

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# The Churchman Advertiser.

OCTOBER, 1937.

## THE PANGS OF HUNGER

MUST WE SAY THEM NAY?

**4** CENTRES PLEADING FOR EXTRA HELP;  
NOURISHMENT for the sick  
FOOD for the Aged  
MILK for the Children

ONE WARNING SAYS :

**“ UNLESS WE GIVE FOOD THEY  
WILL DIE OF STARVATION ”**

Please help at this time of great emergency.  
Food is costing more than double the price last year.  
Unemployment is also increasing.  
Sickness, largely resulting from being underfed is alarming.

## Armenian Massacre Relief

at the office of

**Bible Lands Missions' Aid Society**

Ald. HARRY FEAR, J.P., *Hon. Treasurer.*  
Rev. S. W. GENTLE-CAKETT,  
*Secretary.*

**9P, TUFTON STREET,  
WESTMINSTER,  
LONDON, S.W.1**

## THE REFERENCE BOOK FOR SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS

### The Catholic Faith

By Rev. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D.

Cloth gilt, 2/6 ; Cloth limp, 2/- ; Paper, 1/6.

"Simple, but wonderfully comprehensive."

*Church of England Newspaper.*

---

#### FOUR EXCELLENT PAMPHLETS FOR SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS.

2d. each, or 1s. 6d. per dozen.

"Sunday Schools and their Management," by W. G. Lambert.

"The Preparation of a Lesson," by Rev. Guy H. King.

"The Characteristics of a Child," by R. J. Bartlett, M.Sc.,  
A.R.C.S.

"The Preparation of the Teacher," by Dorothy M. Graves.

---

#### SUNDAY SCHOOL REGISTERS.

(Atkinson's "Excelsior.")

##### Dated Registers for Morning and Afternoon Attendances :

*(Dated from Advent Sunday to the last Sunday in December following—13 months.)*

No. 1.	18 lines ( $5\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ )	.. ..	4½d. each
No. 2.	26 lines ( $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ )	.. ..	6d. „
No. 3.	40 lines ( $5\frac{1}{2} \times 12$ )	.. ..	8d. „

##### Registers for Marking Single Attendances :

No. 13.	18 lines ( $5\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ ), Dated	..	4½d. each
No. 17.	18 lines ( $5\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ ), Undated	..	4½d. each

##### Undated Register for Marking Morning and Afternoon Attendances at School and Church and for Lessons and bringing Bible :

14 lines deep ( $5\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ )	.. ..	9d. each.
--	-------	-----------

*The Registers are specially prepared for the Church Book Room, with Notes for Teachers and forms for opening and closing the School, etc.*

---

**The Church Book Room**  
7, Wine Office Court, London, E.C.4.

# THE EVANGELICAL HYMN BOOK FOR EVANGELICAL PARISHES

Arranged on the order of the Christian Year.

Has about 900 hymns and 1,000 tunes.

The selection is varied and of an unusually high order, while true to the Evangelical and Protestant doctrines of the Church of England.

There is a Children's Supplement of 102 hymns which is available separately.

## THE CHURCH HYMNAL FOR THE CHRISTIAN YEAR

is obtainable in various bindings and type sizes as follows :

		s. d.			s. d.
Music Edition, with complete Indexes, cloth .. ..	7	6	Words only, small type, Persian Morocco .. ..	4	6
Music Edition, for Choir use, cloth .. ..	6	0	Words only, small type, Pluviusin boards .. ..	1	6
Words only, large type, Persian Morocco .. ..	6	6	Children's Supplement, Music Edition .. ..	2	3
Words only, large type, Pluviusin .. ..	4	6	Children's Supplement, Words only, limp cloth .. ..	6	
Words only, large type, cloth ..	2	6	Children's Supplement, Words only, paper cover .. ..	3	
Words only, medium type, music expressions, cloth .. ..	2	6			

A special Grant of one-third is made to Churches on the introduction of this Hymn Book for general use if ordered direct from the National Church League. For terms for Members of the League, after introduction, please write to:—

**THE SECRETARY, N.C.L., 7, WINE OFFICE COURT, LONDON, E.C.4**

NEW AND ENLARGED EDITION  
OVER 100 PAGES

## “A Few Picked Gems”

MANY NEW POEMS HAVE BEEN  
ADDED TO THIS BOOK OF  
EXQUISITE POETRY, BUT THE  
PRICE IS STILL

**ONE SHILLING (Post Free)**

The testimonials received are too numerous to publish, but it can safely be asserted that no book of poetry could give more pleasure. It is suitable for every class of reader.

From

THE MANAGER, “C.E.N.,” LTD.  
19, Tavistock Street, London, W.C.2

## Some N.C.L. Publications BIOGRAPHIES.

Francis James Chavasse, Bishop of Liverpool. By Canon J. B. Lancelot. 3s. 6d. (post 5d.)

Jix—Viscount Brentford. Illustrated. By H. A. Taylor. 7s. 6d. (post 6d.)

The Life and Work of John Wycliffe. By Canon Dyson Hague, D.D. 3s. 6d. (post 4d.)

## PAMPHLETS.

Secret Prayer : A Great Reality. By Henry Wright, M.A. 2d.

How to say your Prayers. By R. E. T. Bell, M.A. 2d.

The Ten Commandments. By the Bishop of Chelmsford. 1d.

The Confessional. By Canon F. Meyrick. 3d.

Write for Catalogue to:—

**THE CHURCH BOOK ROOM  
7, Wine Office Court, London, E.C.4**

*All Young Churchpeople are invited to the*

## AUTUMN RALLY

of the

**Young Churchmen's Movement  
at Queen Mary Hall (Y.W.C.A.)**

GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.,

on **TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12th, at 7 p.m.**

---

*Chairman* : REV. H. E. EARNSHAW-SMITH, M.A.

*Speaker* : ALFRED BUXTON, ESQ.

---

**SEE THE CINÉ FILMS OF OAKHILL SECRETARIES' CONFERENCE  
AND COLWYN BAY HOUSE PARTY!**

**ORDER NOW!**

THE

## National Church Almanack 1938

With Full Tables of Lessons according to the Lectionary of 1871, incorporated in the Book of Common Prayer : and also according to the alternative Revised Lectionary of 1922 ; and Introduction, Notes and Addenda.

**2d.**

A specimen copy will be sent on receipt of 3d.

---

**THE CHURCH BOOKROOM,  
7, WINE OFFICE COURT, LONDON, E.C.4**

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
NOTES AND COMMENTS .. .. .	181
The Bucharest Conference. Oxford and Edinburgh. The Reformation.	
THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. By the Rev. Prebendary Clayton, M.C., M.A. .. .. .	185
THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES AND THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION. By W. Guy Johnson .. .. .	193
THE NON-JURORS 1688-1805. By Albert Mitchell .. .. .	205
THE PROBLEM OF SUFFERING IN THE LIGHT OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. By the Rev. R. Wyse Jackson, LL.D. .. .. .	212
EMIL BRUNNER'S CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY. By F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D. .. .. .	220
REVIEWS OF BOOKS .. .. .	225
That Inferiority Feeling. Hebrew Religion Between the Testaments: An Exposition of the Judaism of the Home of Jesus. New Light on Hebrew Origins. The Prophetic Road to God. The Wisdom of God. A History of Christian Worship. Moscow: The Third Rome. Christian Democracy. Faith and Fact. Workmen of the Bible. Prayers for Common Worship, Morning and Evening, Every Lord's Day throughout the Course of the Christian Year.	

---



---

## A Persecuted Church



PREACHER USING PICTORIAL AID.

The Moravian Church was born in days of persecution. Its founder was an honoured martyr. It continued through periods of persecution when its members met for worship under pain of imprisonment and worse; when they were forced to bury their Bibles and meet at midnight. But the "hidden seed" has born much fruit in the most difficult of Foreign Mission Fields in earth's darkest places. God has blessed this ancient Church very richly. Do you feel led to give it your support? If that is so please send your annual subscription or donation to

CHARLES HOBDAY, Esq.,  
Chairman and Hon. Secretary,  
70a, Basinghall St., London,  
E.C.2.

*London Association*  
**MORAVIAN MISSIONS** *in aid of*

President: Sir George H. Hume, J.P., M.P., L.C.C.

---

# A BOOK OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Ready in November

**DEVOTEES OF CHRIST: Some Women Pioneers of the Indian Church.** Illustrated with photographs. By D. S. BATLEY. A companion volume to *Hot-Hearted: Some Women Builders of the Chinese Church*. By F. I. CODRINGTON. A delightful group of short biographies introducing pioneer Indian Christian women to their Western fellow-Christians. A book which is long overdue and which should have an enthusiastic welcome.

**2/-**  
Postage 3d.

## Other Recent Publications

**UNDER FIVE REIGNS.** The Coronation Souvenir of the C.E.Z.M.S.

An album of delightful photographs from India, Ceylon, China, and Singapore.

**6d.**  
Postage 1d.

**THE TWO-SHILLING BABY.** By D. S. BATLEY. A charming story of India—very suitable for reading aloud. Illustrated with photographs.

**6d.**  
Postage 1d.

For Children

**DAVID'S BAND.** By D. S. BATLEY.

The story of an Indian Christian family who wanted to be "like David". Illustrated.

**1/-**  
Postage 2d.

Publications Department

**Church of England Zenana Missionary Society**  
19-21, Southampton Street, Fitzroy Square, London, W.1

## Their only contribution

"Your grant is making possible the sustaining of work at Kelvington and Lintlaw and northward, where a great number of families have moved in from the diocese of Qu'Appelle. This cannot be other than a mission point for some years, because these people have come in from the drought area with only their zeal and earnestness as their contribution, but we are thankful that they have that."

*Extract from a letter from the Bishop of Saskatoon:*

The need for considerably increased grants in aid from the C.C.C.S., is very urgent. In Western Canada's drought area there is much anxiety regarding the wheat harvest—and much distress.

Remembering the great needs of our own kith and kin overseas, kindly send a generous contribution to the Secretary,

**THE**  
**COLONIAL**  
**AND**  
**CONTINENTAL**  
CHURCH SOCIETY

9 Serjeants' Inn, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4

# THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1937.

## NOTES AND COMMENTS.

### The Bucharest Conference.

**N**OTWITHSTANDING the approval given by the Houses of Convocation to the Report of the above Conference, there is a strong feeling among many Churchmen that the matter must not be allowed to rest there. Convocation has never counted for very much in the esteem of the Church as a whole or of the country generally. It has usually been a centre of obstinate conservatism and a focus of reactionary influence, and its latest pronouncement is not likely to increase its reputation. We are glad, therefore, that Prebendary Hinde has challenged its decision by calling the attention of a wider audience to the matter. He in concert with a few friends prepared a Declaration which appeared in *The Times* newspaper last August, and of which he has sent us a copy. The following is the full text :—

“ We the undersigned (clerks and laymen of the Church of England), earnestly desiring such unity of the Church on earth as is according to God’s will, affirm our conviction :—

“ That Intercommunion is to be regarded as an important step in the path of unity and not as a goal or crown to be postponed until organic unity has been otherwise achieved.

“ That Intercommunion should be sought first with those of our own blood and language who use and acknowledge the authority of the same Bible and use the same hymns of praise and devotion ; and then with the other Churches of the Reformation with whom our divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries held fellowship ; and ultimately with all who hold the faith of the Triune God and recognize that Christ is Lord of all.

“ That the establishment of such Intercommunion would be a manifestation of the true essential unity that exists between all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth.

“ That such Intercommunion should be governed by the principle already formulated that ‘ Intercommunion does not require from either Communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other ; but implies that each believes the other



to hold all the essentials of the Catholic Faith.' (Concordat made in July, 1931, with the Old Catholic Churches of Western and Central Europe.) This principle ought to be applied to those who, holding all these essentials, yet differ from us in the lesser matters of Church order and discipline."

This Declaration was signed by, among others, Sir Thomas Inskip; the Revs. J. M. Hewitt, H. W. Hinde, Canon V. F. Storr, H. McGowan, Canon T. Guy Rogers; Principals C. Sydney Carter, D.D., T. W. Gilbert, D.D., J. P. S. R. Gibson, F. B. Heiser, J. R. S. Taylor, and W. Dodgson Sykes. Further signatures are invited and should be sent to the Rev. Prebendary Hinde, Oak Hill College, Southgate, N.14.

We are glad that the matter has been so promptly taken up and so well dealt with; and we trust that a large number of further signatures will be sent in, for it is a matter the grave significance of which is not, we fear, yet adequately realized. A further step has been taken by those in authority in the direction of departure from the reformed basis on which the Church of England must continue to rest if it is to be the Church of the people of England. There may, and probably will be, further steps in the same direction.

### Oxford and Edinburgh.

The two Conferences on Church, Community, State and on Faith and Order which have recently been held at Oxford and Edinburgh respectively, in continuation of that held at Lausanne in 1927, may not have fulfilled all the expectations of some of those who composed them, but they have marked a definite advance in the direction of Christian Unity. Great preparations were made beforehand in order that when the Conferences met, time should not be taken up with preliminaries and explanations and the result seems to have justified the arrangements. It would have been a mistake to expect that the Conferences would produce definite and tangible results which could be tabulated and put on record as something actually accomplished.

### *An Analogy.*

Ecclesiastical, like political difficulties, are not removed by majority resolutions or amiable expressions. The League of Nations has not ended war and few people of reflection and knowledge anticipated that it would do so; but it set up an ideal and pointed men's minds in the right direction and it has ameliorated some of the conditions and consequences of war. It is not a small or unimportant thing that there is a carefully constituted body in which diplomatists and statesmen from many nations can meet and discuss their various aims and at least tone down their animosities by conferring over them and so understanding better each other's grievances. In a similar way such Conferences as those at Lausanne, Stockholm, Oxford and Edinburgh foster the aim of unity and create an atmosphere in which that great Christian ideal may be more nearly realized. It is the great increase

in this atmosphere of mutual understanding and friendly feeling, in place of animosity and embittered controversy, which is the real achievement of these two Conferences. They have not added much to our knowledge of the differences which hinder unity and they have not seriously come to grips with any specific points, unless it was that of Apostolical Succession, and on this a prepared statement had to be omitted from the general Affirmation on Unity because its phraseology was said "to present difficulties."

#### *A Main Hindrance.*

This brings us to the heart of the matter and shows how much ground has to be covered before the desired end can be reached. No very clear view as to what is actually meant by Unity seems to have emerged. Is it comprehension in one great organization, or agreement on such fundamental doctrines as are contained in the Apostles' Creed, or a recognition of each other as brethren in Christ, thus keeping "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," or is it to include agreement on secondary matters of Church organization such as the nature and purpose of the Ministry, the Church and the Sacraments? Experience does not encourage the attempt to provide one great organization, and to make episcopacy an essential is to place a principal stumbling block in the path of unity. Those who hold what is called the "Catholic" view, though it has no legitimate claim to that honoured name, maintain a theory of Apostolical succession of so exclusive a character that it practically denies the validity of any ministry except that alleged to have come in unbroken succession from the Apostles through the laying on of Episcopal hands. Any order of ministers not thus derived are said to have no power to administer the Sacraments, their ministry is irregular and can only look to the "uncovenanted mercies" of God, whatever that may mean, for any blessing upon it. There is no support for such a theory in the New Testament, and, so far as the Church of England is concerned, her authorized teaching gives no countenance to it. This it is which more than anything else is the great cause of dis-unity and the evidence of the fact is that the Roman Church, which is the typical example of rigid adhesion to the theory, refused to be represented at the Conference. While this is maintained there can be no possible union. It even prevents the meeting together at the Lord's Table of those who are earnestly endeavouring to promote union. The Bishop of Gloucester, who is an ardent supporter of the necessity, at least on practical grounds, of Episcopacy in a United Church, offered a protest against the view that it necessarily unchurches other ministries. The Conference at Edinburgh owed much to the able, wise and tactful chairmanship of the Archbishop of York whose position, experience and knowledge of all the intricacies of a most difficult business, marked him out as the obvious President of such a gathering. It was, however, a real blunder, to say no more, that the Evangelical representation from the Church of England was so small as to be almost negligible and it is worse that there is not one Evangelical Churchman on the Continuation

Committee. Dr. A. J. Macdonald called the attention of the Conference to the fact and it is possible that something may be done. It is not so difficult to get harmony and unanimity at a Conference, if the members are carefully selected beforehand and all who might oppose, excluded. But people sooner or later are able to estimate the value of such agreement.

### **The Reformation.**

The time for the active steps to commemorate the Reformation for which there has been long and careful preparation is now very near at hand. The occasion is the fourth Centenary of the movement and the particular date selected is neither its commencement nor its conclusion, but the year in which the Bible was, by Royal authority, set up in the parishes of this country for all to read who were able and desired to do so. To make this the centre and focus of the Reformation was a happy and appropriate inspiration, especially as one of the great purposes of the commemoration is to attract people of every class and creed in the country to the Bible and to induce them to discover for themselves afresh the treasures of literary beauty, moral teaching and spiritual help which it contains. It is to the message of redemption and forgiveness therein contained that the Reformation itself was due—that great liberating and uplifting movement which brought the individual man into the very presence of God through Christ without the intervention or intrusion of any earthly mediatorship whether of Church or priest or canonized saint. Subsequent history bears witness to the vast and beneficial changes which were wrought by the spiritual freedom thus realized and made possible. But a mere commemoration of the setting up of the Bible in Churches without any reference to the great truths which, revealed in Scripture and reasserted at the Reformation, worked so amazing a change in the life and character of the English people, would be to leave an incomplete impression of all that took place. A corrupt and cruel tyranny over men's minds and bodies, the grossest superstition in worship and the most flagrant greed and immorality, had steadily grown until they could be endured no longer. These have to be known, before we can estimate aright our debt either to the Reformation or the Reformers. And further, the commemoration should furnish a fresh stimulus for those who value the blessings of the Reformation, to preach its great message of free and full redemption more zealously than ever, and more earnestly endeavour to defend that message from being again corrupted and overlaid.

## THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

By the Rev. Prebendary CLAYTON, M.C., M.A.,

*Reader at the Temple Church.*

**A**N English visitor is likely to be puzzled by the churches in a Highland village ; he will probably find one or two labelled "Church of Scotland," a "Free Church" and a "Free Presbyterian Church," possibly also an Episcopalian Church and a Roman Catholic Church. Of these bodies the Church of Scotland is far the largest, but its position cannot be understood without some knowledge of Scottish ecclesiastical history which can be summarized as follows.

### I.

The evangelization of what is now called Scotland began in the 5th and 6th centuries. The Christianity of Ninian Kentigern and Columba was of the "Celtic" type, with little organization ; its unit was the monastery where the bishop seems to have lived in subordination to the presbyter abbot. Diocesan episcopacy was introduced in the 11th century and the mediaeval church in Scotland, in order to protect itself from the claims of York, was in close dependence on Rome. By the beginning of the 16th century it possessed some cathedrals, abbeys, and collegiate churches comparable with at least some of the greater churches in England, but it never had the rich heritage of beautiful parish churches such as abound on the south of the Tweed. In the later Middle Ages the Scottish Church shared in the general corruption of the national life and reform was long overdue when at length it came, under the leadership of John Knox in 1560.

The Reformation period lasted from 1560 to 1690. Knox gave to the Church of Scotland a Confession of faith and a liturgy modelled on Calvin's Church at Geneva ; he also procured the abolition of episcopacy, though the setting up of the Presbyterian system of church courts was the work of Andrew Melville in 1581 rather than of Knox. Those who refused to be reformed continued as the Scottish Roman Catholic Church, mainly in the north-west Highlands and islands.

In 1610 Episcopacy was grafted on to this Presbyterian system not without some success ; but in 1638, owing to the attempt of Charles I to impose an unpopular prayer-book on the Church of Scotland, the bishops were abolished. In 1661 episcopacy was again restored, but the second episcopal period was far from happy and in 1690 the Scottish Parliament again abolished the bishops and re-established Presbyterianism. Those who still wanted bishops now dissented from the Church of Scotland and formed the Scottish Episcopalian Church.

From 1690 to 1843 the Church of Scotland was weakened by many schisms. In 1690 the Reformed Presbyterian Church broke away. Then, as a result of the restoration of lay patronage in 1712, there were the schisms known as the Associate Presbytery (1733) and the Relief Church (1761). Meanwhile within the Church of Scotland were two

parties, the Evangelicals who adhered strictly to the doctrines of Calvin and the Moderates who sat more lightly to those dogmas.

In 1843, again as the result of "patronage," many of the Evangelicals seceded and formed the Free Church, which was opposed not to Establishment in principle but to the conditions of Establishment then prevailing.

Since this disruption there have been movements towards reunion.

In 1847 most of the schisms of the 18th century amalgamated as the United Presbyterian Church, opposed on principle to any state connection.

In 1876 the Free Church was strengthened by the addition of most of the Reformed Presbyterian Church (of 1690) and in 1892 weakened by the secession of the Free Presbyterian Church.

In 1900 the majority of the Free Church joined with the United Presbyterians with the title of the United Free Church ; but a minority, strong in the Highlands, held aloof and are known as the Free Church (locally as "Wee Frees").

After a while negotiations began between the United Free Church and the Church of Scotland. In the Church of Scotland patronage had been abolished in 1874, and in 1921 a Declaratory Act was obtained by which the State acknowledged that the Church of Scotland was free to manage its own affairs so long as it holds the Trinitarian theology and adheres to the Scottish Reformation. The majority of the United Free Church then agreed that the grievances that had justified the disruption of 1843 had been removed and in 1929 united with the Church of Scotland. A minority, however, were not satisfied and they still continue as the United Free Church.

If the Church in Scotland means the whole congregation of Christian people, it can be analysed thus :—

1. The Church of Scotland with a communicant membership of a million and a quarter.
2. The Roman Catholic Church which dissented in 1560 ; owing to Irish and other foreign immigration its adult members are said to have increased to 600,000.
3. The Scottish Episcopalian Church which dissented in 1690. It insists on episcopacy with a rigidity far greater than that required by the more comprehensive Established Church of England. Its communicants number about 60,000.
4. The Dissenting Presbyterian churches representing the remnants which have held aloof from the various reunions :
 

(a) The remnants of the Reformed Presbyterians	-	1690
(b) The remnants of the Associate Church	- - -	1733
(c) The Free Presbyterian Church	- - -	1892
(d) The Free Church	- - - -	1900
(e) The United Free Church	- - - -	1929
5. English dissenting churches (Baptist, Congregational, Methodist) which have a small following.
6. A number of smaller religious bodies with perhaps about 70,000 adherents.

It will therefore be seen that the Church of Scotland is far the largest of the churches in Scotland. To it belong all the parish churches, including the mediaeval cathedrals still in use (St. Giles, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dunblane, Dunkeld, Brechin, Aberdeen, Dornoch, Kirkwall, and Iona). It is the national church, Established, though free from state control; the Sovereign attends its worship and is represented by the High Commissioner at the General Assembly. More important than these external advantages is the influence that it evidently exercises over a large proportion of a religiously-minded nation.

## II.

The position of the Church of Scotland may be examined under the headings of Doctrine; Discipline; Ministry; Sacraments; Worship; Relation to the State.

### (1) *Doctrine.*

The Declaratory Act of 1921 states that the Church of Scotland holds the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic faith (God, the Incarnation, the Holy Spirit) as contained in the Scriptures; that it adheres to the Scottish Reformation; that its principal subordinate standard is the Westminster Confession of 1647 (a Calvinistic document which superseded the earlier Confession of 1560). The Westminster Confession, besides expressing the fundamental doctrines on which the Church of Scotland is at one with the Church of England, also includes the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination; but as the formula of subscription only binds the signatory to "the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith contained in the Confession of faith of this church" a minister is not committed to Calvinistic or Augustinian doctrines which at most are only inferences from Scripture.

### (2) *Discipline.*

This is maintained by the Presbyterian system of Church Courts. Each parish has its Kirk Session consisting of the minister and a number of elders. Each parish belongs to a group known as the Presbytery, and to this court (meeting as a rule once a month) it sends the minister and one elder. Above the Presbytery is the Synod, corresponding in area to a diocese, where the membership of the court is the same as that of the Presbyteries—the minister and an elder from each parish within the bounds of the Synod. The supreme court is the General Assembly meeting every May in Edinburgh under the presidency of an annually appointed minister known as the Moderator. Its decisions are final, subject, in matters affecting the constitution of the Church, to the "Barrier Act" by which a measure passed by one Assembly must be referred to the Presbyteries and come up for final settlement at the next Assembly.

The Moderator during his year of office has the title of "Right Reverend" and takes precedence at Court after the Royal Dukes.

(3) *The Ministry.*

One order, that of the Presbyterate, is regarded as essential, and the utmost care is taken over the training, the appointment, and the commissioning of the presbyter.

A candidate must first obtain a degree in arts or else satisfy the church authorities that his educational attainments have reached that standard. He must then spend three years at a recognized divinity hall and pass the prescribed examinations. Then he may be licensed to conduct worship and preach but not to administer the Sacraments ; in this position, comparable to that of the Deacon in the Anglican church, he becomes in most cases an assistant minister. After a year or so he may receive a call from the communicant members of some church to be their minister ; if the call is accepted and sustained by the Presbytery to which that church belongs, he will be ordained by prayer and by the imposition of the hands of the ordained members of that Presbytery, the service being conducted by a minister specially appointed, generally the Moderator of the Presbytery. After the ordination he will be "inducted" in the "living."

Then and then only will he be allowed to dispense the Sacraments of Baptism and Communion, though occasionally in some large parishes there is an ordained assistant ; in this case when he gets a charge of his own, he will only have to be "inducted."

(4) *The Sacraments.*

Baptism is not given indiscriminately, and some guarantee is required that the child will be Christianly brought up. The law of the Church is that this Sacrament be administered "in the face of the congregation," but private Baptisms are not uncommon : of recent years much success has attended the efforts of ministers to have Baptism administered at public worship. The other Sacrament has always been regarded with the greatest reverence, to be received after careful preparation on occasions which must not be too frequent. The doctrine of the Westminster Confession is Calvinist (i.e. "Receptionist"), not "Zwinglian." In country parishes the Communion is generally dispensed twice a year, in town churches four times ; a roll of communicants is carefully kept, but members of other churches are welcomed at the table. Though there is no fixed liturgy, the service follows a prescribed order in which the elements are set apart and consecrated, the bread broken, and the elements distributed first by the minister to the elders and then by the elders to the communicants seated in their pews. In some churches a liturgy is used, compiled from ancient sources in which the *epiklesis* or invocation of the Holy Spirit is a prominent feature. The service on these great occasions includes the singing of Psalms and Paraphrases and traditionally ends with some verses of the 103rd Psalm in the metrical version, sung to the tune "Coleshill." In some churches there is a more frequent administration ; at St. Giles, Edinburgh and at Glasgow Cathedral there is a Communion once a month after morning service ; at St. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh, there is a monthly Communion at 8.30 a.m. At Govan Parish Church (the centre of the "High-church" movement) there is a choral Communion at the morning service on the

last Sunday in each month and a second administration after the evening service (otherwise Evening Communion is rare, the evening service being regarded as a service of thanksgiving); at one church, Trinity, Coatbridge, there has been for over 20 years a Celebration at 8.30 a.m. every Sunday, in addition to the great quarterly Communion which, here, as at some other churches, coincide with the great festivals of the Christian year.

(5) *Worship.*

The chief service is held on Sundays at 11 or 12. The proclamation of the Word of God is a central feature, though the service includes prayer and praise as well as lessons and sermon. In most churches there is also an evening service at which the attendance is usually smaller than in the morning. The praise consists of metrical Psalms and paraphrases sung to tunes which generally leave pleasing impression on the visitor from other churches. Hymns have also been introduced and in the revised hymnary the Church of Scotland has a book of praise that some other churches may envy. In some town churches the singing of prose Psalms and canticles finds a place, and anthems are perhaps somewhat too frequent. The minister is usually vested in cassock and bands, gown and hood. Weekday services, though not unknown in the Reformation period, are not popular. Some of the churches that formerly belonged to the United Free Church have a mid-week prayer meeting, and in two churches in Edinburgh, three in Glasgow, and one each in Dundee and Aberdeen, there is a daily service. It must, however, be admitted that church-going except on Sundays does not find favour in the Church of Scotland, though Christmas Day and Holy Week are gradually coming to be observed.

(6) *Relation to the State.*

Though the Church of Scotland is "Established" it has complete freedom to manage its own affairs. Patronage has long since been abolished; Parliament has no veto on the legislation of the General Assembly; and there is no final court of appeal corresponding to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But the situation in Scotland is different from that in England, and the Church of Scotland was acknowledged in its present freedom only on the understanding that it adheres to the Scottish Reformation.

### III.

After this description of the Church of Scotland it may be worth while to record the impression made on the present writer, a minister of the Church of England of partly Scottish descent, who since 1922 has officiated each year in various churches now belonging to the Church of Scotland, though some of them were until 1929 connected with the United Free Church.

(a) The strength of a national church which out of a total population of about five million numbers a million and a quarter among its communicant members. No doubt some of these communicants are content with the barest minimum of attendance, and there is in Scotland



a "churchless million," yet even so the Church of Scotland is a "national church" to a degree probably unique among the reformed churches.

(b) The high standard of its ministry. Many of its assistant ministers wear a B.D. hood and the parish minister is frequently a doctor of divinity. The educational standard of the ministry is seen not only in the preaching but in the many books that come from the manses (frequently the country manses), and also in the publications in which the Church of Scotland explains its position in books and pamphlets which are honest, clear, readable and cheap. No doubt there are a number of ministerial misfits, but the general impression is that, unless he is too isolated, the parish minister is happy in his work.

(c) The Eldership, which represents not "the ecclesiastically minded layman" but the average religiously minded churchman of every grade in society. If an Anglican minister should be present at the meeting of the session in an ordinary working class parish he will probably be impressed by the efficiency with which the business is transacted and also by the power of expression shown by many an elder, whatever his social position.

(d) Its energy in tackling the problem of the new housing areas. As far as can be seen, each new area is quickly provided with a minister and a church hall and in due course with a church.

(e) The varieties of churchmanship. Presbyterian discipline does not permit those changes in ritual which so often lead to friction in the Church of England; but in spite of this outward uniformity, there is certainly an Evangelical, a Moderate and a High-church party or group. The last-named lay stress on the "Apostolic Succession" derived through presbyteral ordination and on the value of the Sacraments, but there is very little, if anything, that deserves the reproach of "Sacerdotalism" and nothing that deserves to be called "Romanizing." Further, a dignified service such as that in St. Giles, Edinburgh, is no sign that the minister is a High-churchman, any more than in the Church of England where a choral service is quite compatible with a Protestant theology.

One sometimes hears about the "Modernism" prevalent in Scotland. That term should be used with the greatest caution. It refers only to a movement which seeks to combine the Sacramentalism and devotion of Catholicism with the often negative criticism of modern science; as such the term may be used of a movement in the Roman Catholic church which has been suppressed and of a somewhat similar movement within circles known as Anglo-Catholic. It should not be used of those in the various Reformed churches who hold a critical view of the Bible that a generation ago marked the holder as a "broad-churchman". Probably such views are now common to a large number of all parties within the Churches both of Scotland and of England.

(f) The increasing attention now given to beauty in church architecture and furniture.

Since the war Kirkwall Cathedral, Paisley Abbey and St. John's, Perth, have been examples of large churches completely restored; similar

work is now being done at the Holy Rood, Stirling, and at the Greyfriars Church, Edinburgh (both of them hitherto divided between two congregations) and the "friends of Glasgow Cathedral" are hoping to make the furniture more worthy of that splendid building. Among small churches restored to perhaps more than their former beauty may be mentioned those at Dalmeny and Aberdour (both near Edinburgh). Among the beautiful modern churches built during the last 50 years the large church at Govan, the little church at Connel Ferry, and the somewhat freakish church at Loch Awe come to one's mind; while among the successful attempts to beautify the interior of a commonplace building the church at Kippen is the outstanding example. Many of these churches are left open on weekdays, another pleasing feature. But though much has been done, much still remains to be done. There are still some churches of interest that are roofless and unused; and many of those who visit the island of Iona wish that more use could be made of its rich heritage of sacred buildings.

(g) Though the greater part of the United Free Church joined with the Church of Scotland, that union is not without its difficulties. In particular there are still in many places two churches where one would be sufficient. But the completion of that union must take time and until it has settled all these difficulties within its own borders the Church of Scotland can scarcely be expected to launch out into schemes of union with other churches.

#### IV.

The last of these impressions leads to the question with which this article will conclude, namely, the relation between the Church of Scotland and the Church of England.

Those members of the Church of England who rejoice in the title of "Protestant" (whether they be low-church, broad-church, or Evangelical) will probably wish for complete inter-communion with the Reformed and Presbyterian Church representing in Scotland what the Reformed and Episcopalian Church represents in England. But such inter-communion would be so distasteful to High-churchmen and Anglo-Catholics (who also have a place within the comprehensive Church of England) that if it were now formally allowed, there would be a disruption not only of the Established Church of England but of the Anglican Communion; and, much though we may desire a closer relationship with other Reformed churches, we do not wish for it at the price of the break-up of the Church of England. Further, an attempt to reach a better understanding with the Church of Scotland has recently been frustrated.

But, though the Church of England as a body is apparently unable to approach the Church of Scotland, individual members of the Church of England are free, if they so wish, to associate themselves with the Church of Scotland as soon as they cross the border.

The Established Church of England does not exist in Scotland, though St. Thomas', Edinburgh and St. Silas', Glasgow, claim to be "Church of England"; and the rules of our church say nothing about what we are to do when outside England. Those Anglicans who regard Episcopacy as necessary will of course associate

themselves with the Scottish Episcopalian Church which corresponds to the High-church section of the Church of England. Those who do not set so high a value on forms of church government and regard the Church of England as the national expression of the Protestant religion are not likely to feel at home in the Scottish Episcopalian Church and will therefore turn to the Church of Scotland where they may be sure of a welcome. If the legality of such a course is questioned, we reply that the rules of the Church of England do not forbid its members to worship, communicate, or (if ministers) preach in the Church of Scotland, and that until such action has been declared illegal by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council we have a right to exercise that freedom ; if precedent is sought, Charles Simeon, at the end of the 18th century, used to officiate in the Church of Scotland on the ground that where the King and his court must attend an English clergyman may preach ; and in 1872 Dean Stanley set an example at the Greyfriars Church, Edinburgh, which has been followed by not a few English clergymen, not all of them so "Broad-church" as the Dean. The fact that the Scottish Episcopalian Church forbids any such inter-communion is irrelevant to those who have never subjected ourselves to the discipline of that church. On the other hand, an English clergyman exercising what is undoubtedly his right incurs the wrath of the Scottish Episcopalian Church and of High churchmen within his own communion, and for the sake of peace he may hold that in his case that which is lawful is not expedient.

In the Bidding Prayer of 1604 we are bidden to pray for "Christ's Holy Catholic Church which is the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the world, especially for the Churches of England and Scotland" and the Church of Scotland at that date was, as now, Presbyterian. Those who regard both churches as expressing for their respective nations the reformed or Protestant religion will wish for a closer union between them, and will regret that the liberal attitude of the Church of England to the other reformed churches which characterized the Reformation period was not continued during the period which followed the settlement of 1662.

This paper is concerned only with the Church of Scotland. Lack of space prevents any further account of the dissenting Presbyterian churches, from one of which, the United Free Church (continuing) the writer has received much kindness. Nor has it been possible to describe the history of the Scottish Episcopalian Church, a history which goes far to explain its exclusive attitude to-day. But while these and other small churches play a part in the religious life of Scotland, readers of *THE CHURCHMAN* will probably feel more interested in the great communion which so well deserves the title of "The Church of Scotland."

NOTE.—The Rev. J. Hutchison Cockburn D.D., Minister of Dunblane Cathedral, kindly read through this article in typescript ; the writer is indebted to Dr. Cockburn for a number of explanations and for some corrections, mainly on matters concerned with the internal administration of the Church of Scotland.

## THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES AND THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

By W. GUY JOHNSON.

IN June, 1935, a Conference to which reference has been made in previous issues of *THE CHURCHMAN*, was held at Bucarest between a Delegation appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and a Commission appointed by the Rumanian Church, in order to discuss points of agreement and of difference between the two Churches with a view to the possibility of arranging for intercommunion. There can be no valid objection to such approaches, and though their practical utility for English Churchpeople may not be very obvious, it is somewhat different for members of the "Orthodox" Churches of which the Rumanian is now the second largest. There are considerable numbers of these scattered throughout England and America in places where they have no access to their own clergy. It would naturally, therefore, be an advantage to those who desire to have the ministrations of clergy of the Anglican Communion, if they might do so with the full approval of their own Church. A converse arrangement would be, of course, contained in such an approval by both sides; and such intercommunion between all who profess and call themselves Christians is greatly to be desired. It should, however, be on a basis which does not jeopardize truth; and it should not be so narrowed as to include only a particular group of unreformed Churches to the exclusion of others but should extend to those Protestant Churches which, like the Church of England, derive their distinctive teaching mediately from the Reformation of the sixteenth century and ultimately from Holy Scripture alone.

The Conference at Bucarest, if judged by the Report, would appear, however, to have very seriously jeopardized the truth so far as the teaching of the Church of England is concerned, and the hope it expresses of "full dogmatic agreement" between the "Orthodox" and the Anglican Communion has since acquired an additional significance by the approval given to it by the Convocations of Canterbury and York. There is, unfortunately, little knowledge among English people generally of the history, doctrines or present state of the Churches of the "Orthodox" Communion, which may in great part account for the small support which the Bishop of Birmingham, the Bishop of Truro, Prebendary Hinde and Canon Guy Rogers received in the Convocations when they protested against the terms of the Report.

It will, therefore, not be out of place to indicate the various Churches which compose the group known as the Orthodox Communion and examine, as briefly as may be, their doctrinal position in order to gather what "full dogmatic agreement" would involve, before attempting to discuss the conclusions reached by the Conference at Bucarest two years ago.

The Orthodox Communion is known generally by three names. "The Eastern Church," as in Dean Stanley's well-known book; "the Greek Church," as in Dr. Adeney's history entitled "The Greek and Eastern Churches"; and, to use their own name, "The Orthodox Church," the title of a book recently published by the Great Archimandrite Michael Constantinides who is the Dean of the Greek Cathedral Church of St. Sophia, in London. The bodies composing the Orthodox Communion are enumerated by Dean Constantinides as follows :

"When we speak of the Orthodox Church, by this term we mean, first, those Churches founded by the Apostles themselves, or the disciples of the Apostles, and which have remained in full communion with one another. Secondly, those Churches which have derived their origin from the missionary activity of the former, or which were founded by separation without loss of communion. To the first class belong the four Patriarchates of Constantinople, of Alexandria, of Antioch, of Jerusalem, and the Church of Cyprus. To the second class belong : (1) the Church of Sinai ; (2) the Church of Russia ; (3) the Church of Greece ; (4) the Church of Yugoslavia ; (5) the Church of Rumania ; (6) the Church of Georgia ; and (7) the Church of Poland. All the enumerated Churches are independent in their own administration of each other, and, at the same time, in full communion with one another. All these Churches, although independent of each other, have the same faith, the same dogmas, the same Apostolic Tradition, the same Sacraments, the same services, and the same liturgies."\*

The list is given in "The Second Survey on the Affairs of the Orthodox Church," published by the Church Assembly, in the following form :

1. The Œcumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople.
2. The Patriarchate of Alexandria.
3. The Patriarchate of Antioch.
4. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem.
5. The Church of Cyprus.
6. The Patriarchate of Russia.
7. The Church of Greece.
8. The Patriarchate of Serbia.
9. The Patriarchate of Rumania.
10. The Church of Bulgaria.
11. The Church of Poland.
12. The Church of Albania.

This "Second Survey" contains much useful information with reference to the past history and present position of the Churches concerned, particularly that of Russia. For a table containing dates when Christianity first came to these Churches, and other particulars, the reader may be referred to the Rev. E. G. Parry's pamphlet "The Divisions of the Church : a Historical Guide" published this year (1937) by the Student Christian Movement.

There is among them, therefore, no one Church claiming jurisdiction and supremacy over the others and certainly not over the rest of Christendom as does the Roman whose supremacy the Orthodox

\* *The Orthodox Church*, p. 49.

Church repudiates as strongly as do the Protestant Churches of the West. Of this Orthodox Communion, the Rumanian Church is a very important member, having, next to the great and unhappy Russian Church, of which no reliable statistics are at present available, though Professor Zankov estimates the number at 120 millions, the largest number of members, variously estimated at from eleven to thirteen millions. There are besides the above-mentioned national or organized Churches, a great number of Orthodox members scattered throughout Europe and North and South America. There is an Archbishopric of North America, under the Patriarchate of Constantinople and an Archbishopric of Japan, under the Church of Russia. The very names of the countries above enumerated where the National religion is Orthodox bring to mind the bitter calamities and trials by which most of them have been beset through the long course of their history and not merely since the outbreak of the Great War in 1914. Everyone will sympathize with them in their distresses and admire the tenacity with which they have contended for and maintained the faith, but neither sympathy nor admiration can blind us to the fact that unhappily their faith contains very much that is corrupt and superstitious, for though they repudiate the supremacy of the Roman Church their doctrines differ on the whole but little from those of Rome. It is true that they have not the same passion for precise definition as the Roman Church, and owing to their comparative isolation from the rest of Christendom they have not been under that necessity of framing exact statements which was forced upon Western Christendom by the controversies of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. It is often, therefore, not easy to know exactly what it is that they hold on particular points or where we may look for information regarding the authorities to which they defer. For example, the Bishop of Gloucester, at a Conference held at Lambeth Palace, in July, 1930, between a special committee of Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference and a Delegation of the Eastern Orthodox Churches, had to enquire "whether it would be possible to find the official teaching of the Orthodox Church on the Doctrine of the Church, the Ministry and the Sacraments?" ; and further, asked "what authority was possessed by the Metropolitan Philaret's Longer Catechism of the Russian Church?" \* We shall refer later to the replies to the Bishop's question and to his own statement in regard to them. While, however, it may at times be difficult to learn what is, in precise terms, the Orthodox belief, the general character of the teaching and the sources from which it is derived have always been sufficiently clear and have been much illuminated in the course of the discussions which have taken place since the meeting of the Lambeth Conference in 1920.

It should be remembered that Christianity came from the East ; Jerusalem, not Rome, is "the mother of us all" ; its earliest conquests were made in the East, e.g., Antioch, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi ; its first General Councils were Eastern ; Nicea A.D. 325, Constantinople

\* *The Christian East*. Vol. xii, No. 1, p. 31 (1931).

A.D. 381, Ephesus A.D. 431, Chalcedon A.D. 451, etc. The Creeds are mainly Eastern. The earlier heresies were Eastern. The East and the West were practically agreed upon doctrine for approximately five centuries. Augustine who has been well described as the Father of Western Theology died in the first half of the fifth century. The causes involving the ultimate separation between East and West were many, and the rift which led to it only widened slowly. The addition of the "Filioque" clause to the Nicene Creed, was more the occasion than the cause of division. The reasons were in part political, in part racial and temperamental, in part concerned with ecclesiastical administration and only in part theological. The removal by Constantine of the capital of the Empire from Rome to Constantinople; the division of the Empire into the Eastern Roman Empire and the Western Roman Empire; the disputes regarding precedence between the Bishops of old Rome and new Rome (Constantinople) and the growing claims of the former to supremacy and jurisdiction over the whole Church were potent factors. Moreover, the occupation of the Western Church with the task of absorbing and christianizing the barbarian conquerors of the Empire and the tendency of the Eastern Church to devote itself to speculation on the deeper mysteries of the faith, concerning which speculation too often leads to arid wastes of controversy, produced a marked difference of outlook. There was, therefore, no community of practical interest sufficient to arrest a drift apart which was so gradual as perhaps hardly to be noticeable at any particular moment. But through it all, there was substantial identity of faith and belief. Any differences between East and West were similar to those existing between different sections of either. The same causes which had produced the corruptions of doctrines which we find in the eleventh century had operated in both East and West. Notwithstanding substantial theological agreement, separation had become inevitable. If no other reason existed, the exorbitant claims of the Roman See were sufficient sooner or later to bring it about, and, as a matter of fact, it was the action of the Roman Bishop which effected it at last. Paradoxically enough it was precipitated by an effort on the part of Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, to bring about closer relations with the Western portion of the Church. In 1042, or thereabouts, he addressed a letter to this effect to the Bishops of Apulia, but referred to some difficulties which stood in the way, among them the clause "and from the Son" in the Nicene Creed. A copy of this letter came into the hands of Pope Pius IX who wrote a violent letter to the Patriarch saying that if necessary he would not "seethe the kid in its mother's milk" but "scrub its mangy hide with biting vinegar and salt."\* These amiable sentiments not having the effect of making the Patriarch submit to the Pope's directions, the papal legates formally laid on the altar of St. Sophia "a sentence of anathema, denouncing eleven evil doctrines and practices of Michael and his supporters and

\* Adeney, *The Greek and Eastern Churches*, p. 240, where a reference is given to Mansi XIX, 649. It is interesting to read the quite different account, from the Roman Catholic point of view, in Adrian Fortescue's book, *The Eastern Orthodox Church*, pp. 197-8.

cursing them with the awful imprecation : ‘ Let them be Anathema Maranatha, with Simoniacs, Valerians, Arians, Donatists, Nicolaitans, Severians, Pneumatomachi, Manichees and Nazarenes, and with all heretics ; yea, with the devil and his angels. Amen, Amen, Amen.’” This was on July 16th, 1054. After that, as Dr. Adeney observes, “ The Schism was now complete.” It could not well be otherwise. In much the same spirit, the Roman Church has ever since treated the Eastern, though its formal expression may now be more in harmony with the conventional speech of modern days. It seems at first surprising that with so much of theological belief and practice in common, such an attitude of rancour and malevolence should be adopted, but the claims to Supremacy and Infallibility of the Roman Church, baseless and absurd as they are, are pressed with an arrogance and presumption which will tolerate neither freedom of opinion nor the least criticism of what that Church chooses to lay down for unquestioning acceptance. The Orthodox Church faced with the alternatives of submission or separation chose the latter.

In considering the doctrines which are held by the Orthodox Church, it will not be necessary, if it were possible within the limits of the present article, to discuss Orthodox theology as a whole, in order to see where the path to full dogmatic agreement would lead the Church of England. When the Bishop of Gloucester asked the questions as to Orthodox official teaching, to which reference has already been made, the Patriarch of Alexandria referred him to certain Confessions of the 16th and 17th centuries, especially the catechism of Peter Mogila and the Confession of Dositheus, but added that a special importance was attached to the Decrees of the seven Œcumenical Councils. He further said, in reply to a question from the Bishop, that in case of difference of opinion they would be guided by the opinions of the Church as expressed in the Liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom. The Bishop of Gloucester replied that this method agreed with that of the Church of England, though he refrained from giving any authority other than his own for so extraordinary a statement. It is interesting to read the Patriarch’s reply to the question of the Bishop as to the authority possessed by the “ Longer Catechism of the Russian Church.” The Patriarch said that “ it was the work of one who had especially criticized the Church of Rome and by reaction *was influenced by Protestantism*. It had *not*, however, received any *official* disapproval and any person who made use of its teaching would *not be out of order*,”\* a very fair example of damning with faint praise. We do not think that the Catechism is likely to convey to the ordinary reader any strong impression of Protestant influence. For example, a more important place is given to Tradition than to Scripture and in regard to the latter it is stated : “ we must take and understand it in such sense as agrees with the interpretation of the Orthodox Church and the holy Fathers.” The perpetual virginity of the Mother of our Lord is asserted and the title “ Mother of God ” ascribed to her ; the number of the Sacraments is given as

\* *The Christian East* as previously cited. (Italics are ours.)



seven ; transubstantiation is expressly taught : “ the bread and wine are changed or transubstantiated into the very Body of Christ and the very Blood of Christ ” ; The foregoing quotation is from Blackmore’s translation of Philaret’s Longer Catechism and there has been considerable discussion as to the correctness of “ transubstantiation ” as an equivalent for the Russian word in the text. But it is significant that the Russians have coined a word *Transubstantziatzija*, which, in the Russian translation of the Acts of the Synod of Jerusalem (held in Bethlehem, A.D. 1672), is used to express the doctrine. That word is not the one in Philaret’s catechism, but another, of mixed Russian and Greek construction representing the Greek *Metousiosis* and on that ground it is contended that Blackmore’s translation is incorrect. Much of this is a mere strife about words. Words are often at best imperfect vehicles of human thought. It is what they actually convey that matters. As Dr. Adrian Fortescue says “ As for the word, they (the Orthodox) always say *Metousiosis*, which is an exact version of *Transubstantiation* (*meta*—trans ; *ousia*—substance) . . . Moreover, when Mr. Palmer showed his book with a denial of this faith to the Archpriest Koutnevich, the Archpriest promptly said, “ But we believe and teach Transubstantiation.”\* Fortescue quotes the definition of the Synod of Jerusalem as follows :—“ the bread and wine at the consecration are changed, transubstantiated, converted and transformed, the bread is changed into the very Body of the Lord that was born at Bethlehem from the Ever-Virgin, baptized in the Jordan, suffered, was buried, rose again, sits at the right hand of God the Father, and will come again in the clouds of heaven, and the wine is converted and transubstantiated into the very Blood of the Lord that He shed on the cross for the life of the world.” A summary of the Acts of this Synod is given in E. H. Landon’s “ A Manual of Councils of the Holy Catholic Church ” published in London (Rivingtons) in 1846. It asserted *inter alia* the necessity of Episcopacy ; the invocation of the Virgin Mary and of the Saints ; asserted, as above, Transubstantiation and condemned Consubstantiation ; admitted the doctrine of Purgatory. The Acts are signed by Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, Nectarius, the ex-Patriarch, seven other prelates, and by sixty-one other ecclesiastics.

The tendency among some modern Orthodox theologians to deny that their Church holds the dogma of transubstantiation appears, when examined, to amount to little more than a dislike for the word itself and a repudiation of the more materialistic explanations and inferences attaching to it ; but this latter sentiment is to be found equally among Roman Catholic writers when pressed with the consequences of the doctrine. But when Orthodox writers state what they do hold, we find that it comes to the same thing in the end. Thus Zankov :—“ The consecrated elements are the true body and true blood of Christ ” ; † or Callinicos :—“ Its solemn words are those contained in the ‘ Invocation ’ by which the Holy Ghost is asked

\* *Op cit*, p. 385.

† *The Eastern Orthodox Church*, p. 117. (Translated and edited by Donald A. Lowrie. S.C.M. 1929.)

to descend upon the Holy Gifts and convert the bread into the Body of Christ, and the wine into His Blood.”\* These and other writers may prudently prefer to reject particular explanations as to *how* this is brought about, but they agree as to the *fact* of the change, though they may not use the word Transubstantiation to describe it; but the doctrine remains the same.

If anything is needed to justify the use of the word “superstitious” as applying to much in the doctrinal and practical system of the Orthodox Churches, it may be found in the place which is given to icons and in the ceremony of the Holy fire in Jerusalem at Eastertide. There is no occasion here to give the history of the Iconoclastic controversy which raged in the Eastern Church from about A.D. 736 for a long period until in A.D. 787 a General Council was summoned to determine whether images and pictures (icons) should be retained in the churches or not. The violent methods by which two reforming Emperors had removed and destroyed the images had in each case produced a reaction equally violent; and it was at the time of one of these reactions that the Council was summoned. It met at Nicea and was the second to be held in that place. It is known as the Seventh General Council, and to its decisions the Orthodox Churches attach very great importance. In the Report of the three Delegates sent to London in 1920, they say “we thought that we should make clear that the acceptance of the Seventh Œcumenical Council as such is indispensable, it being granted that it presents all the marks for acknowledgment and acceptance. The Committee of Bishops assured us that they had taken note of this declaration of ours, and it seems that on this question a favourable wind blows, at least in certain quarters, and it is observed also that in practice † there is a gradual return to the earlier, but of course not superstitious practice of giving honour to the Saints and to their images.” ‡ The Council was mainly concerned with this question of images, though it passed a number of disciplinary canons of which one was that “if in future, a bishop consecrates a church without relics, he shall be deposed.” § On the matter of images, it decreed that where they had been removed they were to be restored “and at them prayers should be offered,” and that incense and lights should be used in their honour.\*\* Those who are in close touch with the religious life of the Orthodox Churches tell us of the predominating influence among the people of the veneration of icons. The Rev. F. S. Cragg, now Vicar of St. Aldate’s, Oxford, who had, when working in Palestine, ample opportunity

\* *The Greek Orthodox Catechism*, p. 42. (Published under the auspices of the Archbishop of Thyateira. Bayswater 1926.)

† Presumably in the Anglican Churches.

‡ Bell. *Op cit.* 63.

§ Hefele. *History of Church Councils*. Vol. 5, p. 380.

\*\* *Ib.* 372, 375.

for observation, wrote, in a paper read before a conference of Lay Churchmen in London :

“ The people are in spiritual chains. This is very evident when we look closely at the life and religion of ordinary Greek Church members. The mass are uneducated peasants, and their priests are men of the people with no more education than they possess themselves. Among such people there is no teaching, and every kind of ignorance and superstition is rampant. The worship of saints and ikons is the basic element in their everyday religion. Morality is low. In the discipline of the Anglican Church in Palestine the chief difficulty is created by the proximity of Greek Christians with a very lax moral code. Nor are the lives of monks or even hierarchs always an example of Christian morality.”

Much ingenious casuistry has been expended upon the defence of image-worship. Distinctions are drawn between *Dulia*, *Hyperdulia* and *Latreia*, the last being due only to God Himself. The reverence, or worship, however it is described, may be claimed to be given not to the image but to the person represented by it, though this is also the defence offered by non-Christian idolators for their practice ; yet centuries of Church history witness to the fact that the irresistible tendency of human nature is to give to the visible and tangible symbol the worship which belongs alone to that which it is supposed to represent.

The ceremony of the Holy Fire which takes place on Easter eve, affords an even greater example of superstition than that attaching to the religious use of images. It has frequently been described. The Hon. R. Curzon gave a melancholy account of it in the year 1834 in his “ Visits to monasteries of the Levant.” Dean Stanley who was in Jerusalem in 1853 and witnessed the ceremony, has described it in his “ Sinai and Palestine.” We borrow from a more recent account, in the paper by the Rev. F. S. Cragg, the following brief description of it.

“ The theory is that fire comes down from heaven and is received by the officiating bishop waiting within the Holy Sepulchre. Outside the tomb are thousands of people, each waiting with a bundle of taper-like candles. At one moment the whole great Church is almost in complete darkness. At the next the light passed out by the bishop flashes from one candle to the next, and almost in an instant the whole Church is lit up by thousands of burning candles . . . I do not know a sadder picture than that of those thousands of men and women carried away in a wave of ecstatic emotion, shouting and singing, men rubbing their hands and faces with the smoke of the burnt-out candles, women rubbing it upon their breasts. For them it is magic. They believe it is from heaven and that belief is encouraged. For them there is no nice distinction between the sign and the thing signified. The basis of it all, so far as they are concerned, is a lie, just as the basis of so much superstitious worship of the sacraments in mediæval England was symbolism. I can only say from my own experience of the Holy Fire that symbolism in itself may be, and often is, the enemy of true religion.”\*

It is doubtless true, as Dean Stanley wrote,† that every educated Greek knows and acknowledges that the Fire, so far from descending from heaven, is kindled by the Bishop within the chapel. But the

\* *Protestantism and the Eastern Churches*. (Published by the World's Evangelical Alliance.)

† *Sinai and Palestine* (New Ed. 1871), p. 468.

people believe, and are encouraged to believe, that it comes from heaven and it is to that belief that the scenes of frenzied fanaticism which accompany the ceremony are due. If the hierarchy do know and admit that the whole thing is false, then there could be no greater condemnation of them than the fact that they continue to pass it on to an ignorant and credulous multitude, knowing that they will believe it to be true.

The direction which Orthodox teaching takes upon such matters as Holy Scripture, Justification, the Sacraments, came out clearly enough in the Conference at Bucarest and agrees with what we have already seen. Before, however, proceeding to consider this, there is one point raised in the Conference at Lambeth in 1930 which is worth noting. The Patriarchs there present appeared to feel very strongly the impropriety of the fact that in the Churches of the Anglican Communion the laity are not merely allowed to offer advice and to express opinions on matters of doctrine; but actually have a vote in their decision. In the report of His Holiness Nectarie on the Conference, we read that "The Patriarch of Alexandria said that an assurance excluding the laity from voting on matters of Faith would be hoped for. And the Bishop of Gloucester said that the Anglican Bishops present were ready to prepare a statement agreeing that such was their opinion." We have not heard of any such statement, but whether it has been prepared or not, the Bishop's answer looks uncommonly like throwing dust into the Patriarch's eyes, for he would naturally gather from the Bishop's words that such an exclusion was to be attempted, while the Bishop himself must be quite well aware that it is not within the sphere of practical politics.

To turn now to the Bucarest Conference of July 1935. The Report was issued last year and it was at once seen, from the agreements arrived at, that the Anglican Delegation had betrayed the position which they were supposed to represent. It occasionally happens in conferences or discussions where a "give-and-take" policy is aimed at, that one side does all the giving while the other does the taking. This appears to have been the case at Bucarest. As in the earlier discussion just mentioned, where the Bishops were prepared to give away the lay vote, so here the Church of England position was misrepresented or explained away, in order that it might seem to agree with Orthodox requirements. Obviously the first thing to do was to repeat the disparagement of the XXXIX Articles which had been taking place ever since these recent approaches to the East began. Articles VI, XXI and XXIV do not deal tenderly with the authority of Tradition or of General Councils. It is as difficult to find the doctrine of the Seven Sacraments in Article XXV as it was, in the Laputan project, to extract sunbeams out of cucumbers. Article XI leaves no more place for good works as helping to procure the justification of a sinner, than do Articles XXVIII and XXIX for the doctrine that the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. The Orthodox representatives had made some study of these Articles and were clearly uneasy about them, and as long ago as 1920, a delegation of three members who were sent to London at the time of the Lambeth Conference of that year, reported to the

Holy Synod at Constantinople that in view of the fact that "the work of reunion would be strongly advanced by the abolition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Confession," they had ventured to propose that this should be done. The English Bishops anxiously endeavoured to reassure them by such explanations as the following: "the aim of Elizabeth and her counsellors was to find a means to the reconciliation of those of Catholic and Protestant tendencies." It does not seem a hopeful way of conciliating those of "Catholic tendencies" to deny the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome; to denounce the sacrifices of Masses as blasphemous fables; to condemn Transubstantiation and to assert the doctrine of Justification by Faith only; but there it is, and it helped to calm the Delegation. They were also told that "In the last fifty years the Thirty-nine Articles have fallen, while the Creeds have risen, in public estimation. Such words, in addition to others, the President of the Standing Committee spoke, and the President of the Committee of Bishops spoke somewhat as follows: 'we understand that the abolition of the Thirty-nine Articles would be an advantage . . . given an opportunity the Articles might be revised' . . . it was proposed to us by the Standing Committee that our Standing Committee should undertake to suggest what alterations in our opinion are necessary. *As long as no separation between Church and State is made in England . . . only a revision of these Articles will perhaps be possible. This revision being invested with a competent authority, would evidently, in great measure, take the place of a final abolition of the Articles.*" The italics are ours. The Report can be read in full in the Bishop of Chichester's volume of "Documents of Christian Unity," published in 1934 by the Oxford University Press, and ought to be studied by all those who would resist the corruption of the teaching of the Church of England. However, the "explanations" and the prospect of revision seem to have satisfied the Orthodox representatives, who found a more hopeful ground of agreement in the "high estimation" of the Prayer Book by Anglicans, "the more so *as it is being steadily amended and revised. To this revision we also were invited to contribute.*" Happily, the revision scheme failed, though the foregoing gives an indication of what might have happened had it succeeded.

In view of this recent history, we can understand how it was that agreements seem so easily to have been reached at Bucarest two years ago, but it is difficult to suppose that many of the members of Convocation who voted their approval of the proceedings can have read, or given any serious attention to the documents relating to previous negotiations on the subject, or even to the Report of the Conference itself. The Orthodox delegates have made it clear that they require a full acceptance of their position, while they themselves concede nothing. Their recognition of the validity of Anglican Orders was only given on the understanding that the Anglican Delegation really represented the Church of England; and finding that "their declarations were in accordance with the Doctrine of the Orthodox Church" this recognition followed naturally. In the Conclusion to the Report we find the opinion expressed "that this Conference has prepared

a solid foundation for full dogmatic agreement between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches." In the Conference, agreement was reached on four points. First the subsidiary position of the Thirty-nine Articles in relation to the Book of Common Prayer. In one respect this may be regarded as a comparatively unimportant matter, for there is no opposition between the two. It would be exceedingly difficult to find in the Prayer Book any support for teachings condemned by the Articles. But the point is important practically, for the intention is to weaken the force of the Articles by a subtle form of disparagement less open, but not less mischievous in the impression produced, than the "explanations" of the Bishops, already referred to. The other matters agreed upon were "The Holy Eucharist," "Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition" and "Justification." The "Divine Mysteries," viz. the Sacraments, were discussed, as to whether they were two only or seven, and a formula was presented by the Anglican Delegation which differed materially from that of the Rumanian members. This, however, the Rumanian Commission only agreed to refer to the Holy Synod of Rumania for consideration.

The whole subject of the Report was fully dealt with in a letter sent by the Committee of the National Church League to the Archbishop of Canterbury soon after its appearance; and later, Prebendary Hinde prepared for Convocation a document, giving in parallel columns, (a) Statements in the Report; (b) Quotations from the Thirty-nine Articles; (c) Passages from the Prayer Book; and (d) Quotations from the New Testament. We have only space to note (1) that in regard to the Eucharist it was agreed at the Conference, that "In the Eucharist the bread and wine become by consecration (*metabolē*) the Body and Blood of our Lord. How? This is a mystery"; (2) that on Holy Scripture it was agreed that:—

"The Revelation of God is transmitted through the Holy Scriptures and the Holy Tradition. Everything necessary for salvation can be founded upon Holy Scripture, as completed, explained, interpreted and understood in the Holy Tradition, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit residing in the Church. We agree that by Holy Tradition we mean the truths which come down from our Lord and the Apostles and have been defined by the Holy Councils or are taught by the Fathers, which are confessed unanimously and continuously in the Undivided Church and are taught by the Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit;"

and (3) that on Justification it was agreed that:—

"By the redeeming action of our Lord Jesus Christ, mankind has become reconciled to God. Man partakes of the redeeming grace through faith and good works, and reaches through the working of the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, sanctification by means of the Church and the Holy Sacraments."

The foregoing quotations do not include all that is given in the Report on the particular points, but they contain the substance and show how far the Conference went in departing from the teaching both of the Church of England and of Holy Scripture.

It is not the object of this paper to discourage any effort to promote inter-communion between the Eastern and Anglican Churches. There should be no hindrance to the meeting together at the Lord's Table of all who profess and call themselves Christians and are endeavouring

by their lives to justify that profession, even though they may be far astray in their doctrinal opinions. We pray in the Litany "That it may please Thee to bring into the way of truth all such as have erred and are deceived" and we should believe in the possibility of that prayer being answered. It is lawful to excommunicate men of openly evil lives until they repent and reform; but we need not and should not refuse to meet at His Table any who own Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord, simply because they are in error and have been deceived. In the case of the agreement with the Old Catholic Church, this was reached on the ground that "Inter-communion does not require from either Communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion or liturgical practice characteristic of the other; but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Catholic Faith." Had this precedent been followed at Bucarest, there would have been no protest raised, but it is not possible or proper to keep silence when the official teaching of the Church of England is so grievously distorted and misrepresented as to make it appear to agree with a whole system of doctrine, against which its very existence as a separate and independent Church, is a standing protest. In the coming year the English Church and the whole English people will be invited to celebrate with thanksgiving to Almighty God, the setting up in our Churches of the English Bible. There seems a strange irony in teaching, at such a time, that the Bible needs to be completed and interpreted by the traditions of men as embodied in the decrees of a hierarchical Church. We have in this country been delivered by the Gospel from that bondage, and it will be well for us if we refuse to submit again to its yoke; "It is not a vain thing for you; because it is your life."

---

THE SOUTH AFRICAN MELTING POT. By Desmond K. Clinton, B.D., B.Litt. *Longmans. 3s. 6d.*

In these days it is not necessary to vindicate to thinking men the policy and programme of Christian Missions. During the early days of missionary activity, however, it was otherwise. Much had to be done in the face of opposition from within and without. Government officials were not so friendly that they are, on the whole, in these days. Colonists had their own axe to grind also.

This present study deals with the early days of the London Missionary Society in South Africa, and Mr. Clinton has summarized his aim in the sub-title of his book, "A Vindication of Missionary Policy 1799—1836." Three great names stand out in the work, those of The Rev. Dr. J. T. Vanderkemp, the Rev. John Campbell and Dr. John Philip. The work of each of these is vindicated, in particular that of Dr. Philip, whose ideal is the generally adopted policy of modern missions. The narrative carries one along because of its absorbing interest (see p. viii.). One whole chapter is devoted to the pioneer work at Bethelsdorp, yet there is a thrill throughout the entire story. The last chapter, devoted to "conclusions" is most helpful. Another excellent book has thus been added to an already large library of fine studies on Christian Missions. E. H.

# THE NON-JURORS, 1688-1805

By ALBERT MITCHELL.

On the 7th February, 1688-9, the Convention Parliament recognized William and Mary as Sovereigns of England, in the place of James II, who, having left the realm on the previous 23rd December, had been declared by the Convention Parliament to be deemed to have abdicated the throne. While there was widespread feeling that government by King James had become impossible, there had been no complete agreement as to the course to be followed: the desires of many went no further than a Regency by William, preserving the title of James: but the more influential majority felt that such a middle course would but defer the trouble: and called for a change in the settlement of the Crown. A very simple new oath of allegiance was required in place of the older form: but nevertheless a distinct issue arose in the Church of England. There were those who felt, or expressed, no difficulty in giving a new allegiance to the new Sovereigns *de facto*, accepting the legal fiction that the desertion of the realm by the king *de jure* had vacated the throne. But a minority regarded the oath of allegiance already given, in more stringent terms, to James as of a personal nature that could be determined only by his death. The Archbishop of York and nine other bishops took the former course. The Archbishop of Canterbury and eight other bishops took the latter course. Of these, three died before the time limited by Act of Parliament expired: but the senior primate and five bishops were by the Act first suspended and then deprived. It would have been wise if the Government had refrained from tendering the new Oath to existing bishops and contented itself with requiring it from newly appointed bishops: but the suspicious fears of an era of revolution are not allayed by considerations of wisdom. Others of the Clergy were faced with the same problem, and a minority went with the Archbishop of Canterbury\*. The separation that consequently took place is known as the Non-juring Schism.

The Non-jurors fell roughly into four sections: (1) those who acting solely from personal conscientious scruples voluntarily retired into private life and gave no trouble to the State: (2) those whose scruples were accentuated by a belief that James remained lawful King, and who therefore refused to acknowledge those who had taken the oath, particularly those intruded into the sees of the deprived bishops, as orthodox or to accept their ministrations: (3) those whose position was purely political and who regarded the whole matter as a move in the dynastic dispute: (4) those whose main motive was protest against the action of the State which they regarded as unwarrantable in the ecclesiastical realm. The most distinguished of the Non-jurors was Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells (author of the famous morning

\* About 400. Lathbury 84. 1 Feb., 1690/1.



and evening hymns) who consistently refused to be associated with any overt action and was of opinion that the schism should have been closed with the death of King James. The most pathetic figure was that of William Sancroft, who exchanged the Archbishop's House at Lambeth and the primacy for a poor Cottage at Friesingfield ("at this time indeed very hard frozen," as he punningly writes to Bishop Lloyd) in Suffolk, his native place. Sancroft at first opposed separation, but, whether by persuasion or otherwise, came to authorize the organization of the Non-jurors as a separate communion, and being old and infirm delegated or purported to delegate his primatial authority to William Lloyd, deprived bishop of Norwich, as his "Vicar. . . . Factor and proxy General, or Nuncio." Acting in apparent pursuance of this commission, Lloyd, assisted by the deprived bishops of Ely and Peterborough, consecrated George Hickes, deprived Dean of Worcester, to be Suffragan of Thetford, and Thomas Wagstaffe to be Suffragan of Ipswich. Wagstaffe never assumed to do any episcopal acts, but Hickes became the real leader of the Non-jurors, who were known as the "communion of Dr. Hickes." Archbishop Sancroft had died more than two months before these consecrations took place; and it could scarcely be claimed that his delegation of his powers to Lloyd could have survived his death, even if he had approved of them in prospect.

But the attitude now assumed by the Non-jurors was that the whole Church of England—"the public church" as they came to call it—was in schism from the primitive Church; and that they themselves were the only Catholic remnant; and their efforts were directed to keeping alive some sort of a "succession" in hope of a day when the realm would return to its rightful allegiance to the house of Stuart and they would have the privilege and duty of "reconciling" the ministers of "the public church" to their own faithful remnant. They therefore had, of necessity, to drop even the fiction of "suffragans" of the deprived bishops: and as the original Non-juring bishops died off one by one: and Bishop Frampton and Bishop Ken the last survivors refused to do anything to continue the separation—Bishop Frampton (deprived of Gloucester) regularly attended the service of the Church and even catechised the children, and Ken desired the breach to be closed and communion with the existing bishops to be restored—the whole movement fell under the control of Dr. Hickes and the numerous consecrations were frankly performed to keep open "the succession," and the Non-juring bishops who continued into the early days of the nineteenth century were simply a "college" (although that title was not used in England) of bishops without dioceses, and many of them did not attempt any episcopal functions. They were, however, inter-related in a peculiar fashion with the Jacobite bishops of the little episcopal fragment of the Church in Scotland: at one time or other each body called the other in aid. The history is long and involved.

In 1716 the then Non-juring bishops opened negotiations with the Greek Church for recognition, representing themselves as the orthodox and catholic remnant of the British Churches. Long correspondence

ensued, there was an attempt to secure the mediation of Tsar Peter the Great and some astounding proposals were made, and negotiations dragged on till 1725. But all came to nought. The Non-jurors, although some of them had moved far from the Reformation standpoint, could not swallow the grave doctrinal errors and superstitions of the East, and the Greek bishops appear to have had some difficulty in locating the ecclesiastical status of their applicants. The main points of Greek Orthodox doctrine and practice to which the Non-juring bishops scrupled were (1) the placing of the authority of the General Councils on a level with Holy Scripture (2) the giving of divine honours to the Blessed Mother of the Lord (which however the Greeks denied) (3) the invocation of the saints (4) the doctrine of transubstantiation, insisted on by the Greek bishops who described the Non-jurors' belief as blasphemous (5) the use of sacred pictures as in the East, as involving danger of idolatry. The Non-jurors argued at great length with the Greek Bishops (who had spoken of them as "born and educated in the principles of the Lutheran Calvinists and possessed with their prejudices"). The Non-juror leaders in this strange episode were Jeremy Collier (consecrated 1713) Archibald Campbell (a Scottish freelance consecrated 1711) and Thomas Brett, LL.D. (consecrated 1715-6, and not to be confused with a later namesake, Thomas Brett, M.A., consecrated 1727). The other Non-juring bishops of the day, Nathaniel Spinckes (consecrated 1713) and Henry Gandy (consecrated 1715-6) withdrew from the affair in 1722, when it became clear that the Eastern Church was immovable on matters of doctrine. Spinckes had been the scholar who drew up the proposals in Greek. Dr. Thomas Brett was not originally a Non-juror and some time before his secession was Lecturer at the Parish Church of Islington. He joined the Non-jurors in 1715 and less than a year later was consecrated by Collier, Hawes (consecrated 1713), and Campbell.

But by this time the "inbreeding" which is the unhappy result of a close community had produced doctrinal and ritual aberrations from the strict standpoint of the Articles and Prayer Book that had at first been jealously adhered to by the separated remnant; and the little community, worshipping in back courts and private houses here and there, was torn by the "Usages" controversy; and the Non-jurors became divided into "Usagers" and "Non-usagers," vilifying and even excommunicating one another with painful acrimony. The quarrel seems originally to have arisen out of the intensive studies of the Non-juring clergy in Christian origins and the ancient liturgies, on which Dr. Brett had written a book that is still regarded with respect by liturgical students. He had contracted a great admiration for and devotion to the Clementine Liturgy, generally believed to date from the Fourth Century, and probably the oldest complete liturgy other than the *Ordo Romanus*.

There is controversy as to the value of the Clementine liturgy: there is no evidence that it was ever in actual use: and it may be merely an ideal form compiled by ancient scholars "in the study" rather than in the "church."

Anyhow he and those who followed his lead now asserted that the English Prayer Book was defective, and its defects needed to be supplied from what they believed to be "primitive" models. The "four things," as they were termed, of the Usagers were variously stated, and not always treated as of equal importance; but they were substantially (1) An express Oblation of the Elements in the Eucharist to God the Father; (2) A direct Invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the Elements that they might become the Body and Blood of Christ; (3) the omission of the words "militant here in earth" from the title of the prayer for the Church, thus recognizing prayer for the departed; (4) the use of the mixed chalice. Round the much varied views of the lawfulness or propriety or necessity of these Usages such dispute raged that a schism within the schism arose that was not healed till 1732. When that schism (which had involved two hostile or opposed lines of succession) was more or less patched up, other schisms arose the reasons for which are still more obscure. John Blackburne (consecrated 1725) set up a separate communion in 1732 and continued it till his death in 1741, when he was buried at the east end of Islington Churchyard.\* The last bishop in the regular succession was Robert Gordon (consecrated in 1741) who died in 1779 greatly respected. A section of the Non-Usagers who had refused the accommodation of 1732 tried to perpetuate themselves, with Campbell's original help, by "solus" consecrations, but that wing of the Schism also ended by the death of Charles Booth (the date of whose consecration is unknown—even his Christian name is in doubt) somewhere about 1805, probably but not certainly in Ireland. Thus finally disappeared from history the Church of the Non-jurors. From 1693 to the end of the eighteenth century twenty-nine bishops were consecrated. Of these two really belong to the Scots communion: and eight being consecrated by single bishops are regarded as more or less irregular. Quite a number of these bishops never exercised any episcopal act: and none of them claimed any special diocese. There was no question of election of any of these bishops: they were simply selected by their predecessors to carry on the succession. Hickes and Wagstaffe appear to have been approved or selected by proxy by James II in exile: and for a while an appearance or pretence of approval of the successors by the prince whom they called James III (and even of him, whom they called Charles III) was maintained, but this dropped out. The formula used was "the consent of the landlord," mystifying phraseology being used in which the bishops were disguised as "factors": and a hazy "general assent" was asserted to have been given by the prince to such steps as were necessary to preserve the succession. The political sanction had worn threadbare long before the schism was dead. It is interesting to note that one of the early Non-jurors, Kettlewell, before the first consecrations, debated sympathetically whether the clergy may in cases of necessity minister without episcopal powers—a somewhat far-reaching proposition.

\* John Lindsay, presbyter, who succeeded to the charge of Blackburne's Chapel was also buried in Islington Churchyard in 1768.

The Non-jurors were probably never rich in laity. There were a number of small congregations in London. Jeremy Collier at first ministered in a little chapel in Broad Street, up two flights of stairs. The principal centre, in Scroop's Court, Holborn, was sometimes referred to as Headquarters. Here daily Morning and Evening Prayer was kept up, and on one Easter as many as 50 Communicants were reported. The tradition of weekly Communion was largely but not universally respected. There were other little congregations at Dunstan's Court, Fleet Street; in Gray's Inn; Red Lion Street; and Marylebone; one at Isleworth, and another at Feversham, to each of which Dr. Brett went every fourth Sunday. Farther afield there was a stronger centre at Manchester, which shot out a branch at Shrewsbury; and a strong centre at Newcastle. There are no indications of wealth: when a Northern presbyter was invited to take charge of one of the London oratories and be consecrated bishop, all the stipend that could be promised was £40. The presbyters who appear to have been more numerous than the numbers of the laity warranted seem, except in a few cases where they had private means, to have followed secular avocations. One bishop was a practising physician, and others of the clergy seem to have been tutors, schoolmasters or shopkeepers. Richard Rawlinson, D.C.L. (consecrated 1728) was a benefactor to St. John's College, Oxford, to which he bequeathed his heart. One well-known presbyter was William Law, the Mystic, but he dropped out of sight in his later days. Some were recluses seldom coming out into public, and most ministered in private houses. Some of the presbyters, including William Law, seem at times to have given considerable trouble to their bishops.

On the crucial point of Ritual that is the line of demarcation between different doctrines of the Eucharist it is clear that the general practice was for the Minister to stand at the North Side of the Table. Dr. Brett regarded the "Eastward Position" as "shocking."\* That is to be expected, seeing his admiration for the Clementine Liturgy which requires the Bishop to face the people—a point Broxap has missed. On the question of vesture it would seem that the Non-Usagers most likely adhered in the main to the surplice, but amongst the Usagers at least there may have been some variety. Brett sent some silk to Laurence to be dyed and made into a cope which he wished to "be a fine purple," and later Campbell sent Brett a parcel of purple cloth in the selection of which he said he had taken as much care as if his friend were Archbishop of Canterbury. Jeremy Collier, however, as Primus or presiding bishop, appears not to have worn any such vestments. Brett (as appears from a letter in 1736) thought that the "Seasons" which called for variations of colour were Spring, Summer, Autumn and Winter. But he adds, "Though I believe the Church of England either before or after the Reformation never directed these different colours." G. Gilbert Scott (Secundus) thinks the Non-jurors

\* In his correspondence with Wheatley (a Juror) Brett asked that in his contemplated book he should make it clear that those "who consecrate with their back to the people are wrong."

used the cope only by mistaken belief that it was identical with the Greek phenolion or chasuble, which opens in front, but Brett evidently knew that copes and chasubles were different vestures.

On questions of doctrine some at least of the Usagers deviated from the standards of the Articles and Prayer Book. In their desire to claim an Oblation in the Eucharist they advanced the view that the Sacrifice of Christ was commenced in the institution of the Lord's Supper and only completed on the Cross.\* Collier was the more cautious and said "Twas typified and begun in the Holy Eucharist and continued on the Cross and by this last voluntary act our redemption was purchased." But Brett wrote,† "I was once of opinion that the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice was reconcilable to the Communion Office of the Established Liturgy. . . . but I have since seen my error and find that the notion of Christ's offering Himself on the Cross alone, exclusive of any other oblation. . . . is utterly inconsistent with any oblation made by Christ in the Eucharist and if no oblation is made by Christ in the Eucharist neither ought we to make any oblation there." Thomas Deacon was perhaps even more insistent: "He did not offer the Sacrifice upon the Cross: it was slain there but was offered at the Institution of the Eucharist." Brett also departed from the Articles and Catechism on the point of the necessity of Faith, and he tended to associate Tradition with Holy Scripture in the place of authority. But the question how far his opinions (as the most outstanding personality in the Non-juring Community) were held by the larger body of the Non-jurors, and especially of the Non-Usagers, remains in doubt. The isolation and exclusiveness of the little community operated in two different directions: in one way it bred conservatism in the rank and file and in the other it invited eccentricity in the outstanding men. The new Order of Holy Communion set forth by the Usagers contained a rubric for adding water to the wine: and words of commendation to "Thy mercy, O Lord, all Thy servants, who are departed with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace": also a prayer to "send down thine Holy Spirit, the witness of the passion of our Lord Jesus, upon this Sacrifice, that he may make this bread the body of thy Son, and this cup the blood of thy Son": and also two passages importing the one the offering of "this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice for our sins and the sins of the people," and the other the offering of the bread and cup with a prayer to "look favourably on these thy gifts, which are here set before thee, O thou self sufficient God." In addition the book contained a form for consecrating chrism to be used in Confirmation. In the later developments after the first Schism was healed other services and orders arose among those whom Lathbury calls Separatists, the dominant inspiration of which was probably Thomas Deacon (consecrated in 1733 by Campbell and Laurence after Campbell had consecrated Laurence "solus"). Deacon was the stepson of Jeremy Collier, and

\* Cf. the dispute at the Council of Trent in 1562 (Dimock, *Romish Mass in the English Church*).

† I rely upon Broxap for these quotations.

was ordained by him at 18 years of age : one of his sons was executed for complicity in the Forty-five. Lathbury asserts that only those whom he calls Separatists were implicated in the Forty-five, and none of the more regular Non-jurors. The New Communion Office of the Non-jurors (largely expressing the views of the Usagers) influenced the development of the Scottish Office.

While in the earliest stages of the movement prominent Non-jurors were treated with great harshness and persecution, largely resulting from political fear ; yet, as the political dangers died down, kindlier relations, at least in the spheres of society and learning, appear to have arisen. The Non-jurors suffered from poverty, and those who gave themselves to literary pursuits settled in the vicinity of the universities for the sake of access to the libraries, as they could ill-afford to purchase books. And there is not wanting evidence that their brethren of "the established liturgy," including even an Archbishop, contributed to the funds raised to assist necessitous members of the community. The earlier Non-jurors did go out into the wilderness for conscience sake, receiving no pensions or allowances : and much the same may be said for those who joined them at the accession of George I. Yet Dr. Thomas Brett could say that with certain small exceptions he had not been molested in the discharge of his ministry : and there was constant interchange of correspondence between scholars on both sides.

It is interesting to conjecture the extent and strength of the influence exercised by the little body of Non-juring clergy upon their brethren in the "public church" : or the result of the merger of the remnant of the Non-juring laity, as the schism died out, in the National Church upon their associates. But it is reasonably clear that a small nucleus was ready to hand for the influences of the Tractarian movement to work upon. As late as 1836 there are references to a small community holding the Non-juring tradition ; apparently mainly lay by that time. Would it be fair to suggest that the Non-jurors are in the ancestry of the Anglo Catholic School ? Certainly there is a family resemblance between the Doctrines of the Usagers and some modern teaching.

But whatever view we may take of the principles and practice of the Non-jurors we cannot withhold a meed of respect for a community that was painfully in earnest and suffered, perhaps more than we know, for conscience' sake. I have endeavoured in this article to present a concise and intelligible story of a chapter of our English Church History that is but little known to most Churchfolk, but has always had a fascination for me and ought I think to be interesting to many others, in the light of Lord Acton's famous dictum that "the prize of all study of history is the understanding of modern times."

(Principal authorities : *History of the Non-jurors*, by Thomas Lathbury, M.A., Pickering, 1845 : discursive and argumentative and lacking in precision ; but very valuable, especially for the negotiations with the Greeks and the inter-relations with Scotland. *The Later Non-jurors*, by Henry Broxap, M.A., Cambridge University Press, 1924 : very precise and restrained, with full table of bishops.)

# THE PROBLEM OF SUFFERING

## In the Light of Holy Scripture

By the Rev. R. WYSE JACKSON, LL.D.

(*A paper read to the East Killaloe Clerical Society.*)

### I

**T**HE problem of suffering is an age-old one. Men ask, Why, if God is a righteous and all-powerful God, does he permit hunger and disease and cruelty, the agonies of childbirth or the horrors of war? This is a question which has been put from all time. It was ancient when, centuries before Christ, Habakkuk asked—

“Thou that art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and that canst not look on perverseness, wherefore lookest thou upon them that deal treacherously, and holdest thy peace when the wicked swalloweth up the man that is more righteous than he?”

The problem still remains, and is still without a complete solution. Indeed, we can hardly hope that in this sphere of life we shall ever see other than in a glass darkly. Our world is a pinpoint in God’s universe, and our three score years and ten are a mere fragment of eternity.

Christianity is content with certain fundamental mysteries. Such is the problem of suffering. We have good reason to believe that God is love, and that we are His children made in His image. And we must be prepared to accept that great fact, even though we may not be able to explain away what appear glaring exceptions.

For all that we must not give way to agnosticism or despair. We must retain our faith in God’s good purpose.

A striking parable of this is given in chapter xviii. of the Koran.

The tale goes that as Moses was travelling along a lonely road he was met by a stranger. Together they walked until they reached the sea-shore, and there they found a boat. The stranger did something at which Moses wondered—he knocked a hole in the bottom of the boat. Then they went a little further on their journey, and the stranger met a youth—and drew his sword and killed him. Moses was horrified and said—

“Thou hast slain an innocent person without his having killed another? Now hast thou committed an unjust action.”

But the stranger explained: although his actions seemed so blameworthy, he was really a messenger of God, acting for the best. He had damaged the boat to preserve it for its owner, because a pirate was coming who stole away all sound boats. He had killed the young man, because he foresaw that otherwise the youth would have killed his parents and lost his own soul.

Crude as it is, the parable contains a sound warning. It is never safe for us to criticize God's ways and say that they are wrong. We humans cannot see very far into God's providence, and it is foolish for us to presume to say that the world rests upon an unsound foundation.

Nevertheless, if we bear this warning in mind, we may see some way into the problem of suffering and perceive indications of its place in God's plan for the world. No complete solution is possible, but we may hope to find some light thrown into dark places.

No Christian examination of any human problem can be complete without a study of Biblical teaching upon that problem. Accordingly we must begin with what the Bible tells us about human suffering.

As may be expected, we find a development of belief. We begin with a primitive idea of God as a non-moral being whose demands are purely ritual. Concurrently with this type of ritual belief we find the strong solidarity of the family and nation, so that individuals suffered divine or human punishment for the misdeeds of some or all of the group—as the episode of Achan in the Book of Joshua illustrates so vividly.

With the advent of the great writing prophets both these doctrines were smashed. And, as always happens, new truths brought new problems in their train.

In the first place, God was seen to be a moral being. To put their teachings in a nutshell, Amos taught that He was just, Hosea that He was loving, and Isaiah that He was holy.

Secondly, the doctrine of individualism grew up—as we shall see later, a less absolute truth in ways, for our human solidarity never allows us to be free from ties of different sorts. We find the first great teaching of individualism in Jeremiah; Ezekiel followed by countering the popular proverb—

“The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge” (xviii. 2)—with the principle—

“The soul that sinneth, it shall die, the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father” (xviii. 20).

From these two doctrines it appeared to follow that individual suffering was a penalty for sin, that sin was always punished with material disaster, and that goodness would be rewarded with earthly prosperity. This became the orthodox Jewish doctrine, stated thus in Psalm xxxvii :

“Mark the perfect man and behold the upright : For the latter end of that man is peace. As for transgressors, they shall be destroyed together ; the latter end of the wicked shall be cut off.”

Of course there were many apparent exceptions. In this case it was assumed that the sufferer was guilty of some great secret sin—and the result must have been much cruel suspicion which made the burden of the sufferer even harder to bear than it might have been.

As against this line of thought there were two Old Testament suggestions. The first is the hint given by the great prophet of the Exile that suffering may be vicarious and have a redemptive purpose.



“ He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities : the chastisement of our peace was upon him ; and with his stripes we are healed ” (Isa. liii. 5).

The second is incomparably the most valuable Old Testament treatment of the problem of suffering—the Book of Job.

We have the picture of a man who maintains that he is righteous though he is afflicted. His friends argue that as he suffers, he must necessarily be guilty of personal sin.

“ Remember, I pray thee, who ever perished being innocent ? Or where were the upright cut off ? ” (iv. 7).

“ If thou return to the Almighty, thou shalt be built up ; If thou put away unrighteousness far from thy tents ” (xxii. 23).

But all the time Job is certain of his innocence, and at last he throws out his challenge, that he may appeal to God and stand before Him and state his case.

“ Oh that I had one to hear me ! (Lo, here is my signature, let the Almighty answer me.) And that I had the indictment which my adversary hath written. . . . If my land cry out against me, and the furrows thereof weep together ; If I have eaten the fruits thereof without money or have caused the owners thereof to lose their life ; Let thistles grow instead of wheat, and cockle instead of barley ” (xxxi. 35ff).

God answers. But He does not argue with Job. Rather, He gives an exposition of the greatness and wonder of His universe, wrought with loving care upon a great scale past human comprehension.

“ Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth ? Declare, if thou hast understanding. Who determined the measures thereof, if thou knowest ? Or who stretched the line upon it ? Whereupon were the foundations thereof fastened ? Or who laid the corner stone thereof ; When the morning stars sang together, And all the sons of God shouted for joy ? ” (xxxviii. 4ff).

And when Job knows God, his doubts and questions vanish away. He no longer needs a specific answer, for he has attained his soul's certainty—the peace of God which passeth all understanding. Perhaps, indeed, this mystical knowledge of God is the only true answer to which man can attain—the knowledge which enables him to cry like Job—

“ I have heard of thee with the hearing of the ear, But now mine eye seeth thee, Therefore I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes ” (xlii. 5, 6).

Turning to the New Testament we find ourselves in a world where the orthodox solution is that stated by the islanders of Malta when St. Paul escaped from the wreck, only to be bitten by a poisonous serpent.

“ No doubt this man is a murderer, whom though he hath escaped the sea, yet vengeance suffereth not to live ” (Acts xxviii. 4).

But in that world we find a flood of new light thrown upon the problem by the whole life and works and words of Jesus Christ.

The first great truth that strikes us at once is that Jesus does not look on suffering as necessarily being a punishment for sin. Even

to-day we still hear of good people who search their souls in agony, wondering what sin they have been guilty of that they should be punished so cruelly. Wives who say, "I can't think why this accident happened to my husband, he was always a good-living man." Mothers who go through tortures of remorse for some imagined sin when their baby dies.

Jesus makes it clear that this is false thinking—pain is not necessarily the scourge of God on the individual, though certainly sin often brings its recompense of suffering. He Himself treated the sick with much the same attitude of mind that a modern doctor would adopt. He looked on sickness as something evil which must be cured. When those afflicted with disease were brought out to Him at sunset He laid His hands on them and healed them. And we cannot conceive of an antagonism of purpose between the Father and the Son—the Father, as the Old Testament taught, punishing with pain, and the Son taking it away again.

Rather, His attitude towards pain was that expressed on the occasion when He healed the woman who had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years.

"Ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan had bound, lo, these eighteen years, to have been loosed from this bond on the day of the sabbath?" (St. Luke xiii. 16).

"Whom Satan had bound." Not the work of God, but the work of the power of evil, contrary to God's desire.

The same thought about suffering and punishment is expressed at two other occasions upon which Jesus is reported to have spoken about the subject.

The first is the reference in St. Luke to the massacre of the Galileans and the disaster of the Tower of Siloam.

"Think ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they have suffered these things? I tell you, Nay: but except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish. Or those eighteen upon whom the tower in Siloam fell and killed them, think ye that they were offenders above all the men that dwelt in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay: but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (St. Luke xiii. 2-5).

Here Jesus runs contrary to the traditional Jewish idea of mechanical rewards and punishments, and then goes on to warn His audience that, nevertheless, sin does produce disaster, and that they, too, are in danger as long as they fail to repent. The same question was raised by the disciples in the case reported by St. John.

"And as Jesus passed by, he saw a man which was blind from his birth. And his disciples asked him, saying, Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" (St. John ix. 1, 2).

Jesus's answer to the rather bewildered question of the disciples makes it clear that there is suffering in the world which cannot be accounted for by the sin of the individual.

"Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents; but that the works of God should be manifest in him" (St. John ix. 3).

God is manifested in destroying the works of evil. And man's duty is action, conflict against evil—to do like Jesus, going about, doing good.

“I must work the works of him that sent me” (St. John ix. 4).

The duty of man is to seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. Then “all these things”—which include the conquest of human suffering—will be added to us.

\* \* \* \* \*

## II.

We have seen how our Lord has made clear that suffering is not necessarily God's method of inflicting punishment upon the sinning individual. We have also seen how our Lord indicates the practical road towards the cure of human suffering.

“I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day” (John ix. 4).

From this point we must strike out for ourselves, for our Lord gives us no other information. He Himself was perhaps more concerned with the practical work of ending suffering than with explaining the intellectual why and wherefore. But we must at any rate be profoundly grateful that He gives us the essential assurance of the falsity of the point of view which is satirized so pungently by Studdert-Kennedy.

“He bids us love our enemies  
And live in Christian Peace,  
’Tis only He can order Wars  
And woes that never cease.”

In other words—*God is Love.*

Now the loving omnipotent God has limited Himself in certain ways. The first limitation that He has put upon Himself is that He has given to man freedom of will. He has decided to work out His purpose through man, a self-creating being—“Man is his own star.”

No doubt God might have made man an automaton, a non-moral being. As such, man would have been incapable of evil. But it would also have followed that man must then have been incapable of good, incapable of advance, a soulless being without love.

There is a well-known brand of milk labelled “Carnation Milk from Contented Cows.” God might have created a world of contented cows. But who would not prefer humanity—with all its possibilities for good, albeit with the almost inevitable chances of mistakes, sin, and sorrow?

God has decided to work out His purposes through man. As it were, He has voluntarily surrendered to us His work, to act as His agents. In the words of St. Theresa—

“Christ has no Body now on earth but yours, no hands but yours, no feet but yours; yours are the eyes through which He is to look out compassion to the world; yours are the feet with which He is to go about doing good, and yours are the hands with which He is to bless us now.”

As God's members upon earth, we must strive, beings of free-will. Without that striving, indeed, there could be no advance. That is a fundamental law of life. Mr. H. G. Wells, in his book *The Time Machine* gives a powerful illustration of that truth. He describes a race at the end of time, when conflict had ceased and life had become effortless. A race of charming cultured little people, but spineless, thoughtless, utterly hopeless and ineffective, a parody upon humanity. And the logic of experience shows us that Mr. Wells' parable is a true one.

It is through conflict and suffering that we arrive at humanity's greatness. The spirit which carries the world to victory is the spirit of sacrifice—the spirit which shines through the deathless story of Captain Oates' giving of himself in the Antarctic and which comes to its climax at Calvary itself.

“Measure thy life by loss instead of gain ;  
Not by the wine drunk, but the wine poured forth ;  
For love's strength standeth in love's sacrifice ;  
And whoso suffers most hath most to give.”

And there can be no true sacrifice, no true love, no victory, except among beings of free choice.

But necessarily this weapon of free choice is double-edged. It is possible for man to make the wrong choice. Man can become a saint—but he may also be a sinner. Besides man's willed good, there may also be man's willed evil. Man has been put in a sphere where he can live dangerously. And he has often misused his freedom. That is the cause of most of our suffering, if we can trace cause and effect far enough. We see a family in our slums, pinched with want, the children going to bed crying with hunger. We can trace it all back to man's inhumanity to man ; the greed of speculators, the indifference of the rich. We ask why God allowed the War. But its cause was not God's will, but rather man's reckless misuse of his God-given freedom. Kipling summed up the truth when he wrote,

“Money spent on an Army or Fleet  
Is homicidal lunacy . . .  
My son has been killed in the Mons retreat,  
Why is the Lord afflicting me ?  
Why are murder, pillage and arson  
And rape allowed by the Deity ?  
I will write to *The Times* deriding our parson  
Because my God has afflicted me.”

• • • • •

“As was the sowing, so is the reaping,  
Is now and evermore shall be.  
Thou art delivered to thine own keeping.  
Only Thyself hath afflicted thee.”

It is useless to cry out against God because of suffering which is the result of man's own vice or carelessness or neglect of opportunities. Rather, we must strive to follow the God of Love and work towards that which is a human possibility—the conquest of sin and suffering.

Before we conclude these thoughts on the problem of suffering another great principle must be examined. That is the principle of family life—of human solidarity.

The way of the world is the way of co-operation. That is obvious in our everyday life. To take a simple illustration, think of the first meal of the day. The oatmeal for our porridge comes from the plains of Canada. Our kipper is provided by trawlers working on the high seas. Our eggs come from Denmark, our tea from Ceylon, our sugar from the West Indies, our marmalade from the orange groves of Seville. Hundreds of unknown men have worked together to give us the necessities of life. Indeed, the individual life is impossible. The world is not a collection of isolated individuals, but a family working for the mutual good. That is the heart of our Lord's teaching of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man.

And so, too, we are bound together by our common human nature, and by ties of heredity, to those who have gone before us. We have developed a physique suitable for its purpose from the modes of life of our ancestors. Humanity is designed as a co-operative whole.

Without that co-operation advance would be impossible. And so the human race was designed by God to be a family—a universe, not a multiverse.

God was faced with the alternative of making man either a collection of units or a family. He chose the latter alternative, because individualism would have inflicted greater suffering upon man.

But God cannot give the benefits of family life without its necessary risks. If we are to benefit from our bond to our fellow-men, we must also accept the disadvantages of that bond. That is inevitable, and it does not constitute a valid argument against the omnipotence or love of God.

For the co-operative principle, like the principle of free-will, is double-edged. Co-operation multiplies our blessings, but it also multiplies our troubles. For instance, it makes clear the essential truth that the sins of the fathers fall upon the children. A drunken, immoral father brings misery upon his innocent family. A rogue brings ruin and unemployment upon his honest business associates. Mankind is so closely bound together that the greed of a speculator may mean that God's bounty of harvest is kept back from starving little children a thousand miles away.

These are accidents necessarily arising from the misuse of the principle of human co-operation. The principle in itself is devised for the betterment of humanity, but human sin has intruded and the results of sin have magnified themselves through a long chain of cause and effect.

Again, not only is mankind bound together by certain connections into a family, but we see the whole universe of life going through a co-operative evolution towards a final end. This evolution is not haphazard, but it has a definite upward aim obviously directed towards a purpose by an intelligent Being. In that universe the inferior and

the imperfect are being conquered. And that conquest, from the very nature of existence, must imply suffering. We suffer as from growing pains in order to achieve perfection.

If our mistakes and sin cause suffering and disease ; if our ignorance and carelessness allow us to suffer from earthquake and flood ; if our solidarity allows the perpetuation of the sins of the fathers upon the children ; if our growth necessitates suffering in the submersion of the inferior and the imperfect, yet we can see that very suffering does act as a spur and an incentive towards advance.

So we can see that suffering is also at the basis of God's purpose. Perhaps that is the explanation of much of the suffering which we can not attribute to our own abuse of God's scheme of life.

Admittedly, to us who are yet imperfect, to whom it doth not yet appear what we shall be, that suffering does remain something of a puzzle.

Yet it ought not to be a complete stumbling block to us. It ought not to justify us in losing our faith in God. We do know that the universe is a great harmony. "And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold, it was very good." We may liken the universe to a great symphony with occasional apparent discords, yet with a definite purpose and theme running through it. And we may reasonably conjecture that were our faculties more adequately attuned and educated, we should find that the apparent discords fitted in with the whole symphony. We have at least sufficient evidence that the universe is the ordered work of a master hand to make us willing to take another step in the realm of faith, and to face and fight sin and sorrow in the right way.

And we have the assurance that our fight will not be in vain. When God came to earth He led the way, going about doing good, "healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness among the people" (Matt. iv 23). One way the fight will be won is the way of faith. Another way is the way of sacrifice, the *via dolorosa* which led to Calvary, the way towards God's final purpose. We have the guarantee that that way is the way to victory. That guarantee was given once for all on the third day when our Lord burst from the rocky tomb, making certain the final and inevitable conquest of evil.

"In the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer : ye have overcome the world."

---

THE CHILDREN'S PULPIT. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. net.

The essay by the Bishop of Bristol on Talking to Children is one of the best things in this volume of sermons and addresses by various writers. It may be pondered with profit by all who desire to speak effectively to the young. Many of the talks are suggestive and useful, but in some there is a distinct Anglo-Catholic bias.

## EMIL BRUNNER'S CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY.

By F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

THE DIVINE IMPERATIVE ; A STUDY IN CHRISTIAN ETHICS. By Emil Brunner, Professor of Theology in Zürich. Translated by Olive Wyon and published by the *Lutterworth Press*. 25s.

THIS is a large book of 730 closely printed pages, full of matter, hard to digest, and ranging over a vast number of subjects. A reviewer is simply helpless when confronted by such a complex of themes. Under the splendid title *The Divine Imperative*, which recalls the golden rule of Christ and the categorical imperative of Kant, we have such varied subjects discussed as labour and civilization ; science ; the Church in Action ; State Church, National Church, Free Church ; the nature of the Church ; the acting Christian in the acting State ; the nature of the State ; the Christian in the present Economic order ; the nature and task of the Economic order ; individual problems connected with marriage ; the fundamental problem of marriage ; the natural forms of community ; life in love ; religious and moral practice as limiting cases of the moral ; the individual and the community ; success and progress ; autonomy, natural law and love ; the hallowing of the means by the end ; the active life as a gift and a demand ; service as an "office" and as a personal relation ; the calling ; service ; the better righteousness ; self-affirmation and self-denial ; the threefold meaning of the law ; the unity and the variety of the Divine command ; the Divine command as gift and demand ; the Will of God as the basis and norm of the Good ; the Christian Ethic—past and present ; the definition of the Christian Ethic ; justification by grace alone ; the rationalization of the moral in philosophical ethics ; morality and the religions of the world ; the phases of the immanent moral understanding of the self. Such are some of the headings in this truly colossal work—what the Romans would call a "dubia cena," bewildering the guests by the variety of the dishes and courses. We have printed a rather long list, but it is only fair to an author to give his readers some idea of the contents of his publication. The work is intended to give the Christian directions for his conduct in all the relations and circumstances of the modern world. He deduces a doctrine of Christian conduct directly from the central affirmations of evangelical faith. He follows the method of Spinoza, without

having the clarity of thought and diction of that great philosopher. He opens every chapter of the second book with a proposition, which he proceeds to develop and apply in some detail. For instance, Chapter XI is headed so—"Proposition : We know God's Will only through His revelation, in His own Word. Therefore His command is also primarily a gift, and as such a demand." That in front of Chapter XII is : "Since the Divine command is absolutely concrete, it cannot be formulated in general terms. But since the Will of God which demands obedience is the same as His Will which gives, He cannot command anything but the obedient imitation of His activity as Creator and Redeemer." He well says, in his explanation of this difficult and ponderous proposition, which is by no means self-evident, that "if it is dangerous to be in bondage to the legalism of orthodoxy, it is just as dangerous to fall into the opposite error of a fanatical antinomianism, which holds that it is impossible to lay down any rules at all, that it is impossible to have any knowledge beforehand of the content of the Divine Command. The Will of God, which alone is the Good, is made known to us in His action, in His *revelation*. This Divine process of revelation, however, is not only present, nor is it only past ; in fact, it is present, based on the past. We know God through His present speech—in the Holy Scriptures. He is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever and this not only in what He gives but also in what He demands. But in His historical revelation He has made Himself known to us as the Creator and Redeemer. Thus in this unity of His revelation, He is the God of the Bible, the God who is revealed to us in Jesus Christ. As Creator He is the beginning and ground of all existence, the source of all life ; as Redeemer He is the End, the Goal, towards which all existence tends."

Dr. Brunner's attitude to the Scriptures is thus conservative. He finds God's will there. We are familiar with the expression of the eschatological school for the ethics of the New Testament—"interim ethic," a rather contemptuous slogan for its conditional and imperfect nature. Brunner says they have actually singled out the characteristic aspect of every genuine system of Christian Ethics. The ethical element is essentially an "interim ethic," being provisional, for the time between the Fall and the Resurrection, the way of life of the pilgrim who must make resolves, because things have not yet been decided. But the Christian ethic is the only system which—because it is aware of this fact of a decision still in the future—the Judgment—treats this "interim" period seriously as a period for decision (p. 602). This passage, which recalls Barth's philosophy of crisis, gives an index to the system of Brunner. It is thoroughly evangelical and protestant in the old-fashioned way. In fact, the title of the second edition was *Entwurf einer protestantisch-theologischen Ethik*. Outline of a protestant theological Ethik. There is also much to say about his notes and appendices which display a vast range of reading, and explain obscure references in the text. They are by no means the least valuable part of the work. For instance, he has an acute note on Kant's maxim or categorical imperative (p. 48). He also praises Barth (p. 699) for having



asserted this indispensable idea of Plato and Kant that reason can only realize itself in freedom (p. 483), that is in the fact that man seizes the opportunity provided by his own powers, in the fact that he transcends the given in reaching out after that which is not given—"the idea." This freedom he asserts is the life-element, indeed the real substance of reason. Without this freedom to raise himself in free self-determination, above what is given, man, as man, cannot be imagined. It is precisely this freedom which previously we called formal freedom—which is characteristic of man: this freedom lives in every rational act, in the creation of the artist and the thought of the scientist. It is one aspect of the fact that man was made in the image of God. This formal freedom man cannot lose without ceasing to be man; but in the material sense freedom can be lost by sin. "This distinction between formal and material freedom," he says, "helps to explain the relation between reason and revelation, faith and culture." He says that Kant's analysis of radical evil is the nearest approach in philosophy to the Christian conception of original sin (p. 606). On page 607 he has a note on *syn-eidesis*, *conscientia*. He says the *syn* in the word—which means knowledge with—never refers to God, but in the first place to other human beings who shared this knowledge, and that later it referred to a human subject divided into two parts, one which instructs and one which is instructed, and the word ought to be rendered self-consciousness. Kähler, he says, is right in "stating that the conception of conscience is not central to the thought of the New Testament, that it is a connective idea taken over from Hellenism."

It is clear to the present writer after a long study of Philo, that St. Paul got his idea of *syneidesis*, as well as a host of others, from Philo, who used that term not seldom but most frequently *syneidos*. In fact, the term "convicted by their own conscience" is frequently in Philo, who was deeply studied by St. Paul. Among other subjects discussed in the voluminous work are Gandhi's passive resistance; and Nietzsche's criticism of Christianity. He says that the latter was right in holding that the distinctive element of the Christian Ethos is self-denial, and surrender, passive love. Which would result in the development of a one-sided, half-formed character, a psychological deformity.

The excellence of the book consists in its numerous references to, and remarks upon, the writings of the philosophers of the various German schools, past and present; in the position to which it assigns the Bible as the revelation and Word of God, and in many shrewd criticisms of modern ideas and opinions scattered all over the work; which we may regard as always clever without always considering them convincing. He is evidently a pacifist—not, however, of the "absolutist variety" which he condemns—one who extols the passive element: but our Lord was no pacifist, neither was St. Paul. The one whipped people out of the temple: the other was a born fighter, one who contended with beast-like men in Ephesus. It is true that patience is a moral virtue which was exhibited by Christian martyrs; but Christianity also founded chivalry and the protection of the weak.

The chief weakness of the book is the conception of Christianity as a code of laws, or of deductions from one great law. He called the work *Das Gebot und die Ordnungen* (the command and the directions).

Christianity is something more than a code of laws. It is a *spirit*. To follow Christ's example is not Christianity in the highest sense; neither is obedience to His precepts, neither is carrying out His golden rule. But to have the Spirit of Christ is Christianity. It is to have the character, the *ethos* of Christ Himself. To make out a list of Christian virtues, to draw up a list of Christian duties, to lay down a series of Christian propositions were an excellent work indeed, if there were not a better one still—to have the Spirit of Christ. We cannot reduce that Life as depicted in the Four Gospels to a series of propositions. As has been said, we can no more analyse it into its constituent parts than we can the glory of the rainbow. The difference between the followers of Plato or any Greek or Hindu philosopher and followers of Christ is this—that for those the teaching of the master was all important, whereas for the Christian the all important factor is the Master of the teaching. At the same time, Brunner is right in insisting that a sound belief, a true grasp of sound ethical principles is a necessary foundation for good conduct. A sound faith and belief do stand for much; and help men to stand much for Christ: whereas those who hold that it matters not what one believes, provided one does what is right, if they act upon that maxim, will find that it is no prop in adversity; and no help in a difficulty. Right thinking or belief is the basis of right conduct. Brunner does not like mysticism. He considers that the influence of mystical ideas upon the faith obscured the social side of man's development, and "made Christianity, fundamentally, a monastic business" (cxxviii). He holds (wrongly, we believe) that the Church was led astray by Greek ethic into making the threefold scale of—God—the self—the world (the neighbour). This scale was based upon the principle of duty; the Christian's first duty being the life of the soul with God, the second as a higher kind of religious duty, preoccupation with his duty to himself, and thirdly with his duty to his neighbour. This seems correct logically and also in accordance with the Scripture if we remember the Greek saying that one's neighbour is another self. But Brunner does not start from the idea of duty, but of grace. He is correct there, to some extent, for we must begin with God. It is God seeking man that comes first, then man seeking God. That is God's grace bringing man into a right relation with himself, but it is man's duty to respond to the call of God: and he must if he desires justification. In mysticism the world (the neighbour) is not an obtruding element. The soul is communing with God, set right with God or justified by His grace and its faith responding to that grace. Of course, if over-emphasized it leads to abandonment of the world (the neighbour) and its duties. Accordingly, the individual ethic is inferior to the social ethic—with which Aristotle himself began, saying that "man is a social animal." At the same time mysticism or preoccupation with our duty to God, has an important place in the Christian life. Every soul should have its mystical moments if it is to stand the

wear and tear of the world—and to carry out its duties to the neighbour. A social ethic which leaves no place for the development of the individual soul and the cultivation of spiritual gifts and graces must in time become ineffectual and effete. Brunner's theory is one-sided and partial and, therefore, illogical. Notwithstanding, he is always interesting and instructive.

In conclusion, we could recommend this book to all readers of *THE CHURCHMAN* whose own good sense and intelligence will guide them in their selection of what to take into, and their rejection of what to leave out of, their own ethical and religious system.

CHRISTIANITY, COMMUNISM AND THE IDEAL SOCIETY. By James Feibleman. *Allen & Unwin*. 12s. 6d.

All down the ages, thinkers have outlined their ideals for the life of society. Many voices are heard in these days, and Mr. Feibleman has added his in a study which bears the sub-title "A Philosophical Approach to Modern Politics." The author sees contemporary history as a strife between Christianity and Communism. "The choice, then, between the teachings of Christ and those of Marx seems to the modern man to be the exclusive one that is facing him. But the choice is one that he is loth to make, and the reasons why he hesitates are easy to grasp" (p. 69). However, Mr. Feibleman seeks a third order of society in which the best of both systems shall be preserved, whilst that which is deemed to be ill is rejected. Pursuing this eclectic path in reaching the desired end both Christianity and Communism are examined. It is unfortunate that Christianity is almost entirely identified with Roman Catholicism. Protestantism is not fairly treated. "The Protestant sects are not religious in the sense that the Catholics are religious. Protestantism merely retires the religious element in human life to special services and holidays" (p. 188). One scrap of credit is thrown to Protestantism. "There is one good effect of the Protestant reform which we must not overlook. The return to the origins of Christianity, to the Bible as the source of revelations, threw a renewed emphasis on the person of Jesus Christ and on the truth of His teachings" (p. 188). If the examination of Christianity had been made from the point of view of Christ Himself, it is possible that this study might have presented a different set of conclusions. During the examination of Communism, much is found as deserving censure and rejection, yet certain elements are accepted as worthy of entry into his Ideal Society, where science finds its place alongside the rest. This society is an ideal for the future to be realized in an "unlimited society" which "shares with Jesus Christ a belief in human destiny and the hope and promise of reason" (p. 348).

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THAT INFERIORITY FEELING. John S. Hoyland. *George Allen and Unwin.* 7s. 6d.

This book suggests that its author is a psychologist, a Christian, and an enthusiast for "social reform."

As a psychologist he follows the late Dr. Adler in emphasizing the importance of the first few years of life and the permanent damage often done by unwise treatment during the first few months. In untechnical language he explains "that inferiority feeling" (is this the same thing as that much-discussed "inferiority complex"?) which he ascribes to either Dominance or Coddling; its offspring includes Jealousy, Fear, Conceit, Superiority-striving, Egotism, besides such "minor spawn" as cruelty, laziness, fantasy, other-worldly piety etc., etc.; the results are likely to be lunacy or suicide. This inferiority feeling is especially likely to arise in those who are only children, elder children, or younger children, and as every reader of the book must belong to one of these three classes, the book is likely to produce a feeling of depression and alarm. The writer, however, is ready with a cure. Apparently the mischief could be avoided if every child at the age of two were sent to a nursery school; but such institutions are not numerous and those who read the book will presumably have got beyond the stage at which such treatment would be possible. For those who have reached adult life more drastic measures are needed; for instance let the man with an inferiority feeling go and work as an agricultural labourer in a camp for the unemployed in a depressed area, while a woman in similar danger should go out as an unpaid domestic servant for those who need such menial help but cannot afford to pay for it. However quixotic such advice may sound, the author has evidently practised what he preaches and is therefore speaking of that of which he has had first-hand experience.

The value of the writer's psychology will depend on the value to be placed on the views of Dr. Adler, whom Mr. Hoyland follows so faithfully: for making such an estimate the present writer is not qualified.

The writer is a Christian, apparently of the Quaker type. A hostile critic might quote a remark on p. 125, "You should hear what the average unemployed man has to say about parsons and dog-collars" as an example of the attack on ecclesiastical Christianity that is now so fashionable, but it is, to say the least, doubtful whether the words were so meant. He regards the religion of Christ as consisting of "Agape," the love which gives, without thought of any personal advantage or reward, and through such "agape" is experienced the "release of joy which comes through effective friendship." Then follows this characteristic sentence: "Christ said as much when He instituted that solemn last Sacrament of Menial Service, which the

Church has so easily and conveniently forgotten. As He finished bathing that ring of dusty feet He looked up and said, If I your Master have done this menial service for you, you must do the same ; . . . if you realize what these things mean, happy are you provided that you act on them " (p. 221).

Mr. Hoyland evidently desires drastic changes in our social system. On pp. 46 and 47 and 86 and 88 he speaks with approval of the nursery schools and of some other institutions that he has found in Russia ; but he does not approve of the confiscation and violence that some Christian social reformers seem to contemplate without dismay. It is not fair to denounce him as a " Bolshevik."

A word must be said as to the style of this book. The author avoids the technical terms which make so many books on psychology a terror to the ordinary reader ; he also avoids those nauseous details that one sometimes finds in books on this subject, and for both these merits we are grateful to him. But in order to make his book " popular " he writes in a style that can fairly be described as jaunty, and his jocosity is somewhat overdone ; and yet these features, which are so irritating to some readers, may commend the book to many more.

Perhaps a fair criticism might be expressed thus : the author has received and answered a call not unlike that of Francis of Assisi ; but such a call is not given to all who desire to behave like Christians ; and to attempt the way of Francis without a vocation may be as fatal a mistake as to refuse such a vocation when it has been given.

---

J. F. C.

HEBREW RELIGION BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS : AN EXPOSITION OF THE JUDAISM OF THE HOME OF JESUS. By Thomas Walker, D.D. *James Clarke & Co., Ltd.* 1937. Pp. xii. + 152. 3s. 6d.

The general subject of the development of religious ideas in Judaism in the Inter-Canonical period has received deservedly close attention from competent scholars during the past thirty or forty years. Moreover, for the benefit of students generally, a large number of the texts themselves in which these ideas are embedded have been published in English translations by the S.P.C.K.

The able writer of the present volume is well known as one interested in bringing together Liberal Jew and Christian. His *Jewish Views of Jesus* appeared in 1931.

*Hebrew Religion Between the Testaments*, a miracle of compression, contains six chapters—I, Their Idea of God ; II, Their Views of the Reign of God ; III, Their Trust in God's Special Providence ; IV, Their Notion of Themselves ; V, Their Conception of Their Duty ; VI, Their Hope of the Hereafter. Thus the whole field of a practical theology is covered, and covered in a most instructive way. Each subject is treated by means of quotations (with references) from the various texts. Thus the general reader as well as the serious student, in addition to following Dr. Walker's comments, can turn up documents as he goes along.

We do not know anything so good in this class of work as the chapter on "The Idea of God." It is not easy for the reviewer in a few words to pass on the picture conveyed. "The Invisible Father," "the Father of All," is the Being of Whom the patriarch Joseph (in the Testament of Joseph) could say, "The Lord loved me." We are all familiar with the quotation from Wisdom (xi. 26): "O Sovereign Lord, thou lover of souls" (R.V. lover of *men's* lives) in the opening line of the hymn "Jesu, Lover of my soul." "Religion," says Dr. Walker, "for these people between the Old and New Testaments was more personal than it had ever been anywhere in the world before" (p. 21). Prayer was the breath of life. It is like manna: "We must rise before the sun to give Thee thanks, and must plead with Thee at the dawning of the light" (Wisdom xvi. 28).

The reign of God—for so perhaps the Hebrew "Melukkah" must be translated—was not always and essentially a kingdom with local or racial boundaries. It was invisible, and in heaven as well as upon earth, and not for Jews only, "O Lord, mighty and eternal! who are the people in this picture on this side and on that? And He said to me: 'These which are on the left side are the multitude of the peoples which have formerly been in existence and which are after thee destined, *some for judgment and restoration.* . . .'" (Apocalypse of Abraham, ch. xxii).

There are, of course, dangers in the method employed, so successfully, in the present volume. The sub-title "An Exposition of the Judaism of the Home of Jesus" might lead to misunderstanding. The Judaism pictured by a collecting of statements from all these various diversely circulated and variedly dated documents is the religion of no one person's home. And to suppose that Joseph and Mary knew even the titles of the major part of the books quoted would be (as Dr. Walker would admit) absurd. The reviewer does not refer merely to such books as that for convenience styled 2 Enoch—which in reality emanated from the 4th century of the Christian era and whose pre-Christian material (so far as there may be any) is far from easy to identify with convincing certainty.

The time has gone by when it could be supposed that by means of the Old Testament alone it is possible to understand the background of the thought of Christ's hearers or to appreciate fully His own sayings. The Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical literature simply must be read and studied. 1 Enoch and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs are more important to a right understanding of the First Three Gospels than they are for that of the Apocalypse itself of St. John the Divine . . . But even if in the home of our Lord all the ideas of all such literature were well familiar, at least we can assert that our Saviour showed His own partiality for the canonical books of Scripture and for the doctrines contained therein. For example, *He* never referred to the prayers of angels or saints on man's behalf. When asked in the words of 4 Esdras, "Are there few that be saved?" He did not reply in the tenor of that book of pessimism and narrowness, but in the joyous sentence of His own coining: "they shall

come from the east and the west and sit down in the kingdom of God."

It may seem but a small point, but we deprecate the use upon the title-page of the mere name Jesus. Some additional designation of reverence for the Divine Saviour of the world would seem to be right and proper. Even the Jews gave such respect to their great teachers that the personal name was preceded by the title "Rabbi." The book is an admirable production, with an excellent subject-index and with few typographical slips. We confidently predict for it a career of usefulness to Christian students, and it should help to break down the barrier between Jew and Gentile.

R. S. C.

---

NEW LIGHT ON HEBREW ORIGINS, by J. Garrow Duncan, D.D.  
S.P.C.K. Pp. xiv. + 282. 5s.

The author of this volume is a recognized archaeologist in Bible lands. As long ago as 1906 Mr. Garrow Duncan was working with Sir Flinders Petrie in the Nile Delta, and he contributed chapters to the classic *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*. His articles in the *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* are always of a high order. The present volume is divided into three parts; I, The Babylonian Narratives of Genesis (72 pages); II, The Egyptian Narratives in Genesis and Exodus (117 pages); and III, Canaanite Influence on Hebrew Religion (84 pages).

Let it be said at once that some who read into Part I only might not realize what good things were laid up in store for the reader of the later parts of the book. The Hebrew account of the Flood, it is suggested (pp. 25, 26), is a conflation of two ideas—a Babylonian deluge of rain and a Nile inundation. "The depth of the Flood in Genesis vii. 20 is given as 15 cubits. . . which could not cover even the city mounds of Babylonia: but 15 cubits is the average rise of an ordinary inundation of the Nile." Dr. Duncan accepts Woolley's calculation that the Flood affected an area of 400 miles by 100 miles. We do not dispute such an estimate, but it ill agrees with the statement of Genesis vii. 21. "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both fowl, and cattle and beast, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man." The attitude and the author of *The Accuracy of the Old Testament* might well be expected to be more "conservative."

In Part II, the writer appears to depend too much upon Professor Yahuda. At times Erman (so recently taken from us) or our own Alan Gardiner or the late Eric Peet is needed to balance and to check the Spanish professor's results. It is better for us to say that the name Moses will never be found in Egypt than to derive, as Yahuda is said to do (see Duncan p. 145), the Hebrew name *Mōs̄sheh* from *Mu* (water) and *shē* (the sea), *i.e.* Moses—"water of the Nile!" But, in fairness to Yahuda the question may be asked, Does our author quote his view here sufficiently fully? See Yahuda, *Accuracy of the Bible*, p. 66.

Garrow Duncan is right in recognizing that the name of Goshen does not occur in Egypt as a district name. The identification, however, of a *town* of Saft=Kes=Goshen he is committed to (*Hyksos Cities*, p. 35), but this identification is distrusted by Egyptologists like Peet (*Egypt and the Old Testament*, p. 87). It is on general grounds connected with the Septuagint that it is fairly reasonable to place the land of Goshen in the west part of the modern *Wady Tumilat*, and Duncan aptly quotes the Egyptian record concerning Bedawin tribes from the district of Atuma (= ? the Etham of Exodus xiii. 20, Numb. xxxiii. 8) being permitted to pass through Thuku (= ? the Succoth of Exodus xiii. 20) to feed their flocks. The invitation to Jacob and his sons (Gen. xlvii. 6) to live in this same small region (or a little farther west) might be considered as an extension of such a recognized permission or hospitality to non-Egyptian tribes. We confess to much sympathy with the author in seeing the whole district as "enriched by the building activities of Rameses II"; and certainly it is the impression gained from reading such passages as Exodus i. 11, to say nothing of the fact of the prevalence in the Valley of Tumilat of archaeological remains bearing the name of Rameses II.

And so we come to the interesting point that Dr. Duncan entirely favours the identification of the Pharaoh of the great oppression with this Rameses (1292-1225 B.C.), and he places (p. 189) the Exodus itself during Merenptah's reign (c. 1226 B.C.), maintaining that the actual conquest of Canaan's strongholds did not begin till the weak reign of Rameses III. He thus is against Garstang's early dating of the Exodus at around 1445 B.C. The facts as set out by Duncan confirm the present reviewer in his opinion that the battle for the popular theory of a Thutmose III—Amenhotep II date has not been won.

This brings us to Part III. For, under the general section of "Canaanite Influence on Hebrew Religion," the author gives several arguments for the late date of the Exodus (pp. 180—189). And here the reader is provided with an example of Duncan's strength. We must take account of his evidence as that of one who is not merely a hearer of the word but a doer of the work of an archaeologist in Palestine. "From the archaeological evidence it is quite clear that Canaan could not have been in the hands of the Hebrews between 1450 and 1150, since all the chief fortresses were actually held by the Canaanites or Egyptians down to the latter date" (p. 188). But to pass on.

The writer, by means of a number of short articles in Part III, presents the reader with information—archaeological and Biblical—upon such matter as altar-hearths (Isaiah xxix. 1, R.V. margin), oracles, human sacrifices, gods and goddesses, idolatry, etc. The section on "Imageless Cults" (pp. 239—241) calls attention to the fact that in ancient times in other religions besides Israel's men appear to have worshipped their Deity without the help of images. Information about the Serabit turquoise mines in Central Sinai (worked centuries before Israel left Egypt) is always fascinating, and pp. 218—221 with their reference to the Egypto-Semitic temple and other features of this old civilization should not be missed. The occasional references



to the Ras Shamra inscriptions are good so far as they go; those who desire information on this vastly important branch of discovery can follow up their inclination in such works as Dussaud's *Les Découvertes de Ras Shamra (Ugarit) et l'ancien Testament* (1937) or in the various articles upon the subject by the Englishman Theodore Gaster. There seem to be few misprints (on p. 196 "I Sam." should read "II Sam."), and the indexes are full and are, so far as tested, accurate. One can only add that the price of 5s. brings the volume within the reach of all.

We close with words from the Preface which fitly describe the author's recognition of the fact that the Hebrew Religion (even as Christianity itself) is not a natural development from, or synthesis of, earlier or contemporary ideas, be they Babylonian, Egyptian or Canaanite. "Israel had one gift peculiarly his own—the message of a God who cannot be made with hands, who cannot be depicted in wood or stone."

R. S. C.

---

THE PROPHETIC ROAD TO GOD. By T. H. Sutcliffe, M.A. S.P.C.K.  
3s. 6d.

Mr. Sutcliffe is to be complimented on having achieved his object of producing a book on the Prophets, written in a popular style. Many will find it useful, for he has dealt with a long period in a volume of about two hundred pages. Many "theories" of Biblical Criticism are adopted. Whilst many extremities are avoided, it is repeatedly acknowledged that numerous points are open to question.

Much of the earlier portion of the book deals with man's approach to God, and one is ever conscious that God's revelation to man could have figured more prominently. Whilst man's approach is not disregarded, one feels more in touch with realities in the New Testament view of the Old Testament given in Heb. i. 1. God used men as they opened their hearts to Him. That is why men arose from time to time, who, in standing out above their contemporaries, seemed to have arisen before their time. Still the book's title is *The Prophetic Road to God*. God's approach to man might well be the subject of another study by the author.

Mr. Sutcliffe is at his best in dealing with the eighth-century prophets, yet the approach from the human side is always evident. Can it be enough, as he says later, to summarize the message of the Prophet of the Exile as—"Second Isaiah roused them with a great hope that Cyrus might give them freedom" ? (p. 116). The prophet had more than a hope, it was a confidence born of what he knew to be a revelation of God's will. He saw that the solution of all their difficulties was from God's side. Man's part was co-operation with His will. There are excellent sections on the Servant Passages. However, the Saviour's sufferings were far deeper than were his. One feels that Mr. Sutcliffe has not gone far enough in saying "The sufferings of Jesus help others to God" (p. 116). The atonement is not to be accounted for under such terms alone, for reconciliation does not depend primarily on human

effort or desire. The author's treatment of the Book Daniel is rather unconvincing. Its solution is not so simple a matter as is suggested.

The book, however, will serve a useful purpose, and not least the questions on each chapter which appear in appendix form at the close of the book.

E. H.

---

THE WISDOM OF GOD. By the Very Rev. Sergius Bulgakov.  
*Williams & Norgate, Ltd.* 6s.

There can be little doubt that it is good for Christians of one Church to know what Christians of another Church are thinking. The freer the exchange of thought the better it will be. From that point of view we welcome this book on *The Wisdom of God* by the Dean of the Russian Theological Institute, Paris. Dr. Bulgakov, who is not unknown in England, has devoted himself to the study of Sophiology, and this book is intended to serve as an introduction to the subject. He says, "Sophiology represents a theological or, if you prefer, a dogmatic, interpretation of the world (*Weltanschauung*) within Christianity" (p. 29). This department of study has not occupied a prominent position in the west. Dr. Frank Gavin says in the Preface, "the West has been decidedly sceptical about the place of reason in the scheme of God's things," a statement not quite accurate of the Church of England, however true it might be of other Churches. The author sets out a noble conception of God under the terms *Ousia*, *Sophia* and *Glory*, and His nature as "a living and, therefore, loving substance, ground and 'principle'" (p. 59.) His relation to His world is seen through *Divine Sophia* in which He "unites the world with His own divine life. In so far as the creature is able to bear it, he communicates *Sophia*, the creaturely *Sophia*, to creation" (p. 112).

The chapter on the Incarnation is excellent. Christ is not only the Eternal Word but also "the Prototype *par excellence* of humankind" (p. 126), and, "in him, indeed, for the first time the true idea of God-manhood, according to the conception of the Creator, is realized in its integrity, in the unshadowed clarity of its form" (p. 142).

Yet the book presents wide differences from Anglican theology. Particularly is this so in the matter of the Holy Communion with its stress upon the *Epiclesis* and the veneration of the Virgin Mary. It is interesting to know that "The Churches of St. Sophia in Russia, as a general rule, have their feasts of title on feasts of our Lady (in Kiev, the day of her Nativity; in Novgorod and other places on the day of her Assumption)" (p. 16). This veneration is distinct from that accorded to her by the Roman Church. It is held that "she remains a woman, however fully deified" (p. 183). Many claims are made for her, which if accepted, would logically lead to the conclusions set forth. One has to ask for proof of these claims, and it is noticeable that the chapter devoted to this subject has few direct Biblical references to the matter, whereas the rest of the work abounds in them.

This kind of reasoning is unconvincing. It demonstrates the wideness of the gap between the reformed and unreformed Churches.

The book closes with a statement on the sophianic conception of the Church. "The Church in the world is Sophia in the process of becoming, according to the double impulse of creation and deification; the former imposes the conditions of the latter, the latter constitutes the fulfilment of the former. God created the world only that He might deify it and Himself become all in all to it" (p. 203). All comes within its scope, "Nature is not alien to the Church; it belongs to it" (p. 210).

Those interested in the subject should read the book.

E. H.

---

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP. By Oscar Hardman, M.A., D.D.  
The London Theological Library. *University of London Press.*  
5s. net.

In spite of the considerable number of books dealing with the Prayer Book and Liturgiology in general, including large reference volumes like *The Prayer Book Dictionary*, *The Tutorial Prayer Book*, *The Cambridge Liturgical Handbook* series, Bishop Frere's, Bishop Dowden's, Dr. Swete's and Dr. Dyson Hague's books, there is still room for another and rather differently arranged account of this vast subject. And it would seem that Professor Hardman in this small unpretentious contribution has very successfully filled the niche. In the short compass of 240 well-printed pages he has traced in a clear, comprehensive and most readable manner the growth and development of Christian worship and culture. He has also included "Preaching and Teaching" and a short description of the varying styles of Church architecture. The differences in the various liturgical rites and the Church Orders and Service Books in different countries as well as in the East and West are carefully delineated. He even manages to squeeze in a rapid and meagre outline of contemporary Church History.

He divides his outline before the Reformation into four distinct periods in which, with a genius for compression, he narrates in a clear and unprejudiced manner the changes and developments in ceremonies and worship during these centuries. By a bare narration of facts he exposes the spread of harmful and un-Scriptural practices, so that "superstition and thinly veiled paganism vitiated the faith and practice of the laity in many parts of Christendom during the Dark Ages." Again, he lays bare the evil effect of the medieval doctrine of transubstantiation when he declares that "the primary object" of those who heard Mass, "was to witness the miracle of transubstantiation, to adore Christ whose presence was thus effected, and to win the benefits of His sacrifice accomplished anew by the priest at the altar, more especially on behalf of the souls in purgatory."

The book is well written and will be really valuable to the ordinary theological student, and we are therefore reluctant to point out some rather serious historical blemishes which appear in the description

of the later period. They afford, however, either evidence of a want of accurate knowledge or of a definite partisan bias. Dr. Hardman, for instance, uses, quite unhistorically, "Puritanism" in the 17th century as equivalent of "Protestantism," while the current contemporary religious division was that of "Papist, Protestant (i.e. Churchmen) and Puritan." Dr. Hardman actually divides England into "Catholics, Anglicans and Protestants" in a way which would have scandalized such stout Churchmen as Andrewes, Dean Jackson, Bishop Hall, Jeremy Taylor or Cosin. He declares that the foreign Reformers were "anti-Catholic" and "rivals to Catholicism itself," forgetting that Andrewes quoted the "Harmony of Protestant Confessions" to prove that English Churchmen held with them "One Faith." While Dean Jackson declared that "We Protestants of Reformed Churches, are . . . the truest Christians, and the most conspicuous members of the holy Catholic Church . . . dare not vouchsafe to bestow the name of 'Catholic' upon any Papist."

Dr. Hardman's practical assumption is that the Church of England, even of the 17th century, was not "Protestant," but a sort of "*tertium quid*" between the Reformed Continental Churches and Romanism. It is surprising that the recent traditional Coronation Service did not correct such an unhistorical theory. The Archbishop asks the King to maintain "the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law," and the next question defines this religion as "the settlement of the Church of England and the doctrine, worship, discipline and government thereof *as by law established in England.*" This description is singularly reminiscent of the answer of the Bishops in the House of Lords in 1673 to the question, "How much is meant by the Protestant Religion?"—"The Protestant religion is comprehended in the 39 Articles, the liturgy, the catechism and the homilies and canons of the Church of England."

Of course Dr. Hardman makes the usual "Anglo-Catholic" dogmatic assertion that "the Vestments were retained in 1559 and confirmed in 1662" "though as a result of Puritan influence this order was mainly ignored." Certainly if the Revisers in 1662 had intended to reintroduce the Eucharistic Vestments, which had been carefully destroyed by ecclesiastical authority for the past 100 years, Puritan opposition or "influence" would have been the one incentive to urge on their enforcement, since the Restoration Bishops had no love for Puritans! But where, until the middle of the last century, does Professor Hardman find any trace of their use? There is certainly none by the Restoration Bishops.

There is increasing evidence to-day of a conspiracy either to condemn or ignore the 39 Articles. Professor Hardman takes the trouble to mention, under the section "Preaching and Teaching," discarded and purely temporary Formularies such as the "Bishops' Book" and the "King's Book," but the 39 Articles, which since the Reformation have been the authoritative doctrinal standard of the Church of England to which Dr. Hardman himself has given his solemn "Declaration of Assent" are nowhere even alluded to!

When we read Professor Hardman's severe strictures on the

dissolution of the monasteries we wonder if he has read the recent work by George Baskerville on "The English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries"?

C. S. C.

MOSCOW : THE THIRD ROME. By Nicolas Zernov. D. Phil. S.P.C.K.  
Pp. 94. 2s. 6d. net.

This interesting little book embodies a series of Lectures delivered at King's College, London, under the auspices of the School of Slavonic Studies. In its new form, these Lectures represent an attempt to place before the English-speaking public a concise account of the Russian Church, which has always been something of an enigma to the average Englishman. As the writer states :—

"It is one of the most striking paradoxes of the twentieth century that in an age of wireless and air-lines to all parts of the world this Church of many million people inhabiting northern Europe and Asia is still a body so little known, that almost any fantastic account of her is believed, and may be accepted as the basis of the policy of other nations. The study of Russian Christianity is one of the tasks of our time, urgently needed both in and outside the Russian circles."

Obviously, space will not permit of any detailed account of the history of the Russian Church which the writer has set forth with considerable felicity of language. That history is certainly full of interest and instruction and it will obviously do much to correct many false notions widely prevalent about the Russian Church and its rôle under the old régime.

The writer does not seem very hopeful about the future of Russia, but he points out that :—

"The history of the Russian Church is a warning that no one national Church can ever fulfil itself if it is cut off from the other Christian bodies."

He does, however, state that :—

"It would be premature to predict which side will be taken by the majority of the Russian people in the fierce struggle between the Christians and the militant atheists which has been raging in Russia since the revolution, but its intensity and duration suggest a deep-rooted religious feeling among the people such as even the totalitarian State of the twentieth century may not be able to eradicate."

Perhaps this little work will arouse fresh interest in the tragic history of a great Church.

C. J. O.

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY. By William Temple, Archbishop of York.  
S.C.M. 6d. net.

This little pamphlet of forty-six pages is marked by all the brilliance and lucidity characteristic of its distinguished author, and deserves to be read, with care and close attention. While it is a thorough-going defence of the use of Reason, first in matters of religion

and then in those which relate to politics, yet it carefully notes the limitations to which Reason is subject, amongst them that "there is that in Christianity which Reason could not discover for itself, nor prove when revealed"; and, further, that no one individual or group of individuals can know all the facts needed before a reliable judgment can be formed.

The aim of the pamphlet is thus expressed: "What is urged in the following pages is the intrinsic kinship between the ultimate intuitions of Christian faith and the attitude towards life which is both expressed in, and encouraged by, reliance upon Reason." The argument is developed mainly in the sphere of politics, and we are given a very acute analysis of some present world, or, rather, European conditions, together with many shrewd and penetrating comments on them. Though the Archbishop sums up in favour of Democracy, he says truly that "more high-flown nonsense has been talked about Democracy than about any other political system" and he points out the defects both in tendency and practice to which it is specially subject. He is probably right in saying that "Christianity best expresses itself through democracy," and he is certainly so in saying that "democracy can only survive if it is Christian. It needs alike the inspiration and the check that Christianity can supply—the inspiration that leads each citizen to desire a fair deal for his fellow-citizens, and the check that hinders each from using his liberty to exploit that fellow citizen. . . . So far as democracy becomes a mere welter of competing self-interests it is on the way to perish and will deserve its doom." The Archbishop's brief discussion of the connection and inter-relations between Reason and Authority alike in the sphere of religion as well as of more mundane matters should be read and pondered, for there is much foolish writing in regard to both to be found in current popular literature. This pamphlet is that of an idealist who is fully conversant with practical affairs, and has no illusions, but who knows well that "where there is no vision the people perish."

W. G. J.

---

FAITH AND FACT. By W. B. Selbie, D.D. *James Clarke*. 3s. 6d.

The present reviewer first came across the work of the former Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, when he read that delightful book published last year by Messrs. Duckworth at the price of 5s., entitled *The Fatherhood of God*. In the preface to that book the author saw signs of a more hopeful period of religious enquiry and interest: "Materialism is as dead as Queen Anne, and humanism has been found out. There is a swing back to a kind of orthodoxy, but neither the crisis theology of Karl Barth nor the purely experimental technique of the Group Movement seem able wholly to meet the need." Dr. Selbie is a firm believer in a practical theology—a faith by which men can live as sons of a living God. He holds that religious experience is real and that it brings us into touch with reality. He contends that revelation implies the capacity of man to hear as well as the willingness of God to speak. His present book is based upon papers which have

appeared in the *Christian World* or in the *Spectator*. Dr. Selbie writes as a Free Church Protestant, but he believes that in such matters as the observance of the Christian Year modern Nonconformity must not "throw out the baby with the bath water" but must realize how much it has lost owing to the failure to use and observe the great days of the Church Year. We have read with special pleasure his chapter on Scrupulants which begins: "Of all the sins peculiar to saints that of scrupulosity, or, as it came to be called in the later Middle Ages, *pusillanimitas*, is the most characteristic." Nor have we read anything since Bishop Paget's day that is so good on that sin of the monastic life—*accidie*. His chapter on "sermon slavery" is a wholesome and necessary corrective to those who have suggested that it is impossible for any minister to preach two good sermons on Sunday. Most certainly this is a book which clergy and ministers should buy. Better still, let the Evangelical laity who read *THE CHURCHMAN* buy a copy for their Vicar or Curate. It is the author's mature thought on some of the central subjects of Christian theology.

A. W. PARSONS.

---

WORKMEN OF THE BIBLE. Donald Davidson, B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D.  
*James Clarke & Co.* 2s. 6d. net.

This little book containing 17 chapters presents a series of workmen of the Bible, and builds around their lives and occupations some fascinating studies. The chapters include such occupations as that of the Carpenter, the Shepherd, the Fuller, the Potter, the Weaver, the Fisherman, the Tent-maker, the Coppersmith, etc. The two closing chapters are striking in their originality, the Fatal Accident, and The Unemployed.

The author makes the very best of his subjects, weaving into them a great deal of information and spiritual teaching.

This little book is very suggestive to the preacher or the Bible class leader. It is something quite out of the ordinary and will be read with profit and interest from cover to cover.

C. E. WILSON.

---

PRAYERS FOR COMMON WORSHIP, MORNING AND EVENING, EVERY LORD'S DAY THROUGHOUT THE COURSE OF THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.  
The Rev. James Ferguson, B.D., Crieff, Scotland. *Allenson.* 6s.

In the preface the author states: "This book of prayers is intended as an aid to ministers in their preparation for the service of the Sanctuary week by week. It includes many prayers taken from the ancient supplications of the Church, as these may be found in readily accessible treasuries of devotion. It is very desirable that the beautiful forms of prayer which have nourished the faith and worship of the Church for ages, should not be lost to any part of the Church, but rather should be brought into more general use. A printed prayer is like printed music: it needs the living soul of the worshipper, as

printed music needs the soul of the executant, in order to give it life. In the arrangement of prayer for public worship no method is simpler or better than that which follows the course of the Christian Year. The great moments of faith are thus brought before the soul of the worshipper in orderly historical sequence."

The order of the Prayers is set forth as follows :—

- (1) The Call to Prayer : The Invocation : The Confession of Sins : Prayer for Pardon and Peace : Prayer for Grace : The Lord's Prayer.
- (2) Prayer of the Offering.
- (3) The Thanksgiving : The Intercessions : The Remembrance of the Blessed Departed : Ascription of Glory.
- (4) (Before Sermon.) Prayer for Illumination : The Preacher's Prayer in secret.
- (5) (After Sermon.) Ascription of Glory : Prayer of Commendation.
- (6) The Blessing : The Final Amen.

The usefulness of this valuable volume of prayer gathered from not less than 137 sources is not limited to the worship of what are called the Free Churches : there are many prayers in its pages that might enrich the more rigid services of the Church of England, and could be found useful in services of intercession and in private use.

The keeping of " a Silence " in every service is something which with advantage might find a place in the normal worship of the faithful.

The whole volume is admirably arranged and provides treasures gathered from a wide variety of sources—ancient and modern ; English and foreign, Protestant, Greek, Roman Catholic, Catholic Apostolic, and even pre-Christian.

C. E. WILSON.

---

MARK. By B. Harvie Branscomb, D.D. pp. xxxviii + 314. *Hodder & Stoughton*. 8s. 6d. net.

A further volume in the " Moffatt New Testament Commentary " is always welcome, even though the reader may not be prepared to accept all the conclusions of the writer. In this case the author is the Professor of New Testament in the Duke University, Durham, North Caroline, and competent beyond most to handle this key gospel. The text itself is, as in the other volumes of the series, Moffatt's Translation. That of itself gives the commentary a particular character, though a certain freedom is permitted. As a commentary this volume will rank as high as its fellows. It is clear, sane, helpful and written with sanctified imagination. The introduction is not the least valuable part of the book. With scholarly judgment the author makes his contribution to the questions of authorship, purpose, sources, date. For purposes of reference, and for help to appreciate more fully this Gospel, preachers and teachers will find Dr. Branscomb's book of great value.