

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

February, 1919.

THE MONTH.

The Memorial.

THE Memorial promoted by nine bishops as a protest against the proposed changes in the Service of Holy Communion has been most numerous and influentially signed. Upwards of one hundred thousand lay signatures have been obtained as well as those of three thousand clergy. The number of Diocesan Bishops whose names it bears will soon be increased to ten, for within the last few weeks one of the signatories, the Rev. Canon Pearce, of Westminster Abbey, has been appointed Bishop of Worcester. It was originally intended that the memorial should be presented to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York long before this, but the dissolution of Convocation, following upon that of Parliament, necessitated a postponement. It is expected, however, that the presentation to the Primates will not be much longer deferred. It is yet uncertain to what extent the election of new Convocations will affect the general issue of Prayer Book Revision : it ought to tell heavily in favour of those who, while fully prepared to acquiesce in a reasonable orderly and loyal adaptation of the Prayer Book to the needs of to-day, are prepared to resist to the utmost any and every attempt to alter the doctrinal balance of the Church of England. This is a point upon which Evangelical Churchmen have insisted again and again, and it was very emphatically insisted upon by the speakers at the National Church League's Meeting at the Church House on Monday, January 13.

N.C.L. Meeting.

The meeting convened by the National Church League for the evening preceding the Islington Clerical Meeting is always one of great importance, and this year it was assuredly no exception to the general rule. The attendance was large, and was composed principally of representative clergy. The subject set down for consideration was "The Proposed

Changes in the Communion Service," and the speakers took occasion to express their deep regret that a subject of such acute controversy should have been thrust upon the Church at this juncture in our national life. Thus, Sir Edward Clarke, who presided, pointed out that these proposals were making deeper and deeper the divisions between Churchmen. "He was quite sure that the proposals could not be carried into effect, for, whatever happened elsewhere they would have to be submitted to the Houses of Laymen, who would have no tampering with the service, and would not submit to any mischievous suggestions of alternative services for optional use. He hoped that this element of discord would be withdrawn." So, too, Dr. Guy Warman, Vicar of Bradford. He spoke of the challenge of the Evangelisation Report and said:—

It was a pernicious thing that the response to that challenge should have been interfered with by the resuscitation of a controversy which many of them thought to be dead and buried three years ago. The presentation of the Gospel to the people was an even more important thing than the present controversy, but at the same time they could not do their duty with regard to the more important thing until they had got the less important out of the way. He himself was a whole-hearted Prayer Book revisionist. But he was quite clear that Prayer Book revision must not be made at the expense of tampering with the essential doctrines of the Church. Both those who supported and those who opposed the new proposals did so on the ground of doctrinal significance, save for a very few who preferred the altered order for archæological or æsthetic reasons. The Bishops of the Northern Province had not yet made up their minds, or at any rate had not expressed them, and when they did express them they would probably save the Bishops of the Southern Province from having anything further to say.

Finally the Dean of Canterbury stated the position with all his customary clearness and force. He said:—

The proposals had at least the advantage of showing beyond all doubt what the ritualistic party meant. It was clear now to everybody that they intended nothing less than the Romanisation of the Prayer Book. It might be that this particular alteration was compatible with the holding of Protestant doctrines. But there was no question at all now as to the meaning behind this alteration. It was one thing to accept a form of words which had come down with a comparatively neutral meaning and another to alter the existing canon of the Church in a distinctly Roman direction. A writer in the *Church Times* had recently stated quite boldly that the ritualistic party were now in the majority, and intended no longer to plead for toleration, but to take the offensive. It was incumbent upon those who would resist these proposals to show—what recent discoveries tended to demonstrate—that the present canon of consecration of Holy Communion was more primitive than the Roman. In point of fact, the English reformers, with a far deeper learning than many gave them credit for, penetrated through the mists of ancient history and put into the Prayer Book perhaps the most primitive form of consecration that ever existed. The proposals of the ritualistic party were

not merely anti-Protestant, but anti-English. If the party which was now dominant in the Church could obtain its way, there would be a great gulf created between the Church of England of the present time and the Church, not merely of the early reformers, but of Beveridge, of Pearson, of Bull, and of Laud, Jewel, and Hooker—that century and a half which produced what he might venture to call a true English religion.

In face of these facts it is clear that loyal Churchmen can make no compromise on the proposals in question.

The Bishops seem really determined to make a stand at last. They have yielded so long and so often to the pressure of the extreme "Catholic" School that one almost despaired of their ever doing anything to stem the onward rush of Romanism in the Church of England. The episcopal "line" seems to be drawn at the Service of Benediction with the Sacrament! In some dioceses Reservation of the Sacrament for the purpose of communicating the sick is allowed; in others it is even permitted to pay visits to the Sacrament and say prayers before it; but no bishop has yet sanctioned "Benediction," although it is quite impossible to say what effect a little further pressure on the part of the extreme clergy may have. They may break through the "line" at its weakest spot. That time, however, is not yet, and we will not anticipate trouble. For the present "Benediction" is forbidden—even in the diocese of London. It is not clear, however, to what extent the episcopal prohibition is faithfully observed. In one diocese—Birmingham—it is being openly and flagrantly defied by a prominent clergyman, who has expressed his determination to continue the practice and not to budge "for the whole bench of bishops." It is too early yet to say whether the Bishop of Birmingham will demand obedience and see that he gets it, or, whether, following the more ordinary episcopal example, he will be content with merely putting the church under discipline—which usually means that the church will not be visited by the Bishop or receive any diocesan grants. Now, if the Bishops really mean to make an effective stand they will have to do something more than this. Past experience has shown that such "discipline" is regarded very lightly by offending clergy, and there are not wanting instances where, after a time, the Bishop—not the offender—has grown tired of the isolation and has gradually withdrawn the ban. This is very bad for all concerned. It is bad for the Bishop—it weakens his

authority ; it is bad for the offender—he proves that if he can only hold out long enough the Bishop will yield ; it is bad for the parish—it creates the impression that the Vicar is right after all ; it is bad for the Church—it establishes the fact that Bishops will not rule and that clergy need not obey. In the case of a thoroughly disloyal and disobedient clergyman there is only one thing to be done—he should be proceeded against according to law. So long as the Bishops decline to fulfil this very obvious duty, so long will they be disobeyed and defied.

The service of Benediction with the Sacrament is
 What is Benediction? so foreign to the Church of England system that a large number of people have no idea of what it really consists.

It is essentially Roman in its construction and suggestion, and whenever it is used the service as set out in the Roman Missal is more or less closely followed. Slight variations there may be, but in substance the service is essentially the same. Only one such service was reported to the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, but the details of it, as given by the witness, show so clearly the character and intention of the service that we venture to quote the following passage from the *Minutes of Evidence* :—

Evensong was sung at 7.30 p.m., at which a sermon was preached by one of the curates, in which he insisted upon the absolute identity of the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacrifice of Calvary. They were, he said, one and the same thing, and in this fact was to be found the answer to all objections urged against the Sacrifice of the Mass. The congregation, which at the beginning of Evensong was very small, had by this time reached a fair number, and it seemed evident by the way people kept coming in that another service was to follow. After the collection of the offertory a priest wearing a magnificent cope and escorted by two acolytes carrying aloft two portable lights, and by the thurifer and incense boat bearer, came rapidly from the vestry and passed into the little chapel on the south side of the chancel, where the Sacrament is reserved in a tabernacle on or above the altar. The congregation hurried to the chapel, which, however, does not accommodate more than about fifteen or twenty persons. The remainder of the congregation knelt round the entrance to the chapel and in the south aisle. The altar was a blaze of light, all the candles having been lighted. The priest knelt in front of the tabernacle with an acolyte on either side of him, while immediately behind him knelt the thurifer who kept the censer swinging throughout the service with the result that clouds of incense filled the neighbourhood of the altar. The Roman Missal provides that at the service of the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament the priest shall open the tabernacle and cense the Sacrament. At St. — the tabernacle was not opened, but in every other respect the service was substantially the same as that provided in the Roman book for that service. The hymn, " O Saving Victim," as suggested in the Roman Missal, was sung, after which the Litany of the Holy Ghost was sung. This in turn was followed by the singing of the hymn, " Bow we, then, in veneration," also

in the Roman book, and the people made a profound obeisance in the earlier part of the verse, as provided in the Roman book. Afterwards some versicles were said, followed by a prayer beseeching God to grant us so to venerate these sacred mysteries that we may ever feel within us the fruit of redemption. Some more versicles followed, and the Benediction brought this service to a close. With the exception above stated, the proceedings were a close imitation of the Roman ceremonial.

“A Very Serious Cleavage.” It was probably the knowledge of the trouble with the Birmingham Benediction case that led the Bishop of that diocese to write as he did in his January letter to his people. He had just come back from a visit to America :—

I return to find that there has been some ferment even in Episcopal circles, and I see that we may be nearing a very serious cleavage in our ranks, dangerous at all times, but most of all just when we ought to be united in our efforts for the home-coming soldier. We shall lose him, not only for the Church but for Christ, Who is greater than any earthly expression of Him, if there is strife instead of peace, estrangement in the place of love. Broadly speaking, it seems to me that courage is the need of the moment. This courage may demand self-sacrifice, and what is rarer perhaps in our ranks of the clergy, humility in judgment. We have, broadly speaking, three schools within our Church, and all of them must beware lest they claim to be the only right pronouncers of shibboleth. They are :

(1) Those who for the sake of winning souls wish to force upon the Church of England practices, some of which it has rejected, others which it has let fall into disuse.

(2) Those who for the sake of winning souls think it all-important that there shall be no obscuring of the vision of a personal Christ, and who cannot approve of teaching and of ceremonial which they believe to be not only contrary to the teaching of the Church of England, but also calculated to make people depend upon something outside Christ for their spiritual healing. A goodly number of this school would sanction such association with Nonconformity in religious services as is in ordinary judgment not contemplated by the Church.

(3) Those who for the sake of winning souls wish a more critical attitude adopted towards not only Church teaching, but even to the accepted version of the Scriptures, pleading that inaccuracy is the enemy of truth. This school has adherents and foes in both the other classes.

For some time these schools have borne one with the other, mainly because each knew that the intention of the rest was to win souls. They respected the motives, they disapproved of the methods. But things are coming to a head. One section talks of forcing the hands of the Bishop by indulging in the unlawful but helpful, another says that it must sever its connection with Church management until all extravagances are put down, the third is gradually leavening the teachers of the Church with ideas which if expressed in the pulpit, shock the elect, but attract those who love the new and the startling.

How are these sections to be dealt with? The **The Difficulty of Authority.** Bishop thinks any plain man would demand that “authority should express itself, and that obedience should be rendered, or that those who cannot submit to order should

withdraw"—in other words "obey or retire." But "the difficulty" is, so the Bishop expresses it, that a divided Christendom destroys definite authority, "the nearest approach" to which in the Anglican Communion is the united voice of the episcopate, "but that cannot mean only the forty Diocesan Bishops who form the Upper Houses of Convocation." Even if these were to be the final court of appeal the Bishop questions "whether we should be much nearer a perfect solution." He believes the best thing for the moment to be "the loving persuasion of the man in close association with his people, viz., the particular Diocesan Bishop." No doubt in many, perhaps the majority, of cases this "loving persuasion" is all-powerful, but what of those where it meets with no response? They are the cases which test a bishop's capacity to rule, and too often he is found wanting. Of course he will be told that he is "by no means of infallible judgment," but this, the Bishop of Birmingham points out, "can also be said of the voice of the united episcopate," and he urges that "surely some account must be taken of the fact that he is the man in all the world who is most interested in the welfare of the Church of Christ in the particular area he administers," and he is "bold to say that he is the person who has the deepest and most tender affection for his clergy of every shade of religious thought." The Bishop of Birmingham has determined, therefore, to rely upon his personal influence:—

I believe (he adds) that in asking you to consult me, whether you are clergy or laymen, and in begging you to try to render willing deference to my honest judgment, I am doing that which will make most for the welfare of the Church in our midst. If it is true that I am over patient with much that I think unwise, I am not sure that this is a great fault, but that there must be a limit placed upon private judgment by the clergy in several directions I cannot deny. The times are critical. Are we going to combine for God and Christ, or are we going to steer towards separation? In all love I ask you to consider this alternative, and to decide so to act as shall bring a greater, fuller, and more active union to fruition in our Church.

Apart from every other consideration the letter is important as showing that at least one bishop realizes that in the present chaotic state of the Church we are drifting "towards separation."

Reformation
or
Revolution? In the effort after Reconstruction great care will be needed lest much that is useful in national life is "scrapped" for no other reason than that some change is necessary. It is a day of programmes, but the various proposals

that are brought forward should be tested in the light of cool collected common-sense argument, rather than by the pressure of what may prove to be merely transitory conditions. If this is true of national life, it applies with ten-fold force to the affairs of the Church. Just now the Church is suffering from the too persistent efforts of over-zealous reformers—men who see, or think they see, clearly enough what is demanded and are in a great hurry to carry their plans lest the opportunity should pass. But much that is presented to us as a considered scheme of reform is in reality revolutionary in its tendency and would be disastrous in its results. It is not a thankworthy task even to seem to want to damp the ardour of enthusiasts, but it is clear that the time has arrived when some one should have the courage to utter a warning note based upon the philosophy of experience, and it is good to find that the Bishop of Hereford has done so with impressive effect. In his January letter to the clergy and laity of his Diocese, Dr. Hensley Henson writes :—

We find ourselves in front of changes, profound in character, far-reaching in effect, which we cannot resist, and ought not if we could. Reconstruction is as much a moral obligation as a political necessity. But this necessity does not invalidate the teachings of experience, or exempt us from the penalties of ignoring them. Perhaps the main difference between Reformation and Revolution consists in the degree of authority which those teachings are allowed to wield over the process of change. Frankly, both as a citizen and as a Churchman, I am for Reformation and against Revolution.

The Church of England cannot possibly lie outside the general Reconstruction of our national system, to which the course of events has committed us, for of all the institutions which we have inherited from the past none is more precious in itself, and none is more embarrassed in its working. There are many among us, especially among the younger clergy in the great towns, who allow their indignation at the practical defects of the existing Establishment to blind them to its substantial merits and large possibilities. I beg them before taking irreparable decisions to make sure that they have duly appreciated all the factors of the problem which they aspire to solve. For my part I feel with respect to the National Establishment what the prophet felt about his nation : "DESTROY IT NOT, FOR A BLESSING IS IN IT." I would aim at strengthening the Church of England by removing those defects in its practical system which experience has proved to be spiritually enfeebling, but I would be slow to embark on a policy, however alluring on paper, which is properly inconsistent with the Establishment, and must needs, therefore, precipitate the very disaster which I desire to avert.

It does not appear to me necessary, I am sure it is very unfortunate, to raise large questions of ecclesiastical theory, when the reform of the national establishment of religion is in debate. There is no general agreement among English Churchmen on those questions, and there is never likely to be any. The circumstances of the English Reformation were unfriendly to internal agreement. The Church of England has always been the least united of the

Reformed Churches in point of ecclesiastical theory. It would be a vain task to attempt to prove identity in this respect between CRANMER, PARKER, LAUD, SANCROFT, TILLOTSON, TAIT, and BENSON, to mention but a few outstanding names from the illustrious line of the English Primates. The episcopal succession of every see in England, of Hereford conspicuously, points the same moral. The fact is that, while English Churchmen have commonly agreed in accepting the practical system established by law, they have always differed widely in ecclesiastical theory. That difference cuts deep, and its consequences are considerable and apparent, but even those who most regret it will admit that it has hitherto been consistent with practical co-operation in a spiritual service of the English people which has been of priceless value. Certain it is that, unless we can count in the future on the same subordination of ecclesiastical theory to practical religion which has existed in the past, the maintenance of the Church of England as an Established National Church will have become impossible.

The Bishop of Hereford's wise and weighty words will not, we hope, be without their effect. We see in some of the so-called "reforms" now being pressed upon the Church, a real danger to the Church's national position. It is quite easy to talk glibly about the blessings of "freedom" for the Church, but the dark spectre of disestablishment is never far away. The Bishop of Hereford promises to discuss more fully in his Primary Charge the questions he has raised in his letter, and his exposition will be awaited with keen interest.



THE TEACHING OFFICE OF THE CHURCH.¹

BY THE REV. THOS. J. PULVERTAFT, M.A.

THE Committee that sat and reported upon "The Teaching Office of the Church" had been instructed "to consider and report upon the methods by which the Teaching Office of the Church can be more effectively exercised." It was asked specially to bear in mind the duty of preventing thought and discussion becoming desultory and the obligation of forming a strong public opinion in the Church as to the things which ought to be and can be done. On one point the Committee has made itself clear. The Church has failed in the exercise of its Teaching Office, and this failure is re-iterated in the pages of the Report. There has been a great deal too much talk of failure. A knowledge of our shortcomings is the best preparation for remedying them, but when we are told that shortcomings exist on every side, that they are universal and it is the duty of every one to confess them, we are in danger of using the word "failure" without any of that poignancy of meaning which leads to repentance. There arrives a stage in the collective and individual religious consciousness when confession becomes meaningless as a moral experience—it is simply the echoing of the conventional, the repetition of the expected that is followed by an acquiescence in failure as normal and in contentment with things as they are. We do not find that the clever epigrams that have adorned the well written Reports have made any deep impression

¹ We have arranged to publish in the *CHURCHMAN* a series of articles reviewing the Reports of the five Committees of Inquiry which were appointed by the Archbishops as an outcome of the National Mission. These will appear month by month not in the order in which the Reports were issued, but in the order in which the Committees were appointed. That on "The Teaching Office of the Church" was the Archbishops' *First* Committee of Inquiry. The Report is published by the S.P.C.K. (2s. net). The Members of the Committee were: The Bishop of Ely (Chairman); Sister Annie Louisa; Dr. Barnes (Master of the Temple); Miss G. M. Bevan, S.Th.; Archdeacon Bodington; the Rev. A. C. Bouquet, S.C.F.; Prebendary Caldecott; Miss Zoe Fairfield; Canon C. F. Garbett; Canon H. L. Goudge; Canon A. C. Headlam; the late H. Scott Holland; Dr. Edward Lyttelton; Canon A. W. Maplesden; Mother Agnes Mason, S.Th.; Miss Winifred Mercier; Professor A. H. McNeile; the late A. S. Orlebar; the Bishop of Oxford; the Bishop of Ripon (who could not attend any of the meetings); the Rev. T. Guy Rogers, M.C.; Mrs. Romanes; Principal A. J. Tait; the Rev. W. Temple; and Canon J. Vaughan.

on the Clergy or Communicant classes. We are not surprised. Failure has been used too freely, and in the repetition of the word we find a sort of absolution that gives us an excuse to go on failing.

The Christian method of instruction is to hold up an ideal and to point men to it. When they see the ideal they strive to follow it. Dr. Gore rails against the use of the Commandments in the Communion Office as being the law code of an imperfect revelation. He has something on his side, but it is one thing to put before men in their self-complacency a statement of "Thou shalt not" to lead them to action and quite another thing in a Report to dwell upon failure to such an extent that the sense of failure is the main impression left on the mind of a reader who somehow feels that when all have failed he cannot be expected to succeed. If the report had been less intent on the exposition of the presumed causes of failure and the impressing on the Church the individual opinions of its members it would have served a much more useful purpose. An ideal set before the Church as to its real place as a Teacher would have made men think and have caused them to bring from the study of the thoughts of the Committee an earnest desire to reach that ideal. As it is most readers will say, "failure is so universal, it is due to so many causes beyond my power to remedy that I can only continue to muddle along in my own way and do the best I can. My penitence for failure can at best be only vicarious, and this means I am not really penitent at all."

We regret that this should be the case, and are of opinion that the Report misses its mark by its effort to crowd into its pages the favourite opinions of its most prominent members, and thereby it loses that measured weight and well-defined perspective which make documents influential. The study of the hundred pages of appendices—attached to the sixty-one paged Report—shows the part the leading members took in the composition of the joint document. There is much that is good in Report and appendices—but it is obscured by talking about the subject instead of placing before the reader a clear conception of what the Church is supposed to teach and the best manner of accomplishing its mission.

We are told that the Church has to teach "a message of Divine origin and transcendent importance for the well-being of the human race," and has "the duty of interpreting the gospel to each genera-

tion." This is on p. 2, and after fourteen pages of exposition of the causes of failure we are told that the "message or Word of God which the Church is commissioned to deliver takes shape from the first in a doctrine about God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit ; about man, his nature, destiny, his sin and his redemption ; about the incarnation and the Atonement ; about the earthly life and death of the Lord Jesus Christ, His Resurrection and Ascension, and the Mission of the Spirit ; about the Church, and the sacraments and the Ministry. This body of truth, which is declared in New Testament and summarised in the Creeds, though it expresses itself in a series of propositions or 'articles' is one coherent whole." We may remark in passing that the Creeds do not contain any reference to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper and are silent concerning the Ministry. The Report proceeds : " This is the Catholic Faith or Word of God which it is the primary business of the Church to study and proclaim. We ask of the Church, and especially of the Clergy, a fresh effort to study it, and to recognize their need of the Holy Spirit to enlighten their minds to receive and to understand it."

We pass over the use of " the Word of God " as synonymous with the coherent whole as set forth in the statement made by the Committee. We welcome the emphasis placed on the continuous movement of the Spirit of God in the world that has compelled the Church to reform itself when its teaching had become corrupted, on the use of free inquiry and the duty of " the disciple of Christ to welcome truth of all kinds." " It is of the greatest importance to know, and to be able rightly to declare what the Church teaches. But it is not enough, especially when the Church by its divisions is disqualified for teaching with authority. The more thoroughly we have thought things out for ourselves, the more simply and humanly we shall be able to teach so that all may understand." May we add that all through this Report we find a certain paralysis of teaching, through an evident disagreement among the members of the Committee as to what the message really is. There is nothing more misleading than to give in general terms a statement of the message when that message is obscured by the interpretation placed on different parts of it by those who deliver it. We all know the contrast between the Institutional and the Evangelical conception of Christianity, and we have a suspicion that the members

when once they got to grips with the fundamental question of the meaning of salvation and the means by which it can be obtained would fail to secure anything like unanimity. This is really the main source of the "failure of the Church." It speaks with many voices and an absence of authority follows from the confusion of utterance. We have anodynes administered to prevent the really fundamental differences becoming evident, and in consequence the Church of England has no definite message.

Later in the Report we come across a passage that is much more satisfactory: "The main business of the Church as an Educator is to receive into itself the personality of our Lord and let that personality be presented in its fullness alike of majesty and graciousness. Inasmuch as we are Christians we believe that 'the master light of all our seeing' is the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, whose life, death and resurrection are the pivot about which all human history turns. Here then we have the supreme test by which the Church's discharge of its teaching office must stand or fall." "He must be brought near; He must become the Master-Companion; otherwise we have only succeeded in teaching about Him. 'Until Christ be formed in you' is perhaps the best expression of the purpose as well as of the duration of the Christian teacher's labours." This is well said, and goes to the root of the whole matter. The message of the Church is not Church teaching as understood by ecclesiasticism—not an "articulated faith" of which the key-stone is a certain view of the ministry which certainly is not found in Holy Scripture—but the interpretation of the Master Companion who is at once Saviour and King.

We miss in the Report the personal note so well expressed in an address by a great Scotch theologian: "Preaching, whatever it was in the past, is in the present day a deeply personal thing. You must have a message which has spoken to your own soul in order to move the souls of your hearers. However you account for it, abstract thinking and abstract expression have no longer the power they once had; the message must be something personal; something that you have felt to come to your own soul with power; that is the sort of preaching that has power over the souls of others." All experience proves this to be the case, and no matter how orthodox our preachers may be in the exposition of "Church Doctrine" in its articulated form, this alone will never make them teachers of

“repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ” which still remains the specific message of the Christian pulpit.

We naturally turn to the important work of training for the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments. We need the best training for candidates for the Ministry. Whatever we may think on the subject an educated Ministry is required and expected by the people. No man has any right to stand forth as a teacher of the mind of God as revealed in Holy Scripture unless he has disciplined his reason to think accurately, to make the best use of whatever capacity God has given him to expound His truth and to be in touch with the thought of his time. The subject divides itself into two parts—provision for the present need and the permanent supply of men for the Ministry.

We expected to find in the Report more actuality than is in its pages. The Church to-day has a shortage of something like 2,000 men. Every one knows that curacies cannot now be filled, and a large number of old men who had retired from active work—in many instances with a heroism that has not been acknowledged—have come forward to fill the gaps. They cannot long remain at their present posts, and the lack of workers will shortly be more pronounced than it now is. We must draw from the ranks of the men who have been in the service of the Crown during the past four years. They have largely lost touch with intellectual life. Their theology—if they ever had any—has become rusty, but they have become wise in the University of the Trenches and the North Sea. They have kept their faith and have proved it sufficient in the day of trial. They have graduated in a far harder school than any provided by the universities or theological colleges. Such men have a deeper insight into realities than most of us, and their offers for service prove the genuineness of their zeal and the reality of their desire to serve God in the Ministry. We have seen outline schemes for the training of service candidates that are as foolish as they are pretentious. They are well fitted to kill enthusiasm and to deprive the men of that evangelical devotion and determination to sacrifice their consecrated lives in whole-souled work for God. They must of course be treated as individuals. To send them into a theological college for a routine course with its insistence on Latin and Greek and the heresies of the early Church means a grinding toil that will do them no good and will break their spirit. We often

wonder whether the Bishops realize how little practical value crammed subjects are for after work in the ministry. It would do them good to visit the "libraries" of the men who have slaved to reach pass standard, and have joyfully devoted themselves to forget what they have stored in notebooks!

These men should receive under sympathetic care instruction in Holy Scripture, homiletics and literature. They should be taught the fundamentals simply and clearly and be trained in a short course how to express themselves. Their service in the war should be recognized and permission should be given them to wear on their stoles the medals they have won. There is no fear that their people will think less of them on account of the absence of a university hood. It is probable that as the years pass they will be more highly esteemed than the "regularly trained," and if they are regularly trained they may easily be trained out of usefulness. With all respect for the Advisory Council and Examining Chaplains we do not think they are the best judges of what is needed in the education of this large and special class. Even professors think too much of the machine of which they form part, and are apt to place too great weight on the possession of a certificate duly acquired in the *right* fashion. God has different schools for His children, and the school of war with its manifold temptations faithfully overcome by His grace, gives better character training than cloistered calm and head work in an atmosphere of pious study. We hope our ecclesiastical leaders will bear this in mind.

When we approach the ordinary training of candidates for the ministry we find much in the Report that is of value: "A sound general education is of course absolutely necessary; if it has not been obtained special education narrows the mind. But for all who desire to be ordained priests a full special training—moral, intellectual, devotional and practical—must also be provided and two years should be regarded as the indispensable minimum of time to be devoted to it." We expect under existing conditions that the standard of education throughout the country will be greatly raised. Our universities will be crowded and culture will be widespread. Under these circumstances it is of first importance that men should be impressed by the duty of seeking training that will place them in the van of the people. A clergyman should be above the general level of the education of his people. He should

be able to meet on equal terms professional men in his congregation, and to hold his own with the rapidly growing cultured non-professional class.

To attain this position he should possess not only a university degree but a university education. The two things are not synonymous. The older universities provide something that is not found of necessity in the new universities. It exists, however, in every university centre and in the various college societies the candidate for the Ministry should find his place. He should learn to be clubbable, to have his opinions pulled to pieces without resentment, to learn that infallibility drops from his shoulders as soon as he professes to impose his prejudices on all his friends and acquaintances. One of the chief needs of the day is a ministry that sees things in perspective, that recognizes the difference between fundamental truth and the opinions of the market place or the narrow circle of men who think alike. Most of us have learned more out of the classrooms than in their stimulating or drowsy atmosphere, and we hope that anything like a segregated life for theological students during their university career will be opposed by those who have weight in the councils of the Church. The clergy must be able to hold their own in the world if they are not to degenerate into dogmatists of coteries who are more ignorant than themselves, and the best school for gaining this power is the school of the college unions and clubs where frankness, if at times brutal, has the virtue of sincerity.

Post-graduate training should be on wider lines than it now follows. There is too great a tendency to turn out men in one mould. There is not sufficient elasticity in the courses, and the Bishops' examinations are not always conducted on right lines. It is sometimes e.g. possible to obtain full marks on Holy Scripture without any knowledge of the text of Scripture, and whatever view men may hold of inspiration the old motto "bonus textuarius, bonus theologus" is still true. In our universities there are a variety of courses in which men can graduate according to their individual gifts. It is not so in the average theological college. The ordinary man—of whom we are thinking—must take the specified course and pass in that. It happens that a man without linguistic gifts has to waste valuable time on language that might be spent more advantageously on philosophy, history or literature.

It requires a large college and a strong staff to give all men the training for which they are specially fitted, and one improvement in our present system would be the determination of Bishops not to recognize smaller colleges except for Honour men who are engaged on specialized advanced courses. The ordinary man will not develop his mind or manhood to its fullest capacity in a small hall with a few companions and still fewer tutors.

The ideal course would be large colleges devoted to the training of candidates—free from theological colour. If our Church were united this would be possible, but in existing circumstances it is an unattainable boon. The Church of Ireland has greatly benefited from its Divinity School—we use the word “its” without prejudice—being attached to Trinity College, Dublin. There, however, the pronounced conflict of ideals so prevalent in England finds no place. We must continue evangelical colleges and colleges of other schools where men will find an atmosphere conducive to the development of their capacities. These however ought to be sufficiently large to permit a number of tutors of different types to engage in the work, and it is essential that the gulf between teachers and taught should not be so wide as to prevent the most cordial relations between them. Christianity is a personal religion, and the closer a man is brought to the professor to whom he looks for guidance the better for him in his after work.

For many years past it is acknowledged that the Church of England has not received into its ranks its due proportion of the best men in the universities. It is openly stated that socially and intellectually the standard has declined. It should be the object of the Church to remedy this defect, and it can only be done if there be a more spiritual outlook on the part of the Church as a whole. We have lost ground because we have not been true to the foundation truths we expound. We have become so divided that the ordinary layman cannot conceive how it is possible for men so sharply divided to co-operate as teachers in the same Church. Whatever may be thought of the validity of our formularies as a proper check upon the holding of certain contemporary opinions, there can be no doubt as to their aim in connexion with Roman teaching. The men who framed them were specialists in Roman doctrine and did their utmost to purge our services and formularies of the errors they repudiated. We can only expect to be a powerless Church among

the seventy per cent. of the nation that nominally adheres to us, if the nation considers us dishonest in our outlook. It is not a time for camouflage of any kind, and "The Teaching Office of the Church" forces all thinking men to ask three questions.

1. Why have we with seventy per cent. nominal adherents not nearly that proportion of worshipping Christians in our Churches?

2. Why have we to deplore the fact that nothing like this proportion of Honour graduates enter the Church when contrasted with the other professions?

3. Why is it impossible for a Committee that dealt with the Teaching Office of the Church to give a clear unambiguous summary of the Church's message?

The reason is plain—we have lost our power and have failed in our mission because our divisions have given the country a conviction that dishonesty lurks somewhere, and no spiritual force can be effective unless it upholds truth and is honest in its professions of unity. Truth has many facets, but they all reflect the same light, and the pity of it is that the light reflected by Church teachers is by no means the same and cannot by any stretch of charity be identified as coming from the one source. Until that ends we greatly fear that attempts to reform the machinery of teaching will be ineffective. Not by machinery—no more than by dialectic—has it pleased God to save mankind.

THOS. J. PULVERTAFT.



THE HEALING OF THE TWO BLIND MEN AT CAPERNAUM.

BY THE REV. WALTER R. WHATELY, M.A.

FEW, I suppose, among the miracles of Our Lord have attracted so little attention from critics and commentators as the story of the blind men of Capernaum. It is a story, however, which opens a door of investigation into more than one subject of considerable interest and importance. My present purpose is, first, to discuss the general subject of the healing of the blind, as it is presented to us in Scripture, and more particularly in the Gospels, secondly, to ask why Our Lord, on this and on certain other occasions, laid an injunction of silence upon the recipients of His mercy, and thirdly, to urge that there is good reason for regarding the story as authentic. The second of these questions is so closely connected with the third, that the discussion of the one must be incorporated in the discussion of the other. Something will also be said, incidentally, as to the historicity of the three other narratives in which Jesus is represented as giving sight to the blind.

The healing of the blind appears, as Bishop Westcott has pointed out, to occupy a position of peculiar interest and prominence among the Gospel miracles. In the first place, it is a miracle peculiar to Our Lord Himself.¹ Neither in the Old Testament, nor in the apostolic history, is any similar miracle recorded. The restoration of sight to the Syrian host in Samaria, and to Saul of Tarsus in Damascus cannot be said to furnish a real parallel. The Syrians, at least, were not the victims of disease; their blindness was only a temporary disability, miraculously inflicted for a special purpose, and then removed; and Saul's case may naturally be regarded in the same light.

But, further, there seems to be, in the Gospel narrative, a special stress laid upon this particular type of miracle. Four cases are recorded, and no more than two of any other.² This, in itself, is

¹ Westcott, *Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles*, pp. 39, 40.

² I mean, of course, among the miracles of healing, as distinguished from the exorcisms. There *may* be three recorded cases of paralysis, but it is better to regard the case in John v. (where the word *παραλυτικός* is not used) as being of a different type.

worthy of note. No one, I think, who has closely studied the miracles of Our Lord will hastily conclude that it is a mere accident, or that it can be explained by pointing to the prevalence of ophthalmia in Eastern lands. The miracle stories are not selected at random, nor with a view to showing which kinds of disease were most prevalent in Palestine at the time of Our Lord's ministry. And the same prominence appears in the allusions made by the Evangelists and by Jesus Himself, to the miracles of healing. We ought not, perhaps, to lay much stress on the fact that in each enumeration of these miracles this particular cure finds a place—a statement which can be made of no other—but it can hardly be an accident that in Luke vi. 21 it is actually put in a category by itself—"In that same hour He cured many of their infirmities and plagues, and of evil spirits; and unto many that were blind He gave sight."

Yet again, there is no individual miracle of healing which occupies so conspicuous a place in the Gospel narrative as the case recorded in John ix. of the man who had been born blind. A whole chapter is devoted to it, and it is made the occasion of the enforcement of the spiritual truths which it symbolized.¹

The prominence of this particular miracle is, as Westcott has reminded us, in accordance with Old Testament prophecy. The opening of the eyes of the blind figures conspicuously among the works there assigned to the coming Messiah; and it was one of these very passages that Jesus, in His first public address, applied to Himself and His Messianic ministry.

And if we ask why this type of miracle occupies so distinctive a position alike in Old Testament prophecy and in the Gospel narrative, the answer is not far to seek. It appears, perhaps, most conspicuously in the ninth chapter of St. John. It can hardly be doubted, quite apart from the evidence of the Fourth Gospel, that Our Lord's miracles were meant to have a typical significance. Both in the Old Testament and in the New, sickness is a type of sin, and as in the one Jehovah, so in the other the Lord Jesus is the Physician of the soul. But the discourse in John ix. is really unintelligible on any other supposition.

Now of all the metaphors which might have been drawn from bodily sickness or infirmity to describe the spiritual condition of

¹ I am disposed to find a partial parallel to this in Mark viii. 22-26 (*v. infra*), where again the case was one of blindness.

Israel at that period, none was so obviously appropriate as that of blindness. Leprosy may be regarded as a symbol of the uncleanness of sin, fever of the thirst and restlessness which it breeds, and paralysis of the moral incapacity to which it reduces the will ; but while all these might have been found in abundance in the Palestine of the first century—as in all countries and at all times—the supreme and crucial indictment against Israel was that she had not the spiritual insight to recognize her own Messiah when He came. It was wilful blindness, no doubt. The light had come into the world, “and men loved the darkness rather than the light, because their deeds were evil.” But it was blindness, none the less. Unwillingness to see reacts swiftly and surely upon the power of seeing. Those who yesterday would not see, to-day cannot. And there is no mistaking the emphasis laid by Our Lord upon the blindness of Israel. Again and again He refers to the subject, and sometimes with a note of hopelessness in His voice, as though the evil were incurable. After all, it was the one thing that really mattered. Had Israel known Him for what He was, all else would speedily have been put right ; the one fatal disease was the blindness that failed to recognize the great Physician.¹

Nor does the charge of blindness lie only against unbelieving Israel ; it is brought against the Twelve also :—“Having eyes, see ye not ?” (Mark viii. 18). And here an interesting point comes into view. A connection has been suggested between the words just quoted from St. Mark, and the healing of the blind man which is recorded in the verses immediately following. But there may perhaps be more in this connection than appears at first sight. Why did Jesus perform two acts of healing on the blind man ? Dr. Swete suggests that the man’s faith was not at first sufficient for a complete cure. This explanation seems to me unconvincing, or at least inadequate, and I would venture, though with considerable diffidence, to suggest another. In the rebuke already quoted, Our Lord seems to lay marked stress on the fact that He had fed the multitudes *twice*, and this would appear to be the point of *ὄψω* in verse 17—“perceive ye *not yet*, neither understand ?” Would not this rebuke be driven home by the unusual method adopted, apparently very soon afterwards, in healing the blind man ? After the first touch,

¹ To St. Paul also the supreme and fatal sin of Israel is her blindness. V. Rom. xi. 7, 25, and 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15.

the man saw *something*, and was able to reason about what he saw ; he realized that he was still partially blind ; after the second, " he was restored, and saw every man clearly." Is not the Lord here once more saying, in effect, to His disciples, " I have, not long since, performed two acts which ought to have cleared your spiritual vision ; after the first you remained as blind as before, and now, after the second, you are blind still " ? The physical miracle, even where there was, apparently, most difficulty, was an easy thing compared to the task of opening the eyes of their souls.

But now, what are we to say of the historicity of the four narratives, and in particular of the miracle at Capernaum ? The narrative in John ix. stands, of course, in one sense, by itself. Stamped as it is throughout with marks of authenticity, it is not likely to be accepted by critics who minimize the general historical value of the Fourth Gospel. But even the instances recorded by the Synoptists have not all escaped adverse criticism. The narrative in Matthew ix., which is the main subject of this paper, has been confidently asserted to be a " doublet " of the story of blind Bartimæus at Jericho. Sir John Hawkins has argued the matter at length in his famous work, *Horæ Synopticæ*.¹ No one, I think, is ever likely to present the case against the narrative more ably or thoroughly than this learned and sober-minded critic, and we cannot do better than take his argument as the basis of the present discussion.

But before examining the argument in detail, it may be well to make one or two preliminary remarks on the subject of doublets. The first is, that life is full of coincidences which are at least as striking as any that exist between similar incidents in the Gospels, and which, if they had occurred in the Gospels, would have been confidently set down by many critics as due to confusion on the part of the Evangelists. Harnack has shown us, in a comparatively recent work, how dangerous it is to assume such confusion, even when the details of two narratives absolutely coincide. Nor will readers of Freeman's *Methods of Historical Study* be likely to forget the really extraordinary parallel which he points out between the reigns of our own Kings Henry I and Henry II.

In the second place, I would remark that those who hunt—as I think some critics really do—for " doublets " in the Gospels, could hardly find a more unpromising field for their activities than the

¹ And previously in the *Expository Times*, vol. xiii.

miracles of Our Lord—except, indeed His sayings. He must surely have performed multitudes of miracles so exactly like each other that one narrative, however detailed, would have described them all. And, as a matter of fact, no such similarity exists between any two miracle-stories in the New Testament.

I am conscious, as I read Sir John's arguments, of an uneasy suspicion that they are partly controlled by a major premiss which never, so to speak, appears in public, but pulls the strings from somewhere behind the scenes, and is perhaps not clearly present even to the writer's own mind. Probably, if it had been, he would have perceived its weakness; major premisses, like measles, are never so dangerous as when they are suppressed. Sir John appears to think that obvious coincidences of detail and of phraseology are the characteristic marks of a doublet. I shall return to this point later, but in the meantime I would suggest that in a real doublet the differences would be obvious and probably superficial, while the resemblances would be real and significant, but not always obvious. It appears to me that in the narrative under discussion we have just the opposite of this.

Let us begin with a glance at the resemblances, as noted by Sir John. Some of them need not detain us long. He notices, for instance, that in both stories the men called after Our Lord. Of course they did. It was the simplest and most obvious way of attracting His attention. There may have been scores of similar incidents in His ministry. Another similarity is found in the words, common to both narratives, "Have mercy on us." Here, again, there is nothing whatever noteworthy in the coincidence. The phrase was a very natural one to use, and there are other instances of it in the Gospels.¹

The same remark applies to yet another coincidence, the use by the blind men of the title, "Son of David"; but as this introduces us to what I believe to be a real and important difference in the narratives, we may leave it on one side until we have discussed the other resemblance.

Sir John marks in black type the words which in the story of Bartimaeus are peculiar to Matthew and which occur also in his ninth chapter; and, speaking of the last portion of the earlier narrative, he says, "In the account given of the disobedient pro-

¹ Luke xvii. 13; Matt. xv. 22; Mark ix. 22.

mulgation of the miracle we seem to find Matthew, here as elsewhere, transferring the familiar language of Mark from one place to another (e.g. *διαφημιζειν* is a rare word). If that view is accepted, there remains nothing distinctive and unparalleled in the narrative."¹

But this argument from coincidences of language is even weaker than the arguments we have already discussed. In the first place, its details will not stand cross-examination. We have only to sift it to find that by far the greater part of it disappears at once. Granted, provisionally, that there were actually two blind men, both at Capernaum and at Jericho, who asked Jesus to heal them, the coincidence of phraseology is fully explained, and in part even demanded, by the coincidence of fact. How could Matthew, in either narrative, have dispensed with the words *δὺο* and *ἡμᾶς*? What possible argument can be drawn from their occurrence in both? Nor is there anything in the least noteworthy in the recurrence of such words as *κράζειν* and *παράγει*.² The only rare word adduced is *διαφημιζειν*, and that does not come from the Jericho narrative at all, but from Mark.

But, as a matter of fact, the whole argument is a fallacy. The major premiss is even more unsound than the minor. Even if the verbal resemblances adduced are anything more than coincidences, they do not furnish any support whatever to the doublet-theory. The first Evangelist was admittedly familiar with St. Mark, from whom he borrowed not merely isolated words, but whole sentences. What could be more natural than that he should borrow in this way, consciously or unconsciously, where the similarity of incident was sufficiently close to bring the familiar words to his mind? If anything more natural can be imagined, it is surely the repetition of his own vocabulary, when he has to narrate the same *type* of incident twice over, though with certain differences of detail. And it is obvious that the greater the similarity of the incidents, the greater, as a rule, would be the coincidence of language.

But is there really nothing distinctive in the Capernaum story? Must we acquiesce in Sir John's verdict that it is so "comparatively

¹ I have not attempted in this paper to deal with all Sir John's arguments, but the omissions are few, and, I think, unimportant. Those who desire to look further will find his own statement in *Horæ Synopticæ* and in vol. xiii. of the *Expository Times*.

² *παράγει* has been used previously by Matthew in this very same ninth chapter, verse 9.

colourless and uninteresting," and "so very similar" to the story of Bartimaeus, that it is "almost impossible not to regard them as doublets"?

Now, if by distinctiveness we mean the presence of one or more features which occur in no other miracle-story, this is surely something more than we are entitled to demand, and something which we do not always find even in more generally accepted narratives. That the story in Matthew ix. has distinctive features as compared with that in chap. xx. is obvious—I hope to show that there is a marked difference between them in one matter where Sir John sees only a resemblance—but it is not merely to isolated features that we must look; we must consider the narrative as a whole, and we must consider it in relation to its context. This latter consideration alone would redeem it from the reproach of being without point or colour. It forms one of a closely linked chain of events which extends from verse 10 to verse 34.¹ Jesus is interrupted in a discourse by the arrival of Jairus, who asks Him to come and restore his daughter to life. So much is He in request that a crowd follows Him as He goes, and He is even, so to speak, compelled to perform a miracle on the way thither. On the way back His help is again solicited. Two blind men cry after Him in the street and follow Him into His own house, there to receive the healing which they sought. As these are in the act of departing, a demoniac is brought in to be cured.

What a picture we have here of the crowded life which Jesus lived at that period in Capernaum! And what a commentary it supplies on the curse denounced later (Matt. xi. 23) upon the guilty city which had enjoyed and rejected such unique opportunities of salvation! Had this story been only a link in such a chain, there would have been sufficient reason for its insertion.

¹ With a possible, but not, I think, probable break at verse 14.

WALTER R. WHATELY.

(To be concluded.)

QUEEN MARY TUDOR AND THE MARTYRS OF THE REFORMATION.

BY THE REV. S. HARVEY GEM, M.A.

QUEEN MARY is the person chiefly responsible for the conversion of the English nation to Protestantism. And yet she was the most thoroughly Roman Catholic sovereign that we ever had. How are we to explain these apparently contradictory facts? The reason is simple. She had no statesmanship, no diplomacy about her. Her principles were strong, and she was ready to carry them out, cost what it might, to the bitter end. She never stopped to consider whether she might not, by ill-timed persistency, be defeating the very objects she had most at heart. That she was so little diplomatic did honour to her motives, but not to her talent. Statesmanship is often dishonest, but honest statesmanship need not be blinded by its own virtue. Even in our own small sphere it is desirable to consider before we act, what the results of our actions are likely to be. And so, in politics, if the proposed action is likely to defeat the object in view, a good statesman may allowably hold back. The great object of Mary was to restore the Roman obedience, and to extirpate heresy: but it might have occurred to her that to light bonfires all over the country and burn people in them would alienate for ever the very sympathies that she desired to win. These fires dotted about in various parts of England consumed between 200 and 300 persons, and so it began to be widely doubted whether a religion which required such human sacrifices could be the true one. There had indeed long been a Protestant party, but the Lollards and extreme Reformers had no great hold on the mass of the people. Except in London and the eastern counties the population generally was attached to the ancient faith and ritual, and did not even object to the Pope, provided he kept himself in his place. Moreover, the selfish and designing laymen, who had led the Reformation in the reign of Edward VI, had brought the reformed teaching into general odium. A conciliatory policy on the part of Mary would have quieted the adherents of Protestantism far more than the aggressive measures that she imagined to be necessary. This was pointed out by some of

her advisers. There were times when even the Emperor Charles V and her husband Philip counselled her to be moderate.¹

But in view of these terrible facts are we justified in handing on the accusing designation by which she has so long been known, and describing her as "Bloody Mary"? The epithet implies a hard heart, a cruel intention. She thought all the while that she was just simply doing her duty. She even shows by some of her words that she felt it a painful duty. She had not originated the punishment of burning. It had long prevailed on the continent, and had been introduced into England in the reign of Henry IV. It was not practised only by Roman Catholics. Reformers had been known to burn Anabaptists. Cranmer burnt Joan Boucher, Calvin burnt Servetus. In those days, errors of belief were regarded as carrying with them a deadly infection. So the differing parties burnt their opponents on principle, lest the particular infection which they dreaded should spread. You may say, if this was the case, why did the martyrdoms under Mary shock the feelings of the nation so deeply? Chiefly, I think, because they far exceeded in number those that had ever occurred before. Also because so many of the victims were persons in the humbler walks of life, whose sufferings appealed more clearly to the people than those of greater men, and who might more readily have been pardoned than they; and further, because of the widespread effect produced by so much constancy and endurance, shown in all directions under such fearful agony. We may acquit her of any cruel intention, and yet must consider that the terrible persecution which had been inaugurated by her mistaken conscience, eventually produced a hardening effect on herself. We can understand how such cruelty, even when set in motion by right motives, would gradually produce a hardening effect on the perpetrator of it, and if we assume this to have been the case with Mary it accounts for two difficulties. First,

¹ Prescott, vol. I, p. 225. He says of Queen Mary: "Her fate had been a hard one. Unimpeachable in her private life, and, however misguided, with deeply-seated religious principles, she has yet left a name held in more general execration than any other on the roll of English sovereigns. One obvious way of accounting for this, doubtless, is by the spirit of persecution which hung like a cloud over her reign. And this not merely on account of the persecution; for that was common with the line of Tudor; but it was directed against the professors of a religion which came to be the established religion of the country. Thus the blood of the martyr became the seed of a great and powerful church, ready through all time to bear testimony to the ruthless violence of its oppressor."

when she saw that the burning of the earlier martyrs did not check the Reformers' determination, why did she not stay her hand? I suggest as the answer, that she got hardened, as victim after victim perished in their agony. Secondly, why, when Cranmer had so completely recanted did she not spare him? Here was a splendid opportunity of forgiving the man who had so deeply injured her and her mother: and of showing the world that forgiveness was a virtue especially honoured by Romanists. I answer that her heart had been, in spite of the good motives that actuated her at first, becoming gradually harder. We cannot suppose she did not know perfectly well that Cranmer's judges intended to burn him in spite of his recantation—we cannot acquit her of complicity in that terrible wrong. Hence though deprecating the condemning epithet, we cannot acquit her altogether, we can only say that she began the persecution with honest though mistaken motives, and that as she went on she became hardened.

We cannot wonder that Mary was embittered against the Reformed opinions: she had suffered from them in the reign of her brother Edward, and they were associated in her mind with the divorce of her mother, and the dangers she had been exposed to during her father's life. On the other hand she naturally grew up attached to the Papal party; the Pope had been on her mother's side in opposition to the wickedness of her father, her nearest friends were Romanists, her Spanish relatives were Romanists. Her cousin Charles V was ruler of Spain and Emperor of Germany, and he and his son Philip were, outwardly at least, devoted Catholics. To her Romanism seemed not only the way to heaven, but the path of true religion, and also of true conservatism, amid the disputes and factions of the day. Her people regarded her as the rightful heir, and hailed her as the representative of order and stability. No one was ever more popular on first coming to the throne, or threw so much popularity away. And this was done by obstinate adherence to opinions formed without regard to consequences. The Emperor Charles warned her to be conciliatory. "Tell her," said Charles, "not to be hasty at the beginning in altering what she may find amiss; to be conciliatory, to wait for the determinations of Parliament, preserving always her own conscience, having her Mass privately in her chamber without any demonstration, at present making no edicts contrary to those which are established

in the realm, so let her proceed by little and little to bring things into a better frame. Let her not only have for her end the good of the realm, but let her make others perceive that the good of the realm is her end." But Mary had not statesmanship enough to accept this very prudent and sensible advice; we might say she had not common sense enough to adopt it.

In her urgent desire to restore Romanism, she did not give due consideration to the fact that, on her accession, the laws bearing on religion were those that had been enacted in the Reforming days of her father and her brother Edward VI, and those who guided the councils of the latter had gone a long way in the direction of the more extreme Reformers. Was it not advisable to repeal all this, and to get Parliament to reverse the new arrangements, and restore the old, with due form of law, before interfering with the Protestants? Mary had not caution enough in her to await such measures. So she laid herself open to the obvious retort that the Reformers were simply carrying on the form of worship authorised by the existing laws. Could they be reasonably expected, they might ask, to change all these legalised doctrines and practices at once, merely because the Queen happened to be a Roman Catholic herself? Mary had indeed begun by asserting that she did not intend to compel men's conscience, but a riot which ensued when one of her preachers addressed the multitude at Paul's Cross led to her prohibiting all preaching except that on her own side. The Reformed preachers who would not keep silence were arrested and thrown into prison. They replied that the law was in their favour.

In several places the Latin Mass was illegally set up. The indignation of the maintainers of the Reformation prompted them to prosecute at the Assizes some of the priests who thus presumed on the royal countenance, and a judge who charged the jury as he was bound to do, to find according to the existing laws is said to have been rebuked by the Lord Chancellor.

A bold action on the part of the often timid Cranmer hurried on the rupture between the Queen and her opponents. He was reported to have himself set up the Mass in Canterbury Cathedral. To this he gave an indignant denial, and presently went on to offer a challenge to a disputation, that he and Peter Martyr would conduct against the doctrine of the Mass. He offered to prove that the Book of Common Prayer was more in accordance with God's

Word than that of the mediæval Church, and to show that the Reformed order of the Church was not a new invention but in harmony with that of the primitive Church 1,500 years ago.

“ Let God's Word be the Judge ; let the arguments and process be set out in writing. . . . We shall prove that the order of the Church, set out at present in the Church of England by Act of Parliament is the same that was used in the Church 1,500 years ago. And so shall they never be able to prove theirs.”

The sequel of this boldness on the part of Cranmer was that he was arraigned before the Star Chamber, and thrown into the Tower. It was not surprising, for Queen Mary had spared him, when guilty of supporting Northumberland's plot, showing thereby a noble feature of her character which appears from time to time, namely an unwillingness to avenge offences committed against herself. Then, he might not unreasonably have been executed, and when he came forward now to oppose her in religious matters (though we may wish she had allowed the disputation) we can hardly be surprised that she recalled to herself his former offence and threw him into prison.

Many of the reformers, especially the foreigners among them, were taking refuge abroad. It is to the credit of Cranmer's courage that he had remained, to defend as best he might the cause of the Reformation.

We are now speaking of the year 1553. On October 1, the Queen was crowned with the splendid rites of the Latin services which were still illegal. A general pardon was promulgated, but all the prisoners for religion were exempted from it.

The first Parliament of Queen Mary assembled on October 5. It was mainly chosen from the Catholic counties and contained no member at all from the City of London. In this Parliament all the Acts of Edward's reign, on the subject of religion, were repealed.

Mary desired the restitution of the abbey lands, but this was resisted, she never could persuade her nobles and gentry to relinquish their ill-gotten gains. Even the Pope was eventually obliged to give a definite sanction to the retention of these estates. For the noblemen and gentlemen of England were quite willing to adopt whatever religion was in turns established by the Crown, and to chance the result in the next world, provided they could keep a firm hold on the Church property which they had appropriated,

while they were here below. Whether that would send them further down eventually they did not stop to think.

The Convocation of Canterbury, which met on October 7, in conjunction with this Parliament, was one of the most memorable in the Church of England. The Catechism of Edward VI was to be disowned, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation was to be reasserted.

Among the Deans and Archdeacons, there were five or six bold men who held to the Reformation, and now stood forth to defend it—Philpot Archdeacon of Winchester, Cheney of Hereford, Aylmer of Stow, Philips Dean of Rochester, James Haddon Dean of Exeter, and Young the chanter of St. David's. On Monday, October 23, many nobles and gentlemen of the Court and of the City came to witness the expected contest in the Chapel of St. Paul's. It lasted several days. The Reformers appear to have had by far the best of the argument. (See Parker Society: *Philpot's Examinations*, pp. 199-202, and the Harleian Library MS. 422, vol. 38.) Canon Dixon, himself a High Churchman, says (p. 88) "those who were arguing on the Roman side were reduced to palpably absurd asseverations as to the Holy Communion."

In the Upper House four articles were framed and passed, for Communion in one kind, for Transubstantiation, for the adoration and reservation of the Eucharist, and concerning its institution and intention.

The disturbances about religious matters had already begun to diminish the popularity of the Queen. Her accession had been welcomed by the loyalty that the English are always ready to show to a rightful superior. She had been the object of popular sympathy during the wrongs she had suffered from her father, and the troubles of her brother's reign, but the dictatorial line she soon took up on matters of controversy, and before any formal reconciliation to Rome had been attempted, had given offence, and now she was about to adopt a course that tended at once to place her in opposition to the feelings of her people, both Catholic and Protestant. She was intending to marry a foreigner and a Spaniard. Though in the time of Henry VIII, the nation had deeply sympathised with the wrongs of Queen Catherine, and had then gladly passed on the allegiance of their hearts to her daughter Mary, yet the Spaniards were not liked, and the prospect of a Spanish consort and king in

England filled the people with horror. The French ambassador fomented the discontent by holding over them the prospect of a Spanish army and of the Spanish Inquisition.

Mary's choice was highly impolitic, but it was not unnatural.

The two great sovereigns of Europe were the King of France and the Emperor of Germany. It happened also that Charles V was King of Spain, and ruler of the Neapolitan states in the South, and of the Netherlands in the North. He was Mary's cousin, he and his ambassador had befriended her in her long years of danger and misery, and now she was on the throne, he continued to exercise his thoughtful statesmanship by advising her how to act with prudence. He had dissuaded her, though in vain, from any hasty steps in matters of religion. She was grateful to him even when she did not follow his advice, and he was almost her only friend. He indeed was not so simple and honest as herself; and his own European policy came before his regard, genuine as far as it went, for her. He wanted to outweigh the King of France, and he thought that to marry his son Philip to Mary would complete the preponderance that he had striven to attain. So Renard his ambassador, not badly named for a diplomatist, laid himself out to persuade her into the marriage. She was no longer young, and it would have been far better had she remained single. So thought her cousin, Cardinal Pole. At any rate her people hoped she would marry an Englishman.

It might have weighed with her that to marry a Spaniard would injure the cause she had most at heart and which she valued more than any happiness of her own, namely the restoration of the Roman obedience. To marry Philip was to excite prejudice against the reconciliation of England to Rome. With her usual bluntness she disregarded all considerations of policy. Her wisest statesman, Gardiner, was much opposed to the match, but she would have her way, and he was obliged to content himself with making careful provisions against the legal dangers that might arise with a foreign husband on the throne.

The House of Commons did not omit an effort to save the country from the impending misfortune. The Speaker with a deputation of members waited on the Queen, and in earnest terms, but with respectful circumlocution, he prayed the Queen to marry, but not to choose a husband from among foreigners, expatiating

on the advantages she would derive from a union with a member of the English nobility. This language, respectful though it might be, was not such as to be acceptable to Tudor ears ; her reply was short and characteristic :

“ For that you desire to see us married, we thank you. Your desire to dictate to us the consort whom we shall choose we consider superfluous. The English Parliament has not been wont to use such language [to its sovereigns, and when private persons on such matters suit their own tastes, sovereigns may reasonably be allowed to choose whom they prefer.”

Herewith she dismissed them, and a few days afterwards Parliament was dissolved. The year 1554 witnessed the well-known rebellion of Wyatt and the attempted rebellion of Suffolk. Lady Jane Grey, spared before, was now brought to the block, though guiltless of any connivance with the rebels.

The popular dislike to the Queen's marriage had given occasion to these risings. Elizabeth, supposed to be privy to them, was sent to the Tower. Gardiner however was wise enough to shield her, the English nobles were in her favour, and though Mary has been accused of wishing for her execution, which the Emperor Charles was constantly suggesting, there is no evidence that she treated her sister with cruelty. Philip, after his marriage, saw that it would be good policy to befriend and to conciliate Elizabeth. It was fortunate that a mistake, which would have changed the history of England, was not added to the many others of the reign.

S. HARVEY GEM.

(To be continued.)



THE CENTENARY OF RUSKIN

BY J. C. WRIGHT

JOHN RUSKIN was born on the eighth of February, 1819, at 54 Hunter Street, Brunswick Square, London. His father was a wine merchant, who appears to have had fine tastes; he loved books and pictures, and devoted a considerable amount of money to their acquisition. From him the boy learned those lessons in life which he was destined to teach in later years. And young Ruskin very early exhibited indications of coming greatness. When he was about four the family moved to a house on Herne Hill, "a rustic eminence four miles south of the 'Standard in Cornhill.'" Here he was among the green fields and hedgerows. Though brought up with few luxuries, he spent frequent holidays at Perth and Croydon with his aunts.

We are told the boy was educated at home, his mother "drilling him in Bible reading and Bible study." His father intended that he should be a bishop, but the only indications he gave in that direction was by preaching sermons at home, his text being, "People, be good." It is said that by the age of seven he was compiling books on electricity, and at nine puzzling his head about mineralogy. To his mother he was indebted for his grounding in Latin grammar, but when he reached eleven, he was put to Greek under a tutor.

The most distinguishing feature of Ruskin's young life was his remarkably correct etchings of Cruikshank's, and when he saw the fine vignettes of Turner, his enthusiasm knew no bounds. His artistic tastes were still further whetted by travel up the Rhine with his father, and over the Alps to Milan and Genoa.

Returning home he was entered as a gentleman commoner at Christchurch, Oxford. Here he attempted poetry, and won the Newdigate prize for English verse in 1839. But it would appear the strain upon his physical strength was too great, for he was stricken down by sickness, and was taken in haste to Italy. In the next two years he gradually gained strength, returned to Oxford, and passed his final examinations.

In the following year the first volume of his great work *Modern Painters* was issued. It was something entirely new. Its aim was

to show that art means something more than pleasing arrangement of lines and colours, and that the best artist is he who conveys the highest ideas of truth and of beauty. His teaching fell on unwilling ears—nay, more; it produced a feeling of aversion towards the author, who certainly abused every artist except Turner. To Ruskin, Turner was, “beside Shakespeare and Verulam a third star in that central constellation, round which, in the astronomy of intellect, all other stars make their circuit.” His *Modern Painters* was followed by *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, in which he emphasises the relationship of art and religion. *The Stones of Venice* was published three years later: it teaches “the dependence of all human work or edifice, for its beauty, on the happy life of the workman,” and its aim is to show how art is conditioned by human wants and surroundings, and by human virtues and vice. It describes the early Venetian buildings, and shows the debasement of architecture during the Renaissance period.

During the next seven years Ruskin’s work in lecturing and writing was relieved by visits to Italy and Switzerland, and later to Germany, where he studied the German and Italian paintings in the picture-galleries of Berlin, Munich, and Nuremberg. On his return he completed two books which reveal his teaching perhaps more accurately than any of his works. These are *Unto this Last* and *Sesame and Lilies*. The former shows the dependence of national wealth upon the principles of justice, mercy and admiration, and that the laws of life, if followed, always lead to happiness. In *Sesame and Lilies* the guiding and purifying influence of women is expressed in language at once rare and beautiful. We quote a brief paragraph which it may be well for us to remember in these days: “We are foolish, and without excuse foolish, in speaking of the superiority of one sex to the other, as if they could be compared in similar things. Each has what the other has not; each completes the other, and is completed by the other; they are in nothing alike, and the happiness and perfection of both depends on each asking and receiving from the other what the other only can give.”

But Ruskin did more than write books, or deliver lectures. Like *Chaucer’s Parson*, he was one who,

“Christes lore, and His apostles twelve
He taught, but first he folwede it himselve.”

He showed the practical side of his own life by spending the whole

of his considerable fortune on public and private charities ; he appointed Miss Octavia Hill to manage his London property on principles which have since been adopted by philanthropists generally ; he presented his drawings and minerals to various public galleries and museums ; he inspired co-operative undertakings, and endowed a Guild which had for its primary object the redeeming of waste lands peopled by well-ordered lives.

There was hardly a branch of practical life that Ruskin did not touch. As a social reformer he maintained " that no great arts are practicable by any people unless they are living contented lives, in pure air, out of the way of unsightly objects, and emancipated from unnecessary mechanical occupation." To carry out his designs, he formed the Guild of St. George. The ideas underlying the Guild he desired to see developed in a practical form—he wished to prove that " food can be got out of the ground, and happiness out of honesty " ; but, unfortunately, the industrial part of the undertaking was not sufficiently tried to warrant success. There was, however, one branch of the Guild which was destined to be widely useful—the St. George's Museum, near Sheffield, which contains specimens, copies and casts " of the truly greatest of human art of the times of the highest development in each branch, and from those parts of the world where they best flourished."

Another interesting industrial experiment was inaugurated by Ruskin. He endeavoured to introduce hand-spinning and weaving of linen in Westmorland. People said : " It won't pay ; no one wants linen to last fifty years ; it's fantastic, unpracticable, sentimental, and quixotic." Ruskin turned a deaf ear to these rebuffs ; and in Langdale Valley he took a cottage, and made it into a spinning school. With the help of friends the scheme was carried out ; pupils were secured, and applications for wheels came from all sides. Says Mr. Albert Fleming : " We got an old weaver, and one bright Easter morning saw our first piece of linen woven—the first purely hand-spun and hand-woven linen produced in all broad England in our generation." When the present writer visited the school some fifteen years ago, the industry was still flourishing.

Since the death of Ruskin in 1900, his influence in art and literature and social politics has been slowly but surely spreading in the life of the nation. His art criticism is still highly valued ; he has taught people to look and admire, and that is much ; his literary

style, though pronounced by critics as sometimes rhetorical, is full of beauty and restfulness ; perhaps the autobiographic sketch of his early years in his *Praeterita* is as near the perfection of literary work as it well can be. And what shall be said of his social theories ? Though it may be conceded some of them are crude, they are based on principles which reveal the livableness of life.

J. C. WRIGHT.



THE SACRAMENTAL PRINCIPLE.

BY THE VEN. ARCHDEACON DAVIES, M.A., Principal of Moore
Theological College, Sydney.

I.—WHAT IS MEANT BY THE SACRAMENTAL PRINCIPLE?

IN simple language the Sacramental Principle may be stated thus :—God uses material means in fulfilling His spiritual purposes. Man may not live by bread alone, but bread, and all that is implied by bread, material means of subsistence, does play a great part in maintaining vital activity. Mind is greater than matter, and controls it, but mind works through matter. The brain does not create thought, but it is the organ of mind.

There is great risk in using ordinary terms of speech, mis-called "simple" speech, rather than technical terms, in handling such a question as the sacramental principle. The risk is illustrated by the false antithesis that is so often drawn between "material" and "spiritual." Nevertheless the use of plain speech brings one into more direct touch with the foundations of the subject, and this paper has a practical end in view. The questions are intensely alive and practical. Their interest and importance are as wide as Christianity itself. They are not merely academic or ecclesiastical, or even partisan, though they differentiate parties.

The object of this paper is to get at a working basis for definite teaching as to the place and function of the Sacraments in organised Christianity, in public worship, and in personal conduct. A subtitle of this paper might well be "The Sacraments in the Christian Economy." "The Sacramental Principle" has been taken as the actual title because it is a widely current expression, and the ideas it suggests are used as the basis of very different systems of worship, doctrine and discipline. Briefly repeated, it is taken to mean that God uses material means in working out His spiritual purposes. From the other side it may be stated thus :—The "material" is but the outward expression and vehicle of the "spiritual."

The Sacramental Principle is a great truth, as it combines in itself the transcendence and the immanence of God. It does call attention to the fact that spiritual processes are at work in the material world, that the visible order of the universe is the expression of the

invisible Reality behind all things, that God is *in* the world as well as *over* the world, and that He does give gifts to men.

1. *The philosophical basis* of the Sacramental Principle is the unity of all life, of all things, spiritual monism, we might say, as against popular dualism on the one hand, and a materialistic monism on the other hand. The scope of this paper forbids more than this bare reference to a most important aspect of the subject.

2. *The Spiritual significance* of the Sacramental principle has already been indicated briefly. The word "spiritual" connotes meaning, purpose, personality. The Sacramental Principle asserts that the universe is not a closed mechanical automatism, but that what we call natural processes are full of meaning, are informed and directed with purpose, are really the personal working of the personal God who is over all, through all and in all things.

3. Herein lies its *practical religious* value. The external world becomes a help rather than a hindrance to the knowledge of God. "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork." The water of baptism speaks of the cleansing, renewing personal touch of God. The Holy Communion is the symbol, pledge and seal of God's sustaining, sanctifying grace, feeding and strengthening our souls. Nay, more, the Sacramental Principle, when applied to the daily experiences of life, transforms them into occasions and means of getting into touch with God. The Bible becomes the sacrament of revelation, preaching becomes the sacrament of the living message as wrought out in experience, "truth, through personality." The pastoral functions of the ministry, the word fitly spoken, the sympathy feelingly expressed, the warning sincerely uttered, the direction and advice wisely tendered, the personal influence discreetly applied, all take on a sacramental significance and become ways and means whereby God speaks and works through man upon man. Then, too,

"The trivial round, the common task,
Will furnish all we need to ask,
Room to deny ourselves, a road
To lead us daily nearer God."

The whole of life becomes instinct with sacramental meaning, and the presence of God in power becomes a fully realised fact, every experience adding its quota of assurance. Thus the Sacramental Principle is in line with the best philosophical thought of the age,

invests the whole of life with spiritual significance, and helps to give the religious interest its rightful pride of place in the daily round of life.

II.—THE PLACE OF SACRAMENTS IN WORSHIP AND LIFE.

Hence the Sacraments have always held a high position in the public ministrations of organised Christianity. Though there are Christian bodies that apparently neglect the institutions generally recognised as Sacraments, they form a very small minority and have shown no power of self-propagation to any extent. The largest and strongest churches are those that set a high value upon the Sacraments, not only in public worship, but in personal life. There have been men and women who have manifested a high level of Christian life and character without any apparent assistance from Sacraments, but such are few, very few, and history seems to show that among the many the neglect of the Sacraments is at least coincident with a low level of spiritual vitality, and that where the Sacraments are duly honoured and used spiritual vitality is stimulated and sustained. And even among the few who apparently neglect the recognised sacraments, the sacramental principle may be seen at work though not consciously realised and applied.

III.—WHAT INSTITUTIONS, THEN, MAY BE REGARDED AS SACRAMENTS ?

If the Sacramental Principle is universal, there can be no fixed limit to the number of sacraments, in theory at least. But, as a matter of history, the term sacrament has been limited to certain institutions, though almost every form of experience has, in practice, at one time or another, been found capable of bearing a sacramental significance.

Still, the principle of limitation has to be brought in if the Sacramental Principle is to receive its proper recognition, and we have now to decide how this limitation is to be applied.

Two illustrations will bring out the meaning of this principle of limitation. (1) While it is true that every day should be regarded as holy unto God, the principle that God has a claim upon our time is best asserted and recognised by setting apart one day in seven as pre-eminently the Lord's Day. (2) Again, while we should pray without ceasing, we are more likely to form the habit and maintain

the attitude of prayer if we set apart regular times for that spiritual exercise. What may be done at any time is never done at all unless times are fixed for doing it.

So, too, while every outward act may in its turn become an outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace, the fact that everything may be sacred to God is best safeguarded by definitely fixing upon certain acts and investing them with sacramental significance. The Sacramental Principle, therefore, is best safeguarded by applying to it the principle of limitation in its modes of expression. Certain acts must be marked out as specially significant, and must be reserved for that significance. The real question arises when we ask who or what has the authority so to mark them out. The Church Catechism supplies the answer in its definition of a sacrament as "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same and a pledge to assure us thereof."

Two institutions answer to this definitely, namely, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but as a matter of fact we find five other institutions, "commonly called Sacraments" (Article XXV), namely, Orders, Confirmation, Penance, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction. The two former are sometimes described as the greater, the five latter as the lesser, sacraments. Another way of stating the distinction is to say that the Holy Communion and Baptism are sacraments of the Gospel, whereas the others are sacraments of the Church. But there is a large body of Christians who include the seven as sacraments of the Church.

IV.—THE NEW TESTAMENT VIEW OF THE SACRAMENTS.

If the Sacramental Principle is of such universal validity, and if the sacraments are so necessary to vital Christianity, we may reasonably expect to find in the New Testament some definite guidance and authority for deciding what constitutes a sacrament. There are scholars who deny that there is any specific direction in the N.T. as to the observation and ministration of the Sacraments, and who regard the Sacraments as institutions that grew up under influences which may be seen at work in the N.T., but which are not peculiarly Christian. Most Christians trace the institution of the Sacraments to the direct command of Christ, but these scholars deny any such command, and ascribe the growth of the sacramental system partly

(1) to ideas and tendencies at work in the pagan environment of the early Church, partly (2) to the need of strengthening the organisation and discipline of the Church, and partly (3) to the influence of ideas carried over from the Old Testament. Some of these scholars accept the validity of the Sacramental Principle, while others assert that the growth of the sacramental system was a departure from the simplicity of the original Gospel of Jesus Christ, was a hindrance to its spiritual efficiency, and is an illustration of the tendency of vital religion to harden and crystallise into a mechanical formalism. Others, again, have regarded the development of sacraments as a legitimate adaptation of methods to circumstances.

But the main question at present before us is whether what we regard as sacraments are to be found at all in the N.T., or whether they are based upon the specific direction of Our Lord. The great majority of Christians have always regarded the sacraments of the Gospel as instituted by Christ Himself.

1. *Baptism* is enjoined in Matthew xxviii. 19. Whatever doubt may be cast upon this text by scholars, they would still have to explain Peter's action on the Day of Pentecost when three thousand were baptised (Acts ii. 41). The other instances of baptism are familiar, at Samaria (Acts viii. 12), the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts viii. 38, 39), Cornelius (Acts x. 47), Paul's actions at Philippi (Acts xvi. 33), and Ephesus (Acts xix. 1-5), and his statement in 1 Corinthians i. 13-16, must be placed alongside his rhetorical declaration in 1 Corinthians i. 17, which simply meant that the first work of the apostle, and indeed of any minister of the Gospel, is to proclaim the Gospel. The sacraments follow the Word and pre-suppose its proclamation and acceptance. But they follow as a matter of course, not only baptism, but the breaking of bread, as the Pentecostal story indicates.

2. The institution of *the Lord's Supper* is traced to our Lord's words, "This do in remembrance of Me," as recorded by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians xi. 24, 26. The evangelists do not record these exact words. St. Luke has them in the Textus Receptus, but their presence in his gospel is not attested by sufficient evidence, and in any case he, being Paul's companion, merely repeats Paul's testimony. But a careful examination of the passage in 1 Corinthians shows that Paul records the words of our Lord with the strongest assertion of their genuine authority, and under the fullest sense of personal

responsibility (1 Cor. xi. 23). Christians at Corinth had disgraced their worship. Paul provokes them to shame by reminding them of what he had taught them, recalling the very actions and words of the Lord at the Last Supper. To the words already quoted Paul traces the origin and purpose of the Holy Communion or the Lord's Supper. The words "This do in remembrance of Me," as uttered by our Lord plainly point to a future observance of the rite He was then performing. They are as definite an act of institution as if our Lord had uttered an instituting formula. At any rate the disciples knew Him after the resurrection in the "breaking of bread" (Luke xxiv. 30, 31), and the breaking of bread was performed immediately after the Day of Pentecost, if not on the very day itself (Acts ii. 42, 46). Besides the Pentecostal story we have references to the Holy Communion in Acts xx. 11 and in 1 Corinthians x. However, the Holy Communion is not mentioned in the N.T. as often as Baptism, mainly because the N.T. records only the beginnings of organised Christianity, and baptism is the sacrament of initiation. Still, *both* sacraments are mentioned, and their matter and form described, though the term "Sacrament" is not actually used, nor is its Greek equivalent—if there is one in the New Testament.

DAVID J. DAVIES.

(To be concluded.)



THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.

BY THE REV. HERBERT MARSTON, M.A., Rector of Lydford-on-Fosse, Somerset.

II. DETACHED QUOTATIONS.

NEKROSIS IESOU (Chap. iv. 10).

This is a notable expression. Does not mean the dying of Jesus; rather it means Jesus' investment with the aspect and attributes of the dead. His Death, His Graveclothes, His Sepulture are all involved in the expression.

HIS UNSPEAKABLE GIFT (Chap. ix. 15).

This is God's irreducible or inexplicable gift, i.e. the Gift of Grace which cannot be reduced to experience or explained away by reasoning.

APOSTĒ (Chap. xii. 8).

That he might stand away: might be off. This word with its cognates is a favourite with St. Paul, but its use is not to be pressed extravagantly so as to give colour to what is technically known as "apostasy."

SUNIASIN (Chap. x. 12).

Does not mean, as the A.V., "are not wise." This meaning would be impossible. There is a tempting conjecture to inset "s" between the i and the a. This reading would give the sense "they have no conscience."

TOLMÂU

Meaning to be audacious in a bad sense, while "*tharrein*" means to be cheery and confident.

ANOTHER JESUS (Chap. xi. 4).

"*Allos*" means "other in kind." It implies a difference in species. "*Heteros*" means "other in degree, rank, quantity or number." Another Jesus is Jesus destitute of earthly reality and of Heavenly power. It is the fictitious Jesus of the rationalists in all generations which denies the true Jesus of the Evangelists and Apostles. St. Paul did not merely preach Christ, he also preached Jesus.

Exact and adequate renderings are specially required for Chapters iii. and v.

In Chapter iii. St. Paul treats of the Ministry of the New Testament placed in vivid opposition to the Old. The New Testament is not of Letter but of Spirit. The New Testament makes alive. The New Testament is permanent and progressive. Thus the New Testament surpasses the Old in spirituality, in vitality, in finality. These three elements compose that Glory in which the New Testament excels the Old. The New Testament is spiritual because it is negotiated and communicated by the Lord the Spirit. Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty from the letter and the law. The Spirit in the believing Soul and Society is the Counterpart of the Ascended Lord, and reproduces in Christians the image of Christ. The essential meaning of "*diatheke*," translated "Testament" or "Covenant" is that of a Settlement between two consenting parties. God wills this Settlement, and believing men agree to it; thus it is everlasting in its Divine Efficacy and in human enjoyment.

In Chapter v., St. Paul's main thread of teaching is clear. There are occasional gaps. The A.V. rendering of verses 14 and 15 is misleading, and misrepresents the Apostle's argument founded on the death and resurrection of Christ. In verse seventeen the text and translation are alike bad. The term "a Christ according to the flesh" is difficult to explain. It is to be noted that St. Paul does not say "though we have seen" and does not speak of "Jesus," but of "Christ." He had seen Jesus. What he denies is any knowledge of a Christ conformable to the carnal ideals of the Judaisers. The closing verses of this Chapter form St. Paul's masterpiece upon the Atonement. Looked at full and fair they seem to justify the following conclusions:—

St. Paul does not assert a doctrine of substitution, but comes very near to the fact of substitution.

St. Paul does assert a world-wide reconciliation affecting every human being.

St. Paul does not restrict the reconciling work of God to Christ's death.

St. Paul subverts every idea on which rests any doctrine of Priestly absolution.

St. Paul declares that Christ was even more than Sin-bearer, for God made Him "Sin on our behalf."

CHAPTER III. 4 ff.

Such persuasion have we through the Christ directed towards God. Not because we are qualified of ourselves to calculate anything as resulting from ourselves, but our qualification proceeds from God Who also qualifies us to be Ministers of a new Covenant, not of letter but of spirit ; for the letter kills while the Spirit makes alive. But if the Ministry of death printed in letters upon stones passed into a state of glory, so that the sons of Israel were unable to contemplate the face of Moses because of the glory of his face though that glory was to be abolished : how shall not the ministry of the Spirit be invested with glory ? For if the ministry of condemnation be glory does not the ministry of righteousness possess a surplus glory ? For that which has been invested with glory has been disgrorified in this respect for the sake of the surpassing glory. For if that which has been abolished still passes through glory certainly that which abides is far more in a state of glory.

CHAPTER V. II ff.

Being conscious, therefore, of the awe inspired by the Lord we are persuading men and have been made manifest to God ; and I hope to have been made manifest also in your consciences. We are not recommending ourselves again to you but we are giving you a starting point for boasting on our behalf in order that you may have advantage with reference to those who boast in appearance and not in heart. For be it that we are enthusiasts ! It is for God. Be it that we are rational ! It is for you. For the love of Christ restrains us, having made the grand decision that One died on behalf of all : all therefore, died ; and He died for all in order that the living ones may no longer live to themselves but to Him who died on their behalf and rose again. We accordingly from henceforth know no one according to the flesh : if we have ever recognized a Christ according to flesh now certainly we recognize him no longer. So that if any one is in Christ there is a new creation. The things original have passed away, lo ! they have become new. Yet all things are of that God Who reconciled us to Himself through Christ and gave to us the ministry of that reconciliation the substance of which is that God in Christ was the World's Reconciler to Himself

not attributing to them their lapses and vesting in us the tidings of that reconciliation. On Christ's behalf, therefore, do we stand as ambassadors conscious that God is appealing through us ; we plead on Christ's behalf "be reconciled to God." Him who knew no sin, sin on our behalf He made, in order that we may become God's righteousness in Him.

HERBERT MARSTON.

(To be concluded.)



STUDIES IN TEXTS.

SUGGESTIONS FOR SERMONS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.

BY THE REV. HARRINGTON C. LEES, M.A.

II. THE SCAFFOLD AND THE THRONE.

“ Having therefore obtained the help that is from God I stand
Unto this day, bearing my witness ” (Acts xxvi. 22).

[Book of the Month: THE STORY OF ST. PAUL'S LIFE AND LETTERS * = PLL. Other references: Hastings' *Dictionaries of the Bible* = HDB, and of *the Apostolic Church* = HDAC. Ramsay's *St. Paul the Traveller* = RPT, and *Pictures of the Apostolic Church* = RPAC. Whyte's *Bible Characters* = WBC, and usual abbreviations for Tacitus and Josephus.]

“ Ample space devoted to these episodes in Cæsarea by the historian shows his sense of their critical importance ” (RPAC, 287).

“ St. Luke sketches for us in his diary *four vivid little pictures* ” (PLL, 187). Lowell wrote—

“ Truth for ever on the scaffold, wrong for ever on the throne,
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and beyond the dim unknown
Standeth God within the Shadow keeping watch above His own.”

So we shall call these four pictures—

I. TRUTH ON THE SCAFFOLD (xxiv. 1). Paul before Felix (calls himself “ the aged ” four years later—Philem. 9), charged with sedition, heresy, sacrilege. Felix best hated governor Jews have had (PLL. 187). “ He hoped that money would have been given him by Paul, but after two years—— ” (Acts xxiv. 26). Luke aptly hits off the contrast between Felix' venality and Paul's honesty. Paul “ regarded as person of standing and wealth ” (RPAC. 295) had “ considerable command of money ” (RPT. 310). Allowing of appeal endorses this expensive process. Must have used his hereditary property (RPT. 312).

Felix, Roman Procurator, entirely different position from ordinary imperial Governor: career made or marred by emperor's whim. Men otherwise appointed not so easily got rid of (HDAC. II. 277). Man of high position and wealth, brother of Pallas, richest man in Rome (RPAC. 292). Paul witnessed by his consistent

* By Dr. J. Paterson Smyth. Publishers: Sampson Low, Marston & Co.

honesty as much as by his speech. Truth can face even death unstained.

II. WRONG ON THE THRONE (xxiv. 24). Felix and Drusilla listen to Paul, and are convicted. Drusilla, now aged 18, "exceeded all other women in beauty" (Jos. Antiq. XX. vii. 2). Enticed away from her husband, King of Emesa, by fascinations of Felix. Felix "married successively three queens" (HDAC. i. 315). "First man born slave to rule Roman Province" (HDAC. ii. 277): "Exceptionally bad governor" (RPAC. 289). "A slave's heart all time under Felix' robes" (WBC. vi. 48). "Fanned flames of popular trouble by unsuitable remedies" (Tac. Ann. xii. 54). These two sinners may be King and Queen, but Paul is their king and not their slave here. Righteousness, temperance, judgment, trembling.

III. THE DIM UNKNOWN (xxv. 11). Paul launches out into an appeal from Festus to Cæsar to test the legality of the Christian position. Festus wise and righteous official (HDAC. i. 406). Strong ruler cleared sedition and brigandage. Jews demand Paul's blood: at Jerusalem might have had it. Paul not afraid to face the unknown, because he knew he could trust God to guard (2 Tim. i. 12).

IV. GOD WITHIN THE SHADOW KEEPING WATCH (xxvi. 32). Paul before Festus, Agrippa, Bernice. Agrippa II, aged 31, son of Agrippa I (Acts. xii.). Roman at heart endeavouring to bring customs of his people into conformity with Gentiles (HDAC. i. 565). But to Jews professing to be very Jewish. So Paul's appeal distasteful (xxvi. 27). "Kept his Judaism for Jews, not willing to display it in Gentile court" (RPAC. 299).

Bernice, aged 30, "Herod's sadly spotted sister" (WBC. vi. 62), "infamously notorious" (HDAC. i. 148). But the three are agreed that there is no wrong in Paul. "If he had not appealed he might have gone free." The "if" is important. Paul happily went to Rome and was tried. God kept watch above His own. "The issue of the trial was a formal decision by the supreme court of the Empire that it was permissible to preach Christianity. The trial therefore was a charter of religious liberty" (RPT. 308). And the whole Church got the benefit.

One day "Felix and Festus and Agrippa and Bernice will be compelled each in their own way to confess the truth and the power of all preachers of an original and a passionately undergone experience" (WBC. vi. 67).

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE PHILOSOPHIC MYSTIC.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PLOTINUS. By the Very Rev. W. R. Inge. Two Volumes. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 28s. net.

As we laid down these two volumes, so full of wise sayings and incisive criticism, we wondered whether Plotinus was more misunderstood by the writers of the past than Dean Inge is by his contemporaries. Lecky informs us that "Plotinus was so ashamed of the possession of a body, that he refused to have his portrait taken on the ground that it would be to perpetuate his degradation." The historian of rationalism is one of the most accurate of writers, and even he has not caught the true meaning of the action of Plotinus who, when asked to sit for his portrait, said: "Is it not enough to bear the image (*εἰδωλον*—the mere simulacrum of reality) in which nature has wrapped me, without consenting to perpetuate the image of an image, as if it were worth contemplating?" The contrast between the true and the alleged reason of the refusal is at once evident to any one who is acquainted with Platonic philosophy. The name of Plotinus has become familiar to all students of mystical literature. He was the philosopher of mysticism and the less one knew about him the greater he seemed to be. His sayings divorced from their context were quoted and at times they appeared to the ordinary reader to be mere word juggling of an unintelligible type. Yet we know that he influenced Augustine more than any other writer, and it is not too much to say that the great Christian philosopher learned from him that "God is spiritual, that true communion with Him is possible and that it is not to be reached by reasoning, but by holy living and trustful self-surrender" (Gwatkin, *Knowledge of God*, ii. 184).

Dean Inge has devoted nearly twenty years to the study of Plotinus, whose thought is by no means easy to follow, owing to the condensed style of his *Enneads*. The Dean openly professes himself to be not only an admirer and critic of the philosopher but also a disciple. This masterly exposition of the root conceptions of Plotinus is a proof of the affection with which the disciple regards his teacher, and few will read its pages without a deep regret that the Neoplatonist had not found his way to the Faith of Christ. From his writings he appears only to have been familiar with certain Gnostic misinterpretations of Christianity. We agree, however, with the contention that he must have known more than he has written. We feel that he had the mind naturally Christian, and are not surprised to learn that "from the time of Augustine to the present day, Neoplatonism has always been at home in the Christian Church." We are convinced that, of all the philosophies, Platonism is most at home in the Christian Church, and believe that Scholasticism, with its dependence on Aristotle, was largely responsible for the philosophical perversions that accompanied the growth of medieval accretions on the Faith of the Gospel.

Plotinus was a mystic and the philosopher of mysticism. When we say this we do not imply that mysticism is something that is extraneous to Christianity. Rightly understood, mysticism is an essential part of the teaching of Christ. The fact that prayer, direct communion with God, is possible, is a proof that without the foundation truth of mysticism our faith would not be a living working creed. Mysticism involves a philosophy and is at bottom a philosophy. Plotinus says: "Remember that there are parts of what it

most concerns you to know that I cannot describe to you; you must come with me and see it for yourselves. The vision is for him who will see it." Is not this exactly what the Christian preacher cries: "I cannot give you the experience which trust in Christ bestows. I can only lead you to Him. It is for you to find Him for yourselves."

The great problem of mysticism is to determine whether the vision is real or only the fruit of auto-suggestion and training. Those who are familiar with its literature know that much of what is written cannot stand at the bar of reason. Even the Lady Julian of Norwich—the sweetest of English mystics—has passages that are evidently the fruit not of her direct communion with God but the result of her Roman beliefs positing a reality that does not exist. God can be known directly. Of that there is no doubt, and students of Dr. Inge's volumes must feel that Plotinus in his mysticism gets into communion with the Eternal. For us Christians there must be a check on our mystical experiences, and it is precisely on account of its historical character that Christianity is safeguarded against the excesses of self-delusion. In the Gospel of St. John we find the exposition of the mystical side of our faith, and as Dr. Inge tells us in his Bampton Lectures: "It is true that the historical facts hold, for St. John, a subordinate place as *evidences*. His main *proof* is experimental. But a spiritual revelation of God without its physical counterpart, an Incarnation, is for him an impossibility, and a Christianity which has cut itself adrift from the Galilean ministry is in his eyes an imposture. In no other writer, I think, do we find so firm a grasp of the "psycho-physical" view of life which we all feel to be the true one, if only we could put it in an intelligible form."

It is impossible to condense the exposition of Plotinus as given by Dean Inge or to do justice to his modern interpretation of the philosopher. These Gifford Lectures owe much of their value to the extraordinary insight of their author into problems of the age. It is not too much to say that there is scarcely a modern or ancient philosopher of eminence whose opinions do not come under notice. At times we have been compelled to hunt up references and to find that the Dean has correctly interpreted what we had inaccurately grasped. Whether a passage from Hegel or Plato, Bergson or Augustine is quoted we are impressed at once by its appositeness and the incisiveness of the Dean's remarks. We find in the third century as laid before us a strange modernity and we do not think the lessons he draws from that period will be lost on his readers. Is it not true that "a thinker may be in advance of his contemporaries, but not of his age? The great man gives voice to the deepest thoughts of his own epoch." The Dean is not without hope of our future. "After Porphyry there was more sound philosophy in the Church than in the Pagan schools. Unhappily the time came when priestly tyranny destroyed the philosophy of religion, or drove it under the reign of scholasticism into bondage as the *ancilla fidei*. With the modern period, the emancipation of science and philosophy from religion began, and Europe retraced, in the diverse direction, the steps by which the independent science of Ionia developed at last into the Neoplatonic philosophy of faith and devotion." The severance was complete in the materialism and agnosticism of the nineteenth century; there are signs that the tide has now begun to turn again."

In his final reflections Dr. Inge, after describing the Neoplatonic philosophy as free of nearly all the religious difficulties that are caused by the age of science, proceeds: "There is a Christian philosophy of which the same might be said. There are Christians who believe in the divinity of Christ because they have known Him as an indwelling Divine Spirit; who believe that He

rose because they have felt that He has risen ; who believe that He will judge the world because He is already the judge of their own lives. Such independence of particular historical events, some of which are supported by insufficient evidence, gives great strength and confidence to the believer. But it does not satisfy those who crave for miracle as a bridge between the eternal and temporal worlds, and who are not happy unless they can intercalate 'acts of God' into what seems to them the soulless mechanism of nature. Christianity, however, is essentially a struggle for an independent spiritual life, and it can only exert its true influence in the world when it realises that spiritual things are spiritually discerned, and when it stands on its own foundations, without those extraneous supports which begin by strengthening a religion and end by strangling it." "What does this mean? At first sight it appears to adopt the Modernist attitude to the facts of Gospel History and to waive them aside in favour of a conception of Christianity that makes them superfluous because they find no place in our experience. Is it a direct denial "of the claim which the Gospel makes to be a revelation of eternal truth through certain events of time?" We do not think from the study of Dean Inge's writings that he accepts the Modernist position. We believe that he has in his mind the miracle of Transubstantiation and other errors that are now so popular in circles where they are least expected to be found. Like all writers with the gift of clever epigram, Dean Inge forgets that his readers are impressed by thought ably presented from one point of view and are apt to misapprehend his real meaning. In spite of this defect which we have noticed on more than one page, we welcome this contribution to religious philosophy as one of the most striking expositions of thought essentially Christian that it has been our good fortune to read. His already great reputation as a fearless thinker is enhanced by this profound study, and in extenuation of our deliberate avoidance of any attempt to condense his exposition we can only say that he makes the task of a reviewer exceedingly difficult owing to the closeness of his writing and the absence of anything like verbiage in dealing with a complex subject. He has made Plotinus a living voice to us. He has transformed him from something little more than a name, into a man with a message that needs to be learned by the present age. He has wrestled with obscurities which he makes plain and he has justified the devotion of nearly a score of years to a philosopher who has been strangely neglected by professed students of the thought that is at the back of the philosophical system of St. Augustine. To understand the evolution of Christian doctrine it is necessary to understand Plotinus and we can now do this, thanks to these absorbingly interesting and extremely modern volumes.

T. J. P.

The appealing interest of discussions on the great events of the last four years when viewed in the light of prophecy is evidenced by the fact that a third edition of the reissue of the late Canon Edward Hoare's *Great Britain, Palestine, Russia and the Jews* is now published (C. J. Thynne, 1s. 6d. net). It has been brought up to date by the Rev. E. L. Langston, than whom no one is more fitted for the task. The Rev. C. C. Dobson's little book *God, The War and Britain* (C. J. Thynne, 1s. net) has gone into a second edition. Its purpose is to show that God is bringing good out of the evil and it breathes throughout a strong message of hope. *The Great Shaking* (C. J. Thynne, 1s. net) has as its opening words "The War is running its course to a divine time-table, and the key to this is to be found in the Bible," and this sentence indicates with sufficient clearness the purpose of the treatise. It will command the attention of prophetic students. *The Framework of Prophecy* by Cecil Orr (C. J. Thynne, 6d.) deals with "spiritual law in the natural world" and is described as "a primer for students."

TWO BOOKS ON HOME REUNION.

I

THE CHURCHES AT THE CROSS-ROADS. By the Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A. London: *Williams and Norgate*. 7s. 6d. net.

This is decidedly the most important contribution that has been made as yet to the discussion of the re-union of the Churches. Hitherto the Free Churches have seemed to take less interest than we could have hoped for, in this profoundly important subject. For instance, we remember that certain generous proposals, which were outlined in *The Church Times* not long ago, were coldly received by the Wesleyan Conference—the reply was that there did not appear to be, among Methodists generally, any widespread desire for reunion and there the matter ended. But Mr. Shakespeare's book, which has attracted a good deal of attention, serves to show that there are not wanting among nonconformists earnest souls who feel that the subject cannot be shelved—that our "unhappy divisions" weaken the Church of Christ—that they have a tendency to bring reproach upon her and that the time is rapidly drawing near—if indeed it has not already come—when they should be brought to an end. It has not always seemed, unless we are much mistaken, as if the Baptists were closest to the Church of England, and it is a hopeful sign either that we have misunderstood them or that a change of feeling is taking place among them, when a leading Baptist minister puts forth such a remarkable eirenicon as this and we can assure him that the great body of Churchpeople, clerical and lay, view his position and his pronouncement with prayerful sympathy.

In his opening chapter Mr. Shakespeare proceeds to show the senses in which we are at what he terms "the Cross-Roads," indicating three of the social problems which press upon the modern Church and he goes on to remark upon the regrettable fact that "the Church does not count for so much to-day as it once did," and that "a general weakening of faith and conviction has acted as a solvent upon its influence." There can be no doubt that it is true, as he says, that "the Church is no longer in the centre of the stage. Preaching and praying do not count for so much to the statesman when he reckons up the forces with or against his policy. The discussion of a sacrament, or of a form of Church polity, will never again be a national event of the first magnitude. The Church is not so much beset as disregarded." He goes on, however, to show that there "must be a place for the Church in the new world" and to indicate what he terms the supreme function and true objective of the Church. He shows, as we might expect, a wide acquaintance with past and present modes of thought and expression and he sums things up in a graphic and lucid way—as for example where he speaks of Mr. H. G. Wells (whom he aptly describes as "scribe to the spirit of his generation") and his opinions, as expressed in *God the Invisible King*—"His theology has no validity. It rests entirely upon his own experience and its weakness is that he has invented it!"

Mr. Shakespeare's programme for the Church (and he explains that he uses the term in the widest sense) is no narrow one. She must have the passion of conviction, understand the attitude and temper of the time, take part in solving the ills of society, transcend Nationalism and as a militant Church engage in an offensive and take the field, and he shows how in the past the Church has renewed her life when she has "got back to Christ and drunk of the original springs." He outlines the history of the Free Churches in this country and gives some statistics. He feels that "the process of time has softened the emphasis upon the things that divide" and that the Free

Churches" are coming to see that infinitely more important than to maintain lines of separation in doctrine which have been obliterated or weakened, is to bring together those who share the same conception of the Christian faith." The gain and loss of denominationalism are discussed very fully and frankly. To quote as we should like to do is impossible—we hope our readers will study the book—but we must at least record Mr. Shakespeare's expressed conviction that "the Free Churches can never make their full impact upon the life of the nation while they are split up into sections." He reveals somewhat of the inner life of nonconformity when he tells us that their most gifted young men are more and more "unwilling to risk what the Free Church ministry has to offer," and again that their divisions are "disquieting and repelling." He gives some distressing, but probably by no means unique, examples of overlapping—the cost of which, he says, "cannot be expressed in statistics." Every page of the book is alive with interest for all who feel the importance of the subject but undoubtedly the most significant chapters are those towards the end of the book. After discussing at some length, and with his customary courage and candour, the proposals for the Federation of the Free Churches he proceeds to face the larger question of the reunion of the Evangelical Free Churches with the Church of England. He does not consider federation practicable here, and sees "no middle way between the present separation and corporate reunion." Here again we find his courage does not fail him and he boldly maintains his conviction that "reunion will never come to pass but upon the basis of episcopacy." Elsewhere he declares that "to seek any other basis but episcopacy is a pure waste of time." He feels that there might be a recognition of *the fact* while at the same time there might be, as there are, differences of opinion as to *the theory*, and he argues this point with characteristic force. This is, as he himself recognizes, "the crux of the whole problem of reunion." He has gone further, we venture to think, than any leading nonconformist divine has hitherto travelled and he has incurred the wrath of some of the Free Church journals. But we feel that he, at least, will be undaunted in his advocacy of the splendid cause he has espoused and we are grateful to him for having given us a volume which is instinct with a passionate desire for Christian Unity. Scattered through these pages are some brilliant descriptive touches. Dr. Jowett's former Church in Birmingham is "the Vatican of Independency." Dr. Scott Lidgett is "a loyal Wesleyan, but he has not a shred of sectarianism in his nature." Dr. F. B. Meyer is "a united Free Church of England in himself." Mr. R. J. Campbell "has a genius for friendship as well as for preaching." Bishop Talbot—"a statesman, a born ecclesiastic." These are some of the lightning sketches which illuminate this academic discussion.

REUNION: A VOICE FROM SCOTLAND. By the Very Rev. James Cooper, D.D., D.C.L. London: *Robert Scott*. 3s. net.

From Mr. Shakespeare, we turn to Dr. Cooper, who gives us in these pages the text of the two addresses he delivered in London in the spring of 1918. Dr. Cooper was, in 1917, Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and occupies the Chair of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Glasgow. He deals with but one aspect of the subject, namely that of reunion between the Presbyterians and the Church of England—a proposal which, as Mr. Shakespeare fully recognizes, is not without its own distinctive difficulties. Dr. Cooper's argument from history shows that there is precedent for a combination of the main features alike of the Presbyterian and Episcopal systems. It is a long story but, needless to say, it is well told and it certainly

affords an illustration of the way in which we who are not up against the politics and passions of the seventeenth century, might "find a way whereby the differences between Anglican Episcopacy and Scottish Presbytery might be bridged and reconciled through the free and voluntary action of the Churches themselves."

The second of the addresses was delivered in St. Faith's Chapel, in the Crypt of St. Paul's Cathedral and it sets forth the possibilities of closer relations between the Church of England and the Presbyterian Churches. Not that Dr. Cooper would rest content with merely "closer relations"—these he says "must be simply a stage towards the one right relation of a sound and acceptable union." He believes that "it is quite possible for Presbyterians to accept the Historic Episcopate without surrendering thereby any essential feature of their own system." Such action would not be either prejudicing or subverting that system, but rather "supplementing, completing and enriching it." In some Chapels we believe that ordination is nothing more than a mere recognition of the choice of that particular community or congregation but with Presbyterians it is much more and ordination is ministered with as great care as in our own Church. This ought to simplify matters considerably. It is refreshing to read that in Scotland this is "no longer the vision of a few" and that is "receiving more and more attention every day." We are grateful to Dr. Cooper for yielding to the pressure that was brought to bear upon him to induce him to send forth these valuable addresses.

* * * * *

In conclusion a few observations may not be out of place. The larger question of the reunion of Christendom is of course outside the scope of these two volumes. The question indeed is full enough of difficulty without introducing a further consideration, which for the present at least seems to be outside the range of practical politics. However Dr. Cooper is probably right in saying that if home reunion became an accomplished fact "it would give us some right and power to go forward to the greater work of holding out the olive-branch to all the rest of Christendom." Since both these writers are at one in recognizing the improbability of any organic union apart from the acceptance of Episcopacy, it follows that the verdict of nonconformists generally will be more anxiously watched for than any pronouncements on the part of Churchmen of any school of thought. It is a time, then, for prayer that all who profess and call themselves Christians may in this important matter, have "a right judgment."

S. R. CAMBIE.

MR. HARDY'S "CATHOLIC CHURCH."

A VISION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By Rev. T. J. Hardy, M.A. London :
Robert Scott. 4s 6d. net.

We must give Mr. Hardy credit for having managed to introduce a very considerable amount of extreme teaching into his collection of but fourteen sermons. He somewhat viciously attacks persons from whom he differs. He pronounces this elegant opinion of the religious work which has been going forward at the Front—"Is it the eviscerated religion of the accommodationists? the non-miraculous faith of a sublimated Creed and an invertebrate Church?" Why did he ask the question if it should receive a negative reply for he tells us on the same page that it is "the old religion of the Cross, the Mass, the Confessional, that is helping our brave fellows out there to fight, and die. That is what men are longing for and to that they will submit when it is offered to them plainly." We should have supposed that submission

would not be difficult to secure if they were really longing for it! We are told that men are being offered "a creed that will not offend the sickly stomachs of a few 'Varsity dons," that the members of Convocation are "elegant triflers" while he speaks of the Bishops as "the academic gentlemen who throng the Episcopate" and he wants them to be "given a few hours in the trenches." It is a pity if Mr. Hardy has not been in the trenches himself or visited the Front, as the writer happens to have done, for he might have modified some of his censorious pronouncements. But really this kind of thing is not very edifying, it cannot be considered convincing nor is it in good taste. It is unworthy of the best traditions of the Church of England pulpit.

But this is not all. We find a sermon entitled "Ave Maria" and in it an exhortation to us to lay "at the feet of our Lady" the devotion of our hearts and this is to find expression in the recitation of the "Hail Mary!" of the Roman devotions to the Virgin. This is rather audacious! His teaching on Purgatory is thoroughly Roman. He advocates prayer for the departed "that they may be loosed from their sins," and he bids us "raise our eyes anew to the Saints and address to them our prayers." Quoting St. Paul's words—"God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross" he has the temerity to add—"of course St. Paul meant the Crucifix." In a sermon on Intercessory Prayer at Mass (*sic*) he speaks of "the Altar *whereon* (the italics are ours) is the Real Presence of the Saviour." Enough has been said to show the unsatisfactory character of this book. Mr. Hardy must have read some Church history and know what the doctrinal standards of the Reformers really were. He must surely know that the Crucifix was not in use among primitive Christians and that even the Cross is not found in the Catacombs before the fourth Century. With the history of our Church in mind and her formularies in our hand we can only say that we are amazed and saddened to read much that Mr. Hardy has written in these pages.

A YOUNG PEOPLE'S GUIDE.

THE THREE KINGDOMS. A Young People's Guide to the Christian Faith.
By the Rev. F. G. Goddard, M.A., B.D. London: Macmillan & Co.
3s. 6d. net.

It is refreshing to turn from Mr. Hardy's pro-Roman sermons to this little volume, to which the Bishop of Liverpool contributes a Preface. It has been written by the Vicar of All Saints', Stoneycroft, in "odd moments" at the Front and there are several touching anecdotes which reveal the writer even more than the excellent instructions which he has packed into these pages. Mr. Goddard is not ashamed of the word Protestant and he is careful to point out that—"it is not merely negative but stands for the greatest *positive* truth of our religion—the all sufficiency of Christ."

His counsels on the Commandments are both shrewd and sane. For instance on the Seventh for example, we have sound advice, most tactfully given on "going straight" and this is only characteristic of much else in the book. Fasting, he points out, is "not essential or compulsory in the Church of England," and he reminds us that she "does not forbid the fairly modern custom of Evening and non-fasting Communion." His remarks on non-communicating attendance and the use of wafers leave us in no doubt as to his position, but he is never provocative or vituperative when he touches upon disputed points. Our only fear is that the price may make it impossible for the Clergy generally to distribute this exceedingly useful manual among their Confirmation Candidates, and we can only express the hope that when the

present edition is exhausted and the cost of book-production has gone down somewhat, it may be found possible to issue a cheaper edition. Meanwhile we heartily commend the book to the Clergy and to parents who wish to instruct their children in the Christian Faith along the lines of the good old Church Catechism.

CREATION'S STORY.

FABLE OR FACT? By Captain S. Bramley-Moore, M.C., A.S.C. London :
E. J. Larby, Ltd. 1s. net.

In a pamphlet of fifty-five pages Captain Bramley-Moore has given us a really valuable treatise dealing with the creation of the earth, the antiquity of man and evolution. He quotes the words of an eminent Hebrew scholar that "the records of the prehistoric ages in Gen. i.-xi. are at complete variance with modern science and archæological research" and then proceeds to show the unsoundness of the assertion. Comparing the chronological order of Genesis with the data obtained from scientific research he concludes that the two have more points of agreement than of divergence. Whatever may be said on the question of authorship "one thing at least is certain, the Book stands—and ever will stand—an impregnable masterpiece." The chapter on the antiquity of man is of great interest and he takes the view that there is no evidence of the existence of man previous to the Great Ice Age and he supports it by a wealth of argument and illustration. He shows that that Age was not "an epoch of the remote past" but that "it took place within comparatively recent times." He quotes approvingly the conclusion of Sir Joseph Prestwich that "the Glacial Period together with Palæolithic man, came within 10,000 to 12,000 years of our own times," and lest it should be said that fresh evidence may have increased these "apparently low estimates" of man's antiquity he examines the geological data in some detail and with much care. The third part of the treatise deals with evolution and his arguments are able and convincing. He claims that modern scientific research corroborates the Bible story that all mankind can be traced back, not to a variety of species, but to one primitive racial unit; and his conclusion of the whole matter is that while "scientific theories with increase of human knowledge, must always be liable to constant change" it is not so with revealed religion. "The teaching of the Bible, adapted for all men, in all ages, is the unalterable Word of God, the same yesterday, to-day and for ever." *Fable or Fact?* is just the book to place in the hands of those who are troubled with doubts about Creation's story.

Is Rome behind the War? is the title of a booklet of compelling interest by Mr. J. A. Kensit (Protestant Truth Society, 1s. net). The facts he adduces in support of his plea are most striking and show conclusively that the Vatican ought not to be allowed any place at the Peace Conference.

* * * * *

Prebendary Denison's pamphlets are quite interesting reading. In one—*An Open Letter to the Bishop of London on Canonical Obedience*—he hits out quite heavily and cleverly about "Episcopal Expediencies," and demands "some fixed and intelligible principle on which such leading or government shall be solidly and consistently based." The demand is reasonable though we fear that the principle we venture to suggest should be acted upon, viz. *steady obedience to the law as it is* will not meet Prebendary Denison's approval. In his other pamphlet—*Life and Liberty and the Church*—he runs a tilt at Dr. William Temple's Movement. Both pamphlets are published by Mr. Robert Scott at 6d. each. What can be said for the other side of the Movement can be seen in a pamphlet *When the Church is Free* (S.P.C.K., 2d. net) which is issued as a Statement of Policy by the Council.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1

A DIFFICULTY is often experienced by Theological Students and the younger clergy in procuring the books which they need for their work. Very often the students of Theological Colleges have only sufficient means to procure those text-books which are specially prescribed and therefore absolutely necessary for their studies. It is much to be regretted that many of these text-books are of a doubtful theological character, and the importance of providing students with a list of books which give a fair and accurate presentation of the history and teaching of the Church of England cannot be over-estimated, especially now when so many young soldiers are entering upon a theological course. Such a list has been compiled by "The Church Book Room" and will be sent post free on receipt of 3d.

Aimless and desultory reading in any branch of study cannot be so effective as that which is done systematically and with a clear purpose in view.

This is as true of Bible Study as of any other kind of reading,

The Bible. and a section of the list above named gives the names of a few books which it is hoped will be helpful. Of these a little pamphlet entitled *Bible Study for Personal Spiritual Growth*, by J. R. Mott (id.), *Systematic Bible Study*, by D. H. D. Wilkinson (1s.), and four books in the Anglican Church Handbook Series, *The Joy of Bible Study*, by Harrington C. Lees, *Old Testament History*, by F. E. Spencer, *Old Testament Theology*, by R. B. Girdlestone, and *New Testament Theology*, by F. S. Guy Warman, D.D. (1s. 3d. net each), will be found most useful.

"What is Christianity?" is a question often asked, and books on the Person and Work of Christ should occupy a central position in this study.

The Person of Christ. Material for answering the question is shortly and ably provided in *Christianity is Christ* (1s. 3d. net), by W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. It is a manual for general use, and as a summary of the Christian position will prove of service to students, the younger clergy, and to the men and women in our Churches who are brought face to face with various attacks on the Christian Faith. Other books which may be specially recommended are *The Fact of Christ*, P. C. Simpson (3s. net), and *The Jesus of History*, by T. R. Glover (4s. net).

At an early stage of their theological study it is essential ordination candidates should have a clear view of what the teaching of our Church actually is, and the student cannot do better than to go to

The Teaching of the Church. Canon Barnes-Lawrence's wise and helpful compendium, *A Churchman and His Church* (1s. net). The book is free from technical expressions and is more intent to awaken thought and to refer men to the sources of belief than to dogmatize. The manual has the outstanding merit of fixing the mind of its student on the personal work of Christ and interpreting creed and ceremony, rite and institutions in the light of the revelation of the Mind of God in Holy Scripture. Its exposition of our Anglican teaching on the Church and the Lord's Supper clears away the growth of false accretions and makes plain what God has taught. Other books which should be read carefully and which contain

much which will be found helpful, are *The Catholic Faith*, by W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., and *Scriptural and Catholic Truth and Worship*, by F. Meyrick (1s. net each).

Reliable books on the Book of Common Prayer are of importance, and several useful books were named in these notes last month. Of these may be mentioned Charles Hole's invaluable work, *A Manual of the Book of Common Prayer* (2s. 6d.), as its purpose is to assist those who are preparing for Holy Orders. In no other work of the same compass have references been furnished in so much detail to encourage and satisfy the student's inquiries among works both old and new, great and small. Other books of value are *The Tutorial Prayer Book*, by Charles Neil, and J. M. Willoughby, D.D. (3s. 6d. net), and *Outlines of Prayer Book History*, by W. Prescott Upton (2s. 6d. net). The first-named book is one of sound scholarship and lucid exposition. Every Service is carefully analysed, the history of the Prayer Book is sketched and arguments that popularly pass for convincing lessons are submitted to a rigorous criticism based on a full knowledge of documents and a comprehensive grasp of the lessons of history.

The Doctrine of the Church of England on the Holy Communion, by F. Meyrick (2s. 6d. net), was for some time used as a text-book at Trinity College, Dublin. It is a clear exposition of primitive doctrine, and as Bishop Harold Browne says in a preface. "Of the doctrine of that Church which glories in reverting to and taking hold of primitive faith and must be useful to puzzled consciences, may assure those who are in doubt, and may also help to the recruiting of the scattered members of Christ's divided body. . . ." Principal Tait's new book, *The Nature and Functions of the Sacrament* (3s. 6d. net), cannot be overlooked by any student. It is written clearly and forcibly, and in it we have definite statements which are helpful and illuminating. *Our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving*, by P. C. Ingrouille (1s. 6d. net), is pointed and clear and contains many valuable quotations. *The New Testament Doctrine of the Holy Communion*, by G. Estwick Ford (1s. 6d. net), and *Primitive Church Teaching on the Holy Communion*, by Dean Goulburn (1s. net), should not be forgotten as they deal with particular aspects of the subject. As regards "Baptism," J. B. Mozley's *Baptismal Controversy* should be secured. It is unfortunately out of print, but second-hand copies can be obtained fairly easily for 3s. or 3s. 6d. *Baptism. What Saith the Scripture?* by D. H. D. Wilkinson (1s. 3d. net), *Infant Baptism*, by A. E. Barnes-Lawrence (1s. net) are smaller books.

The Creeds: Their History, Nature and Use, by Harold Smith (7s. 6d. net). A very valuable historical account of the Creeds and their growth. It is not an exposition, although some useful expository suggestions will be found in it.

Lecture Outlines on the Thirty-Nine Articles, by Principal Tait, is intended for use of candidates for the Ministry and the outlines have arisen out of the need which he has personally experienced in lecturing in placing in the hands of his students. Other books which may be named in this connexion are *Boulbee's Commentary on the Thirty-Nine Articles* (6s. net), Bishop Moule's *Outlines of Christian Doctrine* (3s. net), and a valuable pamphlet by B. C. Jackson entitled *The Thirty-Nine Articles* (3d. net).