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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1930.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Church Assembly Commission on Church and State.

IN spite of strong opposition to the proposal, the Church Assembly has decided to set up a Commission to inquire into the present relations of Church and State. The Archbishop of York, who introduced the motion, based it on a previous declaration of Archbishop Davidson: "It is a fundamental principle that the Church, that is, the Bishops together with the clergy and laity, must in the last resort, when its mind has been fully ascertained, retain its inalienable right, in loyalty to our Lord Jesus Christ, to formulate its faith in Him and to arrange the expression of that Holy Faith in its form of worship." The appointment of the Commission at this time may be harmless, but with the Bishop of Durham determined to bring about the disestablishment of the Church, it seems inopportune to stir up an unnecessary controversy. As *The Times* and other papers have pointed out, there is no new feature in the relationship of Church and State. It is obvious that the Commission would not have been appointed if the House of Commons had not refused to sanction the Deposited Book, but that refusal was quite in accordance with the terms of the Enabling Act, which set up the Church Assembly and arranged the procedure by which legislation was to be submitted to Parliament. The proviso that the mind of the Church must have been fully ascertained seems to indicate that recent events do not indicate that the Church Assembly adequately represents the mind of the Church. Those who are endeavouring to head the Church to disestablishment cannot be fully aware of the disaster they are seeking to bring upon English religion.

The Real Presence.

The Archbishop of York recently declared on behalf of the Bishops that "there has been no thought of calling in question the doctrine of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ under the forms of bread and wine in the Eucharist as a permissible doctrine in the Church of England." He appeals to the Bennett

Judgment as having vindicated this doctrine. Articles in several of the Church papers have pointed out that a proper understanding of the Judgment does not bear out this claim, and that the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in 1906 pointed out clearly that the judgment has frequently been misunderstood. "His language has been taken in the sense which the Court held that it narrowly avoided; and his acquittal has been treated as establishing the legality of doctrine which his language was held not to express." The whole question of the Real Presence was discussed at the Fulham Conference of 1900 when the Evangelicals were represented by able theologians, including Bishop Handley Moule, Dean Wace and the Rev. N. Dimock. Reference has been made to Bishop Moule's statement at the Conference when he repudiated any association of the Presence with the elements. He said, "I believe that if our eyes, like those of Elisha's servant at Dothan, were opened to the unseen, we should indeed behold our Lord present at our Communions. . . . Not on the Holy Table but at it would be seen Himself, in our presence, to bless the Bread and Wine for a holy use, and to distribute them to the disciples. . . . I do not believe that the Holy Scriptures give us reason to believe that this sacred procedure involves any special attachment of His Presence to the sacred Signs, albeit called His Body and His Blood by reason of their equivalence as divine Tokens." If Christ is thus present throughout the Holy Communion, there can be no other Presence under the forms of Bread and Wine. The teaching of our formularies nowhere indicates that the prayer of Consecration works a miracle. Such teaching destroys the nature of the Sacraments and opens the gate for Adoration, Reservation and other allied practices.

Persecution in Russia.

The Christian world has been deeply stirred by the accounts of the systematic persecution to which Christians as well as all other believers in God have been subjected by the Soviet Government in Russia. An Anti-God Campaign is being carried on with the avowed object of banning every form of religion from that country within five years. To effect this object religious believers have been treated with a barbarity probably never before equalled in the history of Christianity. If only a portion of the narratives of suffering that have reached us are true, they show a calculated and cold-blooded system of torture carried out especially against the Bishops and clergy of the Russian Church. Public opinion in England is thoroughly roused in protest, but it is difficult to take any effective measures to bring relief to the sufferers. The plain claims of humanity have been mixed up with political questions, with which they should never have been connected. The question of the exchange of diplomatic representatives between this country and Russia should not have been allowed to interfere with the strongest expression of the horror with which the diabolical treatment of Christians is regarded. If Russia indicates the condition

to which a country can be reduced which aims at the elevation of the human race to a higher level on the principles of equality and fraternity, then it is terrible to contemplate the future of humanity, unless the teaching of Christ prevails throughout the world. The future possibilities are a call to renewed effort on behalf of Christian work at home and abroad, and in the meantime we can only pray that God will change the hearts of the rulers of Russia, and that they will be brought to a realization of the crimes which they are committing against the most treasured and sacred rights of men.

"God's Call to Union."

The Committee of the Conference of Evangelical Churchmen which is to meet at St. Peter's Hall, Oxford, on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, April 7, 8 and 9, in continuation of the Conference formerly held at Cheltenham, has chosen as the subject for its meeting "God's Call to Union." The Committee explain in their letter of invitation that "in view of the practical importance of the schemes for reunion in South India, China, Persia and other parts of the world, and of the prominent place which principles underlying unity will have in the discussions of the Bishops at Lambeth next July, the Committee regarded reunion as the most appropriate subject for this year's meeting. The Committee felt, however, that it should be considered primarily from the point of view of God's will and His purpose. They therefore adopted as the general title of the programme of the Conference, 'God's Call to Union.' This is the essential feature in all the movements, and the Committee came to this decision in order that the spiritual realities may be adequately presented to the Churches." The speakers are well-known Evangelical Churchmen whose words will inspire confidence. They will focus the results of modern scholarship and spiritual insight upon the great issues involved. They will pass under review such aspects of the subject as: The Nature of the Church, Scripture and the Creeds, the Ministry and the Sacraments, Rome and the East, the Churches of the Reformation and the South India Scheme. It is anticipated that there will be more than usually large attendances. We hope to print the chief papers read at the Conference in the next issue of THE CHURCHMAN.

The Founding of "The Churchman."

The Rev. W. A. Purton recently contributed to *The Record* an interesting article giving an account of his father's work in the founding of this magazine. The Rev. W. O. Purton resigned the editorship of *The Record* owing to ill-health and very soon after conceived the idea of a magazine on Evangelical lines. The first number appeared in October, 1879, and the contributors were Edward Garbett, Edward Hoare, J. M. Holt, J. C. Ryle, H. B. Tristram, Cunningham Geikie, Eugene Stock, E. H. Bickersteth and the Rev. W. O. Purton. The Rev. J. C. Ryle, afterwards Bishop of Liverpool, wrote an article for the first number on the position of Evangelicals under the title "Where are We?" Mr.

Purton quotes at length from this article, the closing words of which have reference to those who are carrying on the work to-day :—

Finally, he writes: "I am no prophet, and in a changing world I dare not conjecture where the Evangelical party will be when another fifty years have passed over the Church of England. It may be that sifting, trying times are before us. It may be that our numbers may be thinned, and many may desert our cause under the pressure of incessant official frowns, persecution, ridicule, and unpopularity. But, come what may, I trust the Evangelical cause will always have a representative body in the Church of England. Things were in a better condition in 1879 than they were in 1829. Then let us stand firm and fight on."

Editorial Note.

Dr. J. D. Mullins has kindly acceded to our request to contribute "Some Reminiscences of Oxford Fifty Years Ago," and we believe our readers will enjoy this insight into the University life of half a century ago. Canon Kennett, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge University, permits us to print his sermon on "The Christian Priesthood," in which he explains the true position of the Christian Presbyter in the light of Jewish worship. Canon Lancelot's fresh and illuminating study of St. Peter will be found helpful both for exegetical and devotional purposes. The principles underlying the Movements for Union are at present demanding special attention. We have therefore two articles dealing with important aspects of them. One by the Rev. G. Freeman Irwin on "Unity—the Ministry and the Sacraments," and the other by Dr. A. C. Whately on "Reunion. The Ideas behind the Ideal." Recent discussions on the Flood and the account in Genesis lend topical interest to the views put forward by Lieut.-Colonel F. A. Molony on "The Probable Connection of Lake Van with Noah's Flood." The writer's technical knowledge enables him to bring forward a number of points not readily perceived by the general reader. The Rev. J. B. McGovern gives a new study in historical values in dealing with "The First Four Bishops of Rome." He discusses afresh several disputed claims. The number of new books issued each quarter seems to increase, and it is difficult to do justice to them all. We hope the selection which our reviewers have made will give some help in appreciating at least a few of the most interesting new books on religious and kindred subjects.

SOME REMINISCENCES OF OXFORD FIFTY YEARS AGO.

By the Rev. J. D. Mullins, D.D.

I ENTERED into residence at Pembroke College, Oxford, in the short three weeks' Trinity term, in order to sit for "Smalls" and get that examination out of the way, for the present system of a corresponding examination while yet at school had not become general. I was lodged for those weeks in a set of rooms whose tenant was absent. They were the highest set of rooms in the turret over the college gateway, and tradition had it that the great Dr. Johnson had lived somewhere on that staircase. The dean of the college liked to think that his rather spacious rooms had been inhabited by the Pembroke worthy whom he always called "the great lexicographer." The undergraduate on the next floor above him was quite confident that his were Johnson's rooms; but when I think of the story of the poor proud scholar who found a new pair of shoes outside his door and indignantly threw the well-intentioned gift down the stairs, I am inclined to think that my temporary habitation might have been his after all. It would be more like his narrow means to have lived so high up. My window looked out over St. Aldate's Church, which is half embraced by the college and its Master's Lodge, and farther away to the right one could see Christ Church.

My first appearance at college chapel gave me a shock. The service was quite plain, without any music whatever. The psalms were read in alternate verses by the dean and the congregation, and the reading was expedited by the dean's habit of starting his verses when the undergraduates had barely reached the middle of theirs. The shock came at the Creed, for every one turned to the east. I had been brought up in a church where the black gown was worn in the pulpit and every other detail of the services corresponded with it. So I stood as I was, though full of fears of the possible consequences. Writing home to my father, I told him of this circumstance and he, proud of my staunch Protestantism, took my letter to our kindly vicar. He, however, an Oxonian of the old school, said that the custom was ancient and had nothing to do with modern Ritualism and I should give offence if I did not conform. Such advice coming from so impeccable a source was not to be resisted, and I obeyed; but the habits of youthful days are not easily forgotten, and I still feel some qualms if I have to turn to the east in the Creed.

On Sundays I found my way to St. Aldate's, for there were no sermons in our college chapel, although there were fuller services in other colleges, and I cannot remember Holy Communion there. The Rector of St. Aldate's was Canon Christopher, whose kindly benevolent face I had seen as I walked about the neighbouring

streets. I learned in the course of time that he had a Saturday evening meeting for undergraduates in his rectory room, and used to attend it. Mr. Christopher was at the time the only Evangelical clergyman who laid himself out to be helpful to undergraduates. Although hampered by his deafness—he and his big ear-trumpet were conspicuous at the May Meetings of the period—he had carried on those weekly gatherings for many years. Sometimes he secured Evangelical leaders to address them, but very often he spoke himself. I remember how inexhaustible he used to find the eighth chapter of Romans. Besides these meetings, he organized every year a great missionary breakfast, and at all times readily gave spiritual counsel in private to individual men who sought his help. Thus to one who was anxious and dissatisfied about his spiritual state and had laid his troubles before him, the old man said:

"Where do your desires for a higher life come from? From the Devil, or from your own sinful heart?"

"No, of course not," replied the inquirer.

"Then they must have come from God," said Mr. Christopher, and then quoted Philippians i. 6: "Being confident of this very thing, that He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ."

I have no doubt that like a wise physician of souls he heartened or guided many another as he did this young man.

Staunch Protestant and Evangelical as Canon Christopher was, his treatment of controversial subjects was without bitterness, and High Churchmen as well as Evangelicals often resorted to him. He was an embodiment of Christian love.

A year or two later a younger man became Rector of the neighbouring parish of St. Peter-le-Bailey—the Rev. F. J. Chavasse, one day to become Bishop of Liverpool. Before very long he attracted the undergraduates in large numbers to his services and Greek Testament classes. It would not have been surprising if Canon Christopher had felt himself supplanted by the new-comer, but on the contrary it was beautiful to see how heartily he rejoiced in the success of his younger rival, without a trace of jealousy or irritation.

I was one of those who, without deserting Christopher's meetings, regularly attended Chavasse's Greek Testament readings held in his house after Sunday evening service. There used to be a supply of little folding chairs; each man secured one, and with it crowded up to the speaker's desk till the large room was packed. The door had to be left open, and outside it those who could not get in sat on the landing and on the stairs above and below, content so long as they were within earshot of the lecturer. I still have some of the notes I took of those lectures, and can recall the tiny figure of the lecturer, his clear unhurried voice, and his lucid expositions. After I was ordained I showed my notes to Bishop Drury, then the Principal of the Church Missionary College, Islington, who remarked that he could not hope to work out lectures as exhaustive as they were. Those meetings were the beginning of a friendship

with one whom I loved and reverenced as I still love and reverence his memory. If I do not describe him and his manner more particularly it is because the beloved Bishop has so recently passed to his rest and the vision of him is still fresh in the minds of many.

I might perhaps mention that about the same period Canon King, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, used to hold classes for undergraduates in Christ Church. I never happened to attend them, but remember hearing that he rendered that characteristic of the ideal bishop in 1 Timothy iii. 3—*μὴ πλήκτης*—as "not given to scoring off people." Some present-day bishops might well lay that phrase to heart.

Besides the influences of Christopher and Chavasse came the afternoon University sermons in St. Mary's. The services were unique. They consisted of a hymn, the Bidding Prayer and the sermon. The preacher wore the gown and hood of his degree and a pair of bands. The floor of the church was reserved for dons and the huge gallery for the undergraduates. The gallery was a barometer of the preacher's reputation. If a famous orator was to preach, it would be full to overflowing, but if some unknown country clergyman was unwise enough to preach in his turn he was confronted with a "beggarly array of empty benches." I used to attend if I heard that the preacher was well known, and amongst them I remember hearing Liddon, Vaughan, Wilkinson (afterwards Bishop of St. Andrews), Salmon, Burgon and Magee. Twice Pusey was announced, and the excitement was great, but the crowd was disappointed on both occasions for the sermon was read by another, in the one case by Liddon and in the other by Paget, afterwards bishop.

Of Liddon, what I chiefly remember were his dark ascetic features and the vehemence with which he would fling his body from side to side in emphasizing some point in his discourse. Vaughan, then Master of the Temple, impressed me by the grave, serene goodness of his face. Wilkinson, with his sallow complexion, the skin tightly drawn over his face, his jet-black hair and his sepulchral voice, seemed almost unearthly. One of his sermons was on the Prodigal Son, and ended with some thrilling question which, alas, I have forgotten. Salmon may have been suffering from a cold, but my memory is that of a snuffling old man, hard to reconcile with one's mental portrait of the lucid and brilliant author of *The Infallibility of the Church*.

I went to hear Magee expecting a flow of glittering oratory and was disappointed. My attention was riveted for an hour and I followed his thought with ease, but I had no ears for his language. However, the sermon was published in the following week, and when I read it at leisure I discovered the charm and appropriateness of his phraseology. Surely this was after all the acme of oratory, for the words were a perfect instrument for conveying the message and did not distract attention from it to themselves. In like manner, when Demosthenes delivered his Philippics his Athenian audiences went away saying not "What a brilliant oration that

was!" but "Let us fight against Philip!" One simile used by Magee remains with me. He compared the truth to an ancient fortress round whose walls in the course of ages had clustered other buildings. When the enemies of truth assailed the fortress they would from time to time beset one of these excrescences, and the crash of its ruin would cause exultation to the enemy and dismay to the defenders of the fortress; but when the din had died down the walls of the fortress itself would be seen to stand out more impregnable than ever.

Dean Burgon was a man with a peculiarly mobile face and the muscles round his mouth worked as he paused to give effect to some utterance. He was something of a belligerent but also a man whose natural cast of thought was humorous. Thus in a sermon which dealt with the Darwinian theory, then a subject of heated controversy, I heard Burgon say, with great solemnity, "I am quite content to seek my ancestors in the Garden called Eden." —Pause.—"Let others, if they wish, look for theirs in the gardens called Zoological." And a ripple of laughter ran over the congregation.

I am afraid I did not attend those Bampton Lectures in which Hatch propounded theories of the primitive church which were then scouted as revolutionary, but have since found more favour when propounded by such men as Headlam and Streeter. I retain no recollection of any sermon by Jowett, though I must have heard him, but oddly enough I do remember a description of him in a contemporary journal—that "with the face of an elderly cherub he poured forth views which corroded like vitriol." A Balliol friend also described to me a course of Jowett's sermons in the college chapel which consisted in portraits of unnamed characters, trait after trait being added until the name was disclosed at the end. The subjects were of varied types as diverse from each other as Bunyan and Spinoza. I was assured that acute but ribald undergraduates in the stalls indulged in surreptitious bets as to the identity of the person intended, and that the odds grew closer as the clues multiplied.

Naturally the teaching of the University sermons varied from Sunday to Sunday and presented an infinity of mutual contradictions to regular hearers. One might say that the successive statements of doctrine cancelled each other! One of the old bedells is credited with the authorship of the well-known saying, "Sir, I have attended University sermons for fifty years and still I remain a Christian!"

Though I never heard Jowett in the pulpit, I used to hear a good deal about him. He was then in the zenith of his fame and had raised Balliol to the highest pitch of scholarship, and one might add of cosmopolitanism, for all colours, nationalities and creeds were represented there. Stories of him abounded. Perhaps the best was the apocryphal legend that he had accepted as an undergraduate a Thug—one of that race of religious assassins in India happily now extinct. The Thug had not been long in residence before he exercised his devotions by slaying a man on his staircase.

The Master, ever tolerant of doctrinal eccentricities, sent for the Thug and reproved him. He was sorry, he said, to interfere with any man's religious convictions, but he must not make a mess on the staircase. Some little while afterwards the Thug went to the Master and stated that he proposed to become a Christian. This time the Master remonstrated. He regretted, he said, that the Thug should abandon so picturesque a religion and one that solved so beautifully the problem of a surplus population! The kernel of truth in this burlesque bit of fiction was that the Master was understood to have dissuaded a Mohammedan from becoming a Christian! Certainly if the Master's reputation did not belie him, his creed was shorter than that of the average Mohammedan!

Amongst the celebrities of that period no one was more picturesque than Ruskin, then almost at the close of his term as Slade Professor. It was my privilege to attend one or two of his last lectures. They were held in the lecture theatre of the New Museum early in the afternoon. Undergraduates of course had to go in cap and gown and that at an hour when most self-respecting men were in flannels. The room was packed long before the time announced for the lecture, but I remember how unfair I thought it that two seats in the front were reserved for two ladies who came in at the last moment. They were the two daughters of the magnificent Dean Liddell of Christ Church. I did not know then that one of the two was the original of "Alice in Wonderland." When Ruskin appeared he had on a glaring blue stock and his gown was all awry. He wore mutton-chop whiskers, and, generally, one would never have taken him for an apostle of culture. His lecture would begin on some topic connected with art, but wandered off in all sorts of directions. The only thing I remember was his exaltation of Carpaccio above Titian and Giorgione. I believe the very picture he praised so much was in the recent Royal Academy Italian Art Exhibition. At one of the lectures he exhibited a painting of a Venetian doge, and expatiated on it. After he had left the room we naturally crowded up to the picture for a closer view. One undergraduate near me, after an apparently intense study, remarked sagely, "I should like to have a smoking-cap like that!"

In the foregoing I have of course far overrun my first term and indeed my first full year. When I went up for my first October term I was settled in rooms of my own in the inner quadrangle. During my first year my opposite neighbour on the same landing was a singular man named Podmore, who in later life became closely associated with Psychical Research. By the following October he had gone out of college and his rooms were taken by a mathematical scholar who had just come up from the City of London School, named Francis Scott Webster. An ardent Christian and possessed of a gift for discovering like-minded men, he soon became the centre of a large group of earnest Evangelical undergraduates. One of his first acquaintances was a very tall Wykehamist of Corpus, George Anthony King, who became Webster's

devoted admirer. Sometimes when he called it would happen that Webster wanted to read and turned him over to me, whereupon King would come across the landing and lie on my sofa, overlapping it at both ends. Thus began a friendship which lasted as long as he lived. I had already known A. R. Buckland, now Archdeacon of Norfolk, for we came up together and both held Townsend scholarships; indeed, we had first met as schoolboys at the Oxford local examinations. Amongst other members of the circle were David Stather Hunt of Merton (afterwards Canon) and his brother Matthew; F. Baylis, student of Christ Church (afterwards a Secretary of C.M.S.); F. C. Paul of Wadham, Walter Horne of Worcester, and F. W. Newland—the last named being the now prominent Congregationalist. There was also a senior man, an artist and married, who lived in rooms somewhere near Worcester—A. R. Tucker, destined to become Bishop of Uganda.

Through these men I learned of a Daily Prayer Meeting held somewhere in the Broad, and of a small weekly Missionary Prayer Meeting, presided over by a mild-looking young don of Merton named Knox. Little did any of us then know of the reserves of force in the man who was to become Bishop of Manchester and the leader of the attack upon the Revised Prayer Book.

Before very long I came to know a very remarkable man, now almost forgotten, the Rev. Henry Bazely. His story, as nearly as I remember it, was somewhat as follows. He was the son of a clergyman, had come up to Oxford, taken his B.A. degree, had been ordained deacon and had worked for a time as curate to old Canon Christopher. But he had come under the influence of a middle-aged Presbyterian clergyman from the Orkneys named Johnston or Johnson, who used to take his annual holiday by coming up to Oxford every year to reside during the short Trinity term; when he had qualified by keeping twelve such terms he took his degree, and, owing to a defect in the statute, was eligible for the Kennicott Hebrew Scholarship, which he secured. He must have been a man of unusual personality for he was able to impress his views on Bazely, who was far from being a weak or malleable character: so much so that the latter resigned his curacy, and joined the Presbyterian Church, but because of his views about establishment, the Established Church of Scotland, not the English Presbyterians. To maintain himself he became a theological coach—the best in Oxford, it was said, and sought after even by High Churchmen—and to be free of the jurisdiction of the proctors took the B.C.L. degree. He was now wont to frequent fairs and races as an evangelist, sometimes carrying texts on boards like a sandwich man. Later, he set up a chapel in one of the poor districts of Oxford. I visited him sometimes at his lodgings, and he gave me the impression of an ascetic capable of all the self-mortification of a mediaeval anchorite.

It was through Webster, I think, that the rest of us got to know him. He became the leader of a large band who went down to St. Thomas' after hall on Sunday evenings, and were divided up

into sections of three or four, each group told off to hold services in one or other of the "doss houses" in the neighbourhood. I myself never aspired higher than the last chosen and smallest of these lodging-house kitchen services. These over, we reassembled and marched to the Martyrs' Memorial, where we lined up against the railings facing the Randolph Hotel. When we had sung a hymn, the undergraduates who were strolling up and down St. Giles' gathered round in large numbers. Then would come addresses, perhaps from Webster or one of the others—I never reached that honour myself—but at any rate from Bazely. I can picture him now, a gaunt figure in a B.C.L. gown, with a trumpet-like voice which caused people on the far side of the street to throw up their windows to listen. It was no mere rant that he gave, but always a powerful, reasoned address, and, knowing his audience, he did not mind occasionally quoting Latin. Thus I remember his telling of a clergyman who had inscribed over his door "*Tanquam non reversurus*" as a reminder of the uncertainty of life. When Bazely had finished the crowd would melt away. The life of this striking character was written by Canon E. L. Hicks, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, and published by Macmillan, but I fear it must now be out of print. Bazely died in 1883, at the early age of forty-one.

With the memory of that scene at the Martyrs' Memorial these stray notes may well close.

Mr. Harold B. Shepheard, M.A., raises a number of searching questions in his book, *For Middle-class Christians* (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 3*s*. 6*d*. net). There is a contrast between the religion of Jesus and much of our conventional morality. He seeks to probe our insincerities and to show that there is a stern need for a deeper understanding of all that is implied in the following of Jesus Christ. There are problems of wealth, of class distinction, of business relationships, of political theories which require fresh examination. Even if we may not agree with all that Mr. Shepheard writes, we may find a stimulus to conscience which may not be unnecessary.

The Triple Chord is a series of Thirty Sermons and Stories for Young Folks, by the Rev. James Aitchison, Falkirk (H. R. Allenson, Ltd., 5*s*. net). These addresses are rich in variety of matter and of illustration. The author's gift of verse adds a further element of interest. They will be found very suggestive by those instructing the young.

The Man Christ Jesus, by Dr. John Lamond (Simpkin, Marshall, Ltd., 3*s*. 6*d*. net), contains much useful information on the historical character of Christ, but is marred by some unnecessary speculations, some of which are based on the supposed discoveries of psychic science.

THE CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD.

SERMON PREACHED IN ELY CATHEDRAL.

BY THE REV. CANON R. H. KENNETT, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge University.

Revelation i. 6: "He made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto His God and Father."

Hebrews vii. 24 *f.*: "He, because he abideth for ever, hath his priesthood unchangeable. Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."

IT will be admitted by all who have had experience of such a task that few things are more difficult—one might well say impossible—than to translate the literature of one race into the language of another whose culture and mental equipment are entirely different. It will be frequently found that the one language possesses no equivalent of words which are familiar enough in the other. Modern writers about the religions or customs of heathen nations have therefore found it expedient to adopt words from these nations (when there is no precise English equivalent), as for example, *taboo*, *totem*, and in some cases such words have become incorporated in our English vocabulary. Now modern English has taken shape in a race which for some thirteen centuries has professed the Christian faith, and which, before its conversion to Christianity, possessed no written literature. Our Anglo-Saxon and Danish forefathers, when they first settled in this land, were heathen; and since in their heathen state they were illiterate, their language, before their conversion to Christianity, had not reached the literary development which had been attained by the Greeks and Latins before the Christian era. It would therefore be much easier to express the thought of a native of Central Africa in Greek than in English, because English has entirely lost names for ideas and things connected with paganism, for which names survive in literary Greek. It is important to remember this, for failure to do so is likely to produce, and indeed has produced, an enormous amount of confusion of thought. Most non-Christian nations that have possessed any sort of system of sacrifice or of precise religious ritual, have a class of men who have special knowledge of this ritual and of all the taboos connected with it, and who, moreover, have the right to touch things deemed holy which the ordinary layman is forbidden to approach. The Greek name for a member of this class is *ἱερεύς*, but perhaps the corresponding Hebrew word would be more easily remembered by English people who are unacquainted with Greek. This word is *Cōhēn* (plural *Côhănim*, just as the plural of *Cherub* is *Cherubim*) and it survives to-day

among the Jews as a surname. Jews with this surname are still recognized as descendants of those who once ministered at the altar in the Temple at Jerusalem, and to them, at all events until recent times, was conceded the right of giving in the synagogue the special benediction prescribed for Aaron and his sons in Numbers vi. 23–7.

In the days of the Temple at Jerusalem the *Cohanim* ministered at the altar; below them was an inferior order of ministers known as Levites; and at the head of them all, *Cohanim* and Levites, was one known as the "Great" or "Head *Cohen*." Thus in the Jewish Church there were four classes: (1) the Head *Cohen* who alone had the right once a year to enter into the Holy of Holies, (2) the *Cohanim* who ministered at the altar, (3) the Levites who performed duties not directly connected with the altar, and took part in the musical services, besides acting as doorkeeper and the like, (4) the laity generally. These four classes were at least in theory permanently separated, though in later times the office of Head *Cohen* was not always strictly hereditary. No mere Levite however could minister at the altar, nor could any mere layman perform those offices which were assigned to the Levites.

In the early days of the preaching of Christianity, as communities of Christian believers began to arise in various places, it gradually became necessary to provide some simple organization. Accordingly we read that the Apostles appointed in various Christian communities certain officials whose duty it was to arrange for, and preside at, meetings for worship, and in general to exercise care over the Christian community. The organization of these officials, however, was not copied from that of the Jewish Church. They were not called by any name corresponding to *Cohanim*, but they were styled *elders*, or, to use the English word derived from the Greek for elders, *presbyters*, and also *overseers* (from the Greek word from which our English word *bishop* is derived). In the New Testament there is no difference of order between *elders* (i.e., presbyters) and *overseers* (i.e., bishops), both words being applied to the same people. In course of time, however, the terms *overseer* or *bishop* came to be limited to the head of the elders in one locality, while the term *presbyters* continued to be used for those who presided over, and had the charge of, the various congregations: below these being a class of *deacons*, ministers or attendants.

From the word *presbyter* is derived by shortening the English word *priest*, which therefore means merely an *elder*. It will be remembered that when the older form of the word, viz., *presbyter*, was revived in the seventeenth century, John Milton complained that "new presbyter was but old priest writ large." The word *priest* is therefore a *Christian* word, and it does not correspond either to the Greek word ἱερεύς or to the Hebrew word *Cohen*. It would be felt incongruous if Caiaphas were described as "Archbishop of Jerusalem," or if John the Baptist's father were styled "Canon Zacharias"; but it would not be one whit more incongruous than calling them, as we are accustomed to do, *priests*. It

is most unfortunate that our English translation of the Bible, having no English equivalent of *Cohen* and ἱερεύς, translated them by the Christian word *priest*, which does not correspond to them. It would have been infinitely better if they had kept the Hebrew or Greek word, just as they kept the Hebrew words *Cherubim* and *Seraphim*.

It was perhaps almost inevitable in an uncritical age that, after the evolution of a Christian organized ministry, men who regarded the Old Testament as virtually on a level with the New, should compare the orders of the Christian ministry with those of the Jewish; but such confusion has been intensified in England by our translation of the Bible. The result of the misapplication of this Christian word *priest*, i.e., *elder* to *Cohanim*, whether Jewish or non-Jewish, has led to endless confusion, and in many cases has helped to confirm the assumption that the ministry of the Jewish Temple provided a model of the Christian ministry; though the two are entirely distinct. Thus the order of Deacons has been equated with that of the Levites. A beautiful Latin hymn written in the twelfth century calls S. Stephen a *Levite*. In Wilburton Church there is a monument of a former Archdeacon of Ely on which he is described as an *Arch-Levite*. Unfortunately the mischief did not stop there: the office of the Christian elder, i.e., priest, was confounded with that of the Jewish *Cohen*, and the former was regarded not as the *elder* delegated to preside over a congregation, but as having after his ordination as an *elder* certain virtually miraculous powers inherent in him, which he did not possess before his ordination. THE MINISTRY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH HAS NOTHING WHATEVER TO DO WITH THE MINISTRY OF THE TEMPLE, and it recognizes as its supreme Pastor and Overseer One Who in the days of His flesh was a *layman*, and Who neither claimed the right to go up to the one legitimate altar at Jerusalem, nor would have obtained the concession of such a right if He had claimed it. And when this is recognized, we shall be in a position to understand the first passage which I have taken for my text, wherein it is said of Christ that He made us to be a kingdom, to be priests (i.e., not *presbyters*) but *Cohanim*, ἱερεῖς, to His God and Father.

What would an early Christian understand if he were told that he was made a ἱερεὺς or *Cohen*? No Jewish Christian would suppose for an instant that he was called to offer *sacrifice*, nor would a Gentile Christian, being admitted into a community in which there was no sacrifice, so understand it. He would, I think, associate with the office of a *Cohen* two main ideas. In the first place, the *Cohen* had direct access to things holy: in the second place, he was constituted mediator between God and those who were unconscious of possessing such right of access. We need not shrink from affirming that in these two respects all Christian believers, not merely the clergy, are *Cohanim*. Every one who accepts the Gospel message has a right of access to God—access more direct and intimate than that of the Head *Cohen* in the Temple: for

our Saviour has taught us to pray "Our Father," and what nearer relation to God could we have than that of His own dear children?

Further, we are mediators between God and those who do not know Him or are alienated from Him. Do not distort the meaning of that verse, "There is one God, one Mediator also between God and men, Himself man Christ Jesus," so as to repudiate what is alike your right and your duty. Every missionary, layman or cleric, is a mediator, or if you prefer it, an ambassador, between God and those who do not know Him. But the object of the Christian mediator is to establish direct communication between those to whom he takes God's message and God. He is not in place of God, but is a minister by whom is brought the saving Gospel of the love of God.

We then, all of us, as well as the blessed company of all faithful people elsewhere, are *Cohanim*, having right of direct access to God, and charged with a message to deliver to those who know not God: and thus we all, clergy and laity alike, possess a dignity in itself greater than that of those who are set apart for the better maintenance of order and discipline in the Church. I was ordained thirty-nine years ago to the office of a priest, i.e., a presbyter or elder, but before that I was a *Cohen*. I am not a *Cohen* like the *Cohanim* of Israel presiding over, and apart from, a community of laymen: I am an elder in a Church of *Cohanim*.

And if it be clearly understood in what sense it can be said of every single believer in the Gospel that he is a *Cohen*, we shall understand how our Saviour also comes to be so described. He has the right of direct access to the Holy of Holies—not like the Head *Cohen* in the Temple—only once a year, but always. We are not like the crowd who year by year waited in the Temple court in suspense to know whether the act of propitiation had been accepted, and whether the Head *Cohen* would return from the awful presence of God unscathed, for our Saviour is with us always even to the end of the world. His presence with God is an abiding proof that what in the Jewish Church was supposed to be accomplished on the Day of Atonement is for us in a fuller measure, and in a more spiritual sense, an eternal reality. The *effect* of the Head *Cohen's* intercession on the Day of Atonement was thought to be worn out by the time that the next Day of Atonement was celebrated: but the *effect* of what our Saviour has accomplished continues unchanged day by day and year by year. Not that He literally in His glorification makes intercession for us. There is no divergence between the will of the Father and the will of the Son, that the Son should endeavour to change the purpose of the Father. When the Apostle used the figure of the intercession of the mediating Head *Cohen* to illustrate the work of Christ, he was writing to Hebrew Christians who would understand that he had in mind not the *process* of the ritual of the Day of Atonement, but its supposed *effect*. It is through ignorance of Hebrew modes of speech that Christ has been represented as coaxing

the Father, reminding Him of His death—as though God could forget! The familiar words of Wesley's moving hymn,

> "Still for us He intercedes,
> His prevailing death He pleads,"

are due to a misunderstanding of the meaning of Scripture, and we should do well to discontinue their use, and to seek to set forth the work of our salvation in words more directly suitable to men and women of our own race and language. The truth remains unchanged, though the metaphor by which it was once expressed to Hebrew Christians has ceased to be easily understood. That which the Apostle, writing to Jews, illustrated from the ritual of the Temple, can be made clear in these days without going so far for an illustration. Christ is our elder Brother Who, in His perfect knowledge of the Father's love for us men, came and by His life and death and resurrection preached peace to those who were very far off as well as to those who were much nearer. Christ's charge to Mary Magdalene may be applied to every individual Christian in every age: "Go unto my brethren and say unto them, I am ascended unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God"—it being always remembered that the glorification of our Saviour is no bar to our communion with Him, for lo, He is with us everywhere and always, even unto the end of the world.

JUDGES. (PROLEGOMENA.) By Rev. Charles E. Jackson, M.A., Rector of Longnewton, Durham. *London: A. H. Stockwell, Ltd.* 2s. net.

This little manual consists of a short Introduction to the story of the troublous times when the Judges ruled in the land, and it contains some notes—the work of a scholar—on the two opening chapters of the book.

THE GREATEST BOOK IN LITERATURE. By F. E. Marsh, D.D. *London: Hulberts, Ltd.*

Dr. Marsh's output is simply prodigious, and we happen to know that it is not an exaggeration when we say that millions of his helps to Bible study and understanding have been circulated and still they continue in great demand. His two volumes of Bible Readings are a treasure store for preachers and teachers. This latest volume from his busy pen consists of Lectures delivered to the students in The Missionary Institute, Nyack, New York. Like all Dr. Marsh's work, these studies are orderly and lucid and they cover a great deal of ground, and considering the size and price of the book (2s.), it contains a large amount of suggestive material. We very cordially commend it to our readers.

S. R. C.

ST. PETER.

An Address to the Liverpool Clerical Society, 6th January, 1930.

By Canon J. B. Lancelot, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Birkdale, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Liverpool.

I WAS present a few weeks ago at a meeting of a little clerical Society where, as it chanced, the talk fell upon St. Peter, and, ever since, his character and doings have recurred constantly to my mind. I want to make him for a little while the subject of our meditation, and (it may be) the vehicle of our self-judgment. Yet not these only, but also a message of encouragement. Can we all, with him, rise on stepping-stones of our dead selves, and, in spite of repeated failure and disappointment, start, once again, to feed the flock to which we have been assigned? Such would seem to be the goal and purpose of that Devotional Meeting of your Society which so rightly marks the beginning of a New Year. May it be used of us all to our good!

There were members of the Apostolic band who remain little more than names to us: never mind, they shine like stars for ever in the firmament of God. But St. Peter was no imaginary person, no shadowy "St. John the elder," but is thoroughly well known to us—few men better perhaps in all history. Not that we have the story of his life, full and complete: its earlier days and its closing scenes, save for a legend or two such as *Domine, quo vadis?* are alike missing. But, for all that, we are quite well off: and however much of his history and doings may be lost to us, we feel that we do know the man; and very human we find him. In each Gospel he is just the same man, with his failings and his virtues marked upon him unmistakably—another, shall we say, of Paley's "undesigned coincidences"? The Fourth Gospel was probably given its present form some time after the rest, and it supplies much new and supremely interesting matter about St. Peter; but it is exactly the same St. Peter still. He who says in St. Luke, "At Thy word I will let down the net," or in St. Mark, "Let us make three tabernacles," is clearly the same eager, impetuous disciple who in St. John declares, "Thou shalt never wash my feet," and, a little later on, girds his fisher's coat about him, and leaps into the water, to be the first to reach his Risen Lord.

It is questionable, I think, whether, in Protestant churches at least, St. Peter has ever had real justice done to the greatness of his merits. This has been due, I suppose, in part, to the ecclesiastical pretensions of the Roman See, based upon what seems to us a grossly unwarranted use of St. Peter's name. You remember the "chain of hypotheses" on which those claims depend: may I confess that living as I do in a parish where Romanism is the chief form of Dissent, I feel sometimes that we shall be driven,

however reluctantly, to proclaim them to be *hypotheses*, far more openly and vigorously than any of us have done of late? First there is the assertion that St. Peter, by our Lord's appointment, had a primacy over the other Apostles, a claim based, scripturally, on the "Rock" passage, and "Feed My sheep." The former is, I am aware, suspect with some, as found only in St. Matthew. But let us accept it. Then St. Peter himself may be the Rock—but not, I would urge, divorced too sharply from the faith of which he had just been the spokesman. Even so, our Lord was "foretelling a career" rather than "creating an office."[1] Had they understood Him to have done the latter, how *could* they, a little while after, have been disputing among themselves which should be the greatest? And how came "Acts" and the "Epistles" to be written in complete ignorance of such a claim? Further, was it only and pre-eminently to St. Peter that the command was given, later on, "Feed My sheep"? Then we are told that this primacy was not personal, but derivable to his successors: that he became "bishop" of Rome, and that he continued so till his decease: that the bishops of Rome, by Divine Institution, have a universal supremacy and jurisdiction over the Church: that they have, in fact, continually enjoyed and exercised this power; and that it is indefectible and unchangeable.[2]

Little wonder, in face of all this—and much else—that we freedom-loving Englishmen have turned elsewhere for our great Doctor and Saint, and, half-unconsciously, done some little injustice to the memory of a man who (one cannot but think) would have been shocked to find himself so unduly exalted. And then St. Paul's services were so overwhelming. In spite of the tradition—I suppose I am bound to say, the generally accepted tradition—which associates St. Peter's name with Italy and the Imperial city, it is the atmosphere of the "Syrian Lake" that clings to him: it is St. Paul who is the cosmopolitan, the Christian Imperialist, the Apostle and Teacher of the West.

Yet St. Peter's own labours were surely considerable. Half-breed Samaria and Romanised Cæsarea evidently knew him well, not to mention Jerusalem itself. He was seen at Antioch, known at least by name at Corinth, and must, we think, have worked successfully amongst the sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia—certainly if that beautiful letter, commonly known as his First Epistle, be really and substantially his. It is one of the Church's best literary treasures, and the explanation of its supposed "Pauline" tendency—and therefore non-Petrine authorship—is that however slow St. Peter may have been in adopting new ideas, however wedded he had once been to "carnal" views of Messiah, and, in his all-but-rude, blundering way, ready, alas, to give expression to them, he was nevertheless "Pauline," increasingly, if not always consistently, Pauline, himself—and St. Paul Petrine, if by that we mean a man who would have given his right hand in order that his Jewish

[1] Gore's Commentary [2] Barrow.

brethren might be saved. In my judgment the contrast between the two has been needlessly over-accentuated.

But I have wandered—I hope not too vagrantly—on to ground which yields controversial rather than devotional fruit; and the man, the disciple of the Lord—let us return to him. A nature like his, so warm, so winning, so human, must always have and retain its interest. For he was, above all things, a *man*, and a "man of good will": teachable too, receptive, a fitting subject for the work of grace—such (we note) the stuff the Master chose, out of which to fashion a leader and shepherd. But in this case the interest is heightened, because, unlike some men who go quietly on from strength to strength, his life had its crisis—perhaps lives of his ardent type generally do. A crisis, I say, a change, though one cannot but think that flashes of the old self must have appeared, right on to the end. Yet there was, in his biography, so to say, a page turned permanently down. The prevailing spirit of its earlier half has always seemed to me to be expressed in the question, the dangerous, self-revealing question, *Lord, why cannot I follow Thee now?* There speaks the native, unregenerate ardour of the man. Why? he asks, like the eager, impatient schoolboy. But that is a type of question which is not always answered in word. Give them time, and life, experience, self-knowledge will do it better. And "why not *now*?" When loyalty bids, and affection urges, no time (we say) like the present!—The question was answered, once, twice, first in words of solemn warning, then in a look which Peter never forgot. It was the decisive moment. That look opened his eyes, and pierced his heart. No wonder he wrapped his face in his mantle—is that the meaning of St. Mark's obviously colloquial ἐπιβαλών?—went out, and wept bitterly.

"Why not now?" Yes, the question is very like the man—eager in affection, impetuous in word and deed. And such people are often very lovable, very generous. But, like the rest of us, they have their failings. St. Peter protests his readiness to go with his Master at once both to prison and to death: is it the warm heart that so speaks, or, something very different, a reflective loyalty that has really counted the cost? Worse still, his natural readiness to give a lead, makes him vain and self-confident: "though all shall be offended yet will I never be." He will have gentle, yet wholesome, reminder of these hot words some day. Yet we need not say that it was mere empty boasting. The man was no coward in the ordinary sense of the word, but ready to resist His Master's enemies to the death, *if force were the one thing necessary*. But was it? And, if not, then, what was Peter to do in the impending crisis? To follow Him, quietly, patiently, and refuse to be separated from Him, to wait upon Him, not to assume the initiative himself, but to leave it to Him—yes, that would have been his glory. The *passive* virtues were wanted, and it is in these that the ardent temperament is usually lacking. Fight with the sword—that he would do, even against odds; but to keep awake, and keep still, and pray against temptation—stick

to his post, silently, resolutely—this required a stronger patience and calmer courage. So he failed, and this first failure lowered his self-respect, weakened his moral nerve, and made further failure likely, if not inevitable.

There are dangers, then, to the life of faith (and the work of the ministry) against which the story of the disciple would seem to point a warning, and, obviously, first, that of self-trust, and, the impulsive word and deed to which (in some natures) it is wont to give birth. You remember how (according to the story told us in St. Matthew xiv) in his daring impetuous way he joined the Lord on the water. It was—yes—an act of faith. But self-confidence mingled with it, and spoilt it, and failure followed. The antidote, of course, is self-knowledge. Of this, however, at that stage the disciple had but little. He was not given to introspection—fishermen, out-of-door men, rarely are. Indeed, for us all, the lesson is difficult, and there are probably whole tracts of life where, for us, for this reason, a fall like his is possible.

Self-confidence however is doubly perilous when it is found (as it often is) in company with genuine warmth of feeling. It is found, of course, sometimes, where feeling seems to be almost entirely eliminated—in the man, for instance, of cold and critical intellect, and dispassionate grasp of public affairs. But it is a fault to which the man of ardent nature is more peculiarly liable. He feels strongly at the moment: *Now*, he says, "Why not now?" And, so saying, no doubt, he has his uses, for though, often, there is a strength, a wisdom in waiting, it is not always wise to wait. Feeling, however, alone will not make a man wise and virtuous, or keep him so, and probably the more religious he becomes, the less subject he is to its waves and onrush, for usually, in the case of the more aged Christian, will, conviction, understanding are the real masters of his life. Yet, "Rejoice in the Lord alway, and again I say Rejoice." There, feeling must come in, and after all it may be urged that it is "in feeling, and not in thought, that we come nearest to Him whose Name is love." We cannot then abolish it altogether. The emotional appeals of the old Mission preachers accomplished results which our own calmer, saner eloquence—as we think it—seems utterly powerless to produce. For my part I am not ashamed to confess a certain weakness for many quite sentimental children's hymns, or even "Moody and Sankey"—tunes and all. They move me at times as the Latin hymn moved Dr. Johnson, for he never read it, he tells us, without tears.

> Quaerens me sedisti lassus,
> Redemisti, crucem passus,
> Tantus labor non sit cassus!

We may often have to complain that we find too little feeling in others as well as in ourselves. We have most of us met the phlegmatic churchwarden whom no appeal would ever seem to touch, and there are occasions when our own souls are as dry as

boards. If it do little else for us, feeling does, on occasion, reveal to us the possibilities of our nature, makes the hardest sacrifice seem for the moment quite easy, and lifts the whole man to a higher level. All the same, it is like the floodtide, to be made use of at once, and turned into channels of usefulness.

Our love for the Master then—and we cannot truly be His disciples without it, though *faith* ON Him will rather seem to some to be the Apostolic writers' prevailing requirement—is it mere emotion, transient, unprofitable, weak? Or does it nerve the will, animate the life, help us to carry on in spite of apparent failure? Heaven grant it may be the latter.

The peril of feeling, the peril of assurance—together, as I said, they are very dangerous. But the story gives us one more—the peril (shall I call it) of our strong point. We some of us have one. Here is a clergyman who is strong in Christian philosophy, though he will not succeed in his work unless he can supplement it with other means and gifts: *another* is an adept in finance, and neither will he, if that be his all-in-all: a *third* is "good with young men," and he needs to ask himself, again and again, good for what? Such powers need watching, or they may be sources of the most alarming weakness and failure. So with gifts of temperament and character. Here is a man who is a marvel of sympathy—there, another, of meekness—a third, of restraint and self-mastery; and yet each may be betrayed at the exact spot where victory seemed certain. Moses was very meek, yet once at least he spake unadvisedly with his lips: the Apostle had courage—cowardice, the last thing we should have laid to his charge. Yet it was there he fell. How was it? The temptation came upon him, not when he was braced, erect, alert, but when he was comfortable, unguarded—he was "warming himself": *and* it was a sin of surprise.[1]

There are certain forms of temptation which we have all known well, for they were more or less habitual, and came to us at regular times, in the same scenes, under the same circumstances,—and we met them forearmed. But there are others which come upon us quite suddenly. We are taken off our guard, shaken, vanquished, before thoughts of duty, or love, or even of prudence, can come to the aid of the startled self, and in a moment the deed is done.

Now, however it may be with other crises, it is as a surprise that the temptation to deny the Master usually comes. A chance remark in a drawing-room will lead up to it, and then, before our loyalty has time to awake, the word is said—sometimes left unsaid—which we would give our right hands to recall. And our collapse is really so unlike our usual selves. Where were all those old friends of ours—instinct, nature, habit, training, character—that they did not come to the rescue? No, at the critical moment they failed us, and the shame is there. We have come very near to denying Christ before men.

Of such unguarded moments, I would, in all humility, counsel you to take heed and beware. You have a strong point. Use it.

[1] Cf. Temple, *Rugby Sermons.*

Make the most of it. The Church needs it. But do not rely on it overmuch. "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." If we do, well for us if we only "remember" as the disciple did, and seek restoration in that Presence where alone it can be found.

For, let us not forget, after that bitter night the Master and the disciple met again, and alone. "The Lord is risen indeed and hath appeared unto Simon." Alone he had fallen: alone he is to be restored. One is constrained to say, in all reverence, What a gentleman the Master is! How thoughtful of personal feeling, how delicate in His treatment of a difficult case! The disciple is spared that agony of shame which a public forgiveness would have induced in that warm and sensitive nature of his. Of the details of that interview we know nothing—they are hid in sacred silence. Did St. Peter ever, in a burst of brotherly confidence, tell the story to St. John?

He told it not,—or something seal'd
The lips of that Evangelist.

In solitude, then, the disciple is restored to the Master's confidence. But Peter owes a debt of courtesy and humility to his brother disciples. And so, one day, the question comes, *Simon, Son of John, lovest thou Me more than these? Lovest thou Me deeply?*—for so Christ's word means—with a love that carries all true homage and noble obedience—and *more than these?* Thus gently does He touch the old sore—*more than these.* But mark the answer. There is no boasting now. Those who read the Greek will see that the disciple refrains from using his Master's word for "love"—I still think *intentionally*, though nowadays, I understand, it is more usual not to press the contrast. He will not claim to "love deeply": he is not so sure, as once he was, about his homage and obedience. Nay, he will not say of himself that he even loves at all. He appeals from his own inward commotion to the perfect understanding of his Lord: "Thou knowest all things: Thou knowest that I love Thee."

Then follows the threefold charge, corresponding to the three ages of human life—to "*feed* the lambs," the new converts, the children of the Church; to "*tend* the sheep," that is, to guide the strong and vigorous members of the flock; and to "*feed* the sheep"—the sick, the aged, the infirm. We (you and I) have, with what skill we may, to attempt all three, though in a well-organized Church we would gladly see some specialists for each. But, by God's especial grace, the disciple was equal to his task. He was strong now, because he was humble. He had had his experience and learnt his lesson. In the Upper Room promise and disappointment had mingled together—"Thou canst not follow Me now, but thou shalt follow Me afterward." Now it is simply, "Follow thou Me." And he did, he did. He followed the blessed steps, even to prison and to death.

It is in some ways a sad, and yet very human, very inspiriting story, this of the great disciple. It speaks to most of us, assuredly to all who have *failed*, who have been caught unawares, and left humiliated and ashamed. Take it, then, as written for your learning. Be encouraged by it. There is "Gospel in it," as a good layman once said to me, with tears in his eyes. There is forgiveness, restoration. Whatever his past may have been, does not our Lord, through it, still say to every man: At least from this day onward *Follow thou Me?*

Simon, Simon, behold Satan asked to have you—all of you—that he might sift you as wheat: but I have made supplication for thee that thy faith fail not, and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren.

You, who are older, pardon me if I say my last word to-day especially to you. You are they to whom the years are bringing (as they pass) the clearer vision, and the surer step, and the more delicate charity. Your grasp of large and fundamental truth, your maturity of conviction is such as no crisis will easily surprise, much less overwhelm. Have a thought, then, a very tender thought, for the young men, the beginners in our ranks. Bear with them; guide them if they will submit to guidance, teach them, if they will let you: give them hints from your experience, lessons of hope from your failures, of diligence in study and endurance in ministry from your crowded hours. For all their superficialities, their present inexperience, their possible ignorance, their all but inevitable frailties, so shall they, even they, go from strength to strength in the difficult times that lie ahead of them, and their labour not be in vain in the Lord.

Marshall Brothers, Limited, have issued *Pioneers of Protestantism*, by James Johnson (6*s*. net). The record contains an account from the earliest times of those who have stood out against the claims and errors of the Papacy. Special attention is paid to the Reformation in England and the rise of civil and religious liberty under the British Constitution. The book makes a strong appeal to all who value freedom to stand shoulder to shoulder in upholding the principles of Protestantism.

Messrs. Charles J. Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd., publish two papers read at the Islington Ruridecanal Conference on the position of the laity in the Church of England (4*d*. net). From the legal standpoint, Mr. R. E. Ross, LL.B., gives a summary of the various powers and duties of laymen.

Mr. F. W. Davy, M.A., treats the subject from the "historical and in outlook" point of view. Laymen will find these papers of special interest and full of useful information.

UNITY—THE MINISTRY AND THE SACRAMENTS.

By the Rev. G. Freeman Irwin, B.D., Vicar of Wandsworth.

"WITHIN the Christian Church, the social nature of the Gospel of Christ and its world-wide outlook have been more fully realized than in former times. The modern movement towards Christian reunion is instinct with the consciousness of both principles. God and His Kingdom and His Will for man are all unifying in their nature. 'There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all' (Ephes. iv. 4–6). It is St. Paul's expression of the truth which inspires the whole prayer. More and more, in spite of great difficulties, the duty of seeking a united Christian Church is pressing upon the hearts of Christian men of all kinds."

The Archbishop of Armagh, in his recent book *The Christian Outlook in the Modern World*, indicates in this passage the high motives which are inspiring the movement towards unity among Christian people. It is generally recognized that the consideration of the subject ought appropriately to begin with the interpretation of our Lord's words in the High Priestly prayer recorded in St. John xvii. 20 *et seq.*:

"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word. That they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

The unity indicated in this passage is a spiritual reality. It is the unity of all Christian people in Christ. It is a frequent thought in St. Paul's Epistles. He says "the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ" (1 Cor. xii. 12). And again:

"For we being many are one bread, and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread" (1 Cor. x. 17).

"But now are they many members, yet but one body" (1 Cor. xii. 20).

"Ye are all one (man) in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 28).

"So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another" (Rom. xii. 5).

"Let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body" (Col. iii. 15).

This spiritual reality consists in union with Christ by faith in Him, and by love for Him. "Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity (uncorruptness)" (Ephes. vi. 24). The movements towards reunion are fundamentally endeavours to secure the outward expression of this spiritual reality, to make the visible expression of Christianity in organization correspond to the inward fact.

Some have endeavoured to represent the desire for unity as

merely an effort on the part of the authorities of various religious organizations to secure economy and to prevent the overlapping of the various sects in districts where it is now difficult to support more than one Church. The sneers at Pan-Protestantism have been inspired by such representations. While there has no doubt been a desire and a very natural one to effect necessary economies, it is unfair to regard this as the chief or even an important element in the movement towards unity. The spiritual motive is fundamental and is the driving power behind the whole movement.

This is, at any rate, clearly the motive behind the South India Scheme. The basis of that scheme, as stated in the *Proposed Scheme of Union* (p. 15), is this:

"The uniting Churches are assured that the unity of His Church for which Christ prayed, is a unity in Him and in the Father through the Holy Spirit, and is therefore a reality of the spiritual realm. They seek the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. But this unity of the Spirit must find expression in the faith and order of the Church, in its worship, in its organization, and its whole life."

The same desire is expressed in the preliminary statement of *The Purpose and Nature of the Union*, and with such high spiritual aims in view it is necessary to examine carefully the obstacles which stand in the way of their attainment. The hindrances to such a unity, if they are to be allowed, must be shown to be fundamental in character. They must be definitely proved to be contrary to the mind of Christ, and therefore insuperable. It is our present purpose to examine some of these obstacles and to see if they can be regarded in this light.

In the first place there is a very large measure of agreement. The four points of the Lambeth Quadrilateral have been accepted as a basis of union.

For purposes of reference it may be well to state them as they are given in the *Appeal to All Christian People* of the Lambeth Conference of 1920.

"The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the ultimate rule and standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal Confession of belief:

"The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ:

"A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body."

From the Report of a Joint Conference held at Lambeth Palace between representatives of the Church of England and the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England issued in May 1922, it is clear that there was general agreement as to these terms.

The only point on which there were any serious differences of interpretation was in regard to the ministry, but this was not even then apparent in the Report.

The Lambeth Conference statement on the ministry issued in 1888 required the acceptance of:

"The Historic Episcopate locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church."

The statement of the Joint Conference on the Episcopate was:

"In view of the fact that the Episcopate was from early times and for many centuries accepted, and by the greater part of Christendom is still accepted, as the means whereby this authority of the whole body is given, we agree that it ought to be accepted as such for the United Church of the future."

This readiness to accept the Episcopate was, it must be acknowledged, a considerable step on the part of the representatives of the non-Episcopal Churches. It was a departure from their traditions and showed the depth of their desire to secure unity. Since this resolution was adopted there has been a distinct cooling of the warmth of this desire, and this is practically due to the insistence of a section of churchpeople on a theory of Apostolical Succession which cannot be accepted by Presbyterians, Wesleyans, Congregationalists and Baptists.

The Proposals in the South India Scheme of Union show that the uniting Churches are willing to accept the fact, but that they will not be bound by any special theory of Episcopacy. They say:

"The uniting Churches, recognizing that the episcopate, the council of presbyters, and the congregation must all have their appropriate place in the order of the life of the united Church, accept in particular the historic Episcopate in a constitutional form as a part of their basis of union, without intending thereby to imply, or to express a judgment on, any theory concerning Episcopacy." They further add: "Continuity with the historic Episcopate shall both initially and thereafter be effectively maintained, it being understood that no particular interpretation of the fact of the historic Episcopate is thereby implied or shall be demanded from any minister or member of the united Church."

This practically represents the position of Evangelical members of the Church of England at the present time. They do not accept the views of Anglo-Catholics on the Episcopate, but there is little practical difficulty in the life of the individual Church member.

In South India and in other parts of the Mission Field the position is different, and practical difficulties in regard to Holy Communion have required some adjustment to be made. The Sacrament of Unity which ought to be the means of expressing the reality of the spiritual unity has become a means of indicating and accentuating the differences between the Episcopal and non-Episcopal Churches.

Through the comity of missions, to prevent overlapping, large areas are set apart for the workers of the various sections of the Church. One district is reserved for workers of our Church,

another for the Presbyterians, another for the Congregationalists, and so for other bodies of Christians. The native Christian who has been taught in a district of our own Communion, may move into that of one of the non-Episcopal Churches. The problem then arises in an acute form. Is he to be commended to the Christian Community in his new home? Is he to partake of Holy Communion administered by a ministry without Episcopal ordination? Not to do so implies excommunication, and that in the eyes of a native Christian is a punishment of a severe character reserved for serious offences. No one can believe it right for such a Christian to cut himself off from association with the small band of Christians maintaining their cause in the midst of the overwhelming mass of their heathen fellow-countrymen.

The grounds of the demand for unity have been well expressed in the often-quoted statement of Nehemiah Goreh, the Indian scholar and saint.

> "The difference between the Hindu who worships a cow and an Indian Christian who has ceased to do so is so great that any theological differences there may be between Indian Christians make no impression on us."

These differences turn ultimately upon the nature of the ministry, and their practical difficulty is most clearly evident in regard to the Holy Communion.

The Roman Catholic Church does not recognize the validity of the Holy Communion in Anglican Churches, because it does not recognize the validity of Anglican Orders. We are told that we lack the true Episcopal succession. Our own Communion in practice does not at present recognize the validity of the Sacrament of Holy Communion in the non-Episcopal Churches, because it does not recognize their ministries owing to their lack of the Episcopal succession. We thus have a system of exclusion based on the character of the ministry.

In the South India Scheme this difficulty is to be met by giving Episcopal ordination to all who enter the ministry of the United Church, but for a period of thirty years the present ministries, Episcopal and non-Episcopal alike, are to continue and to work side by side, each ministering to their own people.

At the end of this period there will be an episcopally ordained ministry throughout the Church, and there is no doubt that this will be regularly maintained.

This proposal has given rise to objections in the minds of some members of the Church of England who hold "that an episcopally ordained ministry which has descended in orderly succession from the Apostles is the only legitimate ministry of the Church."

This rigid theory of the necessity of an apostolical succession raises not alone a question of historical fact, but also one of ecclesiastical theory. Is the succession necessary for the transmission of grace by which alone a valid communion service can be held? Can there be no exceptions to this rigid theory of the episcopal ministry? As we have seen, the episcopal system is acknowledged as the best,

the most ancient and the most suitable for the future unity of the Church, but does the validity of the Sacraments depend upon it? The ambiguity involved in the word "valid" has been recognized. The validity of a Sacrament can only be known to God. We have to accept such tests as are available. Does the Sacrament unite the believer to Christ? Does it build him up in holiness of life and conduct? "It is clear that if a Sacrament answers to these two tests, its character as valid is vindicated." [1] Bishop Gore, in *Orders and Unity*, says—

"There have arisen Christian Churches with a noble and continuous record of spiritual excellence—exhibiting, both in individuals and corporately, manifest fruits of the Spirit alike in learning, in virtue and in Evangelical zeal. To deny God's presence with them, and His co-operation in their work and ministry, would seem to me to approach to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. We cannot express in words too strong our assurance that God has been with them and that we are meant to learn from their saints and teachers, and to sit at their feet as before those who possess God's Spirit." (Quoted in this connection in *Episcopacy and Unity*, by H. A. Wilson.)

The point has been raised acutely by some who ask the question: Who can claim a right to differentiate between the two Sacraments of the Gospel and put Holy Baptism in a different category from Holy Communion? In cases of necessity it is acknowledged that a lay person can administer the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. It is not claimed that its validity depends upon the character of the ministry of the person who administers it. Why then is it claimed that the validity of the Sacrament of Holy Communion depends upon the character of the ministry of the celebrant, and that it can never in any circumstances be administered except by a priest in the apostolical succession? In Dr. C. H. Turner's essay on "Apostolic Succession," in *The Early History of the Church and Ministry* (p. 144), the view of St. Augustine is given: "The Sacraments derive their reality not from the minister, who is nothing except an agent, but from Christ as the only source of grace and power, and His power is the same everywhere."

Can it be maintained, as such an exclusive view of the validity of the Sacraments would imply, that the succession of the ministry through the episcopate from apostolic times is the only channel of covenanted Grace? It is difficult to believe that if this were the will of God we should be left without some very clear and definite statements of the Divine purpose—such statements as would remove all uncertainty and doubt in regard to it. It is clear from the writings of such scholars as Lightfoot, Hort, Hatch and Gwatkin there is considerable doubt and an absence of certainty.

There is nothing resembling a definite command either by our Lord or by His Apostles. There is no direct evidence as to our Lord's method of commissioning the Apostles, and it is clear, from the earliest days of the Church's history, that the succession of the bishops from the time of the Apostles was not regarded as a guarantee

[1] H. A. Wilson, *Episcopacy and Unity*, p. 244.

of the transmission of grace, but as an assurance of the maintenance of sound teaching and orthodoxy of belief.[1] Dr. Streeter has recently shown in *The Primitive Church* that it would be difficult to prove that a succession of bishops was universal in the early centuries of the Church. The position of the Church in Alexandria has often been cited. The succession was one of Presbyters till the fourth century.[2] Down to the fourth century there are instances of deacons administering the Holy Communion.

There are a number of historical facts which tell against the rigid theory of apostolic succession as maintained by a section of the Church of England. In England at the time of the Black Death in 1348 deacons were allowed to minister the Eucharist. In Ireland in the reign of Elizabeth, owing to the scarcity of Roman Catholic bishops, a special dispensation was given to consecrate bishops by one bishop and two presbyters.

From the year 1552 to the year 1662 the formularies of our Church were not so precise as they were made in the latter year, when episcopal ordination became a requisite for admission to the ministry of the Church. There are several instances in that period of men who had received Presbyterian orders, or the orders of the Continental Reformed Churches occupying offices in the ministry of the English Church. The views of some of the most learned divines of our Church are against it. Bishop Andrewes wrote in 1616:

"Though our government is by Divine Right, it follows not, either that 'there is no salvation' or that 'a Church cannot stand without it.' He must needs be blind that sees not Churches standing without it; he must needs be made of iron and hard-hearted that denies them salvation."

Bishop Cosin's opinion on ordination in the French Reformed Church is well known,[3] and it is recorded that in 1643 he communicated with the French Presbyterians during his stay at Charenton.

At a much later date S.P.G. and S.P.C.K. employed Lutherans as clergy in their missionary work in India.

This evidence of the views of leaders of the English Church in the past can be supplemented by reference to Archdeacon Hunkin's recent book, "*Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation in Relation to Inter-Communion and Reunion.* A Collection of Anglican Precedents and Opinions."

Two quotations may appropriately be added from the writings of the Rev. N. Dimock, an exponent of Evangelical views, whose books are not as widely known and appreciated as they ought to be. He was an ardent student, a capable theologian, a most accurate thinker, always reliable in the record of his researches and careful to express himself with moderation.

[1] "Irenaeus taught that in the apostolic successions of the bishops lay a divinely ordered guarantee for the truth of Christian doctrine." Dr. C. H. Turner, *The History of the Early Church and Ministry*, p. 133.

[2] Dimock's *Christian Unity*, p. 8.

[3] Quoted in *Episcopacy and Unity*, pp. 122–4.

In *Church Unity*, written nearly twenty years ago, he said:

"Who can look on with cold heart, unmoved with a feeling of joy and praise, to see how in the mission fields the evil and weakness of division—division among those who should be at one in the love of the Saviour, and for His sake in the love of one another—is being felt, or beginning to be felt, as that which should be overcome and put away as far as possible by united effort, so that our warfare against the powers of darkness may be led on under one banner, the banner of one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one army moving onwards with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love, giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace?" (p. 71).

"It is for the true sons of the Church of England thankfully to maintain and faithfully to defend our precious inheritance of primitive faith and Apostolical order. But we need not fear that we shall be laying down our Churchmanship or opening our hearts to too wide a sympathy if we learn to say: 'Grace be with all them that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity'" (p. 85).

SOME LIFE PROBLEMS. By J. C. Jamieson, Youth Secretary of the Presbyterian Church in Victoria, Australia. *Religious Tract Society.* 1s. net.

The series of "Outline Studies for Young Men and Others" is of exceptional value and usefulness. Not only has the author selected the most vital problems for the best development of the young, but he has dealt with them in a telling and effective way. The subjects include such questions as: What are we here for? Is Religion Worth While? The Problem of Marriage, The Use of Spare Time, Temptation and the Way to Victory. Is Gambling on a Small Scale Really Wrong? What is Christianity? Is the Church Worth While? Is Fellowship the Solution of all our Problems? Each of these is divided into appropriate sections for the use of study groups, and each section is enriched by numerous references to great authors and by illustrations from their works, and by the lives and actions of great men. Suitable questions for discussion are suggested. The whole series make a course of study of unusual interest, and nothing could be more calculated to set a high standard of life for young people, and to teach them the best way of maintaining it.

FROM THE HEART OF MOTHERHOOD. By One who Fathomed its Pain and its Bliss. *London: Longmans, Green & Co.* 3s. 6d. net cloth; 1s. 6d. paper boards.

A charming volume of *real* poems. In his Foreword Mr. John Oxenham tells how they were sent to him some years ago—"They seemed to me much too good to be withheld from the many who would rejoice in them as I did." However, they were long withheld as too sacred for publication. They are now published for the first time, and very beautiful they are. Just the book for the expectant mother and for those who have reached motherhood.

REUNION: THE IDEAS BEHIND THE IDEAL.

By the Rev. A. R. Whately, D.D.

WHAT we miss so constantly in various controversies among Church people—in the Prayer Book controversy no less than in the Reunion controversy—is a clear and steady recognition of *underlying* differences. When we "meet to discuss our differences," it is so easy and so tempting to regard the meeting as intended directly for their minimization, and to slur the necessary process of probing even to depths where no agreement is practically possible. It is so much more pleasant, at all such times, to seek for agreement of substance under difference of terms than for difference of substance under sameness of terms. And yet the broadest outlook is surely not that so much which merely emphasizes the common denominator as that which accepts differences boldly, and their necessity: which acknowledges that we all alike have our treasure "in earthen vessels," and looks forward to the time when that which is perfect is come.

The movements for reunion of the churches at home and abroad are certainly not prompted solely by the ultimate theological principles that lie behind them. It would be an obvious exaggeration of what we have just said so to regard them. And one would be sorry indeed to represent them as the movements essentially of any party in the Church. But that differing conceptions of the Church profoundly determine our attitude is inevitable, if we are not utterly inconsequent in our thinking. We may even come to conclusions on the main question differing from those held by most who share our general doctrinal position; but at least the former must be viewed in the light of the latter; and we must never forget that the same rule applies to others also. The closer scrutiny of facts, again, may profoundly affect our views, and even react upon our theology. But the truth remains that we must get down to these deeper levels if we are to understand the point of view of others, or even to *understand* our own. And, at the same time, if we seek to understand, we must also seek to explain.

It is desired in this article to suggest a few considerations respecting the logic of the question of reunion with the non-episcopal churches, in view of the differing conceptions of the Church held by those concerned with the matter. It is written definitely from one of these standpoints, but of course my particular points commit no one. And it is a defence of principles, not of any special view of the facts that determine their precise application.

The broad question of what we used to call home reunion, but which must now be viewed as a world-wide problem, or set of problems, can only be solved by the action and reaction between

theory and fact. A simple way to reach the heart of the subject will be to take our start from a paragraph in an article (very sympathetic in spirit) by the Rev. W. H. G. Holmes, of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, in the *Review of the Churches*, January, 1930, relating to the South Indian scheme. It is, of course, only the principle itself that here directly concerns us.

Mr. Holmes, on page 78, objects that, if the spiritual reality of the Nonconformist ministries is not to be called in question, "it seems a grave and terrible error for the members of the Anglican Communion to have remained out of communion with their fellow Christians for all these long years." It is not a question, he says, whether God has blessed such ministries or no, for the general operation of the Spirit cannot be confined within the limits of Christendom. What is permissible for thirty years is permissible for ever.

First let it be noted that the attitude here taken toward the non-episcopal ministries differs, at least in form, from that adopted by some High Churchmen, as, for instance, by Lord Hugh Cecil in a recent pronouncement.[1] It is not here said that we grant to these ministries all that they claim for themselves, and only claim for ourselves what they deny. They are classed with whatever corresponds to them in the heathen and Moslem world. The argument certainly appears to be this: that, if these ministries are to be recognized, we ought not, on any consideration, to be out of communion with the Christian communities they serve; but that, if God's evident blessing on them be the "sole test" for their recognition, we who affirm their validity are open to the *reductio ad absurdum* that non-Christian religions would have the same claim to recognition.

Now if this test—the Divine blessing—be really and strictly taken, in and of itself, as the sole test, then, so far, the reply may be allowed to stand. But surely it is not necessary to take the weakest and narrowest interpretation of an opponent's meaning. Surely behind this plea is the assumption that the Christian religion does not owe to any "validity" of ministry or sacraments its unique and effective position as the Kingdom not only of the universal Father, but of the incarnate Christ. Even Mr. Holmes seems to recognize this; for, as in the words we have already quoted, he manifests a strong sense of the claims of "our fellow-Christians" as such, claims that ought not to give way for a moment to anything less than those of a valid ministry. But, if so, the position of non-episcopal Christian ministries and that of non-Christian ministries are *not* the same.

We may put the matter another way. When Mr. Holmes says that "we shall have to apply the same principle to Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism," we may take up the challenge, and say that we are quite willing to apply it—*so far as it is applicable*. The qualifica-

[1] Limits of space make it impossible to notice the various Liberal Catholic eirenical views. I would do so with great sympathy and respect, but must here confine myself to sharp antitheses.

tion, surely, comes in as a matter of course. There *must* be a *mutatis mutandis* clause, and that, once admitted, shatters the whole parallel. For Christian fellowship is the expression of Christian ideas. It is fellowship in the incarnate Christ. Whatever margin of possibility there may be of religious union with non-Christians, compatible with full loyalty to our own religion, may be illustrated by the occasion (there may have been many occasions) when, under the stress of famine, or some other great public calamity, Christians, Hindoos, and Mohammedans met for prayer. One can understand, at any rate, the position of those who might say that we, who pray in the Name of Christ, ought not actually to pray *with* those who do not; and, in fact, there is no need to discuss the right or wrong of the matter at all. The simple appearance of marginal cases like this brings into relief the definiteness of those main conceptions which the margin presupposes. These conceptions, it may be said, are expressed in the institution of the ministry. But, as a simple fact—the fact that creates the problem—they are not tied to it; and the more we emphasize the claims of our fellow-Christians as such, even with emphasis also on the ministerial order, the harder it is to treat the South Indian and such-like proposals as resting on no firm logical foundation.

We are brought back, as we regularly are, I think, in these controversies, to the antithesis of two standpoints from each of which it is hard to do full justice to the other. It is this larger antithesis that we require at least to understand, even though it cannot be resolved.

The mere appeal to the evidences of grace outside episcopacy, even if the common Christian basis is tacitly assumed, is not really sufficient. We must somehow get behind it and justify the whole connection of thought which makes it paramount in our own minds. And yet one is disposed to ask, in passing, whether the very necessity to adopt the exclusive attitude should not raise questionings tending to the revision of the ecclesiology that involves it.

But before offering a brief suggestion of how, theologically and fundamentally, the counter-position may be stated, it may be well to complete the direct reply to such challenges as that in the article before us. Mr. Holmes' main point seems to be this. Breach of communion with our fellow-Christians is so profoundly serious that nothing but his strict theory of the ministry ought to justify our not having completely and in face of all possible objections united ourselves with them long ago, and our not doing so at all costs now. But who are the "we" to whom the plea is addressed? If it means the Anglican Church as a whole, as her position *would* be if as a whole she rejected Apostolical Succession, then, so far as we are able to envisage a merely hypothetical state of things (which would differ in many other ways which we cannot reconstruct *a priori*), we should probably most of us assent, at least as regards regular intercommunion. But then the question is a merely abstract one. But if, on the other hand, it is the more Protestant section of the actual Church of to-day that is meant, then we may well

ask why it should be "illogical" and "un-Christian" to try not to heal one schism in such a way as to create another.

But now, in a very few words, I would venture to give some slight formulation of the general ideas that give to such proposals a *primâ facie* claim to support, without prejudice to the full consideration of criticisms which do *not* presuppose theological differences. Though writing, generally, in defence of a common position, I quite recognize that particular points are my own and commit no one.

First, it must be said that no one is competent to approach the discussion of the subject who is still in the toils of the preposterous delusion that Protestantism is essentially *mere* individualism. It is just precisely because, in its truest and most constructive forms, it so appreciates the social meaning of the individual that it finds the terms of Institutionalism inadequate to the understanding of the Divine Society. Whether or no certain denials into which this perspective sometimes leads it—or even some of its positive assertions—are justified must needs be matter for difference of opinion. But it is essential to understand what that conception of the Church is that its teachers are solicitous to follow up whithersoever its light leads them.

Where corporate Christian life is, there, *ipso facto*, is the Church. We see no grounds in the New Testament, or in inferences from the terms of its Gospel, to build our ideas on any narrower basis. The Church, on this primary basis, is neither on the one hand the mere combination of previously-made Christians, nor, on the other, an institution offering a covenanted social membership narrower than the sphere of those who confess the Name of Christ, and do mighty works in His Name. We take our stand on the analogy of human society. The individual is inherently and by definition social, in nature, as, we believe, in grace. Now the expression of individual discipleship is faith. Not merely faith in a general sense—bearing fruit in high ideals and good works—but specific faith in Christ, is to be found outside the ministerial succession, and even outside all sacramental fellowship. And we cannot deny to faith that covenantal character of which, by its very meaning, it carries within itself the assurance. And we regard grace and faith correlatively. As it is *impossible* to divide faith into "general" and "specifically Christian" otherwise than by reference to its Object—God in Christ or some vaguer sense of the Divine—so we at least are unable to divide general and specific *grace* at any other point.

That is only our starting-place, but it determines the direction of our thought, and we have one eye upon it all the time. We advance from it, not in order to supplement its deficiencies, but in obedience to its own demand.

And does it follow from this that institutions are mere appendages, and that episcopacy, being not of the *esse*, is negligible? Surely not. If the logical *prius* of the institution were merely a loosely-knit society of Christian believers, this might be so. But,

for us, the *prius* of the institution is the *de facto* spiritual community, personal and inter-personal, the social Life of the Spirit, that not only contains the individual, but is contained within him. Institutionalism is an essential aspect of its realization on earth, but it is not the whole, nor the matrix of the whole. Christ created a community, and a community is not an institution.

Now to us for whom the idea of the community as such, rather than that of the institution, is the dominant factor, other pivotal differences reveal themselves in various directions. But these lie outside the range of the few slight hints that are here offered towards the winning of a better understanding from those who differ from us. But, in any case, we shall never admit that we are treating the official ministry of the Church as negligible if we regard it rather in the light of the self-consolidation of the Spirit-guided society (which reunion itself is in another way) than as the covenantal basis of her existence. For us the concrete realities of corporate spiritual life and work to-day, the progressive movement of the Spirit in the Church, are the primary fact.

But the very principle that places us outside the limits of the theory of validity leads us, if broadly and truly applied, to take the fullest account of the *de facto* dominance of this theory among the realities that create the situation. And, be it insisted, this is not to say that we merely make concessions to what we believe to be error and prejudice. The logical jig-saw puzzle that theology is and must be does not exhaust its meaning. We are all struggling towards an ideal of comprehensive truth, and our intellectual visions are harmonized in God. The significance of the dominant position of sacerdotal and hierarchical conceptions of the Church in the actual situation is on the one side divine, if on the other human. "We all are wrong," says Barth; "only God is right."

One word more. Between the Church as the "blessed company of all faithful people" and the organized system stand the Sacraments. Of these it is the Sacrament of Holy Communion that comes into our direct line of thought. If the sacramental principle on the one hand and the ministerial institution on the other are necessary expressions of the life of the Church, which is primary? In other words, is it right to say "This or that community is (on the sacramental basis) a true part of the Church, because, in spite of ministerial deficiencies, it celebrates the Holy Communion," or to say "It is not part of the Church, because of these deficiencies, and therefore does not truly celebrate the Holy Communion at all"? The former alternative is ours. "We, who are many, are one bread, one body, *for* we all partake of the one bread." It would be radically against our whole conception of the Kingdom of grace to admit that the divine ordinance, celebrated in the Name of Christ, loses its covenantal meaning outside the limits of an institution. Whether we are right or wrong is another question. But no one can enter into our feeling with regard to intercommunion who does not keep this in view. If the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is, within the sphere of ordinance, the fundamental creative

factor of our corporate life as the Body of Christ, then it is above all conditions of validity. We cannot think of it as having grace merely *attached* to it when celebrated within a previous defined circle, delimited as such by correctness of organization. It has no "validity" but what is immanent in its own direct meaning, in the simple command of its Author, and in the intention of those who would carry out that command. And if some Christians of later days have failed fully to apprehend their Master's will in respect of the ministry, this no more stultifies their faith in Him as the Giver to them of the Sacrament than does any other of our failures and blindnesses that does not belie the sincerity of our profession. The Sacrament presupposes the spiritual community, but not the consolidated institution. This, at any rate, is our cherished belief.

If, then, we seem to emphasize the (relatively) immediate needs of our missions at the expense of fundamental principles, we must reply, directly and decidedly, that, *so far forth*, our principles themselves diverge from those of our critics. This is not opportunism, but what we claim as a vision of God immanent in the *changing* life of the concrete community, as it strives to realize itself as such upon earth. And this compels us to regard our institutional heritage rather as one factor interacting with others than as an iron law for all ages. That heritage is a very powerful factor, both for its value in our eyes and for its more than value in ranges of Christian thought other than our own. But we know no covenant defining the basis of Christ's Church but that which is immanent in the terms of the Gospel, and no criterion of the validity of the Sacraments that they do not carry within themselves.

AS IT WAS IN THE BEGINNING. By Mary Gould. *London: S.P.C.K.* 2*s.* net.

Parents and teachers who have to unfold the meaning of some of the earlier Biblical narratives will welcome this little book in which Genesis is "told anew," and in which helpful illustrations abound. Although the several stories are told again there is really nothing new and on the whole Miss Gould has accomplished her task with sound judgment.

Messrs. Charles J. Thynne & Jarvis have added to their "New Evangelical Library" *Where go the Dead?* by the Rev. C. W. Hale Amos, to which the late Dr. Casher contributed a Preface in which he commends the work as a scholarly contribution to the literature of the subject, and refers to the fullness of illustration and appeal which should impress the candid and thoughtful student. The subject is treated in two parts—"Prediction" and "Revelation"—in both of which much valuable information is brought together.

CONSPIRACY AND CONSCIENCE.[1]

A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE GUNPOWDER PLOT.

By John Knipe.

PART II. THE JESUIT POLICY AND THE PLOTTERS.

July–November 1605.

IT was probably at the "House in Essex" that Father Garnet met Father Greenway again and more earnestly renewed his protests. "At my second conference with Mr. Greenway," he records; during which interview he explained to his fellow-priest how "he hoped to persuade Mr. Catesby, who was not a bad man." Greenway, whose real name was Oswald Tesimond of York, was apparently quite impressed by Garnet's plain warning to him that it was their duty either to inform their Superiors in Rome, or to urge Catesby himself to submit the case of the English Catholics to the Pope, and ask his direction. I think that the astute Greenway really dreaded lest Garnet should declare the Confession to be "a Reserved Case" which only the Pope could decide. He told Garnet that it would be sacrilege to break the Seal, but he consented to speak further to Catesby.

Third Interview between Garnet and Catesby. White Webbs, Enfield Chace. July 24 (?).

Dr. Gardiner places this conference a few days before the fatal disclosure by Greenway at Fremland. But I find that he overlooked the fact that Garnet says he met Catesby again at White Webbs, while it was "at the House in Essex" that Catesby came to see him with Lord Monteagle. Further, Garnet, to his great relief, had just received an important letter from the Father General of the Order (Robert Parsons), and this letter he says that he answered on the 24th, *i.e.*, twelve days after the Provincial had been told the secret. White Webbs was their favourite rendezvous. Here the Jesuits "met twice a year to confess and renew their vows" in "that desolate half-timbered house full of trap-doors and secret passages" which stood on the verge of the Royal Chace hidden in trees from the Barnet Road. It was rented by Mistress Anne Vaux, herself bound by the Jesuit Vow of Obedience, from a certain Dr. Hewick, of whom nothing is known except that he was supposed to live in London. Anne Vaux was related to Catesby and a sort of cousin to most of the plotters; she was very rich and hospitable to all Jesuits and secular priests, who were called by their friends "Journeymen and Workmen." As many as fourteen Jesuits sometimes slept at White Webbs; "two beds being placed in a room," and the house was "spacious, fit to receive so great a company

[1] These articles on Conspiracy and Conscience have been published by special request.

that should resort to him thither " (Garnet). Anne passed as " Mrs. Perkins," sister to Mr. Meaze (Garnet), and she also called herself a widow, by which convenient alias she was known to her own servants, and, as was later admitted, " Mistress Anne Vaux doth usually go with him whithersoever he goeth." She caused some scandal by riding alone with her " good father " at night. Gentle and very devoted to her religion, Anne had some influence with Catesby, and no doubt Garnet hoped she might help him, at least indirectly, to frustrate what he called " unlawful, and a most horrible thing."

Although Garnet's account is designedly vague, we can form a fairly accurate idea of the conference between the two Jesuit Fathers and Robert Catesby. " Soon after this " (*i.e.* Catesby's visit to Fremland with Monteagle and Tresham) " Mr. Catesby came again, as he was seldom long from us, from the great affection he bore to the gentlewoman with whom I lived (Anne Vaux) and unto me." It was then Catesby's habit to stop at White Webbs whenever he passed through Barnet. Garnet continues: " I showed him my letter from Rome and admonished him of the Pope's pleasure. I doubted he had some device in his head, whatsoever it was, being against the Pope's will, it could not prosper. He said that what he meant to do, if the Pope knew, he would not hinder for the general good of the country. But I being earnest with him, and inculcating the Pope's prohibition, did add this, *quia expresse hoc Papa non vult et prohibet,* he told me he was not bound to take knowledge by me of the Pope's will. I said indeed my own credit was but little, but our General, whose letter I had read to him, was a man everywhere respected for his wisdom and virtue, so I desired him that before he attempted anything he would acquaint the Pope. He said he would not for all the world make his particular project known to him for fear of discovery. I wished him at the last in general to inform him how things stood by some lay gentleman."

What a fencing-match! With Greenway a silent and deeply concerned listener. But if Catesby's replies are carefully studied, and Garnet's urgency taken together with his warnings to Greenway and his messages by him to Catesby, it becomes clear that the Jesuit Superior must surely have already known their terrible secret, which the Seal of Confession forbade him to mention, except to Father Greenway. In reply to the Father General at Rome Garnet merely speaks in general terms of the danger of any private treason or violence against the King, and asks for the orders of his Holiness as to what is to be done in the case, and the formal prohibition of armed force. He has recorded that " he wrote repeatedly to get a prohibition under censures of all attempts." . . . " I remained in the greatest perplexity that ever I was in my life, and could not sleep at nights. . . . I prayed that God would dispose of all for the best and find the best means that were pleasing to Him to prevent so great a mischief."

Rome would only answer that " the Pope thought his general prohibition would serve." No doubt Father Garnet was sincere and he was in a horrible predicament. But his conscience had

been atrophied by years of countenancing treasons and plots against his country, and his sympathy was more stirred by the recusancy fines and petty hardships borne by Catesby and his friends, than by the plain ugly fact that these men premeditated the murder in cold blood of nearly eight hundred persons, besides those who lived in the various buildings adjacent to the House of Lords.

It must be understood that Garnet knew from Greenway how both the house in Whynniard's Block and "the Bloody Cellar" had been rented by Percy, that powder-barrels, billets and faggots were actually disposed in the vaulted Lumber-room, although Fawkes had gone back to Flanders as a blind, having locked up the coal-cellar and left the key with Mr. Percy.

If Father Garnet had been a man of stronger character he could doubtless have frustrated Catesby's schemes, and that without breaking his word as a priest. He admits this when he says, "Partly upon hope of prevention, partly that I would not betray my friend, I did not reveal the general knowledge of Mr. Catesby's intention which I had by him. . . ."

English Criminal Law does not allow that a man's knowledge of intended murder and treason can be kept in separate water-tight compartments, and it is difficult to see how justice could distinguish between his subsequent acts which must be influenced by both his professional and his ordinary sources of information.

Garnet rested his "hope of prevention" on Catesby's reluctant consent to send an emissary to inquire further of the Pope's will. But the arch-conspirator stipulated that his envoy should be furnished with Letters written by Father Garnet's own hand. The weak, irresolute Garnet played Catesby's game when he refused to do more than write Letters to the Nuncio in Flanders. It was his fear of the Pope which made the English Provincial try to shift the responsibility if he could.

The "Lay Gentleman." Sir Edmund Baynham.

Catesby fixed upon his friend Sir Edmund Baynham. He was a wild and dissolute adventurer, probably another supporter of Essex; who was nicknamed "The Captain of the Damned Crew." In a letter to Chief Justice Popham the King orders him "to apprehend certain loose people of the 'Damned Crew of Swaggerers' who seek to create disturbance against Scotchmen, and bind them over to keep the peace." (April, 1604.)

Baynham readily consented to convey Garnet's Letters to the Low Countries, and he may well have had good reasons for leaving England for a time, since he was a notorious person in town and suspected by the Government. The "Damned Crew of Swaggerers" were fierce young bloods of good family who picked quarrels with Scottish gentlemen, got exceedingly drunk and were a grievous annoyance to sober and law-abiding citizens.

Sir Edmund was a curious person to choose as an emissary to Rome, but he was utterly unscrupulous, which suited Catesby's plans. He let Baynham know that there would be something

of a seditious sort attempted for the Catholic Cause when the Parliament met, and Catesby secretly instructed the other to delay his journey after he reached Brussels, and to wait there until he heard whatever might have happened, then to go on post to Rome and inform the Pope. Garnet urged that the envoy should go abroad quickly. Yet when Bates, Catesby's servant, "inquired of Mr. Thomas Winter, 'Why they did not keep Sir Edmund Baynham here?' Winter answered that he was not a man fit for this business, but they had otherwise employed him by sending him to Rome, and that he stayed there only for Father Walley" (alias Garnet). (Examination of Thomas Bates.)

This statement looks as if Catesby tried more than once to get direct Letters for Rome from Garnet. And Baynham did not actually start until September; while Garnet comments: "Mr. Catesby's promise of doing nothing until Sir Edmund had been with the Pope, made me think that either nothing would be done or not before the end of the Parliament; before what time we should surely hear, as undoubtedly we should if Baynham had gone to Rome as soon as I imagined." Yet Garnet, who knew Catesby, must have seen that he was deceiving him by false assurances, and henceforward the Jesuit decided he would avoid White Webbs, and shun the pleasant company of his fast friend Mr. Robert Catesby.

Garnet leads the Pilgrimage to S. Winifred's Shrine. Flintshire. September.

The Judges of the Western Circuit had recently hanged a few priests under the Penal Laws, while further executions were quickly stopped by the King's express orders. Wales was fermenting with sedition and Garnet resolved on a General Pilgrimage to S. Winifred's Well, as a demonstration of the political influence of the Jesuit Mission.

He may possibly have meant to challenge arrest, hoping thus by imprisonment to escape the consequences of the intolerable and dangerous secret. About this time he heard that Parliament was again prorogued until November 5. This was good news, for Garnet hoped that the delay would hinder Catesby's Plot and give time for Baynham's audience and Rome's answer. Somehow rumours were current of a coming "Stir" during the next Parliament, and this caused much expectancy and agitation among the leading Roman Catholic families, who eagerly threw open their houses to the pilgrims. Unwittingly the relatives of those same Catholic Peers whose lives were threatened by Father Garnet's particular friend now joined the Pilgrimage, which started from Gothurst in Bucks, the beautiful seat of Sir Everard Digby, forgathering there under cover of an Otter Hunt in the River Ouse, which flowed by his grounds. Digby was another cousin of Anne Vaux, and his house-party included her sister, Mrs. Brooksby, and her husband; Mr. Ambrose Rookwood of Coldham Hall, Suffolk, and his wife; Mr. Thomas Digby, Sir Everard's brother, and other leading Papists. Of Jesuits besides the Provincial, there came Father Strange, Digby's chaplain, and that notorious lay-

brother, Garnet's server, Nicholas Owen, nicknamed " Littlejohn " from his being so very tall (" who hath a broken leg grown crooked "), a man who was admired for his skill in contriving " Priests' Holes," called " that useful cunning joiner of those times." Digby was so struck with Owen's work that he engaged his services at Gothurst after he should return from Wales. Altogether thirty persons started and rode by easy stages westward, being joined by others, and soon by Father Fisher, another Jesuit, stopping at different houses for the night, these being marked by the Government ; on the return they stayed at Huddington, the Warwickshire home of the two Winters, and also rested in the fortified manor of Norbrook Hall, belonging to Catesby's friend, Mr. John Grant. Cecil, now Lord Salisbury, did not attempt to interfere, though Masses were said daily, and the pilgrims became bolder, passing through Shrewsbury openly, and when Holt was reached a procession was formed with the Crucifix carried and it was headed by the priests, while the ladies walked barefoot the twenty miles distance to the shrine. Father Greenway does not appear to have been with them.

CATESBY ENROLS THE LAST FOUR. MICHAELMAS—OCTOBER.

Meanwhile Catesby had been busy in town and country. The plot was seriously embarrassed by shortage of funds, and it had been thought best to hire the ship of Henry Paris of Barking to convey Fawkes to Gravelines, " lest being a known dangerous man his presence should be suspected." This means of course that Fawkes was well known in the Low Countries, and his prolonged absence would be remarked. Paris waited six weeks at Gravelines to bring back Fawkes and his companion," both disguised," at the end of August. Percy had spent money lavishly, and paid one York, a carpenter, for " repairing his lodging " in Westminster, and " he caused a new door out of his house into the cellar to be made, where before there had been a grate of iron." The plotters had grown more reckless and narrowly escaped discovery when on September 4 one John Shepherd, a servant of Mr. Whynniard, being taken suddenly ill at Hampton Court where his master was employed as Keeper of the Wardrobe, " saw a boat lie close by the pale of Sir Thomas Parry's garden and men going to and fro the water through the back door that leadeth into Mr. Percy's lodging . . . though being sick and late he did not regard it."

What Shepherd saw that night we know must have been Keyes' boat bringing over the powder stored at Lambeth, and Fawkes with the rest carrying it to the cellar by the garden entrance to the right of Parliament Stairs. Fawkes had seen his friend Owen in Brussels and informed him of their conspiracy by leave of the rest, after he had taken the Oath, so that " he might hold good correspondency after with foreign princes." Catesby was not relying only on Baynham's services.

We learn this about Owen from Winter who explains further : " Now by reason that the charge of maintaining us all so long together, besides the number of several houses which for several uses

had been hired, and buying of powder, etc., had lain heavy on Mr. Catesby alone to support, it was necessary for to call in some others to ease his charge, and to that end desired leave that he with Mr. Percy and a third whom they should call might acquaint whom they thought fit and willing to the business, for many, said he, may be content that I should know who would not therefore that all the Company should know their names. To this we all agreed."

And nothing perhaps shows us the real Robert Catesby's mind more than this subtle proposal, which was, under Providence, the means of his being caught in his own devices.

Winter relates that "about this time (before Michaelmas)" Catesby met Percy at Bath.

Lord Monteagle was also expected to join them, but there is no proof that he did so, though he wrote to Catesby as "the dear Robin, for whose company he languished." During this conference at Bath Percy and Catesby discussed funds, and planned a rising in the Midlands. Doubtless Catesby was watching the Pilgrimage, for he rode to Norbrook Hall, which "moated and strongly walled house" he wanted to use, and was welcomed by MR. JOHN GRANT. Before Catesby left he had sworn in his friend who, being "a turbulent and quarrelsome man," had few scruples to overcome. He had once threatened to cut off the ears of a King's Messenger if he searched for priests in his house.

Grant showed Catesby his stables and promised him his hunters for the Catholic Cause. Norbrook Hall was to be a rallying centre.

Catesby departed before the pilgrims arrived, being anxious to intercept MR. AMBROSE ROOKWOOD, the wealthy Suffolk squire, whom he and Grant expected to ride ahead of the rest. Probably this meeting was contrived by Thomas Winter at Huddington, another halt near Norbrook, where Rookwood passed by. Rookwood scrupled at first, saying he disliked their intention of "taking away so much blood." He was the youngest of the number, only twenty-eight and recently married to a very devout and beautiful lady, but his affection for Catesby, "whom he loved and respected as his own life," made him believe the plausible assurances of the other that Father Garnet knew and had approved of the Plot. Rookwood had a chapel hidden in the roof at Coldham Hall, and there were three of Littlejohn's "Holes" concealed in the building. Having consented, Rookwood undertook to hire Clopton House near Stratford, to be within easier distance than Suffolk.

"HE CALLED IN AFTER SIR EVERATT DIGBY." (WINTER'S CONFESSION.)

There is a sinister significance in the peculiar deliberation of Robert Catesby's rides to "call in" friend after friend that autumn.

Accompanied by Bates, his old servant whose son was also in the service of his mother, Lady Anne Catesby, he rode on into Bedfordshire and stopped at Turvey Hall, where Lord Mordaunt greeted him hospitably, being the patron of Robert Keyes, as well as Catesby's friend.

Here something may have been said which Catesby resented. Possibly he had thought of " sounding " Mordaunt as to his willingness to join in the Rising for the Cause, which would have kept him away from the fatal Parliament ; or he may have asked his help in other ways. His reference to Mordaunt was contemptuous and bitter later on, and Catesby did not remain long at Turvey Hall, but having learned that Digby was now gone to Great Harrowden, the seat of Lord Vaux, he turned south and went straight into Bucks, being particularly desirous to find Sir Everard alone before the ladies returned with Garnet.

Digby expressed great pleasure at seeing Catesby and was full of his own affairs, having just arranged the betrothal of his ward, Lord Vaux, Anne's nephew, a boy of fourteen, with Lord Suffolk's daughter. Catesby could not well break his horrible intentions to Digby at such a time, and he stayed on at Digby's earnest entreaty and was as charming a guest as his friend expected. Earlier in the year Digby had written to Cecil, just granted the earldom of Salisbury, a strong and dignified remonstrance against the Recusancy Laws. (This letter must, I believe, be placed between May and October, although mistakenly given a later date by such as do not know that State prisoners accused of Treason were *never* allowed to seal their letters, nor retain their signet rings.) And Catesby very probably decided to " call in " Digby because of this same letter.

In a few days Lady Digby returned with Lady Vaux, Anne, her sister Mrs. Brooksby, Garnet and " Littlejohn," and Mass was said for the close of the Pilgrimage. Garnet was much disturbed to find Catesby with Digby.

And Father Greenway seems also to have visited Harrowden since Bates testified : " I saw them all together with my master at my Lord Vaux's," and he is speaking of the Jesuits and those who frequented White Webbs. Anne Vaux was distrait and uneasy, and Garnet observed that she watched Catesby furtively and seemed to suspect him. But Catesby did not appear to observe it and he treated his " dear Cousin " very affectionately before them all.

Harrowden was an uncomfortable house, being much dilapidated, and Digby asked them all to stay at Gothurst, which was one of the finest residences in the Home Counties.

The Ride to Gothurst. Early October.

Delighted with Catesby's conversation, Sir Everard proposed that they two should ride ahead to Gothurst Manor, which was fifteen miles away. Both were famous riders and the road was unfrequented. The October morning was fine and on horse-back they could talk freely on dangerous topics without risk of being overheard. Catesby considered the time was now ripe to acquaint Digby with their schemes. He knew his host meant to employ " Littlejohn " to construct secret chambers at Gothurst. When they had gone some distance Catesby told Digby that " he had a communication of great importance which could only be made on Oath ; all others who knew, gentlemen of name and blood, had been required to

seal the Oath with the Sacrament but he, Digby, was so honourable a man that his simple Corporal Oath would suffice." And having thus flattered his victim, Catesby drew his poniard and offering it to him, he asked Digby if he would swear like the rest. Sir Everard agreed and repeated the Oath of Secrecy. He expected to hear of some attempt for the Cause, and he had become like wax under Catesby's subtle handling or he would not have pledged himself so rashly. He kissed the steel with his hand on the cross-shaped hilt.

According to his manner Catesby told him curtly of their full intent. Digby could hardly believe his ears in the horror of that moment. He hesitated and temporized when Catesby demanded his consent. In silence they neared Gothurst, Digby turning over the details of the scheme in his mind. Once he ventured to ask Catesby what would become of their friends, the Papist lords?

"Assure yourself," replied Catesby quietly; "that such of the nobility as are worth saving shall be preserved and yet know not of the matter. The rest are atheists, fools, and cowards, and lusty (vulgar) bodies would be better for the Commonwealth than they." Digby reflected. He inquired if Catesby had placed the Case before the Father Provincial, or other priests of the Order.

"Yes," answered Catesby. "We have their approval in general and I would not have acted without it myself." Seeing how Digby was vacillating he named those whom the other knew: the two Winters, the Wrights, Percy, John Grant, and Ambrose Rookwood. "These," he said, "had all given consent and help."

But Digby said he must have further time to consider in so extreme a matter. Catesby was anxious that his host should not consult Father Garnet in confession, since the Provincial would of course deny that he approved of the Plot. He replied that when they reached Gothurst he would let Digby read for himself that their religion allowed acts of violence against heretic princes. Catesby regarded Digby's full consent as of vital importance.

Sir Everard was much respected and he was a very rich man in spite of recusancy fines. All the conspirators were now much impoverished, "they having spent great sums . . . especially Catesby . . . he having already taken up as much money in London upon interest as either his own credit or his friends would extend unto." (Howes' *Annals*.) This means that he had borrowed a full reversion on the property of which his mother, Lady Anne Catesby, held the life-interest. Percy had not even been able to pay the rent due at Michaelmas for the two houses at Westminster in Whynniard's Block, and the cellar sub-let by Mrs. Skinner.

Neither did Catesby let any friend go before he had secured him once such had been sworn to the Oath of Secrecy.

Now he showed Digby the Jesuit Treatise which convinced the wavering mind. "I saw the principal point of the case, judged by a Latin book of M.D." (Father Martin del Rio S.J.). "Digby to his Wife."

Listening to Catesby's plausible arguments, after the first shock passed off Digby began to doubt his own scruples. The horrid sugges-

tion lodged in his mind and became attractive, for Digby, though he was in his private life kindly, chivalrous and moral, inclined to bigotry, and he was the type of religious sentimentalist who can become amazingly cruel and cold-blooded. Afterwards he excused his conduct thus: "If I had thought there had been the least sin in the Plot, I would not have been in it for all the world: and no other cause drew me to hazard my Fortune, and Life, but Zeal to God's Religion. For my keeping it secret, it was caused by certain belief, that those which were best able to judge of the lawfulness of it (Garnet, etc.) had been acquainted with it, and given way unto it."

And he adds: "his friendship and love to Mr. Catesby prevailed."

ANNE VAUX TELLS GARNET HER SUSPICIONS OF CATESBY.

But Anne Vaux was much alarmed and Garnet admitted: "Mrs. Vaux came to him either to Harrowden or at Gothurst . . . she feared some trouble or disorder was towards, that some of the gentlewomen had demanded of her where they should bestow themselves until the *burst* (uproar) was past in the beginning of Parliament." He adds that "she durst not say who told her so; she was (choked) with sorrow." But we know from Anne herself how she told Garnet "she feared that the horses at Winter's (Huddington) and Grant's (Norbrook) were for mischief, and begged him to prevent it."

Garnet spoke to Catesby, "who said the horses were for the Low Countries."

Another desperate plan of Garnet's was to persuade Catesby to take the Spanish service. And Catesby dissembled, assuring Anne he meant to go there, when certain obstacles, such as obtaining leave from the Government, for himself and his troop, could be overcome.

But Garnet noticed how Digby also increased his stud with swift powerful horses, and he was alarmed by observing Nicholas Owen's work which included the device of a revolving floor into secret rooms and passages. It seems certain that Garnet and Anne Vaux were anxious to leave Gothurst while Catesby remained there. And as Digby arranged to rent Throgmorton House, Coughton, next month Garnet promised to go thither and celebrate All Hallowstide.

FAWKES COMES TO GOTHURST. OCTOBER.

Determined to compromise Digby with the Westminster scheme as well as the "Burst" in the Midlands, Catesby secretly sent for Fawkes. And I have personally no doubt that Father Garnet took care to be gone before Mr. Guy Fawkes arrived.

He came of course to take charge of money, since on his return he paid the rent due to Mr. Ferrers, acting as Percy's trusted servant John Johnston. And Digby was willing to talk with Fawkes, for that wet stormy night when Fawkes rode to his door, mud-splashed and soaked, the wind howling, and dank leaves blown against the shutters, while seated with his host and Catesby in Digby's own closet

Fawkes muttered: "he feared the powder would get damp and not explode, and more must be procured on his return."

Did Digby think when he heard that of the grief and distress his treason must bring upon his unsuspecting wife, and his two boys, the elder of whom was but two years old, and the other a baby in arms? Hardly, for he drank with Fawkes and Catesby to the success of their enterprise! Henceforth Sir Everard Digby carefully avoided seeing "his brother" Father John Gerard.

"And last of all Mr. Francis Tressam." (Winter's Confession.)

More money was still needed. They must hire a ship to take Fawkes over as soon as he had fired the train, and ridden to Greenwich. He himself set a high price on his dangerous services, for he had been hired for his own job, and was not to take part in the Rising. The richest man whom they knew was Mr. Francis Tresham of Rushton, Northants, whose father, that stanch old recusant, Sir Thomas Tresham, had just died, leaving Francis a rent-roll of more than three thousand a year. Tresham was "a wild unstayed man," discontented and continually engaged in seditious schemes, who had helped Christopher Wright's mission to Spain, and had discussed armed revolt before Monteagle, his brother-in-law, when they saw Garnet with Catesby at Fremland last July. Only Tresham, as the owner of Rushton Hall, and other fine houses, had more to lose, and being more settled in his married life he might be harder to persuade.

On October 14 Catesby met Francis Tresham, and it is almost certain the interview was either at Rushton Hall or Ashby St. Ledgers, for about the middle of the month Catesby was holding secret meetings at the Bell Inn, Daventry, near both houses, as was testified later by Matthew Young, the host, one Rogers being sent to Lapworth to fetch Mr. John Wright, "to meet certain parties," and Mr. Fawkes being present, while the younger Bates watched that no unfit person should spy on such conferences. They also met at Clopton House by Rookwood's invitation, and Shakespeare must have seen "the richly-clad gallants" who rode past his Welcome lands, for his fields were only divided from Clopton by hedges. He would recognize Sir Everard Digby, who often dined at the Mermaid in Cheapside. But it is doubtful if Tresham came there.

The case of Tresham presents more perplexities than any other whom Catesby enrolled. He agreed with little hesitation and promised an instalment of two thousand pounds by November 1, and he offered to furnish the ship for the escape of Fawkes. He showed some natural concern for his brothers-in-law, Lords Stourton and Monteagle, but he accepted Catesby's assurances that they would be kept away.

Then Tresham seems to have given Catesby to understand his support would be only financial, and he withdrew from their company.

The Plot Funds amounted to about £30,000 in coin and promises, which was an enormous sum for those times: Digby would give £1,500, besides supplying men, horses and armour; Rookwood as much or more; Thomas Percy hoped to squeeze another £4,000 from the Earl's rentals, Northumberland being naturally quite unaware of the forced levy,—while all the sworn conspirators threw what they had into hotch-potch, and other wealthy friends contributed who knew only of the proposed Rising.

TRESHAM VISITS CATESBY AT WHITE WEBBS. OCTOBER 18.

Though Garnet's movements are obscure, both he and Anne Vaux were at White Webbs for a few days in October. He said to his confidant, Father Oldcorne: "I think it not convenient to deny we were at White Webbs. . . . Since I came out of Essex I was there two times." One visit has been fixed, viz., July 24, and by the later testimony of the servants it seems evident that Garnet had been there very recently. Now the sworn plotters were assembling in and round town, except Percy, who was busy collecting rentals, and Digby, who was selling cattle and sheep at Gothurst. On October 18, Tresham, who was Anne's favourite cousin, came to White Webbs, and saw Catesby, Fawkes and Winter. He said plainly that "he was in a state of terrible anxiety," and he begged to warn his noble relatives, Lords Stourton and Monteagle. Alarmed though Catesby was, he remained cool and discussed the question freely. They all wished to save the young Lord Vaux and the boy Earl of Arundel, and Catesby even propounded a plan "to send someone to wound him (Arundel) slightly," and keep him abed. Percy had spoken for Northumberland and Keyes for Lord Mordaunt. The latter name caused Catesby to swear that "he would not for a chamberful of diamonds acquaint him with their secret, for he knew he could not keep it." He added, "the innocent must perish with the guilty, sooner than ruin their chances of success."

However, Tresham persisted. He declared if these could not be saved when Parliament met, the explosion should be put off until a more favourable time, and that all but Fawkes had better retire to Flanders, in the ship which lay at anchor in the Thames mouth. Then Catesby changed his Roman manner and he promised some means should be found to warn such of their friends whom he thought likely to be there, and said he had pledged his word to Digby. Tresham went away apparently satisfied. Catesby dared not detain him, lest Monteagle might know of this visit. He told Winter to watch Tresham's movements and see if he went down to Rushton for the money, which he now declared he could not raise by November 1.

CATESBY WARNS LORD MONTAGUE. OCTOBER 22 (?).

"Mr. Catesby could not find it in his heart to go to see the Lady Derby or the Lady Strange at their houses, though he loved them above all others. It pitied him to think they must all die." (Garnet.)

Whether on impulse or intention Catesby himself warned Lord Montague, who on November 12th wrote the following explanation to the Earl of Dorset, his father-in-law: "Upon the Tuesday before All Saints' Day (October 29) in the Savoy I met Mr. Robert Catesby, with whom I had some few words of compliment, and among the rest in these words or the like: 'The Parliament I think bringeth your lordship up now?' Whereunto I answered to this effect and in these words as much as I can remember: 'No, surely; but it will on Monday next, unless my Lord Treasurer (Dorset) do obtain me his Majesty's licence to be absent which I am in some hope of.' Then he said to this effect: 'I think your lordship takes no great pleasure there?' Whereunto I assented. And so after a word or two 'of my walks' (as I remember) and 'of maintaining them' which to my knowledge he nought has, I parted from him." In another letter Montague says carefully, "having met him by chance in the way," and put the date as the 14th, Tuesday, which is impossible since Catesby was then in Northants, and the 14th was a Monday. Certainly he was at White Webbs on the 29th, and he had no such friendly concern then!

It is evident, as Fawkes admitted, that "some general warning was given as from friend to friend." Probably Keyes told his wife to warn Mordaunt, since she lived in his house and had care of his children. Stourton, Vaux, Arundel and Northumberland were not likely to be present. On the 25th Thomas Winter saw Tresham unawares in his Clerkenwell lodging and demanded £100, which Tresham gave him being in a hurry to go down to Rushton. He promised to meet Winter at Barnet on the 29th and give him more money for the Plot.

Finally on October 26 Lord Monteagle, while supping at Hoxton, received the anonymous letter, bidding him "to devise some excuse to shift of your attendance at this parliament."

THY WORD IS TRUTH. By Professor Hain, Ph.D., F.R.S.L. *London: Simpkin Marshall, Ltd.* 1s. 6d.

A small book which must not be judged by either its size or price. It has earned the commendation of Dr. Burroughs, Bishop of Ripon, Bishop Welldon, the Dean of Durham, the Bishop of Plymouth and others, and has been well described as "an invaluable 'source-book' for the preacher." Here will be found a collection of valuable testimonies to the beauty, living power and truth of the Bible. Great scholars, eminent Divines, powerful sovereigns, statesmen, poets, novelists and others, come upon the stage to deliver themselves upon the subject of the Bible and we recommend every Christian teacher and preacher to possess himself of this useful manual.

S. R. C.

THE PROBABLE CONNECTION OF LAKE VAN WITH NOAH'S FLOOD.

By Lieut.-Colonel F. A. Molony, O.B.E., late R.E.

LAKE VAN, in eastern Turkey in Asia, is a very large lake, of about 1,500 square miles. Its height is 5,680 feet above the sea, and it has no surface outlet.[1]

The remarkable point about it is, that six different valleys lead out of the depression in which Lake Van lies. That is, if the waters of Lake Van were raised by various amounts totalling 1,062 feet, it would empty itself by six wholly different routes, of which two lead to the Euphrates, and four to the Tigris. The "cols"[2] cover an arc of 85 miles, and high mountains usually lie between them. Now in the case of such depressions, geologists usually infer that the valley first formed must have got temporarily blocked, causing the formation of a lake, the waters of which rose until they found a different depression, which they proceeded to cut into a valley. In the case of the Lake Van depression, this blocking must have happened several times. Old shore lines have been noted round Lake Van, 15 feet, 40 feet, and 100 feet above its present level.

Only a rise of 260 feet would be needed to cause the lake to overflow by two widely separated valleys.

The blocking of the valleys was probably caused either by volcanic action or by glaciers.

The broadest valley leading from the Lake Van depression is that to the south-west of the lake. Six miles north of this valley is Nimrud Dagh, a very large volcano, with a crater over 4 miles in diameter. It erupted violently as recently as A.D. 1441, and was "rent asunder to the breadth of a city." A geologist writes: "An eruption of cindery basalt dammed up Lake Van." It appears from Felix Oswald's geological map of Armenia that lava has flowed from this volcano via the Bitlis valley for 30 miles. Lava would make a permanent dam, cinders a permeable dam, but volcanoes often emit mud, and mud would make an impermeable dam, but one that would give way rapidly once the water rose high enough to top it.

Several instances have been known of valleys having been so blocked by glaciers that considerable lakes have formed. In such

[1] The 4-miles-to-one-inch map published in 1919, says that Lake Van has a "periodic rise and fall of about eight feet, lasting five years each movement." There has been much speculation as to the cause of this. The most natural explanation is that a subterranean syphon must exist, with an aperture of such a size that it takes 5 years to run 8 feet off the lake. The rain then usually takes another 5 years to fill the lake up again, when the next strong wind towards the passage starts the syphon again. On the other hand, no known stream in the neighbourhood has a similar periodic rise and fall, nor does any spring come out of the ground so strongly impregnated with soda as the waters of Lake Van.

[2] A "col" is a neck between hills, or the top of a pass between mountains.

cases the material of the dam, being lighter than water, gives way with great suddenness, causing a flood very dangerous to life in the valley below. We shall also need to inquire whether a glacier could have come down as low as the level of Lake Van in Noah's time, for certainly they do not do so now in that latitude.

The best-known instance of a glacier creating a lake, is the creation by the Aletsch Glacier of the Marjölen See, north-east of Brieg, in the valley of the Upper Rhone. This lake is a mile long, by 550 yards wide, and is about 90 feet deep. T. G. Bonney gives half a dozen other cases, and writes: " Though a large mass of ice can act for a time as a dam, this is very liable to give way." He says that he once saw the Marjölen See drop 60 feet in twenty-four hours.

Bonney gives interesting details of the inundation of the valley of the Drance in 1818. It was caused by " the advance of the glacier of Gétroz, which dammed up the river and formed a lake about 10,000 feet long, 400 wide, and 200 deep ; containing, it was estimated, about 800,000,000 cubic feet of water. The danger of the situation being recognized, about two-fifths of the water was successfully drained off by means of an ice tunnel, and people in the valley were warned of their danger ; but the dam suddenly broke up, the water came down like a wall, and 50 lives were lost."

The case of a glacier blocking a tributary of the Indus, near its head-waters, will be fresh in every one's mind ; a very dangerous flood was the result. We were told that a flood similarly caused had once drowned a Sikh army. It is generally believed that the " parallel roads " of Glen Roy were due to a similar cause. If so, it proves that ice can hold water up to a depth of 700 feet.

Before considering whether a glacier could have come down as low as the level of Lake Van in Noah's time, it is essential that we assign some date to that much-discussed deluge.

Archbishop Usher put the date of the flood at 2448 B.C. It has long been recognized that this date is too recent. The Babylonian " King lists " would put it very much earlier, but if we adopt the recently proposed and reasonable method of assigning to these kings average reigns of twenty-five years, this gives the date for the great flood as 4500 B.C. say, 6,400 years ago. The evidence that the Ice Age was then not long past its greatest intensity is partly astronomical, but mostly geological.

Astronomical Evidence.

The obliquity of the ecliptic has, for the last 100 years, been decreasing steadily at the rate of 0·47 seconds of arc a year, but this would only amount to 50 minutes in the whole period, and, though it would mean an extension of the polar circle by 50 minutes, is hardly worth mentioning.

Astronomers do not profess to be at all certain about the cause of Ice Ages. The theory which they favour most is that the ellipse of the earth's orbit is elongated every 21,000 years. At present,

winter in the northern hemisphere occurs when the earth is nearest the sun, but 10,500 years ago the opposite condition prevailed, and there must have been a long succession of very cold winters. If this caused the last Ice Age, then at the date we are assuming for Noah's flood, 6,400 years ago, the Ice Age was indeed passing away, but the melting had not yet reached its fastest epoch.[1]

Geological Evidence.

Mr. H. H. Howorth, writing about the "Pleistocene flood," says that he is disposed to think that "it was one of a recurrent series of similar catastrophes . . . though far from being universal, it was certainly one of the most widespread catastrophes which the world has seen." It was "probably caused by the rapid and perhaps sudden upheavals of some of the largest mountain chains in the world." What follows here is not written in opposition to these upheaval theories.

The same author says: "We must allow that in the last period of the earth's history there was a development of glaciers on a large scale in nearly all latitudes where high land existed . . . this view . . . seems to be established beyond question."

The Aletsch Glacier in Switzerland descends to 5,500 feet, a little lower than the level of Lake Van. The latitude of the glacier is 46° 20′, of the lake 38° 20′. So we have to account for a glacier descending to the same level in 8 degrees of latitude further south.

Felix Oswald, in his geology of Armenia, mentions several glaciers still existing in the Armenian highlands. He writes of a "quite imposing glacier" on the west side of Ararat, and another "at the head of the great Akhury chasm descending to as low an altitude as 8,000 feet."

Now J. Geikie, in *Prehistoric Europe*, shows the ice cap on the Caucasus coming down to the shores of the Black Sea. These two latter facts, taken together, demonstrate that glaciers may have come down to the level of Lake Van (5,680 feet) long after the fastest epoch of melting of the Ice Age had passed.

Geologists have lately come to believe that the last Ice Age was much nearer our time than they formerly supposed.

Rocks like those at the head of Derwentwater, which have obviously been polished by ice, do not look as if they had been exposed to all weathers for more than 7,000 years.

Niagara receded 4·4 feet a year before so much of its water was taken for power purposes. The post-glacial gorge which it has cut

[1] Major-General Drayson claimed to prove that the pole of the heavens describes a circle round a point 6 degrees distant from the pole of the ecliptic in 31,686 years. That the minimum obliquity of the earth's axis to the plane of its orbit will be in A.D. 2295. That its maximum was in 13,548 B.C. and was 35½ degrees. Consequently 5626 B.C. was the fastest epoch of melting. If Drayson be right, it is certain that glaciers must have descended to Lake Van in 4500 B.C. It is quite possible that both Drayson's and the ellipse theories are true causes of the Ice Ages, and this may account for those ages occurring in groups.

is 7 miles long. In strict proportion this should have taken 8,400 years to cut. Gilbert puts it at 7,000 years.

By counting mud markings, De Geer seems to have clearly established that the ice margin retreated north past Stockholm only about 9,000 years ago.

Now considering that the height of Lake Van is 5,680 feet, it seems fairly certain that glaciers must have descended to its level 6,400 years ago, and one of these may easily have caused a temporary block, like that which recently happened on the Shyok tributary of the Upper Indus.

As regards the volume of the flood, the area of Lake Van is 1,476 square miles. If it rose 100 feet, its area would be 1,771 square miles. Taking the mean of these, we find that if the water ran off to its present level when the lake had been filled to the height of the 100-foot raised beach, it would send down 30 *cubic miles* of water. Now this is 5,600 times what the burst of the Gétroz Glacier sent down, even taking that figure at 800,000,000 cubic feet of water, which is obviously an over-estimate, as it is got by multiplying together the maximum length, breadth and depth of the temporary lake.

Let us take another instance to help us realize what a 30-cubic-mile flood means. It is 468 times the volume of the flood sent down by the bursting of the glacier on the Indus, taking the figures as published in the journal of the Geographical Society, and reckoning as in the last case. The topography is such, that the flood from Lake Van may have been 400 cubic miles.

The gradient of the valley down which such a flood would run is as much as 22 feet per mile for the first 200 miles, then 4 feet per mile for 240 miles, and then only 1 foot in 3 miles for the last 330 miles to the Persian Gulf. Needless to say, this marked flattening of gradient is precisely what makes for a great flood.

Sixty miles north-west of Mosul, or Nineveh, the Tigris comes out of the high hills, and from there to 20 miles south of Mosul the contoured map shows low rounded hills, all rising to about the same graded plane, and looking very much as though they were made of the coarser silt deposited by some tremendous flood.

To this we can now add evidence about the finer silt.

Mr. C. Leonard Woolley's article in *The Times* of 16th March, 1929, is headed: "The Flood. New evidence from Ur." The following are extracts from his concluding summary. "What we have then is this. First, evidence of an extremely early occupation in which two elements seem to combine; of its duration our work on the fringe of the island can give no idea. Then comes a catastrophe which buries the low-lying parts of the island, with its relics of human activity, under a huge bank of water—laid clay. On the top of this we have a fresh occupation which carries on some of the old traditions . . . only a flood—and that one of unexampled magnitude—could have deposited the 8-foot bank of clay which we have found overlying the original settlement of Ur—and we have found it, not in one spot alone, but in three, as much as 200 yards

apart. . . . The flood of Sumerian legend is also the flood of the book of Genesis . . . in no other way can I interpret the facts which our excavations here give us."

This is evidence that the flood came down from the mountains, and not up from the sea, as some have supposed. For the mud producing the clay would naturally be carried further than the coarse gravel, and would have been found near Mosul, not near Ur, if the flood came from the sea.

If the flood came down the Tigris, then Ur was a backwater, where the water stood almost stagnant for months.

Evidence from the Records.

The earliest version of the story of Noah's flood is the Sumerian. The late Dr. L. W. King, F.S.A., published in 1918 a book entitled *Legends of Babylon and Egypt in Relation to Hebrew Tradition.* He used early texts inscribed towards the close of the third millennium B.C. These texts are very much damaged, but say :

> " By our hand a flood will be sent
> To destroy the seed of mankind."

The missing portion of the fourth column must have described Ziusudu's building of the great boat in order to escape the deluge, for at the beginning of the fifth column we are in the deluge itself.

> " All the mighty wind-storms together blew.
> The flood . . . raged
> When for seven days, for seven nights
> The flood had overwhelmed the land.
> When the wind-storm had driven the great boat over the mighty waters."

The reader is requested to note the last line, as we shall have occasion to refer to this wind later.

Gilgamesh Epic.

The most important ancient version, outside of the Bible, is the Gilgamesh Epic. Mr. C. P. T. Winckworth, of Cambridge, has kindly given the author the following as the best translation :

> " For one day the de(luge . . .)
> Swiftly mounted up (. . .) mountain (. . .)
> Like a war engine it comes upon the people.
> By six days and nights the wind drives,
> The deluge tempest overwhelms the land,
> When the seventh day arrives the tempest subsides in the onslaught.
> Urragal tears out the mast."

The Gilgamesh Epic states that the man corresponding to Noah built the ark at Shuruppak, which has been identified in latitude 31° 35′ N. and longitude 45° 45′ E. If this be correct, then a flood coming from Lake Van would have emerged from the mountains 430 miles from where the ark was built. The waters would have spread themselves before they lifted the ark, consequently the bore wave did not cause the ark to capsize, but apparently gave it a very nasty flick, which caused it to lose its mast.

An Irish fisherman once told the author that he was sailing in the mouth of Bantry Bay, where there is a submerged rock on which waves break occasionally. He reckoned that it could not break at the then state of tide, and sailed over it. But it did break, and snapped his mast.

The portion of this extract most relevant to our subject is that about a war engine, because such, in early days, generally took the form of a tower, with battering ram below, which was *rolled* towards the fortress it was to attack. Mr. Bonney writes regarding the flood in the Drance Valley already mentioned: "It is said to have issued from the defile of Lourtier like a moving wall or mound, a hundred yards high, the head of the column of water being entirely masked by the confused mass of mud, stones, beams and trunks of trees which it swept along, and overhung by a dense cloud of dust. The people in the valley had been warned of their danger, nevertheless 50 lives were lost."

The advance of a war engine would appear to be a very apt illustration to use to describe floods caused by the bursting of glacier dams.

The mention of the dense cloud of dust in connection with the Drance disaster should also be noticed, because the Gilgamesh Epic mentions a "Black cloud" in connection with the flood it describes.

When a "bore" rushes up a tidal river, there is generally a main wave or "wall," but a good many rises after it. In the same way the flood caused by the bursting of a dam at Lake Van would probably "mount up" after the "wall" had passed. In the centre of the Mesopotamian plain this would probably take a whole day. If we attach weight to the two first lines of the foregoing extract, we can no longer believe that the flood was mainly due to rain. Nor does the Bible say so. In view of the size of Lake Van, it is easy to see that the flood might keep the same high level for five or six days more.

The Bible Account.

We now come to the Biblical account of Noah's flood.

This account says that the ark was 300 cubits long, 50 broad and 30 high; and these are very near the dimensions of a pre-Dreadnought battleship. But the Sumerian account says that the length and breadth of the ark were equal, and Dr. King remarks that, if so, it was probably like the circular coracles still used on the Tigris. But if made to the dimensions given in Genesis, its construction would be easier than if made circular, because one or two big logs would span it from side to side. It probably drew 15 cubits of water.

By saying that "the fountains of the great deep were broken up," the Bible hints that the flood was due to some cause in addition to rain. If the waters on Lake Van were nearly topping the temporary dam, then a bout of wet weather would cause the dam to overflow and burst.

The author has long held that Genesis vii. 20 has not received the attention it deserves. It runs, "15 cubits upward did the waters prevail, and the mountains were covered." Now 15 cubits was probably not more than 25 of our feet—a quite insignificant measurement compared to what we now call mountains, but sufficient to submerge all the artificial mounds and sand-dunes of the great plain of Mesopotamia. It would seem that the chronicler in the ark, seeing nothing but water, and knowing that the mounds were about 15 cubits high, stated that the water had risen that much. How much more, he had no means of judging.

Genesis viii. 3 implies that for 150 days there was nothing but water to be seen. The fourth verse describes the grounding of the ark at the end of that period—probably the first intimation the inmates received that the flood was running off. Two and a half months later the tops of mounds appeared,—very likely there were no high ones in the vicinity. Two months later, the plain began to dry, but, as there was no grass to be seen anywhere, while there still was forage in the ark, and as travelling to where grass could be got would be rendered very difficult by the fact that every depression was still full of water, Noah wisely waited another eight weeks before disembarking.

The Bible account certainly represents the flood as taking a very long time to run off. We have, however, seen that Lake Van might send down a most colossal flood. And the gradient of the Mesopotamian plain is so slight, that when the wind was from the south-east and strong, the water would hardly run off at all.

W. K. Loftus, in *Travels and Researches in Chaldæa and Susiana*, (*re* Bagdad) says, "The Tigris rose 22½ feet, and it was a full month before the people could ride beyond their walls."

Thus it would seem that we have hitherto been dealing with perfectly clear and credible statements, consistent with our idea of the flood proceeding from Lake Van.

Now we come to a more debatable passage, which must be noticed, lest we be thought to shirk the evidence, for Genesis vii. 4 states that the ark rested upon the mountains of Ararat, and not at the south-east end of the great plain, though we should expect a flood coming from Lake Van to carry it to the latter neighbourhood.

There seems scant reason why we should take this passage to refer to the particular peak we now call Ararat, which is unlikely to have been known to the author of the original record. It was more likely meant as a name for the whole of the Armenian highlands. The Jews have a tradition that the ark grounded on the Judi Dagh, which is east of Mosul, and about 50 miles south of Lake Van.

Other accounts state that it grounded further to the south and east on Mount Nisir.

It seems that we may assume that the ark grounded among the foothills north-east of the great Mesopotamian plain. Perhaps a south wind drove it up there; such a wind might easily cause a comparatively lightly laden ship to ride over the current, which

would not be strong so far from where the flood debouched upon the plain.

SUMMARY.

The raised beaches on the south shores of Lake Van prove conclusively that in past times its waters have stood at higher levels than they do now. The number of valleys leading from the depression of the lake imply that this was due to temporary blocks, and not to ordinary processes of denudation. These blocks may have been caused by volcanic mud, landslides or glaciers. Records show the latter to be a very probable cause, and it is known that, when ice-dams break, they do so suddenly.

We then found reason to believe that Noah's flood may be dated about 4500 B.C., at which date the last Ice Age would not have passed from so high a lake as Van.

We then noted the colossal volume of the flood that Lake Van could send down, the steepness of the drop, and the flatness of the great Mesopotamian plain. The low gravelly hills round Mosul, and the 8-foot bed of clay at Ur, both point to a very huge flood, which cannot have come up from the sea.

We then turned to the ancient records, and found that the Sumerian speaks of the flood overwhelming the land for seven days, while the Gilgamesh Epic says that it mounted up in one. The Biblical account is rather vague on this point. The description of the flood coming upon the people like a war engine, and the tearing out of the mast, both imply that the flood was extremely sudden. The Biblical account is perfectly consistent in its account of how the flood ran off, though the time it took to do so was longer than we should have expected.

Finally, we saw that the Biblical statement that the ark grounded on Ararat need hardly force us to abandon a theory for which there is so much evidence.

The Biblical and other documents all agree as to the fact of the flood : recent excavations at Ur confirm it : and the author trusts that the suggestion of a flood coming from Lake Van may explain as eminently reasonable what has hitherto appeared to be unlikely or incredible.

Those Fifty Years, by Bramwell Booth, C. H. (Cassell & Co., 7*s*. 6*d*. net), contains some further reminiscences of the late General of the Salvation Army. They throw an interesting light upon his early days and the home influence of his mother, and tell of the part he played in the expansion of the Army movement. There are recollections of associations with many interesting and important people, and stories amusing and pathetic illustrating the experiences of the officers. The whole series of memories gives an insight into the development of the Army from the days of struggle and persecution, and an impression of the work for God which has been accomplished.

THE FIRST FOUR BISHOPS OF ROME.

A NEW STUDY IN HISTORICAL VALUES.

By Rev. J. B. McGovern, F.S.A.Scot., F.Ph.S.

THE proudest royal houses are but of yesterday, when compared with the line of the Supreme Pontiffs. That line we trace back in an unbroken series, from the Pope who crowned Napoleon in the nineteenth century to the Pope who crowned Pepin in the eighth ; and far beyond the time of Pepin the august dynasty extends, till it is lost in the twilight of fable.

So wrote Macaulay in 1840 in his grandiloquent essay on Von Ranke's *History of the Popes of Rome during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, and the passage closes with equally high-flown and oft-quoted sentences :—

" She [the Roman Church] was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's."

These two passages, entirely Macaulayesque, reach assuredly the high-water mark of rhetorical laudation. One wonders why the illustrious author did not, either before or after his famous Essay, make a pilgrimage to Westminster and submit to the Church in which he saw such unrivalled success, and for which he prophesied such triumphant longevity. But it is two expressions in the former paragraph—" unbroken series " and " twilight of fable "—that I purpose dealing with here. The first is a strangely inaccurate phrase to be dropped from the pen of so eminent and practised an historian as Macaulay. Nor can he be accused of a deliberate *suppressio veri* in the matter ; probably (the most lenient view to take of his curious inaccuracy) his rhetoric must have overrun his knowledge, or the urge to coin telling phrases have unconsciously swamped the truth, but he must have known that the line of Supreme Pontiffs from Pius VII (1800–23) to Zacharias (741–52) was the very reverse of an " unbroken series." Was Macaulay ignorant of the " Babylonian " Captivity of 68 years (1309–77) ? Did he not know that between Pius VII and Zacharias there were thirty out of thirty-three Anti-Popes, and, many vacancies of the See, lasting in the aggregate for some twenty-nine years ? [1] Did the period of the Great Schism (1378–1427) entirely slip his prodigious memory ? If at any time the " line " was not "unbroken " it occurred during the vacancy of two years and five months—between the

[1] For the lists of anti-popes and vacancies, cf. Chronological Table, skilfully and carefully prepared from authentic sources, by Rev. H. F. Gaster, M.A., Lect. in Eccl. Hist., Lond. Coll. of Div., 1905–26 ; in *Protestant Dictionary*, 1904.

deposition of John XXIII and the election of Martin V (1415–17), and the thirty-nine others during the centuries. Up to 1870 Roman theologians explained these interregna simply on the ground that Papal Infallibility resided then in the Church and Council, but the Vatican Council's Decree rendered both deposits nugatory by defining it to be personal to the Pope alone ("Ex sese non ex consensu Ecclesiae"). In other words, the Vatican Council cut its own throat and that of all Councils past and for evermore.

The second phrase of the first paragraph—"lost in the twilight of fable"—is truer than possibly its author meant it to be. For beneath its rhetoric lies a throbbing assertion of truth, which it has been the passionate endeavour and interest of the Church of Rome to deny. The question presents itself thus primarily to the unbiased student of ecclesiastical history. (1) Was Simon Peter the First Bishop of Rome? (2) If so, what was the duration of his Pontificate? (3) Who were his first four successors? On these three questions the whole fabric of the Papal claims is reared. They are not new, but it is claimed that their present treatment in this paper is such. (1) Was Simon Peter the first Bishop of Rome? Upon the historical values of this question depend, of course, those of Nos. 2 and 3. And on the threshold of this inquiry we are confronted with Macaulay's staggering phrase, "lost in the twilight of fable." We have no means of knowing now what precise meaning he attached to it. And mere surmise is not very helpful. It may mean that its author was tolerably sure that from Napoleon to Pepin the line or series of Roman Bishops was sober history, but that from Pepin upwards it was decidedly dubiously such, and melted away gradually into the "twilight of fable" in the dusk of which Macaulay's otherwise clear vision failed to penetrate to any certainty. It is certainly a saving phrase, and aptly descriptive of the attitude of many towards this first of our three questions. But let me first clear the ground by a sub-question: Was Simon Peter ever in Rome at all? This is held to be as vital as it is thorny in the scale of questions. Can it be solved? Only by haling it to the bar of history fairly and judicially. Roman apologists cling to 1 Peter v. 13, as Scripture proof of the affirmative: *Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ* (Scholz Text)—Vulgate: Salutat vos ecclesia quæ est in Babylone coëlecta—as an allegorical allusion to Rome under the symbol of Babylon; but, as the Rev. H. W. Dearden, M.A., observes, "Symbolism does not seem in character with the rest of the Epistle."[1] Besides, the Epistle was written *from*, not *to*, Babylon.

I. Was Simon Peter ever in Rome?

Von Hase's remarks on this text are worth quoting:

"The Roman contention has detected the sole support in Holy Scripture for a residence of St. Peter in Rome in the first Epistle of St. Peter, where he offers a salutation from the Church at Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13), since they

[1] *Modern Romanism Examined*, 1909, p. 76.

are so modest as under this town of heathen abominations to consider without more ado that Rome is signified. . . . A straightforward letter, in which otherwise there is not to be found the most remote allusion to Rome. On the other hand, in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, where it brings St. Paul to Rome, in the letters of St. Paul from his Roman prison, above all, in his Epistle to the Romans, in all the individual salutations in the last chapter to members of the Roman Church, we seek in vain for a hint of the presence of St. Peter there, or even for any reference to him whatever. Support is sought for the view by assuming various journeys and long absences of St. Peter from his bishopric. They must indeed have been long-continued, according to the tradition. And if a twenty-five years' bishopric is to be our conclusion, it commences in the year 43. Now we find St. Peter in the year 44 in prison. In the year 50 St. Paul meets him again in Jerusalem. The Epistle to the Romans belongs to the year 58. When St. Paul two years later comes as a prisoner to Rome, and during his long confinement there, no trace of St. Peter is to be seen; that is to say, all the time that we happen to have a more precise knowledge as to a place of sojourn of St. Peter or the circumstances of the Church in Rome, St. Peter is not to be found there." [1]

But fairness exacts that the precept *Audi alteram partem* should be borne in mind especially in this discussion. I willingly call the subjoined from Dr. Salmon's long-famous work, *Infallibility of the Church*, 1914, p. 348:

"Plainly if Peter was ever at Rome, it was after the date of Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy (68). . . . Some Protestant controversialists have asserted that Peter was never at Rome; but though the proofs that he was there are not so strong as I should like them to be if I had any doctrine depending on it, I think the historic probability is that he was; though, as I say, at a late period of the history, and not long before his death. . . . For myself, I am willing, in the absence of any opposing tradition, to accept the current account that Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome. We know with certainty from John xxi. 18 that he suffered martyrdom somewhere. If Rome, which early laid claim to have witnessed that martyrdom, were not the scene of it, where then did it take place? . . . Baronius (in *Ann.* LVIII, § 51) owns the force of the Scripture reasons for believing that Peter was not in Rome during any time on which the New Testament throws light" (p. 350).

There is, further, the "Domine, quo vadis?" tradition, and the difficulty of proving the negative of Scripture silence, but the one is as unreliable as the other, for tradition is not history, and logic is fallible. This expresses my own view of this part of my inquiry. I then turn to the second portion, which Dr. Salmon shall again voice for me (*ibid.*, p. 349): "From the question, whether Peter ever visited Rome, we pass now to a very different question: whether he was its bishop."

II. Was Simon Peter ever Bishop of Rome?

What is the value of the evidence either way that gave rise to such a supposition? Let me call a new witness into the box: Bishop Moorhouse, of Manchester:

"I repeat then what I said before, that while the Roman tradition about St. Peter is plainly inconsistent with the Scriptural notices of the Roman

[1] *Handbook to the Controversy with Rome*, Von Hase, 1909, Vol. I, p. 205.

Church—there is not a scintilla of Scriptural evidence that the Apostle was ever Bishop of Rome. . . . I believe that Bishop Wordsworth is right, and that the First Epistle of St. Peter was written from Babylon. But suppose I admit the truth of the opposing contention, that St. Peter wrote this Epistle from Rome; how does this show that he was ever Bishop of that city? There is not a word in the Epistle which implies any such thing. I admit that St. Peter taught at Rome, as did also St. Paul, but I urge that it is no more legitimate to conclude from that fact that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome than that St. Paul was. Once again, I have endeavoured to prove that St. Peter's Roman Episcopate is plainly excluded by the earliest and most trustworthy tradition of the Church. I must remind you of the principal statements respecting the list of Roman Bishops made by Irenæus in the year 180. After stating that the Church of Rome 'was founded and organized by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul' he proceeds (Adv. Hær., III, 3, 3): 'The Blessed Apostles then having founded and built up the Church, committed into the hands of Linus the office of the Episcopate . . . to him succeeded Anacletus, and after him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement was allotted the Bishopric. To this Clement there succeeded Evaristus. Alexander followed Evaristus; then *sixth* from the Apostles Sixtus was appointed; after him Telesphorus, who was gloriously martyred; then Hyginus.' Now I would ask you to observe in this account the facts following:

"(1) That in a loose sense of the word 'founded' the Church is said to have been founded by the two Apostles Peter and Paul.

"(2) Both Peter and Paul appointed Linus. What the one did the other did, and we can no more say that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome for what he did than that St. Paul was.

"(3) We find both the Apostles excluded from the Roman Episcopate by the numbering of the list. . . . This list is quoted by Eusebius in exactly the same words in his Ecclesiastical History (*E. H.*, V, 6). It is adopted by Jerome; it is accepted by Epiphanius in the East, and by Rufinus in the West, and it is contained in the Roman liturgy to the present day. If we accept this as the true statement of the Roman succession, it is certain that St. Peter was not Bishop of Rome." [1]

III. Who were the First Four Bishops of Rome?

I again call upon Dr. Salmon to open the closing section of my inquiry:

"I have already stated the earliest list of Roman bishops we possess is that published by Irenæus about A.D. 180. But Irenæus was not the first to publish a list of Roman bishops. A list had been made by Hegisippus some twenty years earlier, as we learn from an extract from his writings preserved by Eusebius (*H.E.*, IV, 22). The claim of certain Gnostic sects to have derived their peculiar doctrines by secret tradition from the Apostles stirred up the members of the Catholic Church to offer proof that whatever apostolic traditions there were must be sought in those churches which had been founded by Apostles, and which could trace the succession of their bishops to men appointed by Apostles. It would seem to be with the object of collecting evidence for such a proof that Hegesippus travelled to Rome, where he arrived in the episcopate of Anicetus, which may be roughly dated as A.D. 155–165. He tells us that he then made a 'succession of bishops (*διαδοχήν*) down to Anicetus.' He adds that Anicetus succeeded Soter, and to Soter Eleutherus, who had been deacon to Anicetus. Thus it appears that the work from which Eusebius made his extract was published in the episcopate of Eleutherus—the same Episcopate as that in which the work of Irenæus was published." [2]

[1] "The Roman Claims," Lecture III, 1895, pp. 4–7. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 358.

Macaulay's "twilight of fable," albeit unknown to him, seems to have expressed the nebulous state which enveloped the line of succession of Roman Bishops even in the very days of its infancy, and well deserves the qualification, "Se non è vero è ben trovato."

"The lists of the earlier Roman bishops," writes the Rev. W. Heber Wright, M.A., T.C.D., in *A Protestant Dictionary*, p. 517, "as they have come down to us present discrepancies, not merely in the order of succession but in names and dates. Tertullian and others make Clement the immediate successor of Peter, while Irenæus gives the order: (1) Linus, (2) Anacletus, (3) Clement. From the very start, therefore, the Roman Episcopal succession is involved in doubt and obscurity. We append the Roman authorised list (according to Dr. Bruno, *Catholic Belief*, London, 1902) up to A.D. 335. This list coincides with that of Eusebius (*Ecclesiastical History*):

	Assumed date. A.D.
Peter (?)	29–67
Linus (?)	67
Cletos (?)	78
Clement I	90

The first three alleged Roman Bishops are rightly queried, and Mr. Gaster (*ibid.*, p. 809), in his annotated list of Pontiffs, supplies a list of his authorities as subjoined:

"The following list of Bishops and Pontiffs of Rome is based on the list compiled by the well-known Jesuit writers, Philip Labbé and Gabriel Cossart, and printed in the work entitled *Sacrosancta Concilii*. This list has been compared with the lists of Bishops and Pontiffs compiled respectively by l'Abbé Migne, le Comte de Mas-Latrie, and the Very Rev. Dr. Bruno, so as to secure, whenever possible, the combined testimony of these authorities."

The divergencies between these modern leaders of Roman history on this matter would be ludicrous if they were not so serious. Here are a few instances from this "Table":

Under Anacletus, 78–90.

1. "Some authorities place him No. 5 in the list, and place here the name Cletus" (p. 810).

2. "Stephen III, 757–67. L'Abbé Migne places here Paul I, but Labbé and Cossart, and also Mas-Latrie, support the order adopted in this Table."

3. "Formosus, 891–96. Sergius, by some authorities called an Antipope, and Boniface VI. Dr. Bruno includes both in his list; but neither of them was properly elected to the Chair."

4. "Romanus, 897. L'Abbé Migne places Romanus in the list of Pontiffs as No. 113. Mas-Latrie places him in the list, but dates him 897–8. So also Bryce and Dr. Bruno. Labbé and Cossart class him as an Antipope."

And so these edifying discrepancies continue down to Leo XI, 1605, whom Dr. Bruno dates 1600, and Paul V (1605–21), 1605.

The "combined testimonies" of these modern Roman chronologists yield nothing but utter unreliability and "confusion worse confounded," and one cannot but marvel at the irony of fate that it was reserved to two Protestant clergymen to discover their inaccuracies and contradictions. Even Simon Peter himself has not escaped the pen of misrepresentation, as evidenced in the famous

Non videbis amos Petri (belied in the case of Pius IX), Bishop Serapion's *Gospel of Peter* (Edited by Rendall Harris, 1893), and "Was St. Peter a Buddhist Saint?" (*Home Words*, September, 1929).

Although it is foreign to the purpose of this paper to discuss the attributes attributed by Roman theologians to Simon Peter and his alleged successors in the See of Rome, I judge it expedient to refer to a passage in a volume entitled *The Church*, 1928, containing a series of lectures edited by Rev. C. Lattey, S.J. The passage occurs at the paper headed "The Ante-Nicene Fathers," by Rev. Dr. P. G. M. Rhodes, Professor of Dogmatic Theology at Oscott, to show on the one hand that those attributes are still claimed for every link in the assumed "unbroken" chain of Supreme Pontiffs from Linus (or Simon Peter) to Benedict XI, and on the other that even eminent opponents of those attributes must be whitewashed or explained away:

"We may now apply these principles that we have established to the question that for Catholics is both the most important and the most interesting in the ecclesiology of the early Church, namely, the recognition of the successor of St. Peter in the See of Rome as the divinely appointed head of the Church on earth. It is plain that the exact implications of the promise made by our Lord to St. Peter required careful consideration and a considerable lapse of time before they could be perceived in their fulness. 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth . . . The gates of hell . . . The gates of hell shall not prevail . . . Feed My sheep.' What did it all imply for St. Peter's successor? Right to excommunicate heretics? The right to supervise and admonish other Bishops? That was plain enough from the beginning. No one contemplated the possibility of the Catholic Church not being in communion with the Apostolic See of Rome. Gnostics and Monarchians knew well enough that if the Roman See accepted them as orthodox they had nothing to fear elsewhere. But did it include the power of the Bishop of Rome to supervise the disciplinary arrangements of other Churches? Had the Pope necessarily the right to hear appeals from the decision of other bishops? Could he interfere between a priest and his own bishop? Could he set aside the instructions that St. John was believed to have given to the Churches he founded? Suppose he acts unjustly or hastily, may his instructions be ignored? Many such questions presented themselves in the early ages of the Church, and not every Father succeeded in answering them correctly at the first attempt. In the Ante-Nicene period the doctrine of the Papacy remains in the first stage; the position of the Bishop of Rome as the successor of the Chief of the Apostles is accepted as a matter of course, and acts that imply universal jurisdiction arouse no complaint in that respect. St. Irenæus rebuked St. Victor [193–204] for what appeared harshness in threatening to excommunicate the East; but there was no suggestion that St. Victor had not the power to carry his threat into effect. But, for the most part, attention was simply not drawn towards the particular personal powers that the Bishop of Rome might possess. The Christian of this period did not ask himself whether the Pope was infallible. The Church was infallible, and the Apostolic See was always with the Church. Would a Catholic of the Ante-Nicene period have accepted the Vatican definition of Papal Infallibility? He might have been astonished at what would be an unheard-of way of putting it, but after having the meaning clearly explained to him, would have agreed that it expressed, in an apparently paradoxical way, what he himself believed. At the same time, difficulties might have been raised by certain thinkers in quite good faith, who were influenced by 'early theories,' just beginning to appear, on the constitution of the Church.

On this subject, as on most others, the first theorizers did not succeed in including all the factors of the problem. The name that at once occurs to us is that of St. Cyprian ; and I think it must be conceded that St. Cyprian propounded theories that are not completely reconcilable with the later formal teaching of the Church " (pp. 95–7).

It is needless to prolong this passage, which is a virtual excuse for Cyprian's attitude towards Pope Stephen (253–7)—much as the writer would offer for Erasmus, Lord Acton, or Rev. George Tyrrell. Let me, however, offer an animadversion on a few sentences therein.

(1) In the Ante-Nicene period (29–325) the doctrine of the Papacy remains in the first stage ; the position of the Bishop of Rome as the successor of the Chief of the Apostles is accepted as a matter of course, and acts that imply universal jurisdiction arouse no complaint on that respect. I doubt very much whether Hermas (150), or Papias (150), or Hippolytus (230) would have subscribed to this confident statement, still less the bulk of Christians of that period. Certainly the latter would have been more than " astonished " at the language of the Vatican definition of Papal Infallibility. Anyway, Dr. Rhodes himself provides us with two outstanding instances of the inaccuracy of his own assertion, though whittled down almost to zero, as evidenced by this cautious sentence (p. 97) :

" It is not unfair to point out that St. Cyprian is not among the great Doctors of the early Church. He is canonized by the Church, not as a Doctor, but as a Martyr ; though the Canonization implies that his teaching was not fundamentally or finally uncatholic . . . but in view of his lack of real theological preparation, there was ever the danger that details of doctrine, quietly accepted in simple faith by the Church at large, but not much considered or discussed, might be misunderstood, or even overlooked by him. This is, in fact, what happened."

Moss' revised edition (1929) of Robertson's *Sketches of Church History* (p. 33) provides a fairer (because less biased) estimate of this Stephen-Cyprian episode thus :

" Cyprian had a disagreement with Stephen, Bishop of Rome. . . . Now, the bishops who were at the head of this great church were naturally reckoned the foremost of all bishops, and had more power than any other ; so that if a proud man got the bishopric of Rome, it was too likely that he might try to set himself up above his brethren, and to lay down the law to them. Stephen was unhappily a man of this kind, and he gave way to the temptation, and tried to lord it over other bishops and their churches. But Cyprian held out against him, and made him understand that the bishop of Rome had no right to give laws to other bishops, or to meddle with the churches of other countries. He showed that, although St. Peter (from whom Stephen pretended that the bishops of Rome had received power over others) was the first of the Apostles, he was not of a higher class or order than the rest ; and therefore, that, although the Roman bishops stood first, the other bishops were their equals, and had received an equal share in the Christian ministry. So Stephen was not able to get the power which he wished for over other churches, and, after his death, Carthage and Rome were at peace again."

(3) A note of uncertainty concludes Dr. Rhodes' paper (p. 109).

" Whether St. Cyprian was ever really out of communion with the Holy See must remain uncertain. We have hardly any information, except in

the exaggerated and ill-tempered letter of Firmilian. Nor have we any positive information about St. Cyprian's relations with Stephen's successor, St. Xystus. But Xystus afterwards enjoyed the reputation among the Africans of ' a kindly and peace-loving bishop, which suggests an amelioration of relationship."

This confirms Robertson's verdict; yet the entire paper is a smart, one-sided presentment of the famous case, and an unblushing whitewashing of both Pope and Bishop.

To the S.P.C.K. series of " Manuals of the Inner Life " Canon J. B. Lancelot has contributed a most helpful little book, *The Religion of the Collects* (2*s*. 6*d*. net). The Collects are, as he says, " not only a rich treasury of devotion, but a casket containing much pure and suggestive wisdom." In issuing these meditations, which originally appeared in the *Liverpool Review*, Canon Lancelot will help many readers to realize some of the best lessons which the Collects have to teach. Although the Meditations are brief, they are packed with suggestive ideas, and they will require some thought on the reader's part to gain and retain the valuable truths set out. Each collect is made to yield up its central truth and its bearing on religious experience and its relationship to the whole Christian System centred in Christ.

Miss Gertrude Leigh has put forward a novel interpretation of Dante's *Inferno* in her book *New Light on the Youth of Dante*, the Course of Dante's Life prior to 1290 traced in *The Inferno*, Cantos 3–13 (Faber and Faber, Ltd., 15*s*. net). Her view is expressed in the second portion of the title—that Dante under the figure of a journey through the lower regions is giving an account of his own early experiences, and a criticism of the ecclesiastical authorities of his day in a manner that saved him from the penalties which a plain narrative would have involved, and at the same time gave scope for his powers of artistic expression. This allegorical purpose is worked out with a wealth of detail, and " the implications involved in the recognition of a contemporary narrative of historical events underlying that tale of damned and tortured souls which has hitherto been accepted as a sample of Dante's religious convictions " show his design of exposing the errors of the Papal administration and vindicating his own conduct by affording a secret history of his life and times. The repressive power of the Courts would have prevented him expressing the views which Miss Leigh attributes to him. Much study and thought have been devoted to the working out of this ingenious theory, and it presents a rich array of interesting facts in a peculiarly interesting epoch.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

THE Bishop of London has chosen the Rev. W. P. G. McCormick, Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, London, to write his Lent Book this year, and Mr. McCormick has taken as his subject, *Be of Good Cheer* (Longmans, Green & Co., 2*s.* 6*d.* net). St. Martin's is well known as one of the chief centres for the Broadcasting of religious services, and its Vicar has a wide experience of many types of humanity through the correspondence which these services bring to him. He dedicates his book "To Listeners, in grateful acknowledgment of their prayers and encouraging letters." His experience has shown him that people to-day do not "enjoy their religion," to probe the causes and to suggest a remedy is his aim. The Bishop of London in his Introduction is of the same opinion. He says, "I am glad he has chosen the subject of 'Joy,' as Joy is the one note wanted in our religion to-day." This defect arises in the first instance from false ideas concerning God. "If we are to revive Religion, we have got to restore the idea of God to the world, not as a malevolent Power, or as a merely good-natured 'Jove,' but as revealed in all His Holiness, Greatness and Love in Jesus Christ Himself." Mr. McCormick deprecates his own power as an author, but he has no reason to fear his ability to get his message across to those for whom he writes. He does not require the gifts of an accomplished theologian to convey some of the reality of his own joy in God to others. In these chapters he illustrates the joyous life from many points of view. The first requisite is a right idea of God. Then follows the Joy in God's Will; the Joy of the seeker and the worker; Joy of Communion, of Discipline, of Sunday; Joy in Church, and finally, the Joy with God. Practical in their purpose they deal with life practically, and they convey instruction that will be a help to many in the routine of daily duties.

The name of the poet Cowper has been more or less intimately associated with the Evangelical Movement in the eighteenth century through his connection with the Rev. John Newton of Olney and Mrs. Unwin. Cowper's mental instability affected his whole career, and rendered him a victim of many delusions. No one has attributed these to his Evangelical surroundings. It could even be maintained that he owed to them a certain measure of relief which he would not otherwise attain. In the long and extremely drawn-out examination of Cowper's mental state in Lord David Cecil's *The Stricken Deer, or The Life of Cowper* (Constable & Co., 15*s.*), a vague impression is conveyed that in some way the peculiar tenets and practices of Cowper's Evangelical associates were in some measure responsible for deepening the gloom which ultimately settled down upon the poet's mind. Evangelicalism is depicted in the fashion popular with those who maintain that

it was narrow, ignorant and intolerant, though in all three respects it was probably not more so than any other movement, religious or secular, of the time. The influence of Newton upon Cowper is represented in a most disadvantageous light, but there is no tribute to the spirit of generosity and love inculcated by Evangelicalism which led Newton to take the poet into his home for a year during one of his periods of gloom. Nor is any mention made of the source of the devotion and care of Mrs. Unwin due to the same Evangelical teaching. The best that is said for Evangelicalism is this, " it is true that the emotional tension encouraged by Evangelicalism, and the personal responsibility for its own fate which it placed on the individual soul, did increase Cowper's nervous agitation and so accelerate the advent of his madness. But though it accelerated it, it did not make that advent more sure." It is acknowledged that the one happy period of his mature existence was due to his Evangelical surroundings. No one can say what his life would have been without them. The Monastery or Nunnery cell could probably provide worse cases than prejudice can bring against the Evangelical system.

In *The Bishop's Register* with Introduction and Notes (S.P.C.K., 12*s.* 6*d.* net), the Rev. Clifford J. Offer, M.A., has brought together an interesting collection of extracts from Episcopal registers of the Middle Ages illustrating varied aspects of Church life and the duties of many classes of Church officials. There are informative introductions first to the documents illustrating the religious life, and secondly to the administrative and parochial documents. There is a third section of miscellaneous documents which are by no means the least interesting, for it includes such items as " An Indulgence for Listening to Sermons," " An Assault on a Rector," " Exorbitant Charges of Unbeneficed Clergy," " A Bishop borrows (*a*) a Bible, (*b*) Money." While the documents are interesting in themselves, in spite of the official and tedious language in which they are couched, Mr. Offer's introductions are full of information illuminating the life of the period covered by the extracts. His account of monastic life and the conditions of the monasteries and nunneries tells of the internal affairs of the orders, and the methods employed for the support of the establishments and the maintenance of order and discipline which in many instances left much to be desired. The documents also reveal a laxity which show that the realities of the religious life often fell far short of the ideal. The Introduction to the second section makes clear the administrative difficulties encountered by the bishops, by reason of the immense size of the dioceses, the difficulties of travel, and the many interests which presented obstacles to episcopical jurisdiction. Mr. Offer provides a useful picture of a portion of the life of the Middle Ages, and his book will take its place among those valuable contributions to the subject which are now giving a fresh insight into the past ages of the Church.

The Purpose of Jesus in the First Three Gospels, by Campbell W. Moody, M.A., D.D., being the Bruce Lectures in the United Free Church College, Glasgow, 1929 (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 5*s*. net), is a book that everyone should read. Every age has its trend of thought and gets into grooves where many things are taken for granted until a thinker of freedom and boldness comes to point out the inadequacy of many current conceptions and shows that in paths neglected there are old truths that cannot be ignored. Dr. Moody is such a thinker and many will thank him for these thoughtful reminders of enduring truths concerning great fundamental facts. "It is high time that we came back to the Lord Jesus." With that motto he leads his readers to a fresh examination of our Lord's public preaching with its emphasis on repentance and faith. The word of the Cross with the substitution implied in it is a central theme.

The Making of Modern English Religion, by Bernard L. Manning, Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge (Student Christian Movement, 3*s*. 6*d*. net), is described as "An historical impression of certain religious forces in Modern English History." It is a striking study of some religious movements from novel points of view and is full of suggestive thoughts on the significance of the developments of religious life. The Medieval legacy in institutions and beliefs decayed and in their place came the rediscovery of Evangelical religion with Martin Luther and a restatement of the meaning of churchmanship with John Calvin. He is quite emphatic that the Anglican Church broke with Medievalism at the Reformation, but we cannot agree that it adopted an attitude of compromise or was indebted to Luther for its doctrine of the Holy Communion. The author has a stimulating and thought-provoking method which will interest students of Church History.

The English Heritage Series edited by Viscount Lee of Fareham and Mr. J. C. Squire (Longmans, Green & Co., 3*s*. 6*d*. each net) will without doubt prove a very popular venture. "To describe the main elements in the wealth of character, custom, and beauty of mental and material possessions, which are summed up in the word 'England,' is the task which the Editors of the English Heritage Series have set out to perform." An Introduction by Mr. Stanley Baldwin appears in each volume and is a happily conceived appreciation of all that is essentially English. Among the volumes which have already appeared are *English Humour* by J. B. Priestly, an interesting study of those English writers who indulged in "thinking in fun while feeling in earnest." *The English Public School* by Bernard Darwin, in which the merits and demerits of the English Public School system are displayed, and an account given of some great headmasters. *Shakespeare* by John Bailey, a fresh and independent study of our great dramatist as representative of the English spirit. *English Wild Life* by Eric Parker, which will appeal to all lovers of outdoor things by the wealth of information concerning our flora and fauna. G. F. I.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

PRINCIPLES OF THEOLOGY.

THE PRINCIPLES OF THEOLOGY. An Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles. By the late W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. *Longmans, Green & Co.* 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

The number of standard works on the Thirty-Nine Articles by present-day writers is not very large, and it is unfortunate that those which are most in use to-day are written from a very partial standpoint. The result has been that students have too often received impressions, both of Anglican doctrine and of English Church history, which are not always true to fact. For this reason, as well as for others, it is a pleasure to welcome this book on the Thirty-Nine Articles by the late Dr. Griffith Thomas.

The name of Dr. Griffith Thomas is itself an indication of what the book provides. Exact scholarship, a profound knowledge of the Bible, clear arrangement of his subject—these are some of the characteristics of all the writings of Dr. Thomas, and these characteristics are manifested to the full in this, the last book that he wrote.

The volume opens with an Introduction which discusses briefly the meaning of Revelation, Faith, Doctrine, and Theology, and then indicates the relations of such matters to Creeds, and to the Thirty-Nine Articles. This is followed by a history of the Articles, a history which incidentally shows the relation of the English Articles to those of the Continental Churches as well as to those of Rome. The main body of the book is then taken up with an examination of the Articles themselves. Each Article is in turn treated in a systematic way. A brief reference is given first of all to any important historical points connected with the drawing up of the Article. This is usually followed by a commentary upon the salient features of the Article, with a history of the development of the particular doctrine, and concludes with a penetrating examination of the theories, old and new, on the subject under discussion. The closing pages of the book contain, amongst other things, some important discussions on the relation of the Articles to the Prayer Book and to Rome, whilst there is a specially valuable dissertation on the Ethics of Subscription. In addition there are several appendices, the most important and the lengthiest of which is on the subject of Prayers for the Dead.

This outline of the contents will give some idea of the comprehensive nature of the book, and will show that we have here a serious contribution to Anglican theological literature.

Amongst the many points of value which we have noticed we should like to mention the following. We were struck first of all by some of the sections dealing with Article VI. " The character

of Holy Scripture " gives a careful treatment of Divine Revelation, and shows how this Revelation is to be found in the Bible as in nowhere else, whilst there are some wise remarks concerning the phrase " the Bible CONTAINS the Word of God " as contrasted with " the Bible IS the Word of God." The section on the " Supremacy of Holy Scripture " is also clear and emphatic in showing that the Bible is supreme over Reason, the Church, and Tradition.

Then we would mention as specially important the pages dealing with the doctrines of the Atonement and of Justification. These are words which are not heard so much nowadays in Evangelical teaching. We venture to think that if preachers will read, mark, learn and teach what Dr. Thomas has to say on these two subjects there will be greater reality and greater depth in the lives of many Christians than is seen to-day.

In view of present-day discussions on the South India Scheme we were interested in the views expressed with regard to Articles XIX and XXIII. The historical and biblical treatment of the subjects referred to in both these Articles shows plainly that the Anglican view of the Church and of the Ministry will present no bar to those who are seeking the closer union of the English Church with the Nonconformist bodies.

We naturally turned next to the sections on the Sacraments. Here again we were impressed with the sane and straightforward methods adopted. Everything starts from the Bible itself, and not from the Mystery Religions or from philosophical presuppositions, as is so often the case. The Holy Communion in particular is accorded a thoroughly comprehensive treatment, the study of which should do much to correct some of the specious and non-biblical teaching which so often evacuates the Holy Communion of its real meaning.

Wherever we have examined the book, however, we have found valuable help, for it is essentially a miniature encyclopædia of Christian doctrine. We would therefore bespeak a wide circulation for Dr. Thomas's book, for it is just what is needed for days like the present. There are many tendacious movements going on these days, and one of them is an attempt to get away from any appeal to the Thirty-Nine Articles as a standard of doctrine in the English Church. Part of the same movement is the effort to subvert the meaning of some of the Articles and to show that they mean something very different to what they obviously mean. But although we may consider that one or two of the Articles are limited in their application owing to the historical circumstances in which they were drawn up, yet the general body of the Articles have an eternal application for the reason that they summarize biblical truth. They are an endeavour to test doctrine by the Bible, for they reject doctrines because they are repugnant to the Bible, they attest matters of Church order and Church discipline by appeals to Scripture, just as they judge the value of Sacraments by the standard of Holy Writ. From beginning to end it is the Bible which is the touchstone by which everything is judged. In view of this fact

it is not surprising that efforts are to-day being made to dethrone the Thirty-Nine Articles from the place they have occupied for the last three and a half centuries. When appeals are made to the Church and to tradition rather than to the Bible, it is not surprising that the Thirty-Nine Articles should be felt to be in the way.

But the Articles are a testimony to the fact that the Church of England bases its doctrine ultimately on the Bible. The Reformers have their value for us just as the early Fathers have their value, but however much we may appreciate their writings, their value is only in so far that they introduce us to the Bible itself. And that fact is made abundantly clear from the greatest of Elizabethan divines like Bishop Jewel, downwards. The Bible is the basis of the Thirty-Nine Articles.

It was because Dr. Griffith Thomas was first and foremost a Bible student that he could give us the book we have before us, a book which makes us realize how our Church is faithful to the principle laid down in Article VI. It is, moreover, because Dr. Thomas was a close student of history that he could give us the necessary historical background to appreciate the ways by which some of the Articles were brought into being.

Above all, because Dr. Thomas was a man of clear spiritual vision he could cut through much sophistry to give us the essential teaching which is too often submerged by circumlocution or by philosophical obstructions.

The work is in short just the book for the time. It is not perfect, nor does the reviewer necessarily agree with every detail in it, for in a work of this magnitude there must always be room for some criticism. But it is a book which will refresh the ordinary student of Christian doctrine, it will strengthen the preacher who will take of its teaching, and it will re-invigorate all who will trouble to study its pages.

LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION.

LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION. Vol. IV. By James Mackinnon. *Longmans.* 16*s.*

Dr. Mackinnon knows Luther and his times as no other living British historian knows them. He was uniquely equipped for the great work he has brought to completion, for he loves liberty, he is a skilled historian who can place himself at the centre of the age with which he has to do, and he is as free from bias as any honest man can be. In the three preceding volumes we followed the Reformer from his birth to the zenith of the movement he initiated, and in this we have the movement vindicated and the man who led it appreciated. It is the custom nowadays to sneer at Luther, and to depreciate his motives and to look upon his life as one that did more harm than good. Roman Catholic and Anglo-Catholic writers delight to find fault with his character and to rejoice over his weaknesses, and the time had come for a refutation of the

assaults of malice and the pseudo-history that has been accepted as true. No longer can men indulge in this sport of bias as the consequence of the new discoveries made, for Dr. Mackinnon has brought together and placed under review all that has been brought to light, and his book is the last word of unprejudiced scholarship on the theme. This summer Germany, and we hope England too, will commemorate the four-hundredth anniversary of the Augsburg Confession, which has done so much to influence thought. This was the work of Melanchthon, who somehow does not escape censure for weaknesses by Dr. Mackinnon, who looks upon him as a man more pliable than he ought to have been, and although gentle he was not able to have the iron hand beneath the velvet glove when firmness was needed.

We see Luther contending against Anabaptists, face to face with the Emperor Charles, and engaged in his last controversy with Rome when he declared in keeping with the polemics of the age that the Pope was not the Vicar of God but of the Devil. Dr. Mackinnon rightly condemns the part Luther took in the bigamy of Philip of Hesse and shows how deeply he repented of the deed. To judge Luther aright we have to take into account the whole matrimonial outlook of the time and the power of dispensation and annulling marriages practised by the Papacy. But two wrongs do not make a right. Luther did wrong and paid the penalty not only in his own lifetime but in the pages of history.

Interesting and informing as the historical chapters are, they have not the attractiveness of those that attempt to show the place of Luther in History. He was a man of his age. He shared to the full the prevalent coarseness of expression, and much that he has written jars on our ears. But who that has read for himself contemporary writing will rate Luther lower as a master of coarse invective than his papal contemporaries who without his power outdid him in coarseness? We recall how an eminent writer of historical fiction was reproved by his friends for some coarse passages in his tales centred on this period. He replied, "I cannot help it. I am steeped in the literature of the time and it creeps out even against my will." And it can only be said that Luther was no worse than his contemporaries, although he ought to have been much better. He had the gifts of a great leader without being a constructive statesman, of a spiritual force, of unquestioned sincerity, of a veritable lion in defence of what he believed to be true, of a devotion to the Church of God that was founded upon the mind of the New Testament. He has been discredited for his lack of that all-round efficiency that would have made his work in our opinion less great than it was, for the men who do great things are not the men who are always thinking they may be wrong. As Dr. Mackinnon says: "Yet, when all is granted, the fact remains that he did a mighty work for the emancipation and progress of the human spirit. For the Reformation, with its tendencies, good and bad, the world is indebted largely to him. His work, with all its limitations, was a mighty impulse forward. Not even Luther

could be more than he was. That he *was*, is the greatest fact of the sixteenth century." No student can afford, if he wishes to understand the Reformation, to neglect these great volumes which, without any great distinction of style, hold the attention and make us see what took place as far as possible through contemporary eyes. And, after all, this is the most successful type of historical writing.

OBJECTIVE VIEWS OF THE ATONEMENT.

THE ATONEMENT IN HISTORY AND LIFE. A Volume of Essays edited by the Rev. L. W. Grensted. S.P.C.K. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Two thoughts must be borne in mind when considering this valuable and comprehensive volume. It is the work of men who had no opportunity of discussing their several points of view in friendly collaboration, and it is incomplete, as it has no special paper dealing with the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Editor does something to remove this weakness, but he would be the first to acknowledge that he has not succeeded in presenting the teaching of the Epistle fully before his readers. When we have said this, we have no hesitation in stating that *The Atonement in History and Life* is by far the most scholarly of the many composite volumes written in recent years by Evangelicals. It deals with great matters in a competent manner, and although from the very nature of the case there are certain repetitions, we find them in no way unnecessary, for their treatment by independent minds gives them a right perspective in the several Essays. There is no man who can possibly accept all that is written in the book, for it is plain that the writers are not in accord among themselves on a number of points, but all who read carefully will be impressed by the sense of awe with which the Atonement is approached and the desire to give due weight to the teaching of Holy Scripture.

Frankly, we do not think that the Essays on the Old Testament are satisfactory. They are written from two opposite angles, and of the two we think that Mr. Cripps has caught the spirit of the Revelation of God to Israel. It is not easy to write of a progressive Revelation in a manner that will separate always the passing from the permanent, but when we remember that the Christian Church was born in an atmosphere created by the Bible of our Lord and the Apostles we have to give due weight to the Revelation. Sacrifice has a definite place in the Old Testament, and "according to the Scriptures," in the Creed, has a reference to the Old Testament.

Canon Lukyn Williams surveys the place occupied in Jewish Literature from 400 B.C. to A.D. 200. It would seem that while the notion of the Atonement was there, it was not connected with the Messiah, "For, after all, He has never held in Judaism the all-important position which we Christians naturally suppose Him to have held. . . . That, however, the Jews did look for atonement, and that they regarded this not primarily, as affecting

a change in themselves in relation to God, but as bringing about a change in the attitude of God towards them—of this there seems to be no doubt." In a too brief paper Canon Tait reviews the teaching of the Atonement in the Synoptic Gospels, and he concludes that it was the perfect self-offering of our Lord in the entirety of its manifestation that constituted the objective Atonement. Canon Dawson-Walker, with the fullness of knowledge and soundness of insight we associate with him, reviews St. Paul's teaching with its stress on the personal element based on the love of Christ and the objective view of sacrificial propitiation. The Essay demands reading and re-reading. In fact we advise all who study the book to begin with this contribution. Dr. W. H. Rigg is most helpful and thorough in his discussion of the message of St. John, which tells us of eternal life obtained by belief in Jesus as the Son of God and as the Christ, who as a willing offering for us men and our salvation laid down His life that He might take it again and bring us to God.

Dr. Harold Smith's rapid, but sufficiently full, notice of the Atonement in Patristic Writings is followed by a well-balanced and thoroughly competent account of Anselm's Doctrine of Satisfaction, which is the great English contribution to the classics on the subject. The Rev. V. J. K. Brook will give many surprises to his contemporaries—who have overlooked the teaching of the Reformers —by his narrative of the evolution of their views and the weight that is given to them in popular theology of to-day. Mr. Essex takes up his story and brings it up to date. He makes us feel the enormous difficulty of constructing an even apparently adequate theory of the Atonement by his series of propositions. In spite of their number we turn to Dr. Dawson-Walker for some fuller light on the mystery of our Redemption through the Cross. The Archbishop of Armagh approaches the insoluble problem of the origin and nature of evil. He has before his mind the conception of the " Divine Adventurer "—a description that lends itself open to misconceptions which Dr. D'Arcy avoids. But, Adventure with God means success and unification, and the transforming power of love can alone bring victory over evil. The Essay must be taken as a whole to be understood, and few who read it will fail to fall under the spell of the spirit and mind of its writer.

Mr. Grensted writes a moving article on " The Atonement in Personal Experience," and the most striking and original contribution in the volume follows from the Rev. J. Shebbeare on " The Atonement and Some Tendencies in Modern Thought." He reviews the teaching of Barth, with whom he shows much sympathy. His own idea may be stated thus : " If the Father and the Son are conceived as fully agreed that the cleansing sacrifice must be made, is it not fitting that the Father should accept and demand it as that the Son should offer it ? " The closing sermon by the Rev. C. M. Chavasse on " The Preaching of the Cross " has a fine ring about it and warms the hearts of all who have found the Cross to be for them the source of their forgiveness. We sincerely hope

that this book will be studied by all Evangelicals who have the duty of presenting the central Truth of the Gospel to Congregations and Bible Classes.

CHRISTIAN UNITY.

THE CALL FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY: THE CHALLENGE OF A WORLD SITUATION. *Hodder & Stoughton.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

"This book of Essays represents the outlook of Liberal Evangelicals on the present situation confronting the Church of England on the great question of Reunion." Here at once we have a symptom of the cause of divisions—"Liberal Evangelicals" and other "Evangelicals." We are convinced that the opinions of this volume represent the convictions of all Evangelicals face to face with the present world problem. In the past, the fact that some men declared themselves to be of one school or another of Evangelicals would have been the beginning of schism, but to-day it is happily true that whatever Evangelicals may think of one another on particular points, there is no desire to separate into different Churches. May we, however, humbly ask, is it wise in a volume of this character to announce on the cover a division among Evangelicals which certainly does not extend to the subject under debate, for all Evangelical Churchmen rally to the support of the South Indian Scheme, adopt the principles that underlie it, and show a common front against the attacks of those who hold what they must believe to be a mechanical conception of what gives validity to the Ministerial Commission and consequently to the ministration of the Sacraments of the Gospel?

Like all composite volumes this shows signs of inequality of grasp and treatment. Some of the Essays are admirable and adequate—others have signs, if not of haste, of incomplete grasp of all that may be said on both sides. The opening paper by the Rev. G. H. Harris is a masterly production and is written by one who has his finger upon the pulse of the time. He sees clearly that what may be considered academic in England is a matter of vital importance in the case of the younger Churches that have to make their influence felt in the presence of heathendom. He tells us that the youth movement throughout the world is the determining factor for the future. He shows how this is the case among Christian communities as well as in Soviet Russia. Youth must be won for Christ if the Church is to grow and prosper, and only a united Church working in correspondence with the world movements for unity can bring the Gospel to humanity with hope of success. Besides, this Union is willed by God. The Rev. G. F. Saywell points out that the New Testament Church was essentially a fellowship marked by Unity of the Spirit, Freedom, Loyalty to Christ and a powerful evangelistic spirit. In the future "Order must once more learn to subserve spirit; fellowship must once again become the distinguishing characteristic of the Church." Canon Tait traces the history of Orders and criticizes with marked

acumen the theory of Apostolical Succession. The Archbishop of Melbourne shows how Disunion had arisen in the past and dwells on the part that has to be played by the English people in the new era that has dawned if it is to be true to its past. The Bishop of Bradford and Dr. Carnegie Simpson deal with the problems that have to be faced by Lambeth this year, and both agree on the fact that a heavy responsibility rests on Lambeth, whose first duty is to seek the Kingdom of God. Three papers consider the Movement towards Unity overseas. China is discussed by Professor Francis Cho-Min Wei, Persia by Bishop Linton, and India by Dr. A. W. Davies, all of whom write out of fullness of local knowledge which adds value to their contributions. They leave us with the conviction that the local Christian urge to Union is so strong that it must prove irresistible. Archdeacon Hunkin gives us a careful and comprehensive survey of the relations between "The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Ministries." He clearly states facts that are of the utmost importance, and many will turn to the essay for accurate information. We feel the strength of deep conviction that the separation must be ended in Principal Gibson's essay on "The Reunion of the Reformed Churches," and Canon Guy Rogers writes with point and clearness on the promotion of "Unity at Home." He dwells on the need of Group Study for the coming together of the rank and file of the Churches. Canon Storr, who shared with Mr. Harris the editing of the volume, closes with a paper on "The Mind of Christ and Lambeth 1930," in which he calls for an "honest and thoroughgoing revision of our scale of spiritual values." This is the great need on all sides, and as we lay down the book we are thankful that the Vision of Unity has been seen so clearly and has been put so unambiguously before the Church by men who have made up their mind to follow the Will of God in this the most important of practical problems, that cannot any longer be considered on mere theoretical and academic grounds.

THE MALINES CONVERSATIONS.

THE CONVERSATIONS AT MALINES, 1921–1925. Original Documents edited by Lord Halifax. *Philip Allan & Co.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

We have no desire to enter into the controversy as to the morals of the publication of the contents of this book. We are glad that it has been published, for it will destroy many legends and enable Churchmen and Nonconformists to judge for themselves the motives that lay behind the Conversations and the way in which the Roman Catholics and Anglican members approached the subject of Reunion. And what is more important still, they will be able to judge for themselves how far the Archbishop of Canterbury was justified in giving even limited approval of the Conversations being participated in by Anglo-Catholics on foreign soil under the chairmanship of a Cardinal whose patriotism was only equalled by his devotion to the Roman See. The Conversations in our opinion mark an

epoch in the history of the Church of England, as they prove once and for all, how little at least three of the members of the English Group were in touch with the real thought of the English people. They have a direct bearing on the recent Prayer Book controversy, for they prove beyond a peradventure, that a number of Anglicans were prepared to make concessions to specifically Roman teaching on the question that divided Churchmen into two camps. After reading the Minutes no one can doubt that willingly or unwillingly Lord Halifax, Dr. Frere and Dr. Armitage Robinson accepted as accurate a description of the teaching of our Formularies as not only compatible with Transubstantiation but as having no other meaning.

His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury satisfied himself that the Pope had some cognizance, official or semi-official, of the Conference. But we find the Roman Catholic members dissatisfied with the official approval given by the English Archbishops, and explanations why no fuller approval could have been given proffered and apparently accepted by the Cardinal and his friends. On page 85 we are told that the Pope in writing approved, encouraged and blessed the Roman Catholics, and that the Archbishops of Canterbury and York sent the Anglicans "in their behalf" to Malines. On page 305 we read that the Roman Catholics were "dépourvus de mandat officiel." We attribute no deceit to anyone, but there is something about this question of recognition that makes us look forward to the appearance of the whole of the Correspondence in connexion with the Conference. When this is published, we shall know exactly where the Anglican authorities stood and why the Conversations were in any sense considered to carry with them the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury. We are aware that many Churchmen who have no sympathy with Roman Catholicism in its Roman and mediæval aspects approved of the Conversations as the direct outcome of the Lambeth Appeal, but we never understood why, if that were the case, Cardinal Bourne and not Cardinal Mercier had not been approached, and why the Conversations took place on Foreign soil when the Roman Church had its Cardinal and Bishops on English soil. It is, however, satisfactory to know that the Conversations will have no successors on the same lines, for the Pope has written "it is clear that the Apostolic See can by no means take part in these assemblies, nor is it in any way lawful for Catholics to give to such enterprises their encouragement or support. If they did so, they would be giving countenance to a false Christianity quite alien to the one Church of Christ." This is definite, and it is well to know the fact.

First let us see where the First Conversation arrived at an agreement on the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Cardinal Mercier stated, and we find no dissent from his assertion, "Sur la doctrine de la Transubstantiation, les anglicans déclarent admettre le changement du pain et du vin en le corps et le sang du Christ par la Consecration. Aux yeux des Catholiques, le mot Transubstantiation ne signifie pas autre chose." Cardinal Mercier was one of the ablest and best informed minds in the Roman Church, and after learning

the views of the three Anglicans he pronounced their teaching to be none other than that of the Roman Church, on Transubstantiation. There was no attempt to camouflage. The statement is as broad and clear as it well can be, and disposes once and for all of the special pleading which we had for more than two years that Transubstantiation as understood by Rome was not taught by any representative English Churchman. The men who accepted that statement in Malines were representative of a section of Churchmen who, we are glad to say, do not represent Churchmen as a whole. Dr. Armitage Robinson when challenged how far he and his friends could be considered representatives, said that what they had written represented the views of three Anglicans of different shades and that it could be considered as showing the preoccupations of all the members of their Church interested in Reunion. This memorandum stated that reconciliation between Rome and England would involve on the part of Canterbury the acknowledgment of "a regular pre-eminence for Him [the Pope] above all other bishops, which is seen in the recourse to Him before others in matters concerning the whole Church."

The Archbishop of Canterbury would receive the pallium and certain customs should be retained: the use of the vernacular and the English rite, Communion in both kinds, authorization of marriage of the clergy. "The topics of a practical nature which we have just raised here outlined appear to us to call for preliminary consideration. If an understanding could be reached as to the solution of the questions thus raised, it would pave the way to further conferences of a yet more authoritative kind."

We cannot discuss further the documents, which deserve the closest scrutiny of all English Churchmen. The important paper written by Bishop Gore is not published, but we know that he laid down the distinction between Fundamental and non-Fundamental dogmas. And here we may quote the words of the Pope: "It is never lawful to employ in connexion with articles of faith the distinction invented by some between 'fundamental' and 'non-fundamental' articles, the former to be accepted by all, the latter being left to the free acceptance of the faithful. The supernatural virtue of faith has as its formal motive the authority of God revealing and this allows of no such distinction. All true followers of Christ, therefore, will believe the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God with the same faith as they believe the mystery of the august Trinity, the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in the sense defined by the Œcumenical Vatican Council with the same faith as they believe in the Incarnation of our Lord. That these truths have been solemnly sanctioned and defined by the Church at various times, some of them even quite recently, makes no difference to their certainty, nor to our obligation of believing them. Has not God revealed them all?" If this be so, why did not the Archbishops and the Conversationalists know the Roman position and—if they knew it—why were the Conversations ever undertaken?

A SCHOLAR'S SERMONS.

THE RESURRECTION OF MAN AND OTHER SERMONS. By Archdeacon Charles. *T. and T. Clark.* 7*s.*

We have seldom read a volume of sermons with which we were in more hearty agreement and disagreement. When the Archdeacon discusses the arguments for and against a blessed future life, we feel that we are in the presence of a mind that has no *parti pris* and desires to arrive at truth. When he deals with the absolute claims of Christ's service, we wish that the Sermon would be read by all the Clergy. The teaching of Jeremiah is expounded with a clarity and confidence that win sympathy with the prophet and give us his place in history, and the concluding addresses on Wycliffe are masterly in their grasp of the teaching and work of this great son of the Church of England.

But when we read the first five sermons we are saddened by the freedom with which Dr. Charles abandons the plain meaning of the New Testament and the dogmatism with which he condemns the legend of the empty tomb " as due to the spiritual incapacities of the Apostles, owing to which they failed to recognize the Risen Christ till the second day after the Crucifixion, though all those two days Christ was present in their midst for all who could recognize Him. The closing chapters of the Gospels are late." Are the chapters any later than the rest of the Gospels? And was St. Paul, who wrote 1 Corinthians xv, among the spiritually incapable? And what have we to say to this sentence : " To connect our Lord's Resurrection with such a gross physical miracle as the empty tomb, would make it impossible for thoughtful people to believe in Christ's Resurrection and in His full spiritual life immediately after His death on the cross "? It is true that Dr. Charles lays emphasis on the non-mention of the empty tomb by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians xv, but does St. Paul not presuppose it in all his resurrection references? We feel the full force of the criticisms on what is meant by a " mutilated personality " and believe that those who die in the Lord live on through the change which we call death. But we are convinced that the story of the Empty Tomb is an integral part of the revelation of God to man, that the early Church universally believed in its occurrence, and that the Church founded its belief of the fact of the Resurrection on its existence. We are not gravely troubled by the temporary difficulty of an apparent " mutilated personality " of our Lord during His body's stay in the tomb. But we are convinced that this perplexity is minor compared with the perplexity in which the teaching of the Archdeacon involves the candid reader of the Gospels when the empty tomb is written down as a legend.

GENESIS.

RASHI ON THE PENTATEUCH—GENESIS. Translated and Annotated by James H. Lowe. *London: The Hebrew Compendium Publishing Company, Camomile Street,* 1928. Pp. 519. 16s. net.

This handsome volume forms the second number of Lowe's "Series of Tutorial Preparations for Rabbinics," the first number of which received unqualified praise from teachers and reviewers. Mr. Lowe's plan is to print in square characters the commentary of Rashi with an English translation and a running explanation which clears up the difficulties of the terse Hebrew style. Considering the varieties of type in the book, and the fact that the text is fully vocalized, the volume is issued at a reasonable price, and we trust that its sale will be such as to encourage the editor to deal with the remaining books of the Pentateuch in due course. It is in the first place a volume for students of Rabbinical Hebrew, and any student who masters it will readily find his way, with the help of some dictionary of abbreviations, such as Händler's, and a knowledge of Rabbinical script, which is easy to acquire, through most Rabbinical Commentaries. But those unable to read Hebrew can use the Commentary, as the English translation can be read verse by verse, and the reader will thus gain an insight into Jewish methods of interpretation.

Rashi, who lived in the eleventh and twelfth centuries (1040–1105), is the most eminent of medieval Jewish exegetes and the founder of the German-French school of exegesis. During his lifetime he acquired a reputation as the most learned scholar of his age in Jewish matters, and his notes on the Bible are, as Ginsburg says, "almost looked upon as part of the Bible, and his interpretation is to the present day regarded by most orthodox Jews as the authoritative import of Holy Writ." The greatest modern authority on Rashi, Morris Liber, says that the Commentaries "carry weight and authority which have rendered them inseparable from the text." The same authority points out that Martin Luther's exegesis owes much to Rashi, since Nicolas de Lyra drew many explanations in his *Postillae Perpetuæ* from the Jewish expositor.

> Si Lyra non lyrasset,
> Lutherus non saltasset.

It will thus be seen that, as in the case of Kimchi, whose commentaries so powerfully influenced the translators of the English Authorized Version, the commentaries of Rashi have had an influence reaching far beyond what might have been expected. We commend this translation to our readers, whether Hebraists or not. We have tested it in several passages and find it dependable. Its publication marks an epoch in the furtherance of Rabbinical studies.

A. W. G.

KANT.

KANT'S CONCEPTION OF GOD. A critical Exposition of its Metaphysical Development together with a Translation of the *Nova Dilucidatio*. By F. E. England, M.A., Ph.D. *George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.* 10s. 6*d*. net.

This work is an elaborate and penetrating study of the theistic side of Kant's philosophy, in the closest connection with his general position, and of the latter in relation to the ideas of his immediate predecessors. The fact that Professor Dawes Hicks has contributed a foreword will be a sufficient commendation of the book to all who are interested in the subject and are accustomed to philosophical reading.

Kant, as is well known to students of philosophy, made a great breach with the old rationalism. (The *Nova Dilucidatio*, of which a translation is given, is an earlier work, more on the traditional lines.) This traditional rationalism was characterized by the assumption that "the results of formal logic are ontologically valid," and also by a sharp distinction between necessary and contingent existence. The former belief, taken as a basis, made contingent existence very hard to work in, for its relations are not merely logical. It fell to Kant to assign to the mind on the one hand and the object world on the other what belongs to each. It is from this point of view that the doctrines of God, freedom, and immortality are approached in the *Critique of Pure Reason*. Broadly speaking, Kant removed these ideas from the sphere of theoretical knowledge, and treated them as directly related to our practical needs. Occasionally, though not always, the idea of God is referred to as a working ideal of thought rather than as really true. How this is to be understood in the light of his general theory of knowledge is a subject treated with great thoroughness in Dr. England's book.

To many the primary interest in Kant lies in his attitude towards the "Ontological Argument" for the being of God. Most people who know just one thing only of all that Kant taught know that he said that a hundred thalers in his pocket had no more content than a hundred thalers in his mind—a truth that it did not require a Kant to discover. Of course this saying has to be taken in close connection with the whole context of his thought. It does not seem to be aimed at Anselm's form of the argument, and we agree with those who hold that it does not refute it. We are not sure that Dr. England reaches the true inwardness of Anselm's contention; but he sees in it a large measure of truth, and says that Kant did too. The question, he says, turns upon the positing of "a supreme *Urgrund* or *Ens Realissimum* in some form as the necessary presupposition of all things." Only it is just here that we fail to find a satisfactory place in Kant's philosophy for the recognition of this Original Ground of things as intelligibly objective. Dr. England's amendment of Kant's treatment of the subject will meet with wide agreement. A. R. W.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

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

Communicants' Manuals.—For presentation to Confirmees we again recommend the following books: *Helps to the Christian Life* (new edition), by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D. (leather, 2*s.*; cloth gilt, 1*s.* 6*d.*; cloth, 1*s.*; paper cover, 6*d.*). This manual, containing advice and suggestions on Prayer and Bible Study, and also instructions and devotions before, at the time of, and after Holy Communion, has been found a real help to the young and to the adult communicant. *My First Communion*, by the Rev. A. R. Runnels-Moss (cloth, 1*s.* net), has reached a third edition, and is a simple explanation of the Sacrament and Office, together with the Service. A third edition of Canon Barnes-Lawrence's valuable manual, *The Holy Communion: Its Institution, Purpose, Privilege*, has been issued in three forms (cloth gilt, 1*s.* 6*d.*; cloth limp, 9*d.*; paper, 6*d.*). The body of the book is largely devotional, and some instruction on difficult points is given in an appendix. It is particularly useful for presentation to Public School boys and girls. We also recommend *At the Lord's Table*, by the Bishop of Chelmsford (cloth gilt, 1*s.* 6*d.*; cloth, 1*s.*). The "preparation" is very practical and shows a true appreciation of the lives and thought of the younger generation. The Self-examination portion is not overdone and is on original lines. It has three lines of thought—one based on the Fruit of the Spirit in Galatians v; one on the Beatitudes; and one on the shorter Exhortation.

Lenten Reading.—The following books may be mentioned as suitable for Lenten reading: *The Time of Refreshing* (2*s.*) and *At the Lord's Table* (1*s.* 6*d.* and 1*s.*), by the Bishop of Chelmsford; *Seven Times He Spake*, addresses for Good Friday (6*d.*) and *Helps to the Christian Life* (1*s.* 6*d.*, 1*s.*, and 6*d.*), by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D.; *Addresses on the Seven Words from the Cross*, by the Rev. H. Browning (6*d.*); *Christus Redemptor*, Meditations on 1 Corinthians, i. 30, by Canon A. J. Tait, D.D. (cloth 9*d.*, paper 6*d.*); *Be of Good Cheer*, by the Rev. W. P. G. McCormick (2*s.* 6*d.*); *The Life of Love*, by Prebendary H. W. Hinde (1*s.* 6*d.* and 9*d.*); *The Dawning of That Day*, by the Rev. H. G. J. Howe (1*s.* 6*d.*); *Worship and Communion*, by the Rev. H. Montague Dale (2*s.* 6*d.*); Dr. Gilbert has also prepared *A Form of Service for the Three Hours on Good Friday* (2*d.* or 12*s.* per 100). For children we specially mention *The Master and His Friends*, by the Bishop of Chelmsford (5*s.* net). The basis of this book is the Gospel story, around which the author has built up a narrative written from the point of view of two children who lived at the time of our Lord and knew Him personally. It is designed to appeal to the heart of children and young people; to make the Supreme Figure in the world's history live before them and to lead them to feel the winsomeness of His Personality.

Missionary Books.—An excellent biography of *Patteson of Melanesia*, by F. H. L. Paton, B.D., has recently been published (3*s.* 6*d.* net). The book gives a vivid impression of the real Patteson and the description of the Pacific is of intense interest.

Another very interesting Missionary book of a different type is *The Pear-Tree Family*, a tale of modern Manchuria by Emily McN. Miskelly (1*s.* 6*d.* net). The book gives a wonderfully life-like account of life in China and the work of the Missionaries in the homes of the Chinese. It makes an excellent gift book.

Offertory—A notice to be placed on Church doors announcing the amount of Offertories and Collections has just been printed by the Book Room, price 2*s.* per 100. A sample will gladly be sent on application.

The Bible.—Messrs. Thynne & Jarvis have just published a third impression of *Messages from the Epistle to the Hebrews*, by Bishop Handley C. G. Moule, which has for its sub-title A Study of the great Epistle and its application for certain needs of our own time. The book is published at 2*s.* 6*d.* net. The same publishers have also published at 3*s.* 6*d.* net in a uniform edition the same author's *Philippian Studies*, *Ephesian Studies* and *Colossian Studies*, and *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans* at 5*s.* net, this latter being a valuable commentary and book of devotion.

Bible Stories for Children.—Several inquiries have been made at the Book Room for a selection of books on the Old and New Testament, with pictures, which would give children a happy interest in the Bible and could either be given to them to read or be read to them on a Sunday. The following books are specially recommended and have been found of service in a number of cases, particularly to families abroad where the children get little or no Bible instruction. The Children's Sunday Bookcase is a series of Bible stories intended to be a simple and helpful gift to little children. Each book is illustrated in colour and published at 2*s.* net. The majority of them are founded on the Peep of Day series, and the story is simple and attractively put for the children of to-day. The following is a list: *Stories from the Old Testament; From Bethlehem to Calvary* (new *Precept upon Precept*); *Fifty-two Bible Stories for Children; The Children's Pilgrim's Progress; The New Line upon Line; The New Peep of Day; Children's Life of Jesus; The Kings of Israel and Judah.* Two other books, also at 2*s.* net, are specially useful, *The Children of the Old Testament*, and *The Children of the New Testament.* For older children the books by Mildred Duff and Noel Hope published at 1*s.* 9*d.* are recommended and are as follows: *Where Moses learnt to Rule; Where Moses went to School; Daniel the Prophet, or The Boy with a Purpose; Esther the Queen, or Life in the Ancient Palace of Shushan; Hezekiah the King, or The City Defended by God.* A new series of Bible Story books, attractively bound, has also just been published by Messrs. Shaw, the letterpress being by Catherine Shaw. They are profusely illustrated and the following are issued at 1*s.* each: *The Children's Saviour; Fed by the Ravens;* and *Sunday Stories.* At 6*d.* each: *The Sower; Stories of Jesus; Bible Stories* and *The Good Shepherd.* In addition to these we would specially mention the Scripture Rewards by Catherine Shaw, which are published at 1*s.* each. The pictures and letterpress are both excellent. There are eight titles in this series, as follows: *Living Waters; Miracles of Jesus; Parables of Jesus; Twilight Talks; In the Temple; Servants of God; Bible Talks; Bible Lands.* These books are particularly useful as presents and prizes as they differ from the ordinary picture book, and incidentally would be very excellent for teachers.

The Book of Martyrs.—Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* was at one time constantly referred to and circulated very widely. To-day few of the younger generation seem to know much of the sufferings of the early Reformers. A cheap, well-bound, well-printed and readable abridged edition of this famous book was recently published in the Evergreen Library and the Book Room has purchased a number of these and is able to offer them at 2*s.* net. The book contains excellent memoirs of Savonarola, Luther, Tyndale, Wycliffe, Huss, Hooker, Ridley, Latimer and Cranmer, together with a number of memoirs of the less-known martyrs.