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

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

The Churchman Advertiser.

JANUARY, 1925.

Spanish & Portuguese Church Aid Society,

CHURCH HOUSE, DEAN'S YARD, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1

President . . . Right Rev. Bishop Ingham, D.D.
Chairman of Committee . . . William McCall, Esq.

THE SPANISH & PORTUGUESE CHURCH-AID SOCIETY endeavours to help the work of the native Evangelical Churches, whose members are unable to accept the unlawful terms of Communion imposed by the Church of Rome. Their work is self-denying and progressive. In town and country they have congregations and schools, and conduct Mission Services. Never at any time were the countries so open to their efforts, and they report sympathy where they formerly met open opposition and persecution. Spain and Portugal were for centuries closed to the circulation of the Scriptures. Through the influence of the printed page and faithful Evangelistic efforts the Churches have come into existence, and all who have visited them testify to their zeal and devotion.

CONTRIBUTIONS, which are urgently needed, will be gratefully received by the Rev. C. F. FISON, M.A., Hon. Finance Secretary; or by the Rev. THOS. J. PULVERTAFT, Editorial and Consulting Sec., Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.1.

CONTENTS.

THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1925

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Autumn Session of the House of Clergy.

AT the session held in November the House of Clergy resumed their consideration of the Prayer Book revision proposals. Some of the Occasional offices were under review. Popular interest in the revision seems to be more centred on the proposed changes in these, than on the larger issues involved in the more serious alterations in the Communion Service. The creation of a loophole for the introduction of the doctrine of the Mass is a far more important matter than any of the changes suggested in the Baptismal or Marriage services, yet the secular press devoted much more attention to the retention or omission of the word "obey" in the latter.

The course of the discussion in the House at this session has deepened the widespread regret that a subject so important and far-reaching in its results as Prayer Book revision should have come up at such an early stage in the history of the Church Assembly. The debates gave an impression of want of proportion. There seemed to be considerable difficulty among the members themselves to understand the course of procedure. To the casual visitor in the gallery the gathering had an air of ineffectiveness, and he might well be pardoned for thinking that the members did not realise that they were engaged in legislating for the great historic Church of England.

A Want of Sense of Proportion.

When the discussion came down to some of the smaller points in the services, it was possible to understand the somewhat vigor-

ously expressed indignation of the writer of a letter to *The Times* who said, " I speak for many laymen and clerics when I say how very puerile and futile are these discussions in the Church Assembly on chrism and chrisom, and candles and the duty of obedience in a wife. When there are really important and live questions before the Church, such as reunion, Prayer Book revision, Church schools, etc., which are not yet settled (one wonders if they ever will be !). To debate such tomfool puerilities, and whether a wife shall perjure herself by promising to obey her husband, does seem to us a wicked waste of time. . . . No wonder laymen, and a few sensible clergy, lose heart and patience and despair of the Church of England."

When the demand is ever growing more persistent that the Church shall recognise its great mission and " get on with its work " it certainly appears to indicate an incomprehensible lack of the sense of proportion to find some of the ablest intellects and busiest men engaged in efforts of amazing ingenuity to put forward reasons for the adoption of practices that will not help to win a single soul for Christ, or strengthen and deepen the faith of believers, or build up their spiritual life. We often hear complaints of controversy being carried on while the great realities are neglected. Those who occupy the time of the Houses of the Church Assembly with these proposals show a deplorable example.

Uncertainty and Confusion.

At the outset the Chairman had to remind the House that they were discussing N.A. 84, and that there were some 200 amendments to be dealt with. He referred to the multiplicity of books—Grey, Green, Orange, etc., before them. To these another was added—a Blue Book apparently containing some compromise adopted in the Jerusalem Chamber with regard to the Baptismal service. There were also some papers referred to as Clergy 1, 2 and 3, and some reports from the House of Laity were expected. We may be pardoned for observing that this confusing complexity of documents seems to indicate some want of business capacity and good management somewhere. The Chairman also stated that provision was made in the measure for the House of Bishops and the Convocations to issue from time to time supplementary services. The uncertainty, confusion and vacillation apparent in these

matters seem to indicate that even at this late hour it would be better for the Church if the whole scheme were dropped. In view of the want of permanency in the revision, the prospect of minor changes being constantly brought forward, and this newly indicated power of the Bishops to authorize additional services, together with the total absence of any guarantee that obedience can be secured to the Prayer Book or its numerous alternative forms, many are seriously asking if it would not be well for the Bishops to postpone the whole scheme, or failing that, if it would not be advisable for Church people to appeal to Parliament to reject the measure.

"Dumb and Dark Ceremonies."

When the Baptismal office came up for consideration some hoped that a shortened form would be adopted for use in the course of Morning or Evening Prayer, but the proposals were of quite a different character. The chief point of interest seems to have been the adoption of the ceremonies of anointing the child, of the putting on the child of the chrisom after reception, the priest saying, "Take this white vesture for a token of the innocency given unto thee," etc., and also the presentation of a lighted candle either to the child or the godfather, the priest saying, "Receive the light of Christ, that when the bridegroom cometh thou mayest go forth with all the saints to meet Him," etc. One of the speakers described these as "dumb and dark ceremonies" in spite of the lighted candle. He pointed out that these had once been in use in the Church but had been deliberately rejected by our forefathers. The general wish we believe was that the Baptismal service should be simplified and made more intelligible to the mass of the people. These innovations would on the contrary render it less intelligible and would add an undesirable element of "fussiness." We are told that the purpose of their introduction is to add dignity to the service. Even the *Guardian* speaks of the acceptance of the chrisom and lighted candle (the chrism was rejected) as due to a desire to add importance to the service. It is difficult to understand how they will do so. Any one who has been present at a baptism in a Roman Catholic Church in Italy will smile at the idea of dignity and importance being added to the service by the chrisom and the lighted candle.

The Dignified Simplicity of our Services.

To witness such ceremonies leads to a greater appreciation of the simplicity and dignity of the services of our own Communion. One result of the decision in the House of Clergy has been to arouse a sense of merriment and ridicule at their expense. Some of the comments expressed in lay circles, and in the secular press, were not flattering to the intelligence or sense of humour of that body, while others feel that this is another step in that rapidly developing process of driving wedges between the Church and the people of England, with the exception perhaps of the ecclesiastically-minded layman. The House very wisely rejected the proposal to follow the example of the Roman Church in anointing the candidates at Confirmation.

It would be well to take note of the recent statement of the Bishop of Coventry that " there is a real danger that the practice as well as the Liturgy of the Church might be fundamentally altered in a way which did not commend itself to the vast majority of the clergy and laity. The clergy should be certain that they were following not some fashion of the hour, but customs which held a great Catholic tradition, and which could be justified from the Scriptures." By Catholic tradition we are sure that the Bishop did not mean Roman Catholic. This is clear from his requirement that they could be justified from the Scriptures. That is the principle our Church has asserted since the time of the Reformation.

The Marriage Service.

In the discussion on the Marriage service a considerable amount of time was spent over the proposal to change the question addressed to the woman from " Wilt thou obey him and serve him " into " Wilt thou love him and comfort him." It was also proposed to change " love, cherish and obey " into " love, cherish and serve." The former was rejected by 100 votes to 69, and the latter after a recount (another instance of the peculiar methods of the house) was accepted by 86 to 78. There is no doubt that the omission of the word " obey " would have been generally acceptable. Some of the arguments advanced for its retention appeared to indicate that the speakers were completely out of touch with the actualities of life. The refusal to alter the phrase " with all my worldly goods I thee endow " seems to indicate the same want of touch with

reality. The harmless practice frequently adopted now of the woman giving a ring to the man was also forbidden. In these as in so many other matters the House of Clergy seems out of touch with the general feeling of the people. The opinion of some student of the liturgies or practices of any century between the sixth and the sixteenth seems to have more weight with them than the consideration of the practical needs and the outlook of the people of England in the twentieth century. Yet one of the first principles of the Revision of the Prayer Book when the scheme was proposed eighteen years ago was its adaptation to the life of to-day.

Reservation of the Elements Sanctioned.

One of the most important decisions was in regard to the Reservation of the Elements in the Communion Service for the use of the sick. The rubrics were so drawn as to permit first of the elements being taken on the same day to the sick, and secondly of the elements being reserved in the Church for use at some subsequent time. There were many, including some among the Evangelical members of the House, who were prepared to support the first of these proposals. They felt however that it would be impossible to support the second, especially after the declaration of Dr. Darwell Stone at the July sessions, that he and his party desired to use the reserved elements for purposes of adoration. Attempts to separate the two proposals were in vain, and the House passed unreservedly the rubrics permitting reservation. This decision with the changes already sanctioned in the Communion Service indicates the most radical change in the teaching and practice of the Church of England yet reached. Even more moderate members of the " Catholic " School recognize the dangers that are connected with the practice, and although in private some of them may express their opposition to it, yet the extremists who advocate such purely Roman observances as the Assumption of the Virgin and Corpus Christi seem to be able to get their own way over their less advanced friends.

Prayers for the Dead.

When the Order for the Burial of the Dead came before the House several significant changes were proposed. It was suggested

that new services should be introduced—" Placebo or Evensong of the Departed and Dirige or Mattins of the Departed." It was not made clear what the nature of these services was to be. The House was told that in consequence of the war an entire change of view had taken place as to prayers for the departed. It is well known that the Church of England has not had public prayers of this character since the Reformation, whatever may have been allowed as to private practice. Such prayers, Bishop Ingham pointed out, had been grievously abused in the past, and with the introduction of Requiem Masses there can be no doubt they will be abused again. If it were only desired that there should be, as one of the speakers suggested, a simple form of commemoration of the faithful departed, no serious objection would be raised, but when Dr. Darwell Stone's proposal was accepted that the Gloria should be omitted after the psalms in the Burial Service and the words substituted " Rest eternal grant unto them, O Lord, and let light perpetual shine upon them " it is clear that we are well on the way to the old abuses that led the Reformers in their wisdom to remove public prayers for the dead from our services. The sanctioned observance of All Souls' Day, which originated in the saying of masses for the souls in torture in purgatory, is an indication of the real significance of this movement.

Favouring the Extremists.

In the absence of the Dean of Westminster, the Dean of York acted as Chairman at these sessions. Two statements from the Chair in the course of the meetings deserve attention. One was in reply to a speaker who indicated that some of the changes proposed went beyond anything that had ever been found in any Anglican Prayer Book, and that the House was creating a serious situation for English religion as it was bolting and barring the door against Home Reunion. He added that " everything the House did seemed to favour the extremists." Many feel that all the changes are in one direction and tend towards one end, yet the Chairman interrupted this speaker to say that " extremism in any form was exactly what the House had endeavoured with considerable success to avoid in all their deliberations." Many will question whether the Dean is the best judge on this point.

The other statement was his declaration, " It was some time

since C.A. 84 was first produced. Many things had happened since then and every day that passed saw a widening knowledge and increasing interest in Church affairs. It would be a misfortune if that House submitted a Revised Prayer Book on the lines of what was required perhaps some years ago instead of to-day." This seems to give weight to our view that there is no finality in this revision. It may be re-opened every few years if in the opinion of a sufficient number in the Church Assembly the lines of a few years past are not sufficiently up to date.

The Finality of the Revision.

This question of the finality of the revision is one that ought to be considered carefully. In the Report of the Committee which drew up N.A. 60 it was stated:

"From what has been said it will be seen that we do not claim finality for our work. Indeed we have clearly indicated that further revision not only may, but will, be needed in the future. But we believe that if legal authority be given to the forms that we submit, time will show which of them really commend themselves to the judgment of the Church at large; and in this manner the way will be prepared for a further revision some years hence, when we hope that greater uniformity of use than seems at present possible may be secured with the general consent of all Church people."

The aim expressed by the compilers of the Green Book should also be noted when they say:

"There is, therefore, in our opinion, no other course open to 'Catholic-minded' members of the Church of England than frankly to resign themselves to an era of liturgical experimentation and 'alternative Rites,' to endure the resulting confusion and discomfort as best they may, and to concentrate their efforts upon securing permission to build up a really august and majestic English Catholic Rite."

We may fairly say that the aim of the extremists is to keep the Prayer Book in the melting-pot until the time is ripe for the exclusion of all but the "really august and majestic English Catholic Rite."

The Presentation of the Bishop Knox Memorial.

Bishop Knox, accompanied by a strong and representative deputation of the signatories, presented the Memorial against changes in the Service of Holy Communion, and against alternative

Communion Services to the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth on November 27.

The Bishop had previously written an introductory letter to His Grace in which he stated the desire of the 305,000 memorialists, and answered objections raised against the form of Petition, its contents and the manner of its promotion. This Letter has been published by Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. (price 3*d*.), and ought to be widely read. It shows that the Memorial refers only to the Holy Communion. It had been represented as an appeal "from the bar of learning to that of ignorance, from sound and well-informed reason to blind prejudice; from sober Churchmanship to intolerant partisanship." Dr. Knox points out that the Memorialists are simply asking for the same decision as the Upper House of Canterbury made ten years ago. No new discoveries in liturgical knowledge have since been made, and the Bishops could not be described as "ignorant and prejudiced partisans." Several other objections are answered with the same effectiveness. The signatories sent in their names in spite of opposition and in some cases of intimidation. This opposition found expression in "Parochial Magazines—in at least one Diocesan Magazine, from Cathedral pulpits, in Diocesan Conferences and even in the Convocation of York."

"Cruel Want of Consideration."

The Memorial, the Letter goes on to say, represented the views of many who had been driven from their Parish Churches by changes "made with cruel want of consideration." The objection to alternative services was fairly and moderately stated. When examined in the light of the New Testament they were found to be less faithful to that standard, and the permission to use them would shatter our Church into narrow groups. They represented divergences on foundation principles. The Tractarians and their successors, in spite of the favour of Prime Ministers and the influence of a section of the Press, have lacked the confidence of the English nation. The Movement has not captured the Church as a whole, nor the people of England. The reason is that it has never been able to persuade the English nation that it expresses quite truthfully the faith and worship of the Book of Common Prayer, or that it is able to set clear limits to its Romeward reaction.

This letter constituted a strong apologia for the Memorial. The first speaker was the Marquis of Lincolnshire, who gave his own experience of the methods used to introduce the Mass. He appointed, on the recommendation of his Bishop, a clergyman to the old Parish Church of an important town. Within a few months Choral Eucharist without communicants was introduced and there was no redress. Lady Leitrim spoke on behalf of the country villages where similar changes were introduced, and the people ceased to attend a worship which they could not comprehend.

Sound Principles of Worship.

Sir William Joynson-Hicks, speaking not as Home Secretary but as a loyal member of the Church, pointed out the grave dangers in the proposals. He feared the disruption of the Church. They were tolerant of many changes, but they were opposed to the Mass, which would be sanctioned under the proposed alternatives, and these would also lead to reservation in the "Tabernacles" for purposes of worship. They appealed to the Bishops as they did not wish the doctrines of the Church to be discussed in Parliament, but they would be bound to fight to the last ditch on behalf of the truth. Bishop Ingham spoke of the effect of the revision upon the Church in the oversea dominions.

The Archbishop in his reply expressed his gratitude for the contribution made by the speakers to the material to be brought before the Bishops. He acknowledged the moderation and reserve with which they had spoken. He assured them that such a representation as they had made would receive the careful consideration of the House of Bishops. He was not in a position to express any opinion as to what the Bishops would do when the matter came before them. The questions at issue touch some of the profoundest elements of the Church's faith. They could rest assured that the Bishops would stand loyally to the distinctive doctrines and the sound principles of worship which characterize and are prized by the Church of England. No more could be expected from the Archbishop at that stage, and it is exceedingly unfair and ungenerous of opponents of the Memorial to seek to minimize the importance of His Grace's reply by saying that it was marked by characteristic reserve and caution. Churchmen will look to the

Bishops to be faithful and fearless in maintaining sound principles of worship.

The Patronage Report.

The second Report of the Committee on Church Patronage has been issued, but the Church Assembly has postponed consideration of it till the Spring Session. The delay is welcome, for the Report bristles with proposals of a highly controversial character, and it is important that Churchpeople should have an opportunity of expressing their views upon it before the Assembly proceeds to deal with it. The first Report recommended the preparation of a Measure making the right of patronage of a benefice incapable of sale after two vacancies subsequent to the passing of the Measure ; and so strong was the support accorded to the proposal that a Measure on those lines passed quickly through the Assembly and has since received the Royal Assent. Thus the sale of livings, involving what is euphemistically called " the traffic in souls," will in a few years be brought absolutely to an end. This fact should be borne in mind when considering the second Report, as it furnishes a key to the due understanding of the significance of some at least of its proposals. For example, if a private patron is no longer able to sell his interest in the advowson, it is not unreasonable to suppose that he will be more ready to transfer it, and the Report does not hesitate to suggest that the transfer should be to the Bishop or to the Diocesan Board of Patronage which it is proposed should be established in every diocese, of which the Bishop would be chairman. Yet the Committee accept the principle of private patronage, and " on the whole " think that its variety is productive of good results as, for one thing, " it tends to prevent the domination of any one party in the Church." There are some 7,000 benefices in private patronage, or about one-half of the total number ; it is interesting to conjecture how many of these will remain so after a few years of the working of the new system of patronage—always supposing, of course, that the proposals are given effect to. The whole trend of the Report is to strengthen the powers of the Bishops, and if these recommendations are agreed to the amount of patronage in episcopal hands, directly or indirectly, will be enormously increased.

The Rights of Parishioners.

In any new scheme of patronage the rights of parishioners must inevitably receive attention. It is a matter of real difficulty, but the Committee are clear that "the parishioners should have some effective means of expressing their views and real protection against the intrusion of an unsuitable clerk," but whether their proposals will meet the need is open to doubt. The Committee recognize that the rights of the patron must not be unduly interfered with and that the casting of an undeserved slur upon the nominee must be avoided, and so they have come to the conclusion that "the most satisfactory way of giving effect to these principles is by an enlargement of the powers of the Bishop." Their recommendations are to the effect that, on a vacancy occurring in the benefice, the Parochial Church Council may make representations to the patron and the Bishop as to the needs of the parish; and that the Bishop may, on receiving the name of the intended presentee, inform the patron that his nominee is unfitted for that particular benefice and that the Bishop would be unwilling to institute him. From this episcopal decision the patron would have the right of appeal to the Archbishop, but the parishioners, whatever may be the decision of the Bishop, are given no such right. We are glad to see that two members of the Committee, Sir Thomas Inskip and Canon Guy Rogers, add a note of dissent from this part of the Report. "There is no provision," they say, "by which parishioners are enabled to prevent the appointment of an incumbent who is entirely unacceptable by reason of his opinions on matters of doctrine and ritual to the parishioners." It will, we think, be generally agreed that unless some such provision is made the value of the other proposals will not count for much, and that amendment on these lines is absolutely imperative.

The Diocesan Board of Patronage.

The proposed Diocesan Board of Patronage would consist of the Bishop, the Archdeacon, the Rural Dean, and two beneficed clergy and four laymen elected by the Diocesan Conference. It is suggested that the Board should have the patronage within the diocese now falling to Roman Catholics, Jews, Aliens, Lunatics, Infants, Bankrupts, and persons against whom within the last ten years a conviction has become conclusive. The Board, it is hoped, would come in also for a large share of the patronage now in private hands, for the Committee "think that there are many patrons who would prefer to transfer their patronage to a Diocesan Board, if there was one, rather than to the Bishop or a party trust." The Committee make proposals for the rearrangement of Crown patronage in the interests, generally, of the Bishops or the Diocesan Boards—and Bishops, whose patronage "needs to be strengthened," are to have the appointment to the principal incumbencies in the larger towns.

Trust Patronage.

The Report shows a strong bias against what it calls "party trusts." While it is admitted that the trustees conscientiously endeavour to act in the way which they consider most beneficial to the Church, the Report adds that "patronage trusts tend to accentuate partisanship within the Church." The Committee look to the establishment of Diocesan Patronage Boards to "check the extension of this form of trust patronage," and recommend that "trustee patrons should in all cases be set free from all restrictions which now govern their choice in making appointments to benefices—they should be free in all cases to appoint any fit and proper person."

Sir Thomas Inskip's Dissent.

The best answer to the proposals of the Committee in regard to Episcopal Patronage and Trust Patronage is to be found in the note and reservation of Sir Thomas Inskip.

In regard to the former he says: "I am not prepared to assent to an extension of episcopal patronage which is already very extensive. I regret to be compelled to express the opinion that evangelical clergy of perfect loyalty and integrity as well as ability are in many cases practically excluded from enjoying episcopal patronage in the way of presentation to benefices. I am far from saying that this criticism is of universal application, for I am aware that there are many notable exceptions; but in many cases the opinion is held by Bishops that adequate provision is made for evangelical clergy by trust patronage. I do not dissent from the opinion that the Bishop is primarily responsible for the spiritual efficiency of his diocese, but I am not prepared, under the conditions which exist in the Church to-day, to see key positions placed to any larger extent in episcopal hands."

As regards Trust Patronage he says: "I respectfully dissent from the proposal that trustee patrons should be set free from any of the trusts to maintain which they became trustees. The suggestion that trustees should be free in all cases to appoint any fit and proper person is one that does not require any alteration in any trust deeds with which I am acquainted. Opinions differ as to the qualifications of a 'fit and proper person,' and undoubtedly many trust deeds contain statements of principle by which such matters are to be judged. I do not believe that trust patronage has prevented in any way the 'healthy development of thought,' and, on the whole, the continuity afforded by the exercise of trust patronage is very much welcomed by parishioners."

These are wise and weighty reservations, and Evangelical Churchmen will be thankful that Sir Thomas Inskip, as a member of the Committee, felt able to make them. They will carry conviction in the country.

BISHOP TEMPLE'S NEW BOOK.[1]

A REVIEW

By the Right Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D.

NO one who has tried to realize the position held in our Church by the present Bishop of Manchester can afford to be indifferent to a work published by him, even though he modestly describes it as an essay. In scholarship and philosophical ability he is in the front rank not only of ecclesiastics but of English men of learning. His literary and artistic judgment is keen and cultivated. He has the spirit of leadership and great gifts of organization. The development of our Church through its Assembly for good or for evil is the outcome of his hurricane campaign of Life and Liberty. He is the leader of the new movement known as Copec, which is a splendid endeavour to bring Christian principle into Politics and Economics. Youth and health are his. There can be few safer prophecies than that at some date, perhaps not very distant, he will be a successor to his father in Augustine's throne, if it be God's will to spare him. The wide reach of his interests, the practical turn of his forceful intellect, his undaunted courage, and last but by no means least the depth, sincerity and tenderness of his spiritual life present a combination of endowments which it would be difficult to match in the long line of Archbishops of Canterbury. His writings consequently claim the attention of every serious Churchman.

Unfortunately, in his book, as in the Epistles of St. Paul, there are "many things hard to be understood." The present essay is a contribution to "Christo-centric metaphysics," an exposition of "the Christian idea of God, life, and the world." The Bishop writes because he is convinced that "one reason why comparatively few men of the highest ability and education are at present offering themselves for ordination is that the intellectual atmosphere is dominated by a philosophy which leaves no room for a specific Incarnation." He writes for philosophers in the language of Philosophy, and that is not the language of everyday

[1] *Christus Veritas.* An Essay by William Temple, Bishop of Manchester. London: Macmillan & Co., 1924.

life. But those who will face this difficulty and take the pains to understand him will find a rich reward for their labour.

The object of this review is to reproduce the impression left on my mind of Bishop Temple's outlook, and to call attention to some passages in his book that will specially interest readers of the CHURCHMAN. I am persuaded that if I add a note of some points of disagreement, I shall not thereby disparage his influence nor hinder his work in the Diocese of Manchester, but rather help him to understand more completely a line of thought, with which he has, perhaps, not had much contact at first hand. Such a contribution I am sure that he will welcome. For a distinguishing feature of his work is openness of mind, readiness to modify and correct his own conclusions, and large-hearted sympathy with those who disagree with him.

My impression, then, of Bishop Temple's Christian philosophy is this. He refuses to think of the Universe as an aggregate of self-subsistent physical objects to which God and the whole realm of spirit have only a shadowy attachment. For him God is the sole self-subsistent Being, for Whose pleasure and by Whose creative activity all things are and were created. He regards the Universe as a continuous whole in which Matter, Life, Mind and Spirit are strata. At the head of the whole is God Who has given to each order its value, or, if I understand the Bishop rightly, its true worth. Value in each order only comes to light in proportion as that order is indwelt by the order that it is above it. Matter has not its true value till it is indwelt by life, and life again till it is indwelt by mind, and mind till it is indwelt by spirit. Value is not a quality accidentally attaching to an object, but it is the potentiality which is revealed by the indwelling in it of the higher order. Scientific inquiry will show us the constituents of which an object is composed, but it cannot teach us its true value in relation to the Universe as a whole. It can show us what the thing is by itself, but not what it is capable of becoming. It can answer the question "How," but not the question "Why."

It will be seen that this view of the Universe makes a Divine Incarnation not only a possibility, but an absolute necessity, if once it is accepted. But, by itself, it takes no account of the two great problems of evil and of sin. As to the former, in a brilliant chapter relating to it, the Bishop does not seem, after all, to go

beyond the simple words, "What I do thou knowest not now." We are onlookers at an unfinished drama, of which God alone sees the whole, and sees it not in time but in eternity, that is in its completeness: sees it not as an indifferent spectator incapable of being moved by suffering, but as suffering with it, and working through it for the higher good. Bishop Temple considers that the first of the XXXIX Articles is seriously misleading, if by "without passions" we understand "impassible," or, "incapable of suffering."

The problem of sin is obviously far more serious, and I trust that in trying to explain the Bishop's view I shall not misrepresent him. The reader will find no light treatment of the problem, no palliating the gravity of sin, no tampering with the majesty of the moral law. Whether, from another point of view, he will be fully satisfied remains to be seen.

Bishop Temple insists that humanity is not an aggregate of human beings subsisting side by side, but it is the coming to self-consciousness, in many centres, of the one Universe. A person is a self-conscious and self-determining system of experience. Every person is the Universe coming to consciousness of itself in a particular focus. But as each focus is separate and individual, man is at once involved in deliberate selfishness, and the discovery that we exist is the "Fall of Man." The result of this view is to shut out all idea of a departure from original righteousness unless we take that righteousness to be an ideal which man ought to seek. If so the word "original" would be wholly misleading. The fall of man would be no more than an imperfect conception of his real destiny and of his true interests. Bishop Temple would, however, go farther than this. He says (p. 158), "The task of man is to achieve inner and outer unity—the inner unity of complete personality and the outer unity of a perfected fellowship as wide as humanity. For this human nature is plainly destined by the qualities inherent in it, that is to say, *by the qualities originally bestowed upon it by the Creator* (the italics are my own). Toward this, human nature is impelled by the Creator's act at the Incarnation, and the consequent activity of His Spirit at work upon humanity from within." Here we have a phrase far more nearly approaching to the idea of "original righteousness." But we seem to be confused by the conception of humanity as a unit, coming

to consciousness in several focuses, each separate and individual: nor do we understand how far the "qualities bestowed upon humanity" are consistent with the selfishness involved by the awakening of consciousness in the individual, a selfishness for which he is very imperfectly responsible.

When, however, Bishop Temple proceeds to the actual dealing of God with sin and sinners, he is very clear as to the wrath of God, and does not hesitate to say (p. 258): "There is real antagonism of God against the sinner so long as he continues in his sin. It is true, of course, that God loves the sinner while He hates the sin. But that is a shallow psychology which regards the sin as something merely separate from the sinner, which he can lay aside like a suit of clothes. My sin is the wrong direction of my will, and my will is just myself so far as I am active. If God hates the sin, what He hates is not an accretion attached to my real self, it is myself as that self now exists. . . . He loves me, even while I sin; but it cannot be said too strongly that there is a wrath of God against me as sinning; God's will is set one way, and my will is set against it." To overcome this hostility, Divine immanence is not enough. It is necessary that God should enter into the course of human history, and this came to pass in Jesus Christ. It follows that the Cross is much more than an example of patient submission to wrong, or an heroic exhibition of self-sacrifice. A reconciliation was to be effected without loss of the majesty of the moral law. Forgiveness, which is much more than remission of penalty, and nothing short of the establishment of new relations between God and man, was not to be effected without cost to God. How great that cost was, how awful the impact upon God of the sin of the world, was revealed by the Cross. It was in fact a propitiation in the sense that it fulfilled the aspirations previously expressed in propitiatory sacrifices. "In so far as the term propitiation represents something objectively accomplished in and by God apart from our forgiveness altogether, and even apart from our sins except in so far as these are part of the cosmic evil, to that extent it is the word that carries us farthest into the mystery of the Atonement" (p. 262). It will not be easy to most readers of the CHURCHMAN to reconcile this statement with scriptural teaching concerning propitiation. But I quote the words as evidence that the Atonement to Bishop Temple is something more

than a light passing over of sins. Speaking of the parable of the Prodigal Son he remarks, "We must consider not only what our Lord said, but also what He did."

I must content myself with drawing attention to two valuable chapters on the Godhead of Jesus Christ and the Person of Christ (Chapters VII and VIII) which form a necessary part of the Bishop's argument, and, if I am to fulfil the promises at the beginning of this paper, at once mention one or two passages, which readers of the CHURCHMAN will specially appreciate. Bishop Temple is at his highest level whenever he touches on Prayer. Thus (p. 41): "The real significance of prayer lies in the fact that it is the effort and attitude of the soul which makes possible the unity of the human spirit with God: it is therefore itself the supreme aim of human existence. Only when it is experienced and valued as itself the goal of life, is its secondary quality, as producing results beyond itself, fully operative. For it is only then that the human spirit reaches the maturity of its powers; it is only then that the infinite sources of omnipotence can play upon the world through human instrumentality." And again (p. 43): "Not as mere appreciative intelligences do we pray, but as children who want to be with their Father, as friends who must mark off certain times to enjoy the company of their Friend. This Father is the composer of the music of the spheres; this Friend is the author of the tremendous drama of history. To enter into His mind is to be on the high places to which art aspires; but it is to be there in company. This method only leads us to its goal as we become one in moral character with God, for this is partly the meaning and partly the result of being in the company of God. Only the pure in heart can see Him; only by longing for Him do men become pure in heart; only by His own impulse do men begin to long for Him. Prayer is a correspondence with the impulse of God to draw us to Himself." Let me quote also a passage towards the close of the book: "God is Love. But we miss the full wonder and glory of that supreme revelation if we let the term Love, as we naturally understand it, supply the whole meaning of the term God. There is a great danger lest we forget the Majesty of God, and so think of His Love as an amiability. We must first realize Him as exalted in unapproachable Holiness, so that our only fitting attitude before Him is one of abject self-abasement, if we are to feel the stupendous

marvel of the Love which led Him, so high and lifted up to take His place beside us in our insignificance and squalor that He might unite us with Himself. 'When I consider Thy heavens, even the works of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars that Thou hast ordained —what is man, that Thou art mindful of him?' It is a defective Christianity which has no use for the *Dies Irae*." There are other passages of a yet more intimate character that I have not space to quote, if I am to present, as I suggested, some points of view less familiar, as I think, to Bishop Temple.

To us it is not without significance that the Bible begins with an individual and ends with a City. The individual precedes the Society. Is not this after all the historical and the scientific order, and must not our philosophy at least find room for this order? I lay the more stress on this, as I find Bishop Temple's conception of Humanity as more than an aggregate of individuals, as a unit, each member of which is actually linked with the whole, far from easy to understand. Thus I find on p. 214: "The Humanity which consists of human beings is a real unity, wherein each of them is linked to every other in a nexus of mutual determination." Of families, tribes, nations, the statement is true, but there have been centuries of human history in which large groups of mankind could not be said to be "linked to the rest in a nexus of mutual determination." There was, till the discoveries of the Western hemisphere, no sort of nexus of mutual determination between the inhabitants of the two hemispheres: the same is true of large portions of Africa, for very many centuries. These races were as separate from the rest of mankind as if they had been inhabitants of other planets. These facts have theological implications of a very real nature. It is noteworthy that the two great impacts of Predestinarian doctrine coincide, the first with the barbarian invasions of Europe, and the second with the discovery of America. Men were forced to think of whole nationalities outside the range of the Cross, and to take some account of them in their theology. We may dislike the explanation that was offered and may quarrel with it. But I do not find that Bishop Temple's view of Humanity solves the difficulties that history presents.

There is another difficulty raised in my mind by Bishop Temple's conception of Humanity. It must be noticed, because it affects the meaning which he attaches to the sacrifice of the Cross, and,

consequently, to the Eucharist. He tells us (p. 238): "In this service (i.e. the Eucharist), which is pre-eminently the Christian's means of access to the Eternal, and wherein he worships not as an individual but as a member of the Church at all times and all places, the relevant conception of Christ is not that of the historic figure but that of the Universal Man. The sacrifice of Christ is potentially but most really the sacrifice of Humanity. Our task is by His Spirit to take our place in that sacrifice." (P. 239), "We, by repeating and so identifying ourselves with His sacrificial act, become participants in His one sacrifice, which is the perfect dedication to the Father of the Humanity which God in Christ has taken to Himself." And again: "The union of Humanity with God in perfect obedience in Christ is the essential sacrifice." At first sight these passages taken by themselves suggest the idea of an impersonal humanity, of that unit which comes to self-consciousness in several focuses, of the idea that Christ is *man*, but, not in any intelligible sense as truly man, as one of us is man. The idea is corrected by other passages in the book. It is enough to quote one (p. 106): "We see One Who was born by no activity of human will, but only in the acquiescence of the Virgin Mother in the Divine Will, Who called men to such a fellowship with and dependence on God as had never been conceived, yet lived always as one Who Himself experienced what He taught," etc. It would be quite untrue to say that Bishop Temple does not specifically teach us to believe in the perfect Manhood of our Lord. But the impression which he leaves, at this point and at others, is that of personality as the product of influences (p. 152) and of the Incarnation as "the inauguration of a new system of mutual influence." For him "the self *is* the self-conscious system of experience. . . . If there is no experience there is no self; if there are other experiences, there is another self" (pp. 65, 66).

In this connexion I seem to find a view which profoundly affects my relation to God. For, while it is true that our experiences do influence our personalities, they influence different personalities in very different ways—as is manifest in the children of one family. There is also one experience common to all mankind—the experience of God, which has far from one influence upon all. The testimony of our consciences (I speak as an Evangelical), confirmed by Scripture, is that of active hostility of the natural self against God, of

indifference to Divine Love even as manifested to us on the Cross and reflected in the lives that are nearest to us and dearest: the experience which we often call "self-surrender" is the overcoming of this hostility by a Power that is not ours. In no sort of sense could we claim that it was a self-identification with the sacrificial act of Christ. For us that act stands all alone in its majesty and its efficacy—a Divine act of self-sacrifice, for us and on our behalf, in which Christ being God bore our sins in His own body being man. It is true, no doubt, that inasmuch as Christ is both God and Man, and Man Whose Manhood was sinless, Humanity was united with Godhead in that sacrifice, and that the self-surrender upon the Cross was the self-surrender of One Who is very God and very Man. But we cannot distinguish between the Divine and the Human in the Sacrifice. The Sacrifice was the Sacrifice of one Christ for the sin of the whole world, which none but He could offer: in which none but He could take a part, a Sacrifice in which the Godhead was united with the true bodily substance of a man. It was offered indeed in a moment of time. In no other way could it have been offered then, or be manifested to us now. But for God time is not: for Him there is neither yesterday, to-day, nor to-morrow. Therefore, in Heaven, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world is, and must be for ever, before the Throne until sin and death are no more. For us that Sacrifice is one Sacrifice of sins for ever, offered, once for all, for us by God Himself, and exposing for ever the emptiness of all human sacrifice for sin. We can accept the benefit of it; Christ may call us to take up the Cross; He does so call us; and we fill up the yet incomplete sufferings of His Body, the Church. But with His Sacrifice we dare not identify any sufferings of our own.

It is, at root, the same conception of personality that makes it impossible for me—again I speak as an Evangelical—to accept the idea that any existing Church is the true, the ideal, Church which St. Paul describes as the Body of Christ. I can understand as Divine, and of Divine institution, a fellowship of believers actually indwelt by the Spirit of God, and gladly confess that Christ came to found such a fellowship, to be the Kingdom of God upon earth. I can also understand the necessity of the existence of communities for worship held together by visible bonds of creeds and ministries, and that it is the duty of these communities to aim at purity of

life and doctrine, and to cultivate the spirit of loving intercommunion, recognizing gladly wherever they can find it the Spirit-guided life in the members of any of these bodies. But my very faith in the unity of the Church, Catholic and Apostolic, forbids me, as I love the truth, to identify any of the aforesaid communities with the Body of Christ.

In short, I find that in the whole conception of personality, and of the relation of human personality to the Divine, with all that is therein involved of revelation and of grace, Bishop Temple's teaching, while it interests, is far from satisfying me. I am not unaware that modern thought refuses to accept the idea of "persons" as mutually exclusive beings "who have no more connexion with one another than so many marbles in a bag." It is true, as Professor Wallace taught, that "there is in each of us a potential universality," and that we all are affected, more than we know, by environment. But, for all that, each living soul is also "a point excluding others and excluded by them," and it is at this point that we most truly come into relation with God, for here are we most veritably in His image, and differentiated from the rest of creation. It is heart that speaks to heart, spirit that speaks to spirit. We may call the universe sacramental, and may behold with joy and uplifting of spirit the glory of God in His creation. But our affinity with the Creator, as history testifies, warns us of an ever-present danger of putting the creature in the place of the Creator. In that danger is to be found the degeneration of Christianity, as of every other religion. In that sense, and as witness against that danger, the Church of Christ will always have to be Protestant, until the shadows pass away, and the reality alone remains, the day when God shall be "all in All."

P.S.—This review must not be regarded as an exhaustive account of all the points, or all the grounds on which I am not in agreement with Bishop Temple's book. Such a review I could not have written without entering into controversy with my successor in the See of Manchester for controversy's sake, the last thing that I should wish to do. I have desired only to do justice to his line of thought, and to suggest the kind of criticism for which he asks in his preface.—E. A. K.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL'S MESSAGE ON JUDGMENT FOR TO-DAY.

By the Rev. W. H. Rigg, D.D., Vicar of Beverley Minster.

THE outlook of the present generation on life, whether economic or religious, has changed in a way which it is not easy for those belonging to an older generation to sympathize with, still less to appreciate and understand. Each generation forges on a little further ahead of the previous one, but whereas in times past, the progress, if it be progress, has been made on foot, thus enabling both parties to keep in sight of each other, to-day the younger group, metaphorically speaking, having eschewed pedestrian methods, has taken to motoring, in consequence of which its rate has been so greatly accelerated that it has left the older generation far behind, and out of sight. The moral and spiritual atmosphere which surrounds the people of to-day is very different to that of fifty or even thirty years ago. Appeals which were successful then have lost their cogency now. Some competent observers maintain that in addressing large bodies of men and women on the subject of religion, their belief even in the existence of God must not be taken for granted. Our experience is somewhat different to this. Amongst the masses of our population we should say that there is a vague idea in the existence of a Supreme Being, somebody above them who will occasionally intervene on their behalf, that somehow and somewhere everything will come right in the end provided they try to do their best, this best being construed in the sense of not doing any harm to anybody. That this is a satisfactory condition of things no one who has the spiritual interests of mankind at heart will allow. But it is true of the present as in the past that there is a light which lighteth every man who comes into the world (St. John i. 9). One of the most noticeable changes in present day teaching and thought is the absence of any appeal to the motive of fear. Long ago Clement of Alexandria observed that " the Saviour has many tones of voice and many methods for the salvation of men ; by threatening He admonishes, by upbraiding He converts, by bewailing He pities, by the voice of Song he cheers." [1] But upbraiding and threatening have disappeared from many circles ; indeed, if the truth be known,

[1] *Ad. Graecos*, Ch. I.

rarely are those particular tones to be heard in our voices, a kind of paralysis comes over us, so great is the power of herd suggestion and reaction.[1]

When, however, we go back to the New Testament, and essay the difficult task of clearing our minds of all preconceived ideas and notions, and endeavour to find out what the apostolic writers felt and thought on the subject, the conviction is forced upon us that the appeal to fear found a place both in the foreground and background of their teaching (2 Cor. v. 11 ; Phil. ii. 12 ; 1 St. Peter iv. 18).

By all means let it be conceded that on the highest levels of religious experience, fear ceases to operate in the individual life and conscience, and love exercises undivided sway, nevertheless St. John does contemplate their existence side by side with each other until love has done her perfect work (1 St. John iv. 18). Fear will ultimately be cast forth from the soul (*ἔξω βάλλει*), but that implies that she was there to begin with, and had her place in the education of the spiritual life. Unlike sin which is lawlessness, and being contrary to the will of God (1 St. John iii. 4) ought never to have existed, fear has her place in the divine economy. He who was Perfect Love Incarnate said, " Fear not them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul : but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in Hell " (St. Matt. x. 28 ; St. Luke xii. 4, 5). In the past attempts have been made, and they will be made again in the future, to lift up before men a purely human Christ, but they will only succeed by tearing the Gospels to shreds and doing violence to Christian experience, and we believe that those Gospels will have to undergo the same fate at the hands of those who would eliminate a doctrine of Judgment to come from Our Lord's teaching. To attain that object the sacred records will have to undergo a similar drastic revision.

[1] In his chapter on the instinctive bases of religion Professor McDougall writes that " the long persistence of fear and awe in religion is well illustrated by the phrase widely current among the generation recently passed away, ' an upright, God-fearing man,' a phrase which expresses the tendency to identify uprightness with God-fearingness, or, rather to recognize fear as the source and regulator of social conduct. It is a nice question to what extent is the lapse from orthodox observances, so remarkable and widespread among the more highly civilized peoples at the present time, due to the general softening of divine retribution to a very secondary position, and to the discredit into which the flames of hell have fallen."—*An Introduction to Social Psychology* (Methuen & Co., London, 1923), 18th ed., p. 312.

Whilst, then, we shrink altogether from some of the appeals which Revivalists make in their efforts to turn men from sin to God, a painful example of which is given by Professor Pratt in his book on the religious consciousness,[1] yet we would plead for a more careful investigation from a psychological point of view of the part the emotion of fear may and should play in the moral and religious development of mankind. The famous line of Petronius " primus in orbe fecit deos timor " (It was fear that first suggested the existence of the gods) is an exaggeration, but that it is a *vera causa* of religion, no serious student of religion will deny. With regard to the matter of education we sympathize with Professor Mosso when he says " The educator should always treat the child as intelligent, because the animal (in him) will disappear and the man remain. He should have recourse to means the most easily understood, and the most persuasive. He should enable him to avoid occasions of wrong-doing, when he perceives that he has taken to bad habits, and seek by offering him greater attractions to withdraw him from unhealthy temptations." [2] At the same time we are afraid that Mosso has not made due allowance for the fact that in the majority of people " the animal " never quite disappears. The average man is governed not so much by reason as by instinct, a truth which modern psychology is never weary of emphasizing. And of those who have come to love God for Himself more than for the gifts and blessings He brings, perforce not a few would admit that in hours of fierce temptation and conflict fear has exercised a salutary and restraining influence, and prevented them from abandoning themselves to courses both fatal and lasting in their effects. Do we not, it may be asked, lay ourselves open to the rejoinder that any claims of the spiritual life put forward on the ground that should they be rejected, the most serious consequences must ensue, will meet with little favour to-day ? In answer to this we would suggest that the teaching on Judgment presented in the fourth Gospel is calculated to cause even the most light-hearted to pause and think, on account of its convicting power and self-evidencing truth.

In the opening chapter of the Gospel, apart from the Prologue, no hint is given of approaching judgment, but a divinely Human Figure is presented. " Come and see Him " are the words addressed

[1] *The Religious Consciousness* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1923), p. 178, note 23.

[2] *La Peur* (Félix Alcan, Paris, 1908), 4th ed., p. 169.

by Philip to Nathanael, and in the succeeding chapters those who have eyes to see are to behold His glory. More than once it is stated that His coming was not for the purpose of judging the world, but that it might be saved through Him (St. John iii. 17). "You Pharisees judge according to the flesh, and I (and it is a very emphatic I) judge no man," and at the close of the Ministry "If any one heareth My words and keepeth them not" (φυλάξῃ) (again the emphatic "I" makes its appearance) "*I* do not judge him, for I came not to judge the world but to save the world" (xii. 47). Continually is the Lord being judged, His claims questioned and scrutinized. During His first visit to Jerusalem in His public ministry when He drove the traffickers in merchandise and the moneychangers from the Temple, it was demanded of Him by the Jews that He should display His credentials authorizing Him to perform what in their eyes was a very high-handed action. "What sign shewest Thou that Thou doest these things?" (ii. 18). Nicodemus came to Our Lord by night, and with a scholar's characteristic caution allowed that from God He has come, a teacher (iii. 2) in contrast to those whose teaching is of their own invention (cf. vii. 17 ff). The evidences of his own senses had carried him to a certain point, but beyond that he could not go. His visit suggests that he had come either on his own initiative or as the representative of a class, to judge what manner of Man was this new Rabbi, and appraise Him at His true value. The woman of Samaria, when she came into contact with the Lord, took up a position of enquiry (iv. 9, 12, 19–20). From Chapter V onwards till Chapter XIII is reached, the Evangelist allows us to see groups of people discussing whether He who purports to be the Son of God is indeed what He makes Himself out to be. The scene is laid for the most part in and around Jerusalem, but in one instance it is transferred to Galilee and Capernaum. The Sanhedrin meets and holds secret conclaves (vii. 45–52, xi. 47–53) and various opinions and judgments are expressed. At the very outset "the Jews," i.e. the Scribes and Pharisees, are openly hostile, and it is not long before we find that they are determined to bring about His death (v. 18), though even in their case their judgment was shaken after witnessing the Lord's miracle on the young man born blind. Some amongst them judged Him to have a demon (x. 20, cf. viii. 48), others denied it (x. 21), but as a rule active unbelief characterized their attitude (x. 31, 39; xi. 53).

As for the people, the ordinary folk, their opinions sway to and fro. Sometimes they wish to make Him King (vi. 14, 15). "He is a good man" is the verdict of some. "He deceiveth the people" is the exclamation of others (vii. 12). Eventually the Pharisees take the lead, and all through the Lord's life evince a bitter and growing resentment against Him (vii. 32; viii. 13 ff; ix. 16; xi. 47 ff; xii. 42) until at length the climax is reached, when Pilate, the embodiment of Roman Law and Order, delivers Jesus to the chief priests to be crucified (xix. 16). At the same time we see the judgments of those who believed in Him. Nicodemus, from being a secret disciple, openly proclaims himself to be such by bringing myrrh and aloes for the burial of the Lord's body (xix. 39). The woman of Samaria and those of her own city confess that the Lord is indeed the Saviour of the world (iv. 42). And the once doubting Thomas climbs the heights of faith and confesses "My Lord and My God." We must test the claims of Christ. It is His wish. It is what He requires of us all.

"What think ye of Christ, Friend?
When all's done and said.
Like you this Christianity or not?
It may be false, but will you wish it true?
Has it your vote to be so if it can?"

Alongside of our judgment of Christ stands Christ's judgment of us and all men. For weighty statements meet us in the gospel on this inevitable result of His Life and Teaching which, on the surface, appear to be in utter contradiction to His previously mentioned utterances. When we look into the subject as a whole, it will be seen that this is not so. "For Judgment came I into this world, in order that they who do not see may see, and those who see may become blind" (ix. 39), and this has been given Him by His Father, "For the Father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgment unto the Son" (v. 22), and more than that hath given Him authority to carry it out owing to His having come into the world, and taken our human nature with all that it entails, weakness, suffering and death. As Son of Man He will execute Judgment (v. 27). But though the Father has delegated judgment into His hands yet the judgment is not separate from the Father because of the Son's absolute dependence upon Him. "I can of Myself do nothing, as I hear I judge, and this judgment which is Mine is righteous because I seek not Mine own will but the will of the Father that sent Me"

(v. 30). Now the actual visible judging during the Son of God's earthly manifestation had not arrived. As it has been well said, "As little did He come to judge as the sun to cast a shadow; but like the shadow, judgment must naturally and of necessity ensue, having regard to the constitution and character of the cosmos." [1] The main object of our Saviour's coming was not judgment, but incidentally the process of judgment was taking place, for the perfect Revelation had come. Judgment flowed from His very presence. In judging Christ Pilate was himself being judged. The ruler of this world, the prince of darkness, though it was his hour (St. Luke xxii. 53) made assault after assault upon Christ (Col. ii. 15), and at the time appeared to have full and complete triumph, yet all unwillingly proclaimed his own downfall, and brought judgment upon himself, and those identified with him (St. John xii. 31). The very presence of the Son of God called out on the part of some, great faith, while others became more and more hostile, and thus became blind. The Light illumined some, and blinded others. "The light may become lightning." In the very judgments we pass on Christ we discover that we are not judging Him but judging ourselves. The Perfect Revelation was and is the touchstone by which a man, through his acceptance or rejection of it, is revealed, judged, all unwittingly, to himself.

"Eternal Life" is in the fourth Gospel a present possession identified with Christ. He not merely bestows, He *is*, eternal Life. The acceptance of Christ, dependence upon Him admits the believer to eternal Life here and now. In like manner a rejection of Him, which is both deliberate and wilful, implies judgment "here and now." A man who does not believe in the name of the only Begotten Son of God has already by the very attitude he adopts brought judgment upon himself, the process of judgment has commenced. And this judgment is not external to himself, an arbitrary sentence imposed upon him from without, but is internal, the outcome of his character. By his own act he has cut himself off from the Fountain of Life, and the seeds of death have already begun to germinate. In St. John iii. 18, the full force of the perfect tense must be allowed for, but "he who believeth not has already been, and is being judged" (*κέκριται*), and "this is the judgment, *ἡ κρίσις*, which denotes the

[1] *Evangelium des Johannes.* Holtzmann-Bauer (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1908), 3rd ed., p. 90.

process rather than the result, for the Light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light." Death then is the reverse side of life, judgment of eternal Life, and this is true to experience. This silent judgment which is ever going on within the human soul is recognized by modern thought.

" Some day," says Mr. Ruskin, " you believe within these five or ten or twenty years for every one of us the judgment will be set, and the books opened. If that be true, far more than that must be true. Is there but one day of judgment? Why for us every day is a day of judgment—every day is a *dies iræ*, and writes its irrevocable verdict in the flame of its west. Think you that judgment waits till the doors of the grave are opened? it waits at the doors of your houses—it waits at the corners of your streets; we are in the midst of judgment—the insects that we crush are our judges—the moments we fret away are our judges—the elements that feed us, judge as they minister—and the pleasures that deceive us, judge as they indulge. Let us, for our lives, do the work of men while we bear the form of them if indeed those lives are not as a vapour and do not vanish away." [1]

But it is not Mr. Ruskin only who says this. The same truth is urged by one of the greatest if not the greatest Psychologist of our generation, the late Professor James. " We are spinning our own fates, good or evil and never to be undone. Every stroke of virtue or of vice leaves its never so little scar. The drunken Rip Van Winkle in Jefferson's play excuses himself for every fresh dereliction by saying ' I won't count this time ! ' Well he may not count it, and a kind heaven may not count it, but it is being counted none the less. Down among the nerve cells and fibres, the molecules are counting, registering and storing it up, to be used against him when the next temptation comes. Nothing we ever do is in strict literalness wiped out." [2]

In conclusion it may be asked, did St. John believe in a great day of Judgment? To this question an affirmative answer may be given without any hesitation (v. 24, 29). Already has the believer, in this life, passed out of the sphere of judgment. In his case what is partly hidden will be made manifest in the light of God's countenance. He will see the Christ who already belongs to him as He

[1] *Sesame and Lilies*, Ch. iii, pp. 193, 194.
[2] *Principles of Psychology* (Macmillan & Co., London, 1901), Vol. I, p. 127.

really is (1 St. John iii. 2). The abiding in Him, often partial and imperfect, will become complete and entire; and the Life eternal, dimly realized here, will be revealed in all its splendour and glory. None of these experiences are wholly and entirely new, the believer has had a foretaste of them in this world, but only in the " Resurrection unto Life " are they clearly seen and apprehended. The same law operates in the case of him who has rejected Christ, but entirely in the opposite direction. What has been going on within him, often ignored and even unknown to himself, will be brought and displayed before the burning light of God's Holiness and Love. The hideousness and malignity of sin will be exposed.[1] The judgment which has already begun under our present conditions is seen in all its terrible consequences. In Origen's words " Every sinner kindles for himself the flame of his own fire, and is not plunged into some fire which has been already kindled by another, or was in existence before himself. Of this fire the fuel and food are our sins."[2] Such questions as Eternal Hope, Conditional Immortality, the unendingness of future punishment, are outside the limits of this article. It may be that the severity of the truths just enunciated needs to be qualified by other truths. Notwithstanding this, who can deny that they demand a greater place in the life and thought of the Christian Church than is accorded them to-day. In the background of the Johannine view of judgment, the Saviour's words " Ye will not come unto Me that ye might have Life " assume an importance and an urgency which the passing of the centuries has not diminished nor rendered obsolete. Should Judgment be ignored by the pulpit, the Scientist and the Novelist, and we may add all living Drama, will, when men and women least expect it, flash home to them its inevitable certainty.

[1] " And to me was shewed no harder hell than sin." *Revelations of Divine Love*, by Julian of Norwich, Ch. xl.
[2] *De Principiis*, Book II, x. 4.

RELIGIOUS FASHIONS.

By the Rev. W. S. Hooton, B.D.

IN the everyday life of mankind, all things are ruled by fashion. Custom is the standard in matters commonly called "secular": some things are "correct," others are not; and to transgress the unwritten rule is at the worst "bad form," and at the best eccentricity. And while it would not be difficult to point to some advantages in this universal tendency of mankind, it is quite notorious that it may and often does lead to perilous developments in the ethical sphere.

We are concerned to-day with those aspects of life which are more distinctively connected with the religious duties and experiences of the professed Christian. It is obvious that the same innate human tendency must be manifested in these; and that here, too, it is partly advantageous, partly perilous. And the Word of God, which is always true to nature, recognizes this fundamental fact from beginning to end, in exhortations and illustrations too numerous and familiar to need exemplification. Perhaps it would not be disputed by any that these relate more to the perils inherent in the tendency than to any advantages it may carry with it. At any rate it seems quite to the point to suggest that the warning note may be more necessary for our guidance, because both advantages and perils are so often likely to operate unconsciously, and while nothing but good can come in the former case, special watchfulness is needed with regard to the latter.

But although such Biblical illustrations are so familiar, it will serve our purpose well if we recall some of the more striking New Testament sayings which bear upon the subject. These, indeed, will aptly introduce those aspects of it which are proposed for more detailed examination presently. Consider the proud claim of the religious leaders of our Lord's time to set the fashion in religious thought. "Hath any of the rulers, or of the Pharisees, believed on Him?" Or His own application to those leaders of the prophecy of Isaiah—"teaching for doctrines the commandments of men": and His pronouncement in the very same context—"they be blind leaders of the blind." The deadly consequence of such blind following of passing religious fashion is summed up in a terse con-

demnation of the rulers by St. John—" they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." Such perils beset both doctrine and practice ; and later on we find St. Paul warning Asiatic converts against being " tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine."

What is the message of such a topic for our own day ? Every generation has its special circumstances ; and temptations which are universal take on very varied forms. It is proposed to deal briefly with three directions in which the rule of fashion in religious life is calling for watchfulness just at the present moment, and particularly in our own country—though by no means only here.

I

It may have more to do with the alarming spread of the " counter-Reformation " than is generally recognized. Anyone with memories of the last thirty to fifty years will realize how widespread the tendency has been to adopt methods and practices in worship, which in the early portions of that period were regarded with suspicion. There is no need to provoke controversy by going too far into details. It may be true enough that some of these changes have been entirely devoid of harmful significance, some even positively helpful. But the tendency to " be in the fashion " has led many to adopt a quite untenable position with regard to others, which are *in fact* illegal, or *in fact* likely to inculcate erroneous doctrine, whether they recognize it or not. An incumbent may declare quite truly that a certain posture, or a certain piece of ecclesiastical dress, or a certain practice in worship, is entirely devoid of significance to him. But he will never get over the fact that his adoption of it gives practical support to the aims of those to whom these things mean a great deal, and prepares his own people for the acceptance of the doctrine which those most concerned about their adoption declare to be signified and enforced by them. The adoption of current fashions has had its effect in matters of detail which many have never for a moment considered as capable of having such an effect—even the singing of hymns, as a recent correspondence in *The Record* has sufficiently testified. And was it not once suggested that if the people learned to sing *Hymns Ancient and Modern* they would learn about the doctrines of the movement we are discussing ? If it was, the adoption

of that hymn-book in Evangelical Churches is sufficiently widespread! And what do we find? Is it a coincidence that many people talk of "altars" with perfect unconsciousness of anything disloyal to the Prayer Book, which carefully and designedly omits the word? But "altars" involve sacrifice; and we have quite enough contemporary evidence of the peril underlying that kind of looseness of speech. The controversy over Canon Bright's well-known hymn ("And now, O Father . . .") is an equally apt illustration. Many Evangelicals undoubtedly find it not only innocent but helpful to themselves. But there can be no question that it is exactly fitted to prepare the way for the doctrine now put forward in alternative Communion Services; and the correspondence above mentioned produced evidence, which has not been contradicted, that its author's intention was to teach doctrine of that general character.

And so we might go on. Evening Communion is not "in the fashion" in many Dioceses. The easiest course is to drop it. And the tendency is to emphasize unduly, almost to the exclusion of other times, and in a way calculated to support current doctrinal claims, an hour for that sacred service to which at any rate no such emphasis ought to be given, however helpful the practice may be to many. Nobody needs to attack those brethren who personally prefer that hour: but there can be no denying the peril of the prevailing fashion of extreme emphasis upon it, without any warrant of Scripture or of Prayer Book.

What is proposed to be done by Evangelicals, in face of this universal evidence of the effect of following prevailing fashions in religious life and worship? Certainly nothing that has hitherto been done by Evangelical representatives in the Church Assembly, as a body, provides the least hope of checking the landslide. On the contrary, the concessions to which most of them seem ready to agree can only have the effect of accelerating its progress and increasing its deadly effect.

II

Let us turn to an illustration of an altogether different kind—the claims of Christian discipleship in a world such as ours. From many points of view, the way in which fashion has overridden the very elements of Christian ethics and practice is a subject which

has been almost as prominently as the last before the minds of many in quite recent months, through the discussions arising from "Copec." Whatever may be thought of that movement, and with whatever reservations any of us may feel our attitude towards it is tempered, there can be no doubt that it has laid a heavy hand upon many terrible anomalies. If we do not ourselves approve of the basis or methods of "Copec," it is at least incumbent upon us to say how we ourselves propose to meet the inconsistencies in current "Christian" practice which it remorselessly exposes; and, indeed, how we propose to clear our souls from the guilt of any complicity in the prevailing "fashions" which are at the root of these practices.

But "Copec" would lead us too far to-day; and our purpose is a simpler one. Our Lord's standard for His followers is that they should not be of the world, although of necessity in the world; and again, that they should "renounce," or (as Dr. Weymouth so suggestively puts it) "detach themselves from" all that they have. Indeed, unless they do that, He plainly says they cannot be His disciples (Luke xiv. 33).

And are we doing that, in our generation? What is the usual standard of living, not among worldly people, nor even among mere professors of Christianity, but among really earnest followers of Christ? Can it by any stretch of imagination be described in such terms as those above quoted? They seem natural enough in the case of Apostles like St. Matthew or St. Peter or St. Paul. Perhaps we think they were suited well enough for those early days. But they are phrased in terms of universal import! They apply to the twentieth century no less than to the first.

And again, what is it to be "not of the world"? In what does "worldliness" consist? Those who give warning against its perils are apt to turn their attention to a list of habits and practices, which are denounced as worldly. And this is right enough, as far as it goes. Principles must be illustrated by detailed examples; and such a method is quite in accordance with our present aim in considering the dangers attaching to a heedless following of prevailing fashion. But it does not go far enough. In the last resort, worldliness is a matter of the heart and spirit. It may, indeed, be evidenced by practices such as are commonly condemned as worldly; yet those who avoid such practices are not therefore

necessarily unworldly in spirit. It is common to regard as worldly the indulgence in theatre-going and dancing and card-playing, and so forth: and it is no part of our purpose to question any such standards. Many of us do feel, as the present writer does, that while it is not for us to say that these things are under all circumstances inconsistent with the Christian profession, when they are considered in themselves, it is nevertheless so impossible to regard them apart from questions of association and example that the only course is to avoid them altogether. The mistake lies in thinking that any such list can be necessarily comprehensive. A man or woman may abstain from theatres and dancing, wines and spirits, cards and smoking, and may nevertheless be more worldly in heart than many of those who indulge to some degree in these practices.

In the midst of a world of appalling spiritual and physical destitution, what avails it to abstain from a series of such habits and practices, if the Christian's standard of living in more ordinary matters is no different from that of the openly worldly? In a world of appalling spiritual and physical destitution, why should not unnecessary motor-cars, and unnecessarily expensive holidays, be considered as worldly as theatres and dancing? Or, indeed, anything and everything which prevents our "detaching ourselves" from all that we have, for the sake of Christ and His needy ones? "Whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" And if he has not the love of God abiding in him, it is because the love of the world is there, in some deadly, insidious form. The veriest "Puritan" (to adopt for a moment, and for the sake of vivid expression, the rather objectionable use of that term) may be a veritable Dives in his sumptuous faring day by day, and in heedless neglect of the poor and suffering, in matters literal or spiritual, at his gate or far away. Crumbs they may get: but what does *he* get?

Sweeping generalizations are of course absurd, and only tend to destroy their own object: but surely there is enough cause for heart-searching in all our lives! It is impossible to say that motor-cars, for example, are always an indulgence, or that an expensive holiday can in no case be a necessity. And many of those who seem to have all that the heart can desire in this life may be exercis-

ing more real self-denial than their critics, and may quite honestly, before God, believe they are able to serve Him best, for one reason or another, in their present manner of life. The true method is not to judge individuals (except ourselves), but *fashions*; and to point out the perils and disasters that spring from assuming that what everybody does, even what excellent Christians do, must be right. Associations and upbringing are too often taken as the norm of life, rather than the Word of God. It cannot be pretended that the common standard of living among even earnest Christians is the New Testament standard. And that is a deadly example of the effect, in a desperately needy world, of following a fashion of supposed discipleship which our Lord plainly says is no discipleship at all.

III

Our third illustration is one more obvious, perhaps, and more commonly mentioned, than any other. But we have just been provided with some telling examples of the results of fashion in this particular—the rule of fashion in matters of science and criticism. And here the blind following of the majority is the more unaccountable because of the frequent lessons that such fashions are utterly untrustworthy.

Take a case in point with reference to systems of philosophy. A Modernist Conference was held recently at Oxford; and a distinguished authority in such matters is reported to have said that "the philosophy of Spencer, Huxley, and others in their time was a queer mixture of subjectivism and mechanicism." Quoting this utterance, a writer suggests that, forty years ago, Spencer had "the most exalted name among English *savants*"!

Again, all Biblical scholars know how the Tübingen school of New Testament criticism was utterly discredited and overthrown. And those who observe the signs of the times are prepared to believe that a similar fate awaits the present fashions in Old Testament criticism, at no very distant date—unwilling as its sponsors are to admit the discrediting of what to many of them has been the labour of a lifetime. How difficult they must find it to know what exactly to do with Professor Wilson, and Mr. Finn, and others whose "criticism" of their own literary edifices is "destructive" enough!

Yet it is surprising how the old confident assertions continue

to be made. There must be an end of it some day, of course. But apparently that is not yet. Only quite recently a little volume has been published, entitled *The Doctrine of the Infallible Book*, the author of almost the whole being Bishop Gore. He begins by assuming the main critical position as to the Old Testament. It is fair to recognize the limitations evidently imposed upon him by space, and by the specific object which he has in view—he is trying to show that such criticism causes no hindrance to faith. Yet he shows what a fuller treatment would be, by confidently summarizing the usual list of points about the Pentateuch, etc., etc., and even (after all that has lately been written on the subject) about Daniel. And the chapter which he himself recognizes as touching "the most important and weighty objection" to the critical view (viz., our Lord's attitude towards the Old Testament) is partly occupied by a restatement of the usual critical devices for overcoming that objection, in which there is no sign of any recognition of the forcible replies that have been repeatedly made to those devices within the last few years of controversy. We need not question his own assertion of candour in facing the difficulty: but even if he himself is not influenced by current scholastic fashions to a degree of which he is quite unconscious, we may undoubtedly find in publications of such a character, especially when they are issued under such auspices (for the book is published by the Student Christian Movement), an alarming illustration of the peril to students and others which arises from the prevalence, for the time being, of fashions so widespread and so influentially backed.

Another example, almost at the moment of writing, is equally illuminating in a rather different way. *The Record* of October 16, 1924 (from which we have already gathered our illustration touching Spencer and Huxley), mentions a sermon by the Bishop of Birmingham in his Cathedral, in which, at the outset of his work in that city, he is stated to have taken occasion to reply to his critics. The Bishop, speaking of the Reformation Divines, is positively alleged to have said that when they used the term "God's word," they meant God's revelation of Himself, primarily through Christ the Word of God, but also the revelation which He gave through the discoveries which He enabled man in all ages to make.

That perhaps does not profess to be an exact verbal report:

but presumably it represents the substance of what was said; and in any case the main object of any such statement is evident, whatever its exact form. When we have recovered from our surprise, some of us may begin to wonder whether Bishop Barnes will next tell us that where the alleged "discoveries" of man contradict the written revelation of God (as it is notorious that he himself believes they do, in connexion with a doctrine distinctly taught by the Apostle Paul), the Reformation Divines always intended us to accept those discoveries as overriding the testimony of our Lord and His Apostles. Is that to be the next step in the interpretation of their meaning when they made the Word of God the touch-stone of all doctrine?

Our latest illustration might be difficult to surpass, as an example of the logical consequences of following unproved scientific and literary fashions and presuppositions. Into what quagmires does it lead those who desert the solid ground upon which those Reformation Divines in reality lead us to take our stand!

As to those in peril of being swept off their feet by any of the tides of thought and custom which we have considered, our chief resource for helping them is prayer. And, for ourselves and them alike, the only safe refuge is "the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture." Many before our day, and in far more perilous conditions, have been called upon to adopt an unpopular line. Perhaps it is the very absence of personal peril at the moment, and the universal prevalence of suave speech (at any rate in conference), together with the strong tendency of the age to seek an outward appearance of unity, that make such a line more difficult resolutely to adopt, in the strength of the Lord, than it would have been under an attack more obvious and a peril more personal. We are not called upon to judge the motives of others; but neither the fear of this unjustified charge, nor anything else, must keep the disciple from following the leading of his Lord in the three matters now considered, or in any other. Whatever the appearances, never was the call to unpopular decisions more urgent; never was the response fraught with more far-reaching issues.

THE HISTORY AND TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.[1]

By W. Guy Johnson.

THE issue of his first Episcopal Charge by a scholar of the weight and distinction of the Bishop of Gloucester, still best known as Dr. Headlam, is an important event at a time like this; and it becomes yet more important when the Charge is found to consist of a comprehensive review of the history and teaching of the Church of England. The extent of ground covered by this substantial volume makes anything like a complete summary of its contents impossible within the compass of a magazine article. No more will be attempted here than an appreciation of the Charge as a whole and a brief criticism of some of the points which seem to call for special comment.

The scope of the Charge is expressed in the concluding paragraph of the Introduction, where the Bishop writes:

"I cannot but think that, especially in view of the discussions and hopes of the present time, it will not be inappropriate if I devote my primary visitation Charge, to reviewing the history and purpose of the Church of England, to discussing its doctrine, its worship, its organization, to considering its relation to other religious bodies, and to attempting to outline its mission in the world."

This is an extensive programme for a single volume of less than three hundred pages. It is, of course, inevitable when so many matters, each of which bristles with the controversies of the moment, are dealt with that the treatment should frequently be dogmatic in form and that statements should be made for which the available space will not allow the evidence on which the author relies to be given. The Bishop, indeed, tells us that this Charge is but the outline of a larger work which he hopes some day to complete. We trust that this hope will be realized, for all that Dr. Headlam writes is marked by solid scholarship, an independent judgment and complete outspokenness. It is possible that closer examination of the evidence may lead him to modify some of the statements he makes here.

[1] *The Church of England*, by the Rt. Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, C.H., D.D., Bishop of Gloucester. London: John Murray. 12*s*. net.

One of the first impressions which the book will leave on the mind of the reader is the evident and sincere effort which is made to approach the consideration of the various questions to be discussed, with fairness and detachment of mind, and to give the fullest weight to the arguments upon them from whatever quarter they may come. Difficulties are in no case evaded, even if we may think that at times they are not fully met; and it will be found that in many cases where a questionable admission seems to be made it is deprived of much of its possible mischief by the powerful antiseptic of the Bishop's strong common sense expressed in some qualifying statement.

The Charge comes from a High Churchman, and one who in some respects is more advanced than the High Churchmen of Caroline days, though his attitude towards Nonconformity is more tolerant and reasonable than theirs. He sees clearly the drift of the Anglo-Catholic movement as developed in recent years and speaks strongly enough about it at times; but he does not seem to realize how completely subversive of the whole basis of the Church of England the movement is. And it is unfortunate that in the introduction he suggests a doubt as to the possibility of ascertaining what the teaching of the Church of England is:

"A further characteristic of it is that it (the Church of England) is difficult to define or to describe. We know what Calvinism is. We find its tenets admirably put before us in the Institutes of Calvin. We know what Lutheranism is: it represents quite clearly the teaching of Luther. The Church of Rome has systematically defined and regulated its doctrine, its worship and its law; but what is the teaching of the Church of England? There is no great theologian to whom we can appeal and say 'Here you can find what we teach'" (p. 1).

But, even if there were no great theologian to whom we could appeal, which can only be admitted with qualification, have we not two authoritative documents which sufficiently meet the need—the Prayer Book and the Articles of Religion. Is either of these so obscure as to convey no meaning? Until the exigencies of the party which sought to reverse the Reformation Settlement, but desired to hide this purpose, compelled a meaning to be read into both which they were never intended to bear and which grammatically and historically they are not capable of bearing, there was no doubt as to the position and teaching of the Church of

England in the minds of the great and distinguished band of her Divines from the Reformation until the middle of the nineteenth century. It is a bad policy to weaken the standards of authority. They may be altered or superseded, just as they superseded earlier standards; but hints of disparagement or suggestions of obscurity furnish excuses for withholding obedience to people who ignore altogether the limits which the Bishop would place upon his own words. And it is here where so many of the Bishops, and other people as well, seem to go astray. They cherish the idea that if permission to disregard authority in certain directions is given it will still be possible to say "Thus far, but no farther." Have we not just seen the Anglo-Catholic Bishop of Pretoria trying to put the brake on, and protesting against Mr. Pinchard's advocacy of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary? Just as the demand for adoration of the Sacrament has been forced on during the last decade, so will the adoration of the Virgin Mary in the next few years, unless we return to history, to common sense and to the standards of the Church of England—Holy Scripture, the Creeds, the Prayer Book and the Articles of Religion.

We find another example of the weakening of the standards of authority in the case of the treatment of the question of the Mass Vestments, or as the Bishop calls them "Eucharistic Vestments." It is admitted (p. 81) that "the actual law depends upon a judgment which has not been overruled, according to which the Eucharistic Vestments are not legal." So far good, but the Bishop goes on to say: "There was strong ground for thinking it was a judgment of policy rather than of law," and adds, "I have read with much care what has been said on this subject, and I cannot feel that there is any real force in the argument which has been used condemning the vestments." The Bishop can hardly have realized how serious an accusation he makes against so eminent and distinguished a body of judges as those who tried the case Ridsdale *v.* Clifton, in suggesting that their judgment was one of policy rather than of law. The original author of the statement, Chief Baron Kelly, was one of the judges, but dissented from the conclusion of the majority, which included the first Lord Selborne and Lord Chancellor Cairns. Annoyed, we may presume, at having been overruled he charged the majority with following policy and not law. For this he had to make a public apology. It was dated

October 25, 1877, and was published in *The Times*, "withdrawing and correcting the statement." Those who have read the chapter on the Ridsdale Judgment in Lord Selborne's *Memorials* will be able to estimate the value of the accusation. As the author withdrew it publicly it ought to have been left to its merited oblivion. The Bishop, however, proceeds to discuss the question of the Vestments, and it must be admitted that he does so in a candid and tolerant spirit. It is evident that he has taken great pains to get at the truth of the matter. Though he does not see the force of the argument against vestments, his own opinion is "quite decidedly in favour of the surplice," "to me the dignified simplicity of the white surplice harmonizes better with the whole character of this service." He goes on, however, to say that "both usages prevail in the Church, both have become legal by prescription." But, surely, it is the province of *the law* to declare what is legal, and the surplice is legal by more than prescription. Space will not admit of a discussion of the Ornaments Rubric, but as the Bishop has been persuaded, or has persuaded himself that the rubric requires the vestments, we may ask if he has really considered the bearing of the historical evidence, much of which he recounts on the matter. In its present form the rubric comes to us from the revisers of 1662. Not one of the Bishops of the time required, and not one of the clergy used the vestments. They had disappeared for 100 years and were never revived until after the rise of the Oxford movement. Moreover, all the Bishops on the bench required in the ministering of the Sacraments the use of a large and comely surplice with sleeves. It is one thing to connive at neglect of the law; it is quite another to issue directions contrary to it. Surely the Bishops who had taken part in drawing up the rubric knew what they meant. The utter disappearance of the vestments and the universal recognition of the surplice are impossible to reconcile with the theory that the rubric was intended to direct the use of the vestments. The conclusion at which the Bishop arrives is startlingly paradoxical: "It seems to me, therefore, that by the law of the State vestments are enjoined; by the law of the Church there is no authority for their use." By the law of the State the Bishop here means the Prayer Book, since that is enjoined by an Act of Parliament. But the Prayer Book, before it reached Parliament, was drawn up by the Church; it comes to us with the authority of Convocation as

well as that of Parliament. Is it conceivable that Convocation should deliberately draft a rubric in contradiction to the Canons, which direct the use of the surplice, send it to Parliament for enactment and then universally violate it? Most people would feel that a theory which does such violence to the facts stands condemned. On this point the Bishop repeats the statement which is often heard, that "The original policy of the Queen (Elizabeth) was in favour of retaining the vestments." For this statement there is no evidence, and what we know of Elizabeth's actions points the other way. Bishop Boyd Carpenter, of Ripon, in his *Popular History of the Church of England* (p. 215), wrote: "It is thought that the queen, who loved pomp and ceremony, hoped that the old vestments would be revived. But this is only a conjecture *and is not borne out by what took place afterwards.*" Elizabeth was fond of pomp and ceremony, and the ordering of the use of the cope in cathedral and collegiate churches on great festivals may have been due to her; but she had a much clearer view of matters concerning doctrine than she is usually credited with, and a desire to retain the Mass Vestments in the services of the Church is quite out of harmony with what we know of her.

On the subject of Confession the Bishop writes much that is of real value. His practical sense and clear theological perception put the matter on its proper footing. He sees what is the mischief of Confession: its tendency to undermine self-reliance and to lead to a dependence upon the direction of a priest. "When once people begin the habit of confession they begin to exaggerate formal ecclesiastical offences, they lose the idea of character and substitute the idea of discipline" (p. 99). But it is unfortunate that he makes an admission which greatly weakens the force of his counsel. He tells us that in the Long Exhortation in the Communion Service, the Church of England "quite clearly recognized the value of confession" (p. 97). But is this so? Let us compare the present Exhortation with the form in which it appeared in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.

"And if there be any of you, whose conscience is troubled and grieved in any thing, lacking comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned *priest*, taught in the law of God, and *confess* and open his *sin* and grief *secretly*, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice and comfort, that his conscience

may be relieved, and that of us (as of the ministers of GOD and of the Church) he may receive comfort and absolution, to the satisfaction of his mind, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness: *requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession, not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest; nor those also which think needful or convenient, for the quietness of their own consciences, particularly to open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to* GOD, *and the general confession to the church. But in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity, and every man to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging other men's minds or consciences; where as he hath no warrant of God's word to the same.*"

This was carefully revised three years later, in 1552, and, practically, as so revised it appears in our present Prayer Book. The following is the form as it now stands:

"And because it is requisite, that no man should come to the Holy Communion, but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore if there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."

In view of the fact that all the words marked in italics in the earlier form were removed, it is a very strong assumption to regard the present form as having reference to confession. And considering that in both, the resort to a minister is regarded not as the normal but as the exceptional thing, the Bishop's statement, "It is, I think, clear that if any man or woman desires habitually to go to a priest for confession, for absolution and direction, there is nothing contrary to the teaching of the Church of England in that," is scarcely in accordance with the evidence.

It is to be wished, too, that in his references to the Malines controversy the Bishop had dealt rather with the realities of the situation than with its appearances. There is, moreover, here a tone of irritation in his comments strikingly absent from the Charge as a whole. He speaks of the "curious controversy which has arisen as to which religious community has been wicked enough to try and behave in a Christian way for the first time" (p. 158). With most that the Bishop says on the subject there will be general

agreement. But, surely, the point of the objection to the Malines "conversations" was that Rome has made it perfectly clear that the only terms upon which relations can be established are those of complete submission to her claims and full acceptance of her teaching; and this objection derived additional weight from the fact that Lord Halifax was the leader in the matter. Of Lord Halifax's sincerity and devotion to the cause of religion, the Bishop speaks in the highest terms, and deservedly. But it remains true that Lord Halifax is the representative of those who accept with very slight reservations almost the whole system of Roman doctrine, and while he is universally respected, he can hardly be regarded as one who would suitably represent the position of the Church of England.

It is a profound mistake to represent the differences between Rome and the Church of England as merely, or even mainly, a matter of the primacy or supremacy of the Pope. The differences are far deeper and are to be found in that dark region of unscriptural teaching and monstrous superstition from which the papal claims derive their origin. We differ, not in this or that detail, nor in this or that extravagance of expression, but in the whole conception of the nature of the Gospel of Christ. Hooker's words are as true now as when they were written:

> "Wherein then do we disagree? We disagree about the nature of the very essence of the medicine whereby Christ cureth our disease; about the manner of applying it; about the number and the power of means, which God requireth in us for the effectual applying thereof to our soul's comfort." (*Works*. Vol II. p. 486.)

These are two ways by which reunion with Rome may be reached: the Church of Rome may reform itself by relinquishing its arrogant claims to supremacy and infallibility, and by renouncing its false doctrines; or the Church of England may abandon all that it secured at the Reformation. There is no other way, and "conversations" which ignore this are futile.

It is obvious that a Charge so comprehensive in its scope must raise questions, at almost every point, upon which opinions will differ, and differ widely. The Bishop has not hesitated to express his own views frankly and forcibly, and for this he deserves our gratitude. His Charge will stimulate thought; it lays down important principles; it offers much valuable guidance, and it should be widely and carefully studied.

COMMONWEALTH CIVIL MARRIAGES.

By the Rev. Harold Smith, D.D., St. John's Hall, Highbury.

THE most important dates in the history of Parish Registers are :—

(1) 1538. Royal Injunctions were issued, drawn up by Thomas Cromwell, "Vice-gerent to the King's Highness for all his jurisdiction ecclesiastical." The twelfth of these ordered that every parson, vicar, or curate should keep a book or register in which to enter weddings, christenings, and buryings. The parish was to provide a sure coffer, with two locks and keys, one to be kept by the incumbent, the other by the churchwardens. Every Sunday the incumbent was to take out the book, and in the presence of one or more wardens make the entries for the past week. Every time this was omitted the party in fault was to forfeit 3*s.* 4*d.* towards the reparation of the church. This order was renewed in the Injunctions of Edward VI, 1547, and in those of Elizabeth, 1559. The one difference is that under Elizabeth half the forfeit was to go towards church repairs, half to the "Poor Men's Box"; under Edward all was to go to this Box, nothing to repairs. But one wonders how often this forfeit was actually paid. Over 800 registers still go back to 1538 or 1539.

(2) 1597. It was now ordered by Convocation that parchment books be substituted for paper, and that all past entries during the reign of Elizabeth be copied into them. Every Sunday, after Morning or Evening Prayer, the minister was to read out the list of the past week. Each complete page was to be signed by the minister and churchwardens. The chest was to have *three* keys, so that the minister might do nothing without the wardens, nor the wardens without the minister. But the fine for omission was dropped. This was mostly repeated in Canon 70 of 1604. Into the parchment book were to be copied the day and year of every christening, wedding and burial since the law was first made in that behalf, so far as the ancient books thereof could be procured, but especially since the beginning of the reign of the late Queen. Each warden was to have his own key. The order for reading out the week's list was dropped. These regulations account for two

facts. (1) That so many existing Registers begin in 1558. This is probably rarely due to neglect of the early Injunctions, but to many copyists having thought that, according to the terms of the Canon, they need not go back beyond Elizabeth's accession. (2) That in Registers in general the early entries down to about 1600 or rather later are written in one handwriting, obviously at one time. They are not the original entries, but were copied from the original paper registers, only a few of which still remain. The copying might be done by the incumbent, but was often due to an official scribe, sent round to see that it had been done. Hence it was some time before all the Registers were duly copied. (These Injunctions and Canons will be found in Cardwell's *Documentary Annals* and *Synodalia*; and in Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*.)

(3) 1653. Elected Registrars, and Civil Marriage by a Justice. (see below).

(4) 1753. By Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act, books with a printed outline to be filled in and signed by the officiant, were first introduced for Marriages (and for Banns).

(5) 1812. Rose's Act extended this to Baptisms and Burials.

(6) 1837. The Registers took practically their present form.

Until the introduction of these printed books there is great variety in registers, according to the personality of the incumbent (or clerk). Some make very brief and scanty entries, saying nothing e.g. about abode, occupation, or age. Others make very full entries, sometimes at least as full as those required now. Thus when John Venn, afterwards Rector of Clapham, one of the founders of the Church Missionary Society, became Vicar of Little Dunham, Norfolk, in 1783, he started a new register, giving the profession or trade of the father and the maiden name of the mother of each child baptized; and in the entries of burial, the age and not unfrequently the cause of death. He also prefixed to this register seven or eight pages dealing with the history of the parish. We often find in old registers notices of the coming of a new incumbent. But before the days of printed forms entries were not signed by the officiant; though often the incumbent or curate, and perhaps a churchwarden, signed at the foot of the page or at the close of the entries of the year. Thus John Strype signs regularly year after year at Leyton, until his old age, when his curate takes his

place. This signature was enjoined by the Canon, but was most commonly neglected. We also often find miscellaneous notices, especially at the end of the book. E.g., lists of briefs and of money collected upon them are very common.

To come to our main subject: the supplanting of the Book of Common Prayer by the Directory in 1645 did not affect the keeping of the registers. But in 1653 the Little (or "Barebones") Parliament passed an Act ordering the election of a "register" (i.e., registrar) in every parish, to be approved and admitted by a Justice of the Peace. He was to keep a book in which to enter all births (not baptisms), burials and notifications of intention to marry. He was to be elected for three years. Marriage was to be performed by a Justice of the Peace, on certificate of such notification having been made publicly thrice, either in church or in market, without any opposition. No other form of marriage was to be legal.

There are several current misconceptions of this ordinance.

(*a*) It is often regarded as a gratuitous insult to the clergy, an instance of anti-clerical feeling. Considering the composition of this Parliament, an assembly of nominees, largely idealists, such a feeling is not improbable. But the evidence of registers shows quite clearly that their keeping had too often been neglected of recent years, and not only when and where the War was raging. Some "intruders" kept their registers most carefully; we find some, coming after several years' neglect, doing their best to discover and supply past omissions. But there were many cases of neglect, and some of these may have attracted attention.

(*b*) It is commonly said that this Act established *Lay* Registers. But there was nothing in it to prevent clergy being thus elected; and there are a fair number of known cases of this. E.g., at Epping and at Great Clacton, the mother parish of Clacton-on-Sea, the vicar was so elected; at Barking and at Waltham Abbey the assistant curate.

(*c*) These registrars are often blamed for the loss of earlier registers, because in a number of parishes the first extant register is that started by them in 1653. But in such cases it is doubtful whether the old register was ever in their hands, although the Act provided that they should have it to keep as a record. If they had it, it is strange that the incumbent did not get it back when he received the one started by them. There could hardly have been

many lost in half a dozen years. The older one has more probably been lost subsequently in the same way as other old registers have been; some incumbent (or warden, or clerk) of the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries is probably responsible. Many have been lost since 1831.

In some cases, when the new register started in 1653 was filled, the clergy went back to the older one; in others, the remaining pages of the older register were utilized for special matters, e.g., at Waltham Abbey for entering Briefs, of which there is a very full list. Only when the first existing register begins in 1659 or thereabouts is there much ground for supposing that the loss of all preceding registers may be due to the elected registrars. But even in this case there are other possible causes. The loss of early registers has hardly stopped, though checked by constant enquiries by Rural Deans.

The notices of this change, in registers not started by these registrars, are curiously varied. Often there is no notice whatever of the appointment of such a registrar. This may be due to the fact that no such elections took place in this parish; or more probably that the incumbent continued to carry on his own register independently. Probably in more cases than we can ascertain the elected registrar was the parish or vestry clerk, in which case he would probably work in with the incumbent. But not unfrequently there is notice of the election of a registrar, and his approval by a Justice; but the entries continue in the same writing as before. The election may have been a mere formality; or two registers may have been kept independently.

But some registrars did their work very thoroughly; the number of their entries marks a great advance upon those of the years immediately preceding. They frequently enter baptisms as well as births, or even instead of them.

Registrars were to hold office for three years, when there might be another election. We occasionally find notices of a new election in 1656, but not later. By 1659 the "Rump" was restored, and was none too much inclined to favour Cromwellian legislation; and by the end of the year it was tottering to its fall. The Act or Ordinance will be found in Firth and Rait's Ordinances of the Interregnum, II, 715. It was passed on August 24, 1653, to come into force from September 29.

The registrar after election took an oath before a Justice to discharge his office diligently, and not to charge illegal fees; and was then admitted by the Justice. At West Ham forty-five voters elected Edward Lawson as "Register"; he was sworn in by Robert Smith of Upton, a City alderman, who had been Sheriff of Essex in the critical year 1642; he was an active member of the County Parliamentary Committee, but was created a baronet at the Restoration. A new register book was purchased for £1 15*s*. Lawson kept it most thoroughly; he had however a curious habit of prefixing or adding the Hebrew names of the months, e.g., "February: the Scripture month is called 'Adar'; " "the eighteenth of the month Abib or Nisan, called March." In 1656 he was succeeded by Richard Grane.

The number and character of *marriage* entries in registers vary greatly. In some registers practically none are entered during these years; perhaps the clergy or clerks thought that marriage being no longer a Church matter, it was none of their business. In other registers, especially those known to have been kept by registrars, the notices of the publication of banns are duly entered, but not the marriage, which took place outside the parish at the residence of some Justice. Combined with the frequent neglect of registers in the year immediately preceding, and with the fact that marriage licences were no longer issued, this makes the period a bad one for the genealogist. But others give not only the dates of publication, but also the date of the marriage and by whom performed. The most full and interesting cases are where an active magistrate lived in the parish, and people came from some distance to be married by him; in such cases the parochial registrar may record from what parishes they brought certificates, and by whom these were signed. This is the case in several parishes near the London end of Essex: Waltham Abbey, Walthamstow, Wanstead, West Ham. At Waltham Abbey about ninety marriages are recorded as taken by Henry Wollaston, J.P., whose wife Ursula was a grand-daughter of John Foxe, of the *Book of Martyrs*; in twenty-seven of these both parties were of other parishes. At West Ham a very large number, some from outside, were taken by Robert Smith (and a few others); at Walthamstow many by William Conyers, Serjeant-at-Law.

Publication of banns was far more common in the church than

in the market, though the latter had its advantages when the two parties lived in different parishes, and the Justice in the market town; one set of publications served all purposes. But we have a case of two Walthamstow people being published three weeks in Waltham Abbey Market, and yet married at Walthamstow. There is also a curious case of banns being published (1) at Enfield Market, (2) at Chingford Church, (3) at Waltham Abbey Market; as the parties were married by Serjeant Conyers, we may suppose that this was strictly legal.

The Waltham Abbey Registers show that the new system was not popular at first. The normal number of marriages there was two or three a month. But in September, 1653, there were as many as *ten*. There was clearly a rush to get married before the new system came in.

The ceremony is thus laid down: "The Man to be married, taking the Woman to be married by the hand, shall plainly and distinctly pronounce these words: 'I, A.B., do here in the presence of God, the searcher of all hearts, take thee, C.D., for my wedded wife, and do also in the presence of God and before these witnesses promise to be unto thee a loving and faithful husband.' And the Woman, taking the Man by the hand, shall plainly and distinctly pronounce these words: 'I, C.D., do here in the presence of God, the searcher of all hearts, take thee, A.B., for my wedded husband, and do also in the presence of God and before these witnesses promise to be unto thee a loving, faithful and obedient wife'." The Justice was authorized in the case of dumb persons to dispense with pronouncing the words aforesaid; and with joining hands in the case of persons which have not hands.

It is not clear to what extent (1) this civil ceremony of marriage was supplemented by a religious service; or (2) prayer was offered by a minister at it. Both of these are known to have taken place not unfrequently, but it is hard to say how widely they prevailed.

The former is noted occasionally in registers; sometimes the church marriage preceded that before the Justice, sometimes it followed. It may have been added not simply from religious motives, but to make quite sure that the parties were recognized by all as legally married; there was no assurance of the new order lasting. (It seems in fact to have largely gone out as early as 1657. There is no marriage by a Justice at Waltham Abbey after the early

part of that year ; at West Ham, and elsewhere, marriages by clergy are by then replacing those by a Justice.) Similarly when the Directory first replaced the Prayer Book there were doubts about the new marriage service. It is said that a daughter of Stephen Marshall, the noted Puritan preacher, who had taken great part in the composition of the Directory, was married by her father with the Prayer Book service ; he immediately paid down £5 to the churchwardens as fine or forfeiture for using any other form of marriage than that in the Directory. Fuller says that probably some for greater security twisted the Liturgy and Directory together, " as since some have joined to both, marriage by a Justice of Peace ; that so a threefold cable might not be broken." In the event these marriages before a Justice were recognized as valid by an Act of the Convention Parliament, 1660.

Among those thus doubly married were Cromwell's two younger daughters, Frances and Mary. According to Clarendon, " It was observed, that though the marriages were performed in public view according to the rites and ceremonies then in use, they were afterwards in private married by ministers ordained by bishops, and according to the form in the Book of Common Prayer ; and this with the privity of Cromwell, who pretended to yield to it in compliance with the importunity and folly of his daughters." Frances was married November 19, 1657, to Robert Rich, grandson of the Earl of Warwick, by Henry Scobell, Clerk of the Parliaments, a Justice for Westminster ; after however " a godly prayer made by one of his Highness' divines." It is not clear who took the subsequent religious service. In the case of Mary Cromwell, married to Lord Fauconberg, it was taken by Dr. Hewitt, Vicar of St. Gregory by St. Paul's, where she used secretly to attend. When, only a few months later, Dr. Hewitt was condemned to death for his share in a royalist plot, the Fauconbergs " used their utmost credit with the Protector to preserve his life ; but he was inexorable."

Cases of prayer being offered by a minister at the marriage before the Justice are naturally not recorded in registers ; but probably the practice at Frances Cromwell's marriage was not at all uncommon. Ralph Josselin, Vicar of Earl's Colne, Essex, notes in his Diary, April 10, 1655, " This day the Justice and I married Peg Nevill to Butcher ; the first I intermeddled with since the late Act."

I know of more than one case of clergy being thus civilly married,

in the market, though the latter had its advantages when the two parties lived in different parishes, and the Justice in the market town; one set of publications served all purposes. But we have a case of two Walthamstow people being published three weeks in Waltham Abbey Market, and yet married at Walthamstow. There is also a curious case of banns being published (1) at Enfield Market, (2) at Chingford Church, (3) at Waltham Abbey Market; as the parties were married by Serjeant Conyers, we may suppose that this was strictly legal.

The Waltham Abbey Registers show that the new system was not popular at first. The normal number of marriages there was two or three a month. But in September, 1653, there were as many as *ten*. There was clearly a rush to get married before the new system came in.

The ceremony is thus laid down: "The Man to be married, taking the Woman to be married by the hand, shall plainly and distinctly pronounce these words: 'I, A.B., do here in the presence of God, the searcher of all hearts, take thee, C.D., for my wedded wife, and do also in the presence of God and before these witnesses promise to be unto thee a loving and faithful husband.' And the Woman, taking the Man by the hand, shall plainly and distinctly pronounce these words: 'I, C.D., do here in the presence of God, the searcher of all hearts, take thee, A.B., for my wedded husband, and do also in the presence of God and before these witnesses promise to be unto thee a loving, faithful and obedient wife'." The Justice was authorized in the case of dumb persons to dispense with pronouncing the words aforesaid; and with joining hands in the case of persons which have not hands.

It is not clear to what extent (1) this civil ceremony of marriage was supplemented by a religious service; or (2) prayer was offered by a minister at it. Both of these are known to have taken place not unfrequently, but it is hard to say how widely they prevailed.

The former is noted occasionally in registers; sometimes the church marriage preceded that before the Justice, sometimes it followed. It may have been added not simply from religious motives, but to make quite sure that the parties were recognized by all as legally married; there was no assurance of the new order lasting. (It seems in fact to have largely gone out as early as 1657. There is no marriage by a Justice at Waltham Abbey after the early

part of that year ; at West Ham, and elsewhere, marriages by clergy are by then replacing those by a Justice.) Similarly when the Directory first replaced the Prayer Book there were doubts about the new marriage service. It is said that a daughter of Stephen Marshall, the noted Puritan preacher, who had taken great part in the composition of the Directory, was married by her father with the Prayer Book service ; he immediately paid down £5 to the churchwardens as fine or forfeiture for using any other form of marriage than that in the Directory. Fuller says that probably some for greater security twisted the Liturgy and Directory together, " as since some have joined to both, marriage by a Justice of Peace ; that so a threefold cable might not be broken." In the event these marriages before a Justice were recognized as valid by an Act of the Convention Parliament, 1660.

Among those thus doubly married were Cromwell's two younger daughters, Frances and Mary. According to Clarendon, " It was observed, that though the marriages were performed in public view according to the rites and ceremonies then in use, they were afterwards in private married by ministers ordained by bishops, and according to the form in the Book of Common Prayer ; and this with the privity of Cromwell, who pretended to yield to it in compliance with the importunity and folly of his daughters." Frances was married November 19, 1657, to Robert Rich, grandson of the Earl of Warwick, by Henry Scobell, Clerk of the Parliaments, a Justice for Westminster ; after however " a godly prayer made by one of his Highness' divines." It is not clear who took the subsequent religious service. In the case of Mary Cromwell, married to Lord Fauconberg, it was taken by Dr. Hewitt, Vicar of St. Gregory by St. Paul's, where she used secretly to attend. When, only a few months later, Dr. Hewitt was condemned to death for his share in a royalist plot, the Fauconbergs " used their utmost credit with the Protector to preserve his life ; but he was inexorable."

Cases of prayer being offered by a minister at the marriage before the Justice are naturally not recorded in registers ; but probably the practice at Frances Cromwell's marriage was not at all uncommon. Ralph Josselin, Vicar of Earl's Colne, Essex, notes in his Diary, April 10, 1655, " This day the Justice and I married Peg Nevill to Butcher ; the first I intermeddled with since the late Act."

I know of more than one case of clergy being thus civilly married,

e.g., in 1655 Henry Osbaston was appointed Vicar of Little Ilford, then a very small parish of some ten or twelve families only. He had previously been in West Kent. The law was that any one presented to a living had to be approved by the " Triers " ; or, to give them their proper title, the " Commissioners for Approbation of Public Preachers." Their certificate of approval was equivalent to institution and induction. They required, besides a personal interview, at least three certificates from godly men personally acquainted with the minister presented ; one at least of these must be a minister. In practice, very few risked bringing merely the minimum ; most brought at least six, all or nearly all from ministers. But Osbaston was not taking any risks, so he brought *fifteen*, from the ministers of Tonbridge, Sevenoaks, Ightham, etc. He was married to Joyce Richards, widow of his predecessor, Humphrey Richards, on April 2, 1657, at Walthamstow, by Serjeant Conyers. He conformed in 1662, and got also the Rectory of Stapleford Abbots.

The Register of Prittlewell, the mother parish of Southend, is very interesting for this period. Their elected Registrar was Nathaniel Benson, schoolmaster. Couples had to go for marriage to magistrates living near Chelmsford or Maldon, some fifteen or twenty miles away. Among the marriages entered by Benson are those of Samuel Keeble, minister of Ashingdon, married at Hasely by Isaac Aleyn, J. P. ; of Thomas Peck, minister of Prittlewell, married at Stowmarket by George Groome, J.P. ; and his own, at Hasely church by Mr. Hewetson, minister of Woodham Mortimer, in the presence of Isaac Aleyn, J.P. This is the only marriage so described.

Thus civil marriage was the law in England from Michaelmas 1653 till 1659 or 1660, though in fact it largely went out in the summer of 1657.

There are two marked differences between this and the civil marriages of the present day. (1) The solemn recognition of God. (2) The absence of secrecy. Marriages before the registrar are now largely sought on account of this privacy, which is desired on one ground or another. But in 1653 the only alternative to publication in church was publication in the market. There is much to be said for more real " publication," e.g., by a list placed *outside* the church or registrar's office. However much one may sympathize with desire for a quiet marriage, the present system encourages rash and unfit marriages. This our fathers guarded against.

VESTMENTS.

By Albert Mitchell, Member of the Church Assembly.

In the unreformed Church of England a large number of vestures were in use, the form and variety of which served to distinguish both the grades of the clergy and the functions that they performed. The general term clergy included those in minor orders, whom we to-day regard as laymen. Many of these vestures might be worn not only by those in minor orders, but also by others of the laity who were called upon or permitted to take part in ecclesiastical functions. But others of these vestures were restricted to those in the higher orders, and some to those who executed the office of the Holy Eucharist, called the Mass. It is to these last that the technical term vestment is usually applied: while when mention is made of "the vestment" the reference is always to the Chasuble, the vesture that, in the Middle Ages, was assumed by the priest, who presided and officiated at the service then called the Mass, which was and is presented as the celebration of that ordinance of our Blessed Lord which we delight to call by such names as "The Lord's Supper," and "The most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ."

It may be observed in passing that at the Mass, as also at the Sacrament in our Reformed Church, there is only one Priest—*the* Priest—*the* Minister. His assistants, whatever their ecclesiastical rank, were "*the* Deacon," and "*the* Sub-deacon." For these three ministers were provided the three stalls, still found in the more important of our old churches, which we name Sedilia.[1] In our modern usage the "Gospeller" and "Epistoler" roughly answer respectively to the "Deacon" and "Sub-deacon."

At the beginning of our consideration of this question, we are met with a sharp difference of opinion as to the origin of the vestures used in Church during the Middle Ages (I intentionally use the expression "the Middle Ages" to avoid prejudging the question of the antiquity of the use of the Mediaeval vestments).

One view, stated very fully in Stanley's *Christian Institutions* (Chapter VIII), derives them all from the secular dress of the ordinary civilised laity (Roman and Greek) of the early centuries. "The dress of the clergy had no distinct intention—symbolical, sacerdotal, sacrificial, or mystical; but originated simply in fashions common to the whole community of the Roman Empire during the three first centuries:" and again, "Not the clergy only but the laity as well, when they came to their public assemblies, wore indeed their ordinary clothes, but took care that they 'should be clean.'"

But this view is hotly contested by others, who insist that

[1] In great churches a fourth stall is provided for the contingency of the presence of a prelate who (without taking part in the essentials of the service) ornamentally "pontificates."

the vesture that came to be associated with the Christian ministry was taken over from the Jewish Priesthood. For this view see G. G. Scott's *Essay on English Church Architecture*, pp. 66–69. While it has even been attempted by symbolising enthusiasts to identify different articles with incidents in the dress of our Blessed Lord Himself.

The lesser vestments need not detain us long. The vestments of the Mass were the Amice, the Alb, the Girdle, the Maniple, the Stole, and the Chasuble. To these we may add the Cope, the Dalmatic (with its variant the Tunicle), the Surplice, the Pall, the Rochet, and the Chimere (chymmer).

The *Amice* (Amictus) is merely a linen collar, and is to be carefully distinguished (*pace* Palmer, *Origines*, 320) from the Almuce or Amess (Amitia) which was a scarf of black cloth, lined with fur (probably worn for warmth as a kind of muffler), the original of the modern black tippet or scarf. The *Alb* was a close-fitting linen vesture with tightened sleeves, girded in at the waist, and coming below the knees. The *Girdle* explains itself. The *Maniple*, on the utilitarian theory, was either the cleric's handkerchief (Sudarium), or a napkin to cleanse the lip of the cup. It is pinned or buttoned to the left sleeve of the alb. It has no modern use, but is now a narrow slip said to symbolise the cord of scourging. The *Stole* may have had a similar origin to the maniple. It is frequently confused with the tippet or scarf. The symbolists say it represents the rope by which the Lord was led to the cross. The *Dalmatic* is a loose robe, with open sleeves. Originally its use was reserved to the bishop, but in the fourth century the Roman deacons began to use it in their struggle for power: [1] and it came in time to be the distinguishing costume of "the Deacon" (Gospeller) at the Mass. The Tunicle is the simpler form worn by Subdeacon.

The *Surplice* is well known. It is a *full* linen gown, made to be worn over other garments (superpellicum, "over the fur"), with full sleeves. It was the "clerkly habit" (Foxe, iv. 364). The *Pall* was possibly originally merely a long stole, twisted in fantastic fashion. In the result it became in the West the distinguishing mark of an Archbishop [2] (*praerogativa pontificalis dignitatis*), and appears to-day in conventional form upon the arms of the English primates. It could be sent only from Rome. The *Rochet* is simply the lawn surplice, with sleeves gathered in at the wrist, worn by bishops. The *Chimere* or chymmer is the loose

[1] *Camb. Med. H.* i. 156. (The writer is Mr. C. H. Turner.) The essential superiority of presbyter to deacon was not established without a struggle. Do. pp. 154–5. At the council of Arles 314 it was found necessary to forbid a deacon to celebrate the Eucharist. The Archdeacon of Rome had a fair chance of the papal chair.

(The *Spectator* reviewer, Jan. 1912, challenged the statement that the dalmatic was originally an episcopal vesture. Prof. Sanday, *Contemp. Review*, Feb. 1912, bore testimony to general accuracy of Mr. Turner's facts.)

[2] See Cranmer's challenge to (the jurisdiction of) his degraders (Foxe, viii. 79), "Which of you hath a pall, to take off my pall?"

sleeveless overcoat, of scarlet or black, now worn by bishops over the *rochet.*

There remain the *Cope* and *Chasuble.* The Cope is a large cloak, covering the whole body and garments, open down the front, but held together with a strap or band over the chest. In olden times it sometimes had a cowl or hood attached, but that is now represented merely by a pattern on the shoulders. The simple cope (cappa nigra—black cope) was of plain black cloth worn in choir over the surplice, probably for warmth. (It must be remembered that mediaeval churches were very chilly.[1]) The processional cope (cappa serica—silk cope) was of coloured or embroidered silk, worn in procession, and at ceremonial functions. It was worn by laymen as well as by the clergy, and even in wholly secular functions. It is not enumerated amongst the " Paramenta degradando."

The mediaeval cope was, undoubtedly, a soft, clinging garment. This is shown particularly by the vivid sculptures on the famous " Seven Sacraments " fonts of Norfolk. The priest could throw the cope back over the shoulder to have his arm free. The stiff formal structure affected in modern days was probably suggested by the stilted late mediaeval paintings aided by the analogy of the obsolete vestments grown rigid in old chests, etc. At Lincoln the Canons were directed to change their processional copes for their choir copes in their stalls. There would certainly be no room in a Lincoln stall for two of the modern Church-furnisher's copes, *plus* an ecclesiastic! The black choir cope was worn at Lincoln from September to Easter, and during the rest of the year the Canons carried their Amesses (mufflers) with them in case of cold. This shows that the cope was really a kind of overcoat (probably the " respectable " man's topcoat).

None of the foregoing vestments can be claimed as possessing doctrinal significance. But it is otherwise with the *Chasuble,* round which the whole controversy rages.

" Chasuble," or " Chesille," or " Chesible," were varying characteristic attempts of the awkward English tongue to achieve the Latin " Casula " (literally, " a little house," from its enveloping character). Another name was *Planeta* (" wanderer "), signifying its loose swaying character.

On the secular derivation, it was the ancient poorer man's overcoat (paenula, Phenolion)—probably more protection against rain than against cold—and as a secular dress it survives to this day in countries of Spanish origin as a *poncha* or *poncho.* Under this name it has (appropriately to its likely origin) found a use in England as a cyclist's rain cape. But Mr. Gilbert Scott disputes the secular origin, and claims (following Dr. Rock) that the chasuble is derived from the vestment described in Exodus xxviii. 32. He argues that as the paenula was the " vulgar " dress, as distinct

[1] The portly appearance in ancient pictures of even ascetic-faced ecclesiastics is largely due to the quantities of clothing necessary to support sufficient heat of body.

from the dignified *toga*, it is impossible that it should have been taken as the dress of the clergy. Others may be inclined to invert the argument.

In its original form the *casula* (Chasuble) was the shape of an obtuse cone, with the apex cut off to pass the head through, and ideally made up from a complete semi-circle of stuff stitched up. But such a make-up would involve a waste of material; and in practice two different ways of making up the garment were resorted to. In the Latin form it was made up of three pieces of stuff. This made three seams, which met on the chest so as to form a T cross. Another make-up (common in England and elsewhere) was of two pieces of stuff. This involved two seams only, one down the front and the other down the back. A variation of this by cross seams produced Y crosses back and front. The lines of the seams were ornamented with embroidery, called *orphreys* (i.e. "orfrais," gold embroidery), which made the "pillar" or "crosses."

According to Prebendary Meyrick (*Prot. Dict.* 100), it was about the end of the eighth century that the chasuble, ceasing to be worn by the laity, began to be an exclusively clerical vesture, although not necessarily a *ministerial* vesture.

So long as the primitive practice of the priest standing behind the Lord's Table, facing towards the people, continued, coupled with simplicity of rite, the uncurtailed conical shape of the chasuble presented no great inconvenience. But with the introduction and extension of the later practice of officiating with the back to the people, and with other developments of ritual expressive of development of doctrine, the freer use of the arms became necessary to the action of the celebrant.

The simplest alteration in the *Casula* was made in the East. There the priest is separated from the people by the *iconostasis*, or screen: and the Mysteries are not presented to the people for adoration until the moment of blessing, when the priest comes out and faces the people for the purpose. This does not require him to raise his hands above the level of his breast, and to suit this action the front of the chasuble is scooped out, so that it somewhat (to an uncritical judgment) resembles the Western cope.[1]

But in the West (to quote Gilbert Scott) "When the custom of veiling the altar [2] during mass (*sic*) had grown obsolete in the Latin Church, it became possible, and fitting, to make the moment of consecration the moment also of adoration, and one action to suffice for both. Thus the elevation of oblation became also the elevation for worship." (*Essay*, p. 117.)

To this end the rubric directed "post haec verba (sc. Hoc est

[1] It is suggested that the adoption by the Non-juring "Usagers" of the cope as their Eucharistic vesture may have been induced by a belief that it was identical with the Eastern "phenolion." The nonjurors largely influenced the Tractarians, with whom they were merged.

[2] There is no evidence of any such custom being general. By quoting Scott I do not adopt his views.

enim corpus meum) inclinet se sacerdos ad hostiam, et postea elevet eam supra frontem ut possit a populo videri." [After these words (For this is My Body) let the priest incline himself towards the Host, and afterward raise It above his forehead so that it may be seen by the people.] To make this action possible the sides of the chasuble were shaved off so that it came to a point back and front. Thus the very shape of the mediaeval chasuble was expressly due to the needs of ritual expressive of (*a*) sacrifice and (*b*) worship of the Host. It is therefore difficult to suggest that the use of the mediaeval chasuble does not involve doctrine.

In the Form of Degradation (see Foxe, viii. 77–79) the appropriate passage runs: Casulam sive planetam per posteriorem partem captivi accipit degradator, et degradandum exuit, dicens: "Veste sacerdotali charitatem signante te merito expoliamus, quia ipsum et omnem innocentiam exuisti."

See also Foxe's account (iv. 364) of the degradation of Dr. John Castellane at Tournay (1525): "Then he took away from him the chesille, saying: 'By good right we do despoil thee of this priestly ornament, which signifieth charity: for certainly thou hast forsaken the same, and all innocency.'" And in the degradation of Sautre (1401) by wicked Thomas of Arundel (see Foxe, iii. 227): "We pull from thy back the casule, and take from thee the priestly vestment, and deprive thee of all manner of priestly honour."

A further development of the shape of the chasuble has taken place since the Reformation for the same reasons, in Churches following the Roman Use. The whole of each side of the chasuble has been scooped out: and the result is reminiscent of "sandwich boards."

But it is worthy of note that where the primitive and orthodox position of the priest, facing towards the people, was retained, the "ancient ample unmutilated vestment" was also retained. (Scott, *ibid.*) It is a true instinct that connects the mediaeval vestment with the so-called Eastward Position (which I prefer to term "Arianistic"). The two cannot long be kept separate. Both stand for the doctrine of the *Priest*, the Sacrificer, interposing himself between the redeemed child and the Eternal Father, as if (forsooth) to re-Present to the Father that great Oblation which the one-begotten Son made once for all in complete union with the Father's will and purpose and love: and both, therefore, are contrary to the Truth of the Gospel. Both were excluded from the service of the Reformed Church at the same moment.

In the Order of the Communion issued in 1548, there was no reference to either the position of the priest or his vesture.

But at once on the issue of the First Book of Edward VI in 1549, relief was given in the matter of the vesture: "the Priest that shall execute the holy ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say: a white Albe plain, with a vestment or Cope." The "vestment" is, of course, the Chasuble of the unreformed ritual: but the significant innovation is the allowance of the alternative of the Cope. And when it is

remembered that " Cope " meant, in actual Divine service, as distinct from processions, quite as much (even if not more commonly) the *plain black cloth Choir cope* as the more showy " cappa serica," the possible extent of the innovation, and relief, begins to be appreciated.[1]

The First Book of King Edward does not appear to have been specially popular, and its revision was early commenced.

The Revised Book was issued in 1552, and was widely circulated (Gee, *Eliz. P.B.* 127). By this the Reform was carried further. The new Rubric ran:

> " And here it is to be noted that the Minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither Alb, Vestment, nor Cope: but being Archbishop, or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet: and being a Priest or Deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only."

While the service of Holy Communion was directed to be said by the Priest " standing at the North side of the Table," a direction that has never since been varied.[2]

The Marian reaction restored the whole Mediaeval Ritual, although there is reason to believe that the 1552 book was used in private. But Mary died in November 1558, and the use of the 1552 book was at once revived without waiting for legal sanction. (Parker Society, *Lit. Serv. Eliz.* xi.)

By the Elizabeth Act of Uniformity, the 1552 book was re-enacted, and directed to be used " with one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the Litany altered, and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the communicants, and NONE OTHER, or OTHER WISE." These words, undoubtedly, taken literally, re-imposed the 1552 Ornaments Rubric; and if nothing else had been said on the subject no question could have been taken as to what Vestments were lawful under this Act. But towards the end of the Act there occurs a very ambiguous proviso:

> " Provided always and be it enacted, that such Ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in use as was in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI, until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorised under the great seal of England, for causes ecclesiastical, or the Metropolitan of this realm."

[1] It is not impossible that this fact is behind the lament of the old Papist chronicler that the Archbishop (Cranmer) did the service in " Powles " (St. Paul's) wearing no vestment, but only a cope! (1549).

[2] The theory of the change of position of the Table is not substantiated by the evidence. Under this Rubric the Table stood, and was intended to stand, in the same posture that it stands to-day.

The proviso is ungrammatical, which suggests that some change of wording in the original draft had caused some crucial word or words to be left out. But we have no clue. In any case, the proviso is clearly temporary in its intention. There are two contemporary items of evidence as to its meaning, and each points in a different direction.

At the end of April 1559 (two days after the passing of the Act) Dr. Sandys (afterwards Archbishop of York) wrote to Dr. Matthew Parker (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury): "The Parliament draweth towards an end. The last book of service is gone through with a proviso to retain the ornaments which were used in the first and second years of King Edward, until it please the Queen to take other order for them. Our gloss upon this text is that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away, but that they may remain for the Queen." "Gloss," be it remembered, is the ordinary word for "comment," and is from the same (Greek) root as "glossary." It has no connexion with the meaning "gloze" (which is from a different—Icelandic—root) as a well-known Ritualist controversialist dared to pretend a few years since in a public correspondence!

Dr. Sandys wrote without book, as the Act was not issued from the press until after May 30, and his allusion to the *first* year is an error. The "we" means, of course, the clergy.

If Dr. Sandys' view is right, it would appear that no ritual use of the discarded vestments was contemplated, but merely their leisurely disposal to the profit of the Crown. It is worthy of note that the word "Use" has the same legal, technical meaning as the word "Trust": so that for property to be "held in use" was the same as to be "held in trust." The famous Statute of Uses (27 Hen. VIII, c. 10) uses the phrase "in use" in this sense: and it was a commonplace with sixteenth-century lawyers. For a lay use of the same expression see *Merchant of Venice*, Act IV, Scene 1, line 383. But only a Conveyancing Lawyer is likely to appreciate the force of this view (see Mr. J. T. Tomlinson's evidence before the Royal Commission, Vol. I, pp. 208–224, 283–293): and, however fascinating the theory may be, there are no signs as yet of its winning general acceptance. It was, unfortunately, not before the Tribunal in *Ridsdale v. Clifton*.

The other (contrary) piece of evidence is the fact that, in the new editions of the 1552 book printed in Elizabeth's reign, the original rubric (quoted before) was omitted: and the following note substituted:

> "And here it is to be noted, that the minister at the time of the communion, and at all times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI according to the act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book"

This note was quite illegal, as it was not prescribed by the Act, and it does not profess to do more than refer to the Act: but it certainly suggests that some one, with power to control the licensed printer, thought, or wished others to think, that the (temporary) ritual use of the alb, and tunicle, and the "Vestment" *or* Cope, was at least permissible under the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity: yet the very change of expression from "be in use" to "shall use" witnesses to some uneasiness as to the meaning of the former phrase.

But it has been shown, beyond all question, that within a few months the Vestments somehow or other disappeared from ken (see Mr. Tomlinson's evidence, as above).

One of the consecrators of Matthew Parker, Bishop Barlow (Dec. 1559), wore a silk cope,[1] and the Queen retained a peculiar Use in her private chapel. The Advertisements of 1566 prescribed the use of Copes by the three ministers of the Eucharist in Cathedrals only; and the Canons of 1604 (in James I's reign) limited even this use to "principal feasts." The disuse of the chasuble appears to have been complete, and that of the cope almost so. (Canons may lapse by desuetude.)

The explanation is probably to be found in the fact that during the summer of 1559 Royal Visitors (whose Commission appears to have been under the Great Seal and for causes ecclesiastical) were, fortified by Royal Injunctions, busy scouring the country, and taking "other order" under the Statute. At St. Paul's Cathedral it is said that they forbade copes and amices, and the Bishop-elect ordered the cathedral clergy to use only a surplice at the service time; and at Bartholomew Fair there was a holocaust of "ornaments," including copes. The question as to whether the action of these Commissioners or Visitors technically satisfied the Statute and exhausted the proviso (and the unauthorised note in the printed Elizabethan Prayer Books) is considered in *The Prayer Book Articles and Homilies* (J. T. Tomlinson), pp. 41 *seq.*, and in the same author's evidence before cited. The "highly authoritative action of the Royal Visitation" (Frere) certainly gives colour to Dr. Sandys' view; and it is on the assumption of the contrary view that doubts as to the Injunctions being the taking of "other order" partly rest. But it would not be fair to press this argument too far. It is probable that the situation was rather strained in the later months of 1559 by reason of the awkward dilemma, in regard to the confirmation and consecration of the Primate-designate, in which the contumacy of all the old bishops (except Anthony of Llandaff) had placed the Government. (See Courrayer.)

If, however, there was any technical deficiency in the action under the Royal Injunctions of 1559, it is claimed that it was

[1] Bishops Scory and Hodgkin wore linen surplices. Bishop Coverdale wore only "toga lanea," which probably means his warm overcoat, for he was an old man. Archdeacons Bullingham and Guest who were Epistoler and Gospeller also wore silk copes. After consecration, Parker assumed rochet, black chimere, and a sable "muffler."

remedied, or perfected, by the Royal Advertisements of 1566. This, in effect, was the decision of the Appellate tribunal in *Ridsdale v. Clifton*, where the Privy Council (after expressing their doubts as to the Injunctions) advised the Sovereign that:

> " Their Lordships are clearly of opinion that the Advertisements (a word which in the language of the time was equivalent to ' admonitions ' or ' injunctions ') of Elizabeth, issued in 1566, were a ' taking of order,' within the Act of Parliament, by the Queen, with the advice of the Metropolitan."

All attempts to question the *fairness* and uprightness of the decision in *Ridsdale v. Clifton* have failed. See the Report of the Royal Commission (Minutes), Vol. I, pp. 160–161. The Advertisements run:

> Item: In the ministration of the holy communion in cathedral and collegiate churches, the principal minister shall use a cope with Gospeller and Epistoler agreeably;[1] and at all other prayers to be said at that communion table, to use no copes but surplices.
>
> Item: That the dean and prebendaries wear a surplice with a silk hood in the choir; and when they preach in the cathedral or collegiate church to wear their hood.
>
> Item: That every minister saying any public prayers or ministering the sacraments, or other rites of the church, shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charges of the parish; and that the parish provide a decent table standing on a frame for the communion table.

So that (according to *Ridsdale v. Clifton*), by 1566, the law of the Church as to vestments was settled by the imposition of the use of the Surplice only in Parish Churches, with the use of three Copes in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches. The second half of the provision gradually fell into abeyance. In 1604 the use was limited to principal feasts, and, in practice, it is doubtful if copes were used except at the Coronations.

But the Prayer Book was again revised in 1661, upon the restoration of the monarchy, and the revised book was imposed by the Act of Uniformity of 1662. In the Revised Book the Ornaments Rubric Note appeared in the following form:

> " And here is to be noted, That such ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI."

Three points are to be remarked. First, that the language is so reminiscent of the Elizabeth Proviso that it is manifestly founded on it: Second, that the use of the word " retained " precludes the

[1] It should be noted that the vesting of the Gospeller and Epistoler as Ministers of " the Word " in the same garb as " the Minister " of the Sacrament negatived any significance of a " distinctive " vesture.

suggestion that *disused* ornaments were intended to be brought back: Third, that the omission of any special reference to the "time of communion" seems to imply that the framers of the rubric knew nothing of any special dress for use at Holy Communion.

The history of the 1661–2 Revision is very interesting. One of the leading advocates of Revision was Dr. Matthew Wren, Bishop of Ely. In his MS. suggestions he wrote of the Elizabethan Ornaments Rubric (i.e. the interpolated note):

> "But what is now fit to be ordered herein, and to preserve those that are still in use, it would be set down in express words, without these uncertainties which breed nothing but debate and scorn. The very words too of that Act, 2 Edw. VI, for the Minister's Ornaments, would be set down, or to pray to have a new one made, for there is somewhat in that Act that now may not be used." (Jacobson, p. 55.)

It is a great pity that Bishop Wren's sensible suggestion was not then carried out, and the legal vestments "set down in express words."

But it seems pretty clear that the Bishops thought that the printing of the Elizabethan Act in the Prayer Book in full, and the use of the very words of the Act in this reference note, answered all reasonable objection. In the Prayer Books (preserved at Durham and Oxford) which record stages of the revision, Sancroft (afterwards Archbishop), who acted as a clerk, wrote against the amended rubric, "These are the words of ye Act itself, v. supra," and in the later of the two books he added "sec: penult ut supra" (Tomlinson, pp. 195, 147).

When the Savoy Conference, called by the King in the hope of agreement between the Bishops and the Presbyterian leaders, broke up without any result, the House of Commons decided to move for itself. It first directed search to be made for the original MS. of the 1552 Book, apparently with intent to re-enact it as it stood. When that could not be found, it fell back upon a copy of the Prayer Book printed in 1604 (before the suspect time of Laud's supremacy), and scheduled it to a Bill, read the Bill three times, and sent it up to the Lords. The House of Lords read the Bill a first time, and then laid it aside; as tidings came that Convocation had at last begun the work of Revision. This is, so far as is known, the first time that Convocation, as such, touched the Prayer Book. The theory that Convocation was consulted in 1549 has no documentary support.

When the Prayer Book revised in Convocation was presented to the Lords, that House duly passed it and sent it down to the Commons. The Commons received it sympathetically, but warily. A Committee was appointed to examine it and report. On the report that none of the alterations were serious, the House of Commons first asserted the rights of the laity by resolving (*nem. con.*) "That the amendments made by the Convocation and sent down by the Lords to this House, might, by order of this House, have

been debated," and then passed the Bill with the Scheduled annexed Book. A previous resolution, not to admit debate, was carried only by a majority of six. (See *English Churchman*, Oct. 5, 1911.)

Much of the actual work of Revision was done by a small Committee of Convocation, meeting at Bishop Wren's house in Ely Place. The Elizabethan Act of Uniformity was included in the Prayer Book, and numbered 1 in the Table of Contents. The falsification of this Table in modern Prayer Books deserves severe reprobation.

It is clear that no one in 1662 imagined that the effect of the new Prayer Book was to bring back the obsolete vestments. Mr. Tomlinson has unearthed nearly all the Visitation Charges of Bishops and Archdeacons in the years immediately following 1662 and all proceed on the assumption that the Surplice is the only vestment to be used (Royal Com. Rep. Minutes, I, 284). Many of these were referred to in the cases of *Ridsdale v. Clifton* and *Hebbert v. Purchas*. Bishop Cosin's 6th Visitation Article ran, " Have you a large and decent Surplice (one or more) for the Minister to wear at all times of his public ministration in the Church ? "

No further question was taken on this subject until the middle of the nineteenth century, when in the progress of the Tractarian Movement the claim was set up that the Ornaments Rubric required the use of the Vestment (i.e. the Chasuble) or Cope at Holy Communion.

The law was very carefully and painstakingly considered before a very strong Committee of the Privy Council, in *Ridsdale v. Clifton*, and the Judicial Committee advised the sovereign, That the 1622 Ornaments Rubric was only a Memorandum or note of reference to the Law : that the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity remained as an unrepealed and effective law, and that that Act must be read and construed with the insertion of the order as to vestures in the Advertisements of 1566 ; and the effect of that insertion would be to the effect :

> " That the surplice shall be used by the ministers of the Church at all times of their public ministrations, and the alb, vestment or tunicle shall not be used, nor shall a cope be used except at the administration of the Holy Communion in cathedral and collegiate churches."

Unfortunately the opinion of the Judicial Committee is very long, and digresses from time to time to consider side points ; so that it is by no means easy effectively to summarise its decision : but the foregoing may be relied on. It is in its digressions that this opinion or " judgment " is (mainly) claimed, by those dissatisfied with it, to be vulnerable.

The case is in Law Reports 2 Probate Division, p. 276 (a cheap copy of the " Judgment " only was published by the Church Association for threepence, and can still be bought). The official head-note of the editor of the Law Reports (which, of course, has no independent authority) runs :

"1 Elizabeth, c. 2, s. 25 must be read together with the order made thereunder by the Advertisements of the Queen in 1566, and the law so understood acted upon and enforced from 1566 to 1662 (excepting a brief interval) cannot be repealed without a distinct and repealing enactment or an enactment inconsistent and irreconcilable therewith. The Rubric Note of 1662 could not and did not purport to repeal the law and all that had been done under it, while the Act of 1662, 13 & 14 Car. II, c. 4, s. 24, expressly confirms the Act of Eliz. c. 2; nor is the rubric inconsistent with s. 25 of the latter Act read as if the order made thereunder had been inserted therein."

It is customary to speak of the "advice" of the Committee as a "Judgment," but it should be remembered that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is not a "Court"; its members are the legal advisers of the Sovereign, *whose* decision is given, on the appeal made to the *Crown*, in accordance with their advice.

No attempt has ever been made to procure any reversal of this decision of the highest tribunal. A not very creditable attempt has been made to suggest that the tribunal was not impartial; but the following interesting questions and answers, enshrined in the Minutes of Evidence of the Royal Commission, Vol. I, are significant. The questioner is Sir Lewis T. Dibdin, admittedly the first Ecclesiastical lawyer of the day, and the answerer is Dr. W. Howard Frere, then of the Mirfield Community and now Bishop of Truro, one of the leading experts of the Ritualist School of Liturgiologists:

Questions 2432, 2433. "Well now, would you tell me . . . any single fact which was left out of the consideration of this case by the Privy Council . . ." *A*. "I think that the most important thing that was not before the Privy Council is the letter to the Dean of Bocking. . . ."

Question 2437. "Give whatever weight you like to it, I do not think you will put your case so high as to say, with this mass of historical documents of authority, that that letter by itself could turn the verdict from one side to the other?" *A*. "No."

Question 2438. "So that we really have got to this: that the Privy Council substantially had the case before them as it is before you, and before us to-day?" *A*. "To a very large extent they had, no doubt."

Question 2439. "Then your real grievance with the Privy Council is, is it not, that on those facts they came to a wrong conclusion?" *A*. "On the question of history. Yes."

Question 2440. "No, on the question of law." (Then follows a dispute as to whether the question is one of law or history.)

Question 2451. "But the point I put to you on that is—we have arrived at this—that this is a question of law, and that on the question of law I read to you what I am sure you

will agree with me is a very authoritative opinion (i.e. Lord Selborne's) upon the question of law?" *A.* "Yes."

Question 2452. "And there I think I had better leave it."

And in his book *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform* Dr. Frere makes the admission: "It seems more hopeful to have a new law than a new judicial interpretation."

So it may be taken that the decision in *Ridsdale v. Clifton* is not very likely to be upset by any "new decision," as, a few years ago, experts of the Ritualist school were fond of assuring us it would be.

The Royal Commission formally reported, "Thus for ceremonies the date of the standard is 1662, for vestments 1566, and for church ornaments 1549" (p. 6, c. ii).

In point of fact part of the strength of the Tractarian (or Ritualist) contention that the Mass Vestments are lawful, despite the legal decision to the contrary, lies in the appeal to prejudice against "the lawyers." This line is also taken by Dr. Frere, in his (cited) book, where he ventures to say (page 126) that the Advertisements of 1566 were (by the Privy Council) "presumed to have the necessary royal authority"; whereas as a matter of fact this point was carefully discussed for some nine pages. That very fact has laid the document open to criticism, as an argumentative "judgment" necessarily invites academic debate!

The contention that the Mass Vestments are really legal under the present law, rests upon a series of assumptions:

First, that the Elizabethan Act directed their temporary *ritual* use. This assumption is not unreasonable, but it is not certain.

Second, that the "other order," promised by the Statute, was never taken by the Queen. This assumption goes contrary to all the available evidence as to the practice of the latter years of Elizabeth.

Third, that the Bishops in 1662 knew that no "other order" had been taken. This assumption is negatived by Bishop Wren's express note that "there is somewhat in that Act" (i.e. the 1549 Act) "that now may not be used."

Fourth, that the 1662 Bishops, at least (not to speak of the others concerned), intended that the temporary provision (on the first previous assumption) should become permanent. This is negatived by their striking out the reference to "time of communion" in the Rubric Note and by their Visitation action.

This series of assumptions ought scarcely to carry weight against the careful, considered opinion of the Judicial Committee in *Ridsdale v. Clifton*, which, I submit, holds the field as the most generally and practically reasonable view. After all, the dry, critical judgment of a body of trained lawyers should command more respect, in such a matter, than the consensus of any number of clerical experts, who (however upright and honourable they may be and are) cannot help being unconsciously biased towards what they would prefer to be true.

Let it also be remembered that the suggestion sometimes made that the Ritualist view is the simpler, is a little absurd, as it requires a much more involved reference to extraneous documents than the really simple rule established in *Ridsdale v. Clifton.* Moreover, it is not a question of two opposed theories. There are a large number of variants (for all of which something may be argued). When so many rival theories are afloat, it seems safest, on the whole, to assume that the highest Appellate Tribunal was most probably substantially right. That is my view, although I regret that the Tribunal had not before it the valuable evidence subsequently collected by Mr. J. T. Tomlinson, and now partly accessible in his published Tracts.

I think I have said enough to show that Evangelicals need not be apprehensive that, under the present Prayer Book, they could ever be coerced into use of the Vestments. But, on the other hand, it has been made abundantly clear that any hope or expectation that the use of the Vestments by those who desire to use them can be effectively controlled by legal methods is illusory.

The attempt in connexion with Prayer Book Revision to substitute for the so-called " Ornaments Rubric " a plain rubric based on the rule in *Ridsdale v. Clifton* failed. The rubric propounded in N.A. 84 leaves the question of the present law uncriticised, and the present " Rubric " unaltered. But it proposes to recognise the practice of alternative use, " for the avoiding of all controversy and doubtfulness."

Evangelicals have, therefore, to make up their mind, not between assent to the prevalence of two or more alternative uses, and the enforcement of uniformity (for the possibility of enforcement of uniformity is outside presently practical politics) ; but between tacit acceptance of the fact of existing diversity, punctuated with public and private protest of the " illegality " of one or other use, on the one hand, and assent to official recognition of both fact and (hereafter) legality of the existence side by side of two uses, on the other hand. In putting the matter thus, I am not taking a side, but simply seeking to make the issue clear. Either way, the Laity suffer severely, as always, and they are likely to continue without adequate redress. The growing realisation by the Laity of their utter helplessness as against the clergy constitutes one of the greatest dangers in the Church to-day. There is no doubt that the movement for revision is purely clerical and artificial. The Laity as a whole do not want it, even in its more practical points. Certainly the Laity are almost wholly opposed to any alteration in regard to Holy Communion ; and, I think, this includes a preference for leaving the matter of Vestments alone. Certainly any change means a price too heavy to be paid with equanimity. It really resolves itself into a matter of practical statesmanship rather than controversial polemics. Doctrinally, the Eastward Position is of immeasurably more importance and concern than the Vestments alone. The two together reinforce each other.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

THE Autumn Publishing Season has produced a number of important works which will be of interest to the readers of the CHURCHMAN. Several of these are dealt with in special articles in this number. They include the Bishop of Gloucester's Primary Visitation Charge—*The Church of England*, the Bishop of Manchester's continuation of his philosophical studies, *Christus Veritas*, and Dr. Selbie's important contribution to the new Oxford series, *The Psychology of Religion*. Those selected for notice here will probably be of special interest to Church people engaged in religious and social work. The clergy will find several of them useful in the preparation of sermons and addresses. All of them, in one way or another, bear upon the practical application of the Christian Faith to life. They deal with the three great aspects of religious life to which attention is chiefly directed to-day; the personal life of devotion, the interpretation of the doctrine of the Church, and the social implications of Christianity—perhaps the most popular of all at the moment.

"The Living Church" Series, under the editorship of Dr. J. E. McFadyen, maintains its high standard of interest and usefulness. Among the latest additions to the series are two volumes, *The Story of Social Christianity* (James Clarke & Co., 6s. net each), by Francis Herbert Stead, M.A. Mr. Stead was Warden of Browning Hall, the well-known centre of social work in South London, from 1894–1921. He has therefore a first-hand acquaintance with current problems, and has shown a long practical interest in the application of Christianity to social relationships. He regards religious individualism, "the saving of one's own soul," as a failure to realise the fulness of Christ's teaching. "The very purpose of Jesus was to found a Community—a Community which should fulfil and surpass the noblest dreams of Hebrew prophecy. The creation of that social miracle was His supreme achievement. . . . To show this process at work is the aim of our story." He gives a long catalogue of the benefits that have been won for mankind by Christianity in many departments, including care for the sick, the helpless, widows and orphans, the disabled, and prisoners, as

well as in the Women's Movement, in education, in the emancipation of slaves, in the responsibilities of property, in international relationships, and in the inspiration of the Arts. Behind this wide range of movements there is the creative impulse of the Personal Will. "The story of the true Church is, properly told, the continuous biography of Jesus."

It is in this spirit that he tells the story of Social Christianity. The first volume brings the narrative down to the discovery of the New World in 1492. It traces the development from the time of the Apostles, through the penetration and capture of the Roman Empire (A.D. 90–325), the period of the Western Empire to A.D. 476, the Barbaric Flood to A.D. 814, the triumph of Feudalism and the Papacy to A.D. 1085, the Crusades, the Friars, and finally the revival of Paganism A.D. 1384–1492. There is ample scope here for a varied picture, and for the interpretation of the life and work of many interesting personalities. Mr. Stead has gathered into one view a mass of important information. He praises generously where he believes praise is due, and does not hesitate to condemn where he sees failure. The second volume will be found even more interesting as it brings the story down to our own day. It is divided into four periods. From 1492 to 1600 the forces of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation were at work. Special prominence is given to Luther, Calvin, and Knox among the Reformers, and to Loyola and the Jesuits among the Roman Catholics. The seventeenth century, with the Pilgrim Fathers and the foundation of the United States, makes a special appeal to Mr. Stead, although he allows his indignation against the Stuart sovereigns somewhat too violent expression. Of the first three-quarters of the eighteenth century he gives a brief account, with special reference to the Moravian and Methodist movements. In the last section, from 1776 to 1923, he allows himself full scope, and gives a useful account of the varied movements of the period.

His sympathies are all on the side of Labour. "The Trades Union is a product of Christian civilisation." The Methodists "have through their lay preachers been the prophets of Labour solidarity, and the fathers of the first Socialist Government." He expresses strong disapproval of "the wild men of Moscow." He looks forward to the Organised Unity of Mankind and sees in the League of Nations a means of its achievement. These two volumes

are inspired by high ideals of Christian brotherhood and fellowship. In spite of a bias due to ardent sympathy with the Labour movement they will be found exceptionally useful as a source of information on the practical results of the influence of Christian teaching. At a time when the social aspect of Christianity is claiming the chief attention, Mr. Stead's story will win wide popularity.

Another volume in the Series is Mr. R. H. Coats' *The Changing Church and the Unchanging Christ* (6*s*. net). Here again we have an estimate of movements due to the influence of Christ in history. Mr. Coats deals more particularly with movements of thought and the conceptions of Christ and His work which have appealed to particular ages and countries. In Russia, for instance, there was "the fossil pedantry of the official Church" and a striving for "the pure simplicities of primitive Christianity." In Catholicism Christ is placed in a setting of institutionalism, and a vast and complicated system of authoritative dogma. After a survey of the value and significance of these, he points out the semi-magical means adopted, by which docile obedience produces a state of contented ignorance and servile pupilage. He adds, "The Roman Church seeks in a thousand ways to accommodate its message to the needs and longings of average human nature." In Evangelicalism he finds the best interpretation of Christ. Rationalism fails to understand Christ. Speculation represents some aspects of Christ's character but cannot deal adequately with His divinity. Art has done much to interpret Christ, but contemporary religious art is disappointing. His brief account of Christ in poetry brings out some of the chief features of Christian thought in such representative writers as Milton, Browning, and Tennyson. These references indicate the wide range of thought in this fascinating series of studies. The writer's powers of expression give distinction to his penetrating and suggestive thoughts.

Dr. A. J. Carlyle's *The Christian Church and Liberty* (4*s*. 6*d*. net) in the same Series, is a brief sketch of the attitude of the Church in different ages towards the ideas of individuality and equality. He says many hard things of the Church and its failure to realise the import of its essential principles. He traces the development of persecution and the setting up of the Inquisition to the influence

of St. Augustine. In more modern times he condemns the attitude of the Church towards the Labour Movement. At the same time he shows that Christian teaching maintains a high ideal of individual liberty, and in a closing chapter on the Church and Liberty to-day gives an account of the opportunity of the Church in face of the present conditions. Dr. Carlyle's scholarly treatment of a difficult subject will be read with interest.

Anglican Church Principles (The Macmillan Company, 10s. 6*d*. net), by Dr. Foakes Jackson, is an interesting volume, although it does not quite fulfil the anticipations raised by its title. It is in reality a history of the Church of England, with special reference to the type of thought prevailing in different periods. The author's account of the earlier days, in fact up to the time of the Reformation, is in the main sympathetically written, but from that period onwards he seems in a more critical mood. Cranmer is " by no means an attractive character—few people were at this period! The reigns of Edward VI and Mary I were the most regrettable in the history of the nation." He speaks of " the consummate duplicity of Elizabeth," although he acknowledges her " consummate ability " with an intellectual, rather than a moral, admiration. The clergy in the days of Elizabeth were worse in quality than at any other time, " nor was the Elizabethan episcopate altogether a credit to the Church." He gives the Evangelical Movement credit for its enthusiasm for humanity and the cause of missions. " Probably no movement has contributed more to the general alleviation of the miserable and the oppressed." It lost its vigour when the official rulers of the Church changed their attitude of hostility for one of approval. The Tractarian Movement only made headway when the churches were made more attractive, and " the drabness of Evangelicalism " was superseded. Newman's Tract XC " made it possible for a Catholic-minded man to stay inside the pale of the Church of England." Dr. Jackson's views on many points are not ours, but we have read his account of the Church with interest.

The Secret Garden of the Soul, and other Devotional Studies (James Clarke & Co., 6*s*. net) is a book of unusual quality. The writer, Mrs. Herman, died in December, 1923. She was the wife of a Presbyterian Minister, and engaged for many years in jour-

nalistic work. Towards the close of her life she was drawn to the Church of England. She was for a time on the staff of the *Challenge*. Finally she became an Anglo-Catholic and a writer for the *Church Times*. Her husband dedicates this volume of her studies to her memory as "Journalist, Theologian, Mystic." There is also an Appreciation of the Author by her friend, Dr. Duncan C. Macgregor. These studies have appeared in various religious journals. They attracted the attention of such a discriminating judge as the late Dr. J. H. Jowett, who pronounced them to be "the best of their kind in modern devotional literature." They certainly stand in a class by themselves. They are marked by a wide knowledge of human nature in its weakness and in its strength, and by deep spiritual insight. To a marked power of expression is added an exceptional command of simile and imagery. All these characteristics combine to give these studies a wonderful fascination and effectiveness. We may add that there is no trace of Anglo-Catholicism, and indeed the whole outlook is derived from a very different source. Her earlier upbringing and associations had left their mark too deeply upon her.

Two small books on the Atonement will be of interest to students of the latest thought on that subject. Dr. H. Maldwyn Hughes, the well-known Principal of Wesley House, Cambridge, has written *What is the Atonement?* A Study in the Passion of God in Christ. (James Clarke & Co., 4*s*. 6*d*. net). With brief and clear analysis he goes over much of the old ground, and by careful and moderate statement seeks to express what he believes to be in harmony with the teaching of the New Testament. He is fully aware that no complete answer can be given to the intellect of how the Cross "breaks the power of sin, cleanses us from the guilt of sin, and gives us the assurance that our sins are forgiven." Yet he has no doubt of the fact. Spiritual illumination and apprehension and the testimony of thirteen centuries attest it. His central thought is that "the Cross is the revelation in one focal act in time and on the field of history of what God is from all eternity," and "the key to the meaning of the Cross is to be found in the passion of God." The other book is *The Message about the Cross*. A Fresh Study of the Doctrine of the Atonement (Allen & Unwin, 3*s*. 6*d*. net), by C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D. He also feels that it is "not more than a

limited distance that the intellect can carry us," but the Cross gives "that peace-giving and enabling grace of God, of which it has never ceased to speak to the human heart." His treatment of the subject must be placed among those that are described as "Moral Theories." Yet he expresses dissatisfaction with previous presentations of them. At the same time his own leaves the same impression of inadequacy. He finds only a difference of degree between the death of Jesus and those of the martyrs. "Human goodness and self-sacrifice redeem by revealing God." This does not satisfy, the belief still prevails that Jesus is more, and that He did more.

Devotional Classics is the title given by J. M. Connell to a series of Martha Upton Lectures delivered at Manchester College, Oxford (Longmans, Green & Co., 5*s*. net). The subjects of the eight lectures are St. Augustine, St. Patrick and St. Columba, St. Bernard, John Tauler, Thomas à Kempis, St. Francis de Sales, John Bunyan, and William Law. A brief sketch of the life of each in its historical setting leads up to the chief work associated with his name. The essential spiritual truths drawn from experience of communion with God are emphasised. The whole collection, although so varied in age and environment, combines to give an effective presentation of the power of Christ in moulding human personality.

Another volume of *The Speaker's Bible* (12*s*. 6*d*.) has appeared. It contains 1 and 2 Peter and Jude. The characteristics of this Commentary have already been stated in the CHURCHMAN. It ranks among the most useful compilations we owe to Dr. Hastings. The brief Introductions contain the latest information as to authorship, date, place and purpose of writing, together with the leading characteristics of each Epistle. The comments on each passage aim at giving substantial aid in the preparation of sermons. They are selected from the writings of modern preachers, but "so much has been done in the way of condensing, re-arranging, re-writing, adding to, and illustrating, that the sources have not as a rule been given." There is also much original matter by the Editor and others. There is a useful list of Commentaries for reference. An Index to Sermons gives all the most important published in recent years on the various passages.

G. F. I.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION. By W. B. Selbie, D.D. Oxford: *Humphry Milford.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

On no theological subject has so much been unwisely written in these latter days as on the Psychology of Religion. It may be true that we shall have to appeal more and more to psychology for guidance as to the best means of bringing religion home to the whole man, but no student of Christian origins or Christian history can be satisfied with a merely psychological apologetic. We may be able through increased knowledge of the working of the human life to interpret more faithfully man's interpretation of facts in so far as what is recorded agrees with actual occurrences, but when once psychology declares that the most vital facts of faith are self-projections and the historical basis of our faith is the fruit of excited discipleship, then we need no such help from psychology. Its approach becomes that of the abnormal man to the discussion of unusual experiences, not the attitude of the healthy mind to the calm consideration of things as they are. The New Psychology is very often a label for the old rationalism, and as far as we have been able to observe the coming of psychology into the forefront of theological or religious interest has had very little influence on the acceptance or non-acceptance of the root facts of Christianity by men anxious to discover truth.

We welcome Dr. Selbie's noble presentation of " The Psychology of Religion," for he knows what psychology is and what religion is in the life of collective and individual humanity. He is fearless in his approach to new knowledge, but he requires to be satisfied that pretence to the possession of truth is equivalent to the possession of truth. He draws the line between extravagant claims and justifiable assumption. He knows that there are many psychologies claiming to be the one and only explanation of the working of the human mind, and he also knows that they are mutually exclusive and contradictory. We need guidance and Dr. Selbie gives us what we require. He is never unduly dogmatic and he has the great recommendation of recognising that the abnormal is no real test of the truth of the contentions of the writers who are accustomed to argue from abnormal mental conditions to normal states of mind.

The material for the study of the psychology of religion comes from many sources. The biographies of religious men and women, the results of the described experiences of those who reply to definite questions on the subject and the history of religions throughout the world, all supply matter that must be analysed and synthetised. But introspection is seldom a safe guide and the interpretation of the recorded experiences of the Saints and religious leaders is coloured by their environment and upbringing. Religion is the

expression of the whole self and every aspect of consciousness has its contribution to make. The more we know of mankind the more we discover that in all ages and in all lands he has been religious, and it is hardly too much to say that the differentia between man and the rest of the animal world may be given in the word religious. But mankind has had many religions, and the adherents of all religions in so far as they are sincere believe in their truth. We investigate the manifestations of religion and are at once presented by a certain unity and at the same time a diversity. It is certainly true to say that the element of awe and wonder enters into all religious experience and Christianity has to be judged by its capacity to satisfy the entire nature of man, and to give a true explanation of God and His relation to man.

Dr. Selbie discusses the religious consciousness and the unconscious in religious experience. We wish that this chapter had been read before many recent dogmatic assertions had been made. We entirely agree with him when he says, " It would seem that the unconscious presents us with a mass of raw material with which will and intelligence have to deal, and which they can make either ' a savour of life unto life, or of death unto death.' To relegate religious experience to the subconscious realm exclusively is to deprive religion both of rationality and of motive power. If man is to respond to the voice of God with any effect he must do so as a conscious, free and intelligent being." The influence of the unconscious in religious experience, and we, for our part, believe in normal life, has been greatly exaggerated. In the last resort man is regulated by his conscious conation, not by his unconscious memories and stored-up experiences. The latter are driven out by fresh experiences that revolutionise life, and these experiences are the result of conscious communion with God.

We must pass over the informing chapters on " Cult and Worship " and " Belief in God." He maintains " to believe in God is not merely to accept the fact of His existence as we would accept the truth of a mathematical proposition. It means that we are prepared to act on such belief. In other words religious belief involves practice. Faith is known by works, and there is no radical opposition between the two." The relation of Religion to the individual and society are discussed and the important problems of children and adolescents under religious influences, and the psychology of Conversion are treated with balanced judgment. There is no doubt that the great number of conversions in adolescence have a definite bearing on all Christian work. In adolescence resolutions are made that affect all subsequent life and the need of definite instruction to confirm faith is imperative. " It is because man's nature is inherently religious, and because religion is so closely bound up with the normal functioning of his instincts, that his nature is so profoundly moved when his religion becomes conscious and articulate. To further this process and to ensure that it shall be carried out in a sane and normal fashion, and without undue emotional disturbance should be one of the great objects

of religious education." The neglect of heeding this warning accounts for the sad falling off of converts during Missions.

" Prayer," " Sin and Repentance " and " Mysticism " as well as the " Hope of Immortality " are all discussed, and the treatment of Mysticism is one of the best descriptions we have read of what mysticism is, and how far it is to be cultivated. He says, " It is a good rule that we should trust our faculties, and the issue in this case certainly seems to show that some deeper explanation of the mystic consciousness is to be found than simply education and auto-suggestion. These may condition but do not create the experiences in question." Every Christian who loves God and prays to Him is a mystic, but that is different to asserting that the special experiences of mysticism are the test of ultimate reality.

We read with pleasure and profit the dissection of the claims of the New Psychology and its stress on the abnormal. The madhouse is not the place for educationists to learn the working of the normal mind. Psychologists are in grave danger of being so obsessed by the abnormal, that they overlook the working of the normal mind and attribute to this, that, and the other complex what is as natural to man as to think logically when he thinks rightly. We have simply touched on a few points in one of the most instructive and practically helpful books that we have recently read. Here and there we do not agree with Dr. Selbie, but taken as a whole the book is pre-eminently sane, well-balanced and calculated to steady the mind perplexed by the many claimants to the acceptance of partial and very often perverse interpretations of the religious consciousness. We recommend it most heartily to all who are interested in the problems it discusses.

CHRISTIAN UNITY.

PROBLEMS OF CHURCH UNITY. By Walter Lowrie, M.A. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 9*s.*

DU BOSE AS A PROPHET OF UNITY. By the Rev. J. O. F. Murray, D.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

These two volumes deal with Christian Unity. The writer of one is an American and the other is the exposition of the views of an American Theologian by the Master of Selwyn. Both books have a freshness and frankness that make them acceptable to the reader. Mr. Lowrie is at times perplexing in his use and spelling of words, but he is suggestive. He holds that " our faith is not great enough, not hot enough, to unite us, even within the limits of a single denomination. We have not enough faith, not enough love, not enough of the spirit of prayer. It seems to me no more than hypocritical civility to affirm, as many do, that each denomination has its own precious gift to contribute to the united Church. In reality we are each too poor to enrich one another. Yet faint embers glow when they are brought together. They glow and finally blaze because of the draught which their union makes possible." We cannot exactly follow his metaphor, but we see his meaning

and believe that a great deal of loose thinking is prevalent on this enrichment idea. The spirit that unites is of much more importance than the particular gift which appears to be emphasised in the individual denomination, and as a matter of fact that gift would fail to live itself out in the environment of a Church such as many believe to be the culmination of the idea of unity. A religious revival in the best sense, a common attitude to Christ as Lord and Master, as God and Saviour, and surrender to Him would do more to solve our difficulties than any amount of word splitting on the character of organisation and the precise interpretation of the orders we possess or do not possess. It is one of the great signs of weakening grip on central truth that men are quarrelling upon the secondary to the forgetfulness of what really matters. Mr. Lowrie has said much that needs saying. We hope that his frank views on primitive Church organisation will be widely read.

Dr. Du Bose was not an easy writer. He had a great spirit, but at times we felt when reading his works that he was in danger of forgetting the essential Deity of our Lord. Dr. Murray quotes him, " I myself have no hesitation in denying any presence or operation of real deity in Jesus Christ as manifested otherwise than in the fact of His accomplished and perfected human divinity." Our Lord's Divinity, as Dr. Murray says, " can only be apprehended through the mirror of His Humanity," but the Incarnation was the taking of the manhood into God. Dr. Murray says, " The manhood that He assumed was not perfected before the Ascension." The Incarnation so regarded is clearly an act extending over the whole of our Lord's earthly life, and even beyond it. For St. Paul has familiarised us with the thought of the Church as the Body of Christ in which He is still even now " being fulfilled " (Eph. i. 19). We have always thought that the Sacraments are an " extension of the Incarnation." So we can grant further that the Incarnation of our Lord is " part of the universal process " which is " still in progress." From one point of view this is true, for when a man becomes a new creation in Christ Jesus, our Lord dwells in Him, but the historic Incarnation of the Son of God is not identical with this. We run the risk of losing our sense of " God manifest in the flesh " when we parallel this with the universal process now in progress. Dr. Du Bose has much to teach us and he has a sympathetic expositor in Dr. Murray. It is by no means necessary to agree with all the positions taken by a man who has a real message to his age.

ENGLISH THEOLOGIANS.

RICHARD HOOKER. By L. S. Thornton. London: *S.P.C.K.* 4*s.*
THE LADY JULIAN: A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY. By R. H. Thouless. London: *S.P.C.K.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

As we laid down Mr. Thornton's book on the Theology of Hooker, we were reminded of Dr. Frere's re-written " Procter on the Book of Common Prayer." Had Procter been alive when the Mirfield Liturgist had published his work, he would have found himself in

striking opposition to many of his conclusions. Another member of the Mirfield Community has expounded Hooker and we venture to say that Hooker would disown his teaching on the Ministry and the Holy Communion. Mr. Thornton pays tribute to Hooker's ability and orthodoxy on Christological questions, he is deeply impressed by his conception of Law and he rejects his doctrine on Church and State. Hooker made one great mistake. He accepted the main positions of the Reformation, and it is the part of his expositor to show that if he had only been better informed he would be to-day an Anglo-Catholic authority. We have lately been told that the Church of England has no idea of abandoning the position it took in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. If Mr. Thornton be a true interpreter of present day opinion, its chief object will be to turn its back upon all that the most representative of English Theologians taught on the great questions that divided Rome and England in the sixteenth century. A few quotations will prove that we do not exaggerate. " Two questions of vital importance have always divided Christians since the Reformation, the questions respectively of eucharistic *presence* and eucharistic *sacrifice*." " In adopting a version of the Reformed doctrine Hooker necessarily accepted the Protestant view as against the Catholic on both these latter points. As to sacrifice there is little to say. Hooker does not mention it in his discussion of the Eucharist. On that point there was no issue between him and the Puritans; both alike rejected all notion of sacrifice in the Eucharist. In a later chapter, on the Ministry, he says that, ' sacrifice is now no part of the Church Ministry ' and that the Eucharist is, ' that which the Gospel hath *proportionable* to ancient sacrifices . . . although it have now no sacrifice ' " (p. 84). He quotes Hooker's well-known passages on the presence in the Eucharist that has to be sought for in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. He tells us that on the doctrine of the Church and the Eucharist, Hooker failed to draw the natural conclusions which his doctrine of the Incarnation demanded. We venture to say that Hooker's doctrine on both these points is New Testament, and excludes rather than involves the conclusions which Mr. Thornton and his friends draw. Hooker knew what and why he wrote. His critics have followed a tradition that is not primitive, or truly Catholic.

Dr. Thouless writes as a psychologist, and if Hooker would have been surprised to find himself " logically bound " to conclude what he believed he had definitely excluded, the Lady Julian would have been amazed to find herself included among English Theologians. She was a religious woman—a child of her age who lived very close to God. Her little book, " Revelations of Divine Love," is prized by many who reject much of what she accepted as true in the fourteenth century. But her heart was centred upon her Saviour, and her experiences have a positive value for all who know the secret of Divine Love. All Christ lovers who have entered into her spirit claim her as one of themselves, and Dr. Thouless has quoted so largely from her pages that a reader of this book will be familiar

with her thought. It is debatable whether Dr. Thouless is accurate in his discussion of the place the Virgin Mother has in the religion of the Lady Julian, but he is quite right when he says, " While Julian's sentiment for the Blessed Virgin is strong and deep, as one loved singularly by Jesus Christ, above all creatures, this sentiment does not take the central place that it came to take later in devotional literature." But we can afford to overlook controversial questions in dealing with the Norwich mystic, and we are grateful to Dr. Thouless for an exposition that is at once sympathetic and penetrating.

SHORTER NOTICES.

Messrs. Longmans publish a five-shilling edition of Mrs. S. B. Macy's well-known *The Master Builders*, which is the story of the Acts told in simple form for children. Boys and girls cannot fail to be interested in the narrative, which has the merit of being accurately set forth. The historical and local background is based on wide and well assimilated reading.

Messrs. H. R. Allenson, Ltd., issue some interesting books of Talks to Children. The Rev. H. S. Seekings has an exceptional gift of winning the attention of the young people, and telling them fascinating stories with useful lessons. *Frozen Butterflies* (2*s*. 6*d*. net) is a title that in itself suggests much. The Rev. A. Stanley Parker, in *The Dragon at the Last Bridge* (2*s*. 6*d*. net), has brought together twenty-four interesting talks, all of them full of interest and good teaching.

The Naughty Comet, by Mrs. Laura E. Richards, is a series of stories and fables in which there is much of the fascination of the old German fairy tales, and at the same time unobtrusive lessons of the first importance.

Messrs. Seeley Service & Co. issue a series of Missionary Lives for Children at 1*s*. net. *Bishop Bompas of the Frozen North*, by Nigel B. M. Grahame, B.A., tells " The adventurous life story of a brave and self-denying missionary amongst the Red Indians and Eskimos of the great North-West." It is an alluring narrative of a pioneer of the Church in Canada. *Livingstone of Africa*, by C. T. Bedford, gives a vivid picture of this " Heroic Missionary, Intrepid Explorer and the Black Man's Friend." This is a popular account of the most popular of all missionaries. *John Williams of the South Sea Islands*, by Norman J. Davidson, B.A. (Oxon.), narrates the life of " a Fearless Pioneer and a Missionary Martyr " in a Mission field of many tragedies and romances. These books are well illustrated and produced in good type with attractive covers.

In " Christian Faith and Practice Papers " S.P.C.K. issues at ½*d*. each or 4*s*. a 100 a number of leaflets, mainly by Evangelical Churchmen. They ought to be found useful for general circulation. Those already on sale are: (1) The Church, by E. H. Pearce, D.D., Bishop of Worcester. (2) The Holy Communion, by A. J. Tait, D.D. (3) Conversion, by H. C. G. Moule, D.D. (4) Sin, by Preb. Eardley-Wilmot. (5) Fasting and Self-Discipline, by G. B. Durrant, M.A. (6) The Place of the Holy Communion in the Life and Worship of the Church, by Canon Devereux. (7) The Ministry, by F. S. Guy Warman, D.D., Bishop of Chelmsford. (8) Worship, by Ven. J. R. Darbyshire, M.A. (9) Justification by Faith, by E. A. Knox, D.D.

(10) Future Life, by C. F. D'Arcy, D.D., Archbishop of Armagh. (11) The Place of the Bible in the Life of the Church, by A. J. Tait, D.D. (12) The Death of Christ, by H. G. Grey, D.D. (13) Confirmation, by A. A. David, D.D., Bishop of Liverpool. (14) Forgiveness of Sins, by E. S. Woods, M.A. (15) The Manhood of God, by E. A. Burroughs, D.D. (16) Repentance, by H. Gresford Jones, D.D. (17) Authority in Religion, by Canon George Harford. (18) The Divine Ordinance of Preaching, by Preb. E. Grose Hodge, and (19) The Devotional Study of the Bible, by Ven. R. C. Joynt.

The Anglican Movement for the Maintenance of the Doctrine of the Church of England as Catholic and Reformed is issuing a series of " Church of England Handbooks " (6*d.* each), dealing with some of the chief points in the teaching of our Church. The writers are well known and hold assured places in the world of scholarship. Among the latest additions to the series are *Christianity and Science*, The Story of Creation, by the Archbishop of Armagh. This sermon preached in Westminster Abbey is a new treatment of the text, " My Father worketh even until now, and I work." The Rev. Alfred Fawkes, M.A., gives a clear statement of the difference in spirit and teaching between our Church and the Roman Church in *Latin and English Christianity*. Canon Lancelot sets out the teaching of our Church on the Holy Communion in *Holy Communion in the New Testament*. Dr. Bethune-Baker, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, treats another aspect of the subject in *The Meaning of the Order for Holy Communion*. He deals chiefly with the doctrine of sacrifice as represented in it, but does not represent the element of Communion as clearly as our Service makes it. He rightly emphasises one essential, viz., that the Sacraments depend " on the moral or spiritual conditions under which alone they can have their proper values and effects." Archbishop Lowther Clarke has made a useful selection of *Extracts from Bishop Jewel's Apology*, and the Rev. Benedict Kennet has performed a similar task in his *Extracts from Laud's Controversy with Fisher*.

Short Chapters on Ancient History, by H. T. C. Weatherhead, O.B.E., M.A., late Head Master, King's School, Budo, Uganda, is one of the " African Readers in English " published by the Sheldon Press (1*s.* 6*d.* net). The selection of subjects is well made. The narratives are clearly and simply given, and are well calculated to give a vivid impression of events and personages ranging from ancient Egypt and Babylon to the Beginnings of the Christian Era. A summary of the chief lessons taught is added. It is a well illustrated guide for older boys and girls.

The Bishop of Southwark's Charges at his Primary Visitation are issued by S.P.C.K. under the title, *After the War* (1*s.* net). They deal effectively with the Witness of the Church on Present-Day Problems of Faith, Morals and Society.

Where Light Dwells, by Catherine B. MacLean (S.P.C.K., 2*s.* 6*d.* net), is a reprint of " mental photographs " from *Greatheart*, the Scottish magazine for boys and girls. They are brief reflections on texts illustrating natural objects such as Light, Water, Flowers, Seed, Stars, etc. Simple and attractive.

Of literary interest is the translation from the Liégeois of the sixteenth century of portions of one of the old mystery plays—*The Mystery of the*

Nativity. Mr. Richard Aldington contributes an explanatory Foreword to the verses. It is tastefully produced with a reproduction of the Nativity after Botticelli (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1*s.* 6*d.* net).

A series of imaginative sketches based on St. Luke's Gospel is given in *Men Who Met Jesus*, by F. Chenalls Williams. They will appeal to many who read New Testament stories in a modern setting with pleasure (Longmans, Green & Co., 2*s.* 6*d.* and 3*s.* 6*d.* net).

What of the Bible, by A. R. W. (Skeffington & Sons, Ltd., 1*s.* 6*d.* net), is a modernist's plea for his interpretation of the Bible.

Messrs. Chas. Thynne & Jarvis send *The Divine Mystery*, or The Babe that lay in the Manger, by J. Reader, of Punnichy, Saskatchewan, Canada (1*s.* net). It is an answer to modern criticism on the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, also a second edition of the Rev. D. H. C. Bartlett's *The Mormons or Latter-Day Saints* (3*d.*), *The Order of Holy Communion, The Real Presence, Memorial and Sacrifice*, by the Rev. George Henry Hewitt (2*d.*), and *Rock of Ages*, A Song of the Soul, by the Rev. R. L. Lacy, 1*d.*

The late S. Baring-Gould's last addresses to his congregation at Lew Trenchard, where he was Rector for forty years, are issued by Skeffington & Son under the title *My Few Last Words* (3*s.*). They are models of the popular exposition of the faith he held.

MAGAZINES.

The *East and the West* for October, 1924, contains an interesting article by Colonel Seton Churchill on "The Abolition of Slavery, Widow Burning and Infanticide in the British Empire." He gives a number of facts regarding these practices which have not been brought together before, and pays a well merited tribute to those missionaries and legislators who helped in the abolition of them.

Theology, edited by E. G. Selwyn, B.D., and published by S.P.C.K., 1*s.* monthly, is devoted to the interests of Anglo-Catholicism. Needless to say we do not agree with the views expressed, nor can we appreciate the attention given to the opinions and writings of members of the Church of Rome. Recently it contained a favourable review of Dr. Coulton's *Five Centuries of Religion*, Vol. I, St. Bernard, His Predecessors and Successors A.D. 1000–1200, which called forth a series of notes as a rejoinder from the Editor. Praise for such a recognised authority as Dr. Coulton could not go unchallenged, though some special pleading was required to make a case against him.

The Moslem World, edited by Samuel M. Zwemer, D.D., continues its excellent work of reviewing quarterly current events, literature and thought among Mohammedans and the progress of Christian Missions in Moslem Lands.

The Dawn is an Evangelical Magazine recently started under the Editorship of Mr. D. M. Panton (Chas. J. Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd., 6*d.* net). Its contents are of varied interest, including Scriptural interpretation, missionary work, and Sunday School teaching.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

House of Laity Representation.—The issue by the Standing Committee of the House of Laity on the Returns made under the House of Laity Representation Regulations, and the fact that only 3,537,020 parishioners are entered on the Electoral Rolls of *all* the parishes of England, emphasise the importance of every Parish Council, Incumbent and parishioner taking pains to secure the proper number of signatures of every earnest and serious Churchman and Churchwoman. It will be remembered that in every parish the Electoral Roll must be revised not less than twenty-eight days before the Annual Parochial Church Meeting, and that notice of such revision must be given fourteen days at least before the elections to the Parochial Church Council take place. Forms for enrolment are prepared by the Church Book Room with a special invitation emphasising the importance of enrolment, and can be obtained for resident and non-resident electors at 2*s.* per 100, post free. Forms of the notice for the Revision of the Roll are also obtainable, price 1*d.* each, or 9*d.* per dozen, post free. A sample packet of forms suitable for use by Parochial Church Councils will be sent for 6*d.* post free.

Sunday School Prizes.—A list of books suitable for Sunday School prizes for this year has been compiled as a guide to those who are unable to call at the Church Book Room and select from the shelves. This will be sent on receipt of a post-card. Care has been taken only to include books which have some merit and to ensure that the minimum amount of trouble shall be given to intending purchasers. It is often impossible for Clergy and Sunday School Superintendents to spend the necessary time over a careful selection from the ordinary publishers' lists and booksellers' stocks, and it is hoped that the fact that all the books have been carefully read before they are included in our list will obviate this difficulty and enable customers who are unable to choose for themselves to leave the selection to the Book Room, simply stating the price, the age and class of the recipient, and whether the books are for boys or girls.

Confirmation Leaflets and Pamphlets.—To those who are making preparations for Confirmation Classes, we would recommend the sample packet of pamphlets obtainable from the Church Book Room at 1*s.* 9*d.* post free. This contains five courses of instruction for the use of candidates: (1) *The Faith of a Churchman*; (2) *The Christian Disciple*; (3) *A Soldier in Christ's Army*; (4) *Class Notes*; and (5) *Strength for Life's Battle*; also a series of leaflets by Canon Grose Hodge, the Bishop of Peterborough, the Rev. B. C. Jackson, the Rev. Canon H. A. Wilson, the Rev. G. P. Bassett-Kerry, Canon Allen, and others. In addition to these, Dr. Gilbert's manual, *Confirming and Being Confirmed*, is recommended, and is published at 1*s.* in paper cover and 2*s.* net in cloth. Bishop Chavasse writes of it that it contains "clear, forcible and Scriptural teaching—an invaluable help."

Manuals for Communicants.—For presentation to Confirmees we again recommend the following books—*Helps to the Christian Life* (2nd edition), by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D. (cloth 1*s.* 3*d.*, cloth gilt 1*s.* 6*d.*). This

manual containing advice and suggestions on Prayer and Bible Study, and also instructions and devotions before, at the time of and after Holy Communion, has been found a real help to the young and to the adult communicant; *My First Communion*, by the Rev. A. R. Runnels-Moss, M.A. (price 1*s.* 6*d.* cloth gilt, 1*s.* 3*d.* cloth), has already reached a third edition and is a simple explanation of the Sacrament and Office, together with the Service. A devotional section has been added to the third edition, which has greatly enhanced the value of the book. Bishop Knox says of it, "I cannot doubt that this manual will find an extensive circulation, since it is both instructive and inspiring, and I have much pleasure in commending it to the notice of Evangelical clergy for the use of their communicants." A third edition of Canon Barnes-Lawrence's valuable manual, *The Holy Communion: Its Institution, Purpose, Privilege*, has been issued in three forms (cloth gilt 2*s.*; cloth limp 1*s.* 3*d.*; paper cover 1*s.*). The body of the book is largely devotional and some instruction on difficult points is given in an appendix. It is particularly useful for presentation to Public School boys and girls.

Fundamentals of the Faith.—The Rev. J. W. Hayes, lately Vicar of West Thurrock, has written a little book entitled *Five Fundamentals of the Faith* (1*s.* net), particularly for use in his work of instructing young men in their preparation for Holy Orders and especially for the Mission Field. So many of those who have come under his notice show such woeful ignorance of the case for the Church of England and many of the leading facts connected with the Reformation, that Mr. Hayes has compiled this manual, which we are sure will do much to enable students to retain these facts in their memories. He has gone to original sources for his information and gives many useful quotations. The "Five Fundamentals" with which Mr. Hayes deals are: (1) Justification; (2) Sanctification; (3) Regeneration; (4) The True Conception of the Holy Communion; (5) The All-Sufficiency of Christ as Mediator. A foreword is contributed by the Bishop of Barking.

Book Racks.—At the time of the publication of the series of pamphlets entitled English Church Manuals, a special book-rack was designed and sold by the Church Book Room for the sale of these and other pamphlets in the Church porch or Parish Hall. Over 500 were quickly disposed of, but unfortunately owing to the large increase of prices in 1914 we were unable to continue the supply. Many inquiries have been made for similar book-racks of late, and in compliance with many requests we are glad to state that arrangements have now been made for their supply at a reasonable price, strongly made in unpolished walnut with oak finish. In order to meet the requirements of all our members, two designs have been approved of. The original rack, which also contains space for the Parish Magazine, is of a convenient size, 22 in. by 12 in. by 7½ in. The second rack is slightly larger, and is more suitable for placing on a wall, not being so wide. Its size is 19 in. by 22 in. by 2½ in. It is designed to show more manuals, but fewer of each kind. Each rack is fitted with a strong money-box, with a lock and key, in which purchasers of the pamphlets can place the amount of their purchase. A neat label is affixed to the front of the box with the words "Please take one and place money in the box." Both racks can be supplied at the same price, 16*s.* net each, or with 100 1*d.* manuals, or 50 2*d.* manuals, 20*s.*, carriage extra, which varies according to distance, but might be taken on an average at 2*s.* 6*d.* The racks are sent packed in strong wooden cases. Over fifty have been sold during the last six months, and in one case over £10 worth of manuals have been sold.