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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1925

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Some Results of the "Call to Action."

DURING the past three months there have been indications that the " Call to Action " has been doing quiet and effective work. It drew attention to the existence of a definite Romanizing section among the Anglo-Catholics, and called upon those of the Party who regarded themselves as loyal to the distinctive position of the Church of England to repudiate the work and aims of the extremists. At one time it was denied that there was such a Romanizing party. Its existence was attributed to the imagination of " Mr. Prejudice and his nine blind men," as Bishop Knox points out in his interesting article on " Creating Atmosphere " in last month's *National Review*. In this article he also shows the steps by which " Puseyism " developed through Tractarianism, with its definite opposition to the Roman Catholic Church, into an Anglo-Catholicism which accepts the teaching, practices, methods, ideals and the whole conception of Christianity peculiar to the Roman Communion. One result of the " Call to Action " has been that the existence of the Romanizers has been definitely acknowledged even by members of the Anglo-Catholic party. The next matter of concern is to see whether the Church will take steps to secure itself against their efforts, or will quietly acquiesce in their retaining their position in our midst and carrying on their work.

Bishop Gore on the Anglo-Catholic Movement.

One of the first results of the " Call to Action " has been the issue of a pamphlet by Bishop Gore on " The Anglo-Catholic Movement To-day." It is a candid examination of the present situation. He realizes that there is " a widespread sense of indignation and

alarm at certain more or less recent developments in the Anglo-Catholic Movement. People are," he says, " asking us bitterly, ' What are you out for ? Is it the introduction of the whole Roman system of doctrine and practice, only leaving out the actual duty of submission to Rome ? ' " He admits that there are great numbers of those who would claim to belong to the Catholic movement " who are anxious and disquieted about the tendency of things among us, and many of them are reproaching themselves for cowardice in not opposing an active enough resistance to those who have been dragging them on to very treacherous ground." He therefore thinks that it is time to call a halt, and to reconsider their aims in order to secure a rallying point for forces which appear to be falling into confusion. His real aim is to represent " the Catholic cause in the Church of England intelligibly and so that a man who is starting in life might feel that he can gladly make it his own." His words suggest to us that some of our Evangelical leaders might undertake the task of representing Evangelical Churchmanship in a similar manner.

The XXXIX Articles as an Authoritative Standard.

In his interpretation of the " Catholic " conception of Christianity, the Bishop follows lines that are familiar to all readers of his works. We appreciate his appeal to Scripture as a characteristic of the Church of England, but we regard his deductions from the language of Scripture as misrepresenting both the teaching of the primitive Church and that of the Church of England. We cannot therefore regard the position which he adopts as that of our Church as represented in our Prayer Book and XXXIX Articles. In fact, Bishop Gore is clearly aware that it is difficult to square his views with those represented in this authorized statement of the teaching of our Church, for he loses no opportunity of deprecating their use, and in this booklet makes it one of the planks in the Anglo-Catholic platform that the XXXIX Articles shall be removed " from the position of authoritative standards (in any sense) of belief or practice in the Anglican Church." The other points in his Anglo-Catholic programme are (1) the restoration of our eucharistic canon to a form more agreeable to the principle and use of the Church Catholic, (2) Reservation for the sick, (3) the restoration of public prayers for the dead, (4) some prayers to God, glorifying Him for

His saints, and asking that we may be assisted by their prayers, (5) unction for the sick, (6) reform in the method of appointing bishops. We may regard these as the minimum of the Anglo-Catholic demands. We have seen no sign yet that they will be accepted by the Party as a whole, and we may reserve our criticism of them until there is some such sign.

It is the Mass which Matters.

We may frankly confess that we do not expect to see any large movement to follow Bishop Gore's lead. The extremists have captured the Party and they have made their intentions quite clear. We doubt very much whether it will make any practical difference if they do follow the Bishop, for as a writer in *The Nation* recently pointed out, Bishop Gore does not deal with the central matters which are the really important ones. This writer says, " The real issue is to be found in the Mass, not in its accretions and developments. It was in the Mass that the Reformation settlement centred ; and, if it is admitted, as both sections of the Anglo-Catholic party insist it shall be, to quarrel over its aftergrowths is to eat the cow and worry over the tail. . . . The Anglo-Catholics represented by Bishop Gore are as bent on forcing this upon him [the English churchman] as the Anglo-Ultramontanes represented by Lord Halifax ; and he sees as little difference between them as between Tweedledum and Tweedledee."

Archdeacon Thorpe stated the facts of the situation with admirable clearness in a letter to *The Times*, from which we give the following passage :

" While all ' men of goodwill ' will welcome the Bishop of London's ' belief in the loyalty of the great mass of Anglo-Catholics to the Church of England,' I fear it does not carry us far. For Anglo-Catholics differ considerably (as he implies). How are we to ascertain the loyalty of ' the mass ' of them, and by what test ? If we take loyalty to the Church as meaning acceptance of its doctrines as Catholic and Reformed, surely we must first examine the doctrines taught by the minority of Anglo-Catholics and tacitly, or otherwise, accepted, or acquiesced in, by ' the mass ' before we can accept assurances as to their loyalty. I am bound, as a student of Anglo-Catholic literature, to confess I find little trace of the influence of ' the mass ' there.

" I therefore submit that the time has gone past for discussing the loyalty, or otherwise, of any section of the Church. Our most pressing need is not charity to men, but love of the truth. We

should certainly advance a real stage if the Bishops (whose office it is to define doctrine) would answer such a question as, ' Is there an adorable Presence in the consecrated elements *extra usum Sacramenti* ? ' Let us cease expressing opinions about men and concentrate on ' What is the doctrine of the Church on the points now in dispute ? ' This, I take it, is the real mind of Canon Glazebrook in his admirable letter. No stretching of brotherly hands, however lovely, can take the place of agreement in sound doctrine, or bring peace to the Church by itself."

The Bishop of London's View of Success.

The mention in the Archdeacon's letter of the Bishop of London and Canon Glazebrook refers to the visit of the Bishop to an Anglo-Catholic Congress in London, where he said he came as a result of the " Call to Action " to testify to the loyalty of the great mass of Anglo-Catholics. The Bishop is reported to have said :

" I tell you frankly that my presence to-night is due to the ' Call to Action.' . . . I always stand by my friends when they are attacked. I thought it was most unfair to seem to imply that the great bulk of the Anglo-Catholics were disloyal to the Church of England. I come, therefore, this evening to show my belief for what it is worth in your loyalty, and I will go further and say that the really loyal and instructed Anglo-Catholic is the best Churchman, because he follows all the directions of his Church."

Canon Glazebrook, in a letter to *The Times* on Bishop Gore's booklet (the logic and history of which he regarded as open to question in some particulars), referred to the Bishop of London as denying " that there was any ground for anxiety." The Bishop, in reply, said he had not made such a statement, and that he agreed with every word of Bishop Gore's pamphlet. The main fact is that the Bishop went to the Anglo-Catholic Congress as a result of the issue of the "Call to Action," and congratulated the members on the success of their work for the last twenty-five years. That success consisted in daily Eucharists, opportunities of making confessions, " the loveliest Choral Eucharists in the World," and unction for the sick. These things ought to make them thank God and take courage. Such success is specially noticeable in the Diocese of London, but what a sense of proportion it conveys !

No Compromise on the Mass.

In the same letter Canon Glazebrook dealt with the aims of the extremists. He said : " We all know now that from the aged Lord

Halifax who . . . openly advocated submission to the Pope, down to the silly young ordinand who avows that his faith is that of Rome and his object in seeking ordination is to gain a position in which he can advocate obedience to Rome, there range men of all ages and degrees of standing who are more or less consciously striving for the same end. And all these champions of a counter-Reformation call themselves Anglo-Catholics." He desires to stretch out brotherly hands across all the lines of ecclesiastical division to those who separate themselves from the false Anglo-Catholics for the sake of peace, of brotherhood, and of spiritual progress. We all share the desire for unity, but it cannot be achieved while there are conflicting ideals in the Church. The bishops will this month begin their final review of the revision of the Prayer Book. They will have to decide which ideal they will keep before them. However much they may desire to maintain the comprehensive character of the Church, there are limits. Those limits will be passed when any changes are authorized which tend to change the present Communion Service into the Mass. English Churchmen understand increasingly the significance of any movements in that direction, and the great majority will resist them to the utmost of their power. This is a matter on which there can be no compromise.

The New Heresy Hunters.

Lord Shaftesbury has addressed a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury regarding a sermon on Catholicism and Christianity preached by the Bishop of Birmingham in Westminster Abbey. The sermon was "carefully considered by the Theological and Liturgical Committee" of the English Church Union and denounced in vigorous terms. We have no intention of entering into the merits of the controversy. But it is interesting to find the Organization which has flouted for sixty years the authority of our Church, and made Anglo-Catholic advance possible by the unconstitutional method of disobeying the law, now endeavouring to arraign a bishop for "incessant and bitter attacks upon the Catholic faith." The Anglo-Catholics have so often represented themselves as being a persecuted party, that it is somewhat inconsistent for them now to adopt the rôle of persecutors and heresy hunters. They evidently think they have secured for themselves a sufficiently strong posi-

tion in the Church to justify them in attempting to carry out the policy recently announced of ejecting from the English Church all who do not accept their reading of the Catholic faith with its assertion of the presence of Christ in the Elements, the sacrifice of the Mass, the necessity of Apostolic Succession for the validity of sacraments. These things they now assert are of the same value as belief in the Incarnation. In this they are also following the Church of Rome.

Editorial Note.

We desire to draw the special attention of our readers to the article, *The Study of the Reformation*, by Prof. W. Alison Phillips (Professor of Modern History in Trinity College, Dublin), in the present number of THE CHURCHMAN. It is in substance a lecture which he gave to the Reformation Study Brotherhood, and is printed here in order that wider publicity may be extended to the important advice which he gives as to the study of the Reformation movement. Although it exceeds the usual length of our articles, we felt that its contents were of such outstanding importance that our readers would be glad to have it in full for future reference. We hope that it may be possible to arrange for its publication in pamphlet form.

The articles on The First Three Chapters of Genesis, by Chancellor P. V. Smith, LL.D., and on The Council of Nicæa, by the Rev. Thos. J. Pulvertaft, M.A., are of special interest as they have reference to matters of current interest. Canon J. M. Harden's account of The Church of Ireland To-day will, we hope, help to increase interest in the work of our Communion outside England. It is the first of a series which will be published at intervals on the Work of the Church in various parts of the Empire. Canon Lukyn Williams' contribution is of a special character that speaks for itself. At a time when there is an undue tendency to model our worship, and even to mould our Christianity upon the interpretation of some of the centuries subsequent to the Apostolic age, it is valuable to have a first-hand insight into the actual modes of thought, the methods of controversy, and the attitude towards the Supernatural set out with such vividness in these illuminating extracts from the records of the past. This Discussion from the fifth Century will interest students who have not the opportunity of reading Migne, and yet desire to know something of the nature of its contents.

THE STUDY OF THE REFORMATION.

By Professor W. Alison Phillips.

A SOCIETY has been recently established, under the name of the Reformation Study Brotherhood, the object of which is to aid in the solution of the problems which are now distracting the Anglican Communion by answering the question, "What really happened at the Reformation?" To answer this question truthfully it is necessary to turn to history, in the spirit of the scientific historian, that is to say, with the determination to establish the truth and nothing but the truth. It is the function of history to explain the how and why of things; and, in order to do so, it must get down to the facts. My aim in the present paper is, to the best of my ability, to assist those who desire to do so.

The Renaissance scholar Leonardo Bruni, writing in 1450 to the illustrious lady Baptista Malatesta, commended the study of history as well suited to the capacities of women. "After all," he said, "history is an easy subject: there is nothing in its study subtle or complex. It consists in the narration of the simplest matters of fact. . . ." That is an opinion which still largely prevails—except among historians. These at least are conscious of the pitfalls and the stumblingblocks in their path. For the facts of the past survive only so far as they are recorded, and of the things recorded by no means all are facts. The records are full of fond things vainly invented; of lies, conscious or unconscious; of puzzles, unsolved and sometimes insoluble. What, indeed, *is* a fact? The one thing certain about a fact is that, if it is to have any meaning for us, it cannot be simple; for a simple fact, like a point in geometry, would be without parts and without magnitude. The existence of William is a fact; but it only begins to have any meaning for us when we add, let us say, "the Conqueror" or "the Silent"; and we have to add a great deal more before the full historical significance is revealed. Or, to take an example more germane to our subject, the existence of "the Mass" is a fact; but does the word represent the same thing in the Confession of Augsburg, the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, and the Decrees of the Council of Trent? The fact, or the word which represents the fact, must be put into its historical setting before its full meaning and implications can be seen.

History, then, is concerned with the interrelation of facts; its aim is to reconstruct an accurate picture of the past, based on a selection of facts—since all cannot be included. Scientific history starts with a verification of the facts; it tries first to make clear *what* happened, and then to explain *why*. To be scientific, it must be free from prejudices and predilections, political, personal, social, religious. The scientific historian is in the position at once of solicitor, counsel, and judge; he collects and sifts the evidence, cross-examines the witnesses, and finally sums up. The value of

his summing up depends on his judgment and impartiality in selecting and presenting the facts.

It follows that scientific historians are rare. The vast majority of history books, especially the most popular, are not scientific; they are compilations from compilations, generalizations of generalizations. Even those based on independent research are too often vitiated by the obvious bias of their authors; and this is true even of some histories which are justly regarded as classics. Mr. Augustine Birrell stated the dilemma, with his usual wit, thirty years ago in connection with this very inquest in which the Reformation Study Brotherhood is engaged.[1] "Historians!" he said. "Their name is perfidy! Unless they have good styles they are so hard to read, and if they have good styles they are so apt to lie. By what means shall a plain man—a busy man, a man very partially educated—make up his mind as to what happened at the Reformation?"

The truth is that we—and, too often, we historians—are apt to bring to our researches into the records an intention, conscious or unconscious, which warps our judgment and paralyses our critical faculty. Too often we set out, not in quest of truth, but of confirmation of *the* truth as we conceive it. This tendency is not confined to religious people, but is undoubtedly most marked in them. It is, indeed, obvious that for those who hold the articles of their creed to be divinely inspired, and their own religious system to contain the truth and nothing but the truth, all history must conform to their standards, and in so far as it does not conform it is not history. That is, broadly speaking, the Roman Catholic attitude. Certain Catholic scholars, like Döllinger or the late Monseigneur Duchesne, may depart from it; but—well, Döllinger died excommunicate, and Duchesne is on the Index. There is a Catholic Truth Society—as though truth could be Catholic or Protestant, or anything but just truth!

It is not in this spirit that we must go to history, if we appeal to it at all, but humbly relying on our own reasoning faculties. These, of course, are not infallible. Yet, as Browning says, "our rush-light has for its source the sun." So far as the affairs of this world at least are concerned, it is the only guide vouchsafed us, and if properly used it suffices. Stripping ourselves, then, of our prejudices and predilections, let us turn to this question of what happened at the Reformation.

I do not, of course, pretend to give a full answer to this question; I could not do so if I tried. My purpose is only to make some suggestions by way of introduction to its study. I shall begin, then, by outlining the situation which makes the right answer to the question of present importance. I shall then state broadly what light historical evidence throws upon the question. After this, I shall point out some of the peculiar difficulties which face those, and especially religious people, who study the question.

[1] "What Happened at the Reformation?" *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1896.

In conclusion I shall give some indication of the authorities which may be profitably consulted.

For more than three centuries after the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century in England there was little difference of opinion as to its character and consequences. The issues remained clear. The dividing line between Roman Catholic and Protestant was definitely marked in England, as it still is on the Continent; and the test used to separate the one from the other was, not the question of Papal supremacy, but the acceptance or rejection of the doctrine of transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass. Mr. Birrell, in the article already quoted, pointed out the reality of this division. "It is the Mass that matters," he said. "It is the Mass that makes the difference: so hard to define, so subtle is it, yet so perceptible, between a Catholic country and a Protestant one, between Dublin and Edinburgh, between Havre and Cromer." For three hundred years the Church of England stood, both officially and in the popular mind, as a chief bulwark of those qualities which thus differentiated the English people from their Roman Catholic neighbours.

Then, some hundred years ago, there burgeoned inside the English Church that curious, exotic outgrowth of the Romantic movement—Tractarianism, which in our own day has blossomed into the full flower of "Anglo-Catholicism." I need not enlarge on this, for its main developments and claims are familiar. I will merely note that it began by contending that the doctrines and practices characteristic of it were prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, or at least implicit in its formulæ, and that it has now reached a point where it recognizes that this is not the case, and that the Prayer Book must be revised to suit these practices and doctrines.

From the historian's point of view—which is that from which I approach this question—this change of attitude has the merit of honesty. For what was, from this point of view, intolerable was the assertion that no great doctrinal changes were made in the Church of England by the Reformers; that all that happened was the repudiation of the usurped jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome and the removal of certain generally recognized abuses. It was a reading of history admirably summed up by the learned Jesuit Father Thurston, who said that it is based on the assumption that the authorities of the Church in England chose the moment when the house was on fire to begin a spring-cleaning.

It is hard to characterize the processes by which Anglo-Catholics have sought to give an historical foundation to their position. I do not accuse them of conscious and deliberate dishonesty, but rather of sheer incapacity to look at facts except from an angle which distorts and obscures them. Newman was certainly not dishonest. He simply became involved in an intellectual and moral tangle which he attempted to solve by the dialectical methods in which he had been trained. The scientific point of view was quite alien to him. He knew and wanted to know nothing of the new

and wonderful world which science was beginning to open up. He shrank from it appalled, retiring into a nebulous world of his own creation, a sort of cross-word puzzle, which he tried to solve by verbal dexterity. It was the method he applied in Tract XC, that amazingly ingenious, but hardly ingenuous, attempt to show that the doctrines of the Church of England were not irreconcilable with those of the Church of Rome. To this—the *fons et origo malorum*—I shall have occasion to return.

Tract XC set the fashion. It suggested a method of approaching the history of the Reformation which would reinforce, not weaken, the Catholic cause. For example, in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, to the words " the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion " is added " commonly called the Mass." The later Prayer Books say that the First Prayer Book contains nothing contrary to God's Word ; therefore the later Prayer Books did not abolish but retained the Mass. With this matter I shall deal in more detail later. Again, there is the Ornaments Rubric. This is taken as not only permitting but prescribing all the pre-Reformation ornaments of the Church and its ministers. Therefore, since these ornaments were by common consent symbolical of certain doctrines held before the Reformation, these doctrines are not only permitted but prescribed. The dialectical process is perfect. Yet we may say about it what Latimer said about the papists of his day : " Now the papists do brawl about words, to the maintenance of their own inventions, and follow rather the sound of words, than attain unto the meaning of the Fathers." Substitute " facts " for " Fathers," and this remains true of our latter-day papists. Their case, as presented by themselves, sounds plausible enough. It can only be met by getting behind the phrases to the facts.

Before suggesting the methods by which we may get at the facts, I should like to say a word or two about the peculiar difficulties which face us in dealing with the period of the Reformation. Since the questions then debated are still living issues, we may find that we are hampered in our study of them by the experiences of the centuries that have since passed, and may, unconsciously it may be, credit the sixteenth century with ideas which have only developed since. We have, then, to remember the peculiar conditions of that age. In the minds of the Reformers there was, at least for many years, no conscious breach with Catholic tradition ; rather they appealed to it. There was no revolt against Catholic authority ; for on the points at issue Catholic authority had not pronounced. The debate was between parties within the Church ; it began, indeed, to all seeming, in a quarrel between rival doctrines of the Schools—Augustinians against Aristotelians. To conservatives and reformers alike the modern idea of " Free Churches " would have been utterly abhorrent ; for both alike believed in the one Catholic Church, though they differed as to its character and constitution. Moreover, both rejected utterly the principle of liberty of conscience, as we understand it ; whichever view of the Church triumphed here or there was at once established as that to which all

had to conform. It is this last fact that we have to bear in mind in studying the evidence for the history of this period. We have, for instance, proof enough that many clergy of the Church of England conformed unwillingly to the frequent changes of religion, and we have also proof that they, very naturally, sometimes tried to adapt the new forms to their old beliefs rather than their old beliefs to the new forms. This has made it possible for Anglo-Catholic controversialists to gather here and there facts which seem to prove their contention that the old doctrine and ritual survived the Reformation. The wonder is, not that such evidence can be found, but that it is so infrequent and so obscure.

. . . . . .

I will now endeavour to illustrate the proper method of studying the history of the Reformation, by taking one question connected with it, and suggesting the answer. The question is, was the Mass abolished in the Church of England or was it not? It is the most important question of all; for "it is the Mass that matters; it is the Mass that makes the difference."

I need not describe the changes in the English liturgy, embodied in the two Prayer Books of Edward VI, and that issued in 1559, in the second year of Elizabeth. These changes are generally admitted; it is only their character and implications that are in dispute. With regard to this Mr. Birrell wrote: "The general intention of the parties making these changes involves an amount of judicial research and careful examination of such a mass of material, not all easily laid hands on, as to place it as much above the intellectual capacity of the laity as it would prove to be beyond the pecuniary resources of the majority of the clergy. Clergy and laity alike must wait till the work is done for them by some one they can trust." Well, whatever my intellectual capacity may be, as a mere layman I should certainly shrink from the task of reading and collating all that remains on record of what was said by the sixteenth-century divines on this subject. They are certainly no light reading, for all the vigour of their language. Nor do I think it necessary to read them all in order to arrive at a pretty just estimate of what the intentions of the parties were. Mr. Birrell, I think, exaggerated both the magnitude and difficulty of the task.

Let us take first the Anglo-Catholic view of the matter. The *locus classicus* for this is § 9 of Tract XC. In this Newman, after quoting Art. XXXI on the Sacrifices of Masses, says: "Nothing can show more clearly than this passage that the Articles are not written against the creed of the Roman Church, but actual existing errors in it, whether taken into its system or not. Here the Sacrifice of the Mass is not spoken of, in which the special question of doctrine would be introduced; but the 'sacrifices of Masses,' certain observances for the most part private and solitary, which the writers of the Articles saw before their eyes"—and so on. To this I may add a somewhat pontifical pronouncement of the late Mr. George Russell, in an article on "Reformation and Reunion" published in the *Nineteenth Century* for July, 1896 (Vol.

50). "Before the Reformation," he said, "the Mass was the Eucharist. . . . The Reformers regarded the words as synonymous." These two quotations fairly sum up the Anglo-Catholic view.

Now it is true that the Reformers did, at the outset, regard the words Mass and Eucharist, or Lord's Supper, as synonymous —Luther compiled a German Mass-book; we shall presently see how long they continued so to regard them. The apology presented by the Reformers in 1530 to the Emperor Charles V—known as the Augsburg Confession—uses the word Mass alternatively with Holy Supper and Lord's Supper. But *what do they mean by the Mass?* The answer to this is important, as it throws considerable light on the *intention* of the framers of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. The third of the Articles concerning abuses which have been reformed is headed *De Missa*, and runs as follows:

> "Our churches are falsely accused of having abolished the Mass. For the Mass is retained by us and celebrated with greater devotion and earnestness than by our gainsayers. Thus the people are often and with the greatest diligence instructed in the Holy Sacrament, why it was instituted and how it is to be rightly used, so that alarmed consciences may be comforted and the people drawn to Communion and the Mass. Thereto is added instruction as to false teaching about the Sacrament. Moreover, in the public ceremonies of the Mass no notable change has been made, save that (for the instruction of the people) German hymns have been mingled with those in Latin."

Here, then, we certainly have the Mass; but it is made quite clear that it is not the Mass as traditionally conceived, or as defined in the decrees of Trent. After denouncing certain abuses of the Mass, for instance, the doctrine that the Sacrifice on Calvary was for original sin, and the Mass for all other sins—whereby "the Mass is made into a sacrifice for the quick and the dead, to have remission of sin and reconcile them to God"—and the consequent immense multiplication of "hole-and-corner Masses" (Winkelmessen)—it lays down that "the Holy Sacrament was instituted, not as a sacrifice for sin (for the Sacrifice had already been offered), but in order that our faith might be stirred up and our conscience comforted, which are reminded that through the Sacrament Christ promised them grace and forgiveness of sins. Therefore the Sacrament demands faith, and *without faith is used in vain.*"

The doctrine is more clearly defined in Article XIII, "On the Use of the Sacraments." "Sacraments were instituted as the signs and witnesses of God's will towards us, in order to excite and confirm the faith of those that use them." The logical deduction is drawn in the recension of the Confession made in 1540 (the *Variata*). In this there are added the words: "Therefore they condemn the pharisaical opinion, which destroys the doctrine concerning faith,

and does not teach that in the use of the sacraments there is need of the faith which believes that grace is bestowed upon us for Christ's sake, but feigns that men are justified by the use of the sacraments *ex opere operato* and even without any good motion in those who use them." Against this doctrine, so monstrous in its consequences, the Reformers set up the doctrine of justification by faith only. In their intense conviction of the unworthiness of man in the presence of the awful righteousness of God [1] they tended, indeed, to exaggerate their language, so that to some it seemed that this doctrine absolved them from the obligation of "works" altogether. Thus it came that the doctrine of justification by faith only had also its monstrous consequences—in antinomianism. Historic truth compels this admission. For our purposes, however, it is enough to point out that this doctrine, with its corollary that good works are the necessary fruits and evidence of "a true and lively faith," was adopted by the Church of England.[2]

Applied to the Mass, the doctrine of justification by faith was to prove revolutionary. It did not, indeed, touch the doctrine of the Real Presence: the Augsburg Reformers held that the Body and Blood of the Lord are really present in the Supper and are there given and received, and they condemned those who taught otherwise.[3] But, in their view, the channel, so to speak, of the grace bestowed by the Communion was the faith of the communicant. Neither the Presence nor the Sacrifice conferred grace *ex opere operato*.

[1] Thus Luther, writing to his friend Georg Spenlein, Augustinian friar at Memmingen, on April 7, 1516, says:

"In our age there burns in many a tendency to presumption, and in those especially who study with all their strength to be just and good: not knowing the justice of God, which is most lavishly and freely bestowed upon us in Christ, they seek of themselves to do good works so long that in the end they may stand confidently before God, as though graced with virtues and merits, which is a thing impossible to be done. You, while with us, were of this opinion, and I shared it: yet it is against this same opinion, or rather this error, that I now fight, though I have not yet vanquished it. Therefore, my sweet brother, learn Christ and him crucified, learn to sing to him and, despairing of thyself, to say to him: 'Thou, Jesu, art my righteousness, but I am thy sin; thou didst take what was mine and gavest me that which was thine: thou tookest what thou wast not, and thou gavest me that which I was not.'"—W. M. L. de Wette, *Luther's Briefe* (Berlin, 1825–1828), s. 17.

[2] The language of the Canons of the Council of Trent on this matter is hard to follow. Canon VIII of the *Decretum de Justificatione* (Sess. Sexta, Jan. 13, 1547) lays down that neither faith nor good works, which precede justification, promote justification, which is a grace freely bestowed by God. The language of Canon XVIII is even strongly reminiscent of that of Luther quoted above: "None the less, far be it from a Christian man that he should trust or glory in himself, and not in the Lord, whose goodness towards all men is such, that he wills to ascribe to them as merits what are his own gifts." Yet Canon XXIV lays down that "if anyone shall say, that accepted justness (*iustitiam acceptam*) is not preserved, and also not increased before God through good works; but that the works themselves are only the fruits and evidence of justification, or not the cause of its increase, let him be anathema."

[3] Article X (1530): "De coena domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint et distribuantur vescentibus in coena domini, et improbant secus docentes." This remains orthodox Lutheran doctrine.

We will now examine briefly the Edwardine office for the Lord's Supper, "commonly called the Mass," in the light of what the Confession of Augsburg says about the Mass.

The late Canon McColl, in his *Reformation Settlement*, affirmed that the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, unlike the Second, was uncorrupted by the pestilent interference of foreign divines. In view of the intimate intercourse from the first between the Reformers in England and those on the Continent, this statement was, to say the least of it, very rash. Whether foreign divines had any direct share in compiling the First Prayer Book or not I am not in a position to say. That they strongly influenced it is certain. Cranmer was one of its authors; and Cranmer had had long discussions with the Lutheran divines who had come to England by King Henry's invitation in 1538. The thirteen Articles discovered among his papers after his death, which clearly formed the basis of the later Articles of Religion, are supposed to be those agreed upon at this Conference. These Articles closely follow the language of the Confession of Augsburg; and it is therefore the more significant that the liturgy, "commonly called the Mass," in the First Prayer Book embodies the reformed doctrines as proclaimed at Augsburg, and also closely follows the precedents set by Lutheran Germany in the externals of worship, e.g., in the retention of those vestments and ceremonies which were regarded as *adiaphora*.

The Anglo-Catholic contention is that the First Prayer Book retained the old office of the Mass essentially unaltered. This can be easily refuted by turning to the rubric inserted in the midst of the Canon, immediately after the solemn words of consecration:

> "These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning to the altar, *without any elevation, or showing the Sacrament* to the people."

That is to say, the central act of the Mass—the oblation of the Host, "the Victim"—is not only no longer enjoined, but expressly forbidden. The Host itself is gone. The "Sacrament" is not to be shown to the people for that divine worship (*latria*) which, according to the decrees of Trent, is due to the very presence of God in the consecrated elements.[1] As Canon Estcourt pointed out in his "The Question of Anglican Orders discussed," from the Mass in the First Prayer Book, "every expression which implies a real and proper sacrifice has been carefully weeded." The idea of sacrifice is, indeed, retained, but it is a "memorial" of the Sacrifice once offered, a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

The whole character of the service, indeed, reveals the intention of its framers to substitute the Communion for the Mass—in

[1] Sessio XIII (Oct. 11, 1551) Decretum de sancto eucharistiae sacramento. Canon IV affirms the doctrine of transubstantiation. The logical deduction from this is drawn in Canon V: "Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Christi fideles pro more in catholica ecclesia semper recepto latriae cultum, qui vero Deo debatur, huic sancto sacramento in veneratione exhibeant."

the sense in which the word Mass was now beginning to be understood. I need only point to the long exhortations to the people to be diligent in coming to Communion, and to the rubrics, more than once repeated, which lay down that there is to be no celebration unless there be others to communicate with the priest.

A word, too, about the vestments ordered to be worn. It is confidently asserted that the First Prayer Book prescribed all the eucharistic vestments. This is not the case. At the celebration the priest is ordered to put on "a white alb plain, with a vestment or cope." There is nothing about girdle, maniple, amice or stole. The contention is that these vestments are, so to speak, taken for granted, or that they are covered by the single word "vestment." Why, then, a white alb "*plain*"? Did this imply no more than a puritan objection to apparelled albs? Well, again we must go to the Continent for light. The Reformers well knew the symbolism of the vestments, and they rejected those which symbolized doctrines or practices which they had repudiated. The Lutherans—to give them the most convenient title—cast off the amice, maniple, girdle and stole (for one reason or another); they retained precisely the white alb plain and the vestment or cope, as they still do in the Scandinavian churches.[1]

And now let us glance at contemporary evidence to see whether the Lord's Supper, according to the Edwardine rite, was regarded as synonymous with the Mass. First let us fix dates.

The First Prayer Book of Edward VI came into use on June 9, 1549. It remained in use until November 1, 1552, when it was superseded by the Second Prayer Book. Well, in May, 1550, we find Bishop Ridley, one of the compilers of the liturgy, in his injunctions to his clergy, forbidding "any counterfeiting of the popish mass . . . in the time of the Holy Communion." We find him abolishing the altar, "that the form of a table may more move and turn the simple from the old superstitious opinions."[2] Dr. Frere, indeed, argues that in ordering the destruction of altars the Bishop was acting *ultra vires*, since "such authorization as the Council could give for this destruction was not issued till the 24th of November."[3] But the retention of the "altar" did not necessarily imply the retention of the "Mass" (the altar remains in the Lutheran Churches), though it certainly favoured it. Nor, it seems, did the removal of the altars stop the effort to continue the Mass. The altar in St. Paul's was removed in June. In the *Acts of the Privy Council*, under date October 13, 1550, is recorded:

> "A letter to Thomas Asteley to joyne with ij or iij honest gentlemen of London for the observation of the usage of the

[1] See my articles "Vestments," in *Enc. Brit.* (11th ed.), xxvii. 1060, d. *Anglican Church*, and "The Surplice not a Mass Vestment," in *Nineteenth Century* for March, 1913.

[2] Frere, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, ii. 241, No. XXXVIII.

[3] *Ib.* i, Introduction, p. 137.

> Communyon in Powles, whereof information was given that it was used as a verie masse."

This may serve to explain the intentions of the framers of the Second Prayer Book. The comparatively moderate changes made in the First Prayer Book had failed in their object. After all, this book had been accepted, though with reluctance, by churchmen of the type of Bishop Gardiner, precisely because it could, with a little ingenuity, be reconciled with what they held to be Catholic doctrine. From the point of view of the Reformers, therefore, it quickly became evident that the service must be so altered that it could no longer be used "as a verie masse." Hence the Second Prayer Book: the splitting up of the prayer of consecration, so as to eliminate from the Canon the idea of a sacrifice, the change in the form of administration of the Sacrament, the prescription of the surplice alone as the dress of the minister, and—last but not least—the elimination of the very word Mass.

This word, indeed, was by this time no longer synonymous with the Lord's Supper; it was henceforth universally used of the sacrifice of the altar, as the Romanists conceived it, as a mystery conferring grace *ex opere operato*. The language of the Reformers, and of the later Anglican divines, leaves no doubt upon this point. That of the Reformers, indeed, offends our more sensitive taste; but it is at least unequivocal. Thus Ridley wrote, from prison a day or two before his martyrdom:

> "This heathenish generation, these thieves of Samaria, these Sabaei and Chaldaei, these robbers have rushed out of their dens, and have robbed the Church of England of all the holy treasure of God. In the stead of God's holy word, the true and right administration of Christ's holy sacraments . . . they mixed their ministry with men's foolish phantasies, and many wicked and ungodly traditions withal. In the stead of the Lord's holy table they give the people, with much solemn disguising, a thing which they call their mass; but indeed it is a very masking and mockery of the true supper of the Lord, or rather I may call it a crafty juggling, whereby these false thieves and jugglers have bewitched the minds of the simple people. . . ."

Latimer was, if possible, even more explicit. "The very marrow-bones of the mass," he said, "are altogether detestable, and therefore by no means to be borne withal; so that, of necessity, *the mending of it is to abolish it for ever.*"

This was certainly the view of those Reformers who, after the Marian interlude, returned from exile in Geneva, where Calvin had succeeded in realizing his austere ideal of the City of God. They came back full of zeal for this new model, determined, if possible, to strip the Church of the last "rags of popery." And they found the English people, on the whole, in a mood to follow their lead; for the Marian persecution had done its work, and especially the

martyrdom of the three bishops had lighted a candle which was destined never to be put out. Apart from this new temper in the people—which it is perhaps possible to exaggerate—the whole ecclesiastical situation in Europe had been radically changed by the activities of the Council of Trent. Its decrees were not formally promulgated until 1564, but on the main subjects of controversy between Protestant and Romanist it had already pronounced authoritative judgment. All the distinctive doctrines of the Reformers were condemned in unequivocal language. We need but take one, which involves all the rest. The XXIXth Article of Religion, "Of the Sacraments," repeated, in almost identical language, the definition of doctrine given in the XIIIth Article of the Augsburg Confession of 1540 : the gist of it being that the sacraments do not confer grace *ex opere operato,* but only according to the faith of the recipient. The VIIIth Canon of the Decree on the Sacraments, passed at the Council of Trent on March 3, 1547, runs as follows :

> "Whosoever shall say, that grace is not conferred by the sacraments of the New Law *ex opere operato,* but that only faith in the Divine promises suffices to obtain this grace, let him be anathema."

And this doctrine is given a special application to the Sacrament of the Altar. The IIIrd Canon of the Decree on the Eucharist, passed on October 11, 1551, begins thus :

> "The most holy eucharist has this in common with other sacraments, that it is the symbol of a sacred thing and the visible sign of an invisible grace ; but this excellent and singular quality is found in it, that, whereas the rest of the sacraments have the power of sanctification only when some one uses them, in the Eucharist the sacrament itself is the author of sanctity *before use.*"

This is deduced from the presence of Christ, God and Man, in the consecrated elements, which *must* of itself sanctify. It hangs upon the doctrine of transubstantiation ; and this again involves the oblation perpetually repeated at the altar, which confers grace *ex opere operato.* Thus the doctrine of the Mass—as it is commonly understood—was now fixed authoritatively for those who acknowledged the authority.

The Council of Trent solemnly affirmed that the efficacy of *this* sacrament does not depend on the faith of those for whose intention it is celebrated. They need not even be present. It is a sacrifice for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt. Since its virtue is *ex opere operato,* its efficacy is increased by repetition, and it loses nothing by being made a matter of bargain and sale.

But—to get back to history. What happened when Queen Elizabeth came to the throne? A certain confusion has been introduced into our vision of this transition period by the equivocal attitude of the Queen herself as "Supreme Governor of the Church

of England." It is well known that she herself favoured the First Prayer Book of Edward I, and the retention of the traditional ritual. But her attitude was determined not by religious predilections but by political exigencies. She was in a position of singular difficulty; her disputed title inclined her to lean on the Protestants, at home and abroad; her native caution led her to avoid as far as possible taking any steps involving an irrevocable breach with the Catholic Powers. She was, I think, perhaps consciously inspired in her ecclesiastical policy by Machiavelli's shrewd advice to Princes wishing to make a revolution, namely, " to preserve carefully the semblance of old institutions, while entirely changing their substance."

But in this respect circumstances were too strong for her. It was, indeed, she herself who flung down the first gage of defiance to Rome, when on " Sunday in Christmastide," 1558, during the celebration of Mass in the Chapel Royal, she interrupted the service at its most solemn moment, harshly forbidding Bishop Oglethorpe to elevate the Host. The Bishop, with new-born courage, refused to celebrate the sacred mysteries otherwise than as ordered by the Church.[1] It was a declaration of war against the Sacrifice of the Mass.

The zeal of Parliament outran the politic advance of the Queen. In April, 1559, without Convocation being consulted, and in the teeth of the opposition of all the bishops, both Houses hurried through the Act of Uniformity, which imposed upon the Church the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. Certain amendments were, indeed, introduced, intended to conciliate the consciences of those who clung to what now began to be called " the old religion." The offensive reference to the " detestable enormities " of the Bishop of Rome was, for instance, omitted from the Litany, and the formula used in the administration of the Sacrament to communicants according to the first Edwardine rite was added to that prescribed in the Second Prayer Book. Most mysteriously, too—probably by the direct intervention of the Queen—that much-discussed word-puzzle, the " Ornaments Rubric," was introduced in the Act prefixed to the Book.

Into the meaning and intention of this rubric [2] I do not propose to enter, but will confine myself to its immediate effects. Doubtless, the Queen—for political reasons mainly—hoped that the outward semblance of the old services would continue until she should judge it expedient " to take other order." Canon McColl (p. 127) asserts boldly that this is what actually happened. " There can be no doubt," he says, " that a large majority of the clergy who conformed did believe in Transubstantiation, and observed unmolested the

[1] *Spanish Calendar*, p. 19. The significance of this refusal is increased by Oglethorpe's previous record. Canon Venables (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*, xlii, p. 48), says that " his conduct shows him to have been a man of no strength of character, with little love for the series of religious changes through which the clergy were being hustled, but reluctantly accepting them rather than forego the dignity and emoluments of office." In 1559, the year of his death, he was Bishop of Carlisle.

[2] It was only incorporated as an actual rubric in 1662.

accustomed ritual. And this went on till the issue of the Bull of Excommunication . . ."—i.e., till 1570!

"There can be no doubt!" Whence this certainty? The Canon produces no tittle of historical evidence to support his statement, which is wholly based on his view of what the Ornaments Rubric meant and the presumption that it was effective in this sense. He admits, indeed, the ruthless iconoclasm of the Puritan bishops; but this was, he affirms, "a gross violation of the law," and Elizabeth herself at last interfered "to stop this vandalism." Well, as we shall see, the Canon is supplementing history from the treasury of faith.

What are the facts? I cannot give them all; but I can give enough to show that the Canon is talking nonsense. There is evidence, certainly, that some of the clergy resisted the Act of Uniformity; in remote country parishes it is even possible that the Mass continued to be celebrated for some time with the old rites. But the evidence is overwhelming that, wherever the arm of authority reached, the Mass *sans façon* was abolished.

The Act of Uniformity was passed in April, 1559. On May 30 the Venetian envoy reports home that the Council had sent for the Bishop of London and given him "orders to remove the service of the Mass, and the Divine Office; but he answered them intrepidly."[1] Bonner's intrepidity was of no avail. He held out for awhile; but on June 11, Machyn, a citizen of London, records in his *Diary* that there was no Mass at Paul's that day.[2] "The Mass," in short, as Parkhurst wrote to Bullinger, had been "abolished." Indeed, a special Act made it a penal offence to "say or sing Mass" and even to "willingly hear Mass;" and the Visitation Articles of 1559 include the inquiry as to whether any parishioner had secretly said or heard "Mass or any other service prohibited by the law." (Cardwell ed. 1844, i, p. 248.) The *Acts of the Privy Council* contain many notices of priests being summoned before it for "saying Mass" and laymen for "hearing Mass." The penalty was imprisonment.

As for "the ornaments of the Church and the ministers thereof," the records of the Privy Council are even more illuminating. Thus the Council orders all "Massing stuff" to be everywhere defaced (*Acts*, xiii, pp. 186, 187); it orders search to be made for "hidden vestments and such-like tromperie for Massing" (*ib.*, p. 234). An injunction (printed by Cardwell, i, p. 221, No. XXXIII) orders that

> "they shall take away, utterly extinct and destroy all shrines, coverings of shrines, all tables, candlesticks, trindals, and rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry and superstition, so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glass windows, or elsewhere within their churches and houses."

We have evidence of the lamentable thoroughness with which these orders were carried out. Who can measure the loss to

[1] *Venetian Calendar*, vii, p. 94.
[2] *Diary*, p. 200. Cf. *Spanish Calendar*, p. 76.

English art? Wriothesley (*Chron.*, p. 70) records how, on August 24, 1559,

> "were burned in Paule's Churchyarde, Cheape, and divers other places in London, all the roods and images that stood in the parish churches. In some places the copes, vestments, altar-cloths, books, banners, sepulchres and other ornaments of the churches were burned; which cost above £2,000 renewing again in Queen Mary's time."

This is confirmed by another account in Machyn's *Diary* (pp. 207–208). Machyn describes the "two gret bonfires of Rodes and of Mares and Johns and odur images," and tells us that there were also burnt "copes, crosses, sensors, altar-clothes, rod-clothes, bokes, banners, etc." The records in the parish registers all over the country tell the same tale. "Perhaps the most eloquent of all these entries," says Mr. Round,[1] "is that which is found at Eltham, Kent (one of the Queen's seats): 'for a bibell—for putting downe the allter.'"[2]

It was, indeed, above all, the altar that had to go. Efforts were made to save it; but, according to Strype (i, pp. 237–241), it was pointed out in a memorial to the Queen that it was "illogical to take away the Sacrifice of the Mass, and to leave the altar standing; seeing the one was ordained for the other." "The Mass priests," argued the objectors, "are most glad of the hope of retaining the altar, etc., meaning thereby to make the Communion as like a Mass as they can, and so to continue the simple in their former errors."[3]

So the Queen issued injunctions for "tables in churches," and everywhere, as the parish registers prove, the masons were set to work knocking down the altars and repairing the holes in the church walls thus made. The consecrated altar-slabs were deliberately put to every base use. The work was thoroughly done. I myself have indeed seen a stone high-altar with its slab in place, in the splendid church of Abbeydore in Herefordshire; but this, so the vicar told me, had been found and set up again in the days of Archbishop Laud.

[1] "The Elizabethan Religion." *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1897, vol. xli, p. 203. In this article Mr. Round gives other pertinent quotations from parish registers in various parts of the country.

[2] Accounts of 1559–1560 (*Archæologia*, xxxiv, p. 56). Mr. Round adds: "Conversely, when the Northern Catholics rise in rebellion (1569), 'altars are erected in their camp, the Holy Bibles are committed to the flames (*comburuntur*), and Masses are said' (Bishop Jewel to Bullinger, *Zurich Letters*, I, 228)."

[3] With reference to this document, "of cardinal importance," Mr. Round wrote: "Although Mr. Gladstone himself, like other writers on the subject, quotes from Strype without question, I have avoided doing so where possible, as he wrote from the 'Protestant' standpoint. But apart from the fact that his own statements seem to be generally accepted, the documents which he quotes *in extenso*, giving his reference for the text, may fairly, and do, command our confidence, especially when they are in perfect harmony with all our evidence *aliunde*." "Elizabethan Religion," *loc. cit.*, p. 199.

It was by such processes that—to quote the ingenuous editor of the *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*—" the people were being gradually weaned from their love for a Catholic ritual."

The result, so far as the services of the Church are concerned, can be seen in the pages of that witty and delightful book, Harrison's *Description of England*, which was first published in 1577. William Harrison, who became a Canon of Windsor in 1586, was a Puritan, but throughout he assumes the continuity of " this Church of England " before and after its Reformation ; he hated " idolatry," but he was a lover of the beautiful, and is unstinted in his praise of the great monuments of church architecture. All the more significant is his description of Divine service as conducted in the Church of England in his day.[1]

> " As for our churches themselves, bells, and times of evening and morning prayer, remain as in times past, saving that all images, shrines, tabernacles, rood-lofts, and monuments of idolatry are removed, taken down and defaced ; only the stories in glass windows excepted, which for want of sufficient store of new stuff, and by reason of extreme charge that should grow by the alteration of the same into white panes throughout the realm, are not altogether abolished in most places at once, but by little and little suffered to decay, that white glass may be provided and set up in their rooms.
>
> " Finally, whereas there was wont to be a great partition between the quire and the body of the church ; now it is either very small or none at all : and to say the truth altogether needless, sith the minister saith his service commonly in the body of the church, with his face toward the people, in a little tabernacle of wainscot provided for the purpose : by which means the ignorant do not only learn diverse of the psalms and usual prayers by heart, but also such as can read, do pray together with him : so that the whole congregation at one instant pour out their petitions to the living God, for the whole estate of his church, in most earnest and fervent manner."

At this point I may well close this historical sketch of the changes made at the Reformation in the central service of the Church of England. Even the few proofs adduced should convince any impartial person that, whether the Reformers were right or wrong, their intention was to root out the Mass—not any particular abuse of it, not only the dogma of Transubstantiation, but the Mass itself considered as a sacrifice for the quick and the dead " to have remission of pain or guilt," offered by what the Canons of Trent call the " new priesthood." In order to make this clear, so far as the Church of England is concerned, you have but to lay the Thirty-nine

[1] The Second and Third Books. Edited by Fred. J. Furnivall for the New Shakspere Society. Part I (Book II), 1877, p. 31 : " Service in the Church of England."

Articles side by side with the Decrees of Trent, note the dates at which they were respectively framed and issued, and compare what they respectively say about the Sacraments in general and the Mass in particular. You will find that they flatly contradict each other and reinforce the contradictions with anathemas ![1]

I have treated this subject wholly from the point of view of the historian, who is not concerned with the merits of the controversies involved, but solely with their character and consequences. My intention has been to indicate the method by which, from this point of view, they should be approached. This is, to get back—behind the mass of controversial and biased "history," falsely so called—to those contemporary documents which still survive in great quantity and still speak with the voice of unchallengeable authority. What happened at the Reformation? To answer that question we must study the *ipsissima verba* of those who lived at the time of the Reformation, witnessed what happened, and put it on record. I will, therefore, in conclusion, suggest to you some such sources and the means by which you may discover others.

The contemporary literature dealing with the Reformation is alone so vast, that it would be impossible for me to give a complete guide to it, even were I equipped for doing so. The obvious approach to it is through the published bibliographies and catalogues: e.g., the Subject Index of the London Library, the bibliographies at the end of the volume on the "Reformation" in the *Cambridge Modern History*, and those attached to the various articles in the great encyclopædias—the *Enc. Britannica* (eleventh edition), Hastings' *Enc. of Religion*, Herzog-Hauck's *Realencyklopædie*, the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, etc. In the London Library Catalogue, for instance,

[1] ARTICLES OF 1552, 1563, and 1571.

Art. XXXI. *Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.*

The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in 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.

DECREES OF TRENT. Sessio XXII (Sept. 17, 1562).

De Sacrificio Missae.

Canon I. Si quis dixerit, in missa non offeri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium . . . anathema sit.

Canon II. Si quis dixerit, illis verbis: Hoc facite in meam commemorationem, Christum non instituisse Apostolos sacerdotes; aut non ordinasse, ut ipsi sacerdotes offerent corpus et sanguinem suum: anathema sit.

Canon III. Si quis dixerit, missae sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis,* . . . non autem propitiatorium; vel solum prodesse sumenti; neque pro vivis et defunctis pro peccatis, poenis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offeri debere: anathema sit.

Canon IV. Si quis dixerit, blasphemiam irrogari sanctissimo Christi sacrificio in cruce peracto per missae sacrificium, aut illi per hoc derogari: anathema sit.

* This seems to be directly aimed at the words in the English post-Communion prayer: "accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

is a list of published parish registers covering this period, fairly extensive though not complete.

Of prime importance are the great published collections of State Papers and other documents. In consulting the *Calendar of State Papers* it must be remembered that this consists for the most part only of *précis*, and that it may therefore in many cases be expedient to consult the original documents, which can be done at the Record Office. Much evidence is also to be found scattered in the *Reports* of the Historical MSS. Commission, e.g., the very valuable *Cecil Papers* preserved at Hatfield. Of peculiar value are the *Spanish State Papers* (published 1892–1896), the *Venetian Despatches* (1890)—it was the duty of Venetian ambassadors to send very detailed reports home—and the *Acts of the Privy Council* (1893–1896). The State Papers *Domestic, Addenda,* for 1547–1561 and 1566–1579, contain treasure-trove. Dr. W. H. Frere (now Bishop of Truro) published in 1910 the *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation.* Earlier collections are also still of use, e.g., Edward Cardwell's *Documentary Annals of the Church of England,* 1546–1716 (two vols., third edition, 1844).

In addition to such collections of documents, we have contemporary diaries, letters, chronicles and descriptions, such as those I have quoted—Wriothesley's *Chronicle,* Machyn's *Diary,* Strype's *Annals and Memorials,* William Harrison's *Description of England.*

I would also call attention to certain books and articles which, apart from their own contributions to the solution of the questions at issue, serve as an invaluable index to original sources. Especially I recommend two articles contributed by Mr. Horace Round to the *Nineteenth Century* in 1897, in the course of the very lively and instructive controversy which arose out of Mr. Birrell's inquiry, "What happened at the Reformation?" These are "The Elizabethan Religion" (vol. xli, p. 190) and "The Sacrifice of the Mass" (*ib.,* p. 837), to which I desire to acknowledge my own obligations. Quite apart from their controversial quality, which is reminiscent of the spirit of the Renaissance, they are models of historical method, and their wealth of exact references makes them an invaluable guide through the documentary maze. The fact that Mr. Round approaches this controversy wholly in the spirit of the scientific historian, and that he has always regarded an avoidable historical error as a crime, makes his judgment all the more valuable.

Of the innumerable modern books about the Reformation there are two or three to which I should like to draw attention. Mr. J. T. Tomlinson's *The Prayer Book, Articles and Homilies* (1897), is a controversial work written from the Protestant point of view, but it is admirably documented and its references are to be trusted. This, too, is a most useful guide-book. Mr. Tomlinson devotes much learning and space to a discussion of the Ornaments Rubric, and he gives an ingenious explanation of its appearance in the Prayer Book, which may be compared with what Canon McColl said on the subject in his *Reformation Settlement.*

Another very useful book is Theodor Kolde's *Die Augsburger Confession* (1896). This is a comparative study of the various Confessions of Faith put forward by the German Reformers up to 1540—the Marburg Articles, the Schwabach Articles, the Torgau Articles, the Augsburg Confession of 1530, and the *Augustana Variata* of 1540. He also prints in full the so-called *Confutatio pontificia*, the formal counterblast by Eck and others to the Augsburg Confession.

Lastly, I should like to draw special attention to Gieseler's *Ecclesiastical History* (Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte), of which an English translation was published in Edinburgh in 1865 by the Rev. John Winstanley Hull. Unfortunately this translation only carries down the history of the Church to the beginnings of the Reformation; the later volumes which carry it down to 1648 must be consulted in German. This, however, is of minor importance, as the value of the book lies more particularly in its elaborate citation of original authorities. It is this method, indeed, which—in the words of Gieseler's biographer—gives to this book, of which the first volume was published a hundred years ago, an "imperishable value." Gieseler was, in fact, one of the first of scientific historians, and his principles and methods well illustrate what I said at the beginning of this paper as to the right way to study and write history.

"Gieseler," says his biographer again, "conceived the chief task of the historian to be to show what has happened. But each age can only be rightly understood when we hear it speak itself. It is therefore by means of a comprehensive and exhaustive research into the sources, by an uninterrupted and impartial examination of the evidence, that he seeks to establish the historical facts, and to present them in a simple, strictly objective form—in a text kept as brief and as precise as possible and footnotes containing, in due sequence, well-chosen extracts from the sources, as well as copious literary references."

I would, indeed, suggest Gieseler's method as the best to follow in any effort that may be made to instruct people in what happened at the Reformation. As far as possible, let the Reformers and their contemporaries themselves speak. Let people know the evidence on both sides of the great controversy, in the language of the disputants. Let the bulk of the book, or books, consist of well-chosen extracts from the sources, with just enough of text to bind them together, as it were, and make them intelligible. For this purpose I do not think there is much need for laborious research into unpublished sources. Yet in one direction there is room for such work—I mean in the case of the parish registers. But few of these have been published, and it is precisely in these humble records that will be found what *did* happen in the parish churches throughout the land. The cumulative effect of this evidence, if collected, would be immense; and since, for this special purpose, it is only a somewhat narrow period that is to be covered, the labour involved would not be prohibitive—if some one can be found in each parish, or

group of parishes, to undertake it. In this connection I may mention that Mr. Round specially commends as "useful and instructive" Canon Raven's Introduction to Mr. Holland's "Cratfield Parish Papers" (1895). He quotes from this Introduction: "Few suspect the importance of those documents which are lying entombed in the parish chests of England."

Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. issue in pamphlet form (3*d*. net) a Letter to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury from the Right Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D. (formerly Bishop of Manchester), on the occasion of the presentation of a Memorial against Changes in the Communion Office and Alternative Communion Services. This is followed by a Verbatim Report of the Speeches made on the occasion (Nov. 27, 1924) by the Marquis of Lincolnshire, the Countess of Leitrim, Sir Wm. Joynson-Hicks, Sir Henry de Beauvoir de Lisle, and Bishop Ingham. The whole forms a useful record of an important occasion.

Ego Sum, by Arthur C. Bruce (R.T.S., 6*s*. net), is "A Study of Some Aspects of the Logic of Personality." It is intended to help young men to answer some of the fundamental problems of life which often lead to doubt concerning the Christian verities. The author has had considerable experience of dealing with these questions as they appeal to the young, and in this volume he sets out his answers. He leads on from the consideration of the individual personality to God and the Incarnation, and thence to the victory won by the death and resurrection of Christ. The "Divine Scheme for the Universe" is thus set out, and many sources are drawn upon to illustrate the great truths maintained with much force and clearness.

Prof. C. F. Rogers' Study of Evidence in *Rome and the Early Church* (S.P.C.K., 1*s*. 6*d*. net) brings together a number of important passages bearing on the claims of supremacy for the See of Rome. From these he draws the modest conclusion that there is not sufficient evidence to lead English Churchpeople to desert their own Church for that of Rome. He adopts, however, a tone of deference to that Communion throughout, which is in marked contrast to that adopted by the protagonists of the Papacy. We have not the least desire to be discourteous to Romanists, but little is to be gained and much misunderstanding may arise on the part of Romanists at the almost adulatory tone in which references to them and to their Church are conceived. Why is it necessary to go out of one's way to say, for example, "the English Church may have many faults and the Roman (as she undoubtedly has) many virtues." Romanists are quite convinced on both points and do not require to be reminded of the faults of our Communion by one of its own members, or to have an unnecessary tribute to virtues of which they are fully conscious and lose no opportunity of proclaiming. It simply makes them feel that English Churchmen have something of which they are ashamed and increases their hopes of fresh recruits from our ranks to theirs.

THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA.

By the Rev. Thos. J. Pulvertaft, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's-at-Kilburn.

AN organized body requires some means of expressing its collective mind. When the Church was small and scattered, intercommunication between the various parts was frequent. The letters we have from the second century are proof of this. But as it grew and men began to think about the rules that should regulate discipline, the conditions that determine intercommunion and the doctrine that lies at the root of all worship and service, the need became pressing for something more than a mere local expression of principles. Bishops of neighbouring communities met together to take counsel—at first these gatherings were irregular and probably were devoted to the solution of specific difficulties that arose. Afterwards when a matter was found to be a source of disturbance in different parts of the Church, separate Councils were held simultaneously, and at the end of the second Century we find Councils held concerning the date of the observance of Easter in Palestine, in Gaul, in Pontus and Oesrhene. The third century saw such assemblies as part of the general machinery of the Church, and Cyprian was the Bishop who utilized them for practical purposes to secure joint action.

When Constantine became Emperor and Christianity became a lawful religion, a new current appeared in Church life, and Councils represented a larger area. The Council of Arles in 314 was a General Council of the West summoned to end the struggles between the followers of Cæcilian and Donatus. Constantine, then Emperor of the West, showed his belief in the advantages to be derived from a united Christendom. When he became master of an undivided Empire he took the step of summoning an Œcumenical Council at Nicæa, where he brought together Bishops from many Provinces. We see in this development the fruit of the pressure of local needs and Catholicity—the determination to make Christianity a Christian Church, one in outlook, one in discipline, and one in doctrine. The genius of Constantine grasped the fact that for the peace and well-being of the Empire it was essential that the one religion which was represented everywhere should be at unity within itself. How far his policy was dictated by religious as distinct from secular motives

is still a matter of controversy, and the most diverse opinions are held as to his character and aims. Gwatkin says, " If it were lawful to forget the names of Licinus and Crispus, we might also let him take his place among the best (of the Emperors). Others equalled —few surpassed—his gifts of statesmanship and military genius. Fewer still had his sense of duty, though here he cannot rival Julian or Marcus. But as an actual benefactor of mankind Constantine stands almost alone in history " (*Studies in Arianism*, p. 110). Prof. Whitney writes, " He was a Christian Emperor from conviction as well as from political instinct, and the New Rome, which was to bear his name, was to be a Christian city from the start, unhampered as the Old Rome had been and was going to be by heathen traditions and worship " (*Theology*, June, 1925, p. 300). Dr. Adeney describes him as " at heart an eclectic theist with a distinct preference for Christianity and a measure of real belief in it ; and in these respects his state policy reflects his own ideas " (*The Greek and Eastern Churches*, pp. 39–40).

Councils were not as orderly in the fourth Century as Councils and Conferences in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Gregory of Nazianzus wrote in 382 that he never saw " any good end to a council nor any remedy of evils, but rather an addition of more evil as its result. There are always contentions and strivings for dominion beyond what words can express " (*Cambridge Med. History*, p. 166). No impartial student of the Councils of the fourth century can fail to share the feelings of Gregory. But Councils were at their worst a necessary evil. Their multiplication gave the Church too much of a good thing. There is point in the saying of Dr. Gwatkin —whose breadth of knowledge and keen insight make his opinion the more valuable. " If men do not care for religion they will find something else to quarrel over. ' Nations redeem each other ' and so do parties ; so that the dignified slumber of a catholic uniformity may be more fatal to spiritual life than the vulgar wranglings of a thousand sects " (*Studies in Arianism*, p. 207). The history of the Church has proved this saying to be true in both East and West. The *sensus communis* of the faithful must be obtained at certain stages of the Church, if peace with progress is to be gained. The spread of the Anglican Communion inevitably led to the summoning of the Lambeth Conferences and in a similar way the growth of Christianity from small communities into a large body. Harnack

holds that there were not much more than one in twenty of the inhabitants of the Roman Empire Christian in the time of Constantine, although he believes that the real age of Christian expansion was after Decius (250). And the main strength of fourth-century Christendom was in the East. Others give a far larger proportion, but the growth was sufficiently large to warrant the development of Councils as the one means of securing a common attitude on matters of universal as distinct from local importance.

As long as men are intent on propaganda, clear definitions do not become necessary. Christianity, like other religions, is caught rather than taught. The early Christians were united in a brotherhood that made them realize their oneness in Christ, whom they worshipped as God. They had in their hearts the witness of the Spirit, they found in the simple words of Scripture the food of their souls. Under the pressure of persecution they were driven together and the first great controversies had more to do with organization than with doctrine. Even in the very thick of the bitterness of the post-Nicene struggle, Nicenes and Arians united against the common enemy Julian. But men could not be always content without a reasoned basis of their faith. Greek philosophy had a hold over the thoughts of men, and the application of its principles to Christianity led Christian teachers to evolve views of the Person of our Lord that were at variance with those latent, it may be, but none the less really held by the great mass of Christians. A Synod held at Antioch in 269 marks an epoch in the Church, for it deposed Paul of Samosata for heretical teaching concerning our Lord's Deity. He held that the Divine Word—conceived of as a quality of God and not as a person—dwelt in our Lord as it dwells in other men. He possessed it in a unique degree, so that having been a man he became God. This aspect of theological thought is known as Adoptionism and it exists among us to-day. The Emperor Aurelian ratified the sentence of the Council. Since 269 the pre-existence of Jesus as the Word has been a dogma of the Church. The more we study the early centuries and their intellectual difficulties, the more striking is the similarity of their perplexities with those of our own day. The most modern of heresies is very often the most ancient.

Constantine was Emperor of all Rome. Alexandria was the second city in the world over which he ruled, and it was disturbed

by religious strife. For centuries Alexandria had been famous for its University and the keenness of its teachers. It was the intellectual centre of the world as well as the great emporium of the grain trade. Its Church Baucalis marked the tomb of St. Mark and in it the Alexandrian Presbyters elected their Patriarch from among themselves, and on election, like the Pope from the College of Cardinals, he undertook office and exercised spiritual authority and discharged Episcopal function without being consecrated by other Bishops. Its fame was enhanced by the knowledge of the greatness of Origen and Clement, and its Bishop Dionysus won prestige by his wisdom. Local trouble which led to schism disturbed the ecclesiastical peace of the City. The internal strife was embittered by another controversy which had much more importance than anything that could arise out of the treatment of lapsed Christians. Arius was a Presbyter of Alexandria who was remarkable for his personal magnetism and had won the respect of the Christian community. Like many other leaders of opinion that is opposed to the Revelation of God he united with heresy a high type of character. His views were largely determined by his philosophical outlook. It is said that "he could not understand a metaphor" and his trouble arose from his inability to see that the Son of the Eternal is not governed by the time relations we of necessity postulate in earthly parentage. Arius held firmly by the unity of God and was convinced that He existed from eternity, is alone good, almighty, without beginning and is hidden in eternal mystery. But he argued that the Son of God cannot be either eternal or equal to His Father. He is a creature and begotten. This carries with it the significance of created. He followed what he conceived to be logic and philosophy to the elucidation of the Divine mysteries. He argued that if Christ is God He is a second God. "But if the Churches did worship two gods, nothing was gained by making one of them a creature without ceasing to worship Him, and something was lost by tampering with the original fact that Christ was true man. As Athanasius put it, one who is not God cannot create—much less restore—while one who is not man cannot atone for man. In seeking a *via media* between a Christian and a Unitarian interpretation of the Gospel, Arius managed to combine the difficulties of both without securing the advantages of either. If Christ is not truly God, the Christians are convicted of idolatry, and if he is not truly man, there

is no case for Unitarianism. Arius is condemned both ways" (Gwatkin, *Camb. Med. Hist.* Vol. I, p. 118).

Arius had been highly esteemed by his Bishop, Alexander. He, however, charged Alexander with Sabellianism, that conception of the Godhead which argued that if Christ be God it follows that God is Christ, and this involved the view that God, even the Father, suffered and was crucified. After some time, as Alexander was unwilling to act, Arius was condemned by a full Council of Egyptian Bishops and was excommunicated.

He fled to Cæsarea and there he began a propaganda amid those who were ready to listen to him. Bishops came to his aid, and a Bithynian Synod convened by Eusebius of Nicomedia—a man of great astuteness and high in favour with the Emperor—demanded his recall. Eastern Christendom was divided and the Emperor tried to restore unity. Listening to the advice of Hosius—who had suffered in persecution—he wrote a joint letter to Alexander and Arius advising them to compose their differences, which in his opinion could easily be done. Men of mature age and responsibility should not, like ignorant boys and common people, quarrel about trifles. Hosius delivered the letter and saw for himself that vital questions were at issue. It required a great deal more than good feeling to bring together the conflicting elements. Something of an unusual character was required, and Constantine determined to summon a General Council of the Bishops at Nicæa in Bithynia. The name was auspicious, and he hoped that victory over disunion would result from its deliberations.

Whether or not before this Council sat, a Synod met at Antioch and showed itself politically opposed to Arius, is a question hotly debated since Prof. Schwartz called attention to the synodal letter discovered in a Paris Syrian MS. of the eighth or ninth century. If the Synod met it had only local importance, but it may have had influence on the reputation of some of those who took a leading part in Nicæa, whither Bishops from East and West flocked. The great majority of the Bishops were eastern. Most of them were men who had no great claims to learning. They did their work as pastors of Christ's flock, and their knowledge of theological subtleties was very limited. Some of them were held in high repute through their learning and statesmanship. Eusebius of Cæsarea is one of the great scholars of the Church, and Hosius of Cordova was looked upon

as a man of sound judgment and insight. There was present a young man of twenty-eight who had proved himself to be in Alexandria a debater of unequalled skill and a theologian of the first rank. The pronounced Arianizers were in a minority, only about twenty out of the 300, more or less, who attended. The group that stood firmly with Athanasius was small, too. The others were more anxious to stand in the old paths as they understood them to be, than to take share in any innovation which might engender further controversy and depart from the Faith of the Church. They had a part to take in the discussions and decisions, and it would seem that they recognized their responsibilities.

When the Emperor arrived he received a great packet of papers. These were the accusations made by Bishops against Bishops. These personal controversies are an unpleasing memory of the past, for the whole history of the Councils is marked by what we can only consider to be the rivalries of those who had to administer the affairs of the Church of Christ. Constantine listened to the addresses of welcome and stressed the duty of unity, " I, your fellow servant, am deeply pained whenever the Church of God is in dissension, a worse evil than the evil of war." He called on them to lay aside all personal enmities, produced the packet of accusations, which he burned in a brazier, reminding them of the Christian doctrine of forgiveness. The way was then cleared for the great doctrinal discussion. The Bishops felt that the time had come for putting forth a Creed which would be the Creed of Christendom. Up to then there was no universal Creed. The Churches had their own baptismal Creeds ; there was a traditional Rule of Faith, and Holy Scripture was regarded by all as a final standard of doctrine. Constantine and the Council agreed on this point, and the work of settling the terms of the new Symbol began.

Eusebius of Nicomedia brought forward a Creed which was palpably Arian. To the surprise of the Arianizers the Bishops showed their anger and tore it to pieces. Only five stood by Arius. The rejection of Arianism was assured, but was it possible to draft a document that would avoid Sabellianism and affirm the true doctrine of the Person of Christ ? Eusebius of Cæsarea, who stood high in favour with his brother Bishops, proposed that the Creed of his own Church, which he had learned as a Catechumen and taught as a Bishop, should be adopted. It is a short document which expresses

belief in " one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God from God, Light from Light, Life from Life, Son only begotten, first born of every Creature, before all the ages, begotten from the Father, by whom also all things were made, Who for our salvation was made flesh, and lived among men, and suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended to the Father, and will come again in glory to judge the quick and the dead. And we believe also in one Holy Ghost." He added a clause safeguarding the Faith against Sabellianism. Everybody could agree with this Creed. It is Scriptural, and calculated to secure unity without calling into operation too much criticism of its ambiguities. It had its origin long before the teaching of Arius had become known, and all could sign it without reservations.

But it had the fault of all compromising or comprehensive documents. It avoided affirming or denying anything that was in dispute. It was a formula that was admirable in itself, but had no settlement in it of the great questions at issue. Nothing was decided and all would be as it was before. No one dared to contradict the teaching of this Creed. The Arians were put to " shame by the arguments addressed against them: but withal they were caught whispering to each other and winking with their eyes, that ' like ' and ' always ' and ' power ' and ' in Him ' were as before, common to us and the Son, and that it was no difficulty to agree with them." Athanasius and his friends saw where they were drifting. Agreement could be purchased at too high a price. They had faced the great question whether our Lord is truly God or not. They had come to their conviction and could not leave it an open question for Bishops to teach as they thought fit. The very life of the Gospel was at stake. If Christ be not truly God then the Gospel is a hopeless message to a sin-stricken world. Something more than the affirmation of that which everybody agreed and was known to permit the proclamation of the false teaching of Arius was needed. The attitude of the Arian Bishops proved that their satisfaction would involve the retention of Arianism as legitimate within the Church. Some of the Bishops had been sustained during the trial of persecution by Creeds that were identical in substance with the Creed submitted to the Council. They did not wish anything new, and their conservatism was an element to be reckoned with by anyone who brought forward a new phrase or a suggestion that had the

appearance of requiring more from Bishops than they had been accustomed to proclaim as essential.

Athanasius and his friends were in a small minority. They knew, however, that they had Truth with them and that their doctrine was in full accord with New Testament teaching. They could not purchase peace by the sacrifice of truth—they would not rest content with a formula permitting interpretations that reduce the Lord of Glory to a creature. They had to discover a word that would place beyond dispute the Church's acceptance of the Divinity of our Lord, and they found it in Homo-ousios—which means of one substance—of one essence. This word carries with it the implication that that which makes God God, is possessed by our Lord Jesus Christ. The essence of a thing is that by which it is what it is—the particular existence as distinct from all else. The Son shares through being of one essence or substance with the Father all that the Father is in regard to His Deity. There is no escaping this conclusion, and the Nicene Council doubly assured that there would be no mistake by inserting a clause that is not in the Creed we recite " only begotten, that is from the essence of the Father."

The Creed as it was adopted by the Council reads :—

We believe in one God, the Father all Sovereign,
Maker of all things both visible and invisible :
And in one Lord Jesus Christ,
the Son of God,
begotten of the Father, an only begotten—
that is, from the essence of the Father—
God from God,
Light from light,
true God from true God,
begotten, not made,
Being of one essence (homo ousion) with the Father ;
by whom all things were made,
both things in heaven and things on earth ;
who for us men and for our salvation came down and was made flesh,
was made man, suffered, and rose again the third day,
ascended into heaven,
cometh to judge quick and dead :
And in the Holy Spirit.
But those who say
that " there was once when He was not "
and " before he was begotten He was not "
and " he was made of things that were not "

or maintain that the Son of God
is of a different essence,
or created or subject to moral change or alteration—
Those doth the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematise.
(Gwatkin, *Cambridge Med. History*, pp. 121–2).

The Arians and those who wished for " no change " had something in their favour. The word homo-ousios had been condemned as used by Paul of Samosata and therefore had for Easterns a somewhat objectionable history. But Councils are not infallible. Their decisions may be revised and a word used in one connotation may have a different import in another. Athanasius and his friends argued that if the word was not found in Scripture the doctrine is. Whatever tradition may say, it must be judged by Scripture, and the appeal of Athanasius was always to Scripture. Paul of Samosata used the word in one sense and Arius denied it in another. " The Council paused. The confessors in particular were an immense conservative force. Some of them, like Hosius and Eustathius, had been foremost in denouncing Arius ; but few of them can have been eager for changes in the faith that had maintained them in their trial. Now the plan proposed was nothing less than a revolution —no doubt in its deepest meaning conservative, but none the less externally a revolution. So the council paused " (Gwatkin, *Studies in Arianism*, p. 48). But the pause was broken. No other course was open to it, if Arianism was to be excluded. All other formulæ had broken down under the remorseless logic of the friends of Athanasius and their steady appeal to Scripture. The future of Christendom was in the balance. Its rigorous insistence on the Deity of our Lord as against the subtleties of Arianism—philosophical and theological—demanded a statement that could not be explained away. Some minds might, by that peculiar capacity which the human mind possesses, accept the critical words in a sense which honest thinking excludes. And it is plain from the after history of the Council that they did this. All in the end, with the exception of two Egyptian Bishops, signed. Arius and the two Egyptians were exiled and the Emperor ordered the writings of Arius to be burned. The age of liberty had not come, and the use of temporal power in support of spiritual effort had sad consequences in the immediate future.

We are not now concerned with the settlement of the date of Easter and the other matters dealt with by the Council. What

made Nicæa memorable was its Creed and its condemnation of Arianism. Its effects live in our own time. Thomas Carlyle, according to Froude, made a remark illustrating this, which is worth recording. "In earlier years he had spoken contemptuously of the Athanasian controversy—of the Christian world torn in pieces over a diphthong; and he would ring the changes in broad Annandale on the *Homoousion* and the *Homoiousion*. He now told me that he perceived Christianity itself to have been at stake. If the Arians had triumphed, it would have dwindled to a legend." And this is the verdict of history. Athanasius stood for the religion of the New Testament as revealed in the Person of Christ—Arius stood for the philosophy of his age regulating the religion of Christ as he conceived it ought to be in the light of his philosophy. The Church to-day is faced by dangers similar to that met and overcome by Athanasius. And there is a difference. We are in the presence of many philosophical theories. Current philosophy is Protean, and the solutions given to ultimate problems vary according to the minds of those who attempt to measure Eternal Truth by the rule of human capacity. Reason has its place in testing every proposition brought forward by the human mind, but it has its limits. We think to-day in terms of personality, not in terms of substance and essence, but the terms we use do not alter the great truth at stake. The Nicene decision is true because it is a faithful account of the revelation of God in Christ, and we are bound to hold by it in the face of all attempts to dethrone its meaning, "for the doctrine of Christ's Divinity gives reality and life to the worship of millions of pious souls who are wholly ignorant both of the controversy to which they owe its preservation and of the technicalities which its discussion has involved." It has been preserved because it is true, and it has stood the test of ages on account of its preservation of the central fact of the Incarnation.

It may be said that good work is being done by those who cannot accept the Nicene definition. Good work was done in the past by Ulphilas, who was under Arian influence. His work "is an abiding witness that faith is able to assimilate the strangest errors; and the conversion of the northern nations remains in evidence that Christianity can be a power of life even in its most degraded forms." "Streams rise above their source in mission work: we cannot judge of Ulphilas by Eudoxius and Demophilus, any more than we can of

Wilfrid and Boniface by the image-worshipping popes of the eighth century" (Gwatkin, *Studies in Arianism*, pp. 27–28). And when we see good work done in our own time by those who hold erroneous convictions, we must remember that the Spirit of God can work through anything but conscious untruth. It is for those who hold and love the Truth to contend earnestly and fearlessly for its maintenance, knowing that Truth alone is great and will prevail.

Note.—The main authorities for this *Résumé* are Gwatkin, *Studies in Arianism*—an invaluable work which is almost a classic—and *The Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. I. The Dean of Salisbury has published a learned and able little book entitled *The Council of Nicæa* (S.P.C.K. 3*s.* 6*d.*), which can be highly recommended. It contains matter that has been discovered since Gwatkin wrote, and an admirable chapter on "Our Nicene Creed."

Little Gidding and Its Founder (S.P.C.K., 1*s.* net) is an interesting account of the religious community founded by Nicholas Ferrar in the seventeenth century. The author, Mr. Henry Collett, is connected by descent with the Ferrar family and writes with due veneration of the remarkable man who gave up positions of influence to lead the community life. The book is well illustrated and a useful bibliography of books dealing with the subject is added.

An Analysis of the Sunday and Holyday Lessons, Epistles and Gospels, with notes on the Collects, etc., by the Rev. Meredith J. Hughes, B.D., is issued by S.P.C.K. under the title *Conspectus of the Revised Lectionary* (3*s.* 6*d.* net). The Editorial Secretary of the Society explains in the preface that the book contains neither sermons nor notes for sermons, but tries to give a bird's-eye view of the teaching of the Church of England for each Sunday and Holy Day. We have tested the brief statements for several Sundays and find that they answer the claim made for them. Although they are exceedingly brief they are wonderfully suggestive.

Among the latest additions to the S.P.C.K. series of Little Books on Religion (2*d.* each) are St. Columba; Bishop Patteson, Missionary Bishop and Martyr; St. Augustine of Hippo; and The Christian View of Gambling. Many of the booklets in this series are very useful, and it is therefore with regret that we find that we cannot express approval of all of them. Some of those dealing with historical matters, and especially one on the Reformation, is marked by the Anglo-Catholic bias which endeavours to misrepresent that great movement as a mere attempt on the part of the English Church to throw off the yoke of Rome. Any further movement to restore the doctrine of the New Testament and of the Primitive Church is regarded as a mistake due to the influence of the foreign Reformers. This is simply a travesty of history.

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND TO-DAY.

By the Rev. J. M. Harden, D.D., Headmaster of the King's Hospital, Dublin, and Canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral.

FIFTY years ago the affairs of the Church of Ireland were far better known to the average Englishman than they are to-day. It was natural that this should be so. Disestablishment had then taken place but a brief five years previously. The two Churches had been before united, and English Churchmen, whatever had been their private views about Mr. Gladstone's Bill, naturally felt a greater interest in the early circumstances of the disestablished Church than they do now after the lapse of half a century. Two new generations have since arisen, and, though in Ireland something is still occasionally heard of what happened in the "seventies," there are few in England, outside the ranks of historians, who know anything at all about the movement of Irish Church affairs at that critical time.

The object of this paper is not to supply such information. Into the question of the rights and wrongs of disestablishment I will not enter; neither will I tell of the discussions, often of great interest, which took place in the early synods about the revision of the Prayer Book; nor will I speak of the labours of the body of experts who made the financial position of the disestablished Church as secure as they could. My object is with the present rather than with the past; it is to say something of the results, as they are seen to-day, of these labours and deliberations. It may be best first to describe the organization of the Church and then to endeavour to give some idea of the existing conditions within it. It is impossible to mention everything. Many things which I might otherwise have discussed I have omitted because they have recently been said, far better than I could hope to do, by the Provost of Trinity College in a recent article in the *Review of the Churches* (January, 1924).

A line, not a very straight one, reaching from the north of the County Dublin to Galway divides the Island into its two ecclesiastical provinces of Armagh in the north and Dublin in the south. At the time of disestablishment the number of dioceses in each pro-

vince was six.[1] At present there are seven in the northern province, owing to the separation of Clogher from Armagh in 1886. The number in the southern province is still six. Many of these dioceses, all in fact except Armagh, Clogher and Meath, are formed by a union of original dioceses, and therefore the bishop may have two or more synods, with their accompanying organizations, within his jurisdiction. An example may make this clearer. The title of the diocese of the Bishop of Ossory is Ossory, Ferns and Leighlin. There are, or were at any rate, three Synods doing their ordinary business separately and only meeting in one on extraordinary occasions as for the election of a bishop.

Each Diocesan Synod consists, besides the bishop, of all the clergy licensed in the diocese and of a number of laymen (elected triennially) equal to twice the number of clerical members. In addition to the routine work of these synods their two most important functions are the election of the bishop when the see becomes vacant and the triennial election of its representatives to the General Synod. In the case of the General Synod the same rule works of having two laymen for each clerical member. The number of representatives for each diocese varies according to its size, but, if a diocese has ten clerical representatives, the number of lay representatives is twenty. In each Diocesan Synod the clerical and lay representatives to the General Synod are elected by the members of their own order.

The rules for the election of a bishop are complicated and difficult to explain briefly. On the vacancy of a see the Diocesan Synod is summoned and each member votes for one or more eligible persons (not exceeding three). "No person," the statute adds, "shall be entitled to vote for himself!" After this voting a list is made out of all those who have obtained, either one fourth of the total votes, or one third of the votes of either order. When the Select List has thus been prepared, each member of the Synod proceeds to vote for one of the names found on it. If, after the counting of these votes, any person is found to have obtained a clear two-thirds of the votes of both orders, he is declared elected. If no one has obtained so large a majority, the Synod by resolution may, and often does, leave the appointment to the Bench of Bishops, or if this be not done the

[1] It may be of interest to record the fact that the number of dioceses in the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland is far larger (28) and that that Church still retains the old provinces of Tuam and Cashel.

appointment will fall by lapse to the Bench after three months.

An additional complication in the matter of election occurs in the case of the see of Armagh. The Archbishop being the Primate of all Ireland, it is not considered just that he should be appointed by one diocese only. Accordingly, though the Armagh Synod elects a bishop, the person elected does not necessarily become Archbishop of Armagh. He becomes merely a member of the House of Bishops who then meet to elect a primate from their number. The man elected by Armagh, unless he be elected Primate, goes to the diocese vacated by the Primate chosen.

Besides its synod each diocese has its own diocesan council to manage its finance, its own diocesan court, its own boards of education and of missions and so forth.

In a similar way the whole Church is governed by the General Synod, which meets once a year and whose authority is supreme. No change can be made in the constitution or laws of the Church without its sanction. The executive council which directs the financial affairs of the Church is the Representative Church Body which meets monthly and consists of the Bishops, of members chosen by the various dioceses and of a certain number of co-opted members.

In the parochial organization the widest body is the General Vestry. In this may be enrolled not only all the qualified parishioners of either sex, but also any accustomed attendants at the parish church and any who are holders of property in the parish. This General Vestry meets, as a rule, but once a year to elect the people's churchwarden and the Select Vestry for the ensuing year. The last-named body is the real working force in the parish and consists of the clergy, the churchwardens and not more than twelve other elected members. Every three years the meeting of the General Vestry assumes a higher degree of importance, for at these intervals it elects not only the annual officers already mentioned, but also the synodsmen to represent the parish in the Diocesan Synod and the parochial nominators.

The mention of these parochial nominators suggests a word on the method of appointment to parishes. The appointment of nearly all the incumbents in the Church of Ireland is made by a Board of Nomination. Private patronage and Trustee Churches are almost entirely unknown. The board consists of seven members, the bishop of the diocese, three diocesan nominators (two clerical and

one lay), to represent the interests of the diocese, and three parochial nominators (all lay) to represent the parish. This system of appointment works well as a rule. It is not perfect, but it at least prevents a man being thrust into a parish by the bishop or a private patron, in complete disregard of the wishes of the parishioners to whom he is to minister. It will be noticed that, apart from the bishop, these boards are composed of six members, two clerical and four lay, the same relative proportion as in the synods. It was feared by some that this preponderance of the lay element might be a source of weakness. It has not proved so in practice. If it has done nothing else, it has at least given the laity a far greater share in and responsibility for the work of the Church in diocese and parish than they have in England.

The Church of Ireland is, it must be remembered, a small church, though it is, even still, the largest of all the Protestant Churches in Ireland. Only in Ulster do the Presbyterians outnumber the members of the Church of Ireland. In the West and South especially, but even elsewhere, the number of Churchmen is in many districts rapidly diminishing. Recently I met a friend from no very remote part of the Midlands. Possibly he is a pessimist, but his prediction was that there would be no Church families in his parish after fifty years. The young men are emigrating, or at any rate leaving the parish, the girls are marrying into Roman Catholic families. In Ireland one knows what that means. One result of this diminution in numbers has been the amalgamation of parishes. This has proved a good thing in some ways, as it provides the clergy with more work to do, and also, in many cases, with a larger income. It has, however, its disadvantages. The distances to be covered for services and for pastoral work of every kind, are often very great. A motor-car is essential, and even the increased income does not always readily allow of this. Another disadvantage is that a change in the hour of service in one or both of the amalgamated parishes is often necessary. This may be, and is, a cause of jealousy between the parishes, as both wish to retain the old hour of divine service. This may seem in the abstract a very small matter, but when translated into concrete experience in a remote country place, it does not seem small to those concerned. Tact, good-will and lapse of time will, however, go a long way towards obviating this difficulty. Irish Churchmen, particularly in the country parts, are,

as a rule, regular churchgoers. Even in the towns the congregations are good as compared with England. In Dublin, for example, the congregations are as large or larger than in London, while in most of the Dublin parishes the churchpeople do not number as many hundreds as there are thousands in a London parish.

The type of service found in the average church in Ireland, even in Dublin, not to speak of the country, must seem to the English very "low." This is in part due to the fact that the Irish Church was disestablished, its Prayer Book revised, and its canons drawn up at a time when the "ritualistic" controversy was newer than it is now, and when the ordinary churchgoer was more frightened by petty changes and novelties than he (or she) would be now in 1925. Also, it must not be forgotten that the presence of Romanism everywhere in Ireland, and the fact that it was generally in the ascendancy numerically, had then, and has still, a considerable effect on the opinions of the average Irish Churchman.

The Irish Prayer Book, first published in 1877, remained in all essentials as it was before disestablishment, though a vigorous attempt was made to make it more "protestant." But if the Prayer Book remained essentially unaltered, the new canons were so drawn up as to prevent many of the usages which were then gaining ground in England. Vestments are forbidden by the fourth canon. The next canon forbids Eastward Position, any use of the sign of the Cross (except in Baptism) and any bowing or other obeisance to the Lord's Table. Canon 35 lays down that there shall not be any lighted lamps or candles on the Communion Table or in any other part of the Church . . . except when they are necessary for the purpose of giving light; and the next forbids "any cross, ornamental or otherwise, on the Communion Table or on the covering thereof . . . or on the wall or other structure behind the Communion Table." Other canons forbid the mixed Chalice and the use of "incense or any substitution therefore, or imitation thereof."

All the canons have been, for the most part, loyally observed and obeyed, however much some may have desired the removal or alteration of one or other of them. Perhaps the concluding words of the Preface to the Irish Prayer Book may not have been without effect, and the belief may have gained ground "that what is imperfect with peace is often better than what is otherwise more excellent without it." With canons such as these just mentioned in force it

is but natural that English visitors often feel themselves in a different atmosphere when they are present at Divine Service in one of our parish churches or even in one of our cathedrals. They go home and write a letter perhaps to the *Church Times* about it, quite forgetting, or being altogether ignorant of, the fact that the worshippers in the service which they despised were doctrinally just as strong churchmen and in fact as truly catholic as the objectors.

The Irish Prayer Book has been recently revised, or rather enriched. A tentative edition was, it would seem somewhat unnecessarily, issued in 1921. This has been in use in many churches. Since 1921 there has been further discussion, and within the last few weeks a pamphlet has been published containing the alterations authorized by the General Synod. The chief changes are better expressed by the word "enrich." There has been some revision in minor matters, such as change of wording, "clergy" for "curates," "all who are set over me" for "my betters," "fitting" for "convenient," and so on. We have lost an old friend by the exclusion of "N. or M." from the Catechism. There are also a few points in which definite authorization is given to practices which have been more or less accepted by custom already. As instances may be mentioned, the shortening of the Exhortation at the beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer and the abridgment of the *Benedicite* by using the refrain after a group of verses. Permission is also given for a change in the Sunday use of the Psalter. A selection of Psalms has been made for all the Sundays in the year, and the choice is left, except on great Festivals, between these and the Psalms as formerly arranged according to the days of the month.

Perhaps the most important enrichment is in the way of new Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings. Here we have nearly thirty new Prayers *for Industrial Peace, at the time of a Parliamentary or Civic Election, For Absent Friends, For a blessing on Local Industries, For the right use of the Lord's Day.* These titles are merely a choice out of many, but they will suffice to show the variety of the enrichment.

This will not be a Book for optional use, as some of the proposed revisions in England were to have been. It will be used by all. One, at least, of the bishops has already written to his clergy directing them to make themselves familiar with the changes. This will be done. Obedience is not generally regarded as a distinguishing

feature of the Irish character. It may not be amiss, therefore, to quote a paragraph from the article above mentioned by the Provost of Trinity College:

"I suppose that in no part of the Anglican Communion have the bishops more real authority than in the Church of Ireland. Such a spectacle as that of clergy flouting the directions or ignoring the wishes of their diocesan is hardly ever to be seen. A few cranky men, constitutionally unable to endure authority, may be found here and there; but they are very few, and they get no support or encouragement from their brethren. . . . The Church of Ireland has often been described as 'Puritan' in its outlook, and this may be so; but it is at any rate a remarkable note of 'Catholicity' that the bishop's counsels are treated with respect not less than that which they are accorded in any part of the Anglican Communion, and much greater than is observable in some of its parts."

Some bishops even in England may be tempted to say, *O si sic omnes.*

The Church of Ireland, as I have already said, is a small Church. Englishmen seldom realize how small it is. In 1911 the Church population was only 575,000, that is, about 13 per cent of the total population. In at least five dioceses the Church population numbers under 10,000, a number which in England suggests the parish rather than the diocese. It must be remembered also that almost half of the total Church population is contained within the one diocese of Down. In both the North and the South Irish Churchmen are therefore in the minority, in the former case as compared with the Roman Catholics, in the latter in comparison with the Presbyterians.

But, if small, the Church of Ireland is a united Church. The disquiet of the times immediately succeeding disestablishment has long ago vanished. The Church has in her synods made her own laws, and her sons, with a few exceptions here and there, are ready and willing to abide by them. One great unifying force, so far at least as the clergy are concerned, is the fact that with hardly an exception they have all been trained in the same Divinity School of Trinity College, Dublin. Of that great school there has been distrust at times amongst some of the laity, but never, so far as I know, amongst the clergy. They regard it as loyal to the Church, and they themselves are content to teach and abide by what they learned there. North and south of the Boyne the message of the Irish clergy has been the same. This union between the North and the South in ecclesiastical matters—and not in the Church of Ireland alone—may have important consequences in the future. Politically

North and South are now separated, but no Irish Churchman, whatever be his political views, wishes to see his Church divided.

Irish Churchmen have also shown themselves generous in their support of their Church in the past. The Church population is now only five-sixths of what it was fifty years ago. Still in spite of the decrease in numbers the subscriptions to the Sustentation Fund have not fallen off. By the end of the present year these contributions will have amounted since 1870 to very nearly £10,000,000. The average each year has not been far short of £200,000. Nor has their liberality been confined to home work. Five times as much is now contributed every year for missionary work abroad as was given in 1870.

I will conclude by saying that, if these somewhat scattered remarks on the Church of Ireland have kindled in anyone a desire to learn more about it, he will find much of interest in a book which the present Bishop of Killaloe (Dr. Patton) published a couple of years ago, and which bears the title, "Fifty Years of Disestablishment."

The Rev. H. Elvet Lewis, M.A., is the author of the Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah in the R.T.S. well-known Devotional Commentary Series, edited by the Rev. C. H. Irwin, D.D. (3*s.* 6*d.* net). It admirably fulfils the purpose of the series. Each section is fully explained with pointed illustrations drawn from life and literature, and a helpful "Application" and "Supplication" are added to give practical value to the truths emphasized.

Silence unto the Lord is a collection of passages from the writings of authors, new and old, arranged as meditations by Constance M. Whishaw (S.P.C.K. Manuals of the Inner Life, 2*s.* 6*d.* net). The selection covers a wide range of subjects and has been carefully made. A full index gives necessary guidance to each topic.

Messrs. Allenson's series of "Heart and Life Booklets" contains a number of well-printed and dainty works by great authors on subjects of a religious character. An Exposition of Newman's Hymn, "Lead, Kindly Light," by Dr. Isaac Hartill is a practical and helpful study of one of the best-known hymns in the language. It helps to clear up some of the difficulties in that composition. An Introduction to Rabindranath Tagore's Mysticism by Sybil Baumer gives some selections from the writings of the Indian mystic with a brief commentary and introduction (1*s.* each net).

THE FIRST THREE CHAPTERS OF GENESIS.

By Chancellor P. V. Smith, LL.D.

THE Tennessee trial will have brought home to the minds of all the reading public throughout the world, whether Christian, Mohammedan, or heathen, the fact that at the present time there exists among Christians a profound difference of opinion as to the meaning and interpretation of the first three chapters of Genesis—a difference which was not apparent in the last or preceding centuries. It is, of course, due to the increased knowledge which we believe that God has given to us of His past dealings with the universe in general, and this earth of ours in particular, through the researches and discoveries of astronomers, geologists, archæologists, and biologists. The modern allegorical or pictorial view of these chapters has been adopted by theologians and thinkers who would not be classified as Modernists. No one would think of labelling the late Bishop Handley Moule as a Modernist. Yet some years before his death he wrote:

"Genesis is really the foundation book about man's sin and God's first steps both of judgment and redemption, and the preparations for the Christ in the story of His human forefathers, the heirs of the promise. The first few chapters are figurative and symbolical (just like the last chapters in Revelation), giving us great facts and truths in enigmatical language. We need not worry about the literalism of them. We are to take their clear messages to our spirits, and trust the true author."—*Letters and Poems of Bishop Moule*, Letter 51.

In view of this difference of opinion, a country clergyman, by no means deficient in reading or thought, lately remarked to the writer of this article that he thought anyone must be an ass who tried to preach before a country congregation on the first three chapters of Genesis. I replied that in that case he was talking to an ass, as I had done so on more than one occasion. Thinking that possibly some other readers of the Churchman may be of the same opinion as my friend, I will endeavour, with the permission of the editor, to sketch the lines on which I venture to think that useful and non-controversial sermons may be preached on the contents of these chapters.

I.—The text of the first might be ch. i. 31: "God saw every thing

that He had made, and, behold, it was very good." The picture of creation given in the first chapter of Genesis sets before us four important truths.

(*a*) In verse 1 it teaches us that "in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Spirit is prior in existence to matter. Matter was not self-existent, as atheists would maintain, nor did it owe its existence to any inferior being, as the old Gnostics supposed, but it was brought into existence by the Supreme Spirit whom we call God. This is the fundamental article of our faith. We believe "in one God the Father Almighty (or, rather, All-ruler, as the Greek *παντοκράτωρ* should be more correctly translated), maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible." Stress on this basic truth is quite sufficient in a rural pulpit, without going into the question whether F. W. Faber was right when he wrote of God:

> "I see Thee in the eternal years
> In glory all alone,
> Ere round Thine uncreated fires
> Created light had shone."

And when he penned the more familiar lines:

> "When heaven and earth were yet unmade,
> When time was yet unknown,
> Thou in Thy bliss and majesty
> Didst live and love alone."

Or whether Bishop J. E. Mercer was not more correct when he said:

"Creation was not a definite event happening at some time in the life of the Creator, after the lapse of a past eternity of solitary existence; it is an outcome of creative activity that is co-eternal with the Being of God Himself."—*The Problem of Creation* (1917), p. 305.

(*b*) But, secondly, this chapter teaches us that the universe did not spring into existence at once. The process of creation was gradual; there were six successive days of creation after an indefinite time during which the earth was in a state of chaos. To that extent the chapter agrees with what God has since revealed to us by what we call science. But any attempt to press the analogy between the two is, to say the least, unsatisfactory and inconclusive. Some have endeavoured to do so by maintaining that the days of Genesis were intended to mean periods of an untold number of years. But the mention of evenings and mornings seems to be fatal to this theory.

It is difficult to see how an evening and morning can describe the beginning and end of an æon. Moreover, the theory is obviously inconsistent with the first three verses of ch. ii., which connect the weekly rest of the Sabbath with the rest of God on the seventh day, after having completed the work of creation in six similar periods of twenty-four hours.

(*c*) Again, the chapter teaches us that all that God created was good. This is repeated seven times, the seventh assertion being emphasized by the prefix "very." It is a moral and spiritual truth and a condemnation in advance of the errors of the Manichæans, who taught that matter, or nature, was created not by a good and holy God, but by an evil spirit; and of the early monks, who believed that everything connected with the body was evil and that they ought to free themselves from it as much as possible. The sevenfold assertion teaches us to look to God as the source of all that is good—beauty, truth, and moral perfection or love; and it warns us against supposing that pain and suffering and sacrifice are in themselves evil. The beauty of God's creation is displayed in the glories of the heavens—the colours of sunrise and sunset, the varying forms of the clouds, and the splendour of sun, moon, and stars; the loveliness of earth with its trees and shrubs and flowers and varied landscapes, and of the sea with its many twinkling smiles; and its goodness is shewn in the vast amount of sentient happiness which prevails in the animal world, and possibly also in the vegetable world; while its truth is set forth in the constancy of the laws by which it is governed and which enable men to turn it to their own account.

(*d*) Lastly, and this is the most important lesson of all, the chapter teaches us that man was made in the image of God. All the earlier stages of creations, so far as our earth is concerned, led up to this; that God might have children, who, so far as was possible for limited creatures, should be like Himself, and should be able to return His fatherly love towards them by a childlike love to Him and a childlike trust in Him. But this involved two things—(i) a possession by man of an independent individuality, and a freedom of will, with the risk of abusing that freedom; and (ii) a gradual and progressive education and development which St. Paul, in his day, regarded as still to be completed at some future time (Rom. viii. 19–22).

" God is Spirit," said our Lord (John iv. 24) ; and in our Creed we affirm our belief in His Spirit as " the giver of life." It certainly seems more consonant with what we know of the workings of spirit and of God's subsequent dealings with the world to suppose that creation was effected by the infusion of God's *Spirit*, or, in other words, of *life*, into matter, thereby causing its gradual and progressive development into various forms, than to suppose that God, like a human carpenter or artificer, moulded all these forms separately.

II.—The chief lesson intended to be conveyed by the narrative in ch. ii. 4 to end, is expressed in the 24th verse, " Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife ; and they shall be one flesh," which was quoted by our Lord as conclusive against the lax ideas on the subject of divorce which prevailed in His day. In the first chapter it had been stated that God created mankind " male and female," which was not declared of any of the other living creatures ; but this was hardly sufficient to denote the difference between the relation to one another of the two sexes in mankind and their relation in the case of the other creatures. To emphasize this difference, the compiler of Genesis was inspired to insert this second account of the creation of the earth, which evidently comes from a separate source and differs from the first in many important particulars. Clearly its main purpose is to teach the light in which woman is to be regarded in the constitution of the human race, in being a help suitable for man, and especially in being the lifelong mate of her husband. In all ages of the world's history woman has had no small share in the social and political and religious life of mankind ; though it seems to have been reserved for the present generation completely to recognize in how many respects woman can materially assist man, and to take full advantage of her services. But marriage in some form or other has from time immemorial been a feature which has differentiated mankind from the rest of the animal world. The females of other creatures are, for the most part, merely united for a short time to the males for the purpose of producing offspring and sheltering the first tender days of their offspring. When this time is past, they separate and forget all about the males with whom they were united and the offspring which they brought forth ; and the offspring go their own way without any remembrance or thought of their mothers. But the protracted period during which God has ordained that the young of the human

race remain immature and helpless, requires that their parents shall bestow on them prolonged care and protection ; and this naturally leads to a succession of offspring of the same parents growing up in the same home. Thus arises the relationship of the family which is extended to grandchildren and to collaterals. But God did not intend that the connection between husband and wife should merely consist in a physical union. The wife was to be a spiritual help to her husband. They were to be joint-heirs of the grace of life (1 Pet. iii. 7). And marriage was destined, in process of time, to assume a mystical significance. For St. Paul, in Eph. v. 22–33, wrote that " the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the Church." " Husbands, love your wives," he added, " as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself up for it. . . . He that loveth his own wife loveth himself, for no man ever hated his own flesh ; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as Christ also the Church ; for we are members of His body." St. Paul was, no doubt, thinking of how the parable or allegory of Adam and Eve was fulfilled in Christ (Whom in 1 Cor. xv. 45 he calls another Adam) and the Church. For the Church came into being by the sleep of our Lord in the grave and His resurrection from it, and St. Paul calls the Church His body. The Apostle then goes on, like our Lord Himself, to quote the great lesson of the parable : " For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh." " This," he adds, " is a great mystery ; but I speak concerning Christ and the Church," which in Rev. xxi. 9 is called " the bride, the Lamb's wife." Rightly, therefore, do we look upon the union of man and wife as Holy Matrimony.

III.—The last of the three chapters under consideration, dealing as it does with the entrance of sin into the world, is clearly the most important of them from a spiritual and religious point of view, The origin of sin or moral evil is wrapt in insoluble mystery, but two things are clear : first, that there was a period when there was no sin or moral evil on this earth of ours ; and secondly, that at some time or other it entered in, since for centuries past, and at the present day, there has been, and is, only too much of it. It was impossible for lifeless matter to sin, and therefore it did not exist on the earth until life came here. Nor can we recognize any sin or moral evil in the vegetable world, though here the struggle for existence begins

between one plant or tree and another. When we come to the animal world, a later development, we find this struggle becoming more acute. Pain now comes upon the scene, and one creature preys upon and destroys another. But still there is no sin or moral evil; each creature merely obeys the law of its being—and we may safely say that no animal has any sense of right or wrong, except, to a certain limited extent, some domestic animals who have been taught it by their contact with man. There was, therefore, no sin on this earth until man came into it; and as there is abundance of sin on the earth now, it is clear that at some time or other the first sin must have been committed by some human being who for the first time awoke to the difference between moral good and moral evil. Is the Eden story an historical record of this incident, or does it teach us the occurrence of the incident by way of allegory or parable? We have no right to dogmatize upon the question or to assert that those who hold a contrary opinion upon it to our own must necessarily be foolish or wrong. We do not know the origin of the Eden story or the source from which the compiler of Genesis derived it, or through how many generations and in what manner it was handed down before it reached him. No one can say for certain that the events recorded in the story did not actually happen as they are narrated in Genesis iii. But, on the other hand, we may be allowed to think that it is highly improbable that they did so, and that a general knowledge of the universe and of God's workings in it teaches us that they did not so happen. But if so, how do we account for the story being found in Scripture which is given to us by inspiration of God? Can God have allowed what is false to be included in it? The answer to this question depends on a right understanding of what is true and what is false. A statement or a narrative is true or false according as it conveys a true or false impression to the mind of the person to whom it is made; and whether it does this or not, depends not only on the form and contents of the statement or narrative, but also on the condition of the mind of the person who receives it. A statement which is perfectly true and would be fully understood by a grown-up person may convey an entirely false notion to a child. In order to give the child a true idea of the matter, or as true an idea of it as he is able to form, it may be necessary to use language which is, strictly speaking, inaccurate. And what applies to the childhood of an individual applies also to

the childhood of the human race. If the revelation of Divine truth was only gradual as men were able to bear it, and was not fully made until our Lord Jesus Christ came into the world, we need not be surprised if such a mysterious part of it as the origin of sin was at first taught in the form of an allegory. Allegory or parable was largely used by our Lord Himself in His teaching. It is the best way of instructing children, and shall we dare to say that it was not the best way of instructing the childhood of the human race? Is it not sometimes the best way of teaching our own enlightened selves? Do we not sometimes learn more from fiction than from history? Allegory is not false. On the contrary, what can be truer than Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*? It contains far more and far deeper spiritual truth than the actual *Life of John Bunyan*. And if it is objected that St. Paul in his Epistles refers to the temptation of Adam and Eve by the serpent as if it actually occurred, we may reply that, in the course of religious teaching, events in the *Pilgrim's Progress* are frequently referred to, and lessons are drawn from them, as if they had actually taken place.

But whether we look upon the Eden story as history or as allegory, we must all acknowledge that it is a marvellous and unrivalled picture of sin, its origin, its causes, and its effects, and that the story contains lessons of most profound truth for men of all ages. In the first place, it teaches us what sin actually is. It is disobedience to the laws of God, which are, in other words, the laws of nature and of our being. Man has been so constituted by God that he may lawfully do certain things, while there are other things which he ought not to do. He has also been endowed by God with the faculty of knowing these laws and limitations; but at the same time he has liberty, if he chooses, to transgress them. If he uses this liberty, he commits sin, he breaks the laws of God and nature, and must in some way suffer for it, since these laws cannot be broken with impunity. And the story of Genesis iii. goes on to tell us fully and accurately what are the causes which lead to sin. "When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat" (verse 6). She had three motives for transgressing this law of God—her bodily appetite, desire to gratify her sense of the beautiful, and an ambition to be wiser, or, in other words, to rise in the scale of existence. And every

temptation to sin may be classed under one or other of these three headings, which are here represented as present together, and at one and the same time, to the mind of Eve. They are the same three headings of which St. John speaks in the second chapter of his First Epistle when he says (verses 15–17): "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. . . . For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the vainglory of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." The woman saw that the tree was good for food—the lust of the flesh; and that it was a delight to the eyes—the lust of the eyes; and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise—the pride of life. Overcome by these temptations, man fell and sinned originally; and overcome by one or other of them, and sometimes by two or all of them together, men have been continually falling and sinning ever since. Our Lord, in His threefold temptation, was assailed once by the lust of the flesh and twice by the vainglory of life, and perhaps also once by the lust of the eyes in viewing all the kingdoms of the world.

It is to be noticed also, as to these three classes of temptation and sin, that they all consist in a misuse, a misdirection or misapplication, of proper and lawful faculties of our nature. Man was created with bodily appetites, which he is at liberty, nay, which it is his duty, to satisfy within the limits laid down by the law of God. But he can, and, as in the Eden story, does, transgress these limits, and then it is sin, and he is bound sooner or later to suffer for it. Again, he was created with a faculty for perceiving and loving the beautiful, and within lawful limits he is at liberty, and it is actually his duty, to cultivate and indulge that faculty. But if this interferes with or runs counter to his other duties and his obedience to the law of God, it becomes unlawful, it becomes a snare and leads to sin. And, in like manner, progress and advancement in wisdom and knowledge, and in the general conditions of life, is the law and destiny of the human race. We cannot doubt that man was created, not to remain for ever in a primitive and savage state, but to move forward in arts and science and literature and to obtain continually increasing knowledge of the forces of nature, and control over them. But all this was intended to be done in an orderly and reverent way, with due regard to the laws of nature, which are the laws of God. If these laws are not observed, the process, instead of being lawful and right, is sinful, and, so far as it is sinful, no real benefit can come from it.

The Eden story relates that the unlawful attempt of the man and the woman to better their condition in a way forbidden by God resulted in no improvement of their lot, but in a signal degradation. Truly, as a recent commentary has well put it:

"In this famous 'Eden Story' we possess a wealth of moral and spiritual teaching regarding God and man. The intention of the writer is evidently to give an answer to the question, 'How did sin and misery find their way into the world?' As is natural among Orientals, he put his reply into narrative form; and though it is generally accepted that the details are to be interpreted symbolically rather than literally, yet they are in marvellous agreement with the real facts of human nature and experience. Adam is the representative of the human race. The story of his temptation, fall, and consequent forfeiture of Paradise, shadows forth some of the greatest mysteries of the human lot—the strangely mingled glory and shame of man, his freedom of action, the war between the law in his members and the law of his mind. It thus seems to have a universal significance, and shows each man, as in a mirror, his own experience. When he reads this narrative his conscience says to him, like a prophet of God, 'Thou art the man.'"

But the Eden story does not end here. In God's address to the serpent, it contains the prophetic promise: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." These words are generally regarded as referring to our Lord, and they have, no doubt, a special significance in reference to Him. The serpent bruised His heel by causing His death on the Cross; but by His glorious Resurrection He dealt a fatal blow to the serpent's head. The words, however, have a far wider meaning. They mean that throughout the long course of man's history, Evil shall commit dreadful ravages, but that in the long run Good will prevail. This is our sheet-anchor of confidence in the final victory of Good and the ultimate establishment of the Kingdom of God amid all appearances to the contrary.

Such are the lessons to be drawn from the first three chapters of Genesis. They contain truths which will endure throughout all ages and for all time.

THE DISCUSSION OF GREGENTIUS AND HERBAN, HELD IN YEMEN IN THE FIFTH CENTURY.[1]

By the Rev. A. Lukyn Williams, D.D., Hon. Canon of Ely.

We can picture the scene, the crowded assembly under the open sky, the King upon his throne, with Gregentius the Archbishop at his side, " Scribes and Pharisees " with other learned Jews from all the cities crowding round in support of Herban their spokesman, and, seated near by, the secretary Palladius taking down the speeches. We can hear the Archbishop demanding a statement of the difficulties which the Jew feels in becoming a Christian, and note his readiness in debate. For he had an intimate acquaintance, not indeed with Jews or Judaism (knowing nothing of either), but with the approved and traditional method of meeting Jewish objections. We can feel the contempt of the cultivated Greek and highly placed ecclesiastic for a mere Jew, and can appreciate the good temper with which the latter states his case, free from all servility.

Naturally this Discussion has nothing distinctively original in the general treatment of its subject. The difficulties professed by Jews in accepting Christianity have always been the same ; while the deeper reason, the natural dislike of that humiliation of spirit which is necessary for the reception of the Cross of Christ, has remained unnoticed by them, and but dimly perceived by Christians. There are the usual questions, as, for example, why Christians disregard the Law and its ordinances, just noticed here but not dwelt upon ; whether the seed of Abraham stands for Jews or Christians ; how the doctrine of the Trinity can be true ; or that of the Incarnation of the Son of God ; and these questions are stated and discussed in the ordinary manner, with appeals to well-worn texts.

And yet this treatise has its distinctive points and its own interest. These lie in the personality of the disputants—for if Gregentius is commonplace, Herban is not ; in the historical setting —this is the earliest record of a public controversy in presence of

[1] *τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Γρηγορεντίου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου γενομένου Τέφρων Διάλεξις μετὰ Ἰουδαίου Ἑρβὰν τοὔνομα.* Migne, *P. Gr.*, lxxxvi., *cc.* 621–784. *Cf.* Krumbacher, *Byz. Lit.*, 1897, p. 59.

royalty; in the special order in which the controversy takes its course; in the striking events which mark its close; and lastly, as we now know, in the reaction which followed them.

Nothing is known of Herban save what may be gathered from this document, and little more of his opponent. Gregentius is said to have lived for many years as an anchoret in Egypt, and then to have been sent with his secretary Palladius by Proterius, Patriarch of Alexandria (who died in A.D. 487), to be Bishop of Tephra (Ẓafār), the capital city of the Himyarites (or Homerites, as they are called in patristic writings) in S. Arabia.[1] A book exists entitled *The Laws of the Homerites*, which is attributed to him.

The Discussion of Gregentius with Herban the Jew professes to be the record of a four-day public controversy between them, taken down by the Palladius above-mentioned. We may reasonably suppose that some years elapsed from Gregentius' appointment as Bishop before he would be able to persuade the King to arrange such a Discussion, which therefore can hardly have taken place much earlier than A.D. 490. The end of the document implies that some years had elapsed since the controversy itself. But it contains nothing that points definitely to a later age, and there does not appear to be any valid reason to doubt that the narrative, essentially as we have it, belongs to the beginning of the sixth century. It may be dated, with some confidence, between A.D. 510 and 520.

When we turn to consider the substance of the Discussion we find that, as with the majority of these polemical tracts, it is very diffuse, and goes from point to point without much method. One wishes in vain that their writers had been as orderly as Isidore of Seville. It must be sufficient therefore to indicate what seem to be the primary objects of discussion on each of the four days, selecting from each anything that is of special interest.

The general subject of the First Day seems to be the Divinity of Christ. The Archbishop asks why Herban resists the light of the Sun of righteousness, and the latter retorts by saying that Christians resist God even more by following other customs than those He has ordained. For Gentiles are inferior to Jews, whom God protected in coming forth from Egypt. Gregentius replies that rather the Jews were like the Egyptians, for they perished in the wilderness.

[1] Ẓafār was about 50 miles N.N.W. of Aden.

At this Herban expresses his regret that the Scriptures had ever been translated into Greek! The subject of the Trinity is then discussed, the Archbishop pleading that it is not he but David who teaches it. But, says the Jew, how can a crucified Nazarene, a malefactor, be the Son of God? Deuteronomy xxviii. 66 *sq.*, replies Gregentius, points to Jesus on the cross; you are to *see* the life hanging there. Consider also Genesis, xlix. 10. Ah well, says Herban, when He comes we shall believe on Him. Fool, retorts his Eminence, it says, He that cometh is the expectation of the Gentiles, and we Gentiles have believed on Him. So He has already come. "Israel the beloved" and "Jacob the servant" in Baruch iii. 36 *sq.* mean Jesus. You conjecture that Jesus is God, replies the Jew, when the preceding words in that same passage are, "This is our God, and there shall none other be accounted of in comparison of Him!" I make no conjecture, says Gregentius, for *v.* 37 says that He "did appear upon earth, and was conversant with men."

Prophecies and types of the cross are then advanced.[1] Herban asks why the prophets did not speak more plainly, and is told that they use parables because they are not tied by the ignorance of those to whom they spoke.[2] Psalm lxxii. is discussed, and the reference to Jesus is upheld. When the Jew urges that when Solomon "humbled the false accuser" (*v.* 4, LXX.), it was not only one but all the tyrant demons, the Archbishop grants that he did indeed "keep the demons in jars, and sealed them down, and covered them with earth," but adds that he was himself overcome by them, and showed no sign of repentance. No one blesses the name of Solomon. Yet your Christ, replies the Jew, could not even save Himself! What then of Psalm xvi. 10? says the Archbishop. On the Jew asserting that this cannot refer to the Son of God, but to a servant who is entreating, Gregentius replies that He is there speaking as Man, for the form of a servant was necessary in fighting against the adversary. "I'm in a maze," cries Herban, "the son of Joseph the carpenter and of Mary his wife is the Son of God who comes into the world!" Psalm ii. 7 and cx. 1 are adduced as proofs.

But evening had now come, and the Jews rejoiced that Herban

[1] Cf. Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, xl. 3; xc. 4 *sq.*

[2] Observe that there is no mention of the argument which is to be found in tracts of the seventh century onwards, that if they had spoken plainly of Jesus their writings would have been destroyed by the Jews.

had had enough independence to stand up to the Archbishop in discussion, and they eagerly covered him with kisses. He said, let us rather pray that the God of the Law may help us; because, as you see, the Archbishop is very skilful in the Scriptures, and no little strength is needed to persuade him. He knows the subject, and how to bring arguments against us. So they encouraged him not to be afraid.

The prominent matters of discussion on the Second Day are the meaning of the Law, the nature of Israel, and the Restoration to the Land.

The King is present as before, and the Archbishop, after commanding silence, informs the Jew that Christians do not, as he supposes, worship idols or any other than the One God. To this Herban replies that they blaspheme in saying that the Crucified is at the right hand of the power of God. But, Gregentius retorts, Psalm cx. 2 says even more, for "the LORD shall send forth the rod," and this suggests the cross. Then he should have said so, answers the Jew. Besides, when it adds "out of Sion" the implication is that it had come first from Mount Sinai, and the wood from which the Cross was cut cannot be shown to have come from there.[1] Gregentius points out that a rod has no power in itself, but the Cross needed power from the heavenly Sion. The Logos took the Rod, and smote all His enemies with it.

Shall Joseph's son judge the world? asks the Jew. But He is not Joseph's son, replies the Christian. Consider Psalm cx. 3, "Before the morning-star I begat Thee," and His human nature was born of the Holy Spirit through the Virgin, who remained inviolate. For in Isaiah xxix. 11 *sq.* the sealed book is the Virgin; the man is Joseph; the man knows letters, *i.e.* Joseph had had another wife; the man could not read the divine letter, *i.e.* Joseph could not have carnal intercourse with Mary. As the fire did not consume the bush, so she remained Virgin even after the Birth. Then, retorts Herban, He was born only in semblance and appearance! Nay, for remember how Habakkuk visited Daniel in the sealed den.[2] Further, though He died a violent death, this also was foretold in Isaiah liii.

Herban was silent for a full hour, and the other Jews were con-

[1] This appears to be the meaning of a difficult passage (col. 653 B).
[2] Bel and the Dragon, *v.* 36.

founded ; while the Christians praised the High Priest, and the King rejoiced, for he had never heard the truth told so clearly before. And once more the Jew says " I'm in a maze "—for Moses bids us serve God alone (Deut. vi. 4), and yet David and Isaiah say this of Him who is reckoned Christ !

That, says the Archbishop, answers to Isaiah's words, " Who hath believed ? " If your fathers disbelieved when they saw Christ's miracles how can you—you offspring of vipers—believe when you only hear of them ?

Yet, says Herban, our Law is the greater, for it was given before yours. See too Psalm xix. 7, " restoring the soul." That, replies Gregentius, speaks of a future Law, and my Christ is " the Law of the Lord," who has turned thousands and tens of thousands to Him, for my Christ is sinless. Habakkuk iii. 3 is then discussed at some length with curious interpretations. *Paran*, for example, " the darkshaded mountain " of the LXX, means that Messiah was hidden in the Virgin. " God " and " the Holy One " are both mentioned. When the Jew affirms that they are two names for one object he is asked which is the greater, and, on his replying " God," the Archbishop triumphantly cries, " So there is a greater and a less Name in God ! " It means, he adds, that He shall come, but in a body. And indeed the preceding verse " between the two living creatures " (LXX) refers to His two natures, human and Divine.

Yet, says Herban, the old wine is better than the new. No doubt, is the reply, your Law is wine, but it has gone bad.

Then follow many passages dealing with the relation of God to Israel, and again others referring to the Restoration to the Land. But is not, asks the Archbishop, Jerusalem now filled with Churches of the Crucified Christ ? Further, the name Israel, " The Mind seeing God," [1] no longer is yours, for you have willingly shut your eyes, and it has been given to the Gentiles. " And I will charge the clouds to pour no rain " upon the vineyard (Isa. v. 6), where the " clouds " mean the prophecies and the books of the Law, and the " rain " is the words and thoughts, because you cannot understand what the Scripture says. Neither is it of any use for Herban to appeal to passages indicating God's blessing upon the Jews, for the

[1] *Νοῦς ὁρῶν τὸν θεόν.* Cf. Philo, *De Praemiis et Poenis*, § 7, Mangey ii, 415. So Jerome on Isaiah i. 3 (*Israel, id est, mens videns Deum*), but rejected in his *Quaest. Hebr. Gen. xxxii.* 28.

Archbishop invariably answers that they all refer to the Church.

Yet, after all, retorts the Jew, Moses charged us in Deuteronomy iv. 26 not to believe in another God. But Christ is not " another God," replied Gregentius, and adds, with some attempt at philosophising, this *νεώτερος θεός* (to use your phrase) is necessary, for without Him God the Father works nothing, even as a King needs speech to issue his edicts. God works by His Word (Ps. xxxiii. 6). But if you do not believe God, you will not believe me, no, not if you live as long as Methuselah ! You must be baptized, Isaiah i. 16. No, retorts Herban, the verse refers to ceremonial washing in the Temple laver, after sin has been committed.

At the end of this second day the Jews once more rejoiced over Herban, and the Christians over " the blessed Gregentius, because the grace of the Spirit was with him."

The account of the Third Day begins by the Archbishop taking up Herban's last argument, and replying that Isaiah i. 16 cannot refer to legal washing, for the whole chapter shows that God does not want the Jews to appear in the Temple before Him. He could not therefore bid them use legal washing. But, replies Herban, why did He say (Isa. i. 25, *sq.*), " I will purge thee by fire that thou mayest be clean " ? He refers, is the answer, to the effect of the Babylonian captivity. Yet does not, Herban asks, Isaiah x. 17–20 tell of our final salvation and of the destruction of the Gentiles ? Certainly not, Gregentius replies, it means that when Israel is under Rome Christ will come, and be rejected by the Jews, and will ascend to heaven, and send out His disciples, and turn all the Gentiles to the knowledge of Himself. Isaiah xlix. is discussed, the Archbishop urging that the Judaea which shall be inhabited for ever is " the Judaea above, the country of the Word of God who took human flesh of the line of Judah." So too Psalm xlvii. must refer to the Ascension of Christ with His rule over " all the nations." When Herban adduces Psalm lxxvii. 14 *sq.* the Archbishop says that the hour is too late to discuss it then. And the King rose up and the silence was broken.

But as the Jews encouraged Herban, he answered, When I consider the man and his intelligence I shall never be able to convince him. In fact we shall be worsted by him. For I saw this night Moses and Jesus standing on a pinnacle of some temple and disputing. And I saw Moses worshipping Him, and binding His

hands to Him, as to the Lord God, and standing by Him in fear. I cried, "Lord Moses, it is a fine thing that you are doing!" He turned and rebuked me, "Cease, I make no mistake. I am not on your side. I recognise my Maker and Lord. What then have you to do with the just Archbishop, whom you trouble in vain? Still, you shall see to-morrow and next day that you will be badly defeated, and will, as I, worship Him, my Jesus and Lord." These things have I seen, Brethren, and know not what they mean. Still, I will do my best.

Next day, the Fourth Day, when the assembly had been prepared the King came with the Archbishop. And Herban too stood with the priests and the teachers of the Law, who accompanied him.

Tell me, said the Archbishop, who is the Holy One in whom is God's way? Israel, said Herban boldly, for it is said in our Law, which is higher than yours, "I said ye are gods" (Ps. lxxxii. 6). Liar! retorted the Archbishop, you holy, who slew in body the God of heaven and earth! You forget the rest of the verse, "you shall die." The Holy One is Christ. Perhaps, said the Jew, you want to enlarge on Psalm xcvi. 5, "the gods of the Gentiles are demons"? From the day, replied Gregentius, that the Lord Jesus was crucified all the gods went away like smoke. If you do not believe me bring me some demoniacs, and I will call on the Lord Jesus, and the demons will be seized with terror and depart. Yes, says Herban, I have heard that the prophets of the Christians in these days, and especially those who have forsaken all, and live in the deserts, do great miracles. No doubt you can injure me, but persuade me first with words, and then act if you are allowed to do so.

They then discuss Psalm xcvii. 1; xcix. 1, "the Lord reigneth," and then the Jew returns to his old difficulty that he cannot understand how the Christ could suffer and die. The Archbishop explains that as all had sinned, even the Jews, and the Demon was rejoicing thereat, God nevertheless did not wish to act tyrannically or unjustly even to him by seizing man out of his hands, but sent His Logos, who is united with a man in the Virgin's womb (the Archbishop comes very near heresy), and defeats the demons, dies, and rescues men from Hades, and afterwards ascends, and sends out His disciples, to the Jews first and then to all the Gentiles. If Christ had appeared in all this as God, the devil might have had some excuse for thinking he had not been treated fairly.

But Jesus broke the sabbath, and this was the reason why our fathers crucified Him! What then, replies Gregentius, is there against the Law in His raising the dead and working other miracles of kindness? Yes, says Herban, why does He say, "I go to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God" (John xx. 17), if He was the true Son of God? For I often read your Gospels, saying to a Christian friend, Hand me one of your books, that I may gain profit from them, and become a Christian. Small blame to you for this! says the Archbishop. But when Jesus said "Father" and "God" He had His human nature in His mind.

Herban sees Palladius, "whom the Archbishop had brought with him from Alexandria as his secretary," writing down the whole discussion, and remarks that what has been said will be made clear (*δηλωθήσονται*) to others. Yes, replies Gregentius, for "the opening (*δήλωσις*) of Thy words giveth light, and giveth understanding unto the simple" (Ps. cxix. 130). But, cries Herban, who are the simple? You Hebrews, replies Gregentius, who had the imperfect law. Imperfect! when Moses and Elijah had their sight perfected by it! Yes, "imperfect," not ineffectual, for even they were not made perfect. It was only Jesus who was sinless, and took on Himself the sin of the whole world, and deifying the lower nature took it to heaven and made it sit down with God the Father. This is true perfecting.

Why waste time! cries Herban, I'll end the controversy.[1] Show me Jesus and I'll be a Christian! Then the Jews shouted, Don't be deceived! Play the man! For nothing is stronger than the God of our fathers. But Herban said, You talk nonsense. If he persuades me that Jesus indeed is He about whom the Prophets spoke so much, I shall be an alien from the God of our fathers if I do not believe on Him, free from all doubt.

But how, said Gregentius, do you wish me to convince you? Pray your Master, replied Herban, if He is in heaven, as you say, to come down to me, that I may behold Him and speak with Him, and be baptized.

Yes, shouted the Jews, let us see if your talk is justified by deeds. Show us your Christ, and we will believe. But privately they said, Do you wish him to show us this? Alas, we shall become Christians! But how can He appear, when his bones are in the tomb?

[1] *Ἐγὼ παραλύσω τὴν δίκην.*

The Archbishop goes away a little distance to pray, bending three times to the very pavement, and when the King and that part of the multitude which believed saw him praying, and had said *Amen*, then there was a great earthquake, and a thunderstorm arising in the east. All were terrified and fell to the ground. The heavens opened, a bright cloud unfolded itself from the gate of heaven, and came towards them, and behold! the Lord Jesus, who cries aloud, "At the entreaty of the Archbishop I appear before you, I who was crucified of your fathers." The eyes of the Jews were blinded, like Paul's, and Christ withdrew in the cloud.

Herban is led by the hand to the Archbishop, complaining that Christ has rendered evil for evil. Nay, is the reply, seeing the Lord with unworthy eyes you were blinded. If then our eyes are opened, says Herban, we will be baptized. Not so, but if you like I will baptize you and then you will recover your sight. But suppose you baptize us and our eyes are not opened! I will baptize one of you as a test.

So one Jew was baptized, and he saw, and he cried aloud, "Jesus Christ is very God, and I believe on Him." The rest were then baptized, and recovered their sight. Herban confessed his faith, and his reverence for Gregentius. Now the King was his sponsor, and gave him the name of Leo, and made him a member of his Council. Innumerable [1] Jews were baptized with him, and at the command of the King and Archbishop "the whole congregation of the Jews which dwelt in all the cities of the kingdom" were also baptized. At the Archbishop's suggestion the King forbade them living any more together, but dispersed them among the Christians, marriages with unbaptized Hebrews being strictly prohibited. "So the whole Jewish nation became mingled with the Christian, and kneaded together in the course of time completely forgot its ancestry."

The document ends with a description of the blessed effect of this illumination of the whole kingdom of the Homerites (*τῶν ὁμηριτῶν*)—joy, peace, divine services, almsgiving, the rescinding of all unjust laws, though offenders against God's law were put to death. And the King obeyed Gregentius until his death some thirty years later, when he was buried in Tephar, the royal city of the Homerites, Serdidus his son succeeding him, and being like his

[1] *ὡσεὶ πεντακισχιλίων πεντακοσίων χιλιάδων.*

father [in all things. Gregentius dies soon, and is buried in the cemetery of the great church, with grievous lamentation.

What does it all mean? Is it not in reality an idealised description of a sincere attempt to win the Jews by methods which seemed right at the time? The Archbishop appears to have done his best—with very inadequate knowledge of the real difficulties felt by Jews—to persuade them of the truth of Christianity. But the closing pages raise the suspicion that there was more than moral suasion at work. The velvet glove covered, one fears, the iron hand.

If so, the reaction was terrible. For after the death, presumably, of the successor of Gregentius' patron, there was persecution, and almost the extermination, of the Christians by a Jewish ruler.

We are not indeed yet in a position fully to coordinate the events recorded in the newly discovered fragments of the *Book of the Himyarites* [1] with such other information as we possess about the Himyarite kingdom. But it seems that in A.D. 523 a Jew named Masrūq,[2] only indirectly connected with the reigning house, usurped the throne, and, with the help of "Jewish priests who were from Tiberias," and of some who were "Christians in name," seized the capital Ẓafār (Tephar), and offered to all the Christians in the kingdom the choice of Judaism or death.[3] There was a very large number of martyrs, male and female, some being killed with the utmost cruelty. Many were in the Church at Ẓafār when it was burnt after the siege. It is consoling to know that the triumph of Masrūq and his followers was but shortlived. For during the persecution a Christian fled to the Emperor Justin (A.D. 518–527), at Byzantium, who sent him, with recommendations, to the King of Abyssinia. The latter, "the Christ-loving king Kāleb," came with a great army, defeated and slew Masrūq, and told the priests to grant absolution to those remaining Christians who had apostatized out of fear, and now repented. But even the success of the Abyssinian Christians did not last more than half a century. For about A.D. 570 they were displaced by "a small band of Persian adventurers" [4] who in their turn had to give way to the enthusiastic followers of Mohammad early in the seventh century.

[1] They were found in 1920 in the cloth-covered boards of a Syriac liturgy written in 1469–70 A.D. They have been edited, with a Translation and Introduction in English, by A. Moberg, Lund, 1924.

[2] His name is written upside down in the MS., as a form of execration.

[3] Syriac text, p. 7a, ll. 2 *sq.*, 7 *sq.*

[4] *Encycl. Brit.* ed. 11, s.v. *Sabaeans*, xxiii. 956.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

WHAT is meant by the term "the Modern Mind"? To some it may suggest Modernism, and conjure up ideas not in any way essentially connected with it. The Modern Mind is a fact which like other facts cannot be ignored. It is the outcome of the intellectual movements of recent years, and its characteristics must be taken into account, especially when we think of the best method of presenting the Gospel to the younger generation. Two Evangelical leaders have faced this problem and have brought out a volume to which I referred in the last number of THE CHURCHMAN: *The Modern Evangelistic Address.* Dr. W. R. Matthews, Dean of King's College, London, whose *Studies in Christian Philosophy* are well known, has dealt with the subject from a different point of view in a course of lectures delivered in New York, and now published under the title *The Gospel and the Modern Mind* (Messrs. Macmillan & Co., 7*s.* 6*d.* net). I regard it as a book of special usefulness to preachers, who have regretfully to acknowledge that they have reached the period of life described as "middle age" and feel that they are not as closely in touch with the thought of the generation which has grown up since 1914 as they ought to be. We have to recognize that there is a gulf between the older thought and some phases of this later thought—largely due to the study of the New Psychology, and to the new phraseology it has brought with it. This gulf must be bridged, and Dr. Matthews indicates some of the methods by which it is to be done. For this reason alone it is a book which in my opinion deserves attention from all who wish to make the message of the Gospel effective to the younger thinkers around us.

He begins with an analysis of the differences between our age and its predecessors, and finds that in our scientific age "the word 'continuity' is the key to the modern mind." But the need for the Gospel is permanent. The inner conflict with sin brings with it the need of peace and unity, therefore the modern man needs salvation. He requires to be shown a life that is worth living and to obtain the power to live it. The Gospel of Jesus is "something prior to organisation and institution." It is summed up in the words "the Kingdom of God," which means primarily the rule of

God. This leads to a further examination of what Jesus means for the world. The mystery of Calvary is shown to be central to the Christian message. He finds no foundation for the assertion that St. Paul perverted the simple ethical message of Christ. The threefold aspect of the Gospel is thus summed up: that God has revealed Himself in human life; that the life and death and resurrection of Christ have an eternal significance; and that with Jesus there has entered the world a spirit which can save society and achieve the ideal of brotherhood. The sermons go on to meet objections raised by modern thought; such as "Is God a Projection?"—an outcome of the "father complex." The important subject of personality is discussed in the section "Is God a Person?" The final emphasis is on love which never fails. We may not agree with all that Dr. Matthews says, but we appreciate the value of his study of a series of problems of the first importance for the future of Christianity. The views set out ought to be carefully considered, and more especially, as I have suggested,by those who may be least inclined to sympathize with the modern mind and feel the difficulty of keeping in touch with new modes of thought.

Another book with special appeal to the modern mind is *In Defence of Christian Prayer*, by E. J. Bicknell, D.D., Prebendary of Chichester and Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon College. (Longmans, Green & Co., 2*s.* 6*d.* net.) It is described as "A Consideration of some of the Intellectual Difficulties that Surround Petition," and its aim is "to examine and meet various objections brought against the practice of prayer from the side of science, psychology, and philosophy, which, if admitted, would render prayer intellectually impossible or at least seriously limit its scope." It is intended to help the ordinary educated man or woman who has to face the difficulties raised by some sections of modern scientific and philosophical thought. Those who trouble little about these modern movements will not find much to interest them in the considerations which are reviewed, but the great body of those who are learning to think in terms of the New Psychology will find much in this book to help them to a correct view as to the permanent value of prayer, in spite of objections which may appear to be raised with some force against it. It is part of the constantly recurring problem which faces each generation—how to express the old truths funda-

mental to Christianity in terms of new thought. An opening chapter on the evolution of prayer makes clear several important distinctions, such as those between early religion and magic, and between spell and prayer, but shows that religion tends to slip back into magic and prayer into spell, so that " when Christianity has been weakened by superstition, Masses have been supposed as it were to put a certain compulsion on God." Prayer must be judged by what it is at its highest and best. It has been throughout history the expression of the desire to be at one with the presence behind the world, and must be taken as seriously as any other form of human activity. These general considerations open the way for the explanation of the special character of Christian Prayer. Here guidance is sought from our Lord's example in the garden of Gethsemane, and from the Lord's Prayer. The essential factor is that " All Christian prayer has for its primary aim the direction of desire towards the fulfilment of God's will." The common difficulties are then considered, such as, Why pray when God knows our needs ? Ought we to ask for material benefits ? Is prayer answered ? The following chapters deal with the whole question first from the point of view of modern science and then from those of psychology and philosophy. Here there is much help for those who have felt the problems raised by modern thought. The limitations of science are clearly explained. It can furnish no answer to ultimate questions. Its laws are simply " observed uniformities." Prayer lifts up the individual to a realm of new and great possibilities which falls outside the range of natural science. The various schools of psychologists which treat prayer as auto-suggestion, or God as a projection, or religion as a product of the group mind are shown to fail because they question the validity of all knowledge. They attempt to deal with questions properly belonging to the sphere of philosophy, and these are discussed in a chapter which, after a brief examination of the special features of the latest phases of philosophical thought, states that prayer is one of the facts of experience to be explained and not ignored. There are many to whom this treatment of the whole subject will give just the help that they need.

The Religious Tract Society's Devotional Commentary series is so well known that it does not require commendation. The books of the Bible are treated so as to meet the needs of those who seek

guidance in their spiritual life, and desire to use the Bible as the chief means of their devotional development. The details of scholarship are not for them the chief interest, though the writers of the series are naturally adequately equipped in this respect. Devotional writing of this character requires special gifts, and among those well qualified for this work is Dr. Charles Brown, who has already written on the Epistle of James, and the Epistle to the Ephesians in the series. His latest contribution is two volumes on the Acts of the Apostles (3*s.* 6*d.* each), of which the second has just been published. The value of these commentaries can best be appreciated by those who use them for Bible Class purposes or for courses of sermons. The general impression of the life of the early Church can then be estimated, and the importance of particular incidents realized. Dr. Brown, who has a sound knowledge of the extensive literature on the Acts, gives some useful comments on such modern problems as the probable exercise of powers of auto-suggestion or hetero-suggestion in cases of healing. His use of a modern parallel to illustrate the significance of Agrippa's reply to St. Paul, when he says it would have been a far lower stoop for him to become a Christian than for a Prince in our day to don the uniform of a simple soldier of the Salvation Army, is an example of his effective method of making a point clear. I have read the Commentary, practically as a connected narrative, with both pleasure and profit.

The bi-centenary of the birth of John Newton was celebrated last July. Messrs. C. J. Thynne and Jarvis have appropriately published a second edition of their issue of his autobiography under the title *Out of the Depths*, together with some further particulars of his life, some selections from his conversation, and his well-known hymns, including "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds," and "Rejoice, believer, in the Lord." I was glad of the opportunity of refreshing my memory by re-reading this account of one of the most remarkable of the great Evangelicals of the eighteenth century. The younger generation of Evangelical Churchmen to-day are probably much less familiar with the lives of the great leaders of the past than they ought to be. The story of Newton's life is one of exceptional interest. In these letters. written originally in the year 1764 to the Rev. T. Haweis, there is the narrative of a series of experiences which led their author to a firm conviction that a special

providence guided his career. As we follow his account of adventures in the slave trade on the African coast and note the various stages by which he passed to the ministry of the Church and finally to the position of rector of St. Mary, Woolnoth, from 1779 to 1807, few will question that he was justified in his simple faith. An interesting feature of his record is the way in which he prepared himself for his work by his study of Latin, Greek, Hebrew and Syriac. His desire to gain as full a knowledge as possible of the Bible led him to these studies—an example which it must be confessed too few follow in these days, when the many calls of a busy life are made the excuse for neglecting the strenuous and often uncongenial duty of study. There is still much inspiration in the records of our Evangelical Fathers.

The recent celebration of the Sixteenth Centenary of the Council of Nicæa has attracted attention to the purpose of that gathering of bishops in the year 325, and the character of its decisions. There are features of Church Councils which are not edifying. We recall the oft quoted saying of Gregory Nazianzus: "I am disposed to avoid every assembly of bishops: for of no synod have I seen a profitable end; rather an addition to than a diminution of evils; for the love of strife and the thirst for superiority are beyond the power of words to express."

However our thoughts turn this year to the decision of the Council in regard to the person of our Lord and its effect on the history of the Church. The Dean of Salisbury (Dr. Burn) has written a short account of the Council (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6*d*. net) and its decrees which gives in scholarly fashion first the immediate events leading up to the Council, then the actual meeting of the bishops, the creed drawn up and the canons, the later developments and reactions with some general reflections on Councils, Creeds and their critics. Although it cannot be described as a popular account it will be found by students a useful summary of the results of the latest researches of scholars in regard to the origin and development of what is now known as the Nicene Creed.

In marked contrast with a book dealing with dogma is Professor F. S. Peabody's *The Church of the Spirit*, A Brief Survey of the Spiritual Tradition in Christianity. (Macmillan Company, New

York, 7*s.* 6*d.* net.) Some of Professor Peabody's previous works have had a wide circulation on this side of the Atlantic, the best known being *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, and *Jesus Christ and the Christian Character*. The present volume is intended as the last of a series of which the two mentioned are the first, and *The Christian Life in the Modern World*, and *The Apostle Paul and the Modern World* the others. The whole form a body of teaching which has secured wide attention here as well as in America. There have been many historians of Christianity as an institution. Professor Peabody desires to outline the history of its Spirit as of far greater importance. Although, as he frankly acknowledges, " it approaches at some points an exposition of the principles known as those of Liberal Christianity," the book is a stimulating account of the " inner inspiration " which is like " an invisible subterranean stream of thought gushing up intermittently through breaches that become larger with the advancing years." It is true that the institutional tends constantly to become stereotyped, and at times requires reformation and indeed revivifying. Here we have some striking examples of this process at work. At a time when the institutional is absorbing almost completely the attention of large sections of Christians it is of great value to have our thoughts directed to the inner power of the Spirit.

The issue of another volume of *The Speaker's Bible* gives me again an opportunity of expressing my high opinion of the series. The present number is the second dealing with the Psalms and covers from Psalms xiv. to l. There is a pathetic little note which reminds us of the loss we sustained by the death of the original designer of these volumes. It says : " This volume completes the material left by Dr. Hastings on the Book of Psalms." Sermons are sometimes regarded as dull reading, with little to attract and retain the reader's attention. The difficulty with these sermon notes is to lay them down. The Psalms always provide topics for practical treatment. Here the general divisions are Guidance, Waiting, Fainting, Charm and Christian obedience, while a special section is devoted to a full consideration of the Shepherd Psalm. Preachers will find this volume a source of inspiration, and a valuable aid to an adequate treatment of any passage chosen. The price of the volume is 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

G. F. I.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

EVANGELICALISM.

EVANGELICALISM. Essays on Christian Fundamentals by Members of the Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen. Edited by the Rev. J. Russell Howden, B.D. London: *Thynne and Jarvis*. 6*s*. net.

It was inevitable that the Essays issued with the title "Liberal Evangelicalism" should call forth a reply from those who do not accept the attitude and views adopted by the group who published their opinions as a contribution to a New Evangelicalism required in their conviction by the altered circumstances of the times. It is a pity that Evangelicals should be divided into two camps, and for our part we do not think that they permanently are, for both sections contain many whose views do not differ in principle, and, as so often happens, those who are on the extreme wings constitute themselves as spokesmen for all with whom they generally co-operate. The atmosphere of a time of transition gives opportunity for the growth of suspicion—men are very jealous for Truth, and some fear lest the revelation brought to its fulness in Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour is imperilled by apparent concessions to "Modernism," while others hold firmly that unless Christianity be re-stated in terms that will commend it to the Modern Mind it has little present and less future. The one school is afraid of the invasion of opinions that have proved themselves destructive of historic Christianity—the other of an ostrich-like attitude to the discoveries of the present day. The Liberals claim to have attained a knowledge of Truth that their conservative friends have missed, and the Conservatives hold that the Liberals in their desire to accommodate themselves to the Spirit of the Times have made concessions that are subversive of much that is essential in Evangelical teaching. The latter observe a tendency to an assimilation to the ecclesiasticizing of the Church of England and a desire to stand well with the organization that has brought about a spirit of indifference to historic Evangelicalism. They are men who are out for conversion and expansion by preaching and living the Word. They feel that the hand of Ecclesiasticism may prove a palsying influence on the enthusiasm that definiteness gives, and are therefore eager to stay the drift.

The Essays in "Evangelicalism," taken as a whole, are a real contribution to the solution of the present difficulties. They are earnest, well informed and free from anything approaching combative narrowness. One of them—written by the Rev. T. C. Hammond on the "Fiat of Authority," reaches an intellectual level that places it in a class by itself among all the papers that have appeared in the three manifestoes—for the volumes are in reality manifestoes. Its philosophical acumen, its religious spirit and its wealth of knowledge give it distinction. Here is a specimen

sentence that demands more consideration than is usually given to the thought it enunciates. "The assumption of a 'Catholic' body giving form to the Epistles in contradistinction to local communities that required the rebukes contained in them must be dismissed as a pious abstraction, natural to some minds, but altogether unhistorical." We hope that this Essay will be read and re-read by all who wish to understand the meaning of Authority and the difference between the authority of Holy Scripture and that loosely called Church Authority. We believe that Mr. Hammond has cleared away much that has encumbered the thought of Evangelicals, and shows clearly where we are to seek the authority we need for preaching Christ and His doctrine.

Mr. Siviter deals with "The Incarnation," and we cannot but admire his earnestness in commending the Deity of our Lord. It was never more necessary to make this plain as the sheet anchor of our faith, for we have so many conceptions of the Person of Christ put forward to meet the philosophical needs of the times that we welcome every honest formulation of the great fact that "the Word became flesh." Human categories of thought can never place the Person of Christ under their range. He transcends all thought and we cannot, bearing our limitations in view, ever reach a final exposition. We know Him to be God—we know Him to have been God incarnate during his sinless sojourn upon earth, and we go so far as to say that we have no authoritative positive account of the Incarnation which solves all the intellectual difficulties it raises. We go so far and find nothing contrary to reason, but, as with all ultimate questions, we reach mystery and can only say, "I do not understand, I trust," and in this instance add reverently, "I love." The Editor, Mr. Russell Howden, discusses "The Resurrection" and "Sanctification." In the former we do not think that he is at his best, but his paper on Sanctification is illuminating and most helpful, as he follows Scripture diligently, and his grouping of passages is most suggestive.

Mr. Titterton has been assigned "The Atonement," which is for him, as for all Evangelicals, central. He truly says, "The modern view that Christ revealed the Divine love by dying for us, and the revelation of the love in its power over our heart and life —this alone redeems us," is a shallow and altogether inadequate conception of redemption. It is more in accordance with the mind of Scripture to say "Christ redeemed us by dying for us, and by so redeeming us revealed the Divine love; the death itself was the great factor in our redemption, as well as the love which it reveals." This certainly is the teaching of the New Testament. Many will not go all the way with Mr. Titterton in his discussion of Old Testament prefigurations of the Cross, but we are in danger of forgetting that the Old Testament was a *preparatio Evangelica*, and the minds of the Apostles were steeped in its spirit. Mr. Titterton also discusses with sobriety and sense the Second Advent, which we may say still remains an Article of the Creed as well as a plain Scripture doctrine.

Dr. Dyson Hague, with his usual incisiveness and knowledge of the subject, gives us the Scriptural view of Justification which has been pushed into the background by many Evangelicals. It is still an article of a standing or falling Church, and we cannot throw it overboard without taking from the New Testament a great portion of its central teaching. "We are justified by or through faith. Faith is simply and only an act of trust. It is merely an act of receiving, an act of resting or coming to, or laying hold of." Mr. Manley writes on "The Inspiration of the Bible," and holds that "we see no reason to give up one whit of our belief in the inspiration of the Old Testament, or to depart from that faith in its teaching which we have learned from Christ's precept and example." He speaks of "the broad lines of Bible history as true." "The Scripture is not a handbook of statecraft and politics, as certain Puritans fondly imagined, nor is it a text-book of science, even though, as a fact, it propounds much political truth and no scientific error. It refuses to answer idle questions and bans controversy over genealogical or philosophical subtleties." These passages give the general view adopted and set forth by Mr. Manley, who says "the Divine character does not exclude the human element, but the Divine and human elements are not separated as in a mechanical mixture of the two substances, but united, qualifying and affecting one another as in a chemical compound." But is not a chemical compound radically different from its component parts? If this be so then the simile does not help us much.

The subject of the Sacraments is treated by Mr. A. E. Hughes, who brings to their study a reverent mind and a deep belief in their value. His general outlook is expressed in his words, "Every sinner needs a sacrifice; but he that knows the meaning of Calvary knows that he needs no sacrifice but the one offered there. He rests upon it, and it meets his need." Mr. Albert Mitchell, in his article on the Prayer Book, shows his wide and detailed knowledge of the subject, and Mr. F. G. Llewellin writes forcibly on "Confession and Absolution." We have said enough to show the value of a book which, like all composite works, is of unequal value. Taken as a whole it deserves the careful consideration of all Evangelicals, for the better they understand one another the closer they will work together.

SAYINGS OF OUR LORD.

THE UNWRITTEN GOSPEL. Ana and Agrapha of Jesus. By Roderic Dunkerley, B.A., B.D. London: *George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.*, Museum Street, W.C. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

An interesting and important contribution to the study of the Redeemer's life, being a critical study of some 250 sayings ascribed to Him elsewhere than in the Canonical Scriptures. Mr. Dunkerley has selected, arranged and commented upon these passages with a judgment that entitles him to a place in the ranks of competent and judicious scholars. He has gathered these "sayings" from

apocryphal books, patristic writers, manuscripts of the Gospels, papyrus fragments, moslem works and other sources, and they are arranged so as to present a sort of " extra " Gospel narrative " that was not written but might well have been." The surprising thing is the amount of material available for this purpose, some of it having only recently come to light. The sources, the principles that guided the author in his selection, etc., are dealt with very fully in an illuminating introduction. Those who are strangers to the subject will probably learn with some surprise that a number of references to our Lord have been discovered embedded in Mohammedan writings, and the story is told of how one of the most famous of the extra-canonical sayings ascribed to Him (" The world is merely a bridge ; ye are to pass over it and not build your dwellings upon it ") was discovered by the Scottish missionary, Alexander Duff, in 1849, inscribed in Arabic on the gateway of a mosque near Agra. Hardly less interesting are the stories of how other " sayings " have come to light. Besides the seven sections of the introduction, there are thirty chapters consisting of the various passages, each being followed by an exhaustive comment. For example, we have three chapters, The Nativity, The Boyhood of Jesus, with its work and its play, The Years of Preparation, and so it runs on, like our Gospels, to the end of the Lord's ministry, His Crucifixion, Resurrection, etc. We congratulate the author. No other English writer has attempted a work of such magnitude as this, and there can be little doubt that a vast amount of patient research lies behind the printed page.

S. R. C.

THE REFORMATION.

THE REFORMATION IN NORTHERN ENGLAND. By J. S. Fletcher. *George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.*

The book gives an interesting account of the suppression of the Religious Orders and the changes in the economic and social life of Northern England during the important years 1536–1553.

Unfortunately it is very difficult for any writer to approach this period with an unbiassed mind, and even a " leading authority " can exaggerate. For example, Mr. Fletcher sums up the character of the statesman associated most with the suppression in these words : " In the whole course of English history, the executioner's axe never fell on the neck of a more abominable and unworthy villain than when it fell on that of Thomas Cromwell." Still the book may be of value to readers who are more concerned with the political story of the period than with the intellectual and spiritual movements that were mainly responsible for the English Reformation, and the author rightly bids us respect the local craftsmen who executed not only carving in wood and stone, but also engraved the monumental brasses, painted the stained glass in the windows and panels in the screens. As he says, " The work of their hands testifies to the greatness and the reality of their faith."

Now Mr. Fletcher believes that the whole Reforming movement was a "purely political job from start to finish." What an invincible despotism must have been exerted by the King if the people did not believe the tales of irregularity in the monasteries, and if the Church treasures were not associated in the minds of many with doctrines of the Mass that the new learning discredited!

There is a good Bibliography at the end of the book, and amongst the books named R. B. Merriman's "Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell" should certainly be consulted in forming an estimate of the character of a politician who with all his faults had the courage alone to defend Wolsey before his autocratic Sovereign.

JONAH.

JONAH: PROPHET AND PATRIOT. By D. E. Hart-Davies, M.A. *Thynne & Jarvis.* 3*s.* net.

It is popular to brush the book of Jonah on one side with something like a contemptuous superiority. But this cannot be the attitude of those who know their New Testament and read our Lord's allusions to Jonah. The book has a message, and as we are reminded, one who has little sympathy with traditional views says "that out of the stony heart of Judaism such a book should come is nothing less than a marvel of Divine grace." Too much attention has been given by most writers to the miracle of the great fish, and we are not sure that Mr. Hart-Davies has altogether avoided this error, for his parallels will not be accepted as helpful by many who hold his central position as to the message and authority of the book. The most interesting and thought-compelling chapter is the third, which Mr. Hart-Davies describes as "The Pivot of the Problem; Why did Jonah flee to Tarshish?" He discusses this question with skill and insight, and shows that he was not influenced by physical cowardice or by any less motive than patriotic zeal for the preservation of Israel. "Jonah went out from the presence of the Lord, believing that by his disobedience he had become accursed. He will not go to Nineveh; he will not give the Ninevites a chance of repentance; because he dreads both the military might of the Assyrians and the tenderness in the heart of God." There is much to be said for this view in the presence of his words, "I pray thee, O Lord, was not this my saying when I was yet in my country? Therefore I hasted to flee unto Tarshish: for I know that thou art a gracious God, full of compassion, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy, and repentest thee of the evil." We find it hard to fit in this utterance with a coward's heart making excuse to God who knows the heart of man. The book has many suggestions that deserve attention, and its writer never forgets that he is bound to follow what he believes in his heart to be truth. We cannot write off Jonah as a fictitious character without more knowledge than we at present possess. To do so is to make subjective impressions the rule of critical conclusions.

A LAYMAN'S RELIGION.

THE DIVINE PURPOSE OF SALVATION. By David Cumming. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

The author of this thoughtful, concise dissertation was an Edinburgh business man who lived a strenuous life. He tells us in the preface of the little girl who, returning from Church, said the subject of the sermon was "Keeping your soul on the top," which was her interpretation of the text, "I keep under my body," and he goes on to tell us that, in order to keep his soul on the top—he devoted what time he could to study and active Christian work. He passed away in 1922, and his Executor has published this little volume which embodies the result of his thought and study along one definite line. He shows that redemption reveals to angels and men the moral attributes of God and His power over moral evil. He maintains that its purpose is to raise man to a higher plane than he could have reached while in a state of innocence, and that all the varied experiences of life are a training for future and more noble service in a future state. Other aspects of God's purposes are outlined, and two chapters are devoted to the consideration of the Christian's place and work and to his acquiescence in the Divine purpose. This will give some idea of the scope of this treatise. Although it deals with some of the profundities, it is eminently readable and perhaps this is to some extent due to the fact that it is the work of a devout layman and not of a theological professor. We very warmly commend it to our readers.

S. R. C.

SUNDAY SCHOOL WORK.

"THE SUNDAY SCHOOLS OF TO-DAY AND HOW TO MAKE THEM EFFECTIVE." By the Rev. W. Hendy Cock. *S.P.C.K.* 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

It is becoming increasingly important for every clergyman to have in his study a long shelf with up-to-date books on Sunday School work, and Mr. Hendy Cock's book should certainly be one of these books.

The writer commences by giving his readers an historical survey of the origin of the Sunday School Movement, and then tries to deal with the question, "Why Sunday Schools fail to-day?" So he appeals for modern methods to make the teaching effective. In his opinion, "to spiritualize education is the only way to escape the materialism hanging over the world to-day." "The Church," he says, "with her Teachers alone can do this."

At this point Mr. Cock stresses the futility of taking all ages together. He feels so strongly the importance of grading the children that he commends a county school of nine scholars where "three children formed the Infant Department, two the Primary, and four the Middle, all taught by different Teachers." But he is on more controversial ground when he gives the system of reform

in one large Nonconformist body where "the young Teachers, after three years in the first department, are gradually to work their way up to be Teachers of senior scholars and even to be Superintendents." Some writers would surely point out that there are teachers who are specially gifted in teaching children of certain ages—some senior children, some infants, and it is well to make it quite clear that the work of the Infant School is as important as in senior departments. The Infant School must not be considered as a practising school for the novice before she can be entrusted with older children.

Part II opens with a chapter on "The Mind of the Babe," and the teaching of modern psychology as regards sound religious education is well explained. Part III has valuable advice on the use of the Old Testament in the syllabus, and the rules for preparing the lessons and the specimen lessons for different grades will be carefully read.

Part IV deals with difficulties. Very wisely Mr. Cock tabulates the difficulties of small country schools, but only the expert and the enthusiast combined will find the solutions easy to verify in experience. The remarks on Children's Services, e.g. the hymns, should be carefully read by all those who wish to make these services helpful to the children.

Unfortunately, through pressure of space, the book reads rather like a summary, which takes from its interest and sequence.

SOME TWIN TRUTHS OF THE BIBLE. By the Rev. W. C. Procter. London: *Robert Scott*, Paternoster Row, E.C. 2*s.* net.

The late Rector of Fisherton has in this useful little book dealt with some fundamental truths seldom preached or written about, and when they are, they are not often taken together, as Mr. Procter has arranged them. In twelve short chapters we have such subjects as the Goodness and Severity of God—Divine Sovereignty and Human Freewill—Divine Predestination and Human Choice—the Final Preservation and Perseverance of Believers, etc., etc. Our author has an analytical mind and method, the plan of each chapter can be seen at a glance, and there are copious references to Holy Scripture—indeed, every argument is supported by the words of the Book. No doubt many people will find difficulties explained in these pages, and it will be seen that some statements which seem contradictory are really complementary.

S. R. C.

THREE BOOKS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

ISRAEL AND BABYLON. By W. Lansdell Wardle, M.A., B.D., Tutor in Hartley College, Manchester; sometime Scholar of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. *Holborn Publishing House*, 1925, pp. xvi.+343. 5*s.* net.

The conspicuous features of Prof. Wardle's book are (i) first-hand knowledge of sources, manifest on every page; (ii) thorough

acquaintance with the literature in English, French and German, shewn right up to date, with references; (iii) a singularly fair judgment; (iv) a clear style.

The Primitive Methodist College at Manchester has two distinguished Old Testament scholars upon its staff—A. S. Peake and W. L. Wardle; and both of them in their respective departments make their learning accessible to the wider public of reading men and women. Let us pass in review the contents, and some of the conclusions, of this 25th Hartley lecture. In chapter ii, in order to make the background complete, the author treats not only of Babylon and Palestine, but summarizes the latest knowledge concerning the very live peoples, the Egyptians, the Hittites and the Amorites. In chapter iii., on "Israel's Ancestors," the writer draws the conclusion that the *Habiru* of the Tell-el-Amarna letters "are one element of the people whom we know as the Hebrews"; and that "the Habiru embraced more than the Hebrews." (The seven references to the Habiru in the Amarna correspondence are set out in clear tabular form). Their possible connection (Kittel, Peet) with the *'Aperu* in the service of Rameses II, III and IV is discussed. In the main subject of the treatise, Israel and Babylon, the writer speaks with singular authority, for he happens to be one of the very few British scholars who read Babylonian. Prof. Wardle makes short work of such fancies as would compare Jeremiah to a Babylonian "prophet" (i.e. diviner, or priest), or would make Amos a political agitator, the agent of Ahaz, stirring up the people of North Israel against their king. In chapter v ("the Origins of Hebrew Monotheism") the author, criticizing a too thorough acceptance of the Wellhausen evolutionary thesis, says "the growth of religion is not as the light which shineth more and more unto the perfect day" (p. 113). He compares the nature of the advances in astronomical science from the work of great personalities like Copernicus or Newton. "It is impossible to find a single historical case of monotheism issuing from polytheism by a process of gradual refinement." We should like to have quoted many passages from this chapter. "The prophets certainly on the whole do not speak as if they had recently made the discovery that there was but one God. . . . The real source of Hebrew monotheism we should probably find in the religious experience of Moses (p. 116). This chapter before its publication was read as a paper before the British Society of Old Testament Study. Prof. Gressmann accepted it for the *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, in which periodical it would have been seen by every Old Testament scholar in Germany. We are sorry that its appearance in the present volume may prevent its publication in the *Zeitschrift*, where it would do much good.

We pass by this Assyriologist's 100 pages of latest information and treatment of "Creation Stories"—"Paradise and the Fall"—"the Ante-Diluvians"—"the Deluge," and refer to another chapter more especially upon religion—"Sabbath and Yahweh." Prof. Wardle has some valuable things to say about the Sabbath,

which in his opinion, "goes back to Mosaic" times. It is *Yahweh's* day. "At present no evidence has been produced to show that the Babylonians had any real equivalent of the Hebrew Sabbath." The brief discussion of the name Yahweh (pp. 248–251) will be to many one of the most suggestive pieces of the book. The Christian theological problem raised by the fact that the name is known outside the Israel of the Bible in (i) ? Babylon, (ii) Taanach, (iii) Hamath, receives from the writer reverent and helpful treatment. We feel, however, that the statement is a little too strong (p. 251), "there is not the least reason to suppose that the name came to Israel from Babylon." The idea that "*Yahweh* is an epithet rather than what we generally understand by a name," is, as far as we are aware, absolutely new. We hope that fresh evidence will arrive to support this suggestion.

The only misprint we have noted, is *cunei* for *cuneiform* on the Publishers' loose paper cover. When ministers of religion and Christian workers are often unable to afford the books they feel they need, the Holborn Publishing House has rendered good service by issuing this volume at an amazingly low price. Whatever their personal views, the clergy at any rate dare not in these days (when, e.g., the commercial traveller is found reading Driver's *Genesis*), remain ignorant of the mass of material bearing upon the Old Testament such as is now made available in this volume.

THE CODE OF DEUTERONOMY: A NEW THEORY OF ITS ORIGIN. By Adam C. Welch, D.D., Professor of Hebrew in New College, Edinburgh. *James Clarke*, pp. 224. 6*s*. net.

Dr. Welch is another Old Testament professor of influence and of repute. He is known to a wide circle as the author of "The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom" (the Kerr lectures published in 1912), "Visions of the End," his translation of Jeremiah in the *National Adult School Union* series, etc. As long ago as the appearance of his article in the *Expositor* for December, 1913, it was known to Old Testament students generally that Prof. Welch was not satisfied with everything in the Wellhausen theory of the Pentateuch. Yet in it he wrote, "The scheme in its broad features still holds the field, and even many of its detailed results are proved." Dr. Welch's latest book upon Deuteronomy shews him developing his own theme of constructive conservative criticism.

It is common knowledge that, according to the Wellhausen hypothesis, the kernel of Deuteronomy (chs. xii.–xxvi.) was a Judæan composition (largely made from old material) dating from not long before, and giving rise to, the reform of Josiah in the year 620 B.C. The account of the movement in 2 Kings xxiii. 1–24 agrees with the distinctive regulations of Deuteronomy, (i) prohibition of child sacrifice, (ii) prohibition of sacred men and women in Jehovah's worship and, especially, (iii) the observance of "the law of the one sanctuary," clearly laid down in Deuteronomy xii. 5–7. Before Josiah (except for Hezekiah's partial and temporary

reformation) sacrifices had been offered by Jehovah's representatives in *any* hallowed spot in accordance with the (earlier) law of Exodus xx. 24 (" in *every* place where I cause my name to be remembered "). Samuel did so at Ramah, Elijah on Carmel, King Solomon at Gibeon (" for that was the great high place "). Of recent years, while of course it is still maintained that the characteristic feature of the Josianic reform was the centralization of worship at Jerusalem, some critics have suggested that the *Book of Deuteronomy* is the result or deposit of the movement, not its cause. So Kennett in *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*, 1920, and, more elaborately, Hölscher.

Now, while scholars have been waiting to see to what final conclusions Hölscher's work would lead him, Dr. Welch has come forward with a theory as unorthodox, critically, as that of Hölscher and Kennett. The body of Deuteronomic laws, our author maintains, was written neither in Josiah's time, nor by Jews in the captivity period, but (probably within *North* Israel) between the division of the kingdom and the time of the prophet Hosea. " Judah was longing for a second David, but Israel was dreading a second Solomon " (p. 129). So Dr. Welch explains the prohibition in Deuteronomy xvii. 14–20 of royal harems and horses. The foreigner Queen Jezebel had brought about mischief of far-reaching consequences. Because of this, and for other reasons, the statute was drawn up (Deut. xvii. 15), " one from among *thy brethren* shalt thou set king over thee." But what of the law of the Jerusalem sanctuary? Dr. Welch claims that, except for Deuteronomy xii. 1–7, this regulation has been read *into* Deuteronomy. The pivot upon which the professor's theory rests is that xii. 1–7, which undeniably permits one sanctuary only, is a post-Josianic preface to a law book otherwise complete in itself. Critics have always recognized in chapters i.–xi. a series of introductions to the Deuteronomic code proper. Dr. Welch maintains that within xii. v. 8–xxvi., " the place which the LORD shall choose " may mean Bethel, or indeed *any* of the sanctuaries.

It is not possible here to do justice to Prof. Welch's arguments, which are detailed and extend over 300 pages. The present writer must say, however, that he remains unconvinced. Moreover, *is* there any real difference between verses 14 and 5 and 6, apart from the absence from the former of the word " habitation "? Surely " in one of thy tribes " is, legally, as exclusive as " out of all your tribes." There are two great merits in the book. (1) It is a patient, thorough, investigation over a fairly limited field which makes it a real contribution to learning. (2) It is an attempt to work out a background in which a set of laws might have been codified to suit the political and religious needs of a given time. How little such important matters have interested the earlier school of Critics may be seen by a glance at Estlin Carpenter's monumental exposition of the Wellhausen theory. There no detailed attempt is made to explain how the various codes of laws might have any relation to the several periods to which by literary analysis they are assigned.

EARLY HEBREW HISTORY, AND OTHER STUDIES. By Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. *Robert Scott*, 1924, pp. 117.

The present volume consists of three essays, two of which appeared in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for 1923. (i) In "Some Factors of Early Hebrew History" the author proposes the thesis "Centrifugalism and separation, the special religious position, and external pressure—these are the four great forces that stand out in the web of the national history." In this careful essay it is interesting to note that though a conservative outlook is often apparent, the investigation proceeds along critical lines. The lawyer sees (e.g.) "duplicate accounts of many matters" in the "period of Saul's lifetime," which "cannot always be reconciled in all respects. . . . Nor can we be certain that our informants always had exact knowledge. . . . Great care must consequently be used in testing the narratives. . . . The narrative of 1 Samuel xiii. 8–14 . . . is so discreditable to Samuel as to be incredible" (pp. 25, 26).

(ii) The thesis, "The Law of Change in the Bible," is a definite contribution to the conservative cause, of which Mr. Wiener holds the reputation of being one of the strongest exponents living. He proves that the early laws may (like any other codes) be subject to modification in detail in the course of time and use.

(iii) In many respects the last of the three essays is the most suggestive. The author here allows himself a freer hand. "The Biblical Doctrines of Joint, Hereditary and Individual Responsibility," provides a difficult and very practical subject, which is dealt with boldly. In treating of the *locus classicus*, 2 Samuel xxi. 1–14, "The man that consumed us . . . let seven men of his sons be delivered unto us, and we will hang them up unto the LORD," the writer does not explain the concluding sentence of the narrative, "And *after that* God was intreated for the land." His suggestion is a clever one, that it is Gibeonite, and not Hebrew law at all, which was administered on that occasion—the kind of enactment exemplified in Hammurabi's precept that negligence on the part a builder was to be visited not on him but on his son (p. 99).

All three books are well printed and have good indexes.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

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

Catalogues.—A new edition of *A Short List of Books specially intended for Theological Students and Others*, has now been prepared. The list contains only those books at present obtainable and the Committee has endeavoured to make it as comprehensive as possible with a view to assisting Churchmen, both Clerical and Lay, and particularly Ordination Candidates and the younger clergy, in making additions to their libraries.

A new General List of Publications by the Church Book Room has also been prepared. Both these lists will be gladly sent post free on application.

The Church Congress.—As in previous years there will be a large stall at the Church Congress Exhibition at Devonshire Park, Eastbourne, during Congress Week, when the publications of the League and books recommended by the Committee will be on sale. Clergy and other members are specially invited to visit the stall (which they will find in Block " C "), to inspect and purchase the literature on view, and to mention it to their friends, particularly drawing attention to the books and pamphlets on Prayer Book Revision and Prayer Book Teaching.

We would also draw attention to the excellent series of calendars, motto-cards and framed verses written and issued by the Rev. R. F. P. Pechey, which will also be on sale. These are artistically illustrated and beautifully arranged. They are suitable for placing on a desk or wall. The calendars are published at 1*s.* 3*d.* and 1*s.* 6*d.*, the motto-cards at 1*s.* 6*d.*, and framed at 2*s.*, 2*s.* 6*d.* and 3*s.* 6*d.*

Transubstantiation and the Mass.—One of the most important papers read at the Cheltenham Conference in 1924 was that entitled *Transubstantiation and the Mass*, by the Ven. J. H. Thorpe, M.A., B.D., Archdeacon of Macclesfield. This paper has been revised and is now published as one of the Prayer Book Teaching pamphlets, price 2*d.* net. The Archdeacon traces the historical development of Transubstantiation and points out that " the 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." Having stated the doctrine clearly, the Archdeacon deals with the Mass, showing that the doctrine of Intention, and the possible defects in the Mass leave it doubtful if there could ever be a valid celebration. " No member of that Church . . . can have any certainty that an undefective Mass is ever celebrated." He examines the doctrine further to discover the nature of the Body and Blood that was supposed to take the place of the substance of the bread. He deals equally clearly with the doctrine of the Mass, showing that it is irreconcilable with Scripture. " The Institution itself 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," and " 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." We recommend the Archdeacon's treatment of the whole subject to the careful consideration of our readers, as it is a scholarly statement of essential

truths that require emphasis in view of recent developments in our own Church.

Our High Priest in Heaven.—Archdeacon T. T. Perowne's little book, *Our High Priest in Heaven ;* or, *The Present Action of Christ as High Priest, in its relation to the Worship of the Christian Church,* has just been reprinted at 1*s.* 6*d.* net. The value of this little book cannot be over-stated, and we are glad to see a reprint at the present time. Some useful notes have been added, drawing attention to recent statements on matters dealt with in the text. The wide dissemination of the great truths which this book contains and upholds would do incalculable good.

Church Booklet Series.—An addition has just been made to the Church Booklet Series (1*d.* each, 7*s.* per 100), entitled *Why Stay Away from the Holy Communion ?* by "Pax" who also contributes the booklet, *Why Go to Church ?* The present booklet is written specially for parishes and the style is clear and simple. Other books in the series are *A Communicants' Manual,* by Canon C. W. Wilson ; *Time to Think. For Invalids,* by E. B. B. ; *A Talk About your Baby's Baptism,* by the Rev. B. Herklots ; and *Conversion,* by Bishop H. C. G. Moule.

Sunday School Lessons.—The Rev. G. R. Balleine has written yet another Course of Lessons, this year on the Apostles' Creed entitled *Faith of our Fathers.* We have seen the book and believe it will be found as helpful and as fresh as Mr. Balleine's other books. He specially emphasises in the preface that the book is a talk to teachers, offering them help and material for constructing lessons of their own. Its aim is to help teachers to understand each clause in the Creed, and to suggest methods of treatment and possible illustrations. The book is published by *Home Words* at 2*s.* net.

We are particularly interested in the lessons which Mr. Balleine has called *The Duty of Comradeship, Comradeship and Worship* and *Comradeship and Work.* The emphasis given in the last lesson to co-operation and team work is excellent, as is also the reference to the teaching of St. Paul's illustration to the Corinthians from the body and its limbs.