

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

The Churchman

OCTOBER-DECEMBER, 1944.

Vol. LVIII. No. 4. New Series.

Contents :

	PAGE
EDITORIAL	146
THE DUTY AND DIFFICULTY OF CLOSE ADHERENCE TO THE PRAYER BOOK	
The Rev. R. J. Cobb, M.A.	147
THE PRAYER BOOK : AMENDMENTS AND ADDITIONS THAT WOULD ASSIST EFFECTIVENESS	
The Rt. Rev. Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man	152
LAWFUL AUTHORITY FOR ADDITIONS AND AMEND- MENTS TO THE PRAYER BOOK	
The Rev. F. J. Taylor, M.A.	157
EVANGELICAL CATHOLICITY	
The Rev. W. Leathem	165
A PIONEER OF RELIGIOUS TOLERATION	
The Rev. C. Sydney Carter, D.D., F.R.Hist.S.	173
BOOK REVIEWS	179

PRICE : ONE SHILLING

"The Churchman," 1s. quarterly. Annual subscription, 4s. 6d. post free.
Church Book Room Press, Ltd., Dean Wace House, Wine Office Court, E.C.4

Editorial.

THE subject which had been chosen for the Oxford Conference this year was "The Prayer Book". Unfortunately, the war situation compelled the abandonment of the Conference, to the disappointment of many.

At our invitation, three of the selected speakers have contributed papers for this issue of *The Churchman*, dealing with some of the important aspects of the subject which are of interest to all Churchmen, and we acknowledge our indebtedness to the writers. Their papers include the question of Adherence to the Prayer Book in Public Worship; the needful Amendments and Additions to make it more effective for use to-day, and the very vital question of Lawful Authority for any variation from the prescribed order.

It should be understood that their contributions are only intended to give some indication of what would have been the substance of their papers had they been read at the Conference, and further that the content of their papers would have been open to general discussion, and, following the usual custom of the Conference, "Findings" would have been issued giving the general consensus of opinion of the members.

The subject is of supreme importance to Evangelicals and we therefore hope that these contributions will stimulate thought and be useful if, in the near future, the question of Prayer Book Revision should become a "live" issue, which is by no means beyond the realm of possibility.

The writer of the paper "Evangelical Catholicity" wishes us to state that his contribution is the substance of a paper read at a Conference arranged by the Church Pastoral-Aid Society at Heightside.

We would like to take this opportunity of expressing our warm appreciation to all our writers, including those who contribute book reviews, which are so much appreciated by our readers.

The Churchman is recognised as a magazine which is making a most valuable contribution in theology, and is evidence that, in the ranks of Evangelicals, there are theologians possessing a knowledge of modern scholarship. The steady increase of its circulation during the year is a real encouragement to all who have any share in its production.

We must offer our sincere apology for the delay in the publication of this number, but it was quite unavoidable.

The Duty and Difficulty of Close Adherence to the Prayer Book.

BY THE REV. R. J. COBB, M.A.

“IN Public Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments I will use the form in the said Book Prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority.” These words, binding upon each of us who has entered upon a cure of souls, form the obvious starting point for this day’s Conference; for they not only give the subject matter of this initial paper, but with their hint of review and adaptation of the Prayer Book Services through regular channels they also afford the introduction to the other papers as well. Our purpose is to face as fully as may be, the present situation of the Evangelical in his ministry—at least in his conduct of public worship. The writers of the later papers have the more enviable task of making constructive suggestions, while our present concern is that of attempting to review the position of one who is conscientiously seeking to implement the promise he has made when entering his sphere of ministry.

That is no easy task, and not the least difficult part is the decision as to the approach which must be taken. The most tempting is to set forward in all its rigour the actual course of worship as it stands prescribed in the 1662 Book; immediately we do so, we find ourselves forced to agree with Stanley Morison in his statement ‘The Act of Uniformity is dead’, though I feel we would, many of us, be far from agreeing with him as he continues, ‘There never was much chance of survival of the Act, if only because the directions in the rubrics of the *Annexed Book* are insufficient in number and ambiguous in meaning.’ We would rather acknowledge that the Act of Uniformity is dead in the letter, but very much alive in the spirit: there are, I fear, none of us who have exactly fulfilled the conditions of the ‘said form prescribed’ even, shall we say, during the past seven days—and that bearing in mind the somewhat slender reliefs which the Shortened Services Act permit.

It is, however, an easy matter to say ‘No one observes the Prayer Book nowadays,’ and far too easy to come to the conclusion that very few really care about loyalty to the Book on that account. Indeed, those who are anxious for drastic reform find in such a cry the starting-point for an attitude of mind that sets up the Book as a ‘liturgical Aunt Sally’ in order to prepare the mind for those violent handlings of its services which render them quite unrecognisable. We must meet such an attitude by declaring that, while we agree that the full terms of the Book are such as are not really applicable in these days, there is a mean of loyalty to the Book which is consistent with departing from some of its provisions.

The definite formulation of such a position is no easy task; but the attempt seems to be the only rational course for this paper. It will

involve a reference to the principles which the compilers of the Book sought to express in their work, some consideration of practical parochial questions, and the chief concern will be with the relation between Faith and the Worship which is conducted in accordance with the Prayer Book. Maybe in so doing we go a little beyond the strict scope of this paper as defined in its heading, yet it is only so that we can provide something by way of background for the later discussions.

We are concerned, then, first with the *duty* of adherence to the Prayer Book. This, as we have already noted, is a matter of obligation for all in the Ministry of our Church : we were ordained on our avowal that we were 'truly called, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the due order of this Realm, to the Ministry of the Church', it is a Ministry which involves a discipline in Public Ministration, for one of the principles in Worship which we are commissioned to maintain is that of Uniformity—'all the whole Realm shall have but one use.' How loosely the Church has, in practice, sat to this provision is a matter of History ; every age has had its 'non-conformists' in this respect. Wickham Legg in his *English Church Life* instances a letter of 1683, written by a gentleman of the Inns of Court, who complains that, in London, there are as many ways of worship as there are ministers. He speaks of : leaving out the opening Sentences, Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution at Mattins and Evensong ; substituting a metrical psalm for the Benedictus or Jubilate ; interpolating into Altar Prayers ; the use of extempore prayer in place of the Prayer for the Church Militant ; omission of the opening Lord's Prayer and the Creed from the Communion, and so on. This of course is exceedingly 'modern' in its tone, but I wonder if we realise quite how far things might go were suggestions of the Deposited Book to be accepted : in this connection, Dr. Brightman calculated that there would be 384 possible varieties of Mattins, 2080 if the Litany followed. Such astronomical figures seem to justify the assertion that, if the Book had been accepted, the principle of Uniformity would have given place to one of '*quot ecclesiae, tot liturgiae.*' If we have a conception of the Church which regards her ordered worship as related to her Unity, the principle of Uniformity is one that has great bearing on our conception of the duty of adherence to forms. It is a great witness and constant reminder of the fact that the Church is One Body, divided in time and space, we are none the less one in worship. As we depart from the Prayer Book provisions we weaken the witness to that aspect of Truth.

It is right here, in view of the terms of this paper, to insert a reminder of a fact frequently forgotten, and that is that the 1559 Act of Uniformity is part of the Book. In the Annexed Book of 1662 the Act of 1559 is written in full, and is numbered 1 in the Table of Contents. This has a bearing on the question of the introduction of ceremonies, for the Act clearly prohibits the use of any ceremony not ordered by the Book ; it is not within the immediate province of this paper to discuss the bearing of this on, for example, the Ornaments Rubric, but the allusion is to the point as a reminder that the Prayer Book is intended to be sufficient in itself, and not to need reference to outside authority.

But the great principle which governed the compilation of the Prayer Book was that of Edification. Here again, much criticism is levied at the Book; Addleshaw, in *The High Church Tradition*, summarises this feeling very aptly. "The celebrated principle of edification, 'whereunto', as the Prayer Book says, 'all things done in the Church (as the Apostle teacheth) ought to be referred', was one which our forefathers regarded as of vital importance in liturgical worship. Modern writers on liturgy dislike the phrase, and the emphasis laid on it in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has been the subject of considerable criticism. It is said that the principle makes the liturgy more concerned with man's moral and mental uplift, the improvement of the congregation, than with the worship of God. One modern writer, in an article in *Laudate* on the relationship between the Prayer Book and the Liturgical Movement, speaks of the Prayer Book as displaying 'a manward movement intent, first of all, on the edification of the worshipping individual, and even so over-emphasizing words at the expense of the whole make-up of man.' If this is true, Anglican liturgical thought becomes fundamentally anthropocentric and our claim to possess a liturgy in the technical sense of the words is made very questionable." The 'modern' type of thought misses the whole point, and that a most important one, for our emphasis is inclined to be on 'uplift,' while our Reformers will insist that a man cannot really worship unless and until he is responding to the Truth as revealed in the Word of God. It is with this end in view that the services are framed.

This, too, gives the key to the 'order' of the services, each being designed to provide an act of worship meeting every need of the soul as a man comes before God, and affording the opportunity for uniting with fellow-believers in such an act. You will scarcely require me, on such an occasion as this, to elaborate the point, by analysis of the different services. It is sufficient to state it.

We have thus covered, very rapidly, the matter which we need to hold in mind as we come to our subject: Adherence to the Prayer Book is a matter of Duty for those who have accepted the conditions of ministry in our National Church. The Book itself was compiled to provide a uniform worship for the whole nation, one calculated to promote true Christianity among the people, and by the order of the Services to provide means of spiritual worship.

The crucial question which we understand to be involved in the second part of our subject is just how far this ideal is being realised, and we feel justified in asking what modifications seem to be justified within the fabric of our 1662 Book. Again, let us frankly acknowledge that the full Order of Morning Prayer to the third Collect, Litany, and Ante-Communion with the appropriate Exhortation giving Notice of the Communion (or on Communion Days the regular reading of the Exhortation) is a thing of the past. Each of us has his pet modification of this scheme, and in fact quite irregularly puts into operation the permission given by the Shortened Services Act to use for example the Order for Morning Prayer as a separate service, (a proceeding which can, strictly, only be followed on a weekday, or in addition to the full service on a Sunday). In short, it is acknowledged on all hands that the full implementation of the 1662 Book

is quite out of the question for the practical conduct of the regular worship of our Parishes.

Yet, when we have said that, it is important to realise just how much we have lost : the scheme of Worship as it is presented in the Book, longsome as it may be, is nevertheless magnificent in its comprehensive nature. There is no need of the soul that is left unprovided for, and few, if any, needs of national life that are not included in our petitions. It is easy enough to gibe and say that a Prayer for the King, a Prayer for the Royal Family, a Prayer for the Church, a Prayer of St. Chrysostom, and the Grace, do not make a very comprehensive or adequate scheme of Prayer. To do so is to lose sight of the fact that the use of the Occasional Prayers is not optional but prescribed : the ' . . . to be used before the two final Prayers . . . ' is not permissive, it is jussive, and hence these prayers are for regular use as and when they are applicable. The Prayer ' In the time of War and Tumults ' is as much a part of the Litany to-day, as the prayer of St. Chrysostom itself, and when we remember the Collect or Prayer for all conditions of men, to be used at such times when the Litany is not appointed to be said, our Scheme of Prayer in Morning and Evening Prayer is seen to be indeed representative of every need, and a very strong case can be made for considering the Prayer Book as sufficiently providing in its actual terms for every need, even in the twentieth century.

But what of all this in practice ? How far is the Book as we have it really a Book of Common Prayer ? What of the archaisms in which it is said by some to abound ? Each of us will place a differing value on these questions, as we differ in regarding our Services as in themselves a means of educating the worshipper, specially from the point of view of spiritual development. But it is also important to bear in mind the fact that, as Duncan points out in his commentary on Galatians, Christianity is a Way of Life, not a higher education, and so we must most seriously review our services as they really provide for the needs of men and women as they come to worship. Perhaps that point may be best brought home by quotation from the Article on Christian Worship by Mr. Nowell Rostron which appeared in a recent number of the Churchman : " In the matter of archaisms Prayer Book revision is overdue. But there is that about the structure of its main services, its insistence on sincerity and personal religious experience, its use of a tongue ' understood of the people,' its emphasis on the part that each worshipper is called upon to fulfil, and its fidelity to and quotation of the Bible, that is a constant recall to the immediacy of our religion. Its stately and impressive language sets a standard rarely, if ever, reached since it was drawn up, though it does not forbid or quench, outside its liturgical offices, the spirit of freedom in prayer too little exercised to-day ; whilst for use in the Prayer meeting there is no book of prayers to compare with it. The ministry of the Word to which it points, and on which it is based, preserves the prophetic note as an essential part of worship, and is joined with that of the Sacraments in its devotional scheme. The Prayer Book still speaks to the deepest needs, and opens up the highest lights of the soul. Penitence, forgiveness, adoration, praise, listening to God's voice, waiting on Him in prayer and, in the Holy Communion,

the memorial of Christ's death 'till He come,' the reception of the 'dear tokens of His passion,' the self-oblation of the communicant, the sense of the living presence of Christ by His Spirit, and our fellowship with the whole Family of God, cleanse, satisfy, strengthen and nourish the Christian life in all its aspects. But no liturgy can do more than bring us to the fountain of living waters. That the Anglican Liturgy has done for countless Christian people, and is doing to-day." Those of us who are sincerely seeking to use the 1662 Book in accordance with its provisions, feel we can most sincerely add our testimony to that fact.

The plain fact is, that to us as Evangelicals, the 1662 Prayer Book is a completely satisfying Form of Worship: this is specially so in regard to the Administration of the Lord's Supper. Most of us would stand by the leaders of the Opposition to the proposals for Revision who were willing to concede the need for Revision, and to co-operate in such a task, so long as the Communion Service remained untouched. How far such amendment of the Prayer Book would go, may be seen from the practices of many of us who in our own ways, specially where the Evening Service is concerned, seek to adapt our forms to the mood of those who come to Worship. This is probably chiefly seen in the intercessions; there are no elements that we feel able to vary in the Scheme of Worship before we come to the final prayers, but there we, maybe by biddings, maybe by using extempore prayer, certainly from time to time by silence in which the congregation is invited to join in a united act of individual prayer, feel we must seek to meet the need for helping our people to bring their personal burdens before the Throne of Grace. What this amounts to, really, is the giving of some degree of flexibility to the prayers of our congregation, so meeting a need of which we are very conscious.

It was said, at the time of the Revision Discussions in 1927-8, that the strength of the Evangelical case lay in the fact that we had no suggestions to make. This is true! But that is not a result of weakness, it is rather the expression of the conviction which most of us have that the Prayer Book itself is so excellent and really does meet the needs of our people. We feel that the Forms of Worship should be, and are, normative to a very large degree of the spiritual life of the worshippers. That our forms do meet a real need of the present day is witnessed by the fact that there is an increasing tendency in Non-conformist circles to use them, virtually in their entirety, and that the major need in this respect of our day is that the liturgy should be more fully exploited, so that the people may learn to enter into the Services in which they join. There is no doubt that our people do, to a very large degree, appreciate the chance to take the full share in the actual 'progress' of the Service which our forms give to them. We would re-echo the words of Charles Simeon, "The finest sight short of heaven would be a whole congregation using the prayers of the liturgy in the true spirit of them."

The Prayer Book : Amendments and Additions that would Assist Effectiveness.

AN ESSAY BY THE LORD BISHOP OF SODOR AND MAN.

IN the final chapter of his book, "The Prayer Book of 1928 Reconsidered," Dr. Lowther Clarke analyses the causes of its failure. Few fair-minded and well-informed people will wish to quarrel with his analysis as a whole : but one statement that he makes is open to challenge. I do not agree that "the Evangelicals wanted no change." It is an undoubted fact that many Evangelicals voted in favour of the new book, and for various reasons. Some were prepared to make concessions for the sake of peace and order, recognising the comprehensiveness of the Church of England, and not wishing to fetter the expression of other traditions in worship by a too rigid insistence on the forms which satisfied their own needs. Still more wanted to have proper authority for the deviations from the Prayer Book of 1662, which had become customary and which they practised in common with the great majority of the clergy. They agreed with the finding of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline of 1906 that the existing "law of public worship is too narrow for the religious life of the present generation," so that strict conformity to the law can only be purchased by spiritual loss to the people. Even those Evangelicals who voted against the proposed Book were not united in their opposition by a common dislike of any change whatever in the familiar forms and words of the Prayer Book. Many of them remembered that Cranmer's original edition had undergone four revisions in little more than a hundred years, and that the Restoration had given the 1662 Book a sentimental value, but not a claim to final perfection. Indeed, considering the enormous changes in the size and distribution of the population and the tremendous advances made in education and especially in scientific knowledge since that date, most of them not only took the customary deviations from that book for granted, but were prepared to accept a large measure of the proposed reforms. What then drove them into opposition? Their determination to admit no change *in doctrine*; for they disbelieved the assurances that no doctrinal change was intended or implied. How could they believe otherwise in face of the persistent attempt being made within the Church of England to discredit the English Reformation and to put the clock back to Mediaevalism? How soon will the Church awake from the same kind of lazy complacency as blinded the country too long to the menace of Hitler? This is not an irrelevant aside. For there is too much in the Nazi subordination of the individual to the State that reminds the historian of the mediaeval subordination of the individual to the Church. The Gestapo has not much to teach the Inquisition. But it is not as the charter of private judgment mainly that the Evangelical values the Reformation, nor is he so wedded to the Tudor settlement as to be

blind to its mistakes and compromises. He thanks God above all that the Reformation, which reached these Islands simultaneously with the Renaissance, brought to our people the knowledge of the Bible, and especially of the Greek New Testament. That knowledge revived once more the preaching of the pure Word of God and the ministration of the sacraments according to Christ's ordinance.

It is to the New Testament, therefore, and especially to the teaching and example of our Lord, that the Evangelical looks for the fundamental principles of Christian worship. Though he often finds valuable corroboration and illustration in the Patristic writings, he does not base his appeal on "Catholic practice," which often means a narrow and arbitrarily defined circle of ecclesiastical precedent. All the great progressive movements in Church History have been inspired by the cry "Back to Christ," in the same way as the wise teacher makes the child start his copy-book at the bottom of the page and work upwards, keeping his eye on the model at the top and not on his own imperfect efforts.

From our Lord then we learn the two basic principles of true worship—spirituality and simplicity.

1. *Spirituality*. This is implicit in all His teaching on religious practices, whether it be the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, or the Sermon on the Mount, where He shows that the disciple's righteousness exceeds that of the Pharisee in this one qualification, that it is done in the conscious presence of the Father, Who "seeth in secret." But the *locus classicus* of Christ's teaching on worship is in His conversation with the Samaritan woman in St. John iv. 20-24. First, He declares the nature of God, for worship is conditioned by our conception of God. Because God is Spirit, alive and present, He is "free from the temporal and special limitations, which are characteristic of matter. Consequently there is no need to seek for Him in a local habitation." (Archbishop Temple). Our worship therefore is to be spiritual and sincere: it must be worship of the heart, where "spirit with Spirit can meet," and worship that is free from conscious hypocrisy and idolatry.

2. *Simplicity*. This also is traceable to our Lord's revelation of the character of God. As He is the heavenly Father, Who loves His children and knows their needs before they ask, we are not to "use vain repetitions," that is mechanical and long-winded prayers, but approach Him with the simple trust of children. And He gives us the terse, direct petitions of the Lord's Prayer as our model. The same quality of simplicity can be seen also in Christ's attitude to the elaborate ritual of the Temple services. An examination of the references in the Gospels to 'temple', 'altar' and 'sacrifice' shows that His emphasis is prophetic throughout, not priestly. It is true that as a loyal Jew He observed the customary religious practices: for so it behoved Him to "fulfil all righteousness." But when as a boy of twelve He went up to Jerusalem, His mother found Him in the Temple, not lost in wonder over the priestly ceremonial, but "sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions." The temple for Jesus was His Father's house of prayer, and He consistently used it for prayer and for teaching. The later elaboration of hierarchic and ritual worship in the Christian

Church, as the counterpart of the ceremonial system of the Jewish priesthood, is distasteful, and even abhorrent, to the Evangelical Churchman, not only because it is quite foreign to the teaching and example of our Lord and of His Apostles, but also because it is destructive of the simplicity which is in Christ.

But the New Testament contains other principles of Christian worship which derived from the teaching of the Lord. As they influenced Cranmer and his collaborators, so they should have a direct bearing on all later revision. I mention them in turn, numbering them consecutively.

3. *The Pre-eminence of the Word.* Throughout the Prayer Book the Christian Ministry is described as ministry of "the Word and Sacraments," in that order. For that is the New Testament order. For instance, in the earliest description of the Christian Church, immediately following the events of the day of Pentecost, we read "And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." There is ample evidence that the two sacraments were administered in the Church from Pentecost onwards. But there can be no question that the Apostles gave pre-eminent place to the preaching of the Word. The reason which they gave for the appointment of the Seven was, "It is not fit that we should forsake the word of God and serve tables." And St. Paul in a different context declares that "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." For St. Paul, as for the rest of the Apostles, the preaching of the Word, and particularly the word of the Cross, was the God-chosen means of salvation, by which men received the Spirit (I Cor. i. 21; Gal. iii. 2; I Peter i. 23, 25). And the sacraments of the Gospel were ordained by our Lord to express the good tidings and thus to convey in dramatic symbolism the new life of forgiveness and fellowship in Christ.

4. *Intelligibility.* This principle follows closely on the preceding: for the word that is preached reaches the heart and conscience through the understanding. The operation of the Holy Spirit is needed indeed to open the eyes of the natural man, and often babes receive the revelation which the wise and prudent miss. But in giving direction for the conduct of worship to the Corinthian Church, St. Paul clearly states the principle of intelligibility. "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also . . . I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue." So in church, we must worship intelligently ourselves, and we must also help others to worship intelligently. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy mind." This principle inspired Cranmer to give the people the Bible and the services of the Church in the language that they could understand, that they "might continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of true religion."

5. *The Evangelistic Aim.* It is remarkable that in his prescription for the worship of a Christian congregation, St. Paul makes provision for the presence of the unconverted—"If there come in one unbelieving or unlearned" (I Cor. xiv. 24). Like the Good Shepherd, he cannot forget the "other sheep, which are not of this fold." Although that

church was suffering persecution, it did not worship within closed doors. And neither should we, literally or metaphorically.

6. *Decency and Order.* This is the last of the principles which St. Paul expressly states in his directions for public worship, though it clearly influences his ruling in regard to the veiling of the women worshippers, and his correction of disorder at the Lord's Supper, earlier in the same epistle (I Cor. xi). There he condemns the unworthy conduct as insensibility to the sacredness of the service, and an outrage on the fellowship of the church. The words "decently and in order" then seem to include both reverence towards God, and consideration for our fellow-worshippers.

Now that we have reviewed the principles which we find governing Christian worship in the New Testament, we are in a position to consider briefly such Amendments and Additions to the Book of Common Prayer as would be likely to promote these principles. And I here express my strong conviction that it would be the gravest error to produce another alternative Book, or a revision of the 1928 Book, in the near future. What is wanted is a properly authorised schedule of permissive uses, to be published separately from the Prayer Book. And that for two reasons: first, that the Book of Common Prayer is (together with the Thirty-nine Articles) the standard of the Church's doctrine, and secondly, that such permissive usage would be experimental and needs the test of time, before it becomes stereotyped.

For the sake of clarity and convenience, I shall arrange my Amendments and Additions under the six principles of worship, taken in the reverse order.

1. DECENCY AND ORDER.

The serious lack of discipline and the disloyalty to authority within the Church of England is a grave scandal. The great majority of Evangelicals are anxious to see a reasonable measure of uniformity restored, and to possess proper authority for such deviations as by common custom have become desirable or necessary, *e.g.*, the neglect of the rubrics concerning the exhortations in the Holy Communion office, or concerning the table of Vigils and Fasts.

2. THE EVANGELISTIC AIM.

We desire the express recognition of the long-established custom of the sermon in Morning and Evening Prayer, and of the use of suitable hymns. But in addition we seek authorisation for services of an informal kind, such as Mission, Lantern and Children's services. Also we desire occasional elasticity in the statutory services, especially Evening Prayer, *e.g.*, during Lent and Advent, so as to provide a more popular form of evangelistic service.

3. INTELLIGIBILITY.

Towards this objective, the following changes seem to be desirable—

The substitution of modern equivalents for such obsolete expressions as "conversation," "indifferently," "bowels of mercies," and "our vile body";

The excision of references to Old Testament characters in the Occasional Services, especially in Matrimony and Baptism;

The omission of the regular recitation of the *Quicumque Vult*; and the use of a short and carefully prepared introduction to the more difficult lessons and psalms.

4. THE PRE-EMINENCE OF THE WORD.

Cranmer observed this principle by arranging for the continuous reading of the Bible in the Lessons and in the Psalter. But the break in continuity occasioned, on the one hand by irregular attendance at public worship, and on the other by the introduction of fresh lectionaries and of a new arrangement of the Psalter, lays an added responsibility upon the preacher for declaring "the whole counsel of God." If it is true that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ," then the minister of the Gospel cannot discharge his great and glorious responsibility by ten-minute sermonettes.

Lastly, SIMPLICITY and SPIRITUALITY, the fundamental principles, hardly admit of separate treatment. They will find expression supremely in him who ministers in the congregation, in his whole bearing, voice and manner: and also in his control of the choir, and particularly of the organist, that the whole conduct of the service may be subordinated to the one object of the glory of God.

But there are also certain amendments in the ordering of the service which may contribute considerably to this end. For instance, permissive variety in the opening of Morning and Evening Prayer would allow a fresh and appropriate approach to worship on special occasions, and similar freedom in the choice and use of prayers and thanksgivings after the third collect could increase the sense of unity or relevance in the Service. A like permission in regard to the opening and closing of the Holy Communion office may not be so widely desired: but where the sacrament follows closely upon Morning or Evening Prayer, the option of avoiding a repetition of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Collect for the day would certainly make for simplicity.

Many other suggestions come to mind, but these few must suffice for our present purpose, as illustrations of the way in which Evangelical Churchmen ought to test the various proposals which are being, and will be, made, by the touchstone of the abiding principles of the Gospel.

I claim no finality for my statement of those principles. I only hope that it will encourage a more worthy study and statement of them by others. For I am convinced that the only sure anchorage among the sands of shifting opinion lies in the Word of God.

Lawful Authority for Additions and Amendments to the Prayer Book.

BY THE REV. F. J. TAYLOR, M.A.

THE law of public worship in the Church of England still bears the characteristic mark of its origin. The history of the Western Church from the pontificate of Hildebrand towards the end of the eleventh century, to the close of the council of Trent in 1563 was a continuing process of administrative and theological centralisation which finally placed the Pope in the position of being the Universal Ordinary. This ecclesiastical development was reflected liturgically in the growing dominance of the Roman rite and the virtual suppression of local rites. Since the Council of Trent such rites as the Ambrosian in Milan or the Mozarabic in Spain are only permitted on strictly limited occasions. No doubt, had the Reformation not supervened, the sixteenth century in England would have witnessed the effective supremacy of the Sarum rite before in time it would have been obliged to yield to the Roman rite.

The dominance of the Papacy in the sixteenth century church was matched by the absolutism of the monarchy in the new nation states—indeed in those states which repudiated the jurisdiction of Rome, the crown inherited the authority both of Emperor and of Pope. The break with Rome inaugurated by Henry VIII could only be justified and perpetuated if accompanied by liturgical reform, for the theology of the common man is moulded and expressed by the way in which he worships. The Prayer Book of 1549 was compiled against this background and it served to show that certain fundamental principles of positive worth underlay the English Reformation. A comparison of the revised book of 1552 with the first English liturgy of 1549 will demonstrate the positive sacramental doctrine which the reconstructed Communion service was designed to teach. This radical change in the method of public worship could only have been accomplished by the executive power of the crown. It would be idle to pretend that the bulk of English churchmen in the middle of the sixteenth century desired to make such differences in public worship. They were not greatly disturbed by the repudiation of Papal lordship but changes in worship touched their personal religion very closely. As the Cornish rebels of 1549 put it, they desired to have abolished "this Christmas game" of an English service and to return to the worship of God! It was therefore inevitable that the use of a reformed liturgy would have to be enforced by Act of Parliament. Indeed the Prayer Book in all its revisions, was annexed to an Act of Uniformity making its use compulsory in every church and chapel in the realm.

Such a policy of liturgical rigorism was probably the only way, under the circumstances, to get a reformed rite well established in the country. The first Edwardine Act of Uniformity began by reciting the evidences for liturgical chaos and the failure of previous attempts to terminate

it. "Of long time there has been had in this realm divers forms of common prayer, commonly called the Service of the Church; that is to say the use of Sarum, of York, of Bangor, and of Lincoln; and besides the same, now of late much more divers and sundry forms and fashions have been used in cathedral and parish churches . . . and as the doers and executors of the said rites and ceremonies, in other form than of late years they have been used, were pleased therewith, so *others* not using the same rites and ceremonies were thereby greatly offended."¹ The Act then proceeded to order that the conclusions of the commissioners, appointed to draw up one uniform order of Common Prayer, now embodied in the Book of Common Prayer, must be accepted "throughout England and Wales, at Calais and the marches of the same." "All and singular ministers in any cathedral or parish church . . . shall . . . be bound to say and use the Matins, Evensong, celebration of the Lord's Supper and administration of each of the sacraments, and all their common and open prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said book and none other or otherwise."² This order was repeated in substantially the same language in every succeeding act of uniformity, including the Act of 1662 which is still the law of public worship in the Church of England.

This uniformity in the conduct of public worship and the celebration of the sacraments has been a foundation principle of the Prayer Book for four centuries. It involved, as the Acts of Uniformity made plain, the abolition of provincial rites for "from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use."³ This was to follow the parallel procedure in the Roman church whereby local rites were virtually eliminated, but it was also to vindicate against Rome the liberty of a nation (represented by lawful authority) to make such order for public worship as seemed necessary. It also involved a denial of any power of discretion on the part of the minister responsible for the conduct of public worship since he was obliged to use the Prayer Book, the whole Prayer Book, and nothing but the Prayer Book, and periodically to signify publicly his assent to this principle.

The Prayer Book was subject to attacks from two different directions. Conservatives and pro-Romans disliked the use of vernacular and the doctrinal changes while an influential minority, influenced by reformed modes of worship on the Continent, desired radical changes in the Prayer Book and the grant of a considerable measure of freedom to the officiating minister. In the circumstances of the sixteenth century and the political considerations dependent upon liturgical questions, it was only to be expected that a fixed liturgical form would require the sanction of a statute of the realm.⁴ Religious toleration, amounting almost to indifference, with which we are familiar, was unthinkable in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries. To men of that time it appeared to endanger public order and the only question at issue concerned which form of religion should be legally enforced. The Uniformity Act of 1662 states explicitly, "that nothing conduces more to the settling of the peace of this nation which is desired by all good men, nor to the honour of our religion and the propagation thereof, than a universal agreement in the public worship of Almighty God."⁵ Probably this conviction had been reinforced by the disturbances experienced during the Civil War and the Commonwealth, but

the important thing to remember, is that it was a conviction firmly held by the majority and only repudiated by Independents and a few other sectaries.

Now it is clear that such liturgical rigorism cannot possibly be maintained at the present time, although it is important to understand and to appreciate the reasons, cogent enough in their place, for this earlier insistence on uniformity in all respects. For good or ill, the history of the last century and a half has changed the temper of English people on this issue and we no longer think that liturgical diversity is either a danger to the realm or an offence to the honour of Almighty God. The influence of the French Revolution and the Enlightenment has caused us to lay emphasis on the right of the individual to worship God as he pleases, instead of the earlier emphasis on his duty to engage in that form of public worship provided by authority. This is evident from the complete failure of the policy of prosecutions for liturgical illegalities initiated in the nineteenth century. Legally, the prosecutors had a strong case, but it was a policy which aroused much distaste and brought little but discredit to the Evangelical cause. It is important that Evangelicals in the twentieth century should be dissociated from any such invocation of the secular authority in liturgical disputes.

At this point we are confronted by a problem of peculiar urgency for Evangelicals, for the question of lawful authority in public worship raises the deeper issue of law and grace. Meticulous attention to ceremonial detail and the prescribed order of a rite is characteristic of "Catholic" worship, but opposed to Evangelical emphasis on the necessity for worship to be "in the Spirit". This contrast is not of course absolute, and evangelical worship must be a worthy visible token of the devotion of the heart and obedience of life. Charles Simeon was wont to declare that nothing was more moving or more acceptable to God, than the sight of a congregation reverently and intently offering the worship of the Prayer Book services. It is an apostolic principle that all things should be done decently and in order, which means that our worship must be intelligible and orderly, dignified and scriptural. These qualities will not be found in any worship unless it is disciplined by some law, for otherwise the congregation is at the mercy of the minister or still worse, of his moods. But law is here used in the sense of guidance for the church, showing the regenerate the path in which they should walk.⁶ The Christian is always beset by the temptation to permit law to fall into disuse or contempt, or on the other hand to allow it to supersede grace. It is clear that we live in a period when the law of public worship has fallen into contempt and every man does that which is right in his own eyes. The greater measure of discipline which is needed, based on agreed Gospel principles, must not be confounded with a policy of legalism which would call upon the bishops to administer the law of the church, or the State to discipline any recalcitrant bishops.

The fact is that the law of public worship which we have inherited is too rigid and thereby opposed to true evangelicalism. It was designed for different circumstances as the earlier part of this paper sought to show. In those circumstances, it possessed an historical justification but in the altered situation of modern times it is now obsolete. The

Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in its report in 1906, after commenting on the fact that Acts of Uniformity set up and require universal conformity to one standard in the conduct of Divine Service including words spoken, vesture worn by clergy, ornaments of the church, and rites and ceremonies, went on to point out that any distinction between things important and things trivial had been expressly and emphatically precluded.⁷ No deviation from the Prayer Book and no supplementation is allowed by the terms of the Act of Uniformity.

Now it is not possible for a living church to be subject to such rigid standards for an indefinite period of time. Certain things are bound to become obsolete and certain additions are clearly required with the passage of time. Indeed it could be argued that a standard of Uniformity had been set up which never was and never could be, fully and universally observed. The strict legal interpretation of the meaning of the Act of Uniformity was given by the Judicial committee of the Privy Council in *Martin v. Mackonochie* in 1868. Their lordships quoted a judgment delivered in an earlier case and declared themselves disposed entirely to adhere to it: "In the performance of the services, rites and ceremonies ordered by the Prayer Book, the directions contained in it must be strictly observed; no omission and no addition can be permitted."⁸ It is unlikely that there have been many clergy since 1662 who have not infringed the Statute of Uniformity in some particulars when it is interpreted with this strictness. Once the Prayer Book was assured of survival and of general acceptance in the decades following upon 1662, it is improbable that its use was generally observed with such exact care, but until after 1850 there was no desire to replace Prayer Book worship by a rite drawn from other sources, and consequently few occasions of dispute on the meaning of lawful authority.

As a matter of fact, since 1559, it has been clearly recognised that the standard forms of worship in the Prayer Book stood in need of supplementation from time to time. A bulky volume of nearly 700 pages in the publications of the Parker Society contains "Liturgies and Occasional forms of Prayer set forth in the reign of Queen Elizabeth." Besides the Prayer Book of 1559, these vary from orders for "Prayer and Thanksgiving (necessary to be used in these dangerous times) for the safety and preservation of her Majesty and this Realm"—set forth by authority, to prayers or forms of service issued by Bishops for use in their dioceses or even by private persons. "Certain prayers fit for the time" seem to have been issued whenever there was a political crisis (such as an assassination plot) or when the forces of the crown were engaged in a campaign. Single prayers were issued to be appended to the Litany or read after the Collect before the Epistle. A volume entitled "Certain Prayers and other Godly Exercises for the seventeenth of November (accession day)" compiled by the Sub-dean of York but obviously intended for public use was issued in 1585.⁹ Occasional forms of service to supplement the prescribed forms were also issued by individual bishops in the seventeenth century.¹⁰

It was probably in the light of evidence of this sort and of the developing needs of nineteenth century life, that a Royal Commission of 1864 recommended that the Declaration of Assent should end with

the words : " I will use the form in the said Book prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." This exception was adopted by Parliament in the Clerical Subscription Act of 1865¹¹ and in the opinion of Archbishop Davidson giving evidence before the Royal Commission in 1906, " the reason for its insertion was chiefly to protect a clergyman in the case of a service ordered by the Privy Council ; such for example as was ordered at that time in connection with the cattle plague."¹² But the commissioners of 1906 were bound to admit, that even taking into account such deviations from the Prayer Book as were involved in special services of national thanksgiving and the like, drawn up by the Archbishops and issued with the authority of the Privy Council, it was still true that " from the sixteenth century down to the present time there has existed a contrast between the theory of the law clearly expressed in the Acts of Uniformity and the practice of the clergy in the conduct of public worship."¹³ This is the liturgical problem bequeathed to us by four centuries of Anglican church history culminating in our present state of chaos.

We must therefore begin to tackle this grievous problem by admitting that the Act of Uniformity has very largely become obsolete. Nothing short of this will meet the real difficulties of the situation. No one obeys the law rigidly construed, for there is scarcely a clergyman to be found who makes no change in the authorised forms of service while the bishops are neither willing nor able to see that an impossible law is carried out. A law which is largely ignored or flouted with impunity is productive of grave scandals and the present position has resulted in a generation of clergy who do not share that serious respect for Prayer Book rubrics or for the solemnity of the declaration of assent which marked the outlook of earlier generations. As the Preface to the Prayer Book says : " Although the keeping or omitting of a ceremony in itself considered, is a small thing, yet wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order and discipline is no small offence before God." When a law has clearly outlived its usefulness it should either be repealed or modified. A considerable measure of relief would be obtained if it could be agreed that the existing law needs to be modified by acknowledging a great difference of principle between things trivial and things which would change the order of the rite or alter the implied doctrine.¹⁴ There is for instance a wide difference between the adoption of the 1549 Eucharistic canon on the one hand, and on the other the addition of hymns and a sermon to Morning and Evening Prayer. This agreement could be achieved somewhat along the lines of the Synodical Declaration suggested as a temporary measure by the Archbishops' Commission on Church and State in 1935 and would probably not be refused by Parliament. That declaration began with the assertion that the Services of the Book of Common Prayer should always be regarded as the normal standard of worship and went on to claim that no deviations from this standard should be authorised unless in the opinion of the Convocations it was neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from the fundamental doctrines and principles of the Church of England as set forth in the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer.¹⁵ Such a proposal would no doubt give rise to many difficulties of inter-

pretation and much variety of opinion on the limits of what is covered by the doctrines and principles of the Church of England. But diversity of interpretation is part of our Anglican heritage and cannot easily be ignored.

Further, if it should be said that this attempt to modify the working of the Act of Uniformity amounts to an attempt to ignore or, still worse, to flout the authority of the State, the answer must be made that the authority of Parliament, strictly interpreted, is being flouted now, even in most Evangelical parishes, Sunday by Sunday. Parliament plainly does not wish to interfere with the legitimate need of a living church to adapt and enrich its public worship and is quite content for the present situation to continue. Archbishop Davidson as long ago as 1906 said, "as far as I am aware, no responsible people in public life desire that the rubrical details of the Book of Common Prayer shall be discussed in Parliament" and again in 1910, "that any party in the House of Commons desires to have the rubrics of the Prayer Book made the subjects of its debates I entirely disbelieve".¹⁶ In these days when the attention of Parliament is fully occupied by great secular matters it is most likely that these statements of the Archbishop carry even greater weight than when they were originally uttered. We repeat, the Act of Uniformity strictly interpreted is obsolete—no one obeys it or will obey it and alike in the interests of Church and State it should be amended to allow for reasonable change.¹⁷ It ought to be possible to get wide-spread agreement for such a step without raising grave doctrinal issue, for of itself it would not make any alterations or additions to the Prayer Book.

The phrase, "lawful authority", as it stands cannot normally signify anything else than the authority of the Crown exercised through Parliament. But it is intolerable that strictly we should have to resort to the secular power every time it is desired to make some changes or additions in the use of the Prayer Book. In fact by long established usage, diocesan bishops possess some power to relax the strict letter of the rubric, *e.g.*, to sanction one service instead of two where the circumstances of the parish do not require more.¹⁸ Archbishop Davidson, commenting on the phrase "except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority" in the Act of 1865 said, "that the words as they stand now, part of an Act of Parliament, are capable of giving to the Episcopate some larger authority than existed before, seems hardly to admit of a doubt"¹⁹. This would suggest that in addition to the right of the bishop to settle matters of doubt in the contents of the Prayer Book, he also possesses some power to sanction such services as Harvest Festivals, Missionary Festivals and other similar special services provided that he does not sanction what is expressly forbidden in the rubrics of the Prayer Book. This would probably cover most diocesan forms of service and the issue of diocesan service books and other manuals of prayers and thanksgivings, much in vogue at the present time.²⁰ It is evident that we are passing through a period of necessary liturgical experiment and provided that the framework of the liturgy is not ignored it is important there should be some opportunity for experiment. This can only be secured if there is the necessary flexibility about the law of public worship to allow temporary deviations, for it would be disastrous if the tastes and desires

of our age were to be given such liturgical sanction in a new Prayer Book, as would require wholesale revision at the end of the next half-century. To quote from the evidence submitted to the Commission on Church and State by Sir Ernest Barker, "I do not think you can go on reformulating the ritual and reformulating the Articles of Belief, of an old Church. . . . If you begin to reformulate and tighten, it is a process which is unending."²¹ Such flexibility is in fact our present possession and Parliament manifests no desire to take it away. But it can only exist on the basis of a standard of worship expressed in a Prayer Book (to which there may hardly be exact conformity in any one place) and a commonly accepted principle of procedure for making the required adaptations. Parliament might do well formally to acknowledge this fact.

No discussion of the lawful authority for additions to the Prayer Book would be complete without reference to the authority of custom and usage, which is an important factor in any liturgical history. Certain things, such as the Exhortations in the Communion Service, drop out of use during the course of years and although the rubric ordering their use remains untouched in the Prayer Book, any attempt to enforce it would be doomed to failure. Similarly, the controversy over the compulsory recitation of the Athanasian Creed has died away and there are now comparatively few churches where it is used and fewer still where it is used on every occasion prescribed in the existing rubric. The custom of providing three, four or five hymns and a sermon at Morning and Evening Prayer is well established by a long tradition and any attempt to conform to the strict letter of the rubrics by providing a sermon only at the Holy Communion would be deeply resented by the laity. Whatever may have been the original intention of the Reformers, Morning Prayer has become the principal service of worship in the Church of England and even the Oxford Movement has failed to affect its position in the church as a whole. Such customs are commonly recognised as possessing considerable liturgical authority and it should be possible to make the necessary rubrical changes, if considered desirable, without much likelihood of serious disagreement. This would suggest that each age in turn should make its contribution to the Prayer Book in the way of enrichments or adaptations but that only those which can show the authority of long continuing custom should be formally incorporated in the Book and these will necessarily be few in number. The tendency to make the supposed needs of our age the final criterion in liturgical reform is to be discouraged.²² The Book of Common Prayer has won the affectionate regard of generations of loyal members of the Church of England and moulded their piety, because it was constructed from materials which had themselves already stood the test of time. Modification of the strictness of the Act of Uniformity would retain for us our proper liturgical standard while allowing time to exercise its dissolving influence on the majority of amendments which must for a long time be experimental and should not possess any final rubrical authority.

¹ Documents Illustrative of English Church History. H. Gee and W. J. Hardy, p. 358.

² *ibid* p. 360.

³ 'Concerning the Service of the Church' prefixed to the Prayer Book.

- 4 Note however that the authority of the Crown and of the Crown in Parliament is a supremacy of rule and not of direction or of initiation. This is true even of Henry VIII. See 'Establishment in England' Sir Lewis Dibdin, p. 73.
- 5 Gee and Hardy *op. cit.*, p. 603.
- 6 Christ's Strange Work. A. R. Vidler, p. 52.
- 7 *Vide* Report of Commission on Church and State (1935), Vol. I, pp. 78-9 quoting paragraphs 23-44 of 1906 report.
- 8 Church and State Report Vol. I. p. 81.
- 9 Liturgical Services of Queen Elizabeth (Parker Soc.) pp. 466-7, 679, etc.
- 10 Darwell Stone. F. L. Cross, p. 230.
- 11 Church and State Report, Vol. I. pp. 82-3.
- 12 Randall Davidson. G. K. A. Bell. Vol. I. p. 469.
- 13 Church and State Report. Vol. I. p. 79.
- 14 On the importance of this distinction as a practical possibility see 'Establishment in England' Sir Lewis Dibdin, pp. 82-3.
- 15 Church and State Report, Vol. I. pp. 87-8.
- 16 Quoted in 'The Prayer Book of 1928 Re-considered': W. K. Lowther Clarke, p. 72—*cf.* 'It is unthinkable that the State should claim to dictate to the Church what Prayer Book it should use . . . supremacy of rule implies protection . . . if the society protected is at liberty to make changes of substance without the consent of the ruler, that ruler—the Christian State—may be left in the absurd position of ruling and protecting under circumstances and for purposes which it neither contemplated nor desired. Dibdin *op. cit.*, p. 77. *cf.* p. 13 on the unwillingness of the House of Commons to meddle with forms and words. *cf.* Bell *op. cit.*, p. 350 for statement of Mr. Balfour.
- 17 Even the 1662 Act of Uniformity contains a provision for changing the names of the Royal Family in public prayers when necessary. Gee and Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 615.
- 18 Church and State Report, Vol. I. p. 83.
- 19 Bell *op. cit.*, Vol. I. p. 469. *cf.* Lowther Clarke, *op. cit.*, p. 71.
- 20 *e.g.*, the many litanies, forms of prayer and intercessions issued during the war.
- 21 Church and State Report, Vol. II. p. 74.
- 22 See for instance the enthusiastic advocacy of the Revised Prayer Book by the late Bishop F. T. Woods in 'The Prayer Book Revised'. Most of what he said is now out of date.

Evangelical Catholicity.

BY THE REV. W. LEATHEM.

IN his "Religious Essays" (described in the sub-title as "a supplement" to his better known "The Idea of the Holy"), Rudolf Otto speaks of "the shrinkage of the world arena" and of "the coming nearer and coming together of realms hitherto far apart." That this is true, a moment's reflection will make plain whether we think in terms of accelerated speed or dissemination of news by wireless. The Orient and the Occident are no longer mutual irrelevencies. What had its rise in scientific invention comes home to us as political necessity. For good or ill we are enmeshed in the inevitable world shrinkage.

The past three or four decades has given birth to a similar idea within the Christian consciousness, the idea of a world Church. This has expressed itself in the great Œcumenical Movement of the present century, wherein as the result of penitence and prayer and careful study, Christians have discovered that their age-long differences are really scars and not the original features in the countenance of Christ's Church. It is within this context that we are met to consider our position as Evangelicals and Catholics. For such a task, much preparation of mind and heart is required. As a minimum may I suggest two things (1) a determination to be ruthless in our self-judgment, (2) a generous appreciation of those who are persuaded otherwise. This does not mean that we should blunt the sword of truth in the pursuit of a charity that is sub-Christian, but only that we should extend to others the courtesy we would expect ourselves.

But for the particular problem we wish to discuss to-day, *i.e.*, how to realise the spiritual unity which already exists in God, the most urgent need and our most obvious lack is an adequate doctrine of the Church. Because of this lack, we are talking largely at cross purposes. The nature of the Church, her origin and destiny in the purposes of God, her character as partaking of the Divine nature and expressing it midst the concrete situations of time and space, her pristine splendour as the Bride and Body of Christ, and how she may thus be distinguished in her humble garments of earth from the many societies that have their beginnings in merely human impulse, in a better understanding of this truth we may hope to find a key to locked doors—locked against brethren in the same household of faith.

In attempting to resolve this problem, it will be well for us to possess not only some grasp of the doctrine itself, but also an acquaintance with its history. Thus we may be saved from the mistakes of those who have preceded us. In the past, two methods of discussion have prevailed. These we may distinguish as (1) the Approach of the Practical Mind, and (2) the Approach of the Traditional Mind. In the one we have an idea intoxicated by the dream of Freedom from external authority, and in the other, a mind denied the right to a large spiritual freedom by an exaggerated respect for the Authority

of Tradition. I would suggest a third method which may be named the Theological Approach. In this I profess to find what each of the others seek in wrong directions : (1) For the so-called Practical Mind, Freedom, not from external authority, but Freedom in the Spirit, and (2) For the Traditional Mind, Authority, not in the letter of Tradition, but in Christ. Let us first consider :

1. The Practical Approach to the doctrine. Historically this is the standpoint of liberal Protestantism and of Evangelicalism of a certain—or uncertain!—brand. The liberal theologian starts with the unwarranted assumption that our Lord did not found a Church, and so allies Himself with that figment of His own imagination, “the historical Jesus” against the “ecclesiasticism” of Paul and the early Church. The twentieth century Evangelical on the other hand accepts our Lord’s founding of the Church but is apt to deny (perhaps implicitly rather than explicitly) that its marks or notes are rooted in revelation. The former, in the interests of modernistic thought, subjects the Church to the test of expediency—“What will be agreeable to the greatest number on the easiest possible terms?” The latter in commendable enthusiasm for the establishment of the Kingdom brings the doctrine to the utilitarian test of “What will prove most serviceable to the need of the moment?” In either case, the doctrine of the Church is treated as being almost endlessly elastic. It can be stretched to suit the prevailing mood, and can be shaped to any utilitarian end. The Church in this view resembles a misshapen sorbo ball which can be bounced in any direction at the whim of each player in turn. This easy “coming to terms” arises from a faulty conception of the Church. It assumes that the Church is nothing more than “the body of Christians,” a religious association of like-minded people. This loose conception sets aside what both Old and New Testaments alike reveal concerning the Church’s calling as the People of the Presence, as the Creation of the Holy Spirit, and as the Body of Christ. It fails equally to do justice to the historic apprehension of the Christian faith as enshrined in her creeds. In the two great creeds there are only two Articles of Faith (1) in the Holy Trinity, and (2) the Holy Catholic Church. All that follows is but exposition of the doctrine of the Church—(a) the earthly home of the saints, (b) the place where forgiveness is preached and received, (c) where life and immortality is brought to light through the Gospel. She so embraces Christian experience that a great Congregational High Churchman can write “Christian experience is always ecclesiastical experience.”

In this light the Church can no longer be bandied about as a “utility article” but must be recognised as “an article of faith.” It is essential that we regain the lost note of confidence, “I believe in the Holy Catholic Church.” Protestantism refuses to treat the visible Church seriously, and as a consequence that party, which should hold the key to the situation as sharing with the Reformed Church the blessings of the Reformation, and sharing with historic Catholicism the liturgical riches of the whole Church, finds itself passed by in every serious discussion on re-union.

We have spent much time on a criticism which is largely directed against our own position as 20th century Evangelicals. Perhaps

it will not be without reward, for just as diagnosis precedes treatment, so self-criticism may lead to reformation.

2. The Traditional Approach. Our second criticism is levelled at the Traditional Mind, and it is here that we need to remind ourselves afresh of the most excellent gift of charity. Let us pay a compliment before we enter upon criticism. As to the compliment—it is our plain duty to acknowledge our indebtedness, however much we may disagree with their interpretation, to the Tractarians for their restored emphasis on a “high” conception of the Church. For long years it lay a forgotten truth in Continental and Anglican Protestantism. If considered at all it was looked upon as an “extra” to personal faith or as an “optional subject” for those who possessed the “herd instinct.” The Tractarians restored the emphasis, however much they distorted the doctrine. To admit this, is not to retreat from following the Reformers, for they were great Churchmen.

But, in the intervening years, the Tractarians have shifted their ground. They have forsaken the broad front of the doctrine of the Church for a shorter line of defence, and have dug themselves in on the doctrine of the Ministry. They have taken up positions on this shortened front in the hope of fighting a more effective delaying action. In doing so they make their stand on a truth of temporary significance and evacuate from one of eternal validity. For the ministry itself, and consequently any doctrine of it, possesses only a secondary value. St. Paul says it is “for the perfecting of the saints . . . till we all attain unto the unity of the faith.” Note well the little word “till.” It marks the terminus ad quem of the ministry. There will be no need for it when the Church is perfected in glory, and from this we may conclude that, whilst there will be a Church in Heaven, there will be no Bishops, Priests, or Deacons—that is in their official capacity! Thus it would seem that the position is unworthy of the cost of defending it.

Further, “catholicity,” a much bandied word, refers primarily to the Church and not to the Ministry. The truly Catholic Church has, by that very fact alone, a valid ministry, and that ministry will make potent its claim by producing what is the essence of Catholicity, the Apostolic Gospel. This is crucial in the whole argument—the ministry is only part of the Church. This will be the better understood if the essential position of the Minister in the Church is seen to be that of servant and not that of “prince of the Church.” As servant he does not give validity to the status of the household of faith, but derives his own status from his connection with it and its Head.

Let us change the metaphor to pursue the point. On what does a business house stake its claim to acceptance with the public? Ultimately on the quality of its goods. It will not be sufficient to proclaim “established over 100 years.” To maintain its hold, it must produce the same high quality of wares on which it built its reputation. In the same way every claim to catholicity must be substantiated by the test of apostolicity. Nothing is truly catholic that is not first truly apostolic. And nothing can be denied catholicity that bears the obvious marks of apostolicity. Ultimately it is apostolicity, not catholicity, in some undefined sense, that is the determinative

principle. "Catholicity" has little value unless closely associated with, and interpreted by, "apostolicity."

To proceed one step further. We have seen that apostolicity determines catholicity. What in turn determines apostolicity? Surely it is the possession of "the truth as it is in Jesus." The dismembered apostolate was restored by the election of one who had first hand knowledge of the facts from the baptism of John until the day that Christ was taken up into Heaven, and could thus bear witness to the Resurrection. St. John based his claim to be heard on the same ground; "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, of the Word of Life . . . That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you that ye may have fellowship with us, and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ." Here the apostolic succession consists in the possession of apostolic witness and catholicity is fellowship on the basis of that witness. It is therefore primarily a succession of truth, not of persons. Its nature is theological rather than historical. In this is seen its immeasurable superiority, for its validity depends, not on uncertain historical succession, but is derived immediately from Christ. Thus, in the highest sense it is "from above" and not "from below." For this good reason we discard the Traditional Approach.

But having criticised others and counted them unworthy, have we anything better to offer in their place? Can Evangelicals formulate a worthy conception of the Church that will, in theory and experience, be worthy of the name "Catholic?" If we have nothing constructive to bring forward, we had at least better cease being destructive. Let us open our final section of this paper with two questions which may enable us to answer those immediately preceding. (1) What do we consider an adequate expression of Catholicity? (2) How far do we Evangelicals approximate to it?

What is an adequate expression of Catholicity? or to put it in another way—What are the Theological marks of a truly Catholic Church? I persist in emphasising the word "theological" because it is borne in on me that nothing else ultimately matters. To speak of a thing's theological significance is to speak of its significance in revelation, in God. This restored emphasis on the Theological is due to the fact that men are beginning to see (i) that everything must ultimately be judged in relation to God; (ii) that every other judgment is partial and to that extent untrue.

So far as this question is directed towards the Church's Catholicity, the true answer will be found in most Reformed Confessions of Faith, these are (i) The Word of God preached, (ii) The Sacraments duly administered, (iii) The Discipline of Christ given adequate expression. Should this third mark be neglected it will result in the loss of the other two, and create the chaos it was given to offset.

1. THE WORD OF GOD PREACHED. At once someone will say "Surely if any party in the Church has this mark of Catholicity, it is the Evangelical." Superficially this may be true, actually I have grave doubts. Perhaps we should enquire diligently what "preaching the Word of God" means. It means at least three things, that preaching must be at once (i) Objective, (ii) Pertinent, (iii) Extensive.

(i) *Objective.* It is primarily the Word of Another we are to preach. The Word of God is given to us in the acts of God culminating in and deriving meaning from the supreme act of God in Christ. Hence the Word of God is a Fact, *the* Fact, and expresses itself in an Event, *the* Event—the Word was made flesh, the Son was made sin. Thus it is strongly objective in character. But much Evangelical preaching has lost this objectiveness. Indeed, it is dangerously subjective. Instead of Christ as He is set forth in the Word of God, it is the very different Christ mirrored in the religious consciousness, and this is frequently a very distorted picture and a very emaciated Christ. These are subtle analyses and expressions of the preacher's own none-too-robust religious life, and are frequently admired as "devotional" and "spiritual," but the quality proceeds from its affinity to the spirit of man and not from the Holy Spirit of God. This type of preaching has no abiding reality. It is but a vapour that rises out of the earth and is of the earth, earthy. It has its roots in the "devotional self"—no less "self" because of the adjective. Such preaching can never represent the message of the Catholic Church as it confronts the world with the Word of God.

(ii) *Pertinent.* But this Word of God in all its "givenness" must be adequately expressed. Men must certainly recognise its note of authority, but they must also understand the language in which it is spoken. The everlasting Gospel has ever new emphasis and expressions. The Church's spokesman must be alive to the situation. A Church truly Catholic must ever be reforming the expression of its unchanging and unchangeable faith. She must not be in shackles to either the 5th century or the 16th. Herein lies a challenge to those of us who live in this interim period.

(iii) *Extensive.* The scope of this preaching must be wide and deep. It must enter into the whole structure of life. It must be relevant to the situation that exists. It must be as deep as, and deeper than, every problem of man. It must speak to the nation as well as to the individual. It will penetrate to the centre of the political situation and yet will not degenerate into a political address. It will diagnose the social structure unerringly, and yet will never be mistaken for a lecture on social problems. It will always bear the stamp of its Divine origin. Truly Catholic preaching will see to it that no sphere of life lies outside the judgment of the Word of God.

To what extent does Evangelical preaching approximate to these ideals?

2. THE SACRAMENTS DULY ADMINISTERED. In considering this second mark of a Catholic Church Evangelicals as a whole are less sure of themselves. In discussing sacraments there is observed a certain hesitancy and reserve which betrays uncertainty. In this the Evangelical has developed a decided limp. He puts his sacramental foot to the ground with a wariness that suggests it might hurt. This shows itself in a number of little ways. *First, on the emphasis he throws on the conjunction*—Word *and* Sacraments, often with the suggestion that it comes between them rather than unites them. Surely it is better to emphasise the oneness of their witness to the Gospel. We should recognise their affinity. We require the Reformers' confidence when they asserted that the preaching of the Word was the

Word Audible whilst the Sacraments were the Word Visible. *In the second place this uncertainty is expressed in Evangelical readiness to lapse into negative rather than positive statement concerning the Sacrament—in denying the error more than in declaring the truth.* In Catholic doctrine, positive truth must predominate. *A third indication of this apparent timidity* is seen in the practical use of the Lord's Supper in worship. Perhaps some may argue that the increasing use of the Holy Communion is an indication that this fear is being overcome. But a better test than that of frequency of use would surely be prominence in use. Are we quite sure that, in a special sense it is "the Lord's own service?" In practice we use it either at an hour when few are present, or tack it on to the end of one of the other services. The Church of the early centuries did not so treat it. Neither did the Reformers who brought it back to its original position at the centre of the Church's worship. The Word and Sacrament were united in the principal Sunday Service. I believe there is room for heart-searching among Evangelicals on this matter.

But to return to our main enquiry: What positive elements can Evangelicals bring to the Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments? I believe there are two closely related emphases that may well be lost sight of if we do not supply them, and in giving expression to them I would acknowledge my indebtedness to some lectures of Dr. Carnegie Simpson.

First, there is need to emphasise *the Divine "givenness" in the Sacraments.* The essential thing is not what we do and say, but what God in Christ does and says. We must rid our minds of Anthropocentric ideas and make them Theocentric or Christocentric. The human element or the ethical response is real but secondary. Failure to recognise this is more obviously true of sacerdotally inclined Christians, but may be more insidiously true in evangelical circles. Any suggestion that the Lord's Supper is for an inner circle of the devout, for those who are in some vague way the spiritually élite—thoughts not wholly unknown among Evangelicals—is a denial of the "givenness" of the Gospel, for it suggests that we bring something to it.

The use of the word "Gospel" brings us to our second main emphasis in the Evangelical contribution to a Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments. The Sacraments of the Church are *essentially Gospel Sacraments.* They are offered to saints who are still sinners. The Church where they are administered is the refuge of sinners even as it is the home of saints. The Sacraments come to us not as men, but as sinners. They are related to redemption, not to creation. The "sacramental principle" may have its legitimate place in art, but it is dangerous in theology. It may obscure the true nature of the Gospel. If everything good and beautiful is sacramental, then the distinctiveness of the Evangel as good news coming down from God to man may become blurred. The great error of the sacramental principle is that it argues from beneath—man discovers and judges of the fitness of the symbolism. In the Gospel sacraments the argument proceeds from above. God gives the symbols: "He took bread . . . He took the cup." They stress what man is eager to avoid, that he is not only a creature, but he is a sinner. Surely this is a major contribution to any Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments.

3. THE DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCH. This subject brings us into a less rarified atmosphere. We descend from the Evangelical Mount to the Ethical Plain, from the realms of spiritual ideas to a sinful world, from the harmony of the Divine Will to the discords of human contradictions. But it is on this plane that the service of the Church to the Head of the Church is to be rendered. Ability to bring order out of chaos and to disentangle truth from error, will be the credentials of the reality of the presence of the Spirit in our midst. For God is not the God of confusion but of order.

Lack of this has been the measure of the Church of England's inability to take her proper part in the matter we are here to discuss—Evangelical Catholicity. Our Church is powerless to speak, not because she has lost her voice—there are noises many and voices many—but because she cannot speak with one voice. Her condition resembles Israel in the period of the Judges when “every man did what was right in his own eyes.” Here we see the most motley of crews—Plymouth Brethren once removed, jostling for places with those equally closely related to Roman Catholicism, whilst Pelagians and Unitarians regard themselves as the New Orthodoxy. In all this, we have developed a marked likeness to Mars Hill and Marble Arch.

What is true of the Church of England in general is true of the Evangelical party in particular. Our schisms have become a by-word. Our whole genius has been prostituted towards internal disruption. The Corinthian evil of partisanship has left us immeasurably weak. It is unnecessary to name the Evangelical successors of the “Paul . . . Peter . . . Apollos” spirit. They are cliques rather than persons in most cases. It is enough that we recognise these Squander-bugs of our inheritance. We need to pay attention to what our Presbyterian Brethren call “the Godly Order of the Kirk.”

In all this unseemliness and disorder there is no room for the Lord of the Church to speak. No one of Pauline stature has arisen to say “And the rest will I set in order when I come.” Christocratic Government has given place to democratic rabble-law. The Christ who appeared in the midst of the Churches as judge is absent from her assemblies. There seems to be no keen desire to know what the Spirit saith unto the Churches. “Christ is no longer Lord in His own Household.”

The relation between this, and a true conception of the Church is obvious. We are not in a position or condition to co-operate with anybody. To join with others at present would be to sin against them. We would only spread the infection of our own unhappy divisions. Can anything be done to put right this wrong? We are all acquainted with the remedies, or expedients that more serious Evangelicals have tried in the past. There is the legal weapon much in favour in the 19th century, but which broke in the hands of its users. It has only brought humiliation to the cause, and an easy-won martyr's palm for the other side. Whilst we may respect the sincerity that would go so far in the interest of Church discipline, we cannot but recognise its unwisdom. Spiritual warfare cannot be waged with carnal weapons.

Or again, there is the problem of *Establishment*. The Evangelical party has shown more enthusiasm for it than most others. In this

it appears to be inconsistent with its character. It has always drawn a sharp line between the spiritual and the secular. In spirit it seems to be on the side of a "gathered Church" idea, but in practice it denies it. Apart from the rights and wrongs of Establishment, it must be considered an unworthy expedient to support it mainly for the maintenance of our own position. Must we lean on the arm of flesh? Do we really believe the Ark of God can take care of itself—or that God will take care of it?

There are other aspects that would come under consideration of Church discipline, but these are mentioned, not to exhaust the list, but to indicate their seriousness.

The writer does not presume to offer a cut-and-dried solution as to how this "godly union and concord" is to be realised, though he would express the conviction that it lies in the direction of internal reformation based on spiritual principles. Such principles can only become operative in an atmosphere of understanding and mutual respect, and this in turn can only be achieved when we learn something of the meaning of New Testament *koinonia*, and can affirm as a living article of faith: "I believe in the Communion of Saints." The primitive Church was shot through with an infectious sense of its oneness in Christ which expressed itself in a community of worship, service and goods. "They had all things common." In that living fellowship they possessed an environment wherein the deepest problems of life were solved, and the most divergent issues discussed and reconciled. In no other way can we solve our problems. Ultimately "the Church as it is" will become "the Church that it ought to be" only by a baptism of repentance and the pouring out of the Spirit from on High, and when we cease from our individualism and congregationalism and denominationalism to catch the meaning of "the unity of the Spirit" in a vision of the one, Catholic and Apostolic Church wherein the crown rights of the Redeemer are unquestionably acknowledged.

A Pioneer of Religious Toleration.

BY THE REV. C. SYDNEY CARTER, D.D., F.R.Hist. S.
Principal of Clifton Theological College.

THE great struggle for complete liberty of conscience and toleration in religion has been a very long and costly one, and is not even yet fully won. It is well, therefore, that we should remember the arduous and conspicuous part in it which was taken by one of its earliest pioneers of whom too little is known to-day, although he most unselfishly sacrificed his whole life for this sacred cause.

Roger Williams was not the first Englishman to advocate religious toleration, but he was the first, against fierce opposition, to put his principles into practice. Sir Thomas More in his 'Utopia' had preached toleration in theory, but in practice, he openly encouraged the persecution of the Reformers. Thomas Helwys, the first to form a Baptist congregation in England, had, as early as 1612, declared that the King could only demand civil obedience "for men's religion to God is betwixt God and themselves, the king shall not answer for it." The Pilgrim Fathers sailed to America in 1620 to secure liberty of conscience for their own worship, but they were not altogether prepared to grant to others what they had secured at such sacrifice themselves. An impartial review of history reveals the fact that no religious party had at this time adopted, or at least understood properly, the principle of full and complete liberty of worship. Even the plea made by the 'Separatists' for liberty of conscience, was based as much on their difficult circumstances as on their conscientious convictions. We have definite evidence of this in the case of the Pilgrim Fathers of New Plymouth, for they expelled the Puritan divine, Lyford, for endeavouring to form a Church Prayer Book party in their infant Colony. Similarly the Puritan Colonists of New England, having gained freedom from the persecution of the English bishops, persecuted equally severely all who would not accept the rigid and harsh discipline of their theocratic government—"always tender of their own consciences, they were unyielding towards the religious beliefs of others." In 1656, the four United Colonies, including New Plymouth, passed a law punishing Quakers with stripes, and imprisonment with hard labour, and adjudging all defenders of their tenets to fine, imprisonment or exile. Massachusetts Colony even resorted to hanging.

As late as 1657, Plymouth Colony declared that "full liberty of conscience was prejudicial, if not destructive to Civil and Church Societies." In England, a similar persecuting spirit was not lacking since the Independent divine, John Owen, the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, ordered two Quaker women to be flogged for exhorting a congregation after the Service. Cromwell, who loudly proclaimed his belief in liberty of conscience, denied it to Prelatists and Papists, and humorously declared to the Governor of a surrendered Irish garrison—"As to what you say concerning liberty of conscience, I meddle not with any man's conscience, but if you mean by liberty

of conscience, liberty to exercise the Mass, I judge it expedient to use plain dealing with you, and to tell you that, where the Parliament of England have rule, that will not be allowed of."

We must therefore sorrowfully admit that early in the XVIIth century with but few exceptions, the championship of religious toleration was regarded as a mark of heresy or sedition. But we should also remember that this persecution of those who dared to oppose an authorised or State form of Faith, was a relic or "*damnosa hereditas*" of the Middle Ages, which, even though in a modified form, survived the Reformation Movement. Thus Calvin acquiesced in the burning of Servetus, as did also Cranmer in that of the Unitarian Joan Bocher, while Arian heretics like Bartholomew Legatt and Wightman were executed as late as 1611. Thus, while it took at least two generations before persecuted Puritans and Separatists acted on the implications of the equal priesthood of all believers, which they preached, it is all the more remarkable that Roger Williams, as early as 1631, had fearlessly affirmed that the "civil magistrate has no right to restrain or direct the consciences of men, and that anything short of unlimited toleration for all religious systems is detestable persecution." In all his future chequered and varied career, and in spite of many hardships and much opposition, especially to his censorious and often dangerous views, Williams was absolutely consistent in advocating and carrying out this enlightened principle. He was certainly an unwearied apostle and pioneer of full religious liberty.

Very little is known of his early life and upbringing, and even his parentage and date of birth are disputed. One view is that he was born in Wales in 1599, another that he was an Englishman, born in London, and a son of a merchant tailor. It has also been asserted that he was of gentle origin and born in Cornwall in 1602, although one of his biographers declares that he was not born till 1607. In any case we know that he secured the interest of the great lawyer, Sir Edward Coke, who entered him as a scholar of Charter House in 1621, and sent him to Pembroke College, Cambridge, in 1623 where he graduated B.A. in 1626. He was evidently then ordained, and became Chaplain to Sir W. M. Otes in Essex, but he very soon espoused advanced Puritan views, and opposed the Church liturgy and ceremonies, and on conscientious grounds refused the offer of two livings—"my conscience" he declares, "was persuaded against the National Church and the ceremonies and Bishops." Wishing to escape persecution he then accepted a call to work in New England, and he sailed with his wife, Mary, from Bristol in December, 1630, and arrived in America in February, 1631, where he was welcomed by Governor Winthrop as "a godly minister." We must bear in mind that these Massachusetts Colonists, whom Williams now joined, although strongly opposed to many of the Church ceremonies, still professed affectionate loyalty to their 'dear Mother', 'the Church of England', and blessed God for the spiritual 'parentage and education' which "they had sucked from her breasts." Neither they nor the Pilgrim Fathers had any quarrel with the doctrinal teaching of the Church. John Robinson, the much loved Pastor of these 'Separatist' exiles, declared that "to the Confession of Faith published in the name of the Church of England, and to every article thereof, we do with the Reformed

Churches where we live, and also elsewhere, assent wholly." The New England Puritans were strong Calvinists, and established their Colony on a strict ecclesiastical basis. John Cotton, their spiritual leader, declared that "It is better that the Commonwealth be fashioned to the setting forth of God's house, which is His Church, than to accommodate the Church frame to the Civil State." Members had to satisfy the Church as to their faith and doctrine, and only such members could be freemen of the City and Colony, and this ecclesiastical stranglehold remained in force till 1684. In fact, the intolerant persecuting methods of this New England Church, were equally severe with those of Laud and the Anglican bishops which had caused this Puritan emigration. They "whipped, mutilated and banished" any who dared to oppose them or assert their rights of conscience. It was not therefore surprising that Williams could not long remain happy as a minister of a Boston Church of this type. He already held 'Separatist' views, and so he regarded his congregation as an "unseparated" people because they refused to declare their repentance for having had communion with the Church of England, and they also allowed the Civil authorities to punish for spiritual censures. He therefore accepted an invitation to act as Assistant minister to a Salem church, which had just turned 'separatist'. But the Boston Council objected to this 'heretical' preacher of toleration remaining in their midst, and so Williams migrated to the Pilgrim Fathers' Colony of New Plymouth, where he was received with respect by Governor Bradford, and he became an Assistant pastor in the Church there and for two years supported himself by manual labour, and it was here that his eldest daughter was born. He also made friends with the neighbouring Indian chiefs with a view to evangelistic work amongst them—"My soul's desire" he affirmed, "was to do the natives good." But he soon alarmed and alienated the Plymouth Colony by declaring that the Crown had no right to grant them a Charter for their land, since it belonged properly to the Indians. They were therefore much relieved when Williams accepted an invitation to return to the Salem church. Here he advanced extreme views, maintaining that those considered as 'unregenerate' could not pray or even take an oath of fidelity to the Civil government, and that no godly person could have any communion with them, and that other Boston churches who did not accept these censorious views were "anti-Christian." Singularly he did not regard his strenuous advocacy of full religious toleration as incompatible with these harsh, uncharitable opinions. As the Salem Church was not prepared to go to such extremes, Williams created a serious schism, by gathering round him a few like-minded fanatics to whom he ministered in his own house. As he also denied the authority of the Colony's Royal Patent, the Massachusetts Council banished him as a disturber of the peace, and even tried to get him shipped home to England. He had further angered them by denouncing the Church of England as anti-Christian and by denying the authority of the Civil Power over consciences in its order to make attendance at public worship compulsory. Williams managed to escape into the 'wilderness', and for a time endured a very perilous and unhappy exile. At length, with a few companions, he settled beyond the reach of the Boston

authorities at Providence, Rhode Island, with his family and a few followers, and here he founded a new Colony and purchased the lands from the Indian chiefs, thus satisfying his sensitive conscience concerning the justness of his title to them. He divided these lands with his twelve fellow exiles and very soon other refugees from Massachusetts and England joined them, and the Colony became a 'Cave of Adullam' for a difficult company of 'cranks' and 'disturbers of the peace' in other Colonies. As Williams declared later, he desired that the new Colony "might be a shelter for persons distressed for conscience" and evidently his wish was fully realised! His friendship with the Indians proved of great service to all the Colonies, as he was able, at great personal risk, to frustrate the design of a league of Indian tribes to destroy the Colonists. Later on he was not as successful, and a tribe of warlike Pequods attacked the Colonies, but were in the end defeated and wiped out, except for a few women and children who were sent as slaves to Boston. As Governor of the infant colony of Rhode Island, Williams had a difficult and uphill struggle, since Massachusetts refused all trade and intercourse with it, and in 1643 all the four Colonies formed a federation of the "United Colonies of New England" which deliberately excluded Rhode Island. Williams started a Separatist Church in Providence and adopted Baptist views, and thus established the first Baptist Church in America. He got himself and others re-baptized, but even this definite change did not satisfy his uneasy and exacting conscience. After four months, he resigned his charge, declaring that he could not accept any established form of Creed, because it might restrict individual liberty of conscience. He then doubted the validity of his own recent baptism as well as the Apostolic authority of all Orders, and called himself a 'Seeker'. It seems probable that he relinquished these extreme fanatical views later on, and although he allowed full liberty of conscience to others, his own peculiar conscientious inhibitions must have sadly marred his fellowship with other Christians. In 1643, Williams paid a special visit to England to secure a Charter for the new Rhode Island Colony. His mission was no easy one as the Civil War was at its height; but he had influential friends, including Cromwell, Sir Harry Vane and John Milton. At length, after nearly two years, he succeeded. While in England, he wrote a challenging treatise denouncing "The Bloody Doctrine of Persecution for the Cause of Conscience," which so angered the presbyterian House of Commons that they ordered it to be burned. In his crusade for complete liberty of conscience, Williams was far ahead of his generation, as even the Independents regarded it as 'rank heresy leading to anarchy and chaos', while Milton in his 'Areopagitica' wished for the complete extirpation of Roman Catholics. It was therefore all the more remarkable that just 300 years ago, in 1644, Williams secured a Charter expressly providing for liberty of conscience. It is a memorable date in the history of Christian civilisation. It provided for a Civil government, the executive power resting in an annually elected President, and four assistants who could punish all who transgressed the accepted Code of laws, and then it stated that "all men may walk as their conscience persuade them, every one in the name of his God. And let the saints of the most High walk in this

Colony without molestation, in the name of Jehovah their God for ever and ever."

The principles set forth in the Rhode Island Charter allowing government by popular consent, freedom of conscience, speech and of the press anticipated the later democratic principles enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence. It was not surprising that this striking success was specially obnoxious to the Massachusetts Colony, and it endeavoured to suppress and persecute this infant Settlement. Some of their leading members were arrested and taken to Boston, where they were brutally treated as 'Anabaptists.' On the other hand, the numbers of disgruntled and anarchic refugees in Rhode Island hindered the establishment of a stable and organised form of government there, and Williams had no easy task to maintain order and prevent open strife. Quarrels between the different towns continued, and an unsuccessful attempt was made to get the island of Rhode Island included as a member of the new England federation. At length, in 1650, Williams journeyed again to England to prevent the sinister designs of William Coddington, one of the Colony's magistrates, to get himself appointed Governor for life of Rhode Island and Connecticut. In 1652, an Order in Council annulled Coddington's commission, and directed the warring towns to unite under the Rhode Island Charter. This Order, accompanied by a strong Appeal made by the Home Government, brought about a much needed reconciliation and soon after Williams was elected President of the Colony, and again his personal intervention saved the Colonies from an Indian War.

Williams allowed the Jews to settle in the Colony, and granted them full civil rights and, much as he detested the tenets of the Quakers, he allowed them also to settle there in 1656, although they were fiercely persecuted as 'heretic vagabonds and enemies of both Church and State' by the other Colonies. Such liberal actions proved the truth of his assertion that "I desire not liberty to myself which I would not freely and impartially weigh out to all consciences of the world besides." But in recording the brutal treatment meted out to the Quakers, it is only fair to notice their fanatical excesses which naturally aroused the anger and indignation of the Puritans. Naked Quaker women, in a frenzied state, paraded the streets and entered the churches, interrupting the services to denounce the Puritans and their teaching, as well as the Governor and the magistrates. As a consequence many were branded, whipped and imprisoned, while three men and one woman were hanged. Rhode Island, however, refused to join the other Colonies in passing severe laws against them, and in 1663 it secured a new Charter from Charles II granting full religious liberty to all who did not disturb the civil peace. It was a unique Charter for those intolerant days. Roger Williams remained a member of the Rhode Island Government till 1677, when he voluntarily retired. He was disheartened by the constant strife between the Colonies disputing about their respective territories, and he uttered words which are as true to-day as they were in 1670, when he asked, "What are all the contentions and wars of this world about, generally, but for greater dishes and bowls of porridge." Williams had found time to do a certain amount of missionary work amongst the Indians, but in 1675 a bitter and desolating war broke out between them and the

Colonies. Twelve towns were utterly destroyed, and over a thousand inhabitants killed. Williams himself, although advanced in years, acted as a Captain of Militia. He had no ambition to seek power or honours or wealth, and in his old age he gave away his lands and property to those in need and became dependent on his children, and he died quite poor in March, 1684. In his long, eventful and arduous career, Williams encountered much opposition and persecution, but the Colony which he founded appreciated and recognised his real worth. As early as 1654 it declared that "from its first beginning you have been a noble and true friend to an outcast and despised people; we have ever reaped the sweet fruits of your constant loving kindnesses and favour. We have long been free from the iron yoke of wolfish bishops. —We have not felt the new chains of Presbyterian tyrants, nor in this Colony have been consumed by the over zealous fire of the so-called godly Christian magistrates. We have long drunk of the cup of as great liberties as any people we can hear of under heaven."

Even those who found Williams impossible to work with realised his consistent advocacy of his high ideals. Governor Bradford of New Plymouth bore testimony that "he was a godly man and zealous, having many precious parts, but very unsettled in judgment." He admits that Williams soon fell into "strange opinions and practices", and he prayed the Lord "to show him his errors and reduce him into the way of truth, and give him a settled judgment and constancy in the same." He was a man of good education and could read French, Dutch, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and, as we have seen, he was, in an intolerant age, an intrepid and unwavering advocate of toleration and a firm upholder of justice and liberty. There is real justification in his inclusion in the Geneva Reformation Monument as one of its five foremost leaders, and his great labours for civil and religious liberty are suitably recognised by a statue to his memory in Washington.

As Englishmen we have felt for centuries that freedom and religious toleration are as established as the air we breathe, but the present gigantic struggle against totalitarian dictatorship, with its denial of full religious freedom in several lands, should warn us that we may still have to fight to preserve this precious heritage, and that the price of freedom of conscience, as well as of truth, is eternal vigilance. Evidently President Roosevelt recognised this when he included "freedom to worship God of every person in his own way" in his "Four Freedoms." We do well therefore to recall the very real debt that we owe to the unflinching and heroic pioneers in this sacred crusade. We must look to ourselves that we lose not the treasure which they wrought at such great cost, but that "we receive a full reward."

Book Reviews

HANDBOOK TO THE CHRISTIAN LITURGY.

By *James Norman, M.A., Archdeacon of The Herbert, North Queensland.*
S.P.C.K. 10/6.

"Life can only be understood backward, but must be lived forward" is a profound warning of Kierkegaard which applies as pertinently to the "Christian Liturgy" as much as to anything else. The study of the ancient liturgies, however, is an exceedingly difficult field to cover in a systematic way. Few have the facilities, few have the time, and still fewer have the inclination to become specialist students in this important branch of study. It is a subject that has been unduly neglected by Evangelicals but with such a "Handbook to the Christian Liturgy" available there is little excuse anywhere for factual ignorance on the main lines of the development of the "Christian Liturgy."

The first part of the book deals with the "Regional Rites" and the second part consists of "Commentary." This second part is sub-divided into the sections "Mass of Catechumens," "The Mass of the Faithful" and "The Anaphora." It is sufficiently obvious that such a "Handbook" as this must be read critically. There is a tendentious suggestiveness in these studies. Our own experience, however, is that they throw into admirable relief the simplicity and witness to the Holy Scriptures and the early Christian centuries of our own Prayer Book office of "The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion." A more widespread knowledge of the ancient liturgies is essential if our own Prayer Book Service is to be fully understood. In this way slovenly ignorance and spurious innovations are alike avoided. In the past there has been too much of both.

Not only is this unpretentious "Handbook" a marvel of compression but, what is unusual in such compilations, it bears every evidence of fresh and scholarly study of the liturgies themselves. Added to this, it is admirably arranged and produced. It is excellent value for half-a-guinea. The absence of an extended bibliography is a serious defect in a "Handbook" and might well be remedied in a subsequent edition. "Handbook to the Christian Liturgies" is a title that might also be considered in a new edition as giving perhaps, a less tendentious indication of the contents of the volume. A.B.L.

"CHURCH WORSHIP AND THE NON-CHURCHGOER."

By *Gordon W. Iveson.* S.P.C.K. 6/-.

This present volume, intended as a "handbook for Clergy and Teachers" is presented as a help to the solution of a problem now challenging all organised Christianity. It is claimed to be the outcome of experience, for in the Preface the author tells how he gradually "came to realise the folly of trying to make the Christian Faith (and the liturgy which proclaimed it) fit modern people, instead of trying to fit modern people for the Christian Faith." For the state of affairs now obtaining, it is plainly asserted that "local departures from the Prayer Book services have been largely responsible," and the author's considered judgment, which is stated again in the body of the work, is given as follows: "The only way out of our present chaos is loyal adherence to the Prayer Book rite in public services."

After such a beginning, calculated to stimulate a most lively interest and anticipation of good things to come, the author deals with the problem in six chapters and four appendices. The chapters are headed "The Present Situation," "The Catechumenate," "Training in Worship," "The Eucharist," "Morning and Evening Prayer," "Worship and Drama."

The first chapter is admirable as a review of present circumstances regarding the decline of worship, both public and private. This chapter is clearly the working out of a statement made in the Introduction—"Man needs redemption from sin." We all know the need, but unfortunately it is not what *all* men want, for to many "sin is no longer sin, but only imperfection." The remedy proposed is "the revival of a training-stage or catechumenate" (p.28). This is envisaged as resulting in admission to Holy Communion immediately after

Confirmation, but in delaying the ratification of the baptismal vows to "not before eighteen and possibly even later."

After this proposal, we come to the core of the work, in the reading of which Evangelicals will question the accuracy of many statements, decline to accept the author's assumptions, and reject his proposed solutions. They will recall that the Catechumenate is pre-baptismal in conception, not post-baptismal. Moreover, our Prayer Book, following New Testament precedent, considers Communicant status as that of confessed Christians, who have had some definite experience of Christ as Saviour and Lord, a fact which the Confirmation and Communion Offices clearly presume. However, the Chapter "Training in Worship," assumes otherwise, and the author must not be disappointed if those who reject his premises also reject his conclusions.

The most contentious part of the book, and the most dangerous in its teaching, is that devoted to "The Eucharist." Here, the shibboleth "The Lord's own Service on the Lord's own Day" is worked to death. As is to be expected, the Eucharist is considered as the central act of worship, and on p.92 it is asserted that the Communion Office "is in essence a drama—i.e. something done." All this is in keeping with a gross and blatant mistranslation of 1 Cor. xi. 26. The passage is quoted more than once as "As oft as ye do eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do *shew forth* the Lord's death until He come." The A.V. has "shew," and the R.V. has "proclaim" in translation of the Greek *katagello*. This verb has been shown by Deissmann in his "Bible Studies" as meaning "proclaim in the manner of a herald." Such a proclamation, then, such a "shewing," of the Lord's death, is done by word, rather than by deed. The Eucharist is not something "done," and the Prayer Book shews it as something received. "The Body and Blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Following up this false theory of "something done," which is neither the teaching of the New Testament nor of the Prayer Book, our author says on p.104 "What we can do, therefore, is to put our sin-stained, unworthy and trivial little offering into the perfect ('sacrifice'—offering) of our Lord." That statement lends itself to misunderstanding, for His offering was perfect, unique, offered once for all, whilst ours is necessarily imperfect. All that we can do is to claim the merits of His mediatorial death by faith, receiving His gift at His hands, and then offer our imperfect selves to God as St. Paul exhorts in Rom. xii. Of a piece with the above is the statement on p.145: "When the priest puts on his priestly vestments (a 'dramatic' adjunct of first class importance) he puts on Christ. He is not the Rev. John Smith, but a priest." One wonders how St. Paul would have dealt with such a statement. If the vestments make him a priest, why was he ordained? He should have put on Christ long before the occasion here mentioned. "As many of you as were baptised into Christ did put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 27). This emphasis on the Eucharist as "something done" reaches a climax on p. 143 where a quotation is cited with approval: "The only dramatic satisfaction I find now is a High Mass *well performed*." (Italics ours). The true Anglican must turn away from such an assertion with dismay, for to us, it is impossible to conceive of anything more remote from "The Lord's own Service" than is High Mass, whether it be *performed* on the Lord's own Day or any other.

As is to be expected from the foregoing, Morning Prayer is treated with scant grace. Eucharistic Worship is the only thing conceivable to the mind of the author for Sunday mornings. One wishes that he had defined Eucharistic Worship, but he lets us see into his mind on p.99, where he speaks of drawing "near to our Lord in His Sacramental Presence." Evening Prayer, one is gratified to learn, has a place in his plans.

On laying down the book, and recalling the anticipation stimulated by the Introduction, the present reviewer felt that he had been the victim of a rather mean 'confidence trick.' Evangelicals will not read the book with approval: but if its perusal sends them back to the New Testament and the Prayer Book to see how far the author's position and his proposed remedies are from their own, it will have served a useful purpose, but not the one which the book has as its aim.

E.H.

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE GOSPELS.

By R. V. G. Tasker, B.D., S.C.M. Press, 5/-.

This is a refreshing review of the present position in critical study of the Gospels. It is primarily addressed to school teachers but will prove useful as an assessment

of recent work in the study of the Gospels, and also as an introduction to such study from the point of view "which regards all the Gospel material as influenced by Christian doctrine." The author alludes to studying and teaching the Gospels for some 25 years, and in his work gives us evidence of the very wide range of these studies and his thorough mastery of his subject.

The book is interesting, particularly in its able presentation of the views of different schools; for example his analysis of Form-Criticism, concerning which he remarks "this type of criticism becomes very arbitrary when it attaches more historical value to pronouncement stories . . . Many of the narratives in our Gospels took shape in the living and ever-growing Christian community, and they had a pastoral work to perform in the edification and instruction of Christian believers both before and after they became entrenched in the written Gospels; but we cannot form any judgment upon their relative historicity merely by a consideration of the particular shape or form in which we find them." As regards the older critical approach he says: "The idea so popular amongst early 'higher critics' that we can sit in judgment on this narrative, and in the light of our modern insight and knowledge pick out parts of it which are congenial to the modern mind, and regard them as historical and primary, and reject others as unhistorical and later accretions, is an idea which is increasingly seen to be impossible, once the true character of the document is understood."

The author is concerned in his discussion of sources of the Gospels to assert that the "Jesus of History" and the "Christ of Faith" are in the Gospel inseparable; but the book is particularly interesting in the way in which the major part is devoted to a study of each of our four Gospels as an entity with its particular characteristics and yet one element of the four-fold Gospel. Mr. Tasker is concerned to point out that each and everyone of the Gospels has its own contribution to make to what is in the aggregate "the Gospel, the *one* Gospel according to four different evangelists."

He includes in his study a very valuable presentation of the teaching concerning the Kingdom of God, and also appendices which survey the extra-canonical gospel material and the importance of the study of New Testament Greek. He concludes the latter with the remark "it was not wholly fanciful or childish considerations which made some of the Christians of old time to speak of New Testament Greek as the 'language of the Holy Ghost'."

We welcome this study, and particularly the note on which it closes. "The Jesus that must be accepted or rejected by mankind in every age is not the Jesus that can be reconstructed by critics from certain passages of the Gospels (for such a Jesus is, as a rule, scarcely worth accepting or rejecting), but the Jesus of the four Gospels Who is no one less than the Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. And any 'Scripture teaching' or 'religious education' which presents Him as anything less than this is scarcely worth the trouble of those who may engage in it."

SPIRITUALISM AND RELIGION.

By G. W. Butterworth, Litt. D. S.P.C.K. 9/-.

This book is a scholarly attempt to examine in detail the religious claims of Spiritualism and the evidences on which those claims are based. Five chapters on the history of Spiritualism, in the last two of which the 'automatic writings' of Miss Geraldine Cummins are given special attention, are followed by a further five chapters on the spiritualistic treatment of the Bible. In two further chapters the author describes and discusses the spiritualistic view of God and of the after-life, and then, in two concluding chapters, the validity of the spirit hypothesis (*i.e.* 'that there are numberless spirits of departed human beings in close proximity to the earth and able and anxious to communicate with those whom they have left behind') is examined and the nature of psychic phenomena set forth.

On its critical side the book is excellent. Dr. Butterworth has spared no pains in searching through all the available literature on the subject and he has conducted his investigation with commendable impartiality and an obvious desire to get at the truth. He entirely rejects the spiritualistic doctrine that psychic phenomena are due to the activities of incarnate spirits while at the same time he affirms the impossibility of placing those phenomena 'within our scientific categories.' He realizes that spiritualism is a kind of protest against what he calls the 'materialistic madness' of much of modern thought, but he also realizes that, because spiritualism exalts the psychic over the moral and spiritual aspects of man's nature and replaces the Biblical witness to God's work

of revelation and redemption by the notion of deceased man's work of revelation giving assurance of man's survival after death, the view it presents 'of the surviving soul and its environment is not one which is worthy of our highest thoughts'. Indeed, spiritualism is itself materialistic (in the Aristotelian sense of the word 'material') in that it accepts the lower ranges of psychic phenomena 'as determining factors in religious thought'.

On its Biblical side this book is not so fully satisfactory. The author shows a tendency to equate 'religion' with 'revelation' as, for instance, when he writes that 'religion is the most sublime product of life, at once men's highest discovery and God's supreme revelation'. There is also a suggestion that prophetic monotheism represents a development of thought from some primitive undifferentiated religious awareness rather than the witness of faith's response to God's revelation becoming conscious of itself. 'The modern study of the Bible', we are told, 'reveals how by slow but sure stages they (*i.e.*, the prophets) arrived at the conception of a single spiritual Ruler of the universe'. Yet in the Bible, because revelation is history and not just 'religion', monotheism is set forth, not as a product of understanding and reasoning, that is, a developing conception about God, but always as a product of faith, that is, a new personal relationship with God. In short, there is a 'monotheism of the Fathers' as well as of the prophets and apostles, so that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ is none other than the God of Abraham.

To conclude: this book is an examination of the religious claims of spiritualism, is first-rate, and it ought to be read by all who seek for an exact knowledge of what those claims are and the evidence on which they are based. Yet it is somewhat marred by an approach to the Bible which gives the impression of itself being not fully Biblical. E.S.

PRAYER BOOK INTERLEAVES: SOME REFLECTIONS ON HOW THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER MIGHT BE MADE MORE INFLUENTIAL IN OUR ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD.

By William Palmer Ladd, late Dean of the Berkeley Divinity School. Oxford University Press, New York, \$1.25: Humphrey Milford, 8/6.

The Prayer Book concerned is not our English Prayer Book, but that in use in the American Episcopal Church (the author discards the adjective Protestant) which, of course, follows a different tradition, derived from the 1549 Book, through the Nonjurors and Samuel Seabury. The main material was originally issued in periodical form in the American Church press: it was collected into volume form, with revision and addition of other matter, in 1941 and is now (1944) introduced into England. It would appear that the Author died before seeing his work through the press. The Berkeley Divinity School is now affiliated to Yale University.

The Author describes himself as an Anglican: uses the term Catholic affectionately: but distinguishes himself from the Anglo-Catholic wing. He writes respectfully of Luther and Cranmer and John Wesley: but he speaks slightly of the 1552 Book, and our English tradition based on that book does not appeal to him. He does not betray any conversance with Evangelical men or movements. He is more acquainted with the Oxford Tractarians, but is contemptuous of Pusey and not over-respectful to Keble's poetry: and of the Tractarians generally he says, "Their appeal to ancient and medieval precedent was handicapped by their lack of historical knowledge." But the Author's own historical accuracy (despite the rather grandiloquent puff on the inside of the dust cover, attributed to an unnamed, and therefore suspect, "English scholar") leaves much to be desired. Evidently, history is not his strong point, which is not to be wondered at as on p. 139 he writes: "We cannot understand history, we cannot understand nature in any other way, than as drama. We are not interested in history as mere facts."

To the mature and discriminating student, who is qualified to criticise, and patient to work through a vast mass of discursive learning, ill-digested, prejudiced, and at times inaccurate, this book may well be of real interest and not unconstructive. But it is not a book to put in the hands of a learner, or a beginner in liturgical study; as to such a one it might well prove an *ignis fatuus* to lead him into mazes of doctrinal and liturgical error.

The author recognises that the genesis of the volume necessarily results in repetitions, for which he apologises. But it also results in inconsistencies, as it gravitates from emotional mysticism in matters of theory and principle to a

somewhat crude modernism (I do not use the word in the controversial sense) in matters of practice and experience. The author's emotions are not always the same and his practical suggestions are not always in true accord. He condemns the Eastward position and admits that the Westward position is "proper"; but in his description of a service in his own chapel it would appear that he practised the Eastward position.

There is considerable diversity in his judgments. He metes out his condemnations with unsparing hand, and without respect of persons or schools: and his praises are eclectic. While he animadverts on Roman Catholic errors in teaching and worship and devotion, some of his highest praise is reserved for the new liturgical movement in the Roman Church, centred round the Benedictine monastery of Maria Lasch, near Andernach on the Rhine. On this subject he grows enthusiastic, and evidently has knowledge: and he says it is "beginning to take root in America". He says there is in it, "a return to the old custom, still found in the Roman basilicas, of the priest standing behind the altar facing the people as he celebrates mass." (His reference to the Roman basilicas, however, needs some qualification). In this connection it may be noted that his frontispiece is a reproduction of the famous ivory panel preserved at Frankfurt representing a prelate, whom he calls "the bishop" but the pall shows to be an archbishop, consecrating standing behind the Table. (The middle section of this panel is given by J. T. Tomlinson in his tract *The Liturgy and the Eastward Position*: but Dr. Ladd's reproduction is the more complete, and shows the deacons behind the celebrant, and presbyters apparently "concelebrating" in front).

The author condemns the use of wafers as contrary to "the 'one loaf' of St. Paul", and he is stern in condemnation of the practices of some of the clergy in adopting modern Roman innovations, particularly the use of "the last Gospel". But on the whole his support is given to very elaborate ritual and ceremony. Some of his ideas are eminently sensible: he insists that there should be a definite pause after the Comfortable Words (which he appears to dislike) before the *Sursum Corda*. This is of course indicated by the use in the rubric of the word "after". It may be here interposed that the use of the same word "after" in our English order before the First Thanksgiving indicates that the Post Communion commences here, and not with the preceding Lord's Prayer. He condemns insistence on fasting communion, and also what he calls D'Oyly Carte music, expressing preference for a "memorable and real Holy Communion" in a Congregational Church, to which he withdrew one Christmas Day, as more "simple and austere". He advocates a greater part by laymen in the services, but at the same time would free the minister from all obligation to conform to a set service—which would be a great blow to the laity. Indeed he would slacken all rules of uniformity. He gives a form of "The Holy Eucharist simplified" which jettisons not only all penitential note (he wages war against the confession and absolution) but also the *gloria in excelsis*. Indeed one notable feature of his proposals and criticisms is an apparent desire to exclude all insistence upon the fact of sin, and to place exclusive emphasis upon joy. He regards confession and absolution and the Decalogue (and perhaps the Comfortable Words) as the result of evil Puritan influence. He dislikes the crucifix and apparently also the Cross; and would merge Good Friday in Easter: and he objects to worship being Christocentric.

One very good point he makes is as to the inadequate attention that is paid to Baptism, which seems to be even worse in America than in England. He says, "I know no scholarly, comprehensive, and up-to-date treatment of Christian baptism in any language. This is another proof of the low estate to which baptism has fallen in the modern Church."

There is a good bit that Dr. Ladd says on the subject of funerals and confirmation that indicates that church life in America is lower than in England in these matters. And there is not a little that carries the same idea into other regions. His statements as to the interest in theology or theological training shown by laymen and clerks are worthy of thought. His strictures upon the bad reading of the clergy might apply elsewhere than in America. His condemnations of church architecture and decorations are also instructive.

The present reviewer has rather enjoyed reading this startlingly original and unconventional and highly provocative book. He has found much to agree with and very much to disagree with: but he has learned not a little and discovered some new danger-signals. But he would not regard it as tending to widespread edification: rather the reverse. It must again be emphasised that the Book of

Common Prayer with which Dr. Ladd deals is not that on which we English Churchmen have been nurtured but differs from it in essential particulars; and also that Dr. Ladd is not a safe historical guide. His sacramental standpoint is that of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI (1549), for which he has an unqualified but modernised admiration; and, although he makes use of evangelical phraseology, his doctrinal standpoint is not Evangelical.

ALBERT MITCHELL.

PRAYER AND THE SERVICE OF GOD.

By Daniel T. Jenkins. pp. 103. 5/- net. Faber and Faber.

It is refreshing to find a book on the great theme of Prayer which takes an almost completely new line in its treatment of the subject. Some time ago the author of this small but valuable work, who, incidentally, has already established a reputation for himself as a competent Theologian by his immensely interesting book on *The Nature of Catholicity*, wrote a supplement on Prayer for the *Christian News-Letter*. That supplement aroused much interest and raised many questions and, as a consequence, the Author felt that these deserved that kind of careful answer which only a book can provide. This volume is the answer and we are immensely glad that Mr. Jenkins has taken the trouble to write it. He says in it so many things which badly need saying and which in some cases we are surprised to find coming from a Free Churchman.

For the main theme of the book is that Christian prayer to be effective must be in and through the Church, the body of Christ. He will have nothing to do with that kind of Christian who attends Church "anonymously for whatever remote and impersonal help it can provide." Nor is he satisfied with a merely "pastoral relationship" with the minister or parish priest: "We need a deeper and more coherent fellowship among ourselves within the Church for our own sakes" and, much more, "for the exercise of our ministry of Christ to the world." This, although it comes from the concluding chapter of the book, indicates the standpoint from which it is written.

Actually, the Author starts with a very able and penetrating analysis of the current conception of human life which must be adequately grasped if the neglect of prayer, worship and religion in general is to be understood. "The characteristic social development of modern times", he writes "is the amorphous soulless city" when "people have no time or opportunity to take rest . . . and to build around them the network of customs and institutions and obligations which makes a community". Hence "it is almost impossibly difficult to live the life of common prayer, which . . . is the only full and truly satisfying life of prayer."

In an important chapter on "The Dimension in which Prayer exists", he has much that is valuable to say about personal relationships, that "encounter of our personal will with another, the stuff out of which our most significant experiences are formed". Thus the whole texture of modern life militates against the basic conception of Christian prayer as a relationship expressed between God the supreme person and ourselves as subordinate subjects. Because "the one thing 'mass man' flees from is a genuine personal relationship, because that involves responsibility and decision, assuming the burden of attaining unto the fullness of the stature of manhood and taking action in freedom." And he ends the chapter by remarking that "We must become new creatures before we can pray aright."

These quotations serve to show the profound treatment accorded to the subject. This is not a devotional book, but it is just the book that was needed at the present moment. Perhaps the most vital part of it is the chapter in which the Author stresses the importance of prayer in the Church. "The modern idea that prayer is, in effect, simply a matter between the individual soul and God and that it can exist quite adequately independently of the believing community would have been completely unintelligible to a Biblical Christian, who accepted as axiomatic the "corporate personality" of the New Israel in Jesus Christ".

This is surely something which needs emphasis at the present time. It is bound up with the Highpriesthood of Christ, who is our representative before God not so much as individuals in isolation, but as members of the redeemed community, the Church of God—one idea adumbrated in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

We hope this work, small as it is, will be widely read and fostered, for it has much to say that Christians of this generation need to heed.

CLIFFORD J. OFFER.

JESUS CHRIST THE TEACHER.

By Prof. W. A. Curtis. pp. 259. 10/6 net. Oxford University Press.

A book on the teaching of Jesus designed apparently more for the educated layman than the theological expert is certainly sure of a welcome, especially if it combines, as in this case, real scholarship with a capacity for popular exposition. These lectures were delivered in a Scottish parish church in Edinburgh on the Croall Foundation and it is one of the conditions of the lectureship that it should be delivered to the general public. And in this case the listeners were particularly fortunate. Dr. Curtis gives of his best and we have a most useful exposition of our Lord's teaching as a result. The sub-title describes its scope: "A study of His method and message based mainly on the earlier gospels."

The writer divides his work into three parts. Part I. is concerned with The Teacher at Work. Part II. with Themes of the Teaching, and Part III. with The Teaching and the Church. In the first part he deals with what might be termed preliminaries necessary to a proper understanding of our Lord's words. This part will be of real value to preachers and teachers. He describes with great fullness the social and political forces and the various sections of the population amongst whom our Lord moved. He portrays very vividly the world in which He taught, the methods He used and the people He met. All of which form a valuable introduction to the sections which follow.

Quite early in the book the Author stresses the importance of the words of Jesus. "No doctrine," he writes, "concerning Him which fails to take full account of the things He said Himself can satisfy Christian faith. It is still true that His words do not 'pass away' that they are 'spirit and life' and that to hear them and obey them is to build on everlasting rock."

He shows Christ's special liking for the book of Deuteronomy, Isaiah and the Psalms. He has some interesting comments to make as on p. 63: "There is indeed more than a touch of irony in the witness of history that Peter, the chosen patron of the Roman Catholic Church which came in time to insist on the celibacy of the priesthood, was a married man, and that Paul, the chosen patron of the Reformed and Evangelical Church, which claimed liberty from the first for its minister to marry, was a celibate!"

The Author has also some very good things to say, of special value to teachers, on the various literary artifices used by our Lord, such as parable, proverb, hyperbole and paradox. On the last two he has some interesting comments: "If paradox daringly affirms what is apparently self-contradictory, hyperbole in the same spirit ventures to state what is apparently impossible or incredible or unnatural. It does not so much distort truth as overstate it, heightening its form in order to impress dull vision with its existence, and challenging even the slowest understanding by its manifest disproportion, so that, in the recoil or reaction under the shock of surprise, its sober and essential meaning is both recognised and remembered." He quotes a number of examples to illustrate this. And with regard to what he has to say about parables, we would like to draw particular attention to his remarks on that one so difficult to interpret, The Parable of the Labourers.

In the second part, Dr. Curtis draws out with unerring instinct the main theme embodied in the teaching of our Lord and he has much to say that will help greatly in a better understanding of the mind of the Master. The third part is much shorter and perhaps in some ways the least interesting.

This book challenges comparison if only by virtue of its tilts with Prof. T. W. Manson's great work, "The Teaching of Jesus". But in reality the two cannot be compared. Prof. Manson's book is a really great work of a highly technical character dealing with many problems presented by modern historical and critical research. Here we have a book of a totally different character and far less ambitious. Its main task is to expound the teaching of Jesus exactly as it is preserved for us in the Synoptic Gospels. There is plenty of scholarship in the background to which the book pays indirect tribute. But its main purpose makes it all the more valuable both for those who have to teach themselves as well as those who only want to learn. That is why we particularly welcome the appearance of this most interesting book.

CLIFFORD J. OFFER.

DISPENSATION IN PRACTICE AND THEORY.

S.P.C.K. 7/6 net.

This is the Report of a Commission on this subject, 'with reference to the Anglican Churches', appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1935. It

was drawn up in March, 1942 but not published till this year. The Chairman was Bishop E. J. Palmer and he was assisted by nine other members, one of whom, Bishop Talbot, resigned in 1938 and another, Professor Gavin of New York, died in that year. The Bishop of Oxford, in a short Minority Report, explains why he is unable to sign the General Report while Canon Sparrow Simpson, in Minority Report 2, gives a lengthy criticism of it mainly on doctrinal disciplinary grounds.

The Majority Report is therefore sponsored by Bishop Palmer, Mrs. E. L. Howse, Canon W. L. Knox, Dr. A. J. Macdonald, Rev. R. C. Mortimer and Dr. H. B. Vaisey—a fairly representative body although it only includes one who can definitely be classed as an Evangelical. The Report is prefaced by a most instructive 'Historical Introduction' which should prove a valuable short research study on the origin and development of Dispensations in the Western and Eastern Churches. Mr. Mortimer deals with the Western Church from Patristic times and adds a short note on the post-Tridentine and post-Reformation periods. Then follows a well condensed summary on 'Economy', as practised in the Orthodox Church, which is extracted from a long Essay by Professor H. S. Alivisatos of Athens University. A third Part deals in short outline with the 'Law and Practice of Dispensations at present obtaining in the Anglican Churches.' There are six Appendices, one quoting in full the relevant Acts of Henry VIII on the subject. This is followed by 'Historical Notes on the Working of Ecclesiastical Discipline,' by Bishop Frere, 'Dispensations in the Old Catholic System', and Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 on the subject of Intercommunion.

Mr. Mortimer shows that, in the early centuries, the Bishops claimed the sole right of dispensing until the Synods challenged it, and then shared it with them during the first 10 centuries, often without regard to the Pope who claimed to be 'guardian of the Canons' and who increasingly usurped fresh powers and gradually exercised them unchallenged. These Dispensations were regarded as only temporary expedients for the common good of the Church and did not revoke the Church law or ancient custom, and for many centuries the *private good* of the individual was not regarded as justifying dispensation. Gratian in his *Decretum* declared that all laws, for private as well as public good, were dispensable, except those of Natural Law and Apostolic Ordinances and the first Four General Councils. It was soon held that the Pope, as being above the law, could dispense even an Apostolic rule because he had "greater authority than an Apostle." "The Pope can dispense in anything provided it is not against the Faith and will not clearly give rise to mortal sin."

Mr. Mortimer notices the serious abuse and the 'excessive number' of Dispensations in the later Middle Ages when they were often indiscriminately granted for purely financial reasons. When we recall the grave mediæval abuses connected with Dispensations, and their corollary, Indulgences, we have great sympathy with an Overseas Metropolitan, at the Lambeth Conference of 1920, who declared "We in our Province greatly object to dispensation. We will have nothing to do with it." But this adverse view is based on an erroneous limitation of the word 'dispensation' to an easy treatment of sin for some 'consideration', e.g., the granting of a special relaxation of the marriage law to some highly privileged person. The Church is a large organised corporate Body and it must possess certain general laws and regulations which often bear hardly on particular cases and therefore are better on occasions to be relaxed or 'dispensed' by some recognised Authority. There are also minor technical disciplinary questions where the exercise of Dispensation is beneficial, such as temporary non-residence of the Incumbent, pluralities, the ordination of illegitimates, or the grant of Communion to an 'innocent party' re-married divorcée. These and kindred questions are very carefully considered by the Report and it wisely concludes that cases of Dispensation should be reduced to a minimum, since it recognises that Dispensation "is a wound inflicted on the law."

With regard to the difficult question of the proper authority to grant Dispensations, the Report urges that the Bishops should employ "Synodical Action" and it seems to advocate the Lambeth Conference as a final Appellate Authority. But as Dispensation is often concerned with matters of doctrine, such a final appeal would be contrary to the clear declarations of the first two Archbishops who summoned these Œcumenical Assemblies. For they expressly disclaimed the right of the Conference "to make declarations or lay down definitions on points of doctrine." And the Majority Report recognizes that the Lambeth Conference is now merely a wide Consultative advisory Body of the

Anglican Communion (p.83). It is not a properly constituted Authoritarian Assembly, and it has therefore no legal power to make binding 'Determinations' or to issue Dispensations concerning any member, clerical or lay, of an autonomous Church represented at it. Thus Resolution 42 of the last Conference on Intercommunion, quoted in this Report, although commanding the respectful consideration of all Anglicans, cannot bind an English clergyman in the way he is bound by his 'Declaration of Assent' or by any special rubric of the Prayer Book.

We are glad to see that Mr. Mortimer and the Majority Report recognise that much of the old pre-Reformation Canon Law is now obsolete and cannot be enforced. Indeed some of it is directly prohibited by the Act for Submission of the Clergy, 1534—"where it is contrariant or repugnant to the existing laws and Statutes of the realm." For instance, neither an individual bishop nor Convocation can now legally dispense the clear rubric against Reservation, because the Act of Uniformity, 1559 (included by the 1662 Revisers as the first item in their new Prayer Book), forbids under heavy penalties any Minister to use 'any other rite or ceremony in celebrating the Lord's Supper that is mentioned and set forth in the Prayer Book.' The Report laments this limitation of Dispensation where 'it is incompatible with existing Statute law' (155).

In dealing with Dispensations touching Sacramental doctrine the Report fairly states the differing views now held by churchmen, and it frankly admits that our "Articles are so phrased that they neither condemn the presbyterian Continental Churches, nor suggest that they had no ministry or sacraments because they had no episcopally ordained ministers" (121). On the other hand the Report suggests that a United Communion Service celebrated by a non-episcopal minister might be permitted if regarded as merely an *Agapé* and not a Eucharist" (123). There is also a misleading statement affirming that lately there has been "a considerable approximation in doctrine" with the English Dissenters. For even the early Separatists, as their Pastor, John Robinson, declared, agreed to the Anglican Confession of Faith,—'and to every Article thereof, we with the Reformed Churches do assent wholly.' Richard Baxter had no quarrel "with the doctrines of the Prayer Book," and in compliance with the Toleration Act Nonconformist ministers willingly signed the doctrinal Articles of the Church of England. Neither can we regard, as the Report does, Free Churchmen as those "who have severed themselves from the body of the Church" (123). For "there is one Body" and by one Spirit we are all baptized into the Church "which is His Body." There are also, I hope, few Evangelicals who could accept the bald unqualified statement that "our spiritual life has come to us through the Church" (150).

The Report concludes with the Commission's twelve "Recommendations," including first of all the "revival or extension of the practice of Dispensation." They cover a very wide ground of Church law and practice and involve some highly contentious questions concerning organisation and doctrine, which would considerably increase the powers of the Bishops and Synods and correspondingly, limit the independent judgments and actions of the clergy. A long "Table" is given, of subjects in which Dispensations might be granted, covering the clergy, the laity, and controversial subjects touching doctrine. A Resolution of the Synod is to decide such disputed questions. Thus even in the official interpretation of a rubric the granting or refusal of a dispensation might well change or reverse what hitherto had been regarded as the accepted doctrine or practice of the Church. Such "new doctrine" might easily narrow the prized comprehensiveness of our Church, and even outrage the conscientious convictions of a section of the clergy who are now only bound by their "Declaration of Assent" to doctrine "set forth" in the Prayer Book and Articles. For instance, one subject suggested for the Bishop's dispensation "under a Canon," is "Admission to Communion of the unconfirmed" (164). This would at once conflict with the existing Confirmation rubric which allows those "desirous to be confirmed" to communicate, but it would probably bar the "Table" to the nonconformist "guest," although this rubric, as the Archbishop's Kikuyu Judgment declared, was designed "for the guidance of Churchpeople" and not for those who were not her children.

Dr. Sparrow Simpson in his Minority Report objects to the Commission's treatment of Sacramental doctrines. He condemns their indefinite statements concerning what constitutes a valid Eucharist. Regarding all non-episcopal

ministers as mere laymen, he insists that Apostolic teaching and tradition forbids an unordained layman to celebrate the Eucharist. Disregarding the fact that, in early times the 'successors' of the Apostles were sometimes presbyters and not bishops, as in the early Corinthian and Alexandrian Churches, he stoutly maintains that there can be no valid Eucharist without a priest, and he affirms that this has always been the teaching of our Church, although even Bishop Gore candidly admitted "that the Church of England imposes upon the clergy no obligation to hold the dogma that only episcopal ordinations are valid, and only priestly consecrations of the Eucharist, and that Bishops are of the *esse* of the Church." But Canon Simpson goes even further and, in spite of much clear evidence to the contrary from leading Churchmen like Cranmer, Jewel, Parker, Grindal and Whitgift, he actually asserts that his rigid theory of Apostolic Succession was held by "our Fathers of the Reformation." He thus ignores Keble's well known contradiction of such a misrepresentation of their views. While rightly insisting that the Faith of the Church must be ascertained from its own official declarations, Canon Sparrow Simpson then ignores Canon 55 of 1603, which *officially* includes the Scotch Presbyterian Church "as a branch of the Holy Catholic Church." He also conveniently forgets that in 1610 and 1662, the Scotch Church recognised the validity of a presbyterianly celebrated Eucharist by allowing the existing presbyterian ministers to retain their cures. By an amazing misreading of the rubric for "Spiritual Communion" for any "in extremity of sickness," Dr. Simpson declares that in *this* rubric "the Church directs what is to be done if a priest cannot be obtained to consecrate the Eucharist" and also "forbids its celebration in his absence." But the rubric contains no such "direction," because it speaks not of the priest's "absence," but of his presence at the bedside of the dying person and instructs him how to comfort the sick man with the teaching of "spiritual communion," if by reason of "extremity of sickness" he is unable to receive the sacrament.

As attempts will almost certainly be made to carry out at least the chief Recommendations of this Report, it is most important that all clergy should study it very carefully and thus be able to estimate the wisdom of disturbing the peace of the Church by some of its questionable or even dangerous proposals.

C. SYDNEY CARTER.

THE READING OF THE BIBLE: AS HISTORY, AS LITERATURE, AND AS RELIGION.

By Sir Frederic Kenyon, G.B.E., K.C.B., F.B.A., F.S.A. John Murray. 4/6.

Following an introductory chapter on "Principles of Bible Study", Sir Frederic Kenyon discusses, in three other chapters, the three main branches of his subject as expressed in the sub-title given above. His standpoint is frankly that of modern criticism in general, though he gives several warnings as to the lack of finality and permanence in many of its conclusions; and he adopts the now familiar thesis that the modern outlook in no way affects the literary and spiritual value of the Bible, but even enhances it.

Sir Frederic has useful things to say on some points of detail—*e.g.*, the authorship of St. John's Gospel, the authenticity of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and the use and limitations of modern translations of the Scriptures. A paragraph in which he trounces those who denounce "dogma" is also very welcome. It is interesting to note that he has no opinion of the likelihood of permanence in the "form-history" theory regarding the Gospels. But in various other matters he lays himself open to obvious retorts. In a collection of alleged "errors" in Old Testament narratives, early in the book, there is no recognition of the quite reasonable explanations that have been offered in the cases named, and, though the author does speak of our dependence on copied manuscripts, no clear distinction is drawn between supposed errors in original statement and errors of copyists in transcription. In the opinion of many good judges, and on very high spiritual grounds, it will be contended that comparisons with the growth of scientific knowledge, or with the transmission of ancient literature in general, are essentially fallacious. Nor does the undoubted progress in revelation which is traceable in Holy Scripture afford any ground for supposedly progressive (or should we not rather say retrogressive?) theories as to the accuracy or authority of any parts of Divine revelation. The two things are quite different.

Again, it is strange to read that in the time of Jacob there was "no conception as yet of a God Who is the King of all the earth," when Abraham knew, at a still

earlier date, that Jehovah was "the Judge of all the earth"; it is also said that even in the days of Solomon "the conception that He is the one God of all the earth has not yet been reached." Evidence against this seems simply to be ignored, or swept aside by mere acceptance of critical assumptions that are widely challenged. If Amos was the first to give a "a call to a more spiritual form of religion than the conventional ritual of sacrifices," what are we to say of the deeply spiritual utterances in the Psalms of David, not to speak of the many other evidences in the same direction? Such matters are not disposed of by a general reference to the uncertainty of the date of "many" of the Psalms.

Happily, there is in Sir Frederic Kenyon's treatment of his subject none of the attitude of intellectual superiority which is so vexatious in some writers; yet a reader not fully acquainted with the points at issue (and presumably, it is chiefly for such that the book was written) might be excused for concluding that no other outlook on Scripture is reasonably possible. There is nothing particularly new in a book which follows a line that has become familiar in present-day literature; but the author's reputation and ability as a writer may make the thesis he adopts seem more plausible in the eyes of readers who have no knowledge of all that has been said, and ably said, on the other side.

Unfortunately for his general thesis that no harm, but rather good, should come of the modern outlook on Holy Scripture, two serious matters need to be pointed out. In the first place, the Incarnate Son of God endorsed what may be called the older view; indeed, He seemed to single out for endorsement, Old Testament personages and incidents which have been special targets of critical attack. After a very careful reading of this book, no single reference to this most vital consideration can be recalled from its pages. One feels disposed to echo the apostolic words, with very slight adaptation of their original use, "Let God be true, and every man a liar."

In the second place, we have our Lord's own test for false prophets, "By their fruits ye shall know them." It may sound very well to argue that the modern outlook on Holy Scripture *need not* affect its value, or *ought* to enhance it: but it is plain for all to see that in the eyes of the general public it *has done* the former and *has not done* the latter. Hence, very largely (whatever other causes have operated), the neglect of the Bible which undoubtedly Sir Frederic himself deplores as much as we do.

W. S. HOOTON.

THE THRILL OF TRADITION.

James Moffatt. S.C.M. 7/6. 190pp.

The Thrill of Tradition is the title given by Dr. Moffatt to the published form of some lectures recently delivered in the University of Virginia, under the James W. Richards foundation. They contain an immense number of quotations and references to the subject of tradition in all its shapes and forms, together with the author's reflexions and moralisings suggested by them. The field covered is so wide that it might almost seem as if hours had been spent in some great library, culling a sentence here and a phrase there which had any sort of bearing upon the subject. Euripides and other Greek classics, Muslim and Jewish writers, Dante, little known Elizabethan poets, early fathers and French moralists, all supply grist to his mill.

As Plato used the word, tradition or *paradosis* meant oral instruction or the delivery of a discourse, whilst Bacon defined it as "expressing or transferring our knowledge to others." So Dr. Moffatt roams over the whole field of literature, ancient and modern, commenting upon whatever can be included in this term, customs secular and religious, the phrasing of prayers, the traditions of religion, or science, or music or the stage.

Three chapters are devoted to the rise of Christianity and the handing down of the Message until it took shape in the books of the New Testament. He remarks that great literatures commonly follow in the wake of great movements, and instances the age of Pericles in Greece, of Augustus in Rome, of Louis Quatorze in France, and the Elizabethan period in England. But in contrast with these, the great Deliverance which the New Testament writers commemorate "was in a sphere without frontiers or capital. It was historical, but neither political nor national; the thrill of it was for the wide world, for men of every tribe and tongue."

Another chapter entitled "The New Trent Religion" is devoted to the place of tradition in the Roman Church, as it led up to the decrees of the Council of

Trent, and the reactions to which they gave rise in English and Continental writers on to the time of Cardinal Newman.

Dr. Moffatt in these lectures does not set out to establish a series of definite conclusions, but, like a bee flitting from flower to flower, he quotes one writer or group of writers after another, and from them sucks the honey of his own criticisms and reflexions by the way. Yet here and there, his own thoughts are expressed in quite definite form. For him life is more important than truth itself; God's object in revelation "was not to impart information about any object, not even about Himself," but that His Will might be done upon earth. "The vital traditions of the faith—become a handicap rather than a help if they are left alone. To grow and glow, they require loyalty; and loyalty implies a mind open to the ends which dogmas and traditions are designed to serve."

He quotes with approval Lessing's criticism of Luther, that he freed men from the yoke of tradition but subjected them to the bondage of the letter; yet whilst criticising traditionalists who hinder freedom of thought, he would sooner have them than those pioneers who "kick up the dust of self-importance as they scurry here and there to improvise a better order of things." The value of tradition is found in the continuity of Christian teaching and worship, and this not only in great cathedrals, but in humble chapels and meeting-houses over the country-side, "for there the continuity of the real catholic tradition is verified, although most of the members would shrink from what is supposed to be meant by 'catholic'."

The author's view of inspiration is kept in the background, though a phrase here and there suggests a critical, rather than a conservative outlook. To those who enjoy a polished literary style, shrewd observations and a wide sweep of allusion, this volume will make a great appeal, and it will provide ample food for thought to every careful and interested reader. G.T.M.

"LIGHT OF CHRIST."

By Evelyn Underhill. Longmans. 5/-.

The late Evelyn Underhill had many admirers and disciples. Fine Christian as she was, her writings reveal in so many subtle ways the mysticism which was an essential part of her devotional life. This element was blended with a practical common-sense view of life, and a sense of humour as mischievous and disarming as that of any healthy boy.

This present book is in three parts. The main, central part consists of a series of addresses given by Miss Underhill at The House of Retreat, Pleshey, in May, 1932. The first part is a memoir of the authoress by Lucy Menzies who was Warden at Pleshey when Miss Underhill gave most of her retreats there. The last part, almost in the form of an appendix, and which possibly would best have served its 'purpose had it appeared after the memoir, is an address given by Miss Underhill at the 1932 Annual Meeting of the Association for Promoting Retreats.

The author of the memoir, who has also edited the addresses, gives a satisfying pen portrait of Miss Underhill, revealing her Christian life under varying conditions; its deep spirituality and its rich humanity. Von Hügel's influence, so clearly noticed in the addresses, is plainly stated. Miss Underhill's rather exacting demands made on the retreatants is not minimised, her mysticism is revealed, and her dependence upon prayer is shown. Her health was evidently not robust, for she suffered from asthma. Yet she had a "capacity for moving easily between the homely and the transcendental, the natural and supernatural levels run right through her life, conversation and teaching too, sometimes appearing with disconcerting effect." (p. 20).

The addresses are based on the life of our Lord and its meaning for men. The first talk is preparatory, and then follows in succession, considerations of Christ's Incarnation and Childhood, His teaching, works of Healing and of rescue, His Cross, and His glorified life. Whilst the approach to the subject would not be exactly that of an Evangelical, there is much in these addresses for which he will be thankful. Lessons are repeatedly thrust home by some arresting saying. Three quotations will illustrate this point. "There is no need for peculiar conditions in the spiritual life;" "In one way or another, we are all pupil teachers, working for love;" "Never hoard the spiritual treasure! Give all the time! That principle runs through Christ's life." Of the Cross and the

Sacraments she says: "The Cross and the Sacraments cannot be separated in the Christian's thought of Christ. Only the utterly self-given is able to give supernatural cleansing and supernatural food." (p.87). The addresses seem to lead up to the challenge on p.93: "Our religion is not a refuge from Reality, it is a demand that we face Reality with all its difficulties, opportunities, implications; that we face God and His whole mysterious purpose and our own solemn responsibility to Him."

The last chapter, the address on retreats, is a splendid justification of times of withdrawal, which are described as bits of "spiritual welfare work," having in view the objective of "the production, fostering, and maintaining of holiness."

E.H.

FROM JESUS TO PAUL.

By Joseph Klausner, Ph.D. Allen and Unwin Ltd. (624 pp., Price 15/-).

Any attempt, favourable or hostile, to explain the rise and early growth of Christianity must pay supreme attention to Jesus and Paul as the directive influences. In an earlier work Dr. Klausner was concerned with Him whom Christians call Lord and God and Who, therefore was, in their view, the creative personality. In undertaking his present study he summarises briefly the position adopted as to Jesus in the earlier volume. "It did not even enter into the mind of Jesus to form a new religion and proclaim it outside the Jewish nation." A new religion did, however, in fact emerge, and that is attributed, "*au fond*" to external factors—particularly, the dispersion of the Jews outside of Palestine, the spiritual conditions among the Gentiles at that time, the Hellenistic Jewish culture of the non-Palestinian Jews in those days—and so far as Jesus Himself is concerned, to the extremism of His claim to the relations between Himself and God and to such an "extreme emphasis on ethics" as inspired a new movement with some, at least, of the qualities of a new religion.

No one who believes himself in spiritual descent from the specific experience and outlook of the New Testament can, of course, accept this as an adequate interpretation of the significant facts. He will, however, be disposed to examine it with sympathetic seriousness—and to ask how, on this hypothesis, can Christianity have become the distinctive thing that it did actually become. Dr. Klausner fully appreciates the reasonableness of this rejoinder to his estimate of the person and influence of Jesus,—hence this second volume. Its basic position and claim may be quoted in the form of a simple statement which occurs early in chapter one of its 'sixth book'. "Saul was the real founder of Christianity as a new religion and a new church after it had been in existence for some years as a Jewish sect and Israelite congregation alone." That, at any rate, is to take Saul seriously, for which even a Christian may well be grateful, since it has resulted in a detailed and fascinating and provocative study of one whom Dr. Klausner counts even more important, if less laudable, than does the average Christian!

From a practical point of view the argument of any work of front-rank scholarship—and "From Jesus to Paul" is unquestionably in this class—is vastly more important than its conclusions. These last the intelligent reader can accept, modify, or reject, by virtue of the judgments to which he feels himself led. We are far from accepting the most thoughtful, as also a critical, investigation of them. Almost exactly half of the book has the nature of background studies. The stage upon which Saul of Tarsus is to step is elaborately furnished by reference to the World empire of Rome, the religious syncretism of the period, and, more particularly, such distinctive literature as the Sybilline Oracles and the work of Philo. If the reader seeks detail as to the political, intellectual and religious forces which were dominant in the Mediterranean world of the First Century, A.D., he will find it in plenty. He will also learn, perhaps more clearly than ever before, how inevitable it was that the human agents by whom the Gospel was first proclaimed, and the Church first established, should be in part conditioned by their complex environment. We have not outgrown the need of this kind of reminder, and we gladly recognise the ability and insight of Dr. Klausner in helping us to be historical and realist where we are too often prone to be merely pious and sentimental. But, as so often happens in those who administer our correctives, he is betrayed into claiming too much. Not even his own evidence can support the weight of his really important conclusions. We quote two of them by way of example. "Christianity . . . borrowed many . . . things from Philo. For example, the idea of grace, any number of ethical opinions,

and the like." "The secret of his (Paul's) success is that he made use in large measure of those weapons which a paganism anxious for the salvation of the individual placed in his hands; and he added to them the ethical demands, the ways of salvation, and the irreconcilability with other religions which Judaism gave him." If this is the whole truth it would seem strange that the influence of Jesus and of Paul has proved so persistent that Dr. Klausner has found it necessary, or at least worth-while, to devote to each of them a volume of monumental scholarship and thoroughness!

Detailed appraisal of "From Jesus to Paul" would far outstretch the most liberal limits set for a book review. Two further points of a general nature are, therefore, the most that we can attempt. The first is "appreciative," the second more "critical," in the popular sense attached to these words.

The "Fourth Book" of this volume is given over to a thoughtful study of the New Testament Literature relevant for our understanding of Paul,—the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles. The writer's attitude is that of one concerned with criticism that seeks to be objective, impartial, and not unsympathetic. In his treatment of the Acts he discusses the significance of the well-known "we" passages, the possibility that St. Luke was acquainted with the Pauline letters and the Antiquities of Josephus, and the probable date of the work. He inclines to the view that "Luke drew his historical items from the Antiquities, but did with this book what he was accustomed to do with the Epistles of Paul; that is to say, he made use of it from memory without the exactness characteristic of scholars." For this and other reasons he is of the opinion that the probable date of the Acts is about 94-96 and that it "was published after the death of its author as a book which the author began but never finished." It is interesting to note that Dr. Klausner is more conservative than have been some Christian critics with regard to the Pauline authorship of the Epistles, attributed to him, for although he concludes that "the *basic content* of the Pastoral Epistles indicates a time later than the sixties of the first century" he comes down definitely on the side of the Pauline authorship of 'Ephesians'. He has a useful comment on the limitations of the "critical and analytical study" of literature. "Much caution is needed here. It must always be remembered that a man, and especially a great man, is not such a simple and easily understandable organism. He is not always unified and constant, nor do his occasional outward expressions always correspond to the *totality* of his nature, which we learn by continuous and more general observations." Had this wise *caviat* been more frequently kept in mind some of our more "assured" judgments would have been less boldly and confidently asserted!

The closing 'Book' attempts a systematic examination of Paul's teaching, and is amazingly thorough in its scope and detail. It makes heavy demands upon patience and perseverance, but they will be well rewarded. Nevertheless, gratitude will not blind the reader to the fact that the author is too far outside the essential experience of Paul to be fair in his personal judgments on one who was human enough to provide a wide target for criticism. He allows, indeed, that "Paul was a mystic and a man of profound religious insight," but the determinative judgment of him is that he was also, and more characteristically, a master of compromise and the typical "clever politician." He sees in Paul a responsible agent of antinomianism and, rejecting alike his experience and his interpretation of Jesus, never comes to real grips either with his theology or with his ethics. Speaking for himself and his fellow Jews he says, "We know how to appreciate all the lofty ideas and beautiful sayings of Paul; but we cannot accept his phantasms or the asceticism and the pessimism in his Epistles." The derogatory words are an index of the inability of Dr. Klausner to evaluate the distinctively Pauline teaching. They are also a symptom of the inherent weakness of what is, in many other respects, a really great work and one that is of special importance and value for Christians who would see themselves as others see them.

T. W. ISHERWOOD.