastern in form—remained in vogue until the time of Wilfred and Benedict Biscop, who introduced the Roman mode of singing the psalms. It is not to be concluded that the effect of the spread of the Gregorian tones was to establish throughout western Europe a system of daily services which the lay-folk attended in large numbers. Indeed the system only succeeded because of the growth of monasticism and the increase in the number of monastic houses, and even at Rome itself Gregorian chanting was in general use only because the presence of a numerous body of monks or of clergy, trained in monastic houses, enabled the parish churches to be easily staffed with clergy well trained in antiphonal singing. In the country districts the daily services could not have been maintained in their complete form, and even in later medieval days, when every parish priest had his Breviary, it was used almost entirely by himself. If the lay-folk went daily to church, and many of them did, as Dr. Coulton's works show, it was to the early morning Mass.

Apart from the Mass, the only element of worship which found a place in the life of the people, distinct from those who lived in urban centres, where the daily office was no doubt used by some, was the Processional. Processional litanies date from the fifth century in Gaul and the sixth century at Rome. In Gaul they were associated with the earthquakes or volcanic eruptions in the Auvergne. At Rome they appear to have originated with the blessing of the crops at Rogation-tide. Quite early the processional litany in which the people joined was organized on the occasion of any public distress or calamity, such as the fire at Vienne on Easter Eve (*c.* 470); during times of plague or famine, or when the town was besieged by invading armies. Processions were also organized for the dedication of churches, and, in England, on Palm Sunday; and they were used without the Litany on different occasions connected with the Mass. It is however noteworthy that the later popular Corpus Christi processions did not begin until the twelfth century, and were not officially sanctioned until Urban IV issued a regulation in 1264.

The history of the Corpus Christi ceremonies is an indication of the tendency of all medieval worship to concentrate popular devotion more and more around the service of the Eucharist. The monastic hours quickened this process, and any development of monastic worship which took place after the foundation of the Rule of Benedict and the introduction of antiphonal singing was devoted almost entirely to making more and more splendid the pomp and majesty of the service of the Mass. This tendency is clearly marked in Lanfranc's Palm Sunday procession, when the consecrated host was carried on a bier, with special rites.

In tracing the development of eucharistic worship two points are to be observed. Firstly, it was originally confined to Sundays and

the great festivals. Secondly, although none of the popular medieval sacramentaries or Mass service-books issued from the monastery, yet the increasing devotion and elaboration of ceremonial detail encouraged by the monasteries no doubt played a large part in popularizing the service, especially as so many of the parochial clergy were trained in monastic houses, or in the cathedral school choirs where a similar routine was observed. In earlier times the growing list of martyrs and popular saints rapidly increased the number of days when the lay-folk were expected to attend the service of the altar.

The Sacramentaries, whether Roman, Gallican or Mozarabic in the West, did not originate in the monasteries, and their predominant influence reflects the early precedence of the cathedral church over the Benedictine minster, as the centre of eucharistic worship. Even in England at a later date, when monasticism had become widely spread, and when most of the leading secular clergy were trained in monastic houses, the missals of Sarum, York, Hereford and Lincoln, four secular foundations, were in use in most of the parish churches of the country. This is the more remarkable because some of the great cathedrals were organized on monastic lines. It is curious that great minsters like Canterbury, Winchester and Worcester did not succeed in popularizing their missals throughout the country. The phenomenon in England reflects the ancient antipathy of the Saxon clergy to the regular monastic life. In the case of the Gregorian, Gelasian and Leonine Sacramentaries, which ousted the Gallican Missal in Gaul, though never quite the Mozarabic or Gothic Missal in Spain, nor the Ambrosian in Milan, we must probably trace the influence of the Papacy. The traditional respect enjoyed by the Bishop of Rome established the predominance of the Roman Missal throughout continental Europe, and no monastic liturgy ever developed to displace it.

The first trace of an ordered eucharistic service is to be found in Justin Martyr, who records the reading of Gospels and Prophets, a discourse on the lesson, followed by thanksgiving over the bread and wine. Thus, like non-liturgical worship, eucharistic worship was in its origin quite simple and free from ceremonial. Similar features are to be found in the fragments of the Roman liturgy which survive from the second century. The beginning of liturgical formulation can be seen in the use of the Trisagion or Tersanctus in Africa mentioned by the *Acts of Perpetua* (*c.* 202). By the time of Cyprian (*c.* 250) the " Sursum Corda " appears. In the *Mystagagic Catecheses* of Cyril of Jerusalem (*c.* 347) ceremonial action is present for the first time. The deacon offers to the celebrant and other priests water for washing their hands in fulfilment of Psalm xxvi. 6. The kiss of peace is exchanged. We also find the Greek " Epiclesis" or invocation of the Holy Spirit, and a prayer for the world, for kings and their armies, for the sick and needy, together with reference to the departed, all details which are retained in our Prayer for the Church Militant. The Lord's Prayer follows, preceding the administration of the elements.

To this liturgical procedure, the *Apostolic Constitution*, a Syrian document of the second half of the fourth century, added lections from the Old Testament, the chanting of psalms, readings from the Acts, Epistles and Gospels, an exhortation of the people—a kind of address—the bidding prayer, broken by the "Kyrie Eleison" of the people. In the fifth and sixth centuries liturgical development was rapid, and the numerous liturgies can be grouped into five great systems, Syrian (East and West), Alexandrian, Roman and Gallican. Ceremonial during this period also steadily developed, although not yet into extravagance. The preparation of the elements was elaborated, and by the fifth century the procession of the oblation had been introduced.

The history of Western eucharistic worship is the record of the gradual displacement of the Gallican rite by the Roman. The Gallican office, which Duchesne maintains against English liturgiologists sprang from Milan, contained marked resemblance to and yet clear contrasts with the Greek liturgies. Like the Greek liturgies, it possessed the Epiclesis or invocation of the Holy Spirit, which appears to-day in the Scottish liturgy, and was revived in the Prayer Book recently rejected in England. On the other hand, it contained a much larger proportion of variable elements, especially in the form of collects and explanatory prefaces for different occasions. The Gallican Missal maintained its influence in Gaul until its abolition by Pippin the Great (741–68). It was used in Ireland, and was introduced by the Irish missionaries into northern England, where it survived till after the time of Theodore.

Considerable variation characterized the early stages of the Roman Missal. Three Sacramentaries were traditionally associated with the names of Popes Leo, Gelasius and Gregory, but in no case did any of these liturgies secure official recognition or predominant influence in Italy or any part of the West. But the *De Officiis Ecclesiasticis* of Amalry, written about 830, seems to show that the "Ordo Romanus" was more or less fixed by the ninth century, although the order of the Canon or Prayer of Consecration in the Roman Mass had been defined since the beginning of the fifth century. Indeed, no complete Missal was drawn up at Rome until the eleventh century. Before this time the Mass-books included the Sacramentary, the Ordo, the Lectionary or Epistolary, the Evangelarium, the Antiphonary, and the Troper—a book of musical interludes. Thus when the Missal was finally drawn up, a process was followed similar to that adopted by Cranmer when he simplified and compressed the English medieval office-books. There was no Epiclesis in the Greek sense in the "Ordo Romanus," its place being taken by an invocation to the Father to send angels to bear the elements into the Divine presence for blessing.

Throughout the early Middle Ages constant elaboration of the Mass cultus went on. The ceremony of the Fraction of the Bread was introduced before the time of Gregory (604). By the eighth century the use of liturgical vestments became the custom in the Roman service; censers were swung and lighted tapers were carried,

but no censing of the altar, the church or of the clergy and people was yet introduced. Throughout this early period two doctrinal conceptions prevailed in the Western liturgies. In his recent work Geiselmann has drawn attention to the fact that while the earliest interpretation of Ambrose dominated the Gallic and Spanish liturgies, and formed the main strand in the Roman sacramentaries, yet Augustinian symbolism also exerted an influence on the structure of the Roman books. This double current, as it is termed, was emphasized by Batiffol in his edition of 1905, which was afterwards withdrawn by the Roman authorities.[1] During the same epoch widespread attempts were made to quicken the devotion of lay-folk and simple monks by the dissemination of grossly material legends concerning the effect of consecration. These legends can be traced to the East, and were popularized in the West by Gregory the Great. They were repeated by Paschasius Radbert in the ninth century and by Durand of Troarn in the eleventh.[2] We may note that the use of the cup by the laity only began to disappear at the end of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century, the period when, owing to the excitement caused by Berengar's teaching, the Roman authorities devoted increasing attention to the systematization of eucharistic ideas and practices. Pope Gelasius at the end of the fifth century had condemned the withdrawal of the cup as a " grande sacrilegium."

In England the process of systematization was introduced by Lanfranc, the great organizer of the Cluniac reforms among the abbeys and cathedrals of England, and the renovator of English diocesan life.[3] We have already drawn attention to the fact that in the next period English eucharistic worship was organized for popular purposes along four main channels—the Missals of Sarum, Hereford, York and Lincoln. The Mass with its elaborate customs had for many centuries ousted popular non-liturgical worship. The great achievement of the Reformation, and of Cranmer's work especially, was to restore the balance between non-eucharistic and eucharistic worship in England. Even the radical change from the Latin to the English tongue was a return to primitive custom. The earlier Christian communities, outside Palestine, were in Greek-speaking or Syrian areas. All early liturgies were therefore drawn up in Greek or Syriac. For several generations the Greek liturgy survived at Rome; the Latin liturgy and Bible appear first in North Africa. The Saxon church had its Anglo-Saxon liturgy. So also, when Cranmer, following in the steps of Cardinal Quignon, compressed the medieval service-books into the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, he restored the ancient and characteristic feature of Christian worship—he re-created the opportunity for non-liturgical worship. We shall do wisely if we hesitate before undoing the wisdom of Cranmer, by making worship again centre in the Eucharist. The modern trend is not in a primitive direction.

[1] Cf. my *Berengar and the Reform of Sac. Doc.* (Longmans, 1930), pp. 227 f.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 250 ff.
[3] Cf. my *Lanfranc: His Life, Work and Writing* (Oxford, 1926).

It is merely an attempt to undo the Reformation by reviving a system that is merely medieval.

Cranmer's second achievement was to restore eucharistic worship to its primitive place. The Prayer Book clearly contemplates no more than a weekly Eucharist for lay-folk, and the instruction concerning the three annual communions, of which Easter is to be one, shows that even the weekly celebration is only a counsel of perfection. When we glance at the structure of the Prayer Book liturgy we see that while simplification and purification have taken place, no radical breach with medieval usage has taken place. A change has been made in the order of the service, the Prayer of the Canon has been shortened, but no attempt was made to insert the Greek Epiclesis at the point where the rather fanciful Roman invocation for angelic assistance was removed. If, as Swete says, the English liturgy "heads a new liturgical family," yet Cranmer did not refuse to make use of the materials which he found at hand. "There is no reason why English churchmen should regret the fact" that our own Communion Office often does diverge in structure from that of Rome, "or pine for a restoration of the Roman Mass. It was fitting that the Church of England should possess not merely an uniform use, but one which, while in accordance with ancient precedent in things essential, should proclaim her independence of foreign dictation in the order of her worship. It would have been a grave misfortune if the great English race had been tied for all time to customs and forms which rest ultimately upon the local traditions of an Italian Church." [1]

This wise monition of the late Professor Swete may well cause some of the more zealous among us to pause before they launch out into other foreign innovations. "Benediction," even in the Roman communion, is a modern practice which scarcely began before the beginning of the sixteenth century. So recently as 1850 the Roman "Congregation of Rites" left the sanction of its usage to the diocesan bishops. If new forms of popular devotion are necessary, they can be more safely procured by the development or re-adaptation of existing forms of non-liturgical worship. This course will preserve not only Reformation practice, but will tend to quicken the primitive habits of Christian worship—habits which centred worship in regular prayer and in regular reading of the Word of God. This suggestion does not involve the relegation of the Communion Office to the merely occasional status assigned to it by many of the churches associated with the principles of Geneva. Canterbury preserved the due balance between eucharistic and non-eucharistic worship. If a special dignity and reverence are attached to the twice-yearly Presbyterian Communion, there is little doubt that the system of worship in vogue in the Free Churches passes over opportunities for quickening popular devotion by the infrequency of their devotions. If, on the one hand, we must guard against the revival of extravagance by demanding the restoration of daily eucharistic worship, on the other hand we cannot afford to run the risk of reducing the quiet regularity of Anglican sacramental practice by relegating the act of communion to the three great festivals.

[1] *Services and Service Books*, pp. 120 f.

THE SENSE OF VOCATION IN PREACHING.

By the Rev. S. Nowell-Rostron, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Bayswater.

IT is well for those to whom preaching is a constantly recurring responsibility to recollect from time to time the motives that alone justify a preacher in exercising his office. Such a consideration is particularly urgent to-day for many reasons. Preaching is to some extent under a cloud. The very word is often used as a term of contempt. People are impatient of long sermons, and will not tolerate dull ones. Indeed, speaking generally, in the scale of modern values, as has been the case in every period of history when licence of morals and of manners has been prevalent, dullness is the one unpardonable sin in literature and in speech. Our restless, cynical age prefers the dangerous glitter of the swiftly moving shallows to the quiet safety of the deep mid-stream. Vice is condoned and even admired and petted if it be clever. Simple goodness has no beauty that the world should desire it. It is the sport of the licentious wit of the theatre, the cinema, and of a hundred novels. Religion is, with significant frequency, explicitly and implicitly pilloried and condemned as unattractive and hypocritical, and preaching shares inevitably in the general disdain.

I am not concerned here with an attempted analysis of this widespread attitude. But, in passing, two causes may briefly be mentioned. First, the newspaper habit, by which the mind is fed on a conglomeration of sensational, often unsavoury and always tersely expressed, tit-bits of news, together with the press and hurry of modern life, have created a demand for the short, pointed addresses which now commonly go by the name of sermons. Secondly, the revolt from dogma and ecclesiasticism and from organized Christianity has given the cheery, ethical optimist the popular ear. Dr. Dale tells us that, when still a young man, just after he had gone to Carr's Lane, Birmingham, he met one day a Congregationalist minister whose preaching was greatly admired for its humour, pathos and passion. He began to speak to Dr. Dale about his ministry, and amongst other things said: "I hear that you are preaching doctrinal sermons to the congregation of Carr's Lane; they will not stand it." "I answered," said Dr. Dale, "'They will have to stand it.'" "There was too much of the insolent self-confidence of youth in both the temper and form of my reply," wrote in after-years that great scholar and preacher, though we may note that, from Dr. Dale himself, they *did* stand it: and few pulpits in England had greater influence than his. Nevertheless, it was true then, and it is still more emphatically true of the post-war world, that the average preacher, with the average

congregation and in the regular preachments at his popular services, cannot depend upon his audience to make the effort to follow deep or closely reasoned arguments. He can do little more than touch briefly upon and try to express in simple language the great religious themes, which both merit and require concentrated and prolonged thought that their importance in the realm of truth may be grasped and their application in the issues of human life understood.

Nevertheless, preaching is to-day, as it always has been, one of the many ways by which God expresses Himself, His will and His appeal to the soul of man. There are, of course, many forms of Divine ministry to human need, but this is clearly indispensable. Thomas Carlyle asks in *Signs of the Times*: "How did Christianity rise and spread among men?" He answers: "It arose in the mystic depths of man's soul, and was spread by the preaching of the word; by simple, altogether natural and individual efforts; and flew like hallowed fire from heart to heart, till all were purified and illuminated by it." Preaching has always had a vital part in the coming of the Kingdom of Christ upon earth. The immediate herald and forerunner of that Kingdom was John the Baptist, who "came preaching in the wilderness of Judæa." Our Lord Himself "went about in all Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom." He chose twelve "that they might be with Him and that He might send them forth to preach." "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to the whole creation," was His commission to the eleven, and probably to the five hundred; and through them to the whole Church. We think of the preaching of St. Peter at Pentecost; of St. Paul's words, "Christ sent me to preach the Gospel" (1 Cor. i. 17); "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, was this grace given, to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ" (Eph. iii. 8). We remember the pointed argument, "How shall they hear without a preacher?" (Rom. x. 14); the Apostle's advice to Timothy, "Preach the word: be instant in season and out of season" (2 Tim. iv. 2). We see the place preaching held in Christian worship in the sub-Apostolic age, and in the evangelization of the ancient world. All the great revivals of spiritual life throughout the centuries, though they were begun in the silence of men's hearts and nurtured often in quiet thought and prayer, yet invariably and inevitably swayed the multitudes through the spoken word uttered by men on fire with their message. Is it not clear that God has honoured this method of work for Him in a signal and remarkable manner? To untold numbers of human beings it has been the door through which they have seen the vision of the love and holiness of God, and have themselves entered into the treasury of the inexhaustible spiritual wealth of Christ. A Church which neglects its opportunities of preaching is a Church which is unresponsive to the Divine leading, and neglectful of a Divinely chosen method. It leaves one of its most effective sources of inspiration and spiritual vitality unused, and allows one of its most potent weapons for the cause of Christ to lie rusting in its sheath.

What then is preaching? We need not search far for a definition. In the New Testament (A.V.) various Greek words are translated by the word "preach." The general idea underlying them all may be quickly reached by examining the words used: "to announce thoroughly" (*διαγγέλλω*); "to give a reasoned exposition" (*διαλέγομαι*); "to tell good tidings" (*εὐαγγελίζω*); "to proclaim as a herald" (*καταγγέλλω*); "to discourse" (*λαλέω*). Add to these a verse such as 2 Corinthians v. 20, which is full of synonyms for preaching: "We are ambassadors (*πρεσβεύομεν*) on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating (*παρακαλοῦντος*) by us. We beseech you (*δεόμεθα*) on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God." There can then be little doubt as to what is involved in the New Testament conception of the office and responsibility of the preacher. One of the most famous preachers of the last generation, Bishop Phillips Brooks, in his delightful *Lectures on Preaching*—a book which should be on everybody's bookshelf, and often in our hands—defines it thus: "Preaching is the communication of truth by man to man," or as he puts it again, "It is the bringing of truth through personality." Is it impertinent to offer a criticism of the definition of one who felt the sacredness of his preaching office as few preachers have done, and who made it so potent an influence for God? There is perhaps need for closer and further elaboration. It is true that such a definition obviously and rightly rules out from our consideration such purely poetical conceptions as "sermons in stones." Great creations of human skill, of the sculptor and the painter, and the beauty and the majesty of Nature can speak and do speak to us of the things of God. They do not preach to us. Their message does not come to us directly through the medium of human personality. Even so, I venture to suggest, the Bishop's definition is still too wide. Man may convey to man through his personality—and through the spoken word—the truths of science, art, mathematics, philosophy, even of ethics and theology, yet we could hardly term such communication preaching. Or again through the human personality truth may be conveyed without the spoken word. The silent influence which one life exerts upon another is one of the greatest forces in human experience. It is not preaching, though we sometimes incorrectly so describe it: "What he is speaks louder than what he says"; "His life is his best sermon." Preaching, as I conceive it, for purposes of our thought may be described, if somewhat clumsily, yet I think more accurately, as the passing on to others, at the call of God, of divinely-revealed truth through a consecrated personality by the spoken word. It will at once be seen that this marks off the sermon from the lecture scientific, literary, theological; from the debate and the discussion; from the essay, whether written or spoken; and takes us right to the heart of our subject by bringing before us the intimate and essential relationship between the human and the Divine in all true preaching, and that sense of vocation which is the main subject of this paper.

Very simply, therefore, we may approach this theme under

three headings: The Divine summons, the revealed truth, the human personality; or the call, the message, and the messenger.

1. Every true preacher is called of God. Every true sermon originates in Him. What is the nature of that call? The Ordinal helps us here as far as the ministry of the Church of England is concerned. Ordination is very clearly the giving by the Church to the ordinand of an authorization and commission to preach. It is true this is only part of the ministry, which is twofold—that of the Word and the Sacraments, and that the relation between these two elements of the ministerial office is very variously interpreted. There are some who exalt the one almost to the exclusion of the other, concentrating on the ministry of the Sacraments to the neglect of the ministry of the Word, and vice versa. In Dr. Gott's well-known book, *The Parish Priest of the Town*, I read: "The sermon is lower than the Absolution and the Blessing: the pulpit has not the same rank as the Font or the Altar." There are those who go further and regard any special prominence of the sermon in common worship as a Protestant error. There can, however, be no doubt as to the true relationship. Neither ministry, of the Word or the Sacraments, should be allowed to overshadow or conflict with the other. They are co-ordinated ministries, both to be used in building up the Church of Christ. At the same time —and here is a point of special significance—wherever in the Prayer Book the two are found conjoined in one phrase, it is the ministry of the Word that comes first. "Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments." "Be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments." To the ordinand is given a Bible, not a Chalice and Paten. In other words, our Church sets the ministry of preaching in the foremost place amongst the responsibilities and duties of her clergy. Every ordained priest goes forth with this laid upon him as a solemn obligation to which he is pledged to give the most earnest attention and the utmost care. But it will be noted that the Church of England gives that authorization on one ground only. It is one of its glories that the Church of England insists ever upon spiritual as well as official qualifications. The Ordinal takes us back to the fundamental and essential call. "Do you think in your heart that you be truly called according to the Will of our Lord Jesus Christ?" It is not our own will, not even the will of the Church, but the will of Christ that separates the preacher for his office. It is this that fills the soul with a sense of utter unworthiness for so lofty and so responsible a vocation, with all the awe of a great privilege bestowed, with the thrill of a great trust committed to one's care. It is this that keeps us humble when we think we may have done well, and keeps us calm and undepressed when we might easily be burdened with the sense of failure.

Such a commission marks out the ministry of the Church of England as, whatever else it may be, essentially prophetic in type and function. We hear too much to-day about our problematical apostolic succession and too little of our undoubted prophetic

succession. If indeed the modern preacher is called to fulfil in the Divine purpose and in human affairs the office of the ancient prophet, how clear should be his sense of vocation, and how deep his understanding of the sacredness and meaning of his work! The prophet may in some instances have been commissioned only for a special task, while the office of a Christian minister is a "calling" rather than an isolated "call"; a lifelong vocation, not an occasional mission. But the essentials of the two offices are the same. The prophets prophesied because they were moved by the spirit of God. They spoke what it was given them to utter. They preached because they had to preach, or be false to their true selves and to the Divine summons. Always there was in heart and conscience the sense of a God-given mission. Deliberately, definitely, whole-heartedly they yielded themselves instruments of God's purpose. His Spirit directed them, His word came through their lips. They spoke on His behalf. It was always: "The lion hath roared, who will not fear? The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?" "Hear ye the word of the Lord." "The word of the Lord of hosts saith." It was not a mere emotional or ecstatic state that was thus produced. Nothing could be further removed from the ecstasy of the ancient "vates" or the trance-like and unnatural semi-consciousness of a modern spiritualist medium than the vigorous, eager and vital personality of the great Canonical prophets, with every faculty quickened by the Spirit of God, glowing with life and passion, delivering a message, conceived not in their own hearts and minds, but taking shape from them as it passed through them to the souls of men. There was an immense and overwhelming sense of urgency possessing them: a divine necessity not dissimilar perhaps in kind from that which bound together the whole of the earthly life of our Lord to the accomplishment of that task which He "needs must" carry to its completion.

Unless there be in his own experience some degree of definite realization of such a call and mission from God Himself, I do not see how any man can be a preacher. Preaching is the utterance of a soul to whom God has given, in its own communion with Him, some truth to declare to the world. The true preacher must experience something of the conviction that formed itself in the heart of Savonarola as he knelt before his open Bible, "without preaching I cannot live." In my old church of St. Andrew in Liverpool is a pulpit fashioned in exact facsimile to that which Bishop Ryle had had made for himself, and round its ledge are carved these words that every preacher might see: "Woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel." Indeed, that cry of St. Paul is as a window into his soul and into the soul of every true herald of the Kingdom. You remember how F. W. H. Myers writes of the great Apostle:

> Oft when the word is on me to deliver,
> Lifts the illusion and the truth lies bare;
> Desert or throng, the city or the river
> Melts in a lucid Paradise of air.

Only like souls I see the folk thereunder
Bound who should conquer, slaves who should be kings,
Hearing their one hope with an empty wonder,
Sadly contented with a show of things.

Then with a rush the intolerable craving
Shivers throughout me like a trumpet call.
Oh, to save these! to perish for their saving,
Die for their life, be offered for them all!

It is surely this that makes the preacher and constitutes his call. The vision of the needs of men: the vision of the all-sufficiency of Christ: the readiness to spend and be spent for Him and for them. It is no erratic impulse this—but the steady flame of a constant devotion. In Wesley's diary there is an account of an experiment he once made. It was suggested to him that he should not speak to any one of Christ unless he was conscious of a special summons. He rode from London to York, and when he reached York found he had not been conscious of any call at all, and had said no word of Christ to any one. He concluded that such a suggestion was a device of the devil.[1] Preaching must not be allowed to depend on feeling. Here are men and women needing Christ. There is Christ needing them. In the preacher's heart the Holy Spirit has brought the conviction that Christ depends on him to be His voice, and he "can no other" but speak, not depending on his own inclination but upon the opportunity and the Divine leading.

2. What is the message the preacher has to proclaim? What has he to say? We may put it shortly thus: "Christ," "the Gospel," "the Word of God," "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." The modern prophet is the interpreter and ambassador of Christ to the age. The Ordinal by the phrases it uses, and by the delivery of the Bible into the hand of the priest, quite clearly indicates what is to be the great treasure-house of the preacher's themes. But when we have said that, how much more there is to say! The preacher must relate his message to the outlook of his hearers. The Student Christian Movement has recently published a book by Dr. J. Fort Newton entitled *The New Preaching*, where it is pointed out with considerable force and truth that in an age where life moves "to the rhythm of motors, movies, and jazz," where vast and increasing masses of people are growing up in almost entire ignorance of the Bible, where "a spirit has been released wild, restless, ruthless, realistic, rebellious, disillusioned, sad, making mock of chastity, reverence, restraint and even Truth itself," there seems to be an ever-decreasing scope for expository sermons like those of the great expositors of the last generation. The very terms we use in proclaiming the central truth of salvation, like "grace," "faith," "justification," "repentance," are but vaguely intelligible to numbers of our people. This means there is to-day urgent need of clear, simple, unhesitating

[1] Quoted by T. R. Glover, *Jesus in the Experience of Men*, p. 194.

guidance, in a word, of the prophetic voice. Yet the pulpit seems too often to lack the accent of conviction. It gives the impression of a preacher himself perplexed, uncertain, unable to find his way. The spirit of the times easily invades our studies and breathes in our utterances. It is no wonder that so many of our Church people are bewildered. "If the trumpet gives an uncertain voice, who shall prepare himself for the battle?" (1 Cor. xiv. 8). As soon as a preacher loses his sense of vocation and his grip upon his message, his preaching loses its power. He begins to try to substitute his own ideas. His sermons may be suggestive and interesting, possibly rich in beautiful and helpful thoughts, but not in the eternal verities by which the soul lives. God does not call the preacher without giving him a message to deliver. He does not send any man forth to proclaim his own poor ideas and little schemes as the panacea for the world's ills. The preacher's function is the transmission of a message infinitely greater than himself. To remember this is to guard oneself from wild and wanton speculation, from preaching about Christianity instead of "preaching Christ," from feeding those who listen on the husks of one's own miserable rhetoric.

There is then available, obtainable, within our reach a clear, authoritative message for every preacher. It is a necessary part of his task to work out that message in terms of modern life. Never was there an age more scornful of mere empty solemnity. To use the happy illustration of Bishop Phillips Brooks, we dare not stand before others like the chest of drawers Mr. Bob Sawyer showed to Mr. Winkle. "Dummies, my dear boy. Half the drawers have nothing in them, and the other half don't open." The preacher must have a soul "opendoor'd to God," and quick and responsive to human need, lest Milton's words be true of him: "the hungry sheep look up, and are not fed."

But he must not be under any delusion as to how his message comes. It will not be written in the skies. It will not flash, fully developed, into the mind, in a moment, through some supernatural vision. Its substance will be the truths of the written Word. But these will only become to us a message for others by prayer, meditation, reading and concentrated thought. Nothing is more needed to-day than a fresh presentation of old truths to a new world. So many lose the old truth in trying to make it modern. One of the movements I hope to see amongst us is the counterpart of that spiritual movement on the Continent, which, while proclaiming as a living message for to-day the essential doctrines of the truth of the Scriptures as emphasized at the Reformation, is abreast of modern thought, and avoids the intellectual stagnation of the obscurantist, "the petrification of Christianity" (as some one has called it) on the one hand, and the destructive criticism of the modernist, which is "the dissolution of Christianity," on the other.

3. And that brings me to the messenger. It is through a consecrated personality that God speaks. "Here am I, send me."

The prophet offers himself to be God's instrument first, and then comes to him the Divine message for his lips to utter. It is perhaps amazing that God chooses to work so—in and through human personalities. But so it is. The highest instance of this method is to be found, of course, in the Incarnation, where God and man are in perfect union. We see it again in the Bible, the Book which being human is yet Divine. So a sense of vocation for preaching must include the preacher's consecration of himself to the Divine purpose as God's fellow-worker—and this must be a consecration of the whole personality. Preaching makes the utmost demands upon every part of one's nature, physical, mental and spiritual. It calls upon every power and faculty of the personality, and gathers them all into its service. All the force and vitality of the body, all the intellectual grasp and all the powers of insight and imagination of the mind: all the emotional, mystic, passionate nature of soul go to the shaping of the Divine message and the passing of it on to others. To be mentally careless and slovenly in preparing to speak for God, to be indifferent and casual as to the manner in which it is done, to subordinate the spiritual aim and purpose to lower ends, is to degrade the whole office of the preacher. It is in this personal element that there lies our chief peril and difficulty. A youthful curate once asked Bishop Wilberforce for some advice about preaching. The Bishop was grave for a moment and then said, "Some men prepare their sermons and others prepare themselves." It is this, the discipline of self-preparation, that is so largely in our own power. Dare I say it is this that is so often the weak spot in the preacher's ministry? Nothing can take the place of hard, it may be toilsome, and concentrated quiet prayer and thought, or of the preparation of character behind the spoken utterance. The sermon has its origin in God, but it passes through the medium of a human personality. If it is to be clear, logical, earnest, winsome, sincere, these qualities must first be in the preacher himself. The message must have gripped him and become impregnated with the characteristics of his own personality. It goes forth still a Divine message but in human dress—a dress given to it by the preacher's own humanity.

Is there then not something to add concerning the instrument the preacher uses to convey his meaning? I mean human speech. One is often amazed at the careless and irresponsible use of words in common speech. It is tragic when that invades the pulpit. The snares of speech are so numerous, so disastrously easy to fall into, that one order of monks takes the vow of silence lest they should offend with their speech. Silence is forbidden to the preacher. His only alternative is a careful, close and prolonged study of the meaning of words. "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned" must have a special application to those whose words are to be the vessel of the water of life to thirsty souls. The vessel must not be despised. Water is infinitely more attractive and sweeter to the taste in a clear, clean and beautiful goblet than in a broken bit of dirty earthen-

ware. The mastery of words has had no small part in the success of most of the greatest preachers. The biographer of Newman tells us he would spend hours, and even days, searching for the correct and apt word. It is related of the late Dr. Jowett that on one occasion he spoke at an important meeting at Birmingham Town Hall. He spoke only seven minutes, but made an immense impression. After the meeting three men waited on him to ask him to come to a meeting in a neighbouring town. They pleaded that it would not be a tax upon his strength—only six or seven minutes such as he had given that night. A look of pained amusement came over Jowett's face: "That is all you ask; you will probably not believe me when I say that behind those seven minutes were seventy hours of the hardest work I ever did."[1] That is only an illustration, but it shows how in the estimation of great preachers the office of preaching is worthy of infinite pains. Like every other part of God's service it must bear the marks of sacrifice. A preacher must give his life with his message. As I think of all the preparation demanded by most of the professions, and of the scant preparation many preachers do or can give to their sermons, I am astonished, not by the poverty of these but by the high level so frequently attained. It is a tribute to that deep underlying earnestness that communicates itself by a power greater than the power of words alone to those who listen. For reality is always effective, even when voiced by a stammering tongue. A preacher who has been forgiven can speak movingly about forgiveness. To know in one's whole nature what it is to live in Christ, to be His and not our own, is the first condition of our bringing others to Him. Nothing but fire kindles fire. And yet when all this is said we are unfaithful servants and presumptuous if we constantly depend upon the inspiration of the moment to do what ought to have been done before. In Matthew Arnold's words:

> We cannot kindle when we will
> The fire that in the heart resides.

Only the Holy Spirit can do that. But we must provide the material—and it must be there. The Holy Spirit will give us in every moment of sudden emergency the word that we ought to speak. The Holy Spirit will take our feeble and unworthy efforts and make them mightier than we dared to dream. The Holy Spirit will not do our work for us: the work of earnest and faithful preparation. I tremble when I remember how much depends upon oneself. Shelley said:

> Life, like a dome of many-coloured glass,
> Stains the white radiance of Eternity.

How distorted must the Gospel be at times as it passes through the lives and speech of those who proclaim it! As the second Epistle of Clement expresses it: "When pagans hear from one's lips the oracles of God, they marvel at their beauty and greatness; afterwards when they discover that our actions are not worthy

[1] Quoted by the Editor of *The Joyful News*, February 27, 1930.

of our utterances, they betake themselves to blasphemy, declaring that it is all myth and delusion."

And yet, though no sermon can pass through a human personality without having attached to it something of the weakness and fallibility of the messenger, there is this to say by way of encouragement: where there is a deep sense of vocation, the preacher forgets himself, and is forgotten in the truth he declares. God chooses many preachers, for there are many aspects of truth to reveal. He chooses frail and sinful men that the brightness of His glory may be the greater, that perhaps our very faults and failings may not repel but reveal what Christ has done and can do in and through human lives. As Alexander MacLaren beautifully puts it: "Many weak eyes that would be dazzled and hurt if they were to gaze upon the sun may look at the clouds cradled by its side, and dyed with its lustre, and learn something of the radiance and the glory of the illuminating light from the illuminated vapour." So they themselves may come to live in the splendour of Christ's presence. If indeed the ministry of preaching so results, it brings to the preacher one of the purest and most precious joys the soul can know. But whether it is given to him to see such fruit or not, there will assuredly be the final and perfect joy of faithfulness to his calling and his message, and the "Well done" of Christ Himself. It is this that will be the preacher's certain crown of glory and his exceeding great reward.

The Starting-Place of Prayer, by N. C. Sherwood (W. Heffer & Sons, 3*s.* 6*d.* net), is one of those records of spiritual experience which have a special value for any who are passing through a stage of doubt. With frankness the writer tells of the problems which she had to face and of the various steps by which she was led back to faith. For those who find themselves compelled "to think out their position and to begin at the beginning" the account of this spiritual pilgrimage will help them on their way. The writer does not profess that she has reached the final stage, but she has arrived at a real sense of God in Christ which is the sure foundation.

A third edition, revised and enlarged, of a little book which has had a deservedly wide circulation has been issued. *Is Infant Baptism Scriptural?* by the Rev. Thomas S. Hall, B.D. (Elliot Stock, 1*s.* net). The value of the book is attested by the unsolicited testimony of a number of those well qualified to judge. The Archbishop of Armagh says: "I have never seen anything on the subject so good, so clear, so convincing." It is a most useful summary of necessary information on a subject which exercises the minds of not a few.

Those who desire in brief form information as to the origin and purpose of the Lambeth Conference will find in "as simple and popular form as possible the main facts relating to the Lambeth Conferences" in Bishop Heywood's little book, *About the Lambeth Conference* (S.P.C.K., 2*s.* and 3*s.* 6*d.* net).

"THE BIRTH-DAY OF CHRIST."

By W. Prescott Upton.

THE joyous festival thus described in the Prayer Book has been celebrated by the vastly greater number of Christians on December 25 for the past fifteen centuries, although there is no absolute certainty as to the exact year, let alone the precise day, of the Nativity. There was not always this agreement, for in the latter part of the fourth century the Western Church used December 25, but the usual day in the East was January 6. We have some light on the way in which the change of the Eastern custom took place.

The renowned John Chrysostom preached a sermon at Antioch while he was still Bishop of that city, on December 25, A.D. 386. He compliments them upon the devotion with which such numbers of them are celebrating the feast, although "it is not yet the tenth year since this day has been manifested to us" (*Opera*, ii. 351 ff.: edit. Montfaucon). He says that December 25 "has been known from the beginning by those who inhabit the West. . . . We have received this day from those who have an accurate knowledge of these things and inhabit that city," to wit, Rome, where the archives contained, or were supposed to contain, certain evidence. "For they that dwell there," proceeds Chrysostom, "observing it from the beginning and from old tradition, sent us the knowledge of it."

A happy compromise was soon effected. The date December 25 was taken for the Nativity, while January 6 was regarded as the day of the Epiphany, or rather more correctly in the plural "the Epiphanies," for it was taken as the general commemoration of all the important manifestations of our Lord. To-day perhaps we have most in mind the Epiphany to the Wise Men, although it can hardly be possible that this really took place until after the Presentation. In the Early Church, however, the "Epiphany" or manifestation at the Lord's Baptism was regarded as peculiarly important, and seems to have overshadowed other events.

Whether rightly or wrongly the idea was general if not universal in the earliest ages of the Church, that the Lord was baptized on the (thirtieth) anniversary of His Birth. At the root of this belief, we need have no doubt, lay the difficult verse, Luke iii. 23, which, though it has a decided vagueness for most of us, had a significance in ancient days which we miss through being so much the creatures of cities and almanacks, that very few of us give heed to the most elementary facts about the heavenly bodies. It was far otherwise in the times when two or three different calendars might be used in a mixed community, and well understood. I have myself seen this system at work in the three years which I spent at Salonica during the War. There the city was itself Greek, a large proportion of the inhabitants were Jews, and it had not long passed out

of Turkish domination. People of very moderate education could tell the date not only in both varieties of the solar calendar, the Julian and the Gregorian, but also in the Mahometan purely lunar calendar, and in the Hebrew soli-lunar reckoning. Amongst us, however, we should look on a man as rather a prodigy who could tell the time by the sun, or the Hebrew date by looking at the moon; yet both of these are easily performed with practice.

The allusion to "thirty years" would have suggested a well-known "cycle" of the sun and moon. Thirty years measured by the sun are 10,957 days. Thirty years measured by the moon are 371 "lunations" or new moons, which come to 10,955 days and about 20 hours, so that in 30 years the moon returns to very nearly the same dates in the solar calendar for its phases. It was therefore natural that when people paid attention to the heavenly bodies and widely understood (what is a mystery to most moderns) the main principles of calendars, the words "about thirty years" were read much more precisely than we take them.

The consequence of this general belief that the date of the Baptism (or "Epiphany") had also been the "Birth-day of Christ," was that the rearrangement of the Eastern festivals was greatly facilitated. The Western date was indeed consecrated to the actual Nativity, but the Eastern date being now assigned only to the "Epiphanies" was not felt to be relegated to an inferior position. This politic adjustment of the matter was no doubt largely responsible for the swiftness with which the change was effected throughout the conservative East; yet it would seem likely that Chrysostom's conviction that the Western was the more accurate tradition, must have been very widely shared to secure the new usage such easy progress. For though the heretical Armenians down to the present moment hold the Nativity date January 5, and though as late as the tenth century the Church of Jerusalem still maintained that Christ was born on the Epiphany, it would appear that by the middle of the fifth century the only other churches holding out for January 5/6 were Alexandria and her dependencies. From Cosmas Indicopleustes, however, it appears that by about A.D. 530 Alexandria had fallen into line.

So much for the history of the general adoption of the present Nativity and Epiphany dates. Our thoughts now naturally turn to asking why these particular days should originally have been selected. Various explanations have been offered, but none of them is wholly satisfactory, as is proved by the fact that rival theories still have their advocates.

First there is Chrysostom's assertion that the West had observed December 25 "from the beginning," which though made in good faith cannot really be substantiated, seeing that the only festivals which the Church can be proved to have observed "from the beginning" are Sundays, Easter and probably also Whit-Sunday. The occurrence of December 25 as the Nativity in the "Philocalian Calendar" of 336, may fairly be pleaded to show that by the time of Chrysostom the festival might well have been of immemorial

usage in the Roman Church, and in matters of this sort that would have passed as tantamount to "from the beginning." In matters of doctrine, of course, the Fathers were much more punctilious in carrying their vouchers back to the Apostolic Age itself.

Some scholars hold that the Nativity was first computed to December 25 by Hippolytus, the earliest systematic chronologer of the Roman Church, who wrote about 225. I hold that though he was acquainted with the date he did not devise it. I believe that both Nativity dates were known to Clement of Alexandria, a good thirty years before Hippolytus (*Stromateis*, i. 21). The point is a knotty one and too large for discussion here, but I think the dates have not been recognized hitherto in Clement because exact attention has not been paid to the peculiarities of the Egyptian "Sothic Calendar" used by him, and by the Basilidian and Valentinian Gnostics, the results of whose interesting and instructive computations have been preserved to us by Clement.

The next method of accounting for Christmas Day is by far the best known and most widely accepted. With us to-day the winter solstice is on December 22, but about the Christian Era it was on December 24, so that December 25 was then the first day on which the sun began to return on his upward path through the signs of the Zodiac, bringing back light and life from the death of winter. It was thus the "Birthday of the Unconquered Sun" (*Dies Natalis Solis Invicti*), or the "Day of the New Sun." It is confidently held that Christians adopted this day from the heathen, and the assertion seems to be lacking nothing for acceptance *except proof*! Heathen winter festivals there were, of course, in plenty, but there seems no evidence at all that the heathen observed the precise day December 25, *before* Christians did so. This being the case, the heathen might have "borrowed" from the Christians, for such stealing of thunder was not perpetrated only on one side; or, what is a much more reasonable suggestion than either, both parties might have "borrowed" from Nature. We have to remember that the return of the sun from the winter solstice is not an event in which the "heathen," as such, had any peculiar proprietary rights. If a day was to be chosen for the celebration of the "Birthday of Christ," there could be no happier choice than that which was (for us in the northern hemisphere) the "Birthday of the Sun." Those who are enamoured of this solution do not have any clear idea of its implications. December 25 would only have been selected as the "Birthday of the Sun" when the solstice fell as late as December 24, which it had ceased to do by the end of the first century. Those who make Christmas an imitation of a heathen festival go a long way towards proving Chrysostom's optimistic view that it had been "observed from the beginning" by those who followed the most accurate tradition. Thus do extremes meet.

Another suggested borrowing is deserving of much more respectful consideration. The Jews have a festival of the "Dedication of the Temple and Altar" (cf. John x. 22) in commemoration of the cleansing of the Temple by Judas Maccabaeus in 165 B.C., and

it is held on the anniversary, the 25th day of the ninth Hebrew month called Kislev or Chisleu, which is coincident in the main with December. The chief objection here is that there is no tradition of the adoption, which we should surely have found had it been the real connection between the two festivals. It is, however, worthy of special notice that in the year 5 B.C., which the margin of the Authorized Version (rightly, I believe) determines to have been the year of the Nativity, the Hebrew date "Kislev 25" fell on December 24/25, that is to say it began at sunset on December 24, and ended at sunset December 25. Nor is this all, for if the year 5 B.C. did not contain the extra month "Ve-Adar" (which has to be brought in every three years or so to keep the Hebrew Calendar true to the sun as well as to the moon) the Hebrew date "Kislev 25" had *also* fallen on the Julian date January 5/6, in that year 5 B.C.

The fact is remarkable as offering a possible solution for both the Nativity dates, whereas the alleged borrowing of the "heathen" festival, even if it can account for December 25, cannot make any suggestion as to January 5/6, and thus ignobly shirks the difficult half of the problem. My own opinion is that "Ve-Adar" *was* inserted in 5 B.C., but I am not so sure on the point that I can dismiss the possibility that in 5 B.C. "Kislev 25" did fall twice in the Julian year, to wit on January 5/6 and on December 24/25, and may thus explain both the Eastern and the Western Nativity dates.

There remains, however, for consideration a method of computing (at least roughly) the Nativity of our Lord, which may be precarious, and certainly has been used with indifferent success by very eminent men, but at least has the merit of working upon the only data supplied to us by Holy Scriptures for determining the question.

St. Luke records that Zacharias was "of the course of Abia" or Abijah, the eighth of the priestly courses at the Temple. He implies that the Annunciation was in the "sixth month" after the end of that particular ministration of the Course of Abia at which the Angel appeared to Zacharias, and that the Nativity is to be placed nine months later than this (Luke i. 5, 9, 23–6, 36; ii. 6). Therefore it is reasonable to hold that, if we could know the date of that ministration of the Course of Abia in the Temple, then by adding on to it fifteen months, we must come at least reasonably close to the exact date of the Nativity. The data are too vague to justify the assertion that they would prove the day of Christ's Birth, but they certainly supply the materials for a very interesting investigation, if only we can ascertain the date of the ministration in question.

Now the death of Herod the Great (though even this is sometimes called in question) was in the year 4 B.C., and occurred in the first few days of the Hebrew month Nisan, if we say on March 31, 4 B.C., we cannot be more than a day or two out (Josephus, *Antiq.*, XVII. vi. 4; viii. 1). The Nativity, therefore, cannot have been

later than the winter of 5–4 B.C., though, of course, it may have been earlier. This, therefore, must be the first point of departure. The Nativity not later than the winter of 5–4 B.C., brings us to seek for a ministration of the Course of Abia, about fifteen months earlier, namely in the autumn of 6 B.C. Have we any clue to the exact date of this ministration? The answer is that we have, and this from a source which can have had no possible collusion with Christian tradition.

Towards the end of the Siege of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, the Temple was accidentally set on fire and destroyed on the ninth or tenth day of the fifth Hebrew month, called "Ab." This date corresponds with the Julian day, Sunday, August 5, A.D. 70, which till sunset was "Ab 9," and at sunset changed to "Ab 10." This date is not in dispute.

Now the Babylonian Talmud embodies a Jewish tradition that the Course of Jehoiarib had just entered upon its ministration when the catastrophe occurred. The Babylonian Talmud is a late compilation, but of one thing we may be very certain, the tradition it sets forth was not devised with any view to helping Christians to determine the date of the Birth of Jesus of Nazareth. Yet it leads us to a result which is to say the least of it, thought-compelling. For, once granted the definite date of the ministration of any single course, and then it is but a matter of simple arithmetic to determine the dates at which any and every course fulfilled its ministration at any previous time connected by a regular succession with the courses of A.D. 70. The method is quite easy to understand.

The priestly courses were twenty-four in number (1 Chron. xxiv. 4, 18) amongst which Jehoiarib was the first, and Abijah the eighth in order. They served for one week and entered their ministration on the Sabbath Day (2 Kings xi. 4–9). Accordingly, if the Jewish tradition may be relied upon,[1] the Course of Jehoiarib must have entered its ministration on the Sabbath before the firing of the Temple, that is to say on the evening of Friday, August 3, A.D. 70. That being granted our way is clear to find out the exact week in the autumn of 6 B.C. that the Course of Abia was ministering in the Temple, which, as we have seen, is the latest possible ministration at which the Vision can have been vouchsafed to Zacharias.

From A.D. 70 back to 6 B.C. was but 75 years—not "76" as we might incautiously calculate if we forgot that no year intervened between 1 B.C. and A.D. 1. In these 75 years were 19 leap-years, including 1 B.C. and 5 B.C., both of which naturally were such, as 1 B.C. was four years behind A.D. 4, the first leap-year in the

[1] Some will see a striking confirmation of it in the fact that calculating strictly from this date, it appears that the Course of Jehoiarib was also on duty, but just closing its ministration, when Solomon's Temple was burnt on Ab 9, 586 B.C. The coincidence is all the more striking as it is only of recent years that this burning was definitely fixed to 586 instead of Usher's "588." It requires the assumption that the courses were resumed in Zerubbabel's Temple with strict and exact knowledge of what course should have been in ministration, but for the intromission of seventy years.

Christian Era. Or to put it more correctly, they were respectively 44 and 40 years after 45 B.C., the year when the reformed Julian Calendar first operated. The 75 years with 19 intercalary days are 27,394 days.

The cycle of the 24 priestly courses took 24 × 7 or 168 days; and 163 of these 168-day cycles amount to 27,384 days, or exactly ten days less than the 75 Julian years.

Hence it follows that the Course of Jehoiarib which entered its ministration on the Sabbath, August 3/4, A.D. 70, must also have entered on Sabbath, August 13/14, in the year 6 B.C.

Then as the Course of Abia was the eighth course, it must have entered 7 × 7 or 49 days later than the first course (1 Chron. xxiv. 10). That is to say, we arrive at the conclusion that the Course of Abia entered its ministration at the Temple on Friday evening, October 1, and, having accomplished its ministration, was succeeded by the next course on the evening of Friday, October 8, 6 B.C.

We have then the Hebrew day running October 8/9, as the first day of the departure of Zacharias from the Temple. Computing six months from this we reach in the Julian Calendar, the date April 8/9 for the Annunciation. Here, however, we have to bear in mind that the "month" familiar to Zacharias, Elizabeth and Mary, was not that of the *Julian*, but of the Hebrew Calendar, in which six months are only 177 days. Coming down, therefore, but 177 days from the date October 8/9, we reach the date April 2/3, 5 B.C., for the Annunciation, by remembering that 5 B.C. was a leap-year.

From the Annunciation we have then to compute nine Hebrew months, which are 266 days, to the Nativity. Adding 266 days to the date April 2/3, 5 B.C., we come to a remarkable result, for we reach exactly this date for the Nativity.

(Sunday–Monday) December 24/25, 5 B.C.

The coincidence is surely too striking to be the result of blind chance. It does not prove the date of our Lord's Birth, but it certainly does point to the method whereby the now received date was computed. I say certainly because it also solves the Eastern Nativity date.

I have obtained my result by attention to the fact that we must use not Julian but Hebrew "months" in the computation. The point seems pretty obvious, though it has been overlooked by such men as Gresswell and Wieseler, who therefore reach conflicting results, and both alike fail to arrive at the traditional date.

Now supposing that a similar mistake had been made by early calculators, the use of the Julian Calendar would bring the fifteen months from October 8/9, 6 B.C., to January 8/9, 4 B.C., which most people might think near enough to the "Eastern" date to account for it.

I am not content with this and offer what I believe to be the true solution. If the computation was made on the Egyptian

Sothic Calendar, the "fifteen months" would not be 443 days as on the Hebrew, or 458 days as on the Julian, but precisely 455 days, or twelve days more than the Hebrew computation. Adding twelve days to December 24/25 is not difficult to those who have memory of "Twelfth Night," and it brings us to precisely the Eastern date for the Nativity, January 5/6.

I therefore venture to submit that the true explanation of the Nativity dates is that they were computed from the data furnished by the ministration of the Course of Abia. One computation, in my opinion correctly, proceeded according to the Hebrew Calendar and produced December 24/25 as the Nativity date. Another worked on the Egyptian Calendar, and therefore came to January 5/6. I think we can hardly be wrong in holding that the former calculation was made in Rome, and the latter at Alexandria. Thus originated the Western and Eastern Nativity dates.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST. By J. Gresham Machen, D.D., D.Litt. *London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* 15s.

The experiences of a reviewer to-day are very varied. The last work dealt with by the writer appears to be from the pen of a Presbyterian. It was certainly nothing if it was not unorthodox, and the author was at pains to show that it was not necessary that we should believe in the Virgin Birth. How far the opinions expressed are his own convictions it is not easy to determine. But if they are, then his treatise shows that men who are virtually Unitarians consider themselves justified in remaining in the ministry of orthodox churches. However, it is a welcome diversion to take up such an elaborate, scholarly treatise as Dr. Machen's which embodies in substance, though not in form, the Thomas Smyth Lectures which were delivered by the author at Columbia Theological Seminary in 1927, while it contains, too, certain special studies which have appeared from time to time in *The Princeton Theological Review*. The result is a careful study of the New Testament narratives and of a considerable body of Theological literature dealing with this important question—indeed we cannot remember having seen, in recent years, any work dealing so fully and frankly with the subject. It is not too much to say that no ministerial library will be complete without this volume, which is furnished with an Index. Dr. Machen, by the way, is Professor of the New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, U.S.A. S. R. C.

The Rev. H. Montague Dale, B.D., has written a thoughtful essay on *Worship and Communion* (S.P.C.K., 1s. 6d. and 2s. 6d. net) in which he considers these important aspects of religious life in relation to the present situation and the needs of to-day. The study of psychology has opened many lines of fresh thought in regard to worship, and these are carefully analysed. The place of the Holy Communion is set out clearly, and some of the mistakes concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice examined and exposed.

ABOUT ANCIENT IRISH HANDWRITING AND BOOKS.

By Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D.,
Rector of Tolleshunt Knights, Essex.

IN his essay on Palæography in Sandys' *Companion to Latin Studies*, pp. 780 f., Sir E. M. Thompson, late Director of the British Museum, gives a high tribute of praise to the work of the Irish scribes. The Irish script is the despair and admiration of all judges. Yet he shows how simple its origin was. It was the Roman half-uncial script which was the first model selected by the Irish scribes in preference to the uncial style which was more elaborate. To quote Sir E. M. Thompson's article:

"The Irish scribe adopted the Roman half-uncial script; and then, with his innate sense of beauty of form, he produced from it the handsome literary hand which culminated in the native half-uncial writing, as seen in perfection in the Book of Kells and in other contemporary MSS. of the latter part of the seventh century. But the round half-uncial literary hand thus moulded was too elaborate an instrument for the ordinary uses of life. It was necessary also to provide a script which should serve all the duties of a current hand. Therefore, taking the same model, the Roman half-uncial, the Irish scribe adapted it to commoner uses, and writing the letters more negligently, he evolved the compact pointed minuscule hand which became the current form of handwriting of the country, and which again, in its turn, was in course of time also moulded into a book-hand and eventually superseded the half-uncial.

"Isolated as Ireland became and little disturbed by external influences, the national script grew stereotyped and passed from generation to generation and from century to century with so little change as to become almost the despair of palæographers. To fix the period of Irish MSS. is always more or less difficult. The old forms of the letters remained; and even at the present day the hand which the Irish scholar writes differs but little in the lettering from the pointed minuscule hand of the Middle Ages."

Sir E. M. Thompson proceeds to point out the influence the Irish hand had upon the script of other countries.

"Britain," he says, "borrowed it *en bloc*; and, in the early Middle Ages, the Irish missionaries who spread over the continent of Europe and who there became the founders of so many great religious houses, carried their native script with them.

"Thus, at such centres at Luxeuil in France, Wurzburg in Germany, St. Gall in Switzerland, and Bobbio in Italy, Irish writing flourished and MSS. in the Irish hand multiplied."

But in time the script thus used in foreign places deteriorated, when the connection with Ireland was lost and the Irish monks passed away. It has, however, served its purpose and has an important position in the history of Latin palæography.

The most notable extant example of the English half-uncial hand which was founded upon the Irish hand of the same class is the *Lindisfarne Gospels* (or Durham Book) which is now in the

British Museum. This is supposed to be the work of Bishop Eadfrith about A.D. 700. The English improved upon this borrowed script; they also borrowed the Irish minuscule hand, which is found in places in the Book of Kells, and gave it an English character which is seen in the Cambridge copy of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*.

The Irish books are not only famous for their script but also for their ornamentation, which is in a class by itself both as regards drawing and colouring. Some of these books deserve special mention.

The Books of Kells and Armagh are among the treasures of Trinity College. The former, an eighth-century copy of the gospels, is the finest specimen extant of Irish calligraphy and illumination. Giraldus Cambrensis said it was "the work of angelic rather than of human skill." The interlaced designs and spiral lines, peculiar to Irish art, are wonderfully minute and accurate. Their monotony is at times relieved by a grinning Irish face. Ussher, when Bishop of Meath, inserted this note in it: "Aug. 24, 1621. I reckoned the leaves of this and found them to be 344. He who reckoned before me counted six score to the hundred." The Book of Armagh has several documents, among them the "Confession," probably the earliest known writing made in these islands, and the oldest "Lives" of St. Patrick. Part of the book was written under the direction of Abbot Torbach, who died A.D. 807, part later. Folio 16 has a note said to have been inserted in the presence of Brian Boru, "Emperor of the Scots," when he visited Armagh and placed twenty ounces of gold on its altar (*circ.* A.D. 1002).

It was the Irish custom to make silver cases and leather satchels for their books. Trinity has the "polaire" or satchel of this one, a fine specimen of Irish work. This Book of Armagh was preserved for centuries by an hereditary line of keepers who held certain lands in virtue of their office. The last keeper named Moyre pledged it for £5 in 1680.

The *Book of Durrow* is wrongly stated to be the work of Columba, our missionary to Scotland, who is said to have written 300 books, and this one in twelve days! All are said to have had the property, when immersed, of not losing a letter! The story is told that some monks carrying away the Durham Gospels for safety lost it in a shipwreck, but it was found some days after on the shore, with a few stains of salt water on it. The silver shrine of the *Book of Durrow* has an inscription showing that it was made by order of King Flann (A.D. 879–916). The *Book of Dimna*, hidden by Roscrea monks in the hills above Nenagh, was found by boys, who sold both it and its case to a Nenagh doctor. Another Nenagh resident brought back to Ireland the Stowe Missal carried away during the Danish invasions. Many Irish manuscripts are treasured in the libraries of the Continent, chiefly at St. Gall and Bobbio, and in England, but numbers perished in the Danish invasions.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

THE B.B.C. has taken its place among the educational institutions of the country, and its influence will have to be reckoned with in the future. It will undoubtedly tend to produce a great number of hearers with a new appreciation of music, and the same may be said in regard to history, literature, science and other branches of knowledge. Technical philosophy and science will probably be outside its scope, as the majority of those who listen in would not appreciate the technical terms used by the specialists and experts, but attempts have been made, and will increasingly be made, to give some popular accounts of the results of fresh investigations. These will exercise an extensive influence upon the outlook of great numbers of people, and will in the long run be reflected in the religion and politics of the nation. No doubt every effort will be made to secure the impartial presentation of the views of all schools of thought, but it will always be difficult to secure a well-balanced representation of every Section. The ultimate influence of these Broadcast Talks must depend upon the capacity of the hearers to appreciate the value of the various theories put before them, and to discriminate between those that have permanent merit and those that are merely temporary phases of thought.

Several of the series of Talks already given have been published in book form. They give an opportunity for examining and weighing the contributions by a number of well-known writers to the understanding of the problems of life.

For example, one of the most popular series of Talks, which aroused much interest and discussion when they were given, was "Points of View." Contributions to the series were made by Mr. Lowes Dickinson, Dean Inge, Mr. H. G. Wells, Mr. Bernard Shaw, Mr. J. B. S. Haldane, Sir Oliver Lodge and Sir Walford Davies. With the exception of Mr. Bernard Shaw's Talk, these have been published by Messrs. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. (4*s.* 6*d.* net). They cover a number of the fundamental problems which are occupying the minds of thinking people to-day. They deal with the meaning and purpose of life, the question of a personal or impersonal immortality, the ideal form of Government, the bases of society, the place of religion in life, and other cognate subjects. Needless to say there are wide differences of opinion. There are many speculations and theories put forward which stimulate thought, if they do not satisfy all our intellectual requirements. All are agreed as to the supreme importance of the scientific approach to every class of problem, but differences arise as to the actual nature of the subject-matter. Sir Oliver Lodge is not satisfied with Mr. H. G. Wells' restrictions to a material universe. He rightly requires the inclusion of the spiritual, but others cannot follow Sir Oliver in his methods of dealing with the unseen, although his defence of personal

immortality is a complete answer to Mr. Wells' theories. Dean Inge writes as a "Protestant Christian" and with his usual boldness maintains his position. "Christianity is a religion of spiritual redemption, not of social reform." "It is a heroic religion. It has broken down all man-made barriers by ignoring them and, by making the perfection of the divine life the standard of measurement, has made all differences except moral ones sink into insignificance." This testimony is valuable in the midst of a series which treats Christian teaching as merely one of a number of possible solutions of the problems of life. Such a book as this reveals the points of view which will be put before the people in the future, and provides a warning to clergymen and others of the conditions of thought and the outlook upon life with which they will require to be familiar if they are to make any adequate presentation of the Christian Faith.

Of perhaps even greater interest and usefulness to Christians is the series of Talks recently given by the Rev. E. S. Waterhouse, D.D., Professor of Psychology and Philosophy at Richmond College. Their subject is "Psychology and Religion" and they are published by Elkin, Mathews & Marrot (5s. net). Dr. Waterhouse has an excellent Broadcast manner. He knows how to get into touch with hearers, how to gauge the subjects which will interest them and on which they need instruction, and how to light up his treatment by appropriate illustrations. As a popular manual on the relation of psychology to religion this book can be thoroughly recommended to preachers who desire to know the trend of thought that has been produced, especially in the younger generation, by the methods of the New Psychology. An introductory chapter explains the sphere of Psychology, and where it meets religion. There are Eighteen Talks and each of them deals with some question which is raised by modern thought. Beginning with the fact of religion, "the most important power man possesses," he interprets its various aspects in the light which psychological study throws on them, in the impressions of childhood, the value of the unconscious, the use of symbols and the power of imagination. Specially useful is the treatment of suggestion which is used so largely to-day in attacks upon belief in God, and the practice of prayer. In the Talks on "The Soul Astray" and "Turning Again; Conversion and its Value," the fundamental problems of salvation are dealt with, and the help which psychology can give in the proper understanding of them is shown. The heart of the matter is prayer and here Dr. Waterhouse is at his best. Instances are given of the influence of prayer in the lives of men. "The man of prayer is the trained man, and that tells in life's struggle. There is always something that marks those to whom prayer is a reality, call it character, personality, or whatever you will. The man who goes through life with the sense of an unseen helper will at least have no inferiority complex, and because he believes his strength is not his own, no superiority complex either. He is different, and he is sure that it is

God who has made the difference." Among the other interesting subjects dealt with in these Talks are Fellowship and Religion, Health and Healing, The Mystic Way, Conscience and Temptation, Fear and Joy, Faith and Worship, and Psychology and Ourselves, and on all of them there are fresh and suggestive lines of thought such as preachers will value. A special word must be said on his treatment of Dreams. Much that is difficult to believe has been said about the symbolism of dreams, and of their significance in reference to the waking life, and it is satisfactory to find Dr. Waterhouse taking an eminently rational view and discarding the absurdities of some of the German psychologists. These Talks are of special value as a sane representation of the relation of Psychology to Religion, and as a just interpretation of the new methods of Psychology when applied to religious belief and practice.

Visitors to Rome find three centres of interest. There is the Rome of the classical period represented by the ruins of the Forum, the ancient temples and other buildings. There is the Rome of the early Christian period associated with the footsteps of the apostles and the Church in the Catacombs, and there is the Rome of the Papacy with its centre in the Vatican. It is impossible in a brief visit to explore all three, and the interest of many dwells on the life of the early Christian Church. For them a fascinating book has been written by the Rev. Albert G. Mackinnon, M.A., D.D. He has been chaplain to the Presbyterian Congregation in Rome for many years, and has devoted himself to a study of the Christian antiquities of the city. In *The Rome of St. Paul* (Religious Tract Society, 7*s.* 6*d.* net) he has provided a popular account of the most recent discoveries which throw light upon St. Paul's connection with the Eternal City, and carries his readers on by the contagion of his own enthusiasm to a more complete understanding of the surroundings of the great Apostle and the conditions of his life as a prisoner. We are introduced to the company accompanying St. Paul as they approach the City, and the various objects which met his eye are described with the history and legends attached to them. Then the religion of Rome as seen by St. Paul is explained and interesting conjectures are made as to the thoughts which the various forms of worship would arouse in his mind. His keen eyes would recognize the worship of the Emperor as the deadliest foe to Christianity.

A chapter is devoted to the surprises in the early Church in Rome. Recent excavations have brought to light a number of facts which Dr. Mackinnon uses to make a realistic picture of the life of these earliest Christians. He then describes the place and manner of St. Paul's life, and goes on to tell of some of the Christian homes in Rome, associated with the names of Aquila and Priscilla, Pudens and Claudia. Rome had its problems. There were housing difficulties. There was the greatest problem of all—slavery. The true values of life were unrealized. Selfishness was entrenched in religion and the Apostle's solution for all social problems was Jesus Christ. The old gods have gone but they have left their footprints, and

Dr. Mackinnon traces out for us the marks they have left upon the religion of Rome to-day. "Perhaps the modern world does not realize how the ghosts of those cold divinities still affect its life. The dead hand has even yet some grip in it." The postal system of the Roman Empire was well organized, but St. Paul's letter-carriers were Christian workers—Phœbe, Epaphroditus, Tychicus—and they served him well. St. Paul's Roman friends are given the praise due to their devotion to the Apostle in his prison, and the care they took to supply his needs and to assist him in his mission. The Shadow of St. Peter is the title of a chapter in which the interesting problem of that Apostle's connection with Rome is discussed. Dr. Mackinnon brings together the evidence for St. Peter's residence as well as for his death and burial in the City. He also gives his grounds for believing that the great Church of St. Paul without the walls marks the burial place of St. Paul. It is impossible to give any adequate idea of the wealth of information with which Dr. Mackinnon enriches his treatment of these early days and the life of the primitive Church. The book is embellished with an excellent series of pictures taken from photographs of Ancient Rome reconstructed by Prof. Giuseppe Gatteschi, and they give a vivid impression of the wonders of architecture with which successive Emperors adorned their Imperial City. Rome will always have a peculiar fascination, and Dr. Mackinnon helps us to understand something of its source and power.

In the year of the last Lambeth Conference the Bishop of Gloucester published his Bampton Lectures—*The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion.* He indicated in the Preface of that volume that the views which he put forward were the result of a lifelong study of the subject, and he explained the process of thought by which he arrived at them. His fresh and independent treatment of the subject produced a profound impression and showed that many of the conventional ideas introduced by the Tractarian Movement had no foundation either in the New Testament or in the history of the Primitive Church. For example, in regard to Apostolical Succession, he said that it seemed to him as ordinarily taught in the Church of England to be "mechanical and unreal" and he was surprised and gratified "to find how different was the more primitive teaching on the subject from that which was customary in Anglican circles." His free and frank discussion of the Ministry and the Sacraments contributed much to a better understanding of their true nature and no doubt had due weight with the Bishops in their deliberations ten years ago. During last winter the Bishop delivered two courses of lectures on the same subject and they were recently published by the Student Christian Movement Press under the title *Christian Unity* (4s. net). The lectures, the Bishop says, are based on his Bampton Lectures of 1920, and he adds: "During the years since they were written I have not found anything which has induced me seriously to modify the opinion that I then expressed, and a good deal to strengthen the opinion then maintained." Dr. Headlam

has taken an active part in the Lausanne Conference and the other conferences where reunion has been discussed, and he is in touch to the fullest extent with all the latest developments of the reunion movement. It has been a pleasure to read in this shorter form the clear and definite statements of one of our most accurate scholars and clearest thinkers on the need, the desirability, the possibility and the methods of reunion. He regards reunion in the mission field as an urgent and imperative necessity, "and any European Church which does not take part in the movement will soon find itself left out in the progress of events." He emphazises the fact that " there is a quite definite Christian religion which all Christian bodies alike hold " and that the unity of the faith is represented in the creeds which " contain everything which can be claimed as the faith." This is the true meaning of " the Catholic faith " and Catholicity must be interpreted in its true sense. His statement on the nature of the Church covers the various views which have been put forward and sums up his conclusion in the words " The Church is the whole body of believers and should be one." The lecture on the Sacraments considers the meaning of validity. The spiritual efficacy of nonconformist sacraments is admitted. One section in the Church of England—" those who call themselves Anglo-Catholics, believe that no sacraments or orders are valid unless administered by clergy who have the apostolic succession." This, says Dr. Headlam, has never been the official teaching of the Church of England, nor has it ever been generally held among us. The most difficult part of the problem is the Ministry, and on this Dr. Headlam represents the conclusions of all the best recent scholarship. We recommend the careful study of this lecture as it sums up the teaching of our Church and gives a historical survey which shows that the modern theory of apostolic succession does not represent the original teaching of the Christian Church. A brief review of the facts of the South India Scheme closes a volume which every one interested in the reunion movement should read.

In a very frank preface the Rev. E. H. Archer-Shepherd, Vicar of Avenbury, records his forty years of clerical life in small country parishes, and at the age of threescore years and fifteen he issues a volume of essays which show that unlike many country clergy he has devoted himself to study and by reading of a very wide and varied character has made himself acquainted with the views of the most recent authors in many departments of knowledge. In *Orthodox Religion in the Light of To-Day* (Rivingtons, 18*s.* net) he has touched upon most of the problems which have had to be faced by thinking men during the present century. In fact the book might be taken as a handbook on modern theories in science and criticism as they affect the presentation of the Christian Faith. Some would not agree with all his conclusions; but, while he accepts many of the latest interpretations of science, he is conservative on the great essentials and presents them from a point of view which will appeal to many of the younger generation, especially, as he says,

to those " whose minds have been harassed by doubts begotten of obscurantism." His treatment of such themes as the Resurrection of our Lord, the Temptation, and the Atonement will be found specially full and clear. A large section of the book is filled with a detailed survey of The Ritual of the Tabernacle which contains many valuable suggestions. He examines the theories of a Presence of Christ in the elements of Holy Communion and has no doubt that there is no ground for believing that words of consecration bring about any miracle. Of the Atonement he says, " The Atonement is the keystone in the arch of Christian doctrine, the two pillars of which are the Incarnation and the Resurrection. . . . The keystone not only keeps every stone in its place, but when it falls out the arch is in imminent danger of falling to pieces."

He attributes to Medievalism some of the difficulties of our day. " Not only is the revival of Medievalism the immediate cause of much infidelity : the greatest obstacle to the acceptance of Christianity by the Jews is the adoration of the Host, the worship of the Virgin Mary and of the saints, and the veneration of relics, pictures and images." On reunion he says of the Free Churches, " Their reunion with the Church of England is the hope of Christianity. But, greatly as it is to be desired, that can never come until it be frankly admitted that the regularly ordained ministers of the Free Churches are ministers of the Gospel no less truly than those who have been episcopally ordained." The book has an encyclopædic character from the number of subjects with which it deals, and on all of them there is useful information to be gathered as a result of Mr. Archer-Shepherd's unusually extensive reading. It is a pity that the volume has not been provided with an index of subjects. This would have added considerably to its value as a work of reference. G. F. I.

THE COUNTY ANTHOLOGIES.

(1) MIDDLESEX. By T. M. Pope.
(2) CUMBERLAND. By Walter and Clare Jerrold.
(3) LANCASHIRE. By H. R. Case.

Publishers : Elkin Matthews and Marrot, Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

These attractive collections of poetry and prose have been edited by Mr. R. P. Cowl, and in them will be found the work of many notable men of letters as well as of little known writers. In No. 1 appear John Milton, John Evelyn, Samuel Pepys, Alexander Pope, Hannah More, Charles Lamb, Thomas Hood, Leigh Hunt and others. In No. 2 and No. 3 will be found some delightful specimens of North Country dialect. To each volume there is an interesting introduction, but we miss any biographical notes. Six volumes have been already published, and presuming that the intention is to complete the series, it should constitute an invaluable introduction to English Literature from the earliest times to the present day. S. R. C.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE. By J. M. Creed. *Macmillan.* 15*s.*

Mr. Creed has adopted rather a novel plan in dealing with the Third Gospel. He is so convinced of the thoroughness of the work done by Dr. Rawlinson on St. Mark that he only deals briefly with the Marcan sections of the writing of St. Luke. This is a high tribute paid by an independent scholar—for no one can doubt the independence of the Ely Professor. The book has the usual Introduction, the Greek Text with a Commentary and a number of additional notes. A very useful Index of Greek words shows us what the peculiar vocabulary of St. Luke is. Sometimes as we read reflexions on the use of words we ask ourselves how far this use is conditioned by the subject, the sources and the size of the book, and when we consider these factors we confess we are not as deeply impressed by language as is the case with some Commentators. On one point Professor Creed is perhaps rather too prone to prefer recent opinion to that of twenty years ago. The atmosphere of the Gospel taken into consideration with the language common to St. Luke and medical writers deserves more weight than Mr. Creed gives it as pointing to a medical author.

Dates may or may not be of the greatest importance, but we are unconvinced that St. Luke wrote of necessity after the Fall of Jerusalem, and to place the Gospel as late as 80–85 is not demanded by the evidence. If the Acts be later than the Gospel, we feel that an earlier date is demanded. But the veridicity of the narrative is more important than the date, and we see no grounds to alter the impression left on our mind that St. Luke was a careful historian who had an eye for setting forth what took place and for avoiding errors due to obsession. We are specially glad to have the historical account of the Interpretation of the Gospel, and the discussion of the sources is particularly well done. Mr. Creed concludes that the Gospel literature is the creation of a historical community grouped round a concrete individual personality. "On the one hand it must be recognized that accurate investigation of fact would be alien to the ideas and interests of such a society as the most primitive Church. On the other hand, a popular literature is uniquely fitted to convey truthful characterization. The communal mind will feel, resent and reject the inappropriate. Thus in the Gospels the character and spirit of John the Baptist and of Jesus Christ are each of them conveyed with inimitable because unconscious skill." May we add that we find ourselves unable to accept the conclusion that St. Luke was not an accurate investigator. He had naturally a mass of tradition on which he based his story, but that does not imply that he did not weigh evidence and accept what was told without critical inquiry. We believe that the attitude adopted by so

many modern writers to the miraculous element is the source of their unwillingness or inability to give the Evangelists credit for telling the truth of events as they really happened. We think we see signs of a reaction on the whole question of the miraculous, for men are learning that a non-miraculous Christianity is not the revealed religion as taught by the life and works of our Lord.

The short and long notes in the Commentary display the fruit of much reflexion and make plain what many readers find obscure, and the discussion of the Birth narratives is informing. They have a Palestinian source and we believe that they are largely derived from the Virgin Mary. The attempt to attribute them to Egyptian legends fails hopelessly. " Egypt is not the uniting link between Isaiah and Luke. The link is the Church—nation of the Jews of which from the very outset Jesus was regarded as Messianic King. In the Lucan Annunciation we seem to have moved beyond the primitive Judæo-Christian world of thought, yet in Luke too the Isaianic text is central, not peripheral." We have no space to discuss the comments on the Resurrection narratives. He tells us that " there is no good reason why the story of the Empty Tomb should not be founded on fact." We thank Professor Creed for a book which at times compels us to disagree with him, but on the whole is a real solid contribution to the interpretation of the Third Gospel.

EPISCOPACY ANCIENT AND MODERN. Edited by Claude Jenkins, D.D., and K. D. Mackenzie, M.A. Pp. xxx + 412. *S.P.C.K.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

These essays form a unique and, we believe it will be thought generally, a valuable work. The series has been well planned and the field of the subject is very fairly covered. The book will prove useful to students who do not accept the point of view of some of the contributors.

The first three essays are pure scholarship. They are " The Origins of Episcopacy," by the Editorial Secretary of the S.P.C.K., " The Position of Clergy and Laity in the Early Church in Relation to the Episcopate," by Dr. A. J. Maclean, Bishop of Moray, and " The Mediæval Bishop," by Dr. Jenkins. Dr. Lowther Clarke's contribution is by far the longest of the series (it consists of 46 pages with ample footnotes, giving authorities). As a student of Christian origins he is thoroughly interested in the Old Testament and indeed in Rabbinical literature as it seems to bear upon the problem in hand. The *presbyters* were well established as judges and teachers in first-century Judaism, and *if* we are right in using later evidence, they were actually ordained by the laying on of hands. The Christian *Episcopoi* had their analogy in the *skopoi* of Ezekiel xxxiv. and indeed of Jeremiah vi. They are the " watchmen " or the perfect " shepherds." The distinctive contention of Dr. Clarke is that the origin of the three orders of the Christian ministry is to be sought not in St. Paul's practice as revealed in Acts or even in his Epistles, but ultimately in the Jerusalem

diaconate. Comparing the narrative and language of Acts vi. with Numbers xi. and xxvii. 16 ff., and claiming that, in the story of Acts, some, at least, of "the serving ones" were found doing work which later belonged to another order, the writer maintains that what was to become the threefold ministry developed out of this primitive undifferentiated ministry. Dr. Clarke's theory will doubtless receive the attention of other writers. . . . We should like to have said very much more about the contents of this essay, which exhibits a fair-mindedness not always, we fear, everywhere to be found in this volume. "Somehow or other, both in our theory of the Church and in the practical working out of plans for reunion, if we are to be loyal to the partly prophetic origin of the Church, room must be found for a prophetic succession, intermittent though it be, as well as for Apostolical Succession. The real problem is not so much how to reconcile Canterbury and Edinburgh, as to find room for George Fox and the Sadhu, whom we agree are true prophets, as unanimously as we agree that Mrs. Eddy was a false prophet" (p. 46).

Practical chapters upon present-day usage are contributed upon Episcopacy in England by the Bishop of Southwark, and in Wales by Dr. Hopkin James. This latter writer believes that "in a democratic age we have retained everything that is essential, and have lost nothing which is inherent in the office of a bishop in the Church of God." Dr. Maclean again writes upon Episcopacy in Scotland. Dr. McNeile, before his term as Regius Professor of Divinity in Dublin, was Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge; hence he cannot write as a lifelong member of the Irish Church. Yet this detachment lends but greater value to such an observation as the following: "There are almost no quarrels regarding doctrines preached or ceremonial practised, because both are kept within close limits by law. There is a friendliness and community of interests among the clergy which other countries might well envy" (p. 142). Episcopacy in U.S.A. is dealt with by the Bishop of California, in Canada by the Bishop of Ottawa, in India by Dr. Palmer, in the West Indies by the Bishop of Guiana, and in Australia and New Zealand by Drs. Goldsmith and Steward respectively. This section of the book closes with an article on South Africa by the present Bishop of Grahamstown. In it is retold the interesting story of the rôle this Province played in the legal discovery of the fact that the various Colonial Churches were not part of the *Established* Church. Perhaps the limits of space are alone responsible for the scanty passing allusions to that patient missionary and sincerely courageous man, Bishop Colenso.

Here follow four chapters on Episcopacy outside the Anglican Communion. Dr. Green, Bishop of Bangor, deals briefly with the Roman Church, and Dr. Wigram with the Eastern Orthodox Church. Dr. Wigram knows his subject—or a field of his subject—from long and first-hand experience. We confess that some of the facts he states make us wonder how and when the Anglican Communion could work in close alliance with this branch of the Church. "The

infallibility of the Church is a characteristic of the life of the whole body" (p. 307). We should not like to swear that this must ever be true of even our own branch. Mr. C. B. Moss deals ably with the entrancing subjects of Episcopacy in Sweden and in the Old Catholic Churches. The Lambeth Conference of 1920 accepted the validity of Swedish Orders: this, though "the Swedish Church is in full communion with Lutheran bodies with no succession, and even without Episcopacy of any kind" (p. 324). The diaconate disappeared in the seventeenth century. Communion in Sweden is rather infrequent. In Confirmation there is no laying on of hands. As in the Lutheran Church, all priests have authority to confirm; the preparation for Confirmation is supposed to consist of forty hours' instruction. We miss from the following essay any reference to the overtures of our Archbishop Wake.

Dean Bate has some interesting things to say upon the Ministry in Presbyterianism and Methodism, though we are not sure that he is always as detached and balanced as he should be. He is right in calling attention to the "strong emphasis which Presbyterianism lays upon the due transmission of authority" (p. 344), and in reminding us that John Wesley's early practice of ordination was based on Presbyterian principles. The short note on the *Unitas Fratrum* will interest many, especially as it contains abundant references to authorities (a statement which might be made of not a few of the essays in this volume).

Dr. Darwell Stone's chapter upon Episcopacy and Reunion is limited to less than eleven pages, and few but High Anglicans will find therein what they want. "The popular device of intercommunion as a means towards the end of reunion is necessarily excluded." The concluding essay is by a Methodist layman, Sir Henry Lunn. His judgment is that "Episcopacy as a factor in Church government, apart from the theory of Apostolic Succession, does not to-day present any definite obstacle to union between the Church of England, the Presbyterian Church, the Wesleyan Methodist Church and the Congregationalists as a whole."

The volume is furnished with an index which, though not invariably accurate, adds to the value of the book for purposes of reference.

R. S. C.

ESSAYS IN CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY. By Leonard Hodgson. *London: Longmans, Green & Co.* 9*s.*

Dr. Hodgson has proved his value as a theological thinker by his able volume on the Incarnation. He now re-publishes a series of Essays which in their collected form strive to give an outlook on life as a whole which may develop into a definitely Christian philosophy, which many thinkers consider to be the greatest need of our time. We are not sure that the time will ever again come for a new Aquinas to arise, to pronounce a verdict on all subjects that directly or indirectly may impinge on Religion. The range of knowledge is so vast, the values given to the different departments

of knowledge change so rapidly, and no man can lay claim to the encyclopædic gift which will enable him to embrace all things in heaven or earth in his philosophy, which after all may be described as the unification of all knowledge of the seen and unseen under categories that command universal assent. Man's intellect is admittedly limited, and it has to do with the material supplied to him by experience and revelation. Both need interpreters, and the interpretation of both is determined by the knowledge we possess. God reveals Himself in many ways, and in the last resort a final philosophy is the integration of disunited parts *sub specie eternitatis*. The mind of man would then rise to the illimitable Mind of God. And this man can never attain.

But we must make the effort to understand, and Dr. Hodgson has primarily tackled the great question of Personality, whose abysmal depths have not become less fathomless because some unfathomed depths may have been called the unconscious mind. Dr. Hodgson may be trusted to weigh all that he knows for and against any particular point, and we think that the root of his outlook may be found in the sentences: " Whatever else may be included in the conception of human personality, one highly significant element in the being of a human person is to be one who, when faced by the tension of conflicting demands, neither of which can be denied *in toto*, is called upon to exercise creative activity in the devising of actions that are worth while as embodiments on earth of heavenly realities. If then we are to think of God as in any way ' personal,' this will surely imply, at least, that we think of Him in His relations with us as sharing in these interests, and as Himself acting on grounds of what is worth while, rather than by analogy from the impersonal laws of nature or ' static logic.' " We agree with this, but when we ponder over its implications we are at once faced by the fact that the Knowledge of God is not limited, and that the conflict we feel is not a conflict for Him. On the other hand, He is supremely desirous of the triumph of right among those whose knowledge is limited and nature productive of tension. It is because God knows all that there must be a difference between human philosophy and Divine thought, but human thought can only interpret Divine thought by the Revelation of Divine Mind in the Mind of Christ, the working of history and the world and universe. The Christian philosophy must be ever progressing as God sheds light on His thought, but it can never fail to bring all things to the test of the Mind of Christ if it is to be Christian in any true sense.

The application of the viewpoint of Dr. Hodgson may be illustrated in his discussion of two problems of the day: Birth Control and Reunion. Much as we may dislike facing it, no man who knows what is being said and taught can avoid feeling the enormous difficulties of the first of these questions. Dr. Hodgson sees all that has to be said on both sides, and he draws a distinction between what he calls the Honour and the Pass Schools in life. The Christian is in the Honour School and is bound to maintain the traditional

standard (which is open to qualifications in individual cases). As he says, " That life is an honours school, in which the question to be asked is not ' What must I do to be saved ? ' but ' What must I do, being redeemed ? ' is surely the only possible answer for the Christian teacher. ' Be ye perfect,' said Christ, ' even as your Father in heaven is perfect.' " But nevertheless, the Christian priest, like the university tutor, has to deal with pass as well as honours men. A university, of its charity, provides a course of education suitable to their capacity. Can the Church allow a pass course of life, differing from the honours course set before those to whom she says, " Be ye perfect " ? He answers that this is a commonplace of Catholic theology. We regret to say that the application of this commonplace has not always been Christian even in appearance. The whole Essay deserves careful study in spite of some inherent weaknesses.

On the subject of Reunion and the Anglican attitude to it, he rejects the theory of the Ministry which asserts that the ministry is prior to the rest of the Church ; it is, as it were, the skeleton round which the body coheres, and accepts the view that the Church, as a whole is prior to the ministry ; " it is the body of Christ which concentrates its authority in certain members for the performance of certain functions as official acts of the whole." Holding this conception, he is of opinion that it is possible when there is agreement as to faith, and while deprecating general intercommunion he urges as desirable that in each Diocese an authority should be established with the power of granting dispensations for the non-confirmed to communicate or the members of a suitable joint conference to share in a corporate communion. Dr. Hodgson has not progressed as far as we wish in this discussion, but he is far removed from the rigid among his Anglo-Catholic brethren. We believe that the day is not far distant when the realism which marks his observations and reflections will lead him to accept much that he now considers to be open to question. He is a good man anxious to follow the leading of Truth. This is the main impression left on our mind from the study of a work which raises more problems than it solves.

PASTORAL THEOLOGY *À LA MODE.*

A PARSON'S DILEMMAS. By Canon T. W. Pym. *Student Christian Movement Press.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

We have been studying recent volumes of the Lectures of prominent men to students, who come to them for guidance on Pastoral Theology. There is a great change from the past. Then we find that Lecturers gave addresses on preaching, preparation, the choice of reading and the activities of the parson in his parish. Now we find that their successors are much more anxious to be up to date in the application of new knowledge to the solution of old problems, and largely drift into the discussion of questions that figure more largely as matters for debate than as fundamental principles that should be applied. Canon Pym frankly calls his Pastoral Theology

Lectures *A Parson's Dilemmas*, and in reading them we find that union of good sense and insight which we have learned to associate with his work. He is not among the profound who demand the analysing of every word to reach his sense, or among the Sciolists who provoke the thoughtful into indignation by their shallowness. He has studied psychology to advantage, he has worked among men, and has a temperament that frankly responds to real perplexities felt by very many. He has the courage to say the unpopular thing, " My fear is lest the Church some years hence appear to be vigorously preaching an adaptation adjusted by compulsion to what has then become a popular view. This would mean the Christian Faith would be at a great, and, as I hold, at a serious disadvantage." He wishes us to face thought and to face it boldly, and to remember in words that live in the memory of many of us since we read them in Paget's *Spirit of Discipline* : " The moral influence of any form of unbelief which is largely talked about, reaches far beyond the range of its intellectual appeal, it is felt more widely than it is understood and in many cases it gets at the springs of action without passing through the mind." This lies at the root of much of our non-churchgoing. And the Christian community has to face and overcome this general feeling.

In his chapter on " The Moral Outlook," he discusses the two great questions of " Birth Control " and " War." We are convinced that there is an unhealthy sex sense in the air and that the way in which it has to be sterilized is by no means easy, for excessive attention to the subject brings with it evils that are undesirable. After discussing with frankness and reticence the whole sex question, he concludes : " Whether or not my own choice is right matters less than that you should face the problem and make some choice, whether it be mine or another. For to muddle along any longer, undecided or unnoticing, we simply cannot afford." On War he condemns the Church for not doing its part in the creation of a right public conscience on the subject, but we think that he is in danger of believing that the slow growth of the League of Nations Union among Christians is a proof of their lack of ideals on the matter. There are other reasons why the League has not grown and most of our clergy strive to inculcate the spirit of Peace. The Address on Preaching proves that Canon Pym has realized how far the average man has drifted from Christian conceptions. He appeals for reality in sermons and their direct applicability to the needs of congregations. The whole book is stimulating, and even when it provokes disagreement it cannot be said to be one-sided.

THE DAY BEFORE YESTERDAY.

THE DAY BEFORE YESTERDAY. By James Moffatt. *Williams & Norgate.* 5*s*.

The present is rooted in the past and those who are to-day cast down by the onward march of secularism may well take courage by seeing what their fathers had to face and how great is the triumph that has been won over the forces that confronted them. No man

is better fitted to survey the past when the names of Huxley and Tyndall, Matthew Arnold and Meredith were in the ascendant, and the pessimism of Thomas Hardy was disturbing the minds of those who believed that genius and insight were on the side of those who attacked the faith. Then it was taken for granted that the swan song of the spirit was being sung, and that materialism had been proclaimed the victor in the struggle. Darwin, as interpreted by the materialists, had won the day, and the ill-advised opponents who preferred rhetoric to argument had been routed. It cannot be forgotten that in the ranks of scientists, Darwin had to face just as strong opposition as from the religious Army which appealed from one set of scientists to another. The story of these conflicts is told with that lucidity for which Dr. Moffatt is noted and with a skill that leaves a definite impression on the mind.

When Dr. Moffatt compares the literature of to-day with that of the day before yesterday he pronounces in favour of the Victorian novel. Some of us remember the shock caused by the publication of books that would now be considered mildness itself. They were the exception. To-day " the contemporary passion for realism, in sensational forms, has not indeed swept the higher interests out of our literature ; no one acquainted with modern developments in poetry or in the drama will deny that. Nevertheless, so far as fiction and even poetry are concerned, these nobler interests were on the whole more fully and widely recognized then." Dr. Moffatt truly says : " A living religion will always profit by criticism, even though it be hostile and hasty, even though, as often happens, its true protest is put unfairly. Christianity ought never to turn a deaf ear to any serious criticism from outsiders, any more than it should in panic imagine that such outsiders have succeeded in taking away its Lord." This is well said, and in reading the five essays on " A Third Religion," " The Loss of God," " Nature for God," " Instinctive Faith " and " Some Fables of the Faith " we must ever bear in mind that what we look upon to-day as ghosts that haunted our fathers, and wish that we had only them to overcome, were in reality to them dangerous men in armour.

Of the papers, that on Matthew Arnold is in many ways the most suggestive. Those who have not read Arnold have no idea of the influence he exercised among his contemporaries or the impression he has made on the current coin phrases of present-day religious writing. " Arnold in his own fashion urged that self-denial had a vital glow in it, for the follower of Jesus : it delivers him from ennui and depression and worry." There was in Arnold a note of sincere attachment to the Person and teaching of our Lord which we sadly miss in the outside religious teachers of the day. A Greek paganism has displaced Christian humanism, and in spite of much of what was corrosive of traditional theology the humanism of Arnold was largely Christian. But we must stop with the expression of the hope that those who are dispirited will read Moffatt as a cordial to their fears. They will learn much to cheer them as well as to enable them to see the recent past in right perspective.

The Rev. J. W. W. Moeran, M.A., has issued through S.P.C.K. a small collection of incidents and illustrations for the use of preachers: *Preaching by Parable* (S.P.C.K., 2*s*. 6*d*. net). As the author of a previous book of similar character, *Teaching by Illustration*, Mr. Moeran has experience of the kind of story which makes an effective illustration and can be used in enforcing a lesson. The present collection is well made. The incidents are mostly modern. They are told with simplicity and force, and they supply material for sermons on such topics as Divine Power and Love, Redemption and Renewal, The Church and the World, Faith and Worship, Churches and Service, Death and Hereafter.

Four volumes of "The Study Bible" have recently been issued and form a useful addition to the series. The special characteristic of this "little library of exposition" is a short study, by a well-known authority, of the book and its author, and a number of quotations from commentators, ancient and modern, on the salient passages. The Major Prophets have been dealt with in this way by the Bishop of Durham, Dr. Wheeler Robinson and Dr. W. F. Lofthouse. The Minor Prophets by the Bishop of Plymouth and Dr. G. H. Box. The Epistles to the Corinthians by the Bishop of Middleton and Dr. A. C. Underwood, and the Epistles to the Ephesians and Philemon by Dr. Orchard and Dr. M. P. Williams. Each volume is well printed in handy form (Cassell & Co. Ltd., 3*s*. 6*d*. net each).

Archæological research has thrown a new light on many points in the interpretation of the Old Testament in recent years. The excavations in Eastern lands are having an extensive influence on the views held in regard to the historical value of its records. The Rev. J. Garrow Duncan, B.D., has taken a large part in these explorations as Director of Excavations in Babylonia, Egypt and Palestine, and as Croall Lecturer in Edinburgh he has given some of the results of his work. In his recent book, *The Accuracy of the Old Testament* (S.P.C.K., 6*s*.), he has dealt with "the historical narratives in the light of recent Palestinian Archæology." The object of his book is to show that the Old Testament characters were really playing a part in the actual history and development of the civilization of the country and were not "merely legendary heroes enshrouded in mist." "He shows that excavation is proving more and more fully every year that it is no longer possible to deny that the setting in which the Old Testament narratives place them is true to the period referred to; that in fact there is actual history at the back of all or most of these narratives." He takes his readers through a long series of events, and in a really fascinating way shows the conclusions at which he has arrived from the evidence produced by the excavations in various places. Babylonia reveals the story of the Flood and the Tower of Babel. The peoples of Palestine at various ages have left their records in the ground. The conquest of Palestine is shown in the evidence obtained in Jericho. Jerusalem reveals

many interesting facts which are clearly set out, and the influence of the Canaanite Religion on the Hebrews is shown. A comprehensive selection of illustrations adds to the value of a book which no student of the results of Archæological research should neglect.

" The People's Pulpit," published by Arthur H. Stockwell, Ltd. (2*s.* 6*d.* each volume), is a series of volumes of sermons by Churchmen. The latest are *Members of the Kingdom*, by the Rev. J. W. Augur, M.A., formerly Vicar of Great Horton, Bradford. *Thorough*, by the Rev. H. Bowden-Smith, H.C.F., preached in St. Peter's, Dorchester. *Human Relationships*, by the Rev. Godwin Birchenough, M.A., Rector of Wanstead. *The Centre of the Road*, by the Rev. W. Cocks, A.K.C., Vicar of St. John's, Felixstowe. *Nazareth Politics*, by the Rev. P. T. R. Kirk, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Westminster. *Within the Veil*, by the Rev. Oswald Harvey, M.A.

A BEMBRIDGE FABLE. By J. Howard Whitehouse. *Cambridge: University Press.* 2*s.* net.

The Fable was related to the boys of Bembridge School on the last Sunday of the summer term of 1928, and the illustrations are by John F. Flugel, then the head boy of the school. The school buildings speak and discuss the happy memories they have collected. Those who heard it will be glad to have this pleasant little fable in a permanent form, and very likely other schoolboys, too, will enjoy reading it.

SPIRIT IN EVOLUTION. By Herbert F. Standing, D.Sc. *London: Geo. Allen & Unwin, Ltd.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

It is not easy—bearing in mind the objects of this journal—to review this book with justice both to the author and to the reader. It is clearly written, well illustrated, and assembles within a compact area a large number of conclusions drawn from several fields of knowledge. For the biologist and psychologist, and for those who like that kind of reading no doubt the book was worth writing, although, probably, it does not contain enough either of biology or psychology for the student of these sciences. For the theologian the short paragraphs at the end of each chapter, which attempt to trace the spiritual implications of the preceding biological or psychological discoveries, and to find an issue in spiritual verities, are too brief to be of much value. Their brevity is rather tantalizing. The author is clearly a man possessing lofty moral and spiritual ideals, but with little knowledge of religion and theology, save that gathered in general reading. His spiritual conclusions have not been sufficiently thought out. We therefore hesitate to recommend the book to readers of THE CHURCHMAN who are looking for well-developed spiritual teaching.

On the other hand, coming from a professional scientist, we welcome the book as a remarkable illustration of the change which has come over scientific thought, in its relation to religion. Pro-

fessor Eddington is no voice crying in the wilderness. Dr. Standing throws over the mechanistic view of the universe, and finds teleology in the life-processes. " Spirit is no mere emergence, but belongs to a still higher order of Reality " (p. 24), and, quoting Professor Lloyd Morgan, he says that it is open to us " to acknowledge God as the fundamental Directive Activity " (p. 90, cf. p. 306). " That Ultimate Divine Reality . . . may, and does, come into most vital contact with our spirits as an Unspeaking Word " (p. 200). Except for a statement which we have omitted, this is the voice of Karl Barth, the most modern of the prophets of Protestantism. " The developing personality is conscious of a relationship with the Supreme Reality which can only be described as personal " (p. 71). " May it not be true that the real line of future progress . . . lies not in the predominant development of intellect, but in the cultivation of his spiritual faculties ? " (p. 283). Dr. Standing does not appear to have heard of Karl Barth, but his book sounds that call to the spiritual as distinct from the intellectual, which is the clarion note in the writings of the Swiss Professor. The book contains a useful discussion of the fact of pain in nature.

Roman Catholic Scheme for Tampering with School History Readers, issued by the Historical Readers Committee (*4d.*), gives an account of the insidious methods adopted by the Westminster Roman Catholic Federation to induce the publishers of Historical Readers used in elementary and secondary schools under the London County Council to alter plain statements of historical fact displeasing to Romanists and to allow them to be changed so as to serve the purposes of Roman propaganda. Dr. Coulton, the greatest authority of the day on medieval history, took the matter up and wrote to Cardinal Bourne, the President of the Federation. The only reply was a communication from the Secretary of the Federation to say, " we are under no obligation to discuss our proceedings with you." We do not anticipate for a moment that they will have any such desire. Dr. Coulton has shown himself an upholder of accurate historical statement, and Roman propagandists are not anxious to encounter him after the experiences they have already had of his devastating learning. The methods of the Romanists with the publishers is exposed in this pamphlet and our readers should make themselves acquainted with them in order that they may understand what is going on in our midst.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

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

The Church Congress.—As in previous years, the League has arranged for a large stall at the Church Congress Exhibition, to be held this year in The Market, Ruperra Street, Newport, Mon., during Church Congress Week, from Saturday, October 4 to Friday, October, 10, when publications of the League and books recommended by the Committee will be on sale. Clergy and other members are specially invited to visit the stall (in Block C, Avenue 3) to inspect and purchase the literature on view.

Sunday School Lessons.—A new series of Sunday School Lessons for children from 4 to 8 years of age, entitled *Bible Tales for Little Folks*, by Mrs. J. M. Macdougall Ferguson, has just been issued by the Church Book Room, in conjunction with *Home Words*, price 1*s.* 6*d.* net (postage 3*d.*). The lessons, which are simply and brightly written, are drawn up to enable teachers to train up the child in the way he should go, the literal, and very illuminating, translation of which, as the authoress states, is " Train up a child *according to his own way* ! " and she endeavours to indicate how best to meet his need at each stage of his spiritual development and how to help in his Christian Education, which is the sole aim of the Sunday School. Pictures in connection with the lessons can be ordered as required, and should be used every week to sum up the lesson. They are supplied at 8*d.* each, postage and packing extra, viz. single copies 3*d.*, up to 12 copies 6*d.*, above this number 9*d.* Also an illustrated album has been prepared containing 52 original drawings illustrating the lessons, which the child can either copy or colour. The album also contains a register of attendance and children's prayers. It is supplied at 4*d.* per copy, postage 1*d.*

Copies of Lesson Books for children of the same age which have been published during the last two years, viz. *Stories for the Little People in Sunday School and Home* and *More Stories for the Little People in Sunday School and Home*, have been republished and can be obtained at 1*s.* 6*d.* net. An expression album (4*d.*) is issued in connection with *Stories for the Little People in Sunday School and Home*, and in connection with *More Stories for the Little People in Sunday School and Home* a set of 52 small coloured pictures has been prepared illustrating the Lessons. The cost, with slip-in Album, is 1*s.* 3*d.* per scholar for the whole year.

In response to many requests two of the Rev. G. R. Balleine's Lesson Books have been republished, viz. *Lessons from the Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, 2*s.* net, and *The Children of the Church*, a year's lessons on the Catechism, 2*s.* net. Stamps are available for the former book, price 4*s.* per book, sufficient for 10 children for a year ; albums, 1*d.* each. Both these Lesson Books contain a number of excellent illustrations and anecdotes.

The other Lesson Books by the Rev. G. R. Balleine obtainable from the Church Book Room are as follow : *Boys and Girls of the Bible ; The Acts of the Apostles ; The Young Churchman ; Christianity as St. Peter saw it*, and *Heroes and Holy Days*, all at 2*s.* net each. Stamps are available for the last two books.

The series, which was published in quarterly parts in 1927, entitled *Sunday School Lessons on the Collects, illustrated from the Epistles and Gospels*, by

the Rev. Dr. Flecker and the Rev. Ll. E. Roberts, for Seniors and Intermediates, is still obtainable at 1*s.* 6*d.* the set.

In addition to the above the Church Book Room has also published a manual for adolescents entitled *The Complete Christian*, by the Rev. Cuthbert Cooper, at 2*s.* net. This book contains full Lesson Notes for a year's Bible Class of adolescents ; and the course touches the salient points of the Christian religion as taught by the formularies of the Church. The Bible, the Life of Christ, the Creeds and the Christian Life form the skeleton.

Private Prayers for a Boy.—In response to many requests the Church Book Room has just published a valuable little book of prayers for a boy, entitled *Father and Son*. This has been compiled by the Rev. R. R. Williams, of Leyton Parish Church, and contains prayers for a week. It opens with a concise instruction on the Christian Religion, God, Jesus Christ, The Church, and Prayer. The Lord's Prayer is then given with special annotations, and the daily prayers, morning and evening, follow. The little book is published in duxeen covers at 3*d.* per copy, or 18*s.* per 100, and in stiff boards at 9*d.* net. Several letters of appreciation have already been received from Head Masters of Public Schools.

Confirmation Register.—Owing to several communications on this matter the Church Book Room has published a Confirmation Register, as so many of those in existence do not contain sufficient room for the necessary particulars. This, we hope, has been rectified by the new Register which is now on sale. The size is 8 inches by 12 inches, and the price 5*s.* for 500 names and 7*s.* 6*d.* for 1,000 names. (Postage 6*d.*)

Parochial Church Councils.—The following forms and books have been issued by the Church Book Room : *The Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure*, with complete Text, Introduction, and Notes, by Albert Mitchell, 1*s.* ; *The Enabling Act*, with complete Text and the Constitution of the National Assembly of the Church of England, with Notes, Introduction, and "Ladder of Lay Representation," and other Appendices, including Diocesan Conferences Regulation, 1922, Representation of the Laity Measure, 1929, etc., by Albert Mitchell, 1*s.* ; *Parochial Church Councils*, a leaflet for distribution amongst P.C.C. members, by Albert Mitchell, 3*s.* per 100 ; *Parochial Electors' Roll Book*, containing 100 sheets and with alphabetical index cut through, 3*s.* 6*d.* ; *Application for Enrolment on Church Electoral Roll*, 1*s.* per 100 ; also printed on card for Card Index System, 1*s.* 6*d.* per 100 ; *Notice of Enrolment of a Non-Resident*, 10*d.* per 100 ; *Notice to Cancel Entry in another Parish*, 10*d.* per 100 ; *Notice of Removal to another Parish*, 10*d.* per 100 ; *Notice of Revision of Church Electoral Roll*, 1*d.* each, 9*d.* per dozen ; *Notice of Annual Parochial Church Meeting*, 1*d.* each, 9*d.* per dozen ; *Notice of Joint Meeting for electing Churchwardens*, 1*d.* each, 9*d.* per dozen ; *Notice of Parochial Church Council Meeting* (for Church Door), 3*d.* per dozen ; *Notice of Parochial Council Meeting with Agenda*, 1*s.* 6*d.* per 100 ; *Form of Parochial Voting Papers*, with space for 20 names, 2*s.* 6*d.* per 100 ; 40 names 2*s.* 6*d.* per 100 ; *Electoral Roll Sheets*, 2*s.* per 100 ; *Nomination Forms to Diocesan Conference*, 6*d.* per dozen ; *Nomination Forms to House of Laity*, 6*d.* per dozen ; *Nomination Forms to Parochial Church Council*, 1*s.* per 100. Sample packets of the above leaflets and forms can be supplied on application, price 3*d.* post free.

Catalogue.—A General Catalogue of the Publications of the Church Book Room and Theological Books recommended and on sale in the Book Room has just been issued, and will be sent on application.