

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1932.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The late Lord Brentford.

THE July issue of THE CHURCHMAN had gone to press when the news of the death of Lord Brentford, which took place on June 8 last, was received. It is only now, therefore, that we can express our profound sympathy with Lady Brentford and her family in their bereavement, and our sense of the great loss which the public life of the country has sustained by the removal from it of his strong, energetic and vivid personality. Consistency and courage were the two outstanding marks of his character which *The Times* newspaper dwelt upon in a sympathetic leading article the day following his death; and we may add that he was always in the forefront in the battle for truth and righteousness. He never spared himself nor refused a request if he could possibly accede to it; and it is to his untiring devotion to work and his readiness to help others that we may attribute the breakdown which led to his death at an age when he might still have looked forward to many years of usefulness. He will be long remembered and sorely missed by those who knew him, for there are few who have in so large a measure the gifts of sympathy, friendship and an inspiring courage.

The Bishop of Worcester and Fasting Communion.

The Bishop of Worcester has returned to the subject of Fasting Communion, the erroneous teaching on which he exposed some months ago in his diocesan magazine. A number of extremists in the diocese challenged his statements and endeavoured to show that the practice is not only Catholic, but is to be found in the teaching of Our Lord and His disciples. In his second article the Bishop reviews the position, shows that even the Rubric of the 1928 Prayer Book did not do more than commend it. He quotes Keble and Pusey to much the same effect, has no difficulty in disposing of the casuistical arguments which affect to claim the support of Our Lord, and refers objectors to Dr. Percy Dearmer's book, *The Truth about Fasting*, for the correct teaching on the subject.

He shows that this notion of the necessity for Fasting Communion is allied to the claim for perpetual Reservation, and that in practice it prevents large numbers of Church people from being able to communicate at all. Incidentally, it makes it impossible to arrange for celebrations of Holy Communion at meetings of the clergy where some have to travel various distances to attend. His arguments seem irresistible to the unbiassed reader, but your thorough-paced Anglo-Catholic is impervious to reasoning on his favourite dogmas.

Evangelicals and the Oxford Movement Centenary.

The forthcoming celebration of the centenary of the Tractarian Movement is being made official, and many Evangelicals are likely to be placed in an awkward position by the action of some of the bishops. Officially, the reasons for this celebration are unobjectionable, and they could not be more inoffensively stated than in a recent letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury published in his diocesan magazine. Such claims as that the Tractarians restored the sense of the corporate life of the Church and its claim to be recognised as Catholic may be argued without undue heat. The claim that they restored the teaching and practice of the Catholic Faith goes further, and of it the immortal saying of Captain Bunsby is emphatically true: "The bearings of this observation lays in the application on it." Stripped of all disguise, the fact is that the celebration will be used to demonstrate the Sacrifice of the Mass, with the attendant practices of the Adoration of the Consecrated Elements, Prayers to the Virgin Mary and other saints, and the like, and to impress the public with the belief that these represent the true standard of English Church teaching. Of course these practices were unknown to the early Tractarians, whose ritual was comparatively simple, but it will be argued that they grew out of Tractarian teaching. It is to be hoped that Evangelicals will be able to resist official pressure to take part in the celebration. The attempt to drag in a reference to the Evangelical Revival is of course merely an after-thought intended to draw in Evangelicals: but in what sense is the date of 1832 connected with the Evangelical Revival?

The Indian Mission of Fellowship.

At the Jerusalem meeting of the International Missionary Council, in 1928, the time was foreshadowed when the younger churches, that is, the churches of the foreign mission field, would be sending their missions to the older or sending churches. This prediction has been fulfilled. Bishop Bannerji, Assistant Bishop of Lahore, arrived in England this month with three other Indians, on a "Mission of Fellowship" to Great Britain. Of the others, the Rev. A. Ralla Ram is a Presbyterian, Principal Varki is a member of the ancient Syrian Christian Church, and Daw Nyein Tha, a Burmese Christian lady, is a Baptist. Her inclusion in the party is an evidence of the revolution which is taking place in the position of women in the East. The party are to hold meetings in a number

of different places, and in more than one are to receive a mayoral welcome from the civic authorities. Their coming should be beneficial in a variety of ways. Their cordial reception should do something to counteract in India the anti-British propaganda of the Congressists. Their united action should help to foster inter-denominational co-operation here in Britain. Their message should reveal to us something of what Christ means to the Indian mind and thus may give us a new vision of Him. The party have not come to appeal for missions in any way, but the evidence which their presence and their words afford of the blessings of missions to the heathen should rouse up more interest in the Missionary cause. Ardent as are these Indian Christians, it will be remembered that hardly more than one in a hundred of the inhabitants of India is even a nominal Christian of any denomination.

The Approach to the Church of Scotland.

The first outcome of the Archbishop of Canterbury's visit to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland last May has been the appointment of a Committee consisting of the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of Wakefield, Chichester and Southwark, the Dean of Winchester, the Archdeacons of Coventry, Auckland and Northumberland, Canon Quick, the Primus of Scotland, and the Dean of Edinburgh. In this list Evangelical Churchmanship is very inadequately represented, and we cannot but fear that the Protestant aspect of our Church will not receive due emphasis in the negotiations. On the other hand, if a body in which the higher church schools of thought are so strongly represented is able to come to an agreement with the Scottish Church, there will be no ground for complaint on the part of Anglo-Catholics. We must trust that the Evangelical position will be put before the Presbyterian members of the Committee in some unofficial way.

The Marazion Case.

In a different way, the case of St. Hilary, Marazion, has created almost as great a stir as that of the now notorious Rector of Stiffkey. St. Hilary has been for years the home of extreme Anglo-Catholic services. Besides the more common Stations of the Cross, it had statues of the Virgin Mary and other saints, with candles to burn before them, an ancient font turned into a holy water stoup, and other similar objects. The services corresponded with the images; that is to say, they included such things as the celebration of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary. Certain parishioners, taking the most tangible line of objection, petitioned in the diocesan Consistory Court for the removal of these ornaments. The Chancellor, Sir P. Baker-Wilbraham, pronounced certain of them to be illegal and ordered them to be removed. The Vicar, who had declined to appear in the suit, refusing to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Court, took no notice of the decision. The petitioners, having in vain appealed to the Bishop, who merely replied angrily, obtained from the Chancellor his order to remove the offending articles.

This, after having given notice to the Vicar, they proceeded to do, with the help of Mr. Kensit of the Protestant Truth Society, who had been asked to advise them after the judgment had been given. They appear to have acted as carefully as they were able. Nevertheless, their action was described as a raid, and an outrage, and there was a great outcry in the High Church papers and in the correspondence columns of *The Times*. It subsequently transpired that the Vicar of St. Hilary had substituted cheap copies for the images condemned by the Court and it was these which the petitioners removed. He replaced the original images later. The outcry subsided when it was discovered that the removal of the articles had been effected by the order of the Court.

The Authority of Ecclesiastical Courts.

The controversy afterwards centred round the authority of the Court and indeed of ecclesiastical courts in general. The Vicar of St. Hilary and his Anglo-Catholic sympathisers took the line that the Consistory Court was a civil court, since the final appeal from the ecclesiastical courts was to one of the courts of the realm, and that it was therefore against Catholic principles to obey them. The Bishop of Chichester usefully recalled the past history of this contention, which dates back to the Gorham Judgment of 1850, and showed that while proposals had been made for reforming the procedure they had never been carried out. The opposing party—not by any means all of them Protestants—argued that however the law might be altered, the casuistical Anglo-Catholics would find arguments for refusing to obey it if it did not happen to fall in with their views. The Bishop of Durham intervened in the discussion by advocating Disestablishment, not realising that whether established or not, any Church which possesses property protected by trust deeds would have in the last resort to apply to the secular courts if they wished to eject those whom they considered to be no longer in accordance with the constitution of the Church. It might be added that such ejections or similar action could always be used to create sympathy with the defendant as if he were an ill-used and persecuted man.

THE CHRISTIAN DISCIPLINE OF THE UNDERSTANDING.

BY THE VEN. W. L. PAIGE COX, M.A., B.D., Archdeacon of Chester.

JOHN LOCKE, towards the close of his life, wrote a little treatise on *The Conduct of the Understanding*. It was intended as a practical supplement to the famous *Essay*, which had already gone through four editions. *The Essay on the Human Understanding* has long been a text-book in our Universities, though now it has to be read with a careful regard to its historical setting in the development of philosophic thought. The later tractate was unrevised and incomplete at Locke's death. It has the form of a first sketch, but in substance it is not only readable, but more than up to date, as little has been written since, and nothing so searchingly and of quite such practical value, on a most important branch of conduct, dealing as it does with the moral causes of fallacious reasoning—prejudice, mental indolence, over-regard for authority, self-sufficiency, and the various other conditions of mind which bar the way to the perception and veneration of truth.

Hallam, in his *Introduction to the Literature of Europe*, says: "I cannot think any parent or instructor justified in neglecting to put this little treatise in the hands of a boy about the time when the reasoning faculties become developed." Whatever parents might do with their children, and in these days we cannot but think rather smilingly of such a wish as Hallam's, one would like our students in any branch of knowledge, "sacred or profane," in looking forward to their lives' work, to make a careful study of Locke's treatise as part of their preparation.¹ Certainly no class of students should benefit more from such a study than those who intend to offer themselves for Ordination. The subject is one which those who have to train and examine such students might place foremost in their syllabuses. There is all the more reason for laying stress on such a subject now as it has been so noticeably overlooked in the past.

Lecky has brought the serious charge against organised Christianity that it habitually disregards the virtues of the intellect. Whatever truth there may be in that allegation as regards later Christian influence in different parts of the Church, it certainly does not hold good of the essential genius of the Gospel of Christ, nor indeed of the first Christian teaching.² Christ Himself emphatically

¹ A handy little edition, with introduction and notes by Thomas Fowler, D.D., is in the publication list of the Clarendon Press.

² "On the sanctification of the intellect the ancient Church, and especially the ancient Eastern Church, laid great emphasis; but its teaching on this point is saved from the dangers which beset mere intellectualism by the constant recognition of the Holy Spirit as the source of all true illumination."—H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, p. 403.

taught men to love God with the mind as well as with the heart and the soul, and He repeatedly called upon His disciples to take "heed to what they heard"—to exercise their understandings about the things that He told them. His method of instruction was to implant seed-thoughts in men's minds for them to ponder over at their leisure and to turn to a good account by a devout meditation. "He that was sown upon the good ground, this is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it; who verily beareth fruit" (St. Matt. xiii. 23). The New Testament writers generally, as we shall see, presented Christianity to the world in the same reasonable light, as demanding the consecration of the full powers of the mind to the purposes of religious belief and conduct.

It may be remarked here, by the way, that in this regard Christianity confirms and re-emphasises the doctrine of the moralists of Greece and Rome. It is from them that we have derived the term "cardinal virtues" as signifying those pre-eminent excellences of character on which all others hinge. Among the cardinal virtues the first place is always given to wisdom as "the lampbearer showing the way to the rest," its principal business being "to descry the goal to which they should all strive and the point to which the whole course of life should tend." In the ethical teaching of both Plato and Aristotle the highest good is specially associated with knowledge, and is indeed made to consist in the contemplation of Divine things with all the best powers of the intellect. It is a doctrine which is not very far short of our Lord's declaration, "This is eternal life, that they may know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ Whom Thou hast sent" (St. John xvii. 3).

In the mystery religions of Greece, which had so great a vogue at the beginning of the Christian era, the word "perfect" (*τέλειος*) came to be applied to the person who had attained to the full knowledge of the esoteric doctrine of the "Mysteries," and the New Testament so far adopted the word in a similar sense as to use it of those who had reached a ripe maturity of moral and spiritual understanding. Some such meaning is intended in the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews in which we are exhorted to be "borne on to perfection," as is shown in the verses immediately preceding. "Every one that partaketh of milk is unskilled in the doctrine of righteousness, for he is a babe. But strong meat is for those who are full-grown (*τελειών*), who through habit have their powers of perception trained to distinguish between good and evil" (Heb. v. 13, 14). St. Paul's teaching in the Epistle to the Romans is exactly in accordance with this: "Be not fashioned according to this age: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God" (Rom. xii. 2). So to the Corinthians he writes, "Be not children in understanding, howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be full-grown men" (I Cor. xiv. 20), using the same word, *τέλειος*, that occurs in the similar passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews. When again from his prison in Rome he poured out his soul in prayer on behalf of his beloved Philippians,

his first and chief petition for them was that "their love might abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all discernment, so that they might approve the things that are excellent," or, as it is in the margin of the Revised Version, that "they might prove the things that differ" (Phil. i. 9, 10). At the beginning also of his Epistle to the Colossians, "who had not seen his face in the flesh," he told them that, from the day that he first heard of their love in the Spirit, he did not cease to offer prayers on their behalf, specially entreating that "they might be filled with the knowledge of God's Will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding" (Col. i. 9).

It has been remarked of St. Paul himself that "in him there was the fruitful union of two spiritual activities, two orders of faculties which are rarely united to the same degree in the same personality—dialectical ability and religious inspiration, the rational element and the mystical element, the activity of the mind (*νοῦς*) and that of the spirit (*πνεῦμα*).¹ The Church owes an incalculable debt to St. Paul for the stand he made against the imposition of the Mosaic customs on Gentile converts, for his unparalleled insight into the mind of Christ on all such matters, and for the wealth of argument and exposition in his letters to the Churches; and this is the result of his own full consecration to God of his powers of mind as of spirit.

When Christ promised the illuminating influence of His Spirit to His disciples He spoke of it as that of a Guide. "He shall guide (*ὁδηγήσει*) you into all the truth" (St. John xvi. 13). The word indicates the particular manner in which the disciple is to use his own powers if he is to go forward to perfection. He must pick his steps warily and keep a good look-out. What the Spirit will do for him, according to this metaphor, is to show him the way, to help him with counsel, to check him when he is inclined to err, and to cheer him and give him confidence when he is walking in the right direction.

"He shall guide you into *all* the truth." It is a promise of the widest range, opening out vistas of ever-extending knowledge of God's universe, visible and invisible, as the disciple lends himself to the Spirit's guidance in diversified study and research. But our primary concern is with "the perfect will of God," as revealed in the Life and Teaching of Christ; so the promised illumination of the Spirit is specially to be sought with a view to an ever-increasing knowledge of Christ. "He shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you" (St. John xvi. 14). There were various things in our Lord's teaching which His first disciples could not fully understand at the outset; but they had their recollections of Christ always with them, and it was as they meditated on these that the light from above came, revealing what had been but dimly, if at all, perceived before.

We have the recollections of the Apostles recorded for us in the New Testament; and the promise of the guidance of the Spirit, in the sense of help for those who are exerting their own powers,

¹ A. Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 76.

implies that we must "search the Scriptures," for "they are they which testify of Christ" (St. John v. 39). No religious exercises of any other kind, no study of the most choice and helpful books of devotion can take the place of this regular and thoughtful study of the Bible, carried on with the best assistance, from information of a textual and historical kind, that is available to us for such study.

The Bible is, of course, to be put in the highest place among sources of knowledge concerning the "perfect will of God." Yet it has to be borne in mind that the Will of God is revealed elsewhere, and that there are supplementary sources of knowledge which cannot be neglected without loss by those who are aiming at the perfection of the whole of their higher nature.

"I have a real conviction," [said Archbishop Temple, formerly of Canterbury, in a charge to his clergy] "that all this study of science, rightly pursued, comes from the providence of God; that it is in accordance with His will that we should study His works, and that as He has given us a spiritual revelation of His Word, so also He has given us a natural revelation in His creation: I am convinced that there is nothing to lose, but everything to gain, by a true and careful study of God's works, that the more light we can get, the more cultivation of our understanding, and the more thorough discipline of our intellect by the study of all this which God has scattered in such wonderful profusion around us, so much the better shall we be able not only to serve Him in our vocation, but to understand the meaning of His spiritual revelations."¹

What is true of science generally is true of all learning and culture—of history, philosophy, poetry, art, and music. The various powers of the mind and soul are strengthened and matured by such knowledge and cultivation; and by the exercise of our talents thus we are qualifying ourselves for a full and diversified service, and for pleasures which are not only recreative in the highest degree but have the promise of continuance in the life of the world to come.

For some vocations and functions a wide and accurate scholarship is all-essential. We are not, indeed, all called to be teachers or professed theologians; but we are not qualified to dogmatise on technical points of theology, still less are we entitled to criticise adversely opinions we may suspect or dislike which are dependent on exact scholarship, if we have not travelled over the same ground of research as those who hold those opinions. All the errors and heresies and doctrinal disputes and divisions of Christendom have arisen, more or less, from reliance on knowledge which is inaccurate and incomplete, and too often from the fault in religious circles which the Roman historian remarked as characteristic of the multitude generally, that of insufficient reverence for truth.²

One of the best preservatives against such a fault, which, in the past, has caused such grievous injury to the Church and its influence, as well as to individual souls, is the habit among Christian people, to be acquired from general study, especially from the

¹ Quoted by J. C. Shairp, *Culture and Religion*, pp. 113-14.

² *Vulgi indiligentia veri.*—Tacitus.

study of science, of surveying carefully all the facts which should be taken into account before any conclusion is arrived at, and of being ever ready to revise a judgment previously formed when new facts come to light.

He who submits himself most constantly and prayerfully to the guiding influence of the Spirit of Truth will best avoid the faults of which we have been thinking, and will make the most gainful use of such knowledge as he is able to acquire on any subject ; while, apart from the Spirit's guidance, one who has acquired a good general culture may lose his way sadly, and, indeed, fail altogether to apprehend the deepest things of God. On the other hand, there are many who have had but the slightest educational advantages, who have scarcely heard even the names of the greatest poets, philosophers, and scientists, and yet have been led, as by some secret way, up to the serenest and most beautiful heights of character. "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall in no wise see the Kingdom of God." "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Not as men of science nor as critics, nor philosophers, shall we acquire the true wisdom. "Many a poor unlettered Christian far outstrips your School rabbis in this attainment," said Archbishop Leighton (himself one of the foremost scholars of his day), "because it is not effectually taught in these lower academies."

Wise and weighty words are these, but it is to be noted carefully that they do not give sanction to any presumptuous abuse, in relation to spiritual things, of a deficiency of mental attainment or of a neglect of opportunities of acquiring exact knowledge. Certainly those who have the means of a proper mental approach to truth can hardly expect the guidance of the Spirit of God if they neglect the use of such means. In other words, Divine enlightenment is not to be the reward of human indolence.

After all, it is not defects of knowledge so much as defects of character which warp the judgment. Such defects of character may indeed in course of time quite impair the power of judging rightly on almost any subject ; and a naturally gifted man may, though without being conscious of it, be suffering permanently in his moral nature the consequences of his want of intellectual conscientiousness ; just as the physical constitution of one who has been habitually inebriate may be irretrievably weakened by such indulgence. To set over against all this, when the soul has been wholly given to God, and prayer has been offered continually for guidance from above, there is a wonderful clearance of prejudice and sharpening of perception, so as to "approve the things that are excellent," and to discern between truth and falsehood and between right and wrong.

In a time of upheaval and of division of opinion like the present it is the difficulties arising from psychological causes that are of chief moment. Old practices are revived without a proper appreciation of the reasons for which they were rejected in the past ; new doctrines are brought to the front without sufficient sureness

as to their proof. Intellectual judgment is warped by ill-regulated emotion ; and discussion, which should lead to a wholesome interchange of opinion, is too often embittered by personal prejudice and by fear of having one's own opinions disturbed. It is not uncommon, for example, in some quarters for attempts to be made in book-reviewing to hinder the demand for a book by satirising the author or by misrepresenting or even mis-stating what he has said. This is something quite apart from just criticism, whose aim is to show things as they really are.

Obviously there can be no steady progress towards a better understanding between different sections of Christians till this sort of thing is made to die down through the action of a public opinion which will condemn it as strongly as the unfair playing of a game. And there is no prayer that needs to be more earnestly or widely offered than that in our daily service, that "all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth," and so "may hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life."

Within the limits of such a sketch as this it would be impossible to discuss at all adequately the importance of the Christian discipline of the understanding in relation to everyday life and conduct. It would take us, too, a little off the line of thought we have been pursuing, which has had regard mainly to the formation of our opinions. Yet it is difficult to refrain from just indicating by an illustration or two how necessary this discipline is in order that we may think and act rightly in reference to ourselves, our neighbours, and our circumstances.

St. Paul, after his admonition to the Romans about "proving what is the good and acceptable and perfect Will of God," gives immediately this practical turn to the admonition,—“I say, through the grace that was given me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think ; but so to think as to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to each man a measure of faith” (Rom. xii. 3). A man, so the Apostle teaches us, is really to be measured by his faith, that "gift of God" (Eph. ii. 8) by which he throws himself upon God and becomes receptive of the various powers and graces of His Spirit. In this light it is seen that whatever good a man thinks or does is from God, and the merit of it is God's, while his mistakes and evil-doings are his own. Yet, in blaming himself for his faults and in trying to correct them, the man will not be unreasonably condemnatory of himself. He will recognise the strength of the tendencies and impulses which have made him what he is in his natural state and the persistence in him of these tendencies and impulses. He will be moved to reflect too that in his spiritual life, as in his bodily life, he is subject to the law of growth, so that progress in spiritual things can be but gradual.

Further, under the enlightening discipline of the Spirit, a man is instructed to take note of the laws of his own particular nature—physical, mental, and emotional. He is guided to deal wisely with

himself by giving due attention to his health, by making a careful estimate of his capabilities of strain and effort, and by reserving his most exacting tasks, when he is at liberty to do so, for the seasons when he is at his best and can therefore perform them most satisfactorily.

Yet again the "right judgment" which is the gift of the Spirit will prompt the Christian man to seek retirement when he is in need of rest from spiritual as well as bodily strain; it will place him on his guard when he encounters those temptations to which he knows himself to be especially liable; and it will cause him to set down to "his own infirmity" (Ps. lxxvii. 10) those despondent thoughts and even doubts of God's loving-kindness with which he finds he is not so troubled in his normal and more healthy moods.

It is to be observed, further, that the "right judgment" is indispensable if we are to think and act wisely, lovingly, and justly towards others. It has been said, perhaps rather cynically, that, if we desire to love our fellow-men, we must not expect too much from them. Certainly it is unreasonable to expect from others what we, knowing ourselves, should not wish them to demand of us. We should be ready to make all such allowances for others as we would wish them to make for us, and to recognise in them those peculiarities of temperament and nurture which make their preferences, tastes, and habitudes inevitably different from our own.

It is an act of wisdom, too, to credit our fellow-men with much more goodness and capability of goodness than may, at any given time, appear in their conduct. We know concerning ourselves that the best side of our nature, that wherein God works effectually with us, is not that which is most apparent to men. So it must be with others. Moreover, if we wish to draw out what is best in other men, we must appeal to that best by our patience and sympathy and goodwill towards them. Men are to us very much as we are to them, responsive to our moods of kindness or indifference. Besides, we may exert a wonderful reformatory influence over our neighbours by thinking the best of them and so stimulating them to be what we think them capable of being. When the young Alexander, afterwards Archbishop of Armagh, one of the most moving pulpit orators of his day, was at Oxford, he got into debt, and his parents were put to considerable straits to free him from his difficulties. His mother, in telling him in a letter of the arrangements that were being made on his behalf, said to him, "I have an unalterable belief in you." "From that moment," remarked Alexander in later life, "everything was very different. On reading this letter I determined to be a Minister of the Gospel of Love."

It remains just to notice how this "wisdom from above" is essential to right thought and right action in regard to the everyday duties and experiences of life. It prompts, of course, to great carefulness in ascertaining the facts which should be taken into account in forming a judgment on any subject. "Be not ignorant of anything in a great matter or a small" (Eccles. v. 15). There follows deliberation over the facts, sometimes to give scope for

unconscious cerebration, which counts for so much in the intellectual life. With this there will be prayer of the sort that will prevent or remove prejudice, quicken insight, and purify the motives. It will be very patient prayer, if need be, till clear direction comes, and there will be a readiness all the while to submit the ultimate issue to the all-controlling Will. "I like to be in suspense sometimes," said John Wesley, "for it teaches me dependence upon God."

"Lead, Kindly Light, . . .
I do not ask to see
The distant scene; one step enough for me."

To walk by this rule is the secret of efficient service, and also of tranquillity of soul.

WILLIAM VISCOUNT BRENTFORD.

JUNE 23, 1865—JUNE 8, 1932.

A MEMORIAL RONDEAU.

A FAITHFUL man in our degenerate days
He sought to walk in hallowed wisdom's ways;
He stood for right upon the senate floor
Like a brave warrior in the days of yore;
He made his way through controversial maze
With the safe guidance of his legal lore,
His party much to him, his honour more,
From first to last proved to the public gaze
A faithful man.
Nor less for Church than State he witness bore
Against liturgic forms that would ignore
The present truth and history past dispraise,
Resting on the foundation Scripture lays,
And now is he with Christ passed on before—
A faithful man.

JAMES SILVESTER.

THE HOLY SPIRIT.¹

BY THE REV. J. PAUL S. R. GIBSON, M.A., F.I.A., Principal
of Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

I ACCEPTED the task of writing a paper on the Holy Spirit through no sense of mastery in the difficult subject, but because as a seeker after light I ventured to suggest this theme to the D Society for consideration. A feeling of awe prompted me to do so, for though the country is largely undiscovered, yet from the vantage-ground of the lower peaks of experience one has had glimpses of the beauty, grandeur, and vastness of the land to be possessed. A spirit of adventure was upon me and this has grown as the weeks have gone by. Like Joshua and Caleb of old we have together spied out the land and it remains for us to appreciate the fruits that have been brought home. Certain facts have emerged from our collaboration. On the subject of the Spirit there is no clear-cut metaphysic, no distinct philosophy. We need not be surprised for we are dealing with God Himself in His Person of the Holy Spirit. The incomprehensible is not to be fitted into any human mould nor rounded off by any formula of men's wisdom. Unanimity could only mean failure to grasp the unsearchable depths of our problem. It would spell failure, not success. Yet a baffled mind does not close the door to certain knowledge, even though we may only see through a glass darkly.

For we have found in the varied experiences of widely separated classes of men an agreement that the things of God can be truly apprehended though not comprehended nor explained. Christ our Master was vividly conscious of the Spirit in His own life. He has been called the temporal and spatial product of the Spirit, these words implying the utter dependence of our Lord on the unseen working of God's Spirit within Him. And He knew the Spirit was to be the invisible Guide of those He left to complete His work.

Our studies have also shown us that, in all ages, mystics and poets have lived deeply conscious of the reality and power of the unseen things which are eternal. Scientists, no less, as they have probed the undiscovered and ever-unfolding mysteries of nature, have declared their conviction of a guiding principle in all things; they have become conscious of a trend in the development of this world of ours which defies analysis or final definition in known terms.

Even theologians engaged in rearranging the dry if not dead bones of what were once the living experiences of men have felt the breath of God brooding over their museum specimens and at times have even become aware of a wind which blew where it listed.

¹ A paper read before the D Society, Cambridge.

In all these, in the words of Edmond Holmes, there has been a mystery of self-awareness and a revelation of self to self, an elusive vision, but of intrinsic reality, a light self-kindled and self-sustained. In the mystery of Love's mutuality, of the revelation of love to love, the self-existent is for a moment self-revealed.

In such a definition of Spirit, self-existent, self-revealed, and shared self to self, there are certain implications.

A closed logical system can know nothing of it. The conclusions of all logical thought are contained in the premises. If we ever wish to experience that which is beyond ourselves there must be the readiness to postulate the possibility of such existence and such experiences. Our minds, limited as they are by the bounds of our earthly tabernacle, or if you will the walls of our three dimensional existence, will always be able to interpret every experience in terms of its own limited life. In so doing it may be content and self-satisfied, but it is not thereby any the more certain of having grasped all there is to know. Like Nelson it has shut its eye and served its own purpose and not dealt with the problem, but ignored it.

To sense the beyond in our environment, as Dr. Oman so insistently reminds us, an interest though not a bias is needed which alone renders us capable of the experiences we would know and understand.

And such venture of faith finds its own verification. As it throws itself in trust on an unknown beyond it finds a new depth of meaning in the occurrences of daily life—it actually experiences the postulated thing, and discovers not only a peace in a life removed from this existence but a new congruity in the whole of this world of being, a new power to deal with its problems, a new weapon for forging fresh instruments which in a unique way gauge the eternal values of beauty, truth and goodness.

The validity of the life in the Spirit is its congruity within the life of the flesh.

This new life is intimately associated with a three-fold conception of God which has gradually become the heritage of the Christian.

The Jewish race in course of time reached a belief in a transcendent Creator God. He was apart, unrevealed, invisible; to see Him was to die.

Even here, however, were partial links: His angels came as messengers and told of His Will. At times He spoke in direct question, command or reproof. At first only to chosen leaders and to the prophets. Then later in a more general sense to all who realized within themselves the Wisdom of God. A link there was between the Transcendent God and His people, but the link was not universal, nor was it permanent. There were times when there was no open vision, but it was felt to be necessary, for where there is no vision the people perish. A Transcendent God and a partial link were felt to be inadequate and the mind of seers looked forward to the time of full revelation. This came in Christ when the transcendent became immanent, for a time, in a particular

spot. The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us and we beheld His glory. Such a spatial temporal link, however complete, must needs be broken and with the words "Into Thy Hands I commend my Spirit" it was snapped and could remain but as a glorious memory of grace and truth. But a promise had been given and in due course was fulfilled. The perpetual and complete link between Transcendence and Man was given in the permanent immanence of the Holy Spirit first of all apprehended at Pentecost. The unknown God had become known in Christ, Him whom men ignorantly worshipped had been revealed and now though unseen the Spirit could be understood. The messengers, the angels, the utterances of God, even the wisdom implanted in man, could now be comprehended, for the historic Manifestation was there as the test. The intermittent promptings of an unknown Power had become the constant self-revelation of the known God. How different from the unrevealed Logos. This was but the unknown effluence from an incomprehensible. It might give matter for consideration to the mind of man. It was no living and incarnate person in touch with the personality of man in all his fullness.

The Holy Spirit was the Spirit of God for ever immanently related to the Spirit of Man, the permanent and comprehensible and living link binding man with his Creator in mutual love and understanding. This to me is the fundamental meaning of the Holy Spirit. But we may look at the question from the more human side.

The history of the development of the race is the history of the emergence of the individual. As Dr. Whitehead reminds us, one of the characteristics of religion is solitariness, and only when man can realize that, in the last resort, he stands alone face to face with his God does he rise into definite individuality. Professor Burkitt reminded some of us the other day how a real stage of advance was reached when in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes the Jews opened the long roll of individual martyrs for a cause which they made their own on individual conviction. There was a true development from clan to individual life, and individuals, like the stars, differed from one another in glory.

It was only when Christ appeared that the perfect individual was revealed. Not only was He the answer to man's question What is God? but also to man's search after the perfect Man. In Him we find not merely the perfection of that we normally appreciate, but an irresistible challenge to accept what we had not previously imagined. He is a new life and in Him we find a new life for ourselves, a new depth and breadth for our individualities. And yet Christ stands alone. Despite His telling us of the corporate nature of His relation to the Father and of the corporate unity of Himself and His followers, this idea was but dimly realized. To the disciples He was more the unique, outstanding Personality than the Head of His Body, the Church. The coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost is the birth of a new Corporate Personality, one for which the full development in body, mind and soul of each

unit is essential; but one in which such a single, developed, isolated fragment, however perfect in itself, is realized to be but partial, immature and imperfect. At Pentecost the units without losing their own differentiations realized themselves as a whole body. We have no analogy in the realm of nature, for this is the new creation of the Holy Spirit of God. To this day little has been done to enter into the heritage. Men and Churches still cling to their unsundered differentiations and see in them God's perfection, refusing to see the vision of the new Corporate Personality of developed but surrendered differentiations, in which the whole lives and develops by the free-willed self-sacrifice, for the common purpose of fully developed personalities. The vision is hard to see, but it is the truth behind the thought of the Church as the Body of Christ, and of the Three in One of the Trinitarian God.

Something of the same kind *has* taken place in nature. The individual cells have had to sacrifice their individualities as they have blended, divided or co-operated to build up the forms of life that we see around us and that we *are* ourselves. We look upon ourselves as individuals, but we are an aggregate of what in a lesser degree had individuality. This might have been challenged only a few years ago, but to-day men of repute speak to us of the indeterminate nature of the actions of protons and electrons.

The full Corporate Personality of the life of the Spirit may be beyond our comprehension, but its counterpart is seen in ourselves and its prototype was witnessed at Pentecost and the banner of its procession as it advances to realization through the ages is the Body of Christ given for man, but now glorified and victorious.

Our chief difficulty of realization is that, as in all spiritual experiences, there is a far easier mechanistic solution that offers its substitute and more immediately apprehendable values.

Nature has discovered the blind-alley lines of advance that have given us the mechanized, non-individualized but corporately effective companies of ants and termites, bees and wasps. Had no more adventurous attempt been made along the lines of individualization we should not have found the line of unbroken development that has produced man. The temptation to drop back into mechanization did not cease with the emergence of man. It is ever present with us. It takes many forms from the gregariousness of the clan to the mass psychology of the multitude. It is to be seen also in the rise of bureaucratic empires and of personality-destroying commercial combinations. Politically it appears in the despotisms of dictators and the crushing constructions of Soviets. Ecclesiastically we are not free of the same temptation and a similar fall. Every form of Church life that sets rules above personal trust, order and administration above faith, and that undertakes to do the thinking and willing and feeling of its people under its charge, binding them by vows of obedience rather than drawing them by the cords of Love, all such have taken the less for the greater, the quick return for the true gain, and sacrificed the pentecostal revela-

tion of a new corporate personality for the man-made substitute of a Robot.

We may look at the question from still another point of view. The Old Testament ever looked forward. At first to something on this earth, a perpetuated seed of Abraham or a triumphant rule of the Davidic line. Even apocalyptic thought saw the heavens expressed on earth or the earth destroyed to make place for a new earth. The aspirations of the prophets and seers were fulfilled in Christ, largely in an unexpected way, but one at least in Isaiah liii. had correctly read the inner mind of God and adumbrated His purposes correctly. Christ again looked forward, but He did not rely on the intervention of His Father, though He knew this was possible were it claimed—for were not twelve legions of angels at His disposal—He relied on the certainty of the consummation of that which He did in accordance with the Father's will. Death stared Him in the face, but He never saw death alone, but death coupled with its necessary consequent—the resurrection. Glory was certain though hidden within a veil. And the glory was actually contained within the gradually unfolding events. Life might be an oyster, but within its tough shells lay a pearl. What Christ thus won for Himself in His life in the Spirit must become the experience of all. Such an attitude is not learned by reading in books. The mystery of suffering as enunciated by a Buddha may be left to the mental processes, and this explains why the great character on his leaving the world exclaimed, "Look not to me for help, but seek ye refuge in the law and the order." But Christ's experience could only be conveyed by personal contact. He knew that having emptied Himself He must go from His disciples in the flesh, but His going is to be a coming, His leaving a return, His absence a new Presence. The Holy Spirit by His unseen personal contact ever turns the eyes of men forward not as an escape from the things of earth but in order that men regarding them, not as destiny, but as challenge may use them as malleable potentiality and gather from them, as they develop, the glory that in veiled form lies latent within them from the beginning.

Hence the work of the Spirit is described as leading into all truth; greater things are to be done. Power is to be experienced. Such power comes from the inexhaustible and high-stored reservoirs of God. Thence flows a stream immeasurable in quantity and strength, not only continuous voltage but full force of amperage. The past and present are never to be merely rebelled against or repressed, nor only accepted. They demand facing here and now, but in an attitude of love, joy, peace, which are alone possible if they are viewed as doorways leading out into light. Darkness may lurk within the portal, but the light of God's open country lies beyond.

The Holy Spirit is repeatedly called the Comforter. This is because the passage from attachment to the accustomed human Person of Christ to the unaccustomed unseen Person of the Holy Spirit must needs be a hard one. Only with reluctance do we

forgo the limited and the particular in order to enter into possession of the infinite and universal. The old has the fascination of the known; the new has all the strangeness of the unknown. The Holy Spirit therefore is first of all Comforter, as man perforce had to make the transition, but He is none the less the Truth, for the new is as true as the old—in fact, the new is the old in its universalized form, for the new brings to their remembrance the things of Christ, takes of His and declares them and in all things glorifies the Christ.

We are led to think next of the authority of the Holy Spirit. He represents the only true and final authority man should ask for. The desire for a static authority of written work or established church cannot be satisfied. Hedge the past as you will, circumstances arise that Joseph knew not! and in the end a false authority supported by casuistry and subterfuge must fall clattering to the ground. Any final authority, so Dr. Oman reminds us, must be progressive and dynamic. It must convince by giving the certainty of conviction required for immediate action without satisfying the desire for a complete answer. Such was Christ's authority. He went forward in utter confidence, though even He knew not the day nor the hour. The Holy Spirit brings this authority into our lives.

To sum up this section of the paper I see the work of the Holy Spirit in these three main aspects. He turns our eyes from ourselves to God and reveals Himself as the Eternal living link between the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Man. It matters little whether we are fragments of a whole or sacramental symbols of totality. In either case, alone, we have no meaning, alone we die. The Spirit of Man needs the vitalization that can only come from the sap within the Vine. The Holy Spirit is the Living Link.

Again, He turns our eyes away from our limited isolated selves to the wonders of an undiscovered corporate personality expressed here on earth.

Thirdly, He turns us from a past and present which so readily become our terms of reference on to the things which God hath purposed for us and which lie latent or embedded in the raw material coming to our hands in the constantly changing environment of our lives.

He is thus in a word the Link connecting man with God, man with man, and man with the Time Process.

How shall such a Spirit become known? How can we effect the transition from thinking Him to be nowhere to knowing Him to be now here? Dr. Nairne outlined the answer in his recent University Sermon. All is one though the unity is hidden. Take the rough ore of the day's events, mould it into such shape as the dictates of Beauty, Truth and Goodness demand, and the miracle will happen—the Spirit will emerge from where He has been all the time. If we do the deeds we shall know the doctrine. Surely this was the house of God and I knew it not. He became known to them in the breaking of the bread. The expectant outlook creates the seeing eye. Unto you it is given to know the mysteries.

To them there is but the symbol, for seeing they see not. The Spirit emerges not only in crises but in the common things of life until to the experienced eye there are no common things. What God hath cleansed we can no longer call common.

How then does the Holy Spirit operate? Is the Link from Heaven attached to one spot on earth so that those who would travel hence must seek this specialized and privileged point? This is the attitude of the Roman and other Churchmen who see in their Church the one orthodox Body Corporate on Earth of the living Christ. Orthodoxy depends on definition, and even majorities cannot ultimately count as authoritative. Not only Christ has stood alone and we believe proved to be right.

I cannot conceive the universal link between God and Man to have any but universal application. Monopolies sound of the earth earthy. They belong to that purely human tendency to shelter and preserve one's possessions from too free distribution. We know it as children, as authors, as gardeners as well as in religion. The free forgiveness of Christ the Church took over, making her conditions of which Christ said little. She has hedged her ministries till the order of which Christ knew nothing has actually ousted in importance the faith of which He said so much. Her sacraments have been so safeguarded by many that we wonder whether death and not life lurks concealed within the aumbry.

With the Holy Spirit the same process has been at work and the Grace of God is limited to the particular rites of this or that Church. But the Spirit cannot be chained. Ecclesiasts may dictate to Him His correct mode of operation, but He breaks through man's delimitations and on those without and on those within the Church is the perpetual dew of His blessing outpoured. He maketh His sun to shine on the just and on the unjust. What then does the Church stand for? She stands for the corporate experience of certain truths which can best be learned in her fellowship. None lie outside God's grace, yet those who would profit from the personal and collective mind of men who have made the Christ their special study will find within some company of faithful people an understanding hidden from the ordinary fellowships of the earthly minded. Thus the Church's rites of baptism, confirmation, ordination, consecration and Holy Communion become focal points for the dynamic symbolism of what is universally true for the heart in relationship with the Spirit of God. The Holy Spirit or other Grace is not conveyed by these, but that the Holy Spirit is ever available now for man is in these rites symbolized in a manner patient of creative result.

In conclusion let me urge that no study of this subject should leave one a mere onlooker. Stained-glass windows must be seen from within the building. The Spirit can have but little meaning except to those to whom the fruits of the Spirit are a challenge to be accepted. The growth of the early Church is the note on which we will end, for it is there we see the working out of the reality of the Pentecostal experience. We see a handful of men and women

facing an empire and winning, attempting the impossible and succeeding. Their weapons were not merely the classically-interpreted virtues of Wisdom, Courage, Temperance, Justice, nor the theologically-interpreted ones of Faith, Hope, Love, but the newly discovered and living virtues of the Spirit, a fresh love and joy resulting in a hitherto unknown peace; long-suffering and kindness constituting a freshly conceived goodness; faithfulness and meekness newly defining the ancient quality of temperance.

All these welded together in the fire of enthusiastic conviction, based on a new and irrefutable experience, made them more than conquerors in their conflict with a tired and unanchored world.

Miss P. L. Garlick in *The Goodly Fellowship* (The Highway Press, 2s.) gives an account of the pioneers of the missionary work of the Church in several centuries since the Apostolic Age. The accounts are full of interest and will provide useful material for missionary speakers. Her effort to combine the Evangelical Movement with the Oxford Movement "as two supplementary movements of thought" does not seem to us altogether happy.

RENT HEAVENS. THE REVIVAL OF 1904. By R. B. Jones.
London: Stanley Martin & Co., Ltd. 1s.

Mr. R. B. Jones, Principal of the South Wales Bible Training Institute, Porth, tells in this volume the story of The Welsh Revival, of which Evan Roberts was the recognized leader and of which the late Mrs. Penn Lewis was the historian. The idea that the movement was largely an "orgy of emotion" is strenuously denied, and the author quotes the impressions of such well-known Churchmen as the late Rev. J. J. Luce, of Gloucester, and the Rev. Francis Paynter, of Guildford—who together visited the scenes of the activities of some notable Revivalists and have left us a sympathetic account of all they saw and heard. Others, too, write of the "hidden springs and prominent results" of this wonderful movement, fruits of which still remain.

THE RECEPTIONIST DOCTRINE OF AQUINAS.

BY THE REV. THOMAS C. HAMMOND, M.A.

A RECENT review in "Theology," under the signature of Canon Quick, raises a very important problem in relation to the actual doctrine of Thomas Aquinas which may prove of interest to your readers. I crave pardon for dealing with the matter as it appeared in the review, being convinced that the wider issue will emerge as the article proceeds.

Canon Quick draws attention to the fact that in my chapter on Aquinas and Wicliff in *The Evangelical History of Holy Communion* I offer no reference for a quotation from Aquinas which he considers that I have misapplied.

To accuse a writer of suppressing a reference is rather serious and I trust that this possible meaning of my reviewer's words does not represent his position. The passage which I quoted, taken in relation to its context, is as follows: "What is reality only (*res tantum*) namely, the grace bestowed, is in the recipient." I must apologise to readers of the Article for my failure to give the reference. It is "Summa Pt. III, Q. 73, reply to Obj. 3." Strangely enough my critic does not supply the reference whose absence disturbed him. He, therefore, leaves his readers in doubt as to whether he had discovered it or was relying on his general knowledge of the doctrine of Aquinas. It is surprising that he did not afford his readers the opportunity of testing immediately the value of his criticism.

Readers of my Article will notice that it is fairly fully documented. This may have suggested some sinister motive in leaving this particular extract unattested. On the other hand, it might convey, what is really the fact, that it was a supplementary quotation, on which, alone, no argument is founded.

The context reveals that I was discussing Aquinas's theory that a defect in the offerer reduces the spiritual value of a sacrifice. I wrote: "It is the relation between the offering and the soul of the offerer that really determines the effect of the Eucharist. But such relation is established when the believing soul passes beyond the symbol and gratefully accepts the reality offered to faith." To support this position I introduce the quotation which is the object of criticism. The Latin, which is important for our purpose, reads thus: Et ex hoc etiam consequitur alia differentia nam in Sacramento Eucharistie, id quod res et sacramentum est in ipsa materia: id autem quod est res tantum est in suscipiente, scilicet, *gratia* quae confertur: in baptismo autem utrumque est in suscipiente scilicet et character qui est res et sacramentum et *gratia* remissionis peccatorum, quae est res tantum et eadem ratio est de aliis sacramentis." The italics are mine in the above quotation.

The particular criticism directed against the quotation is that I have misled my readers by ignoring Saint Thomas's technical distinction between what is *res tantum* and what is *res et sacramentum*. Surely it would be a strange proceeding to introduce a passage in which the distinction between *res et sacramentum* and *res tantum* is so obviously contained in order to mislead readers as to the exact force of this technicality.

Two questions obviously suggest themselves. What is the distinction that Aquinas seeks to make? Wherein lies the misuse of the quotation? The answer to the first must be undertaken if we are to rightly appraise the value of the objection which gives rise to the second.

My critic adverts to the "technical distinction" and leaves it there. This may be clever reviewing when the object is to create a vague uneasiness and hostility in relation to a definite presentation, but it is bad theology. The readers of "Theology" are not so conversant, as a whole, with Aquinas's technicalities as to secure from them a valid judgment on the merits of the case. Canon Quick's word becomes their bond. At the risk of labouring the obvious I propose to outline the theory of Aquinas that gives rise to "the technical distinction."

There are seven sacraments of the new Law variously estimated according to the grace conferred and the dignity of the Sacrament itself. If we regard the Sacraments according to their respective dignities, the Holy Eucharist takes first place. It differs from all the others in that while they are perfected by use, in it alone the Author of all sanctity is present before use. This is, of course, the direct consequence of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. If, however, we regard the Sacraments from the point of view of the grace conferred, then there are two sacraments of the dead, Baptism and Penance; and five Sacraments of the living, of which the Holy Eucharist is one.

There is yet another difference running through Aquinas relating to the "res" or "reality"¹ of the Sacrament. Seeing that six of the Sacraments are perfected in use it would seem to follow that there could be no "res" or reality apart from use. To this position Aquinas would give unqualified assent. Consecrated water, for example, does not convey its virtue unless and until a person is baptised. The "res" or "reality" is in the recipient. What is this reality? In three Sacraments it is "reality only" that is "the grace which is conferred."

In Extreme Unction, Penance and Matrimony, the outward sign is a sign of grace and "the reality" is the grace conferred. There is, however, a subtle distinction between these sacraments and the remaining four. This distinction takes on a twofold character. In

¹ It is open to question whether the translation of "res" by "reality" adopted consistently by the Dominican translators has not obscured the relevancy of Aquinas's argument in some places owing to the English meaning of the word Reality. Furthermore there is a subreption in the transference from "res et sacramentum" to "res tantum" in Aquinas's own use.

Baptism, Confirmation and Orders the "reality only" and the "reality and Sacrament" are both found in the recipient and not in the outward element or appearance apart from the recipient. But the "reality only" is the grace conferred. The "reality and sacrament" is a "character." "Character," according to Aquinas, is a new capacity of the soul which is ever after resident in it, but which is quite distinct from grace. He compares the "character" in Baptism to the endowment of the soul with a new capacity similar to the enlistment of soldiers (III. Q. 63. Art. 3 conclusio). It is a "reality" because it really confers a new power on the soul. It makes the soul, e.g. capable of receiving other sacraments. It enables the soul to take part in religious worship. But "character" is also a sign of this conferred power in relation to the sensible Sacrament which confers it (Q. 63). That is to say the baptised person has not only the power which "character" confers but has also in Baptism the sign or token of this power and is marked out from others as its possessor. As it is impossible to separate in this regard, Sacrament and reality, "character" is "reality and Sacrament" and this confirmed experience is in the receiver. This is true of the Sacraments of Confirmation and Orders. It may not be out of place to recall that the "Catechism of the Council of Trent" elaborates the sketch given above and declares that "character" is, as it were, a certain distinctive mark impressed on the soul, which inhering, as it does perpetually, is indelible, and of which St. Augustine has thus written: "Shall the Christian sacraments be able perchance to accomplish less than the bodily mark impressed, namely, on the soldier? That mark is not stamped on the soldier anew, when returning to the military service from which he had deserted, but the old one is recognised and approved."¹ For this reason, seeing that, apart from grace, this feature is an invariable concomitant of administration, these sacraments cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. In the case of an adult who opposes an obstacle to grace in any of these sacraments there is received; "Sacramentum tantum," i.e. the bare outward sign. "Res et sacramentum," i.e. the sacramental character, which in Baptism, e.g. relates to the worship of the Church that now is. But the "res tantum," i.e. the grace conferred, is not bestowed because a hindrance has been opposed in obstinate unbelief or by some damaging sin.

But the Eucharist is intended to be reiterated and does not imprint "an indelible mark on the soul called character." Are we, therefore, to relegate it to the rank of the other three, Penance, Extreme Unction and Matrimony, which have no such dual character? There is the outward sign in them, according to Aquinas, and the inward grace. "Sacramentum tantum" and "res tantum." The answer is no. The Eucharist does not imprint a character, but it has three parts, "Sacramentum tantum, res et sacramentum, res tantum." In order, therefore, to avoid the inevitable conjunction which is inseparable from the "res et sacramentum" as exhibited in Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Orders, Aquinas makes the "res

¹ *Cat. of Council of Trent*, p. 119. Ed. 1816. Dublin.

et sacramentum " in the Eucharist resident in " the very material." He adds " but that which is reality only is in the recipient that is the grace which is conferred." Of course it is impossible for a recipient to avoid receiving " the reality and the Sacrament " when he partakes of the Eucharist. So far the inevitable conjunction is also displayed here. But he, as an individual, adds nothing to the contained reality nor is the reality occasioned by his act of reception. It is there by virtue of the consecration of the priest and not by virtue of administration as in the case of the other sacraments. The Catechism of the Council of Trent clearly indicates the difference : " All the other Sacraments are perfected by the use of their matter, that is, by their administration ; baptism, for instance, becomes a sacrament when the ablution is being actually performed ; but to the perfection of the Eucharist the consecration of the elements suffices ; for, though preserved in a pyxis, either element ceases not to be a sacrament."¹ It is by this distinction that Aquinas relieves himself of the inconvenience of declaring that the Eucharist being " res et sacramentum " must impose a character.

Now the contention which this " technical distinction " is supposed to invalidate is that, granting even his premises, the appropriate element is the more important for Aquinas. Either I must indeed have been " obscure in method," as my critic suggests, or this conclusion is strongly forced upon the critical reader. Is the baptismal " character," important and inevitable as it may be, more important than the baptismal grace? To ask the question is to answer it even upon Aquinas's elaborate formulation. In this case the " res et sacramentum " is of less vital moment than the " res tantum." Can any reason be adduced why it should be otherwise in the case of receiving the Eucharist? Had Canon Quick quoted from page 122 of my chapter he would have seen that I dealt directly with this very question. Perhaps it was here my method was too obscure to enable him to grasp it. Still I venture to submit the paragraph afresh. I stated : " What is the need of these subtle distinctions? Once the question is asked it positively clamours for an answer. And Aquinas supplies the answer. The ' res gratiae ' alone matters, and the ' gratia sacramenti ' is independent of all those changes in material substance which his elaborate theory posited. The two parts of a sacrament sanctioned by immemorial custom and quoted from Augustine to Aquinas himself are compelled to give place to a new threefold division, the ' signum sacramenti,' the ' res sacramenti,' and the ' gratia sacramenti.' " If it is possible to equate in meaning, " sacramentum tantum " and " signum sacramenti," " res et sacramentum " and " res sacramenti," " res tantum " and " gratia sacramenti," then the " technical distinction " has been noted and commented upon.

Does the reviewer mean to suggest that no such equation is possible?

Have we not the last equation in the words quoted already, " res tantum . . . scilicet gratia quae confertur " ?

¹ Ibid., p. 167.

With regard to "res et sacramentum," the reviewer might consider Q. 80, Art. I, reply to Obj. I and II, where we read: "Some receive the sacrament only, while others receive the Sacrament and the reality of the Sacrament (*rem Sacramenti*) . . . that sacramental eating which does not secure the effect is divided in contrast with spiritual eating." And yet again (in Q. 80, Art. III, Conclusio): "Some have erred upon this point, saying that Christ's body is not received sacramentally by sinners. . . . Spiritual eating does not belong to sinners."

That "sacramentum tantum" can be identified with "signum sacramenti" is clear from Q. 80, Art. IV, Conclusio. We read there: "That which is a sacrament is a sign of the reality of the sacrament (*res sacramenti*). Now there is a twofold reality of this sacrament as stated above (Q. 73, Art. VI); one which is signified and contained, namely Christ Himself; while the other is signified but not contained, namely Christ's mystical body, which is the fellowship of the saints."

When we turn to the reference here supplied we find Aquinas writing: "We can consider three things in this Sacrament, namely, that which is Sacrament only, and this is the bread and wine; that which is both reality and sacrament, to wit, Christ's true body; and lastly that which is reality only, namely the effect of this Sacrament."

Once more in Q. 79, Art. III, we read: "The power of this sacrament . . . can be considered in comparison with the recipient of the Sacrament, in so far as there is, or is not, found in him an obstacle to receiving the fruit of this sacrament. Now, whoever is conscious of mortal sin . . . cannot be united with Christ, which is the effect of this Sacrament (*quod sit per hoc sacramentum*) as long as he retains an attachment towards mortal sin."

To sum up: In Aquinas four sacraments cannot be received without what he calls "reality and sacrament." Three out of the four have both the reality and the sacrament in the recipients, that is to say, they mark the recipient, separating him from others and endowing him with certain capacities. Baptism distinguishing him as a Christian (cf. our Article XXVII) and rendering him capable of religious worship and the reception of other sacraments. Confirmation further distinguishing him as a soldier and witness of our Lord Jesus Christ. Holy Orders marking him as a minister of God and conferring priestly powers upon him. The distinguishing element is the sacrament, the capacity is the Spiritual reality, and they are both in the recipients not in *ipsa materia*.

The Eucharist is the fourth Sacrament which has this feature of adding to "sacramentum tantum" the aspect of "res et sacramentum." But in this case the reality and the sacrament is "in ipsa materia." The outward appearance constitutes the sign of an inward reality, the body and blood of Christ. There is indeed a sign further of that which is not in *ipsa materia*, the mystical body of Christ. But in this Sacrament, as in the other three, the "res tantum," the "reality only," is the effect of the sacrament, viz. the union of the recipient with the contained Christ. This effect can

only be accomplished when there is no attachment to mortal sin in the recipient. The presence of mortal sin hinders appropriation of Christ.

I seem to have laboured the point, but it is because the conclusion appeared to me so obvious that it was with some effort I could appreciate a criticism which suggests, in view of this weight of evidence, that the appropriative element is not the important factor for Aquinas. I might add that the quotations given could be largely extended and all would convey the same message that—notwithstanding the alleged miracle of Transubstantiation—the presence of sin in the soul hinders the effect of the Sacrament which is the grace conferred. Sin does not nullify the change of substance, according to Aquinas, but it does nullify the identification with the body of Christ which alone ministers blessing to the soul.

The body, dare we say, remains *ab extra*, a reality in a Sacrament which is ineffective and unprofitable, nay rather is a minister of condemnation. With the best will in the world to understand Canon Quick I can only conclude that his criticism springs from the modern tendency to make Aquinas more obscure than necessary. The unusual terminology in which his message is couched constitutes a difficulty to most students. The attempt to import a mystical indefiniteness into this most matter-of-fact Latin scholastic makes the obscure unintelligible. I am told that the very modern young person exhorts the elderly generation to “come out of their period.” Might I beg Canon Quick to come out of his “technical distinction” and tell us in plain terms what he conceives the distinction to be if it is other than I have described.

Bishop Bernard Heywood in *The Bible Day by Day* (Manchester: Sherratt & Hughes, 2s. 6d.) provides a book for readings for each day of the year with an introduction in which he explains his views on Inspiration, and notes on the selected passages. The passages are short and suitable. The low price of the volume and considerations of bulk probably account for the thin paper used and the type showing through.

Outlines of Teaching Sermons for a Year, prepared by a Subcommittee dealing with Adult Religious Education in the diocese of St. Albans (George Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d. and 2s.), provides a course intended to deal with the questions regarding religion most frequently discussed to-day. Many valuable suggestions for preachers can be obtained from it.

Doctor Vanderkemp was a remarkable man who devoted the later portion of his life to missionary work among the native races of South Africa under The London Missionary Society. Mr. A. D. Martin has written a most interesting account of his varied career, and the many difficulties he had to face in the prosecution of his work (The Livingstone Press, 2s. 6d.).

“ THIS IS MY BODY . ”

BY THE REV. HAROLD SMITH, D.D.

THOSE who maintain the “ Real Presence,” not simply of Christ with His People in the ordinance, but of His Body and Blood in the elements, often claim that they alone believe that the Lord meant what He said, whereas others disbelieve Him and so explain His words away. To this there is a double answer : (1) They themselves do not really take the Lord’s words literally. Few would agree with the recantation imposed on Berengar, that the Lord’s Body was perceptibly, not in sacrament but in reality, handled and broken by the hands of the priest and ground by the teeth of the faithful ; even though such a view was thought to have the support of various miracles. The Roman view is that the elements become in substance or essence the Body and Blood of Christ ; but the “ accidents ” (we might say sensible properties or qualities) of bread and wine remain. The more subtle this is, the farther it is from the literalism from which it starts. Others would say that the Lord’s Body and Blood are in, with, or under the elements. Here also the words are not taken really literally ; the identification is not absolute, but only in some partial and peculiar sense. (2) *Our* interpretation is quite a natural and obvious one, with constant parallels both in Scripture and in common usage. But in maintaining this, care is needed to put forward the closest parallels, and to have many in reserve ; otherwise it is easy to object that the alleged parallels are not exact, or that all belong to one class, e.g. parables, where such language is in place rather than in assertions and statements.

Dr. Moffatt in his translation of the New Testament, renders, “ Take and eat this, it means My Body.” This article seeks to show how this interpretation was upheld at the Reformation. It passes over the full positive teaching of the various writers on the meaning and effects of the Sacrament.

The first to work this interpretation out was a Dutch lawyer, Cornelius Hoen or Honius. He forms a link in an interesting historical line between Thomas à Kempis and Zwingli. One of Thomas’s pupils at Zwolle was Wessel Gansfort, a native of Friesland (see Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*). He did not depart from the received doctrine of the Eucharist, but laid stress on its aspect as a memorial or remembrance of Christ, and identified spiritual eating with believing. The eating and drinking required as a necessary condition of life cannot be limited to the Sacrament.

One of Wessel’s chief friends and correspondents was Jacob Hoeck, Dean of Naldwyk ; on his death his papers, including a number of Wessel’s writings, came into the hands of Hoen, an advocate at The Hague. He was greatly impressed by Wessel’s teaching on the Eucharist, but went much farther, concluding that

in the Lord's words "*est*" ("is") stands for "*significat*" ("means"). He drew up a clear statement of his view and sent it to Germany by two friends, along with a collection of Wessel's writings, which he hoped to get published. (Some of Wessel's works were actually printed at Wittenberg, 1522-3; others not until 1614 at Groningen.) It is not clear whether it was especially Luther or Erasmus whose support was hoped for; at all events, Luther was not impressed. Carlstadt may have seen the Letter of Honius, but his own view differed:—when the Lord said "This is My Body," He pointed not to the bread but to Himself.

The friends, however, went on to Basel, where *Æcolampadius* recommended them to *Zwingli* at Zürich. He was delighted with the Letter; he had felt for some time that there was some "trope" or figure, but was uncertain where it was; now, in his own words, he found the "precious pearl" that *est* should be taken as *significat*. He published the Letter, as from "a pious and learned Dutchman," and it is included in his Works (Vol. IV, Egli and Finsler). The part of the Letter bearing directly on this subject is briefly as follows: Why do not they (the literalists) say that John the Baptist was transubstantiated into Elijah (Matt. xi. 14), or John the disciple into Christ (John xix. 26), or the rock into Christ (Rom. x. 4)? "The rock was Christ," i.e. represented Christ. Custom is, I know, the reason why this sense offends here and not in other cases; but I can find no reason for the distinction. There are many similar sayings of Christ, e.g. "I am the true Vine," yet we are not so precise as to say Him to be a true natural vine. . . .

Through these words "This is My Body," the Saviour did not mean bread to be transubstantiated, but through bread to give Himself; as it is the custom in some places, when the seller of a field wishes to give possession to the purchaser, he gives him a stick, straw, or stone, and says, "See, I deliver to you the field." So the possession of a house is given by delivery of the keys. So also the Lord through the bread delivers Himself to us, as if He had said, "Take and eat, and esteem it not a small thing, because this which I deliver to you signifies My Body which I give to you by giving this." . . . Scripture is full of such expressions, as Genesis xli. 12, 18; xli. 26. But the Romans have not been able to give one example for their exposition, or to show where Christ is believed to have wrought a miracle contrary to all experience; He gave sight to the blind, raised the dead, cleansed lepers; but in such wise that they appeared to all as cleansed, living, and seeing, not merely were believed to be such against experience.

Zwingli first shows the influence of this Letter in his Letter to Alber, November, 1524. He rejects Carlstadt's construction, but says, "The whole matter turns on a very short syllable, *est*, which is to be taken as *significat*." He compares Genesis xli. 26, where clearly *are* stands for *mean* or *portend*; so John xv. 1; Luke viii. 11. Such expressions may be seen constantly in Holy Writ. So here, "This means My Body, which is given for you." By Luke's words as to the cup a key is afforded to unlock those of Matthew and Mark.

In April, 1525, when the proposal to abolish the Mass was carried by a small majority in the Council of Zürich, Zwingli was opposed by the Secretary, Joachim am Grüt, who maintained that his examples of metaphor were not really parallel, being drawn from parables, whereas Christ's words in this case are a plain statement. Zwingli answered this objection, but felt its force, and realised that many were unconvinced. Near the close of the following night he dreamt that he was quite unable to answer the Secretary, but that someone said to him, “ Why do you not answer, that in Exodus xii. it is said, ‘ It is the Lord's Passover ’ ? ” He woke at once, leapt from bed, looked up the passage in the Septuagint, and preached on it with great effect next day. Its force lies (1) in the connection of the Eucharist with the Passover ; (2) in the memorial of a fact or event being called by the name of the fact itself. Zwingli does not attach undue importance to his experience ; “ I am telling nothing higher than a dream.” We may compare Thackeray, perplexed for a title for his novel, hearing a voice under precisely similar conditions, “ Why don't you call it ‘ Vanity Fair ’ ” ? So Nehemiah Curnock, seeking a key to the cipher in John Wesley's earliest Diaries, had his first effective clue given in a dream. Origen, meeting Celsus's objections to the messages of angels in dreams, Matthew i.-ii., says, “ It happens to many to be shown in a dream to do this or that, whether it be an angel or whatever it is that brings images before the soul.” Psychologists would speak of the workings of the subconscious or unconscious mind.

In his “ Subsidium,” August, 1525, he deals at length with this question, and says that the disciples were not troubled when Christ spoke of what He had just metaphorically called His Blood as wine or the fruit of the vine. It is clear from this very tranquillity of theirs that they rightly understood His speech as symbolical. They were used both to Christ's language and to the symbolism of commemoration. They had often kept the Passover, of which similar language is used (Exod. xii. 12). If we accept a figure here, all things are safe and clear, nothing is repugnant either to faith or to common sense, or to the character of Scripture, which is full of figures. All writings and speech are full of metaphors, so that we cannot dispense with them even in everyday speech (iv. 468-71).

In his last work, addressed to Francis I, King of France, he says that the Sacraments are significative of true things, once wrought essentially and naturally ; these things they bring back, commemorate, and as it were set before our eyes. . . . “ We are compelled to recognise that the words ‘ This is My Body,’ are not to be understood naturally and in the precise sense of the words, but symbolically, sacramentally, or by metonymy, ‘ This is the sacrament of My Body,’ or ‘ This is My sacramental or mystical Body,’ i.e. the symbol, sacramental and vicarious, of what I truly took and offered to death ” (*Expositio*, 15 and 83).

Bullinger, Zwingli's successor at Zürich, had much intercourse with England, many of the “ Original Letters ” and “ Zurich

Letters" of the Parker Society being addressed to him. His *Decades* (five books of ten sermons each) were translated into English in 1577, new editions appearing in 1584 and 1587. At the end of 1586 it was enacted by Convocation that every minister having cure, not being a master of arts or licensed to preach, should every day read and make notes on a chapter in the Bible, and every week also one sermon of the *Decades*, and show his note-books once a quarter to some neighbouring preacher, who was to certify to the archdeacon who they were who had performed these exercises and how they had profited. This of course does not involve agreement with every word in the *Decades*, but does imply general agreement and high esteem (see Cardwell, *Synodalia*, II, 562).

Some, says Bullinger (*Decade V*, Sermon 9), condemn our doctrine as heretical. Their argument is, "What the Lord says cannot be false, for He is Truth itself; but He says that the bread is His Body and the wine His Blood; therefore the bread and wine of the sacrament are verily really and essentially the Body and Blood of Christ. This truth must simply be believed, even though reason itself, the whole world, all senses and nature itself be against it." We answer that indeed all things are most true which the Lord has spoken . . . but in that sense which He Himself understood, and not in what we force upon His words. Therefore, before all things we must search out the true sense of His words. . . . There are numberless sentences in Holy Scripture which if we shall proceed to expound simply according to the letter, we shall overthrow the whole Scripture and the true faith. . . . When absurdity, not to reason but to piety, and repugnancy to the Scriptures and contrariety to other articles of our faith enforce us, then we contend that it is godly, yea necessary, to depart from the letter.

The Lord, having one only true human and natural body, with that very body delivered to the disciples bread and no body. . . . Therefore, these solemn words can only mean, "This is a commemoration, memorial or remembrance, sign or sacrament, of My Body which is given for you; this cup, or rather the wine in the cup, signifies or represents unto you My Blood once shed for you. . . ."

[The Lord used recognised sacramental language.] "In the solemnising of the feast of the Passover it is said, 'The lamb is the Lord's Passover.' The apostles understood that this lamb was a memorial of a passing-by in the past. . . . We interpret the Lord's words as, 'This is a memorial and remembrance of My Body'; or else, 'This signifieth My Body.' If the word 'est' ('is') is to be understood substantively, it follows that the bread is changed into Christ's Body. But that this is not so, all our senses bear witness, the very substance remaining, not only the accidents of the bread. It is necessary, therefore, that our adversaries do understand that *in* this, *with* this, and *underneath* this is My Body. But so are they gone from the simplicity of the Lord's words. . . . Again, if we be tied to the words above recited, that upon pain of sacrilege we may not start from them a hair's breadth, how durst Luke and Paul recite the words which belong to the cup far otherwise

than Matthew and Mark ? If we hold on still precisely to the letter, we shall be forced to confess that the cup, not the wine, is either the Blood of Christ or the New Testament, or the remission of sins. Here, to avoid absurdity, we willingly admit a trope ; why are we not impartial in a matter of equal importance ? ”

Calvin (*Institutes*, IV, xvii), says : “ Our adversaries charge us with giving no credence to Christ’s words, which we receive with as much submission as themselves, and consider with deeper reverence. . . . Nothing prevents us from believing Christ when He speaks, and acquiescing in everything He asserts. The only question is whether it be unlawful to inquire into its true meaning. Their objection, that it is not probable that the Lord spoke enigmatically or obscurely, when providing special comfort for His disciples in adversity, really supports our case. For if it had not been recognised by the apostles that the bread was called His Body figuratively, because the symbol of His Body, they would undoubtedly have been troubled at such an extraordinary thing. . . . By eating the bread without any hesitation they testify their consent ; hence it appears that they understood Christ’s words in the same sense as we do, considering that in mysteries it ought not to appear strange for the name of the thing signified to be transferred to the sign. Yet they charge us with accusing Christ of falsehood, if inquiry is made of the true meaning of His words ! ”

Tyndale says that his own school say that the sayings, “ This is My Body,” and, “ This is My Blood,” are true as Christ meant them, and as the people of that country were accustomed to understand such words, and as the Scripture useth in a thousand places to speak. As when one of us saith, “ I have drunk a cup of good wine,” that saying is true as the man meant it—that he drank wine only and not the cup. As when we say of a child, “ This is such a man’s very face,” the words are true as the manner of our land is to understand them, that the face of the one is very like the other. . . . We have a thousand examples in the Scripture where signs are named with the meaning of things signified by them.

In another work he says, Neither let it offend thee that *est* is taken for *significat*. For this is a common figure of speech in many places of Scripture, and also in our mother tongue ; as when we see pictures or images, which ye know well are but signs to represent the bodies to whom they be made like, yet we say of the image of Our Lady, This is Our Lady ; and of St. Katharine, This is St. Katharine ; and yet they do but represent and signify to us Our Lady and St. Katharine.

Hooper says : “ The bread was no more His Body nor the wine His Blood than Christ was a lamb, as John called Him.” Against insistence on the literal sense of Christ’s words he says, “ So may a man after the same sort prove Our Lady to be John the Evangelist’s mother ; and say always, whatever text of the Scriptures be brought against him, as Christ said *Ecce Mater tua*, ‘ Say what ye list, these words be true, Christ spake them ; they be plain, they need no interpretation.’ If any man ask a reason and confirmation

of the proposition, he may say still, '*Ecce Mater tua* ; Ye must make no reason how it can be ; it sufficeth to have the word of God, the manifest text ; reason shall not mell with the matter ; it is a matter of faith.' "

Ridley says : The old authors do most rehearse the form of words in Matthew and Mark, because they seemed to them most clear. But here I would know whether it is credible or no that Luke and Paul, when they celebrated the Lord's Supper with their congregations, did not use the same form of words at the Lord's Table as they wrote, Luke in his Gospel and Paul in his epistle ? Now then if Christ's words which are spoken upon the cup, which Paul here rehearseth, be of the same might and power both in working and signifying [as those upon the bread], then must this word " is," when Christ saith " This cup is the new testament," turn the substance of the cup into the substance of the new testament. And if those will say that this word " is " neither maketh nor signifieth any such change of the cup, although it be said of Christ that this cup is the new testament, yet Christ meant no such change as that : marry, sir, even so say I, when Christ said of the bread . . . This is My Body : He meant no more any such change of the substance of bread into the substance of His natural body than He meant of the change and transubstantiation of the cup into the substance of the new testament. And if thou wilt say that the word " cup " here in Christ's words doth not signify the cup itself, but the wine or thing contained in the cup, by a figure called *metonymia*, for that Christ's words so meant and must needs be taken : thou sayest very well. But I pray you by the way here note two things. First, that this word " is " hath no such strength or signification in the Lord's words to make or to signify any transubstantiation. Secondly, that in the Lord's words whereby He instituted the sacrament of His Blood He useth a figurative speech. How vain then is it that some so earnestly do say as if it were an infallible rule that in doctrine and in the institution of the sacraments Christ used no figures, but all His words are to be strained to their proper significations ! . . . I say it is a like fault and even the same, to deny the figure when the place so requireth to be understanden, as vainly to make it a figurative speech which is to be understanden in his proper signification. Augustine gives rules for distinguishing such cases in his *De Doctrina Christianae*. One is, " If the Scripture doth seem to command a thing that is wicked or ungodly, or to forbid a thing that charity doth require : then know thou," saith he, " that the speech is figurative." And for example he bringeth in (John vi. 53) . . . a figurative speech commanding us to have communion or fellowship with Christ's passion, and devoutly and wholesomely to lay up in memory that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us. . . . This lesson of St. Augustine also teaches us how to understand Christ's words in the institution of the sacrament. . . . Christ commanding in His last supper to eat His Body and drink His Blood seemed to command in sound of words as great and even the same inconvenience and ungodliness as did His words

in John vi. ; and therefore must even for the same reason be likewise understanden and expounded figuratively and spiritually, as St. Augustine did the other. . . . Christ in His Supper to the commandment of eating and drinking of His flesh and blood addeth “ Do this in remembrance of Me ” ; which words surely were the key that opened and revealed this spiritual and godly exposition unto St. Augustine (pp. 21-2, Parker Society).

Cranmer says that Christ spoke so many things in parables, similes, allegories, metaphors and other tropes or figures ; for the most part the meaning is left to the judgment of the hearers without any declaration—e.g. (Luke xii. 35 ; ix. 62 ; John xii. 24), and when He called Herod a fox, Judas a devil, Himself a door, a way, a vine, a well. So here. No man that was there present was so fond, but he knew well that the bread was not Christ’s Body, nor the wine His Blood. And therefore they might well know that Christ called the bread His Body and the wine His Blood for some figure, similitude, or property [propriety, appropriateness] of the bread and wine unto His flesh and blood ; for as bread and wine be foods to nourish our bodies, so is the flesh and blood of our Saviour Christ (being annexed unto His Death) the everlasting food of our souls (*Answer*, p. 36).

It being fully proved (that Christ called natural bread His Body), it must needs follow consequently that this manner of speaking is a figurative speech. For in plain and proper speech it is not true to say that bread is Christ’s Body or wine His Blood. For Christ’s Body hath a soul, life, sense, and reason ; but bread hath none. . . . Likewise in plain speech it is not true that we eat Christ’s Body and drink His Blood. For eating and drinking in the proper and usual signification is with the tongue, teeth, and lips, to swallow down and chew in pieces ; which thing to do to the Body and Blood of Christ is horrible to be heard of any Christian. . . . The words *eating* and *drinking* are translated from the signification of a corporal thing to signify a spiritual thing, and by calling a thing that signifieth by the name of the thing that is signified thereby. Which is no rare nor strange thing, but a usual manner and phrase in common speech (*Defence*, 110).

In common speech we use daily to call sacraments and figures by the name of the things that be signified by them, although they be not the same thing in deed. As every Good Friday, as often as it returneth from year to year, we call it the day of Christ’s Passion ; and every Easter Day we call the day of Resurrection ; . . . and yet in very deed Christ never suffered but once, never arose but once (*Defence*, 125).

Marvel not that Christ spoke in figures when He did institute the sacrament, seeing it is of the nature of all sacraments to be figures. . . . As in the Old Testament God said, “ This is the Lord’s pass-by, or passover ” ; even so saith Christ in the New Testament, “ This is My Body, this is My Blood.” But in the old mystery and sacrament the lamb was not the Lord’s very passover or passing-by, but it was a figure which represented His passing-by ;

so likewise in the New Testament, the bread and wine be not Christ's very Body and Blood, but they be figures which by Christ's institution be unto the godly receivers thereof sacraments, tokens, significations, and representations of His very flesh and blood. . . . When Christ said, " This cup is the new testament in My Blood," here in one sentence be two figures : one in the word " cup," which is not taken for the cup itself but for the thing contained in the cup ; another is in this word *testament*, for neither the cup nor the wine contained in the cup is Christ's Testament, but is a token, sign, or figure whereby is represented unto us His testament, confirmed by His Blood (*Defence*, 135-7).

LIBERATING THE LAY FORCES OF CHRISTIANITY. By John R. Mott.
Student Christian Movement. 4s. cloth ; 2s. 6d. paper.

Any book by Dr. Mott is secure of attention, and this, which is the substance of the " Ayer Foundation " Lectures given in America last year, has much to commend it. The book suffers somewhat from an appearance of hasty production, and while Dr. Mott's theme is incontestable, it is only here and there that he hints at the root cause of the troubles that he has in view. Hardly anyone now denies the responsibility of ordinary Christian laymen in regard to evangelisation and other forms of work for the spread of the Gospel, or disputes the propriety of their undertaking it. The difficulty of the present time is a standard of spiritual life which is deplorably low in regard to knowledge and woefully deficient in enthusiasm. Until this is remedied there is little in the way of Lay " forces " to liberate. We have not among us men like D. L. Moody or Henry Drummond or the others of whom Dr. Mott writes so appreciatively, nor do we appear to have a body of clergy and ministers who can evoke and train these qualities in the layman. The problems of clergy and laity are bound up together. " Like priest, like people " epitomises this, so does the question which comes to us from the fourteenth century. " If gold should rust, what shall iron do ? " That there is another side to this we learn from Jeremiah : " The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means ; *and my people love to have it so.*" It is doubtful whether more conferences or more organisation will help us in our present need. We have had them in superabundance and have gained much from them, though we have also lost through them in some measure a sense of the urgency and value of individual effort and of the fact that it is not by organisation but by prayer that the power of the Spirit of God is made accessible to us. Those who desire that that power may have free course among us, will find much of interest and stimulus in Dr. Mott's book.

W. G. J.

THE CLERGY AND THE NEW HOUSING SCHEMES.

BY the REV. A. J. MACDONALD, D.D., Rector of S. Dunstan's-in-the-West, E.C.4.

IN his book *This Freedom*, Mr. Hutchinson describes the disastrous career of a poor clerical family. He describes the effect of clerical poverty upon the family, and especially, upon the character and effectiveness of the parson. But he leaves to our conjecture the wider effect upon the people dwelling within the parish. When the Vicar cries "Infernal parish! Hateful people!" it is not difficult to estimate the deadness and drabness and ineffectiveness of the spiritual life and worship of his parishioners. Yet the experience of the Vicar of Ibbotsfield, and the experience of his parishioners, are typical of the clerical and parochial life of hundreds of our town parishes. Church life is a sluggish meandering stream, possessing little movement and little power. It is unable to attract or to inspire, still less to uplift and to save. The church itself is a squalid building, meanly planned, indifferently built, ugly without and within, warmed by a defective heating apparatus, badly lighted by evil-smelling gas, seated with rows of cumbersome, uncomfortable pews. The services are sloppily conducted by a jaded, lifeless, disappointed and inefficient parson. The organ-playing is blatant, the voice work of the choir-boys always raucous and never musical. Surplices are dirty and cassocks are torn. The sermon is an insult to the intelligence of a pupil-teacher. It does not even act as a heart-warmer to the sentimentalist who likes to come away from church having been made to feel good. It is without points, incoherent, badly articulated, utterly lacking in the grace of S. John, the reasoning of S. Paul, or the thunder of the Baptist. Yet this is the kind of Church-life which we are not only struggling to perpetuate in old town parishes, but seeking to introduce into the new suburbs springing up around our big towns, as one great housing scheme after another becomes completed.

What is the process? A piece of land is begged or purchased. A tin chapel is rushed up. A young but not too well-learned parson is placed in charge. Under the temporary excitement of coming to live in a brand-new district, and in a brand-new house, a few impressionable people are persuaded to attend the brand-new tabernacle. Excitement is maintained when parochial offices are distributed among the impressionable people who have never held any sort of office in their lives before. It is a fine thing to live in a new suburb, you can be a churchwarden or a sidesman, or you may sit on the Church Council with nothing to do and much to say, and every opportunity for saying it without fear of retort.

In the meantime the young Incumbent exploits this excitement

quite successfully for a while. A grant of a few hundred pounds from diocesan or other funds becomes the nucleus of the building fund of the new church. By the aid of one or two bazaars, perhaps assisted by a free-will offering scheme, some three or four thousand pounds are collected from the people of the neighbourhood, and a church builder is allowed to commence work. But here the tide of prosperity turns. Up to this point fair progress has been made. The new population were sincerely keen to have their own new church, and for the time being the Incumbent was an enthusiastic man. To build that church was the first inspiration of both people and parson, but it also became their first temptation. Before the cost of the building had been completely subscribed or collected, a builder-man was engaged, who undertook to proceed with the work and wait for the balance. But obviously this decision entailed a modification of the Vicar's first glowing vision of the new church—the people probably never had any vision, beyond that of a building to be called a church. Economy becomes the password of the building operations, and of every Church Council meeting held after they began. The contractors, who probably never had a worthy scheme at all, are compelled to modify their badly conceived plans as they proceed. Finally a jerry-built structure with shoddy appointments is finished, and the parson and Church Council are faced with a debt of some £7,000—£10,000.

Now, if there is one thing that the average dweller in a new suburb is afraid of, it is debt. Perhaps he is in debt himself, or, if not, he is constantly on the verge of being in debt. Consequently the church which was to become for him the comforting symbol not only of his spiritual hopes, but of his material hopes of prosperity in the new suburb, ends by being the symbol of that which he most fears. What happens? The eager or curious congregation which half-filled the new church on the first few Sundays after it was opened, dwindles away. The young Vicar is always asking for money. People have already contributed as much as they can afford. New members will not join a concern which is in debt, and, there are no new offices to be distributed in order to attract them by the score with the hope of being appointed.

This is the first hard awakening which breaks the heart of the enthusiastic young Incumbent. What now of his other hopes, his vicarage, his future wife already betrothed, the commencement of parochial organisations, the engagement of an assistant curate, the thronging congregations, the throbbing spiritual life of the new parish of S—, to be run on up-to-date lines, according to the plan of the lecturer on "Pastoralia" at his theological college, and of the confessor who gave addresses at his ordination retreat? He is always mentally harking back to that period of his youth, when, a young enthusiast among other enthusiasts, he enjoyed the friendships and the culture, whether much or little, yet always real, of student-days. The more obscure the college from which he came, the more ambitious will be his hopes of the great career before him, for, if a member of a great University, he at least had

the opportunity of shedding some of his illusions at a University Settlement.

But he struggles manfully, and part of the plan materialises. The debt on the church perhaps drags on, but somehow a vicarage is put up, too big by far, and then the young wife is brought into it. Now comes the second awakening—marriage does not fulfil his hopes. He learns that it is at best a vocation, and always a discipline. In his case it is a vocation which is starved, or a discipline made hideous by the pinch of poverty, or the nightmare of debt. He now understands why many left the church, and others refused to join it so long as it was known that the parish was in debt. If he is wise he admits that those people were right. Yet no relief comes, for even if the free-will offerings and Easter offerings grow, if a couple of thousand pounds are secured, somehow, for an endowment, these benefits are neutralised by the appearance of children—one, two, three, four, five by the end of ten years of married life. Holidays are now impossible, books cannot be bought. He becomes dishevelled and down at heel. The agony of mind is increased by watching an over-worked wife become a dispirited, ailing woman, and by realising that his children are growing up with no better training and no better prospects than those of the struggling little families among whom he dwells. As the first children were born a burst of congratulation, which was really sympathy, was manifested by the parishioners. But they soon tired, and gradually it came about that the most despised man in the suburb, the most maligned, the least understood, is the gloomy, pale-faced, weak-voiced individual who occupies the pulpit of a half-empty church on Sunday, and crawls round to visit a few sick folk during the week. No wonder, that like Mr. Hutchinson's Vicar, he cries out "My God, my God, my youth!"

Yet, this is the type of parochial system and life which diocesan boards of finance are seeking so zealously to perpetuate, now that what has been called the "spring-time of church building" has arrived. The official ecclesiastical mind, while being the most experienced, is also, relatively to its opportunities, the most inept. While faced by long vistas both ways, it is the most short-sighted. While annually uttering grandiloquent periods in diocesan conferences, it is weekly found deficient in words of practical counsel in the committee-room or the study. Their only scheme for the new suburbs is to run up badly-built churches, and to leave them to become empty. Their only scheme for the old suburbs and city centres is to preserve, apart from London, badly-built churches, which have already become empty, because, forsooth, it is their pride to be handed down to posterity as great builders. There is sometimes more virtue in being remembered as great destroyers.

Can the Church Councils save the situation? If so, it will be the first thing they have saved. But it is doubtful. They will consist in these new areas of the same people who joined the Church some years before, when offices were being distributed. The Church is now their hobby, or worse still, a means of advertising

their business. But they dominate the parish. In the place of the parson's autocracy we have set up a domination which is not even wealthy, whose qualifications are a summation of all the minus qualities which go to make a suburban householder.

At the same time no criticism of these people is suggested. The criticism is levelled against those who wantonly hastened to give them birth. The Church Councillors do what they can. They produce what they have. Nothing more can come from them until something more has been breathed into them. Their own existence is drab and dangerous. Yet the Church which is meant to save them, merely accentuates their weaknesses, by providing fresh opportunities for exploiting the instinct to borrow, and by supplying them with a parson whose existence is more drab and more dangerous than their own.

The Church Councils will never reform the clergy, and the clergy are at the centre of the problem. Church Councils may solve the problem of debt on Church buildings, schools, maintenance of the same, and expenses of parochial organisations, but they will not devise a scheme, in these areas, for making one man twice as comfortable as themselves—a scheme which includes the education of his children at their expense.

So the problem of the parson remains. That cry, "My youth, my youth!" is going up, consciously or unconsciously, from hundreds of clerical hearts. It is the expression of a yearning for sympathy from minds of a like temper and training, for the outward evidences of the moderate culture of the old college and home life, for some outlet for the woes of the spirit into a heart which not only takes off the burden, but pours in the balm of friendly understanding. Youth is made gallant and happy, enterprising and courageous by its friendships. Its friendships are maintained not only by easy intercourse, but by constant intercourse. It is the "communio" of interests, the sharing of mental and spiritual gifts, the existence of a common stock of ideas, hopes, aspirations from which are constantly drawn inspiration to fight down individual fears, apprehensions, blunders and failures. Men learn the art of living happily in youth because they pull together and breathe a similar atmosphere.

Community life! Why not attempt it in parochial or inter-parochial organisation? Let the size of the parishes be increased, not decreased. Let them range up to 50,000 souls and more, taking the rural deanery as the unit of organisation. If necessary, let the deaneries be reduced in size and increased in number. Let the deaneries be shepherded by a community consisting of twenty or thirty or more priests and deacons, who are thereby enabled to go on living the human and happy life of youth, sharing a common dining-hall, a common smoking-room and library, separated each in his own quarters for study and reflection and sleep.

Celibacy would, of course, be a condition for all, save the Warden or Rector or Rural-Dean, and his appointment would only be made, if his wife were fitted for the office. The less admirable attitude

of the ladies of the Vicarage towards the assistant clergy could not be tolerated. It must be a community of clergy of equal standing, assisted by a few deacons.

A man who undertook to work in such an area would only be admitted after making a promise of celibacy, to be maintained while he remained a member of the community. On deciding to marry he would be transferred to a parish where marriage was possible on financial grounds, and where social life was such that he would not be dragged down to a level at which he ceased to be an inspiration to the parish. Such areas exist. In such areas a married clergy is the most efficient clergy. But such areas are not the slum regions of big towns or, at present, the suburban regions of the new housing schemes.

The saving of the parish-priest's spirit would be based upon a sound principle of economy—an economy founded upon reducing the personal demands made upon him. While each priest would have his own district for pastoral supervision, and while two priests, or a priest and a deacon, would be attached, in accordance with fourth-century custom, to each church for the administration of the Sacraments, no priest would prepare more than one sermon a week, and while sometimes preaching twice, he would not preach more than once in one church. Moreover, opportunity would be provided for making better use of individual gifts. Talented preachers, effective visitors, efficient organisers of clubs, guilds, and of work among both sexes of various ages could be selected from the members of the community, and regarded as specialists for the deanery.

Holidays could be easily arranged. Books could be easily secured. The absence of family expenses, combined with the communal organisation would enable the area or deanery to be maintained at less cost than under the present ineffective system, while each minister would gain far more in cultural power, spiritual efficiency, and bodily health, than would ever be possible under the present system, without an expenditure of money far beyond the capacity of the Church.

Church-building might cost as much as it does now, because, although fewer churches would be erected, they would be larger, more substantial, more beautifully designed and decorated, and more adequately equipped. By this means alone one of the causes of spiritual deadness would be removed. Even under present arrangements, people attend a well-built, well-appointed church better than a shoddy, draughty, dusty, uncomfortable building.

The economy effected in the stipends of the clergy would be one of the most vital elements of the scheme. No reform can be effected in slum or suburban areas without paying the clergy a sum sufficient to maintain their families in houses four times as big as those of the parishioners, an income at least four times as large as theirs, but then the spiritual influence of the parson would be seriously restricted. He would be regarded in such a case, as the "rich" man of the parish. He would possess the "plum" of the district.

He would be there because he had a good billet. The very moderate comforts supplied by five or six hundred a year to a clerical family in a vicarage house, would appear to be abundant wealth to the slum-dwellers, and to the artisan or clerk trying to bring up a family on two or three pounds a week. But under a community scheme, where the clergy would obtain even more liberal comforts, there would be no parade of wealth, real or imagined. Indeed, stipends sufficient to meet purely personal needs, such as clothes, holiday expenses, golf and so forth, would be rather less than those of the majority of the parishioners. The man in the street is concerned solely with cash payments. Perquisites such as free board, lodgings, and books would not be considered in any comparison made by him between his own lot and that of his parson.

“ Well-paid ” clergy under the present system are generously considered by a working-class population, only if they are supported by private means. But that day for the Church of England has passed. Indeed, clergy of independent means were never common in congested town or suburban areas, particularly in the North. They were the glory of the country-side of old England, and the inspiration of southern town parishes, up to a generation ago. With their passing has departed a spiritual as well as a social force of great value. If these men were the spiritual fathers of rural parishes, it was partly due to the fixity of their tenure, and to the long periods for which they held office, but more particularly because the squalor of poverty seldom came near the rectory in nineteenth-century England. What expedient can be devised to supply the lack of them in rural areas remains to be devised. But in the towns, and particularly in the new suburban areas which are rapidly springing up, some of the effectiveness of the rural clergy of old England might be regained, if the spirit of the clergy were saved from being broken, by preserving through communal organisation some of the best elements of college and country-life. The spirit of both is the spirit of youth, and the broken clergy of the towns are crying out “ My youth! My youth!”

THE FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

BY the REV. C. C. DOBSON, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary-in-the-Castle, Hastings.

HISTORIANS other than those of the Roman Catholic Church have to a large extent been content with the negative argument that St. Peter cannot have been the founder of the Church of Rome, but they regard the records of the early days of that Church as being too scanty to allow of any definite constructive view as to its foundation. There is, however, a great deal more information available than is generally realised, and a pamphlet, written a few years ago by Edwin Wilmshurst, giving "very old and secret tradition," which he obtained through two visits to Rome and one to Jerusalem, but the source of which he is not at liberty to disclose, helps us, whether it be correct or not, to piece together the scattered records of those early days, and arrive at an enlightening story of the founding of the Church of Rome.

The story thus unravelled reveals St. Paul as the true founder of that Church, and places its centre as in the Palatium Britannicum, first the home of the exiled British Royal Family of Caractacus, and later of Pudens and Claudia.

It further suggests that St. Peter arrived in Rome about A.D. 66, St. Paul being absent on his journey in the West, and found the Gentile Church in this headquarters presided over by Linus, the first Bishop of the Church already consecrated by St. Paul. In the home of Priscilla, however, outside the Salarian Gate was a small Jewish Christian community. This he assumed charge of, assisted by Clement. These two separate Gentile and Jewish communities were afterwards united into one under Clement who became the third Bishop of the Roman Church, but the fact that St. Peter for a short time presided over the separate Jewish Christians subsequently gave rise to the claim that he was the founder and first Bishop of Rome.

Such is the story which we shall proceed to unravel, and it should prove of special interest since it reveals the unexpected influence of the first British converts on the founding of the Roman Church.

The Church of Rome, we know, claims to have been founded by St. Peter, and that he was himself for twenty-five years its Bishop. The whole subject has been so ably and convincingly discussed in Rev. Charles Elliott's *The Delineation of Roman Catholicism*, and other standard works, that we shall not attempt to cover the same ground. Suffice it to say that his twenty-five years' episcopate is only a late tradition of the fourth century,¹

¹ An earlier remark quoted as from Papias is uncertain.

and is totally at variance with the known Biblical facts as recorded in the Acts and Epistles. In the whole New Testament there is not a single statement that can be truly regarded as evidence that he was ever in Rome. Acts xv. and Galatians ii. prove conclusively that he could not possibly have been there at any rate before A.D. 50, although there may be reason to think that he visited the city later. He writes his Epistles from Babylon, and the whole circumstantial evidence is against regarding this as a pseudonym for Rome. That he was ever Bishop of Rome is also directly contrary to the earliest historians, for both Irenæus and Eusebius definitely tell us that the first bishop was Linus, the second Cletus or Anacletus, and the third Clement.

In A.D. 58 St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, and implies he had not then visited the city (Rom. xv. 22).

In A.D. 60 or 61 he comes as a prisoner to Rome. He then writes *from* Rome the Epistles to Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians, and Philippians. During his second imprisonment in A.D. 67 he wrote the second Epistle to Timothy. In not one of these six epistles is there any reference to Peter, nor any hint of his being in the city. Among the large number of Christians at Rome whom he enumerates by name it is unbelievable that he would have omitted the name of Peter had he been in Rome, or actively engaged in founding the Church there, or acting as its first Bishop. If Peter was ever in Rome as the Roman Catholics assert, it can only have been during the last years of Nero, when his martyrdom is said to have taken place in 68, and at least thirty years after Christianity had become established there, and we admit he may have been there then. How, then, and when, did Christianity reach Rome?

On the day of Pentecost among those converted were "strangers of Rome." These must certainly have returned to Rome carrying the Gospel message. In his Epistle to the Romans St. Paul mentions two "kinsmen" at Rome, Andronicus and Junia, as having become Christians before himself. He was converted in 35 or 36, so we have two Christians in Rome before that date. These two we shall show were probably relatives of Pudens, and therefore residents in Rome, and not merely visitors to Rome after their conversion.

In A.D. 58 in his Epistle to the Romans St. Paul speaks of the faith of the Christians in that city as being spoken of throughout the whole world (Rom. i. 8) so that by that date the Church was large and flourishing. In the last chapter he enumerates no less than twenty-six by name as Christians in the city, and of several he speaks of their households, or the church in their house, or the "saints that are with them." In Philippians iv. 22 he speaks of Christians in Cæsar's household.

We have thus clear evidence of Christianity reaching Rome and becoming a great and influential body, including members of the Imperial household, before St. Paul arrived in A.D. 60 or 61, and certainly before St. Peter can possibly have come there. Of

many of the names of Christians mentioned by St. Paul we know nothing.

The names that need our immediate attention are Pomponia, Linus, Claudia, and Pudens. A brief account of these, giving only what may be regarded as assured information, will enable us to summarise the story of the early Roman Church.

Pomponia was a sister of Caractacus, her original name being Gladys. She married Aulus Plautius, the Roman commander of the Claudian invasion, probably about the time of the Claudian Treaty in Britain. She now took the name of Pomponia, the name of the clan or gens to which her husband belonged. Aulus Plautius was recalled to Rome about 47, taking her with him. For forty years she was a leader of the best Roman society, the name Græcina being added to her name Pomponia in recognition of her scholarship in Greek. She was accused of a foreign superstition,¹ but the charge does not seem to have been seriously pressed, since her husband was appointed her judge, and she was naturally acquitted. Dion Cassius informs us that her superstition was Christianity, which persuasion she had professed for forty years at the time of her death. This statement would place her conversion in the forties, while still in Britain.

Linus. We have three of this name to consider and identify. 1. The son of Caractacus who shared his exile at Rome. 2. The Linus who was first Bishop of Rome according to Irenæus and Eusebius. 3. The Linus mentioned by St. Paul in conjunction with Pudens and Claudia in 2 Timothy iv. 21. That all three were the same person is proved by the following evidence. Irenæus writes about A.D. 180: "The Apostles, having founded and built up the Church of Rome, committed the ministry of its supervision to Linus. This is the Linus mentioned by Paul in his Epistle to Timothy." ² Here is definite proof that the Linus of St. Paul and the first Bishop of Rome were the same person. Next we find that Linus was the brother of Claudia. Clement of Rome, who succeeded Linus as Bishop about twelve years after his death, Anacletus holding the office in between, writes "sanctissimus Linus, frater Claudiae" (the very saintly Linus, brother of Claudia). Unfortunately dictionaries quote "the Apostolic Constitutions" as saying son of Claudia. The expression, however, reads "Linus, the — of Claudia was first ordained by Paul." This, of course, might mean son or brother. The dictionaries have overlooked Clement's definite evidence and assumed that it meant son.

Linus, therefore, the first Bishop of Rome, ordained by St. Paul, was brother of Claudia, and therefore a British Prince and son of Caractacus, since, as we shall see, Claudia was the latter's daughter.

Pudens. Here, again, we have a Pudens, son of Pudentinus, praetor Castrorum of the Roman headquarters at Regnum (Chichester) under Aulus Plautius during the Roman invasion in A.D. 42-3. His name is on the "Pudens Stone" at Chichester as having given

¹ Tacitus *Ann.*, xiii, 32. ² Irenæus *Opera*, Lib. III, c. 1.

a site for a temple. He almost certainly returned to Rome at the recall of Aulus Plautius in about A.D. 47.

Then we have the Pudens of 2 Timothy iv. 21, mentioned in conjunction with Claudia.

Finally we have the Pudens, whose marriage to Claudia in about the year 53 is described by the poet Martial in his well-known epigram. Martial tells us that this Claudia was a British maiden (*puella*). He again writes an epigram on the occasion of the birth of her third child in her praise.

The following considerations make it equally clear that all these three bearing the name Pudens were one and the same.

The Pudens of Martial and the Pudens of St. Paul are the same, since the Pudens of Martial marries a British girl Claudia, and the Pudens of St. Paul is mentioned in conjunction with a Claudia whom we have shown to have been the sister of the British Prince Linus, first Bishop of Rome, and who was, therefore, also British. Otherwise there would be two British maidens of high standing of the name of Claudia in Rome. The Pudens of Chichester is a wealthy young senator, of the patrician Pudens family of Rome, with religious instincts, for he gives a site for a temple. Of Martial's friend in Rome we know a good deal. His full name was Aulus Rufus Pudens, the latter being the name of his gens, Rufus being his private family name, or perhaps what we should call his Christian name, and Aulus having been assumed either because of his association with his commander Aulus Plautius, or more probably because the Pomponia clan to which Plautius belonged was related to the Pudens clan. Martial's second epigram is addressed to Pudens' cousin whose name was Quintus Pomponius Rufus, thus showing the interchange of names between the two families. This Pudens like the Pudens of Chichester was of a wealthy patrician family of senatorial rank, who owned large estates in Samnium or Umbria, and in his palace at Rome were no less than 400 slaves of both sexes born and bred on his Umbrian estates. To assume that the Pudens of Chichester and that of Martial are two, you must assume that there were two men of senatorial rank of the same name, one in Britain and the other in Rome, who marry a captive British girl, and both of them of religious instincts. In this case you must explain how a proud patrician of senatorial rank came to marry a captive British girl for apparently no reason, whose language he could not have known. If, however, they are the same, everything, including dates, fits in exactly. Pudens meets Claudia in Britain in A.D. 43 to 47, during which time his commander Plautius marries her aunt Pomponia. He returns to Rome with Plautius about 47, and in due course succeeds to his father's estates. In 52 Claudia arrives as a captive with her father Caractacus residing in the famous Palatium Britannicum. Pudens and Claudia renew their acquaintance, the palace of Plautius, the old commander of Pudens, and Pomponia, the aunt of Claudia, doubtless provides the place of meeting. The marriage takes place in about 53.

It is difficult to come to any other conclusion than that the Pudens of Chichester, Martial, and St. Paul, are all the same person.

Claudia. We have already anticipated much of the information about Claudia. That she was a daughter of Caractacus, captured in his final reverse, and shared his captivity in Rome is stated by leading authorities.¹ Her marriage with Pudens we have already dealt with. She was a girl of great talent and accomplishments. Martial extols her beauty, wit, and fascination. He speaks of her as uniting the accomplishments of Rome and Athens.

“Claudia of the clan of Rufus belongs to the blue-eyed Britons. How popular she is, how she holds the hearts of the Latin folk! How beautiful of figure! Italian matrons might think she was of their own race. Praise be to heaven that she has borne children to her pious husband, that still a girl she may hope for sons and daughters. May it please the powers above that she have joy together with her husband, and ever rejoice herself in her three children.”

In his other epigram he calls her Rufina, Rufus being her husband's name.

There is a subdued tone about this otherwise licentious poet when he refers to Claudia and Pudens, whom he now describes as pious, and both of whom we otherwise know were now Christians. Their home became the resort of the most literary and refined society. Claudia was herself a poetess, the author of a volume of epigrams, a volume of elegiacs, and a volume of sacred poems and hymns. Copies of these were preserved in the library at Verulam as late as the thirteenth century.

We thus have Pudens, Linus, Claudia, and Pomponia, all leading Christians in Rome, three of whom belong to the ancient royal line of Britain from which our King is descended, and the fourth a noble Roman citizen, who made their acquaintance in Britain, and joined the family by marriage.

St. Paul's reference to three of them occurs in his closing words of his last message just after his first appearance before the magistrates at Rome, and while expecting to appear before them again, which he fully realizes will result in his condemnation. They are thus the nearest to him in his last days on earth. They are his comfort in preparing for martyrdom.

Is there anything that suggests a closer bond to have existed than merely that of Apostle and convert?

The remarkable pamphlet referred to above was issued a few years ago by a firm in Chichester entitled *St. Paul and Britain*, by Edwin Wilmshurst, who has since passed away. After recounting some of the information we have recorded above, he writes as follows:

“The preceding statements are extracted from writings and documents which are accessible to any reader; that which follows is from unpublished sources, which two special journeys to Rome, and one to Jerusalem, have

¹ Her Welsh name was Gladys. Her aunt Pomponia bore the same name, which was the Welsh for “Princess.” She took the name of Claudia, when the Emperor Claudius adopted her as his daughter.

enabled me to collect, and are quite conclusive to myself; but as I have no permission to disclose my authorities, I give the following as from very old and secret tradition."

We may well guess the source of his information, and that source itself suggests the reason why it is withheld. The information is not only startling, but is so well supported by circumstantial evidence that the sources of evidence are hardly needed.

He tells us that the grandfather of St. Paul was a wealthy Benjamite of Tarsus, who purchased "with a great sum" Roman citizenship for himself and family, and had added a Roman name to his Hebrew. His son Davidus, father of St. Paul, also assumed a Roman name, that of Appius Tullius. The latter's wife, St. Paul's mother, was a lady named Praxedes or Prasedes. St. Paul confirms part of this when he claims to be a free-born Roman citizen.

Wilmshurst further states that Davidus took service in the Roman army, and rose to the rank of centurion, in which capacity he was drafted into Palestine. He was the centurion who said to Our Lord: "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed." It was he of whom the Jews said: "He loveth our nation and hath built us a synagogue." The ruins of a synagogue, bearing both Roman and Jewish emblems, have in recent years been excavated at Capernaum, showing that it was built by a Roman Jew. We could hardly expect that any centurion other than a Roman Jew would do so.¹

This information further explains how St. Paul came to be educated at the feet of Gamaliel, when otherwise he belonged to Tarsus. A loyal and patriotic Jew, though inheriting Roman citizenship, Davidus would naturally desire the best Jewish education for his son, and would, therefore, take the opportunity of bringing his son Saul with him, and sending him to the best college at Jerusalem.

Wilmshurst goes on to tell us that Davidus died, leaving St. Paul's mother Praxedes a wealthy widow at Tarsus. Thither came Pudentinus the Roman senator on high civil, not military, duty, and met Praxedes, whose wealth and education gave her a leading position in the city. He married her and took her back with him to Rome. To them was born the Pudens referred to above.

There is remarkable confirmation of this further information to be found in the Bible.

In Romans xvi. St. Paul writes "Salute Rufus (Pudens referred to by his family or "Christian" name) and the mother of him and of me," an expression which commentators from want of knowledge have refrained from taking literally, but which we now see to be literally correct.

Further, St. Paul says, "Salute Andronicus and Junia my kinsmen": "Herodion my kinsman": "Sospater my kinsman salutes you."

¹ The identity of St. Paul's father with this centurion is somewhat open to question on account of the dates.

How came St. Paul to have so many relatives with Roman names in that city? If by his mother's second marriage he became related to the Pudens gens we can understand it. We find, moreover, that one of the daughters of Pudens and Claudia was named Praxedes, also evidently after her grandmother, thus confirming the fact. We can understand now why St. Paul, as we shall see, resorted to the home of Pudens and Claudia, and why his last message is of them.

The same informant tells us that Priscilla was a sister of Praxedes.

These facts regarding the parentage of St. Paul not only conform in detail with all we otherwise know, but they bear the stamp of truth, since it is impossible to think that they can have been invented.

We shall now proceed to trace out the early story of the Church of Rome with all the foregoing information before us.

Christianity probably reached Rome in about A.D. 37 at the hands of the "strangers of Rome," converted on the day of Pentecost, and a short time before Joseph of Arimathæa is said to have reached Britain, but unlike in Britain, where it received a royal welcome, it was only a few individuals who secretly held it, among whom were Andronicus and Junia of the Pudens gens. Until A.D. 52 it quietly spread, unassisted by any Apostle. Meanwhile in Britain the Royal Family, including Pomponia, Cyllinus, Linus, and Claudia and Eurgain all learnt the truth perhaps at the hands of Joseph of Arimathæa, as did also Pudens, although, from the fact that he presented a site for a temple, he does not appear to have accepted it at so early a date as this. Pudens returns to Rome about A.D. 47 with Aulus Plautius his commander, and tells his mother what he had heard. Her son Paul had doubtless also written her of his conversion, and Praxedes accepts the faith, if she had not already done so. In A.D. 52 the British Royal Family, three at least of whom are Christians, arrive in Rome. Claudia marries Pudens, who, under the influence of his mother as well as that of Claudia herself, joins the faith.

The Palatium Britannicum now becomes the headquarters of the Roman Church. The quiet support of so influential a family as that of Pudens, as well as that of the Plautius gens, gives it a high standing. The Christians gather here for worship and the Church is quietly organised. About the time when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, Caractacus and Cynon his son, and Eurgain, his elder daughter, a Christian, returned to Britain. His father Bran had already returned, a Christian, and we hear of him in Britain propagating the truth in Siluria.

But the Church in Rome is now well established under the leadership of Pudens and the four members of the British Royal Family.

In A.D. 61 or 62 St. Paul himself arrives, a prisoner, and as such is permitted to live in his own house and see his friends and relatives, whose influence doubtless gained him this kindly treatment and eventually secured his freedom. They gather round him

and are strengthened by his counsel and guidance. After two years he is set free, and makes his home with Pudens his half-brother and Claudia. He now formally consecrates Linus as the first Bishop of Rome, and as we shall see later, Eubulus to be the first Bishop in Britain. In process of time the Palatium Britannicum, which had been the royal residence of Caractacus, was constituted the first Christian Church in Rome by Pudentiana, daughter of Pudens and Claudia, and for 300 years, until Christianity was legalised by Constantine the Great, it was the only Church above ground in the city. It was known first as the Titulus, and now as the St. Pudentiana. In another part of the grounds was what was known as the Bath of Novatus, a son of Pudens and Claudia. This was also constituted by Pius I in about A.D. 150 an oratory, to which he appointed his brother Hermas Pastor, from which it became known as "Pastor." It is now known as the Cætani Chapel, and the ancient chamber in the basement, which still has fragments of fresco plaster, is where St. Peter is said to have ministered.

Outside the Salarian Gate of the city lay property belonging to Priscilla, whom Wilmshurst tells us was sister to Praxedes, St. Paul's mother. Here she constructed extensive catacombs as was customary at the time. In these both she and her two martyred nieces, Pudentiana and Praxedes, were subsequently buried. An ancient third-century fresco depicts these two with St. Peter standing between them. If this is indeed St. Peter it constitutes a very early proof that St. Peter did come to Rome. We see no reason to doubt that he did so, but it must have been after A.D. 63 or 64 when St. Paul was set free, or the latter would have mentioned him in his four Epistles written during his imprisonment. From A.D. 63-4 to A.D. 68, when both are said to have been martyred, St. Paul was away from the city preaching elsewhere, and St. Peter may well have visited the city now, and helped to guide and strengthen its Church. But he was certainly not its founder, nor was he its first Bishop. It has been suggested above that while the home of Pudens and Claudia was the headquarters of the Gentile Church, that of Priscilla was where the Jewish Christians gathered forming a separate community, and that St. Peter, "The Apostle of the Circumcision," presided here, with the help of Clement, and that the two communities subsequently united under Clement, who became the third Bishop. This suggestion would reconcile many apparent discrepancies in the early traditions. Linus was consecrated by St. Paul in about A.D. 63. St. Paul then left for the West. St. Peter arrived about 65, and took charge of the Jewish church in Priscilla's house, with Clement assisting. In 67 St. Paul returned, and both were martyred in 68. In the grounds of the Palatium Britannicum stands another church, that of St. Praxedes. The remains of the two martyred daughters of Pudens and Claudia were removed here from the Catacombs of St. Priscilla, where they are still shown.

As we know, bitter persecution of the Christians broke out in the closing years of Nero's reign, A.D. 66 to 68. From the Roman

martyrologies we learn that Pudens was killed privately in A.D. 96, Pudentiana was martyred in A.D. 107, Novatus in 139, Timotheus in A.D. 150, and Praxedes a month later, on September 2—all four children of Pudens and Claudia. Claudia alone died in peace, on the Pudens estates in Umbria. Linus was also martyred in A.D. 90. He was succeeded by Cletus or Anacletus for a short episcopate. Clement, his successor, as third Bishop, united the two bodies.

When the storm of persecution burst upon the Church, and the Christians were hunted out and thrown to the lions, crucified in the public arena, tied up in the skins of wild animals and worried to death by dogs, or fastened to stakes and smeared with tar that they might provide burning beacons to illuminate Nero's palace grounds by night, Praxedes and Pudentiana with heroic courage feared not to brave the death which they afterwards suffered in order to succour the faithful, and Cardinal Baronius records in his Ecclesiastical annals, when referring to the Palatium Britannicum :

“ On this sacred and most ancient of churches, known as that of Pastor Hermas, dedicated by Sanctus Pius, Papa (Pius I) formerly the residence (as guests) of the Holy Apostles repose the bones of 3,000 blessed martyrs, which Pudentiana and Praxedes, virgins in Christ, with their own hands deposited.”

We have thus traced out the story of the beginnings of the Christian Church at Rome with its headquarters in the palace of Pudens and Claudia, its first Bishop Linus consecrated there by St. Paul. From the fact that Linus, his sister Claudia, and her aunt Pomponia, were members of the British Royal Family, apart from other members of the family whom we know played their part, we might almost say that the early British Church were the means of founding the Church of Rome. The disaster which brought the family in chains to Rome was turned into a blessing. The Hand that sent Joseph as a slave to Egypt that he might become the means of blessing, also sent this family to Rome that they might assist in the establishing of the faith in that city.

One other question is of some importance. Were these members of the British Royal Family Christians on their arrival at Rome, or were they subsequently converted through St. Paul or other Christians in the city?

The statement by Dion Cassius that Pomponia at the time of her death had held the faith for forty years places her conversion in Britain before she went to Rome in A.D. 47.

As regards Linus, Claudia and Eurgain, a piece of indirect evidence leads us to the same conclusion that they too were Christians in Britain before arriving at Rome. During the Exile of Carac-tacus, his son Cyllinus, who had not been captured with other members of the family, became regent of his father's kingdom of Siluria, or Gwent (S. Wales) during the latter's seven years' exile. An old Welsh record, which we have no reason to question, states that he had all his children baptised, and was the first to introduce the custom of giving Christian names to children. He, therefore, like his aunt Pomponia, was a Christian, and he did not visit Rome.

If two members of this Royal Family were thus converted in Britain, and the others are found soon after their arrival at Rome to be leading Christians, it is safe to assume that they took their faith with them to Rome.

We thus find the Christian faith accepted in Britain by this Royal Family, and Divine Providence sends them to Rome that there, united to one of the leading families, they may be His instrument in establishing the faith in that city with the help of St. Paul.

Two recent additions to the Home University Library of Modern Knowledge are of special interest to our readers. They are *Christianity*, by Edwyn Bevan, LL.D., D.Litt., Lecturer on Hellenistic History and Literature, King's College, London, and *The Spanish Inquisition*, by A. S. Tuberville, M.C., M.A., B.Litt., Professor of Modern History in the University of Leeds (Thornton Butterworth, Ltd., 2s. 6d. net each). Dr. Bevan's brief account of Christianity from the earliest days up to the present day is a remarkable achievement. In the limits of two hundred and fifty pages he has given a vivid impression of the chief features in the history of the various movements that have marked the progress of Christian life and thought. He writes as a Christian yet with a detachment which will not altogether please the various sections of Christendom that find their views in turn subjected to searching criticism. Yet we have all something to learn from the work of an independent scholar, and we must all appreciate his endeavour to be impartial. The chief interest of his book in the earliest portion for our readers is that his account of the origin and the development of the ministry during the first three centuries amply justifies the Protestant view of the Church and its ministry. In this he is, of course, in harmony with the results of recent scholarship, and the conclusions of the best workers in the period under consideration. Mr. Tuberville's account of the Spanish Inquisition is written as a plain historical record of an institution that played a considerable part in the life of the Spanish nation. Its freedom from any religious bias brings out with greater force the system of tyranny and abominable cruelty that the Inquisition represented while posing as the medium of God's love in His care for the salvation of the souls of those suspected of heresy, especially of those possessed of considerable property that might be useful if transferred to the coffers of the Church. Spain in recent years has had a most unenviable reputation for religious intolerance. The tradition of bitter persecution of Jew and Moslem which replaced the former tolerance towards the end of the fifteenth century has been associated with the barbarous methods of the Inquisition. Its elaborate system of secret spying, its mysterious imprisonments, its elaborate and ghastly devised implements of torture ruthlessly used to extract imaginary confessions from victims frequently innocent, constitute a picture of human infamy of which anything that could be described as Christianity ought to be thoroughly ashamed and repent of in tears and ashes.

TWO SAINTS : ST. AUGUSTINE, ST. PATRICK.

A COMPARISON.

BY THE REV. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

IN many ways the *Confession* of St. Patrick, written about A.D. 450, is akin in spirit and devotion to the celebrated *Confessions* of St. Augustine of A.D. 397. Both quote many of the same scriptural passages; and many of Patrick's phrases and words like *inennarrabiliter* are to be found in Augustine's work. They both express the same utter and complete dependence upon God for everything they are, and have done, and are about to do that distinguishes these writers in an age when Pelagian views were widely spread. Orientius also, a Christian poet as well as a bishop of Auch in Aquitania in the early quarter of the fifth century, denounced Pelagius as a "British snake" (*Coluber Britannus*) and declared that the gifts of eloquence and reason are bestowed by Christ. Otherwise men would not have the power they have. "Quodque etiam possunt hoc quoque non poterunt." Nought is our own, He has it. He gave it. "Nil proprium est nobis, Ipse habet, Ipse dedit." This is the very *dictum* of Augustine scattered through his *Confessions*. "Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis." Give what Thou commandest and command what Thou wilt. Augustine even says: My faith, which is Thy gift, invokes thee (*Conf.*, I, 2). Patrick says: "I have no power (*nihil valeo*) unless He gave it to me" (*Conf.*, 57). Augustine says: "No one can be continent (pure) unless God gives it" (x, 31, 47). "Give me what I love," he cries, meaning the power of loving. "For I love and Thou hast given me that. Do not abandon Thine own gifts" (xi, 2). In his work *On Grace and Freewill*, c. vi, he says: "God crowns His gifts not thy merits." "All my good things (virtues) are Thy ordinances and gifts; all my bad things (vices) are mine own faults" (x, 3), meaning that the only things he really owned were his failings. "Whoever he be that reckoneth up to Thee his true merits (*vera merita*), what reckoneth he up but Thy gifts (*munera*)?" "O that men would but know themselves" and "he that glorieth would glory in the Lord" (ix, 13). Here Augustine appeals to the well-known classical adage—"NOSCE TEIPSUM." He believed if men would practise that habit of self-introspection with a view to self-knowledge they would agree with him, as surely they must. He was far from claiming any merit for himself. He said: "Thou hast wiped out all my bad deservings (*merita*), Thou hast gone before (*praevenisti*, prevented (Church Collect))¹ all my good deservings" (xiii, 1).

¹ Gregorian Sacramentary (A.D. 600), "prevent our actions by breathing upon" (*ASPIRANDO*).

In another work he summed up the matter in these words—“ We live more safely if we ascribe everything (good) to God and not partly to Him, and partly to ourselves ” (*Tutiores igitur vivimus, si totum Deo damus* (*De Perseverantia*, c. vi).

Patrick, similarly, ascribes everything good in his life to God's gift and guidance. “ He called me, He predestinated me to preach the Gospel ” (*Ep.* 6), he says. Everything he did was a ‘*Donum Dei.*’ His work in Ireland, his missionary labours, his sacrifices, his preaching, his evangelistic and organising work for the Church, the writing of his Confession (*Conf.*, 62)—everything was to be attributed to God, Who gave him the opportunity, the good will to seize it and the power to use it to His glory. His success in Ireland was due to God's grace, not his. “ I am debtor to God Who bestowed such grace upon me ” “ I thank my God Who kept me faithful in the day of my temptation, so that I may offer to Him a sacrifice, a living host, my own soul ” (*Conf.*, 34)—the only sacrifice—and that a scriptural one (*Rom.* xii. 1)—he mentions. “ I fear,” he said, “ to lose the labour which I began,” and then correcting himself at once, adds, “ Yet not I, but Christ the Lord.” He does not say “ I ordained clergy,” as a modern bishop might, but “ the Lord ordained clergy through my mediocrity.” He claims that God chose and appointed him and that God was his *authority* (*auctor*). He cries like the Psalmist—“ I cast myself upon the hands of the omnipotent God Who ruleth everywhere.” “ I pray God,” he humbly says ; “ that He may grant me perseverance.” Referring to his work in Ireland he says : “ It was not my grace but God Who gave this care (laying it) on my heart ” (*Ep.* 11).

These are the very sentiments that we find in Augustine's *Confessions*. They are the very woof and warp of both works, and the longer we live and the more deeply we think, the more we are assured of their truth.

How inconsistent with such ideas is the Roman theory of works of supererogation—the word is in Augustine's *Confessions* but not the doctrine—“ Voluntary works done over and above God's commandment,” which Article XIV truly declares “ cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety.” And yet that doctrine is the foundation of the whole system of the indulgences of the Roman Church, which affects to possess a Treasury of Merits, in which are stored up the superabundant merits of Christ and the Saints which the Pope dispenses in the form of pardons and indulgences.

Clement VI (*Bull. Unigenitus* 1350) describes this “ Treasury.” As one drop of the precious blood of Christ was sufficient to save an infinite number of souls, all the other drops could be applied to other purposes. “ Wherefore in order that the mercy of so great an outpouring should not be void or superfluous, He acquired a treasury for the Militant Church, wishing as a pious father to lay up a store for His sons. This treasure He committed to be dispensed through St. Peter, the key-bearer of heaven and his successors. To add to which heap of treasure the merits of the Blessed Virgin and of all the elect from the first to the last, are known to give their assistance,

so that no one need fear its consumption or even its diminution." But our Lord taught us that even when we have done all that is commanded us we are "unprofitable servants."

Such was the opinion of Augustine and the conviction of Patrick—the genuine Patrick who knew nothing of a Purgatory, nothing of works of supererogation, or of justification conveyed by the sacraments, *ex opere operato*, but who believed in the saving grace, the justifying power of the Love of Christ, Who "became poor for our sakes," and "was crucified and died for us," and "rose again having conquered death," and that "we shall rise in the glory of the Redeemer" and "in Him shall reign." How different was his mentality from that of those who believed and still believe that man can do something to merit or deserve justification! The Protestant Church is not antinomian; it believes in a living faith that must produce the fruit of good works, as a sound tree gives sweet fruit, but it does not consider that good works can expiate or atone for sins although done after justification. The Council of Trent decreed, on the contrary, that such good works merit the actual attainment of eternal life. See Sess. vi., Can. xxxii. "If any man says that the good works of a justified man are the gifts of God and not the good merits of the justified man—let him be anathema. Or if he says that the man who is justified by good works does not merit increase of grace, life eternal, and the attainment of eternal life—let him be anathema." St. Patrick—the Patrick of the *Confession*—lies under that anathema, like everyone who like Paul clings to "the Christ in me, the hope of glory"—for he declared that every good thing that he did was a gift of God.

Hitherto we have been considering one Patrick—the genuine Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland in the fifth century. There is another Patrick, quite a different person, who is venerated but not canonised by the Roman Church. Some people have been foolish enough to confuse our Patrick with his predecessor Palladius, who left the country after a short year in disgust, threw up his mission which he had received from the Pope, and died 'in the Britains.' As the Irish chronicler, Muirchu, shrewdly comments: "No one can receive what has not been given him from God! But more have confused the real Patrick with his Romanized understudy, the Patrick who works miracles of an ever-increasingly absurd kind, who visits Rome not once but often, and stays as long as thirty years on one occasion, and, while all Rome slept, surreptitiously annexed no less than 365 relics, including the bones of Paul and Peter, Laurence and Stephen, a sheet with Christ's blood and the hair of the Virgin! In Gibbon's day there were sixty-six biographies of Patrick, regarding which he used an opprobrious epithet. The miraculous element which is absent from the genuine works of the Saint, unless the greatness of God's mercy in converting the heathen Irish to Christ by means of Patrick be called a miracle, as, indeed, it was a crowning miracle. But that sort of a miracle is not what is meant, but thaumaturgy—the performance of marvellous deeds by the saints. It is this that gives the interest and the pep to medieval hagiography—the writer of

which, like the writer of the modern novel, catered for the taste of the public for whom he provided literary recreation such as it was. They perhaps could not appreciate anything better, like those who make the demand for sex literature in these days. We begin a record of marvellous deeds in Muirchu's memoir and Tirechan's compilation, both written about A.D. 680, which is carried on through one life after another, among them the medieval Lives collected by Colgan, e.g. the eleventh-century Tripartite Life edited by Stokes, and the Lives of Probus and Jocelyn of the twelfth. There is no regular system observed, as each new writer felt free to improve and enlarge previous works. As Professor Bury said (*St. Patrick*, p. 267), the Patrician legends were "worked up in the cells of ecclesiastics but the arguments of the stories, which they moulded, were created by popular imagination, and suggested by the motives of folklore." In the legendary Lives we find a most unpleasant person masquerading as Patrick, a creature armed with a potent curse, who drove his chariot over his sister and killed her, to whom the Lord appeared on Mount Hermon and presented to him the Staff of Jesus, and grants him three requests, that he (Patrick) is to be on His right hand in heaven, that he is to judge the Gael in the day of judgment and that he is to have as much gold as his nine companions can carry. The only miracle ascribed by Tirechan to Patrick that would appeal to moderns is the story that when he saw two brothers fighting in a field some way off, he put a spell upon them with a mighty shout, so that they remained rigidly in a ridiculous position with arms upraised until he had time to come up, release them from his spell, and make them embrace as friends. The most world-wide tradition, of course, is connected with the Shamrock (shamar og, small clover). This is said not to be older than the Reformation; but it is a remarkable fact that on the isle of Lerins, with which Tirechan connects Patrick, a species of shamrock called *medicago agrestis* is abundant and the ruined *chapelle de la Trinité* has a roof shaped like a clover leaf and a doorway consisting of three stones.¹

We observe with pain the gradual transformation of a very human-hearted man into a self-seeking despot, as we glance through these later *Lives* of Patrick. Muirchu's account sets the fairy snowball a-rolling. Dom Louis Gongand of Louvain condemns these legends, while Roman Catholic bishops accept them like children. In Muirchu the man Victoricus who, in the *Confession*, visited Patrick in a dream asking for help like the man of Macedonia who appeared to Paul asking for help, becomes an Angel Victor, who visits him every Saturday and ascends visibly to heaven, on one occasion leaving the print of his foot upon a mountain (c. xi).

This new Patrick overcame the Druids with his magical powers, turned a fruitful land into a salt marsh, and changed Coroticus into a fox! The work, in fine, abounds in that miraculous element which is absent from the genuine writings of the Saint.

We notice too in Muirchu the first instance of the veneration of

¹ For an account of the monastery of Lerins, and its founder Honoratus, see my *St. Patrick and his Gallic Friends*, S.P.C.K. (c. iv.).

relics or bones, those of a Saxon lady, Moneisen, baptised by Patrick (c. 27) ; and the first mention of " merit " of Patrick (ii. 8). When he died there arose a fierce contest between the O'Neills and the Ulidians over the relics of the Saint, although the angel had said, " no relics of thy body are to be taken from the ground " (ii. 12), but " by the merit of Patrick (merito Patricii) and the mercy of God the waves of the lough arose so high that the combatants could not get at one another.

In the memoir of Tirechan, compiled about A.D. 680 (he gives a valuable note of time referring to the recent plague *mortalitates novissimae* 664-8) there is no mention of a papal mission of Patrick. A sentence, however, in the *Book of Armagh*, inserted before this memoir by the tenth-century editor, is to the effect that one Sachellus went with Patrick to study thirty years in Rome and that Patrick ordained Sachellus there and carried away some of the relics of Peter and Paul and Stephen which are in Armagh. The whole story is absurd, on the face of it, and was evidently made up in the interests of Armagh. It runs directly counter to Patrick's own statement in his *Confessions* that he never left Ireland even to go to the Britains where his people were, much less to Gaul where his brethren were, the furthest limit of his travels. In the *Liber Angeli* (book of the Angel) of about A.D. 800 or later, inserted in the *Book of Armagh*, we have a colloquy of Patrick and an Angel in the course of which the latter permits the extension of the boundaries of the See of Armagh and appoints to Patrick and Armagh all the nations of the Irish as his " paruchia " or diocese. Patrick thanks the angel for this donation and declares himself bound to provide for the " religious " of the monasteries. The second part establishes the rights and jurisdiction of Armagh as the principal See, because of its possession of the sacred relics of the apostles, and the sacred blood of Christ in a mantle, declares that Armagh is supreme in authority over all churches in the land and that if any case arises too hard for the Irish judges, it is to be referred to the chair of the Archbishop of the Irish, that is Patrick, and " that if it cannot be settled by him and his wise men, it is to be referred to the Apostles and the chair of the Apostle Peter which has the authority of the city of Rome."

It is plain that this document was deliberately framed to establish the primacy of Armagh upon an alleged divine ordinance. As Bury said, it is " a clumsy invention, a fiction." But it shows the spirit that was working in those days in Ireland, when every superstitious device, every miraculous element was dragged in to bolster up the claims of Armagh to rule Ireland and the claims of Rome to rule Armagh. The document itself, short as it is, is full of inconsistencies such as a friendship between Patrick and Columba, who was not born until sixty years after Patrick's death, and late ecclesiastical terms which would have been anachronisms in Patrick's day such as " diocesis," " anchoritae," " abbas," " monasterium," " religiosi."

The Irish Canons which claim to be the decrees of a Synod of Bishops, that is of Patrick, Auxilius, and Iserninus, are likewise not

to be taken seriously. Canon 6 ordering that any cleric whose hair is not tonsured in the Roman fashion, should be excommunicated, shows the tendency. The Irish Church claimed to have its own form of tonsure and its own Easter, whereas the Romanising party, at first evidently but a small faction, strove to bring them into line. The 13th Canon forbids a bishop, who has left his own diocese, to perform episcopal functions in the domain of another, forgetful of the fact that it is condemning Patrick who is stated to have ordained Sachellus in Rome. See the note prefixed to Tirechan. These Canons, drawn up some centuries after Patrick, were assigned to him in order to secure his authority for their regulations. Haddan and Stubbs are followed by Wasserschleben in assigning these Canons to the eighth century.

The *Hibernensis* is another collection of Canons relating to the Irish Church, probably compiled on the Continent. Impartial authorities like Wasserschleben, Haddan and Stubbs, etc., assign them to the beginning of the eighth century. It assigns to Patrick the Canon—"if any questions arise in this island let them be referred to the Apostolic See."

Wasserschleben dates these Canons from a time when the Irish Church after an arduous and lengthy struggle had been forced into union with Rome. Had this Canon about referring questions to the Roman See been in existence in A.D. 664 when the Council of Whitby was held, Wilfrid could have laid the question that disturbed the northern church at rest by bringing it forward. Dr. J. E. Kenny, who has studied the question, says: "In any case it seems certain that the book was composed early in the eighth century by members of the Roman section of the Irish clergy."

Students of Church history are familiar with the forgeries of the ninth century known as the False Decretals (see *Encyc. Britann.*)—a literary fraud which succeeded. Among these were letters composed in the ninth century and foisted upon the earlier popes with a view to aggrandise the papacy and to establish its primacy and the right of the Apostolic See to hear appeals. The power of the papacy was enlarged by these letters and when the centuriators of Magdeburg lodged their protest in the sixteenth century—there had been considerable uneasiness about them for some time before—it was too late to be of any use.

In Tirechan's memoir which was written, though not so audaciously, in the interests of Armagh, a candidate for Baptism is asked this question—"Do you believe in the unity of the Church?" (not the Roman Church). This recalls the great work of Cyprian, *On the Unity of the Church*, in which he was very far from recognizing any primacy of the Roman bishop whom he so often bitterly opposed. Tirechan, who writes in the interest of the *paruchia Patricii*, declaring that the whole island belonged by divine donation to the *paruchia* of which Armagh was the head, referred to the relics of Peter and Paul and others, part of which, he says, Patrick gave a northern bishop who lived near the Bush River. Later writers tell how Patrick obtained these relics "by a theft which was no sacrilege,"

and that Patrick having stolen them in this manner "left the whole of that collection in Armagh, according to the will of God and of the Angel and of the men of Ireland." So the Tripartite Life of the eleventh century. But according to the earlier record of Tirechan he had already bestowed a part of them upon another bishop. Fancy the madness of the idea, Patrick stealing the bones that Rome held in such high honour, and not only that, but being allowed to steal them, and the Irish people being allowed to retain them when they fell under the sway of the Roman See!! No one but children could conceive such *ineptiae*. Patrick never mentioned "relics." No one can prove that he was interested in them. Anyway, his bones have been, like Shakespeare's, left in their last resting-place.

The wonders and signs which Christ showed Patrick (*Conf.*, 45) were not wonders in the physical world, miraculous feats of making the dead talk and converse and live again, but the power of God in keeping him safe and secure from all the perils that threatened him always. As St. Paul gives a list of his conflicts and trials in 2 Corinthians xi. 23-33, Patrick enumerates his in *Confession*, 35. "The most loving God set me often free from captivity and from twelve dangers which threatened my life." Like St. Paul he also suffered from hunger and nakedness (*Conf.*, 27). As in St. Paul's life God's power was made perfect in weakness, so in Patrick's. God helped him to overcome the temptations of his strong enemy, the devil, who never ceased to try to seduce him from his great and holy purpose to lead a chaste life, devoted to the work of saving the souls of the Irish for the Master he loved, Who had died for him, and who was ever present with him to guide, help and love him, and give him patience and perseverance to the end. Such are the genuine, the real wonders of St. Patrick's *Confession*, the wonder of a life absolutely devoted, absolutely humble, absolutely spiritual, absolutely human—a wonder that anyone who follows in the steps of this single-minded and great-hearted disciple may experience. St. Augustine has a striking passage (*Conf.*, viii, 3) in which he describes the joy of his own conversion as a sort of reaction to the joy of the great loving Father who rejoices in the return of the younger son. That joy is the undercurrent of feeling that runs through the *Confession* of Patrick. "What can I do for Him Who has done so much for me?" "This," he says, "is my return, my 'retributio,' to exalt the knowledge of God and to confess His marvellous works before every nation under heaven" (4, 57). This is the only return I can make, he cries, to "*the God I love*, and for whose love I yearn to die" (59). Who has reached a higher than that cry of a heart breaking with joy of loving and sorrow of yearning, the cry of one Saint answering another? Augustine had written in his self-revealing pages: "What return shall I make to the Lord. I shall love Thee, O Lord, I shall give thanks to Thee and confess to Thy name" (ii. 7), using the words of a kindred spirit of a distant age (Ps. cxv. 12). So one Saint goes on answering another all down the ages, until all their voices are gathered into one mighty wave of praise rolling triumphantly towards the shore of the city of God.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

JUSTINIAN. By G. P. Baker. *Grayson & Grayson*. 18s.

Though the research of scholars and the enterprise of publishers have given us a wealth of historical monographs and biographies in recent years, it is rarely indeed that, excellent as many of them are, we find sound critical history clothed in so vivid and fascinating a style as that of Mr. G. P. Baker. He has already written on Hannibal, Tiberius Cæsar, Constantine, Sulla, and "The Fighting Kings of Wessex"; and *Justinian*, his latest book, is a worthy successor to them.

It was the aim of Justinian to revive the Roman Empire to its full glory and power, after the Barbarian invasions had broken into and largely destroyed it; and he went a long way towards doing it. He reconquered North Africa, defeated the Persians, and had Belisarius grasped his idea of interposing Witigis and his Goths as a buffer state between the Franks and Italy, he would have retaken and held Italy. The task was, however, too great for the lifetime of one man, even if the trend of events, the nationalist spirit and adverse circumstances had not stood in the way and ultimately destroyed much of what he had done. Justinian had the qualities of a great ruler and among them the capacity of choosing the right men for the particular work he wanted done; and he was fortunate in having at hand the right men to choose from. Mr. Baker's power of lively and picturesque description makes some of these men stand out before us with stereoscopic clearness. Take for example John, the Cappadocian who had to raise the money for Justinian's vast enterprises:—

"Other people might be decorative and romantic, and might accomplish those things which attract the eye, or read well in a book, or sound imposing in a speech—the lust of the eye and the pride of life—but John was Number One who by hard and unpleasant work rendered all these pretty things possible. He supplied the funds—the Needful. . . . John was a big, massive, quarrelsome fellow, with the constitution of a navvy, the temper of a sea-captain and no book-learning to speak of. . . . When Justinian let loose John the Cappadocian upon the department of revenue he did something for which many of his subjects never forgave him. John grabbed the system, shook it violently and proceeded to make it walk. Any system, from a Byzantine tax office to a modern steel rolling mills, would have walked when a man like John held it by the ear."

As might be expected there was not much wrong with the financial position of the Emperor as long as John had the oversight of the exchequer. Unfortunately for himself, later on he fell out with Theodora, the Empress, and as a result he was the only one of Justinian's principal men who was superseded.

Belisarius, the commander-in-chief of the army, stands out in

these pages with equal clearness. He is in the small circle of the really great generals of history, equally able to organize a campaign on the grand scale or to snatch victory from a superior foe by the hastily improvised use of the most unpromising material and the most unfavourable circumstances. At the battle of Daras the Persian commander, with an overwhelming force, was so confident of success that he sent a messenger to Belisarius ordering a bath and a lunch in Daras the next day. By night-time he was slain with five thousand of his men and the rest were in full flight. Theodora, the Empress, Justinian himself and a multitude of other personages are made to live before us in this book. Of Tribonian, the scholar to whom Justinian entrusted the collection and codification of the laws of the Empire, we do not learn so much, for he is merged in his work; but that work was the one thing which Justinian's reign bequeathed to posterity of imperishable value. The Roman law was one of the great civilizing agencies at work throughout the Middle Ages, and it is still a part of our legal curriculum. The greatness of Justinian lies in the breadth of outlook, the statesman's power of adjustment, the sense of proportion, the sure judgment of men, and the solid practical aims which marked him out from others and gave him the position which he deserved, though it is evident that he might not have retained it but for the tenacity and cleverness of his wife the Empress Theodora. This is a capital book for the holiday season, for it is as absorbing as any novel and a most entertaining aid to the understanding of one of the crucial periods of European history.

W. G. J.

LYRA MYSTICA: AN ANTHOLOGY OF MYSTICAL VERSE. Compiled by Dr. Charles Carroll Albertson. *Macmillan & Co.* 7s. 6d. net.

This charming little book of mystical verse would make a delightful present for a birthday, or at Christmas or on any other occasion, for it would be sure of a welcome at any time. Its principal features as compared with other books of the same kind, are the great variety of authorship, most of the writers being represented by only one piece, and the prominence given to American writers who are far less known in this country than they deserve. The selection is moreover not hackneyed, the compiler has had the courage to stray many times from the beaten path, so that even those who are fairly familiar with verse of this kind will find much that is new to them. It is worth much to be reminded, by one piece from her pen, of Helen Keller, whose victory over the triple limitation of being deaf, dumb and blind from birth is an achievement as great as any recorded of man or woman.

"The word of God came unto me,
Sitting alone among the multitudes;
And my blind eyes were touched with light
And there was laid upon my lips a flame of fire.

I laugh and shout, for life is good,
 Though my feet are set in silent ways,
 In merry mood I leave the crowd
 To walk in my garden.

At last I come where tall lilies grow,
 Lifting their faces like white saints to God.
 While the lilies pray, I kneel upon the ground.
 I have strayed into the holy temple of the Lord."

If there is much that is new in this selection there are also many of the favourites that we cannot know too well and of which we never tire. There is a too brief Introduction by the Dean of St. Paul's, which forms an excellent preface to the book and should be read, for as everyone knows, he writes with authority on the subject. It may be added that type, paper and binding are all worthy of the subject and make the volume as pleasant to handle and look upon as it is to read.

W. G. J.

NICHOLAS OF CUSA. By Henry Bett, M.A. *Methuen*. Great Medieval Churchmen Series. 1932. 7s. 6d.

The career of Nicholas of Cusa constituted both a symptom and a judgment. It expressed the widespread discontent in ecclesiastical circles with the condition of the Church in the fifteenth century and it illustrates the ardent desire for reform which created the Conciliar Movement. At the same time, the abandonment of the Conciliar Movement by Nicholas, and his return to papal allegiance in the second half of life, show that reform from within was impossible for the medieval Church.

Nicholas of Cusa, born in 1401 and dying in 1464, was one of the last great scholar bishops of the Middle Ages. His wide interest in scientific and literary matters suggests the attitude of the man of the Renaissance, but he really belongs to the line of medieval scholars, who maintained an intimate connection with practical life, which included John of Salisbury, whose career has been traced by Professor C. J. Webb in this Series. Indeed, the resemblances between Nicholas and John of Salisbury are many. Both were scholars, both were active in political and theological affairs, both left behind interesting philosophical works. But the impression made upon his age was greater in the case of Nicholas of Cusa. He offered practical suggestions for the reform of the German constitution before that work was undertaken in the time of Maximilian III. He supported the reform of the ecclesiastical constitution at the Council of Basle, and when in later years he abandoned the Conciliar Movement, and became a staunch advocate of the Papacy, he did not cease from ardent attempts to reform the practical life of the Church. In the later half of his career we seem to be following the steps of a Tridentine ecclesiastic. But in practice, not in dogma. In doctrine and philosophy Nicholas of

Cusa stands apart from his contemporaries. He is in the line of John the Scot, Eckhart and other medieval Neo-Platonists, and, like other writers attached to this tradition, he anticipated some of the conclusions of later and even modern philosophic and scientific thought. "The whole of Nicholas's attitude, with its blend of the empirical and transcendental, is a striking anticipation of Kant"; just as in cosmology he was "a precursor of Copernicus and Kepler, and was not without direct influence upon the latter." In theology Nicholas was much in advance of his age. Baptism is the sacrament of faith, the Eucharist is the sacrament of the Word, "and the sacrament of the Word depends in a way upon the preaching of the Word, for how can the elements in the Eucharist be the living Bread to a man's soul unless he has been taught the living Word? Here, too, faith is the necessary factor. For the Eucharist is a sacrament in which we receive the Bread of Life by faith. . . . The spiritual reception of Christ in the Eucharist depends entirely upon the faith of the recipient." So, like his great predecessor Berengar, another Neo-Platonist, Nicholas anticipated the Reformation doctrine of the Sacraments, but, unlike Berengar, he was left in peace by the Church authorities.

Mr. Bett describes the philosophical, scientific and theological teaching of Nicholas of Cusa, with that clearness and grasp of philosophic principles which we have learned to expect from his previous works on John the Scot (*Cambridge Press*) and Joachim of Flora (*Methuen*). The greater part of this excellent book is devoted to an account and explanation of Nicholas's writings and theories, and it is preceded by a clear and sufficient historical introduction.

A. J. M.

ETHICS. By Nicolai Hartmann. *Allen & Unwin*, 1932. Vol. I, 12s. 6d.; Vol. II, 16s.

Messrs. Allen & Unwin have added to their magnificent "Library of Philosophy" the *Ethics* of the new Berlin Professor of Philosophy, translated lucidly and most readably by Dr. Stanton Coit, in three volumes. The first two volumes only are here under review. In a short notice it is quite impossible to attempt an adequate survey of the ground covered by Hartmann, and, indeed, the volumes can only be read and discussed with adequate appreciation by experts in his own field. Yet there is much that will prove of interest to less well-equipped readers. For example, in Volume I, the concept of value has already been treated by English writers. To an analysis of the idea of value and its practical ethical application, Hartmann brings all the equipment of a mind which has been compared with Aristotle's. After criticising the Kantian ethics of ends, he passes to a constructive discussion of values as essences, distinct from persons: "The person does not make the values, but the values make the person." Values have their own self-existence, but not a self-existence that is "real." The self-existence of values

subsists independently of their own actualisation. Thus, if this conception of values belongs to an idealist philosophy, yet the contact with reality is maintained by the emphasis laid upon the necessity for an agent in which values may function. "Conscience is the revelation of moral values in actual consciousness, their entrenchment within the reality of human life." In the second volume he returns to the discussion, and builds upon foundations laid by Scheler. Values are not dependent on the realm of being and non-being. Yet "moral values allow of being intended—if at all—only in their natural and particular carrier, the person." The ignoring of moral life is a sin, an irreconcilable injury to ethical Being—even to that of one's own personality. So although values as essences may appear to be very far off from practical life, Hartmann never allows them to be divorced from actual conduct. This practical application of his finely balanced dialectic is admirably maintained in the lofty sections on the "noble," on purity, on the four Platonic virtues of justice, wisdom, courage, self-control, and on the Aristotelean golden mean. He does full justice, from a purely ethical standpoint, to the new moral values of brotherly love, truth, trustworthiness, fidelity, modesty, humility, and so on, perceived under the influence of Christianity. He then passes to an analysis of the more difficult conception of "love of the remote" and "radiant virtue." "Radiance is the life of spiritual fullness . . . personal living in accord therewith, a vast overflowing, the ability to share, to make rich, to scatter broadcast; and in addition to this a delight in so doing and in enhancing the spiritual insight of those who accept . . . but with no diminution of itself." This idea has already been made known to English readers by Dr. Temple, and we may note that the terminology of stratification, the division into higher and lower regions which the Archbishop of York applied to the metaphysics of Being, is here applied to the concepts of value and virtue.

The massive solidity of Professor Hartmann's argumentation is relieved by constant contact with current problems. He summarily dismisses all attempts "to substantiate high-flying dreams of world improvement," whether upon a collectivist basis or otherwise. Yet the individual must respect the collective mind. A warning is uttered against expecting too much from psychology. Yet he allows full weight for its findings against repression and the disregard of the natural. His work is also illuminated by a keen-sighted wisdom frequently expressed in neat, but not compressed epigrams: "On the whole we learn to understand ourselves more in observing others than we learn to understand others in observing ourselves."—"A person stands defenceless against intrusion; and indeed the more so, the purer and more transparent he is."

Theologically Hartmann's standpoint is agnostic. "There may or there may not be a providence of the Almighty," and his nearest approach to a definition of God, in these two volumes, is to describe Him as "impersonal," but, as Professor Muirhead points out in

his Introduction, there is "less incompatibility than appears between what he calls the autonomy of ethics and what is historically known as the Moral Argument for the Being of God."

A. J. M.

ALEXANDRINE TEACHING ON THE UNIVERSE. By R. B. Tollinton, D.D., D.Litt. *Allen & Unwin*, 1932. 5s.

These lectures on Alexandrine theology and thought were delivered by Dr. Tollinton in Cambridge during the Vacation Term for Biblical Study in 1931. They provide a clear and readable account of the teaching of Clement and Origen and Plotinus, and the Neo-Platonists generally upon the Transcendence of God, His Mediation to the World, and upon the Universe and Man. Dr. Tollinton writes from the standpoint of modern Anglican immanentism, but on the whole he does justice to the Alexandrine view of the transcendence of God. His attractive lectures therefore form a contribution to the growing current of transcendental theology, which is now flowing through theological thought in this country. Indeed, it is significant that a representative of the predominant Anglican tradition should find it worth while to give us this timely and useful sketch of the other school. Dr. Tollinton has some observations upon the relations of modern mathematical science and religion, and his book should certainly be read with Dean Inge's lecture, *The Twilight of the Gods*, and perhaps with Professor Burkitt's *Church and Gnosis*. If the philosophical background of theological transcendentalism proves to be Platonism, we may come to a union between the Dean of S. Paul's and Karl Barth. They have much in common—neither sees any hope of progress in this world, and both look out far beyond time and space into the realm of the wholly Other. What men thought of that wholly Other, in far away Alexandrine days, is set forth in Dr. Tollinton's book.

A. J. M.

TELL JOHN. By Geoffrey Allen and Roy McKay. *Maclehose*, 1932. 5s.

Mr. Allen is Fellow and Chaplain of Lincoln College, Oxford, Mr. McKay is a Birmingham Vicar. They have both gazed steadily at the present-day crisis of religion, in society, in the church, and in the individual, and in these striking chapters they offer the solution which is presented to man by God—utter surrender of self, party and ecclesiastical bias, followed by a life of joyous, obedient service. This is the liberation by way of crisis which is being preached by the Barthian prophets. These two writers were first thrown into a state of crisis by the Barthian message itself, and from that experience they perceived the way out of the current religious crisis. They have caught the Barthian note to a remarkable degree. They speak with the voice of Barth's great

commentary on the Romans, yet in simple untechnical terms, which any reader can follow. Here is no systematic explanation of the dialectical theology, indeed Barth's name is seldom mentioned, but anyone who desires to understand the angle of approach of the Swiss school, will read this book. He cannot fail to be gripped and thrilled. Heart as well as head will be moved. Even Mr. F. R. Barry, whose theology is of an entirely different kind, felt compelled, in the *Guardian*, to praise when he desired to criticise, and reverently to turn aside lest he wrongly handled a book whose power had obviously stirred him.

A. J. M.

THE CHALLENGE OF KARL BARTH. By Carl Heath. *Allenson*, 1932. 1s.

This pamphlet is a defence of Quaker principles, using Karl as a foil. Therefore it is mainly critical of the Barthian teaching, and should be read with caution. But it pays some striking tributes to the influence of Barth upon a mind not disposed to surrender to his challenge. "I hold Barth to be the most challenging and prophetic spirit of the day," writes Mr. Heath. And again: "Once again, men have heard the call in trumpet tones, to consider and to reconsider: God, Life, Man, Sin, and the meaning of the spiritual life and of human nature." That is the spirit in which to read Karl Barth.

A. J. M.

CHURCHES WITH A STORY. By George Long, J.P., F.R.G.S. *T. Werner Laurie*, 1932. 10s. 6d.

The services rendered to English churchmen by Werner Laurie & Co., in their magnificent series of splendidly illustrated books on the cathedrals and churches of England, Wales, London, as well as those of Italy, France and Belgium, deserve the gratitude of all who delight in the glorious heritage which our ancient parish churches represent. Now comes another book from this firm, written in a lighter vein, but with due appreciation and regard for the venerable antiquities described. Mr. Long has not only travelled widely throughout Europe, he has penetrated into remote villages of England, clambered up wearisome crags, and pursued a failing trail across unfrequented fields, in order to gather together materials for this delightful book on the "comedy, tragedy, history and human interest of some English churches." He has taken his camera with him, and sixty-five admirable illustrations adorn the book. This is a volume to tuck away in the pocket of the car, and to be used as a guide on tours into fresh country. It is also a book which the busy townsman, and the Londoner especially, will appreciate. Even Westminster Abbey will be found to yield new results to most readers who are not experts in the architecture or woodcraft of our great churches. To some extent Mr. Long covers

similar ground to that recently traversed by Dr. McCulloch in *Faith and Fable in the Middle Ages*, but with a much lighter touch, with more of the brilliance of the *raconteur*, and with a keen eye for anything that supplies a "human" detail. His book will make an admirable Christmas gift.

A. J. M.

MORAL FREEDOM AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By Cyril H. Valentine. *S.P.C.K.* 5s.

This is an admirable little book, well written, well arranged, showing real constructive thought and abounding in vivid illustrations which fix themselves in the memory.

"We must seek a new vision of God, to meet the new needs of our age," writes Dr. Valentine. And that vision must be of the greatness and glory of God. Not the merely "numinous" but the "glorious" God, is the special revelation of Christianity, a God who can be truly immanent, just because He is truly transcendent, and is not imprisoned in His own Universe. And the glory of God is His nature, which is Love. Love reaches its climax on the Cross, which does not make God what He was not before, but reveals to us what God is. Like Martensen, Dr. Valentine believes that "Etiam si homo non peccasset, Deus tamen incavoratus esset." "The revelation of Himself through the Incarnation was the fore-ordained purpose of God. It was man's sin which determined that incarnation must lead to crucifixion." Sin is a wrong personal attitude to God. Grace is the influence of perfect personality upon imperfect personalities: and sin is the opposition of man to the will of God, which is "the perfection of human personality for fellowship with Himself."

Morality alone cannot give freedom. Mere Duty remains something external. But when Religion comes in to fulfil Morality, and the Perfect Personality as revealed in Christ becomes the standard, we feel that in aiming at it we are free, realizing our true selves. The service of God in Christ—for, as Dr. Valentine well points out, it is not so much the moral character of Christ, as His God-ward attitude, that is at once our standard of obligation, our ideal, and our moral dynamo—is perfect freedom—freedom to develop our true selves. Real obligation issues from the moral and spiritual nature of reality. And Personality is the most real thing in the world—that for the development of which all Nature is a stage. And the one wholly real Personality is that of God, revealed to persons who have the capacity of discerning it, in Jesus Christ. Religion is the free personal development of that capacity: its true symbol, as Barth points out, is not the Temple, but the Tabernacle: it is progressive, not static. And the Religion which fulfils Morality, and gives freedom, must itself be real and free.

The treatment of sacramental grace, and of Original Sin and Baptismal Regeneration, are excellent. And, as a sample of the author's power of happy illustration, one might refer to that showing

how customary standards of what is right and what wrong fail to account for the fundamental distinction of good and evil. "We can, by common agreement, alter all timepieces during the summer months. It would not, however, be all one if we decided by general consent to work all night and sleep all day. Health would suffer. In a similar way, moral health depends upon conformity to the nature of moral and spiritual reality." We confidently recommend this book both to the theologians, who will find in it old truths freshly put, and to the layman, who will find new light on many questions which are troubling the thoughtful in these days.

THE STORY OF WESTMINSTER ABBEY. By Lawrence E. Tanner, M.V.O., M.A., F.S.A. *Raphael Tuck*. 3s. 6d.

The Keeper of the Muniments of Westminster Abbey is specially qualified to write its story, and he has succeeded in telling it in a fascinating way. There are many books written giving the history of our great cathedral church, and this charming little book comes from one who was born and bred within its walls. We are glad to see that it is published at the moderate price of 3s. 6d. It may be looked upon as a simple Guide Book in addition to its being, as the Dean of Westminster states in a foreword, "A plain man's story of the Abbey, free from the inevitable detail of the ordinary Guide Book." The author divides his book into four parts, The Story of the Building, The Story of the Treasures, The Story of the Monastery, and the Story of the Pageantry. In addition to a plan of the Abbey, fifteen excellent plates are given.

AN IDEALISTIC VIEW OF LIFE. By S. Radhakrishnan. Being the Hibbert Lectures for 1929. *George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.* 12s. 6d. net.

This is an interesting and lucid philosophical work by an Indian who is well versed not only in the ancient philosophy of his own country, but also in that of the ancient and modern West. It is written in a broad-minded and sympathetic spirit, and the views of the author are by no means characterised by those extremes of Monism which are commonly associated with the Indian philosophy. Of this, of course, there were different schools. But, in any case, his close contact with the scientific outlook and the individualism of the European thinkers have greatly contributed to the value of this volume. Without being, in its main character, specially original, it seems to us a very good and clear survey of contemporary thought in relation to the supreme problems of religion, and should be welcomed particularly by those who have a strong interest in them, without the opportunity to read widely, and are thankful for brief critical exposition as well as for the stimulus of the author's own thought.

Professor Radhakrishnan is an Idealist in the sense of being a believer in the spiritual meaning of the universe and the eternal

significance of our highest ideals, not in contradistinction to Realism. One great feature of his philosophy is the stress he lays—and we think quite rightly lays—upon intuition. “It is rational intuition in which both immediacy and mediacy are comprehended. As a matter of fact, we have throughout life the intuitive and the intellectual sides at work. . . . Intuition gives us the object in itself, while intellect details its relations” (p. 153). He does not, however, show acquaintance with the important modern school of Husserl, which has made intuitional knowledge the object of close and systematic study. But his treatment of the scope and meaning of intuition in the apprehension of spiritual reality is greatly strengthened by this insistence upon its fundamental relation to all rational process.

With most of the religious philosophy of this book we can heartily agree, for instance with his genuine belief in free-will (an epithet that cannot be applied to all who think they believe in it), and his insistence upon the creative process; but as we get near the end, his doctrine of God, though superior to mere Pantheism, cannot be said to be clear and satisfactory. On page 336 he even says that “God Himself is in the make,” and a little later, “God, though immanent, is not identical with the world until the very end. Throughout the process there is an unrealised residuum in God, but it vanishes when we reach the end. When the reign is absolute the kingdom comes. God Who is organic with it recedes into the background of the Absolute” (p. 340). He concludes the book with the Absolute! God—otherwise almost pantheistically regarded, at least in these later pages—is the side of the Absolute immanent in the world-process. This distinction seems roughly to represent transcendence and immanence respectively.

Naturally, salvation as here set forth is, in a sense, self-salvation. But the self that is in touch with the highest is the universal self. “There is a tendency, especially in the West, to overestimate the place of the human self. . . . If the self is not widened into the universal spirit, the values themselves become merely subjective and the self will collapse into nothing” (p. 274).

We cannot, of course, expect a Christian Theism outside Christianity. Revelation begins where human wisdom leaves off. The highest self in us requires redemption. But there *is* a lowest and a highest, and all honour to non-Christian thinkers who believe in the highest.

A. R. W.

THE ATONEMENT IN EXPERIENCE. A Critical Study by Leon Arpee.
G. Allen & Unwin. 5s. net.

This is an attempt to explain the Atonement along psychological and experimental lines.

The author considers that he has set forth “A perfectly intelligent rationale of the Atonement,” and deprecates Mozley’s statement, “We cannot hope for a final doctrine of the Atonement. There will always be a shadow round the Cross.” In spite of Leon

Arpee many still will feel that Mozley is right. There is "a shadow" in this book, for while the author maintains that "Christ is not merely the supreme sacrifice, but the sole sacrifice for sin" he does not attempt to explain if and how O.T. Saints were saved. Mr. (or should it be Monsieur) Arpee finds the key to the interpretation of the Cross in the deity of Jesus. "The Church from the post-Apostolic age down seems to have failed to consider that while the humanity of Christ is a very precious and vital truth, it is the *deity*¹ alone, unmixed and undiverted, that can yield a true rationale of the Atonement as an *Act of God*."¹

"So orthodox theology, through a hesitancy to admit the possibility of God, never has said what Christian experience and a few heretics distinctly affirmed, 'God suffered in the Cross.'"

The problem of redemption is stated thus :

"The Sinner rebellious, and suspicious of God, defying His law and spurning His love ; God yearning to save the sinner at any cost, except that of His own Character ; how could the divine Father in His mercy offer to the sinner *free* forgiveness without thereby compromising His own righteousness? He simply could not. The Cross shows that he did not. The forgiveness of the Cross is not a gratuitous one. God Himself paid the Cost of it, and in a manner more vital to His own Character than Bushnell's easy-going theory of 'making cost' recognised."

The Chapters on Sin and Faith are suggestive.

"Justice is not done to the conception of sin until it is recognised that at bottom it is a religious idea. . . ." "A Personal God . . . and an Objective principle . . . are both essential to the reality of sin."

"Christian faith is the souls' response to a gracious God in utter self-Commitment."

There are other good things in the book, and it is quite worth reading.

B. M. B.

A SHORT RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF ISRAEL. By E. W. Hammond.
Pp. 158. *Student Christian Movement Press*. 4s. net.

THE EIGHTH-CENTURY PROPHETS. By E. W. Hammond, M.A.
Pp. 154. *Student Christian Movement Press*. 4s. net.

These two books, written by the former Principal of the Jerusalem Men's College, form the third and fourth volumes of a series of seven dealing with the development of religious thought from Moses to Christ. They are intended for public and secondary schools from the Fourth to the Sixth Forms and for Sunday School and other teachers.

Mr. Hammond writes as one who accepts the best results of Biblical criticism. To him revelation is progressive ; men gradually learn more of the Divine nature. The writers of the Old Testa-

¹ Italics are Arpee's.

ment were truly inspired but not mere automatons. The story of creation is not a scientific record; "it would be a real difficulty if the account of Creation in the first chapter of Genesis did agree with the findings of modern science." Similarly the historical books are not quite history in our sense of the word. "But there is a purpose throughout, God's purpose. . . . No longer bound by the letter which killeth, we come to discern in these writings of old-time clear evidence of the working of the Spirit which giveth life."

Accepting the writer's attitude towards certain vexed questions, we have here two books, scholarly, fresh in style and compiled in such a way as to be attractive to young students of the Old Testament Scriptures. The *Short Religious History* is divided into sixty paragraphs rather than chapters, with a useful "Literary and Historical Chart" appended. The association of Biblical events with important happenings in the non-Biblical world gives added value.

The Eighth-Century Prophets has short introductions to Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah, each followed by a simple rhythmical translation, necessitating only a few notes. The author gives, in addition, an historical chart and an analysis of each book.

The books are calculated to increase interest in the greatest book in the world and, it is claimed, will enrich and develop personal religion.

PROBLEM OF THE AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINAL. By E. R. Gribble.

Pp. xix + 157. *Angus and Robertson (The Australian Book Company, 16 Farringdon Avenue, E.C.4)*. 5s.

No one can read this book without experiencing a surprised sense of shame at the inadequate way in which we have discharged our responsibilities towards the aborigines of Australia. The facts, as stated by one who has had forty years' intimate experience of the Australian blacks, are beyond dispute. "From the greater part of the continent the aborigine has completely disappeared and the condition of the remnant is by no means a credit to white Australia." For his disappearance the vices of the white man are largely to blame. The treatment accorded to him has been too often brutal and senseless. Wasn't it Bishop Trower who resigned his position as "Protector" of the aborigines in despair of obtaining for them fair treatment?

The "problem" is twofold—that of thousands of half-castes and others who have lived all their lives in contact with the whites, and the greater number of the race still living more or less in their primitive condition. "The more difficult of these problems is the first." The solution of the other lies, the author contends, in segregation. Let Cape York Peninsula and Arnheim's Land be proclaimed segregation areas in perpetuity. Then give encouragement to missionary effort. "The solution lies with the Government and the Christian Church. No government can uplift or

develop a primitive race such as this. . . . It is the Church alone that can instil into the race incentives to existence and also to higher existence."

The history of missionary efforts among the aborigines is a very chequered one. Effort after effort by various religious bodies has either failed or, where successful, fallen into secular control. Only within the last thirty years has definite success attended the efforts. It is to be hoped that Mr. Gribble's book will serve the purpose of touching the hearts and quickening the consciences of all who have some knowledge of what is involved in Christian stewardship.

F. B.

SAMUEL MARSDEN : A PIONEER OF CIVILISATION IN THE SOUTHERN SEAS. By S. M. Johnstone, M.A. Pp. vii + 256. *Angus and Robertson (The Australian Book Company, 16 Farrington Avenue, E.C.4).* 7s. 6d.

The Rev. S. M. Johnstone supplies a long-felt want in this very readable life of one of the outstanding figures in the early days of Australian settlement.

It is noteworthy that the British Government was quite prepared to establish convict settlements in Australia and to leave them utterly devoid of any religious influence. Happily, the Eclectic Society, one of the fruits of the Evangelical revival, was able to persuade the Prime Minister to authorise the appointment of a chaplain, the Rev. R. Johnson. For a while, under extreme difficulties, without resources and with little encouragement, he laboured alone. In 1794, Samuel Marsden, one of the first students to receive a grant for training from the Elland Society, joined Johnson. From the day of his arrival until his death in 1837 he gave unceasingly his energy and gifts to the work to which he had been sent.

Mr. Johnstone, with a wealth of material under conscription, gives a vivid, penetrating picture of a striking personality, strong-willed, determined, impatient of opposition, conscientious and courageous. In many different ways he shows him an organiser of exceptional capacity.

Marsden arrived in Australia when the population, numbering 3,000, was reduced to its last keg of salted beef, owing to the result of haphazard provisioning. He found a community, many of its members the offscourings of the cities of Great Britain, living under appalling spiritual conditions, and ruled by authorities not too sympathetic to the Church's responsibility and work. It is difficult for the present generation to appreciate the state of things that existed. In 1800 there were in New South Wales 958 children, of whom 398 were either orphans or totally neglected by both parents. The change for the better in the following thirty years was due in no small measure to Marsden.

On the material side he threw himself deliberately and whole-

heartedly into the development of Australia's chief industry. Himself holding considerable land, he was the outstanding pioneer in the improvement of sheep and wool.

A romance in itself is the story of Marsden's untiring and successful efforts to plant Christianity among the Maoris of New Zealand. His visits to North Island, his interest in the Maori chiefs, his constant efforts on their behalf, are told vividly and with convincing power. Marsden is revealed as the Apostle of the Church in New Zealand.

Almost equally important was the part played by Marsden as the agent and inspiring friend of the London Missionary Society in connection with its work in Tahiti.

Mr. Johnstone deals at some length with the charge made against Marsden that he showed no concern for the Australian aborigines. The great friend of the aborigines, the Rev. E. R. B. Gribble, in his latest book begins one chapter: "The first recorded effort made in Australia to Christianise the aborigines was made by the Rev. Samuel Marsden soon after his arrival in New South Wales in 1795." That would appear to be an adequate answer.

Marsden was frequently unhappy in his relations with the civil authorities. Mr. Johnstone makes out a good case for his hero, but was Marsden always in the right? It seems likely that his strong will and his determination sometimes led him into paths that a more placid temperament might have avoided.

Here is an excellent book on an excellent subject, a figure outstanding in the history of Christian Missions, "the sheet-anchor of our hopes respecting the continents and islands of the Southern Seas," as said the 1822 report of the C.M.S.

F. B.

OUTLINE STUDIES IN PHILIPPIANS. By the Rev. Henry E. Anderson. *Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd.* 3s. 6d. net.

These studies are really a running commentary, illustrated, largely, from experiences gained in China. The Author describes the book as "A Missionary's Notes on a Missionary's letter." Mr. Anderson claims to have been "graciously delivered from the false doctrines of Modernism" while on service as a Missionary. The Notes are devotional in character and are coloured deeply by the writer's theological outlook.

THE BOOK OF HOSEA. Edited by Sydney Lawrence Brown, M.A., D.D. *London: Methuen, 1932.* 10s. 6d. net. 146 pp. (Westminster Commentaries.)

Students will certainly desire to possess this latest addition to the Westminster Commentaries. It is edited by Dr. S. L. Brown, whose labours in connection with the supply and training of Ordination Candidates, and in other fields, have not prevented him from completing his task, though they have delayed its completion.

The Commentary follows the critical lines which prevail at the moment, though there is a refreshing unwillingness to dogmatise on matters which must, in the present state of our knowledge, be regarded as open questions. The careful and detailed introduction, together with a Bibliography, Analysis and Notes, and Commentary on the Text, provide abundance of material, which will well repay attention. Hosea is admittedly one of the most difficult books in the Old Testament, the text being in places obscure and corrupt. Yet the general drift of the Prophet's message and the application of particular passages seem clear enough. The loftiness of his conception of God and the depth of his tender appeal are no less moving to-day than they have been down the centuries.

H. D.

PASTORAL PSYCHIATRY AND MENTAL HEALTH. By John Rathbone Oliver, D.D., M.D. *Charles Scribner's Sons.* 8s. 6d.

The Rev. John Rathbone Oliver modestly disclaims distinction as a Theologian or as a Psychologist. But he happens to be a physician, priest, and practising psychiatrist, and so has special qualifications for the task which he undertakes in these lectures. They were delivered on the Hale Foundation in the early part of this year and are printed here with much additional material, including a comprehensive Bibliography and an index, in a volume of 326 pages. The lectures embody considerable knowledge gathered from wide experience, patient investigation and diligent research, and they aim at helping those who have to deal with sufferers from mental illnesses and maladjustments. They are written in racy American style, which makes very easy reading and they are not burdened with technicalities. The book, however, leaves us uncomfortable and dissatisfied. The modern method of speaking quite openly about matters which a former generation seldom discussed may have much in its favour, but a perusal of these pages makes us more certain than ever that the risks and dangers of too much publicity are at least as great as those of too little. It would be extremely easy for the weak in will or mind to find encouragement for evil ways in this book. It would almost seem as if nearly the whole community were morally rotten, and, worse still, the moral rottenness is rather excused than condemned. The doctor is an advanced Anglo-Catholic and has nothing but scorn for Puritans and Protestants. But this makes no difference to our view of his general position, which, on its merits, we deplore.

H. D.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

WINE OFFICE COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

Sunday School Lesson Books.—The senior Sunday School Lesson Book issued this year is entitled *The Story of the Bible : Lessons for the Sundays of the Church's Year for the School or Home*, by "Wayfarer." The author commences his series of lessons by three on the subject of The Dawning of Conscience, The Need for Law, and The Instinct to Worship, and continues with lessons under the headings of How the Law Began in Israel, Duties to God, Prayer in Time of Need, The Lost Library and The Story of the Gospels. Lessons are also given on Wycliffe's and Tyndale's Bibles and the Authorized and Revised Versions. At the end of each lesson will be found a simple summary and application under the heading, The Teacher's Guide. This is a little lesson in itself and is especially intended for the younger classes. Instructions are given to the teacher in a useful introduction, which is divided into the headings, Getting Acquainted, What the Lessons are About, and How to Use the Lessons. A particular point is made that the studies are not intended to be ready-made lessons but the material out of which lessons may be made. The book is published at 2s. (postage 3d.).

The new Lesson Book for Juniors (children from 4 to 7 years of age) (1s. 6d.) is by Miss Marcella Whittaker, M.R.S.T. The lessons contain a rich variety of subject matter and the treatment is always fresh and in every way admirable. The title is *Days in the Life of Christ and Stories Jesus Loved*. An illustrated album has been prepared containing fifty-three original drawings to illustrate the Lessons, and the children can either copy or colour these diagram pictures, which are specially produced on drawing paper and in faint grey ink. The album also contains a register of attendance and children's prayers. It is supplied at 4d. a copy, postage extra, and a specimen copy can be obtained at 5d. post free.

Class Registers.—In response to many requests it has been decided to issue a Sunday School Class Register from the Book Room this year, and two specially prepared cut-in Registers are now ready. They contain special notes for teachers and forms for opening and closing the School. The smaller Register is 18 lines deep ($5\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$) undated, and is for marking single attendances. There is no re-writing of the names quarterly, and it is readily adapted for marking attendances of Choirs, Band of Hope meetings, Lads' Brigades, Girls' Friendly Societies, Mothers' Meetings, Bible and other Classes where a handy Register of Attendances is required. The larger Register is 14 lines deep (size $5\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$) undated, and is for marking attendance (morning and afternoon) at School and Church and for Lessons and bringing Bible and Prayer Book. The Registers have ruled and printed pages for weekly and monthly contributions to Societies, etc., and one page of absentee slips. The smaller Register is published at 4½d. each (4s. 6d. a dozen) and the larger 9d. each (9s. a dozen). The Registers are bound in strong cloth-lined covers and each one is issued in two colours so that those used in the Boys' and Girls' School can be kept distinct.

Articles.—Two additions have been made to the series of pamphlets on the Thirty-Nine Articles: No. 5, *The Articles : A Safeguard against Romanism*, by Rev. T. C. Hammond, M.A., T.C.D.; and No. 6, *The Articles and Modern Church Life*, by Rev. Harold Drown, M.A. (2d.

each). The other pamphlets in the series are (1) *Origin and History*, by Rev. Harold Smith, D.D. ; (2) *Authority and Character*, by Rev. C. Sydney Carter, F.R.Hist.S. ; (3) *The Appeal to Scripture*, by the Ven. J. H. Thorpe, B.D. ; and *Importance of Assent*, by Rev. W. Dodgson Sykes. The six pamphlets will be sent on receipt of cost and postage, 1s. 2d.

Baptism.—The Lecture given by the Rev. G. W. Neatby on *The Meaning of Baptism and its Relation to Infants* to the Young Churchmen's Movement has now been printed in pamphlet form, price 2d. Mr. Neatby's pamphlet will be found very useful for distribution. He deals very effectively and Scripturally with the whole position and the validity of and grounds for Infant Baptism.

National Church Almanack.—The National Church Almanack for 1933, will be ready early in October, and is published this year at 2d. (post free, 3d.). The Almanack contains the full Table of Lessons according to the Lectionary of 1871 and also according to the Revised Lectionary of 1922. The introductory matter contains notes on the Constitution of the Church, Synods, the Church Assembly, Parochial Church Councils and other useful matter. A picture of Christ Church, Oxford, serves as a frontispiece, and a brief account of the building explains its chief architectural features.

Several requests have been received from those who used the Almanack last year that the Lectionaries should be issued in the form of a tear-off pad, which would be more convenient for use at reading-desks, and this has been arranged for. The Prayer Book Lectionary and the Revised Lectionary will be printed together at the price of 6d.

Sunday School Prizes.—The new Sunday School Prize list for 1932-3 is now ready and copies will be sent free on application. The lists contains many new books and has been carefully revised so that only books which are obtainable are included. It is specially useful as a guide to those who are unable to call and select books from the shelves in the Book Room. Customers who so desire, can, however, leave the selection of prizes to the Church Book Room, stating whether the books required are for boys or girls and giving ages and the amount which can be spent.