

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 Advertiser.

JULY, 1924.

Spanish & Portuguese Church Aid Society,

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

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

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

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

A New Edition of
**A Sacrament of
 Our Redemption**

An Enquiry into the Meaning of the Lord's Supper in the
 New Testament and the Church of England.

BY THE

REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D.

Paper Cover, 1/- net; Cloth Cover, 2/- net.

(Postage 3d.)

EXTRACT FROM THE PREFACE:—

"The purpose of the following chapters is to discover the meaning of the Lord's Supper as it is revealed in Holy Scripture and stated in the Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England. In view of some modern works, in which the consideration of the Holy Communion starts from an entirely different standpoint, it seemed worth while to make a fresh attempt to apprehend the meaning of that sacred ordinance from the New Testament first of all, and then, having learnt what Scripture teaches, to examine the statements of the Prayer Book and Articles with the view of discovering the real meaning of the doctrine of the Church of England."

THE CHURCH BOOK ROOM,
82 VICTORIA STREET - LONDON, S.W.1.

WEYMOUTH COLLEGE

WEYMOUTH.

Headmaster — R. R. CONWAY, M.A.

A Public School for boys at moderate fees.
 Church of England and Evangelical.

Playing fields of 20 acres. The climate recommended for its small rainfall, sunshine and sea air.

New Science and Manual Training School recently added. O.T.C. and separate Junior School.

For Prospectus apply to Headmaster.

WHY NOT COLLECT

the works of your favourite author, or books about your hero or hobby? The collection need not involve anything beyond moderate expenditure. We have over 1,000,000 Volumes (Second-hand and New) in stock on every conceivable subject, carefully classified, including 40,000 volumes on Theology, Biblical and Religious subjects. Write to us, mentioning your special interest, and let us keep you informed of books in stock on the subject.

For books always send to us.

FOYLES 121 Charing Cross Road,
 London.

THE CHALET

PEASENHALL, SAXMUNDHAM, SUFFOLK.

A Preparatory School for all the Public Schools. Careful Tuition. Backward, Delicate Boys. Inclusive Fees. Good Food. Home Comforts. All Successes. Common Entrance. Recent Scholarship, Winchester.

The entire charge of boys from abroad can be undertaken and the sons of parents temporarily abroad may remain with the Principal during the holidays on special terms.

For particulars, apply to the Principal.

The Record

THE : : : :
EVANGELICAL
CHURCH : : :
NEWSPAPER :

Every Thursday.

Price Twopence.

To save disappointment readers are asked kindly to place an order at once either with their regular Newsagent or with the Publisher of "The Record," 2 Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, E.C.4. By post: single copy, 3d.; for one year, 13s.; for six months, 6s. 6d.; for three months, 3s. 3d.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM

CHURCH ASSEMBLY:—

THE ENABLING ACT fully explained. By ALBERT MITCHELL.	6d.
THE PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCIL (POWERS) MEASURE, with Explanation and Notes. By ALBERT MITCHELL.	1s.
DECLARATION AS TO QUALIFICATION.	1s. 6d. per 100.
Ditto, printed on card for Card Index System.	2s. per 100.
Ditto, with Form for Non-Resident Electors.	2s. per 100.
Ditto, ditto, printed on card for Card Index System.	2s. 6d. per 100.
Ditto, ditto, for six signatures.	3s. per 100.
FORM OF PAROCHIAL VOTING PAPER.	3s. per 100.
NOTICE OF PAROCHIAL MEETING.	1d., or 9d. a dozen.
NOTICE OF REVISION OF PAROCHIAL ROLL.	1d., or 9d. a dozen.
ELECTORAL ROLL SHEETS.	3s. per 100.
PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCIL MEETING:—	
1. Notice for Church Door.	3d. a dozen.
2. Notice to Members.	2s. per 100.

For full List of Publications write to:

THE CHURCH BOOK ROOM,
82 Victoria Street, LONDON, S.W.1

Keep the bridge open

—its foundations in repair—the bridge by which incurable sufferers of THE MIDDLE CLASSES are enabled to pass from misery and anxiety to comfort and peace.

A home for life and pensions for life are provided by this Institution, in which the beloved Queen-Mother takes such great personal interest, and of which the Prince of Wales is Patron.

There is a long pathetic "waiting list." Will you send, say, £1 towards its reduction? Funds are much needed without delay.

British Home and Hospital for Incurables

CROWN LANE, STREATHAM, S.W.16.

Secretary: EDGAR PENMAN.

Offices: 72, CHEAPSIDE, LONDON, E.C.2

Messrs. Longmans & Co.'s List

Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity

By the Rev. OLIVER C. QUICK, M.A., Canon of Carlisle. 8vo. 6s. net.

Roadmending on the Sacred Way

Suggestions to the Modern Reader of Matthew, Mark and Luke.

By the Rev. J. M. C. CRUM, M.A., Rector of Farnham, Surrey.
Crown 8vo. 6s. net.

"A helpful and, indeed, a beautiful book. . . . Throughout this book there is knowledge for the head and there is insight for the heart."—*Church of Ireland Gazette*.

The Way of Fellowship

By the Rev. F. W. DRAKE, M.A. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. net.

The Wondrous Passion

By the Rev. F. W. DRAKE, M.A. With an Introduction by the BISHOP OF LONDON. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

Ideals of Holiness

An Aid to Preparation for Holy Communion.

By the Rev. F. W. DRAKE, M.A. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.
Thin Paper Edition. Imperial 32mo. Rexine, 3s. 6d. net.
Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., 39 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
NOTES AND COMMENTS	165
Matters of Principle. Cheltenham Conference. Some Recent Appointments. Dean Wace House. Bishop Knox Memorial. Objections to Alternative Services. Truth about the Bennett Case. Passages from the Judgment. What of To-day's Teaching? Late Dr. Griffith Thomas.	
BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS. By G. F. I.	177
CLERICAL NERVES. By the Rev. Charles Courtenay, M.A. ..	183
CHELTHENHAM CONFERENCE PAPERS:	
ROME AND OURSELVES: HISTORICAL SURVEY. By G. G. Coulton, M.A.	195
THE THEORY OF THE PAPACY. By the Rev. R. H. Murray, Litt.D.	203
THE ROMAN DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND MINISTRY. By the Rev. Chancellor Kerr, B.D.	208
TRANSUBSTANTIATION AND THE MASS. By the Ven. J. H. Thorpe, B.D.	217
PENANCE AND THE CONFESSIONAL. By the Rev. T. C. Hammond, M.A.	231
APPROACHES TO ROME BY CONFERENCES. By the Rev. Alfred Fawkes, M.A.	241
APPROACHES TO ROME IN RITUAL AND DOCTRINE. By the Right Rev. Bishop Knox, D.D.	247

All articles appearing in THE CHURCHMAN are the copyright of the Proprietors, and must not be reprinted without permission.



The Responsibility of Empire

We boast of an Empire upon which the sun never sets—greater than any Empire the world has hitherto known.

FOR WHAT PURPOSE has God placed such power in a little Island Kingdom? The only answer which satisfies is that along the highways of Empire may pass the Messengers of His love.

Every Christian member of this Island Kingdom has a responsibility in this matter. What are you doing to extend the Kingdom of Christ? C.E.Z.M.S. is seeking, through its women Missionaries (Evangelists, Doctors, Nurses and Educationists) to **win the Womanhood** of a vast part of our Empire (India, Ceylon and Singapore) for Him. Financial help, much needed, will be gratefully acknowledged by the Secretary.

**CHURCH OF ENGLAND
ZENANA MISSIONARY SOCIETY.**

Office: 27 CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.2.

Telephone: 602 HOLBORN

EDE & RAVENSCROFT

Founded in the Reign of William and Mary, 1689.

CLERICAL  TAILORS*By Appointments.***CASSOCKS, SURPLICES, HOODS, CLERICAL SUITS.****93 & 94 CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.2.****Church Sisters' Home***Recognised by The Inter-Diocesan Board for Women's Work.***62 REDCLIFFE GARDENS, SOUTH KENSINGTON, S.W.10.***Warden: THE REV. CANON H. FOSTER PEGG, M.A., R.D.**Vice-Warden and Lecturer: THE REV. H. W. REINDORF, M.A.**Superintendent: MISS J. PEACOCK.**Hon. Theological Tutor: MISS K. DRUCE, S.Th.L.T.***FOR THE TRAINING OF EDUCATED, EVANGELICAL CHURCH-
WOMEN FOR DIOCESAN AND PAROCHIAL SERVICE AS
"CHURCH SISTERS."****Fees: £70 a year, or £25 per term.****BURSARIES ARE OCCASIONALLY AVAILABLE.***For particulars, apply to the Superintendent at the above address.***MORRISON
BELL HOUSE****BIRCHINGTON-ON-SEA.****A Convalescent Home for
Children.****NEEDS****200****New Subscribers****of 5s.****WILL YOU BE ONE?**

Please send your subscription to the Hon. Sec. at the offices of the National Church League, 82 Victoria Street, S.W.1, marked "for Children's Home."

**A GIRL'S
WEEK
OF PRAYER.****By E. M. KNOX,***Late Principal of Havergal College,
Toronto.***2d. net.**

"Reality is the aim of this excellent Manual."

TO BE OBTAINED FROM

**The Church Book Room,
82 Victoria Street, London, S.W.1.**

THE CHURCHMAN

July, 1924

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Matters of Principle.

ENGLISH Churchmen have recently been charged with paying little attention to Principles. They are said to be willing to compromise even on vital questions, if only they can get things to work. It is pointed out that Evangelicals especially are willing to agree to Anglo-Catholic principles inconsistent with the maintenance of their own position. Recent votes on the alternative forms of the Prayer of Consecration are given as examples of this spirit. No doubt those who voted for the "Orange Book" and "Grey Book" forms would be prepared to justify their action. But it is a serious feature in the present situation if the votes of Evangelical representatives in the House of Clergy tend to strengthen the powers of the section of the Church that has expressed its determination to undo the work of the Reformation. We would beg Evangelical Churchmen not to bring upon themselves the indignation of future generations of English Churchpeople, by any action that may open the way in days to come for the supersession of our present form of Communion Service by one in which either the doctrines of the Church of Rome are fully admitted, or in which the teaching of the New Testament on sacrifice and Communion are either ignored, or completely altered in character. There can be no doubt that this is a very real danger at the present time.

The Cheltenham Conference.

It is also fundamental to remember at the present time that there is a line of deep cleavage between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. However much we may desire to ignore differences, in a general desire to promote the unity of Christendom, it will not be of any ultimate advantage to ignore the fact that there are two conceptions of Christianity. The Church of Rome

represents one of these. Hitherto the Church of England has been regarded as the chief representative of the other. The Cheltenham Conference has this year performed a valuable service in setting out the respective positions of the two Churches. The papers read at the Conference, of which a considerable number are printed in the present number of the *CHURCHMAN*, deserve wide circulation and careful study. A generation has arisen which is unfamiliar with the points of difference, and the great principles underlying them. We hope that the able and constructive contribution to the consideration of the whole subject contained in these papers will help to bring to light once again the grounds upon which the Church of England position rests in contrast with that of the Church of Rome. Even those who sympathize with the Anglo-Catholic School are realizing that the appeal to Scripture has a force not sufficiently recognized in recent years. If the Conference has done nothing else, it has deserved well of Churchmen in bringing out the significance of this appeal. We naturally regard the Conference as having done much more than this.

Important Recent Appointments.

For many years Dean Wace filled the office of Chairman of the Executive Committee of the National Church League. On the death of Preb. Webb-Peploe, who was Chairman of the Council of the League, the Dean also undertook that office. The vacancies caused by his death were filled at the recent Annual Meeting of the Society. The Chairmanship of the Council was filled by the appointment of Bishop Knox. Since his retirement from the bishopric of Manchester, Bishop Knox has taken a keen interest in the progress of Prayer Book revision, and has recently felt able to take a more active part in the work of maintaining the Reformed character of our Church. This marked him out as the most fitting person to preside over the Council of the N.C.L., and the members are fortunate in securing the help of so able and experienced an adviser.

As Vice-Chairman a desire was expressed that the North of England should be represented, as so many of the Society's supporters reside in the Northern Province. The Council were fortunate in securing the consent of Dr. Dawson Walker, Residentiary Canon of Durham Cathedral and Professor of New Testament

Exegesis in the University of Durham. Canon Dawson Walker has been for many years a Vice-President of the League.

Previously the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D., Rector of Bradfield, had been elected Chairman of the Executive Committee. Dr. Gilbert is well known as a scholar, and a writer on historical and theological subjects. He has rendered valuable services to the Church by his contributions to the understanding of its history and teaching.

With these three representatives of learning and Churchmanship in some of the highest offices, and with Sir William Joynson-Hicks, Bart., as President, and Sir Thomas Inskip, K.C., as Treasurer, the N.C.L. is provided with a band of strong and well-qualified leaders, who deserve the support of Churchmen of all Schools desirous of maintaining the principles of the Reformation.

Dean Wace House.

Much thought has been given to the most suitable way of commemorating the great services rendered by Dean Wace to the cause of Evangelical Churchmanship. An opportunity has arisen of securing a building in the City of London, close to Temple Bar which lends itself to the purpose of forming a central rendezvous, where Evangelicals can have their Headquarters, and it has been a happy thought to associate the building with the name of our late leader by calling it "Dean Wace House." The premises are large and roomy, and provide accommodation for a conference room, a library, an information bureau, a publication department and central offices for organization. Being close to the offices of the leading Evangelical Societies it will be convenient for those having business with them, and it will provide a much-needed meeting place where friends can come together for social and other purposes. In order to secure the building and adapt it for this work an appeal has been issued for £10,000. Towards this amount nearly £2,000 has already been subscribed, and we have no doubt that Evangelical Churchpeople who realize the value of the project and desire it to be associated with the name of Dean Wace will be glad to send substantial contributions to the fund. In order to promote the work of furthering Evangelical principles, an appeal is made for another £10,000 so that the scheme may be fully equipped. Gifts may be sent to Sir William Joynson-Hicks.

Bishop Knox Memorial.

The Memorial to the House of Bishops sent out by Bishop Knox in favour of maintaining the Communion Service in its present form, has received close on three hundred thousand signatures. This is a wonderful response, in view of the fact that so many people have a rooted objection to signing any document, however strongly they may feel in favour of the views it represents. The numbers show the widespread feeling that exists in regard to the proposed changes in the Communion Service. The country has been thoroughly stirred by the Bishop's Appeal. It has brought home to Churchpeople the significance of the alterations now before the House of Clergy. The success of the Memorial has produced a certain amount of unkindly criticism on the part of those who are afraid of the influence that it may have. Strong efforts have been made to arouse prejudice against the Petition, and every endeavour has been made to misrepresent it. The most common charge is that numbers of Nonconformists have been induced to sign it. This is not the case. In some Parishes there are Churchpeople who are debarred from attending their Parish Churches by the practices and teachings in them. It is possible that some of these may have signed the Memorial, and no doubt the Clergy in such Parishes would regard the Parishioners whom they have excluded from their Churches as non-Churchpeople. This would not, however, alter their standing.

Some Criticisms of the Memorial.

Some foolish things have been said about the Memorial by its own opponents. One ingenuous critic asserted that the Bishop had no right to start a Memorial, because he was not connected with any diocese, and the Church Assembly knew much better than he did what was for the good of the Church. Nothing could be more ludicrous than the suggestion made by the Rector of a Parish that the signatures should only have been obtained through him, although he expressed violent opposition to the Memorial. The signatures he assumed were of no value because they had not been obtained as he thought they should have been. To say, as one distinguished dignitary did, that the numbers must be weighed as well as counted was so obvious a truism that it was scarcely worth uttering. But it is absurd to imagine that out of nearly 300,000 signatories, includ-

ing Peers, Members of Parliament, Clergy, Churchwardens, Members of Parochial Councils, etc., the great majority can be regarded as nonentities. Whatever objections may be made the outstanding fact remains that it is the most impressive expression of opinion that has been given on any question of Church policy in England for a very long time. The Memorial cannot be ignored, and the supporters of Bishop Knox will have to be reckoned with in the further revision of the Prayer Book.

Objections to Alternative Forms of Services

Some of the arguments in favour of alternative forms in the Communion Service are more plausible than convincing. One newspaper writer draws a "simple analogy" from two travellers to London desiring to go by different routes. The alternative forms represent the two routes. The unfortunate fact for this analogy is that the two routes do not lead to the same place. If the present form of service may be said to lead to Canterbury, the new one leads—it may be by devious but none the less certain ways—to Rome. The same writer says, "The Prayer Book revisers do not ask them to burn the present book or force another one upon them," and he therefore thinks that "Bishop Knox's agitation has done so much harm" because "the chosen alternative Book will meet the needs of that large section of Churchpeople whose requirements are not met by the present Prayer Book." If they are not met by the present Book, it is clear that doctrine and practices are required that are not allowed by it, and it is obvious that the Church of England is not the spiritual home of such people, and while we are not asked at present to burn the present book, the writer ignores the fact that the provision of alternative forms is only a temporary measure, and that every effort will be made to make sure, when the time comes, that the form introduced now as a permissible alternative will be the only form in the future Prayer Book.

The Truth about the Bennett Case.

An attempt is now being made to claim that the Anglo-Catholic doctrine concerning the Real Presence of Christ in the consecrated elements cannot rightly be condemned as repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England since the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of *Sheppard v. Bennett* confirmed the acquittal

of Mr. Bennett, who is said to have taught in the sixties the self-same doctrine that is taught by the Anglo-Catholics to-day. It is to be noted that this claim is advanced not merely by Anglo-Catholic priests—which would not be surprising except for the fact that it is a little odd finding them viewing favourably a decision of the Privy Council—but also by the distinguished lawyer who leads the Anglo-Catholic party in the House of Laity of the Church Assembly. But what are the facts? We should like to see this Judgment reprinted, with its Appendix; it constitutes a most masterly examination of the questions associated with the doctrine of the Real Presence; but in the meantime the main points of it may be referred to.

The Articles of Charge related to the writings of Mr. Bennett in a published letter to Dr. Pusey. The words used in the second edition were held by the then Dean of Arches (Sir R. Phillimore) to have "contravened the plain and clear intent of the formularies of the Church," but they had been modified—it is believed at the request of Dr. Pusey—in the third edition, and the Dean of Arches held that, so modified, the words did not contravene the Articles. From this Judgment the promoter of the suit appealed to the Privy Council. The expressions originally used by Mr. Bennett were "the real actual and visible presence of our Lord upon the Altars of our Churches," and again, "Who myself adore and teach the people to adore the consecrated elements, believing Christ to be in them—believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." These words were condemned even by the Dean of Arches and would most certainly have been condemned by the Judicial Committee, had it not been held that the case must be tested on the revised words. In the third edition the crucial passages were altered so as to read (1) "the real and actual presence of our Lord under the form of bread and wine upon the Altars of our Churches"; and (2) "Who myself adore and teach the people to adore Christ present in the Sacrament, under the form of Bread and Wine, believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." It was upon these carefully revised passages that the Judgment turned.

Passages from the Judgment.

Upon the first charge, that relating to the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Communion, the Judicial Committee

pointed out that "as to the mode of this presence the Church affirms nothing, except that the Body of Christ is 'given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner' and that 'the means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten is faith.'" Their lordships proceeded:—

"Any other presence than this—any presence which is not a presence to the soul of the faithful receiver—the Church does not by her Articles and Formularies require her ministers to accept. This cannot be stated too plainly. The question is, however, not what the Articles and Formularies affirm, but what they exclude. The respondent maintains a presence which is (to use his own expression) 'real, actual, objective,' a presence in the Sacrament, a presence upon the altar, under the form of bread and wine. *He does not appear to have used the expression 'in the consecrated elements' in his 3rd Edition; this is one of the points on which the language of the 2nd Edition was altered* [the italics are ours]. And the question raised by the Appeal is, whether his position is contradictory or repugnant to anything in the Articles or Formularies so as to be properly made the ground of a criminal charge. . . . We find nothing in the Articles and Formularies to which the Respondent's position is contrary or repugnant. . . . The assertion of a 'real, actual, objective' presence, introduces, indeed, terms not found in the Articles or Formularies; but it does not appear to affirm, expressly or by necessary implication, a presence other than spiritual, nor to be necessarily contradictory to the 28th Article of Religion."

The Judgment considered the "Declaration of Kneeling" and the alteration in 1662 of the words "unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood" to "unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood" and the words "true natural Body" to "natural Body." Their lordships, however,

"could not advise the condemnation of a clergyman for maintaining that the use in 1662 of the word 'corporal' instead of the words 'real and essential' in the Declaration of Kneeling was an intentional substitution, implying that there may be a real or essential presence as distinguished from a corporal presence. The respondent has nowhere alleged in terms a corporal presence of the natural Body of Christ in the elements; he has never affirmed that the Body of Christ is present in a 'corporal' or 'natural' manner. On the contrary, he has denied this, and he speaks of the presence in which he believes as 'spiritual,' 'supernatural,' 'sacramental,' 'mystical,' 'ineffable.'"

On the second charge, relating to the adoration of Christ present in the Sacrament, their lordships pointed out that "the Church of

England has forbidden all acts of adoration to the Sacrament, understanding by that the consecrated elements," and their decision was given in these memorable words :—

"Upon the whole, their lordships, not without doubts and division of opinions, have come to the conclusion that this charge is not so clearly made out as the rules which govern penal proceedings require. *Mr. Bennett is entitled to the benefit of any doubt that may exist. His language has been rash* [italics ours], but as it appears to the majority of their lordships that his words can be construed so as not to be plainly repugnant to the two passages articulated against them, their lordships will give him the benefit of the doubt that has been raised."

What of To-day's Teaching?

We seem to have advanced far, in the matter of Anglo-Catholic teaching on the Sacrament, from the days of Mr. Bennett's "rash" language. Let our readers look again very closely at his words, obviously most carefully chosen for the purpose, yet held to be rash, and compare them with the teaching of Anglo-Catholics to-day. What is that teaching? To discover it we need not turn to the New Tracts for the Times issued by a Committee of Anglican Priests (helpful as they would be for the purpose); we prefer rather to quote so high an authority as Dr. Darwell Stone. The "Tracts" have been "repudiated," but Dr. Darwell Stone is vouched for by the Prolocutor of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury; and this is what he says. In *Anglo-Catholic Congress Book, No. 28*, he writes, dealing with Reservation, "The Sacrament thus reserved is not other than the Sacrament which is on the altar after the consecration of the Mass. *It is the body of the Lord* [italics ours]: it is the presence of Him Who is our God as well as our Saviour." In his larger book, *The Reserved Sacrament*, Dr. Darwell Stone, writing on "the true doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," has this significant passage :—

"The Protestant divines of the sixteenth century had their clear answer to all such questions. The adoration of our Lord in the reserved Sacrament, like the adoration at the consecration in the Mass, was idolatry; those who took part in it were idolaters. From their own point of view they were perfectly right. If the consecrated elements are only bread and wine after consecration as before, whatever gifts or virtues may be attached to the profitable reception of them, those who imagine that they are worshipping our Lord are wholly wrong in seeking the object of their adoration in His presence

in the Sacrament. But, if it is true that *by consecration the bread and the wine become His body and blood, if our Lord Himself, eternal God, very Man glorified, spiritual, risen, ascended, is present in the Sacrament* [italics ours], then in the adoration there is no idolatry but rather the worship which is the bounden duty of a Christian."

It will be observed that Dr. Darwell Stone in both passages uses the word "Sacrament" when he is clearly referring to the consecrated elements. According to him the presence is in the elements; they "become," after consecration, "the body of the Lord," "His body and His blood." And it is now being seriously argued that the teaching of this doctrine is protected by the Bennett Judgment as containing nothing repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England. Those who thus argue have either never read the Bennett Judgment or else—but we refrain from stating the alternative. "The real relation of the Judgment," said the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in 1906, "to Mr. Bennett's teaching has been frequently misunderstood. His language has been taken in the sense which the Court held that it narrowly avoided; and his acquittal has been treated as establishing the legality of doctrine which his language was held not to express." It is clear, therefore, that those who persist in misrepresenting this Judgment and its effect are altogether without excuse.

The Late Dr. Griffith Thomas.

The unexpected death of the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., news of which reached this country from America on June 3, is a great personal loss to all associated with the CHURCHMAN, not only for what he was in friendship and fellowship to all who are seeking to uphold Evangelical truth, but also because he was for many years, prior to his going to Canada, its brilliant and honoured Editor, and afterwards continued to manifest the greatest possible interest in its welfare. In recent years he was a frequent and much valued writer in these pages, his *Life of the late Canon Christopher*—to mention only one contribution—being a remarkable illustration of the care and thoroughness in detail which marked all his work. His death has been widely recognized as a grievous loss to the whole Church. As a writer he had a considerable output, among his principal books being *A Sacrament of our Redemption* and *The Catholic Faith*, two books which are invaluable for their clearness and power in upholding the Evangelical position of the Church of

England. He was a Biblical commentator and expositor with great gifts which he used to the highest advantage in elucidating the meaning of the sacred text and in bringing its spiritual message home to the heart and life of the reader. Among these books many will recall with thankfulness *The Apostle Peter, Genesis, Romans* and *The Acts*; and there has just been published also a masterly work on the Epistle to the Hebrews, "*Let us go on.*" All his writings had the devotional spirit, and there were some which were wholly devotional, such as *Christianity is Christ, Life Abiding, and The Holy Spirit of God*. But, perhaps, more than all else, Dr. Griffith Thomas stood out as a champion—we might almost say the foremost champion—of the Bible itself as the true, inspired, authoritative and inerrant Word of God. His strong and able defence of the conservative position brought him into sharp conflict with "Higher Critics," but through good report and ill report—and the experiences to which he was subjected at Oxford often saddened him—he held on his way without deviating one hair's breadth from what he believed to be the Truth. Nor do we forget the splendid work he did as a parochial clergyman, Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, Professor at Wycliffe College, Toronto, and more recently as "a free lance" helping and encouraging churches in Canada, America, and the Mission field. He was a great man—great in his ministry, great as a scholar and writer and teacher, and great in his sympathies because he was great in his love and devotion to the Person of our Lord. He had a wonderful genius for friendship, and men loved and trusted him. He has been taken from us in the full vigour of his powers, but the recollection of what he was and what he did will long remain a fragrant memory.

"Three Million Lapsed Communicants."

Under this heading the *Times* of June 19 reported an address by the Rev. E. W. Sara, Director of the Bishop of London's Sunday School Council, at the Bradford conference of the Church of England Men's Society.

"Mr. Sara described the present-day drift away from organized religion as 'an appalling leakage.' It constituted a grave challenge to the Church. While Churchmen continued to think chiefly of the respectable few in the front pews, the young people were being lost. In the London diocese alone 16,000 boys and girls had been lost from Bible classes since the war, 16,000 from the Church Lads'

Brigade, nearly 4,000 from the Girls' Friendly Society, and 8,000 from the senior Bands of Hope. Those figures were typical of the whole country. There were 3,000,000 lapsed communicants, of whom the London Diocese alone counted 300,000. The overwhelming cause of this state of affairs was the lack of influence in the home. People overlooked the fact that the post-war adolescent was a different creature from the pre-war. They had skipped a whole generation. There was in the home to-day a conflict between youth and age which would not exist if youth were properly trained and age sympathetic. When they were up against the problems of life, our boys and girls did not want 'peptonized Sunday school lessons and wishywashy stuff.'

The facts to which Mr. Sara calls attention are serious enough, but it does not appear that he has any sure and certain remedy to suggest. References to "peptonized Sunday school lessons and wishywashy stuff" always make us suspicious that men who use such words are seeking after "some new thing" instead of placing their faith in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ which is for every age and for every condition and circumstance of the times. The subject is too big to be dealt with in a Note: we mention the facts and hope to return to it later.

Report of the Commission on Church Property and Revenues.

The Commission of Inquiry into the Property and Revenues of the Church appointed in 1920 has issued its report. It is a document of great interest to all Churchpeople. There has long been an idea that the Church has vast hidden resources, and that if these were equitably divided there would be adequate incomes for all the Clergy, and funds for the maintenance of the Church's work. The Commission has gone into the whole matter and has produced a full statement of the revenues of the Church. The Recommendations made deal with the constitutions of the Ecclesiastical Commission and Queen Anne's Bounty, the future support of Cathedrals and Capitular Bodies, and lastly the incomes of the Parochial Clergy. They recommend the union of benefices, and the transfer of funds from richer benefices to help the poorer, but even with these changes they say that much will remain to be done before the financial position of the beneficed and unbeneficed Clergy can be regarded as satisfactory. Among the other satisfactory recommendations are that an adequate system of Clergy pensions should be arranged, that

the dioceses should undertake the management of glebe-lands and tithes, and that unbeneficed Clergy should receive suitable increase of stipend after years of service. Other recommendations deal with the incomes of Bishops and Archdeacons and the maintenance of episcopal residences. The Report is the beginning of a much-needed reform in the financial arrangements of the Church. It is a necessary preliminary to increased contributions on the part of the laity.

C.O.P.E.C.

The Conference on Christian Politics, Economics, and Citizenship recently held at Birmingham is an event of outstanding importance in whatever light some of its conclusions may be regarded. Representatives of nearly every section of Christianity met to consider the bearing of Christian ethics on the practical affairs of life. Its aim was to test all human relationships in the light of the principles of Christianity. Every one must sympathize with the earnestness and sincerity that inspired the meeting. Much good has undoubtedly been done by the discussion of so many subjects of vital interest. At the same time there is some justice in several of the criticisms that have been pronounced upon the gathering. It was evident that the undertaking was too vast for the occasion. It was impossible to deal wisely and adequately with all the subjects. In consequence several of the decisions were, as some of the delegates have emphatically declared, "hasty and unbalanced." One "lapse from prudence" has been acknowledged, but others can readily be discovered. The danger in such a Conference is that it may be "run" by individuals and organizations who have very little to do with its spiritual ends, but who are very eager and very adroit in snatching support for objects of their own." At times extremists seemed to capture the conference, with the result that "visionary theories unrelated to the hard facts of the real world" were mistaken for the ethics of Christianity. While admiring the courage and high purpose of its leaders, their mistakes are a warning against tendencies to "sloppy Idealism" that ought to be controlled in the future.



BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

BOOKS on preaching have always an attraction for preachers. The older standard works are well known and their help has been highly valued. The modern sermon differs in many respects from the model of even Victorian days, and there is a natural desire to learn the methods of the more experienced preachers of to-day. There are few books on preaching from which even the most successful may not learn something. When the new books fail to suggest better methods than the old, they frequently convey fresh stimulus and inspiration to renewed efforts.

Scotland has a great preaching tradition. Perhaps nowhere has the pulpit been so powerful. Scottish ministers take their duties in this respect with great seriousness, and a considerable amount of time is devoted not only to preparation, but to the study of all that goes to make effective preaching. Messrs. James Clarke & Co., Ltd., have recently published a course of lectures by the Rev. James Black, M.A., of St. George's United Free Church, Edinburgh (6s. net), under the title, *The Mystery of Preaching*. They were delivered as the Warrack Lectures to the students of the Free Church Colleges in Edinburgh, and at the Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, U.S.A., under "The James Sprunt Foundation." They are full of practical and stimulating advice, and will be read with advantage by preachers young and old.

Why the "Mystery"? The author gives an excellent reason. "Great preaching will always remain a mystery, not least to the preacher himself. It is bound up ultimately in the greater mystery of personality." The effectiveness of preaching always depends on the personality of the preacher, and although Mr. Black humorously suggests that the sub-title of his lectures should be "How to do it, by One who Doesn't Know," their chief value lies in the revelation of his own personality and method. He faces the modern problems. He will not allow that preaching is a spent force. There are greater difficulties than formerly, yet the pulpit may be as powerful to-day as yesterday, if its opportunities are adequately appreciated and fully used. To do this the preacher must "keep near to the big controlling truths." He must preach only what he believes. "The one sure note of power is sincerity." He must preach with interest.

Preaching is "a message plus a personality." "The Smith at His Forge" is the attractive title of the lecture on preparation. Personal experience is drawn upon with good effect in regard to reading, the noting eye, the homiletic mind, and straight lines or tangents. He warns against texts that are pretexts, and the art that is merely artifice. The one unpardonable thing in Christian preaching is to turn the thoughts of the people from the Message to the Messenger. The marks of good preaching are illustrated from a wide variety of sources. On the use of material and the preacher's conduct in the pulpit, the advice is of the practical kind that is most helpful. A preacher full of true enthusiasm for his work, Mr. Black in these lectures gives fresh inspiration for the message of the pulpit.

While Mr. Black provides the theory that gives Scottish preaching its power, a volume of sermons issued by Messrs. Thomson & Cowan (5s. net) provides excellent examples of the results produced. They are *United Free Church Sermons*, edited by Hubert L. Simpson and D. P. Thomson, with a Foreword by Principal D. S. Cairns. The editors refer with just pride to "the great pulpit tradition" of their Church, and speak of these sermons "delivered in the course of their ordinary ministry by representative preachers" as "interpreting the message of Jesus Christ afresh in the light of contemporary thought." Principal Cairns points out that the volume has a two-fold interest. It shows the seriousness with which the preachers treat their work, the character of their great themes, and the clearness, sincerity, and sympathy with men and women of the discourses. It indicates also the position of their Church with regard to the great verities of the faith, and the outlook and nature of the congregations, for "as every real preacher knows, the congregation has a very large share in the making of the sermon."

When we turn to the sermons we find that they bear out the high commendation bestowed upon them. Some of the preachers have a world-wide reputation as writers on various subjects. Among them are Dr. W. M. Clow, Dr. H. R. Mackintosh, Dr. James Moffatt, and Dr. George H. Morrison, but they would probably be among the first to acknowledge that some of their less well-known brethren represented in the volume have splendid gifts of exegesis and powers of appeal. Many of the sermons are models of all that pulpit teaching should be. It is almost invidious to make selections, and

those we mention are only examples of the whole. For instance, the Rev. James Black, whose volume on preaching we have mentioned, takes as his subject "The Envy of the Angels," and gives an impressive picture of the mystery and majesty of human nature, the wonder of divine grace, and the future glory of the redeemed. In "The Word of the Cross" Mr. Daniel Lamont makes plain the meaning of the death of Christ in glowing terms—"the whole love and entreaty and urgency of God are in it." Mr. Gossip on "What Christ does for a Soul," Mr. Hislop on "Loneliness," Mr. Padkin on "Providence," and Mr. Sutherland on "The Ministry of Sympathy," are all examples of preaching with insight and understanding. They have the gift of touching the heart as well as satisfying the mind.

Two new volumes of "The Living Church" series have appeared. *The Thinkers of the Church* by Archibald B. D. Alexander, D.D., and *The Vocation of the Church* by J. H. Leckie, D.D. They maintain the high standard of the series, and its purpose of showing "what a tremendous factor the Church has been in history," and that she has power to meet in fresh forms the old needs and problems.

Dr. Alexander draws attention to the intellectual activity of the Church as distinct from its other manifestations. He thinks too little attention has hitherto been given to the subject. He chooses representative men in successive periods and through them illustrates the development of Christian thought. In the apostolic age St. John, with the two great gifts of genius—insight and inspiration, and St. Paul, with his varied equipment, stand out. Justin Martyr is the representative of the Apologists, and Clement, Origin and Athanasius of the Alexandrian School. At Nicea the deepest things of the Christian life were at stake. It was the battleground of the soul and one of the turning-points of history.

In St. Augustine, Latin Theology found its highest expression, though Tertullian's power cannot be ignored. He passes from the fifth to the eleventh century and gives an interesting account of the chief of the Schoolmen. The Leaders of Protestant Thought receive sympathetic treatment. "The greatness of Luther lies in his rediscovery of God." The Reformation proclamation of Justification and Freedom were a republication of Christianity. They

broke down the despotic rule of the Roman Church, and the dualistic system of Medieval Morality. They influenced every aspect of life, literature, science, art, citizenship, and social service. The Philosophers Bacon, Descartes, and Leibnitz prepared the approach to Modern Thought. The Deistic Era represented an unhappy period of "Old Bailey Theology" when "the Apostles were tried once a week for the Capital Crime of Forgery." But the age was not altogether barren—Bishop Butler is a landmark in English Theology, though in Dr. Alexander's view our age has passed beyond his method. The principle of development and the sense of historical growth are the notes of the next period. Germany provided the greatest formative forces in it. We come then to the days of the Evangelical Revival and we are glad to find a just appreciation of its thought.

"It is quite a mistake to say of the Evangelical Movement that 'it was completely cut off from any living relation to the thought of the age.' It was a mighty reactive power. It revolutionized every institution of the land—the home, the Church, the State." The religious revival was followed by a literary awakening. Cowper, Coleridge, Wordsworth were its leaders. Of Newman's works (as of other writings of the Anglo-Catholic School) it is true that "though written with the incisiveness and subtlety of thought and literary grace of which he was a master, one cannot help feeling that they are based on assumptions which largely detract from their effect as works of theological enlightenment."

He thus sums up his view of that School. "Anglo-Catholicism has its theoretic basis in a definition of Catholicity which is repudiated by all other Communion, Roman and Protestant. Its traditions are largely legendary. It lacks, moreover, the consistency and thoroughness of Newman himself. There is no half-way house for the Anglo-Catholic. The only refuge for the Pseudo-Romanist is Rome. His imitations are cheap and tawdry. 'The goodwill of the Tractarian firm has been acquired by men with very different aims and methods. The ablest members of the party are plunging violently into social politics, while the rank and file are fluttering round the Roman Candle.'"

Among nineteenth century writers the author may be pardoned for giving Scotland a prominent place. In concluding, he looks for a great reconstructive movement in religious thought. The rela-

tion of man to God, Freedom and Immortality, are subjects of perennial importance. The Incarnation offers the only key to their problems. "The Christian Church stands or falls by the ultimate values she attaches to the historical Christ and to His redemptive and reconciliatory Person and Purpose."

It will be seen from these scanty references that this survey of Christian thought contains a vast amount of interesting and suggestive matter. With most of the views expressed Evangelical Churchmen will be in agreement.

Dr. Leckie's *Vocation of the Church* is a somewhat novel treatment of the character and purpose of the Church. He writes with future unity in his mind, and shows that the true marks of the Church preserve a continuity that is not destroyed by differences apparently most irreconcilable. After a statement of the essential character of the Church as seen in its early development, he devotes himself to the Church's work as Prophet, Priest, and Servant of the Kingdom. The titles indicate the original lines of his thought. While there is much that invites discussion in his treatment, there is a wealth of wise sayings and sound judgments. He endeavours to say the best he can of Romanism, and of those who hold Episcopacy to be of the essence of the Church. We are surprised in a work of this character to find the erroneous popular categories of Protestant and Catholic used as indicating the Reformed and Roman communions. We are told that "Catholics know nothing of Protestant theology," and "Multitudes of Protestants have never worshipped in Catholic Churches."

Under the title *Classics of the Inner Life*, Archdeacon Macnutt edits a series of interesting addresses given last Lent in St. Martin's Collegiate Church, Leicester. The Dean of Bristol gives a sympathetic account of Brother Lawrence and "The Practice of the Presence of God." The Bishop of Edinburgh has a congenial subject in Thomas à Kempis. Bishop Taylor gives the lessons to be learnt from the Private Prayers of Bishop Andrewes. St. Augustine's Confessions fall to Dean Inge, who regards it as "the greatest of all devotional books." The Christian Year has ample justice done to it by Dr. Walter Lock, and the Bishop of Oxford tells of the spiritual influence of Law's Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life. From such a body of lecturers the best was to be expected, and the volume

is assured of a warm welcome from all who value the help and guidance of the experiences of holy men of the past.

S.P.C.K. are issuing a new series of biographies under the general title "English Theologians." Two volumes have already appeared, *Bishop Butler*, by Albert E. Baker, M.A., and *Robert Sanderson*, by George Lewis, M.A. The object of the series is "to make clear, in relation to present knowledge, the work of some well-known English theologians." These books will perform a useful service if they bring the works of a representative body of the great English divines to the notice of a generation that is apt to overlook their merits. Bishop Butler's position in the world of thought is of course secure, and Mr. Baker treats him, as well as the epoch in which he lived, with a critical spirit. At the same time he appreciates the permanent element in his thought, and is more sympathetic to the value of probability as a guide of life than some others who have written on Butler's method. Bishop Sanderson is in quite a different category, and his contribution to the life of the Church was of quite another character. Mr. Lewis gives an interesting account of the stirring times in which the Bishop lived, and of his varied contributions to the Church's thought and work.

G. F. I.

The Girl Guides have found their storyteller in Mrs. A. C. Osborn Hann, who loves the work and has the gift of seeing what it means to the girls. *Peg's Patrol* (Religious Tract Society, 2s.) tells the tale of the formation of patrols in a Walworth parish, the difficulties that had to be overcome and the influences the patrol duty had on the lives of the girls. The remarkable feature of the book is its absence of anything like being written with a purpose, for the story naturally grows, the girls are real, and the captain and her friends are drawn true to life. When we laid down the book we asked ourselves, "Is this exaggeration?" and then we went over the incidents and found that our author has good warrant for saying they are described from life. That is so, but who except Mrs. Osborn Hann could have made them live in cold print? We look forward to other volumes from her gifted pen.

CLERICAL NERVES.

BY THE REV. CHARLES COURTENAY, M.A.

NOT that clerical nerves are different from others. As a matter of fact, dissect a Bishop and his butler, and their nervous systems will be found exact replicas of one another. But clerical nerves stand apart, because of the peculiar place they occupy in the clerical career. For one thing, a parson draws on them more largely, and depends on them more fully. Nothing plays so large a place in his life as nerves, and, like a bank balance, if they run out he is a pauper. Ordinary men call upon them occasionally; a clergyman is for ever turning the tap. They are the wires over which his emotions run. They are the basis on which rest his thoughts and ideas, for the brain is after all only a great mass of nerve matter. For another thing, nerves are more in evidence with the parson. Nerves reveal the man more than any other part of him. He, of all men, wears his nervous system inside out. In his preaching, in his visiting, in his conduct of public prayer, the nerves are the man mostly. Absent nerves spell woodenness. It is by virtue of his nervous system that he under the Holy Spirit arrests the minds of men and speeds a living message. And as he stands up before his people they read the man more by his tones than by his features or his words.

By nerves too the clergy stand or fall. If the nerves fail the parson, all the man is chained and tied in knots. No man does justice to himself if his nerves are all over the place. Then he loses his self-mastery and, like an actor struck with stage fright, memory goes, words fail him and his knees shake beneath him. So far from being self-possessed he possesses nothing. Every thing of value speeds away. Sydney Smith never said a truer thing than that a great deal of talent is lost to the world for lack of a little courage. A nervous preacher is like a musician trying to play on a slack string or with frozen fingers. It is sad to think that so small a thing should unhinge a minister of Christ, and that a great intellect, a loving heart, and a mastery of religious lore should all be wasted for want of nerve. Yet, so it is. There are able men on the shelf to-day, working in the shade, who but for this unhappy failure would be on the Bench of Bishops and swaying multitudes.

There are golden-mouthed men who are tongue-tied because nervousness has smitten them as winter frost the running stream. Many are content to read from laboured manuscripts, who but for this deadly embargo might launch out on the joys of extempore speech. There are stores of sympathy lying idle because of the icy barriers of nervous fears and the dread of letting themselves go. Warm hearts are misjudged and dubbed cold because of the reserves which are born of nerves. The councils of the church are made barren by the pressure upon them of loud-mouthed, self-assured men and because the real brain and heart of the church are locked up by this paralysing nervousness. Your coarse-grained man of the world, with a brow of brass, does not understand this phenomenon of want of nerve, and piles his charges against the unhappy victims. To him they are dumb dogs, unsociable, silent from pride, and a hundred other unpleasant things. I think that in some future world such men may be made to taste the bitterness of nervousness. They will understand then.

It is in the face of such a condition of things as this that I am venturing to discuss the clerical nerve. If I can say one helpful thing, or point out one alleviation, I shall feel well repaid.

I

Our first inquiry must needs be WHY THE NERVES GO WRONG.

In many cases nerves are born so. They are inherited like the family estates. Nerves in the father or mother, or both, will probably mean a too nervous offspring. This natural fact of inheritance is one of the saddest and most inevitable aspects of life. It has to be accepted like the family nose and the family gout. But nature must not shoulder the whole burden. Nerves are also made. And this is a sadder chapter still. For many have come into the world with a splendid equipment of nervous energy, and have squandered the whole by sheer mismanagement. Men often forget what frail things nerves are, and press them beyond their strength. As when heavy weights are put on thin wires their nerves bend and snap. We are fearfully and wonderfully made, it is true, and therefore we must be fearfully and wonderfully careful. There are many men and women who take more care of their watch than they do of their nerves. There is no greater wear and tear in life than that of the nerves, and none

which exacts such fearful penalties. A broken leg or tendon you can get mended, but when the nerves are strained to breaking point there is no easy repair.

I do not speak now of those physical sins which wreck the nerves, such as overdrinking and sensuality, for I am writing for parsons.

The danger is not so much from this side as from the highly moral and spiritual side. A zealous clergyman, with the responsibility of souls heavy upon him, labours and labours to escape the blood taint of neglect. Night and day he gives himself no rest ; summers pass and he takes no holiday ; he frets himself for work undone when time and strength fail him ; recreation appears to him unfaithfulness ; social claims are repudiated in the interests of the parish ; and then he drops. Of course he does. He is not made of cast-iron, and his nerves are not made of gutta-percha, and once past the safety point he loses control and runs down hill, a mass of nervous wreckage. If the poor victim is surprised, nobody else is. But there is not only general overwork, there is also particular nerve strain. Emotion in full flood drains away the nervous energy and leaves men stranded. The nerves are the worst possible things to strain, for they kick back with woeful results. It is good to be zealously affected in a good thing, but you must ride your zeal with a curb as well as a snaffle to keep it from bolting. Vagrant habits, too, are responsible for much nervous breakdown, because they involve unnecessary strain. Thus, one man will turn night into day, and deprive himself of sleep to achieve the work which ought to have been done in the daytime. He will even boast of the few hours he requires for sleep. He does not suspect himself of playing the fool and preparing for a breakdown before long. Another will waste the week-days and attack his Sunday sermons on a Saturday night. In a violent hurry he has to choose his text, gather his thoughts together, write like a pressman, and then go to bed to toss there from side to side, trying in vain to woo sleep. I have known men boast of that feat. The result is that they serve up a hash to their patient congregation, and by and by collapse. They call their nervous prostration the result of overwork. They would do better to call it the certain effect of pure disorderliness. There is nothing heroic here ; simply folly. Many men are daily playing tricks with their bodies which appear harmless enough until the nerves go wrong. Touch the

body harmfully, indulge in habits which are against physical good, and you are making straight for damaged nerves. It is quite possible to fast yourself into nervousness, to smoke yourself into nervousness, to eat yourself into nervousness, and many men do just these things. The body is not our enemy, but our friend, and body and soul stand or fall together.

The trouble is that men will not recognize warning symptoms, and for want of noting these they make matters worse. Restlessness bespeaks nerves in disorder. Discontent, too, tells the same tale. Undue sensitiveness to unfriendly criticisms is a pretty sure sign of disordered nerves, for when the nerves are sane and sound opposition is simply disregarded. Difficulties, too, loom larger than usual when the nerves are on an edge, and seem more insurmountable. We are more disposed to make mountains of mole-hills, and to worry over our work when we are strained and nervous. Anxieties multiply under nervous invasions. Nothing seems to go right under this stress, and we write ourselves down as dismal failures. Our sermons are of the poorest, and our efforts in all directions are worse than useless. Perhaps, however, the worst symptom is irritability of temper. Vexed with ourselves, we get vexed with all who come in contact with us. We become hard to live with, and home turns into a small pandemonium.

How does the ordinary man treat these grave symptoms? He mostly ignores them or he fights them. He turns the wheels of his machinery at a quicker pace, and instead of taking his irons out of the fire pushes them further in, multiplying their number at the same time. And so the malady grows, and the poor nerves, pressed beyond endurance, take their revenge. Not only does he ignore these warnings, and go full steam ahead, but he sets them down to the wrong causes. This depression, this morbid sense, this fear are, he thinks, just trials sent of God to prove and better him. Or they are a temptation of the devil to interfere with and stop his work. They must therefore be fought and beaten down. Or they are just passing things to be worked off. And so the tangle grows, and the case turns from being simply distressing to being malignant. Anything may happen from this mad treatment. And the worst often does happen. Naturally, an Englishman, much more a Christian minister, does not like to give in; all the traditions of his race and order forbid it. But desperate ailments require

desperate remedies. It is only false shame which leads a man to go over the precipice rather than turn back. That a wounded man is carried to the rear is no reflection on the man ; it is the action of the level head and the bold heart. It is the acceptance of the inevitable. And even if he does not like it he is carried back all the same.

II

I will next point out *some considerations* which a nervous man will do well to take to heart. I think they will help to cut the roots of much of the insane overstrain of the clergy and Christian workers generally.

The first is that God is not likely to work His servants to death. I set it down in plain black and white, because some men seem to fancy that they are doing God's will all the better for fuss and fury. To me nerve strain is the voice of God bidding me stop. It is God's warning ; not His voice of approval. I have no more right to break one of God's natural laws than I have to break one of the Ten Commandments. To imagine that all this pressure is pleasing to God is to set Him down as a slave-driver at once.

The second consideration is that we can well be done without, if necessary. It is a foolish fiction that we are indispensable. And so all this strain, like an Atlas bearing up the world, is purely unnecessary. The time is coming when we shall have to be done without, and then it will be seen that our disappearance has not caused anything like the wide gap that we thought. There are as good fish in the sea as any that have come out of it, and there are as good parsons rising above the horizon as those who are setting like the sun in the west, and dipping below. For forgetfulness of this we see old men hanging on to their parishes under the impression that after them is coming the Deluge. When Elijah went up to heaven the Israelitish world went on very well with an Elisha.

The third consideration is that God can only use us so long as we are usable. And as a rule we are only usable so long as we are in possession of our powers of mind and body. Now your nervous man is incapacitated for much of his usual work because his broken nerves bar much active and public service. Therefore to run oneself into nervous strain and disorder is to qualify for a back seat in the earthly kingdom. God can use a broken reed, but He can

do better with one that is unbroken or made as good as new by mending. I say this not to dishearten the nervous, but to warn them, and get them to put the drag on in time.

The fourth consideration is that all success is God's work, not man's. It is not the quantity of a man's work that tells, but the quality of it. God can do as much with a half-time man as He can with a whole-time man. In these days of multiplied services, with every hour of the day occupied, until there is hardly time to get a meal or to breathe comfortably, does it not seem as if the parson is hugging to himself the false idea that when he stops the work will collapse? Not a bit of it, my friend. It is God that gives the increase, remember, and if you could manage to do less, and do it better, God's increase would not be less, but more. Cut your garment according to your cloth, cut your work according to your strength, and cut down your organization as much as possible. Then leave the rest to God. So would nerve and work be both the better.

Another consideration that will be beneficial to our overworking nerve victim is that it is a better thing to work under Spirit pressure than at high pressure. All your high pressure will not turn a single wheel, nor manufacture a single blessing for one poor soul. It is not what you do, but what God does with you, which leaves its mark upon eternity. What is the good of waste? And the worst of all waste, surely, is clerical waste. A spiritless minister is like a revolving engine which has lost its attachment to the machine, and which turn wheels to waste. It is better to stop such an engine, and save good fuel and machinery.

III

I am well aware that these considerations are only for those in danger, to prevent a break-down. And some one asks, "What have you got to say to those already smitten?" I will answer this query by dealing with some thoughts on HOW TO DEAL WITH NERVOUSNESS.

Time will be found to bring with it some correctives; only it has to be waited for, and the question is urgent. Still, it is some comfort to those who are naturally nervous to know that as years advance nerves will grow stronger if well treated. Many a nervous youth has found his nerves grow stronger as the years wore on.

Nerves will improve, too, if he gives them fair treatment. Regular habits will work wonders if persevered in. It will be all to the good if our nervous friend will shun late hours, banish all debilitating habits, take needful exercise, play upon another string than the clerical one, and so switch his mind off from the straining points of his life. Rest is not laziness, and leisure is not sinful. Make meat and drink your friend, and not your enemy. And let nothing "get on your nerves." Keep away from disturbing people, and cultivate the quiet and comfortable ones for your intimate friends. If thoughts begin to ferment and worry, shut them off; and above all don't let them keep you awake at night. Keep away from conflicts, idle controversies, and worrying topics. Don't dwell on anything disturbing. Morbid suspicions play havoc with nerves. Give up the notion that you are going to set the world right, and that without you it will tumble to pieces. We are none of us of such great importance as we think. Let all sense of dignity and proper pride and official greatness be dispatched promptly to their own limbo. Half our worries from people come from ruthlessly putting up their backs and by stroking them the wrong way. Let sleeping dogs lie, and if they should wake, don't step on their tails. Personally, I do not think we are any of us the worse for honest work, but we are infinitely the worse for worrying work, for mismanaged work, and for doing things busily which never need be done at all. To wear away the nerves on trifles, to consume energy on things which are neither duties nor necessities, to fret oneself to fiddle strings which never can be tuned, and only produce wails and howls, is nothing but midsummer madness. To cut off all occasions, and cut them up by the roots, is the primary duty of a nervous man.

But it is not enough to call in common sense and stop the leak. There are spiritual remedies worth tons of mere self-treatment, necessary though it is. Surely, spiritual men ought not to be reminded of these remedies. They certainly will not treat them lightly.

Is it not a plain fact that nervous worry mars work instead of mending it? When anxiety begins, faith ends. And where faith ends, we are ploughing sands, and carrying empty buckets to thirsty souls. Usefulness is killed by the spirit of worry. Worry is the fruitful mother of all that is bad; bad sermons, bad visits, bad efforts of all kinds. Worry turns good food into poison, and makes

us spill the precious treasures we are trying to carry to the needy. The most fruitful moods are the happy moods ; so most of us find. Long faces, mournful tones, pessimistic views of life, and jeremiads are simply pernicious in their effects. Cold water douches may be good in a doctor's hands, but in a parson's they do nothing but lower the spiritual temperature and dispose to perilous chills.

What is there to be afraid of ? we ask again. " Be not afraid of their faces," was the Divine exhortation to timid Jeremiah. " What can man do unto me ? " was the inquiry of another servant. " Great is truth and it shall prevail," and great is the true man and he shall prevail too. With a clear conscience a servant of God may stand four-square to an unfriendly world and be safe. And suppose words do rain and pelt upon us, they are only words, and weak at that. Hard words can only hurt as we stand exposed to them shelterless. Hidden in the Lord we are safe from all their venom. " Thou shalt hide them in the secret of Thy presence from the pride of man ; Thou shalt keep them secretly in a pavilion from the strife of tongues." And if even hell be let loose upon us Christ can deal with devils, as He has before, and send them tripping. The shield of faith can turn all the fiery darts of the wicked one. And if we fear that we may fail in our ministry, let us remember that we are none of us responsible for results ; only for delivering our Gospel. God will see to results. God has never shifted that burden to human shoulders. We may keep an easy, undisturbed mind on that point, for God cannot fail.

The fact of the matter is that a nervous man is standing on wrong ground altogether, the ground of self-sufficiency. Of course he will tremble there. He ought to. But on the Divine rock of a promise, and with a Promiser Whose word is eternally true, trembling ought to be stifled. If it is not, so much the worse for the trembler. Resting in the Lord is infinitely better than resting in self, or in appearances, or in moods, or in idle hopes. Nobody yet has succeeded in keeping his footing on a quicksand. " Are bad nerves curable ? " is the anxious question of many, and the only answer worth giving is to ask another question. " Is anything impossible with God ? " Certainly, it must be along that line that the remedy is sought. Divine treatment is always best for inner disorders, and meets the needs of both body and soul. Prayer works wonders. Faith moves mountains, even mountains of

nervousness. The sense of His Presence gives to us the courage which filled Elijah's heart when he stood before the dread Ahab. He who could say and realize, "The Lord of Hosts liveth before Whom I stand," was not going to tremble before an earthly king, however tyrannous. In the calming, soothing presence throbbing nerve sank into rest, and fears were swallowed up by the larger faith. Fear God and you will fear nothing else but sin. We are but children, the oldest of us, and like children, frightened at shadows and the dark, but we only need a Father to take us in His arms, and like an earthly mother to soothe away our fears. We may still sob a little after we are pressed close to His breast, but it is only the after-swell when the storm has passed.

IV

There is one other topic to be touched upon before we close and that is THE GOOD SIDE OF NERVOUSNESS. That nerves have their uses is apt to be forgotten in the distress that their over-pressure causes. The debit side of nerves we have already considered ; now let us deal briefly with the credit side.

Nerves are a rare provocative of humility. They may be depended on to abate the proud and lofty spirit. Your nervous man is more prone to suffer the pangs of inferiority than to pretend to greatness and excellence. This is all to the good, unless he proceeds to deny the gifts he possesses, and takes a position lower than need be. But take it all round it keeps a nice balance between overweening conceit and grovelling prostration. Naturally too, nervousness takes a man off from excessive self-trust, which is the curse of men who minister. Your man of nerves, with lowered head and self-accusing spirit, finds it easier to trust his Lord than himself. And this too is to the good. Thank God when we can trust simply and fully, and thank God too for the cause which impels us to reach out our hands for the pierced Hands of Another. Probably, there is no man who feels more than does the nervous man the absolute necessity of leaning all his weight on his Lord. Thanks to his nerves too he is delivered from the temptation to pushfulness and aggressiveness. Your nervous man never wants to take a front seat and elbow other men out. All his nervous life he has to be pushed himself to take even a respectable place amongst his fellows. He is all for retirement into the background, and letting

others struggle for place. He has no wish to stand out in the world's great eye, and to cut a large figure. Surely, this too is all to the good, and better for the world's peace. Nervousness saves a man too from many temptations of life. Society has many perils, and life's gaities may engulf a too sociable minister. They may call him unduly from his work, and may consume energies better employed. Now, your nervous man shrinks, perhaps unduly at times, from social life, and retires into his shell in love of peace and quiet. It certainly keeps him from foolish entanglements, and stops the world's chatter. But it does not do to yield too much to the hermit spirit, for there is a ministry in society as well as in the church. But if one must err, let it be rather on the side of safety.

One excellent nervous asset is the refinement which goes with such a physical construction. A coarse nature, which knows nothing of nerves, lacks the finer qualities of the best characters. Gentleness, tact, quick sympathies, and the ability to enter into others' difficulties seem to go with the nervous temperament. You will never find such a man making jokes on others' distresses, and especially on nervous distress. Such cruelty and brutality is the mark of the coarse to whom nerves are unintelligible. It is pleasant to think that there is something good about nerves, something even to boast of. For we are apt to fancy that it would be better to be without them altogether, so excruciating do they become at their very worst. But they have their place, even in the parson's constitution. They certainly cannot be done without. And, rightly handled, there is no reason why the most nervous should not reap the gains, and escape the ills of a too obtrusive nerve.

More Yarns on China, by Arthur E. Southon (C.M.S., 1s. net), is another of the capital little books for young folk and for general popular reading which have been produced by the United Council for Missionary Education, and are published by our different Missionary Societies. Among the titles of its chapters are "Green Peaches," "Poppies and Pills," "Bricklayers and Bandits," etc. This last title heads an account of Mr. F. J. Watt, the C.M.S. missionary recently so cruelly murdered.

THE CHELTENHAM CONFERENCE.

“The Church of England and the Church of Rome.”

Full Text of the Papers.

THE Ninth Conference of Evangelical Churchmen was held at Cheltenham on June 24, 25, and 26. In their Letter of Invitation the Committee wrote:—“Recent events within our Church and the prevailing ignorance of the doctrine and system of the Roman Church have directed attention to the great theological and religious principles involved in the Reformation. The need of a reasoned witness to Primitive Christianity and of a true understanding of the teaching and spirit of Roman Catholicism have made it incumbent on Evangelical Churchmen to realize their duty and to understand clearly the positions of the Church of England and the Church of Rome. For these reasons the General Subject of *The Church of England and the Church of Rome* has been chosen for discussion. The Committee have been fortunate in obtaining the co-operation of writers and speakers, whose competence to treat the important subjects allotted to them will be generally recognized throughout the Church.”

The exigencies of publication do not permit of our giving any detailed report of the Conference, or the text of the Findings, but by the kind courtesy and hearty co-operation of the appointed readers of papers, which we desire most gratefully to acknowledge, we are able to print in this issue of the CHURCHMAN the full text of their addresses. These carefully prepared papers, on a subject which is stirring deeply the hearts of Churchpeople to-day, will be found to be of the highest interest and value. They give to this issue a distinctive character of its own, and, although their insertion has involved the crowding out from the CHURCHMAN, in spite of its enlarged size, of much that usually finds a place in these pages, we believe our readers will appreciate fully the advantage of having within one cover such a full, frank, and reasoned examination, as is

afforded by these papers, of some of the points of difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. The Cheltenham Conference in the past has discussed many matters of deep moment to the life and work of the Church, and the influence of its deliberations and Findings has come to be recognized, even in the highest quarters; but we venture to say that rarely, if ever, before, has it given its attention to a subject so far-reaching in its appeal—for it is truly one of national concern—or has it been privileged to have on its platform men of more eminent distinction.

The Conference met under the presidency of the Rector of Cheltenham, the Rev. Canon H. A. Wilson, R.D., who at the opening session on Tuesday evening gave a warm welcome to the representative attendance of members gathered in the Parish Room, St. James's Square, where all the meetings were held. His Presidential address was followed by a paper by Mr. G. G. Coulton in which he gave an Historical Survey of the position (see p. 195). To him the Rev. C. J. Offer succeeded as Selected Speaker.

Wednesday, June 25, was a very full day. There was first a service of Holy Communion at 8 a.m. at the Parish Church, at which an address was given by the Rev. T. Sherwood Jones. At the morning session of the Conference two divisions of the subject were dealt with, viz. "The Theory of the Papacy," upon which the Rev. Dr. R. H. Murray read a paper (see p. 203), with the Rev. G. Foster Carter as Selected Speaker; and "The Roman Doctrine of the Church and Ministry," upon which the Rev. Chancellor Kerr contributed the paper (see p. 208), and the Rev. Harold Drown was Selected Speaker. At the afternoon session, again, two specific branches of the general subject were considered, viz. "Transubstantiation and the Mass," the opening paper being read by Archdeacon J. H. Thorpe (see p. 217), and the Rev. B. C. Jackson following as Selected Speaker; and "Penance and the Confessional," upon which the Rev. T. C. Hammond read a paper (see p. 231) and the Rev. Oliver A. C. Irwin was the Selected Speaker. At the evening session the two remaining branches of the general subject were taken in hand, viz. "Approaches to Rome by Conferences," the paper being read by the Rev. Alfred Fawkes (see p. 241), who was followed by the Rev. George F. Irwin as Selected Speaker; and "Approaches to Rome by Doctrine and Practice," with a paper prepared by the Right Rev. Bishop Knox, D.D. (see p. 247), and the Rev. H. J. Carpenter following as Selected Speaker.

Such is the record of a Conference which we hope and believe will leave its mark upon the history of the great controversy between England and Rome. The rapid development of events in the Church of England makes it all the more important that Churchmen should inform their minds of the nature of the issues raised by that controversy, and nowhere else will they gain more help than is supplied by the papers read at the Cheltenham Conference.

[We regret that there has not been time for the proof of the paper by the Rev. T. C. Hammond to be revised by the author.]

ROME AND OURSELVES: AN HISTORICAL SURVEY.

By G. G. COULTON, M.A. Camb., Hon. D.Lit. Durham; Fellow of St. John's and Hon. Fellow of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.

FIFTEEN centuries ago, when the Roman Empire broke up and Alaric sacked the capital of the world, men said that Christianity was played out—or rather, that Christianity was the real cause of the world's misfortunes, and that the one remedy was to turn to the heathen gods, who would receive penitent humanity back to their bosom, and restore the Golden Age. It was in answer to this that St. Augustine wrote one of the most famous volumes in all literature, his discourse on *The City of God*. The first ten books of this discourse are directly controversial, designed to show, first, that even the horrors of A.D. 410 were not so bad as many horrors of the pagan past, and, secondly, that, even if we desert Christ, the world can never return to Jupiter and his fellows. Among the other twelve books of *The City of God*, many pages again are filled with negative criticism; far more than half of this great work is negative, though Augustine's own mind was perhaps the most constructive of his age. There are moments in history at which a man's first and last word must be Carlyle's *Everlasting No!* Difficult as were St. Augustine's times, one plain resolution was his from the first: whatever happens, we will not go back to the pagan Pantheon! Difficult as our days may be, we can start from a similar resolve: anything rather than go back to what the Church of Rome was before the days of Protestant competition, or to what (so far as we can see) she would again become if Protestant competition were removed! So long as certain impossible things are publicly pressed upon us as the highest religious truths, so long we must not shrink from condemning them with equal publicity as exploded falsehoods.

Let me make it plain that I refer here not to the rank and file of Roman Catholicism, but to their hierarchy, to their public spokesmen, and above all to their professional apologists. The Roman Catholic layman who can say from his heart, "My creed offers an explanation of the mystery of the universe which, to me, is more real than any other; the sacraments of my Church bring my soul nearer to God than anything else I have experienced or can conceive," seems to me to stand on an inexpugnable foundation. We shall find his life consistent with his words; we shall respect him even through our disagreement; and, remembering the Pauline counsel, "Covet ye the best gifts," we shall be less concerned to disagree with him than to discover the secret, and, so far as possible, to enlist the efficacy of that which still gives life to the Roman Church, and makes it one of the great moral factors of the twentieth century.

It is only when the Roman Catholic steps out from this natural zone of truth and safety, and especially when he trespasses upon his neighbours, that we feel bound to resist him as uncompromisingly as St. Augustine would have resisted the virtuous emperor, Marcus Aurelius. The Roman Catholic has truth to guide his life, but he must not insist on proclaiming that this is the only truth. By his sacraments he has access to Christ ; but he must suffer others to come in their own way to Christ, and forbid them not. He must not encourage, but discourage his priests, and the hierarchy who control those priests, when they claim divine sanction and historical justification for doctrines which, if they could again become almost universal, would plunge the world back into barbarism. Here, for instance, are a few sentences from the most learned of modern Roman Catholic encyclopædias, the writer being a professor of whom *The Catholic Encyclopædia* assures us that "Granderath's name will live for ever among scholars." This Jesuit professor writes : "The Church has not only the right and duty of punishing heretics, but even, by so doing, she earns the highest merit in the sphere of supernatural blessings." Henry VIII and Elizabeth, he goes on to say, were real persecutors ; but "quite different is the authoritative condemnation and punishment of heresy by the Catholic Church. She acts in virtue of a divine commission, and of a power she has received from God ; and that which she rejects as error by her definitive decree is really error."¹ University professors at Rome, four times at least in recent years, have publicly proclaimed the Pope's right of inflicting bodily punishment for disbelief upon all baptized Christians ; and three of these have explicitly asserted his right of life and death over them. No Pope has yet dared to explain away that time-honoured motto : "No salvation outside the Catholic Church."² Thousands of modern priests, no doubt, assure us quite sincerely that they hope good Protestants may be saved, and that their Church would never dream of applying coercion to Protestants-born ; but these modernists are here voicing their own private judgment, in flat contradiction with their great saints and scholars of the past. Fortunately for themselves, they do not know what their own hierarchy was teaching explicitly until quite recent times, and is still maintaining implicitly. These modernists do not, in their heart of hearts, value the doctrine of Infallibility so seriously as to realize the difficulty of reconciling that doctrine with any sort of toleration towards Christians outside the Roman communion. But the hierarchy, presumably, does value this Infallibilist doctrine quite seriously ; and certainly the world at large would value very seriously any attempt on the part of modern Rome to "earn the highest merit in the sphere of supernatural blessings," by inflicting fines, imprison-

¹ Herder's *Kirchenlexikon*, vol. v. (1888), col. 1448. I have printed the whole passage in my pamphlet, "Roman Catholic Truth."

² See the eighteenth of my *Mediæval Studies* : "The Death Penalty for Heresy."

ment or death upon all baptized Christians who, having had the Roman claims fairly put before them, still pertinaciously reject those claims. It is high time, therefore, that the official Church should formulate clearly and unequivocally some doctrine which will explain how Infallibility can be reconciled with Christian charity, or even with the most ordinary human justice. So long as the Pope keeps silence on these points, while the laity and the inferior clergy are developing modernist ideas of tolerance on their own private judgment, this is an abdication of the very essence of Infallibility in any practical sense ; for he thus bows to meet popular judgment, and accepts tacitly (or, at last, may be, explicitly) that verdict which all reasonable people would have agreed upon even though no Pope had ever existed. Yet here, if anywhere, is the need of a definite and immediate voice from Infallibility, since nothing can come more clearly into the domain of faith and morals than that belief that we earn supernatural blessings by killing our neighbours in the name of Christ. Yet such was the frequently expressed conviction of the greatest Roman authorities, down to and far beyond the blessed Robert Bellarmine, one of the most learned scholars Rome ever produced, who has already passed into the first stage of canonization, and will doubtless be placed, as soon as the required interval of time has elapsed, side by side with St. Peter and St. Paul. When our King James I pleaded that mercy must at least be shown to those who had sucked in heresy with their mothers' milk, Bellarmine met him with arguments which, from the Roman point of view, are quite unanswerable ; if James was not in fact crushed, this was only because he was in the fortunate position of being free to deny Bellarmine's fundamental assumptions. There are two voices, therefore, in the modern Roman Church. The voice of the Roman Catholic whom we know personally is that of a Christian, and as a true Christian we respect him. The priest's voice, again, is generally consistent with Christian charity, and the priest also we respect for his Christian works. But far above these simple and respectable Christians stand doctors of the Church like Bellarmine, university professors like those four at Rome who have spoken out between 1875 and 1922, and Popes who seem tacitly to approve all that their predecessors said on this subject ; who can scarcely be ignorant, for instance, that Leo X condemned *ex cathedra* Luther's proposition that "the burning of heretics is against the will of the Holy Ghost,"¹ yet who show no sign whatever of correcting past proclamations of intolerance by some equally public and unambiguous declaration of tolerance. We must make allowance, of course, for the difficult position of a modern Pope ; and, while we exonerate him personally for not attempting what may well seem impossible, it is very important to trace the currents by which the Roman Church, which he represents, has drifted into this

¹ In the bull *Exurge Domine*. The *ex cathedra* character of this bull is pointed out by the great canon lawyer, J. F. v. Schulte, "Die Macht der römischen Päpste," p. 27.

dilemma. Why must she now either disavow her own past, or renounce, if only silently, all pretence of directing the human conscience on one of the most important questions of faith or morals which has ever emerged in the history of thought ?

The answer, I believe, is very simple. The dualism which we have noted in the modern Roman Church is a chronic, if not an essential, feature of that institution. From the first moment in history at which we can properly speak of a Roman Catholic Church, as distinguished from that far more Catholic Church of the earlier days when East and West still formed one communion, there were two different religions in that Church. Western civilization in the Middle Ages was a synthesis of ancient society with that of the barbarian conquerors. The two elements coalesced as best they could ; the higher elements came more and more to the fore, as they always will in such a struggle, but at the expense of much compromise with the lower elements. Christian missionaries converted pagan populations ; but Christianity, in the process, absorbed a great deal of paganism. While we give every credit to the mediæval Church for what it did a thousand years ago, we must not allow modern religion to be bound by the terms of peace with Paganism which Roman religion was tempted, or perhaps compelled, to make in those distant days of protracted struggle and incomplete victory. We must hold ourselves free to follow each fresh indication of truth that God gives us through history, through science, through the unforeseen mazes of social development. The Roman hierarchy, mainly by its own choice, has renounced this liberty. In Roman Church law, from its beginning to the present day, Esau struggles with Isaac ; the son of the bondmaid with the son of the free woman ; and he that is born after the flesh too often persecutes him that is born after the spirit.

The most interesting and instructive example, perhaps, of the compromise between Christian and barbarian elements in mediæval Catholicism is in its doctrine of heaven and hell. Men were awakened to face the deepest problems of life and death ; but they did so partly at the cost of a crude eschatology ; the gold had to be hardened with heavy alloy to stand the wear and tear of currency among these rough multitudes. Christ's words were set in the most glaring contrasts of light and shade ; the exigencies of controversy compelled eminent thinkers to define beyond their natural inclinations, if not beyond all reason ; and Christian philosophy thus gave a permanent sanction to popular ideas. In thought, as in territorial conquest, we are constantly driven forward by the necessity, real or fancied, of keeping that which we possess already ; Newman's *Apologia* shows us how he was driven to Rome because the only other alternative seemed unthinkable ; and St. Augustine, long before Newman, believed in hell because he seemed unable otherwise to retain his belief in heaven.¹ Similar necessities drove Augustine to lay the crudest emphasis upon baptism. Tertullian

¹ *De Civ. Dei*, lib. xxi, c. 24.

and Gregory of Nazianzus had here been mercifully latitudinarian ; to Tertullian, the unbaptized child of Christian parents is an "innocent."¹ Augustine, a man far more kindly by nature, was far less pitiful here in logic. All unbaptized must needs be in hell ; there can be no intermediate place for them between hell and heaven ; heaven is unthinkable ; so to hell they must necessarily go, and in hell there must be punishment, *poena*. Of what exact degree, he will not venture to specify ; in one passage of striking mercy compared with the rest he refuses to assert that it would have been better for such children never to have been born ; he will not here define either way.² But St. Fulgentius shortly after him, speaking as representative of the 466 bishops of Africa, has no doubt that the Catholic faith compels us to assume these unbaptized children of Christian parents to be in actual torment of fire.³ St. Gregory the Great, and even Anselm, followed the Augustinian doctrine. The first who dared to plead for greater mercy was the quasi-heretical Abelard ; and Abelard's merciful teaching was carried still farther by Thomas Aquinas. From that time, most of the great schoolmen admitted that unbaptized children might enjoy some sort of natural happiness in their own milder hell, their *Limbus Infantium*. But, when the Reformation had made this a very burning question again, then the more learned scholars of the Roman Church went back to something like Augustine's harsh doctrine. And, if orthodoxy took this gloomy view even of the children of pious parents, we need not wonder that pessimism should have prevailed with regard to mankind in general. Yet, even when we are thus prepared for it, we must shudder here at the inky blackness of mediæval despair. Aquinas, with characteristic good sense, will only commit himself to a general comparison ; he reckons the saved as "few" [*aliquos*], and the damned as "very many" [*plurimos*].⁴ The calculations of other orthodox teachers range from one saved soul in a thousand to one in more than a hundred thousand.⁵ Moreover, while the more cautious judgments of men like Aquinas were studied by comparatively few scholars even at the universities, these more lurid calculations were spread broadcast by popular preachers. The man who damned more than 100,000 souls for every one that is saved was Berthold of Regensburg, perhaps the greatest preacher of the whole Middle Ages, to whom Roger Bacon has paid a special tribute of admiration. And here is Berthold's estimate of the fate awaiting this overwhelming majority of mankind. "If thy whole body were of red-hot iron, and the whole world, from earth to heaven, one vast fire, and thou in the midst,

¹ *De Bapt.* c. 18.

² *Serm.* No. 294, § 3.

³ *De Fide ad Petrum*, cc. 26, 27, 44 ; see Bellarmine's summary of this whole controversy in his *De Amissione Gratiæ*, lib. vi. I have translated this at some length in a recent pamphlet—*Infant Damnation in the Middle Ages*. (Simpkin Marshall and Co.)

⁴ *Sum. Theol.*, 1a, q. xxiii., art. 7.

⁵ I give full references and quotations in *Five Centuries of Religion*, vol. i, pp. 446-7.

that is how a man is in hell, but that he is an hundred-fold worse." These tortures (adds Berthold) will be multiplied a millionfold again when men are restored to their bodies at the Day of Judgment; "they will endure as many thousand years . . . as the number of all the hairs that have grown on all the men and beasts that have lived since God first made Adam; and then, after all those years, the pains will only be at their beginning."¹

Who, it may be asked, took these things in earnest? It must be answered that a large number of pious folk took them very much in earnest, just as, at a later date, they took the similar horrors which we wrongly associate with Calvin's name, though these have mostly good mediæval pedigrees. The majority, as contemporary preachers assure us, thought little of these things in their lifetime, but believed and trembled, and felt the question very practical on their death-bed. Popular theology emphasized the hazards of the last moment no less sternly than the horrors which lay beyond those hazards. Christ was by this time the Stern Judge—*districtus iudex*—and the real intercessor was the Virgin Mary. However evil a man's life had been, by her favour he might pass into heaven; it is scarcely possible to exaggerate the crude literalness with which this doctrine was preached. Again, however pure his life had been, to die in the wrong faith would damn him; if he had deliberately ceased to enlist the Virgin's good offices, or repudiated the Pope's authority, there was no hope for him. These ideas, growing up in popular theology, had become the science of the schools; and, when the human mind began to advance one step farther, a great rent came between the newer thought and the older orthodoxy. In the thirteenth century, as a modern Roman Catholic philosopher points out, men believed themselves to have reached an equilibrium in thought, so that (he adds) "their extraordinary optimism led them to believe that they had arrived at a state close to perfection."² The scholastic philosophers systematized the traditions into which they had been born with such industry and genius, with logic, so irresistible when once their premisses have been granted, that they might well have seemed divine to all men who accepted those premisses, and who, in fact, would have been burned for rejecting them. For that was one of the most definite triumphs of scholasticism, the legalization and regularization of religious manslaughter. Until the end of the twelfth century, heretics had frequently been killed, but generally by a sort of lynch law. In most districts they were extremely unpopular; and, though priests or bishops sometimes had them executed more or less formally, it was generally enough to stir up the people against them. But the orthodox thirteenth century, with its belief in its own perfection, was necessarily driven much farther than this. Dissent increased in proportion as official religion was stiffened and formulated; there were now whole dissenting popula-

¹ *Predigten*, ed. Pfeiffer, vol. i, p. 127.

² M. de Wulf, *Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages*, 1922, pp. 18, 268.

tions, as in Southern France and Northern Italy; orthodoxy was theoretically perfect, yet in practice heresy was growing like a snowball; something must be done. That *something*, to all who accepted the orthodox premisses, took a form which was obvious and inevitable. Men, at the best, have only a minor chance of escaping hell; they have no chance whatever, unless they die in the orthodox faith. Every heretic is not only a brand for the burning, but a traitor and a poisoner; he may take thousands down to hell with himself. As the great preacher Etienne de Bourbon puts it, wine turns easily to vinegar, but no human power can turn vinegar back to wine: a good Catholic may easily be turned to heresy, but not recalled. And the still greater preacher, Berthold of Regensburg, "I myself, by God's grace, am as fast rooted in the Christian faith as any Christian man should rightly be; yet, rather than dwell knowingly one brief fortnight in the same house with a heretic, I would dwell a whole year with five hundred devils." Philosophers like St. Thomas Aquinas, starting from these ideas, forge an unbreakable chain from heresy to the stake. No section of his great *Sum of all Theology* is more closely reasoned and more convincing than this.¹ Some allowance must be made, at first, for a man who has picked up heresy by mistake. But, when once he has had the Catholic case put fairly and fully before him (except in the few negligible cases of mental deficiency), then he must accept it, or be burned as a pertinacious heretic; for he is worse and more mischievous than the thieves, forgers, and murderers who are daily given over to execution. And Popes had already anticipated the saint in this conclusion. From 1231 to 1917—that is, for nearly seven centuries—it was an integral part of canon law that the pertinacious heretic should be burned. Moreover, any Pope, by a single stroke of the pen, could now restore that law: for the ancient penalty has never been expressly and formally abolished; just one single sentence was inserted in the Revised Canon Law of 1917 to the effect that all punishments not expressly rehearsed in this present code are abolished. This reversal of previous papal decrees rested on the independent decision of Benedict XV; if tomorrow the present Pope preferred to strike out that single sentence, he would thereby at once restore the old law, and any baptized Protestant might justly be compelled to choose between conversion and the stake.² What is even more painful, the most orthodox of Anglo-Catholics hold their lives, on papal theory, by the same frail tenure; and if Pius XI had the will and the political power, my lord of Zanzibar must be converted, or burn.

This, then, is one of the many historical reasons which compel us to meet the official Roman Church, as at present constituted, with such words as St. Augustine would have used even to the most virtuous of Pagan emperors. Common justice demands that we should recognize the social good done by that Church; we often

¹ 2^a, 2^{ae}, Quaest. XI.

² For fuller details, see my *Mediæval Studies*, No. 18.

respect and admire Catholics as our fellow-citizens; even towards those whom we find least convincing and sympathetic, we owe the same charity as we owe to a Bolshevik. But, when it comes to a more practical point than this, we must not let our sympathy with the individual blind us to the legal constitution of his community. Our charity to the individual Bolshevik leaves unimpaired our duty of resisting any attempt to unite the British state and the Bolshevik state under one single organization, with one code of laws, unless the Moscow Government could begin by expressly and finally abjuring certain articles of its present constitution. And, until the Roman Church can pronounce on this question of faith and morals, abjuring her claim of religious persecution at least as unequivocally as for seven centuries she asserted it, we have St. Augustine on our side, who felt that no advance was possible so long as men hankered back after an impossible past; we have St. Paul's example, with his uncompromising protest against those who would destroy the liberty which we have in Christ Jesus: "To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour!"

Dr. H. E. Fosdick wrote *Twelve Tests of Character* (Student Christian Movement, 5s.) for a Ladies' Journal, but most of the contents deal with men. It will be valued by all who desire to see how life can be well lived for the highest ends and how many have fulfilled their life-aim and others have failed. One sentence rings in our ears, and we ask is it as true of England as of the United States? An Insurance Company compiled statistics of hundreds of young men who started life at the age of twenty-five. All had apparently the same chance. "Forty years afterwards, when these young men are sixty-five years old, they will on the average have fallen into the following classes: thirty-six dead, fifty-four financially dependent on family or charity, five barely able to earn their own living, four well to do, one rich." What a prospect for humanity, if this be universally or even partially true! As we might expect, Dr. Fosdick illustrates his points with many anecdotes and quotations. He is never dull and is always invigorating. We hear a good deal of the outgrown philosophy of the late Samuel Smiles, but, with a fair acquaintance with the works of that much-derided inspirer of the youth of a past generation, we must in all fairness remark that we find it very hard to distinguish between the morals of Smiles and the teaching of Fosdick. After all human life can only be lived satisfactorily when a man makes the most of his opportunities for culture and self-improvement, and does not forget that there is such a thing as duty to God and man. We most heartily commend this thoughtful, readable and suggestive volume to all who esteem grit, perseverance and devotion to a high ideal. Our author never poses or preaches, and yet he comes home to the heart all the time.

THE THEORY OF THE PAPACY.

BY THE REV. ROBERT H. MURRAY, Litt.D., Rector of
Broughton, Huntingdon.

THE Roman Empire fell to pieces before the incursions of the barbarians. The Church survived the fierce storms that raged during the fifth century. Institutions decayed and the State was ready to perish. The Church felt the necessity for strengthening every bond of outward union—if even she were to survive. Truth is one, it was asserted, and as it must bind into one body all who hold it, so it is only by continuing in that body that its members can preserve it. There is one Flock and one Shepherd. From this position the transition to the view that the Pope is the Shepherd is an easy one. Then comes the next step. The Shepherd must be not able to commit a single mistake. To Christians it must seem not a little strange to be told that there is anyone infallible. For if there is such a guide, what need is there of a Bible? It is certainly, under the circumstances, superfluous. What, for instance, becomes of such a promise as that which tells us that when the Holy Spirit shall come, He shall guide you into all truth? Plainly, His function is also superfluous, for there is another revealer who aspires to lead us into the truth. Even granting that there is anyone who has grasped all the truth, there is the further difficulty that ordinary mortals cannot understand the truth presented to them in such an encyclopædic fashion. In his famous story, Lessing imagined that he was offered the choice between truth and the pursuit of truth. "If God held all truth," said Lessing in memorable words, "in His right hand, and in His left nothing but an ever-restless striving after truth, though with the condition of for ever and ever erring, and should say to me, 'Choose!' I would bow reverently to His left hand, and say, 'Father, give! Pure truth is for Thee alone!'"

Anyone who has worked at first-hand in any field of knowledge is well aware that it is only through the struggle for truth that truth becomes comprehended. Take a case in point. It is perfectly possible for a skilled metaphysician to present to his class the main results of the creative thought of Kant. It can be put in a series of propositions. Does any man think, for the thousandth part of a second, that this series of propositions is what Kant has done for men? Of course not. We all know quite well that if we want to understand Kant we must grapple with such of his books as "The Critique of Pure Reason." As we read it, as we ponder it, it gradually becomes our own because it is by the pursuit of truth that we can in any wise take hold of it. An infallible Church or an infallible Pope would constitute one of the gravest menaces to which truth has ever been exposed. If either could decisively settle Pilate's question, then the intellectual travail of

our life is finished. It seems to us that behind the conception of infallibility there lies concealed the old Greek notion that there was once, in the island of Atlantis, or elsewhere, a condition of the human mind when truth had been completely attained. The most that men can do now, according to the Greeks, is to regain some of the old knowledge they once completely possessed. Seneca saw the folly of this idea, though it was reserved for the scientist to dispose of it altogether. There is new knowledge which none of our forefathers had ever heard of. This is as true a statement in the world of theology as it is in the world of science.

Patristic evidence lends no support to the dogma of papal infallibility. The Fathers read their Bible with diligence, and, as the outcome of their reading, they were convinced that there was no external authority which could protect them from all error. In truth, any infallible guide presupposes also a people who cannot possibly make a mistake in understanding any message he gives. This is a point that is sometimes overlooked, yet it is an important point. Besides, if we profess faith in the infallibility of the Church or anyone else, we are in reality professing faith in our own infallibility. Take a case. If we are asked to join the Church of Rome on the ground that it is the true Church, it is obvious that our reason must balance the arguments for and against such a course. If we can trust our reason to make such a momentous decision as deciding on the infallibility of the Pope, surely we can trust our reason to arrive at any decision. So long as man lives, he must continue in the everlasting search for truth. It is at once his glory and his torment. No one, however, who cares whole-heartedly for the truth can wish it were otherwise. In a striking aphorism S. T. Coleridge put the matter: "He who begins by loving Christianity better than Truth, will proceed by loving his own sect or Church better than Christianity, and end in loving himself better than all." If ever there was an illustration of this aphorism, it is in the Roman Catholic Church. For she began by loving Christianity better than truth, and to-day she loves the papacy more than either truth or Christianity. The Pope claims an absolute monarchy within the Church upon earth. What, then, becomes of the Headship of Christ? Is He not practically deposed from His place? As the late H. D. Traill put it: "The Pope seems to claim to be the Vicar of Christ in the sense that a man is said to be the vicar of his own curate."

In the quest of truth many a man is tempted to fall back on the a priori idea of what manner of revelation God ought to have made. Men, he argues, seek for truth, and seek for a certainty of truth. Therefore there must be, argues men like Möhler, a sure guide to the most valuable of all truths, the truth of religion. Though Bishop Butler published his "Analogy" more than a century and a half ago, it is not a whit out of date. "As we are in no sort judges beforehand," he wisely tells us, "by what laws or rules, or in what degree or by what means it were to have been expected that God would naturally instruct us; so upon supposition of His

affording us light and instruction by revelation, additional to what He has afforded us by reason and experience, we are in no sort judges by what methods, and in what proportion it were to be expected that this supernatural light and instruction would be afforded us." History points to case after case where this mistake has been committed. The Jews were certain "by what methods" the Messiah would come to them. He would come as a great conqueror, they were persuaded, and the result was that when He actually arrived they were so blinded by preconceived ideas that they could not see Him. Roman Catholicism is certain "by what methods" God would reveal His purpose to mankind. If He gave us a revelation recorded in a book, He would undoubtedly grant us an authorized interpreter of it. How truth would have suffered if He had done so!

Not the least remarkable circumstance in the declaration of the infallibility of the Pope is that it was not officially certified to exist till the year 1870. Through countless heresies, we are asked to believe, the Church was able to exist, and only when she reached comparatively calm waters was an infallible pilot vouchsafed to her. We are so forcibly reminded of Samuel Johnson's letter to Lord Chesterfield that we quote part of it: "Is not a Patron, my lord, one who looks with unconcern on a man struggling for life in the water, and, when he has reached ground, encumbers him with help? The notice which you have been pleased to take of my labours, had it been early, had been kind; but it has been delayed till I am indifferent, and cannot enjoy it; till I am solitary and cannot impart it; till I am known, and do not want it."

It seems to us that the doctrine of infallibility did not give one act of assistance to the Church when she sorely needed it. This doctrine viewed her "with unconcern" when she was "struggling for life in the water" of heresy after heresy. For almost nineteen centuries there was an infallible guide, and the world was unconscious of it! No creed and no catechism (and creeds and catechisms were meant for the rank and file of the Church) ever give the remotest hint of it. Certainly, of all the mistakes the Church has committed, this is second to none. The hiding of this infallible knowledge was all the more criminal when we realize how much it was wanted. For the first six centuries of the existence of the Church were stained by many heresies. Nor were these heresies slight in their effects. As Carlyle first read, for instance, the views of the Arians, he scoffed at them as quarrels about a diphthong. He came later to see that the whole future of Christianity was involved in rejecting Arianism. We are asked to think it credible that the Roman bishops were able to solve such controversies which grievously hindered the growth of the Church, yet they refused for four centuries a decision. The Bull, "Unam Sanctam," of Boniface VIII, in 1303 is perhaps the first formally addressed to the whole Church. Either the bishops were able to solve these controversies or they were not. If they were able, is there any valid reason why they did not use their powers? The Fathers

never dreamt that they possessed infallible powers. It is significant that the Fathers never derive a single article of belief solely from tradition. For them the Word of God is sufficient. If the Church possessed authoritative traditions, they have not heard of them. We are forced to conclude that either there was no organ of the Church in possession of infallible knowledge or that the Church and the organ itself gravely erred in not providing the faithful with such assured knowledge. If the latter were the case, she and he shared their heresies.

The State remained incoherent: the Church became coherent. The power of the coherent Church grew at the expense of the incoherent State. This tendency received no little support from the False Decretals, forged about 850 by a Frankish clerk assuming the name of Isidorus Mercator, and from the Constantine forgery. The temporal power grew buttressed upon the forged Donation of Constantine. The spiritual power grew buttressed upon the forged decretals of Isidore. On this rock or on this sand a lofty papal edifice was built. It is strange that it does not seem to the forgers that there was an easy way out of the difficulty in augmenting the authority of the Papacy. Why not declare it infallible? Such an idea, however, never crosses their minds.

If the Pope were infallible in 1870, he was at all times and in all places infallible when he speaks *ex cathedra*. Innocent I wrote to the Council of Milevis and Gelasius wrote to the Bishops of Picenum, laying down that infants must receive communion, as those who die without it go straight to Hell. A thousand years later the Council of Trent meets in the sixteenth century, and anathematises this very doctrine. Yet Gelasius teaches that "this it is against which the Apostolic See is greatly on its guard, that the glorious confession of the Apostle . . . should not be defiled by the least error or contagion. For if . . . such a misfortune should occur, how could we venture to resist any error, or how should we be able to correct the wandering?" Precisely so; but what if he leads the wandering even more astray?

The divergence of Papal teaching from the Bible rendered the orthodox Church of the East suspicious. Inevitably, it never liked the claims of Rome to primacy. In 1054 there was a breach between the Church of Old Rome and that of New Rome. There were dogmatic divergencies on such points as the double Procession of the Holy Ghost. All these divergencies were the occasion of the schism. The cause of the breach in the unity of the Church was the overweening claims of the Pope. In the eleventh century the barrier in the way of the unity of the Church is the theory of papal supremacy. In the twentieth century the barrier in the way of the unity of the Church is the theory of papal infallibility. There is nothing else of such outstanding importance.

The schism between the Eastern Church and the Western was to be followed by a schism within the ranks of the Western Church herself. In 1305 the Popes transferred their residence from Rome to Avignon, and there they remained for seventy years. It meant

in effect that the policy of the papal court was subordinated to that of France, for we must not forget that the Donation of Constantine had turned the Pope into the head of a State as well as of a Church. Not only was the Pope's policy controlled by France, giving in effect two heads to the Papal States, but there were also rival Popes, giving in effect two heads to the Church of Rome. The period of the rival Popes began in 1378 and lasted to 1417. When two Popes were canonically elected, which was the true one? The Church did not settle this question in the fourteenth century, and it is not settled to-day. For the Church of Rome has never dared officially to say which Pope was the true one. In fact, the more we work at mediæval history, the more we are convinced that Rome is the mother, not of certainty, but of uncertainty.

The Gallican Church signified its protest against the growing claims of the Pope in the articles of 1682, which place the authority of the Council of Constance above that of the Pope, and refuses to call the decisions of the Pope infallible. Still, the hankering after authority persists, and found its climax in the acceptance of the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope by the Vatican Council of 1870. Döllinger deliberately rejected the new decree, and his reasons were: "As a Christian, as a theologian, as an historian, as a citizen, I cannot accept this doctrine."

There is one supreme test of belief, and that is acting. Does the Pope actually issue decrees that are formally infallible? In 1888, Leo XIII, one of the greatest of all Popes, issues the Encyclical *De libertate humana*, and in it occurs his views on liberty. Leo XIII sadly laments that the Church has had to acquiesce in "certain modern liberties," but he hopes that "when times change for the better" she will once more be in a position to use her liberty. The teaching of this Encyclical on toleration is unmistakable: "As to what concerns toleration, it is wonderful how far removed are those who profess Liberalism from the equity and prudence of the Church." Is this Encyclical infallible? Not at all.

W. G. Ward used to long for the day when Infallibility should be declared a dogma of the Church, and he hoped when that day arrived he should have each morning with his roll of bread a fresh decree. Such hopes have been sadly disappointed. With questions of doubt and difficulty pressing on all sides, the following lamentable fact emerges. Since 1870 the Pope has not issued a single infallible decree. We have received no light or leading on the controversies of the past, and we have received no light or leading on the controversies of the present. In fact, we almost come to the laughing view of Benedict XIV when he declared: "If it is true that all justice and all truth lie hidden in the shrine of my breast, yet I have never been able to find the key of it." The Sphinx through the centuries has not been more silent than the infallible Pope for the last half century.

THE ROMAN DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND MINISTRY.

BY THE REV. CHANCELLOR KERR, B.D., Rector of Banbridge,
Co. Down.

IN the New Testament we look in vain for a formal ruling about the polity of the Church. We see there the Church, living, acknowledged, gloried in. It is a fact of profound significance that only once—and that in a single Gospel—did Christ mention His Church. In all His teaching as recorded there is no direct announcement regarding its organization or administration. It is plain that His followers were a flock, a society, attached to Him by discipleship, love, obedience, adoration; united with Him by the closest life-giving union, as branches with the vine, partakers through Him of the Divine life. "I in them and Thou in Me." Membership in His Church meant the life of love that could only be lived through the communication of Him Who was the Bread of Life. The supremely spiritual basis of the membership is emphatically shown in the Final Discourses in the Upper Room—chapters which, as Dr. Hort well says, are "on the whole the weightiest and most pregnant body of teaching on the Ecclesia to be found anywhere in the Bible."¹

In the Acts and Epistles the Church is displayed growing, being adapted to meet the new conditions as they arose, developing its ordered functions. It is the community of the disciples who naturally formed a definite society in each place. Its essence is the Christ-honouring life, the Spirit-sustained existence. Its communal expression is the continuing in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship in the breaking of bread and the prayers—the fourfold bond of belief, community, sacraments, and devotions. As occasion demanded, officers were appointed, but there is no trace of any Divine command as to the form of the organization, nor is there any apostolic ordinance about the permanent constitution of the Church as a whole. Attention is concentrated on quite other issues—the Gospel of Christ in all its relations to human life—the problems of thought and conduct—the working out in daily life of the Christian ideal. The Church is the local group of the baptized faithful followers of Christ. It is, in familiar words, "a congregation of faithful men in the which the pure word of God is preached and the sacraments be duly ministered" (Article XIX).

There is another, a universal, sense in which St. Paul uses the word Church as the Body of Christ. This is the conception of the ideal Church composed not of the visible local churches but of the true individual members of every congregation who, by their mystical union with the Head, Christ, form a sanctified, glorious

¹ *The Christian Ecclesia*, chap. xiii.

Church, not having spot or wrinkle. It is a spiritual transcendental view of the Church as revealing the universal presence of Christ, the Head, from whom all the body through every joint of the supply maketh increase. This is the sense which our Church expresses in the words, "The mystical body of Thy Son which is the blessed company of all faithful people." The unity is progressive, and its centre is the unseen Divine Head of the Church triumphant as well as militant.¹ Any idea of a fixed authoritative system of Church government involving an earthly head of the Church is utterly and grotesquely foreign to the New Testament. It is a delusion so baseless, so inconsistent with the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles, as also with that of the Fathers, that its acceptance by any well-informed people might be thought incredible ("Neither be ye called Masters: for one is your Master, even the Christ"—St. Matt. xxiii. 10).

Yet we have it asserted by the Church of Rome as a fundamental doctrine that the Catholic Church must be subject to the Bishop of an Italian city! Cardinal Bourne, in his last Lenten Pastoral, proclaims that the belief that the gift of infallibility has been granted to the Church of Rome, both in its episcopal hierarchy as a whole and in its visible head personally, is "the fundamental doctrine of the Catholic Church." He adds what to us sounds dangerously akin to blasphemy, that "no man can be a Catholic until, guided and enlightened by the Holy Ghost, he is able to accept it."

In a recent pamphlet by the Rev. P. H. Malden—"Anglo-Catholics: Have they Grasped the Point?" (published by the Catholic Truth Society)—it is taught that Romanists "hold the Pope's supremacy and infallibility as *articles of faith* as vital as

¹ The unity of which visible body and Church of Christ consisteth in that uniformity which all several persons thereunto belonging have by reason of that one Lord, whose servants they all profess themselves, that one Faith which they all acknowledge, that one Baptism wherewith they are all initiated."—Hooker, *Ecc. Polit.*, Bk. iii., 1, 3.

"Primarily then the Church is the spirit-bearing body, and what makes her one in heaven and paradise and earth is not an outward but an inward fact—the indwelling of the spirit which brings with it the indwelling of Christ and makes the Church the great 'Christ-bearer,' the body of Christ. . . . She is one as the branches are one with the vine: that is because the sap of Christ's life is derived into her, and to be in connection with Christ the source of life is therefore the condition of being in the unity of the Church."—Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, chap. ii.

"The unity of the Universal Ecclesia . . . is a truth of theology and religion, not a fact of what we call ecclesiastical politics."—Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, chap. x.

"That the Church as the Body of Christ is one is a postulate of Christian belief. But as this oneness is conditioned by the presence of the Holy Spirit, it would seem that wherever there were the fruits of the Spirit, the oneness in question was in some measure satisfied. Not a word is said about uniformity of outward organization, and the great passage in which the Lord Himself speaks most directly of the oneness of His followers is not a command having reference to the present, but a prayer pointing to a distant future."—Sanday, *The Conception of Priesthood*, p. 17.

the Trinity or the Incarnation," and that their "whole doctrine of the nature of the Church and the Divine scheme of redemption is intimately and indissolubly bound up with the necessity of unconditional submission to Rome in matters of faith." It is repeatedly asserted that "the Catholic Church is essentially and by Divine institution Papal in its nature," that "the only possible right reason for becoming a Catholic is because of the conviction that 'the Church of Christ' means 'the Church over which the Pope rules.'" Such a wild corruption of the faith once delivered is not the less ludicrous because so many blindly swallow it. This monstrous perversion of Christianity, this foisting of an offensive fiction into the fundamentals of belief, and making it of equal importance with the Incarnation, can claim the highest authority of the Roman Church. Pope Pius X authorized a compendium called "The Catholic Faith," which asserts that the Roman Pontiff represents Christ upon earth and takes His place in the government of the Church. The Vatican Decrees of 1870 lay it down that "by the appointment of our Lord the Roman Church possesses a sovereignty of ordinary power over all other Churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate; to which all of whatever rite and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience to submit not only in matters which belong to faith and morals but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world."¹ Anyone who will not admit the Pope to have full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church ("plenam et supremam potestatem iurisdictionis in universam ecclesiam") is anathematized.

These insanely arrogant pretensions go back to the famous Bull "Unam Sanctam" of Pope Boniface VIII (1303): "We declare, affirm, define and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary to salvation that every human creature should be subject to the Roman Pontiff." The position is summed up in a Jesuit Professor's (Gretser) dictum: "When we speak of the Church we mean the Pope." To such vain boastings the Anglican may reply in the words spoken to Falstaff: "It is not a confident brow nor the throng of words that come with such more than impudent sauciness from you can thrust me from a level consideration." Or as Dr. Dollinger put it: "Only when a universal conflagration of libraries had destroyed all historical documents, when Easterns and Westerns knew no more of their own early history than the Maoris of New Zealand

¹ "We further teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful, and that in all cases, the decision of which belongs to the Church, recourse may be had to his tribunal; but that none may reopen the judgment of the Apostolic See, than whose authority there is none greater, nor can any lawfully review its judgment. Wherefore they err from the right path of truth who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman Pontiffs to an Œcumenical Council as to an authority higher than that of the Roman Pontiff."—*Pastor Æternus*, chap. iii.

know of theirs now, and when by a miracle great nations had abjured their whole intellectual character and habits of thought—then, and not till then, would such a submission be possible" (*The Pope and the Council*, xxvii).

The Roman doctrine of the Church is not only flagrantly without warrant from Holy Scripture, or from the writings or practices of the primitive Church, but it is also confuted by them in nearly every way that a falsification can be exposed. How intolerable is it to assert as a fundamental doctrine of the faith something that is alien to the whole spirit of the teaching of Christ and His Apostles. The Acts and Apostolic writings overthrow every plea by which this bogus claim is bolstered up. St. Peter himself is seen writing and acting in irreconcilable inconsistency with his alleged monarchical prerogatives. He is subordinate, opposed, mistaken, censured. The teaching of the sacred writers not only omits this cardinal doctrine—one which from its nature must have been, were it known, put in the forefront, as it is in modern Roman treatises, and appealed to in the emergencies and controversies that confronted the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic Church. The Church developed then without the least knowledge that it had within itself a vicar of Christ, "a visible head of the whole Church militant" (*Æternus Pastor*, cap. i.). The whole New Testament cancels such a theory. The Roman claim is to be put in the category of those instances of absurd megalomania to which belong the pretension of Joseph Smith that an angel gave to him the gold plates on which the Book of Mormon was written and a pair of supernatural spectacles to decipher the characters; or the claim of Joanna Southcott that she was the woman of the Apocalypse.

Ecclesiastical history presents innumerable, express, smashing proofs of the falsity of the imposture. We ask in vain for valid evidence that St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome. We see the earlier Bishops of Rome, from Clement on, showing a blank ignorance of their supposed privileges. "For the first thousand years," writes Dr. Dollinger, "no Pope ever issued a doctrinal decision intended for and addressed to the whole Church." If the Popes were not aware of their "total plenitude of supreme power," it was scarcely to be expected that other Church leaders would know of it. So down the centuries we find the most learned and renowned saints of the Church disregarding any such vital prerogatives—ignoring the "fundamental doctrine of the Catholic Church." They were faced with heresies and conflicts that devastated the fold, but they never thought of refuge and settlement by resorting to him who was the divinely appointed "supreme judge of the faithful," the "Father and Teacher of all Christians." They did more than ignore, they scouted the idea, that recourse in disputes could be had to his tribunal. They employed the laborious and hazardous method of deciding controversies by the holding of local and general councils when they might have learned the Divine Will from him who was commissioned "to rule, feed, and govern the

universal Church." The very calling an Ecumenical Council to define a doctrine is an outrage against the fundamental doctrine of the Roman Church. Therefore all the illustrious Bishops who countenanced that mode of legislating are in peril of the anathema against those who hold the Roman Pontiff is not possessed of the power of infallibly defining doctrine. This is one striking instance of how the acceptance of the Roman claim means the turning of history upside down. The Popes who took part in these councils as participators, not as Supreme Teachers, or who recognized their collective authority, are in a similar danger. Yet Gregory the Great avowed: "I confess that I receive and venerate the four councils as I receive and venerate the four books of the Gospels" (P. L. lxxvii., 478, quoted by Puller, *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, p. 350, 3rd ed.). These Four General Councils were not, except in one case, presided over by Popes or their representatives; none of them were summoned by Popes (Pope Leo resisted the calling of the Council of Chalcedon). They were not only grossly intruding on and dishonouring the office of the Vicar of Christ, but they passed laws which cut at the root of his divine authority. Thus the Council of Nicea, in its fifth canon, provides for an appeal from a Bishop to a Synod, without a word about the supreme tribunal at which all causes could be decided. In its sixth canon it did refer to Rome, but only to cite the metropolitan rights of bishops there as a reason—a parallel case—for endowing the Bishop of Alexandria with similar rights in Egypt. The phraseology absolutely excludes any knowledge of the modern claims of Rome. The Council of Constantinople was presided over by a Bishop, St. Meletius, who was not even in communion with Rome (any more than the Archbishop of Canterbury is now), and whose rival in the See of Antioch the Pope supported. Yet St. Meletius was peculiarly venerated in the Catholic Church, and is a canonized saint in the East and West. This Council, by its second canon, strictly prohibited the interference of bishops outside their own dioceses, without any recognition of "a sovereignty of ordinary power over all other Churches" residing in Rome. By its famous third canon it forcibly testified to the absence of any *jure divino* authority in the See of Rome by elevating the Bishop of Constantinople to the second place, on the ground that "Constantinople is the new Rome." The Council of Chalcedon, with fullness of detail, endorsed this, attributing the privileges "the Fathers naturally assigned" to the See of Elder Rome to the fact that it was the Imperial city; and explaining that Constantinople, as the seat of sovereignty, "should also in ecclesiastical matters be magnified as she is." This Council ratified laws about appeals that ignore the crazy pretensions of the vatican decrees. It makes no mention of the Roman Pontiff in fixing tribunals for aggrieved ecclesiastics to appeal to. The General Councils were careful to defend the self-governing rights of National Churches.

When the Bishops of Rome entered into controversy with other bishops, they were treated as prelates who had no superior

jurisdiction. Their hostile acts were withstood, and they themselves sharply rebuked at times by the most eminent leaders of the Church. No one in the time when Pope Victor severed communion with the Asiatics, or when Pope Stephen did the same with St. Cyprian and the African and other Churches, dreamt that the Pope was the Sovereign-Head of the Church. Cyprian can oppose Stephen's action as "proud," "impertinent," "inconsistent," and can assure a council at Carthage: "No one of us sets himself up to be a bishop of bishops, or by tyrannical terror compels his colleagues to the necessity of obedience"—words which won St. Augustine's eulogy for their moderation! The eighty-five bishops at this Council unanimously repudiated the Papal decision without any consciousness that they were rebelling against the Father and Teacher of all Christians. St. Firmilian, who was also excommunicated then, can comment on the "open and manifest folly," the "fury of contumacious discord" of Stephen, and tells him "how great a sin hast thou heaped up against thyself when thou didst cut thyself off from so many flocks." We find a similar freedom to admonish or oppose the Roman prelates through several centuries. St. Basil is not conscious of impropriety when he complains of the "Western superciliousness" of Pope Damasus, who neither knows the truth of the matters in dispute nor will accept the way to learn it; and so is a supporter of heresy. St. Augustine and the Council of Carthage (A.D. 419) could remonstrate with Pope Boniface against the "unendurable," "arrogant" treatment they received from a Bishop of Rome. The Church of North Africa did not dream of permitting appeals to Rome. In its celebrated letter, "Optaremus," sent by the plenary Council of Carthage (A.D. 426), St. Aurelius presiding, to Pope Celestine, it explicitly denies any right, inherent or assigned, in the Pope to hear appeals from thence, "unless it can be imagined by anyone that our God can inspire a single individual with justice and refuse it to an innumerable multitude of bishops assembled in Council." The Council requests Celestine to refrain from sending any more of his clerks as executors of his orders; "lest it would seem like introducing the smoky arrogance of the world into the Church of Christ."

St. Hilary of Arles, in his bitter dispute with Pope Leo when excluded from the Papal communion, was not by the Church of Gaul regarded as cut off from the "one Rock under one Supreme Pastor." Many illustrious saints like Basil and Chrysostom and Flavian; when remaining outside the communion of Rome, were wholly in ignorance that the bishop of that see had "full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church." Both St. Cyprian and St. Augustine wrote treatises on the unity of the Church without one word in them about the Pope being the centre of unity. The utmost point of absurdity is reached when the Sixth, Seventh and Eighth General Councils condemned and anathematized Pope Honorius as a heretic. For some centuries all Popes professed

their assent to this condemnation. We find another Pope, Vigilius, so little conscious of his Divinely bestowed prerogatives that when he had solemnly, "by the authority of the Apostolic See," defended certain men and doctrines, and when the Fifth General Council, in flagrant opposition to his authority, proceeded to condemn and anathematize them; and when it went on to discard himself, then he surrendered, and in abject fashion acknowledged his error and joined obediently in anathematizing what previously he had ex-cathedra whitewashed.

The supreme authority in the Church of a General Council was accepted even in the Middle Ages. The Council of Pisa (1409) deposed two Popes. The Council of Constance a few years later deposed three rival Popes, and decreed that a General Council "has power immediately from Christ which anyone; of whatever rank or dignity, even Papal (*etiamsi papalis*), is bound to obey in those things which pertain to the faith and the extirpation of the aforesaid schism and the general reformation of the Church of God in its head and in its members (*in capite et in membris*)." ¹ The Council of Basle (1433) published anew, as articles of faith, the decrees of the Council of Constance, and Pope Eugenius IV approved of its findings in a Bull, and declared the sincerity of his devotion to "the holy œcumenical Council of Basle."

It follows logically from the Papal theory of the Church that all officials therein are dependent on the Pope, and derive their authority from him. Gradually as the Papal usurpation extended by encroachment, by secular power, by forgery and fraud and terrorism, bishops and other clergy lost their primitive rights. The bishops, instead of being regarded as the representatives of the Apostles in their sees, having an independent *magisterium*, recognizing only the jurisdiction of their own provincial metropolitans and Patriarchs, possessing together in Councils the supreme legislative authority in the Church, were depressed to be, in effect, vicars and vassals of the Pope. Papal legates tyrannized over them. Their authority was made dependant on the reception of the Papal *pallium*. They had, and have, to take a humiliating oath of fealty to the Pope. Through the influence of the Isidorian fabrications the bishops became the mere assistants of the Pope, functioning only through his delegated authority. The Pope has the appointment of bishops, and he can depose them; he is the universal bishop. In *The Catholic Faith*, a manual prescribed by the Pope, it is taught the bishops officiate "in dependence upon the Bishop of Rome." From the eleventh century the formula-Bishop "by the grace of God and of the Apostolic See" became common. In the Ancient Church the Bishops signed conciliar decrees with the words "*Ego definiens Subscripsi*." Their degradation is witnessed by the superscription to the Vatican decrees, "*Sacro approbante concilio*." The Pope, by the Vatican decree, is the "ordinary" over all Churches; his jurisdiction everywhere

¹ Gieseler, *Ecc. Hist.*, iv., 296.

is "truly episcopal" and "immediate." The sacrilegious despoiling of the privileges inherent in the Episcopate was brazenly proclaimed by Innocent III when he declared that the Pope had called bishops and other ministers "into a share of the charge, so that the weight of so great an office may be the more easily borne by means of the acts of those who are assistants" (cf. Denny; *Papalism*; 1085).¹

We have only to recall how the Ancient Church regarded the office of a bishop to see the frantic arrogance and imposture of such pretensions. Irenæus held bishops to be those "to whom the Apostles delivered the Churches," committing to them their own place of *magisterium*. Cyprian and Jerome style bishops "successors of the Apostles." Cyprian is emphatic in declaring the equality of all bishops. "The Episcopate is one a part of which is held by each *in solidum*" (cf. Puller, p. 6). "The Church is settled upon the bishops, and every act of the Church is controlled by these same rulers." Writing to Pope Stephen he proclaims, "Every bishop hath the government of the Church in his own choice and freewill, hereafter to give an account of his conduct to the Lord." Cyprian saw in the concord of bishops the external unity of the Church, "the Church which is Catholic, and one is not separated nor divided, but is in truth connected and joined together by the cement of the bishops mutually cleaving to each other" (*Ep. Ad Florentium*). St. Augustine tells Pope Boniface, "To sit on our watch-towers and guard the flock belongs in common to all of us who have episcopal functions, although the hill on which you stand is more conspicuous than the rest." With what horror would the Fathers have regarded the imposition of an oath upon all bishops to maintain, defend, increase and advance the rights, honours, privileges and authority of their lord the Pope, or the addition of an article to the Creed promising and swearing true obedience to the Roman Pontiff. It comes to this—the Roman system requires bishops and priests to abandon the commission of Christ in virtue of which they discharge their holy functions, and to become the dependant assistants of an Alexander Borgia or a Belthasar Cossa. Could the impious mind of man concoct a

¹ It is characteristic of Roman tactics that the Vatican decree, when attempting to show that Papal claims did not prejudice episcopal rights, quotes some sentences of Gregory the Great: "My honour is the honour of the whole Church, etc." The context of these sentences and the whole argument of the letter are a powerful refutation of the claims they are with gross unfairness used to endorse. In the sentence preceding, Gregory, repudiating "the haughty appellation" of Universal Pope, writes: "Nor do I consider that an honour by which I acknowledge that my brethren lose their own." The sentences immediately following are: "For if your holiness [i.e. the Patriarch of Alexandria] calls me Universal Pope, you deny that you yourself are what you admit me to be—universal. But this God forbid! Away with words which inflate vanity and wound charity." Even in 1870, an ex-cathedra Papal pronouncement is guilty of flagrant misrepresentation in quoting authorities.

more shocking perversion of Catholic order—a more blasphemous invasion of the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free?

In the whole miserable history of human deceits we cannot find any system so elaborately and imposingly fabricated, of such appalling effrontery, as the Roman doctrine of the Church of Christ being the dominion of the Pope. To rank this blasphemous aggression with the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation is to defile and endanger the basis of Christianity. Its acceptance would mean that there is no imposition too absurd, no superstition too revolting to become a dogma of the Catholic Church. It would mean the emblazoning of a glaring falsehood on the Church's banner, the substitution of a stifling tyrannical usurpation for the Church's freedom.

A convert from Judaism, a scholar of no mean reputation, and an expositor with a strong confidence in the unity and integrity of Holy Scripture, Mr. David Baron has, after eighteen years, brought out a third and revised edition of *Types, Psalms and Prophecies* (Morgan and Scott, 6s. net), a work which has already proved itself to be of real value to Bible students. It consists of a series of selected types, psalms and prophecies, and the object is to show the ultimate fulfilment of the unalterable promises of God to His ancient and covenant people—the Jewish nation—and also to show that all prophetic Scripture is fulfilled in Him Who is the subject of Old Testament prophecy, Jesus Christ.

Time was when, like *Pilgrim's Progress*, Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* was much read; but this is no longer the case. But it is good for us to be reminded of the price that was paid for Reformation principles and religious liberty. The pages of Church history in the sixteenth century are stained by blood and tears shed by valiant souls, "of whom the world was not worthy." Mr. G. Anderson Miller is living and working in Kent, which produced "in the brave days of old" a goodly number of witnesses, and in *Noble Martyrs of Kent* (Morgan and Scott, 3s. net) he has compiled an account of their sufferings. Pastor Tydeman Chilvers, of the Metropolitan Tabernacle, contributes a Foreword in which he reminds us of Rome's boast—that she is *semper eadem*; and he laments that pre-Reformation doctrines and practices are being surreptitiously introduced into the Church of England, a fact of which our readers are well aware. Anything that emphasizes the fundamentals or shows how Rome has violated "the truth as it is in Jesus" is useful. The circulation of this sad little volume with its record of, for the most part, humble lives gladly laid down for the truth, is bound to be useful. Its widespread circulation will no doubt contribute to that end.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION AND THE MASS.

BY THE VEN. J. H. THORPE, M.A., B.D., Archdeacon of Macclesfield, Hon. C.F.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION is a dogmatic assertion of a particular mode of the Real Objective Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, consequent upon the consecration of the bread and wine.

This doctrine of the Real Objective Presence is not found in any creed of the Catholic Church, nor in any decree or canon of any Council of the Undivided Catholic Church. No attempt to formulate a theory of the mode of the Presence was ever made in the early ages of the Church, and no controversy arose about it till the ninth and the eleventh centuries. Historically the controversy had its origin in the gross and materialistic conceptions held by the illiterate masses, admitted without due instruction into the Church in the eighth and following centuries, and their unintelligent misunderstanding of Christ's Words of Institution.

It was not till towards the middle of the ninth century that the doctrine of the actual conversion of the elements into the flesh and blood of Christ was formally taught by Paschasius Radbert, Abbot of Corbie in France, although popularly held probably for long before. He maintained that after consecration by the priest there is nothing else in the Eucharist but the flesh and blood of Christ. This crass and materialistic doctrine was vigorously assailed by many leading theologians of the day who upheld the doctrine of the real spiritual presence of Christ, not in the elements themselves, but in the souls of believing communicants. But the more materialistic theory of P. Radbert, for which the name of Transubstantiation was subsequently adopted, prevailed, till it was formulated as a dogma of the Western Church by the fourth Lateran Council in 1215¹ which decreed that "the Body and Blood of Christ are in the Sacrament of the Altar truly contained under the species of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into the Body and the wine into the Blood by Divine power, so that to complete the mystery of Unity" (between Christ and His people) "we receive of His what He received of ours."

It was the work of the Schoolmen to clothe this view in subtle, philosophical formulæ to bring it into such a shape as would not shock and revolt the intellects of the more educated and intelligent classes. For this they invented the philosophy of substance and accidents known as Realism. It was as manipulated and shaped by the Schoolmen that the subject came before the Council of Trent. That Council bound it on the Church of Rome, so that to-day it is entrenched in Roman theology beyond dispute or question. Probably there has never been a greater disservice

¹ The word "transubstantiated" was first used by this Council to express the real or carnal presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

done to the Christian Religion than the evolution of this doctrine by the Schoolmen and its riveting on Roman theology through their influence. Theologically it has to call in the aid of a perpetually recurring miracle, wrought by the priest at his will, in order "to prevent the accidents of bread being removed with the substance, and to make them continue, suspended, as it were in the air, without anything in which to be."

Philosophically Realism is now an exploded (and absurd) theory which has been trampled in the dust by scientific thinkers.

Although, however, Transubstantiation as formulated by the Schoolmen fails hopelessly to meet the claims of reason, yet, as an attempt to do so, it was a recognition by the acutest thinkers of the Middle Ages that the claims of reason must be met, and so far they justify our application of our reasoning powers to the examination of Eucharistic doctrine. It is a commonplace with Romanists that the dogmas of the Roman Church must be received and accepted in faith and by faith. But the doctrine of Transubstantiation itself, its history and its object, conflicts with that teaching, and amply justifies the principle implied in the Church of England's appeal to Holy Scripture, sound reason and the primitive Church.

It is important that the history and development of this doctrine should be carefully studied by English Churchmen at the present time. For it is clearly possible for men to repudiate the doctrine of Transubstantiation as held now by the Church of Rome, while all the time holding that doctrine in its earlier form. The doctrine which is now held and taught by certain men in the Church of England is a return to the dogma formulated by the Lateran Council, though unencumbered by the impossible philosophical theory of the existence of attributes without any substance or object. Different though it be from the Tridentine doctrine, it tends to the re-introduction of various practices, such as elevation of the elements for purposes of adoration, ringing a bell at the moment of Consecration, observance of the Festival of Corpus Christi, reservation for purposes of adoration, and generally to the same devotional consequences as the Tridentine doctrine.

But I think we are justified in contending that both the Lateran and the Tridentine doctrines of Transubstantiation are equally at variance with the doctrine maintained by the consensus of all the most eminent theologians of the Church of England since the Reformation, and both equally impossible to be reconciled with the natural interpretation of the Liturgy or the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth Articles.

THE ROMAN DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Whatever fault may be found with the Church of Rome, no one can accuse her of obscurity or ambiguity as to what she means by Transubstantiation. The Council of Trent puts all doubt at rest as long as its decrees are accepted as final by that Church. It says:—

Canon I. "If anyone shall deny that the body and blood

together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore entire Christ, are truly, really and substantially contained in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist; and shall say that He is only in it as in a sign, or in a figure, or virtually—let him be accursed."

Canon 2. "If anyone shall say that the substance of the bread and wine remains in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, 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 outward forms of the bread and wine still remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most aptly calls Transubstantiation—let him be accursed."

Canon 3. "If anyone shall deny, that in the venerated sacrament of the Eucharist, entire Christ is contained in each kind, and in each several particle of either kind when separated—let him be accursed."

Canon 4. "If anyone shall say that, after consecration, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is only in the wonderful sacrament of the Eucharist in use whilst it is taken, and not either before or after, and that the true body of the Lord does not remain in the hosts or particles which have been consecrated, and which are reserved, or remain after the communion—let him be accursed."

The Catechism of the Council of Trent teaches that—"Not only the true body of Christ, and whatever appertains to the true mode of existence of a body, as the bones and nerves, but also that entire Christ is contained in this sacrament." (*On the Sac. of the Eucharist*, p. 241, Venice, 1582.)

Consistently with this doctrine (and indeed following from it as of necessity) the Church of Rome teaches that the host is to be worshipped with *latria*, that is the worship given to God Himself.

Canon 5. "If anyone shall say that Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, even with the open worship of *latria*, and therefore not to be venerated with any peculiar festal celebrity, nor to be solemnly carried about in processions according to the praiseworthy and universal rites and customs of the holy Church, and that he is not to be publicly set before the people to be adored, and that his adorers are idolaters—let him be accursed."

ITS DOCTRINAL SETTING.

If this doctrine is taken alone and considered by itself, as a definition of Transubstantiation, it appears to lack nothing in confidence and clearness of dogmatic assertion. But as soon as it is set in relation to other Roman doctrines it becomes beset with difficulties and contradictions, which at once deprive it of the certainty which appears to be entrenched in its strong dogmatic statements and which makes it so attractive to certain types of mind.

The Church of Rome teaches that Christ is offered in an unbloody manner in the Sacrifice of the Mass.

“And since the same Christ who once offered Himself in a bloody manner (*cruente*) on the Altar of the Cross, is contained in this divine Sacrifice which is celebrated in the Mass, and offered in an unbloody manner (*incruente immolatur*)” etc. (Council of Trent, Sess. 22, Can. 2.)

Now how can that be an unbloody sacrifice in which wine is offered which has been transubstantiated into *blood*? How can there be a remission of sins in the unbloody Sacrifice of the Mass, when it is written “without shedding of blood is no remission”? (Heb. ix. 22.)

THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION.

It is the doctrine of the Church of Rome that the transubstantiation of the elements is accomplished by the very words which Christ Himself said at the Institution. The following is the form of the consecration of the wine:—“Take and drink ye all of this; for this is the chalice of my blood of the New *and Eternal* Testament, *the mystery of faith*; which is shed for you, and for many to the remission of sins.” Words are here inserted (“*and Eternal,*” “*the mystery of faith*”) which are not found in our Lord’s recorded words, and so the form in the Missal differs from the very words of Christ by virtue of which it is taught the transubstantiation takes place. Romanists cannot, therefore, have any certainty that there is ever a valid Mass if the rule as to the operative words stands.

THE DOCTRINE OF INTENTION.

The Roman doctrine of Intention has a direct bearing on the doctrine of Transubstantiation and its derivatives. The Council of Trent decrees:—“If anyone shall say, that in ministers, while they form and give the sacraments, *intention* is not required, at least of doing what the Church does, let him be accursed.” Thus if a priest consecrate the Host without the right intention there is no Transubstantiation, and the people are led to worship as God that which is only a little flour and water. But more than this, if the Bishop who ordained him; and the whole line of Bishops before that Bishop; or the priest who baptized the Bishop; or the priest who married his parents, lacked the right intention, all the acts of that priest, as well as the particular Mass, are invalid and he is a minister of idolatry to his flock. Bellarmine (Tom. i., p. 488, Prag. 1721) says: “No one can be certain with the certainty of faith, that he has a true sacrament, since the sacrament is not formed without the intention of the minister, and no one can see the intention of another.”

When the dogma of Transubstantiation is further considered in relation to “Defects in the Mass” which may occur, and which no person present at a Mass can be assured do not occur, it is seen

how little ground there is for that certainty of which Romanists are so accustomed to boast.

DEFECTS IN THE MASS.

The Roman Missal contains the following respecting defects in Mass in consequence of which there is no Sacrament and no Transubstantiation :—" The priest about to celebrate Mass, must take the utmost care that there be no defect in any of the things that are requisite for the making the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Now a defect may occur on the part of the matter to be consecrated ; on that of the form to be applied ; and on that of the minister celebrating. If there is a defect in any of these : namely, the due matter, the form with intention, and the sacerdotal order of the celebrant, it nullifies the Sacrament." Then follows a list of the possible defects :—If the flour of which the host is made is not pure ; if the wine is not pure grape-juice or made from sour or unripe grapes ; if the priest has not abstained from food, or a mouthful of water, or even medicine since midnight. Defects may occur in the ministration itself thus :—If the celebration be made in a place not sacred, or not appointed by the Bishop, or on an altar not consecrated, or not covered with three altar cloths ; if there be not present waxen lights ; if it be not the due time of Massing ; if the celebrant has not said at least matins and lauds ; if he omit any of the sacerdotal vestments ; if the sacerdotal vestments and altar cloths be not blest by a Bishop, or other having this power ; if there be not present a clerk serving in the Mass ; or one serving who ought not to serve (as a woman) ; if there be not a suitable chalice with paten ; if the corporal be not clean, which ought to be of linen, not of silk, adorned in the centre, and must be blessed by a Bishop or other having this power ; if he celebrate with head covered, without a dispensation ; if he have not the Missal before him, even though he should know the Mass by rote, which he intends to celebrate.

If there were any grounds in Holy Scripture or in sound reason for the doctrine of Transubstantiation, in face of these possible defects, any one of which, on Rome's own assertion, prevents Transubstantiation from taking place, no member of that Church, however fully and devoutly he believes that doctrine, can have any certainty that an undefective Mass is ever celebrated. If consecration do not take place, the people fall down and worship what according to their own Church is mere flour and water.

Indeed, so great is the uncertainty which exists in the Church of Rome as to the Transubstantiation of the Host, that the Pope himself does not venture to receive the wafer until it has been first tasted by an officer appointed for that purpose. The same rule applies whenever a Bishop sings Mass. This ceremony is called the PROBA and is meant as a protection against the risk of poisoning. This ceremony owes its origin to persons having been poisoned by the Host. They were taught to believe, on pain

of damnation, that the Host was God. Accepting this dogma they received the wafer and were poisoned.

And thus, before ever the dogma of Transubstantiation is examined in the light of Holy Scripture and reason, no Romanist can be certain of possessing a true Sacrament, or of worshipping a validly consecrated Host, on the principles of that Church itself.

THE BODY OF CHRIST.

As the doctrine of Transubstantiation is concerned with the body and blood of Christ it is reasonable and necessary to point out that the material Body of our Blessed Lord has not always existed in the same state or condition. Before His atoning death it was a body like our own, except probably its immunity from disease as the result of His sinless nature. On the Cross and in the tomb it was a dead body. After He rose from the dead it was greatly and mysteriously changed. This no one can deny. While it retained all the characteristics necessary to convince the disciples of its reality, and so far as it was concerned our Lord could truly say "Handle me and see that it is I myself," yet it is impossible not to see that a marked change had taken place. Thus "we are told He stood in the midst of the disciples although the doors were shut and from the marked manner in which the Evangelist repeats this statement, it is clear that he regarded this mode of entrance as supernatural. At Emmaus He suddenly vanished out of the sight of the two. He seems to have passed from place to place with a rapidity beyond that of ordinary locomotion. We never read of His retiring as of old for rest or food to the homes of any of His disciples. We hear nothing of His hunger, or thirst, or weariness. Even when He allayed the fears of His disciples by showing them His hands and His side, He indicated that He was not exactly what He had been, by speaking *not* of His 'flesh and blood,' but of His 'flesh and bones'; while the fact of the Ascension, and every notion that we can form of the heavenly abode, are incompatible with the idea that His resurrection-body was subject to the same conditions of ponderable matter as before. Nor is this all, for the manner of Our Lord's intercourse with His disciples after His Resurrection bears hardly fewer marks of change than the nature of His person. . . . Facts like these undoubtedly lead us to infer that after His Resurrection Our Lord was not the same as He had been before He died, and that the body with which He came forth from Joseph's tomb was different from that which had been laid in it, and was already glorified." (Milligan, *The Resurrection of Our Lord*, p. 13 seq.)

Now the upholders of the doctrine of Transubstantiation have to face the facts of our Lord's bodily history and to determine (assuming for the moment their doctrine to be true) when the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ, under which of the conditions of that body. Is it into the body of Christ

as He was born and lived and died? Is it the body as it hung dead on the Cross? Is it the glorified body now in heaven?

Suppose these questions be answered by asserting that the bread and wine are changed into the glorified body now in heaven, it is reasonable to ask what authority there is for this. For surely such a momentous statement demands some evidence beyond mere assertion. It is reasonable to point to the testimony of Holy Scripture to the change in our Lord's Resurrection-body I have referred to. How little we know, or are capable of knowing, about that body! Whatever knowledge we possess of bodies is of bodies under present earthly conditions. Were we to accept the philosophy on which Transubstantiation is based as sound and true we would still be faced with the insuperable difficulty that we know so little of our Lord's heavenly body that we cannot tell whether it has any substance as distinguished from accidents. And when we know that the distinction of substance and accidents, even in respect of earthly bodies, is philosophically unsound, exploded and abandoned in every field of thought except Roman theology, surely it is impossible to accept it as applying to our Lord's heavenly body of which we know so little.

THE BLOOD.

Further, great as is the difficulty respecting a change of the bread or wafer into the substance of our Lord's Body, or of any other change of the element which involves its ceasing to be part of the outward and visible sign and becoming the thing signified, the difficulty is greatly increased when we come to apply any such doctrine or theory to the Blood. For a very strong case can be made out for the view that our Lord's Resurrection-body was a bloodless one. Dean Alford's comment on St. Luke xxiv. 38-40 ("Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I myself; handle Me and see; for a Spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have") is "observe 'flesh and bones' but not 'blood.' This the Resurrection Body probably had not—as being the animal life." Our Lord's words to St. Thomas (St. John xx. 27) imply that the marks in His blessed body were no scars, but the veritable wounds themselves. If so, they must have been wounds that had ceased to bleed. And His propitiatory death was the shedding of His blood which He did not afterwards resume.

On the other hand, Professor Milligan held the view that the conclusion drawn from our Lord's words, when compared with 1 Cor. xv. 50 ("Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God"), "seems somewhat precarious, unless we are careful to explain that our only meaning is that the blood was not in the same condition as that in which it had previously been. There seems no reason for saying that the blood might not be glorified in the same way as the more solid portions of the earthly body." (*Resurrection of Our Lord*, p. 242.)

Transubstantiation assumes that our Lord's Body is now, as

it was when on earth, composed of flesh, bones and blood, and pays no regard to the changed character of His heavenly body. There is not only no ground for this assumption but strong presumptions against it. Certainly the onus of proof that our Lord's heavenly body is not bloodless rests on Roman theologians in face of their doctrine of the transubstantiation of the wine into the substance of the blood of Christ.

THE INSTITUTION.

If we look to the circumstances of the first institution and the conduct of the Apostles at the time, we shall be forced, I think, to the conviction that the Apostles who were then present did not believe in any such change as Transubstantiation. Our Lord having broken it said of the bread: "This is My body which is given for you." Likewise after supper He gave them the cup, saying: "Drink ye all of this, for this is My blood which is shed for many."

At the time when He uttered these words neither had His body been broken, nor His blood shed, though He spoke as if the sacrifice of the Cross had been already made. In this point it is certain that His language could not be literally interpreted. Why should it be concluded that the other portions of His speech may be taken literally?

If the Apostles understood our Lord's words as Rome asserts they should be understood, why did they express no surprise? This miracle, if really wrought upon the bread and wine, was effected in a manner altogether different from any other of our Lord's miracles. When at Cana He turned the water into wine, there was not only a real change in the substance, but a change in the outward form of the element manifest to the senses. Why was this miracle made to differ from that in which Christ first manifested forth His glory by a change of water into wine; the only change of a similar kind which He had effected during His Ministry?

But the law of Moses placed before the Apostles an obstacle in the way of their belief of Transubstantiation so formidable as to be insurmountable. To partake of blood was absolutely forbidden to them as Jews. To partake of blood was a permission which to the last they formally refused to all kinds of Christians, and they prefixed to their decree the authority of the Holy Spirit. Yet our Lord called the wine His blood; under that name He gave it to them; under that name they silently and immediately received it. But if they had imagined the wine to have become really and literally His blood, we may be confident that they would not have taken it without reluctance, and without some explanation of the lawfulness of doing so from our Lord. We know from St. Peter's refusal to allow our Lord to wash his feet, that he, at least, would not have hesitated to express scruples if he felt any. The silence of the Apostles and their willingness to obey are indeed an undoubted evidence that they did not consider the bread

and wine to have been actually made the body and blood of Christ, but that they must have understood His words in a figurative sense.

THE SENSES.

This doctrine further subverts the evidence on which all human belief and Christianity itself rest. All our knowledge is derived ultimately through the senses which are five—sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch. The Apostles on the evidence of two senses believed in the resurrection of Christ. On the evidence of all our senses we must disbelieve that the bread and wine are changed into body and blood. If the evidence of two senses were reliable in regard to the truth of our Lord's Resurrection-body, that of all our senses cannot be wrong when they unite in witness against the Mass doctrine.

Indeed (to quote Archbishop Whately again), "It follows that, according to the established use of language, the advocates of Transubstantiation do not speak correctly; for the doctrine, by *their own* account of it, is, *the transformation of Christ's body into bread.*" (*Errors of Romanism*, note p. 33. The whole of this note is very valuable.)

If it be said that the change in the Mass is brought about by the power of the Almighty, it is reasonable to reply that it would have been as easy for God to make the appearances agree with the reality of things as to place them in a perpetual opposition to each other. No reason has ever been given why, if the doctrine be true, the senses should be withheld from giving their testimony to its truth.

THE MASS.

The Roman doctrine concerning the Mass is founded upon that of Transubstantiation, and is as follows:

Fifth Article of the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

"I profess likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead."

Canons of the Council of Trent, can. 2, Sess. 22.

"And since, in this Divine Sacrifice, which is performed in the Mass, the same Christ is contained, and is bloodlessly immolated, Who once offered Himself bloodily upon the cross; the holy Council teaches that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that by its means, if we approach God, contrite and penitent, with a true heart, and a right faith, and with fear and reverence, we may obtain mercy, and obtain grace in seasonable succour. For the Lord, appeased by the oblation of this sacrifice, granting grace and the gift of repentance, remits even great crimes and sins. There is one and the same Victim, and the same Person, Who now offers by the ministry of the priests, Who then offered Himself upon the cross; the mode of offering only being different. And the fruits of that bloody offering are truly most abundantly received through this offering, so far is it from derogating in any way from the former.

Wherefore it is properly offered according to the apostolic tradition, not only for the sins, pains, satisfactions, and other wants of the faithful, who are alive, but also for the dead in Christ, who are not yet fully purified."

It might be enough to dismiss this doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass by showing that if there be no transubstantiation of the elements in the Eucharist there can be no sacrifice.

But there are other and fatal objections to the doctrine.

According to Roman theology, it is essential to the Mass that it be celebrated by a duly ordained sacrificing priest. The claims made on behalf of the Roman priesthood are indeed great. Biel, the Romish doctor, in his "First Lesson on the Canon of the Mass," says: "The priest hath great power over both bodies of Christ"—the Church and the host. "Who hath ever seen anything like it? He who created me, if I may so speak, hath granted me power to create him; and he who created me without me is created by my means." Now if Christ bestowed such powers on any order of men their credentials ought to be clear and beyond doubt. But what are the facts?

Not once in the New Testament is the distinctive word for a sacrificing priest (*Hiereus*) applied to a Christian minister as such of any rank not excepting the Apostles. The doctrine that the Christian ministry is a sacrificing priesthood is incompatible with the commission given by Christ to His Apostles: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." (St. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) Now is it not remarkable that in this commission, while there is mention of one sacrament ordained by Christ, namely, Holy Baptism, there is no direct reference to the other? No doubt it is included in the words "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you"; but may we not find here another of those silences or reticences of our Lord (such as His never calling the Virgin mother) which suggest His anticipation of errors that have since distressed His Church?

The directions given by the Apostles to the first ministers of the Gospel set apart by them are equally incompatible with the assumptions of a sacrificing priesthood (see 1 Tim. iii. 15; iv. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 2, etc.).

In none of the Assemblies of the Church recorded, or glanced at, in the New Testament have we any traces of such a priesthood.

And as there is no priest appointed in the Church by Christ or His Apostles, neither is there any altar. There is one passage quoted sometimes with great confidence, and that even by men of some scholarship,¹ as if it referred to the Communion Table as an altar—Heb. xiii. 10: "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the Tabernacle." But apart from the

¹ E.g. see Canon Daniel, *The Prayer Book*, p. 342.

fact that it would be an anachronism to speak of a Christian altar at the date when the Epistle to the Hebrews was written, when Christian services were held in private houses and the Lord's Supper celebrated at ordinary tables, a critical examination of the passage shows that the persons referred to were "we *Hebrews*," not "we *Christians*." The pronoun "we" is not expressed in the original. It occurs in our translation merely as the sign of the first person plural, and it is not emphatic. The passage is therefore misunderstood when it is read as if the writer were making a contrast between a Jewish and a Christian altar. There is a very direct reference to a particular Jewish altar—the golden altar of incense as used on the Day of Atonement. The bodies of those beasts whose blood was sprinkled upon it were burned without the camp, and therefore could not, under any circumstances, be eaten. This exactly fits in with the argument of the whole passage, which is to show the unprofitableness of meats, while to interpret the altar as the Communion Table is wholly irrelevant. Our reformers were wise when they banished the term altar from our Liturgy as a name for the Lord's Table. They were also better Scholars than those who now wish to restore it.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

As I have called attention to one verse from the Epistle to the Hebrews I may perhaps here remind you that in this Epistle we have the whole subject of priesthood treated more fully than in any other part of the New Testament. The argument in the seventh chapter seems to put it beyond doubt that not only is there no sacrificing priesthood on earth under the Gospel dispensation, but there cannot be one. Contrasting the priesthood under the old law with that of Christ, the author gives three reasons for the cessation of the Levitical priesthood on the appearance in the flesh of the Son of God, "the Apostle and high-priest of our profession" (Heb. iii. 1). These reasons apply with equal force against the Roman priesthood.

(1) Heb. vii. 23. "They truly were many priests (in succession), because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death." (24) "But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable" (or an untransferable (*see margin*)) "priesthood."

(2) Heb. vii. 27. "Who needeth not daily, as those high-priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this He did once when He offered up Himself."

(3) Heb. vii. 28. "For the law maketh men high-priests which have infirmity; but the Word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, Who is consecrated for evermore."

A careful study of the Epistle leads inexorably to one conclusion—that there is no priest in the sacrificial sense under the Christian dispensation but Christ, "the Apostle and high-priest of our profession." Indeed, as Archbishop Whately showed so convincingly in his essays on "Some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion,"

one of its most remarkable peculiarities is "that the Christian Religion alone is without a Priest." I am not aware that those who refuse to accept his conclusions have ever attempted to refute his reasons. Before leaving the Epistle to the Hebrews it may be worth while to glance at the argument drawn by Romanists from the case of Melchisedec. They refer to Gen. xiv. 18. "And Melchisedek, king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the Most High God." The word translated by us "and" they render "for he was the priest, etc.," in order to show that he brought forth bread and wine in his official capacity. (1) Their version is a mistranslation. The Hebrew word they translate here "for" they themselves render "and" in the context. (2) He brought forth bread and wine to refresh Abraham. Josephus corroborates this. (3) It is evident he offered no sacrifice, for the writer of the Epistle says nothing of his doing so. (4) Even if the bread and wine were typical of a sacrifice, for which we have no authority, they were typical of the sacrifice of Christ, of whom Melchisedec was a type.

THE CHARACTER OF GOD.

When we turn to the general teaching of the New Testament we find that the doctrine of the Mass is in sharp conflict with the character of God as there revealed to us.

"It suggests a conception of God the Father which is not in accordance with the teaching of Christ and His Apostles. The specific details of the ritual, the general attitude of the celebrant, the genuflections, the prostrations, the frequent bowing of the attendant clergy and acolytes or servers, the exclusive use of the word altar instead of Lord's Table—all this, conforming as it does so noticeably with what was customary in pagan worship, seems to be adapted to a lower and more primitive conception of God as of One having the attributes of an arbitrary and vengeful potentate, different *toto caelo* from Him whom Jesus described for us in saying, 'I and My Father are One.' The Mass thus tends to keep alive the old popular antithesis between the Father conceived as manifesting the justice and wrath of God and the Son as manifesting the suffering, self-sacrificing love of God. It is needless to say that in the teaching of our Lord there is no such antithesis."

* * * * *

"Now all this" (character of God the Father) "is falsified in the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass with its specific ritual. It obscures, even so as to impugn, the doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that little stress is laid on the Fatherhood of God in Roman teaching or in teaching which is assimilated to it. Nor do we hear much in such teaching of the Holy Spirit and His direct influence upon souls. We hear much more of the ministries of created beings—angels or saints—as mediators between men and the remote and unapproachable God" (Ven. W. L. Paige Cox, Archdeacon of Chester, in *Anglican Essays*, p. 155).

THE FIRST COMMUNION.

The Institution itself, however, is the final court of appeal in regard to the facts and character of the Sacrament as instituted by Christ Himself. No Mass, or Communion, can be in any essential different from the first and be true. Doctrine which does not fit in with the facts of the first Communion cannot be true now. Nor can that be true now which would have been false then. Yet "in view of the great number and diversity of Biblical problems which stimulate research and are freely discussed at the present day, it is somewhat strange that the Institution of the Holy Communion, as it is recorded in the New Testament, is in general comparatively ignored" (*The Last Supper*, by Canon Kennett, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge University).

Now neither the doctrine of Transubstantiation in any form, nor that of the sacrifice of the Mass can be made to fit in with the facts of the first Institution without leading to absurdities which render the doctrine in either case untenable.

CHANGE IN THE ELEMENTS.

1. It is asserted that, on the utterance by the priest of the words of consecration, the bread and wine become there and then the body and blood of Christ. If so, then this must have happened at the Institution. If it happened then, our Lord had two bodies as He reclined at the Table—one, His own, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and another made now by Himself on the utterance of the words "This is my Body; this is my Blood."

If so, must not one of these bodies have been already offered up at the Last Supper, and the other not offered up till the next day upon the cross?

If so, must not Christ have had one body, which was taken and eaten by each of His disciples, and another which was neither taken nor eaten?

If so, and the Apostles understood this, must they not have believed that each of them had the Body of Christ within his own body at the same time that he saw the Lord's body reclining at the Table?

If so, then Christ must have existed and not existed at one and the same time. For already His body, born of the Virgin, existed before He took and broke the bread; but His body which was made out of bread did not exist until the words of consecration were spoken by Him.

If the sacrifice of the Mass is true now it must have been true at the first Eucharist; if it was not true then it cannot be true now.

2. The time when our Lord instituted the Holy Communion is worthy of thought and attention. For the old covenant was not yet, in fact, fulfilled and abolished. Our Lord chose "the night in which He was betrayed" on which to institute this ordinance. Was there any reason why He did not defer the Institution till after His Resurrection? Might He not have instituted it equally well

after as before His Passion? I venture to think not. Apart from the appeal to our love and pity in the pathetic scene in the Upper Room, where we see the Man of Sorrows in the shadows of His coming sufferings, was there not a purpose in the *time* of the institution, that purpose being the anticipatory guarding against the whole idea of any repetition of the sacrifice?

3. Now no sacrifice was offered by Christ at the Institution, for the law of Moses was still in force. (1) The Upper Room was no place of sacrifice; (2) there was no altar of sacrifice there; (3) it was not the hour of sacrifice; (4) neither the posture of Christ nor of the recipients was that of sacrifice; (5) Christ uttered no words of sacrifice, except those of thanksgiving which are not restricted to sacrifice in their use.

4. If every time the Mass is celebrated Christ is offered afresh as a sacrifice for sin, then must Christ suffer afresh each time. For "without shedding of blood there is no remission."

5. But this doctrine is incompatible with the Catholic doctrine of the session of Christ at the right hand of God. The essential meaning of that dogma is that Christ has, after His Ascension, entered upon the Regal phase of His mediatorial work, having completed the work of atonement by His sacrifice upon the Cross. Bishop Pearson points out that the session at the right hand means not only Christ's possession in His own person of the infinite power and majesty of God, but also that "now after all the labours and sorrows of this world, after His stripes and buffetings, after a painful and shameful death, He resteth above in unspeakable joy and everlasting felicity. . . . So Christ is ascended into Heaven where, resting from all pains and sorrow, He is seated, free from all disturbance and opposition, God having placed Him at His right hand until He hath made His enemies His footstool" (Pearson, *Creed*, Art. vi.).

Christ cannot be at the same moment suffering on earth in sacrifices and reigning in heaven. And there is no atoning sacrifice without suffering. "Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission" (Heb. ix. 22, R.V.).

If our Lord offered Himself in that first Eucharist there was no need for His sacrifice of Himself on the cross the next day.

The Twenty-eighth Article of Religion is still justified in asserting that Transubstantiation cannot be proved by Holy Writ, is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

And the same may in truth be said of that earlier and grosser form of Transubstantiation now taught by some in the Church of England, which attempts no philosophical explanation, but merely asserts that the Bread and Wine are the body and blood of Christ, and teaches the ignorant to worship them as such.

The Thirty-first Article still rightly asserts that "the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."

PENANCE AND THE CONFESSIONAL.

BY THE REV. T. C. HAMMOND, M.A., Superintendent Irish Church Missions.

WE are confronted at the outset with some little difficulty in fixing accurately the definition of the word "penance." According to Oscar D. Watkins both the Latin word and its Greek equivalent are used in three distinct senses: (1) the emotion or sentiment of penitence; (2) the penance, penalty or course of humiliation assigned or undertaken; (3) the institution, ordinance or sacrament of penance. (Art. Penance: *Hastings' Dict. Rel. and Ethics.*)

Trench declares that the distinctively ethical meaning of the word derives largely, though not entirely, through its employment in Scripture. (New Test. Synonyms.)

Girdlestone draws attention to the fact that the employment of the word in the LXX imports into it an element of sorrow. (Old Test. Synonyms.)

Calvin who is similarly influenced by a consideration of the Hebrew as well as Greek usage, defines repentance as the "true conversion of our life to God, proceeding from a sincere and serious fear of God, and consisting in the mortification of our flesh and of the old man, and in the vivification of the spirit." (Inst. Bk. III; cap. III, sect. 5.)

The wide meaning given to the term "penance" received a permanent preservation through Jerome's rendering "poenitentiam agere" in the Vulgate, which the English college at Rheims with slavish literalness Englished into "do penance."

Erasmus, it is well known, tried valiantly to substitute "resipisco" and its cognates, and found a doughty supporter in Beza, but the old word with its old dual meaning resisted the attempt to dislodge it in the popular estimation. Although this makes the task of the investigator somewhat more difficult, the fact need not be resented. It is perhaps well to remember that there are deeps in penitence unfathomed by the most competent lexicographical experts. The mania for the cut and dry requires occasionally a healthy check.

Penance or repentance properly considered contains two elements: (1) the inward revolt of the heart against sin; and (2) the outward change of conduct manifesting itself in a determined abandonment of evil.

In the Early Church the conception of repentance was narrowed in another way. The early Fathers preserved the idea of an inward revolt against sin and attached it pre-eminently to the proceedings connected with the administration of Baptism. But the rigorist school dominated the thought of the early centuries, and repentance was associated in their theology with the offer of one chance of

restoration to the Communion of the Church should a serious lapse occur after Baptism.

Tertullian is a leading early authority on this practice. He speaks of a "second and only remaining repentance," and contends that it should not be exhibited in the conscience alone but likewise carried into act. The external exhibition of repentance is called *exomologesis* and consisted in a public confession of sins before God, with the presbyters and "the beloved of God" as ambassadors deprecating God's wrath. The public restoration of the penitent could take place only once; and the public discipline associated with it was evidently designed to deepen the consciousness of sin and intensify the reality of the internal repentance which was the real ground of restoration in the sight of God.

Tertullian urges upon his readers the duty of *exomologesis* by some weird surmises. Volcanoes are little vent-holes of hell, the wounded stag heals itself with dittany, the swallow blinds its young, and restores their sight with swallow-wort, but it is more to the purpose that he cites as an example the public *exomologesis* of Nebuchadnezzar and encourages the timorous by the assurance that no insult shall be offered, but tears shed which are the tears of Christ, because the tears of the brethren. He regards this public confession as a confession of sins to the Lord by which satisfaction is settled and repentance is born. That the discipline involved was at least in many instances voluntarily undertaken may be gathered from his suggestion that men are able to shun it or defer it from day to day and from the question which he asks: "Is it better to be damned in secret than absolved in public?"

It has indeed been urged by a recent writer, Oscar D. Watkins, that *exomologesis* had already acquired a technical meaning in the writings of Tertullian and the other early fathers, and therefore it is not wise to assume that public penance was not preceded by private confession. The answer seems fairly obvious. All that we know about *exomologesis* is derived from the early writers, and they do not mention private confession as a preliminary or any essential part of it.

The reference in Origen (*Hom. II on Levit.*) is not determinat. He instances as the seventh way of remission, of which baptism is the first, the way through penance when the sinner "is not ashamed to publish his sin to the priest of the Lord and to seek medicine." That the reference is to *exomologesis* may be gathered from the use of the word "penance" in Rufinus' translation and from the quotation of the Psalms, "I will confess my iniquity unto the Lord"; and from James, "Let them call for the elders of the Church," with which he supports his opinion.

There is more cogency in the passage on Psalm xxxvii. from the same writer; but even there the suggestion has reference to advice as to whether the sin is meet for confession in the assembly of the whole church, and there is no suggestion that this private confession was in the nature of a practice enjoined by Church authority. Indeed the injunction as to carefulness in the choice of "the phy-

sician to whom confession should be made" makes rather against the idea of an established church custom operative in all cases. Bishop Reichel notes further concerning both these passages that they "are only from the translation of Rufinus, who is known to have taken serious liberties with his author, a fact which strengthens the case as it carries down the maxim of confessing merely for the purpose of obtaining advice a century and a half below the time of Origen." (*His. and Claims of the Confess.*, p. 32.)

It is quite evident that a discipline which could only take place once in individual experience has little relation to the modern development of penance as an institution governing the whole of the normal experience of the Christian from years of discretion until death. It cannot be denied that the procedure outlined by Tertullian is an evidence of the moral earnestness of the primitive church. These early Christians in their desperate struggle against the pervading corruptions of heathendom voluntarily imposed upon themselves humiliation and shame as an incentive to the complete abandonment of those sins which had obtained again a temporary dominion over them after the first renunciation of baptism. But the student ought not to be blind to the fact that the standard indicated, while from some points of view commendable, falls below the New Testament ideal. The cheerful conception of Tertullian that repentance is completed normally before baptism, that the penitent need never require "the second repentance" and that such repentance is only effective once, reads strangely in comparison with the anguished cry of the apostle in Romans vii.

The externalising of the act of confession exercised no doubt a salutary influence upon those who had returned to the "wallowing in the mire," but on the other hand it tended to blunt the higher sensibilities and lower the conception of repentance to that of an act of renunciation of grave evils, rather than to present the New Testament conception of a discipline of continual purifying, drawing the soul nearer to God.

Gradually the system lost its voluntary character and hardened into a code of laws ministered by the ecclesiastical authorities. The sins demanding public penance were specified by Augustine. Incidentally it may be noted that the specification consisted of those offences which in the second century were regarded as altogether unpardonable. The specifying of the sins and the exercise of judicial power gradually supplanting the self-accusation of the penitent produced the impression that the exercise of church discipline had other ends than the preservation of purity in the corporation, that it was in fact the direct infliction of the judgment of God, having eternal as well as temporal consequences, and in all cases ratified by the most High.

The subtle suggestion of change appears as early as Cyprian's time. The problem of restoration had become complicated. There was an excessive number of the lapsed following on the Decian persecution. There arose also a peculiar reverence for "Confessors," as those who had suffered on account of their steadfastness

were called, which introduced irregularity into church discipline and a dangerous laxity in the matter of restoring offenders. Certificates of restoration to communion were issued almost broadcast by "Confessors." Rigorism displayed itself in the severe judgment of some of the brethren that the lapsed had forfeited all title to restoration. The consequent discussions in Cyprian's time created the initial mistake in the matter of repentance. The Church in the person of the accredited minister, the bishop, is to Cyprian's mind the bestower of pardon. The sentence delivered by her is definitely endorsed by God. There is a more definite conception of a judicial process which in itself secures the pardon the penitent seeks. It is true that Cyprian has not lost all sense of the Divine prerogative. He still can say, "The Lord alone can have mercy. He alone can bestow pardon for sins which have been committed against Himself." (On the Lapsed, sec. 17, p. 363, Vol. 1, T. & T. Clark's Transl.) But he can add, "Each one should confess his own sin, while he who has sinned is still in this world, while his confession may be received while the satisfaction and remission made by the priests are pleasing to God. . . . He can regard as effectual whatever in behalf of such as these, either martyrs have besought or priests have done." (Ibid. secs. 29 and 36.)

It would occupy too much time to trace the progress of this judicial idea of the administration of penance through the various forms it exhibits in the early canons regulating the length of satisfaction demanded for specified sins, but the curious will find ample information in Hekele's Councils. The monastic system introduced a rigorous penitential discipline, and gradually the practice of voluntary but now secret self-accusation spread to the laity until in the Council of Lateran, 1215, compulsory auricular confession was enjoined and the system of Penance as it now obtains in the Roman Communion was fully formulated. The link which connects all the various forms that external penance has taken is the underlying idea that the discipline of the Church has direct relation to the forgiveness of God. At first sight the relation was expressed more in accordance with New Testament teaching as being ministerial and declaratory. Little by little approach was made to the view that the minister was not a suppliant joining his tears to the tears of the penitent, nor yet an adviser pointing out the way of life to a wanderer, tortured by doubt and blinded by sin, but a judge hearing the case of the penitent with authority and bestowing, by God's direction, not only the seal of pardon, but the very pardon itself or else withholding by authority the blessing of peace with God. The slow growth of the power of compelling confession is a witness to the magnitude of the revolution that the new theory effected. It seems but truth to say with Canon Meyrick, "These assumptions of the mediæval priesthood, ignorantly acquiesced in, laid the layman a slave at the foot of the priest." (*Scripture and Catholic Truth*, new impression, 1911, p. 144.) For a period of four hundred and fifty years the attempt was made at varying times to compel universal confessions with varying success. Innocent III at length accom-

plished the feat, and the so-called "Tribunal of Penance" became a necessity in the spiritual life of the faithful.

The Church of England consciously and deliberately rejected this serious development of priestly authority. The evidence for this is conclusive and fortunately can be put into small compass. On November 25, 1551, the Council of Trent decreed, "If anyone saith, that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a bare ministry of pronouncing and declaring sins to be forgiven to him who confesses . . . or saith, that the confession of the penitent is not required, in order that the priest may be able to absolve him, let him be anathema. If anyone saith that there are two parts only of penance, to wit, the terrors with which the conscience is smitten upon being convinced of sin, and the faith generated by the Gospel or by the absolution whereby one believes that his sins are forgiven him through Christ, let him be anathema." (Sess. xiv., Waterworth's Transl.)

On March 9, 1552, the revised English Prayer Book was introduced into Parliament. It contained "The Absolution to be pronounced by the Minister alone." It defines the ministerial power in the terms rejected by Trent, "To declare and pronounce to his people being penitent the absolution and remission of their sins." It defines repentance in the terms rejected by Trent, "He pardoneth and absolveth all them which truly repent and unfeignedly believe his holy gospel." Thus in 1552 the charter of a Christian man's liberty was reaffirmed against an ecclesiastical usurpation that sought to destroy it. A smitten conscience and faith generated by the Gospel brings pardon to a guilty soul. There can be no mistaking this definite attitude. The exhortation to private confession of a particular grief was altered by the exclusion of all reference to "the auricular and secret confession to a priest," the substitution of the wider word "minister" for the more definite word "priest" in the exhortation to the troubled "to open his grief" and the substitution of the "benefit of absolution" for the word "absolution." The Homilies go further and invite those whose conscience is troubled to repair to their "learned curate or pastor or to some other Godly learned man." In 1662 the suggestion to restore the narrower definition of the minister of reconciliation by inserting the words "priest the" before the word "minister" in this declaration was deliberately rejected.

But it has been urged that in spite of the cogency of the argument based on the Book of Common Prayer, the position of the Church of England is closely analogous to that of the Church of Rome, as evidenced by the fact that she retains in her Ordinal the crucial words "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained."

It is important, of course, to remember that the words employed in the English Ordinal in the consecration of priests are of very late insertion, probably not dating beyond the thirteenth century, but at the moment the inclusion of the words in the Ordinal rather than any question as to the antiquity of the practice demands notice.

The Church of Rome regards the message of Our Lord to the company assembled on the first day of the week as "the commission stamped by the broad seal of heaven by virtue of which the pastors of Christ's Church absolve repenting sinners upon their confession." (Note in Rhemish Test.) There are not wanting those in the communion of the Church of England who would impose upon the words the same meaning. But it is worth noticing first of all that the English Ordinal does more than quote the divine commission. It adds to it the words, "and be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy sacrament." It follows the declaration by a solemn investiture of authority which again is defined as authority "to preach the word of God and to minister the holy sacrament." If we are to interpret the authoritative language of commission by the exhortation which preceded it in the service, then the priests exercise their function by being "Messenger, Watchmen and Stewards of the Lord," by teaching, premonishing, feeding and providing for the Lord's family, and the manner of compassing the doing of so weighty a work is with doctrine and exhortation taken out of the holy scriptures and with a life agreeable to the same. This interpretation imposed upon the words "Whosoever sins ye remit" is in no way qualified by any reference to a tribunal of penance or even by a remote suggestion of judicial authority exercised therein by the accredited pastor. The cumulative evidence thus afforded indicates that there is an alternative to the interpretation offered by the Roman Church.

The Fulham Conference agreed that the statement in John xx. 23 conveyed a power to the whole church and not merely to the ministry. But it is more important to discover in what manner the power here given was duly exercised. Dwellers in Christian lands where evangelization is widely diffused even though it dare not be said it is completed, have but little conception of the magnitude of the task which confronted the early Christians. To destroy the strongholds of heathenism, to induce a break with age-long custom, and to bring a proud empire to the obedience of the doctrine of Christ. Nothing less than this was the task enjoined upon the affrighted company that gathered behind closed doors for fear of the Jews. To break inveterate customs which were from the moral standpoint inveterate evils required supernatural power. It was therefore that our Lord said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

The declaratory power resident in the preached word was something different from mere declaration. Behind the message was the power of the Holy Ghost. The apostles and their fellows received from the Lord the intimation that the declaration of His Word would indeed prove effective. Sins would be remitted to the penitent believer and the Day of Judgment would endorse the solemn warnings such as that delivered by St. Paul, "Behold ye despisers and wonder and perish."

Attention needs to be directed to the apparently unconditioned character of Our Lord's utterance. As the words stand they seem to confer a power of jurisdiction without any limit or qualification

except such as the administrator may impose at his own caprice. "Whosoever sins ye remit" are absolutely remitted, and "Whosoever sins ye retain" are absolutely retained. No church in Christendom has as yet ventured to declare that the issues of life and death have been so placed unconditionally in the hands of her officers. The Pope's control of the treasury of indulgence is the nearest approach to absolutism that has been devised.

The manner of expression, however, can be readily paralleled from other passages where the implied conditions are at least more obvious. When St. Paul informs us that "the powers that be are ordained of God," and that "rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil," it is obvious, particularly in view of the latter sentence, that he is defining for us the ideal of governmental authority rightly exercised in accordance with the sacred duties that appertain to that office, and deliberately excluding those instances of aberration with which even he was familiar under the dominion of Nero, in order that the divine purpose might stand clear, unobscured by the frailty of human administration. Similarly it is just to argue that the Lord is here emphasizing the efficacy of the gospel with the implied condition that it is *His* gospel.

Interpreted in accordance with this necessary limitation the message of the Risen Lord may be properly understood as conferring upon the Christian community (and it needs to be emphasized that the company addressed represented the Christian community at large, and not merely the proper offices of that community) the power of effecting remission or retention of sins whenever it carried out the will and purpose of its Risen Head. The proclamation of pardon procured pardon, the denunciation of wrath anticipated and procured wrath. Viewed from this standpoint the words as the Divine Charter of the world's evangelists find a proper place as introductory to the Church's Authorization of her ministers as true dispensers of God's Holy Word and Sacraments. It may readily be conceded that reasonable ecclesiastical discipline based upon Scriptural warrant falls within the scope of the Divine authorization and thus the primitive use of these words as indicating the power of re-admission to communion resident in the Bishop can be defended. But such extraordinary functions, even if included under the commission, by no means exhaust it nor can they be said to correctly and fully interpret it. When the Church of God assayed the early and most difficult stage of pioneer missionary work; when she assaulted the Strongholds of Satan and created in the hearts of the heathen listeners to her message that conviction of sin which drove the anxious inquirer to seek the waters of baptism, she drew ever fresh strength and inspiration from those words of the Risen Lord. They are at once her commission, her authority and her enabling for the mighty task of bringing a rebellious world to the feet of the Crucified. In the free atmosphere of the New Testament that is ever the character which attaches to them. St. Paul in his earliest Epistle declares that his Gospel "came not in word only, but also in power and the Holy Ghost," that it was "The Word of God, which effect-

ally worketh." There is surely a suggestion here of that Divine authority which Our Saviour conferred when He said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

It is not for nothing that St. Luke, the companion of the Apostle to the Gentiles, instead of supplying the actual words spoken by our Lord supplies a summary of His post-Resurrection teaching which makes the burden of it "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem." It is confirmatory of the same great conception that St. Peter and St. James concur in attributing to the Word of God that regenerative efficacy which is the divine confirmation of the remission of sins. "It was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe," declares Paul, and further adds that God leads His messengers in triumph and makes manifest through them the savour of His knowledge sometimes from life unto life, sometimes from death unto death. Conscious further of the magnitude of his claim the Apostle humbly declares, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels that the exceeding greatness of the power may be of God." There could be no more striking commentary upon the real meaning of John xx. 22-23. If the positive and emphatic declarations of the New Testament concerning the efficacy of the preached word and also the significance of the baptismal washing both ministered by the authority of the Church of God be carefully noticed in contrast to the striking reticence upon any other agency for dealing with impenitence as it concerns the relation of men to God, there can be little doubt that the honest student will definitely connect the words "Whosoever sins ye remit" with the ministry of the Word of God and of the Sacraments even as does the English Ordinal.

To accomplish her design of making the words the charter of "Penance" in its narrower and unscriptural sense the Church of Rome is compelled to import into the passage a requirement as to detailed confession of sins which is not even remotely suggested by the original utterance. The very form of the Greek with its genitive plural of the persons, seems to indicate a mode of treatment applicable to classes of men rather than an individual inquisition into the frailties of a particular penitent. With singular inconsistency she admits that "by baptism . . . we are made . . . entirely a new creature obtaining a full and entire remission of all sins," and yet that "the minister of baptism need not be a judge" (Council of Trent, Sess. XIV), that it is only to the "penitence after Baptism" there is attached "the sacramental confession of sins and sacerdotal absolution" (Sess. VI). So then the fullest, freest and widest form by which the Church of God minister remission is, on her own showing, strangely excluded from the encouraging authorization that came from the lips of the Son of God. After thus introducing this serious limitation to sins committed after Baptism, of which certainly the words themselves are innocent, the Council of Trent proceeds to import feature after feature into the original commission. It asserts as has been seen the right to demand a detailed confession of all sins

that in its judgment are mortal together with the circumstances which change the species of sin ; it requires such confession to be secret and insists that it is also sacramental. It reserves certain more atrocious and heinous crimes (such for example as attending a Protestant place of worship) so that except at the point of death they may not be absolved by all priests, but only by the highest priests, it permits a lower form of contrition arising from the fear of hell to be pleaded and contends that with the aid of the sacrament such contrition called attrition secures forgiveness although without the sacrament it would prove ineffective. The Council ignores the fact that this cumbrous yet somewhat engaging theory finds no countenance in any portion of the New Testament. It is somewhat startling to find that in the whole exposition of the subject nothing in the nature of real proof texts are adduced except the passage in John xx. 22-23, and the passage " Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven," which obviously relates to things not to persons, to customs and practices rather than to sins. The poverty of proof may help the Protestant to endure with equanimity the Council's anathema on those who " wrest the words contrary to the institution of this sacrament to the power of preaching the Gospel." One possible contention might remain. Perhaps it might be argued that the Church having our Lord's authority to remit sins discovered in her experience that the discipline of the Confessional although not strictly *jure divino* was nevertheless salutary and effective. It would be a matter of some interest to discuss how far such an alteration of procedure might or might not be regarded as an infringement of the limits assigned to the Church's authority. But there is no serious occasion to pursue such an investigation. The history of the Confessional has been written and its unequivocal testimony has been that as an instrument of moral culture it has proved a dismal failure. The thirteenth century witnessed its full enforcement under the presiding genius of a zealous and capable Pontiff, Innocent III. There was need of a moral revolution in his days. A recent admiring biographer has given a description of the Church in the South of France at the time. " The Archbishop of Narbonne . . . had not visited his archdiocese for thirteen years, and amassed riches by the sale of the Sacrament of Orders, benefices and dispensations. His clergy were corrupt pluralists of a low standard of learning, who wore secular clothes, followed secular professions, and openly lived with their wives. The Archbishop himself habitually sheltered robbers and brigands in return for a share of their plunder ; and also countenanced (if he did not personally practise) open usury " (C. Pirie-Gordon, " Innocent the Great," p. 105). Things were not much better in Rome. " (Innocent) seemed to be bidden to fish in Tiber—the first cast of the net brought up eighty-seven murdered infants, and the second three hundred and forty. His attention being thus drawn to the most crying evil of the time, habitual infanticide as blatant as that of the dirty-knuckled Lakonians, he established . . . the Foundling Hospital and Maternity Home " (Ibid. p. 172). Into such an age with its venial Court of

Rome, its corruption in the Church in high places, its general disorder and flagrancy, two instruments of reform were introduced. The new Order of Friars and the new order concerning compulsory sacramental confession. The Friars did something to check the growing evil. Their preaching produced revivals "half sincere, half theatrical, but always fierce and short-lived" (G. G. Coulton, "A revivalist of six centuries ago"). But they yielded at length to the pressure of prevailing viciousness so that Roger Bacon could write "The new Orders are already horribly decayed from their first dignity." (Ibid., "Romanism and Morals.") Did the agency of sacramental and compulsory confession wear down the abuses which overpowered the Friars after their first temporary successes? The answer is recorded in the miserable and continued decay of righteousness during the three hundred years of its uninterrupted authority. The sixteenth century witnesses to the same moral degradation that flaunts itself in the thirteenth. A new method which is nevertheless an old method has since been tried. Men have been accorded liberty, but a liberty tempered by a faithful presentation of the truths of the Gospel and a wide diffusion in the vernacular tongues of God's living oracles. The agency has seemed wholly inadequate for the task of calling back a ruined world to faith and obedience, the agents indeed have to hang their heads in shame at their slothfulness and hesitancy, but a cleaner world, an awakening conscience and the steady march of an emancipated people towards the height of purity which have at least been restored within the ambit of their horizon, justify the change and prove to those who dare to search and see that in a Gospel of free grace, in an open Bible and a fully proclaimed Saviour there is still resident the divine power with which the newly Crucified in His risen might invested the cowering company to whom he said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained.

Who is better qualified than Mr. Samuel Hinds Wilkinson, Director of the Mildmay Mission to the Jews, to deal with the theory that the ancient ten-tribed Kingdom of Israel has been re-discovered in the modern British Empire? Many of the arguments in favour of this theory are ingenious, but a careful study of his volume, *British Israelism Examined* (Bale, Sons and Danielsson), will show every one with an open mind that (as the Rev. E. L. Langston says in his foreword) the theory "has not one substantial fact to stand upon, whether the investigation be in the realm of Scriptural inspiration or historical facts; from beginning to end it is pure conjecture, built up upon coincidences." As an error, then, that must be taken seriously and not treated as a joke, Mr. Wilkinson goes point by point through the argument. A merciless critic, he is yet never discourteous, and we congratulate him upon a work which should be consulted by all who desire to study the question.

APPROACHES TO ROME BY CONFERENCES.

BY THE REV. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., Vicar of Ashby
St. Ledgers, Chaplain to the Bishop of Durham.

A STORY is told of a well-meaning clergyman of a past generation that, animated by the same desire of reuniting the Church of England with the Church of Rome which has lately found expression in the Malines Conference, he went to Rome and obtained an audience of the then Pope, Pius IX. The Pope, it is said, took him for a lunatic; but this is by the way. When he came home he used to describe his interview: "I said to him, 'Holy Father,' I said, 'if you on your side will give up certain doctrines, we on our side will give up certain doctrines.'" Here, however, Bishop Phillpotts, of Exeter, who was present, interrupted him. "I suppose, Dr. Townsend," he said, "that by *we* you meant Mrs. Townsend and yourself?" Is not the moral this:—Do not reckon without your host? "No pledge from Catholics is of any value to which Rome is not a party,"¹ Cardinal Newman reminds us. How much misunderstanding would be avoided were this borne in mind! Dr. Townsend did well in going to Rome rather than to Malines. Where he did less well was in identifying the Church of England with Mrs. Townsend and himself.

2. The distinguished men who have lately discussed Reunion at Malines had no authority to speak for their respective Churches. We may be sure that they claimed none. Only the Pope can speak for the Church of Rome. Only the English people can speak for the Church of England. The Vatican denies that it had any official cognizance of their proceedings. No one who had any acquaintance with Roman procedure could for a moment have supposed that it had. For (1) had it desired to enter into negotiations with the Church of England, it would not have chosen Belgians or Frenchmen, however distinguished, as its representatives; nor would it have acted without the co-operation of the Anglo-Irish Catholic body; (2) it would not have allowed the discussion to take place anywhere but in Rome; (3) and most important of all—dogma lies, as such, outside the field of negotiation. In the case of Père Hyacinthe, Leo XIII was ready (1896) to regulate his marriage by affiliating him to one of the Uniate rites in which the marriage of the clergy is recognized. But a condition of his rehabilitation was his acceptance of and submission to the Vatican definition of Papal infallibility; and it was on this point that the negotiations broke down. We must conclude, then, that the hopes built by enthusiasts on the Malines Conference were without foundation. The discussions, whatever the intention of those who took part in them, were personal and private. It is obvious that the Belgian Primate was free to invite his friends to his house; that his friends,

¹ Letter to the Duke of Norfolk.

whoever they were, were free to accept his invitation, and to discuss any subject or subjects they pleased. We may leave it at this. If the official position of those concerned gave rise to a suspicion that more was intended, the explanations which have been made should be sufficient, under the circumstances, to relieve the anxiety which has been felt in certain quarters. And if the incident, as a whole, leads us in England to regard the proposed scheme of Prayer Book Revision more carefully than we have hitherto regarded it, good will have been done.

3. So much for this side of the question. For another, "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" is at once sense and Scripture. And I shall not apologize for again quoting Newman, whose knowledge of both Churches gives weight to his words.

"See what would be required to bring it (the Church of England) into a condition capable of union with the Catholic Church! There have ever been three great parties in it. The rod of Aaron, so to call it, must swallow up the serpents of the magicians. It is a miracle indeed if the 'Catholic' clergy in the Establishment manage to swallow up the Evangelical and the Liberal. But how much more difficult an idea it is to contemplate that they should absorb the whole laity of their communion, of whom but a fraction is with them! Nor do I see how it is possible to forget that the Established Church is the Church of England; that Dissenters are, both in their own estimation, and in that of its own members, in some sort a portion of it; and that even were its whole *proper* laity Catholic in opinion, the whole population of England, of which Dissenters are nearly half, would, as represented in Parliament, claim it as their own. And when it came to the point, they would have fact and power on their side."¹

4. The temper of controversy is an odious one. Those are the best Christians who live on what the Churches of Christ hold in common rather than on their differences. Here may we not say, with the poet, *πλέον ἡμῶν παντός*—the half is more than the whole? We do not find that the spiritual life of the best Roman Catholics centres in the Papacy; or that of the best Churchmen on the necessity of having Bishops; or that of the best Presbyterians on the necessity of not having Bishops; the soul does not rest on these things. But unity of spirit among Christians is one thing; unity of standards and organization among Churches is another. The reason why the latter is out of the question between Rome and England is (1) the irreconcilable contradiction between their standards; and (2) the radical incompatibility of outlook, character, and temperament from which these contradictions spring.

"Those rites and those doctrines which have made most noise in the Romanist controversy are those which are least of the essence of Romanism. The Virgin and the Saints, Reliques, Images, Purgatory, and Masses—these by-words

¹ *Life and Letters of Cardinal Newman*, II, 116, 117, by W. Ward.

with the ignorant and the unthinking are powerless decorations or natural development. The one essential principle of the Catholic system is the control of the individual conscience by an authority, or law, placed without it, and exercised over it by men claiming to speak in the name of Heaven."¹

This is what old-fashioned people called Popery; because it vests this authority in the Pope. Its results are written large in history. What may be called the common-sense argument against this perversion of religion—the argument found in the Homilies and in Jewel's Apology—is out of fashion; it was defective, often deplorable, in form. But it was sound in substance. The thing was, and is so; and "things are what they are." The Papal Church and the Reformed Churches look different ways. This is not to say that they have no common religious ground. They have much. But they have also differences so fundamental that corporate or organic union between them is inconceivable. Were this not so, history would have to be rewritten; and the Churches in question would be other than they are.

5. "Words are the counters of wise men, but the money of fools," says Hobbes.² They are certainly the money of the religious world of to-day. Reunion, Revision, Catholic, Constructive—what folly is too great to make its way under cover of these question-begging terms? At the very sound of them the herd of Gadara—which is numerous and increasing—rushes headlong down the steep into the sea. In what sense can we speak of "Union" with a Church which claims to be the One Divinely-appointed Teacher of Mankind? "I beseech you by the bowels of Christ to think it possible that you may be mistaken," said Cromwell of the Covenanters before Dunbar. They would not, the Church of Rome cannot, think this possible. In the latter case, with perfect consistency. For a Divine Teacher union can only mean one thing—the acceptance of his teaching. Such a teacher does not refute, or discuss, or reason—he condemns. It is said of a would-be convert that, startled by some statement advanced by Cardinal Manning, he ventured on a question. But the authority of the Cardinal checked the presumption of the proselyte. "Nay," he said: "If you wish to argue, I have done." There is infallibility! "I am not arguing with you; I am telling you." Do not blame it! Blame those who are credulous enough to accept it at its surface value. How can it speak in any other way?

6. To those outside it, the Roman Catholic Church is a *terra incognita*. Those who have from circumstances, a certain knowledge and experience of it find this startlingly brought home to them by the sayings and doings of not a few highly-placed Anglican dignitaries. If one may use an Irishism, they never open their mouth on the subject, without putting their foot in it. While, as for our Anglo-Catholic friends, no amount of Rejected Addresses

¹ Essays. Mark Pattison, II, 255.

² Leviathan, ch. iv.

seems to convince them that their overtures to the Papal Church are unwelcome and will be useless :

“ Such proposals, sure enough,
Will meet a merited rebuff.”

This, I think, is what the Jesuit Father Woodlock meant when he said at Oxford that Rome was better understood by English Modernists than by Anglo-Catholics.¹ We have a certain intellectual respect for an avowed opponent which it is difficult to extend to a mere apologist, who approximates, and deprecates, and trims. It is, I believe, Mr. Chesterton who says humorously, that now-a-days people do not apologize for being Roman Catholics, but for not being so. I am afraid that some of us do.

7. I confess to a profound distrust of the “ Round Table ” principle in religion. Nothing but talk comes of it. Platitude is heaped upon platitude till the question at issue is buried under a mass of verbiage. Here the discussion is obviously at cross-purposes. Either the Pope is the Vicar of Christ—in which case we ought to obey him ; or he is not, in which case we should protest against his usurped dominion. Either the elements in the Lord’s Supper are changed by consecration into the Body and Blood of Christ—in which case they are to be worshipped ; or “ the real presence of Christ’s most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament,” but, as Hooker teaches,² “ in the worthy receiver of the sacrament ”—in which case “ the sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored.” What the Anglo-Catholic’s conception of dogma is, it is difficult to say ; “ every one of you hath a doctrine.” But, for Rome, dogma is a fixed quantity, guaranteed by an infallible authority, which can be taken or left, but not made matter for negotiation. Its treatment by a Round Table Conference is unthinkable.

“ There can be no question,” says Cardinal Bourne in his Lenten Pastoral, “ of a compromise built up on the acceptance, or rejection, or mere toleration of a certain number of religious opinions. We believe that to the Church which finds the centre of authority in the See of Rome, both in its episcopal hierarchy as a whole, and in its visible head, the successor of St. Peter personally, there has been granted the gift of infallibility. This is the fundamental doctrine of the Church ; and all discussions are useless and waste of time until this doctrine is accepted. The difference between the point of view of those who accept the Supreme Authority of the Holy See and the outlook of those who reject it is fundamental. The latter have apparently lost all perception of the Catholic idea of faith.”

Let our Anglo-Catholics weigh these words. The Anglo-Catholic Congress is as much, or as little, Catholic as the Cheltenham Conference : and Bishop Gore as the Bishop of Durham or Bishop Knox. And, unless the Church of England is prepared to accept

¹ *Modern Churchmen*, February, 1924.

² *E.P. V.* 67.

the dogma of Papal Infallibility, the Malines Conversations "are useless and waste of time." The claim to infallibility is, indeed, a shirt of Nessus to the Church which advances it. But it sets this Church above—or below reasoning. This is an attraction to those to whom certainty means more than truth. But it makes discussion impossible. The sword of Brennus decides the scale. The ill-advised and undignified controversy as to Anglican Orders, closed by the Bull of Leo XIII, *Apostolicæ Curæ* (1896), should have shown the futility of these *conciliabula* between enthusiastic English Mediævalists and courteous Continental divines. It is not a foreign—i.e., a non-Italian Cardinal, however eminent, but Rome, that has the say in these matters—and at Rome things are not done in this way.

8. It should be noticed that the English delegates at Malines do not represent the Church, still less the people, of England, they are taken from a section of Churchmen, mostly clergymen, who, though influential in ecclesiastical circles, are out of touch with the English Church and nation as a whole. In 1894 Archbishop Benson, writing to a leader of this party, emphasized its non-representative character.

His correspondent was then, as he still is, engaged in somewhat one-sided negotiations with Rome: the *Church Times* tells us that the initiative in the matter of the Malines Conversations was taken by Lord Halifax and the Abbé Portal.¹ The Archbishop doubted both their propriety and their promoter's qualifications for conducting them.

"I am afraid," he said, "that you have lived for years so exclusively with one set of thinkers, and entered so entirely into the usages of one class of Churches, that you have not before you the state of religious feeling and activity in England with the completeness with which anyone attempting to adjust the relation between Churches ought to have the phenomena of his own side before him."²

The reminder is no less needed now than then. We do not all attend Anglo-Catholic congresses; the English Church is not the same thing as the English Church Union; and not all its members take either their religion or their theology from the *Church Times*.

9. It has been urged that the resolutions of the late Lambeth Conference pledged those who signed them to act, should occasion offer, on the lines which led to such discussions as those which have lately taken place. Not all the signatories are of this opinion, or believe that in subscribing them they gave a blank cheque to persons unnamed to translate rhetoric into action. While those who see the Papal Church at close quarters make no secret of their distrust of these compromising and uninvited overtures. The disuse of the official designation of our Church, "The United Church of England and Ireland," is to be regretted. We have much to learn from the Church of Ireland: when in particular the Irish

¹ March 28. ² Letter to Lord Halifax, *Life of Archbishop Benson*, p. 511.

bishops speak of Romanism they speak of what they know. Hence a clearer and more vigorous note than that to which we in England are accustomed. May I close this paper by quoting the recent Message of the Irish Primate, the Archbishop of Armagh, to the Irish Church?

"A few days ago we were surprised—perhaps, I may say, startled—to hear that conversations had been going on for some time between influential members of the Church of England and a high authority of the Church of Rome, Cardinal Mercier, whose noble conduct during the war attracted our admiration; and, further, that these conversations had assumed a quasi-official character, through the cognizance of the highest dignitary of the Church of England on the one hand, and a corresponding cognizance on the part of the Vatican.

"These facts have given a new orientation to the whole movement towards reunion, and we are bound to reconsider our position: we are bound to ask the question, What sort of Christian Church do we desire to see emerging from the reuniting of the forces of Christendom, if such a reunion should come about? The question is of vital importance, though it has been but little considered by those who have been working towards unity. My own conviction is that, if reunion led to the creating or restoring of a universal hierarchal system dominating human life in all its parts and dictating doctrine and practice with professedly infallible authority, it would be the greatest disaster which could possibly befall mankind. For true advance, whether in all branches of knowledge or in social reconstruction, nothing is so important as liberty of research, of criticism, and of opinion.

"It may be said that it is unthinkable that the world, having won its freedom in these matters, should ever go back to the bondage from which it escaped. That may be true. But what, in this case, could be more fatal for the Church than that it should identify its aims with a system which the world has once for all rejected? To-day we have too much lost sight of the fact that the Reformation was not only a revolution in religion, but the setting free of the mind of man; the Renaissance which preceded failed to effect a real liberation until the Reformation broke the fetters of the human soul.

"I conclude, therefore, that the only kind of reunion we should desire is that which, while holding fast the Christianity of Christ as given in the Gospels, secures ample liberty, not only for every individual, but for every type of organized Christian life which has proved really effective in bringing the influence of Christ to bear on men. It is not desirable that any one Church should absorb the rest. The world would be very much the poorer if that happened. I conclude, therefore, that these overtures, or conversations, or whatever they were, are not likely, as things stand, to help us towards the only reunion we should desire."

APPROACHES TO ROME IN RITUAL AND DOCTRINE.

BY THE RIGHT REV. E. A. KNOX, D.D.

[Read for him in his absence.]

SINCE it was one of the findings of your Conference last year that "this Conference generally approves the proposals in the measure" (N.A. 84), I do not intend to go behind that finding to-day. Let me only say, that while I accept for the present purpose the concentration of our attention on the Communion Services for the whole and for the sick, I do not thereby commit myself to your Finding 4 in 1923.

In approaching the question of Holy Communion, I shall carry all of you with me in the desire to keep its devotional aspect steadily in view, and to state the divergent opinions upon it, as they would be stated by a devout Romanist on the one side, and a devout Churchman on the other; each wishing to communicate to the other his conception of the Sacrament as an ordinance enabling man to hold communion with God. The advantage of this treatment should be that the differences which come to light will not be antiquated and traditional prejudices, but substantial conceptions of the relation between God and man, conceptions which, genuinely entertained, are of necessity character-building, moral and spiritual, not merely ceremonial.

Approaching the subject thus, we find that all—by "all" for the purposes of this paper, I mean Roman Catholics and English Churchmen—are agreed that our Blessed Lord, being about to break off His daily and earthly intercourse with His disciples, assured them that He would not leave them comfortless, but would come to them, and dwell in them by His Holy Spirit. The communion so established would be more intimate and more real than any that they had hitherto enjoyed. For, whereas He had been heretofore an external Master, Teacher and Friend, and Lord, He would henceforth be an inner, truer, higher, and better Self—the communion thus established being as intimate as that between the Father and the Son. So, assuredly, in our Lord's last discourse is interpreted to the disciples the ultimate purpose of the Sacrament which He had at that time ordained. Whatever differences have arisen as to the exact meaning of His words, and as to the method whereby His gift is conveyed to us, about the ultimate purpose, that of fellowship with the Father and Himself through the Holy Spirit, there is, I believe, no dispute. Of that intercourse we must all of us be conscious. For it has been most truly said: "We acknowledge God as above and beyond. But unless we also intuitively enjoy His activity within us, feeling that we are in a measure one with Him in substance, we can have no immediate

knowledge of causality or of God as the source of our existence and of emergent evolution" (*Emergent Evolution*, by Lloyd Morgan—last sentence).

This agreement, however, disappears as soon as we speak of the means by which our Lord purposed to establish it. The Roman Catholic holds that in the Lord's Supper the communicant, whether he be faithful or not, receives not bread and wine, but only the appearance thereof, that which is really received being "the very true Body and Blood of our Lord, which was born in Bethlehem of the most pure Virgin Mary, baptized in the river Jordan, suffered, was buried, rose again, ascended into heaven, sitteth on the right hand of God." It is, in fact, the true Body and Blood that were offered upon the Cross, present not in a gross, material fashion, but as a Spirit is present, externally to, and independently of, the minds of the Priest and the worshippers. The Roman Catholic would go on to say that the gift was conveyed to him from the altar; and that on the altar this Body and Blood were made to be present by the act of consecration, and were duly offered up by the Priest ordained by the Church expressly that he might offer this Sacrifice. Further, he would add that, in virtue of this Sacrifice, God had been made propitious to himself and to all on whose behalf it was offered. Nor would he confine the efficacy of the offering to those who communicated only. The Sacrifice of the Mass is, in fact, the acknowledged centre of Roman Catholic worship. The Church, that is, the Clergy, having the power to offer this Sacrifice; has authority to order the lives, thoughts, and consciences of all her members. Her greatest punishment is to excommunicate the disobedient, and that sentence of excommunication is ratified in eternity. However repellent and foreign to our ideas this teaching may be, we know that it has ministered comfort to many devout souls, and has guided their spiritual life. We do not know its defects, until we have tried, in a sympathetic spirit, to understand the secret of its power. Its great merit is that it inculcates docility and loyal devotion. By its ritual it appeals to imagination, and, bringing heaven down to earth, seems to carry us out of time into eternity. It recognizes the best elements in natural religion, and enlists them in its service. Yet there, assuredly, is its greatest danger. For natural religion teaches that God is a Being Who can be placated, if He is rightly approached. Here, consequently, between us and the intercourse with the Father and the Son, is interposed a religion of external observances. We are brought into relation with God *ex opere operato*.

For it must not be forgotten that, however devout and faithful the worshipper may be, the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the elements is entirely independent of his faith. It is a miracle wrought by the act of the Priest, as truly and efficaciously as any miracle wrought by our Lord on earth. His Resurrection, for instance, would have been equally a fact in the order of world history, even if none of His disciples had believed it. So, if the whole congregation were avowed atheists, the act of the Priest

would cause the substance of bread and wine to disappear, and the natural Body and Blood of Christ to take its place. The Sacrifice which the Priest offered, presenting the Crucified Son to the Father, would have been consummated on their behalf, whether they had any spiritual life in them or not, so long as there was a possibility of their having such life. When we try to approach such teaching as this in a devotional spirit, we are overwhelmed by the impression of a superhuman power vested in the Priesthood. Further, we cannot refrain from offering adoring homage to Him Who is the real substance behind the appearances of bread and wine. The Sacrifice, which the Priest proceeds to offer, must be to the penitent believer of efficacy hardly less than the Sacrifice of the Cross. It is one with that great Sacrifice, and no less than that Sacrifice blots out all mortal sin. It makes satisfaction for sin, and removes the penalty that had been due to the sinner. All this merit it professes solely on account of the fact that it is offered by the Priest who has authority from the Church to offer it. The soul of man can rest on a propitiation wrought before his eyes, which is one with the propitiation wrought on Calvary. The believer is assured that he has seen the Lamb of God, Who taketh away the sin of the world, and has worshipped at His feet. That worship he very naturally continues to offer; when the reserved Host is in the tabernacle, after the service is over; and, if that is his faith, who can blame him?

I have dwelt, with such fullness as the occasion allows, on the Roman doctrine because we cannot otherwise appreciate the meaning of our Communion Service. Very rightly, that service is not drawn up in the form of negations. Very rightly, when we remember that it was first used by congregations that had grown up under the influences which I have described, it preserved for them all that was consistent with Holy Scripture. There was no wilful desire to shock tender and devout consciences educated and trained by the doctrine of the Mass. At the same time, there was an intention of making a radical change. Cranmer tells us frankly that there were two doctrines which he intended to pull up by the roots, viz. the doctrines of Transubstantiation, i.e. of the Real Presence of Christ's Flesh and Blood in the Sacrament of the Altar, and of the Sacrifice and Oblation of Christ made by the Priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead. On what account did he reckon these two doctrines to be so perilous, that, if they were left, they would soon bring back the whole Roman doctrine?

Again, let us try to grasp the devotional essence of the new teaching, and its positive rather than its negative bearings. At the root of it all was the doctrine of justification by faith. "There is no condemnation for them that believe." Its watchword was "that I may be found in Christ, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." We are at once challenged by an idea of righteousness, which leaves no room for merit acquired by the observance of ceremonial law. That had

been the Jewish idea of righteousness as distinct from holiness—to be “blameless as touching the ordinances of the law.” “The righteousness of God” does not, however, exclude simply merit acquired through the ceremonial law. It goes far deeper. It makes of no account before God all merit acquired by observance of the moral law. I need not remind you that this does not mean that the moral law is set aside as worthless. “The law is holy, and the commandment holy and just, and good.” It means that no accumulation of merit, even by obedience to the moral law, can come up to the standard of the righteousness of God. His righteousness is the righteousness of an infinitely pure and holy Being. It is, and for ever must be, out of reach of human attainment. If that righteousness is to be ours, it must be a free gift of God to us—and the message of the Gospel is, that God in Christ has not only reconciled the world to Himself, and blotted out all the transgressions of the souls that have by living faith committed themselves to His pardoning love, but He has also counted them righteous for the merits of the Infinite obedience and righteousness of Christ, Who is one with them, and they with Him.

Forgive me for taking you over such familiar ground. Unless we call it to mind, we cannot really understand how men of genuine piety brought up in the Mediæval Church, and ordained to be priests in it, with the awful power of making the Body and Blood of Christ present on the altar and offering Him up in sacrifice, could ever have turned their backs upon the possession of such an inheritance. No mere juggling with a metaphysical problem, no idle disputation about substance and accidents, could have moved men, who once honestly held such a conception of their office, to set aside teaching that came to them with such high authority, such world-wide acceptance. Nothing short of a new and living gospel would have moved them. That gospel was the gospel of justification by faith—the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*.

That gospel necessitated a fresh orientation of sacramental teaching. The union between Christ and the believer is not only effected by faith, but is so complete and all-pervading as to leave no room for a sacrifice offered by a priest. It is equally impossible in view of this gospel to speak of “God being made propitious to us” through the acts of a human intermediary. Feeding upon Christ is wholly a spiritual experience, the intercourse between our humanity and His Divine Human Being. The Sacraments are “certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and of God’s goodwill towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him.” Whereas all doctrines of real sacrifice imply an imperfect reconciliation with God, Sacraments are overflowings of the grace of God, condescending to our infirmity, and using *material* objects to assure us, through our senses, of His love towards us, and, through that assurance, to further His spiritual work in our inmost spirits. The more we try to turn these material objects into spiritual, whether by transformation or by combination, or

by clothing them with some new virtue of their own, the more surely do we destroy their sacramental value.

It is no exaggeration to say that the Reformation gave us back the Sacraments, and specially the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It found the laity communicating only once a year. It restored the rule of communion at least thrice a year, and opened the way for more frequent communion. The Mass had held the laity spell-bound in the nave in the presence of a stupendous miracle. The communion either brought the Holy Table down to them, or invited them into the chancel. Whereas, hitherto, there had been no communion except after sacrifice, by our service there was no sort of sacrifice except after communion. The devout worshipper was warned to prepare himself by diligent self-examination. Epistle, gospel, sermon, and solemn exhortation called out his faith, and stirred him to make ready for entrance after confession and absolution into the Holy of Holies. There he met his ascended Lord, and was made partaker of the banquet of His Flesh and Blood. Then returning as it were to earth, he joined with the priests in the consecration of the elements, and partaking of the consecrated Bread and Wine, feasted once more, with quickened faith, on the Body and Blood of the Lord and gave thanks for the remembrance of His death. So, united with his Lord and with his brethren at the Holy Table, he offered His sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, "the fruit of lips giving thanks unto His Name." His partaking of that sacred Food was "only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," yet, for that very reason, it was all the more real. The "means whereby the Body of Christ was received and eaten was faith." Without faith there was "no partaking of Christ."

Such is the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion according to our service and formularies. The ritual accords with the simplicity of the doctrine. We kneel to receive the Bread and Wine, but by the act of kneeling no adoration is intended nor ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood. All the old ornaments of the Church, the incense, the sacring-bell, the lights and the tabernacle are gone. The sacrificial ornaments of the minister have disappeared. He no longer elevates the consecrated elements for adoration. They are not gazed upon, nor carried about. They are not reserved, but reverently used for their ordained purpose. Above all, the congregation is a congregation of communicants, and the service is essentially and wholly from first to last a Communion Service. In the old Missals you will find after the Mass the words "*Sequitur communicio*," without a single prayer or ceremony provided, ministered, at all events sometimes, by priests wearing cottas. Our service is the service of *communicio*. The Mass has disappeared, except for a few fragments of prayers, and the Epistle and Gospel. The two services in their aim and structure are mutually exclusive. The very foundations of our relation to God, on which they rest, are mutually exclusive also.

Now, it is proposed to authorize for use in every parish in England an alternative service, or, as some prefer to call it, "a permissible deviation." At first we were assured, and the statement has been repeated in the Press, at Diocesan and Ruridecanal Conferences, and in the National Assembly itself, that no alteration of doctrine is intended. The purpose is described as that of giving emphasis to a side of sacramental teaching common both to the primitive Church and to a large body of Anglican divinity. By a slight alteration of the order of two or three prayers the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist is to be developed for the benefit of those who prefer to make use of the alternative. For those who prefer it, the old service will remain unchanged. Strong appeals are made to us in the name of brotherly love, of Christian charity, and of mutual toleration, to consent to these proposals. The appeals have been very effective. I reckon that at least one-third of the Evangelical clergy have given way to them, and among these many who hold most prominent positions among us. Those who have not given way to the appeals are described as "harsh," as "misrepresenting the truth," as "unfair," as "intolerant and even arrogant." Their policy is called a "dog in the manger" policy, and their Churchmanship is labelled as "erroneous and as defective."

But time and discussion have put a new complexion on the proposals. It now appears that we are being asked to give the sanction of the Church—not to the teaching of Bull, or Jeremy Taylor, or Thorndike, or John Johnson, but to teaching which, in a penal suit, where the Court put the most favourable construction that it could on the words of the defendant, was found to be capable of an interpretation not definitely excluded by the formularies of the Church, an interpretation which the defendant did not intend. With that teaching is to be combined the use of vestments and incense, of elevation of the consecrated elements, and of genuflexion, for all of which, if they had been before the Court, the defendant would have been condemned. This service will, it is well known, be used in churches where fasting communion is inculcated, and non-fasting communion practically forbidden. It will be the chief Sunday service, and, while it closely resembles the Mass, no definite instruction or statement is promised us, to distinguish it from the Mass. The doctrine of the Mass is clear. The doctrine of Holy Communion as stated in our Articles and Service is evidently contrary to the doctrine of the Mass, and even contradictory. The doctrine of the Caroline divines as to Eucharistic Sacrifice is also clearly distinguishable from the Mass. They teach that the *Communion*—let that word be marked—they knew nothing of non-communicating Eucharists—is a pleading before God of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and that the consecrated elements acquire by consecration a new power or virtue. They know of the Spiritual Presence as a presence only to the spirits of faithful communicants.

The *new* doctrine no one has defined, except in terms very

hard to distinguish from the Roman. Archbishops Temple and Maclagan set out to make it quite plain, but they failed signally to do so. Naturally they could not accept the Roman doctrine, but neither did they expressly deny it, for they would have disappointed those whose cause they were advocating. Rome said: "Your priests are not priests. They do not offer our sacrifice." It was no answer to say: "They offer some other sacrifice." There is a passage in the reply of the R.C. Bishops to the Archbishops which is singularly apposite to our present purpose. They say (p. 70): "Cardinal Newman contrasts the traditional Anglican doctrine with the recent doctrine of the extreme High Church section of your Communion; and since the days when he wrote the numbers of this party have grown considerably. We have no desire to question, any more than the Cardinal does, that many of these believe in a true Objective Presence, a true Sacrifice, and a true Sacrificial Priesthood. On the contrary, we acknowledge willingly that their books, and still more their practice, bear indisputable testimony that they do. For we see that they lay stress on the Sacramental Presence, on non-communicant attendance (another name for hearing Mass), and on priestly power, while Cranmer and your divines, together with the not inconsiderable number of their modern representatives, lay stress on the idolatry of Eucharistic adoration, and on the injury done to the perfect oblation on the Cross by the practice of private masses. We sympathize with this returning attraction for the Catholic doctrines."

That reply throughout is worthy of careful perusal to-day, for it defines plainly the essentials of the doctrine of the Mass, and the incompatibility of that doctrine with the sacrificial teaching of the Caroline divines. Those divines would have added the incompatibility also of that doctrine with the sacrificial teaching of the primitive Church. It is not surprising that some of our Evangelical clergy, especially those who have been influenced by modernism, should have been attracted by the idea of making room in an alternative Prayer Book for communion services supposed to be more accordant either with the high Anglican views of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, or with modernist ideas of sin and atonement. There is no terror among some Evangelicals more marked than the terror of being accounted "narrow-minded." Their fear has prejudiced them even against public discussion of the National Assembly proposals. They have dreaded the arousing of sectarian passions. It must now be admitted that public discussion has been of the utmost value, since it has led one who holds the comparatively moderate position of the Bishop of Ripon to his recent avowal. The Bishop has definitely set aside Jeremy Taylor's definition of the Spiritual Presence in the Sacrament in favour of that of Mr. Bennett of Frome, as a measure of the comprehensiveness of the Church of England. The teaching of Bennett of Frome is not to be reconciled with the teaching of Cranmer. The two are mutually exclusive. Clergy who honestly hold Cranmer's teaching will find themselves tolerated as defective and

erroneous teachers in a Church which has made room for the doctrine of a real, objective Presence of our Lord in the elements, quite independently of any Presence to the spirits of communicants.

If it is alleged that both views are to be found among the clergy to-day, and that the Church ought to recognize facts and make provision for them, the answer to this allegation is simple enough. An established Church has to accept all that is involved in establishment, including the decisions of the established Courts of Law. Acquiescence is not the same thing as entertainment. Still less is it the same thing as the inculcation of doctrine. Ceremonial is the outward and effective means by which doctrine is taught to the unlearned with the authority of the Church. A Church which has altered its Communion Service, and sanctioned ritual, previously forbidden, intended to convey the doctrine of the Mass, has passed from acquiescence to active co-operation. It is this co-operation in teaching the Roman doctrine of the Mass by provision of a new service and sanctioning use of Mass vestments, co-operation which makes these lawful in every congregation, and places every congregation at the mercy of the Priest—it is this *active co-operation* in proclaiming what we believe to be untrue, that is filling the hearts of many of the clergy and laity with absolute dismay. It seems to them that the old Church which they and their fathers have loved and served is turning her back upon them ; as if warning were being given that they were only being tolerated in the hope that they may be converted before the time comes for their ejection. For a Church which accepts the Mass, with all that it involves, must eventually close its doors against those who refuse to recognize the claim of its Priesthood to offer the Mass as a sacrifice for the living and the dead.

Messrs. Constable & Co. have published *Ponjola*, by Cynthia Stockley, in a popular edition at 3s. 6d. net. This story of Rhodesian life gives a vivid picture of its romance and its vigour, but more particularly of its sordid and pathetic aspects. The motto of the book is in its closing words, "When He hath tried me I shall come forth as gold." The narrative shows how great a curse the drinking habit is to the mining community.

The Women's Protestant Union send us *In the Desert* (2s. 6d.), by Miss Deborah Alcock, and *A Storm against the Wall* (1s. 6d.), by E. M. Wagstaff Smith. The former is an excellent story of persecution in the Cevennes after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and helps us to see what the Huguenots suffered in France. The latter is a tale of Ireland, in which the machinations of a Roman priest and his friends are described. All ends well after a daring rescue from a trawler. We wish that the works of Miss Alcock were more widely read to-day, as she is careful in her quotation from historical documents, and has a true sense of perspective in her choice of incidents. We are inclined to be forgetful of the trials undergone in the past by the brave Protestant groups in Latin lands.