

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1924

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

February Sessions of the Church Assembly.

THE House of Clergy and the House of Laity continued their discussion of the Prayer Book Revision proposals at their Sessions in February. The House of Clergy was mainly occupied with the further consideration of the Communion Service, and especially with proposed alternative forms of the Prayer of Consecration. Yet another attempt was made to secure the omission of the chief part of the service from the revision scheme. A proposal was made that there should be no alteration from the Exhortation to the end with the exception of the Proper Prefaces. Canon Brook Gwynn and Canon J. B. Lancelot, who brought forward this proposal, maintained that the vast majority of Churchpeople did not desire any change in this portion of the Communion office. They also pointed out that the alternative forms of the Consecration Prayer represented a grave departure from the doctrine of the Church of England as they contain doctrine not to be found in the New Testament, nor in the writings of our great divines.

"New Tracts for Our Times."

At this stage in the discussion Canon Grose Hodge reminded the House that it was understood that there was no alteration in doctrine in the proposed alternative forms, and that they were not to be used as stepping-stones to further concessions. He went on to draw attention to three pamphlets which had been sent to every member of the Church Assembly, and to ask for an assurance that they did not represent the views of the Anglo-Catholics. These pamphlets are entitled "New Tracts for our Times," and are issued by "A Committee of Anglican Priests." Three of them have so far been issued, and their contents may be judged from a few

extracts. The first is on Revision and Catholic Principles, and is based on the novel theory that the Church of England had no right to adopt a Prayer Book of its own because Cranmer broke his "solemn oath of canonical obedience to his ecclesiastical superior the Bishop of Rome." It urges that "the custom of sixty years standing, and daily increasing, of using the Roman Canon in celebrating Mass" should be followed, and, as a practical course, to secure validity for the revised Prayer Book, that it should be submitted to a commission of the Orthodox Churches in order that any statements of dogma objectionable to them may be removed. The doctrine of the Church of England is thus to be subject to the approval of the Church of Rome and the Eastern Church.

Some Bold Demands.

The second of these tracts on *The True History of the Prayer Book* is useful as showing a just appreciation of the teaching of our present Communion Service. It says that the bugbear of the Reformers was the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and that it was their boast that they had changed the Mass into a Communion, but it goes on to say, "We see now the reverse process at work. Step by step as Catholic faith and practice have been regained . . . the missing portions of the old Liturgy are restored, until in many cases the last vestiges of the Communion Service vanish, and we are presented with the Roman Mass pure and simple." That this restoration of the Mass is their aim may be seen from their Statement :

"We demand nothing short of the old Catholic Liturgy, performed in the old Catholic way, in the old Latin language, as being the only canonical Liturgy of the Church of England, the only fitting vehicle of Catholic worship it has ever possessed, and the greatest evidence of good faith in the desire for reunion, though we should be prepared for a copious use of the vernacular as a temporary concession to popular ignorance and prejudice."

There is no mistaking the intentions of this body of Anglican priests, and Churchpeople cannot shut their eyes to the ultimate aims so candidly expressed. They accept not merely this or that ceremony or practice of the Roman Church, but its whole system and discipline. In every detail the work of the Reformation is to be undone. This is the question which, in effect, the Church of England is engaged in deciding at the present time.

Some Frank Admissions.

The third Tract on Catholic Truth and Prayer Book Teaching bears even clearer testimony to the difference between our present Prayer Book and the teaching of the Anglo-Catholics. It states that two things are of primary importance to them, the Real Presence and the Sacrifice of the Mass, and it points out that neither of these is contained in our present form. In it the views of Cranmer are represented, that while the Body and Blood of Christ are truly received by the faithful, there is no real connection between the sacred Presence and the bread and wine. Christ is present in the heart of the worthy receiver, not in the Sacrament. Consequently there is no provision for adoration of the elements. Their objection to the present form is expressed strongly :

“ Let us have done with shuffling and juggling, let us look facts in the face ; the Communion Service in the present Book of Common Prayer has no adequate expression of belief in the real objective Presence of our Lord in the Holy Sacrament . . . it is therefore not a fit or tolerable vehicle of Catholic worship.”

As to the Sacrifice of the Mass, it says that our present form is so skilfully worded as to exclude the doctrine. “ There is in the whole service not one word about offering the divine Victim ; on the contrary all such expressions are rigidly expunged.” It regrets the omission of all commemoration of our Lady and the Saints, of prayer for the dead, and of all mention of the prayers and merits of the Saints. The conclusion is that “ the majority of Church of England people have no faith.” They are in a state of “ invincible ignorance.” In our opinion there was no adequate repudiation of these views on the part of the Anglo-Catholics, and we must take it that they represent the attitude of at any rate a strong section of the extremists.

Purpose of the Alternative Forms.

Bearing this in mind, we may ask, Is it wise to pursue the policy of adopting alternative forms of the Canon ? It is easy to say that the proposed forms do not imply any change of doctrine, but here we have evidence that at least one section of the Anglo-Catholics definitely desire not merely a change in the direction of the Roman Mass, but the Roman Mass itself. If no change in doctrine is desired, what is the necessity for any alteration in our present

Consecration Prayer? For over three hundred and fifty years all Schools of Thought in the Church of England have been content to use it. The change is now desired mainly by one party, and the sympathies of that party are distinctly with those who lament the Reformation with tears and in ashes. We shall only deceive ourselves if we do not clearly recognize that the desire of those who require the Green Book alternative is to secure some form of words that will either definitely state or sufficiently imply the Presence of our Lord under the forms of the Bread and Wine. Having obtained this, their next step is to secure the introduction of some words that again will either definitely state or sufficiently imply that with Christ present in the elements some form of sacrifice is offered. We maintain that this is the aim, however it may be disguised for the present in the first alternative form. Evangelical Churchmen have to decide if it is a policy that they can support. It is no use saying that we must not adopt a "non possumus" attitude, that we must be positive and not negative, dynamic not static. This is a plain matter of principle on which a decision must be made.

The Real Presence and the Doctrine of Sacrifice.

The assertion of the Real Presence is contained in the words, "bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ." Having secured this, the idea of a sacrifice is contained in the following sections, in the words: "We Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here, before Thy divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the Memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make," followed immediately by the petition: "We entirely desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

This form has been adopted by the House of Clergy, and we can only regard it as a reversal of the doctrine maintained by the great divines of our Church since the Reformation. We may recall that this is practically the form that enabled Bishop Gardiner to say that it contained all he required to express the doctrine of the Mass, and that led Cranmer in consequence to adopt our present form in order that the intention of the Reformers could not be misunderstood. We have no doubt that in spite of any assurances that may

be given by the present representatives of the Anglo-Catholics, we shall soon hear complaints of the inadequacy of the new form, if adopted, and we shall then have a bold demand for a clearer expression of the Real Presence and the doctrine of Sacrifice. This policy has been definitely stated. It is the intention "to familiarize the main body of the Church of England with the general conception of an extended Eucharistic prayer," and after ten years' use of it to request the authorization of any Canon they please.

The House of Laity and Reservation.

The chief decision in the House of Laity was the rejection of an amendment to the proposal for the providing for Reservation for the Sick. After a very full discussion in which the weight of the argument was in favour of the amendment it was lost by a majority of 127 to 96. The serious nature of this decision cannot be exaggerated. It indicates another reversal of the teaching and practice of our Church since the Reformation. In our present Prayer Book provision is made for the actual consecration in the presence of the sick person. There is abundant evidence that even in the poorest parish no difficulty need be experienced in carrying this out, and in the great majority of cases it is consonant with the desires of the Communicants. The practice of Reservation has been urged on behalf of those clergy who object to celebrate unless they are fasting. This ecclesiastical custom, which has never been the rule of the Reformed Church of England, is allowed to interfere with the spiritual comfort of the sick. The practice mentioned by Justin Martyr of conveying the elements to sick members of the Church is often quoted, but it should be remembered that this was done immediately after the actual service, in order that those who were prevented from being present might join in the fellowship of the worshippers. It was not the practice of Reservation in the modern sense. It has been more correctly described as Concurrent or Extended Communion, and probably few would object to it today, if the elements were conveyed simply and without ceremony to the sick, if they so desired.

The True Purpose of Reservation.

But the desire for Reservation on the part of a large section of those who are clamouring for it has quite a different origin. In the

Roman Church the wafer is reserved in the Tabernacle behind the altar in order that "the faithful" may offer their prayer and adoration to our Lord present there as "the Prisoner of the Tabernacle." A large number of the Anglo-Catholic clergy have made it clear that they desire Reservation for the same purpose. In fact the Sacrament is so reserved in some of our Churches at the present time, in spite of the definite instructions of the Prayer Book, which the Clergy have promised to obey. No secret is made of the desire, and indeed the intention of using the Reserved Sacrament for purposes of adoration. The Roman Catholic service of Benediction has already been adopted in some churches. The Bishop of Zanzibar has exhorted the Anglo-Catholics to fight for the Tabernacle. At the Anglo-Catholic Congress at the Albert Hall he begged his hearers "not to yield one inch to those who would for any reason or specious excuse deprive you of your tabernacles." They were to make a stand for the tabernacle, as a step towards reunion—obviously with the Church of Rome. Other members of the party have made their desire equally clear, while a few years ago nearly a thousand priests addressed a Memorial to the Bishops asserting that as they understood an attempt was to be made to deny to the faithful the right of access to the Reserved Sacrament for purposes of devotion, they thought it their duty to state their conviction that compliance with such a restriction could not rightly be demanded and would not be given. In face of these facts we can only regard the decision of the House of Laity in regard to Reservation as unwise. Five members of the Committee appointed to draw up the revision proposals expressed their view very strongly on the point in a note appended to the Report, which note was reprinted in the January number of *THE CHURCHMAN*.

The Voice of the Laity.

That great numbers of the faithful laity of the Church of England hold the view disapproving of Reservation expressed in the Note of Protest signed by the majority of the lay members of the Revision Committee, is becoming increasingly clear; and their opposition to any change being made in the central part of the Holy Communion Service is hardly less marked. Whenever they are given the opportunity of expressing their views on these questions, they declare themselves in no uncertain terms in support of the

position taken up by those who, in the House of Clergy and the House of Laity, have resolutely opposed the changes sought to be introduced into the Communion Office and the Order for the Communion of the Sick. Two illustrations of this fact come readily to mind.

The Manchester Conference.

We refer, first, to the very remarkable voting in the Manchester Diocesan Conference, which throws an interesting light upon the real attitude of the laity. The Standing Committee prepared five sets of questions dealing with various matters connected with Revision; these were sent to members of the Conference with the convening circular, and, after discussion, were voted on in the Conference. Passing over the questions with which we are not now immediately concerned, we find that on the question, "Are you in favour of permitting any alternative forms of Holy Communion Service?" the voting of the lay members showed a majority of 133 against such permission, the actual figures showing that 120 answered the question in the affirmative and 253 in the negative. In like manner the question, "Are you in favour of permitting the use of Vestments?" was negatived by the laity by a majority of 107, the figures being *Yes*, 131; *No*, 238. The voting against Reservation was the most decisive of all. The question, "Are you in favour of permitting reservation for the purposes of Communion?" was rejected by a majority of 137, the figures being *Yes*, 117; *No*, 254; whilst the further question, "Are you in favour of permitting reservation for any other purpose?" was defeated by 319 negative, against 29 affirmative votes—a majority of 190 against such permission. The significance of these figures is unmistakable, and can hardly fail to make a deep impression upon the House of Bishops, with whom, so far as the Church Assembly is concerned, the final word rests. It is much to be hoped that the Manchester *questionnaire* will be adopted by other diocesan conferences. The result would be singularly illuminating. But we cannot pass from this subject without saying a word or two about the clerical votes on these questions at the Manchester Conference. On alternative forms of the Holy Communion Service, 94 clergy voted *Yes* and 64 *No*; on Vestments, 101 voted *Yes* and 56 *No*; on reservation for Communion, 81 voted *Yes* and 71 *No*; and on reservation for any other purpose, only 6 voted *Yes*, and 135 *No*. It is satisfactory to

find that only half a dozen clergy voted for reservation for any other purpose than the Communion of the Sick, but on the other questions the clerical voting is to be regretted. A survey of the whole position seems to show that certainly in the Manchester diocese there is a deep cleavage between clerical and lay opinion, and we believe that if similar voting were taken in the other dioceses of the country it would show that on these great controversial questions there is a wide difference of opinion between clergy and laity—the majority of the laity being determined to stand by the Reformation settlement, and the majority of the clergy being willing to allow changes to be made which, in their practical effect, would tend to undo the work of the Reformation. The laity will, we hope, stand firm: if they do so they may yet save the Church of England.

Bishop Knox's Memorial.

The other illustration of the attitude of the laity on these questions, to which we refer, is to be found in the widespread acceptance of the Memorial to the House of Bishops, prepared by Bishop E. A. Knox, late Bishop of Manchester. The Memorial, which is open to the signature of adult communicants, is directed against (1) any alteration in the Communion Service; (2) any alternative Communion Service; and (3) the practice of Reservation. The Memorial, at the time of writing, has been signed by upwards of 79,000 adult communicants, and fresh signatures are being received every day. It is proposed to close the list on March 31, but we hope that, if need be, the time will be extended, as it is difficult sufficiently to cover the whole country within a limited period; and this much may safely be said, that wherever the Memorial is made known and its purpose explained to the people there is never any lack of signatures. Copies of the petition may be obtained from the Secretary, Bishop Knox Memorial, New Alliance Club, 10 Stratford Place, W.1; and should there be any of our readers who have not yet seen it, we counsel them to get a copy at once, sign it themselves, and seek to get other signatures. But even if no other signatures are received, the fact that the Memorial has already been signed by upwards of 79,000 adult communicants—and these, rather than the clergy, are the persons most vitally interested in the changes proposed—should be sufficient

to show the Bishops that to sanction changes in the Communion Service and to permit Reservation will most certainly not bring peace to the Church of England, but will tend to bring strife, disunion, and disruption into almost every parish in the land.

“Still a Minority.”

There are not wanting signs that members of the Anglo-Catholic party are becoming not a little anxious at the development of the opposition to these features in the Revision proposals. The voting at the Manchester Diocesan Conference on the one hand, and the activities of Bishop Knox on the other, are portents the significance of which cannot be misunderstood. The *Church Times* (March 7) warns its readers that the Manchester decision, though “not unexpected,” is “a reminder of facts that must not be ignored.” “So much has been won,” it continues, “that there is a grave danger of exaggerating gains and forgetting the fact that the Catholics in the Church of England are still a minority, and that they are in anything but an unassailable position.” It essays to comfort its readers by the assurance that “the Catholic revival goes on with increasing enthusiasm,” and that “a very large proportion of the piety and devotion of the Church is to be found in the Catholic ranks”; but it urges that it must “never be forgotten—it is a fact that must shape policy—that Catholics are still a minority.” Of course there is nothing new in the disclosure that the Anglo-Catholics are in a minority—every one knows it; what is new is that the *Church Times* should so candidly show that it is alive to the position; and loyal Churchmen, who stand by the Prayer Book as it is, object to the “minority” seeking to impose its will upon the majority.

“Prayer Book and Press.”

Under this heading the *Guardian* (March 14) had a front-page note which showed it is very angry with Bishop Knox, so angry, indeed, that it forgot to be as courteous as it usually is. The Bishop's offence seems to be that he has been writing letters to *The Times* pointing out the disastrous results to the Church of England which would follow the passing into law of the scheme of Prayer Book Revision. These letters, which to most well-instructed people have appeared to be weighty and impressive, to the *Guardian* seem to

“contain positively grotesque pictures,” and Dr. Knox himself is said to be “so well qualified to evoke” the “prejudices of the average man, ill-educated in religious matters.” We do not stop to discuss the innuendo contained in these words, but we do suggest that there is no reason to be rude. The whole note, however, was in questionable taste. Complaining that no reply to the Bishop’s letters came from any of the members in charge of the Measure in the Church Assembly, nor from a single diocesan bishop, the *Guardian* says: “We are aware of the answer which can be made—that religious controversy in the daily Press is undesirable, and that Dr. Knox’s letters will have little influence. But Dr. Knox is a bishop; and the average layman does not know anything else about him; and judges that, being a bishop, he ought to be an authority on the Prayer Book. Further, there was no need for an extended controversy. A simple refutation of Dr. Knox’s misstatements, signed by one or two bishops, or some of the members in charge of the Measure, would have been a sufficient reply.” But this “refutation” is not quite so simple a task as the *Guardian* imagines, and it may well be that those whom it thinks should have replied, shrank from the task. In this they were wise.

England and Rome.

But Prayer Book Revision is not the only subject that has been and still is a distinct source of anxiety to Churchpeople. The Malines Conversations have had a seriously disturbing effect not upon Churchmen only, but upon the whole country. During the three months which have elapsed since the fact of the Conversations was first made known by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the subject has been very fully discussed and the objections to Reunion with Rome have been faithfully pointed out. But the matter has by no means been laid to rest; indeed, there is one outstanding point which cannot but continue to cause the very gravest anxiety. So complete has been the manifestation of the country’s displeasure that we should like to feel that there is no chance of the “Conversations” being resumed, but that is the one point upon which there is no certainty at all; on the contrary, the Archbishop’s original statement that it is impossible to doubt that “further conversations must follow from the careful talks already held” still holds good. His Grace has been approached by many corre-

spondents about the original conversations: not once has he said a single word, as far as we can discover, to show the matter will not be pursued. It may be, indeed, that "further conversations" have already taken place, for if the previous conferences were held in secret, why should not those that follow be secret too? That is the real danger, and the Primate should face the fact that the country is seriously alarmed about it.

Protest by Sir W. Joynson-Hicks.

If the Archbishop were inclined to ignore the protests of minor people—and we agree he could not be expected to answer every protest—he clearly could not pass over so careful and so reasoned a letter as that addressed to him by Sir William Joynson-Hicks, who expressed "amazement and alarm" at what had taken place. To private conferences of individual members of the respective churches he had no objection, but "the matter," he said, "takes a different aspect when such conferences have behind them any official or quasi-official authorization, and from your Grace's letter it is clear that some such authorization has been given in the present case." He continued:—

"Your Grace appears to consider that what has taken place comes within the spirit and letter of the appeal to all Christian people which was issued by the last Lambeth Conference, but the language of that Appeal does not in either of the passages cited bear this construction. In both it is formal and official action by the authorities of the Churches concerned which is contemplated." Sir William Joynson-Hicks then asked whether we are to suppose that His Grace regards persons holding the views of Lord Halifax, Bishop Howard Frere, Bishop Gore and Dr. Kidd as the only or the truest representatives of the position of the English Church? He quoted a passage from the Report of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference of 1888 on the subject of Union with Rome, and said that a similar Committee of the next Lambeth Conference (1897) took the same view. "I submit," he continued, "that nothing has occurred since to show that the Church of Rome is prepared to modify her claims or to reform her doctrines, and as Archbishop Benson wrote in May, 1895, 'Any corporate union with Rome, as long as she retains her distinctive and erroneous doctrines and advances her present unprimitive and unscriptural claims, is absolutely visionary and impossible.'"

This was well and clearly put and the argument was by no means met by the Archbishop in what he himself called his "careful"

reply. His Grace was evidently more concerned to suggest that his correspondent took "much too circumscribed and even petty a view of the great fact in our contemporary religious life that we are solemnly trying in the faith and fear of GOD to press upon the Christian people of our time a bolder and truer view of what Christian unity means as something for which our DIVINE LORD prayed on the last evening of His earthly life." The Archbishop gave his reasons why he cannot rule out the Church of Rome from efforts after unity, but he does not seem sufficiently to allow for the fact that it is impossible for the Church of England even to think of Reunion with Rome until Rome has reformed herself and shown some desire to return to Primitive truth. It is clear that Rome has no such intention. Cardinal Bourne, in his Lenten Pastoral, put that fact beyond dispute. How is it possible, therefore, for English Churchpeople to view with anything but the utmost dismay any "conversations" which have as their object the clearing away of misunderstandings with a view to reunion? There is no room for misunderstanding about the Roman position, and there ought not to be any concerning the position of the English Church. Between the two Churches there is a great gulf which can never be bridged until Rome changes.

The Cheltenham Conference.

In view of the discussions over the Malines affair it is all to the good that the subject chosen for discussion at the Cheltenham Conference in June next should be "The Church of England and the Church of Rome." The subject will be dealt with as follows:— "Historical Survey," by Mr. G. G. Coulton and the Rev. C. J. Offer; "The Theory of the Papacy," by the Rev. Dr. R. H. Murray and the Rev. G. Foster Carter; "The Doctrine of the Church and Ministry," by the Rev. Chancellor Kerr and the Rev. Harold Drown; "Transubstantiation and the Mass," by the Archdeacon of Macclesfield and the Rev. B. C. Jackson; "Penance and the Confessional," by the Rev. T. C. Hammond and the Rev. Oliver A. C. Irwin; "Approaches to Rome by Conferences," by the Rev. Alfred Fawkes and the Rev. G. F. Irwin; "Approaches to Rome by Doctrine and Practices," by Bishop Knox and the Rev. H. J. Carpenter. It is hoped to print the full text of all the principal papers in the July issue of THE CHURCHMAN.

DEAN WACE.

BY W. GUY JOHNSON.

BY the death of Dr. Henry Wace, Dean of Canterbury from 1903 to the beginning of the present year, the Church of England has suffered the loss of a very distinguished and exceptionally gifted man. Though he had entered upon his 88th year, his mind was, within three days of his death, as clear and alert as ever, and his readiness and resourcefulness in debate in the National Assembly only last November seemed to have suffered no diminution in spite of the serious accident which befell him some six months earlier. It was, however, evident that the effort to come to London for the week of the Assembly had taxed him very severely, and those who saw him then were prepared for the news, shortly after his return, that he had been taken seriously ill and that recovery was doubtful. He passed quietly away on January 9.

The late Dean, who was born on December 10, 1836, was a son of the Rev. R. H. Wace, sometime of Wadhurst. He was educated at Marlborough, Rugby, and King's College, London, and at Brasenose College, Oxford. He was ordained deacon in 1861, and priest in 1862, by Bishop Tait, and was for seven years curate with the Rev. J. W. Kempe, of St. James's, Piccadilly, a more residential district then than it now is, and the congregation was just of the kind to appreciate his preaching. He left St. James's for the Lectureship of Grosvenor Chapel in 1870, and, after holding the chaplaincy of Lincoln's Inn, was appointed in 1880 to the preacher-ship, which he retained for sixteen years. He was Boyle Lecturer in 1874 and 1875, Bampton Lecturer in 1879, and in 1875 was appointed Professor of Ecclesiastical History at King's College, where he was afterwards Principal for some ten or twelve years. In 1896 the Drapers' Company appointed him to the benefice of St. Michael's, Cornhill, which he held until his preferment to the Deanery of Canterbury. The foregoing summary of his principal appointments gives a very inadequate idea of his activities, for it covers also a period of literary effort which alone would establish a man's reputation. Dr. Wace was, with Sir William Smith, editor of the *Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects and Doctrines*.

This great work was a continuation of Dr. Smith's well-known *Dictionary of the Bible*, and was designed to furnish in the form of a biographical dictionary a complete collection of materials for the history of the Christian Church from the days of the Apostles to the age of Charlemagne. It was an immense undertaking, for the completed work consists of four stout volumes of an average of 1,000 pages each, in double columns of a small, close type. Of this book a thoroughly competent judge, Dr. Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester (if we may so amplify the initials A. C. G. in the *Guardian* of January 11), writes: "It is by far the best of all the theological dictionaries and encyclopædias which have been published in this country, is remarkable for the amount of work of first-class and original merit, and it is probable that it owes this distinction largely to Dr. Wace."

At the same time Dr. Wace held for twenty years a post as one of the leader writers to *The Times*, and it is interesting that his introduction to Delane, then editor, was through a letter which he wrote to the paper protesting against the treatment of Bishop Colenso by the bishops of the day. He could have had little sympathy with many of Bishop Colenso's views, but he had less with the violent clamour which arose against the man. The letter attracted Delane's attention, and he secured the services of Mr. Wace, then a young curate, for whose work on a great variety of subjects, his first leader being one on the King of the Hellenes, he soon formed a very high opinion. Writing to Dasent in 1863, he said: "I find Wace very useful. I put him, indeed, before George Brodrick. How we should have got on without him is beyond my conception" (*J. T. Delane*, by A. I. Dasent, vol. ii, 71). In the life just quoted from there are included several letters from Delane to "My dear Wace," which show that this opinion, very early formed, was maintained through their whole association. It was no mean testimony to a man's ability to have the entire confidence of so sound and so exacting a critic as Delane. This close and long-continued connection with the leading English newspaper when its influence was probably at its highest, and when his own intellectual powers were at their utmost vigour, must have done much to develop that capacity for dealing promptly and efficiently with public affairs which marked his later life.

It was during this period of strenuous activity that his Bampton

Lectures and Boyle Lectures were delivered. The object of both was the defence and confirmation of the Christian faith, and though they reflect the atmosphere of nearly half a century ago, and deal with difficulties which have changed in form rather than in substance during the intervening years, they are well worth study now, for they deal with matters which are fundamental to human life and thought. In the Preface to the Bampton Lectures, which were entitled *The Foundations of Faith*, he says that the work "is an attempt to exhibit, in some measure, the supreme claim of the Gospel upon our allegiance; and it endeavours to show, not merely that the Christian Creed may reasonably be believed, but that we are under a paramount obligation to submit to it." The subject of the Boyle Lectures was *Christianity and Morality, or the Correspondence of the Gospel with the Moral Nature of Man*. It is to the credit of the reading public that these lectures, when published, passed through six editions in six years, and they have been subsequently republished more than once. Their purpose cannot be better described than in the following passage from the Preface: "The general subject . . . is the evidence on behalf of the Christian Faith afforded by the Moral Nature of Man. The author proposed to deal more particularly with those objections which, admitting the supreme obligation of Morality, deny that it requires any such religious support or superstructure as Christianity affords. Starting from the sense of Right and Wrong, he has endeavoured to show that it can only be explained upon the supposition of our standing in intimate relation to a spiritual world and to a Divine Person, and that it involves spiritual cravings for which Christianity alone offers an adequate satisfaction." There is that in both volumes which reminds us of Bishop Butler: the same gravity and earnestness, the same strong conviction and the same element of surprise that men should treat with the levity they habitually do matters which so vitally affect their eternal welfare. The reader feels in both cases that the writer has not only striven to face honestly the intellectual difficulties of which he has felt the pressure as much as they, but that he is writing from the depths of his own personal experience. In Dr. Wace's other books we have the same deeply religious attitude. We find it not only in *The Gospel and its Witnesses*, a volume of sermons preached at St. James's, Piccadilly, in 1881, and in *Some Central*

Points of our Lord's Ministry, originally prepared for the pulpit of Lincoln's Inn Chapel, but right at the very end of his life, when, in *The Story of the Passion* and *The Story of the Resurrection*, he published the sermons he had preached in successive years during Holy Week in Canterbury Cathedral. These are marked by the same gravity and simplicity of style and the same characteristic dealing with the realities and needs of the human soul. Almost any passage taken at random from either book would illustrate this. The following from *The Story of the Resurrection* is an example:—"It is the supreme blessing of the Gospel that it brings an assurance of deliverance from evil, and of forgiveness for the sins and infirmities which follow upon it. The individual soul craves for forgiveness, for the share it has borne in these violations of God's will, and these injuries to its fellows, and it sees in nature no means of this forgiveness. Still less can it see in the natural order of things any remedy sufficient to purge the whole race of its poison. There is, in fact, only one source from which such forgiveness and such deliverance can come, and that source is the grace of God Himself. He who created is the only Power who can recreate; and He alone can remit to the penitent soul the punishment it has brought upon itself, and remedy its injury" (p. 137).

It was in 1889 that the famous controversy with Professor Huxley took place. Dr. Wace had read a paper at the Manchester Church Congress in the autumn of 1888, and in February of the following year Huxley attacked this in the pages of the *Nineteenth Century*. Dr. Wace replied and Professor Huxley wrote a rejoinder, to which there was again a reply and rejoinder. The matter would have been left there, but Huxley reprinted his articles among other papers in a volume of *Essays on Controverted Questions*. Dr. Wace felt that his replies should also be reprinted, and published them in *Christianity and Agnosticism*. But the volume was much more than a reprint of the articles, for it also contained in an appendix the principal passages from Dr. Huxley's articles, so that the reader might be able more fairly to judge of the matter. It is impossible here to give any summary of the controversy. Huxley had attacked the Christian position and the historical truth of the Gospel narratives. Wace defended them with an ability and vigour which astonished people who had come to think that the case for Christianity had broken down. Undoubtedly the articles did much

to steady a public opinion which had been shaken by the current materialism in science and philosophy, and by such books as Cotter Morison's *Service of Man*, Mrs. Humphry Ward's *Robert Elsmere*, and others whose names have long been forgotten.

Besides the books which have been already mentioned, Dr. Wace issued his Warburton Lectures on Prophecy, and some smaller volumes on critical and theological questions. For some years he edited the *Churchman* and was a frequent and valued contributor to the *Record*. One of his last periodical contributions was an article on Prayer Book Revision in the *Church Quarterly Review* for October last, written in bed during his recovery from his accident a few months before. It is not generally known that the reprint of Dr. Brewer's historical introductions to the Rolls Series (on the reign of Henry VIII), which were published by John Murray in two volumes, was due to Dr. Wace's initiative and energy. It was a great service to students to have this invaluable historical material more readily accessible. He edited, himself, a volume of Dr. Brewer's *English Studies*, to which he prefaced a biographical sketch of his old teacher and sometime colleague in the field of historical research.

Dr. Wace was, however, not only a scholar and writer and preacher: he was a man of uncommon practical ability. His work on behalf of King's College Hospital, his chairmanship for many years of the Clergy Mutual Insurance Society, of St. John's Hall, Highbury, of the National Church League, and countless other activities, were the wonder of those who knew him. The very fine library possessed by the Corporation of the Church House owes much to the fact that its first Committee of Selection were Dr. Wace, Sir E. Maunde Thompson and Sir Lewis Dibdin.

He was an admirable Chairman of a committee or conference. His unflinching courtesy and tact, his sense of humour which often relieved the asperities of debate, and his uncommon power of disentangling the essentials of a subject at the end of a long discussion from the irrelevancies which threatened to obscure them, often amazed those who were present. In 1900 there was held at Fulham, on the initiative of Bishop Creighton, a Round Table Conference on the subject of the Doctrine of Holy Communion and its Expression in Ritual. On the motion of Lord Halifax, supported by Prebendary (afterwards Dean) Barlow, Dr. Wace was unanimously appointed Chairman. The following year, Bishop Creighton having

died in the meantime, the present Bishop of London arranged for a second Conference of the same kind on the subject of Confession and Absolution, and Dr. Wace was again appointed to the chair. Both Bishops testified to the great value of his services in presiding over two conferences presenting unusual difficulties, as the opinions of the members were so widely and sharply divided.

It is even now hardly credible, it is certainly not creditable to those responsible for it, that a man of such learning and such administrative and practical ability should have been left without any important preferment until, at the age of sixty-six, he was appointed Dean of Canterbury. He should have been made a Bishop twenty years before; and, while he was quite free from any ambitions of a personal kind, there can be little doubt that the persistent neglect to give him a position which should have been his was a disappointment, and to some extent clouded his later years, though he never said anything on the subject even to his most intimate friends. He was a great success as a Dean and threw himself into the life of the Cathedral and the town. His work on behalf of the reparation of the fabric of the Cathedral, for which he raised huge sums, one of them being £20,000, was of national importance. His place in civic life is shown by the presentation to him, about three years ago, of the freedom of the city of Canterbury; and the great concourse of people at his funeral and the signs of mourning in the city showed how he had won the affection of his fellow citizens.

It is a difficult matter to give an adequate appreciation of a man of such great and varied gifts and acquirements. For one thing he was always at work and yet he was never hurried. Whether in hospital with an arm broken in two places, or in bed at the Deanery with a fractured thigh bone, or in his study, or at his club, he was to be found at work and yet apparently always at leisure to give his whole attention to every one who wished to consult him, and was always ready to undertake fresh work if it came to him. He had the most unfailing courtesy, and notwithstanding a reserved and perhaps brusque appearance, great gentleness and charm of manner, and he was a staunch and loyal friend. Though he possessed great powers of mind and a scholarship of unusual depth and range, yet he spoke to those who met him as if on equal terms. And the readiness with which he commanded his stores of knowledge was astonishing. His memory never seemed to fail him. He would

quote long passages from Augustine or Aquinas or Coleridge or Dryden ; he could discuss a difficult problem in philosophy or the course of a period of history or a hundred other matters and bring to them precise and accurate knowledge and clear and careful thought, the result of a lifetime of unremitting labour. Modern scholarship in all its departments has become so specialized that this encyclopædic type of mind is now not cultivated and is rarely found. But though specialization has great advantages and in its way is a necessity, it does not easily encourage breadth of outlook, and while giving intensity limits the view.

The period during which Dr. Wace was at Canterbury was that during which the " Anglo-Catholic " party developed to an extreme of teaching and aggressiveness far beyond anything that had gone before, and seriously threatened the doctrinal foundation and the reformed position of the English Church. The Dean was naturally compelled, by his loyalty to the Reformation and by his profound knowledge of the ecclesiastical and theological literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, to take an active part in the unhappy and unedifying controversies thus forced on the Church in the last twenty-five years. But he did it in a manner and with an ability which won for him the respect and regard of friend and foe alike.

Just as he opposed the revival of mediævalism, so did he make a strong stand against the developments of what is known as modernism, because he believed that both were contrary to the teaching of the New Testament : one by encumbering it with superstition and false doctrines, the other by depriving it of any historical basis. The distinctive features of the Christian Gospel were lost in both cases ; and he stood firmly and immovably upon historical Christianity, for he felt that the facts and truths of the New Testament, verified in Christian experience and illuminated and interpreted by the Spirit of God, were the only sure foundation of our hope in this world and the world to come.



THE REAL PRESENCE AND THE GREEN BOOK CANON.

BY THE REV. T. W. GILBERT, D.D., Rector of Bradfield, Berks.

THE discussions on Prayer Book Revision have developed a keenness about liturgical history and kindred studies which all thoughtful Churchmen will welcome. The present stage of Prayer Book Revision is obviously merely a temporary and experimental one which looks forward to a further revision some few years hence. During this present and transitional period, therefore, it is essential for all of us to "read, mark and learn" the history which is behind our Prayer Book, for it is on an intelligent grasp by Evangelicals of Prayer Book teaching that their own future in the Church of England depends.

Nowhere is it more true than of the history surrounding the compilation of our Holy Communion office. Whatever difference of view there may be as to the significance of such matters as abbreviations of services, omission of certain Psalms, and the like, it is clear that the central point of importance will be found in the proposals for altering the Communion Service. This is inevitable, because upon the views held about the Holy Communion depend many other views about the Church and Ministry, and in the long run differences of view about the Holy Communion tend also even to different conceptions of God. It is not too much to say, therefore, that differences about the Holy Communion have the tendency to produce very different conceptions of religion altogether.

A single illustration will make this clear. We hear very often nowadays that "Christ is present in certain churches and not in others," and on asking for the elucidation of this statement we are told that Christ is present in certain churches where the Sacrament is reserved, and not in those where the Sacrament is not reserved. The implication is—the explicit teaching also—that the Presence of Christ is localized in the consecrated elements which ensure the Presence of Christ so long as the consecrated elements are reserved.

Now it is clear that this view, if left unchallenged, will bring about very serious consequences, for such a conception of the localization of the Presence of Christ in the Bread and Wine was

the rock on which the mediæval Church split, and the Reformation was the outcome.

The matter has been further pressed upon the attention of Church-people by the discussions in the House of Clergy on the alternate canons promoted by the Green Book and Grey Book supporters, and a certain amount of mystification has resulted from that discussion. Many Evangelicals, for example, have been surprised to read statements by some of their number in the House of Clergy that they could without hesitation use the alternate canons which are being put forward. It is quite true that those alternate canons could be used by Evangelicals, but it is only true in the same sense that Evangelicals could also use the canon of the Roman Mass. The really important consideration is the method and interpretation of the canon. The interpretation of the Roman canon is governed by the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the interpretation of the new alternate canons offered to us by the House of Clergy will be governed by other criteria than those used by Evangelicals.

What those criteria are will not be far to seek, and one of them is contained in the Declaration of the English Church Union sent to the Patriarch of Constantinople in May, 1922. Article 8 of this Declaration runs as follows: "We affirm that, by Consecration in the Eucharist, the bread and wine, being blessed by the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit, are changed and become the true Body and the true Blood of Christ, and as such are given to and received by the faithful. We hold, therefore, that Christ thus present is to be adored. . . ." This authoritative declaration by the promoters of the Green Book enables us to see quite clearly the import of various expressions used in the Green Book canon, and with this declaration in view it is obvious that the new canon is drawn up for the purpose of teaching a doctrine quite other than that held by Evangelicals. What we have to face is the possibility of the legalization of a new canon of the Holy Communion which is designed to teach the localization of the Presence of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine, with the logical corollary of the adoration and worship of Christ in the consecrated elements.

There are, therefore, at least three things which Evangelicals should consider in view of the attempt to introduce into our Prayer Book this view of a localized Presence of Christ in the consecrated elements.

The first is the evidence of the past with regard to such a doctrine. So far as the early Christian Church is concerned it seems clear that the great majority of the primitive writers held the view of a mystical participation with Christ in the Breaking of Bread. Their teaching is that the bread and wine always remain bread and wine, but that their use in the Holy Communion is a means of grace appointed by Christ, and they are therefore "instrumentally a cause" of grace to the believer. No doubt there is a considerable variety of expression about the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, and it would be easy to isolate statements from some of the Fathers to support theories of Consubstantiation, and even an incipient form of Transubstantiation. But the general position seems to be an absence on the part of the early Christian writers of expressions referring to Christ as present in the bread and wine. Waterland's considered judgment on this point is that the early Fathers "all intended to say, that the elements keeping their own nature and substance, and not admitting a coalition with any other bodily substance, are symbolically or in mystical construction, the body and blood of Christ; being appointed as such by Christ, accepted as such by God the Father, and made such in effect by the Holy Spirit, to every faithful receiver." Such is the primitive teaching, and this is the point of view of Evangelicals at the present time, and, until recently, the generally accepted teaching of the Church of England. But, as has been already hinted, there were many varieties of expressions used by primitive writers with regard to the Presence of Christ in the Holy Communion, and some of them not unlike those in the English Church Union Declaration quoted above. For instance Cyril of Jerusalem, when writing about the changing of the water into wine at Cana, says, "Let us therefore with full assurance receive Christ's Body and Blood: for His Body is given to thee in the figure of bread, and His Blood in the figure of wine . . ." And again: "Look not therefore as on bare bread and wine, for they are according to the Lord's saying, His Flesh and Blood." Now such statements present no difficulty to Evangelicals who understand the figurative and symbolical language of the Fathers, and they are moreover safeguarded from misinterpretation by St. Cyril's own explanations. But the isolation of such statements as those of St. Cyril and the neglect of his spiritual interpretation, led on to the literal acceptance of such passages, until we get the bald

assertion that the consecrated bread is " changed, not in form, but in nature." This latter statement is attributed both to Cyprian and to Arnold of Bona Vallis, a contemporary of St. Bernard ; and the assertion again is patent of more than one interpretation. On the one hand there is Cranmer's interpretation, " that the bread doth show unto us that we be partakers of the Spirit of God, and most purely joined unto Christ, and spiritually fed with His Flesh and Blood : so that now the said mystical bread is both a corporal food for the body, and a spiritual food for the soul " ; but on the other hand the words are taken by many others at their face value and used to uphold a view of a change in the bread itself. So we get the teaching of Paschasius in the ninth century, and he declares on the one side that Christ " has left to us this visible Sacrament for a figure and image of His flesh and blood, that by these our mind and our flesh may be more fruitfully nourished to lay hold of invisible and spiritual things by faith " ; but in addition to such statements he declares that " after the consecration (the elements) are believed to be nothing else than the Body and Blood of Christ," and that it is the " true flesh and true blood, in a mystery."

It is not the purpose of this article to unfold in outline the various developments of the views of the mediæval Church on the Holy Communion ; the only object of the writer is to invite Evangelicals to notice how the figurative and symbolical language of the early Fathers becomes changed in the effort to define the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament. Paschasius may or may not have taught what is generally known as Transubstantiation ; opinions differ on this point, but he is a landmark in so far, that from his time onward Churchmen began to give increasing attention to defining the Presence. The Schoolmen philosophers began to teach that the " substance " of the bread and wine was changed after consecration into the " substance " of the body and blood of Christ, and that the " accidents " of the bread and wine remained : bread and wine were seen by the eye of the worshipper, but they were in reality the body and blood of Christ. The position taken up at the Lateran Council of 1216, however, was that " Christ's Body and Blood are really contained under the species of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into His Body and the wine into His Blood."

During the later Middle Ages, therefore, the views of the majority of Churchmen ranged from the philosophic view of the Schoolmen,

which in its way is not unlike the view which is being pressed on the Church of England to-day, and the purely materialistic view which was later embodied in the decrees of the Council of Trent. For all practical purposes, however, the materialistic view was the view taught officially by the Church and the view held by the ordinary Churchman, and it is summed up by the Council of Trent in the following terms: "If anyone shall say that in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of the bread and wine remains together with the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood, the appearance only of the bread and wine remaining, which conversion indeed the Catholic Church most fittingly calls Transubstantiation, let him be anathema."

This brings us to the consideration of the second point which we must be clear about, and that is the way in which the English Reformers met this perversion of the primitive teaching. This can be seen in the evolution which took place in the Prayer Book, but the whole movement can be summed up as the effort of the Reformers to revert to the primitive teaching which carefully safeguarded the Holy Communion as a real means of grace in spiritually feeding upon Christ, but equally carefully abstained from forms of expression indicating the localization of Christ's Presence in the consecrated elements.

The truth of this can be seen first of all in the 1549 Prayer Book. The canon of the Holy Communion in this first Reformed Prayer Book followed along the lines of the Roman Missal, and amongst many things which may be noticed occurs the prayer that the bread and wine "may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ." The form of the words, if taken at their face value, conveys a perfectly legitimate truth, but the interpretation placed upon the words shows how a form of words may carry two vitally differing meanings. Bishop Gardiner, for example, found full support for the doctrine of Transubstantiation in these words, and to use his own expression about the canon of the 1549 Prayer Book, "we require of God the creatures of bread and wine to be sanctified and TO BE TO US the Body and Blood of Christ, which they cannot be, unless God worketh it and make them so to be. . . . Cranmer, on the other hand, says in reply to this, "we do not pray

that the creatures of bread and wine may BE the Body and Blood of Christ ; but that they may BE TO US the Body and Blood of Christ, that is to say, that we may so eat them and drink that we may be partakers of His Body crucified, and of His Blood shed for our redemption." The two quotations are worth pondering over, especially as they are a fair comment on the similar form of words proposed in the Green Book canon which is going to be interpreted in the light of the English Church Union Declaration of 1922. The fact remains that the difference between the two interpretations comes from the confusing by Gardiner of the thing with the thing signified, and in particular localizing the Presence of Christ in the elements, whilst Cranmer sees in the elements an instrument of grace as the primitive Fathers had done. It cannot be insisted too strongly that Cranmer had given up the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and had also given up the belief in a " Real Presence " in or under the form of bread and wine by the time of the issue of the 1549 Prayer Book. This can be seen in the Great Parliamentary Debate of 1548, and in Cranmer's treatise of the Holy Communion published in 1550.

This was the reason, therefore, for the drastic changes which took place in the 1552 Prayer Book. So far as the wit of man could devise Cranmer deliberately broke up and rearranged the canon for the express purpose of removing ambiguities with regard to the Presence of Christ in the Holy Communion. Students of liturgy may regret the change, but it was inevitable if the service was to be freed from the mediæval conception of a localized Presence contained within the bread and wine. Cranmer's whole purpose was to avoid any form of words and any construction of prayer in the Communion office which would lend themselves to the perversion of primitive teaching.

Cranmer's point of view at the time of the revision of the 1549 Prayer Book may be seen in the following extract from his Answer to Gardiner in 1551. He writes : " The old writers many times do say that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the Sacraments, not meaning by that manner of speech, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the water, bread, or wine (which be only the outward visible Sacraments), but that in the due ministration of the Sacraments, according to Christ's ordinance and institution, Christ and His Holy Spirit be truly and indeed present by their

mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace in all them that worthily receive the same. Moreover when I say and repeat many times in my book, that the body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the Sacrament, lest any man should mistake my words, and think that I mean, that although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible sign, yet He is corporally in the persons that duly receive them : this is to advertise the reader that I mean no such thing, but my meaning is that the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's body that was crucified for us, and of His blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the Sacrament. But all this I understand of His spiritual presence, of the which He saith, I will be with you until the world's end ; and wheresoever two or three be gathered in My name, there am I in the midst of them ; and he that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me and I in him."

Such is Cranmer's clear and unmistakable teaching. There are no subtle refinements of language which would allow his meaning to be misconstrued, but, as far as words could permit him, he definitely repudiated the localization of a Presence of Christ in the bread and wine, and brought the English Church back to the primitive teaching that Christ was "present in the due ministration of the Sacrament," that He was "present in all that worthily receive the Sacrament," and that the consecrated elements were instrumentally a cause for the realization of His Presence.

The same clear and unmistakable teaching is found in Hooker, and the following extracts are sufficiently indicative of the point of view of this great Anglican divine. He says, for example, in Book V, lxvii. 5, that "the bread and cup are His body and blood because they are causes instrumental upon the receipt whereof the participation of His body and blood ensueth . . ." and this statement is in itself a reversion to the teaching of the Fathers. In further explanation he says in the chapter following the above: "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament . . . I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is His body, or the cup His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them. As for the sacraments, they really exhibit, but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not

really nor do really contain in themselves that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow . . .” These passages could be reinforced by many others from Hooker, and the Anglo-Catholic divines of the seventeenth century bear witness to the same teaching. The general position is quite clear, therefore, and bears out the truth of the judgment of the Privy Council in the Bennett case (1872) that the Church of England does not teach a Presence of Christ in or under the form of bread and wine in the Holy Communion.

This brings us to this third consideration. Granted that the primitive Fathers did not teach the localization of the Presence of Christ in the bread and wine, and that the Reformation in England was an endeavour to recover the spiritual teaching of the Fathers, and that the divines of the Anglican Church have consistently followed the primitive and Reformation teaching, what is to be said for the policy of acquiescing in the new alternate canon as suggested by the Green Book?

The answer lies surely in the outline given above. The Green Book canon, with the English Church Union Declaration as the standard of interpretation, falls into the category of definitions of the Presence of Christ in the Holy Communion which have brought disaster to the whole Church in the past. That it has revived some of the old superstitious usages of the Middle Ages is only too clear by the way in which the Presence of Christ is presupposed in the churches where the Sacrament is reserved, and by a corresponding sense of the absence of Christ when the worshippers have left these churches. By whatever refinements of language it may be attempted to prevent the belief in a purely materialistic change in the consecrated elements as was done by the mediæval schoolmen, or by refusing to define the method of change as the English Church Union Declaration does, the error and the danger remain the same. Those who are at all familiar with the present-day teaching of the Roman Catholic Church know how many of the more educated Romanists endeavour to avoid the materialism of Transubstantiation by reverting to the position of the mediæval schoolmen. This does not, however, save the position so far as the popular and official views are concerned. The ordinary view of the average Roman Catholic is materialistic, and it is the obvious corollary from the Tridentine decree which enunciates the doctrine of Transubstan-

tiation. The same holds good of the English Church Union position. It may be feasible for some of those who hold that position to localize the Presence of Christ in the elements and yet at the same time to disbelieve in a material change in the elements. The position is a dangerous one, however—even if it was a true one—and the inevitable result is a confusing of the spiritual Presence with a material Presence in the bread and wine. Moreover, for all practical purposes the emphasis upon a spiritual Presence in the elements is no proper safeguard from a wrong use of the Sacrament, because the demand for adoration is the logical sequence whether the Presence is looked upon either as spiritual or material. The three “ new Tracts for our Times ” sent to the members of the House of Clergy during its last session are a painful reminder of these warnings.

My conclusion, therefore, is that acquiescence in the proposed new canon of the Green Book, whether by permitting it as an alternate use or any other way, is a repudiation of the position taken up by the English Church at the Reformation and a repudiation of the position consistently followed by the great Anglican divines since that time. Moreover, it belies the teaching of the Church of the early years, and merely takes up a point of view developed in a corrupt age. Fundamentally the aim of the new canon is to commit the Church of England to the doctrine of a localized Presence in or under the forms of bread and wine, a doctrine which is a perversion of the truth for which the Reformed Church of England stands.



THE POST-RESURRECTION APPEARANCES OF OUR LORD.

BY CHANCELLOR P. V. SMITH, LL.D.

DIFFICULTIES have always been felt as to how the appearances of the Risen Lord to His Disciples in Jerusalem narrated by St. Luke and in the Fourth Gospel can be reconciled with the message of the angels recorded in the first two of our Gospels and that of the Lord Himself mentioned in St. Matthew's Gospel, that they were to go into Galilee and would see Him there, and with His actual appearance there which is mentioned in St. Matthew's Gospel. The problem is closely connected with another question, namely, what was the original ending of St. Mark's Gospel, and it was ably discussed by Torkild Skat Røndam, of the University of Copenhagen, in the *Hibbert Journal* in 1905. The problem consists in how to combine and harmonize the different accounts which we possess of these appearances in the last chapters of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, the last two chapters of the Fourth Gospel, the first chapter of the Acts, and the fifteenth chapter of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, which is the earliest of them all. It will be convenient in this discussion to speak of the author of the first Gospel as St. Matthew, although the Apostle of that name was probably not the actual compiler of it.

In spite of the late Dean Burgon's elaborate attempt to defend as genuine the present close of our second Gospel in *The Last Twelve Verses of S. Mark*, published in 1871, there can be little doubt that these verses are a later addition to the original work, which, as we possess it, ends abruptly with the words *ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ*,—words that may be rendered in English "for they were afraid that. . .," and that the succeeding verses are the work of a later author. Either the original Gospel was owing to some accident left unfinished, or its concluding portion was very early lost. We shall see grounds for believing that the latter alternative was what actually took place, and that we may with some degree of probability conjecture certain of the contents of the last portion. At any rate we cannot rely on the last twelve verses of the Gospel as throwing any original light on our Lord's post-Resurrection appearances.

We proceed, then, to consider the different authoritative accounts of these appearances. The earliest of them, that of St. Paul, mentions five beside the one to himself long afterwards, and professes to state them in order of time ; namely, (1) to Cephas, (2) to the twelve, meaning of course the eleven apostles, (3) to more than five hundred brethren, (4) to James, and (5) to the apostles. St. Matthew's Gospel records two appearances, first outside Jerusalem to the women on their way from the sepulchre, and secondly to the eleven disciples in Galilee, which is mentioned in such a way as to give the impression that they first saw Him there. St. Luke's Gospel on the other hand mentions three appearances of our Lord in Judæa on the day of His resurrection ; (1) to Simon Peter, (2) to the disciples journeying to Emmaus, and (3) to the apostles and others with them in the late evening. The Fourth Gospel narrates an appearance to Mary Magdalene, two to the disciples, the first at Jerusalem, and the second a week later, and a fourth to seven disciples on the shore of the Lake of Galilee. Lastly in the opening of the Acts St. Luke states that our Lord appeared from time to time to the apostles during a period of forty days, with nothing to suggest that these appearances occurred anywhere except in or near Jerusalem, and with an express declaration that during the last appearance He told them to wait in Jerusalem for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

It is not easy to reconcile these different accounts. At first sight, those in the third and fourth Gospels of our Lord's appearances to St. Peter and the two travellers and the assembled disciples in Judæa on the day of His resurrection appear to be hopelessly at variance not only with the statement in the first Gospel that the eleven went into Galilee to see Him, but also with the message of the angel at the tomb recorded both in that and in St. Mark's Gospel, that He was going before them into Galilee and that they were to see Him there, and with the express command of our Lord Himself added in the first Gospel that they were to go into Galilee to see Him. At first sight ; but a careful examination of them will disclose details which supply hints as to how they may be reconciled. In order to appreciate these details it is necessary to realize the relations which the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels bear to one another. Scholars in the present day are pretty well agreed as to the general character of these relations. We need not at present

consider the narratives in the Fourth Gospel, since the connection between these and those in the other Gospels is a matter of greater doubt and uncertainty. But it is generally agreed that the Gospel of St. Matthew is dependent for the substance of its narrative portion, and especially in its account of the close of our Lord's life, upon that of St. Mark, although it records several additional incidents, which advanced critics are inclined to regard as legendary accretions; and that the Gospel of St. Luke is similarly dependent on the Second Gospel though in a less degree, and with certain marked divergences.

In the case of the visit of the women to the tomb on the Resurrection morning, the records of St. Matthew and St. Mark are practically identical; the only differences being that the former mentions an angel as sending the message to the disciples, and saying with reference to their seeing Christ in Galilee, "Lo I have told you," whereas the latter states that a youth (*νεανίσκος*) sent the message to the disciples "and to Peter" and said that they should see Christ in Galilee, "as *He* said to you," referring of course to the record in both Gospels of the words of our Lord on the way to Gethsemane, "After I am risen again, I will go before you into Galilee" (Matt. xxvi. 34; Mark xiv. 28). St. Luke, on the other hand, says nothing about a message to the disciples from the tomb, but says that "two men" whom the women saw there, announced to them the fact of Christ's Resurrection, adding, "Remember how He spake unto you when He was yet in Galilee." We observe that all the three Synoptists record "Galilee" as mentioned in the utterance at the tomb. The discrepancy between the way in which St. Luke and the other two Evangelists introduce it is capable of different explanations, but need here only be noticed as in accord with the fact that the third Evangelist makes no express mention either in his Gospel or in the Acts of any appearances of the Risen Lord elsewhere than in Judæa.

But to return to the first two Gospels. Both narrate that the women at the tomb were charged with a direction to the disciples to go into Galilee to see the Lord. It is important to realize who these disciples were. Not merely the eleven apostles, but all the other disciples of Christ then in Jerusalem, of whom at the Passover time there must have been a considerable number. St. Luke we may notice expressly speaks of the multitude of the disciples who

escorted our Lord in His triumphant entry into Jerusalem (Ch. xix. 27). That some besides the apostles received the news of the Resurrection on the same day, clearly appears from the words of the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, recorded in Luke xxiv. 23, and from the fact that they on the same evening related their own experiences to "the eleven gathered together and them that were there" (ver. 33), all of whom had also heard of the Lord's appearance to St. Peter and afterwards saw Him themselves in their midst. But St. Mark states that the women on receiving the charge fled from the tomb with trembling and amazement, and said nothing to any one "for they were afraid that." "That" what? Here unfortunately St. Mark's Gospel, as it has come down to us, fails us. We can only infer that they were afraid that what they had seen and heard was an illusion, or at any rate that they would not be able to persuade any one else of its reality. But how did St. Mark continue his narrative? It would have been of priceless value to us to know this for certain. As it is we are left to conjecture it from the conclusion of St. Matthew's Gospel, which we may suppose to have followed the earlier work on somewhat of the same lines as its 26th and 27th chapters follow the 14th and 15th chapters of that work. We notice then that St. Matthew proceeds to narrate the appearance of our Lord to the women recorded in Matthew xxviii. 9, 10, when He bade them "Be not afraid; go and tell My brethren that they go into Galilee and there shall they see Me," repeating the injunction delivered at the tomb. We observe that here too the message is to "brethren," the same word used by St. Paul in his mention of the five hundred and more who saw the Risen Lord together, and clearly including a far larger number than merely the apostles. Now are there any grounds for supposing that this narrative of two appearances originally formed part of St. Mark's Gospel? I venture to think the very strongest. If we had St. Matthew's Gospel alone we should fail to understand the relevancy or importance of the appearance. According to St. Matthew the women, having received at the tomb the message to the disciples to go to Galilee for the purpose of seeing the Lord, departed quickly with fear and great joy—their fear being merely solemn awe—and ran to bring the disciples word. Why, then, should the Lord have forestalled His promised appearance in Galilee by appearing to them just outside Jerusalem? and why

should He have said to them "Be not afraid"? But this appearance and exhortation to the women following on St. Mark's description of their state of mind is perfectly intelligible. According to him, so far from their hasting from the tomb with awe and great joy to deliver their message to the disciples, they fled from it with trembling and amazement, with the intention of telling no one what they had seen and heard. They would therefore not have done so, if their experience had not been confirmed. But it was corroborated by the appearance of the Lord Himself, and then all their doubts and fears were removed. St. Matthew's words accordingly refer to their state of mind and conduct after this appearance, and not to their feelings when they first left the tomb. We may therefore reasonably conclude that the appearance was recorded by St. Mark; whose description of the bewilderment of the women as they fled from the tomb would be a natural prelude to it and far more intelligible as leading up to it than the preceding statement in St. Matthew's Gospel. Judging by the analogy of the insertion by St. Matthew of the incidents of Pilate's washing, of Pilate's wife's dream, of the opening of graves at our Lord's death, and of the earthquake and removal of the tomb-stone by the angel, we may infer that the next paragraph in his Gospel about the conduct of the guard had no place in the lost part of the second Gospel; in which, in fact, the placing of a guard over the tomb is not mentioned at all. Then follows, in the first Gospel, the statement that "the eleven disciples went into Galilee into the mountain where Jesus had appointed them." Much, however, must have happened before this; and no mention is made of the way in which the message from the tomb was received by the disciples. But St. Luke says that the words of the women seemed to them as idle talk, and their incredulity is also mentioned in the appendix to the second Gospel which is found in our New Testament. Clearly, therefore, just as an appearance of the Lord Himself was necessary to convince the women and induce them to carry the news of the Resurrection and the summons to Galilee to the disciples, so an appearance of the Lord to some, at any rate, of them was necessary to induce the disciples to accept and obey that summons and take the journey into Galilee. St. Matthew, who does not suggest any doubt on the part of the women about the reality of their vision at the tomb, does not mention any doubt on the part of the disciples about the

truth of the message which they received from the women. But St. Mark, who records the incredulity of the women in the first instance, after narrating the appearance of the Lord which dispelled it, may very probably have gone on to narrate that the disciples were in their turn incredulous and that their doubts were also dispelled by an appearance of the Lord to them in Jerusalem. At any rate, there is a statement in St. Matthew's Gospel, which, according to our extant records, is unexplained, and must refer to something which the records do not contain. It is said that the disciples went into Galilee "unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them." There is no hint in any of our Gospels of this appointment. But it is most natural to suppose that it was made after His resurrection, and, if so, it was during an appearance to them in or near Jerusalem. This at any rate suggests that such an appearance was recorded in the lost portion of St. Mark's Gospel, and that the appointment of the particular mountain during that appearance was there actually mentioned.

The above considerations afford a satisfactory explanation of how the appearances of our Lord to disciples in Judæa recorded in the third and fourth Gospels are not inconsistent with the express direction which we find in the first two Gospels that they were to go into Galilee and would there see Him. But the two apparently conflicting records can also be reconciled by simply recognizing that the pre-arranged appearance in Galilee was to be to a large multitude of the disciples at once, and that it did not, therefore, preclude previous appearances to individuals or to a limited number of disciples in Judæa. It is true that St. Matthew narrates that the "eleven" disciples—meaning, of course, the apostles—went to the appointed mountain in Galilee; and from his account alone we might conclude that they alone were assembled upon it. But as we have seen, the command to go into Galilee to meet the Risen Lord was certainly not confined to the apostles, and St. Matthew's statement that "some" of those present doubted, is hardly reconcilable with the limitation of the total number to eleven. It is more reasonable to suppose that the appearance on the mountain was the appearance to the five hundred and more simultaneously, which St. Paul mentions (1 Cor. xv. 6). Assuredly that large gathering must have taken place in the open air and must have been specially summoned. The close connection between the first two

Gospels leads us to conclude that St. Matthew derived his account of the appearance on the mountain from the earlier Gospel ; and if we possessed the lost portion of it, we should probably find there an express statement that a far larger number of disciples were present than merely the eleven apostles. We may remark in passing that St. Matthew's parenthetical addition that "some doubted" is not in accordance with the colouring of the rest of his post-Resurrection narrative nor with the general tenor of his Gospel ; and that its insertion is, of itself, further evidence that the narrative in which it occurs was copied from an earlier source.

Having gone thus far, it is but one step further to conclude that our Lord's message on that occasion, recorded in Matthew xxviii. 18-20, was also recorded in the lost portion of St. Mark's Gospel. If this was the case, the authority for the baptismal formula in the name of the Trinity is far earlier than has been generally supposed. The question then arises, did St. Mark's Gospel originally end as abruptly as does that of St. Matthew ? and, if not, how can we account for the unfinished end of the first Gospel ? We can do so in either of two ways consistently with the idea which it is interesting to entertain, that St. Mark's Gospel originally closed with a mention of the return of the Apostles to Judæa, and of the subsequent Ascension in their presence. Dean Armitage Robinson has suggested that the abrupt termination of St. Matthew's Gospel was due to the fact that the recognized limits of a volume had been reached, and that it was practically impossible to add fresh material in excess of them (*The Study of the Gospels*, pp. 33, 45). The tyranny of publishers in restricting the size of the books which authors are permitted to give to the world is not unknown at the present day. Or, we may, with Mr. Røndam, conjecture that the wear and tear of the Marcan MS. which has resulted in our losing the whole of its contents after chapter xvi. 8, had already begun and that the author of the first Gospel did not feel justified or able to add to what he found in the already imperfect original from which he compiled his account. Mr. Røndam conjectures that the words "unto the end of the world" were not in the Marcan narrative, but were added by St. Matthew as a sort of conclusion of his book.

Turning now to the Lucan accounts of the post-Resurrection appearances, we have already seen the relation which they bear

to the narratives of the other Synoptists. St. Luke clearly based his Gospel in part upon that of St. Mark, but not so closely as did St. Matthew. In his preface to it he expressly states that he consulted several authorities in compiling it. As already mentioned, there is a deviation from St. Mark in his account of the visit of the women to the tomb. He states that the message to them was delivered by two heralds of the Resurrection, instead of one, and according to him, it did not include a command to pass on the tidings to the disciples nor any summons to them to meet the Risen Lord in Galilee, although it contained the mention of Galilee with quite a different complexion. He adds, in contrast to St. Mark's account, that the women thereupon remembered our Lord's prediction of His resurrection. We have seen that this was not actually the case until after the Lord's appearance to them. But St. Luke does not record this appearance, and the women's state of mind which he records is that at which they had arrived before they imparted the news to the disciples. These, he adds, received it with absolute incredulity, in which, as already pointed out, we must suppose that he was in agreement with the lost end of St. Mark's Gospel, though St. Matthew does not mention it. At any rate this incredulity furnishes an abundant reason for the subsequent appearances of our Lord Himself on the same day to St. Peter, to the two disciples journeying to Emmaus, and, later, to an assembly of the disciples in a room at Jerusalem, recorded in Luke xxiv.

13-43.

So far then all is tolerably clear. But St. Luke adds :

“ 44. And He said unto them, these are My words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, how that all things must needs be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms concerning Me. 45. Then opened He their mind that they might understand the Scriptures. 46. And He said unto them, thus it is written that the Christ should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day ; 47. And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem. 48. Ye are witnesses of these things. 49. And behold I send forth the promise of My Father upon you ; but tarry ye in the city until ye be clothed with power from on high.”

And then the narrative immediately proceeds :—

“ 50. And He led them out until they were over against Bethany, and He lifted up His hands and blessed them. 51. And

it came to pass, while He blessed them, He parted from them and was carried up into heaven. 52. And they worshipped Him and returned to Jerusalem with great joy. 53. And were continually in the temple blessing God."

These last ten verses raise serious difficulties. Read by themselves and according to their natural import, they imply that our Lord gave His whole post-Resurrection instructions to His disciples on the evening of the same day and at once led them forth towards Bethany, and ascended into heaven in their presence. We do not know whether St. Luke when he wrote his Gospel entertained this belief and intended to convey this impression ; or whether the suggestion that the contents of a Gospel were necessarily limited by a regard to size, which, as we saw, has been put forward in the case of the first Gospel, is applicable also to St. Luke's Gospel, and that he was obliged by considerations of length to compress in this way the account of teaching which he knew to have extended over a considerable period, and of an event which occurred at the close of it. But at any rate, in the opening of the Acts, he makes it clear that the Ascension did not take place until forty days after the Resurrection ; and this interval would give ample time for journeys to Galilee and back again to Judæa and for several appearances of the Risen Lord in both regions. It is clear, therefore, that the last four verses of St. Luke's Gospel point to a different appearance than that recorded in the 36th and following verses of the same chapter. And we infer that the words recorded in the 49th verse, which included a command to the disciples to remain in Jerusalem, could not have been spoken during the earlier appearance, since they are inconsistent with their visit to Galilee. They must have been uttered after their return from that visit and just before the Ascension, as recorded in the Acts. Probably therefore the whole, or at any rate the greater part of the teaching mentioned in verses 46-48 was also delivered not actually on the evening of Easter Day but on one or more subsequent occasions.

We come, lastly, to the appearances recorded in the fourth Gospel. At first sight the narrative gives the impression that the Evangelist knew nothing of the visit of a company of women to the tomb and thought that Mary Magdalene went there alone. But we find one word in it which shows that this is a mistake, and which indicates the connection of the story with that contained in the

Synoptic Gospels. We read that Mary Magdalene said to the two disciples to whom she announced her distress : " They have taken away the Lord out of the Sepulchre and *we* know not where they have laid Him " (John xx. 2). She had gone with the others to the tomb ; they had all been dismayed at the sight of the removal of the stone which had closed it ; and she, in her impetuosity, had run back to convey the news of it, without waiting to receive the message of good tidings which was delivered to the others. She was not with them when the Lord appeared to them as recorded by St. Matthew, and, as we have shown reasons to conclude, probably also by St. Mark. But she returned later on to the tomb and was there privileged to have a private vision of Him, of which we are only informed in the fourth Gospel. His appearance to the disciples on the evening of the same day which is there recorded is, of course, the same as that mentioned at the end of St. Luke's Gospel. The appearance a week later, when St. Thomas was present, and the appearance on the shore of the Lake of Galilee, are not specially recorded elsewhere ; but they would be included in the occasional appearances during the great Forty Days, which St. Luke summarizes in Acts i. 3. The fourth Gospel gives us the impression that the appearance when St. Thomas was present occurred in the same place as the appearance a week previously. But the narrative does not expressly state that this was the case, and it may have occurred in Galilee or during the journey of the disciples thither.

We have thus identified four out of the five appearances of the Risen Lord mentioned by St. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians. The first two were to St. Peter and the apostles on Easter Day, the third in all probability to the assembly on the mountain in Galilee, and the fourth to the apostles at the Ascension. If St. Paul knew of the other appearances recorded in the Gospels and alluded to in the Acts, it was beside his purpose to have enumerated them. There is one, however, of which we know nothing, except from his mention of it, namely, that to James—doubtless James the Lord's brother, whom St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians (i. 19), specially mentions as having been seen by him on his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion. No doubt there were other post-Resurrection appearances of which we have no record whatever. If the Risen Lord appeared to Mary Magdalene and the other

women, and to His brother, we may be sure that He also appeared to His Mother.

The above suggestions so far as they relate to conjectures as to the contents of the lost end of St. Mark's Gospel, and as to the way in which the narratives of the appearances in Jerusalem and in Galilee can be reconciled, are substantially those put forward by Mr. Røndam in his article in the *Hibbert Journal* nineteen years ago. If they are correct, they solve the difficulties and supposed discrepancies involved in the question as to which region was the scene of our Lord's post-Resurrection appearances to the apostles and other disciples. They show the connection between the recorded appearances in both regions and harmonize the closing chapters not only of the Synoptic Gospels, but also of the fourth Gospel. They even point to the possibility, if not the probability, of the formula of Baptism in the Triune Name having possessed originally the authority of St. Mark—a fact which, if it could be established, would be of the very highest theological importance.

Follow the Christ, by E. Vera Pemberton (*Longmans, Green & Co.*, 4s. 6d.), is a book of lessons given to a boys' class of the age of sixteen and contains much that is suggestive. But it is distinctly of the sacerdotal type. Confession is taught and its whole tone gives the impression that its writer is connected with the Anglo-Catholic School. We say this not to disparage what is good in the book—which is well arranged and full of good ideas—but to show that it must be used with discretion.

The second part of the *Speaker's Bible* devoted to the Gospel according to St. Luke has a pathetic interest, as it exhausts the material collected by the late Dr. Hastings. If the present Editors maintain the standard of the late Prince of Editors they will deserve well of the Church, for Dr. Hastings has gathered the cream of expository preaching on seven of the most important chapters of the Gospel (viii. 18 to xv. 12) into a twelve-and-sixpenny book that is worth more than double its price. No man who desires to learn the best that has been said on a Text can do without this book. Published by the *Speaker's Bible* Office, Aberdeen, it will be a very welcome gift to the Clergy, and what is more important it will, if used with discretion, prove beneficial to the congregations of the men who study its pages. Dr. Hastings had a genius for selecting the best, and the present volume is one of the very best compilations that we owe to him.

BISHOP ANDREWES.

BY THE REV. C. SYDNEY CARTER, M.A., Litt.D.

ALTHOUGH nearly three centuries have elapsed since the death of Launcelot Andrewes, his memory is still greatly esteemed and venerated, while his *Devotions*, even if not so much used to-day, have guided and comforted succeeding generations of Church-people. Born in London when the "Fires of Smithfield" were at their height, he was the eldest of thirteen children, his father being a middle-class merchant.

He was early sent to the Coopers' Free School at Stepney, where he displayed such a passion for study that his parents yielded to the head master's persuasion not to make him a "Prentice." Soon after he went to the newly founded Merchant Taylors' School, where his early rising for the purpose of study soon earned for him a well-deserved reputation for exceptional ability. We are not, however, told whether his refusal to join in any school games rendered him as unpopular with his companions as it certainly would do to-day in a public school! In 1571 he went up to Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, with a Greek scholarship, and in 1576 he was elected to a Fellowship there, and thenceforth devoted all his studies to theology. He joined a society for the weekly study of the Scriptures, a member of which was the celebrated and learned Puritan divine, Dr. Laurence Chaderton, the future Master of Emmanuel College. In 1578 Andrewes was appointed "Catechist" of his college, and his lectures in the College Chapel were soon crowded. He was ordained in 1580, and appointed Chaplain to Archbishop Whitgift, and Vicar of St. Giles's, Cripplegate, in 1586, and Prebendary of St. Paul's in 1589. In the latter year he was elected Master of his old college, a post which he held till 1606, when he was chosen for the see of Chichester.

Andrewes was probably one of the most learned divines of the day. He was always a diligent student, and refused to see any visitors before noon. He was reputed to have a good knowledge of fifteen languages. He was a good classical scholar, and undoubtedly possessed a thorough knowledge of the writings of the Fathers and of the mediæval schoolmen. In the quaint but forceful language

of his contemporary, Thomas Fuller, "the world wanted learning to know how learned this man was, so skilled in all (especially Oriental) languages that some conceive he might, if then living, almost have served as an interpreter at the confusion of tongues" (*Ch. Hist.*, iii, p. 348).

In 1601 Andrewes was created Dean of Westminster, and took part in the famous Hampton Court Conference of 1604. He had early won the affectionate esteem of James I, and was in constant attendance at Court, and frequently preached in the Royal Chapel. He was translated to Ely in 1609, and to Winchester in 1618, when he was also appointed Dean of the Chapel Royal. He was a Privy Councillor, but took little interest in merely political matters, and disliked the prevalent custom of the clergy meddling in secular offices. He died in 1626. His last official act was performed at the coronation of Charles I, in which he took part.

We are wont to complain now of the growing neglect of public worship and the consequent desecration of the Lord's Day. It is well, therefore, to be reminded that in Andrewes' day things were no better in this respect, in spite of the stringent law which fined all who neglected attendance at their parish church on Sunday. But the method then employed of discovering offenders would scarcely commend itself to our modern judgment. It reminds us of the drastic methods of Grimshaw, of Hawarth, the zealous but somewhat eccentric evangelical leader of the next century. During the Sunday morning service Grimshaw is reported to have been in the habit of giving out a long hymn or psalm before the sermon, to enable him, whip in hand, to visit the neighbouring public-houses and drive the inmates to God's house! By a similar device Andrewes enjoins the clergy "about the midst of Divine service to walk out of church and see who are abroad in any ale-house or elsewhere absent or evil employed," and to present them to the Ordinary.

Andrewes certainly gained his chief reputation at the time as a preacher. His sermons were full of quaint poetic imagery, as well as of a forceful and attractive vivacity, which fascinated his congregations, while he had a sweetness and simplicity of style which enabled him to administer sharp reproofs without offending his hearers. He was never sleepy or dull, and his sincere spirituality was always most impressive. Above all, he spoke from a heartfelt experience, which always wings a way for the message. Andrewes

went up to Cambridge when the controversy with the Puritans concerning the Calvinistic system of Church discipline was at its height. Cartwright, the very able, although the most bitter and intolerant, advocate of the exclusive necessity of a presbyterian polity, had so virulently attacked episcopacy that he had just been deprived of his professorship. He was Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and rivalled a Spanish Inquisitor in his persecuting zeal. Calvinistic doctrine was, however, still almost universally accepted as orthodox, so that Archbishop Whitgift could cordially approve of the famous "Lambeth Articles" of 1595 as "sound doctrine, and uniformly professed in this Church of England, and agreeable to the Articles of Religion established by authority." We need carefully to bear in mind the great distinction which was maintained at this time between Calvinistic discipline and Calvinistic doctrine. The former was the ardent belief of the Puritan, and his one consistent endeavour was to secure its adoption by the Anglican Church. The latter was the practically universal belief of all Churchmen. For there was no quarrel between the Puritan and the Churchman on purely doctrinal questions. All were followers of Calvin's theology. Hooker tells us that daily men were accused of heresy for holding that which the Fathers held, and that they could not clear themselves from the charge if they were unable to find something from Calvin to justify their views. Andrewes, although certainly inclining to what was then styled the new Arminian "heresy," advocated a moderating policy of silence on these abstruse speculative points of theology, and although he strongly opposed the aim of the extreme Puritan party for a presbyterian *discipline*, he vindicated their *doctrinal* orthodoxy, telling Cardinal Bellarmine that "they had no religion peculiar to themselves," and that, "apart from matters of discipline, they are right-minded enough."

Andrewes was a whole-hearted admirer of the English Reformation. "Look at our religion in Britain—primitive, pure and purified, such as Zion would acknowledge. What! Must we take the field to teach that nowhere does there exist a religion more in accord with the true Zion, that is, with the institution of the Gospel and of the Apostles, than ours? Look at our Confession contained in the Thirty-nine Articles. Look at our Catechism; it is short, but, in spite of its shortness, there is nothing wanting in it.

Look at the Apology of our Church—truly a ‘Jewel,’ whose will may find our doctrines there.” His great reputation for scholarship naturally marked him out to succeed Jewel as the champion of the Anglican religious settlement against the attacks of Rome, and his first book, *Tortura Torti*, defending the oath of allegiance against the denunciation of Cardinal Bellarmine, appeared in 1609. In the following year, in his *Responsio*, he followed the early Reformers in asserting the positive principles which guided them in their Reformation. Bellarmine had denied the catholicity of the English Church because of its rejection of the medieval dogmas of transubstantiation, the invocation of saints, and the temporal claims of the papacy. Andrewes, in the spirit of Jewel’s famous *Apology*, declared that Anglican catholicity was proved by the fact that the Reformers had adhered to the teaching of the Primitive Church. “Our appeal is to the Scriptures alone,” he declared. “Our savour is of the Scripture alone, but everything with you is full of the fabricated opinions of men out of which your faith is founded.” “Our faith is the ancient Catholic Faith comprehended in the two Testaments, three Creeds, and four Councils, only restored to its pristine splendour. On this account we call it a Reformed religion, and not new formed. We are not innovators, but renovators.” “We declare aloud that we are Catholic, but not Roman, the last of which words destroys the meaning of the first.” “Circumstances gave us the name of Protestants. For we protested that we would not any longer endure errors and abuses, but would remove them.” It is sometimes affirmed that although Andrewes repudiated transubstantiation, he asserted a belief in the Real Objective Presence of Our Lord in the elements, but it would seem, from a more careful study of his language, that he was enunciating the prevalent Anglican view of a Real Presence, as being, in the language of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, one “to our spirits only” in the whole celebration, and not in the elements. “The Presence,” he declares, “we believe to be real, as you do. As to the mode, we define nothing rashly, nor anxiously investigate, any more than in Baptism we inquire how Christ’s blood washes us.” It is at least difficult to understand how anyone who believed that Christ was present in the elements under the form of bread and wine could declare: “Let them worship the Deity, hiding there under the species, made in a baker’s oven.

Sion would shudder at this and utterly repudiate it." With regard to the Sacrifice of the Mass, Andrewes declared: "We are willing enough to grant that there is a Memory of the Sacrifice in it, but we will never grant that your Christ made of bread is sacrificed in it. . . . Private masses were unknown to the Fathers, ay, and masses not private, in which you worship transubstantiated bread."

It is interesting, especially in view of our present Reunion problems, to notice the position which Andrewes adopted concerning Church polity. "It had been enough," as Keble accurately states it, for the Elizabethan Reformers "to show that the government by archbishops and bishops was ancient and allowable," but although Andrewes, as the forerunner of the Caroline divines, went a step further than this in his assertion of the "divine institution of episcopacy," there is little doubt that he would have been very far from endorsing Bishop Gore's recent statement, that if the Anglican Church once recognized the validity of non-episcopal orders, "it would lose its status in the Catholic Church." For such a view would have prevented him concurring in Archbishop Bancroft's ruling in 1610, that the Scottish presbyters, about to be consecrated bishops, needed no ordination to the Anglican "priesthood," since "where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful, that unless that were granted the calling and character of the ministry in most of the Reformed Churches might be questioned." Such a view would also have prevented him from complying, as Bishop of Winchester, with the current custom of officially admitting presbyterially ordained French ministers into benefices in the Channel Islands, which were under his jurisdiction.

We get a good illustration from the life of Andrewes that the cordial relationship which existed between the early Elizabethan divines and their benefactors, the foreign Reformers, was fully maintained by the next generation of English Churchmen. For Andrewes lived on the most intimate terms of friendship with several eminent foreign Reformed divines, like Du Moulin and Grotius. He also vindicated the orthodoxy of the foreign Reformed Churches by appealing to the *Harmony of Protestant Confessions*, published in 1581 (which included Jewel's *Apology* as representing the Church of England). He told Cardinal Bellarmine that "we hold one Faith, as the *Harmony* of our Confessions sufficiently

testifies." Similarly, the celebrated French divine, Peter du Moulin, had refuted the accusation of the Romanists that the religion of the French Reformed Church was "diverse" from that of the English, because it had "another form of discipline." "We assemble," he declared, "with the English in their Churches, we participate together in the Holy Supper of Our Lord, the doctrine of their Confession is wholly agreeable to ours." But in his correspondence with Du Moulin, Andrewes, by enunciating the general Caroline view of episcopal ministries, showed that he certainly did not regard this question of "another form of discipline" as an immaterial point of divergence. "We maintain," he declares, "that our regimen approximates most nearly to the custom of the primitive, or, as you allow, of the sub-Apostolic Church. Yet it follows not, if our regimen be of divine right, that there is no salvation without it. . . . It is not utter condemnation of a thing to prefer a better . . . We do not condemn your Church because we would recall it to another form of governance which we have adopted—one which the whole of antiquity preferred." The learned French Calvinist, Isaac Casaubon, who was, without any episcopal ordination, appointed by Archbishop Bancroft a prebendary of Canterbury, was also a special friend of Andrewes, and advised him in the writing of his *Responsio*. He received the sacrament from him on his death-bed, and Andrewes confirmed his son.

Rightly to appreciate the real humility and sanctity so conspicuous in Andrewes' life and character, we have carefully to bear in mind the difficult circumstances in which he was placed. When he first appeared at Court, he found himself surrounded by a compliant, servile, and sychophantic set of statesmen and ecclesiastics who had deliberately adopted the disastrous policy of bolstering up the crude Stuart notions of divine hereditary right and arbitrary government as a protection and safeguard for Church order and discipline. Thus while they pandered to the king's natural conceit and inordinate vanity, they were in a weak position to witness against the idle and wanton luxury and dissoluteness which was so rampant in Court circles, especially since the beginning of the Stuart rule. Andrewes, with his studious, gentle, and retiring disposition, was peculiarly ill-fitted to stem this tide, and although at times he may have been guilty of a weak compliance, or even a culpable neglect, of duty, notably when he concurred with other

time-serving bishops in sacrificing principle to expediency by voting for the divorce of Lady Frances Howard, yet there is no doubt that his humility and sincere piety and asceticism acted as some check on the levity and profanity of the Court. He was at least not afraid to reproach the self-seeking policy of too many worldly Churchmen, or to refrain from joining in their fulsome adulation of royalty. When appealed to by James I, whether the king could not take his subjects' money when he needed it without the formality of a Parliament, Bishop Neale at once assented, declaring to James, "You are the breath of our nostrils." Andrewes, on being pressed, quietly replied: "Sir, I think it is lawful for you to take my brother Neale's money, because he offers it." "Going in and out as he did," says Professor Gardiner, "among the frivolous and grasping courtiers who gathered around the king, he seemed to live in a peculiar atmosphere of holiness" (*Hist. of Eng.*, ii, p. 120). He made no enemies, and was almost universally esteemed and revered, for, as Bishop Hacket declared, "who could come near the shrine of such a saint and not offer up a few grains of glory upon it?"

Andrewes' reputation for sanctity was almost as great as that which he had earned for his scholarship and preaching ability, so that it was said of him at the time that he was "Doctor Andrewes in the schools, Bishop Andrewes in the pulpit, and Saint Andrewes in the chamber." His well-known *Devotions* furnish us with the true secret of his eminently saintly life. His intercessions are most beautifully expressed and most comprehensive. His faith and calm serenity in most difficult, distracting, and ominous times were due to the fact that his life was a life of prayer. In these strenuous days, with our modern conditions of rush and high-pressure work, we are perhaps apt to overstrain the truth that *laborare est orare*. Certainly there are few Christians to-day who cultivate the contemplative life of prayer and spiritual communion to anything like the extent of the saintly Caroline Churchmen. We may safely say that asceticism was then often carried to excess, as in the well-known instance of Nicholas Ferrar, who shortened his beautiful and exemplary life by his severe austerities. But it is not surprising that a man like Andrewes was ready fearlessly to face the world and its problems when nearly five hours of each day had been spent in sacred prayer and meditation! Andrewes'

Private Devotions show us his inner soul, which, as Dean Church well said, was one of "the keenest self-knowledge and the strongest sympathies." It reveals to us one who "wholly spent himself and his studies and estate in prayer and the praise of God and compassion and works of charity." His hospitality and generosity were on a munificent scale, and besides his public benefactions, it is estimated that he gave away £1,300 a year in private charity. It is not surprising that Dr. Ottley declares that, "in an age of noisy controversy, his quiet, unobtrusive goodness and devout temper won him the confidence and reverence of earnest inquirers and of those troubled in mind and conscience" (*Life of Andrewes*, p. 15).

TWO MISSIONARY QUARTERLIES.

The March number of the *Church Missionary Review* (C.M.S. House, 1s. net) has several important articles, and it is interesting to note that in at least three instances the writers are not of our communion. The paper by the Rev. E. W. Thompson (a Secretary of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society) on Christian Education in British West Africa is singularly timely. He refers to the awakening of the Colonial Governments to the obligation resting upon them to educate the masses as a new feature of the situation. He advises missionaries not to fear or deplore this new interest of the State in education. The Rev. Edwin W. Smith (Literary Superintendent of the British and Foreign Bible Society) writes most happily on "An Unbroken Fellowship," and tells the story of 120 years' close co-operation between the C.M.S. and the Bible Society. The Rev. Nelson Bitton (Home Secretary of the London Missionary Society) has a useful article on "Christian Unity and the Experiences of the Mission Field," which should be carefully studied. Other articles are by the Revs. J. C. Winslow, H. D. Hooper, W. S. Hunt and G. T. Manley. The Eastern Notes are good and the Quarterly Survey of the Missions encouraging.

The *East and the West* (S.P.G., 1s. net) for January has a stirring article by Bishop Gwynne on "An Effort towards Unity in Egypt." He shows what has been done—no inconsiderable amount—and outlines a programme for the future. The task may be unattainable in our day, but in pursuing it they are following the will of the Master. The Rev. K. C. Macpherson writes on "Reconciliation in India." He points out that Nationalism is a passion which may be used for noble ends or which may be used as a disintegrating force, and his conclusion is that religion is the only power which can build a nation and save it from itself. The Rev. F. S. Drake describes a new religious movement in China; and interesting information is given about the Japan earthquake.

AN ANGLO-CATHOLIC'S VIEW OF HISTORY.¹

BY THE REV. W. H. RIGG, D.D., Vicar of Beverley Minster.

DR. PULLAN set himself a most formidable task when he resolved to lecture before the University of Oxford on religion since the Reformation. Even allowing for his own proviso that "the lectures make no pretence of being a history of the Church during the last four centuries,"² the ground he has to cover is enormous, and the reader is left in doubt whether to admire most, on the one hand, the immense range of the author's knowledge, and the mass of information which he has been able to compress within less than three hundred pages, or, on the other, the skill with which he has selected his materials, the very omissions proving his mastery of the subject. Certainly Dr. Pullan has projected his own shadow over the work. He does not leave us long in doubt as to his own position, and the particular lessons which his own reading of history is meant to enforce. Towards the end of his first lecture, he indicates to us the direction which Christian thought and life should follow—"a middle path between those two extremes"³ of Lutheranism and Ultramontaniam. With regard to Protestantism Dr. Pullan would endorse Schiller's well-known words, "The history of the world is the judgment of the world," and when weighed in the balances, he finds it wanting in every respect. Tracing its development from its very beginning Dr. Pullan's aim is to show that not only is it the fruitful parent of division, but also how it has led to an undermining of the Christian faith. With approval he quotes the saying of Troeltsch as illustrating his main point: "The old Christological dogma and myth are set aside, the doctrine of the Trinity and vicarious satisfaction are destroyed or rendered uncertain, the roots of the idea of the Sacraments and the Church are plucked up, and direct communion with the Bible rendered difficult," and quite rightly he characterizes these opinions "as neither being a

¹ *Religion Since the Reformation*: Eight Lectures. By Leighton Pullan, D.D., Fellow and Tutor of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.)

² Cf. Preface.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 32, cf. pp. 100, 101.

restatement nor a readjustment in theology, for such a religion is after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." ¹ He finds some of the tendencies in Liberal and German theology destructive of Christianity. Were certain teachers to be followed, we should discover that "the Gospels were shrouded in a winding sheet of sceptical scholasticism and the grandest features of the Redeemer erased." ² Here we are at one with him, also in his complaint that "since the days of Reimarus they have manufactured Christs which threaten to become as numerous as the idols of a Tibetan temple, and so different that it is hard to suppose that all are intended as representatives of the same Being." ³

In the controversy which has agitated many thinkers as to who was the Founder of Christianity, our Lord or St. Paul, his epigrammatic summing up of the whole question, with one important qualification, is severe but true. "Modern Protestantism is," or as we should prefer to say, "*certain forms* of modern Protestantism are betraying St. Paul with a kiss. Modern Roman Catholicism is wont to pass him by." ⁴ But much as we commend the outspokenness of the lecturer—and this is all the more courageous when the critical spirit of his audience is taken into account, for this has caused preachers of all types to deliver University sermons which were little more than moral essays—yet we are left wondering as to whether the author is not almost blind to the immense services which Protestantism has rendered to the cause of true religion, and therefore lays himself open to the charge of lacking in a sense of proportion. To begin with, the narrowness of his definition of "Modern Protestantism" as meaning "a form of Theism which represents Jesus Christ but denies His essential Deity" ⁵ is misleading. Is it quite true that this is the technical sense in which the words Modern Protestantism are employed in Germany and Holland? ⁶ Possibly this may have been applic-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

² *Ibid.*, p. 188. Dr. Pullan's words are slightly altered.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 188.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 243.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Preface.

⁶ Cf. Herzog, *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (J. C. Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1905), 3rd Ed., vol. xvi, art. "Protestantismus," p. 136. It may not be out of place here to quote the words of the late Bishop Stubbs: "I should unhesitatingly reject the theory that regards Protestantism by itself, either at home or abroad, as a religious system devoid of spiritual constructive energy."—Cf. Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. xi, art. "Protestantism," p. 412.

able in the nineteenth century for certain Liberal and theological writers did arrogate to themselves the title of Protestant, but according to Dr. Kattenbusch such is not the case to-day, as it is quite common amongst evangelical circles to call themselves Protestant. A still more serious matter is, that the reader, deriving all his knowledge of German Protestantism from Dr. Pullan, might gain the impression that it had entirely lapsed into Unitarianism. This is very far from being the case. Von Harnack and Troeltsch do not represent the whole of the religious life of present-day Germany. There is the modern positive school as represented by Seeberg, Feine, Barth, Lütgert, not to speak of such veterans as Zahn and Schlatter, who have not only produced large works which are permanent additions to Biblical scholarship and theology, but have appealed to a much wider public in the "Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen," a series of pamphlets or tracts upholding the truth of the Christian Revelation, and proclaiming in unhesitating terms their adherence to the Deity of our Lord, and belief in the general reliability of the New Testament records.

Dr. Pullan will, we hope, forgive our drawing his attention to a book written by R. Seeberg, *Die Kirche Deutschlands in Neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, the Church of Germany in the nineteenth century. In it he will find a description of the work done before the war, both at home and abroad, of a distinctly evangelistic type, and which assumed fairly large dimensions.¹ Not that we ignore the great spiritual loss Lutheranism has sustained by its ready subservience to Prussian militarism and its idolatry of the State. But if Protestant Prussia stands condemned before the world, we do not think that Catholic Bavaria ought to be entirely passed over in silence. But German Lutheranism is only one side

¹ *Die Kirche Deutschlands* is published by A. Deichert of Leipzig (3rd ed., 1910). Dr. Pullan does recognize the existence of a "High Church" movement in Germany; cf. also the article on the present state of religious life in Germany, and its most important tendencies, by Prof. H. Weinel in the January number of this year's *Hibbert Journal*, pp. 277-8. Weinel also says of the Modern Positive School: "This positive tendency still dominates the Churches of the German States except in Thüringen, and perhaps in Baden and Hessen. The most recent events have decidedly increased its power. The more all mediating and subtler tendencies are crushed under the present pressure, and our people are driven apart psychologically into two extremes, the more emphatically do our middle classes turn to Conservatism in religion also, and the mass of Socialists are not to be won as yet for a free idealist Germany" (p. 274). Weinel belongs to the Liberal School of Theology. Troeltsch died last year.

of Protestantism, and we maintain the movement initiated by the Reformation has developed on much stronger and more deeply spiritual lines in Great Britain and America. Furthermore, Dr. Pullan is entirely silent as to the undoubted fact that Roman Catholicism flourishes most in those countries which are least intellectually wide awake, such as Spain, Ireland, South America, and certain parts of Italy. Indeed, Protestantism occupies most of the front-line trenches in the Christian warfare of unbelief. By her very principles she is committed to the hard and exacting task of assimilating the best knowledge of the day, and showing that Christianity is a religion for modern times. It is true that some of the divisions under her command have yielded too much ground, but we should like to ask where would Roman Catholicism be to-day had not Protestantism fought certain battles, the results of which are vital to the cause of Christianity and Religion as a whole? Allowing the truth of much that Dr. Pullan has advanced regarding the undermining of essential Christian truths, his presentation of it is, we fearlessly assert, a one-sided presentation, and the debt to believing Protestant scholarship is immense.

There is another serious omission which we should like to see more carefully considered and rectified by Dr. Pullan. In any attempt to draw comparisons between different forms of Christianity, a thorough examination should be undertaken of the effects which they have had on the life and character of the peoples who acknowledge their sway. Allowance must be made for climate and national temperament, and therefore we admit that it is an exceedingly difficult problem, and will require the most delicate handling and sympathetic treatment, but we cannot but think that, were it to be undertaken, it might profoundly modify some of Dr. Pullan's conclusions. It is a criterion which has the highest authority behind it. "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

Some time ago the late Dr. Sanday quoted the famous Roman Catholic Patrologist, Funk, as follows: "In the countries invaded by it (i.e. the Reformation), the religious life at least pulsates at the present time more vigorously than in the rest. The fact is indisputable, and its explanation lies near at hand. The opposition of the confessions incites to greater care and to stronger

efforts." ¹ Could a more striking testimony to the value of the Reformation be wished for than this?

We would fain linger for some time on the criticisms to which Dr. Pullan subjects Ultramontaniam. The severe animadversions which he passes on some of its forms will, we hope, be taken to heart in those quarters where the strongest possible distaste for everything made in Germany is equalled only by a readiness to receive anything and everything imported from Italy. Dr. Pullan is very outspoken in his denunciation of Probabilism, "the doctrine that a man when in doubt may legitimately follow a course which is probably right even when the stricter course seems to him to be more probable." He states that by canonizing Alphonsus Liguori, the Church of Rome has indirectly sanctioned Probabilism. He quotes from the *Catholic Encyclopædia* in support of his contention,² but even better still would it have served his purpose had he consulted the article on Probabilism in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, written by the Jesuit Father Joyce, who writes: "From the beginning of the nineteenth century, nearly every name of real note may be reckoned among the Probabilists—e.g., Génicot, Ballerini, Lehmkuhl, Ojetti, and Slater."³ Place side by side with this what Dr. Pullan says as to the standard of truth upheld by Liguori, and the extraordinary instance of "Anna" brought forward by the French Jesuit, J. P. Gury,⁴ when such statements are exposed to the light of day they cannot but fail to leave a most painful impression upon those who value truth and honesty beyond all price.

This feeling of distress will not be lessened when the reader once more refreshes (!) his memory with the picturesque account given by Dr. Pullan of the proceedings leading up to the famous Vatican Council of 1870, and the intrigues which attended the promulgation of the dogma of Papal Infallibility.⁵

Although it is a familiar story, we can never quite get over our surprise on learning how the Bishops Strossmayer, Hefele,

¹ Dr. Sanday, *The Conception of Priesthood* (Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1898), p. 102.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 125, 126.

³ Dr. Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. x, art. "Probabilism," p. 350.

⁴ For "Anna," cf. W. Hermann, *Faith and Morals*, E.T. (Williams & Norgate, London, 1904), pp. 137-52, 246 ff.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 243-8.

"Dupanloup, the zealous pastor of souls, and even Archbishop Kenrick, who marshalled the strongest arguments to prove the doctrine to be untenable," gave way and submitted to the decree. Before classing Cardinal Newman entirely with these, it is only fair to his memory to recall the words he wrote to Mrs. Froude in 1871: "As little as possible was passed at the Council—nothing about the Pope which I have not myself always held." ¹

More might be said respecting the evils of Ultramontaniam, but let us hasten on to the conclusion which Dr. Pullan would have us draw from his lectures. Waving to one side the truth or otherwise of his conception of Catholic Christianity, the question arises, keeping strictly to the plane of history, Have the events of the last three or four centuries justified the lecturer's point of view? He bids us "to follow in the steps of Robertson and Lightfoot, of Liddon, and of Sanday also when he was still unconquered by the Germans, and let ourselves be guided by St. Paul to the life of the Risen and Ascended Christ and the life in Christ" ²; of this list we may say that it would have been more complete by the addition of the names of Hort and Westcott, and also that with one exception none of them would have felt at home with Dr. Pullan's presentation of their case! Dr. Pullan would appeal, we gather, to the witness of the Eastern Orthodox Church, to the strain of Gallicanism which acted as the good genius of the French Church from the days of the Counter-Reformation down to beyond the middle of the nineteenth century, as well as to the various movements which have taken place within our own Church. His basis is far too narrow. Our sympathies go out to the Eastern Church in her hour of agony and martyrdom. We are therefore

¹ Cf. *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman*, by Wilfred Ward (Longmans & Co., London, 1912), 2nd Impression, vol. ii, p. 380. The whole letter should be read. Newman continues: "But it was impossible to deny that it was done with an imperiousness and overbearing wilfulness which has been a great scandal—and I cannot think thunder and lightning, a mark of approbation as some persons wish to make out, and the sudden destruction of the Pope's temporal power does not seem a sign of approval either." What Newman felt about the dogma of Papal Infallibility is also stated in a letter written to Mr. O'Neill Daunt on August 7, 1870. "It expresses what, as an opinion, I have ever held myself with a host of other Catholics. But that does not reconcile me to imposing it upon others, and I do not see why a man who denied it might not be as good a Catholic as the man who held it. And it is a new and most serious precedent in the Church that a dogma *de fide* should be passed *without definite and urgent cause*" (p. 310).

² *Op. cit.*, p. 243.

most grateful to Dr. Pullan that he should have devoted one of his lectures to a survey of the religion and history of the Holy Orthodox Church. But the very warning which he gives us Englishmen against the sin of boasting—"self-examination is better than self-congratulation,"¹—reminds us that the standard of right and wrong which we should apply to the Eastern nations of Europe must be of a lower kind than that adopted in the case of the more progressive nations of the West. If this is once conceded, then we must adopt an attitude of considerable reserve towards the testimony of the Eastern Church. Anyhow, before her witness can be entirely accepted, it will have to undergo a much more searching and critical examination than has hitherto been the case.

Gallicanism has produced a fine rôle of saintly men and women, but Dr. Pullan leaves us rather in the dark as to its general effect on the religious life of the French nation, beyond that in one place he mentions that "gradually Gallican priests began to reduce the speed at which Mass was read. Invocations of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints became more strictly requests for their prayers and not for such help as is given by God. Diocesan service books were revised, and in the revised versions there was more of the Bible and less of the legend."² For these and for all other mercies we are devoutly thankful, but on Dr. Pullan's own showing Gallicanism was worsted by Ultramontanism, and though he does not assert this, it would appear that it was powerless to prevent the decadence into which religion as a whole fell during the greater part of the eighteenth century.

As for our own Church, even if it is granted that the Anglo-Catholic party has always numbered some adherents amongst the sons and daughters of the Anglican Communion since the days of Queen Elizabeth, they form a somewhat pathetic streamlet until they empty themselves into the broader river of the Oxford movement. And to-day, whilst we do not deny the devotion and activity of the Anglo-Catholic party, yet their members must allow that by far the larger portion of British Christianity lies outside their fold.

We submit therefore that history does not in the least compel us to accept the view that a modified form of Gallicanism would gather round it all the best elements of Christianity. Perhaps

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 224.

² *Ibid.*, p. 103.

stronger words might be used, but we prefer to leave the matter thus.

Dr. Pullan is at his best in his delineation of character. We should like to single out as special instances his sympathetic sketches of such men as St. Philip Neri, St. Francis de Sales, Calvin, and Bishop Andrewes. His treatment, however, of Goethe deserves a passing reference. We are given one quotation on the Sacraments from Goethe, who with Homer, Dante and Shakespeare may be reckoned as one of the great poets of mankind. The lecturer missed a grand opportunity of reminding his hearers of those great sayings of Goethe about the creative value of faith and the truth of the Gospel. The poet's views about religion varied from time to time, but within eleven days of his death Eckermann quotes him as saying: "Nevertheless, although they are founded on oral tradition, I hold all the four Gospels to be thoroughly genuine, for in them is operative the reflected splendour that proceeded from the Person of Christ, and is as Divine in its nature as aught of Divine ever manifested on earth." ¹

But we are most concerned with Dr. Pullan's judgment on Luther. He never discusses the question as to whether the Reformation could have taken place at all without a serious breach with the great Mediæval Church of the West, or that of the Roman Curia's treatment of the Wittenberg Friar having made it impossible or otherwise for him to remain within the Church of his fathers. Space prevents any lengthy treatment of the subject, but let Canon Ottley, a former Principal of the Pusay House, be our spokesman. "He recalled men's minds from a false to a true conception of faith; from blind and mechanical reliance on a complex system to simple trust in a living person, the Divine Christ. . . . He revived in men's hearts the consciousness of their personal relation to Christ, not only as Judge, but as Saviour," ² and yet Dr. Pullan can ascribe to Luther's influence little else but evil!

We have criticized these Bampton Lectures at some length, but should not like it to be thought that we are blind to their

¹ *Gespräche mit Goethe*, 3. Band. 1822-32 (Philipp Reclam, junr., Leipzig), p. 263.

² *The Doctrine of the Incarnation*, vol. ii (Methuen & Co., London, 1896), pp. 218-19.

merits. From beginning to end, there is not a dull page in the book, and the style in which it is written must please the most fastidious taste.¹ Would that more works of theology could be written in the same way! but more important than excellency of diction is the moral earnestness of the lecturer, and above all his devotion to our Lord Jesus Christ. The problem which concerns him concerns us. What think ye of Christ? The answer he gives is ours as well. In proportion as the sheep learn to keep their eyes more and more fixed upon the Shepherd, will He draw them closer together, not of necessity into one fold, but into one flock. We conclude with the words of an ancient prayer: "We give Thee thanks, O Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou didst make known unto us through Thy Son Jesus: Thine is the glory for ever and ever. As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains, and being gathered together became one, so may Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom; For Thine is the glory and the power, through Jesus Christ for ever and ever."²

¹ When Dr. Pullan is bringing out a second edition of his lectures, we would suggest to him that the long German quotation which he gives from Jülicher on pp. 282, 283, should be given in English. He will find it given in *An Introduction to the New Testament*, by A. Jülicher, E.T. (Smith, Elder & Co., London, 1904), pp. 19-21.

² *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, Chap. IX.

From the S.P.C.K. we have received an important pamphlet, *Reunion: The Lambeth Conference Report and the Free Churches* (4d. net). Its importance consists in this, that it gives within one cover the "Report of the Joint Conference at Lambeth Palace" (with preliminary statement), the "Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry," and the Resolution on the Report passed by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England. For purposes of reference this little pamphlet is indispensable. At the close of the Explanatory Note (signed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and Dr. Scott Lidgett) it is stated: "We submit the document as a whole for the consideration of Christian people in the belief that we are being guided step by step on the pathway of peace. The power of effective action must depend on the sympathy, the co-operation, and the prayers of those to whom is given the trust of membership in the Church of God."

ALL OR NONE ?

BY THE REV. HAROLD SMITH, D.D. (London College of Divinity, St. John's Hall, Highbury, N.)

THERE is a story told of Dr. Whewell, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. When some function was being held at the Lodge, an undergraduate came along with a pipe in his mouth, thus breaking the rule by which smoking was forbidden in the College courts. Whewell pounced upon him, asking, "Do you deliberately intend to insult me, sir, or are you lost to all sense of decency?" The poor man, eager to disown any deliberate intention of insulting the Master, impaled himself on the other horn of the dilemma: "Please, Master, I'm lost to all sense of decency!"

This is simply a somewhat crude case of what often happens. People frightened of one horn of a dilemma impale themselves on the other, forgetting that this other is usually not really the only alternative. It is, in fact, not uncommon for advocates of some particular view to attempt to compel assent to it by setting it forth as the only alternative to some extravagant position which few can admit. Some German theologians are fond of this, but it is not confined to them. It is a good working rule to suspect argumentative dilemmas, and not to choose either side till we are quite clear that there is really no other alternative.

One common form of this dilemma is "All or None?" This is specially common in theological controversy. Either you accept some particular theory of the Sacraments, or you don't believe in the Sacraments. Either Verbal Inspiration in some form (at least complete literal accuracy throughout); or absolute uncertainty and unreliability of everything. But this is treating the Bible in a way one would not treat even a newspaper. No educated man holds that everything he reads in the paper is necessarily true; yet the fact of his reading the paper at all implies that he regards, provisionally at least, the bulk of its statements as substantially true. Those who take the above line as regards the Bible usually hope to force people to accept the first alternative from repulsion from the second; but there is appreciable risk of people accepting the second, if they recognize great difficulties

in the way of the first, and are led to believe there is no other alternative. The dilemma "All or None?"—either *complete* literal and historical accuracy, or else all is unreliable and uncertain—is a dangerous one.

And it is not supported by historical criticism in other departments. Between absolutely accurate history and absolute fiction there are many grades. A story is not proved to be absolutely historical in all details because some historical personages are mentioned in it; nor proved to be sheer fiction just because of some minor mistakes. A narrative with some admitted errors may yet be a valuable historical source, provided the errors are not too many or too bad. But in Biblical criticism this is too often overlooked on both sides. To take illustrations from the Book of Daniel: the perfect historicity of the account of Belshazzar's Feast was not proved by Belshazzar being discovered to be a historical person; nor is the substantial truth of Chapter III disproved if some of the musical instruments there mentioned bear names which they can hardly have had in Nebuchadnezzar's time.

An objectionable line of argument is to magnify the differences between two accounts, giving the name of "discrepancy" to any fact recorded by one writer and not by another, however well it may fit in; and then to regard the fact that the accounts do not precisely agree as casting doubt not only upon the disputed point, but on the whole narrative. If the two accounts agreed precisely they would almost certainly not be independent; we should really have only one source, not two. Their variety shows their independence, unless we can show that the differences of the later one have arisen from sheer misunderstanding of the earlier, in which case it drops out altogether. The main points in which two independent narratives agree are not shaken by difference in minor points; on the contrary they are supported by double the amount of evidence. The details in which the two authorities differ are, however, less supported; we may find it hard to say which of the two is to be followed, and whichever we follow may not in this detail inspire the same confidence as if it had stood alone.

There is a good note on this subject, with special reference to discrepancy in the Gospels, in Fisher, *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief* (Note 20, p. 413). He gives several examples of

variations in detail not affecting the substance of the narrative ; e.g., the different accounts of the death of Cicero. I give a few from English Church History.

(1) Who read the Declaration of Indulgence in Westminster Abbey in 1688 ? The usual view, presented e.g. by Macaulay, is that the Dean, Bishop Spratt, read it himself. This is based on several good authorities, including the second Lord Dartmouth, who was himself present at the service as a Westminster scholar. But Bishop Patrick, then Canon of Westminster, who ought to have known the facts, says that the Dean sent it to one of the Minor Canons to read. Whatever we follow, or however we may try to reconcile, the fact remains that the Declaration was read there ; this is not affected by the doubt who the actual reader was.

(2) The Church of South Ockendon, near Upminster, in Essex, is an interesting one with a round tower and a fine Norman doorway. There is among the State Papers of 1657-8 a petition from the parishioners asking for a Brief to authorize collections to aid them to rebuild their church. This states that on June 21, 1652, the steeple was fired by lightning, the bells and leads totally melted, and the church consumed to ashes, except the chancel which is much defaced. The estimated cost of repairs is £2,200, as appears from a certificate of Quarter Sessions, January 10, 1653. Along with the petition is a certificate from the Quarter Sessions, not of the above date but of July 14, 1657 ; it however dates the fire July, 1653. It is also clear from an inspection of the church that little damage can have been done to the walls, though the roof and interior was destroyed. If we had this discrepancy of date in a Biblical question, we might find extreme Liberals denying that the church was ever fired at all, and supporting the position by archæological evidence ; while some Conservatives would hold it was burnt down twice, in successive years ! Whichever date we accept, one of the two accounts must be inaccurate here ; but this does nothing to discredit the main fact.

(3) An interesting story of an interview between Archbishop Bancroft and Chaderton, the Cambridge Puritan, has reached us by two lines of transmission. It will be remembered that Bancroft did his best to suppress Puritanism, and in his speeches against the Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference went further than even James I approved. On the other hand Chader-

ton, Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, was one of the Puritan representatives at that Conference, though he did not take a prominent part. In fact the Puritans complained at the time that Rainolds was insufficiently supported by his colleagues ; one of them was " as mute as a fish," and others not much better. But this ecclesiastical quarrel did not stand in the way of personal friendship.

One version of the story comes from Thomas Woodcock, ejected in 1662 from St. Andrew Undershaft, London. He had been Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, and Proctor. His stories, though of various types, help to show that the common idea that all Puritans were gloomy is a very partial one. Calamy repeatedly speaks of this or that Nonconformist of 1662 as " facetious," even when, as Dr. Stoughton says, their portraits show them as solemn as the grave. It seems then to have been the fashion for divines to look as solemn as they could when sitting for their portrait ; now, the proper thing is to put on a smile. Woodcock's account¹ is as follows :—

" Chaderton having business with him (Bancroft) when he was at Lambeth, sent in his name. The Bishop dismissed all the company with him, sends for him in, asks him his name, if it was Chaderton. He replied, ' Yes.' ' I shall know that presently,' says he ; shuts the doors, pulls off his gown ; ' if you be Chaderton, then you can wrestle ; and I will try one fall,' (as they had often done at the University). The Doctor flung the Archbishop. ' Now,' said he, ' I know thou art Chaderton,' dismisses him with handsome kindness. It was somewhat ominous that the Puritan should fling the Archbishop. This both Dr. Tuckney and Dr. Horton told Mr. W., and said they had it from Dr. Chaderton's own mouth."

The other version of the story comes from a collection of anecdotes made by Dr. Plume, Archdeacon of Rochester, and preserved in his Library at Maldon.²

Dr. Chaderton was persuaded to come up one time to London to visit Archbishop Bancroft, who had suffered him to enjoy his Lecture all his time at Trinity Church in Cambridge. Chaderton was loth to go, for fear Bancroft would not look upon him. He went, however, to the Archbishop's Hall at Lambeth, and waited till he came home from Whitehall. The Archbishop passed by and saw him there among many others, but said nothing to him.

¹ *Camden Miscellany*, XI.

² *Essex Review*, XV, 22.

“Look you there,” says Chaderton, “I told you how he would serve me,” and so was going away to Lambeth stairs to take water. A gentleman came and called him, and brought him up to the gallery where Bancroft was walking. “Lawrence,” says the Archbishop, “I am as glad to meet you here as ever I was upon Jesus Green or Christ’s in my life”—they had been the two cocks of game. “Come,” he went on, “we must have a fall the first thing we do ; pull off your cloak,” and he threw off his own gown. “Now do your best.” Mr. Chaderton, after a little excusing it, fetched up his heels for him. “Well, Lawrence,” says the Archbishop, “I see the cares of the Council Table are greater than the lectures of the Round Church or Trinity Church in Cambridge. If one should report it as an omen, I see Bishops may fall and Puritans rise.”

Notice the many discrepancies, real or apparent, between the two accounts of this interview. (“P.” = Plume ; “W.” = Woodcock.) (1) W. says nothing about Bancroft appearing at first to ignore Chaderton, who starts to go away. (2) P. makes Bancroft welcome Chaderton before suggesting the wrestle ; W. makes Bancroft propose it as if not sure it was really Chaderton. (3) Bancroft’s final words are in P. only. (4) The “Omen” is in P. suggested by Bancroft, in W. it is a comment by Chaderton, or Woodcock, or his informant. Yet it is clear that all the main features of the story—that Chaderton visited Bancroft at Lambeth, that Bancroft welcomed his old Cambridge friend and challenged him to a friendly wrestle in memory of old times, in which Chaderton had the best of it, are much more fully attested by the existence of the second version of the story than if the first had stood alone. The Plume version, as well as the Woodcock one, must go ultimately back to Chaderton, but must have branched off pretty high up. Chaderton died at a great age in 1640.

(4) Yet another example may be given—the prayer of Thomas Goodwin after Cromwell’s death. Here, however, it seems on the whole more probable that we actually have reports of two different but parallel prayers, rather than two accounts of the same, one of them wrong in the date. There was a widespread feeling among some of the Puritans—the Independents and Sectaries, rather than the Presbyterians—that a thought or plan strongly suggested to the mind in or after prayer, came necessarily from God, and was certainly true or right. This view was shared by Cromwell. John Howe, who saw the danger of it, risked Cromwell’s favour by

preaching before him a sermon against this idea. (It seems reviving now, as regards the convictions of Congresses and Conferences.) That Dr. Thomas Goodwin, President of Magdalen College, Oxford, fully shared this is shown by what he said, according to Woodcock, at Cromwell's death-bed ; according to Burnet, a week later.

Woodcock says : " In Oliver Cromwell's last sickness Goodwin prayed for his success and a great effusion of the Spirit upon him, saying, ' We do not beg his life, thou hast assured us of that already.' But when he died, the Doctor at prayer used these words, ' Lord, why didst Thou lie to us yesterday ? ' Mr. Howe, who heard it, told Mr. W."

The other story or version is recorded by Burnet on the authority of Tillotson (afterwards Archbishop), who had married Cromwell's niece, Elizabeth French.¹

" A week after Cromwell's death he (Tillotson) being by accident at Whitehall, and hearing that there was to be a fast that day in the household, he, out of curiosity, went into the presence chamber where it was held. On one side of a table Richard with the rest of Cromwell's family were placed, and six of the preachers were on the other side. Thomas Goodwin, Owen, Carrill and Sterry, were of the number. There he heard a great deal of strange stuff, enough to disgust a man for ever of that enthusiastic boldness. God was, as it were, reproached with Cromwell's services, and challenged for taking him away so soon. Goodwin who had pretended to assure them in prayer that he was not to die, which was but a very few minutes before he expired, had now the impudence to say to God, ' Thou hast deceived us and we were deceived.' "

It is in this case quite possible that Tillotson and Howe refer to different occasions. But even so there is strong corroboration of the fact that Goodwin had in prayer declared that God had assured him of Cromwell's life, and that he subsequently declared that God had deceived him. It is clear that the Nonconformists, Howe and Woodcock, liked this hardly more than the Conformists, Tillotson and Burnet. The extravagances of the extreme Puritans led straight to the Low Church reaction.

From these and many other examples we learn (1) not to expect perfect agreement in two or more accounts of the same event.

¹ *Own Times*, 82.

The real disagreement may be very little ; but at least it is clear that one or other of the writers has not been very exact. (2) Yet at the same time very commonly the discrepancies do not affect the main points, which are the more firmly established by two accounts differing somewhat than if we had only one account, or if the second appeared simply dependent on the first. This applies to Biblical criticism. We are justified in assuming as few discrepancies as possible between different accounts, and may feel that these would be much lessened if we knew all the facts. But we must not force the accounts into agreement by arbitrary assumptions, or maintain without good cause that they do not refer to the same event. Yet difference in minor detail does not unsettle the main points ; it helps to establish them.

PAMPHLETS ON PROPHECY.

The Rev. E. P. Cachemaille is well known as a diligent and trusted student of Prophecy, and his writings are always instructive and helpful. From Messrs. C. J. Thynne & Jarvis we have received several of his publications and, whatever view may be taken of his conclusions, no one will question the force and ability with which he presents his case. In *Palestine and the Warfare of the End* (4d.) he throws considerable light upon the interpretation of Daniel xi. 40-xii. 1, and Revelation xix. 3, 19, 20. The picture he presents " is woefully different from the present popular outlook and expectation ; and from an era of universal peace and brotherhood of nations and of reunion of Christendom, topics so prominent in public utterances and even in prayers put forth for public or private use." And then he adds a note which all will be glad to read : " It is amazing how in all this expectation, and with an end to its fulfilment, one rarely hears any reference whatever to the Personal Second Coming of our Lord, by which alone can these expectations be realized." The Personal Return of our Lord is, we fear, too little referred to in the pulpits of to-day. Another of Mr. Cachemaille's pamphlets, *The Three Angels and Their Parallels* (4d.), deals with Revelation xiv. 6-11 ; and some of his smaller pamphlets may be mentioned, such as *From Daniel to Revelation* (3d.), in which, in passing from the Visions of Daniel to those of the Revelation, he discusses principles of interpretation and historical and prophetic facts and foreshowings ; *Where is England in the Prophetic Visions ?* (3d.) ; and *Identification of the Antichrist* (3d.).

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

WHATEVER disappointment we may feel at the apparently slow progress towards the realization of the unity of the Churches, we can all be glad of the opportunity afforded by the discussion of the subject for the production of books by representatives of the different sections of Christianity giving valuable information as to their teaching and outlook. There is already an extensive literature in existence dealing directly or indirectly with various phases of the subject. Two recent additions to the number deserve special attention. Dr. Carnegie Simpson, Professor of Church History in Westminster College, Cambridge, is already well known as the author of two books which have had a wide influence throughout the Christian world, *The Fact of Christ* and *The Facts of Life*. He is a clear thinker, with an unusual gift of forceful expression, and he has taken part as a representative of the Presbyterians in the Conferences on Reunion. As an outcome of his work on the "Committee of Six Anglicans and Six Free Churchmen who have met regularly at Lambeth Palace to explore fundamental questions relating to reunion," he has recently made an important contribution to the discussion in a book called *Church Principles*.

All discussion on the fundamental questions relating to reunion must begin with the New Testament. Dr. Carnegie Simpson gives the impression that he is endeavouring to examine the New Testament evidence frankly and freely, and as far as possible without pre-conceptions. In an opening chapter of attractive persuasiveness he gets to the root idea of the Church. "The Creative Fact" is Christ and "Where Jesus Christ is there is the Catholic Church." Church Principle, he reminds us, must not be confused with Legal rule. This places many ecclesiastical regulations in their proper category. When such an expression as "uncovenanted mercies" is used, he makes it clear that it would never occur to any one except under the stress of preconceived ecclesiastical theory that does not fit the facts. "The whole idea has no basis in the New Testament." Similarly he gets to the fundamental ideas in regard to the Ministry. It may give a new view point to some, and enable them to think out the true character of the ministerial commission,

to realize that "It is not ordination that makes the priest; it is redemption" and "What the Church does in Ordination is to recognize a ministry of Christ already in being." Again it is well to be reminded that "Grace is not some metaphysical or semi-physical influence or essence. It is personal." The neglect of this truth brings its own nemesis in some of the errors in Sacramental teaching from which the "Catholic" section of the Church suffers. He criticizes justly the use of the term "Sacramental Principle" as it is found in the writings of Dr. Gore and other of the same school. In regard to the Real Presence, he holds "the larger and worthier conception" that Christ is not the offered oblation but the Celebrant. "This is the greater doctrine of the Real Presence." He finds the basis of authority to be threefold—the evidence of history, the testimony of the Church, i.e. of Christian people, age after age, and experience.

There is a caustic side of Dr. Carnegie Simpson which we cannot resist illustrating, though it tells against ourselves. It may be that we can learn something from his stinging criticism. He says, "The English Churchman does not very much like principles, perhaps hardly knows one when he sees it; and he certainly has no intention of being a martyr prematurely or of dying when he can usefully live. What he wants is a working arrangement. And the average Anglican believes he has this in the English Establishment." We may forgive the partial truth in this statement out of gratitude for the high ideals that he sets before us in this work. When he strikes the deepest note we feel the inspiration of fundamental truth. The Living Church is to present Christ and His view of human life. Of this there are two main aspects, "an unworldly assessment of life's values" and "a really human sympathy." These lead on to the Christianization of human life. Many of our readers will, we are sure, desire to make a closer acquaintance with a book of exceptional interest.

The other book bearing upon the subject of reunion is Bishop Gore's recently issued *The Holy Spirit and the Church*. This is the third volume in his series on "The Reconstruction of Belief," and supplements his *Belief in God* and *Belief in Christ*. It is a further statement of his well-known views with which our readers are probably already familiar from such works as *The Body of Christ* and

Orders and Unity. He also sets out to examine the New Testament evidence, but the impression he leaves here as in his earlier works is that he comes to it with his mind filled with pre-conceived ideas of the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments. And although he describes the volume as "a challenge to think freely" we cannot free our minds of the impression that he is determined to find in the Gospels and Epistles the assumptions upon which his theories are based. We agree with him that in the region of current ecclesiastical controversies "the fetters are likely to be those of the spirit of party, which is apt to be singularly enslaving"; but when we endeavour to obey his request to lay aside "traditional assumptions as far as possible in order to ask again the question—What is the mind of Christ concerning the propagation of His religion? Does it not after all appear to be in a high degree probable that the New Testament documents interpret it aright, and that we cannot get behind them or away from them?" we are convinced that his interpretation is not the one that carries conviction. As there will be a fuller examination of the volume in this number of *THE CHURCHMAN* it is not necessary here to go into the questions raised. We hope our readers will study Dr. Gore's contribution to the subject. It contains much that is valuable, beside the matter that may be described as more immediately controversial. It is the statement of the "Catholic" position by one of its ablest exponents, and consequently contains the strongest evidence that can be brought forward in support of its claims.

There is something peculiarly attractive about the personality of Dr. Albert Schweitzer. In spite of the eschatological views put forward in his *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* his writings compel the attention of a wide circle of readers. This is no doubt due to the interest in the career of a theologian and University Professor, an accomplished musician—the greatest living exponent of Bach, who betook himself to the study of medicine in order that he might go out to Africa as a missionary. Those who have not read his account of his work at Lambarene on the Ogowe should at once obtain his *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest*. It is a fascinating record of a medical missionary's experiences, together with wise reflections on many subjects arising out of the contact of white men with the coloured races. In one chapter he gives a hint of

the studies that occupy his scanty leisure. "If the day has not been too exhausting I can give a couple of hours after supper to my studies in ethics and civilization as part of the history of human thought, any books I need for it and have not with me being sent me by Professor Stroh, of Zürich University. Strange, indeed, are the surroundings amid which I study; my table stands inside the lattice-door which leads on to the verandah, so that I may snatch as much as possible of the light evening breeze. The palms rustle an *obligato* to the loud music of the crickets and the toads, and from the forest come harsh and terrifying cries of all sorts. Caramba, my faithful dog, growls gently on the verandah, to let me know that he is there, and at my feet, under the table, lies a small dwarf antelope. In this solitude I try to set in order thoughts which have been stirring in me since 1900, in the hope of giving some help to the restoration of civilization. Solitude of the primeval forest, how can I ever thank you enough for what you have been to me? . . ."

It is from the surroundings thus graphically described that the first two parts of his "The Philosophy of Civilization" have come. They are the "Dale Memorial Lectures" for 1922, and are entitled, *The Decay and Restoration of Civilization* and *Civilization and Ethics*. There is also a smaller work, *Christianity and the Religions of the World*, being a course of lectures delivered at the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, in February 1922. In these lectures he answers the question whether Christianity is the deepest expression of the religious mind. He contrasts the characteristic fundamental ideas of Christianity with those of the Graeco-Oriental religions of earlier days and with Brahmanism, Buddhism and Hinduism of to-day, and after a searching criticism of their various elements he shows the spiritual and ethical superiority of Christianity. The lectures were given to those who were preparing for missionary work, and his final appeal to them is that "if only our lives, in genuine nonconformity to the world, reveal something of what it means to be apprehended by the living, ethical God, then something of the truth of Jesus goes out from us." To students of Comparative Religion these lectures will be of special interest.

Two additional volumes in the Modern Churchman's Library will appeal to some of our readers. Mr. R. D. Richardson in *The*

Causes of the Present Conflict of Ideals in the Church of England gives an interesting historical survey of the course of theological thought, tracing back the three historic parties in the Church of England to their philosophical sources, and their interpretation of Christian origins. He gives an account of religious thought in the eighteenth century and the formative forces of the nineteenth, till he comes to its distinctive features. Here he offers a presentation of the positions of the Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics which would probably be challenged by representatives of both parties, and he proceeds to estimate the forces at work in the formation of the future. While disagreeing with some of the statements of fact and many of the conclusions of the writer, we can recommend all who desire to know the true attitude of liberal Churchmen to read this presentation of their case.

Canon Glazebrook, in *The Apocalypse of St. John*, has set out the main results of Archdeacon Charles' Commentary. His conclusions have not commended themselves to all our most competent biblical students. We must wait for further discussion before their value is fully estimated. Those who desire to make acquaintance with them will find them adequately presented by Canon Glazebrook in this small volume.

Dr. H. R. Mackintosh, Professor of Theology, New College, Edinburgh, has brought together a number of his contributions to various magazines under the title *Some Aspects of Christian Belief*. The quality of Dr. Mackintosh's work is well known. Whatever aspect of theological thought he treats, he brings new light to bear upon it, and we all owe him a debt for his illuminating and stimulating contributions to our study. The present essays are of the same character. They bring the reader into contact with current thought upon questions of permanent interest. They cover a wide range both of theology and philosophy, and will help "busy readers anxious to keep in touch with lines of thought somewhat away from their dominant interests." It is only possible to indicate some of the subjects with which he deals. The opening essay is on History and the Gospel. The Conception of a Finite God, and The Vicarious Penitence of Christ are two subjects of special current interest. Jesus Christ and Prayer treats of the problem of prayer in our Lord's Life. The later essays are mainly philosophical, dealing

with Ritschlianism, the Psychology of Religion, the Subliminal Consciousness in Theology, Bergson and Christian thought, and Christianity and Absolute Idealism. To those interested in the philosophical aspects of theology these essays will provide an introduction to the latest thought.

A correspondent suggests that we should recommend some short books of a lighter character to beguile an hour not given to more serious study, and yet not altogether unprofitable for a preacher's purposes. Melrose's Pocket Series has a number of delightful little studies of life that just meet the need. They are from America and have a quaint touch reminiscent of the Scotch style. Among the most interesting of them are David Grayson's *Adventures in Contentment*, *The Friendly Road* (New Adventures in Contentment). The titles of these almost indicate their character. His *Hempfield* is a charming little story. Somewhat similar in character is Mary E. Waller's *The Woodcarver of 'Lympus*. It would be interesting to us to know our readers' opinions of this type of American book.

G. F. I.

A special interest attaches to *The Story of Wadhurst* (Tunbridge Wells: Courier Co., Ltd., 4s. net) by reason of the fact that it is closely associated with the memory of the late Dean Wace. Wadhurst was his old home; he always felt drawn to it; and he contributed to this little volume an "In Memoriam" notice of the men of Wadhurst who fell in the Great War. It is an impressive tribute, such as he alone could write, and, dated December 17, 1923, it is believed to be the last paper he signed for publication. The volume is the joint work of Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids (*née* Foley), D.Litt., M.A., whose lecture of thirty years ago forms the basis of the story, and Mr. Alfred A. Wace, I.C.S. (retired), who has edited the notes on which the lecture was founded, amplified them, and brought the story up to date. And a most interesting story it is, appealing alike to the historian, the antiquarian, the economist and the general reader. The history of Wadhurst Church is exceptionally well told. The list of Vicars goes back to 1313. We are told, also, much that is useful to know about old houses and farms, the industries of the place, its agricultural history, and so on. A sheaf of gleanings and reminiscences, and a glowing account of the devoted part taken by the men of Wadhurst in the Great War, give just that living touch to the story which makes it of present-day value and interest. The Roll of Service is a very long one and does infinite credit to this charming Sussex town.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

BISHOP GORE'S NEW BOOK.

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE CHURCH. By Charles Gore, D.D.
Formerly Bishop of Oxford. London: *John Murray*. 7s. 6d.
net.

With this volume Dr. Gore finishes his self-imposed task of laying afresh the foundations for "The Reconstruction of Belief." He has had in view the collapse of the old religious traditions in all classes, the widespread alienation through the intellectual and social movements of the last two generations, and the unrest and unsettlement among the younger thinkers of both sexes. In his previous volumes, *Belief in God* and *Belief in Christ*, he has examined the historical evidence in a critical spirit, and believes the result to be the substantiation of the traditional faith of Christendom. He goes on in this final contribution to the subject to consider some of the implications to be drawn from his previous conclusions. Among the points laid down are these. The gift of the Holy Spirit is restricted to the Church. His answer to the question, "Did Jesus Christ found the Church?" is, that it was already in existence, but Christ refounded it and re-equipped it with officers and institutions. He does not accept the theory of the influence of the Mystery Religions on its teaching. It traces its origin to Hebrew sources, although Hellenic influences aided its growth. The work of the Holy Spirit in the Church is seen in the three bonds of its unity—Baptism, the laying on of hands and the Eucharist. Authority is examined in the light of the Roman theory with its novel interpretation of tradition, and the various views of development associated with it. The Authority of Scripture is limited by the true use of tradition. The question, "What is of Faith?" should be answered by a minimum rather than a maximum requirement. The closing chapters deal with the Test of Rational Coherence and Present-Day Application.

It will be seen from this brief indication of some of the subjects considered that it is not easy to summarize Dr. Gore's method of treatment. He does not hesitate to deal with any phase of current thought that bears upon his theme, and criticizes the statements of present-day writers from whom he differs. Yet in the end he leads his readers through processes of thought that offer a vigorous criticism of the attitude of the Roman Church on the one hand, and of the tendencies of rationalizing Modernism on the other, while at the same time setting out his own view of what the Anglican position ought to be. It is not necessary to say that there is much in the volume for which we are grateful, and much that is valuable to all students of theological thought. We appreciate more especially his treatment of the claims made for the Mystery Religions,

his acute examination of the teaching regarding Purgatory, and the theories of Development that have been advanced by Romanist writers.

At the same time we must frankly say that we do not consider that he has succeeded in his main purpose of giving such an account of the Christian religion as will render it acceptable to the great mass of the younger generation disturbed and distracted by the many problems of science and history. In this volume Dr. Gore seems to display a tone of dogmatic assertion that will repel younger readers to whom such expressions as "There is no room to doubt" and "Nothing seems to me more certain" are only provocative. This is aggravated by his complaint that others do not avoid the mistake of reading back into the past later developments, while to our view he seems to display something of the same want of Historic sense that he finds lacking in them. In this work, as in many of his others, he seems to us to make assumptions based upon reading his own preconceptions into the documents that he is examining, and his tendency to brush aside evidence that is inconvenient to his argument by a declaration of its irrelevance. One of the most striking examples of this in the present instance is his treatment of the passages in St. John xx. 21-3, and St. Luke xxiv. 33, in order to prove his view of the Apostolate. He says, "'the disciples' *appears* to mean the twelve" and "the nature of the commission strongly *suggests* administrative officers." "Apparently there were others present (Luke xxiv. 33), but the special apostolic commission *may very well* have been given in the presence of others." Dr. Hort seems to him to underrate the evidence that the Apostles were understood from the beginning to be the divinely appointed rulers of the Church, but as the meaning of this expression is the very point in question, it seems merely petulance to add, "I think the free and easy manner in which it is commonly taken for granted that the commission was given to the Church as a whole augurs a considerable amount of wilfulness of mind." This is only one of many instances to which we should like, if space permitted, to refer. His whole treatment of the ministry leaves us unconvinced. We cannot accept his interpretation of the evidence given. But the least satisfactory part of his argument is in regard to the Sacramentalism of St. Paul. We are all prepared to acknowledge the place of Baptism and the Lord's Supper in St. Paul's writings, but we cannot accept the interpretation that Dr. Gore would place upon St. Paul when he speaks of "the doctrine of Sacramental Catholicism, which is now commonly acknowledged as the teaching of St. Paul." He assumes throughout that his view of St. Paul is not open to question. St. Paul "shows himself a genuine sacramentalist." "It does not seem to me open to question that St. Paul takes it for granted that there was a real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements blessed in the eucharist." He takes exaggerated care to warn us that "It is a poor plea that St. Paul does not say much about Sacraments," and to point out "the insecurity of the argument from silence," though he is not always

consistent in regard to this himself. His aim in these references to St. Paul is, he tells us, "to make it plain that the sacramental principle was acknowledged in the Church from the beginning, and to indicate the solemn rites in which the principle was recognized." The vagueness of the expression "Sacramental principle" has been frequently pointed out. In this volume Dr. Gore again uses his old illustrations, "the lover's kiss, the friend's handshake and the soldier's flag." In this sense any symbol may be spoken of as Sacramental, and as a recent writer has pointed out, "to classify the naturally symbolical with the evangelically sacramental is to empty the latter religiously and is not to enrich the former philosophically." Even if we were to admit the "Sacramental principle" in this sense in St. Paul it would not help Dr. Gore's contention. What we require is proof that St. Paul's writings give evidence of the Anglo-Catholic's modern interpretation of the Sacraments, that for example not only is there a presence in the elements, but that the presence is the means by which a sacrifice is offered to God, and that the Priest is joining in the act of Presentation which Christ is making in heaven. There is no Sacramental teaching of this kind in St. Paul and the argument from silence does not help those who assume it to be there. There are passages in St. Paul, as, for instance, his great prayer in Ephesians iii. where, if his views of the Lord's Supper were similar to those of the "Catholics" of to-day, he would not, as they would not, have omitted a reference to the Sacrament. To pray "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith" and omit such a reference is incredible on the Anglo-Catholic hypothesis of St. Paul's Sacramental teaching.

Dr. Gore makes it quite clear that religions differ according to their root conception of God, and we fear that Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics differ thus fundamentally. In his closing chapters he gives reason for his belief that reunion is yet far off. If so, it is due in large measure to such views of the Church as are put forward in this volume, at least as far as the non-Episcopal Churches are concerned. He accuses Rome of being a one-sided development of Christianity. To us Dr. Gore's position appears in the same light. There is one human touch in the book that brings us nearer to the writer than all the arguments so carefully brought forward. It makes us feel akin to him to read, "And I write with feeling, because all my life has been a struggle to believe that God—the only God—is love. That is to me as to many other men, not only the governing dogma of the Christian religion, but the only really difficult dogma." If Dr. Gore had treated the Christian religion more from the point of view indicated in this difficulty he would have won the sympathy and the gratitude of the younger generation who are seeking such a conception of God and of His dealings with mankind.

AN ANGLO-CATHOLIC VIEW OF AUTHORITY.

AUTHORITY AND FREEDOM. By A. E. J. Rawlinson, B.D. London : Longmans, Green & Co. 7s. 6d.

In his recently published autobiography one of the greatest of living inventors says, "Faith without Conviction can do nothing." This is equally true in religion, and as long as men have made habitual the attitude "I believe help Thou mine unbelief" as distinct from "I know Him in whom I have believed" real progress will not be made. If this be true of the members of the Church, it must be doubly so of the teachers. Agnosticism on their part—the sounding of an uncertain trumpet—will lead to confusion and defeat. The Church of Christ demands men whose faith is a certainty—not men who believe to-day with the *arrière pensée* that they will believe something different to-morrow. But there is no ground for saying that this certitude must prevail on every speculative doctrine and every form of teaching. Faith in the Incarnation and the Atonement are essential and this Faith must be a certainty that the "Word became flesh and tabernacled among us," and that God was in Christ reconciling sinners to Himself. Without certainty in the Cradle of Bethlehem and in the Cross of Calvary, preachers and ministers cannot win men to Christ.

The questions, "What is Christianity?" and "What is Christian Authority?" cannot be separated. We must know what we believe and the grounds on which we believe. Mr. Rawlinson also sees that it is essential for the Christian to preserve intellectual freedom and to be able to accept Truth wherever it may be found. He tells us "Infallibility, whether of the Church or Bible, is frankly abandoned; but it is maintained that respect for individual freedom is compatible with the recognition of authority as being in a real sense inherent both in the revelation of God in history and also in the interpretation of such revelation by corporate experience and tradition: at the same time that the weight attaching to the latter form of authority (the authority, that is to say, of corporate consensus), varies directly with freedom of thought and of criticism, and inversely with the extent to which unanimity is secured only by methods of discipline." Let us take the last point. To-day in the Roman Communion the irreformability of the teaching of Papal Infallibility is maintained by the Decision of the Vatican Council. Discipline secures what a Council enacts. Does this make Infallibility—which according to Roman authorities was the pronouncement of a Free Council—less authoritative because it is preserved by discipline? All along the line when we are dealing with the Authority of the Church we are faced by questions that can be answered in two ways, and the tendency with writers is to make such pronouncements of Catholicity oracular and demanding adhesion on pain of excommunication—no matter what protests are made against such oracularity attaching to ecclesiastical pronouncements.

Mr. Rawlinson is much influenced by the work of Heiler who was at one time a Roman Priest and is now a Lutheran. He misses in

Lutheranism the corporate life he so strongly felt in the Roman Church and believes that it is possible to combine Catholicism with Evangelicalism in a great Church. "The Catholic Liturgy is a wondrous achievement, of which one can never grow weary; nay more than that, it is a revelation of the eternal God, who is the eternal Beauty and Holiness." But are the ideas enshrined in the Roman Liturgy true or false? Does the Liturgy teach what Christ and the Apostolic Church taught? Is the syncretism that is involved in the service a Christian syncretism or does it implicate non-Christian elements that are destructive of Christianity? Much that Mr. Rawlinson has written seems to forget that it is possible for the Church in its age-long growth to draw into its teaching what is not only capable of receiving a Christian sense and meaning, but also much that is fundamentally opposed to the doctrine of Christ and destructive of its message. He tells us that Reservation for purposes of Adoration and Benediction ought not to be forbidden. "They will never become universal or even normal within Anglicanism; but interpreted, as they can be, in terms of a less rigidly scholastic sacramental theology than that of modern Rome, and safeguarded from superstition by the free play of criticism, they will, it may be hoped, one day cease to be involved in the unedifying atmosphere of controversy, and be regulated rather than forbidden, by Anglican episcopal authority." Here we have a pragmatic sanction given on account of the simple naturalness of the practices without any regard whatever to the superstitions that underlie them and the inability of regulating while the Church of Rome practises them and the friends of Mr. Rawlinson look forward to reunion with Rome.

It is for us impossible to do otherwise than maintain that the Revelation of God in Christ was given in the Life and Death of Jesus Christ who rose from the dead. Historical Christianity centres in Him and the only authentic documents we have of His teaching and deeds are found in the New Testament. Anything that overthrows or improperly develops that teaching has to be rejected, and it is strange that while discounting the authority of the Bible, if it in any way seems by isolating a passage to give support to the contentions of Mr. Rawlinson, it is quoted as final, but where it contains that which Mr. Rawlinson dislikes it is brushed on one side.

More than once in reading these pages we have had the uncomfortable feeling that our author was not very sure of his own ground and was more anxious to prevent Evangelical Reunion and the retention of Anglo-Catholics within the Church of England than to set forth a reasoned statement of the seat of Authority. Having twice read the book we are not yet sure what he means by Authority in a sense that can be grasped as the guiding and determining principle in Faith and Morals. But we have no doubt of his views on Unity. The Church of Rome must be brought into the united Church—its own declarations on its irreformability are passed over and it is forgotten that a Reformed Romanism capable of unity short of absorp-

tion is not the Church of Rome as it exists. It may seem severe in view of much that is said, to assert that the authoritative idea that rules all the lectures is contained in the sentence, "Meantime it is clear that the Anglican Church can never be party save at the cost of creating fresh schism in the very act of attempting to achieve unity, to any scheme of partial reunion upon such lines as would have the effect of making impossible the position of Anglo-Catholics within her borders, or of impairing their freedom; nor can any scheme of reunion, however carefully safeguarded and thought out by responsible leaders, be imposed on the Church by authority without the consent of the rank and file and the conversion of the indifferent majority." In other words, Anglo-Catholics demand their right to veto what does not please them and plead that they are to have the approval of the majority to what they dislike, if it is to be even contemplated. Do they act in this fashion when their own wishes are at stake in the introduction of superstitious rites and ceremonies, avowedly contrary to the Law of this Church and Realm? With this question we can bid farewell to "Authority and Freedom" as on its answer we can see that Authority is to be accepted when it suits Anglo-Catholics and to be rejected when it does not, and the freedom which they claim for themselves they are by no means ready to grant to others.

MISSIONS IN MADAGASCAR.

FIFTY YEARS IN MADAGASCAR: Personal Experiences of Mission Life and Work. By James Sibree, D.D., F.R.G.S. (*George Allen & Unwin*. 12s. 6d. net).

Madagascar has an honourable place in the annals of missions, for the testimony it affords to the power of Holy Scripture to sustain and promote spiritual life where other external aids are removed. The first Protestant missionary went to Madagascar in 1820, at which date the language of the people had not been reduced to writing, and this task was one of the earliest which had to be undertaken. From that date to 1836, a period of only sixteen years, no more than four or five missionaries were sent out, but in that short time a band of about 200 converts had been formed, and the whole Bible had been translated into Malagasy. Almost at the moment that this was accomplished, a cruel and determined persecution under Queen Ranavalona I was begun against the Christians, and raged for twenty-five years. The missionaries were ordered to leave the island, but they left behind, in the hands of their converts, the Bible. When the mission was resumed in 1862, notwithstanding the number who had laid down their lives rather than deny Christ, it was found that instead of two hundred there were two thousand native Christians. Could any other method have produced such a result! Mr. Sibree may well say (p. 201): "From the introduction of Protestant Christianity into Madagascar and up to the present day, the progress of the Gospel has been inseparably connected with the translation and study and reception of the Word of God."

The Rev. James Sibree who writes this account of his fifty years of mission work in Madagascar is well known as a writer on the history and on the natural history of the island and its people. He is an example of the way in which Christian missions, especially where pioneering has to be done, have attracted men of great and varied gifts to the proclamation of the Gospel. He went out in 1863 when the persecution just mentioned had ceased and it was possible to resume missionary work. Mr. Sibree was sent in the first instance as an architect to erect four or five churches to be put up on sites where the martyrs had suffered. This task he accomplished after much difficulty, and he remained to make the preaching of the Gospel in Madagascar his life work. Of the varied nature of the tasks which came to him, of the difficulties which beset the work, of successes and failures, he tells us in this retrospect of the whole. For half of the fifty years he was principal of the L.M.S. College for the education and training of native evangelists and Christian workers generally. The brief description of the religion, if it may be called such, of the Malagasy people, which though originally purely theistic had degenerated into a gross and superstitious form of idolatry, is of much interest as illustrating the universal tendency to degradation in religion. Mr. Sibree gives us an account of the French conquest of Madagascar in 1895 and of the difficulties which it caused to missions through the disturbed state of the country. In addition to these, the Protestant missions had to meet the determined and unscrupulous opposition of the Jesuit missionaries, who told the natives that as Romanism was the religion of the French nation, those who wished to stand well with the conquerors should adopt it. Mr. Sibree goes on to say :

“ Not only so, but in many places they accused the pastor and the leading Christians of the village churches who remained firm in their faith, of being enemies and disloyal, and led the French officers in charge of that district to shoot them ; and thus many of the best people were killed.

“ Besides this they seized about a hundred of our Protestant churches. The Roman Catholic bishop went himself to some of them and told the congregation that he must have the place to celebrate Mass, and ordered all who would not join his Church to leave the building. At one time there was hardly one of the 280 L.M.S. churches in the Betsileo province whose pastor or leading people were not either in prison or banished through the accusations of the Roman Catholic priests and the compliance of the French Governor of the province. It is not to be wondered at that numbers of half-instructed Malagasy were terrorized into joining the Roman Catholic Mission congregations, although a large proportion of them afterwards returned to Protestantism when the ‘ tyranny was overpast.’ The coming of a number of French Protestant missionaries soon gave the people assurance that the priests had deceived them, and that Protestantism was *not* confined to English people. And the Malagasy had an object lesson, a convincing proof that Roman Catholicism was essentially a persecuting system, and ready to use any deception, or trickery, or cruelty to promote its own ends ” (p. 187).

The advocates for reunion with Rome may take note of this example of the manner in which its system regards and treats Protestantism when the opportunity is given. Happily, the work of the Protestant missions has been too thorough and too scriptural

to be easily overthrown, and we may thank God for what He has accomplished through their agency.

FAITH AND LIFE.

PERSONAL RELIGION AND THE LIFE OF DEVOTION. By W. R. Inge.
London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 2s. 6d.

The Dean of St. Paul's is seen at his best in the Lenten volume written for the Diocese of London. He reveals his heart to his readers and allows them to see him as he is in his own home and passes on to them the secret sources of his own faith. The book varies in style and appeal. Many will find the opening chapter difficult to grasp as it deals with mysticism, but all will discover in the last chapter something that will make them return to its pages and re-read words that tell of a Father's love for a dear child. Those familiar with Westminster Cloisters know how they have been brought to a stand by the arresting words on a stone, "Dear Childe," and no monument in the Abbey has spoken to them so eloquently as this record of Jane Lester. So it will be with Chapter VIII of "Personal Religion and the Life of Devotion." Margaret Paula Inge will be for them a picture of innocent childhood—of sainthood, and above all the revelation of home life that is bathed in the sunshine of Divine love. Her nurse wrote to Mrs. Inge: "It was so wonderful to see her goodness and patience. Several times she said, 'Nanna, I am so happy'; although perhaps she did not know why, but I suppose it was just God's sweet peace in her heart. I am glad to have been with her for the last year of her life. She was so pleased to have a Nanna all to herself." Paula was one of those winsome children who carry love with them wherever they go and the Dean does not exaggerate when he writes of his privilege of "being the father of one of God's saints." "There are, thank God, countless other beautiful child characters, and many may think that their own children are not less worthy of commemoration. But let what I have written be taken as a reverent tribute to the child nature, which our Saviour loved and bade us to imitate." All who have passed through the trial of bereavement and have seen the empty child chair at their table will find the words of the brave and true-hearted Dean words of real and lasting comfort.

"There is no substitute for first-hand experience of the spiritual life. We must believe the explorers of the high places of the unseen world when they tell us that they have been there, and found what they sought. But they cannot really tell us what they found; if we wish to see what they have seen, we must live as they have lived." Spiritual things are spiritually discerned, and it is impossible for those who have not been brought face to face with the King in His glory to understand the deep things of God or "to know the love of God which passeth knowledge." Dean Inge realizes this and the book is directed to lead readers to personal communion with God through Christ. As the mystics say, "we could not see the sun if

we had not something sun-like in our eyes," and no man can possibly apprehend what is revealed in Christ Jesus until he has something of the Christ in Him. That is the true secret of Christian mysticism. The Christ in us reaching forth to the Christ who redeemed us and now lives at the right hand of God. We cannot at all times scale the heights that God has set before us, but the memories of the moments when He has spoken to us in the silence of self-surrender to His love, are the great inheritance of our richest experience, and afford us the foretaste of the joy we shall have when we see Him face to face and know as we are known.

We specially direct attention to the chapter on "Joy," for we believe that one of the greatest weaknesses of our day is the confusion between Joy and Pleasure. "Joy is one thing, and pleasure is another. Pleasure is an instrument contrived by nature to induce the individual to carry out nature's designs for the continuance of the race; it subserves the preservation and propagation of life. . . . Joy is the emotional experience which our kind Father in heaven has attached to the discharge of the most fundamental of all the higher activities—namely those of inner growth and outer creativeness. Joy is the triumph of *life*; it is the sign that we are living our true life as spiritual beings." Put more briefly, pleasure is of the body—joy is of the soul. Pleasure passes away—joy abides. In the philosophy of this generation life is emphasized as the supreme category and joy is associated with life at its best and highest. The more we consider our life in Christ as real living—something dynamic not static—the more joy we have, and we are convinced that those who study this book will find in its pages secrets of living that will enable them to realize what St. Paul meant by Joy and what our Saviour Himself wished His followers to possess. We thank Dr. Inge for a book that is worthy of the matured writer of *Speculum Animæ* and the outcome of deep thought on the most sacred of all subjects.

DR. DEISSMANN'S NEW BOOK.

THE RELIGION OF JESUS AND THE FAITH OF PAUL. By Prof. Adolf Deissmann. London: *Hodder & Stoughton*. 7s. 6d.

There is much in this book with which Evangelicals will disagree and there is a great deal more with which they will find themselves in cordial agreement. Dr. Deissmann is a scholar of the first rank and a man of personal devotion. These Lectures are in simple language, which never leaves his meaning doubtful, and they are representative of the best German religious thought. We do not dwell upon our disagreement, as we wish to emphasize the deep reverence that pervades the pages and his surrender to our Lord as the final revelation of the will and mind of God. He makes short work with many popular criticisms and tells us "the peculiar thing is not, that there were to be found, on His string of pearls, twelve or twenty of such size as had never before been seen, but that in the

treasure chamber of the religions of mankind there is this one diamond, which sheds forth rays of such unexampled fire and purity." He emphasizes the fact that the main revelation of Truth is to be found in the Person of our Lord and agrees with Irenaeus that our Lord "brought all that was new, in bringing Himself."

The second series of Lectures finds as the centre of Pauline teaching his communion with Christ. For our part this fact stands so pre-eminently forth as the secret and motive force of all St. Paul's life and actions that we wonder at the attempts to disprove it. St. Paul lived in Christ, worked for Christ and found in Him his all. He was a man of many-sided interests, but he subordinated all to Christ, and Dr. Deissmann is undoubtedly right when he dwells on the unliterary character of the Epistles which are on that account a much more forcible and illuminating account of his life outlook. Very valuable indeed are the pages devoted to the study of Mysticism, and we may say that we have never seen put more clearly or convincingly the two sides of mysticism. Nowadays it is popular to speak broadly of Mysticism as something that has the same meaning everywhere. It has not, and the distinction between acting and reacting Mysticism must always be borne in mind. The former is the mysticism of the Jesuits and the anthroposophists of all types. "To get rid of the world, its torment, its sin, but also its duties and its works, to flutter into the eternal light, to dip into the sea of eternity. This mysticism is not terrified even by Titanic daring: deification is its final desire." St. Paul was not a mystic of this type. For him he started from the root conception that religion is the religion of grace. He was in Christ and Christ was in Him—the indwelling Christ brought Him in to the closest communion with God. He reacted to Divine grace and this reaction brought him the communion—the oneing with God—which was the beginning and the end of all his ministry.

We have been much impressed by the pages that discuss the influence of St. Paul on Primitive Christianity. It is a commonplace of history that it appears to have been slight for centuries, but Dr. Deissmann shows that this is not the case. St. Paul's personal influence remained strong in Western Asia Minor and had much to do with moulding the mind of the writer of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles. The more we reflect upon this masterly and unpretentious volume the deeper our respect for its writer becomes. We regret his departures—unnecessary we believe—from some traditional beliefs that are founded upon Scripture, but that does not close our eyes to the value of a book that makes clear vital truths in an age when these truths are being overlooked.

TIMOTHY RICHARD OF CHINA.

TIMOTHY RICHARD OF CHINA: Seer, Statesman, Missionary, and the most disinterested Adviser the Chinese ever had. By W. E. Soothill, M.A., Professor of Chinese in the University of Oxford. Formerly President of the Shansi Imperial University. London: *Seeley Service & Co.* 12s. 6d. net.

In this attractive-looking volume Professor Soothill tells the story of a very remarkable man who laboured for half a century as a missionary in China, and all who are interested in the people of China and especially in the progress among them of Christian missions should read it. In the title of the book the author makes large claims on behalf of its subject and without doubt he amply justifies them. Dr. Timothy Richard was born in 1845 in a small village in Carmarthenshire. During the great revival of 1858-60, he experienced, in Prof. Soothill's words, "a change of outlook": we perhaps need not mind calling it "conversion." That revival had great results, but probably none were greater in its far-reaching effects than the conversion of Timothy Richard. He was early drawn by the claims of foreign missions, and in his twenty-fifth year set sail for China under the auspices of the Baptist Missionary Society, reaching there in 1870, sixteen years after the arrival of Hudson Taylor, with whom he, later on, came into contact, and, alas that it has to be recorded, collision. Both men were needed in China, but they were of very different gifts and temperaments. It is an instructive and spirit-stirring thing to read the two lives and note the work which each did. Both were evangelists, but Timothy Richard accomplished his best work by educational means and did more than any other man to break down the prejudices and traditions which caused the Chinese to obstruct and persecute Christian missions. He thus opened the way for the spread of evangelization. He aimed at influencing the educated and ruling classes in the direction of a more liberal attitude to Christianity and to foreign ideas and civilization generally. He noted the best in the religions and temper of the people he met, rather than the worst, and by approaching them in a sympathetic spirit gained their confidence and support. This was, fifty years ago, not the prevailing attitude among missionaries, and Dr. Richard's aims and methods were not always understood. It must be remembered, however, that evangelization was always his goal. If he saw elements of good in Buddhism—and his biographer hints that he sometimes might have seen more than was there—he knew that Christ alone was the Way and the Truth and the Life and he never ceased to point men to Him. He felt, however, that the Chinese themselves—the Christian converts—were the best evangelists for the people of China.

There is, incidentally, a great deal of information about the modern history and development of China—the Tai Ping Rebellion, the war between Japan and China, the Reform Movement, the Boxer troubles and other matters, which gives the book additional value. We have greatly enjoyed reading it.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

Prayer Book Teaching Pamphlets.—This series, which was referred to last quarter, now numbers eighteen. The last pamphlet is by Canon H. A. Wilson, Rector of Cheltenham, and is entitled *Apostolical Succession*. Canon Wilson has given us a clear platform, and after stating the doctrine gives the evidence of Holy Scripture, of early Church History, and finally the teaching of our Church. The set will be sent post free on receipt of a P.O. for 2s. 6d. Clergy ordering 50 or more for distribution will be allowed a special discount of 25 per cent. off the published price.

Dean Wace's Books.—Enquiries are constantly being received in regard to the works by Dean Wace now obtainable. Several of the more important ones, such as his work on *The Reformation* and *Christianity and Morality* are out of print, but the following may be specially mentioned:—*The Story of the Passion* and *The Story of the Resurrection*, price 7s. 6d. net each, published in 1922 and 1923; *Foundations of Faith*, (Bampton Lectures) a few copies of which are still obtainable at 2s. 6d. net. This work, as explained in the preface, is an attempt to exhibit, in some measure, the supreme claim of the Gospel upon our allegiance. *Christianity and Agnosticism*, being essays which arose from a paper on Agnosticism read by the Dean at the Church Congress in Manchester in 1888 and which was attacked by Professor Huxley (2s. 6d. net). His papers, Biblical, National and Ecclesiastical, published in two volumes under the title of *Some Questions of the Day*, are particularly recommended. The first volume contains papers written week by week on current questions in *The Record* during the early part of 1912 and reprinted in permanent form at the request of various friends. This volume has as its frontispiece a striking photograph of the Dean standing at the door of Canterbury Cathedral. It is now obtainable at 1s. 6d. net. The second volume (2s. 6d. net) contains the papers written at the end of 1912 and during the year 1913. These two books show more than any other of his writings, the Dean's remarkable power and grasp of matters, both in and outside the Church. As he states in his preface, he endeavours to throw upon the questions of our day the light of that old English Churchmanship and Statesmanship in which alone, as he believed, the true solution of our difficulties in Church and State are to be found. But perhaps of all his books, the one which at the present time is of particular value in view of the controversies surrounding the revision of the Holy Communion Service, is *The Sacrifice of Christ*, addresses given by him in Lincoln's Inn Chapel. This little book was reprinted in 1915 at 1s. net, and those who wish to circulate an extremely useful little book on the history and nature of our Lord's Sacrifice and Atonement, would find this little volume very helpful. Of his pamphlets we would mention three: *The Main Purpose and Character of the XXXIX Articles*, *Invocation of Saints*, and *On the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, all of which can be obtained at 1d. each.

Islington Clerical Conference.—The papers read at the Islington Clerical Conference held at the Church House, Westminster, on January 9, have been

printed in pamphlet form at 1s. net. The papers are on the following subjects : *The Original Intention*, by the Rev. H. W. Hinde ; *The Doctrine of Holy Communion*, by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D. ; *The Place of Holy Communion in the Devotional Life of the Individual*, by the Bishop of Norwich ; *The Place of Holy Communion in the Corporate Life of the Church*, by the Rev. C. S. Wallis ; *The Preparation of Minister and People*, by the Rev. C. E. Wilson, B.D. ; *The Administration of the Sacrament*, by the Archbishop of Dublin ; *The Indwelling Christ*, by the Rev. H. Drown.

Principal Wallis in his paper made special reference to *Scriptural and Catholic Truth and Worship, or the Faith and Worship of the Primitive, the Mediæval and the Reformed Anglican Churches*, by Canon F. Meyrick. It is now published at 1s. 6d. net. He strongly recommended every one who had not done so to obtain a copy of the book and to study it. Canon Meyrick was an author who marshalled his facts clearly, and this particular book gives invaluable information which otherwise could only be obtained by consulting large, costly and out-of-the-way books of reference. It is, moreover, a very readable and interesting book.

Prayer Book Revision.—A reprint of Dr. Gilbert's pamphlet on *Prayer Book Revision from an Evangelical Point of View* has been called for and a revised edition is now obtainable, price 1d., or 7s. per 100. This pamphlet particularly deals with the question "What is the practical attitude for Evangelical Churchmen to adopt on the subject of the Prayer Book Revision proposals which are now before the National Assembly ?" and has been found valuable for general distribution amongst Church Councillors and others.

Missions.—The Rev. Evan J. Hopkins, Vicar of All Souls', Eastbourne, has prepared an excellent little leaflet entitled *Decision for Christ*, for use at time of Missions. It is divided under separate headings :—*My Personal Testimony ; The Means of Grace, (i) Prayer, (ii) The Bible, (iii) Church Services, (iv) The Holy Communion ; The Meaning of Salvation ; The Christian Life ; The Christian's Encouragement ; A Daily Prayer*. Sample copies can be sent for 1½d. post free, or 100 copies for 5s. Mr. Hopkins' booklet is similar in purpose to *My Decision* by the Rev. W. J. Limmer Sheppard, which appears in our Mission Series, and is in great demand. This leaflet explains *The Need of Salvation, The Way of Salvation, The Results of Salvation*. Sample copies are obtainable at 1½d., or 8s. 6d. per 100. Another little book which would undoubtedly be helpful to clergy and others interested in Missions is Mr. Arthur C. Way's *The Uprising of Spiritual Forces*, 1s. net. Dr. Eugene Stock says of it, "We need a revival. This little book will help it."

Church and Faith.—Mr. E. H. Blakeney in a letter which appeared in *The Record* recently, mentioned the valuable collection of essays published in 1900 under the title of *Church and Faith*, with a preface by Dr. Percival, Bishop of Hereford. This book is unfortunately out of print and second-hand copies are scarce, but three of the essays have been specially printed in pamphlet form, viz. *The Reformation Settlement*, by Mr. J. T. Tomlinson, 3d. net ; *The Lord's Supper*, by Bishop Drury, 1d. net ; and *The Confessional*, by Canon F. Meyrick, which has been through two editions in pamphlet form, the last having been recently published with a preface by Dean Wace, 3d. net.