

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1926

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The World Call to the Church.

THE recent Conference summoned by the Missionary Council of the Church Assembly marks a new departure in regard to the work of our Church overseas. The three thousand delegates from all parts of the country, with representatives from Ireland and Australia, and also from the Missionary Societies of the Free Churches, met to consider the contents of four volumes—*The Call from Africa, The Call from India, The Call from the Moslem World, The Call from the Far East*. These were prepared under the direction of the Missionary Council by writers familiar with the conditions in the different spheres. They presented an appeal of overwhelming force to the Anglican Communion to realize the facts of the situation and to make use of the unique opportunities offered at the present time throughout the heathen and Moslem worlds for the spread of the Gospel. The Conference was roused to enthusiasm, and the question now is: What will the response be in workers and means? The Bishop of Salisbury, as Chairman of the Conference, says: "The demands we make are exorbitant, unprecedented, and the home difficulties are immense. What will the Church do in response? Will the offering of life be adequate? Will an adequate offering of wealth follow the offering of life?" On the answer to these questions depends much of the future of Christianity and its character throughout the world.

To Make the Appeal Effective.

It may seem ungracious in the face of the need and of the power of the appeal to offer any criticisms, but there are some points to which attention should be drawn in order to make the appeal as effective as it should be. Nowhere is the weakness caused by the divisions of Christendom more evident than in portions of the Mission field. The Conference represented the united action of the Church at home in co-operation with the representatives of the Free Churches. It is of the utmost importance that no unnecessary barriers should be set up to divide native Christians from one another in the Churches growing up abroad. Some of the stories told of the exclusion of devoted Christians of one portion

of the Church from Communion by other sections of the Church are painful. There must be unity among all portions of the Reformed Church throughout the Mission field on such essential matters as this if the Divine blessing is to rest upon the appeal. There is one omission in the call to which attention should be directed. The Call to the Home Church from our own people in the overseas dominions and in the isolated communities in many lands is omitted. Their needs should not be ignored. They may be the chief source of the strength of our Communion in a few generations. Special attention ought also to be given to work among the Jews. They may also constitute one of the chief factors in the development of Christian influence in the near future.

An Apologist for "Catholicism."

The defence of the Anglo-Catholic extremists by the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford has already been so convincingly dealt with by Dean Inge and others that it may seem unnecessary to take any further notice of it. Its statements have been a source of astonishment to many. It is difficult to understand how anyone holding the position of Head of the Divinity School in Oxford University could issue a document containing so much that is open to direct contradiction. A great thinker has said that "Wisdom consists in the ready and accurate perception of analogies." Some of the Professor's analogies are open to obvious question. Almost every page contains statements which provoke retort. When we are told that St. Paul's sacramental teaching is the same as that of the Anglo-Catholics, we can only say with a recent writer that the sacerdotal theory of the Ministry and Sacraments "contradicts the whole genius and tenor of the New Testament," and that if such a theory had been intended by our Lord and His Apostles "the New Testament—in its affirmations and its omissions—would have been a book altogether unlike the book it is." If any impartial writer were to compare the place of Holy Baptism and Holy Communion in St. Paul's teaching and in that of Anglo-Catholicism to-day, we venture to think that the divergences rather than the resemblances would be the more striking, and that is putting the fact very moderately.

"A Declaration of War."

The Regius Professor repeats the statement so frequently made that the Anglo-Catholics do not desire to interfere with other sections of the Church, and that they are only seeking liberty for themselves. Some time ago a declaration on their part asserted that they would no longer be content with any mere "toleration" of their views. They are claiming that they represent the true teaching of the Church, and they have declared that "When the Catholic influence prevails in the Church, there will be no toleration for Modernists, and the extreme Evangelical will be far happier with his Free Church brethren." The recent action of the Bishop of St. Albans in regard to the Watford Conference shows the sort

of treatment which Evangelical ideas and aspirations will be likely to receive wherever the Anglo-Catholics are in authority. Recently the organ of the extremists has repeated its threat, and has emphasized what Sir Thomas Inskip described as "a declaration of war." It says: "It was an anticipation of what will happen when Catholicism prevails throughout the Church. It must be perfectly obvious that when that happens Modernism and extreme Protestantism will be impossible in the Church of England as they are impossible to-day in the Roman and Orthodox Churches." As such pseudo-Catholicism is of necessity intolerant and tyrannous we believe that the people of England will take care that it never has the opportunity of making its desires effective.

The Reservation of the Sacrament.

The constant repetition of the statement that our present Prayer Book does not forbid Reservation, and that Reservation is required by the Canon Law of the Church, is an instance of the method employed to secure the acceptance of a practice for which there is absolutely no defence. Common sense in the interpretation of the rubric requiring the consumption of all that remains of the consecrated bread and wine at the close of the service is sufficient for most of us, and the interpretation of Canon Law has been condemned by the highest legal and ecclesiastical authorities. All this counts for nothing in the eyes of those who have convinced themselves that Reservation is a Catholic practice which they are determined to follow. The statement drawn up by the Committee of the National Church League gives clearly the teaching and practice of the Church of England. Commencing with the decision against Reservation by the Archbishops (Dr. Temple and Dr. Maclagan) in 1900, it points out the real significance of the demand for the practice. It is not mainly for the sick but for purposes of adoration. The fundamental fact is that Reservation is based on "the unscriptural view of a presence of Christ in the consecrated elements." The words of Bishop Westcott are appropriately quoted: "It seems to me to be vital to guard against the thought of the Presence of the Lord 'in or under the forms of bread and wine.' From this the greatest practical errors follow." (*Life* ii. 351.)

The Bishop of Birmingham and his Critics.

The controversy raised by a small body of extremists in Birmingham against Bishop Barnes has subsided as a result of a clergyman being found to accept the living of St. Mark's, Washwood Heath, on the terms laid down by the Bishop. These were of a very modest character, and did not go as far as they might, and some may say as far as they ought, in maintaining the requirements of the Prayer Book. The Bishop had the possible changes in the revised Prayer Book in his mind, for he says "I merely seek to ensure obedience to the lawful order which we may expect to find in the revised Prayer Book. When the new Prayer Book

has received the sanction of the National Assembly and Parliament, Bishops and Clergy alike must be loyal to it. As Bishop, I could not forbid any practices or forms of service which it allows, nor ought an incumbent to adopt any which it does not authorize." We hope that the Bishop's anticipations of obedience will be realized. From the requirements enjoined by him he seems to suggest that the new Prayer Book will insist on Morning and Evening Prayer substantially according to the Prayer Book at convenient times on Sunday, and that there will be no reservation of the consecrated elements with free access on the part of members of the congregation, nor any so-called extra-liturgical services connected with the elements.

The Bishop of St. Albans and the Watford Conference.

Whatever question there may be as to the wisdom and expediency of the Bishop of St. Albans' action in advising the abandonment of the Conference on "Faith and Order" at Watford between members of the Church of England and Free Churchmen, and in refusing to allow the Communion Service at which Free Churchmen might be present to be held, there can be no question that he was wrong in the reason which he gave for his refusal. He said: "It is quite contrary to the principles of the Church of England to administer the Sacrament to those who have not been confirmed." The point has often been considered, and even the Bishops at the last Lambeth Conference were not prepared to go so far as to say that unconfirmed Christians were to be repelled from Holy Communion. The most convincing argument on the subject is given in a pamphlet by Professor Gwatkin, an acknowledged authority on historical matters, and especially on those relating to our own Church. In this, "The Confirmation Rubric; Whom does it bind?" written at the time of the Kikuyu Controversy, he shows that the Rubric can only refer to members of the Church of England, and cannot possibly be used to exclude other Christians. Non-conformists have not, except in exceptional instances and in unusual circumstances, any desire to be habitual communicants in our churches, and on such a special occasion as at Watford it would have been a gracious act, and it would have shown a more generous Christian spirit to refrain from such a prohibition. In any case the advice to abandon the Conference was regrettable.

The Recent Sessions of the Church Assembly.

The subjects considered at the last session of the Church Assembly were in the main those which had been considered at the previous sittings, viz., Patronage and Clergy Pensions. We dealt with these at some length in our last number, and need not repeat our remarks on the proposals. Some important improvements have been suggested in the Patronage Scheme, but it is still open to the objection that it threatens to interfere seriously with the rights of the Patrons without giving the laity any adequate voice in the choice of the incumbent. In fact, it appears to add unduly to the powers of

the Bishops. There is still considerable dissatisfaction among the clergy with the Pensions scheme. We hope the details will be carefully considered before the final decision is reached. The good will of the clergy, for whose benefit the arrangements are being made, should be secured. The defeat of the proposal that the expenses of the Bishops should be met in any legal action taken by them in regard to discipline in matters of ritual and doctrine is ominous in view of the demands which we gather are to be made by them for a strict adherence to the requirements of the revised Prayer Book when it is issued. By their votes the Bishops themselves seemed to be sharply divided on the question. This does not bode well for the exercise of discipline.

The Church and the Future.

The Cheltenham Conference Committee has chosen as the subject for this year's discussion "The Church and the Future." The Conference will be held in the last week of June, and we hope as usual to publish most of the papers in the next number of *THE CHURCHMAN*. The subject is one of special importance and will attract considerable attention. A number of representative and influential speakers have already signified their intention of being present, and the Conference ought to be one of unusual value and interest. The Programme states that the purpose of the Conference will be: "To consider the teaching and character of Christianity as it will appeal to the coming generation, especially bearing in mind the problems facing clergy who are commencing their Ministry." The greatest need of Christianity to-day in face of its world-wide mission is twofold. There is need for unity, and that presupposes a far larger measure of agreement as to the fundamentals of our Faith. The Conference will, we believe, do much to make clear the essentials of Christianity, and the best means of securing their emphasis in the organization of the Church of the future. The subject appeals specially to the younger clergy, and we hope that they will be well represented at the gathering. Full details of the Programme can be obtained from the Secretary of the Conference at Dean Wace House.

The Position of the Convocations.

At the last meeting of the Canterbury Convocation the future position of the Houses of Convocation was under discussion. The Archbishop of Canterbury assured some of the members who were under an impression that the rights of Convocation were being endangered that as far as he was concerned nothing was farther from his thoughts than that the due privileges and rights of Convocation should be imperilled in any way whatever. But he went on to point out that many of the conditions of the work of Convocation had inevitably changed owing to the establishment of the Church Assembly. There is no doubt that the importance of the Convocations has greatly diminished since the setting up of the Church Assembly. The attendance at the last session was

small, and the proceedings were dull. The work done by the larger Meeting must inevitably render the discussion at the purely Clerical gathering less useful, and in some cases redundant. In the multiplicity of Conferences and Congresses some must suffer. The Convocations have to contend with a process which is difficult to resist. Practical utility will be the deciding factor when the question of survival arises. The discussion of Prayer Book matters has brought the question to the front. No doubt the Convocations have the right to discuss the whole subject again when the report of the Bishops is issued, and perhaps to draw up a report of their own. Whatever value such a report may have as an expression of opinion, there is no body to whom it can be presented, and in that sense it will have little practical utility.

Editorial Note.

We have the pleasure of printing in this number Professor Pollard's second lecture. His treatment of Henry VIII in connection with the Reformation will be read with interest and profit. The other articles which we are able to present are of varied and, we hope, general interest. The Rev. George F. Irwin states some useful points regarding the Evangelical Interpretation of Anglicanism, of which there has been considerable discussion recently. Mr. John Knipe continues the account of the life of Anne Askew, "The Fair Gospeller." It gives an insight into the mentality of important personages in the time of the Tudors. Dr. Harold Smith contributes one of his valuable historical Studies. The results of his researches into ordinations during the Commonwealth throw a useful sidelight on the conditions of the time. The Rev. Norman Clarke deals with one aspect of the important subject of Authority. The Rev. F. Bate writes on a subject with which he is well qualified to deal. His paper on "The Church in North and Central Europe" contains a number of interesting facts regarding the past and present work of English Chaplains on the Continent. In lighter vein are the anecdotes of Dean Swift which an Ulster writer contributes.

Our Notes on Current Events and on the teaching of our Church, as well as the reviews and notes on books, will, we hope, be found helpful to our readers. We thank them for many kind expressions of appreciation and for their continued support of our efforts.

The Record is the oldest Church of England newspaper. It was founded in the year 1828, and will be celebrating its centenary in two years. With the beginning of the present year a number of important alterations and improvements were made in it, in order to render it more generally useful to the great body of Evangelical Churchpeople for whom it specially caters. We hope that in its new form it will receive the increased support which it merits. Its articles are written by experienced and competent writers, and embrace a wide variety of subjects of theological and general interest. It is indispensable for all desiring to keep in touch with Church affairs.

HENRY VIII.

BY PROFESSOR A. F. POLLARD, M.A., Hon. Litt.D., F.B.A.
(Professor of English History in University of London).

The second of a series of Lectures on the Reformation, delivered under the auspices of the Reformation Study Brotherhood, National Church League, at the Dean Wace House on Monday, October 26, with the Right Rev. Bishop Knox in the Chair.

IN the last lecture I endeavoured to deal with one or two of the broader aspects of the Reformation, and to bring out certain underlying developments which seem to me of very considerable importance, but are not obvious, and are not usually brought out very clearly in the books we read. This afternoon my object will be to try and answer the kind of question that Sir William Joynson-Hicks put from the Chair on the last occasion. He expressed a doubt as to what my view was of the importance of Henry VIII. He asked, in effect, "Can you define in any way the exact and real importance of Henry VIII's place in history?"

Now, in human affairs one cannot do anything very exactly. History may be a science, it certainly is an art, but it is not an exact science. Nothing that is human ever is. It is only when we come to inanimate nature or to an abstract study like mathematics that we can be exact. But I do want to try and put before you the kind of importance, and the reasons for that importance, which attaches to the place in history of Henry VIII. We have to realize that no man, however apparently despotic and complete his authority may be, however great may be the force of his personality and his intellect, can ever achieve anything except with the co-operation of forces which exist quite independently of his will. Even the most despotic and absolute government that ever existed has always been necessarily to some extent an expression of some sort of public opinion. And Henry VIII would not have been able to do what he did, had it not been for conditions, tendencies, aspirations, and so forth, which existed among the English people, and indeed elsewhere, quite independently of Henry himself. And in order to bring out the importance of the action of Henry VIII and of the English Crown in the sixteenth century, I want you to carry your minds back over a century earlier than the sixteenth.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century we find already in existence a considerable number of forces tending towards the reformation of the Church and a repudiation of the jurisdiction of the Papacy. But those forces failed, and they failed at that time, largely because of the lack of that particular element which was supplied a century and a quarter later. You had, for instance, at the end of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth obvious signs of the passing of the Middle Ages, and of the disappearance of many of the ideas which underlay the medieval organization

of the Church, society, and the State. You find the Papacy apparently hopelessly weakened by its captivity at Avignon and by the prolonged papal schism. You find social discontent expressed by the Lollard movement, and in France by the Jacquerie. You have Wycliffe anticipating in a remarkable way many of the views that were adopted in England and other countries in the sixteenth century. Wycliffe has been described as the "morning star of the Reformation." So far as a poetic description can ever be historically accurate I think that is a fairly good description of Wycliffe and the Wycliffite movement. You have also the strong feeling against the monastic system as being non-national if not anti-national, expressing itself, of course, in the movement for the confiscation of the alien priories in England during the Hundred Years' War.

Thus you have a considerable movement of tendencies which might conceivably have brought about a Reformation—tendencies which were described at the time as heretical, and which led to the enactment of what were known as the Lollard Statutes for the burning of heretics. But the movement failed, it seemed to disappear, and people have argued whether there was continuity between the doctrines of Wycliffe and the doctrines of the Reformation. I think there is continuity. Throughout the fifteenth century you can find people who held Wycliffite doctrines and even were burned for holding them. Nevertheless, it seemed as though things had reverted to the conditions of the Middle Ages. Why was that? As I indicated just now, the English monarchy, under the House of Lancaster, made up its mind to support the hierarchy of the Roman Church, and the hierarchy to support the throne. Both the Crown and the ecclesiastical hierarchy were nervous. They had seen symptoms and signs enough to make them a little doubtful with regard to the security of their position, the Lancastrians on the throne and the ecclesiastical hierarchy in possession of its privileges and its jurisdiction. How far their policy was conscious and deliberate it is impossible to say. In any case they adopted an expedient that has often been adopted in English history and in the history of other countries by Governments that feared for their domestic position. They realized that there were considerable elements of discontent, and they wanted to neutralize those elements. They adopted what is called a "spirited foreign policy" in order to divert people's attention from domestic affairs and to satisfy them with military glory or other things of that kind. So we have the renewal of the war with France, one of the most unjust, unwise, and wicked determinations ever made by an English Government.

Henry V was a first-class soldier, but he was one of the worst statesmen that ever sat on the English throne. His policy of the conquest of France was brilliantly successful at first, but it was bound to fail in the end, bound to bring home its results; and it was the war with France that was directly responsible for the Wars of the Roses, for the lack of governance in England, and for the postponement for a considerable period of urgent measures of reform. The

ultimate cure—some people have thought it was almost worse than the original disease—of what Sir John Fortescue called the “lack of governance” which characterized England and other countries at the close of the Middle Ages—was found in what J. R. Green called “the new monarchy.” That is a good enough phrase in its way, but it does not express all that ought to be expressed. It takes rather the most obvious part of the movement, but fails to express the fundamental and permanent part. What we commonly call the new monarchy should properly be termed the modern state, because it was the development of that new monarchy that really led to the development of the modern state, and that was something much more permanent and important than simply the development of the new monarchy.

That brings me to one of the things for which Henry VIII stands—one of the things of which he is the most flamboyant expression. Of course, one may describe him, if one likes, as merely the froth on the crest of the wave; and the crest of the wave is obviously not to be measured in importance with the wave itself. The thing that Henry VIII stood for and expressed was this new conception of the State—the conception of the State as we have known it more or less for the last four centuries. That has in it much that is good, and something that is evil, and is still a matter of discussion. What is that conception? Fundamentally it is a form of conscious self-determination. In early times in all communities—but I am thinking now particularly of the national communities of Western Europe—the State was an infant, not conscious of any will of its own. It could not do anything by itself, and, like natural children, the State in its early years was given a governess. We call that governess the Church. The Church told the State what it ought to do. In the earlier forms of the Coronation Service you find the Church telling the King what it is his duty to do. The State had got no will, or hardly a will, of its own at all. There is nothing more misleading than to use the same word for the modern, and the medieval, and the Anglo-Saxon State.

Take what we call law. What do we mean by law? The definition of law now is “the will of the State,” and people almost think that the law consists of Acts of Parliament. That is a purely modern conception which would have been utterly incomprehensible in early times, or even in the Middle Ages. Nobody thought in those days that any human authority could make any law. There was a law of God, and a law of nature—neither of them things in which any human authority could intervene at all. And even in human things the sanction for law was custom. What was right was what was customary. It takes centuries for the law to grow. Indeed, our whole legislation grows up, not from the idea that people are making any new law, but with the idea that they are interpreting eternal law, harmonizing conflicts between its different expressions, and between this older and more authoritative law and the new necessities which call for fresh interpretations of that law. As the Middle Ages go on we get the growth of the idea of positive law,

the idea that human authority can create as law anything that it likes, can pass an Act to do anything that it cares to try to do. That is a modern conception, and that is one of the things for which the New Monarchy of Henry VIII stands. It represents an enormous development. You may call it, if you like, the usurpation on the part of mere human authority in spheres which have always been regarded as beyond the operation of man-made law and beyond the jurisdiction of the State. Still, there is a colossal intrusion into these spheres by the State towards the end of the fifteenth century, and still more strikingly in the early part of the sixteenth.

Now we come to consider some of the circumstances and conditions at the beginning of the sixteenth century. I have already indicated my own opinion that there was a good deal of Lollard doctrine persisting at that time. There was a great deal of what was called heresy in England before Luther appeared at all. Let me quote just one phrase from a letter written by the learned Italian, Ammonio, Latin secretary to Henry VIII. Writing to Erasmus in 1511 he complains that it is a very cold winter, and that he finds difficulty in getting wood because there have been so many heretics burned that wood has become dear! That was in 1511, six years before Luther's Theses were published. It serves as one of numerous illustrations of the existence of strong tendencies towards innovation or reformation in the ecclesiastical sphere. In the interval between Henry V and Henry VIII the Renaissance had made very considerable progress. There had been a great development in wealth and capital among the English people, and on the part of a largely increased section of the people a growth of a new demand for knowledge and understanding. But we must always remember that these manifestations were not peculiar to England.

One of the curious difficulties about the arguments I sometimes read which attribute the whole course of the Reformation in England to some personal action on the part of some man or some woman is that we have to account for the fact that in Germany, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Hungary, and elsewhere there were similar movements. Obviously they cannot be accounted for by these vagaries on the part of Henry VIII. Not only were similar conditions producing similar results in other countries, but in many countries before they appeared in England. You are familiar with those episodes of the Reformation in Germany. There were plenty of examples. The question really was until about 1529 whether England was going to side with one part of Europe or with the other. Europe was clearly dividing itself into two, those who wished to retain the Roman jurisdiction and those who wished to dispose of it. And here again that division and the lines the division followed were not novel. One of the interesting things about the conciliar movement in the fifteenth century, the effort to reform the whole Church by means of General Councils, was that the movement broke down largely because the people who constituted and attended those Councils were found to be divided among themselves, and it is

significant that the line of division then was precisely what it was in the sixteenth century. The countries which in these Councils were mostly for reform in the fifteenth century were those which repudiated Roman jurisdiction in the sixteenth. That shows that the changes in the sixteenth century were not merely accidental.

The question was whether, in the sixteenth century, the indications and tendencies which had been in evidence early in the fifteenth century would be followed. We may say that that depended on the monarch. To some extent that is true. The monarch, by deciding for the Reformation in the sixteenth century and against the Papacy, did make a great deal of difference in the history of the Reformation of England. But I am not quite satisfied with the precision of that statement. When it is said that it depended on the monarch one asks, "What depended?" Assuredly not the question whether there should ever be a Reformation or not in England. It is impossible to believe that there would have been no Reformation in England if there had been no Henry VIII. No sane person can attribute so enormous a change, so momentous a development merely to the personal action of a single individual. What was, then, at stake?

To some extent what was at stake was the question when that change would take place. I have no doubt that if Henry VIII had not been estranged from the Papal Court he could have postponed the breach with Rome during his lifetime at any rate. Secondly, there is a question that does seem to me to depend upon the action of the monarch—namely, whether the method of the change took place more or less constitutionally by Act of Parliament and so forth, or involved revolution and wars of religion. That was the practical issue. Elsewhere in Europe there were wars of religion, and to a considerable extent revolution. Only in England, practically, was the change brought about without these. And that difference was largely due to the personal action of the Tudor monarchs and their advisers. That, of course, is different from saying that without those persons there would have been no Reformation at all. That appears to me quite an impossible attitude to take up. We have, of course, in all our historical and political studies to remember the distinction made by Aristotle when he remarked, with regard to great changes in human affairs, that the occasions of these things might be trivial, but the causes were always profound. There is no commoner mistake than to confuse the occasion with the cause of great events. You may remember that somewhat cynical saying of Pascal that if Cleopatra's nose had been a trifle shorter the whole history of the world would have been different. There have always been paradoxical minds attracted by that kind of argument. We have Gray speaking of the Gospel light "that dawned in Boleyn's eyes," though Anne Boleyn heard Mass, at least, to the end of her life! One acute writer took pleasure in trying to prove that the French revolution broke out because of a particular form of land tenure which obtained in certain parts of France. It all comes from confusing the cause and the occasion. The greatness of the change is

generally accurately measured by the profundity of the causes which brought it about.

Now we come to this question of the alienation of the monarch from the orthodox cause, the cause of the Roman Catholic Church. That made a very great difference to the situation—I hesitate to say all the difference—in the sixteenth century. In the fifteenth century the tendencies towards change were frustrated by the fact that the monarchy threw its weight into the scale on the other side, and the monarchy was in a position to hold the balance between opposing forces. By the sixteenth century the weight of the monarchy had increased owing to the period of anarchy which culminated in the Wars of the Roses and the need that was felt for some saviour of society who would rescue it from this welter of anarchy. So this New Monarchy was in itself a natural development, a development in response to an urgently felt need. Consequently, in the time of Henry VII and Henry VIII the monarchy had greater weight than in the time of Henry IV or Henry V, and that weight now was thrown into the scale of change instead of being thrown into the scale of conservatism. How is it that Henry VIII was brought to transfer his rather considerable weight from one scale to the other?

Down to 1527 or 1529 he had been an ideal King from the point of view of the Papacy. He had received from the Pope some notable gifts; he had intervened more than once in small wars on the side of the Papacy; and he had even written a book against Luther for which the Pope gave him the title "Defender of the Faith." So it seemed that Henry VIII was the least likely of any monarch living at that time to side against the Papacy. He was almost the favourite King of the Popes. The cause of his alienation was that not very attractive subject, the divorce of Catherine of Aragon, and with that one has to deal if one is treating of Henry VIII and his position and attitude with regard to the Reformation.

There is one particular point which seems to be fundamental. In so far as morality was involved, Henry VIII's offence from the point of view of the Papacy was that he wanted to marry his wives. If he had not wanted to marry them, there would have been no trouble. We reprobate Henry VIII, but in this particular respect the case of Francis I was worse, that of Henry of Navarre was worse, that of our own Charles II was worse. Henry VIII was always anxious to marry, not that he wanted wives but that he wanted sons. The fundamental question from his point of view was, of course, the succession to the throne. If he had not cared about that there would have been no trouble. And why was the succession so much in men's minds? Why were they so anxious about it at that time? The view in 1527 was that no woman could sit on the English throne. They were believed by law to be excluded. That was not, strictly speaking, the case. There was no actual law on the subject. Nevertheless, it was perfectly natural at that time that any intelligent observer, English or foreign, should have come to the conclusion that women could not sit on the throne. There had been no queen regnant in England except the Empress Matilda, who had sought to

establish her throne against Stephen; and that attempt led to nineteen years' civil war and anarchy in England. The theory had grown up that, while women could transmit a hereditary claim to their children, they could not themselves occupy the throne. That had been the theory in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Henry VII and even Henry VIII had no right to the throne when they came to it by heredity unless it were true that no woman could sit on the throne. Henry VII derived all his hereditary claim through his mother, Margaret Beaufort, who survived into Henry VIII's reign; but nobody thought of enthroning Margaret Beaufort either in 1485 or in 1509. It was tacitly assumed that no woman could sit on the throne.

At this time Henry VIII had only one legitimate child, the future Queen Mary; people were talking of a renewal of the Wars of the Roses if there should be any dispute about the succession, and there seemed certain to be a dispute about the succession if the crown should descend to Princess Mary. All these things seem strange to us after reigns like those of Elizabeth and Victoria, but we must put our minds back into the circumstances of the sixteenth century. It was not to the person of women that the objection was made. The objection was this, that a queen regnant must marry or leave the succession more doubtful than ever. If she married a subject, that would create rivalries and threaten the revival of factions which caused the Wars of the Roses; and if she married a foreign prince the position would be almost worse. People were seeing at that time one independent state after another brought into the empire of Charles V by means of marriage. "*Bella gerant alii, tu, felix Austria nube.*" ("Blest Austria, though others war, for thee the marriage vow.") It was by marriage that the empire of Charles V had been largely built, and the independence of the Netherlands and of other countries destroyed for the time. That was one of the fears of Englishmen then, that if there were a queen regnant, that queen would marry and bring England under foreign subjection, as was almost done by the marriage of Mary to her cousin Philip II.

Everything, therefore, seemed to depend upon Henry VIII's successor, and also upon Catherine of Aragon. The unfortunate details of the history of Catherine of Aragon are not generally familiar. She had a child on January 31, 1510. It died at once. Eleven months later a son was born, called the Prince of Wales, but died seven weeks later. In September, 1513, another son was stillborn. In June, 1514, a third son was stillborn. In December, 1514, a fourth son was stillborn, and in that year a diplomatist at Rome reports that Henry VIII was seeking a divorce from Catherine of Aragon because he could not have issue by her. That at least rules out Anne Boleyn as the origin of the idea, for this was in 1514 when Anne was seven years old. Matters seemed to mend when in 1516 the Princess Mary was born. Henry VIII was extremely pleased with this daughter, and said that by the blessing of God the sons would come. There were two more children prematurely stillborn, in 1517 and 1518. In 1519 Henry VIII was offering to lead a

crusade against the Turk if only he had a son. Catherine of Aragon was now forty years old. Under these circumstances men's minds went back to the legality of the marriage that had had such amazingly tragic consequences with regard to issue. Of course, there had always been doubts. The validity of the marriage depended upon whether the Pope could dispense for a marriage between brother-in-law and sister-in-law. General councils in the fifteenth century had declared against the papal power to dispense under circumstances of that kind. Pope Julius II himself doubted whether he could grant the dispensation. Catherine's own confessor considered that her marriage with Henry VIII would not be lawful. Ferdinand, Catherine's father, took a great deal of trouble to exorcise these doubts, and the question was anxiously debated in Henry's council in 1509. The doubts were, however, overruled, and nothing more would have been heard of them but for the extraordinary fatality attaching to the issue of the marriage. In that theological age it was inevitable that men should associate the two things, and a French ambassador, who was also a cardinal, wrote that God had Himself pronounced judgment against the validity of the marriage.

The other question was whether, if there could be an undisputed heir to the throne through the divorce of Henry VIII from Catherine of Aragon, there were precedents for it. Technically the word "divorce" is misleading. There was no divorce at all, and could be none according to the law at that time. There could be either a separation, which did not enable either party to marry again, or a declaration that there had been no valid marriage. There were numerous precedents for the latter. Louis XII of France, who was afterwards a brother-in-law of Henry VIII, had been "divorced" from his wife in order that he might marry Anne of Brittany and thus maintain the adhesion of Brittany to France. The Duke of Suffolk, another brother-in-law, had been "divorced" twice. Henry VIII's other sister, Margaret Queen of Scotland, had been "divorced" once, and was in 1528 seeking marriage with a third husband. There was a still more singular precedent. In the middle of the fifteenth century Henry IV of Castile had sought and obtained from the Pope licence to marry a second wife on the ground of the barrenness of his first. If within a prescribed period he had no issue by the second wife, he was to return to the first.

Such were the precedents Henry VIII had before his eyes. What, then, was the difficulty? Clement VII from 1527 onwards could not help himself. As his own papal secretary expressed it, after the sack of Rome in 1527 the Papacy was entirely in the hands of the Emperor's servants. "The Pope is nothing but the chaplain of the Emperor." And, of course, Catherine of Aragon was the Emperor's aunt. The Emperor was a great politician and cared nothing for his aunt as an aunt. His concern was to see that Mary succeeded if there was no male issue. That was a definite political interest; and as a matter of fact, afterwards, when Mary was given by Act of Parliament her position in the order of succession, Charles V's friendship with Henry VIII became closer than ever, in spite of

the way in which Henry had treated Catherine of Aragon. The Emperor, therefore, used all his influence to prevent the Papacy giving a decision in Henry VIII's favour. Of course, Catherine of Aragon was a woman of the highest possible character. She was, however, indiscreet in politics. She had written in 1509 that she regarded herself as her father's ambassador. As a woman there was nothing to be said against her, and there was a very natural and proper and entirely admirable sympathy with Catherine in this affair throughout England. But the matter was not decided on its merits at all. The papal jurisdiction had become a weapon in hands hostile to England.

The causes of that go back a long way. One thing that a Pope ought never to be is a patriot. The idea of the Middle Ages was that nationalism was an insignificant thing compared with the catholicism of the world. The papal system was a reasonable system, comparatively, and an understandable system so long as that remained the case. But as soon as Popes began to be Italians first and Popes second, the whole system became illogical and unjustifiable. Julius II, when he expressed an intense Italian feeling and spoke of driving the barbarians across the Alps, betrayed the catholicism of his Church. The Papacy had become almost as nationalist and separatist as England became under Henry VIII. It was not able to avoid the patriotic infection. Popes laboured under a further defect. If the Papacy was going to be patriotic, it ought to have had the means of being patriotic successfully. But in fact it was ground between the upper and the nether millstone of France in the north of Italy and Spain in Sicily and Naples. 1527, when Henry first applied to Rome—and he was persuaded to do this by Wolsey—about the divorce, Wolsey had no doubt that through the French King it would be possible to bring adequate pressure to bear upon Clement VII. The Pope offered no resistance at first; but in 1528 the French armies in Italy were completely defeated by the armies of Charles V, with the result that in 1529 the whole of Italy passed under the control of the Emperor; with it passed the Papacy itself, and the closest kind of alliance was formed between Clement VII and the Emperor Charles V.

I said just now that Wolsey had persuaded Henry VIII to have recourse to Rome on the divorce. Consequently when, in 1529, Campeggio was revoked from England without granting the divorce, Wolsey's fall was assured. It had been prepared by Wolsey's failure in other respects. Wolsey was a great man, perhaps the greatest diplomatist this country has ever known. But his position had certain fundamental difficulties which ultimately ruined his career. I have no doubt that Wolsey wanted to reform the Church as a whole, only things always got put off; and he realized that he could not reform the Church as a whole unless he himself became Pope. In order to become Pope he must not merely follow a national policy, he must play a big part on the European stage; he must impress himself not only upon the national mind but upon the European mind. Then he might stand some chance of being elected

Pope, and be able to carry out some measure of reform throughout western Christendom. It was very laudable ambition, but again the national differences stood in his way. No Englishman except Adrian IV has ever been Pope of Rome. The double failure first of Wolsey and afterwards of Cardinal Pole to obtain the Papacy showed that there was not the remotest chance of an Englishman becoming Pope or exercising the supreme authority in Christendom. "No Englishman need apply." It was just those countries which were so inadequately represented in the College of Cardinals and in the list of Popes that broke away from Rome. When that nominally Catholic jurisdiction became a weapon in the hands of Italian nationalism or of other nations who were enemies to the northern peoples, the ideal became impossible. So Wolsey failed to secure the Papacy, and therefore it was impossible for him to carry out his projects for the reformation of the Church.

There were other difficulties. Wolsey had thought that by getting an extraordinary commission as Papal Legate—*Legatus a latere*—or Envoy Extraordinary, firstly for a year, then for two years, then five and ten years, and finally for life, he might still be able to carry out the reformation of the English Church. But no legate can ever travel one step beyond the authority given him by his chief, and his chief was the Pope in Rome. There was also a further difficulty about a national reformation to be carried out by ecclesiastical methods. Both the old Roman Empire and the Papacy set themselves against nationalism, and based themselves upon provincialism. There were provinces of Rome, but these never coincided with racial and national divisions. So you had two Archbishops in England, and more than that in France. There was no national ecclesiastical organization in the Middle Ages at all. There were provincial organizations, but no means by which the two Convocations could be brought together except by authority from the Papacy. Wolsey brought them together on a famous occasion, 1523, but not as Archbishop of York. He brought them together as Legate *a latere*, in which capacity his papal jurisdiction overruled that of the two Archbishops. It annoyed the Archbishop of Canterbury, naturally, very much to have to sit in a Convocation presided over by a Legate who was Archbishop of York.

A Reformation was not to be carried out except by the Crown and Parliament. It could not be done by purely ecclesiastical authority. Hence the constitutional developments, so much neglected, in the reign of Henry VIII. He found himself at issue with the Papacy, with Charles V, and with considerable sections of his own people. His one invaluable support was Parliament. Nobody did so much in England to develop Parliament as Henry VIII. He did not do it for the sake of constitutional principle; it was simply that he wanted means to carry out the object he had at heart. It was because Henry VIII was driven into a position in which he must needs cultivate Parliament that he did so much to develop Parliament; and in the latter part of his reign we first get the modern form of Parliamentary liberties put forward by the Speaker

and guaranteed. Henry always asserted and exaggerated Parliamentary liberties. There is some sort of idea that he invaded the liberties of Parliament. He really led a Parliamentary invasion of the liberties of the Church. The Reformation was constitutional on the theory which has since been accepted, namely, that the Crown and Parliament can do almost anything, but was certainly unconstitutional according to the views of the Middle Ages, when the Church had an independent co-ordinate jurisdiction in which no secular authority could intervene at all.

I cannot embark on a sketch of the Reformation in Henry VIII's reign. There is a great deal in Henry VIII that alienates one profoundly. He is almost fit for psycho-analysis. As a statesman I put him very high; but it is difficult to appreciate his greatness as a statesman because of our dislike for some aspects of his character. In spite of the enormous power he developed, he had that rarest sense of knowing how far he could go and when he must stop—the kind of sense that Napoleon, a much greater man in many ways, did not possess. He was never too proud to take advice or accept a warning. About his personality I should like to remark that I do not think he was a hypocrite. I do not think that anybody who is fundamentally a hypocrite ever achieves anything fundamental in this world. You must believe a thing yourself—although you may have a curious conscience. You may have that kind of faculty which convinces people that what they want is really right. Henry VIII convinced himself that what he wanted was really right. No hypocrite ever makes other people believe in what he does not believe himself. But Henry VIII is no representative of Protestantism. Whatever he expresses, he does not express that.

Archbishop Cranmer is a better exponent of Protestantism, and I am pleased to see that he figures as the representative Englishman in that magnificent cathedral now building in New York. I remember that, when at Jesus College, Cambridge, some years ago, a well-known dignitary of the Church was asked to speak for Cranmer, to my great regret the best thing he had to say for Cranmer was that Cranmer was a good sportsman. He was a great deal more than that. When he was appointed Archbishop, before taking his oath of obedience to the Papacy, which he was bound to do, he publicly and openly stated that that oath of obedience was not to bind him with regard to any measures of reformation. He had, as a matter of fact, ceased to believe in the authority of the Papacy. After all, which is the more honest thing to do, to take an oath or subscribe Articles with mental reservations, or to blurt out the truth beforehand? That was Cranmer. He was entirely without guile. He always blurted out inconvenient truths.

With regard to his recantations, some of those were written by Cranmer, some of them not, but only subscribed by him. What was the difficulty in Cranmer's mind? It was that profound problem which nobody has yet really solved. The attitude he had taken was that the nation, through its authorized organs, Crown, Parliament, and Convocation, can set up what standard of faith, of

ritual, and of doctrine it prefers. He had cast in his lot with the supremacy of the nation itself in ecclesiastical matters. He had never taken up the individualist Protestant view. He had never accepted the view that the individual conscience was the supreme authority. He always held that the national authorities had complete power and right to deal with the conscientious objector. That was well enough under Henry VIII and Edward VI, but under Mary——! I do not believe that Cranmer at any time after 1523 recognized papal jurisdiction or believed in it. I do not think he would ever have done so, if it had stood on its own footing. But in Mary's reign Queen, Parliament, and Convocation all agreed or concurred in the validity and binding character of papal jurisdiction. What ground could Cranmer find for resistance? He had never yet taken the individualist point of view.

It was in circumstances like these that those recantations were drawn up from which in time he receded. You are familiar with the story of the last hour of his life. He was never happy until his hand was burning in the fire. He had at last reached the solution of the difficulties. He had realized that there is, as Matthew Arnold said, something in us, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness. He had come to realize that that was the really important thing; it was beyond the reach, not merely of papal jurisdiction but of the English national state; and that was the real essence of the Protestant claim. And so it was that, having reached that conclusion, he was able to suffer in the heroic way in which he did. So far as English history is concerned, that was the act and sign which gave to Protestantism its vital and its unchanging character.

Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. publish Dr. Darwell Stone's *The Faith of an English Catholic* (2s. 6d., cloth 4s. net). The author's views are so well known that it is not necessary to state them here. The book is the most undisguised statement of Roman Catholic teaching for members of the Church of England that we have yet seen from such an authoritative person as the leader of the Anglo-Catholic party in the House of Clergy. No one can have any excuse for saying, after reading this book, that the statements of Protestants for years past as to the true character of the movement are not fully justified. The Roman system down to the colours and ceremonial is advocated, and the book reveals the great gulf there is between the conception of Christianity here set out and the teaching and tradition of Anglicanism since the Reformation. We hope the attention of the Bishops, before they have finished their revision of the Prayer Book, will be directed to this frank acknowledgment of the practice of Romanism in our midst, and we hope that they will have the courage to say definitely that by no stretch of comprehensiveness can such teaching be covered by our Prayer Book.

THE EVANGELICAL INTERPRETATION OF ANGLICANISM.

BY THE REV. GEORGE F. IRWIN, B.D.

BISHOP GORE described the last of his three volumes on the Reconstruction of Belief—*The Holy Spirit and the Church*—as “a challenge to men to think freely,” and he said: “Of one thing I feel sure. There will be no progress towards fellowship except so far as men are prepared to view the questions about the Creed and the Church, and the sacraments and the ministry afresh, laying aside their traditional assumptions as far as possible in order to ask again the question—What is the mind of Christ concerning the propagation of His religion? Does it not appear to be in a high degree probable that the New Testament documents interpret it aright, and that we cannot get behind them or away from them?”

That is a challenge which Evangelicals are prepared to accept, and that is a test of the truth of the teaching of the Church and of the character of its institutions which they willingly adopt.

Although it may seem an altogether unnecessary point to raise, it is essential at the outset to maintain that there is such a thing as the truth in regard to these matters. Lip service is often given to the fact that there is truth to be safeguarded, but in practice many act as if it was quite sufficient to have views, opinions, sentiments, or even feelings and prejudices on the subject. Pragmatists may be able to rest content with a relative truth—a truth of values. They may satisfy themselves that whatever works has in itself a sufficient criterion of its truth, and that in religious matters any teaching or practice which produces a desired devotional effect may be regarded as justifying its adoption. It is scarcely necessary to point out that this may lead to the acceptance of any extravagance in teaching, and to every kind of vagary in ritual, and may ultimately pass from Christianity altogether. When the symbols are evacuated of all real meaning they may become as valueless for religious purposes as we are told that the religious ceremonies and practices in the time of the later Roman Empire became for the Pagan worshippers. The Abbé Loisy's severance of the ceremonies and rites of the Church from any relation to objective fact has logically placed him on the list of the excommunicate, as it also placed Father Tyrrell.

I do not think I have needlessly emphasized this point, because it is fundamental. To get as near the truth—the objective facts—as we possibly can ought to be the aim of all, and especially of the Christian thinker and student. For truth should control our whole lives. It should guide our outlook, govern our thoughts, and regulate our actions in every detail.

The claim made on behalf of the Church of England since the

days of the Reformation is that it has sought to maintain the truth. In many forms the great divines have stated this. It was the meaning which lay behind Bishop Creighton's classical utterance that the Church of England was based on the appeal to sound learning. The passage in his *Life* bearing on the point runs: ¹

" His object was to set forth the principles of the Church of England. He showed how the English Church had been reformed in the sixteenth century by returning to the principles of sound learning which England had the unique opportunity of applying calmly and dispassionately because there the Reformation movement was not inextricably mingled as in foreign countries with grave political disturbances; that the work which this learning had to do was to remove from the system of the Church a mass of accretions which had grown round it; man, to meet his own requirements, had expanded the Truth which God had made known. The problem set before the leaders of our Church in the sixteenth century was to disentangle essential truth from the mass of opinion that had gathered round it. The fact that our Church had avoided 'the method of continually attacking error by negative assertions without any adequate affirmations to take their place' but aimed 'at setting forth the Truth in a simple and dignified system' had led to the groundless assertion that it expresses a compromise: 'Sound learning must always wear the appearance of a compromise between ignorance and plausible hypothesis.' All things cannot be explained, 'where God has not spoken, man must keep silence. It is one duty of the Church to maintain the Divine reserve, and to uphold the Divine wisdom, against the specious demands of even the noblest forms of purely human emotion.' "

The purpose of the present discussion of the subject is to come to some conclusions as to the foundations of Anglicanism, and to see if there is such a measure of agreement as may lead us to hope for fellowship and co-operation of all Schools within the Anglican communion in the future. My task is to state the position of the Evangelicals (so far as I understand it), as it bears on this particular problem. It is obviously impossible to go into all the points of difference, and I must therefore confine myself to the chief issue, which I shall try to state briefly and I hope fairly. The issue arises most acutely in regard to the institutional and sacramental aspects of Christianity. The Anglo-Catholic accuses the Evangelical of practically ignoring them, while the Evangelical says that the Anglo-Catholic over-emphasises them, and does not give them their true significance. The Anglo-Catholic says that the religion of the Evangelical is too subjective, that it is based on feeling, that its teaching of justification by faith is an appeal to an experience which gives too much importance to what may be merely feeling—a subjective condition without adequate basis, and lacking in the external objective expression found in the Church and the Sacraments.

May I say first of all in regard to this that I hope all will

¹ Creighton's *Life*, Vol. 2, pages 314-15.

agree that the basis of any religious life must be an individual experience of personal relationship to God, however it may be expressed, and without such an experience of a personal relationship to God there can be no reality in the religious life.

Some of the medieval writers leave an impression that religious experience was mainly confined to the mystics, and that for the average man such an experience was of less importance than the acceptance of the Church's provision for his needs in the presentation of the Sacrifice of the Mass as an objective external fact in the benefit of which he shared. Indeed, some modern writers seem as if they were tending in a similar direction, in their desire to emphasize the objective element in religion.

We may decline to give any name such as Conversion to the experience of forgiveness and the establishment of a true harmony between the soul and God, but that there must be a turning of the heart to God as an essential of any vital religion ought to be a matter of general agreement. Newman in his Evangelical days and many other Evangelicals who afterwards became Tractarians regarded that experience as fundamental, and it coloured all their later thought and life, which without it would have lacked intensity and depth and influence.

But it is a mistake to say that Evangelicals ignore the institutional and the sacramental. They recognize them as necessary in any adequate conception of Christianity. For they realize that every experience, if it is to be effective, must find objective expression, and only by some mode of expression can it secure the permanence necessary for its continuous manifestation in successive generations.

The chief differences between the Evangelical and the Anglo-Catholic conceptions lie in the interpretation of the institutional and sacramental. The Anglo-Catholic conception, if I do not misrepresent it, is, that the Church has a supernatural character as the extension of the Incarnation, combining both the divine and the human, and that a permanent form has been given to the Church in the Apostolical Succession, by means of which the gifts of grace are conveyed in the Sacrament of Holy Communion, the validity of which is secured and guaranteed by this succession. (I have omitted the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, for I presume its validity does not depend on the Apostolical Succession as it can be administered in cases of necessity by one of the laity.) The Holy Spirit's work is within the sphere of the Church as thus constituted, and is normally evinced only through the Institution thus properly organized.

It is this conception of the Church which the Evangelicals cannot accept. They do not regard the teaching of our Lord or of the Apostles as requiring us to accept the organization of the Church as it has come down in the episcopal succession, *as of its essence*. They value episcopacy as a useful form of Church organization, (one can scarcely in England say of Church government, in view of the present condition of our Church). We can all admit

that the Papacy performed useful services in medieval times, but we do not regard the Papacy as of the essence of the Church. Just in the same way as we value the monarchy in England as the best form of our constitution, but none of us would maintain the divine right of kings as it was held in the times of the Stuarts.

In short, the conflict is between the conception of the Church as depending on certain theories of the permanent necessity and value of some of its characteristics in certain ages—which is the Roman claim, and the conception of the Church as the medium of the Holy Spirit's continuous work in the teaching of truth in every age, and the adaptation of the organization of the Church under the Holy Spirit's guidance to the most effective performance of its work.

It may not be out of place to say here that the Apostolical Succession was not at first regarded as a means of the transmission of grace but as a guarantee of sound doctrine—the truth. In the claims of various bodies of Christians in early days the instruction to questioners was, to go to the Catholic Church which traced its succession of bishops back to Apostolic times as it was more likely to have preserved and to teach the truth. The case of the Church of Alexandria shows that the succession of bishops was not necessary to the existence of a Church.

In very early days the Judaizing section of the Church desired to impose the practice of Jewish rites as necessary upon all members of the Church. One of the earliest protests for the truth and against the imposition of unlawful terms of communion was that of St. Paul against this section, on the ground that they were adding burdens which should not be placed on members of the Christian Church.

In Canon Newport White's recent *Life of Newman* he points out that in the year 1839 the position between the Church of England and the Church of Rome was, in Newman's view, that the Anglican said to the Roman: "There is but one Faith, the ancient, and you have not kept it." The Roman said to the Anglican: "There is but one Church, the Catholic, and you are out of it."

That states succinctly the position at the Reformation. The Evangelicals contend that at the Reformation, by the very test which Bishop Gore wishes to apply, the test of Scripture, there was a rejection of medieval accretions of erroneous doctrine. On the positive side there was a return to the New Testament expression of religious experience in the Pauline phrase "justification by faith," and by the assurance of forgiveness the truth thus accepted left no place for the medieval penitential system, the mediatorial work of the priesthood, the repeated offering of the Sacrifice of the Mass, or the remedial pains of the Roman purgatorial system. They believe that this restoration of the truth was the work of the Holy Spirit leading men to a fresh recognition of truth, a return to the Christianity of the New Testament. They cannot unchurch any of those who have such a personal experience of Christ, and they believe that if we will only follow fully the dictates of the

Holy Spirit, the Church as an institution will be adequately organized on the principle of the primitive fathers that where Jesus Christ is there is the Church.

The Roman Church puts the institution—as an end in itself—before its primary purpose, the teaching of truth. It seeks to impose unlawful terms of communion, as the Judaisers did in the earliest days.

The claims of truth are however always exigent, and in England, under the guidance of scholars—some of them brought up in the medieval teaching but enlightened by the Holy Spirit—such as Ridley and Cranmer at the beginning, and later by such thinkers as Jewel and Hooker, the essentials of the Anglican position were laid down, based as we have seen on the appeal to Scripture and sound learning.

The institutional and the sacramental were retained, but were re-interpreted in the light of the rediscovered truth.

With regard to the Sacramental teaching of the Evangelicals, I believe it is much misunderstood and misrepresented. The much misunderstood term “Zwinglian” is often applied to their view of the Holy Communion and its benefits. Or they are told that they hold it to be a “bare commemoration,” though what that exactly means I have never been able to discover. Any adequate interpretation of the word Grace bars out the possibility of a bare commemoration to any faithful Christian. Or again such question-begging terms as Virtualism and Receptionism are applied to their view of the benefits received at the service.

I think the majority of Evangelicals would accept the teaching of Hooker as given in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*,¹ which was the acknowledged Anglican teaching until recent times when he was pronounced to be defective in “Catholic theology.”

They would adopt as their own the familiar lines, attributed, but with very inadequate authority, to Queen Elizabeth.

“ Christ was the Word that spake it,
He took the Bread and brake it,
And what the Word did make it
That I believe and take it.”

They would even acquiesce in that old High Churchman of the Laudian School, Jeremy Taylor’s description of the presence in Holy Communion.

In reference to the Roman doctrine he said:—

“ We say that Christ’s body is in the sacrament really, but spiritually. They say it is there really, but spiritually. For as Bellarmine is bold to say, that the word may be allowed in this question. Where now is the difference? Here; by ‘spiritually’ they mean ‘present after the manner of a spirit’; by ‘spiritually’ we mean ‘present to our spirits only’; that is, so as Christ is not present to any other sense but that of faith or spiritual susception; but their way makes His body to be present no way but that which is impossible and implies a contradiction. . . .

¹ Hooker’s *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book V, lxxvii. 6.

“They say that Christ’s body is truly present there as it was upon the Cross, but not after the manner of all or any body, but after the manner of being as an angel is in a place; that’s their ‘spiritually’; but we by ‘the real spiritual presence’ of Christ do understand Christ to be present as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful, by blessing and grace.”

But they cannot accept what is called the Sacramental system as maintained by those who claim to represent Catholic theology, for various reasons. They believe it to be illogical, obscurantist, and untrue to the interpretation of Scripture.

If we commence with the Sacramental principle which is now practically a shibboleth in general use with a section of the Church, What is it exactly? and do those who use the term apply it consistently?

We are told that it is the conveyance of the spiritual through the medium of the material. The illustrations which are used by Bishop Gore and others are, that a kiss is the sacrament of love, a handshake is the sacrament of friendship, and the flag is the sacrament of nationality. If the term symbol were used instead of sacrament the meaning would be clearer. But if we admit the use of the term as legitimate and go on to apply it to the Sacraments of the Gospel there is a curious inconsistency. In Holy Baptism the water and the sprinkling are a symbolic act indicating the mystical washing away of sin. The new birth is not a magical process, and the beginning of a life of grace depends upon the sowing of the seed of eternal life in the heart. But no one holds, I think, that the grace is in the water, or that the water is in any way mysteriously changed, any more than that the handshake is the friendship or the flag the nationality. When, however, we come to the Sacrament of Holy Communion the elements are no longer the symbol, but in the view of “Catholic teaching” they become the actual Body and Blood of Christ which are then present in, under or with the elements. There is here an inconsistency in the use of the Sacramental principle which I have never seen adequately explained.

But we are told that it is on the analogy of the Incarnation, of which the Sacraments are the extension: the connection of the human and the divine in one Person. But is there not a considerable difference between the union of the human and divine in a personality, and the union of a personality with portions of inorganic matter. In what way can the divine be present with, in or under the bread and wine? What real meaning can there be in calling down the Holy Spirit upon material things? Can any mental process realize the association of grace, which is ultimately the contact of personality with personality, being in any way mediated by inert matter, in any sense other than symbolic? I am of course familiar with Newman’s explanation of the Presence (*Via Media*, Vol. 2, p. 220). It is quoted in such a recent work on the XXXIX Articles as Preb. Bicknell’s: “If place is excluded from the idea of the Sacramental presence, therefore division or

distance from heaven is excluded also, for distance implies a measurable interval and such there cannot be except between places. Moreover, if the idea of distance is excluded, therefore is the idea of motion. Our Lord therefore neither descends upon our altars, nor moves when carried in procession. The visible species change their position, but He does not move. He is in the Holy Eucharist after the manner of a spirit. We do not know how; we have no parallel to the 'how' in our experience. We can only say that He is present, not according to the natural manner of bodies, but *sacramentally*. His Presence is substantial, spirit-wise, sacramental; an absolute mystery, not against reason, but against imagination, and must be received by faith."

But what meaning does this statement convey to anyone who tries to understand it? Is it not justly open to the charge of obscurantism?

The greatest problem of all is: What is the Presence in the elements? It is claimed that it is the presence of Christ in His heavenly and ascended body. On one occasion Bishop Gore, when addressing a gathering of clergy, emphasized the fact that all that was essential to the Holy Communion was present on the occasion of its institution by our Lord. If that is so, the question was put to him, how could he explain his belief that the glorified humanity of the Lord Jesus Christ was present in the elements, when the Ascension had not yet taken place and His ascended body was not in existence. The Bishop had to admit that he had given considerable study to the point but had never been able to give a satisfactory answer to the question. His words were: "That is one of the most difficult and subtle theological questions which you could ask. . . . I find it an extraordinarily difficult question to answer. I have read a certain number of books on it, from which I have got exceedingly little light. As it is not a very relevant question I think I would rather not answer it."¹ In the opinion of many of us, it is the most relevant of all questions, as the whole of our teaching regarding the use and significance of the Holy Communion depends on it.

These are a few of the difficulties which present themselves to the mind of an Evangelical, and they seem to indicate that there is something seriously wrong somewhere in the Catholic interpretation of the Sacraments, especially as (and I apologize for the necessity of pointing out the fact), if the claims made for the Sacramental system were true, the fruit of it in the lives of those who accept it and are daily present and communicate at Holy Communion should without question surpass in sanctity and holiness that of those who either deprive themselves of this means of grace, or are unable to accept this teaching. No one will, I think, claim that this is the case.

What is the hope then for future fellowship among the various Schools in our Church? Where views so directly opposed to one another are held it is exceedingly difficult to anticipate unity.

¹ *Reservation*. Addresses to the Clergy of the Diocese of Chelmsford, p. 81.

Fellowship is impossible where those who hold views acknowledged to be developments on the teaching of Scripture desire to impose them on those who cannot accept them. It may be said that there should be mutual toleration. This is true, but the meaning of toleration must be understood. We are agreed that it should not be synonymous with indifference. At a recent meeting of the Manchester Diocesan Conference the Bishop said: "The real spirit of toleration is to say 'I feel I would derive great benefit from such and such a practice, but I must refrain from it, unless you with full goodwill agree to my following that practice while we remain in fellowship together,' and the other should exercise the utmost charity in his answer."

S.P.C.K. is issuing a series of small books as "The Churchman's Popular Library," at 1s. in duceen and 1s. 6d. in cloth. Dr. Lowther Clarke, formerly Archbishop of Melbourne, has written *Death and the Hereafter*. The subject is one which in every age has appealed to the curiosity of men. The unknown beyond the grave will always give rise to speculation and especially to those whose relatives have already passed within the veil. It is due to this desire for knowledge of the condition of the dead that the Church in medieval days developed the doctrine of Purgatory and its consequent teaching as to the efficacy of masses for the repose of the souls undergoing the torments so vividly described by writers, not all of them ancient. Dr. Lowther Clarke observes throughout the strict reserve placed upon us by the due regard which we must have for the limitations placed upon us by God's revelation. Again and again he does not hesitate to say that he does not know, when some point comes up on which we have no source of information. He deals with the practical questions regarding preparation for death and the teaching of Scripture and of the great authors who represent the wisdom of the past. His notes on the teaching of some of the New Testament writers is clear and helpful. His warnings against teaching which goes beyond our knowledge is valuable, yet he seems to us to have broken his own rule in this respect in his treatment of prayers for the departed. However much we may sympathize with the natural desire to make petitions for those who have died, we cannot assume such a knowledge of their present position and needs as Dr. Clarke does and from which he deduces the nature of the prayers which we can offer on their behalf.

The second of the series is *What Mean Ye by these Stones?* It is by the Rev. J. M. C. Crum, M.A., Rector of Farnham, Surrey, and contains "Suggestions to Readers of the Old Testament." It is written from the modern point of view, and will give those who desire to have an idea of the lines upon which the Old Testament will be popularly treated for the benefit of general readers, an adequate statement of the method to be employed.

INTERREGNUM ORDINATIONS.

BY THE REV. HAROLD SMITH, D.D., St. John's Hall, Highbury.

THE Long Parliament passed an Act in January, 1642-3, declaring Episcopacy abolished. This, with the subsequent imposition of the "Solemn League and Covenant," is sometimes taken to imply that all clergy ordained by bishops were ejected, and replaced by others in presbyterian orders or not ordained at all. This is a wild mistake. Perhaps in all parts except London the majority of clergy kept their livings, though in some few counties the number sequestered was close on fifty per cent. Those thus remaining might or might not be decided Puritans, but in any case they had all been ordained by bishops; the leading Puritans were themselves in the same position. There was no repudiation or rejection of orders received from bishops; any scruple might be met by the remembrance that others had joined with the bishop in the laying on of hands when they were ordained presbyters. The changes had to do with the present and future; they were not retrospective.

The places of the sequestered clergy were filled up in the first place largely by "plundered ministers"—Puritans driven out from the districts where the Royalists had the upper hand. They were, however, to a large extent, also filled by clergy from poorer livings, or by unbeneficed clergy, curates and lecturers; it must have been a good time for such.

But the question of the supply of new ministers soon became urgent. In the matter of ordination, as in others, it was easier to abolish the old system than to agree on a new one. The Westminster Assembly of Divines had no easy course to steer between the ideas of the Scotch delegates on the one hand and those of the Independents (the "Dissenting Brethren") on the other. Both these groups, though small in number, had great influence in the Assembly because of their backing outside it. And Parliament itself occasionally impressed on the Assembly that its place was to advise, not to determine.

The Assembly began to discuss Ordination in January, 1643-4. It was pressed to hasten the matter by the House of Lords, especially by the Earl of Warwick, who wanted chaplains for the Navy, and the Earl of Manchester, who wanted them for the Eastern Association. The laymen wanted some practical arrangement; the divines sought first to settle the principles of the ministry in the light of Scripture, especially the New Testament. After considerable negotiations between the Assembly and Parliament, an Ordinance was passed in October, 1644, authorizing twenty-three ministers in London to ordain; next month a similar Ordinance was passed for Lancashire. On November 29, 1644, the first ordination "according to the new platform" was held at St. Lawrence's,

London. Lightfoot says that so many ministers were there that it was very late before the Assembly could get a quorum. We have incidental notices of other ordinations—on December 18, when one of those ordained by seven ministers was Samuel Annesley (the maternal grandfather of John Wesley) as chaplain to the ship “Globe,” under the Earl of Warwick; on June 20, 1645, when eight were ordained at St. Magnus, near London Bridge; also on September 18, 1645.

Towards the end of 1645 it was agreed to set up “Classes” or Presbyteries (of ministers and ruling elders) everywhere in the country; the ministers of each Classis should have power to examine and ordain. But though many county committees sent in lists of nominations in the early part of 1646, only London and Lancashire were then settled; the rest had to wait till 1648, when the Presbyterian power was already breaking, as the Army came to prevail over the Parliament. Hence Classes were set up only here and there.

All this delay meant that would-be ministers, especially in the country, had either to anticipate or dispense with ordination, or to receive it from bishops. The Assembly, though not without some opposition, allowed probationers. A man had to be approved by the people of the parish for which he was to be ordained; this meant some preliminary trial before ordination, which might be long delayed. E.g., Henry Havers was in charge of Ongar in Essex from 1645 at least; he was not ordained till appointed to Stambourne in the same county in 1651. Henry Esday, M.A., Peterhouse, Cambridge, was ordained in November, 1649, by the Fourth Classis of London, as assistant to Richard Babington of Ingrave, Essex. But he had clearly been there already for a number of months, as he signed the “Essex Watchmen’s Watchword” in February, 1648–9, as Minister of Ingrave.

We find, however, some bishops continuing to ordain during the War. Joseph Hall, Bishop of Norwich, held ordinations at the regular seasons with usually six or eight candidates, down to March, 1644, the time when the Solemn League and Covenant, with its repudiation of prelacy, was being pressed throughout the country. From this date he ordains only by ones and twos, down to September. But he held a large ordination on September 22, conferring priest’s orders on some who had either just been ordained deacons or had been so ordained the day before. It was probably the indignation roused by *this* ordination which led to his ejection from his palace at Norwich. No more ordinations are entered in his register, and I have found no more notices of men ordained by him till 1648.

Thomas Winniffe, Bishop of Lincoln, was meanwhile ordaining freely at Buckden, near Huntingdon. His known ordinations extend through 1644 and 1645 to September 1646, when he finally left Buckden. He ordained no more, though living for nearly another eight years. In the early part of 1646 two men recently ordained by him presented themselves to the Westminster Assembly

for approval upon their appointment to some parish. On March 4 the Assembly voted that Mr. Rastall, so ordained, should have his certificate. On May 14 it was ordered that Mr. Sprigge should be examined, but that the chairman of the committee should testify the dislike of the Assembly of his act in going to the bishop for ordination. So long as the new system was not thoroughly set up, there was something to be said for continuing the old temporarily. The only alternative at the time was to come up to London and be ordained there. This was in some cases enjoined later, where the county was not thoroughly organized; e.g., in June, 1647, Samuel Crossman was recommended to the Assembly for Minister at Dalham, Suffolk; he was referred to the Seventh Classical Presbytery of London to be ordained about a month hence. He was subsequently Minister of Sudbury, Suffolk, for some ten years; he refused to conform in 1662, and was one of the first to be imprisoned for preaching. But he afterwards conformed, and died Dean of Bristol. He is best known as the author of the hymn, "Jerusalem on high."

London, from Knightsbridge to Stepney, and from Islington to Rotherhithe and Newington Butts, was divided into twelve Classes, of which at least nine were at some time or other in working order. For their limits, see Shaw, *The English Church under the Long Parliament and Commonwealth*, to which book this article is greatly indebted.

From 1648 these Classes took it in turns to ordain, since the Provincial Assembly recognized that for some time at least there would be many candidates from counties where the system was not yet set up. We have the Minute book of the Fourth Classis, comprising fourteen parishes from Cornhill to London Bridge. (Of these only five churches now remain—St. Magnus, St. Mary-at-Hill, St. Clement's, Eastcheap, St. Peter's, Cornhill, St. Michael's, Cornhill. Five were never rebuilt after the Great Fire; four have been demolished within living memory.) This Classis held its first ordination in 1647, and had seven more down to 1659, ordaining about eighty-two men in all. Probably this hardly represents more than one-tenth of the ministers actually ordained in London. Men came from half the counties of England; this of itself tells us that Classical Presbyteries had been set up only very partially.

The preliminaries to ordination were carefully laid down by the Assembly and by Parliament. A good example is the first man ordained by this Classis, whose certificates are given in full. Joseph Crab, B.A., brought (1) a certificate of having taken the Covenant; (2) of his degree in the University, soundness in the faith and holy conversation; (3) of his age. This came from Sir William Waller: "Gentlemen, the experience I have had of the bearer, Mr. Joseph Crab, assures me that he is both pious and orthodox, and I verily believe him to be above twenty-five years of age." (4) of his call to Beaminster, Dorset. The living had been sequestered from Dr. Goodwin; Mr. Terry who had replaced him was now gone into the West. Crab produced the invitation of the people, with thirty-

two signatures, and an order from the Standing Committee of Dorset. (5) that he had presented himself to the Seventh Classis, and had been examined by them of the work of grace in his heart, of his calling to the ministry, and of his skill in the tongues. He was then examined by the ministers of the Fourth Classis in his knowledge and skill in logic, philosophy, and other learning, and had a thesis given him, "An liceat Christianis bella gerere?" ("Is it lawful for Christians to wage wars?") to frame a discourse in Latin thereupon, and bring it to the ministers; and to preach next Sabbath for Mr. Wall (St. Michael's, Cornhill). The ordination took place on April 20, 1647, at St. Mary-at-Hill. Seven ministers took part; sixteen were ordained. One special case has been misunderstood. William Blackmore of St. Peter's, Cornhill (at first in charge of the sequestration, in succession to Thomas Coleman, and then, on the death of Fairfax, the sequestered Rector, succeeding him as Rector), was one of the most influential members of this Classis. He had been ordained deacon by Bishop Prideaux of Worcester, but not priest. It was a somewhat difficult question, in what position he and others like him stood. The general view of the Assembly was that such, not having been ordained presbyters, should now be ordained as such; but Manton and others disagreed, regarding the division into two orders to be only arbitrary. But Blackmore was ordained at this ordination as being previously "not fully in orders." His presbyterian ordination has been taken to be a repudiation of his previous one; but it was nothing of the kind, but simply adding the presbyterate to the diaconate.

We learn something of the history and character of Crab from Calamy. He was "a man of good parts and learning, of a ready invention, and very facetious and pleasant in conversation." After continuing some time a Nonconformist, he accepted the living of Axminster in Devon, and held it till his death at the age of eighty. "Though he was in the Established Church, yet in his principles and way of preaching and praying he so resembled the non-conforming ministers that he was still looked upon as one of them. He visited some of his ejected brethren, when persecuted and imprisoned, sheltered and did good offices to others, and showed on all occasions that his heart was with them."

One of the objects of the Voluntary Associations, formed in Worcestershire under Baxter's influence, also in Cumberland, Cambridgeshire, Essex, and other counties, from 1653 onwards, was to provide for ordinations. It was no part of the duty of the Triers to inquire whether or how a man was ordained; they were concerned only with his godliness and his gifts. Classes having been established only here and there in the country, there was elsewhere no means of regular ordination except after a long journey to London or elsewhere, and then at the hands of strangers. One suspects a fair number of clergy never got beyond the position of probationers.

But many still sought ordination from bishops, and this seems to have increased as time went on. The last years of the Presbyterian ascendancy (1646-1648) were the worst in this respect, and

there were apparently more ordinations in the latter part of the "fifties" than in the earlier. We naturally read especially of those cases where those ordained afterwards gained high rank in the church; but there were many other cases. One great but little-used source of information here is the Restoration Visitation Books. These sometimes give the date of ordination of each of the clergy attending, and the name of the Bishop who ordained him. This is notably the case with the records of the Visitation of the Bishop of Norwich, 1662, and that of the Bishop of London, 1664 (though unfortunately in the latter the information is only occasionally given as regards South Essex). Of course many of the clergy had been ordained before the Troubles, and many since the Restoration, whether these had previously been in Presbyterian orders or not; but there are records of many ordained under the Commonwealth. What follows is based upon these two records; those of other dioceses would add largely, and probably alter the proportion.

We saw that Bishop Hall of Norwich seems to have ceased ordaining at the end of 1644. But in 1648, when the Presbyterian power was broken, he begins again. We have the names of over fifty men, still at work in these two dioceses after the Restoration, ordained by him from 1648 till his death in 1656. They were ordained in his house, which still stands at Heigham, now part of Norwich.

Next in order comes Ralph Brownrigg, Bishop of Exeter, who is responsible for thirty; he seems to have been specially in request among East Anglians after Hall's death; he himself died in 1659. He had been very acceptable to the Puritans before the Troubles, and was nominated to the Westminster Assembly, but sent excuse for non-attendance. Other English diocesan bishops mentioned in these books as ordaining are: Brian Duppa of Salisbury (9), Henry King of Chichester (4), Robert Skinner of Oxford (4). We should probably find many more if we had those ordained in these prelates' own dioceses, or further west.

Most books, however, overlook the many ordained by Hall and Brownrigg, and quite ignore the number ordained by Irish bishops. The Bishops of Down and of Cloyne are responsible for a few. Robert Maxwell, Bishop of Kilmore, is known to have ordained nineteen in these two dioceses between 1648 and 1651, when he returned to Ireland. But the largest figures come from Thomas Fulwar or Fuller, Bishop of Ardfert and Aghadoc (County Kerry). Son of an Essex clergyman, he was wild in his youth and disinherited by his father. Going over to Ireland, apparently the equivalent of going out to the Colonies now, he found himself under "the happy necessity of being sober and industrious." He eventually obtained the above bishopric, but was driven out by the terrible rebellion of 1641, which Cromwell did his best to avenge. He returned to Ireland at the end of 1660, as Archbishop of Cashel, after having been greatly in request for ordinations in the early days of the Restoration. He ordained about forty men in these two English dioceses alone, from 1647 to March 1660. Among

them is John Lake, Rector of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, in 1664, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, one of the Seven Bishops; he was ordained October 19, 1647.

It must not be assumed that such clergy used the Prayer-Book regularly. Whatever chaplains might do, those who held livings would, as a rule, conform to the general practice of the time. Thus Daniel Mills, ordained by Brownrigg March 11, 1655-6, became Rector of St. Olave's, Hart Street, London, early in 1658; but it was not till after the King was restored that he began, in the words of a regular member of his congregation, Samuel Pepys, to "nibble" at the Prayer-Book. Symon Patrick, afterwards Bishop of Ely, ordained by Hall in 1654, did not start it at Battersea till about the same time, and then only after preaching sermons on the advantages of a form of prayer.

He gives the following account of his ordinations. He was Fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge. "I had occasion to go to London, and being bound by the statutes of the College to enter into Holy Orders when I was two years Master of Arts, I knew no better than to go to a Classis of Presbyterians, who then sat, and was examined by them and afterwards received the imposition of their hands. This afterwards troubled me very much, when not long after I met with Dr. Hammond upon Ignatius' epistles, and Mr. Thorndike's Primitive Government of the Church, whereby I was fully convinced of the necessity of episcopal ordination. This made me inquire after a bishop to whom I might resort; and hearing that Bishop Hall lived not far from Norwich, of which he was Bishop, thither I went with two other fellows of our College, and a gentleman, Mr. Gore, with whom I had contracted a great friendship, as a companion and witness of what we did. There we were received with great kindness by that reverend old Bishop, who examined us and gave us many good exhortations, and ordained us in his own parlour at Heigham about a mile from Norwich, April 5, 1654."

This date is confirmed by the London Visitation Book, 1664, where Patrick is down as Rector of St. Paul's, Covent Garden. From this source we also learn that one of those ordained with him was James Spering, then (1664) Rector of St. Martin Vintry.

With this we may compare Nelson's account of the ordination of George Bull, afterwards Bishop of St. David's. "He had read enough to convince him that mere presbyters had no power to give him commission to exercise the sacred function, especially when the plausible plea of necessity could not be urged. . . . He sought out for an unexceptionable hand, that his mission might be valid. . . . He betook himself to Dr. Skinner, the ejected Bishop of Oxford, by whom he was ordained deacon and priest on one day. This suffering prelate had the courage, even in those times of usurpation, to send many labourers into the Lord's vineyard, according to the Liturgy of the Church of England, when the exercising this his power was made penal. . . . Though he was ready to ordain Mr. Bull, yet he refused to give him or any others

letters of Orders under his own hand and seal" [for fear that ill-use might be made of them, if they fell into wrong hands ; but promised to send them to him when the ancient apostolical government of the Church should be restored, which he accordingly did at the Restoration].

The continuity of the English Church through this period is as important as its continuity at the Reformation. And the main line of this continuity runs not so much through the Bishops, nor through the clergy who adhered strictly to the Prayer Book, whether in exile or in chaplaincies and conventicles at home, as through the much larger number who conformed more or less to Puritan requirements in 1644 and the following years, and to Restoration requirements in 1662. It is common—and cheap—to stigmatize all these as "Vicars of Bray"—mere time-servers. This is no doubt true of some, but it is grossly unfair to others. Sweeping statements which would condemn e.g. Sanderson, Hacket, and Fuller, on the one side, or Reynolds, Wilkins, Lightfoot, and the Cambridge Platonists on the other, are self-condemned. The position of such men was largely this: they felt themselves called to the ministry; would they exercise that ministry publicly, though under restrictions which they did not like, or exercise it only in private, or in secret, or not at all? Fuller deals with the question in Chapter XIV of the Introduction to his *Appeal of Injured Innocence*. One may respect the stalwarts, yet have one's sympathies with the conformists on both sides.

Canon Carnegie's *Anglicanism* (Putnam, 7s; 6d.) is intended to be "An Introduction to its History and Philosophy." It is written from quite a conventional standpoint, and represents a current view of the English Church as combining Protestantism and Catholicism in a state of somewhat unstable equilibrium. There is the familiar disparagement of the Evangelical Movement as lacking in learning and as over-estimating the emotional element in the religious life. There is the familiar laudation of the Tractarian Movement as rescuing the Church from the depths of deadly stagnation and spiritual lifelessness. He conveniently ignores the criticism that it lies quite apart from the main current of English thought in the nineteenth century. He holds an exaggerated view of Newman as "one of the greatest intellectual and religious geniuses the English race has produced." His severest condemnation is reserved for Modernism, and he regards Traditionalism as the special mark of the English Church, though it is a Traditionalism not according to the generally accepted meaning of that term.

ANNE ASKEW, "THE FAIR GOSPELLER."

BY JOHN KNIPE.

PART II.

THE ORDEAL OF FAITH. BEFORE THE QUEST. THE SADDLERS' HALL, CHEAPSIDE. MARCH 11, 1545.

The Saddlers' Hall sounds a strange place for a Heresy Tribunal. But it was so used by the Quest. We know little of Christopher Dare except that he was hated by the Londoners. Probably he was a harsh man in his odious office.

"Anne Askew, alias Kyme," was brought before him in the forenoon. We hear nothing of any "indictment or presentment by the oaths of twelve men," and I suspect the proceedings were illegal, although the actual arrest may have been lawful if, as seems likely, the Lord Mayor signed the Warrant.

"Anne's Journal" gives a graphic account. Dare questioned her first on the 1st Article: Transubstantiation.

"He asked if I did not believe that the Sacrament hanging over the altar was the very body of Christ really."

It was a terrible question, subtle and manifestly unjust, since if she denied it before him Anne condemned herself to the stake. She showed the quick wit for which she was famous. "Then I demanded this question of him, Wherefore Saint Stephen was stoned to death?" Dare must have understood the bold allusion. He replied curtly that he could not tell. And Anne answered that no more would she reply to his vain question.

The Inquisitor marked her answer dubious, and passed on. He examined her briefly on the other five articles (Communion in one Kind, Vows of Chastity, Private Masses, Celibacy of Priests, Auricular Confession).

Anne replied by citing Scripture to the vexation of a Heresy Commissioner who apparently was orthodox in his ignorance. His seventh question was a taunt; was she inspired? In the eighth Dare tried to catch her in her words. He asked if she did not think that Private Masses did help souls departed. Anne replied boldly that "it was great idolatry to believe more in them than in the death which Christ died for us."

Whereupon Dare sent her straight to the Guildhall.

BEFORE THE LORD MAYOR.

The proceedings were illegal, for she was not "so accused and presented" as required by the Act, which further provided that the person accused "shall examine the accusers."

Sir Martin Bowes, the Lord Mayor, was a bluff Yorkshireman, member of the Goldsmiths, and proud of his knowledge of theology. He had an eye for a pretty woman and he addressed Anne paternally, calling her a "foolish woman." He asked her if she denied what

common parlance named "God's Body-making." Anne replied: "I have read that God made man; but that man can make God I never yet read." "Foolish woman!" ejaculated Bowes. And he put to her the popular query of that day; which even Bishop Gardiner had not denied. My Lord Mayor solemnly demanded: "What if a mouse eat it after consecration, what shall become of the mouse?" When she was silent, Bowes repeated: "What say'st thou? Thou foolish woman!"

Anne asked what he said. The Lord Mayor thundered: "I say, that mouse is damned!"

Then from the bar of the Guildhall the clear feminine voice observed sweetly: "Alas, poor mouse!"

And the laughter of those present confounded my Lord Mayor. Now uprose the scandalized face of the Reverend Thomas Bage Williams, Bishop Bonner's Chancellor, as he rounded Bowes in the ear and urged him to leave such discussion to the Church.

Before long he rebuked Anne as blameworthy for uttering the Scriptures contrary to Saint Paul's prohibition. Anne replied by quoting and commenting upon 1 Corinthians xiv. It is only fair to remember that in those days when the clergy quoted texts they did not expect them to be known, still less the context.

The examination at the Guildhall ended quickly in Anne's committal.

FIRST IMPRISONMENT. THE COMPTER. BREAD ST. BOW.

In a narrow lane off Newgate Street there was a gloomy stone building, the Compter or Common Jail for persons awaiting trial. Anne was closely imprisoned in a cell. She seems to have been allowed one to herself and probably the jailer thought she could pay for "Garnish." Her woman was admitted, but none other except a priest sent by the Bishop to "give her good counsel"; "which," Anne records tersely, "he did not." She was in sore straits for money, and as the prisoners were accustomed to rattle a box at the window-bars, her faithful woman "went abroad in the streets and told her case" to those who were ever inclined to help any in trouble with the Law—the bold 'Prentices of the City.

They sent Anne money. At first the kindhearted lads gave it themselves, but after they told the maid "divers ladies had sent money." The rumour of her arrest had reached the Court, and later serving men in the blue coat of Hertford and the violet coat of Denny met the woman and gave her ten shillings and eight shillings in the name of those noble ladies.

Then the tale came to Cousin Britain in his quiet chambers at Gray's Inn. For twelve days he could not see his kinswoman, but he took active steps badgering Bowes, complaining at the Consistory, demanding that Anne should have legal advice when accused of a capital crime. March 23rd he visited Anne in her cell. He was alarmed when he heard that Bonner had sent a priest, and doubtless the barrister warned his cousin that she must be prudent in her answers, especially concerning the Sacrament of the altar,

while he would tell her that "offenders standing mute were convicted."

After a long talk, Britain went off to worry the Lord Mayor, and he applied for bail. Bowes said civilly that he was ready to befriend the lady, but that "a spiritual officer's sanction had been necessary to her committal and he desired him to call on the Bishop's Chancellor." Bage would only promise to speak to Bonner, and he desired Mr. Britain to return on the morrow. The indefatigable Britain agreed and met the Bishop.

Edmund Bonner was not yet the savage persecutor of Mary's reign. He was the natural son of John Savage, "a richly beneficed Cheshire priest" of good family. Bonner had a great respect for persons of family. "He showed a rough good nature" to heretics at times, and he was not so hostile to Bible-reading as Gardiner, for he had "set up six Great Bibles in convenient places at Paul's," partly, as he said, because it caused less of a crowd than when there was one. He had allowed if not licensed a "Bible-reader," named Porter. He listened affably to Britain and appointed the day following at 3 p.m. for Anne's appearance. "He desired that Dr. Crome, Sir William Whitehead, and Mr. Huntingdon, for whom she had a particular respect, might be present and report she was humanely treated." And he told Britain "to urge her to speak freely" and swore—Bonner was free of tongue—"that it would not turn to her prejudice. If she did say anything amiss all he would do would be to put her right by godly counsel and instruction."

ANNE BEFORE BONNER. THE PALACE. OLD ST. PAUL'S.
MARCH 25, 1545.

Bonner observed Anne with keen interest, and in a paternal manner he inquired of her opinion about the Sacrament. Britain was present, and his friend a Mr. Spilman, also a lawyer of Gray's Inn. With Bonner there were Dr. Standish, Dr. Weston and his chaplains. The three sympathizers named by the Bishop are not mentioned. The gist of Bonner's opening question was how would Anne believe if the Scripture affirmed Transubstantiation, and how would she believe supposing the Scripture to deny it. Anne replied steadily that she believed "as the Scripture taught." Her answer was not heretical but Bonner "upon this argument tarried a great while." He "would have driven her to make him an answer to his mind." She would not and she refused to let others intervene, saying, "what she had said to the Bishop of London she had said."

After a few moments Bonner rose and withdrew into his private room. But it is evident from what followed that Dr. Weston had been favourably impressed.

THE DISPUTED CONFESSION.

In almost all the records of the Reformers we find some disputed Confession, and the notice in the *Dictionary of National Biography*

on "Anne Askew" by Dr. Gairdner is here amazingly inaccurate. The only real account is that in her Journal and she is emphatic as to what took place. Bonner came back with a fresh-written document, which he read aloud, and asked her if she agreed to it. The statement, of course, was a profession of faith in Transubstantiation, and a general submission to the authority of the Church. Anne answered that "she believed so much as the Holy Scripture did agree unto." And she asked him to add her words to his writing. Bonner retorted that she "should not teach him what he should write." He told her that she might thank others and not herself for the favour that he had shown her as she was so well connected."

He sat down, handed her the writing, and bade her sign it. If Anne obeyed Bonner was willing to order her to be set free.

By recent Statute the Ordinary had the power within his discretion. Britain, Spilman, and the rest seem to have urged her for she says: "With much ado, at the last I wrote thus: 'I, Anne Askew, do believe this if God's Word do agree to the same and the true Catholic Church.'"

Strange to say it was the reference to the Catholic Church which enraged Bonner. "He flung into his chamber in a great fury." Britain rushed after him. "For God's sake, treat her kindly!" he implored. "She is a woman!" roared Bonner: "and I am nothing deceived in her." Britain was a tactful man. "Take her as a woman then, and do not set her weak woman's wit to your lordship's great wisdom."

Dr. Weston had examined what Anne had written and he followed the barrister; the ecclesiastic represented to the Bishop that the lady acted from ignorance, meaning to express her faith in the Catholic Church!

Bonner consented to come out. He took the names of Britain and Spilman as "sureties-in-bond" but remanded Anne until the next day to appear at the Guildhall where Bail might be granted by the Lord Mayor.

SECOND APPEARANCE AT THE GUILDHALL. MARCH 26.

Sir Martin Bowes refused to grant Bail and remanded Anne again. The patient Britain persisted, and finally both Bonner and the Lord Mayor accepted the Bail Bond. Bowes, however, summoned her before him on July 12. She and two others were arraigned for heresy but Chancellor Bage Williams had withdrawn his charge against her. No witnesses appeared and the Lord Mayor ordered her formal release.

THE FAIR GOSPELLER AT COURT. JULY, 1545—MAY, 1546.

Cousin Britain's name is not mentioned again. Anne was heartily welcomed at Court by the Queen and her ladies. The King's favourite, Sir George Blage, gentleman of the bedchamber, was a Gospeller, so were the ushers, Mr. Lascelles and Mr. Morice, father of Cranmer's secretary. Anne got her nickname from

distributing copies of Tyndale's New Testament. She obtained these from the London agent of the "Christian Brethren," Joan Bocher, and the First Meeting-House of the Reformers was a room over a warehouse in Bow Lane. There is no evidence whatever, and the writer has searched every available contemporary source, for the other "loud lie" of Parsons the Jesuit that Joan Bocher was Anne Askew's friend. Madame Askew was probably one of the Queen's gentlewomen, or else she filled some salaried post, for she was an acknowledged Court beauty, wearing unblemished "the white flower of a blameless life." Henry was abroad part of the year, and so was Gardiner, while in the King's absence, Cranmer and the Queen headed the Council. There was a lull in the bitter storm of persecution.

But in 1546 Bishop Gardiner regained the royal favour which he had lost by attacking Cranmer, and he found that the gentle influence of Catherine Parr was defeating his Bloody Statute.

BISHOP GARDINER "BENDS HIS BOW."

"He bent his bow to strike at some of the head deer." (Foxe.) Gardiner at once marked Anne and he accused her to Henry as "tainting the Queen and her ladies with heresy." Henry was enraged at the suggestion that his nieces, the Marchioness of Dorset and her sister, were Anne's dupes. A search discovered prohibited books in the Queen's rooms.

MAY 24, 1546. THE SUMMONS BEFORE THE COUNCIL.

Gardiner's name is on the list of signatures to the following: "Two of the Yeomen of the Chamber were sent and had with them letters to one Kyme and his wife for their appearance within ten days of receipt." (P.C.Bk.) Gardiner meant to part Anne from the Queen her friend. He had a further design, as will appear.

BEFORE THE COUNCIL. GREENWICH PALACE. JUNE 17.

The Council Book shows that Cranmer was not present, then or on the days succeeding. The Lord Chancellor Wriothesley, the Grand Master Lord St. John, Essex, Lisle, Secretary Paget, Gage (Constable of the Tower), the turncoat Rich (bitter enemy of More), and Bishops Tunstal and Gardiner, besides Court officials: these were present. What we know of the close of Anne's short life stands out in a rapid series of vivid events. In the Interrogation the terrible Gardiner was the chief figure. He examined her, cross-examined her, and re-examined her on the First Article, seeking to shake her confident faith. When she answered prudently he admonished her "to speak plainly," and when she quoted texts he called her "a parrot." Tunstal sat silent. We know that he boasted years after that "he had never burnt any man."

The Council had first called Kyme before them and attempted a reconciliation. But if he was willing, the lady flatly refused to live with him again. She would only give her reasons before the King. So he was told to withdraw and was not present during her

examination. And that was the last time Anne Askew met her husband.

Gardiner questioned her on Reservation. Her answer is remarkable. She challenged him to prove it! Let them mark a consecrated wafer, "let it lie in the box and in three months it would turn mouldy." She added boldly; "Therefore I am persuaded it cannot be God." Gardiner told her she would be burnt.

Anne had been five hours before them. They listened and watched to see how she would take Winchester's savage threat. She said quietly that "she had never read Christ and his Apostles put any man to death." There was an amazed silence. Then they commanded her to stand aside. In the recess, Essex, Lisle and Paget spoke to her privately, urging her to recant. Paget whispered; "You could deny it again if need were." When recalled she asked Wriothesley, "How long he would halt on both sides?" An imprudent question, which he never forgave. The horrible business of persecution made every man suspect his neighbour of suspecting him. Anne was asked "if any of the Council (the absent Cranmer was aimed at) had befriended her?" She denied it. She was then remanded in ward. "To my Lady Garnish" she writes playfully. Her warder was not a titled lady, as she learned Gardiner glossed their gentleness! (*Vide* the Compter jailer.)

JUNE 18. The Council Book shows she was before them at Greenwich and not at the Guildhall. Almost every historian has gone wrong on these dates. She gave in a written statement of her faith in "The Sacrament of Remembrance." Again she exasperated Gardiner by her faultless memory of the New Testament. Of the Council "Some liked the wit and freedom of her discourse but others thought she was too forward."

JUNE 19. The Proceedings were formal. Probably it was Gardiner who put to her the fatal question: "Will you plainly deny Christ to be in the Sacrament?" She answered affirmatively, quoting St. Matthew xxiv, and Acts vii and xvii. They committed her and she praised God saying she "neither wished for death nor feared his might."

The record runs: "Thomas Kyme—who had married one Anne Ascue—who refused him to be her husband without any honest allegation was appointed to return to his country—and for that she was very obstinate and heady in reasoning of matters of religion, wherein she showed herself of a naughty opinion, seeing no persuasions of good reasons could take place she was sent to Newgate to remain there to answer to the law." (P.C.Bk.)

But the eager little woman who argued with Gardiner was to suffer a deep spiritual change before she drank of her Lord's cup. On the Sunday (20th) she was seized with fever (probably gaol-fever) and in anguish of body and mind she sent a piteous request to the Council that "Dr. Latimer might come to her." He was their prisoner at Greenwich, but "Stout Hugh Latimer" was the last man whom they would allow to comfort Anne Askew.

Instead they ordered her to be conveyed straight to Newgate and in such pain as she had never felt before, the doors of Newgate closed upon her. Anne, as her request and the Journal show, longed for Latimer to assure her that she was not forsaken by her God. She bore her dark hour alone, and the meekness of the martyr tempered her ardent spirit. After they offered her Dr. Crome, but he had recanted and she would not see him. About this time she wrote the Prayer in her Journal, which begins "Lord, I have more enemies than the hairs of my head." It breathes a touching submission and utter dependence, with the confiding love of a child. It is hard for us to understand her marvellous faith.

JUDGMENT AT THE GUILDHALL. MONDAY, JUNE 28.

"Machyn's Diary" gives a brief account, but there is an obvious slip in the date, which the Council Book and her Journal correct. On the Bench sat the Lord Mayor (Bowes again), Norfolk, St. John, Bishops Bonner and Heath, Chief Justices of King's Bench and Common Pleas, Lord Chief Baron of Exchequer, Master of Rolls, Recorder, the Bishop's Archdeacon, Chancellor and Commissary.

And with all this array the Trial was illegal for it was "without a jury." The judges broke the very Statute by which they condemned the prisoners at the Bar; with Anne being Dr. Shaxton—former Bishop of Salisbury, a gentleman named White, and a poor Essex tailor named Adams." All "confessed the indictment" and "so had judgment to be burnt."

JUNE 29. But on the morrow (Tuesday in the Journal) Anne was suddenly brought from Newgate to The Sign of the Crown. She was taken before Bonner and Sir Richard Rich, who "with flattering words went about to persuade me from God." Two of those condemned with her had given way. "Then came to me Nicholas Shaxton and counselled me to recant as he had done." Poor Bishop Shaxton! He had borne bravely poverty and rigorous imprisonment but he could not face the stake. Anne told him "it had been good for him never to have been born." The apostate was dumb and Rich, enraged at his failure, produced a fresh Council Warrant.

IN THE TOWER OF LONDON. JUNE 29—JULY 12.

At three in the afternoon Anne was led to the White Tower and interrogated by Wriothesley and Rich before Sir Anthony Knevet the Lieutenant. They demanded testimony against the Queen and her ladies, with the names of those who succoured her in the Compter. Anne spoke of the unknown servingmen in the blue and violet coats but she knew of none who sent money. They had her on the rack and under sharp torture, demanded the names of the Gospellers at Court. They asked repeatedly if the Queen were not one of them. Strong men succumbed on the rack but Anne "lay still and did not cry." Wriothesley and Rich flung off their gowns and turned the levers themselves until she was nigh dead. She never accused the Queen or any others. Knevet interposed,

and stopped the Question. She fainted as they loosed her. When she came to she was lying on the stone in that dreadful vault and propped against the rack she "reasoned two full hours with Wriothesley." He ordered her to be racked again. Knevet declared peremptorily that "the woman had borne enough" and he bade them carry her to a house and lay her in a bed. The Lieutenant's word was Law in the Tower. The house was almost certainly that of Partridge the Gentleman Gaoler, which was next door to the Lieutenant's lodging. They carried the helpless form in a chair across Tower Green as the Lord Chancellor swearing "the woman could and should have borne more!" cursed Knevet, threatened to tell the King, and called for his horse. Sir Anthony quietly commanded his wherry, and, favoured by the tide, he beat Wriothesley in the race to Whitehall. He saw the King, told him all and pleaded his knighthood. Henry was silent and embarrassed, but finally he gave Knevet his hand to kiss, and muttered "We had not meant the woman should be handled so extremely." Knevet left the Palace as Wriothesley on his blown horse reached it. He had stuck in the mud of Great Tower Street. Henry vented his rage on his Lord Chancellor. Knevet found the Tower warders anxiously looking out for him, and, what was rare in its annals, the Lieutenant told them what had passed, and they thanked God. In the care of the humane and kindly Knevet, the suffering Anne had a brief respite. It is clear the racking severely injured her spine.

JULY 12. "Machyn's Diary" makes the date plain. "This night Anne Askew was brought by water from the Tower to Blackfriars and from thence carried in a chair to Newgate by the sheriff's officers."

LAST DAYS IN NEWGATE.

There was a little company of martyrs in the prison and they shared a common parlour. Lascelles, the Court Usher, had been condemned, and Blagge whom the King interposed to pardon freely—and Belenian a priest. Anne's friend, sturdy old John Loud of Lincoln's Inn, visited them, and so did the brothers Throgmorton in spite of the warning from an unknown man. "Ye are all marked that come to them. Take heed to your lives." Anne either finished or dictated her Journal which she seems to have given to Loud to be printed in Germany. He gave it "to certain Dutch merchants of the City" and they to the Reformer Bale abroad. Loud wrote of Anne: "The day before her execution and the same day also she had a smiling countenance and an angel's face."

JULY 16, 1546. SMITHFIELD. "RATHER DEATH THAN FALSE TO FAITH."

In these words Anne had rejected Wriothesley's offer of a pardon and pension from the Crown. The Martyrdom has been described in vivid details. How the Lord Mayor and Council sat "looking

on, leaning in a window by the Hospital" (Bartholomew's) the three stakes and piles of faggots, the sultry sky, the four martyrs, the courtier Lascelles, the priest Belenian and the Essex tailor, with Anne "holden up between two serjeants," an eye-witness related, "so racked that she could not stand, sitting there in a chair" (Loud). The really tragic figure was the miserable Shaxton in his pulpit preaching at those who were faithful to death. A vast crowd watched in pity and horror. Anne listened attentively to Shaxton, sometimes audibly approving and once she cried out: "There he misses and speaks without the Book!" He ended and the Martyrs began to pray. They chained Anne alone to the centre stake and Wriothsesley sent her the King's Pardon if she would recant. She turned away her eyes from the parchment. "I came not hither to deny my Lord and Master." Such were the last words of Anne Askew. The others refused also. The sight of the sacks of powder caused an undignified panic among the Council. Bedford said it was about the bodies of the Martyrs and too far off to harm others. Rain was threatening and the Lord Mayor rose and cried: "Fiat Justitia!" The radiant face of Anne was uplifted, the smile still on her lips, her eyes fixed on the sky. "They put fire to the reeds." There was a sudden clap of thunder quickly followed by the powder exploding, and a cloud of smoke.

* * * * *

Amid the rain the Londoners hurried home, asking each other if they had heard thunder or a Voice from Heaven for they thought the Council had burned the bodies of those whose souls the angels rejoiced to receive into Life Everlasting.

NOTE.—I accept the authenticity of the Journal, but not all of Bishop Bale's comments.—J. K.

CONTEMPORARY AUTHORITIES.

Acts of the Privy Council.

State Papers Henry VIII (Domestic).

Machyn's Diary.

Wriothsesley's Chronicle.

"The Journal" printed in *Bale's Tracts—The First Examination of Anne Askew*, printed at Marburg (Hesse), November, 1546; *The Latter Examination of Anne Askew*, printed January, 1547, also at Marburg (Hesse).

Foxe's Acts and Monuments.

Robert Parsons, S.J., *Three Notable Conversions.*

Strype's *Annals and Memorials* (contains Loud's narrative).

Bishop Burnet quotes from *A Journal of Anthony Anthony*, Ordnance Surveyor at the Tower. This document is lost, but the name appears frequently in the Priory Council Book.

AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH. (AD CLERUM)

BY THE REV. NORMAN H. CLARKE, M.A.,
Vicar of St. Stephen's, Bradford.

IT is a striking fact that when our Lord was on earth He appealed almost exclusively to man's moral consciousness. For Him the Church of His day was divinely founded, but, while He gave a general assent to its order, He frequently attacked its ritual and administration and did not hesitate to modify its doctrine. His appeal lay behind the Church to what man, in himself, guided by the prophets, knew of God. And in practice the clergy to-day make the same appeal, and in our own lives we acknowledge the same authority of conscience. Examples may be multiplied, but it will be sufficient to point to one or two. Recently Dr. Major was accused of heresy, but the trial was not proceeded with because the authority of conscience was at least tacitly admitted.¹ Similarly Archbishop Tait declared that nobody in the Church of England takes the so-called damnatory clauses in the Athanasian Creed in their literal sense.² Or, it may be pointed out that some of our brethren refuse to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on conscientious grounds.

But, apart from examples, to confess "I believe in the Holy Ghost" is in itself to insist on the primary importance of the moral consciousness. For, while it is true that we all regard the Church as the Spirit-bearing Body, it is also true that we regard the Holy Spirit as dwelling in the individual and progressively revealing to the individual the will of God. "I believe in the Holy Ghost" must mean "I believe that God reveals Himself to the individual believer who seeks to know Him and to do His will."

This is the only way in which modern thought and historical knowledge, through which we believe God to be revealing Himself, can be brought within the purview of the Churchman. A reference to the Thirty-nine Articles will make this clear. "Viewed in relation to their own day, the Articles may be regarded as a charter of freedom; in relation to ours, they may present the appearance of a fetter to progress."³ It was because the Spirit of God had been leading men into a clearer apprehension of the truth that the formula of assent to the Articles was modified in 1865. But this clearer revelation of the truth was largely due to the changing interpretation of Holy Scripture which is explicitly declared to be the chief authority in sixteen out of the Thirty-nine Articles. The changing interpretation was in its turn due to the acknowledgment

¹ Cf. *A Resurrection of Relics*, Major.

² Cf. *Freedom and Authority*, Bishop Barnes, p. 10.

³ *Liberal Evangelicalism*, p. 41.

of the authority of the moral consciousness, working not in the Church as a whole, but in the hearts and minds of individual believers. This authority must be acknowledged if the Church is to grow, for the principle of growth demands constant readjustment.

But while the moral consciousness of the individual must be supreme in his personal relationship to God, if it is altogether uncontrolled it will lead to something akin to anarchy and will make ordered fellowship impossible. In the make-up of man there is another faculty which we call his social consciousness, and this leads him to form groups for many different purposes, among others for worship. The Church is such a group. In passing it should be pointed out that this does not in any sense preclude the idea of a Divine origin of the Church of Christ.

The group can only exist under an authority other than that of the individual conscience, so that membership of a group, for our purposes a Church, involves to a certain extent the surrender of the authority of the individual conscience to that of the group. Two points need to be made clear—(1) that there are limits beyond which submission cannot go (it will be necessary to say something about this later in this paper); (2) that in surrendering to the authority of the group the authority of conscience is active and admitted.¹ This surrender is eminently reasonable, for in our own sphere we can say that “the sifted experience of Christian history acts as a check to our possible misinterpretations of the Spirit’s leading and admits us to a knowledge of His general principles of working.”² A Church preserves and crystallizes the findings of conscience. Perhaps, in an attempt to relate the two authorities, it may be put thus. Conscience chooses the end; the means by which that end is achieved is a matter of wider experience than that of the individual.³

The way is now clear for an examination of the authority of the Church, and it seems well to begin with a reference to the two distinct vows which each of us has made concerning this question of authority. At our ordination we promised “reverently to obey (our) Ordinary, and other chief Ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over (us).” When we were licensed to a cure the oath read, “I do swear by Almighty God that I will pay true and canonical obedience to the Lord Bishop of the Diocese and his successors, in all things lawful and honest.” Possibly it is easy to raise questions of interpretation, but two things are quite clear. We have freely (for we were under no compulsion to be ordained or to accept a bishop’s licence) acknowledged the authority of the Church and acknowledged that this authority is exercised by certain persons acting freely within certain limits. It will be convenient to examine this dual authority under the two heads of Canon Law and the Power of the individual Bishop.

Canon Law is largely the codification of custom. But that drives

¹ Cf. *Infallibility of the Church*, Salmon, Lecture 3.

² *Liberal Evangelicalism*, p. 45.

³ Cf. *Conscience and Christ*, Rashdall, pp. 18, 29, 30, 31.

us back a step further to the rise of any particular custom. We can trace the formulation of some Canon in this way. A particular custom grew up, perhaps insensibly, in a local church; "the actual form that these customs took depended very largely on local conditions, sometimes indeed on accidental material circumstances. In the formation of such customs we must not ignore the influence of secular life."¹ The custom appealed to other Churches; it spread, and was eventually adopted by some Synod or Council. The constitution of these Synods and Councils varied, but in some, and these not the least important, the laity voted equally with the bishops and the clergy. Cyprian repeatedly states that he did nothing as bishop without consulting his clergy and laity too.² Hooker³ insists that the laity have an equal voice with the bishops and clergy in making Canon Law.

Bearing the origin of Canon Law in mind, "we must beware of arguing that a thing was always done because a Canon was passed to say that it should be done"⁴; and, historically, a Canon might be passed, but it was only observed in so far as it was enforced by the individual bishop,⁵ and thus continued to represent the mind of the Church. We have now arrived at the conception of Canon Law as the expression of the mind of the Church in any particular age. For example, pre-Reformation Canon Law is the law of the medieval Church regarded as a state, which was the prevalent conception of the Church in the Middle Ages. This being so, we have confirmation of the principle that Canon Law is alterable by local churches. Under modern conditions the only alternative to this principle is an acknowledgment of the authority of the Pope. In fact, of course, our Articles of Religion⁶ assert this principle and, to quote but one example, the Civil Power, before the Reformation, modified Canon Law in England in the Constitutions of Clarendon, in 1164.⁷ A committee appointed by Convocation drew up a revision of the existing Canon Law in 1553, but this *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* never received authority, so that we are left with the position that "all those parts of Canon Law which are not repugnant to the King's prerogative and the law of the land are technically valid."⁸

But to attempt to govern the Church of England to-day by Canon Law drawn up in the dim ages would make government ludicrous. One reason is that no one knows what Canon Law is; particular canons may be known, but the system must be regarded as a whole, and there is first-rate authority for the statement that "much of the old law has ceased to be authoritative . . . the present

¹ *The Thirty-nine Articles*, Bicknell, pp. 380, 383.

² *Authority in the Church*, T. C. Hammond, p. 42.

³ *Ecc. Polity*, VIII, vi, 6, 8. Cf. Lord Denman, quoted in *Threatened Revival of Canon Law*, J. T. Tomlinson, p. 3.

⁴ Dr. Collins, quoted in Bicknell, *op. cit.*, p. 383.

⁵ Cf. Bicknell, *op. cit.*, p. 538.

⁶ E.g. *Articles*, 20, 21, 32.

⁷ Cf. *A History of the Church of England*, Paterson, pp. 103 ff.

⁸ Paterson, *op. cit.*, p. 216, note.

Canon Law of the English Church is that which the English Church as a matter of fact uses."¹ This of course is simply an assertion of the principle that Canon Law is an expression of the mind of the Church in a particular age. In any case, who is to interpret Canon Law? It will be remembered that Laud's consecration was delayed owing to a difference in interpretation of a particular Canon which was only determined by reference to a royal commission, a civil body.² Further, such parts of Canon Law as are known are, in many cases, inapplicable. "At Nicea it was enacted that all were to pray standing on Sundays . . . that the receiving of interest for the use of money was wrong, and it was ordered that any cleric guilty of the practice should be deposed."³ And if it be urged that these are out-of-date, the whole principle of the abrogation of Canon Law by desuetude has been conceded. The present Bishop of Truro, Dr. Frere, states: "It is a recognized principle that canonical legislation does lose its force through desuetude. Canon Law is not repealed, necessarily, as is statute law, when it is no longer required to be in force. It lapses through the prevalence of contrary custom or the indirect action of subsequent legislation."⁴ The same principle is affirmed in the opinions of Bishop Stubbs and Sir Lewis Dibdin given to Bishop Boyd Carpenter with reference to an assertion made by Lord Halifax at the Bradford Church Congress, in 1898, that the pre-Reformation Canon Law respecting Reservation was still binding because it had never been repealed.⁵ It is only by a full admission of the principle of desuetude as applying to Canon Law that it is possible to maintain the theory of Canon Law as the expression of the mind of the Church, and this is its sole claim to authority.

If it be asked what place Canon Law has to-day, it must be replied that, as we have already pointed out, Canon Law is originally local custom and, as such, old laws can be discarded and new laws formulated by local churches. An example of this is to be found in the Preface to our own Ordinal,⁶ where the provision as to the age of ordination to the diaconate was twenty-one years in the 1559 Prayer Book, but was altered to twenty-three by the Canons of 1604. In the American and Scottish Churches the age of twenty-one still survives. The Spirit of God acts directly on each generation, and this being so, each generation must determine for itself the Canon Law for its own age. "A mechanical view of the way in which the Spirit guides the Church cannot be reconciled with the phenomena of Church history, and does not agree either with what we know of God in other ways or with the laws of human psychology."⁷

¹ Bicknell, *op. cit.*, p. 539.

² Paterson, *op. cit.*, p. 329 f.

³ *Freedom and Authority*, Bp. Barnes, p. 7. Cf. also African and Roman Synods, Hammond, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

⁴ *Principles of Religious Ceremonial*, p. 182. Quoted by Bp. of Southwark in *Authority and Obedience and Reservation*, p. 34; *q.v.* also for quotations from Bp. Gore and Dr. Adrian Fortescue.

⁵ *The Church Gazette*, Nov., 1925, p. 124.

⁶ Cf. *Tutorial Prayer Book*, pp. 504 f.

⁷ *Liberal Evangelicalism*, p. 38.

It remains to say something as to the power of the bishop, and we start from the point that belief in a living and active Spirit of God precludes the possibility of the Church's being bound by dead law. If the guidance of the Spirit and the old law clash, the old law must go. Because the Church is the Spirit-bearing body we shall expect to see the guidance of the Spirit in the movements in the Church of a given age, these movements being expressed in living men and women, subject always to the appeal, made quite distinctly in the Church of England, to the authority of Holy Scripture. But who shall interpret these movements?

In a Church with an episcopal constitution there are certain definitely episcopal functions, e.g. ordination and confirmation, but the bishop also has power in the administration of the Church. An example of the latter may be cited in the order made recently by the Bishop of Lagos, refusing to admit children born out of wedlock to holy baptism, except under certain conditions.¹ His Synod desired to challenge the validity of the ruling, but he denied their right to challenge it on the grounds that he had, before making the ruling, referred the question to the 250 bishops assembled at Lambeth, and they agreed to the principle. We have here an affirmation of episcopal authority and an illustration of the method of its exercise.

The authority of the single bishop is limited. He is subject to the Archbishop of the Province, acting with or without his fellow-bishops, and is bound by the canons of discipline.² (It was the organization of the Church into patriarchates, which began in the fourth century, which marked the beginning of the displacement of the authority of the local council by the control of the Metropolitan.) One distinct step in the arrest of the spread of Arianism in the Church was the decision of the Council of Nicea to limit the power of the single bishop or group of bishops. The bishop's authority in ordination is limited (though the function of ordination belongs to him in virtue of his office). It will be sufficient to quote the reading of the *Si Quis*, which acknowledges the power of the laity in the choice of church officers; and the alteration of the Preface to our Ordinal, determining the men from among whom the bishops shall choose ordinands, which was made not by the bishops as such but by Convocation.

The bishop derives his authority in administration from the fact that he is now, as he was originally regarded, the representative of the Church. As the representative of the Church he cannot act independently of the other bishops in the Province, but he can claim obedience because he speaks not as an individual but as the mouth-piece of the Church. And this is quite independent of any method by which he is chosen; the Establishment does not destroy the representative character of the bishop. For, apart from any meaning which there may be in the phrase "grace of Orders" (and those

¹ *Church Missionary Review*, Sept., 1925, pp. 237 ff.

² For limitation of power of single bishop, see Hammond, *op. cit.*, pp. 25, 32 ff, 64 ff, 117.

who attach most meaning to the phrase would be the first to insist that the grace is conferred by the Laying-on-of-Hands and not by the method of appointment), the bishop is, in virtue of his duties and his contact with other men of varying mind, a representative, and is best fitted to declare and interpret the mind of the Church in the area for which he is responsible.

Subject always to the appeal to Holy Scripture, the mind of the Church in a given age is the law of the Church for that age, and the bishops, as leaders and through the nature of their work, are both in reason and in practice the best exponents of this mind.

These considerations seem to afford an answer to two questions which are agitating the minds of many of us at this time. One is the question of obedience to one's bishop in regulations he may make concerning matters left to the Ordinary in the Book of Common Prayer, and the other the question of our acceptance (as a permissible alternative) of the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, even if, as seems probable, it contains matter with which we do not agree.

In regard to the first of these questions, the Church having declared its mind in the Book of Common Prayer, and having deliberately left certain matters to the direction of the Ordinary, the priest is bound to obey his bishop in particular regulations which he may make concerning these matters, because *in these matters* the Church has delegated its authority to the bishop and because the priest has promised to obey; the bishop's order having behind it a canonical action of the Church which brings it out of the realm of the authority of conscience into that of acknowledged external authority.

This being so, there would be the more reason for accepting a Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, if it can be presumed that the bishops, acting as a body, have attempted to assess and interpret the mind of the Church in this age and have submitted their attempt to a Church Assembly which fairly represented the Church as a whole and by which it was approved as a fair and valid interpretation of that mind.

There will arise cases, on both sides of our Church, where such revision and such orders will conflict with conscience. If a priest "is clear that it is his conscience and not his prejudice which is speaking to him, he must at all costs follow his conscience. But loyalty to conscience does not excuse disloyalty to engagements deliberately undertaken."¹ If obedience is for him conscientiously impossible, "there is no alternative left for an honest man but to resign his commission and thus regain freedom to follow his personal convictions unhampered by the promises he had previously made."²

¹ *Authority and Obedience and Reservation*, Bishop of Southwark, p. 26.

² *Ibid.*

THE CHURCH IN NORTH AND CENTRAL EUROPE.

BY THE REV. F. BATE, M.A., B.Litt., Foreign Secretary
Colonial and Continental Church Society.

THE consecration of the Rev. B. Staunton Batty as suffragan bishop to the Bishop of London, with the title of "Bishop of Fulham," marks a further and definite stage, though certainly not a final one, in the history of episcopal supervision of the chaplaincies in North and Central Europe. The next step will undoubtedly be the creation of a separate diocese, for which, incidentally, it is to be hoped some more inspiring and appropriate title may be found.

We are apt to think of English chaplaincies on the Continent of Europe as things of fairly modern foundation, whereas, it is probably true to say, that there never has been a time since the days of William the Conqueror when English clergy have not been ministering to congregations, small or large, in some part of Europe. Chaplains in fairly large numbers crossed with the armies of English kings when they went to battle for French territory. English incumbents filled many of the churches in the territory that was held or conquered. In later days English merchant communities, established in various foreign parts, requisitioned the services of an English minister. Still later, when Elizabeth threw troops into Holland and received in pawn sundry fortresses and garrisons, chaplains in large numbers were employed in the field and in the towns. So down to our own era when, as commerce, industry, education, diplomacy, etc., take our sons and daughters to Continental towns, chaplaincies are established and clergy provided.

How far in pre-Reformation days the question of episcopal supervision of such chaplaincies was raised or solved is not very clear. Not without interest is a bull of Urban VI giving the Archbishop of Canterbury jurisdiction over Calais and its neighbourhood. He was led to do this because "representations were lately made to us on behalf of our dear children the curates, and rectors, and other presbyters and priests, and indeed of the whole territory of Calais and other towns and lands adjoining . . . and in Picardy, and under the rule and protection of our very dear son in Christ, Richard II, renowned King of England . . . on account of the many schismatics that flourish, and presume publicly to support and favour that spawn of iniquity Robert, formerly cardinal and presbyter of the Basilica of the twelve apostles, now anti-pope." For some time at all events the jurisdiction of Canterbury in that area was effective.

Since the Reformation there are in the provision of Episcopal control five distinct stages, of which the consecration of Mr. Batty is the last. The first stage was reached through the zeal and

enthusiasm for Church order on the part of Laud, then Bishop of London, which moved him to attempt to bring into order and discipline the many chaplains ministering to regiments, garrisons, and trading communities, particularly in the Netherlands, who "having no superior to overlook them gave divers scandals (he said) by following drinking and other foul courses of life." The probability is that the root of the trouble was not dissoluteness of living but irregularity of Church government and worship. Many of the chaplains were confessedly Presbyterians; some held their Churchmanship loosely, with the result that disorders were decidedly prevalent. Many used a liturgy other than the Book of Common Prayer: they became members of the Netherlands Synod and put themselves under its discipline: in some cases they took part in the ordination of ministers. James I had engaged in negotiations with them and had proposed to appoint a moderator over these chaplains, but this "was thought by them to be a preface to bring in a bishop amongst them; which that sort likes not. So that was utterly refused." James gave up the task. Charles I also for some time suffered these irregularities without too much protest.

Laud however was determined to bring them all into submission. He was in constant communication with Dudley Carleton and Lord Conway: he persistently urged action upon the Privy Council. Finally, in 1633, he succeeded in getting passed by the Privy Council an order placing all ministers and churches in foreign parts, from Holland to far Barbadoes, under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London as their diocesan and ordering the use of the liturgy and discipline of the Church of England in all chaplaincies. The order failed, as it was bound to fail. Use was made of the order to cause trouble and inconvenience, with possibly loss of his employment, to an individual chaplain here and there. Merchant Companies were roundly rated for lapses from grace in making appointments, but as a piece of effective legislation the measure entirely failed. Nor could it well be otherwise, for there was no means of enforcing it in the case of an unwilling congregation.

No further attempt at real oversight was made until the nineteenth century. Theoretically throughout the intervening period, successive Bishops of London had episcopal authority over the whole of the Continent; in reality little or no authority was exercised.

The second stage was reached in 1825 when Dr. Luscombe was consecrated bishop. Luscombe had been resident for some years in Normandy, where he was engaged chiefly in educational work. He knew the Continent sufficiently well to be aware that the condition of English Church congregations left much to be desired. There were said to be fifty thousand English people resident in France, for whom the supply of churches and clergy was totally inadequate. Few of the clergy held a bishop's licence; none was subject to regular supervision; confirmations were almost unknown and everywhere was laxity of practice. Luscombe consulted friends in England and secured the interest of Archdeacon Hook and his

son. They suggested to the authorities that for the continental work there should be appointed and consecrated a suffragan to the Bishop of London. After considerable discussion the Bishop of London, Peel, Canning and others decided against the proposal. Chiefly it was objected that the French Government might regard it as a "piece of unwarrantable intrusion."

Finding this avenue blocked, W. F. Hook turned his thoughts in another direction. Recalling the consecration by Scotch bishops, in 1784, of Dr. Seabury, the first American bishop, he suggested similar procedure in this case. After prolonged correspondence it was agreed to consecrate Luscombe as missionary bishop to the British residents in Europe, he pledging himself to renounce all offers of preferment in England. With the tacit consent of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Peel and Canning, Luscombe was consecrated by Scotch bishops on March 20, 1825. The Letters of Collation delivered to him contained this commission: "He is sent by us, representing the Scotch Episcopal Church, to the Continent of Europe, not as a diocesan bishop in the modern or limited sense of the word, but for a purpose similar to that for which Titus was left by St. Paul in Crete, that he may 'set in order the things that are wanting' among such of the natives of Great Britain and Ireland and the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and to these may be added any members of the Episcopal Church of America who may choose to be resident in Europe."

Let it be said at once that the scheme was not a success. It is to be doubted whether Luscombe had the qualities necessary for so difficult a mission: it is equally doubtful whether any man could have succeeded. At the very outset there was heated controversy concerning his mission; many Churchmen regarded it with deep disapproval. Among the chaplains few showed any desire to avail themselves of his services. Some openly refused to acknowledge his authority: one went so far as to defy him openly and to submit a case to Dr. Stephen Lushington of Doctors' Commons. Lushington replied: "I am of opinion that neither the Bishop of London, nor any other prelate, has any jurisdiction, power, or authority . . . nor ever exercised or claimed any."

Luscombe had become in 1825 chaplain at Paris, and embassy chaplain in 1828. There he built at his own expense the present Embassy Church, which he sold to Mr. Chamier when he left Paris in 1846 for Switzerland, where he died that same year.

He lived to see achieved the third stage. In 1842 there was created by Letters Patent the Bishopric of Gibraltar with a jurisdiction including all the shores of the Mediterranean with the exception of parts of the north coast of Africa. By this means the Bishop of London was relieved of a large measure of theoretical responsibility and fairly adequate provision was thus made for a number of the European chaplaincies.

This new creation revived in full measure discussion with regard to provision for North and Central Europe. Scheme after scheme was proposed and then assailed. In turn Heligoland, the

Channel Islands, the Isle of Man and other places were proposed as best situated to give a seat and title. Many objected to any and all proposals, but were willing to further the appointment of archdeacons under the Bishop of London, and the provision of special arrangements for confirmations. Meanwhile there could be no doubt about the need for some provision. Congregations were being badly served: scandals were rife: many of the chaplains were treating the services as a mere means of livelihood. Dr. Burgess, Rector of Chelsea, formerly chaplain at Rome, after full and careful inquiry, went so far as to say that a large proportion of the chaplains were men who for various offences could not venture to live in England. Yet it was not until 1884 that the fourth step was taken.

By that time the two societies which so largely assist the Continental work of the Church were becoming increasingly concerned at the very low standard prevailing in English church life on the Continent. Anxious to remedy if possible this reproach to the Church, the Committee of the Colonial and Continental Church Society in 1884, offered to be responsible for a reasonable stipend and for all travelling expenses if the Bishop of London would commission a retired colonial bishop as his suffragan for this particular work. Eventually this offer was accepted, and Dr. Titcomb, formerly Bishop of Rangoon, was so commissioned.

The precedent thus created has been followed until the present time. In succession Dr. Titcomb (1884-1888), Dr. Wilkinson (1888-1911), formerly Bishop of Zululand, and Dr. Bury (1911-1926), formerly Bishop of British Honduras, have rendered excellent service under difficult conditions. The results have been uniformly good, though the arrangement was by no means ideal. A jurisdiction so immense (800,000 square miles) necessitates a vast amount of travel for which a bishop who has already retired from some other work is not best suited.

One of the chief difficulties has been that of finance. Dr. Titcomb was content to receive a nominal sum of £150 a year over and above the cost of travel, but for even so small a sum it was hardly right that he should be dependent upon a grant from one society. This objection was met by the appointment of a special committee consisting of representatives of the Bishop of London, the C.C.C.S. and the S.P.G., to consider ways and means of creating an endowment fund. Unfortunately this scheme ultimately failed. Bishop Wilkinson and Bishop Bury were provided with an income by appointment to a city living, but to such an arrangement there are still greater objections.

Now, for the first time in the history of the English Church, we have the consecration by English bishops of one for this particular work. The next step will no doubt be the creation of a diocese quite independent of London. Whether that would be altogether desirable is open to question. Meanwhile we confidently look for the expansion and deepening of spiritual life under the enthusiastic leadership of the new bishop.

THE WONDERFUL DEAN.

ANECDOTES OF SWIFT.

BY P. M. CROFTS-MOLLAN.

PEOPLE are so accustomed to think of Dean Swift as Dean of St. Patrick's, and founder of Swift's Hospital, and therefore as almost a part of Dublin itself, that they rarely give a thought to the interesting fact of his connection with Ulster.

Visitors who are permitted by the kindness of the proprietor of Loughry, Co. Tyrone, to walk through his desmesne, are, at the very gate lodge, brought into contact with the shadow of the personality of "The Dean," as he was designated almost all over Ireland.

"You will like to be looking at Dean Swift's summer house?" said the polite gatekeeper, as she smilingly admitted us. "He used to spend hours in it whenever he stayed up at the 'Big House.'"

Accordingly, when we had passed by the pretty gurgling river, with its bright miniature waterfalls, which runs beside the avenue, we were courteously conducted to the little pavilion, in which stood the chair he sat on, and the table at which he wrote—a quiet spot, with a lovely view, suited to the meditative proclivities of such a great thinker.

Possibly his thoughts were not always in tune with the quietness of his surroundings, though he greatly longed, at that time, to cast his lot in Ulster, to which province in his early manhood many indications seemed to have pointed the way. For at this time his great friend, Sir William Temple, with whom he had lived in his early days (a relative of his mother's), made interest for him with Lord Capel, then Viceroy of Ireland, who presented him with the Prebendary of Kilroot, in the diocese of Connor, which was worth £100 a year.

But Sir William seems to have speedily repented of his intercession, for he missed his young friend's companionship so much that he urged him to resign his prebend in favour of another person, and to return to England, promising him that he would exert himself to obtain for him preferment there.

He was barely twenty-nine at this period, and not long in holy orders.

CONGREGATION OF ONE.

After Sir William Temple's death (he had failed to redeem his promise) Swift returned to Ireland as private secretary to the Earl of Berkeley, an appointment of which he was soon deprived through the treachery of another of the Earl's attendants, named Bush, who intimated to him that such a post ought not properly to be filled by a gentleman in holy orders.

Lord Berkeley consequently made some lame excuse for depriving him of it, but by way of mollifying the blow, gave him the

livings of Laracor and Rathbeggan, in the County Meath, the first of these livings being worth £200 a year, and the second £60 a year. Both of these he held until he was made Dean of St. Patrick's.

On his appointment to these parishes he made an announcement that he would hold services every Wednesday and Friday—and it was at Laracor that the amusing incident occurred of his having no congregation for a Wednesday service, except himself and his sexton.

He waited for some time, but no one came, so he began prayers with—

“Dearly beloved Roger, the Scripture moveth you and me in sundry places,” and then he proceeded regularly through the whole service!

The next step towards Ulster is told in Lord Orrery's lively style in his letters to his son. As he knew the Dean personally, his letters may be considered in the main correct. He tells him that a strict residence at Laracor was not in the least suitable to Dr. Swift's disposition; and that he was making perpetual excursions to all parts of England. Unfortunately his rambling proclivity occasioned him, at this time, considerable loss. The rich Deanery of Derry became vacant just before his appointment to Laracor, and was intended for him by Lord Berkeley. But Dr. King, then Bishop of Derry, interposed, entreating that some grave and elderly divine, rather than so young a man, should receive the emolument. Dr. Swift was at this time thirty-two years of age.

“I have no objection to Dr. Swift,” wrote the Bishop. “I know him to be a sprightly, ingenious young man; but instead of residing, I daresay he will be eternally flying backwards and forwards to London; and, therefore, I entreat that he may be provided for in some other place.”

“Swift,” continues Lord Orrery, “was accordingly set aside on account of his youth; but, as if his stars had destined him to a parallel revenge, he lived to see the Bishop of Derry set aside on account of age.

“TOO OLD TO RISE.”

That prelate had been for many years Archbishop of Dublin, and had been long celebrated alike for his wit and learning, when Dr. Lindsay, the Primate of Ireland, died. Upon his death Archbishop King immediately made claim to the primacy, as a preferment to which he had a right from his station in the See of Dublin, as well as from his acknowledged character in the Church. Neither of these reasons prevailed. He was looked upon as far too “advanced in years” to be removed.

The reason alleged was as mortifying as the refusal itself, but the Archbishop had no opportunity of showing his resentment, except to the new Primate—Dr. Bolter—whom he received in his own house, in his dining parlour, without rising from his chair, and to whom he made an apology by saying with his usual stream of wit:

“ My Lord, I am certain your grace will forgive me, because you know I am too old to rise ! ”

The Deanery of Derry would have been very acceptable to Dr. Swift, as his friend Dr. Delany received the Deanery of Down ; but a greater disappointment was in store for a man of his highly strung temperament.

Queen Anne had promised him a bishopric in England, and when one fell vacant, she proceeded to redeem her promise. But a joint application was at once made against him to Her Majesty by Dr. Sharpe, Archbishop of York, and by a “ great lady ” (we can easily guess her name, the Duchess of Marlborough), who swayed the Queen completely, both of whom represented him as a person who was not a Christian !

Anne upon such assurance gave away the bishopric, contrary to her first intentions.

Swift kept himself, indeed, within some tolerable bounds when he spoke of the Queen, but his indignation knew no limits when he mentioned the Archbishop of York, or the “ lady.” Nor did it console him that the Archbishop subsequently said he regretted what he had done. Indeed we can imagine his feelings !

WOOD'S HALFPENCE AGITATION.

The death of the Queen was a terrible blow to him. It dashed all his hopes of preferment in England, and he returned to his Deanery of St. Patrick's (to which he had been appointed in 1713), to devote himself henceforth to the interests of his countrymen.

The woollen trade of the North had been almost ruined by selfish legislation against Irish trade, which King William had striven nobly to avert by encouraging the manufacture of linen. Swift took up his pen and wrote “ In a proposal for the universal use of Irish manufactures in clothes, and furnishing of houses, etc., ” utterly renouncing everything wearable that comes from England. This tract was written in the year 1720.

Then came his tracts on William Wood's coinage of farthings and halfpence. Copper money had become so scarce in Ireland that some establishments were endeavouring to pass pieces of tin, to be redeemed later on.

Wood, who was described as a hardwareman, and a bankrupt, was nevertheless able to prevail on the Imperial Government to grant him a patent to coin £108,000 of these small monies, to pass current in the kingdom for a period of fourteen years. But his coins were so debased that a shilling of them would only have been worth one penny, while his own profits would have been enormous. Seeing this, the Dean wrote his letters to the people, warning them under no compulsion to accept such spurious money. His action on the subject caused him to become the idol of the populace, who celebrated his praises with portraits of himself, and songs and ballads composed in his honour. In this debased coinage the clergy and the army were to be paid.

There is in the dining-room at Howth Castle, Co. Dublin, the seat of the late Earl of Howth, a splendid picture of the Dean, life-size, in his robes. It was painted by Beridon in 1733. He holds in his hand a paper, on which is written—

“The Drapier’s Fourth Letter to the Whole People of Ireland.”

Wood sprawls, naked, at his feet, clutching his patent for the coinage of this copper money, a quantity of which lies scattered about him. This picture the Howth family have never permitted to be copied.

The outcome of The Drapier’s Letters was that neither Wood nor his coinage gained a footing in Ireland, and he was obliged to surrender his patent.

LASHING A BISHOP.

Dean Swift was a man of commanding appearance, robust and masculine, and his figure erect.

Lord Orrery says of him—

“He was earnest and dignified in conducting the services of the Church, and particularly so in his administration of the Holy Communion. He was a thorough despiser of hypocrisy under any shape or form, and cleanly in his person and habits, almost amounting to superstition.”

To such a man an announcement by a newly appointed Bishop of Meath—lately translated from Bangor in Wales—was inexpressibly offensive.

The Bishop recommended to the clergy of Meath the use of “numms,” which were pieces of white linen, fastened so as to hide soiled shirts! This fired the indignation of Swift to the utmost.

At the next Synod he fell upon the Bishop with terrible severity.

“What!” he cried, “do you think you have gotten among your Welsh clergy. I would have you know,” he continued, stripping up his cassock from his arms, and tearing open the breast of his waistcoat, “that you have gotten into a diocese of gentlemen, who abhor dirt, and filth, and nastiness.”

And thus he went on, lashing the Bishop, and making him writhe under his sarcasms. Yet in spite of his cleanliness, his gown was sometimes very rusty, though his deportment was such as to impress all his acquaintances with his dignity.

MADE A COUNTESS SING.

The following incident is told by his personal friend Mrs. Pilkington, in her Memoirs, as related to her by himself.

The last time he was in London he went to dine with the Earl of Burlington, who was then but newly married. The Earl being willing, ’tis supposed, to have some diversion, did not introduce him to his lady, nor mention his name. After dinner, said the Dean:

“Lady Burlington, I hear you can sing; sing me a song.”

The lady looked on this unceremonious manner of asking a

favour with distaste, and positively refused him. He said she should sing, or he would make her.

"Why, madam, I suppose you take me for one of your poor English hedge parsons. Sing when I bid you."

As the Earl did nothing but laugh at this freedom, the lady was so vexed that she burst into tears, and retired.

His first compliment to her when he saw her again was:

"Pray, madam, are you as proud and as ill-natured now as when I saw you last?"

To which she answered with great good humour:

"No, Mr. Dean; I'll sing for you if you please."

From this time he conceived a great esteem for her. But who that knew him would take offence at his bluntness?

Mrs. Pilkington's husband was a clergyman, and much in favour with the Dean, who often praised his sermons: he was a perpetual friend of merit and learning, and utterly incapable of envy; for in true, genuine wit he could fear no rival.

But he could preach a very pointed and successful sermon himself, as was exemplified by a charity sermon which he once preached in St. Patrick's. He gave out the text—"He that giveth to the poor, lendeth to the Lord."

This he solemnly repeated three times, then looking over the congregation, he exclaimed:

"Now, my friends, if you like the security, down with the dust!"

And there never was such a collection taken up.

Ladies laid their jewellery on the plate, and the men emptied their pockets.

In *The Old Testament Lessons of the New Lectionary* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d. net), Canon Storr issues a series of Sermon Outlines which appeared in the *Church of England Newspaper* during the year 1924. Canon Storr's position as a preacher and a scholar is sufficient guarantee of the character of his treatment of each subject. Those who can make use of outlines will find them valuable as indicating main lines of thought, while for others they will suggest suitable topics from the Sunday portions. Each outline is very brief, but the central theme is clearly indicated. Yet we doubt if it is necessary in connection with sermon outlines to indicate that the defect of the older Evangelicalism was its excessive individualism, and that religion was then a matter of saving one's own soul. The greater fact is that souls were saved through the instrumentality of the older Evangelicalism, and the reality and depth of their religious experience made up for many defects. We wish the same intensity of personal relationship to Christ characterized the whole Church to-day.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

THE *Life and Letters of Sir William Robertson Nicoll*, by T. H. Darlow (Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 10s. 6d. net), is an ideal biography, and its author is to be warmly congratulated on his success in giving us such a satisfying picture of one of the outstanding personalities of our time. The career of this great journalist was in many ways an amazing one. He was a son of the manse, and his father was a book lover whose immense library acquired by much self-denial laid the foundation of his son's devotion to literature. Born in 1851, he passed from Aberdeen University in 1874 to the charge of a church in the small village of Dufftown. He moved in 1877 to Kelso, and through a breakdown in health he was obliged to give up pastoral work and to migrate to the south in 1886. He suffered throughout his life from a weak lung and frequently had to struggle with ill-health. Yet in spite of this serious handicap he was a tremendous worker and, sustained by an indomitable will, he won for himself a unique position in journalism. In face of difficulties which would daunt most men his boundless energy led him to achievements of a rare character. In 1886 his lifelong association with Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton began, with results of an unusually satisfactory nature on both sides. His first journalistic enterprise was *The British Weekly*, which inaugurated a new era in religious journalism. It was well said of him that "he made popular journalism literary and he made religious journalism interesting." *The Bookman*, *The Exp-positor*, *The Woman at Home* and a number of other magazines were also founded and conducted by him. In 1909 Mr. Asquith recommended him for the honour of knighthood, and in 1921 the high distinction of Member of the Order of Companions of Honour was added. He was an omnivorous reader, and the rapidity with which he could get through a book makes the ordinary man envious. The average speed of the majority is said to be about 8,000 or 9,000 words in half an hour; he calculated that he could read 20,000 in that time, and in 1903 he wrote: "I think I average two books a day." At the same time he was keenly interested in men and affairs, and for a good portion of his life was in touch with leaders in religious and political circles. He was a generous helper of others, and especially of young writers of ability who were commencing their literary career. Ian Maclaren and Sir J. M. Barrie were among his discoveries. He had also the great gift of keeping his friendships fresh. One of the most charming letters is the testimony to their long friendship from Barrie which reached him on his death-bed. Although wide in his religious sympathies, his own views were thoroughly orthodox. He declared that "The historical Jesus is the article of a standing or a falling Christianity." Of the importance of theological study he had no doubt. His view was given in these words: "If there is one lesson which my experience has taught me it is the supreme importance for the

Church of theological learning. No Church is wise which does not recognize the necessity of setting its best men apart for study and for teaching, and of trusting and supporting them generously." At a time when many seem to regard "false theories and perverted creeds" as matters of little importance, it may be well to give a passage summarizing his views on several points of a controversial nature.

Mr. Darlow writes: "After all, as Bishop Butler said in his oracular way, religion is nothing if it be not true. Nicoll believed that sacerdotalism is not true, because it contradicts the whole genius and tenor of the New Testament. If Christ and His Apostles had intended to found a hierarchy of priests, the New Testament—in its affirmations and in its omissions—would have been a book altogether unlike the book it is. Nicoll utterly rejected the dogma of 'tactical succession' (as he called it) which makes a bishop's hands the sole covenanted channel of Divine grace, passed on from one generation to another. He found that dogma foreign to the primitive church and disproved by the facts of spiritual experience in every century since. . . . Although he held, as his letters show, anything but a low doctrine of the Christian Sacraments, he firmly held that those Sacraments are 'not exempted at any point from the law of moral action. . . .' He believed, indeed, that men degrade the Gospel to the level of magic when they put any outward forms on the same plane of importance with Christian faith and Christian character."

The chief result of his life-work was to give to the Free Churches a position in journalism such as they had never had before, to give their thinkers and writers a platform from which they exerted a world-wide influence, and to secure to the Free Church press a weight of authority and a massive dignity of scholarship that placed it in the first rank and made all sections of the Christian Church indebted to it and grateful for its work. To use a favourite expression of one of my friends, "he impinged on Western Christendom" with powerful effect.

For some years past the Bishop of London has arranged for the issue of "Special Books for Lenten Reading." He has secured the help of many writers of intellectual power and spiritual insight. Most of the series are useful contributions to our devotional literature, and can be used and enjoyed by Churchpeople of all schools of thought without hesitation. This year the book is called *Personal Religion and the Life of Fellowship* and is written by the Bishop of Manchester (Longmans, Green & Co., 2s. 6d. net). The Bishop of London describes it in his introduction as "a most powerful and convincing book," and adds: "The reader will find himself in the grip of a clear and strong mind which has thought out some of the most perplexing problems in the world, and gives us in well-balanced language his solution of them so far as they are capable of being solved." The subject of the book might perhaps be best indicated by saying that it is a practical explanation of the impli-

cations of Christian brotherhood as applied to the whole of life, and specially with reference to our present economic conditions and our social system. It commences with the Christian doctrine of God. Much needed emphasis is laid on the absolute necessity of a true conception of God. I am glad to see that throughout the Bishop stresses the importance of truth in every aspect. The constant effort at compromise in so many departments of life to-day seems to indicate a degree of weakness in regard to the necessity of maintaining truth, or it may be of doubt as to the possibility of attaining it. Indeed, in some quarters this seems to be taken for granted, with unfortunate results.

Upon a true conception of God depends our true relationship to our fellow-men. It cannot be said that the thought of God as Love has been as extensively applied as an inspiration in the affairs of life as it ought to have been. We seem to have reached a stage in Western civilization in which by the trend of circumstances we are being forced to think out this matter. Dr. Temple sets this thinking out as an appropriate task for Lent. He does not offer any drastic or revolutionary remedies for social ills. In fact he warns us that "the Christian remedy for the ills of society is fundamental and therefore it is scarcely ever possible to apply it as a solution to actual disputes when they arise." But the Christian principles of service, fellowship, regard for the sacredness of personality and the power of sacrifice, point the way to the Christian's duty. The closing chapter on conversion as the primary need makes a powerful appeal for the consecration of the whole of life, which will meet with a ready response from all who are in earnest in seeking to have the mind of Christ, and to deal with the sorrows and troubles of the world from His point of view.

Dr. Vernon Bartlet has brought out a revised edition of his *Early Church History; A Sketch of its First Four Centuries* (Religious Tract Society, 3s. 6d. net). This history was first written about thirty years ago, and the passage of time has brought changes of outlook and additions to our knowledge. Dr. Bartlet has considered it advisable to bring out the present edition with these facts in mind. The result is a book of great interest to students of the early ages of the Church. He emphasizes as one of the chief points in his plan the treatment of each generation apart, as "this gives play to the individuality of an age, and brings out the connection between the various aspects of its life; while it also enables us to see the development from age to age, going on, as it were, before our eyes." As far as possible the writers of each period are allowed to speak for themselves. The outlook and developments of later days are therefore excluded as much as can be, and thus one fruitful source of error in the interpretation of past times is eliminated. In fact the extracts from the early writings and the surroundings of the personalities enable us to realize the foolishness of some dogmatists who desire to use expressions of early writers as proving dogmas formulated much later.

Rhetorical and poetical passages have been pressed into service as formal statements of doctrine with unfortunate results, by writers whose historical acumen would have guided them aright if bias had not influenced their judgment. Here the spiritual side of the development of the Church is prominent. The organization receives due treatment, but its subordinate place is recognized. The rise of errors in regard to sacerdotal and sacramental teaching is indicated. The Apostolic Succession is shown to have had no connection with the idea of a special grace transmitted, but was an obvious means of guaranteeing the truth of teaching which came down in Churches which could trace back the succession of their bishops to Apostolic days. It is interesting to note that one of the earliest indications of teaching as to a change in the sacramental elements was among the gnostic heretics. "A certain Marcus has the notion of change in the elements themselves, when he secures by a trick the transmutation of the contents of the mixed chalice into the colour of blood; and the Valentinian Theodotus, as cited by Clement of Alexandria, says that the consecrated elements in both Baptism and the Eucharist are changed dynamically." Cyprian's novel theories of the Church and the place of the episcopate are carefully examined, and Evangelical Churchmen will agree with the judgment "Never was a theory in reality more subjective in its origin; never one less historical." This just estimate of the unfortunate influence of Cyprian on the thought of the Church is accompanied by a tribute to his personal qualities. The account closes with Augustine, of whose twofold influence on the development of Western Christendom a clear statement is given. In many ways this history stands by itself in the impression it gives of the literature and life of the first four centuries. It is of unusual interest, and represents phases of thought which are too frequently neglected.

The Rossetti family contributed much to the artistic life of England during the nineteenth century. The youngest of its members was Christina, whose religious verses are widely known from the inclusion of some of them in various collections of poetry. S.P.C.K. has issued a new edition of her *Verses* (3s. 6d. net) with a discriminating introduction signed W. K. L. C. It is a book to take up at odd moments, and in special moods. Her appeal is limited, yet there is a charm in her expression of her religious experiences which brings pleasure and gives help to those who have shared the same thoughts and feelings. Like many another to whom the world owes much she learnt in suffering what she taught in song. In the introduction we are told that her religious views were Tractarian and the explanation is added "that is to say Anglo-Catholic." This may be misleading to some who are familiar with the Anglo-Catholicism of to-day, which is widely different in tone and outlook from writers such as Keble. These verses breathe the spirit of the Bible, of which the authoress was a constant and devoted student. There is nothing in these verses such as we

should expect from a modern Anglo-Catholic of "Our Lady" or "Sweet Sacrament Divine" or other exotics from Roman sources which are of so frequent occurrence in the devotional verses of the latest type of Neo-Catholic. If anything there is the touch of old-fashioned Evangelical fervour which gave vitality to the earlier Tractarians, who were in many instances brought up in Evangelical homes and never lost the benefit of their early religious surroundings.

The religious article in *The Times* every Saturday has become a much-appreciated feature of our leading newspaper. It is evidence of the sincere interest taken in the spiritual side of life by numbers we may be sure far beyond the limits of organized Christianity. The articles are written by men of broad outlook and deep insight into the problems of the individual life and the principles underlying our social system and the foundation of our corporate relationships. To have a number of these valuable Saturday articles carefully selected and issued in handy volumes is a boon appreciated by many. A third series has recently appeared, under the editorship of Sir James Marchant, in a volume called *Visions and Strength: Problems of Life and Faith* (H. R. Allenson Ltd., 5s. net). It is pleasant to renew acquaintance with some of these essays again, and to have in permanent form such interesting and stimulating thoughts. The first portion of the volume deals with problems of life, and treats some practical matters of experience with psychological analysis. Self-love, Suspicion, Consistency, and Obedience are examples of the subjects considered. We do not profess to agree with all that is said. There is, for example, the difficulty of reconciling moderation in religion with the whole-hearted devotion which does not permit of compromise and compels controversy in the best sense of that much-defamed word. Yet the writer assures us that moderation "prevents short views, avoids controversy, and recognizes that truth is larger than our measures." The problems of faith may not be of equal interest to all, but they present matters which deserve careful thought from all who value the spiritual interpretation of life.

Christian conduct in relation to belief is one of the subjects to which we return again and again with fresh interest as the changes of thought are reflected in life and character. In a short but very interesting study of the subject, *Religion and Life* (Eliot Stock, 3s. 6d. net), Mr. W. Robinson, M.A., B.Sc., Principal of Overdale College, has dealt with some of the latest phases of thought and their bearing on life. It is a useful account of some of the more recent movements, such as Liberal Protestantism, as well as an estimate of their qualities and their defects. Pharisaism is the enemy of real religion. It divorces religion from life. Conduct, for it, is the observance of a code of ritual. He divides the Christian world to-day into four schools of thought—Orthodox Catholic, Orthodox Protestant, Catholic Modernist, and Liberal Protestant. His own sympathies are with the second of these. He says Chris-

tianity "must in every generation seek its guidance and inspiration in the New Testament, and particularly in the life and teaching of Jesus." He makes a discriminating examination of the Eschatological teaching of recent years, pointing out the defects of Schweitzer and his followers. He also deals with the modern revival of Gnosticism with equal care. His conclusion is that the eternal principle of Christianity is *active love*—not a thing of the emotions, but of the will. "The world needs to see in the Church and in Christians what it saw in Jesus, a complete absence of self-seeking, which absence the New Testament calls Love, and it needs to see this applied in every department of life." It is a book that will repay careful study.

Two smaller publications of interest deserve special notice. Mr. John Murray has published the Prime Minister's Presidential Address to the Classical Association under the title *The Classics and the Plain Man* (6d. net). Mr. Baldwin has been coming forward of late as a man of many hitherto unrecognized gifts. His versatility has shown itself in many ways, and not least in this remarkable address to the Classical Association. He shows his own love for the great authors of antiquity and a discriminating sense of their special contribution not merely to culture but to civilization and social order. As a statesman he naturally applies the teaching of the past to the needs of to-day. For him "the outstanding and peculiar strength of the Roman character lies in the words *pietas* and *gravitas*." He draws a significant lesson from the statement written when the Roman legions were leaving Britain that "the Roman word could no longer be trusted." His concluding story of the bell which he heard in Florence is a fitting close to a memorable address.

The other publication is of quite a different character. The name of Miss Marjorie Bowen is well known as a novelist who has dealt effectively with the life and times of William III. She has collected some of the results of her studies in connection with the writing of these novels into an essay which is published with the title *Luctor and Emergo: The State of England at the Peace of Ryswyck, 1697* (1s. 6d. net). She gives a vivid picture of the characteristics of the Stuart dynasty, and its malignant influence on the fortunes of England. She contrasts with them the honesty, courage and wisdom of William and the benefits which he won for his adopted country. His conflict with France closed with the Peace of Ryswyck, which marked the beginning of a new epoch in our national life. Of this she says in her concluding words: "Indeed, broadly speaking, the epoch of the Peace of Ryswyck lies like a sharp line between the ancient chaos of religious disputes, tyrannies, and social disorders, and the modern epoch of progress, order, industrialism, commerce and democracy." The booklet is of great interest and deserves the careful attention of students of history.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE MEDIÆVAL PEASANT.

THE MEDIÆVAL VILLAGE. By G. G. Coulton, M.A., D.Litt. *Cambridge University Press.* 25s. net.

It is possible that the first impression which the sight of Dr. Coulton's latest book will make on many readers will be disappointment that it is not the long-anticipated second volume of his *Five Centuries of Religion*; but they will be reassured on learning that in point of fact that is what it really is, since it has grown out of a plan of three or four chapters designed to be introductory to that volume.

The extent and variety of Dr. Coulton's knowledge of the Middle Ages is an ever-growing marvel. He seems to be equally at home in Germany, France, Spain, Italy or England, and with the social, ecclesiastical, economic or political aspects of his subject. And this vast mass of information is accompanied with a charm of style and clearness of statement not very often found in the writings of specialists in this particular branch of historical study. The book is very fully "documented," which is a great advantage, as anyone who desires to verify the quotations and has access to libraries can do so; and it has a good index.

The contents of the book would have been better described if the title of it had been "The Mediæval Peasant" rather than "The Mediæval Village," for it is the peasant who is described to us: his lot, his grievances and his general relation to his surroundings. It is not the most encouraging reading for people who cherish the view that the Middle Ages were a period of peace, prosperity and contentment, and that the Reformation produced a vast crop of social and economic evils which we have been striving to remedy ever since. Macaulay wrote in the well-known third chapter of his *History*, "The more carefully we examine the history of the past, the more reason shall we find to dissent from those who imagine that our age has been fruitful of new social evils. The truth is that the evils are, with scarcely an exception, old. That which is new is the intelligence which discerns and the humanity which remedies them." And Dr. Coulton's book might be a commentary on this text. It is a collection of facts on a large scale, and these are not confined to a particular century or a given country, but range over the whole period of five hundred years from the time of the Norman Conquest to the Reformation, and over the greater part of Central Europe.

It must come with somewhat of a shock to the ordinary reader when he begins to realize with any vividness what life for the peasant, and for many above his rank, but principally for him, was really like even in the later Middle Ages, with which mainly this book deals. To take only the degrading condition of serfdom, differing often but little from actual slavery, though the serf did

have rights even if they were often disregarded, while the slave has none, Dr. Coulton tells us :

“ This multitude of men and women, at strict law, had scarcely any rights against the man who was their *dominus* in both mediæval senses of that word ; their owner and their ruler—their landlord and their lord-and-master. Such rights as the serf did gradually obtain were mainly evolved by custom. In England, the King’s law did indeed protect him from actual murder or maiming, as modern law protects a horse or an ox, but on utilitarian rather than on moral grounds. . . . In strict law the serf was incapable of possessing property ; his earnings were his master’s ; only on sufferance could he collect and save for himself. He was bound by law to the soil. He and his ‘ brood ’—his *sequela*, as the law styled them, in contradistinction to the freeman’s *liberi*—might be bought or sold or given with the land that they tilled.”

Dr. Coulton works this out in detail and shows us by the clearest and strongest documentary evidence what it meant in practice. When we remember, too, the miseries which the incessant public and private wars of the Middle Ages ; the universal ignorance of the laws of sanitation which govern life and health ; the absence of innumerable comforts which are now the common possession of all, brought to the peasant, the “ Merrie England ” of imaginative and of controversial writers is not so likely to appeal to us. We may wonder what the Church was doing through these centuries for the peasant and poorer classes, and the answer must be that it was not much. The peasant was on the whole slightly better off on church and monastic lands. Dr. Coulton thinks perhaps five per cent. better off than on the lands of secular owners. We are shown in these pages some of the causes which led to the progressive amelioration of the peasant’s lot, but we are also shown that the economic and other evils under which he suffered in later times were no product of the Reformation : they existed long before. Capitalism, if it be an evil, as some writers say, can be found in full flower in the Middle Ages. For a knowledge of the facts of mediæval social history, no better or more interesting introduction than Dr. Coulton’s *Mediæval Village* could well be chosen.

THE EARLY FATHERS AND SCRIPTURE INTERPRETATION.

ANTE-NICENE EXEGESIS OF THE GOSPELS. Vol. I. By Harold Smith, D.D. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

This is the first volume of a work that must have occupied its author many years. And it is worth doing well, for we have so many partial surveys of patristic teaching that it is very hard to discover what was the opinion of the men who followed the Apostles and interpreted Scripture for the early Church. Dr. Smith has gone through all the Ante-Nicene Fathers, he has collated their Gospel exegesis, and has in an admirably written Introduction given us a guide to the value of their work. They vary in ability

and knowledge, they had their prejudices like our contemporaries have theirs, and we need something that will enable us to judge the weight to be placed on what they have written. We are too ready to classify ancient authorities as of equal weight, and not to assign to them the worth which their contemporaries gave. In some respects we are better judges of the meaning of the Gospel Text than the Ante-Nicene Fathers, but we inherit their interpretations which have done much to mould the thought of the Church. Having read the Introduction and the Translation, we congratulate Dr. Smith on the great range of his studies, on the accuracy of his renderings of passages and the incisive manner in which he discusses their meaning. Evangelical scholarship has reason to be proud of this book, which will be used and treasured by all who know its real worth. Few recent works on the New Testament show such deep knowledge of the patristic testimony to the elucidation of texts, and if it had been done by a member of another School it would have been hailed as a proof of the scholarship of the party. We are content to welcome it as an invaluable contribution to New Testament Studies.

We may refer to two sets of passages which are grouped and discussed by Dr. Smith. He shows that the Ante-Nicene Fathers were by no means of one mind on the interpretation of the Petrine Texts. The four main authorities—Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Eusebius—all differ from one another, and unanimous consent is lacking. We recall the statement of Launoy who, working in a wider field, shows that eighty-five passages from the Fathers are hopelessly inconsistent and favour four different interpretations! On the other hand, Dr. Smith informs us that on the vexed question of Divorce "The Fathers, like people generally till quite recently, are inclined to take the First Gospel as the standard; not to regard Mark as the primary source of Matthew. Hence they do not feel the present difficulty of accounting for Matthew's additions to Mark. None of them doubt the genuineness of 'except for fornication'; nor do they take it distinctively of pre-nuptial sin." May we add that the view now so widely held among Roman and Anglo-Catholics grew up long before any modern theory of dependence was current, and is in opposition to the view of the Greek Church. We cordially recommend this book to all who wish to know the mind of the earliest Fathers on Gospel Text interpretation.

THE THEOLOGY OF EXPERIENCE.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE GODHEAD. By A. E. Garvie, D.D. *Hodder & Stoughton.* 16s.

We are often tempted to wonder how it is that in the midst of all their tutorial and administrative work, the Principals of the leading non-conformist Theological Colleges find time to produce books which are real additions to the learning of the age. Though the Church of England Colleges are by no means silent sisters, too many of them fail to prove to the reading public that their chiefs

are helping the wider public outside the class-rooms. We have, too, the habit of making Bishops of many who are able to contribute to sound learning, and under modern conditions few Bishops can be writers. Fortunately, we have some who still maintain our prestige for scholarship.

Dr. Garvie in "The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead" packs into his pages the thoughts and conclusions of a life of active work and study on practically most of the great questions that are under discussion by theologians. He frequently does not give the grounds for his assertions, but we have no doubt as to the reasonableness of his demand when he says that he has studied the groundwork for many years, as we perceive that the conclusions he reaches are the fruit of deep reflection. If the reader wishes to know what Dr. Garvie thinks on the Synoptic problem and on the miraculous element in the Gospel, he will find our author illuminating and stimulating. He accepts the Gospel narratives as substantially true, but here and there the spirit of the atmosphere which all thinking men must breathe interferes with his full acceptance of details. And we really cannot understand the grounds on which he bases the conclusion that the raising of Lazarus is unhistorical, whereas the other instances of raising from the dead are historical. He has no doubt whatever of the fact of the Resurrection; and no one who reads carefully, with knowledge of the literature which is ever before Dr. Garvie's mind, can call him a Modernist in the accurate sense of that much misused word. He proves himself to be in the main stream of orthodox writers, and at times we believe that his mind is influenced by a reverent agnosticism which prevents him asserting what he naturally would like to say.

Particular interest will be taken in his treatment of the Reunion question, and few Evangelicals can quarrel with his attitude, which is at once sympathetic and thoroughly Christian. He strongly advocates United Communion, and thinks that unless we manifest our will to Unity at the Lord's Table we shall not make much advance. We hope that all who wish to know what one of the ablest of our Nonconformist brethren thinks on the fundamental problems of theology will make it a duty to read a book that will stimulate their thinking and increase their sympathy with men who hold truth firmly and preach it with fulness of knowledge.

A LIFE OF CHRIST.

OUR LORD'S EARTHLY LIFE. By Professor David Smith, D.D.
Hodder & Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

We are living in an age when the public demands and writers provide Lives of Christ. Probably the intense desire of Christians to see the broad outlines of the Gospels filled in by those who have studied the age and environment in which the Master lived accounts for the popularity of these works, which are characteristic of the

past half century. And when we have read them, informing and helpful as they are, we return to the brief pamphlets that are more soul-satisfying than the literary successes of our contemporaries. We cannot overlook the fact that the historical and literary criticism of the Gospels has changed the angle of approach to the study of the documents, and we are thankful to say that when we laid down the brilliant and scholarly volume we found our author convinced of the authenticity and accuracy of the records. It may seem unscholarly to say that we believe the next generation of scholars will revolt against the mechanical analysis of the Synoptic Gospels; for apart from all questions of inspiration, it is very hard to imagine that the Evangelists were so bound to the text of the Sources, and used them so mechanically as is often suggested. At any rate, to us it is more probable that the inspired writers impressed their personality on their work to a much greater extent than is to-day admitted.

"Our Lord's Earthly Life" reads as if it flowed naturally from the pen of a man who has long meditated upon all its phases and lives to pass on his knowledge to others. The reader is not troubled by references except to Scripture passages. Footnotes are few, and the narrative is uninterrupted. But those acquainted with current New Testament literature will be the first to acknowledge that Dr. Smith could not have written the book unless he had read widely, weighed carefully the facts, and given his balanced judgment after full consideration of all relevant facts and evidence. He does not believe in a reduced Christianity. He accepts the miraculous element in the Gospel narratives as true, and fully believes the Divinity of our blessed Lord. We do not always agree with his exposition. He identifies Mary Magdalene with Mary of Bethany; and although he has excellent patristic authority for so doing, it has always seemed to us unlikely that the Pharisees would have been so friendly with her after the death of Lazarus had she been a notorious, if repentant, sinner. We feel the force of Dr. Smith's argument that "it was unlikely she should drop out of the story of our Lord's Cross and Resurrection, and it is reasonable to hold that she was the last to leave Him at the Cross and the first to greet Him on the Resurrection morning." But we remain unconvinced. We hope that this valuable book will have a wide circulation, for the more it is read the more it will be treasured.

ANGLO-CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY.

SOME POSTULATES OF A CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY. By H. Maurice Relton, D.D. *S.P.C.K.* 7s. 6d.

THE APPROACH TO CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. E. G. Selwyn. *Longmans.* 10s. 6d.

These two books are written by leaders of the Anglo-Catholic movement, and both have much to teach us. Dr. Relton confines himself as a rule to an attempt to state the Philosophy of Christianity without any references to those differences that divide

Churchmen, whereas Mr. Selwyn is the apologist for Anglo-Catholicism of, what he would doubtless call, a moderate type. He presents forcibly the main ideas that lie behind even the simplest experience of faith, and is to be congratulated on the stress he places upon "Personal trust in God as revealed in Christ, and as known in religious experience, (which) is the royal road through faith to an unshakable conviction of the triumph of good over evil, and the assurance that to them that love Him all things are working for good." He does not hold that we can fully rationalize our fundamental doctrines, and he believes rightly that all things shade off into mystery. But we are not happy in a number of his references to the ruling ideas of Bergson and Unamuno. Life is not irrational, and it is quite possible by dwelling too much on the limitations of reason to dethrone reason. In fact we at times feel that to use reason to show the weaknesses of reason may produce a worse scepticism than we otherwise would reach. There is a real and genuine place from which reason cannot be dethroned. It is the God-given faculty of testing statements and verifying hypotheses, and we may easily be led in abandoning reason, into accepting superstition. Dr. Relton strives to guard against this, but we have more than once had an unhappy impression that in his eagerness to make room for faith he gives too little room to the rational element in our outlook, and we may before we know it so distrust our intellectual power that we become the subjects of what is irrational. On the whole, the volume is well and clearly written, and deserves careful reading. Faith advances from reason to conclusions that are not irrational but supra-rational, and here Dr. Relton is on strong grounds.

Mr. Selwyn does not strike us as so vigorous a thinker as Dr. Relton. He has in view all the time the conclusions of Anglo-Catholicism, and is at pains to establish them. He discusses in his final chapter Anglican Theology, and deals with the Real Presence, Fasting Communion, Reservation, and the Lambeth Appeal for Christian Unity. He tells us that the consecrated elements are "really and properly what He appointed—His Body and Blood. They make Jesus, that is to say, accessible to us, and appropriable by us, in His sacrificed and glorified manhood, and that in a manner even more real than was possible before His Ascension." Everything depends on the meaning given to these words. Is the Presence in the Elements or in the heart of the recipient? Is the accessibility of Jesus physical or spiritual—confined to the Elements, or are they sacramentally the means by which faith appropriates our Lord? Needless to say that we hold the latter view, whereas Mr. Selwyn holds that "Belief in the Real Presence is wholly compatible with the view that the Elements provide a psychological focus for devotion; but they do so precisely because they are in fact that Reality in which alone the soul is satisfied—the Bread of Life and the Wine of Salvation." He advocates non-communicating attendance, although he admits that it was a novelty in the time of Chrysostom, but it has now become so established that

the capacity for understanding it should become a part of a liberal education. We, on the other hand, hold that to understand it is to reject it, for it is foreign to the whole nature of the Sacrament. Fasting Communion is for him a matter for decision by Anglican authority, which should recognize "the weight attaching to oecumenical custom and of a dispensation from its more rigorous application." Fasting Communion or some definite act of self-denial is required as "a token of veneration for the great mystery of the Heavenly Food and of due regard for the mind of the Church universal." But what of the mind of the Church before Chrysostom? He writes guardedly on the subject of devotions, and shows sympathy with the demand, which however should be regulated by the *jus liturgicum* of the Bishops. Safeguards are his remedy; and here let us say we believe from experience that no safeguards will prevent abuse of a practice which is opposed to the whole conception of the Sacrament as taught in the New Testament. He wishes to see in every Cathedral two chapels—one of the Blessed Sacrament, and one for the prayers of the Puritans. We have said sufficient to show the way in which Mr. Selwyn faces our present-day problems in his interesting book, which contains much of value on fundamental doctrines of our faith.

ORDERS AND JURISDICTION.

ESSAYS AND LETTERS ON ORDERS AND JURISDICTION. By the Rev. F. W. Puller. *Longmans*. 12s. 6d.

It has been the tendency during recent years to exalt Orders and Jurisdiction into a matter of fundamental doctrine. We remember when it was mentioned to a Pope that his Supremacy and Infallibility were under discussion as ecclesiastical questions, his Holiness replied, "But they are doctrine." And in many Church of England circles Apostolic Succession and valid Jurisdiction have been considered almost fundamental doctrine on which the life of the Church depends. Mr. Puller is a foremost champion of this school of thought, and he has done as much as any of his contemporaries to exalt organization into doctrine. In these collected documents we have a formal setting forth of his views, and no one can doubt their definiteness or the strength of conviction with which they are held. On some points we are at one with him, and cordially endorse his conclusion that assistant Bishops at the consecration of a Bishop are co-consecrators. We go further, and claim that the Presbyters who lay on their hands with the Bishop are co-ordainers of the new Presbyter. The act is the act of the Church through the officials of the Church, who ensure the preservation of historic order. And the whole spirit of the Gospel forbids us concluding that in any one man, through his personal succession from the Apostles—if such a succession can be proved—there resides a peculiar power of transmitting the "grace of orders" without which no ministry of the Word or Sacrament can be valid.

The First Essay is the most important, for it is a reasoned criti-

cism of Dr. Headlam's views as set forth in his Prayer Book Dictionary article. As Dr. Headlam in his well-known Bampton Lectures had this paper before him, and has answered practically all its chief points, and has ignored nothing vital, we are content to refer readers to the Lectures. But we have to remark that it will be a very useful exercise in the ascertaining how far a man's prepossessions may influence his judgment, for readers to verify in their context the references made by Mr. Puller. He will find that they do not always support his arguments. Our author holds "while I repudiate with horror the idea that the Holy Spirit is given through Bishops only, I most entirely believe that, according to the ordinary laws of God's Kingdom, the grace of Orders is given by Bishops only, namely, when they ordain, and that the Pentecostal gift of the personal indwelling of the Paraclete is given by Bishops, and, where the Church allows it, by Presbyters when they confirm." He fails, in our opinion, to establish these exclusive claims, and until he has done this we may rest content with the conclusions of Dr. Headlam.

On the positive side of the attack on the *Apostolicæ Curæ* Bull, Mr. Puller says much with which we agree, although we are opposed to his contention that "The Church of England determined at that time (the sixteenth century) to *continue*" the primitive and medieval priesthood, and she has continued it to this day. That priesthood has always, from the day of Pentecost onwards, offered the Eucharistic sacrifice to God; and, as Dean Field truly says, "we also (of the English Church) offer Him (i.e. our Lord) daily on the altar." Let us quote the full passage from Field: "Christ offereth Himself, and His body once crucified, daily in heaven, and so intercedeth for us; not as giving it the nature of a gift or present, for He gave Himself to God once, to be holy unto Him for ever; nor in the nature of a sacrifice, for He dieth once for sin, and rose again never to die any more: but in that He setteth it before the eyes of God His Father, representing it unto Him, and so offering it to His view, to obtain mercy and grace for us. And in this sort we offer Him daily on the altar, in that commemorating His death and lively representing His bitter passions endured in His body upon the Cross, we offer Him that was once crucified and sacrificed for us on the Cross, and in His sufferings to the view and gracious consideration of the Almighty." Whatever view we may take of the doctrine of the continuous offering of Christ in Heaven—and we believe that it was unknown in the Reformed English Church before the time of Field—it is not the offering of the Mass; for as Cosin said, "no one is so blind as not to see the difference between a 'proper offering' which was once performed by His death upon the Cross, and between an 'improper offering' which is now made either in heaven, by that His appearance on our behalf, or here on earth, by prayers and representation, or obtestation, or commemoration, there being only the same common name for these, but a very wide difference in the things themselves." Here we leave the matter.

SOCIAL CHRISTIANITY.

CHRISTIANITY IN POLITICS. By Rev. H. W. Fox, D.S.O., with Preface by Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard. *John Murray*. 5s. net.

Mr. Fox writes with the fervour of conviction and the enthusiasm of hope. He is filled, as he well may be, with a "divine discontent" at the present situation, and declares, with truth, that the present tendency to separate public affairs into two water-tight compartments, secular and sacred, is responsible for most of our ills at home and abroad. There is no real Christian Collectivism, no voice or influence of a United Church, no social Christianity except by the hazard of individuals. He traces the present separation between Church and State in Europe to the leanings towards Political Autocracy (*e.g.* Russia) or Self-Centredness in the Church which have helped to obscure to itself and others its true mission. The Church would have been better trusted if her aim had been the welfare of the State rather than her own. Mr. Fox would endorse Gambetta's saying, "Le Clericalisme, voilà l'ennemi." The isolation resulting from the Separation of Church and State had failed, and the Mission of Christianity came to be regarded as confined to individual interests and concerns. But Christ, as he shows, never set such a pattern for His Church. To Him life was an undivided whole, and, though He discouraged force, yet He taught that His Church must live dangerously, and have no thought for herself. In recent years, since the days of the Christian Socialists, the Church has begun again to realize her social mission, and the failure of Christianity, which the Great War revealed, has quickened a sense of social responsibility. So there is room for hope, and the time is ripe for a move forward. Examples show that common advance is possible.

But how can this be made? Mr. Fox would take as his point of new departure the work already accomplished by C.O.P.E.C. A most careful study has been made of great outstanding problems, social, industrial, and international; and reports have been issued upon them designed for the education of a Christian public opinion. What is needed now is that this should be followed up by some unified, corporate opinion from the Church as a whole, carrying the authority of organized Christianity to Statesmen and Parliaments. A United Council of the Church (Mr. Fox uses the word in the widest sense), should be formed on the foundations laid by Copec, to which elected representatives of the various Churches should be sent by each section of the Church in proportion to their numbers. The Temperance Council of the Churches formed in 1915, or the Federal Council of Churches in the United States are given as examples. Possibly a Referendum might be resorted to upon special questions. The Council would seek to unify and educate Christian opinion, and then apply it in legislation. Thus the influence of Christian opinion as such would be secured. This applies to international as well as home questions. At present, he truly says, the League of Nations is without a soul. But the best

elements in it would probably welcome a strong, corporate influence of the whole Christian Church behind its activities.

We think Mr. Fox is a little hard upon history, as reformers usually are. He seems to lose sight of the many and not ineffective efforts made by the Church of the Middle Ages to promote international peace and mitigate the horrors of war, from the days of Grotius onwards. We may doubt if even a united Church could have prevented the late war. But his aim is sound and his style fascinating, and his book may well stimulate earnest thought. And his good record in War and Peace alike give him, as Mr. Sheppard says in his Preface, a good title to speak.

T. A. G.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

THE FOURTH EVANGELIST, DRAMATIST OR HISTORIAN? By R. H. Strachan, M.A., D.D. London: *Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd.* 8s. 6d.

The sub-title of Dr. Strachan's latest study on the Fourth Evangelist—Dramatist or Historian? aroused within us certain misgivings which were very far from being dispelled by the perusal of his brilliant and attractively written book. "Why should we be faced with such an alternative?" it may be asked. Thucydides was a dramatic writer, and yet he could write objective history. Doubtless the Fourth Gospel is dramatic. Dr. Strachan's analysis of its contents (pp. 94-100), and his most penetrating chapter on the Death of Christ, bring out this aspect of the Gospel story. It is when Dr. Strachan dwells on its historical character that we feel he is less convincing. He seems to be drawn in two opposite directions. There is the old Dr. Strachan, who in his article on the Gospel of John in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, upheld its apostolic character, and there is the new Dr. Strachan, who is hypersensitive to what critics of the negative school have written on the subject. Vigorous exception is taken to those scholars who endeavour to find a substratum of bare historical fact in the Gospel, on the ground that Biblical criticism runs the risk in their hands of degenerating into a branch of antiquarian research. This seems hardly a fair description of their labours, for they would be the first to avow their sympathy with the Evangelist's protest against any vital religion being founded on history alone, apart from experience (cf. p. 35). But Dr. Strachan is convinced of the clear intention of the Evangelist to prove the truth that our Lord was indeed the Word of God incarnate in human life, as founded on historic fact. He also allows that there is a clearly defined, historical element in the discourses of Jesus in this Gospel (p. 178), and that the Evangelist has taken no unwarrantable liberties with the Consciousness of our Lord (p. 174). Sometimes he minimises the historical character of the scenes and events in the Gospel, at other times his arguments tend in the opposite direction. As we read through the book, we found our-

selves making many question marks in the margin, notably on the views expressed about the authorship, the Virgin Birth, on St. John xx. 2-10 and the Ascension. Dr. Strachan is most happy in his quotations, and his account of the *milieu* in which the Gospel was written is the best we have read in English. Our general impression, however, of Dr. Strachan's standpoint is that he will revise it as time goes on. Whether in a conservative or a liberal direction, we do not venture to pronounce an opinion.

W. H. R.

DR. GREENUP'S NEW BOOK.

SUKKAH—MISHNA AND TOSEPHTA. By A. W. Greenup. *S.P.C.K.* 1925. 5s.

This volume consists of a translation, with introduction, notes and indexes of the Rabbinical treatise published in the original Hebrew in 1922 by the same writer. Dr. Greenup has always been known as one of the very few Christians who are specialists in this class of study, and the book before us is a very fine piece of Rabbinical scholarship.

The *Mishna*, the reviewer should perhaps explain, consists of a number of "tractates" upon the practical observance of the Jewish Law. It assumed its present form by about 200 A.D. Needless to say, it is concerned with an innumerable quantity of more or less detailed points. The purpose of the *Tosephta* is similar, but its origin (if there is one origin for the whole *Tosephta*) is obscure. Unlike the *Mishna*, it is not the authorized handbook of the Jewish Church. Of the various tractates the one entitled *Sukkah* deals with the Feast of Tabernacles.

Dr. Greenup's Introduction contains useful material such as dates of rabbis and an analysis of the various laws concerning the Feast of Tabernacles within the O.T. itself. (Incidentally it is interesting to notice Num. xxix. 12-38 spoken of without any qualification as evidence for "the late O.T. period.") The succeeding fifteen pages of the Introduction amount to what is in itself a thesis upon the history and method of the observance of the Feast, according to the evidence of (i) Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, (ii) Philo and Josephus, (iii) the *Mishna*, (iv) the N.T., (v) the period since the N.T. This will be found invaluable, especially as a characteristic of all Dr. Greenup's work is its wealth of reference to other authors and to the original sources.

The Notes upon the *Mishna* will be most useful, not least to the advanced student. If in a second edition the author is able to put us under a further obligation by performing the rather troublesome task of analysing the *Tosephta* sections in such a way as to correspond to the subject matter of the *Mishna*, it would be highly valued equally by the beginner and more advanced. This was done by Dr. Lukyn Williams in his edition of *Berachoth* in the same series.

As suggested above, "Tabernacles" figures in the N.T. One

of the most wonderful sayings of our Lord (St. John vii. 37, 38) had its occasion on "the last, the great, day of the feast." It is interesting to observe that Dr. Greenup holds to the (probably more usual) view that this was the 7th (not 8th) day—i.e. when the water libation *was* being poured out. He rather suggests, moreover, that the Temple lights were lit each night except the 8th; so that the saying in St. John viii. 12 would also be more apposite on the same 7th day. Some may think that the author dismisses rather summarily J. Lightfoot's (certainly sufficiently difficult) suggestion that "palm branches" in St. John xii. 13 indicate a connection with Tabernacles. After all, the very word Hosanna, in the same verse, itself occurs in Targum as a technical term for the palm wands of the Sukkah festival.

After thanking Dr. Greenup for bringing out of his rich treasures so abundantly, in conclusion the S.P.C.K. are to be congratulated upon producing this really invaluable piece of work with so much Hebrew at the wonderfully low price of five shillings.

R. S. C.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

THOSE EARLIEST DAYS. By Tychicus. *John Murray.* 7s. 6d. net.

The writer of this book, which is on distinctly original lines, endeavours to paint a picture which will enable his readers to see the Christianity of "Those Earliest Days" without the prepossessions of the twentieth century. And in doing so he proves himself to be an artist of considerable gifts. Himself accepting modern critical conclusions and holding a definitely Anglican view, he, nevertheless, contrives to keep these things well in the background as he gives his translation of the first half of The Acts with striking comments and many shrewd asides. The exclusively Jewish setting of the story is made very clear. The principal characters are, of course, Jews. They are all members of the Church. In order to make the distinction between the various schools of thought clearer, the Pharisees are designated "The Low Jew" Party (Jewish Puritans). The Sadducees are the "Broad Jew" Party. The new Party in process of growth with its new doctrine about the Messiah and Resurrection is the "High Jew" Party, otherwise known as the Nazoreans. The Samaritans are the Non-conformists. Saul of Tarsus was born a Pharisee, and he lived and died a Pharisee. "In order that we of the twentieth century may get an accurate balance of thought, let us have recourse to

Our Averagethought Table.

Pharisee = Hypocrite.
 Sadducee = Semi-Infidel.
 Samaritan = Kind-hearted.
 Gentile = Gent.

Saul's Averagethought Table.

Pharisee = Righteous.
 Sadducee = Priestly.
 Samaritan = ' Pre-Moslem.'
 Gentile = ' Nigger.' "

This quotation illustrates the method followed in this exposition of primitive Christianity. It is a book from which we should have liked to quote many passages.

Luke's history is written not as a divinely inspired guide for future ages, but as an explanation of current developments, and as an answer to the earnest questions of his friend Theophilus.

Luke, Peter, Paul and the rest were not "Saints" then. No one is a "saint" to the people of his own generation. Our Lord Himself was not in "those earliest days" Jesus Christ with all that that designation connotes, but simply Joshua the Nazorean.

The whole story is worked out on these lines in stimulating fashion. Reverence goes hand in hand with raciness. Scholarship controls imagination.

"GOODNESS."

TRIUMPHANT GOODNESS. By Rev. John S. Hastie, M.A., B.D.
H. R. Allenson, Ltd. 5s. net.

A passion for Goodness sweeps through the nine chapters of this earnest commendation of whatsoever things are honest, lovely and of good report.

The position taken up is that there is an inherent power in Goodness which has triumphed and will continue to triumph against all that is evil in the world.

"Goodness is playing a more and more commanding part in the earth."

This conviction brings with it what may seem a rather easy optimism.

"Gaiety" is a keynote of the author's philosophy. "To all who have seen, even dimly, that the one thing of moment in the world is goodness, our argument is enough to bring back into their lives the gaiety and expectancy of a holiday morning."

Three great enemies which Goodness has or will overcome are Violence, Avarice, and (how odd it seems) Reason.

Much that is admirable is mingled with much that is disputable in this part of the argument.

The chapter on "Goodness and the Bible" is one of the best. The Bible is declared to be impregnable because it is the "Text-book of Goodness." The survival of the Church is due to the fact that it has always been a "Guild of Goodness."

The Church is a necessity, but the churches are lashed; just as the Bible is admired, though its defenders and critics are lashed.

On the whole the vindication of moral purpose in a universe

which is the handiwork of God is sound. It contains, to say the least, some truth.

But there is something lacking.

It may be that the great dynamic of the Christian faith is assumed. But we are left unsatisfied with any encouragement to Goodness which leaves out of account the supreme and overwhelming motive of the New Testament, viz. the grateful response of redeemed souls to the Divine love manifested at Calvary.

To say of our Lord that "He could not think of men needing any other inducement to the good life but just 'the fun of the thing'" is scarcely adequate.

H. D.

TALKS WITH YOUNG PEOPLE.

THE DATE BOY OF BAGHDAD. By J. Cocker. *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.*
5s. net.

Mr. Cocker has written a book which should be an inestimable boon to Sunday School Teachers and leaders of Bible Classes, who are always in need of a series of thoughtful, interesting and arresting talks with young people. The book contains some thirty-five addresses, each of excellent quality and containing apt anecdotes and delightful illustrations. "The Date Boy of Baghdad" leads his readers to look for really happy hours and they will not be disappointed. The illustrations from New Zealand are especially interesting, as we want our young people to feel more and more that our brothers "down under" though separated by some many thousands of miles, are yet one with us in the service of Christ and King. We all know that our brothers who went out from England during the Great War were heroes, but it is well to have the fact emphasized that those who came from Australia and New Zealand were no less heroes. The story of the unknown New Zealander who gave his life to save his brothers is one which will never be forgotten.

R. M. M.

THE JEWISH PEOPLE.

THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL: ITS SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE. A series of connected expositions by David Baron. *Morgan & Scott, Ltd.* 6s. net.

As we sing the Psalms on Sunday we are often inclined to consider those that relate history as being rather long and uninteresting when compared with the others. But in the light that is thrown on Psalms cv. and cvi. by "The History of Israel" they are revealed as possessing much more than history in verse, and when they are coupled with Moses' song as recorded in Deut. xxxii and Isaiah li, they have some very deep lessons to teach. The way in which Mr. Baron has combined exposition and instruction is very masterful.

The Chapters—and parts of Chapters—dealing with the Jewish people in modern times will probably claim far wider attention than

some of the other parts of the book as, at the present time, there is a lamentable ignorance prevailing as to what God's chosen people have suffered at the hands of Russia and Turkey. Yet "God's word still holds true." "I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee will I curse." Time will, no doubt, prove once more the truth of the verse.

While the book does not make what may be termed popular reading, it is of exceptional interest to the student of the Word of God.

R. M. M.

QUESTIONS OF TO-DAY.

SOME SCRIPTURAL PROBLEMS. By the Rev. W. C. Procter, F.Ph. *Robert Scott*, 1925. 1s. 6d. net.

Not only young people but older folk of both sexes are asking questions to-day and refuse to be put off with just anything by way of an answer. Is God a God of love? Why do men have to suffer? and so on. Clergy and Christian laymen often find themselves in deep water when trying to give satisfying answers, and the little book, "Some Scriptural Problems" will afford very real help to those who find themselves thus placed. Of course much old and familiar ground is again covered, but there is a good deal of really helpful matter in the chapters, and Mr. Procter shows himself a deep student of the Bible and ever ready to back up his arguments from the Book of books.

Mr. Procter would possibly have done better to have left out his reference to the Reformation and Henry VIII's matrimonial relations in the Chapter which deals with the Providence of God, and one wonders whether the Holy Land can yet be considered as a national home for the Jewish race, though it may quite well become so in the future.

R. M. M.

DEVOTIONAL READINGS.

OUR GREAT EXAMPLE. Arranged for reading on every day of the year. By Evelyn Villiers. London: S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. net.

We gladly recommend this helpful little volume of devotional readings. There is a carefully-planned Table of Contents, prefaced by helpful suggestions, showing how the book can be used. For each day in the Christian Year there is a short reading from Holy Scripture, and the paragraphs that follow stimulate thought on the outstanding lesson or lessons of these selected portions. They are not mere pious platitudes, but are eminently practical, and they encourage Bible study, an exercise which is too often sadly neglected to-day. Those who take the trouble to use the book in the way suggested will find its original, distinctive characteristics make it quite admirable. A charming present for a young Christian.

S. R. C.

OUR FAITH.

A PRACTICAL FAITH. By the Rev. Harold Anson. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 3s. 6d. net.

The popular Vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, the Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard, contributes a characteristically sane and vigorous preface to this attempt to set out the teaching of Jesus in such a form that the plain man can understand it. Mr. Anson has been prominently before the Christian public now for some years in connection with the Spiritual Healing movement. This treatise covers a great deal of ground and touches upon many of the perplexities that are troubling the minds of thoughtful people in all directions. The subjects of Immortality, prayer, salvation, etc., are among the number of subjects discussed in the light of modern thought. What is religion? What is God like? and the Necessity for a Church, are among the best things in a book that is "alive" and well calculated to help us to understand our religion. We should like to put it into the hands of all our young men, and especially into those whose faith is in a state of flux.

S. R. C.

SHORTER NOTICES.

As we read this book (*Echoes and Memories*, Hodder & Stoughton, 7s. 6d.) we wonder whether the Salvation Army has become so respectable that it is in danger of losing its hold on "the submerged tenth." Or is it that the tenth is no longer submerged, and the Army has devoted itself more to social betterment than to personal salvation? We have long passed beyond the day when a Dean of St. Paul's opposed an Army Service in his Cathedral owing to the dirt and noise caused by the character of the boots worn. We are sure that Dean Inge would be delighted to see even a shoeless crowd fill the building, but he would find it hard to discover this crowd. Mr. Harry Cooper, who is responsible for helping General Bramwell Booth in presenting these memories of a good and true man to the public, deserves warm congratulations, and Churchmen will find some of the shrewdest and most "faithful" analyses of prominent Anglicans that have been printed, within the covers of the book. We do not quote them, but commend them to our readers, who will be compelled by the sheer human interest of the volume to read it from cover to cover. Where is the Army to-day? This question will be asked by many. General Bramwell holds General William's convictions; but does the Army do as definitely a religious work with as wide an appeal as in the past, or has it largely become a great and noble organization for setting human wreckage on its feet?

The Bible as Missionary Handbook, by Henry A. Lapham (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, 4s. 6d.), "contains a series of lectures which Henry A. Lapham used to give at Kingsmead Mis-

sionary Training College." They are published from the manuscript which he used until his death, some four years ago. As a Baptist Missionary in Ceylon for 21 years he had first-hand experience of the needs of the Mission field, and as Warden of the Hostel at Kingsmead he had the opportunity of contributing to the education of fresh generations of missionaries. The lectures deal principally with the Old Testament and are of a practical character. The value of the Bible as a Missionary text-book is emphasized. Its History is used to illustrate the growth of Missionary ideas. The Psalms are treated as Missionary hymns with a modern application on the use of such hymns. The treatment of Missionary work among Animists, Polytheists, Humanists and Legalists is on modern lines. It contains much practical advice on general lines of approach. The brief closing chapter is on the Missionary Method of Christ and the Apostles. The book will be found a useful study of an important aspect of Missionary work, even by those who cannot accept fully the author's outlook.

A tenth edition of Lieut.-Col. W. H. Turton's book *The Truth of Christianity* has been issued (Wells, Gardner, Darton and Co., 2s. net). The whole book has been carefully revised and some changes have been made, especially in the chapter on the Credibility of the Christian Religion. The author does not think that there will be any more changes, and that this will be the permanent edition. The work has already been so long and so usefully known, it is unnecessary to give a more detailed account of it. It has been translated into Japanese, Italian, Chinese and Arabic—a testimony to its value for evidential purposes. The present edition will no doubt have as wide and as useful a circulation as its predecessors.

The Rev. Harry Kenneth Luce, M.A., Master of the King's Scholars, Westminster School, has brought out an edition of St. Matthew's Gospel in English, with Introduction and Notes for the use of Schools (A. & C. Black, 3s. 6d.). From his experience as a teacher, Mr. Luce regards the past teaching of Divinity in Schools as unsatisfactory. It has been dull because it has not made that practical application of the life and teaching of Jesus to the facts of everyday life, which would give religion its real place and force in the developing powers of youth. He aims at clearness and intellectual honesty, and at the avoidance of any artificial piety that would be uncongenial to boys.



CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

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

William of Orange.—Miss Marjorie Bowen, in response to repeated requests, has recently published an exceedingly useful and instructive historical essay entitled *Luctor et Emergo: The State of England at the Peace of Ryswyck, 1697*. The essay contains an account of William III gathered from the material which formed the background of the three books written by her dealing with the lives and times of William III and Mary, viz., *I Will Maintain; God and the King*, and *Defender of the Faith* (now published in cheap editions at 3s. 6d. each). Needless to say, Miss Bowen writes with force and conviction and her historical judgments do not lack either clearness or decision. Particularly does this apply to her able marshalling of the evidence to show how greatly England benefited internally from William's rule. The booklet deserves to be widely read, for it supplies an antidote to much loose thinking and reading at the present time. It is published at 1s. 6d. post free. We wish that it could be possible to secure a much wider reading than at present of Miss Bowen's historical books, particularly those already mentioned, and also *Prince and Heretic*, 3s. 6d., and, *William "by the Grace of God,"* 2s.

St. John's Gospel.—A second edition of the Rev. Dr. Gilbert's book entitled *The Miracles in St. John's Gospel: Their Teaching on Eternal Life*, has now been issued at the price of 1s. 6d. net. Dr. Burge, the late Bishop of Oxford, contributed a preface in which he stated: "These lectures open up in a simple, straightforward way a subject of which too many are, no doubt, unaware: they invite discussion and question, and above all they stimulate the study of the subject deeper and further." The book shows how the Gospel is really built up round the seven miracles selected by St. John, and that there is a definite sequence. And not merely is there this sequence, but the writer shows also that the teaching connected with each of the miracles is so arranged as to bring out the truth of which the particular miracle is a "sign." Miracle and teaching go hand in hand, so to speak, to explain how Eternal Life is possible through Christ, and the development is explained from the first miracle at Cana, with its application in our Lord's words to Nicodemus, until the complete confession of Christ by Thomas in the Upper Room.

Christ the Messiah.—In 1906 Cornelia, Lady Wimborne, wrote and published three very useful and suggestive little essays entitled *Christ the Messiah; Christ the Rest-Giver*; and *The Presence of God*. These she published in pamphlet form, which had a wide circulation. It has been out of print for many years and Lady Wimborne has now re-published it at the original price of 2d. For devotional reading, for circulation at Missions and as a help to those in sorrow, the booklet will be found of great service.

Mariolatry.—Archdeacon Thorpe has just published through the Book Room a very useful little pamphlet entitled *Prayers to the Blessed Virgin Mary*, price 2d. net. Mariolatry in the Church of England has so much increased of late years that this pamphlet meets a real need, and we trust

it will be largely circulated. The danger cannot be over-emphasised, for if men believe, as so many now do, that they are surer of obtaining access to God and pardon of their sins if they approach Christ through the Virgin Mary, the inevitable consequence will be that for one prayer addressed to Christ Himself, there will be ten thousand offered to the Virgin Mary. As Archdeacon Thorpe says, this is no speculation, but an actual fact, as every one acquainted with Roman Catholic devotions is aware. Another pamphlet, written by Archdeacon Thorpe and published in the same series, is *Transubstantiation and the Mass*. This pamphlet, issued two or three months ago, has already had a wide circulation, and we hope this will continue.

The English Prayer Book.—A new book will shortly be published (price 5s. net) by Canon Dyson Hague, entitled *The Story of the English Prayer Book*. This is a book needed to-day, for its object is to supply a growing and increasing demand for a readable and reliable history of the Prayer Book of the Church of England which can be put into the hands of the average reader. It tells the story of the English Prayer Book from the day of its development in the early British Church to the present day, especially describing the work of the various Compilation and Revision Committees in the reign of Edward VI. The story of the Scottish, Irish, American and Canadian Prayer Books is also told in a very readable and interesting way. The author, who is the Rector of one of the largest Churches in Toronto, has also been, for many years, lecturer on Prayer Book History and interpretation at Wycliffe College, Toronto, and was, for fourteen years, a member of the Canadian Prayer Book Revision Committee. The book will not only be valuable to clergymen and students, but it will be particularly useful for Sunday School teachers, scholars and young people generally. The author has the gift of writing in a popular way.

Remainders.—The following books, now nearly out of print, have been reduced in price and can be obtained from the Book Room at the prices named, for a short time :—*The Nicene Creed*, by Rev. Chancellor Lias, 1s. ; *The Heavenly Session of Our Lord*, by Canon A. J. Tait, D.D., 1s. 6d. ; *The Pastoral Idea*, by Bishop J. T. Inskip, 2s. 6d. ; *The Philosophy of the Faith*, by Rev. E. Digges La Touche, M.A., Litt.D., 1s. ; *Quousque ?* Extracts from Pastoral Letters and Charges of Leading Bishops and others during the past fifty years. Edited by Canon Christopher and J. C. Sharpe. With a Preface by Dean Wace, 1s. ; *A Short Introduction to the Old Testament*, by Rev. F. E. Spencer, M.A., 1s. 6d. ; *The Student's Prayer-Book*. The Text of Morning and Evening Prayer and Litany, with Notes, by Rev. W. H. Flecker, M.A., D.C.L., 1s. 6d. ; *The Three Kingdoms : A Young People's Guide to the Christian Faith*, by Rev. F. G. Goddard, B.D. With Preface by Bishop Chavasse, 1s. 6d. ; *Foundations of Faith*. Bampton Lectures, by Dean Wace, 2s. 6d. ; *Episcopacy and Unity*, by Canon H. A. Wilson, M.A., Rector of Cheltenham, 1s. 6d. ; *Home Prayers for a Month*. Chiefly from the Prayer Book, or in the style thereof. Compiled by G. F. Chambers, 6d. ; *Christus Redemptor*. Meditations on 1. Corinthians i. 30, by Rev. A. J. Tait, D.D., 6d. ; *The Meaning of Holy Baptism*, by Canon C. H. K. Boughton, B.D., 1s. 6d. ; *Primitive Church Teaching on the Holy Communion*, by Dean Goulburn, 1s. ; *The Communion of the Laity*. An Essay, chiefly historical, dealing with the question of non-communicating attendance, by Rev. W. E. Scudamore, 6d. ; *Thomas Scott, The Commentator*, by the Rev. Dr. Downer, 1s. Postage is extra, and in most cases would be 6d.