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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1926

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Coal Strike.

THE Coal Strike has engaged a large share of public attention during the past quarter. Its immediate effects are so imperceptible that its disastrous nature is likely for a time to pass unnoticed. Life for most of us has seemed to go on much as usual, yet the cessation of work in the mines has surely and steadily been sapping our national resources. More suffering will probably be ultimately caused to those engaged in other industries than to those actually employed in the coal trade. The families of the miners, in spite of many reports to the contrary, seem to have been well cared for by the local authorities in the mining areas. It is regrettable that additional bitterness was given to the dispute by the exaggerated statements made as to the prevalence of starvation and want. Those familiar with the districts concerned have stated that apart from a decrease in the consumption of tobacco, and a lessening of the numbers attending cinemas—in some measure attributable to the summer weather—there are few signs of change in the usual mode of living. It is stated that the health reports in some mining areas have shown an improvement during the strike period. We are all thankful to see that there are signs of a return to work, and we hope that conditions will be improved and a happy solution found for the present difficulties.

The Bishops' Intervention.

The well-meant intervention of a number of Christian people, including some sixteen of our own Bishops and several ministers of the Free Churches, has led to much unfortunate criticism. The use of the words " Representatives of the Churches " gave occasion for severe comments on the representative character of the group. It was certainly open to any body of Christian men, actuated by Christian zeal, to endeavour to secure some settlement between the Mine-owners and the Miners. Mismanagement of the publication of the outcome of the meetings with the miners and misunderstanding as to the real purpose of the intervention seem to have added fuel to an already kindling fire. We hold no brief for any of the parties in the dispute, and desire to see fair play all round. The various interpretations given to such terms as " moral issues " and " economic

conditions" added confusion to problems sufficiently complex to all but the most expert. Probably the Bishops' proposals, as they have been called, would have formed an adequate basis for further arbitration if there had been no reference to the continuance of a subsidy. This, we have been told, was all that the Bishops desired. They wished to keep open an avenue for approach on both sides, and the continuance of the subsidy was not an essential part of their scheme. Abuse will not help to decide differences of opinion as to what is moral and what is economic, and however useful sentiment may be for many purposes it cannot solve problems of supply and demand.

The Legislation of the Church Assembly.

The Church Assembly continues to come in for a large measure of criticism. It has certainly left itself open to unfavourable comment on the character of some of its legislation, the method adopted in securing its enactment, and the number of radical proposals brought forward in the brief course of its career. We appreciate much that the Assembly has already been able to accomplish, but as we have already pointed out to our readers, the tendency to centralization is growing with a rapidity likely to produce unforeseen and dangerous results unless it is firmly and consistently restrained. *The Daily Telegraph* has recently given prominence to a glaring case of the consequences of hasty and insufficiently considered legislation. A correspondence in its columns pointed out that an Act of the Assembly, shortly to be presented to Parliament—the Benefices (Ecclesiastical Duties) Measure—will deprive any clergyman accused of negligence in the discharge of his duties as incumbent of a parish "of the right of every accused person to know the charge brought against him, to answer it in a court of law, and to have the verdict of his peers on the case submitted to them." We cannot believe that this was the intention of the Assembly in passing the measure, but it is a warning of the autocratic and tyrannous powers that may be conferred upon the central authorities of the Church, without adequate safeguards for the rights of individuals.

The Independence of the Clergy.

The same journal points out in a leading article that "a large proportion of the legislation carried through the Assembly has been directed against the independence of the parochial clergy." This is a further outcome of the process of centralization. A great statesman had a favourite expression when accused of wishing unduly to accelerate reforms—that he preferred to be the engine rather than the brake. This is a laudable desire which we all share, but it ought not to blind us to the fact that a brake is essential, and that without it there are occasions when disaster is inevitable. It has been unkindly suggested by one of the older clergy that the Church authorities have so little confidence in the type of men who are now being admitted to orders, that they desire

to restrain their freedom of action as much as possible, and so render the Church—as it has been effectively if crudely expressed—" foolproof." This may be a desirable aim, but it must be remembered that in future years the Church will not necessarily be bound by legislation adopted now. The Church Assembly will be free in days to come to alter or rescind any or all of the measures now put into force. In fact, one of the objections raised to the revision of the Prayer Book is that whatever decisions are settled, steps will be almost immediately taken by those disagreeing from them to secure alterations at the earliest possible date.

Reforms Needed.

These conditions, we are told, are not due to any defects in the constitution of the Assembly, but to the method of working it. Too much is in the hands of the official element. There is no organized opposition. The proposals are drafted in Committees and " members in charge of measures are in a position of advantage much greater than that of Ministers in the House of Commons, for as a rule they alone have the facilities for acquiring and marshalling relevant facts. It frequently happens, indeed, that the text of measures is circulated so shortly before their introduction that the rank and file have extremely little opportunity of studying them carefully. Lately, the speed of legislation has been accelerated by the practice of taking a division or ' final approval ' immediately the revision stage, corresponding to Committee stage, is complete." Another " serious difference from Parliamentary custom is the method of appointing Committees of the Assembly to examine measures. Instead of including members known to be opposed to the measure concerned, as is the case with the appointment of Grand Committees of the House of Commons, it appears to be rather the practice to exclude them." These obvious defects ought to be remedied at once. We are not convinced that the proposal to have all measures concerning the clergy considered first in the Lower Houses of Convocation and then introduced into the Assembly would be altogether advisable. It would be much better to secure more deliberate discussion and less hurried procedure in the Church Assembly itself.

Psychology and Religion.

It was anticipated by many students of theology, philosophy and human nature that a great effort would be made to enlist the theories and the methods of the New Psychology as allies in propaganda work on behalf of Roman and Anglo-Catholicism. A recent correspondence in a provincial paper shows that the views of a section of the new psychologists are being used to secure proselytes to the practice of private confession, by endeavouring to put forward a new scientific basis for it, and then founding an intellectual appeal on the theory set out. The theory is that " repressions " can only be eliminated and normality restored by bringing them

to expression in the conscious mind. This is used as an argument in favour of the constant and habitual use of private confession as a means of securing peace of conscience when troubled with a sense of guilt. The two may have an apparent outward resemblance but are far from being analogous. One is an exceptional remedy which may be of use in exceptional circumstances. The other is to be a regular habit of life. No one questions the usefulness of the confession of a sin when a burdened conscience can secure peace in no other way. It is an entirely different matter to make habitual confession and the necessity of receiving absolution from a priest an ordinary part of the routine of the spiritual life.

The Place of Confession in the Prayer Book.

It is, furthermore, a complete travesty of the teaching of our Church to say that the Church of England preserved "the sacrament of penance, as anybody can see who reads the first long exhortation in the Communion Service of our Prayer Book." Just the reverse is the case, as anyone can see who compares the terms of the present exhortation with that in the first Prayer Book of 1549. It has been frequently shown that the words in the later form of exhortation were subjected to several significant changes. "A learned priest" becomes "a learned minister of God's Word"; "confess and open his sin and grief secretly" becomes "let him open his grief"; "that of us as of the minister of God and of the Church he may receive comfort and absolution" becomes "that by the ministry of God's Word he may receive comfort and the benefit of absolution." To this must be added the fact that secret confession was allowable as a regular practice in 1549, but in the later Prayer Book it is clearly indicated that it is to be an exceptional practice only to be adopted in the case of those whose consciences are troubled and can be quieted in no other way. It must not be forgotten that the direct form of absolution is not found earlier than the eighth century, and was then only used by bishops in the readmission of penitents to Church privileges. It did not come into any kind of general use until the latter half of the thirteenth century. There is nothing primitive in it. It must also be observed that when the form occurs in the Visitation of the Sick, it is immediately followed by a prayer for forgiveness: "Impute not unto him his former sins," which would be obviously unnecessary if the priestly absolution was of the effectual character claimed for it by the advocates of priestly absolution.

The Growth of the Anglican Communion.

A recent sermon published in one of the Church papers contained a glowing account of the progress of the Church of England during the past ninety years—practically since the Tractarian Movement began. It was satisfactory to read of the various elements in that development, the increase in the number of bishoprics—seventeen in England and Wales—and the large sums raised for them,

the increase in the number of theological colleges—thirty-six—and two colleges at the Universities. "Could anything," it was asked, "more clearly manifest the life and energy and devotion of the Mother Church of this land?" Abroad there has been similar growth. Ten bishops at the beginning of Queen Victoria's reign; to-day one hundred and twenty-nine. On this the comment was: "Think of that! I wonder if any such record as this could be found in any period of the Church's history in any part of the world." We may well be thankful for such progress, but we may also question whether it is as completely satisfactory as the preacher seems to think. The actual numbers are impressive, but it is necessary to see whether they are in proportion to other factors, e.g. the increase in the population of the various parts of the world, and the increase of other religious bodies in the same period. The Roman Catholics are supposed to have made great progress in this country since 1850, and there is constant evidence of their activity, yet careful statisticians point out that any real growth of that Church in proportion to the increase of the population would require it to have several million more adherents than it actually has at the present time. We do not know the figures in the case of our own Church, but the growth of the Free Churches would seem to indicate that our Church does not number among its members as large a proportion of the people as it did ninety years ago. The Electoral Rolls do not give grounds for much satisfaction.

Religious Education in Secondary Schools.

The religious teaching in our elementary schools has been a subject of prolonged and bitter controversy, and no completely satisfactory solution has even yet been reached. Meanwhile, the equally important problem of the religious education given in the secondary schools is treated with apparent indifference, except for the spasmodic efforts of those who know the actual state of affairs to secure some improvement by endeavouring to arouse Church opinion. The late Bishop Burge felt very strongly on the neglect of religious training in the majority of secondary schools, and frequently strove to bring about some much-needed improvements. Probably not more than three-quarters of an hour a week are given to any kind of scripture lesson in the greater number of the secondary schools under the control of the educational authorities throughout the country. In some schools there are probably numbers of the pupils who do not receive even this modicum of instruction. The teachers naturally plead that the pressure of other work, and especially of the subjects required for examinations, crush out the Scripture lesson. Those who regard the religious basis as the most important element in education cannot be satisfied with this treatment of the Bible. It may be urged that the whole of the educational work is conducted in a religious spirit. But even if this is the case, it cannot make up for the lack of a sound knowledge and a good understanding of the Old and New Testaments.

Editorial Note.

We are able to offer our readers in this number a careful estimate of the real significance and value of the principles of the Reformation in an article, "Reformation Principles—Are they worth Preserving?" by Canon V. F. Storr of Westminster Abbey. Canon Storr has taken a leading part in "The Call to Action," and this article helps to strengthen the appeal made in it to the great body of church-people. Miss Kathleen N. Gardiner was one of the lecturers to the Reformation Study Brotherhood at Dean Wace House. Her subject was "The Elizabethan Settlement of the Church." We are glad to be able to print a full report of her interesting lecture on this important subject. During the past year the four hundredth anniversary of the translation of the New Testament into English and its introduction into England has been commemorated, though not as extensively or as fully as such an epoch-making event deserved. Mr. W. Guy Johnson pays a well-merited tribute to the heroic labours of William Tyndale in his full and interesting account of "William Tyndale and the English New Testament of 1525." In his treatment of "The Marriage of Cana and Its Symbolism," Dr. W. H. Rigg, Vicar of Beverley Minster, gives one of his studies of a portion of St. John's Gospel, which many readers have already learned to value for the wide and accurate knowledge of the literature of the subject which they display. The Ecclesiastical Courts will shortly be a subject of keen discussion in the Church Assembly when the Report of the Commission on them comes up for consideration. There are a number of difficult problems in connection with the proposed changes. Some of these, and especially those concerning the alteration of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as the final Court of Appeal, are subjected to expert examination at the hands of Mr. W. T. Lawrance, K.C., in his article "Ecclesiastical Courts." Dr. Sydney Carter, Principal of the B.C.M. College, Clifton, is well known to our readers as a capable writer on historical subjects. His analysis of the teaching of the Caroline divines on the Scriptures and the Rule of Faith is one of a useful series explaining the teaching of some of our great divines, who were regarded until the latest phases of the Anglo-Catholic movement began as the authoritative teachers of the Anglican position. The early publishing season this year was probably affected by conditions arising from the Coal Strike, and the autumn season has scarcely begun at the time when we have to enlist the services of our reviewers. We have, however, tried to make up for the more restricted range than usual by the importance and interest of the books reviewed.

REFORMATION PRINCIPLES—ARE THEY WORTH PRESERVING?

By the Rev. Canon V. F. Storr, M.A., Canon of Westminster Abbey.

THERE is surely no more foolish or ignorant cry than that which is heard to-day in some quarters, "Away with the Reformation." The Reformation marks one of the greatest movements in the history of the human spirit. We are concerned with it here mainly as a religious movement, but it was something far wider than that. It was a movement affecting the whole range of thought, culture, civilization. It was one of those creative moments in the world's history when new forces are released, which powerfully mould the future development of mankind. The principles underlying the Reformation as a religious movement are of a piece with that whole travail of the spirit of humanity, out of which our modern world began to be. I make, therefore, no apology for standing up to defend the Reformation.

Before examining the principles which underlay this great religious movement in England let us remind ourselves that the Reformers kept prominently in mind the continuity of the Church. The charge is sometimes brought that they broke away from the old, historic Church, and made a new one. They themselves, at any rate, were not aware that they were doing so; they certainly had no intention to do so. Their object was the very reverse; they wished to proclaim their continuity with the Church of Apostolic and Primitive times. Reform, not secession, was their aim. They took the Church of the first five centuries as their standard, and merely wanted to remove the errors and abuses of mediævalism. Thus Bishop Lancelot Andrewes writes: "Our religion you miscall modern sectarian opinions. I tell you, if they are modern, they are not ours; our appeal is to antiquity—yea, even to the most extreme antiquity. We do not innovate; it may be we renovate what was customary with those same ancients, but with you has disappeared in novelties." Richard Hooker says: "We hope, therefore, that to reform ourselves, if at any time we have done amiss, is not to sever ourselves from the Church we were of before. In the Church we were, and so are still." Archbishop Laud is even more emphatic: "There is no greater absurdity stirring this day in Christendom than that the reformation of an old, corrupted Church, will we, nill we, must be taken for the building of a new . . . One and the same Church still, no doubt of that; one in substance, but not one in condition of state and purity; their part of the same Church remaining in corruption, and our part of the same Church under reformation." Cranmer would have been horrified if you had told him that he was making a new Church. In drawing up his English Book of Common Prayer he tried to follow closely

the old, familiar Latin Service Books, except where they needed to be purified or simplified. The Roman teaching he rejected was rejected on the ground that it was not the teaching given by the Primitive Church, and had no warrant in Scripture.

Let me, in passing, say at this point a word about the meaning of the two terms "Protestant" and "Catholic." The opponents of the Reformers tried to claim for themselves the title "Catholic," and dubbed the Reformers "Protestants." But the latter always called themselves "Catholics." "We never departed," says Foxe, "from the faith of the true and Catholic Church of Christ. . . . We are the true Catholic Church and maintain the sanity thereof." The true opposite of "Catholic" is "heretic," and "Papist" is the true opposite of "Protestant." The word "Protestant" to-day has a militant sound; it suggests protest against something. But it must be remembered that the Reformers were not simply protesting against mediæval errors; they were contending for the true Catholic faith as it was in the early centuries. "The Church of England became Protestant at the Reformation that she might be truly and more purely Catholic"—so wrote Bishop Wordsworth. "Protestant" is the opposite of "Catholic" only when the latter word is used in a sense different from its true historical sense.

Let us now see what were some of the main principles of the Reformation.

I. The Independence of the National Church.

While there was no breach of continuity with the historical, Catholic Church, there was, of course, a breach with Rome. It was a double breach: (*a*) There was the repudiation of Papal authority and supremacy. (*b*) There was the rejection of certain doctrines and practices current in the Roman Church. The breach with Rome in the matter of Papal authority, brought about at the instigation of that vigorous personality, Henry VIII, was not a bolt from the blue. Henry only gave the last impetus to a movement which had been gathering force for centuries. Bishop Creighton wrote as follows: "There never was a time in England when the Papal authority was not resented, and really the final act of the repudiation of that authority followed quite naturally as the result of a long series of similar acts which had taken place from the earliest times." The nation, like the King himself, might have been ready to accept the purely spiritual authority of Rome, but was not prepared to tolerate Rome's interference in non-spiritual matters and her claim to temporal power. What did this assertion of national independence mean in the religious sphere? The Church of England claims that it is a fount of authority in religious matters. It accepts the common beliefs of the Christian Church. If it did not, it could not claim to be a part of the Catholic Church. But it claims the right to draw up its own Prayer Book, and to settle what rites and ceremonies shall be used. Article XX says: "The

Church has power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of Faith. And yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written." It accepts the decisions of the first four General Councils, but states that General Councils may err and have erred. In other words, the Church of England claims entire freedom of self-management, so long as it does not overthrow what is Catholic and Primitive.

It is important at this juncture to insist on this free power of our national Church, because a different view is being pressed upon us. We are told that the Reformation was a great mistake, and that we ought to submit either to the authority of Rome (the precise amount of that submission causes some difficulty to those who try to define it); or to the authority of what is called Catholicism. That is to say, there is some other authority to which we owe allegiance.

Now I leave on one side the question of submission to Rome. I cannot conceive that Englishmen will ever tolerate it; or that Rome can so far deny her own past as to make possible any form of reunion, which does not involve submission to her authority. At the same time it is well to bear in mind that seeds grow. What seems impossible to one generation may be possible to the next. But I have not any real fears in this matter. Let us pass on to consider the authority of Catholicism. What is Catholicism? We must know what it is, before we can estimate its authority. Here I confess to being in a fog. I have been unable to obtain any clear definition from Anglo-Catholics. In fact, the admission has been made by some of them that it is a weakness of their position that they can find no adequate definition. The usual definition given is, that by Catholicism is meant the beliefs and practices of the undivided Church up to 1054, when the split between East and West occurred. Note, that was not the Reformers' definition. By Catholicism they meant the beliefs and practices of the Church of the first five centuries, before changes had set in which were a departure from primitive purity. Let us take, however, 1054 A.D. as the limiting date. At once two criticisms come to mind: (1) Within that period are we to take over everything? It was a superstitious period. As the Bishop of Durham asks, who is to decide what is to be taken over? The only authorities seem to be, either Rome, or the antiquarian experts, who do not agree among themselves. (2) If 1054 A.D. provides the limit, why are Anglo-Catholics pressing for the adoption of beliefs and ceremonies which came into being later than that date? Benediction and Exposition, for instance, are not found in that period, nor is the observance of Corpus Christi. Catholicism is something vague and nebulous. It lacks a decisive standard. It may mean, and does mean for many, a whole congeries of practices which are simply Roman in origin and colour. Till Anglo-Catholics will define Catholicism, and tell us what it includes in the way of belief and practice, we must continue to resist its authority.

Now we are told that the day of national Churches is over;

that the conception of a national Church is a narrow one, that Catholicism is a wider and finer thing. Men have said to me that they would like to see our national Church destroyed and a "Catholic" Church put in its place. But we *are* a Catholic Church, a true branch of the Church Catholic. And is the day of national Churches over? Is nationality a thing of the past? Can we not continue to have a Church which is the expression in religion of the national life and character? Such a Church need not be insular or narrow. It may possess international characteristics, and preserve an international outlook. Let us remember how the Church of England has moulded our national character, and what an intimate connexion there has been between Church and State in the past. That connexion has, if we take a broad view of the matter, been of real advantage to both parties. The connexion to-day is looser than it was, and no one wishes to make it tighter. But the Church can still do splendid service to the nation in the future. When it has composed its internal quarrels it will grow in influence. Let us cherish this conception of a free, independent, national Church as part of the Catholic system, and not be led away by the vision of some wider authority, nebulous in kind, to which we owe obedience.

2. The Supremacy of Scripture.

At the Reformation Scripture was made the test of doctrine. This appeal to Scripture is the most characteristic feature of the Church of England regarded as a teaching body. Article VI says: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." We recall the great part played by the Bible in the Reformation. The Reformation began with the efforts to give the Bible in their own tongue to the people of England. Erasmus, Colet, Tyndale are honoured names in this connexion. In 1538 Henry ordered the Bible in English to be placed in every church. This return to the Bible was dictated by a double motive. First, there was the desire to make the Bible a common possession of the people. Secondly, there was the desire to pass behind theology as created by the Schoolmen to the fountain-head of the New Testament, and to study doctrine as it was in the apostolic writings. It was the beginning of that historical method, which has become to-day such a potent instrument of research. The Reformers, then, made Scripture the test of doctrine. They accepted Conciliar decisions, not simply because a General Council had made them, but because what the Council had decided was judged to be in accord with Scripture.

To-day we are faced with a movement which (*a*) tends to put tradition on an equal basis with Scripture; (*b*) tends to substitute for "what is true" the pragmatic test of "what helps." Brought

to the test of Scripture many doctrines and practices in vogue at the present time stand obviously condemned. The most notable example is the cultus of the Reserved Sacrament. The plea is put forward that many of these things, which have no warrant in Scripture, are natural developments from the primitive Gospel. Clearly there has been development, and development will continue. Christianity came into the world as a germ which was to unfold and ripen through the centuries. There has been development both in doctrine and organization. But the question we have constantly to ask ourselves is: Are all developments true? Have all the developments of Christianity been true to type? We have to distinguish between historical developments and what may be called natural developments. An acorn must grow into an oak; it cannot become an elm. Why? Because the growth of the seed is regulated and controlled by some inner principle or life-force, which ensures that it shall develop true to type, or at any rate with only slight deviations from the norm. But the chief agent in a historical development is man; and man can and does make mistakes. You must, therefore, have some standard for testing a historical development. We remember the difficulties in which Newman found himself when he tried to harmonize the teaching of Rome with the teaching of the Primitive Church. To solve his difficulties he made use of this idea of development. He drew up various tests, by which a true development could be distinguished from a false one. It was a brilliant piece of writing; but his theory of development was vitiated by the fact that the whole process had taken place under the control of a Papal authority, which regulated the development. There was no free, historical development at all. It was a logical development, and it was assumed that what emerged had been implicit all the time. The whole theory was a glaring example of the fallacy of begging the question.

Now, if we are to have some standard for testing theological and ecclesiastical developments, where can we find that standard except in the New Testament? There is no other standard available. To say that the mind of a particular century is to be our standard, or to canonize the whole period up to 1054 A.D. and offer that as the norm for doctrine and practice, is to refuse to treat the New Testament as the abiding touchstone. Tradition has its place, but it is always subordinate to the standards of Scripture. To substitute "what helps" for "what is true" is to open the door to every kind of emotionalism and superstition. If the present generation were a Bible-reading generation, if it had the knowledge of the Bible which the older Evangelicals possessed, I am sure that we should be free of many of our difficulties. We cannot do a more important thing at this juncture than to insist on the supremacy of Scripture. Since the war there has been a recrudescence of superstition in many directions. Perhaps that has always been the effect of a great upheaval. All the more important, therefore, is it to preserve a sane, critical judgment, and to test all new developments in the light of Scripture.

3. The Priesthood of the Laity.

This was another cardinal principle of the Reformers. The Church of England has always maintained the right of each individual soul to have access to God without any intermediary. This of course does not mean that there is not need or room for a duly ordered and constituted ministry, or that it is not part of the duty of the minister to help in the direction of the spiritual life of his flock. But this is a very different thing from the claim that this ministry has some special authority of a unique kind over the life of the individual. "The Church of England," says Bishop Lightfoot, "has no sacerdotal system; it imposes no sacrificial tribe or class between men and God." "Priest" in the English Church means "presbyter." At the Savoy Conference in 1661 the Presbyterians wished to substitute "presbyter" for "priest" in the Prayer Book. But the Bishops refused to make the change, saying that "priest" was only a shorter form of "presbyter" and meant the same thing. In the Latin translation of the Prayer Book, made in 1670, and made with official sanction, "priest" is rendered "presbyterus" and not "sacerdos." The Epistle to the Hebrews never alludes to any human priest acting as an intermediary between God and man, but bids each "come boldly to the throne of grace."

Can it be denied that we are faced to-day with an attempt to restore that very system of the Mass and the Confessional, which involves the sacerdotal idea, against which the Reformers fought? When we think of the tremendous stress which is being laid upon confession, we are driven to see behind it a claim to spiritual direction and authority, for which surely there is no warrant in the New Testament. The Englishman has a wholesome dread of priestcraft; he will not be won over in any large numbers to an acceptance of any such system of spiritual control of his religious life. The danger lies in another direction, in the possibility of the machinery of the Church being captured by a section, whose views do not represent the views of the mass of the English people. Let us remember (I say it reverently) that Jesus was a layman, and that the very heart of the Gospel is that each human child can move with perfect freedom in his Father's house.

4. The Church of England and the Free Churches.

The Reformers not only showed great sympathy with the non-episcopal Protestant Churches of the Continent, but remained in communion with them. They accepted episcopacy for themselves. They felt it had New Testament sanction, and had proved in actual working to be the best system of ecclesiastical government. But they did not regard it as of the essence of the Church; nor has the Church of England ever done so. There is nothing either in the Ordinal or the Articles to show that the Church of England refuses to allow that non-episcopal Churches are part of the Catholic Church of Christ. The description "branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church" is given in one of the canons of 1603 to the Re-

formed Presbyterian Church of Scotland. Bishop Cosin deliberately communicated when abroad in Protestant Churches. Bramhall would not allow that these Churches were unchurched by the Church of England. He re-ordained Presbyterian ministers who desired it, but always said that in so doing he did not doubt the validity of their orders. Tillotson was prepared not to require re-ordination of those who had been ordained abroad in non-episcopal Churches. Since the Oxford Movement a school of thought has arisen, which lays stress upon episcopacy as of the *esse* of a Church, and emphasizes the doctrine of Apostolic Succession in a way in which, as Professor Turner has shown in his essay in *The Early History of the Church and Ministry*, it was never emphasized in earlier days. We are hearing much to-day about reunion. All Christian people must be anxious to heal as far as is possible our divisions. The question is, with whom is reunion first to come about? Are we to seek reunion first with Rome, or with our own Free Church brethren at home? Surely with these last lie our true sympathies, born of our sharing in the common life and development of our nation. What is keeping back this reunion (whatever form it may ultimately take) is the fact of the presence in the Church of England of a school of thought, which is not content with applying the New Testament principle "by their fruits ye shall know them," but insists that without episcopacy there can be no true Church. At this moment a race is going on between those who would press for reunion with Rome, and those who would begin by seeking reunion with our English Free Churchmen. I am not wishing to defend our divisions, with all the strife and overlapping which they cause, but in my judgment the very genius of Christianity is such that it lends itself naturally to differing expressions. I should be sorry to see only one type of ecclesiastical organization. Deeper than organization lies spirit, and spirit creates for itself differing embodiments.

Attempts are being made to alter radically the historical character of our Church. It is incumbent on us all to make strenuous defence of the heritage left us by our fathers. The more the work of the Reformers is studied, the more does their wisdom and sanity appear. They had seen the mediæval system in operation before their eyes. They deliberately rejected it. Do we wish to see it restored?

THE ELIZABETHAN SETTLEMENT OF THE CHURCH.

By Kathleen M. Gardiner, M.A.

THE power of the Pope and the mediæval Church in England was broken by Henry VIII; his daughter, Elizabeth, established the Anglican Church on the lines which it was thenceforward to follow. While much attention has always been given to the former, too little is sometimes paid to the latter. Yet, in the life of the English nation, the work of the great queen is of infinitely more importance than that of her blustering sire. He established, and sought to perpetuate, a house divided against itself; she, less blinded by her own desires, set up a Church which government and doctrine alike combined to render truly national, and which has been an element of incalculable importance in the lives of Englishmen for more than three centuries. The Church *in* England became the Church *of* England in 1559, and the following years confirmed and substantiated the settlement then made. Criticism and dissension there was in plenty, even in Elizabeth's reign, while the Stuart times saw a struggle in which it seemed as if the whole structure would come crashing to the ground. But the work had been so thoroughly done that all assaults upon it proved unavailing, and the revolution of 1688 secured its continuance as a part of the national life. Had Elizabeth's settlement been other than it was, the outlook of Englishmen would have been different in a hundred ways. For the Anglican Church has worked itself into the fabric of national life so securely that it colours the thought and affects the everyday life even of those who dissent from it: it is as much an English institution as Parliament and the Throne, the country squire and the Derby.

The lasting nature of the Elizabethan settlement, together with the extraordinary power which the Church possesses of adapting herself to changing conditions in the world outside, makes it appear as if the work of the early years of Elizabeth's reign was done by men who were free from limiting conditions and could make a settlement good in itself, not merely as good as possible under the circumstances. Yet circumstances played a large part, if not the major part, in deciding the course which Elizabeth and her advisers followed, and therefore to understand the settlement aright, the circumstances, both in England and in Europe in November, 1558, must be briefly reviewed.

The outstanding factor in European history was the Counter-Reformation which may conveniently be said to begin as an active movement with the accession of Paul IV to the Papal chair in 1555. The Pope's vigorous personality and his sturdy determination to reform the Church and to restore her universality could not fail to affect England, trembling in the balance as she was between

Catholicism and Protestantism. Elizabeth scrupulously observed the courtesies by informing the Pope of her accession ; according to the commonly accepted story, her conciliatory message was met by the blunt reply that the kingdom of England was held in fee of the Apostolic See and that she could not succeed because she was illegitimate. Even if the actual wording of the reply be the invention of ultra-patriotic Protestants of a later age, there is ample evidence in contemporary documents for the antagonistic attitude of Paul IV, and this profoundly affected Elizabeth's handling of religious affairs.[1] It is generally assumed that, owing to the circumstances of her birth, Elizabeth had to be a Protestant, but Maitland suggests another view : " It is sometimes said that Elizabeth's birth condemned her to be Protestant or bastard. But it would be truer to say that, had she cared much about legitimacy, she would have made her peace with Rome. Hints came to her from thence that the plenitude of power can set these little matters straight for the benefit of well-disposed princes." [2] These hints came, however, from Pius IV, not from his uncompromising predecessor, and they came too late to alter the trend of events. The Anglican settlement was an accomplished fact before Pius IV succeeded to the Papal chair, and their policy once decided upon, Elizabeth and her advisers firmly adhered to it, supported by the bulk of the English people, who saw in the Pope only one " from whom nothing is to be feared but evil will, cursing, and practising." [3]

Protestantism was thus to be the accepted religion of England, but it still remained to be decided whether it was to be the Lutheran or the Calvinistic form. Here again circumstances on the Continent radically affected the decision. By 1558 Lutheranism had lost its first enthusiasm, its organization was weak, and its powerful supporters were occupied with secular affairs. The influence of Calvinism, on the contrary, was at its height. Geneva was not only a refuge for the oppressed ; it was also the home of a missionary spirit which had already been felt in England in the reign of Edward VI, and which was only waiting its chance for a fresh effort. At Elizabeth's accession, therefore, the Marian exiles poured back into England, and among these were many of the ablest men of the time. It was on these men that Elizabeth had largely to depend for support in her Protestant policy, and it was from amongst them that the more influential of the bishops under the new *régime* were chosen.[4]

[1] See *Venetian Calendar*, June 11, 1559, and *Spanish Calendar*, June 19, 1559. The earliest authority for the reply appears to be Heylin, and it is accepted by Tierney, Lingard and Hume amongst others. Dixon, however, throws doubt upon its authenticity (see *History of the Church of England*, Vol. 5, pp. 249–254).

[2] *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. II, p. 559.

[3] *Device for the alteration of Religion*, Burnet, *History of the Reformation*, ed. Pocock, Vol. V, p. 497.

[4] Grindal, Sandys, Cox, Whitehead and Pilkington, all returned exiles, were members of the Committee which drafted the Prayer Book for presentation to Parliament, and the first three were made respectively Bishops of London, Worcester and Ely.

Their leanings towards Calvinism tended to give the Anglican settlement a more extreme form than it might otherwise have taken, a form which, it is generally believed, Elizabeth herself regarded with distaste in many respects.

While these two opposing currents from Europe were meeting on English shores, what of home affairs? The hazardous state of England is depicted in a document called *The Distresses of the Commonwealth*, which was drawn up in the first month or so of the reign. The unknown writer summarizes "the many and most grievous diseases that our Commonweal . . . travaileth with at this day" as follows: "The Queen poor. The realm exhausted. The nobility poor and decayed. Want of good captains and soldiers. The people out of order. Justice not executed. All things dear. Excess in meat, drink, and apparel. Divisions among ourselves." [1] One of the causes of these divisions is said to be religion, and the warning note is struck that the case is to be warily handled "for it requireth great cunning and circumspection both to reform religion and to make unity between the subjects being at square for the respect thereof." [2] Elizabeth saw that not only cunning and circumspection but also promptitude was required, and therefore the first problem that she took in hand was the religious settlement.

Personalities, no less than circumstances, played their part in moulding the settlement. Of Elizabeth herself little need be said; the battle has been waged around her complex personality too long and too fiercely for any lengthy analysis of it to be necessary. But it may be noticed that in regard to her religious settlement all her best qualities come into play, her shrewdness, her remarkable capacity for putting aside her own prejudices and desires, her intuitive understanding of her people and their needs. "Lonely upon her throne . . . without ceasing to be a woman, and while loving life in all its fullness, she made everything subservient to purposes of State," [3] and her statesmanship never served her better than in her settlement of the religious problem. That the settlement was her own is undoubted. "I will never be by violence constrained to do anything," she told members of Parliament; but she was too wise not to take sound advice when she could get it, and side by side with her cool and tolerant outlook there can be traced in the settlement the characteristics of two of her most faithful and devoted helpers. William Cecil and Matthew Parker were both men of the Eastern counties and of the middle class, and they had the virtues of integrity, caution, reticence and sound common sense that are associated with their district and their class. Both went to Cambridge, after which one took up law and the other went into the Church. Both had Protestant leanings, hence the Marian reaction meant a temporary set-back in the career of each. Cecil, though he conformed and went to Mass, as did many others, was more or less in the shade throughout Mary's reign, while Parker lost his Church preferment and retired to poverty, obscurity and his beloved books in his native county of

[1] *State Papers Domestic*, Eliz. I. 66. [2] Ibid.
[3] Trevelyan, *History of England*, p. 326.

Norfolk. Elizabeth's accession meant the turn of Fortune's wheel. Cecil became "Mr. Secretary Cecil," while Parker reluctantly accepted the Archbishopric of Canterbury; and henceforward each man laboured in his office in Church or State till he died. Elizabeth and England owed much to Cecil's administrative ability, energy, foresight and loyalty; they owed an equal debt to Parker's learning, and the tact and moderation which never degenerated into weakness. Elizabeth's debt to Cecil is now universally admitted, but Matthew Parker has hardly had his due. Yet he did as much for the Church of England as Elizabeth and Cecil: they established its distinctive character, but he ensured its permanence, its moderation, and its dignity.

Elizabeth succeeded to the throne in November, 1558, and Parliament was summoned for January 25, 1559. For the settlement was to be a national one, not a royal one; not the Queen, but the Queen in Parliament was to lay down the lines along which the religious life of the English people was to develop. Until this could be done, Elizabeth's great object was to prevent disturbance, and so her first act was to issue a Proclamation forbidding preaching and maintaining the *status quo*. She then proceeded to indicate for the benefit of her faithful Commons her own views as to the nature of the settlement to be made. She commanded the Gospels and Epistles, the Ten Commandments, the Litany, and the Lord's Prayer to be read in English. She forbade the Elevation of the Host in her own chapel, and walked out when Bishop Oglethorpe refused to comply. At her Coronation the old ceremonial was used, but Mass was said without the Elevation. Marian prisoners were released, Marian exiles were allowed to return to the country. The Council was remodelled, extreme Romanists were dismissed and replaced by men of Protestant views. Thus the Parliament which duly met in January had a very fair idea of the lines on which their legislation must proceed if it was to meet with the approval of the Queen's Majesty. Their work, the salient features of which were enshrined in the two great Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, was accomplished in less than five months. According to modern ideas, this seems a remarkably short time for bringing about changes of such magnitude, but Parliamentary machinery was far less developed in Tudor times and the influence of Crown and ministers was far stronger than in our own day. It is commonly said that matters were expedited by the device of packing Parliament, but recent research has shown that this is not true,[1] and that far from forcing a Protestant settlement upon an unwilling country, the Queen acted as a restraining force upon the Commons, at any rate. Moreover, the fact that it took over two months to get the Act of Supremacy through shows that there was an opposition of considerable strength in Parliament. The settlement may therefore be said to be representative of the majority of opinion in the country and thus in the very first months of the reign the Queen and Council had gauged aright the feelings of the mass of the nation.

[1] *English Historical Review*, July and October, 1908.

The main features of the Act of Supremacy are indicated by its full title, an "Act to restore to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the estate ecclesiastical and spiritual and abolishing all foreign powers repugnant to the same."[1] The Papal authority over the Church in England, recognized again by Mary, was explicitly denied; the Queen was to be acknowledged "only supreme Governor of this realm . . . as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal," and an oath to that effect was to be taken by all clergy and office-holders. The jurisdiction, visitatorial and corrective, of which the Papacy was deprived, was given to the Crown, and the Queen was empowered to appoint Commissioners to exercise it. This was the origin of the High Commission Court, the machinery for enforcing obedience both to this Act and to the Act of Uniformity, which was its natural complement.

The speed with which the Act of Uniformity[2] went through both Houses (April 18–28) was probably due partly to the fact that Parliament had expended a large amount of its energy on the Act of Supremacy, and partly to the fact that the Book of Common Prayer, which was placed before the House of Commons, had been drawn up by a committee of Protestant divines carefully selected by the Queen for the purpose of drafting a form of service which should excite as little opposition as possible. The Act prescribed the use of this Book of Common Prayer and none other. It was based upon the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, but the history of its adoption is obscure. There is some reason to believe that the First Prayer Book was originally considered, but was discarded owing to the influence of the more extreme Protestant element in the committee. On the other hand, the Second Prayer Book, as it stood, was considered too severe by the moderate party; and Elizabeth herself objected to it because she was anxious not to offend the Lutheran element in Continental Protestantism. A compromise was therefore arrived at, designed to remove the severity of the Second Prayer Book without returning to the ambiguity of the First. The Second Prayer Book was to be used "with one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used every Sunday in the year, the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the communicants and none other or otherwise." The alteration in the Litany was the well-known omission of the phrase "the detestable enormities of the Bishop of Rome," and the change in the Communion Service consisted in the addition of the words of the First Prayer Book to those of the Second Prayer Book at the administration of the Sacrament. Heavy penalties were inflicted upon both clergy and laity who used any other form of service, and the shilling fine was imposed for absence from Church on Sundays and holy days.

Limitations of space make it impossible to enter fully into the controversial question as to the precise ornaments established by the

[1] 1 Eliz. c. 1. Printed in Gee and Hardy, *Documents of English Church History*, p. 442.

[2] 1 Eliz. c. 2. Ibid, p. 458.

Act of Uniformity. But whatever the exact meaning of the proviso in the Act establishing the ornaments of the *second* year of the reign of Edward VI " until other order be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty," and whatever the circumstances which led to the inclusion of the proviso, it seems clear that in practice the surplice was the dress of ministration during the years 1559 to 1566.[1] The use of the cope was connived at by the authorities, but priests who wore alb, chasuble and tunicle did so in defiance of authority and risked punishment for doing so. It may be suggested that the proviso in the Act of Uniformity was a device quite in keeping with Elizabeth's general methods. She sought to lessen the opposition to the Act of Parliament by holding out a hope of concession in ceremonial matters to the conservative element and then, having by this means got round a point likely to arouse strong feeling, she took the loophole provided by the words " other order be therein taken " to put in practice the usage most in keeping with the general trend of legislation and most calculated to preserve peace and order in the country.

When the Anglican Church had been established by legislative enactment, administrative action inevitably followed in order to bring the practice and *personnel* of the Church into conformity with the statutory position. The first business of the Queen and her advisers was to reconstitute the hierarchy of the Church upon a definitely Protestant basis. In the summer and autumn of 1559 the oath of supremacy was tendered to all the Marian bishops. Refusal to take it was met by deprivation, and by the end of the year, all the Romanist bishops had gone except Kitchin of Llandaff. Their places were filled by men of Protestant views. The most important appointment was that of Matthew Parker to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, vacant since the death of Cardinal Pole. The delay in filling the see was due in part to Parker's reluctance to leave his retirement, but even more to the insufficiency of bishops to perform the ceremony of consecration. " There is no archbishop, nor are four bishops to be had." [2] Furthermore, the Edwardian Ordinal of 1550, which had been abolished in Mary's reign, had not been re-enacted by Elizabeth's First Parliament and therefore there was

[1] As evidence for this statement may be cited the silence of the records of the time regarding the use of the ornaments of the First Prayer Book, a remarkable fact if they were openly and legally used, and the fact that the spirit of the Injunctions of 1559 is entirely against the use of these ornaments. The Injunctions are Protestant and somewhat extreme in their general attitude, and it would be contradictory to pull down shrines and altars and keep the Mass vestments. Moreover, if the Thirtieth Injunction dealing with the apparel of the minister " both in the Church and without " refers not only to the outdoor garb of the clergy but also to the dress of ministration, as seems most probable from the words, the latter was that " commonly and orderly received in the *latter* year of the reign of Edward VI," i.e. 1553, and was therefore the surplice prescribed in the Second Prayer Book. But see J. T. Tomlinson, *The Prayer Book, Articles and Homilies*, for a full discussion of the question.

[2] Cecil, annotation of letter from Parker. Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, Vol. 5, p. 201.

no authoritative form of consecration service except the Roman Catholic one. This difficulty was got over by the insertion in the Queen's Commission for consecration of a special clause to make good any statutory defects by her supreme royal authority.[1] The Edwardian Ordinal was then used, and the position was regularized by its confirmation by a later Parliament. The difficulty of lack of bishops for consecration automatically adjusted itself as elections were made to vacant bishoprics. With Parker's consecration, the validity of which it is hardly necessary to defend, the hierarchy of the Anglican Church was re-established and one great stumbling-block to order and good government in matters ecclesiastical was removed.

The next business of the Queen and Council was to see that practice accorded with precept, and therefore in June, 1559, Royal Commissions were issued for a Visitation of the Kingdom. The Injunctions of the Commissioners show clearly the practice which was contemplated by the Elizabethan settlement, and throw light on the attitude of Elizabeth and her advisers towards Church ceremonies and ritual. The Injunctions of 1559 were based upon the Injunctions of Edward VI,[2] but ten were omitted and twenty-four additions were made. They covered a vast range of subjects, from the observance of the royal supremacy to the leading of exemplary lives. The most important referred to the removal of shrines, pictures and images in churches and houses, the provision of tables instead of altars, the preaching of monthly sermons and quarterly homilies, the reading of the Bible and the care of the poor. The marriage of the clergy was distinctly permitted, though not encouraged. The Thirtieth Injunction, prescribing as the apparel of the clergy " Such seemly habits, garments and such square caps as were most commonly and orderly received in the latter year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth," seems to be in direct contradiction to the provisions of the Act of Uniformity, but the difficulty disappears if the injunction is regarded as " other order . . . taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty," and therefore superseding the proviso regarding the ornaments of the second year of the reign. As a whole the Injunctions show a distinctly Protestant spirit, and, if strictly carried out, they would have enforced a fairly extreme form of Protestant worship in churches all over the country.

The last administrative order to be considered is a document of 1566, the Advertisements of Parker.[3] It is a vexed question as to whether these were issued with or without Elizabeth's sanction. The general view is that they were issued by Parker on his own authority, but Mr. J. T. Tomlinson has ably put forward the contrary opinion.[4] What is clear is that they were not issued in defiance of Elizabeth; if they had not her express authority, they had at least her tacit acquiescence. The Advertisements were not a further step forward in the Protestant settlement, but an attempt to safe-

[1] *State Papers, Domestic*, Eliz. VII. 56.
[2] Gee and Hardy, *Documents of English Church History*, p. 417.
[3] Gee and Hardy, *Documents of English Church History*, p. 467.
[4] *The Prayer Book, Articles and Homilies*, Ch. IV.

guard that settlement from the extremists, who by 1566 were agitating for a still greater simplification of ceremonial and a more rapid progress towards the Calvinistic position. The Advertisements reinforced and expanded the Injunctions of 1559, and they were particularly detailed in their regulations regarding the apparel of the clergy, about which there can be no possible doubt after 1566. The Advertisements were an announcement that authority had taken its decision and was not going to be forced out of it; they safeguarded the practice of the Anglican Church from Calvinism as the Injunctions had marked it off from Romanism.

The completion of the Anglican settlement is to be found in the Thirty-nine Articles which were agreed upon by Convocation and received the royal assent in 1563. Subscription to them was enforced by Act of Parliament in 1571, against the wishes of Elizabeth, who, unlike her father, did not desire to enforce belief, but only to secure conformity. The Thirty-nine Articles were practically the Forty-two Articles of Edward VI with a few omissions to soften their severity. On the central doctrines of Protestantism, the Articles are quite clear. Justification by Faith, the taking of the Body of Christ " only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," communion in both kinds, the legality of the marriage of the clergy, the supreme authority of the civil power, all find a place in the Thirty-nine Articles. The wording of some articles is studiously vague, for example, that dealing with predestination, and this was in accordance with Elizabeth's policy of making her settlement as all-embracing as possible. She was anxious not to enter into controversies which were agitating Protestants themselves; the Thirty-nine Articles definitely marked the Anglican Church as Protestant and that was enough.

Despite the many points of controversy which have arisen in connection with the Elizabethan settlement, the principal stages in the establishment of the Anglican Church can be clearly traced. Crown, Parliament and Convocation worked side by side and, taking everything into consideration, in remarkable accord, so that by 1566 the chaotic conditions that had faced Elizabeth on her accession had largely disappeared. But when we turn to the other side of the picture and ask how the Church of England, thus established, was received by the people at large, we are at once in the realm of uncertainties and tentative conclusions. This is in part due to the different nature of the evidence. We cannot rely upon statutes and administrative documents of a governmental character, for these, by their very nature, rarely supply us with any information regarding popular feeling; histories, diaries, memoirs, letters and other evidence of a local and personal nature are the sources of our knowledge, and these are too often coloured by the religious predilections of the writer. It is also due to the fact that much research in local documents still remains to be done. Parish registers and accounts that have already been printed show that much light can be thrown upon the effect of the Elizabethan enactments up and down the country by a systematic study of these sources; the terminology and the provisions of wills often give a vivid insight into the state of mind of

the average citizen and country squire.[1] A wealth of detail can thus be obtained from which we can build up a general picture of the attitude of the average man towards the settlement. Until the ground has been more systematically covered we cannot get the picture completely, but from the material which is already available we can deduce something as to the popular attitude towards the settlement and its effect on everyday life.

Some indication of the general willingness to accept the settlement may be obtained from the number of the clergy who were deprived of their livings for refusing to take the oath of Supremacy. Camden gives these as 189 out of 9,400; probably, however, this estimate is too moderate, and the proportion given by Mr. G. M. Trevelyan, about one-eighth of the whole body of beneficed clergy, is nearer the truth.[2] Even this, however, represents a remarkably small number, and it is clear that the majority of the clergy, even if they did not actually hold Protestant opinions, were not sufficiently fervent Romanists to refuse to conform. Vicars of Bray were as much in evidence in the sixteenth as in the eighteenth century. The impression thus gained from the number of deprivations is confirmed by a study of the circumstances attending the election of the Protestant bishops in 1559. The *congé d'élire* of Henry VIII was returned to by Elizabeth, and therefore the cathedral chapters participated to some extent in the filling of the vacant sees. It is not necessary to postulate complete freedom of choice, probably an indication of the royal will was given and acted upon for the most part, but as there is no record of resistance by the chapters, we may deduce that the majority of the members were no more actively averse to receiving a Protestant bishop than were the parish clergy to conforming to the Acts of Supremacy.

If this was the general attitude of the ministers of the Church it can hardly be expected that the laity should take a firmer stand. The line of least resistance was made easy by authority, whose attitude as regards conformity was not too rigid at the beginning. We hear much of the activities of the High Commission Court in enforcing obedience to the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, but this was later in the reign, when recusancy became a political danger and Puritanism a disturbing factor in the religious sphere. At first the policy of Elizabeth and her advisers was to persuade to conformity rather than to enforce it, and it seems probable that under these conditions the majority of the people, bewildered or rendered indifferent by the kaleidoscopic changes of the last decade, simply accepted the promise of a settled practice and a rest from persecution.

[1] Individual people can do a valuable service to history by copying their own parish papers and any old wills that come their way, for in spite of all that has already been done by historical and archæological societies and enthusiastic antiquarians, an enormous field for research still remains. To the amateur, the Elizabethan handwriting may at first present slight difficulties, but these can easily be surmounted by practice. There is an excellent article to help beginners by Miss M. St. C. Byrne in the *Review of English Studies* for April, 1925.

[2] *A History of England*, p. 329.

It seems clear that the settlement did really make a considerable difference in the daily lives of the people. Many a parish priest had married under the Edwardian *régime*: to these the recognition of clerical marriage brought back the peace of mind and the domestic happiness which had been ruined by the Marian reaction. The worshippers in the parish churches saw their services and their ceremonial changed once more; there is plenty of evidence in contemporary writings that the signs of the old religion were removed and that Protestant usage was promptly reintroduced. Wriothesley and Machyn tell of the changes that took place in London. "There were burned in Paule's Churchyarde, Cheape, and divers other places in London, all the roods and images that stood in the parish churches."[1] "Two gret bonfires of Rodes and of Mares and Johns and other images" were made, and "copes, crosses, sensors, altar-clothes, rod-clothes, bokes, banners"[2] suffered a like fate. The Cratfield Parish Accounts show that the same sort of thing, though on a smaller scale, was taking place in the country.

"Item paide unto Boucher for pullinge down the aulter. viij*d*.
It. paid to John Goodwyn for helpen downe the rode lofte . . . . . iiij*d*."[3]

The same accounts show that the form of worship became definitely Protestant in character.

"It. for making the table for the commandments . . xij*d*.
It. payde for wyne for the Communyon at Hallomes . iiij*d*.
It. payde for a boke of omelyes and prayers . . iiij*s*."[4]

And the well-known passage in Harrison's *Description of England* concerning the conduct of Divine Service in the Church of England shows that by 1577 the change was complete.[5]

A practical effect which can be shown by a study of Elizabethan wills is that money is no longer left to pay for chantries, and masses for the dead. On the other hand bequests to the poor are frequent; such typical examples may be quoted as that Richard Burneham of Knaresburghe bequeaths £5 to be distributed among the poor of Knaresburghe and Harrogate and 50*s*. among poor prisoners in York Castle and in the Kydcoote of York, and that Thos. Hill of Windesore in the parish of Knaresburghe directs that 40*s*. from the sale of "one spangled cow with a broken horn" is to be given to the poor of Knaresburghe within six days of his death.[6] An almost modern aversion to pomp and ceremony in death is shown by Dame Jane Smith: "Alsoe my will is that wheare I holde it vaine and superfluous to have any pompe or vaine expences aboute

[1] Wriothesley, *Chronicle*, Camden Soc. Edn., 1877, Vol. II, p. 146.
[2] Machyn, *Diary*, pp. 207 and 208.
[3] Cratfield Parish Accounts. Years 1559 and 1561.
[4] Ibid. Years 1562 and 1563.
[5] Limitations of space make it impossible to quote the passage, but see W. Harrison, *A Description of England*. Second and Third Books. Ed. Furnivall for the New Shakspere Society, Part I (Bk. II) 1877, p. 31.
[6] *Knaresborough Wills*, Vol. I, p. 177. Surtees Society.

my funeralle insteade of blacke xl^tie^ pounde I will may be distributed among the poor, etc." [1]

" To some extent belief is also indicated in wills. There is evidence to show that the Catholic faith was still held late in the reign. For example in 1593 Owen Clonne, a Londoner, recites his faith, concluding " This is my verie faith, nam senex teneo fidem in qua natus sum puer parvulus," [2] and in 1599 Jane, daughter of Edward Scarisbricke, says " I pray and hope to live and dye a member of the Catholicke Church." [3] But on the whole the evidence shows that the Protestant belief predominated. Bequests of money for sermons to be preached, and bequests of Bibles, prayers and Fox's *Acts and Monuments* (a significant indication) were common.[4] The formula for the commendation of the soul has in most wills dwindled into " I gyve my sowle to almightie God, and my bodie to be buryed within the p'ish church of . . ." [5] But sometimes very decided Protestant views are expressed, and the will of Laurence Doddisworth is worth quoting, if only for its vigorous, full-blooded, Elizabethan speech and sentiment.

" I make it manifest both hear (*sic*) and before God, that I do utterly renounce all the pope's false and usurpth (*sic*) promises and all his detestable inormities, beseeching Almighty God to deliver his Church from all his arrows and false doctryne for he is the very anti-Christ enemy and adversary to the glorious gospel of our Saviour Jesus Christ. God at His good pleasure illuminate the eyes of the world that it may discerne and know Him as He is indeed the very mistery of iniquity the man of the sin and he that exalteth himself against God. . . ." [6]

On the whole the evidence from these various sources tends to show that the settlement was enforced and that its enforcement had considerable effect on the lives of the people in general. On the other hand, belief, as distinct from practice, was variable. There were ardent Protestants and cautious Romanists, there was also a great deal of indifference and confusion ; it was only gradually that the Protestant belief took a firm hold and that practice became the outcome of belief, not of mere conformity to the precepts of authority. But slow though the process was, it was none the less sure, and we to-day have as part of our heritage the Anglican Church, conceived by the woman who, in the opinion of the Spanish Envoy to her Court, was " possessed by a hundred thousand devils," brought to birth by the wisdom and labour of her finest statesmen and cherished to maturity by the instinct for compromise and the deep-seated religious feeling of the Anglo-Saxon races.

[1] *Wills and Inventories* (2nd portion), Chetham Society, Vol. LI, p. 23.
[2] *Calendar of the Court of Hustings,* Vol. II, p. 716.
[3] *Wills and Inventories* (3rd portion), Chetham Society, Vol. LIV, p. 23.
[4] See *Calendar of Wills in the Court of Hustings,* Vol II. pp. 710 and 720, and *Wills and Inventories,* Chetham Society, Vol. LI, pp. 21 and 233.
[5] *Wills and Inventories,* by Madeleine Hope Dodds, in *History Teachers' Miscellany,* Vol. III, No. 9, Sept. 1925.
[6] Ibid. p. 141.

WILLIAM TYNDALE AND THE ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT OF 1525.

By W. Guy Johnson.

FOUR hundred years ago this last Spring, the New Testament printed in English found its way into England for the first time. Wyclif had translated the Bible a hundred and fifty years earlier, but his version was from the Latin and it did not appear in printed form until nearly five centuries after his death. William Tyndale translated direct from the original Greek and himself saw the work through the press. It was completed in the latter half of 1525 and reached this country early in the following year, making one of the most memorable and important landmarks in the history of the Bible. The anniversary, either last year of the completion of the book, or this year of its arrival in England, has attracted comparatively little attention. There have been a few articles in newspapers and magazines, and the Oxford Press has issued a beautifully produced facsimile of that fragment of the work which exists in the King's Library in the British Museum, but that is about all. It is a pity, for Tyndale was a man of rare genius and heroic character; and his self-sacrificing achievement and tragic end deserve fuller remembrance. Macaulay has warned us that "A people which takes no pride in the noble achievements of remote ancestors will never achieve anything worthy to be remembered with pride by remote descendants."

Tyndale's career was in one sense uneventful and affords comparatively little in the way of incident, as anyone who reads Demaus' full and able biography will discover. He stood apart from the stirring events and movements of his time and lived the life of a scholar and specialist. But there were few of his more active contemporaries who did as much as he to stimulate and to give permanence to the movements for reform which were going on around him. His history is that of a life wholly concentrated on a single purpose from which nothing was allowed to deflect him. When at Little Sodbury in the household of Sir John Walsh, he replied to a priest who had asserted that it was "better to be without God's law than the Pope's," "If God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plough shall know more of the Scripture than thou doest." And to this purpose, in spite of dangers, discouragements and difficulties which would have daunted anyone of less heroic temper, he successfully devoted himself for the next sixteen years, at the end of which his only earthly reward was martyrdom at the stake. Bishop Westcott writes "From the first he had exactly measured the cost of his work; and when he had once made his resolve to translate the Scriptures, he never afterwards lost sight of it, and never failed in doing what he proposed to do." [1]

[1] *History of the English Bible.* Third Edition, p. 27, n.

The literature relating to Tyndale is not very extensive, though it is sufficient to give us a very good picture of his life and work. First of all there are his own writings, which are readily accessible in the three volumes published with a biographical introduction by the Parker Society; and there is the account of him compiled by Foxe in the "Acts and Monuments." Among quite modern books there is the *Dictionary of National Biography* which gives a good summary of his career; and the able and scholarly article on English Versions by the Rev. J. H. Lupton in the supplementary volume of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. Bishop Westcott in the first part of his *History of the English Bible* gives a brief sketch of Tyndale's life and character, and in the second part a critical estimate of his work as a translator. But the fullest and most complete account of the man and his work is to be found in the Biography by the Rev. R. Demaus, a second edition of which, edited and revised by the Rev. Richard Lovett, was published by the Religious Tract Society in 1886. This has since been re-issued and is still in print. It deserves to be read, for it is as popular and interesting in style as it is full and scholarly in its matter; and it is not only a good biography, but is also an important contribution to the history of the English Bible.

The date and place of Tyndale's birth are not known. The probability is that the year was somewhere about 1490, though if it were so late as that he showed a maturity of opinion, scholarship and literary expression at an age which was very early in view of the limited material in the way of texts, grammars and lexicons at his command. The place may have been Slymbridge near Stonehouse, in Gloucestershire, as Demaus tentatively suggests, but, whether it was there, or at Stinchcombe or at North Nibley in the same county, it is impossible to decide. A like obscurity envelops his early years, of which we know only what Foxe tells us, that "Tyndale was brought up from a child at the University of Oxford." This probably means that being a precocious boy he was sent to Oxford at an early age. As our knowledge of his earlier life is confined to what we learn from a brief summary in Foxe, the passage may be given here.

"William Tyndale, the faithful minister and constant martyr of Christ, was born about the borders of Wales, and brought up from a child in the university of Oxford, where he, by long continuance, grew up, and increased as well in the knowledge of tongues, and other liberal arts, as especially in the knowledge of the Scriptures, whereunto his mind was singularly addicted; insomuch that he, lying then in Magdalen Hall, read privily to certain students and fellows of Magdalen College, some parcel of divinity; instructing them in the knowledge and truth of the Scriptures. His manners also and conversation being correspondent to the same, were such, that all they that knew him, reputed and esteemed him to be a man of most virtuous disposition, and of life unspotted.

"Thus he, in the University of Oxford, increasing more and more

in learning, and proceeding in degrees of the schools, spying his time, removed from thence to the University of Cambridge, where, after he had likewise made his abode a certain space, being now further ripened in the knowledge of God's word, leaving that University also, he resorted to one Master Walsh, a knight of Gloucestershire, and was there schoolmaster to his children, and in good favour with his master. This gentleman, as he kept a good ordinary commonly at his table, there resorted to him many times sundry abbots, deans, archdeacons, with divers other doctors, and great beneficed men; who there, together with Master Tyndale sitting at the same table, did use many times to enter communication, and talk of learned men, as of Luther and Erasmus; also of divers other controversies and questions upon the Scripture.

"Then Master Tyndale, as he was learned and well practised in God's matters, so he spared not to show unto them simply and plainly his judgment in matters, as he thought; and when they at any time did vary from Tyndale in opinions and judgment, he would show them in the book, and lay plainly before them the open and manifest places of the Scriptures, to confute their errors, and confirm his sayings."[1]

No reason is given for this removal from Oxford to Cambridge. It may be that the "divinity" he taught was of the new reforming type and that the authorities were becoming suspicious. The expression "spying his time" would fit in with this. Or, it may be that the fame of Erasmus, who was lecturing on Greek at Cambridge, drew him. The late Principal Lindsay wrote of Tyndale as the favourite pupil of Colet,[2] a very interesting suggestion; but a request for the authority for the statement brought the reply that, though he must have had some ground for making it, a search among his notes revealed no trace of it. It is not impossible, but the evidence, if there is any, seems to be lost. Colet exercised a profound influence upon Erasmus; and Tyndale's was the nature to profit largely by the same influence had he come within its range.

During the time when, as Foxe tells us, he was attached to Sir John Walsh's household at Little Sodbury, near Bristol, doubtless in the capacity of chaplain as well as tutor, he would meet the local magnates, clerical and lay, who visited there, and as he appears to have spoken his mind pretty freely, he naturally fell under suspicion of heresy, for which he was cited before the Chancellor of the diocese, though nothing came of it but significant threats. It was in Sir John Walsh's house that he declared his intention to translate the Scriptures, and in the preface to his edition of the Pentateuch, he gives us the reason:—

"Which thing only [the objection of those in power 'that the Scripture should come to light'] moved me to translate the New

[1] *Acts and Monuments.* Fourth Edition, Revised by the Rev. Josiah Pratt. Vol. v, pp. 114, 115.

[2] *History of the Reformation,* vol. ii, p. 319.

Testament. Because I had perceived by experience, how that it was impossible to establish the lay people in any truth, except the Scripture were plainly laid before their eyes in their mother tongue, that they might see the process, order, and meaning of the text." [1]

Finding no place to accomplish his purpose in Gloucestershire, he turned his steps to London, where he hoped to find encouragement from the Bishop, Tunstal, whose disposition towards the New Learning had been praised by Erasmus. With a translation of one of the orations of Isocrates in his pocket, and an introduction to the Controller of the Royal Household, he reached London in the middle of the year 1523. Alas, he soon discovered that there was no place in my lord of London's palace to translate the Scriptures, and he was soon to find that there was no place for the purpose in all England. He remained in London for about ten months, during which he preached at St. Dunstan's, Fleet Street, though the existing registers have no record of the fact. The Church itself was destroyed in the Great Fire, the present building standing on the site. By a fortunate circumstance, Tyndale here made the acquaintance of a wealthy London merchant, Humphrey Monmouth, who took him into his house and befriended him both then and afterwards at much risk to himself, for he was later on brought before the authorities on the charge of aiding and abetting him.

It was by now plain that there was no place in all England where the New Testament could with safety be translated and, we may add, published; for it is manifest from the date at which the work reached this country that the translation must have been far advanced before Tyndale left England. Accordingly, in the month of May, 1524, he set sail for the Continent, never to see his native land again. He landed at Hamburg and, according to all contemporary evidence, proceeded to Wittemberg, to confer with Luther. There was then no printing press in Hamburg, so that he would have no object in remaining in that town, though within a year he was again there to receive a remittance from his merchant friend in London.

It is hardly necessary at this time of day to defend Tyndale against the charge of want of originality either in the design of his work or in its execution. He doubtless discussed scores of points of grammar and rendering with Luther and others, but they could give him no assistance with his English version, for the Continental reformers as a whole were generally unacquainted with the English language. The close and vigorous examination to which his work has been subjected has long since vindicated his claim to independence as a translator. The late Bishop Westcott has dealt with the matter adequately in the work already referred to, and it is indeed no longer in dispute. Tyndale was undoubtedly indebted to Luther, as every scholar is indebted to other scholars in the same field;

[1] *Works* (Parker Society), vol. iii, p. 394. *The Five Books of Moses, a verbatim reprint of the edition of* 1530, p. 3. Edited by the Rev. J. I. Mombert, D.D. London, 1884.

but when the question of independence is raised differences have to be considered as well as resemblances, and the differences here are many and not always unimportant.

Tyndale did not return to Wittemberg after his business at Hamburg was completed and the money needed for printing was in hand, but went to Cologne to have the book put into type. That it was ready for this within a year of his reaching Hamburg is sufficient evidence that it was already well on the way before he left England. Cologne was a city thoroughly under orthodox influences, though there were printers who would print secretly the Bible or other heretical books if it paid them to do so. It was less likely to be suspected than Wittemberg, and it offered greater facilities for the exportation of books to London. At any rate here it was that Tyndale put the work in hand. The secret, unfortunately, leaked out: the story is well known, and Tyndale, taking with him the sheets already printed, fled further up the Rhine to Worms, where he found a printer to complete the New Testament begun at Cologne. That version had the glosses or marginal notes which are said to have been responsible for the hunting down and destruction of Tyndale's translation. The notes were in some cases controversial, though in the fragment of the Cologne version the great majority are merely explanatory or expository. There is nothing in them comparable to the very pointed note placed in the margin of the Pentateuch against Balaam's question "How shall I curse whom God hath not cursed?" where Tyndale says "The Pope can tell how." But arrangements were made to seize the books before it was known whether there were any notes or not. And the same efforts at destruction were levelled as fiercely at the edition without notes as at the one which had them. The annotated edition was in small quarto, and there are only two fragments of it known to exist. One is in the library of St. Paul's Cathedral, the other in the British Museum. It is the latter which the late Professor Arber published in facsimile with a very useful introduction. A fresh facsimile has been made by the Oxford Press and was published last year.

But on reaching Worms Tyndale had a smaller edition, octavo, without notes, set up. Both editions were completed, if not by the end of 1525, which scarcely seems possible, yet very early in 1526, and three thousand copies of each were printed. The utmost secrecy had to be observed in their distribution, for the Cologne episode had given warning to the authorities, and Wolsey and Henry VIII had taken prompt action to prevent their being circulated in this country. It was, however, to no purpose, for copies smuggled over in bales of merchandise were in circulation here by April or May of 1526, two years after Tyndale had left London. Froude says "the high dignitaries of the earth were fighting against God and they met with the success which ever attends such contests." Of the 3,000 copies of the octavo edition only one is known to be in existence. Its only defect is the lack of the original title page. Otherwise it is perfect. It is in the library of the Baptist College

at Bristol.[1] Tyndale spent the remaining ten years of his life in revising and perfecting this translation and in translating the Old Testament, which, however, he was not to complete, and in writing various treatises in defence of his work.

His New Testament was warmly welcomed and eagerly sought for, in spite of official prohibitions and of the grave perils to which the possession of a copy rendered its owner liable. Men and women seeking God found Him in His Word and found freedom from the burdens which a corrupt Church had laid upon their souls. The translation was wonderfully true to the original and has left an indelible mark upon every subsequent version. It was violently attacked for its " errors," its most respectable antagonist being Sir Thomas More. Tyndale has found opponents in our own day. An Anglo-Catholic writer, who has since gone over to Rome, had no better description of him than " Tyndale and Coverdale, two dissenting heretics," and this in a book dedicated " by kind permission " to the late Bishop Creighton. It is to be supposed that the Bishop had not taken the precaution to read the book before giving his " permission."

Dr. James Gairdner makes very unsympathetic reference to Tyndale's work in several passages in his *History of the English Church from Henry VIII to Mary*, but Professor Pollard, whose authority is at least equal to that of Dr. Gairdner, in commenting on one of these puts the matter in a truer light. He writes:

" Dr. Gairdner appears to agree with More in considering Tyndale's translation of the Scriptures as ' a mischievous perversion of those writings intended to advance heretical opinions.' Tyndale's object was to spread the knowledge of the Scriptures irrespective of the question whether that knowledge made men heretics or confirmed their Catholicism. If a knowledge of the Scriptures tended to make men heretics, that was the fault of the Church. And as for the ' mischievous perversion,' that surely consisted in enforcing a translation which implied a whole world of ideas not contained in the original. ' Priest,' ' do penance,' ' charity,' and ' church ' all denoted to the men of the sixteenth century ideas which are not to be found in the New Testament; and no Greek scholar would dispute the fact that Tyndale's expressions were less of a perversion of the truth than those they displaced. If Tyndale's translation is a ' mischievous perversion,' what is the Revised Version, which for the most part adopts Tyndale's phrases? " [2]

The late Professor Froude wrote of his work as a translator as follows:

" Of the translation itself, though since that time it has been

[1] The late Mr. Francis Fry had an exact facsimile of this made by a careful process of tracing each page; it was then lithographed and a limited edition was published; copies of this are now very scarce.

[2] *Thomas Cranmer*, p. 110, n.

many times revised and altered, we may say that it is substantially the Bible with which we are all familiar. The peculiar genius—if such a word may be permitted—which breathes through it—the mingled tenderness and majesty—the Saxon simplicity—the preternatural grandeur—unequalled, unapproached, in the attempted improvements of modern scholars—all are here, and bear the impress of the mind of one man—William Tyndale. Lying, while engaged in that great office, under the shadow of death, he worked, under circumstances alone perhaps truly worthy of the task which was laid upon him—his spirit, as it were divorced from the world, moved in a purer element than common air." [1]

The limits of a magazine article will not admit of an account of Tyndale's theological views, or of his wanderings on the Continent from place to place in search of a fresh refuge as one after another became known to those who were seeking to take him. The three volumes of his works, including "The Obedience of a Christian Man," "The Parable of the Wicked Mammon," "The Practice of Prelates," his controversy with Sir Thomas More, Expositions and other writings, will well repay perusal, and will show the man and his teaching as they were.

Mrs. Oliphant in *The Makers of Florence* gives us a charming picture of the artist Giotto as he wandered about Italy "here leaving a mild-eyed Madonna, there a group of saints in glory or sinners in pain . . . and betraying his course wherever he went by something beautiful, some bit of common wall blossomed into an immortal thing."

In some such manner may we think of William Tyndale. Wherever he went we have the same testimony to the beauty and devotion of his character, and to his singleness of purpose and unselfish devotion to the task set before him. Humphrey Monmouth, Sir Thomas More, even the agents sent out by Thomas Cromwell to take him, bear witness to his blamelessness of life. When abroad, his recreation from the strain of study was to visit and relieve the sick and poor and to minister to those of his own countrymen whom he could find. He may well be included in the catalogue of those of whom the world was not worthy, though the Bishops and Convocations of the present century did not find a place for him in their revised Calendar. After eluding his enemies for several years he was eventually taken by treachery, imprisoned at Vilvorde near Brussels, and having been first strangled, his body was burnt at the stake in 1536. His last words were "Lord, open the King of England's eyes." His prayer was answered, for within a year the complete Bible, printed in English and including the very New Testament which had previously been proscribed, was edited by John Rogers and circulated in England without opposition from the king. Mr. Trevelyan, in his recently published *History of England*, writes (p. 310):

"Above all, at Cranmer's instigation, the Bible in English was not only permitted to circulate freely but was ordered to be set up

[1] *History of England*. Popular Edition, vol. ii, p. 497.

in every parish church. A version based on that of Tyndale, the noble scholar and martyr, and on another by his less learned successor, Miles Coverdale, became known, as Tyndale had desired, to craftsmen and to 'the boy that driveth the plough.'"

The only surviving specimen of Tyndale's handwriting is the letter which he wrote from his prison to the governor of the castle of Vilvorde, the Marquis of Bergen-op-Zoom, with whom Thomas Cromwell had already interceded on his behalf, though alas, as it proved, without result. The letter is so characteristic of the man that it may well be given here :—

"I believe, right worshipful, that you are not ignorant of what has been determined concerning me (by the Council of Brabant); therefore I entreat your lordship and that by the Lord Jesus, that if I am to remain here (in Vilvorde) during the winter, you will request the Procureur to be kind enough to send me from my goods which he has in his possession, a warmer cap, for I suffer extremely from cold in the head, being afflicted with a perpetual catarrh, which is considerably increased in this cell. A warmer coat also, for that which I have is very thin : also a piece of cloth to patch my leggings : my overcoat is worn out; my shirts are also worn out. He has a woollen shirt of mine, if he will be kind enough to send it. I have also with him leggings of thicker cloth for putting on above; he also has warmer caps for wearing at night. I wish also his permission to have a lamp in the evening, for it is wearisome to sit alone in the dark. *But above all, I entreat and beseech your clemency to be urgent with the Procureur that he may kindly permit me to have my Hebrew Bible, Hebrew Grammar, and Hebrew Dictionary, that I may spend my time with that study.* And in return, may you obtain your dearest wish, provided always it be consistent with the salvation of your soul. But if, before the end of the winter, a different decision be reached concerning me, I shall be patient, abiding the will of God to the glory of the grace of my Lord Jesus Christ, whose Spirit, I pray, may ever direct your heart. Amen.

W. TYNDALE."

In face of such a life eulogy seems an impertinence. There is a fine statue of Tyndale in the Embankment Gardens in London; a better memorial is perhaps the House of the Bible Society standing side by side with the office of *The Times* newspaper in Queen Victoria Street. But the truest monument to his life and work is a nation which has been liberated in mind and conscience, ennobled and made great by the truths of that Divine Word which Tyndale strove so successfully to put into its hands. If ever England departs from that Word the period of her decline will have begun.

THE MARRIAGE OF CANA AND ITS SYMBOLISM.

By the Rev. W. H. Rigg, D.D., Vicar of Beverley Minster.

" E verso noi volar furon sentiti,
Non però visti, spiriti, parlando
Alla mensa d' amor cortesi inviti
La prima voce che passò volando,
' Vinum non habent,' altramente disse,
E retro a noi l' andò reiterando."

DANTE, *Purg.* xiii, 25–30.

" 'Tis life, whereof our nerves are scant,
Oh life, not death, for which we pant;
More life, and fuller, that I want."

TENNYSON, *The Two Voices.*

WE do not propose to discuss the symbolism of the Fourth Gospel as a whole, but to confine our attention to the first miracle of Cana in Galilee, with a view to apprehending its inner meaning.

Dr. Inge says that " the symbolism " of the Gospel " is often in three stages. The text presents an apparent sense, which is in figure a second, this in turn points to a third deeper yet."[1] It remains to be seen whether this method of interpretation should be applied to the " turning of the water into wine." It might seem to be so were we to place ourselves under the guidance of St. Augustine. According to him, the water is typical of the prophetic writings of the Old Testament apart from Christ. So long as the reader does not discern Him there, what can he find " to match them for flatness and insipidity " ? but once he discerns Christ in them, then what he reads not only hath a taste, but inebriates; Christ is now manifested in the Law and the Prophets.[2] St. Augustine does not himself make the transition to a third and deeper meaning, but when he states " Truly we too were water, and He made us wine, made us savour of wisdom: for we are the savour of His faith, we who before were without all savour of wisdom,"[3] this may well be made to follow from the first interpretation, albeit his order will have to be reversed. Christ being clearly seen in the ancient Scriptures so inspires and inebriates those who study them that they are transformed by Him from water into wine. He attaches mystical meanings to the details of the miracle. The six waterpots signify the six ages of mankind which were not without prophecy. Their being filled up to the brim shows that the fulness of time has at length arrived, but only for those whose eyes are opened and discern

[1] *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, ed. by Dr. H. B. Swete (Macmillan & Co., London, 1909), p. 261.
[2] Tract. in Joh. ix. 3 and 6.
[3] Tract. in Joh. viii. 3.

Christ is the water turned into wine. The two or three firkins apiece testify respectively to the Spirit of the Father and the Son understood together, and the same Trinity more particularly. The Lord's answer to His Mother implies that she gave birth to His Manhood, but not to His Divine Nature from whence proceeded the miracle. The day will however come when her Son will recognize her, when He is hanging on the Cross. Until then His hour has not yet come.

It is a far cry from St. Augustine to M. Loisy. Like him the brilliant French savant attaches to most of the events and sayings of the Gospel a symbolical meaning, but unlike the ancient Doctor of the Church, Loisy regards the Fourth Gospel as destitute of any historical value whatsoever.

With the majority of scholars, both Conservative and Liberal, Loisy asserts " le changement de l'eau en vin signifie le remplacement de l'eau de la loi par le vin nouveau de l'Evangile."[1] The Lord's Mother stands for the Old Covenant, " la personnification de l'ancienne Alliance." The difficult words of verse 4, *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, γύναι*, are translated as follows: " Qu'y a-t-il entre moi et toi, femme ? . . . Jésus dit à sa mère qu'il n'y a rien de commun entre eux, et, ce disant, il lui signifie de le laisser tranquille. . . . C'est le Logos-Christ qui parle et qui se déclare indépendant de toute influence humaine, si respectable qu'elle soit. Sa mère ne lui est rien dans l'accomplissement de sa mission divine."

At first sight the idea of the Lord's Mother representing the Israelitish Community does not seem to merit discussion, for it may well be asked when did Judaism ever say to our Lord and His Church, " Whatsoever He saith unto you, do it " ? On the contrary, the history of the first two centuries proves that the policy she pursued towards Christianity, far from being benevolent, was one of unrelenting hostility, and, wherever possible, of bitter persecution.

But on further consideration, we see that it is not ecclesiastical Judaism which according to Loisy is typified by the Lord's Mother (cf. St. John ix. 32–35, xvi. 2), but the spiritually-minded portion of the Jewish Church (cf. Rev. xii. 1 ff.), the true children of Abraham as distinct from the entire race (St. John viii. 37–39), in other words, that portion of the Jewish Theocracy which afterwards passed over to Christianity, its true home. At the moment when Christ spake in Cana of Galilee, this particular section, in common with the rest of the Jewish nation, entertained political views of the Messiah ; and so long as they clung to these they could have nothing in common with Christ ; but when His hour had come, that is to say, after He had been glorified, then, and not till then, having learnt the true meaning of His Messiahship, they would be numbered amongst His true and devoted followers.

We will not stop to consider now the objections which have been raised against this interpretation of the passage (St. John ii. 4) beyond observing that in St. John ii. 12, immediately after the

[1] *Le quatrième Evangile, deuxième édition refondue* (Paris : E. Nourry, 1921), p. 145.

miracle of Cana of Galilee, the Evangelist informs his readers that our Lord went down to Capernaum, " He and His Mother, and His brethren, and His disciples." Loisy would see in the brethren the representatives of those Jews who were untouched by this revelation of glory, but he leaves us quite in the dark as to the symbolic meaning he would attach to " the Mother " being at Capernaum. Failure to carry out the symbolism of the Lord's Mother in ii. 12, makes us hesitate to adopt Loisy's symbolism in ii. 4.

Leaving on one side the six waterpots which refer to the powerlessness of Judaism, we find it exceedingly difficult to follow Loisy when he says, " On peut croire que le maître d'hôtel et l'époux, qui interviennent à la fin du récit allégorique, quand le Christ et sa mère ne sont pas en scène, figurent respectivement, au moins pour le rédacteur, Jean-Baptiste et Jésus." It is well that the Redactor has been brought in at this juncture. To-day the host of Redactors, which is for ever on the increase, is in evil odour amongst scholars.[1] And it must be confessed Loisy's Redactor fully lives down to the bad reputation of his class, for what are we to say of a composer or editor who causes one actor to impersonate two quite different characters? At the beginning of the scene Christ is one of the bridegroom's friends, and then without any warning He is transubstantiated into the actual bridegroom himself. And how careless of the Redactor not to have mentioned the departure of Jesus and His Mother!

Surely the rule " entia non multiplicanda sunt," or as we should prefer to express it, " Redactores non multiplicandi sunt," should be more strictly adhered to than is usual amongst critical writers. Such desperate expedients as are resorted to by Loisy strengthen our belief that the first miracle of Cana of Galilee has nothing whatever to do with the contrasted Old and New Covenants.

We have already seen that the position which the Saviour occupied at the marriage feast is that of a sympathetic guest, a friend of the bridegroom. It is most important to observe that He is not the bridegroom, and to seek to force Him into this position is an outrage on the text.

On the other hand, we do learn from the Synoptists that the Kingdom of Heaven is compared to a marriage feast (St. Matt. xxii. 2; xxv. 1, 5, 6; St. Luke xii. 36; cf. Rev. xix. 7–9), but it is noteworthy that whenever in the Messianic Kingdom the bridegroom is men-

[1] Archdeacon Charles castigates the poor unfortunate Redactor of the Apocalypse in the following manner: " a most unintelligent disciple, dishonest, incompetent, taking the most unwarranted liberties with his author's text, a shallow-brained fanatic and celibate " (I.C.C. *Revelation*, Vol. I, pp. liv, lv), and Spitta does not conceal his annoyance with the Redactor whose handiwork he discovers in every chapter of the Fourth Gospel. In the chapter on Lazarus he says " This passage, xi. 51 f., is important, more especially because it shows plainly that it is by no means always possible to attribute the gross blunders in the Redactor's interpretations to any incapability of perceiving the meaning of the original " (*Das Johannes-Evangelium* (Vandenhoeck in Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1910), p. 256). Loisy also comes upon traces of the Redactor in the first epistle of St. John.

tioned, the reference is always to our Lord (St. Mark ii. 19-20; St. Matt. ix. 5; St. Luke v. 34-50). Seeing that the Evangelist was a born Jew, he would be the last to choose an incident illustrating the contrast between the Old and New Covenants in which another figures as the Bridegroom in the Messiah's place. Moreover, in St. John iii. 28, 29, the Baptist is actually designated as the friend of the Bridegroom. Again, there is no instance in the first century of the Christian era of Jewish legalism being compared to water. Therefore it is with special pleasure that we welcome Dr. Garvie's refusal to be carried away by the majority of scholars in favour of the belief that there is a reference to the water of the Jewish ceremonial religion being changed into the wine of the Christian Gospel.[1] In company with him we shall decline to spend time and space in defending the Lord's character against the charge suggested by the jest of the ruler of the feast, but that is not to say it should be ignored, for the Evangelist sees in the words the unconscious expression of a most sober truth (cf. St. John xi. 50-52).

The miracle of Cana has a twofold purpose. On the Divine side, the manifesting forth of the glory of the Incarnate Son, not so much in the display of miraculous power as in the dependence exhibited by Christ on His Father's will, His compassion for human needs, and His active sympathy with the joys of mankind. On the human side, it was intended that some teaching should be conveyed that would either enhance the value or unfold the nature of eternal life. Although the Evangelist was an old man, his fondness for the society of young people had grown rather than diminished with increasing years. Twice in his first epistle the young men had been singled out as the objects of his tender thought and solicitude; and with fine insight he had appealed to their strength and their love of adventure (1 St. John ii. 13, 14). The story current in the Primitive Church of the aged apostle seeking to rescue the robber youth from his evil ways, confirms this impression. There is also in the Gospel a most graphic account of the spirited defence made by the young man born blind on behalf of his Benefactor against the ecclesiastical authorities, who come off very much the second best. Not that the Evangelist had forgotten the needs of old age. Nicodemus is a man who is no longer young (St. John iii. 4), hence the piquancy of his being told of the necessity of the new birth. Also the man who was healed by the pool of Bethesda would in all probability be on the wrong side of fifty (St. John v. 5). Well may we believe, then, that in the description of the first miracle in Cana the Evangelist had the young chiefly in view. Apart from the bridal pair, who would be in the heyday of their youth, the jest of the ruler of the feast would contain a warning to those who were standing on the threshold of life.

Human nature varies little from century to century. In speaking of the adolescent period, Stanley Hall says that it is characterized by " the love of excitement and adventure, the fierce, combative instinct that delights in danger, in struggle, and even in destruction,

[1] *The Beloved Disciple* (Hodder & Stoughton : London, 1922), pp. 83, 84.

the restless ambition that seeks with an insatiable longing to better its position, to climb heights that are yet unscaled, the craving for some enjoyment which not merely gives pleasure but carries with it a thrill of passion."[1]

These same desires and longings must have been equally prevalent among the youth of Ephesus at the end of the first century, though even more applicable to them would be Swinburne's verses in " The Triumph of Time," with the exception of the last line:

" The pulse of war and passion of wonder, the heavens that murmur, the sounds that shine,
The stars that sing and the lives that thunder, the music burning at heart like wine,
An avowed archangel whose hands raise up all senses mixed in the spirit's cup
Till flesh and spirit are molten in sunder—
Then things are over, and no more wine."

More life and fuller is the universal cry of youth. If we picture to ourselves a heathen and corrupt society where licentiousness and unnameable vices and practices (Eph. v. 3) were looked upon not only as part and parcel of ordinary everyday existence but were also associated with religion itself, we can appreciate the overwhelming difficulties under which a Christian writer or teacher laboured in those days even to obtain a hearing for his message. Here was a faith presented to the civilized world whose adherents openly boasted that they gloried in a cross, thought it the highest honour to be led captives in the triumphal car (2 Cor. ii. 4) of a Galilean Peasant, and were proud to call themselves His " slaves " and to be regarded as fools for His sake (1 Cor. iv. 10). Nor were these merely phrases, for in their daily life and conversation they not only enjoined but practised self-denial, a vigorous abstention from those pleasures which were inimical to the higher life—*ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ ἡ ἀλαζονία τοῦ βίου* (1 St. John ii. 16)—a crucifixion of the flesh (Rom. vi. 6; Gal. ii. 20; v. 24; Eph. v. 22; St. Ign. ad Eph. viii. 1, 2) and delighted in viewing their life as a continual dying. No wonder that the youth of Ephesus should shrug their shoulders and turn their backs on such teaching, and exclaim " for such a religion we have no use at all." None the less the lives of those who " were arrayed from head to foot in the commandments of Jesus Christ " (St. Ign. ad Eph. ix. 2) could not fail to have their effect. Listen the Ephesians must to those who " against their outbursts of wrath were meek: against their proud words were humble: against their railings would set their prayers: against their fierceness were gentle " (ibid. x. 2). And ever and anon as they listened to these teachers of " the Way," they would hear of salvation, life, eternal life, abiding for ever, love passing all human understanding, joy which nothing in the world could take away,

[1] Quoted by President H. C. King, *Rational Living* (The Macmillan Company: New York, 1908), p. 151. Prof. Coe considers that the period of adolescence extends from about the age of 12 to about 25. This again is subdivided into early, middle, and later adolescence. Cf. Hastings, *Ency. of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. I, p. 101 f.

" of God who appeared in likeness of man unto newness of everlasting life " (ibid. xix. 3). These notes were always sounding in the early preaching of the Gospel, and must have touched many a heart. And then a great event happened. One more Gospel was written claiming to come from an eyewitness; nay more, he was an intimate disciple of Jesus, but now an old man living in their midst. Its message was Eternal Life, no shadowy life relegated to the dim and distant future, but a full, vigorous, abounding life, here and now, with its roots in the Beyond, and so invincible that death itself could effect no change except to free it from the limitations of earth. This was just the very gospel needed for those whose eyes were dazzled by the golden fruit which hung from life's green tree. No attempt was made to disguise the truth that entrance to this life was through a hard and narrow gate. Pleasures had to be abjured, restrictions adopted and eagerly embraced, and, to crown all, a new birth was demanded. At first the samples of the heavenly wine might seem poor and thin, but the deeper men drank of them, the fuller and richer they found them, until at length it came to be realized that the best was being reserved to the last. The hard, exacting bondage which they had to endure was only in appearance, they learnt to their joy that it conveyed an inner freedom enabling them to realize all the God-given powers of their manhood. While they were abiding in the Vine of God and were drawing from Him their daily sustenance and strength, they learnt the secret that they were no longer His slaves but His friends (St. John xv. 14, 15). All things that Christ had heard of His Father, He was making known unto them.

One side of youth has been touched upon, but Goethe has reminded us that the child is a realist, the middle-aged man a sceptic, the old man is inclined to mysticism; he also remarks that the young man is an idealist. Bearing this in mind, we may inquire in what direction would the youth of Ephesus and the surrounding cities of Asia Minor endeavour to find satisfaction for this side of their nature. The answer is near at hand. The Mystery Religions. Now it is quite unnecessary, in fact highly misleading, to suppose as some have that the Fourth Gospel should be looked upon as a handbook to a Greek Mystery Religion. Very far-fetched in our estimation are the opinions of those scholars who would ascribe the miracle of changing the water into wine, as do Loisy, Bauer, and Heitmüller, directly or indirectly to the influence upon the Evangelist of the Dionysiac mysteries. They bring forward the stories of the jars at the temple of Elis being left empty over-night and being found filled with wine next morning, and that, at the temple of Dionysus, wine instead of water flowed from the spring. The rejection of these so-called parallels does not however prevent us from recognizing that the Evangelist, as St. Paul before him, was well aware of the immense attraction the mystery religions exercised over the more thoughtful minds of the day.

The longing after Salvation was widespread. The men and women of those days were not so much crying out to be delivered from the burden of sin as to be released " from the pressure of Fate,

Necessity, and those ills which belong to the limitations of earthly existence."[1] They wished to be assured of a future state of bliss and happiness beyond the grave.

An appeal to the past, however venerable, was useless. Philosophy had proved to be a broken reed. By direct communion with the Deity or deities alone could contact with the unseen world be established, freeing their votaries from corroding care and doubt, and enabling them to attain absolute certainty as to their condition in the Hereafter.

The rites of initiation, regeneration, purification by water in baptism, the secret practices and doctrines which were forbidden to be revealed, had the effect of producing in the minds of multitudes a vivid sense of the divine, and of their being in contact with some saving Deity. The Evangelist makes use of many of these ideas, just as the Sadhu speaks of the relationship of Christianity to his own country. " Indians do need the Water of Life, but not in the European cup." According to St. John, the Ephesians shall have the Water of Life, but in their own cup. The thought-forms of Ephesus shall be made to express the content of the Christian Gospel.

We too have our Mysteries. Only he who is of the truth heareth My voice. The Christian believer goes through a period of initiation. He that doeth the truth shall come to the light. Whoever is anxious to do the will of God shall know of the teaching thereof. He that followeth Christ shall not walk in darkness. Nobody who does not belong to Christ can have any conception of the excellency of the heavenly wine; the more it is partaken of, the better it is found to be.

> No tongue of mortal can express,
> No pen can write the blessedness;
> He only who hath proved it knows
> What bliss from love of Jesus flows."

We may then sum up thus the symbolism of the first miracle of Cana from the human side. It is the stage preparatory to the initiation into the mystery of Eternal Life, through Christ, which is effected by being born again of water and the spirit. In Chapter ii. the goal is presented before the believer and the man who wishes to become a disciple of Christ. In Chapter xv., where again the fruit of the vine is mentioned, we have its realization. Only those who belong to Christ can have experience that the best wine has been kept to the last.

[1] Cf. Hastings, *Ency. of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. IX : Art. "Mysteries (Christian)," by Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy, p. 74.

ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

By a K.C.

"FOR the first time the Church has undertaken to present a scheme for the reform of its Courts." So spake the Archbishop of York at the recent meeting of the Church Assembly. But the official report presented to the Assembly of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission shows that the promoters of the scheme to which the Archbishop referred contemplate something much more than a mere reform of strictly Ecclesiastical Courts. It seeks to deprive one of the King's Courts—the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—of its jurisdiction and powers in Ecclesiastical causes, and it is proposed to set up in its place a new tribunal to be known as the Court of Appeal to the Crown. The suggested reforms therefore are not merely of interest to Churchmen, lay and clerical, but to the whole nation, because in so far as the recommendations made relate to the supersession of the Privy Council in Ecclesiastical suits and causes, and purport to prescribe the constitution and the procedure of the proposed Court of Final Appeal, it is submitted that they touch a fundamental aspect of the English Constitution as by law established. These particular recommendations are, in short, of a revolutionary nature and would, if adopted, be a distinctly retrogade step.

The point which at the outset it is of the utmost importance to realize is that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is one of the tribunals of the realm. It is not a mere spiritual Court. It is not a mere Diocesan or Provincial Court which Bishops may perhaps regulate or control at discretion. It is a national Court, above and superior to any Ecclesiastical Court alike in its constitution and independence, and, as the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in 1906 said, it "seems to comprise the materials of a most perfect tribunal for deciding the appeals in question"—that is, appeals from the diocesan and provincial Courts. This tribunal, as such, succeeded the ancient Court of Delegates in accordance with the recommendation of a Commission in 1830–32. Such Commission, be it noted, which so recommended the Privy Council as the most perfect tribunal for the purposes in question, included the then Archbishop of Canterbury and several Bishops, as well as the most eminent Ecclesiastical Judges of the day. Their recommendations were accepted and have been acted upon for very many years.

Why is it now proposed to replace the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council by another tribunal? It would almost seem that the very independence of this eminently judicial body and its fearlessness in restoring and securing religious liberty when menaced by Ecclesiastical Courts are a grievance to those persons who would restore to the latter a not inconsiderable measure of their medieval power and importance. Such an idea is not, of course, admitted in plain language. But we nevertheless find in the report made to the

Church Assembly these extraordinary words: "though in theory it is conceivable that the Crown might make an Ecclesiastical Court the representative of its own supreme authority over all causes ecclesiastical and civil." Happily, the authors of the report recognize that such a plan would "be unacceptable to the nation as a whole." The nation would not listen for a moment to such a suggestion.

Still, the recommendations which are in fact made with regard to the proposed Final Court of Appeal do in at least one vital and material respect imply an attempted Ecclesiastical encroachment on a Crown Court in the exercise of its powers and duties, and this attempt ought to be fully realized and strenuously resisted, not only by Churchmen who value the freedom and the protection which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has ensured to them, but by all lovers of the Constitution who know the grave importance of preserving inviolate the full integrity and independence of the Crown Courts.

But before I deal in detail with this point, let us see what exactly are the proposals now made as to the constitution of the projected Final Court of Appeal. It is wisely recognized by the authors of the scheme that such tribunal must essentially be a Crown Court, and the implications and functions of such Crown Court are expressed in the following paragraph, which should be fully appreciated alike by Churchmen and the general community:—

> "First, it must be clearly recognized that in our recommendations the appeal is from the Ecclesiastical Courts to the Crown. It is an appeal to the Crown for remedy, based on the contention that justice in the Ecclesiastical Courts has not been done, or that these Courts have improperly exercised their authority. The right must be open in some way or other to members of any religious community within the nation who believe themselves to have been wronged by the action of the authorities of that community. In the case of the Church of England, the right has a special character owing to the place of the Royal Supremacy and the visitational authority of the Crown in the existing constitution of the Church and the Realm. The essence of the appeal therefore is that it lies from the Ecclesiastical Courts to the Crown. It follows that it is from the Crown that the jurisdiction of the Court is and must be derived."

This recognition being so made, the consequential recommendation follows:—

> "That the Court of Appeal to the Crown should be a permanent body of lay judges appointed by the Crown, consisting of past or present Lords of Appeal in Ordinary, members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature, and also of other persons learned in Ecclesiastical law, and that the number in each case should not be less than five, who should be summoned by the Lord Chancellor in rotation."

In the actual constitution of the proposed Court, as so stated, there would not seem to be any ground for objection. But what will the nation think of the recommendation which follows :—

> "We also recommend, with the report of 1883, that each member of the Court should, before entering on his office, sign a declaration that he is a member of the Church as by law established."

It is simply amazing that in this twentieth century—just a hundred years after Lord John Russell succeeded in getting the odious Test and Corporation Acts repealed—such a reactionary recommendation should be made, or even committed to writing. It is no wonder that Sir Edward Clarke, K.C., speaking to the Church Assembly with all the weight of his forensic eminence and experience, should have condemned the proposal as an affront to the Judges of the Judicial Committee. An affront it undoubtedly is, and of course the proposal will never be sanctioned by Parliament or by any body of persons which has the smallest conception of the age in which we live and the tolerant spirit of the nation. These are no Stuart days. These are no days for applying the arbitrary schemes and rigid tests of bigoted monarchs and complacent ecclesiastics of a bygone age. Indeed, the authors of the above recommendation appear themselves to have no great confidence in the proposal. "We cannot consider that this is a matter of vital principle," they concede, "but (they add) we think that such a requirement is, in itself, fitting, and would serve to disarm possible criticism and to ensure the greater confidence of the Church." Assuredly this is a complete misconception. At any rate, the last thing which such a recommendation would do, if enacted, would be to ensure the approval of the nation, and certainly the very fact that even the idea of such an anachronism should now prevail shows the narrow and retrograde spirit which animates some of those persons who are, or would be, responsible for the policy of the English Church. It is difficult to believe that there are many such persons.

So much for the suggested constitution of the proposed Court of Appeal. It is when we pass to an examination of how its powers are to be exercised and applied that the attempted ecclesiastical encroachment on the rights and duties of a Crown Court become apparent. That encroachment is to take effect in this way :—

> "We therefore recommend that where in an appeal before a final Court the Question arises what the doctrine, discipline or use of the Church of England is such Question *shall* be referred to an assembly of the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces, who shall be entitled to call in such advice as they may think fit ; and that the opinion of the majority of such assembly of the Archbishops and Bishops with regard to any question so submitted to them *shall be binding on the Court as to what the doctrine, discipline, or use of the Church of England is.*"

The italics are mine, and I have so set forth the latter words because of their transcendent importance and gravity, and their

imperative nature. Bluntly stated, what does this recommendation amount to? In practical effect it is this: it seeks and designs an incursion upon and a limitation of the rights and duties of a Crown Court—a supreme Court of the Realm—by a rigid, inexorable imposition on such Court of the opinions of a non-judicial body of Archbishops and Bishops. In a subtle and insidious way a sort of *imperium in imperio* is demanded, so to operate that the episcopal bench may dominate the judicial bench. Such a proposal is intolerable and objectionable in the last degree. It would not only strike at the very root of the supremacy and independence of the proposed tribunal, but it would be an invidious reflection on the capacity of the eminent men who would be the Judges of the Court. It is quite true that the opinions of the Bishops are only to prevail and bind the Court in such matters as the doctrine, discipline or use of the Church of England, and that there is not to be any such imposition of episcopal views when the Court has to deal with cases of clerical misconduct, such as sexual depravity or neglect of duty. It is also true that the recommendation further declares that "the Court having taken such opinion (i.e., of the Archbishops and Bishops in matters of doctrine, discipline or use) into consideration, together with any relevant Acts of Parliament, shall pronounce what in the particular case ought to be decided in order that justice may be done." But if the opinions thus thrust upon the Court by the Archbishops and Bishops are to be binding on the Judges, as the report proposes, there would be little need for any consideration on the part of the Judges. In truth and in fact, if such an unconstitutional plan were legalized, and an Episcopal Bench found a clergyman perverse, the Court of Final Appeal would be expected to find him perverse, and the so-called judgment would be a mere registration of episcopal findings. The plan, therefore, is fundamentally erroneous, because it purports to, and would, if adopted, derogate from the full and proper status and dignity of a Crown Court.

But while the report in question acknowledges the Royal Supremacy, and therefore the supremacy of a Crown Court, the submission is added that "it does not follow, nor is it involved in a true construction of the principle of the Royal Supremacy, that in cases of heresy, ritual or ceremonial, the Crown Court should determine what is or is not the doctrine or use of the Church." A great deal of subtle purpose or desire seems to underlie those significant words. Then there is the implication that the findings of the Bishops should be so ascertained, imposed, and made binding on His Majesty's judges because the latter are less likely to be as well informed in the law Divine as the Bishops, or are less capable of ascertaining the law Divine. The suggestion is fallacious and, with respect, does not represent what the real and true functions of a final Court are or should be in relation to a State Church. The principles which guide the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and which, it is submitted, should govern any such final Court in dealing with matters ecclesiastical, were stated (*inter alia*) in the

judgment of the Court in the well-known Gorham case to be, in interpreting Articles, Formularies and Rubrics, as follows :—

> " In our endeavour to ascertain the true meaning and effect of the Articles, Formularies and Rubrics, we must by no means intentionally swerve from the old-established rules of construction (i.e., of written instruments), or depart from the principles which have received the sanction and approbation of the most learned persons in times past, as being on the whole the best calculated to determine the true meaning of the documents to be examined."

And then these significant words are added, which, with respectful deference, I would emphasize :—

> " *If these principles were not adhered to, all the rights, both spiritual and temporal, of Her Majesty's subjects would be endangered.*" [Queen Victoria was then Sovereign.]

Herein is, indeed, implied a great truth, a great warning, a great lesson which runs through the whole course of the national evolution of Church and State in England.

Who is the more sufficient for these things? No opinion of Archbishops or Bishops can possibly be of any value if it is not founded on a knowledge and scientific interpretation of the Articles, Formularies and Rubrics of the Church. So far as knowledge is concerned, lay Judges have the same means of ascertaining the facts as the Bishops themselves, and by their training in the estimate and interpretation of the material evidence they are infinitely better qualified than any Archbishop or Bishop, as the many learned decisions they have given, rightly reversing the judgments of ecclesiastical courts, abundantly demonstrate. Even the report recognizes the exceptional capacity of the lay Judges in the application of rules of evidence.

Lastly, on this point, I would presume to say that, if the opinions of the Bishops are to be binding on His Majesty's Judges in the proposed Final Court of Appeal, we might as well say that the expert opinions of the Elder Brethren of Trinity House who sometimes sit in the Admiralty Court as Assessors should be necessarily binding on the President or other Judge of that Court—a proposition altogether untenable and unconstitutional.

I have purposely abstained from dealing with the proposed changes as regards the diocesan or provincial Courts, as the question of the Final Court of Appeal seems to me of overwhelming importance, not merely for the reasons above stated, but because also of the danger and the confusion which would inevitably result from the further recommendation that an " actual decree (of this Court) alone shall be of binding authority and shall not form a precedent." Thus there would be no finality or uniformity of authority, and probably much vexatious litigation, according to the shifting circumstances of each Diocese and its Diocesan. Surely this could not possibly be for the good or order of the Church.

THE ANGLICAN "VIA MEDIA" AND THE CAROLINE DIVINES.

THE SCRIPTURES AND THE RULE OF FAITH.

By the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A., Principal B.C.M. College, Clifton.

"WHEN Elizabeth came to the throne, although the 1552 Prayer Book was replaced, it was with alterations of such far-reaching significance that nothing vital to Catholic tradition could be said to be authoritatively abandoned" (Eeles, *P. B. Revision*, 108). This definitely dogmatic statement by a modern writer implies that such important changes were made at the Revision of the Prayer Book in 1559 that Anglican religion then recovered a Catholicity which had been sacrificed by the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. It is on a par with similar assumptions by such authorities as Bishops Frere, Gibson and Dr. Kidd. We have carefully examined such statements and found that they are entirely devoid of any historical foundation, since the three small changes made in 1559 in no way affected the doctrinal character of the English Church and certainly cannot be interpreted as in any way affecting its catholicity.

A further contention would, however, if correct, seriously challenge Anglican agreement with "Catholic tradition." For the same writer tells us that there are "Three views of the Church held by four principal sections of Christians. There is first the Papal view held by those of the Roman obedience, according to which ultimately all authority rests with the papacy. There is secondly the old Protestant view, according to which the ultimate authority is Scripture. There is thirdly the view held by Anglicans in the West and by the Orthodox in the East that the ultimate authority is the Church herself, the whole body of Christ speaking through a General Council ratified by subsequent general acceptance" (p. 17). Now this contention that the "Anglican view" places the ultimate authority of the Church as superior to that of Scripture, is not only subversive of primitive Catholic tradition, but it absolutely contradicts the whole Reformation position and appeal, in which there was absolute unanimity between the Anglican and foreign Reformers. The Roman Church had decreed in the Council of Trent that "the truth is contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions which having been received by the Apostles were handed down even to us" and it declared that the Council "receives and venerates with an equal feeling of piety and reverence all the books of the Old and New Testaments as well as the traditions relating both to faith and morals dictated either orally by Christ or by the Holy Spirit, and preserved in continuous succession in the Catholic Church" (Sess. IV, Canon 1, Conc. XIV, 746). Cardinal Bellarmine aptly summarized the distinction

between the Romish and Reformed views on the subject when he said, "The controversy between us and heretics consists in this, that we assert that all necessary doctrine concerning faith and morals is not necessarily contained in Scripture, and consequently beside the Written Word is needed an unwritten one, whereas they teach that in the Scriptures all such necessary doctrine is contained, and consequently there is no need of an unwritten word" (*De Verb. Dei*, lib. IV, c. 3.).

Now if our Anglican Confession of Faith emphasizes one point more than another it is that the Scriptures are to be regarded as the sole rule of Faith and as the final standard of appeal and authority. The ordinances of General Councils are, it affirms, "of no strength or authority" unless they are in accordance with the teaching of Scripture (Article XXI), while even the Catholic Creeds are declared to be dependent on the same supreme authority for their acceptance (Art. VIII). It is well to expose thoroughly the absolute baselessness of this definite contention, for it does not stand alone. Dr. Kidd in his Introduction to the *Thirty-Nine Articles* similarly declares that in common with all the Anglican formularies the Articles make their "new appeal" "not to the authority of the Bible and the Bible only, but to that of Scripture and the undivided Church" (p. 12). In proof of this remarkable assertion Dr. Kidd appeals to the statement made in the *Ten Articles* of 1536 and *The Bishops' Book* of 1537 and *The King's Book* of 1543, "The Elizabethan Act of Supremacy and the Canons of 1571." We can at once dismiss the first three of these formularies, as they only had temporary authority in Henry VIII's reign, and were entirely superseded by the authorized Anglican Confession of Faith drawn up in 1552, which was revised in 1562. It is therefore the doctrine "set forth" in these "Thirty Nine Articles," which is the only binding standard of authority in the Anglican Church to-day. And we should remember that these Articles make no reference whatever to the previous tentative formularies of Henry VIII's reign. We are not surprised that Dr. Kidd makes no effort to justify his contention, concerning the appeal of the Anglican formularies, by references to the teaching of the Articles, but instead relies on a statement concerning the "judgment for heresy" made in the Act of Supremacy 1559. Let us examine the force and authority of this alleged support. A clause in this Act set up a High Commission Court and empowered it to adjudge heresy only, "by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or by the first four General Councils, or any of them, or by any other General Council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be ordered, judged or determined to be heresy by the High Court of Parliament, with the assent of the clergy in their Convocation" (Prothero, *Statutes and Documents*, p. 12). It is immediately apparent that in this statement the main test of heresy is to be sought from the teaching based on "the express and plain words of the Canonical Scriptures." The judgment of the "First Four General

Councils " is certainly admitted, but as the dogmatic canons of these Councils only relate to the Holy Trinity it was evidently thought sufficient to appeal to them to condemn any Arian or Socinian heresy. But this appeal to the dogmatic teaching of the First Four General Councils can by no stretch be construed as committing the Anglican formularies to the standard of " the undivided Church," which would necessarily include the first ten centuries up to the division of East and West. Certainly also Dr. Kidd can find no support for an Anglican standard of " the Scriptures and the undivided Church " in the permission given here to the " High Court of Parliament " to " determine heresy," since no standards other than the preceding ones are set forth for its guidance. Moreover, Dr. Kidd forgets that these tests are found not in an Anglican *formulary* but in an Act of Parliament, and also that this whole section of the Act was repealed with the abolition of the High Commission Court in 1641. Therefore even from 1559 to 1641 it could only be quoted as a standard which the State thought fit to impose on the Church, but since then it does not possess even this value. It cannot therefore, like the Articles, be included in the appeal of the " Anglican formularies."

The only other support which Dr. Kidd alleges for his dogmatic contention is a statement contained in some Canons passed by the Upper Houses of Convocation only, in 1571, which never received royal authorization. One of these warns preachers never to preach anything which they wish people to hold and believe " nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinæ Veteris aut Novi Testamenti *quodque ex illa ipsa* doctrina catholici patres et veteres episcopi collegerint " (Cardwell, *Synodalia*, I, 126). But even if we may regard these Canons in a subordinate sense as an Anglican formulary, this vague and indefinite standard to which they appeal ultimately rests on " the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments," so that it certainly cannot be claimed as exalting " the teaching of the undivided Church " to be a co-ordinate authority with Holy Scripture. On the other hand we get confirmatory evidence that the Anglican standard of authority is ultimately Scripture alone, from the statutory Canons of 1604 which superseded these unauthorized Canons of 1571. For Canon LI of that year, in a similar attempt to prevent erroneous teaching, orders every preacher to be reported to the bishop, who publishes any doctrine " disagreeing with the Word of God or the Articles of Religion and the Book of Common Prayer ") Cardwell, u.s. I, 275). It makes no mention of " General Councils or Catholic Fathers and old Bishops." Since both the Prayer Book and the Articles make their final appeal to Scripture, we may safely say that the Anglican Reformation in its formularies accepted what Mr. Eeles styles, " the old Protestant view " as its cardinal principle—the subordination to Scripture as its final standard of faith and authority.[1]

[1] The unauthorized " Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum " of Edward VI's reign cannot be regarded in any strict sense as an Anglican " formulary," and in any case its statement that " we reverently accept the first four Councils " must be modified by the definite language of Article XXI, which declares *all* Councils fallible.

But not only have we conclusive proof that as regards the standard of authority the Anglican Church takes no "middle position," but as we have seen, there is abundant evidence that its whole doctrinal basis as set forth in the Elizabethan Settlement is in complete harmony with that of the foreign Reformed Churches. In spite of this evidence we are to-day constantly being told by scholars that the Anglican Church occupies a *via media* position. "The Church of England," writes Bishop Headlam, "has in the West the strength, but also the weakness of its position as a *via media*. It seems to many a very unreal compromise. It claims to be something different from the Protestant Churches, yet it is not Roman" (*History, Christianity and Theology*, p. 283). Even though it is impossible to substantiate such a statement as this from the Anglican formularies or from the writings of the sixteenth-century Reformers, it is not unimportant, if only from an historical point of view, to examine carefully if there is any foundation for it in the theological and ecclesiastical position of the prominent Caroline divines of the seventeenth century. In other words, did these celebrated exponents of Anglicanism depart seriously from the principles and position of their Edwardian and Elizabethan forerunners? Did they, for instance, regard the Church of England "as something different from the Protestant Churches"?

Owing to the modern attempt to change the connotation of historical ecclesiastical terminology it is necessary in considering this point to be clear in our definitions. It is evident, for instance, that the Caroline divines would not have endorsed Bishop Headlam's limitation of the designation "Protestant Churches." Bishop Sanderson, one of their most prominent representatives, declares "By the Protestant Churches we understand those visible Churches which, having by an external separation freed themselves from the tyranny and idolatry of Popery, have more or less reformed their doctrine and worship from popish corruptions and restored them more or less to the ancient primitive purity." And he enumerates such Churches as "The Church of England, the Church of Denmark, The Church of Saxony, etc." (*Two Treatises on the Church*, 183). But if by the term "Protestant Churches" is intended the existing English non-episcopal communions, then it must be admitted that the Caroline divines did regard the Church of England as occupying a middle position between their forerunners the English "sectaries," as they were then described, and Rome. But even so such *via media* position was concerned rather with discipline and polity than with doctrine. Thus Bishop Ferne (of Chester) in writing against sectaries and papists says "The English Protestant, or obedient son of the Church of England, as he is well set between a Papist and a sectary, as between two extremes, so he only is able to stand against the opposition or pretensions of both; for if we examine the false grounds and deceiving principles of both as to this point of the constitution, government and communion of the Church, we shall see clearly the truth lies in the midst between both, and the Church of England holds and maintains it (*A Compendious Discourse*,

etc., Sect. 2). It is significant that there is no mention here of doctrine. We should remember also that the Caroline divines not only followed the Elizabethan Reformers in adopting the practically universal belief of the lawfulness of only one form of religion for a particular nation, but they also held, perhaps even more strongly than their predecessors, that to separate from a purely Reformed and apostolically organized National Church was a grievous act of schism. If, however, this ambiguous term " Protestant Churches " is designed to cover the foreign Reformed Churches, then it is certainly historically incorrect to say that the Caroline divines regarded the Church of England as taking a *via media* position between them and Rome. For they regarded the Anglican Church as a real and probably the chief partner with the other Reformed Churches in the defence of the Protestant Faith against Roman corruptions. Seventeen bishops in 1641 joined in a solemn protestation to " maintain and defend the true Reformed Protestant religion expressed in the doctrine of the Church of England," while in reply to a question in the House of Lords in 1673, several bishops explained that the Protestant Religion is comprehended in the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Liturgy, the Homilies, the Catechism, and the Canons of the Church of England " (Campbell's *Lives of Chancellors*, IV, 187, 1857). They rejoiced in the real unity of doctrine which existed between all the Reformed Protestant Churches as evidenced in the *Harmony of Protestant Confessions of Faith* which was issued in 1583 and to which Canon 30 of 1604 refers as approving the Anglican adoption of the ceremony of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism.

Bishop Joseph Hall clearly emphasizes this Protestant unity and solidarity when he declares " Blessed be God, there is no essential difference between the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation. We accord in every point of Christian doctrine without the least variation " (*Works*, V, 56, 1811). " We do love and honour these our sister Churches as the dear spouse of Christ " (*Defence of Humble Remonstrance*, 14. IX, 690, *Works*). Bishop Cosin similarly emphasizes this Protestant solidarity in urging English refugees while in France to join in communion with the French Reformed Churches, since they thereby " declare their unity in professing the same religion which they and you do." And he concludes with the pertinent query that if they renounce the foreign Reformed Churches " what will become of the Protestant party ? " (*Works*, IV, 401). This recognition of the English Church as the ally and champion of other Reformed Churches was very marked amongst the Caroline divines. It is conspicuously evidenced in the address which Convocation made to William III in 1689 when it thanked him " for his pious zeal and care for the honour of the Church of England whereby we doubt not the interest of the Protestant Religion in all other Protestant Churches, which is dear to us, will be better secured " (Cardwell, *Synodalia*, 2, 698). Convocation evidently regarded the safeguarding of the Anglican Church as the best means of securing the Reformed Religion everywhere. The

same sentiment was voiced by Archbishop Sancroft in the previous year when, under the stress of the Romish attack on the English Church, he even includes the English Dissenters in his concern for the common Protestant cause, since he exhorts his clergy " to join in daily fervent prayer to the God of peace for the universal blessed union of all Reformed Churches both at home and abroad against our common enemies." (D'Oyley's *Life of Sancroft*, I, 325.)

There is certainly, therefore, ample evidence to show that the Caroline divines, instead of teaching that the Anglican Church held a *via media* position between Rome and " The Protestant Churches," were most anxious to prove its claim to be " something very different from Rome" and at the same time its essential identity with " the Protestant Churches." But apart from this general attitude let us examine carefully if there is any evidence that the Caroline divines took a *via media* position concerning the authority of the Church and the Scriptures. Did they in any way modify the principle of Scripture alone as the final standard of authority which the Reformers laid down for the Church of England ? Would they have accepted Dr. Kidd's standard of the " Scriptures and the Undivided Church " or even a more recent Rule of Faith to be determined by the " Scriptures, Creeds, Conciliar decisions, and the common teaching of representative divines " ? (*The Faith of an English Catholic*, Darwell Stone, 22). Archbishop Cranmer stated the Reformed position most clearly when he said : " If thou be desirous to know whether thou be in the right Faith or no, seek it not at man's mouth, seek it not at a proud, glorious and wavering sort of bishops and priests, but at God's own mouth, which is His Holy Word Written which can neither lie, deceive nor be deceived." Cranmer goes on to say that while godly learned men may be consulted for instruction in the Scriptures, they are not to be believed " further than they can show their doctrine and exhortation to be agreeable to the true Word of God Written. For that is the very touchstone which must, yea and will also, try all doctrine and learning whether it be good or evil, true or false " (*Works*, 2, 13–14). " The authority of the orthodox Fathers," he declared on another occasion, " is by no means to be despised . . . but that the Holy Scriptures ought to be interpreted by their decisions we do not allow, for the Holy Scripture ought to be to us both the rules and judges of all Christian doctrines " (*Reformatio Legum*, Tit. 1. C. XV, 1850, Cardwell's Edition). Similarly Bishop Jewel in his *Apology* declared Scripture to be " the very sure and infallible rule whereunto all ecclesiastical doctrine ought to be called to account " (Part 2, Ch. IX, 28. 1852). Is there any evidence showing that the prominent Anglican divines of the next century departed in any way from this very definite position ?

Certainly no better representative of the earlier Caroline divines can be found than Dr. Field, Dean of Gloucester, the friend of Hooker. He was a member of the Hampton Court Conference and a most learned and profound theologian. He died in 1616 at the age of

55. In his celebrated treatises " Of the Church " Field examines the witness of the early and medieval Church to the " sufficiency of the Scriptures." He quotes with approval St. Augustine, who declares that " whatsoever a man shall learn without and beside the Scripture, if it be hurtful, it is there condemned, if profitable, it is there found." He also refers to Scotus who affirms " whatsoever pertaineth to the heavenly and supernatural knowledge and is necessary to be known of man in this life is sufficiently delivered in the sacred Scriptures." He cites Ockham that " there is one opinion that only those varieties are to be esteemed catholic, and such as are necessarily to be believed for the attaining of salvation, which either expressly are delivered in Scripture, or by necessary consequence may be inferred from things so expressed." Field then sums up the patristic and medieval writers by saying : " By this which hath been said it appeareth that the Church wherein our fathers lived and died was in this point touching the sufficiency of Scripture, an orthodox and true Protestant Church "(*Of the Church*, Vol. 2, 127–40). Again in refuting the error that the authority of the Church was superior to that of Scripture, Field argues that although " the Church of all the faithful " may be " free from any error " " yet we dare not make it equal to the Scriptures for that Scripture is infallibly true as inspired immediately from the Spirit of truth, securing the writers of it from error." " The whole Church," he concludes (i.e., " all the faithful that have been since and beside the Apostles), is subject to the Scripture in all her parts, and hath her infallibility from it, and, therefore, in her manner of having the truth is inferior unto it, neither are we bound to receive her doctrines as the sacred Scriptures " (Vol. 2, 433, 1849).

In treating of the special authority of the Church to judge matters of faith, Field prefaces his remarks by declaring that the " judgment or determination of the Word of God is that wherein we rest as the rule of our faith and the light of divine understanding as that whereby we judge of all things " (2, 439). But in dealing with the Church's judgment in " particular things," Field lays down certain rules or guides, such as the Apostles' Creed, the Scriptures, the " unanimous consent of all the saints in their writings, and what the most famous have constantly and uniformly delivered, without any contradiction, as a matter of faith, so that those gainsaying them were charged with heresy." The last two rules Field declares are not to be admitted as equal with the former two. Moreover " the decrees of Councils, and the determinations of Popes," he affirms, " are not to be numbered as rules of faith " because " we have no proof of their infallibility." He concludes by saying, " We do not therefore so make the Scripture the rule of our faith as to neglect the other rules, nor so admit the other as to detract anything from the plenitude of Scripture in which all things are contained that must be believed " (2, 444). Such statements are surely very far from accepting the standard of " the Scriptures and the undivided Church " or of " the Scriptures, Creeds and the common teaching of representative divines." In fact, it would

not seem that Field's position differs materially from Cranmer's dictum concerning the authority of the Fathers or from the rules laid down by the Reformers in the Articles—that although "the Church hath authority in controversies of Faith" yet it may not "so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another" nor "enforce anything" beside Scripture "to be believed for necessity of salvation" (Article XXX).

Archbishop Laud speaks in, if anything, more definite language, when, arguing against the Jesuit Fisher, he declares, "I admit no ordinary rule left in the Church of divine and infallible verity, and *so of faith*, but the Scripture. . . . Christ hath left an infallible rule the Scripture, what need is there of another since this is most infallible, and the same which the antient Church of Christ admitted?" (*Works*, 2, 218, 1849).

If we turn to a later Caroline divine renowned for his learning, piety and orthodoxy, we shall also find abundant evidence that Scripture alone is regarded as the sole rule of faith, although the Creeds, the first four General Councils and unanimous Catholic traditional teaching are accepted as guides in judging heresy. For Bishop Jeremy Taylor makes it quite clear that "the Scripture is a full and sufficient rule to Christians in faith and manners, a full and perfect declaration of the will of God, and is therefore certain because we have no other" . . . "we have no reason to rely upon tradition for any part of our faith" (*Works*, Dissuasive from Popery, X, 419–20). When we find him definitely declaring that "the fulness and sufficiency of Scripture in all matters of faith and manners is the principle that I and all Protestants rely upon" (*Works*, X, 268–70), there is no possibility of claiming him as a supporter of any *via media* view that Church teaching and authority should be based on the rule of "the Scriptures and the undivided Church." Taylor makes his position quite clear when he says in his "Dissuasive from Popery" that "nothing else than the Scriptures can be the foundation of our faith," although "to these we also add, not as authors or finishers, but as helpers of our faith and heirs of the doctrine Apostolical, the sentiments and Catholic doctrine of the Church of God in all ages next after the Apostles." But Taylor is careful to make it clear that although "the Fathers are admirable helps for the understanding of the Scriptures," yet no certain and decisive appeal can be made to their teaching, so that he concludes "we do wholly rely upon the Scriptures as the foundation and final resort of all our persuasions and from thence can never be confuted" (Part I, Book I).

It is well perhaps also to record the testimony of a celebrated Anglican Calvinist divine of this period. The learned and "heavenly" Dr. Richard Sibbes (1578–1635) was Master of Catharine Hall, Cambridge, when Jeremy Taylor was an undergraduate. He was not only a man of ripe scholarship, but also a profound theologian of deep piety of whom Isaac Walton declared:

> "Of this just man let this just praise be given,
> Heaven was in him, before he was in heaven."

Speaking of the unique and final authority of Scripture, Sibbes says, "It hath a supreme authority from itself." "What," he asks, "is the judge of all controversies?" and answers, "The Word, the Spirit of God in the Scriptures." Refuting the theory that the authority of the Scripture depends on the Church, he says, "A carrier sheweth us these be letters from such a man, but when we open the letter and see the hand and seal we know them to be his. The Church knows the Word and explaineth it, and when we see and feel the efficacy of the Word in itself, then we believe it to be the Word, for there is the Word that sheweth it, to be the Word" (*Works*, 2, 493–4, 1862).

Dr. Thomas Jackson, Dean of Peterborough, another early Caroline divine, whom the late Dr. Pusey described as "one of the best and greatest divines Our Church hath nurtured," thus defines the difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome over the Rule of Faith. "The making of ecclesiastical tradition to be an integral part of the Canon of Faith (which the Roman Church hath done) doth not only pollute but undermine the whole fabric of the holy, primitive and Catholic Faith." "We affirm," he continues, "with antiquity and in particular with Vincentius Lirinensis that the Canon of Scripture is a rule of faith, perfect for quantity, and sufficient for quality; that is, it contains all things in it, that are necessary to salvation . . . without relying on any other rule or authority equivalent to them in certainty. . . . The modern Roman Church adds tradition as another part of the same rule homogeneal and equivalent to it for quality." And he adds that to supply the insufficiency of both the Scriptures and tradition the Roman Church superadds "the infallible authority of the present visible Church" which "utterly pulls down the structure of faith." Although Dr. Jackson is careful to explain, "When we reject ecclesiastical tradition from being any part of the rule of faith, we do not altogether deny the authority or use of it" (on the Creed, *Two Treatises on the Church*, 155–6).

Again, if we consult the writings of one of the most prominent and representative of the later Caroline divines, Archbishop Bramhall, we shall find no mention of, or support for, a *via media* position of the "Scriptures and the Undivided Church," or the "Scriptures and the common teaching of representative divines" as the standard of Anglican authority. Bramhall certainly accepts the Apostles' Creed as a rule of faith, but only because it is a concise summary of Scriptural teaching. "The Scriptures and Creed," he says, "are not two different rules of faith, but one and the same dilated in Scripture and contracted in the Creed" (*Works*, V, 597). Similarly Bishop Pearson in urging his parishioners "to embrace the first faith to which they cannot have a more probable guide than the Creed," declares that he refers them to this "as *it leads you to the Scriptures*." And he adds that he has "laid the foundation of the whole work (i.e., his "Exposition of the Creed") upon the written Word of God" (*Ibid.*, pp. 2–5, 1880). Bishop Stillingfleet speaks even more definitely when he says, "The Scripture

being our sole and entire rule of faith, all matters necessary to salvation must be supposed to be contained therein" (*Discourse and Grounds of Certainty of Faith*, 51–80).

We might continue our investigation through the writings of all the leading Caroline divines, and we should find that while they give due deference and weight to "Conciliar decisions" and to the accumulated traditional teaching and wisdom of the Universal Church, they never exalt these secondary guides or authorities to be on a level with the supreme rule of Faith in the Scriptures, while they frequently affirm that the teaching of the whole undivided Catholic Church through its œcumenical Councils is not to be lightly rejected, that is, where it can be clearly ascertained, as in the case of the great Catholic Creeds or in the writings of the Early Fathers. But they make it clear that all these standards or appeals must be subordinate to the sole divine rule of Faith in Holy Scripture. On this point they occupy no *via media* position between Rome and the other Reformed Churches. They never seriously challenge what Mr. Eeles terms "the old Protestant view" that the "ultimate authority is Scripture."

"HONEY FROM MANY HIVES." Compiled by Lady Lennard. *Robert Scott.* 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

This collection of quotations from many sources, illustrating such subjects as Courtesy, Kindness to Animals, Patriotism, Thrift, etc., has a useful Preface by the Compiler and is clearly printed and well arranged. A suitable book for those working amongst girls and women, and one likely to prove helpful to speakers.

THISTLEDOWN. By Ida A. Beuttell. *A. W. Board.* 5*s.* net.

A few simple stories such as "Teddy and Beautiful Ann," one or two nature sketches, such as "Caterpillar," some rather weird flights of imagination, such as "A Tonic for Satan," and a few miscellaneous contributions make up this rather strange little book which is intended for children. H. D.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

IT would be easy to fill several pages with notes on the host of interesting points raised by Dean Inge in his last book, *The Lay Thoughts of a Dean* (G. P. Putnam's Sons, 7*s.* 6*d.* net.). The Dean is a close observer of men and of manners. He has the courage of his convictions and does not hesitate to express his views, pleasant or unpleasant. He is gifted with an excellent memory. This enables him to draw upon the large resources of illustrative matter which he has acquired by more than usually extensive reading and an interest in an extraordinarily wide range of subjects. His style is remarkably easy and clear, and it is a pleasure to read his crisp and often epigrammatic sentences. He has been invited by the editors of several of our widely circulated papers to write his views on current events and has thus found an excellent medium for self-expression and for useful instruction on a variety of topics. He passes "from grave to gay, from lively to severe," and is equally at home in each. Probably no ecclesiastic is so widely read at the present time, and in the opinion of many none is more interesting and entertaining. At the same time his scholarship is acknowledged by all and the weight of his learning makes him an acceptable speaker at the gatherings of the learned. He is one of those chosen to preach on such special occasions as a meeting of the British Association. We may not agree with every opinion expressed, but we have to acknowledge that he is able to give good reasons for all that he advances. The present volume shows the Dean mostly in a lighter vein, and it reveals his personality in many interesting ways.

It is a reprint of a number of essays which have appeared in various papers in recent years, and is divided into four sections: Literary, Political, Social, and Religious. In the first he pays a tribute to the memory of one of his great predecessors in the deanery of St. Paul's, John Colet, one of the precursors of the Reformation and the friend of Erasmus. Two essays on Aphorisms bring together a collection of sayings of great men. They are in happy harmony with much of the Dean's own mood and tempt us to extensive quotation. We must be content with two, both of them from Bishop Creighton, whose death many of us regarded as a great blow to the true lines of progress of the Church of England. They are "Socialism will only be possible when we are all perfect, and then it will not be needed," and "We cannot improve the world faster than we improve ourselves." Lovers of the English language will appreciate the Dean's exposure of some flagrant tendencies towards abuses in its pronunciation and use. In the political section the War naturally figures largely, and the effect upon population is considered at some length. As this volume is in some measure intended for American readers it is natural that prominence is given to Ambassador Page's Letters and other matters of interest across the Atlantic. The essays on social affairs are widely

varied. Eugenics have a prominent place. Psychotherapy is severely criticized. It gives an opportunity for one of those welcome pieces of self-revelation which are scattered throughout the essays. "I believe that my reason was given to me that I may know things as they are, and my will that I may bring my refractory disposition into harmony with the laws of my Creator. I will neither twist up the corners of my mouth when I am in the dumps, nor tell myself that in all respects I am getting better and younger and handsomer every day. If I can help it, I will play no tricks with my soul in the faith that though bluff may sometimes pay very well in this world, it will cut a very poor figure in the next."

In dealing with religious topics the Dean discusses the Lambeth Conference of 1920 without much regard for episcopal susceptibilities. He is not a worshipper at the prelatical shrine. He points out that "the Bishops representing overseas dioceses have not a very high average of intellectual distinction," and touches upon episcopal weaknesses by a quotation from Bishop Phillips Brooks, "The bishops are not very wise, nor very clever; but they think they are, and they very much enjoy being bishops." Only a bishop could have said that, and only the Dean of St. Paul's could dare to repeat it. His treatment of reunion in Great Britain exposes the narrowness and the ecclesiastical theorizing which stand in the way of much-needed advance in unity with our non-episcopal brethren.

Such a strong current of wholesome fresh air on the dusty corners of our mental, moral, personal and national life is useful. It helps to bring things to the test of sound common sense, to clear away cobwebs and to restore sanity where it is likely to be lost by some paralysing obsession. May the Dean long continue his work of *censor morium* even though he gives some of us shrewd knocks on occasions. Probably we are all the better for them. "Faithful are the wounds of a friend," though the friend is not often thanked for his efforts.

Dr. Adam C. Welch, Professor of Hebrew in New College, Edinburgh, is well known to Biblical students south of the Tweed. It was a happy thought to invite him to give a course of lectures at the Vacation School for Old Testament Study in King's College Hostel in September, 1925. He chose as his subject, the Psalter in Life, Worship and History. The lectures have now been published by Mr. Humphrey Milford, the Oxford University Press (5s. net). The titles of the four lectures are :—The Psalter and Nature, The Psalter and History, The Psalter and Worship, The Psalter and the Inner Life. He expresses the view in his preface that "the greatest need in Old Testament exegetical literature is a modern hand-book or commentary on the Psalter, which would bring within the reach of English readers some knowledge of the work which has been done in recent years on this book, both in Great Britain and abroad." Dr. Welch's all too brief treatment of the Psalter in these lectures is a fitting introduction to the study. The first lecture shows a keen appreciation of the Hebrew attitude towards

nature. The second displays the view taken of the divine action in history. The national religion was more concerned with its moral and spiritual character than with its ceremonial side. On this element the Psalter dwells insistently and constantly. Its place in worship is considered in the next lecture and some of the accepted theories are questioned. The last lecture is the most interesting of all. Its purpose is to show how the hymns of a sharply defined community have become the classic expression in the wider world of the relation of the soul to God. This is a scholar's treatment of a great theme, and its practical value is not overshadowed by the weight of its learning.

Books descriptive of life in other lands have a special fascination for many of us. Accounts of the habits and customs of the people in tropical countries have their own interest, and present contrasts with the developments of civilization in the more temperate zones. When we come nearer home to the countries which many of us are familiar with, through visits to the Continent, we have still much to learn of the institutions of the larger European countries. Probably the lands that we know least about are the smaller countries of Europe. The Balkan provinces, for example, especially since the War, are unfamiliar to most of us, and some of the northern lands are equally unfamiliar. Mr. Frank Fox, who has already written books on *The Balkan Peninsula*, *Switzerland*, and various portions of the British Empire, has just brought out a book on *Finland To-Day*, which gives the sort of information we are glad to have. There is a short account of the origin of the Finns; then an historical *résumé* telling of the relationship of Finland to Russia and Sweden and the influence of these connections on its development. Several chapters tell of the present industrial conditions, and of the work of the Finns as farmers, foresters and manufacturers. In 1919 Finland secured its liberty and an interesting account is given of the form of government set up. The country adopted prohibition, and Mr. Fox tells of some of the difficulties encountered in enforcing it. A chapter is devoted to the guidance of the tourist. There are a number of excellent illustrations. The volume gives a good impression of an efficiency-loving people who are determined to make good in every way, and not least in educational matters. Their attention to physical culture, as recent events have shown, is strikingly effective. The publishers are A. & C. Black and the price is 7*s*. 6*d*. net.

The name of Dr. Edersheim has long been known as the author of several well-known works on the life and time of our Lord. He made a special study of the conditions of Palestine in that period, and of the thought, literature and customs of our Lord's contemporaries. These he set out in a number of works which have had a deservedly wide circulation. He devoted special attention to the Temple and its services, and gave the results of his researches in

his book *The Temple, Its Ministry and Service as they were at the Time of Jesus Christ.* In another volume he dealt with the more general aspects of the life of the period, the methods of travel, the roads, the inns, the home surroundings and education of the children, the position of women, Jewish trades and commerce and some of the religious sects. These are contained in a volume entitled *Sketches of Jewish Life in the Days of Christ.* The Religious Tract Society has recently brought out new editions of the two books at six shillings each. They contain an amount of information which is specially useful to Bible Class leaders and teachers. We recognize that we cannot fully understand many of the allusions in the New Testament without some acquaintance with the mode of life and the customs of the people of the land. Dr. Edersheim has provided in these volumes the necessary information. His object has been throughout to illustrate the New Testament History and teaching, and the full index shows how completely this has been done. The Book on the Temple gives full information as to the Jewish feasts and festivals. It explains the meaning of many of the symbolic acts in the worship, and deals specially with the relation between the Passover and the Lord's Supper.

I expect the volumes of "Everyman's Library" are well known to most of my readers. They provide, at moderate cost and in a small form suited for overcrowded shelves, a supply of the best literature in many departments of thought. The number of books in the Library is now close on eight hundred, and the choice has been made with such true catholicity that every taste is met. Among the latest additions to the series there are three which I can recommend for general reading. Mr. E. H. Blakeney, M.A., is well known to readers of THE CHURCHMAN. He is a frequent contributor to its pages, and many of the reviews of books which its readers enjoy are from his pen. He is a lover of Switzerland and its mountains, as well as an expert climber. In a volume entitled *Peaks, Passes, and Glaciers,* he has collected a number of essays by great climbers of the past and has added a series of notes to help the uninitiated. Accounts are given of the first ascents of some of the giants of the Alps, and thrilling experiences are recorded by such well-known pioneers as Wills, Tyndall, Mathews, Hinchliff, Ball, Hardy, and Kennedy. Better known even than most of these are Sir Leslie Stephen, the author of *The Playground of Europe,* Canon Llewelyn Davies, and Edward Whymper, whose name is associated with the first ascent of the Matterhorn and the terrible accident which overtook the party on their descent. The account of the accident is given here as it was sent to *The Times* by Whymper, soon after the unfortunate controversy broke out as to the cause of the catastrophe. A chapter on the dangers of mountaineering by Leslie Stephen will remove any false impressions which may be entertained on the subject. We are indebted to Mr. Blakeney for a delightful and interesting book.

For many students of history the reign of Louis XIV has a special fascination. The great monarch who could say without exaggeration " L'État, c'est moi " was a unique personality in the records of Europe. It is little wonder that French writers have delighted to depict the glories of the era and to represent it as the golden age of France. Yet both the Monarch and the age had striking defects which are more obvious to us than to those who lived nearer his time. We are fortunate in having very full information of the life of the times, and specially of the Court and its customs and its intrigues, but probably no brief account of the reign excels that of Voltaire, which is translated by Martyn P. Pollack and appears as number 780 of " Everyman's Library." To Voltaire the reign of Louis XIV was the beginning of the modern era in France. It brought " the birth of a revolution in the human mind." We may make allowance for some measure of exaggeration on the part of the French writer who wrote under the influence of another revolution, though a less eventful one than that of 1789. He gives some interesting details of ecclesiastical affairs, noting the position of the Gallican Church, the influence of Calvinism, the origin of Jansenism and the development of Quietism. His dislike of Mme. Guyon is well known and has to be discounted. With all its limitations Voltaire's Louis XIV is a piece of historical writing which appeals strongly to the student of European history.

Another of the recent additions to the Library is Charles Kingsley's *Madam How and Lady Why*. It is a book from which several generations of young people have received some of their first lessons on the how and the why of this earth, and many more may yet learn from it with equal profit.

With each addition to the volumes of *The Speaker's Bible* the value of the series becomes increasingly evident. The latest volume to appear is on *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, Volume III (*The Speaker's Bible* Offices, Aberdeen, 9*s.* 6*d.* net). In just over two hundred and fifty quarto pages four chapters of St. Luke's Gospel are treated. This indicates the fullness of the treatment, but when we remember that the chapters are from XV to XIX, and that they contain some of the most wonderful and instructive of our Lord's parables, we are not surprised. In fact those who are the fortunate possessors of the volume will be profoundly thankful for the fullness with which such parables as the Prodigal Son, the Unjust Steward, Dives and Lazarus, the Importunate Widow, the Pharisee and the Publican are treated. The parable of the Prodigal Son receives, as it deserves, special attention. Perhaps no subject is more frequently taken as a basis for sermons. It represents so much that is central in the message of Christ, that preachers return to it again and again and are constantly seeking fresh methods of expressing the wonderfully varied applications of its simple story. They will find in the fifty-six pages devoted to it here a host of new and valuable suggestions. Dr. J. F. McFadyen contributes an introduction

which brings out several points in the parable not usually observed, while in the treatment of the text nothing seems to have been omitted. As many as three separate sermons are given on the important words "When he came to himself." Dr. J. H. Morrison contributes similar introductions to the parables of the Unjust Steward and the Importunate Widow. A commentary on this generous scale provides busy preachers with a wealth of suggestion and illustration far beyond anything that was available for their predecessors. The level of preaching should be immensely elevated by the existence of the help given in these volumes. Happy is the younger generation of clergy for whom such ample stores of information are at hand. The commonplace book of even their most industrious predecessors could show nothing like the fullness and variety of these notes and illustrations.

Mr. Joseph Hocking's last novel, *Andrew Boconnoc's Will* (Cassell, 7*s.* 6*d.* net.), will be found an interesting study of the influence of Anglo-Catholicism on character. The hero is the son of a sturdy and rich Yorkshire manufacturer who is repelled by the un-English ways of the Anglo-Catholic priests in their endeavours to bring the doctrines of the Church of Rome into the Church of England. Julian Boconnoc comes under the influence of some of the most extreme of them while at the University of Oxford, and becomes in everything but name a Romanist. He is not received into that Church as his confessor advises him to remain in the Church of England. He is to help in the task of winning over the Church to communion with Rome. He is expected to be heir to the immense wealth of his father, and his father is determined that none of his money will ever be used for the purposes of such propaganda work. The story tells how he carries out this purpose and how at the same time he seeks to save his son from the intrigues with which he is surrounded. In the course of the story some plain facts are stated as to the influence of "Catholicism" both of the Anglican and the Roman types. The influence of Rome upon the life of Spain is depicted, and those who know the condition of Spain are able to confirm his picture as a true one. In the closing chapters emphasis is laid upon the effect of a revival of spiritual religion in the removal of all the barriers set up between Christians by an artificial ecclesiasticism. Mr. Hocking has made a careful study of the facts and has presented them effectively. Books of this kind are needed to counteract the glamour which some present-day novelists try to throw over the Romanizing movement in our Church.

G. F. I.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE HISTORY OF CONFIRMATION.

CONFIRMATION, OR THE LAYING ON OF HANDS. Vol. I. Historical and Doctrinal. By Various Writers. *S.P.C.K.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

Many will welcome this scholarly work on the historical and doctrinal aspects of the rite of Confirmation. There are in existence many Manuals of Confirmation, but there are few books which give anything like a complete history of the rite. The fullest, before the present volume, was that published in 1897 by Dr. Wirgman. There has been much research since then, and this book seeks to make public the results of it.

More than half the book is occupied by Canon Ollard's chapter on Confirmation in the Anglican Communion. This is a very mine of information, but errs somewhat on the side of prolixity. It will hardly be read through, but it is well that it has been compiled for purposes of reference. It is eminently fair. Three of the other chapters also are mainly, if not entirely, historical. Dr. Maclean writes on the Theory and Practice of Confirmation in the Church up to the Reformation, Dr. Feltoe on Confirmation Rites, and Mr. T. J. Hardy and Mr. R. M. French contribute the two sections of Chapter V, dealing respectively with the administration of Confirmation in (A) the Latin Churches, and (B) the Eastern Orthodox Church. The concluding chapter, by Dr. Relton, is philosophical, and deals with much else besides Confirmation.

For most readers interest will centre in the chapters in which doctrine predominates. These are Dr. Lowther Clarke's on Laying on of Hands in the New Testament, and Mr. K. D. McKenzie's on the Relation of Confirmation to Baptism. Perhaps the most important doctrinal question about Confirmation is that discussed in this latter chapter. In 1892 the *Church Quarterly Review* contained an article entitled "Primitive Teaching on Confirmation and Its Relation to Holy Baptism." To answer this article was Dr. Wirgman's self-imposed task in the book above mentioned. As to the doctrine taught in the article, he writes (*Doctrine of Confirmation*, p. vii):

"It is not too much to say that (it) . . . is contrary to the received teaching of the Western Church for many centuries, and to the current teaching that has been accepted in the Anglican Church since the Reformation."

The doctrine is that "Confirmation is an integral part of Holy Baptism in such a sense that what we usually call Baptism is, without it, an unfinished fragment" (Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, p. 414); and that the divine indwelling of the Spirit is given by means of Confirmation alone. It is even held that "Baptism and Confirmation are as much parts of the same sacrament as the consecrated Bread and Wine are parts of the one sacrament of the Holy Eucharist." Dr. Lowther Clarke, and indeed all the writers in this book, with the possible exception of

Mr. McKenzie and Dr. Relton, lean towards, if they do not fully accept, this view.

In April, 1922, I discussed this theory in the CHURCHMAN. My article was not, as Dr. Clarke supposes (p. 24), a criticism of his articles in *Theology*. In it I made but two references to any words of his, and one of these was to a paragraph which has now, with wisdom, been omitted. In the article I described Dr. Mason's theory, in words which Dr. Clarke seems to question, as one "which is fashionable to-day with a certain section of Anglo-Catholic theologians." Mr. McKenzie's words in Chapter VI of the present work support my description. He writes that the view "has in modern times been associated principally with the names of Dr. Mason and Fr. Fuller." Further, he mentions three other views on the matter, of the first of which he says that it "has been commonly held in the Anglican Communion by the upholders of the sacramental doctrine of Confirmation: it was the view of the Tractarian Fathers." He also shows that something very similar is the doctrine of the Council of Trent. The words just quoted from Mr. McKenzie's chapter support also another of my statements that the doctrine is "of comparatively recent growth in the Anglican Church." One has but to compare Mr. Bicknell's recent work on the XXXIX Articles with that of Bishop Forbes to see how the teaching has varied in fifty years. Bishop Forbes wrote in 1871:

"Baptism and Confirmation standing thus distinct in Holy Scripture, the intimate relation between them, and the custom of administering one immediately after the other, do not prove their identity. In matter, form, and character they are entirely different." For Mr. Bicknell, on the other hand, "Confirmation is really a part of Baptism," and "the separation of the two parts of a single sacrament is unscriptural, and the best solution is that it ceases at the earliest opportunity." Dr. Wirgman has some strong words on the point (p. viii):

"It would be strange if the Catholic doctrine of Confirmation had lain dormant and undeveloped for nineteen centuries, and that it had been reserved to these writers to unfold it for the first time to an expectant Catholic Christendom."

The arguments against the view are well summarized by Dr. Darwell Stone (*Outlines of Christian Dogma*, pp. 166–73), and will be found at greater length in Dr. Wirgman's book.

It should be remembered that this is no mere academic question, as Mr. McKenzie allows (p. 286). The view favoured in this book depreciates a sacrament of our Lord's appointment; it will require, if it prevails, a reconstruction of the Baptismal Offices and the Church Catechism; it will require a new definition of membership in the Church Universal; and it will certainly put an additional and unnecessary obstacle in the way of Christian Reunion. When in 1920 the Bishops of the Anglican Communion laid down the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion as essentials of reunion, charity requires us to assume that they did not mentally include Confirmation with Baptism.

J. M. HARDEN.

THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY.

LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION. Vol. I. By J. Mackinnon, D.D. *Longmans*, 16*s*.

We are thankful that this volume has been published. Its writer is well qualified for the task, as he has devoted a lifetime to the study of Ecclesiastical History and is Professor of the subject in the University of Edinburgh. We have lately had published the six-volume life of Luther by a Roman Catholic German writer who has been accepted by many English authors as the man who used the latest information and was thereby enabled to prove that Luther was by no means the honest and able man he is supposed to have been by Protestant writers. And his misrepresentations have been quoted by many to discredit the Reformation. As Dr. Mackinnon says: "It has, in its translated form, contributed to diffuse a one-sided view of Luther among English-speaking readers, and it would appear that it has had some influence in accentuating the anti-Luther spirit in certain circles." It is strange that while this book has been translated, no translation has been made of the recent works of Continental Protestants. Probably the war is responsible for this. Grisar had the field to himself and was eagerly quoted by the enemies of Luther.

This volume carries the life of Luther to the declaration against Indulgences (1517) and gives a most attractive account of his early life and his relation to his family. There can be no doubt of his devotion to what he believed to be true, for he abandoned worldly prospects to become a monk. As a monk he was most strict in his observance of his vows, and what is more, when he obtained a position of authority he used it as a Reformer in his Order. His visit to Rome had a marked influence on his mind, and there is a great deal in the current saying, "Rome seen, faith lost." He was never a humanist in the full sense of the word. His mind had been influenced by Tauler, who drove home to his soul much of what he had learned from Augustine. We have never seen more clearly presented the real character of the Scholastic theology that held Luther captive for so long. We can understand as we read Dr. Mackinnon the character of the spiritual conflict that martyred the soul of Luther, and its resolution when he grasped the teaching of St. Paul on Justification and man's relation to God. The whole attitude of the man to theology and life was changed. His influence as a teacher grew steadily. When the decisive moment came he took his stand against the teaching of Tetzel—never dreaming what it involved.

And here we note what so many fail to observe in the conflict between Roman Catholic and Protestant writers. Much is made of the famous saying, "As soon as the money in the coffer rings, the soul from the fire of purgatory springs." This cannot be found in the works that have survived recording the sayings of Tetzel. "But it appears from his antitheses and other writings against Luther, and from the testimony of reliable witnesses, that he did

preach in that sense." Again and again, when teaching is crystallized in a saying and that saying cannot be traced, it is asserted that no such doctrine is taught or practice followed. But facts show that the words express accurately what was said or done.

We sincerely hope that all who are interested in the Reformation will make an effort to read this work, for it makes plain much that is generally obscured by ignorance concerning the character of Scholasticism and the relation between the Renaissance and the religious movement. The Renaissance certainly created an atmosphere that made clear for many the way of the Reformers, but there was a world of difference between humanism and the re-affirmation of the teaching of the Apostle Paul.

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH AND THE REFORMATION. By the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A., D.Litt. *Longmans.* 5s.

Fourteen years ago Dr. Carter published the first edition of this useful guide to the character of the Reformation and its effect upon the Church of England. These years have not been barren in research, and our author did well to enlarge the book and make use of the best knowledge at the disposal of scholars. He has added portraits of personages and illustrations that appeal to the intelligent reader, and thereby has greatly increased the value of his book. There is need for the wide study of the subject. We have seen a great and serious change in the outlook of many of the Clergy and of a section of the Laity, through the counter-Reformation movement known as Anglo-Catholicism, which has not only accepted the medieval teaching disowned by the Reformers, but has also assimilated many of the counter-Reformation innovations of the Roman Church. And this passes as Catholicity, owing to the ignorance of many and the blindness of others. History has been neglected, and the Church pays the price of its negligence in the spread of teaching that alienates the Church of England from the great Reformation Churches and makes the teaching of many of its officers approximate that of Rome. We need guidance, and Dr. Carter supplies exactly the type of instruction demanded by the times.

Canon Dixon, who wrote with a full knowledge of the Reformation period, has said, " the Reformers who let themselves be called Protestants were never weary of declaring themselves Catholic," and " the opposite of Catholic is not Protestant but heretic; the opposite of Protestant is not Catholic but Papal." These words give the key to much that is current in our day. Protestantism is hated not on account of its lack of Catholicity but on account of its opposition to Roman Catholicism, and as we read the pages of Dr. Carter we see that the Reformers were steadily opposed to the special teaching of the Church of Rome, and in their writings and works did all in their power to show its falsity. This explains why those who have strong sympathy with Roman developments are so

anxious to discredit the Reformers. "The Reformation was a fact of critical importance in our national history." "It brought changes with it which cannot be overlooked or disregarded at will. Contemptuous references to 'the so-called Reformation,' implying that it was a mere illusion, are out of date. They have never carried weight with serious historians, nor have they improved the credit of those who have indulged in them." Thus writes Professor Hamilton-Thompson, who cannot be described as a partisan Protestant. Dr. Carter shows us how the Reformation involved fundamental religious changes in doctrine, worship, and discipline. He traces the movement from the beginning and points out the various steps that were taken to make evident the rejection of Roman doctrine by the Reformers and the Church of England. The halo that is placed on the Medieval Church by partisans is far from being deserved. Even in the thirteenth century Roger Bacon wrote, "The new orders are already horribly decayed from their first dignity. The whole Clergy is intent upon pride, lechery and avarice." We see how the efforts at internal reform were defeated, and that when the crisis came in England Cranmer was raised up by God to do a work that in Divine Providence will never be undone. The story of our Prayer Book is accurately told, and when its Revision is demanded in a medieval sense it is well that the facts should be known. Of all the books dealing with the main problems the Church has to face in regard to its relation with Rome and Anglo-Catholicism, we know of none that deserves a wider circulation among thoughtful Churchmen than this admirable historical record.

AN ANGLO-CATHOLIC APOLOGIA.

ESSAYS: CATHOLIC AND CRITICAL. Edited by E. G. Selwyn. *S.P.C.K.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

After *Lux Mundi, Essays; Catholic and Critical* are an exposition of what is known to its authors as the Catholic Faith. Every age requires a re-presentation of what ought to be fundamental beliefs that lie at the basis of Christianity, for although the faith remains the same its environment changes. The acceptance of the doctrine of relativity in every department of human intellectual life demands that the most influential factor in the lives of men should be set forth as illuminated by modern knowledge. If it be true, then the more it changes the more it is seen to be truth. And our difficulty with much that passes for Catholicity is that it is not catholic in any true sense of the word, but the accretions of centuries that have grown round the faith once delivered to the Saints, which has alone the right to be considered catholic.

The years that have passed since the appearance of *Lux Mundi* have brought into review an entirely new set of circumstances. The growth of Comparative Religion, the science—real or pseudo—of the New Psychology and the problems raised by the Great War all demand attention. And the development of Anglo-Catholi-

cism from Tractarianism into the toleration, if not the acceptance, of the teaching of the counter-Reformation is a factor that requires exposition. The writers of *Essays: Catholic and Critical* are not always in full agreement, but they represent fairly the approach of the dominant school of Anglo-Catholicism to the solution of questions of very grave importance.

Let it be said at once, from the literary point of view, they have done their work well. The outstanding essay is by Professor A. E. Taylor on "The Vindication of Religion." His ability is as unquestioned as his gift of explanation is remarkable, and it would be hard to find a more balanced or more satisfying *apologia* for Christian Theism than that contained in this paper. He shows that it is impossible from the nature of the subject to demonstrate the existence and the character of God. Relevant suggestions are discovered in Physical Nature, the Moral Life, and in the Religious Life. He makes plain the rising ascent and argues that the agreement of the three independent sources gives an invincible force to the contention that Christian Theism is justifiable at the bar of reason. His interpretation of Otto is sympathetic, and we think that he is inclined to place too much stress on his contribution to the elucidation of religion as due to the Numinous. He does not fall into the error of thinking belief in the Numinous to be irrational. Otto has a message for an age lacking in reverence, but he does not justify all irrational beliefs that inspire wonder as true. We think that when Professor Taylor alludes to saying the words of Institution *sotto voce* as a witness to the transcendent otherness, he goes too far.

Dr. James has written an interesting paper on the relation of the beliefs of primitive man to Christian doctrine and sets forth the development of belief in Immortality and God. The two papers on Authority, dealing respectively with "Authority as a Ground of Belief" (Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson) and "The Authority of the Church" (Wilfred L. Knox), are unsatisfying. Dr. Rawlinson tells us that "the purely dogmatic teaching of the Church represents the statement in intellectual terms of such truths as the Church holds to be either implicit in the truth of the Gospel or else presupposed by the assumption of the validity of her spiritual life." Needless to say, the second source leaves us at the mercy of much unfounded speculation. Mr. Knox, after discussing the claims of Rome, says: "Just as the authority of the episcopate is held to be *de jure divino* on the ground that by a process of legitimate development the episcopate has become the repository of the authority given to the Apostles, so it might be held that the Papacy possesses authority *de jure divino* as having become by a similar process the repository of a primacy held by St. Peter. Anglican theologians can and should be prepared to discuss this possibility with an open mind. But while doing so they cannot concede the actual claims made or presupposed by the majority of Roman theologians in regard to the position and authority of the Papacy." It is this matter of "pre-supposition" that makes the difficulties we are

unable to overcome in the Anglo-Catholic as well as the Roman conceptions of authority.

Mr. L. S. Thornton writes with force, beauty, and understanding on " The Christian Conception of God," and his paper well deserves study. Sir Edward Hoskyns gives us one of the best and most concise accounts we have read of the major problems raised by the modern study of the Christology of the Synoptics. He affirms the trustworthy character of the Gospels, and maintains that they contain the Gospel proclaimed by Christ. Dr. J. K. Mozley writes with his customary ability on the " Incarnation," and his short dissertation on Miracle is at once a plea for its credibility and an affirmation of the reality of the miraculous element in the Gospels. We can only mention Dr. Bicknell's paper on " Sin and the Fall," with its departure from certain aspects of the traditional view, and Dr. Mozley's paper on " Grace and Freedom." We do not think that the latter has answered Dr. Oman's view of the excessive stress laid upon the reception of Grace in the Eucharist. Dr. Oman represents more faithfully the New Testament teaching on this subject.

Mr. Kirk is excellent on the Atonement, and we regret that we cannot say the same of Mr. Selwyn on the Resurrection. His theory of Vision appearances neither fits in with the New Testament narrative nor is it in accord with the plain teaching of the Creeds. They are more than mystical experiences of the disciples. He says: " The details of the evidence, moreover, confirm the view, which on broad psychological and historical grounds is seen to be most probable, that the visions and locutions experienced by the disciples —even though in the strict sense ' subjective '—were veridical, for it shows them to be traditional in form and vocational in character; and this vocational character is the common element in virtue of which St. Paul speaks of all the experiences as of the same validity for faith." We do not think that these words in any real sense can be considered a fair account of the New Testament references to the Resurrection.

Mr. Milner-White on " The Spirit of the Church in History " is the most rhetorical writer in the book, and the restrained nature of the comments on " The Reformation " by Professor A. Hamilton Thompson, will, we hope, moderate the language of Anglo-Catholics when they discuss this great movement. Mr. N. P. Williams refutes the idea that the Sacraments owe their origin to alien religious views, and Mr. Will Spens in his paper on " The Eucharist " sets forth a very difficult conception of the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. We thought our inability to grasp it was due to defective capacity on our part, but we find that we are in exactly the same position as members of the Anglo-Catholic School, whose intellectual strength Mr. Spens would be the last to question. When he deals with the Real Presence he leaves us in no doubt. " The devotional use of the Reserved Sacrament is not something independent of Communion and deriving from some separate conception. It is precisely because devout reception unites us to our Lord that the

Reserved Sacrament is His Body, that He is present in a special manner, and that He can thus be adored." In a book that contains so much that is excellent, it is sad to meet views such as those we have criticized put forward, and in the face of Mr. Spens' statement we see where Anglo-Catholicism stands on the great question of devotions before the Reserved Sacrament.

BISHOP GORE'S NEW BOOK.

CAN WE THEN BELIEVE? By the Rt. Rev. Charles Gore, D.D. *John Murray.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Dr. Gore has followed his usual custom of supplementing his writing with a volume covering much the same ground and taking into account criticisms and new knowledge. His trilogy has been widely read and has received the commendation of those who differ from his opinions on many matters. Dr. Gore never leaves his readers in doubt as to his convictions, and when the question is asked, "Can We then Believe?" we have to consider whether the reader has in view the Christianity of our Lord and the Primitive Church or the Christianity which is known as Anglo-Catholicism. For there is a great difference between the two. And having read the trilogy and this supplemental volume we can say all that Primitive Christianity has in common with Anglo-Catholicism we unhesitatingly believe, and are grateful to Dr. Gore for his emphasis on what is revealed in the New Testament, but the particularist doctrines of Anglo-Catholicism we find no reason for accepting. And yet we note two points worthy of attention. In the first place, Dr. Gore is less dogmatic in his presentation of the dogma of the Real Presence and its character. He fails to meet the objection brought to his notice at the Chelmsford Conference and repeated by Dr. Temple. "When Christ in His natural body said to the disciples as He administered the bread, 'This is My body,' He cannot have meant, 'This is My risen, ascended and glorified body,' nor certainly can He have meant that the bread was His physical organism, or that the cup contained the blood then circulating in His veins." The Bishop says: "This is a very old difficulty, and I wish to maintain a largely agnostic position with regard to it." We do not think he justifies his agnosticism by the contention that our Lord was instituting for the future, without reference to what He was then giving them. In the second place, we observe a softening of his attitude towards the cult of the Reserved Sacrament. He reaffirms his view that the development of the *cultus* in the Roman Church has tended to obscure or even to lead to an absolute denial of the doctrine of the permanent dwelling of Christ in our hearts, and urges that we had "better attend constantly to the only purposes for which our Lord appears to have instituted the Eucharist, viz. for commemoration of Himself and His sacrificial death and for the communion in His body and blood." And yet he writes: "It is recognized that the post-Medieval and extra-

liturgical cultus, which it is sought to introduce amongst us, was unknown in the Church universal for a thousand years or more, and is still unknown among the Orthodox. I do not wish to see it stringently prohibited under a compulsory discipline. But I think it ought to be discouraged as tending towards a false theology."

We are struck by the Bishop's emphasis on Butler's statement that "probability is the very guide" of life and that absolute certainty on a great many matters cannot be attained. It is the habit of Dr. Gore and his school to be absolutely certain on matters that are by no means part of the Revelation of God in Holy Scripture and to build their ecclesiasticism on this foundation. His view of the Church and the Priesthood are very far removed from what can be inferred from Scripture, and while we acknowledge that there is need to-day of a Christian philosophy and accept in the main the postulates he lays down in his really fine essay on "Religion and Philosophy," we do not follow him in his assertion, "To these must be added the sacramental system of the Church as witnessing to the principle that material things are made the necessary vehicles of spiritual gifts." From one point of view "vehicle" may be interpreted innocently, but knowing what lies behind it in Dr. Gore's mind we by no means admit that "the sacramental system of the Church," carrying with it the idea of Apostolic succession and all it implies, the localized Presence and all that flows from it, is either a necessary or an advisable postulate of Christian philosophy. It is this "must" habit that vitiates so much of what the Bishop has written, and makes many who accept his adhesion to the Creeds and his conclusions on historical and theological problems unable to assent to what with him are fundamental ecclesiastical contentions.

May we add that the Notes appended to this book can in no way be overlooked? They are even more important than the text. And why do Bishop and Publisher issue a book of this class without either an index or an analysis of its contents?

A NEW ENGLISH HISTORY.

A HISTORY OF ENGLAND. By George Macaulay Trevelyan. *Longmans.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

To take up *A History of England* by Mr. Trevelyan is to arouse great expectations with full confidence that they will not be disappointed, and they will not have been unless the reader was expecting a textbook of the ordinary kind useful for examinations, recording the events in their due course, and supplemented by chronological, dynastic, and other tabulated forms. The book before us is not of that kind. It presupposes a fair acquaintance with English history; and, though it can be read with enjoyment and profit by the ordinary general reader, it will be best appreciated by those who have already given considerable study to the subject.

It is rather a commentary on and explanation of events and movements than a chronicle, but the view presented is entirely

devoid of partisanship. The object is to make clear how the successive changes in social, religious, political, industrial, and commercial life came about; and, given the existing factors, to show that the historical evolution was natural, orderly, and, indeed, inevitable. If during the greater part of the fourteenth century the feudal nobility with large bands of followers spent their time on the Continent in the vain attempt to conquer France, it followed that, when they were driven out, England became flooded with humiliated and disappointed men, who had no interest or training but for war. It was but natural, then, that the baronial leaders, debarred from military exploits abroad, should make war on each other. Hence the Wars of the Roses, which ravaged the fifteenth century so thoroughly that by the end of it there were hardly any of the great feudal nobility left. The principal force capable of offering effective opposition to the Crown being thus weakened or destroyed, it was a necessary consequence that the power of the Monarchy, especially if in able hands, should grow stronger. Hence the power of the Tudor monarchs of the sixteenth century. Such sequences of cause and effect become obvious enough when pointed out to us. They start from the beginning of history and give us the how and the why of it; but it is few historians who have the insight and skill to make it plain in the way that Mr. Trevelyan does. We learn the immense influence on the direction of national development exercised by such diverse factors as the gradual building up of the Common Law, the rise of the cloth trade, the decay of villeinage, the steady upward growth of the middle classes, the creation of the navy and naval power, and innumerable other causes, with the result that history is seen to live and move as we read it. This book furnishes a useful corrective to the unreal imaginings of writers of the school of Mr. Chesterton, who see the medieval age as it never was, and whose paradoxes seem to be taken as serious history by Roman and Anglo-Catholic reactionaries. Mr. Trevelyan does full justice to the better side of the Middle Ages, but he is not blind to their faults. When admiring the architectural glories which the twelfth and thirteenth centuries have bequeathed to us, we are apt to forget some of the motives which went to the building of those stately shrines. The anarchy and cruelty of the time were such that men openly said that Christ and His Apostles slept. The passage in the contemporary chronicle describing how men were blinded, thrown into noisome dungeons filled with adders, snakes, toads, and other vermin, starved to death or tortured in the castles of the great lords, is often quoted. Mr. Trevelyan reminds us that:—

> "While such atrocities were things of every day in the stone castles that now covered the land, the feudal nobility who had reared them were also engaged with a peculiar zeal in founding and endowing monasteries. In Stephen's reign a hundred new foundations were made. Those who caused and exploited the anarchy were foremost in making liberal grants to the Cistercian monks, who first came over from France at

this period. We need not suppose that religious motives of a very high order were always at work, any more than that they were always absent. A Baron, whose imagination was perturbed by some rude fresco in the church of a long-clawed devil flying off with an armoured knight, would reflect that a grant to a monastery was an excellent way of forestalling any such unpleasant consequences that might follow from his own habits of torturing peasants and depopulating villages."

As we pass from the earlier and Middle Ages to more modern times and on to the Great War, Mr. Trevelyan's book is equally fresh and illuminating. There is the same sense of movement, progress, development, throughout. The movement may not always be in the right direction, nor always continuous; violent action is followed by equally violent reaction, but we are able to note the changes and understand them. It is this picture of the evolution by which our country came to be what it now is that Mr. Trevelyan, in vivid and picturesque style, sets before us.

Mr. Trevelyan is equally clear and instructive in his exposition of religious movements and makes plain the extent to which other than religious influences entered into them—those of concurrent social and political movements for example. At one point, however, in the very difficult period of the Elizabethan Reformation, the book shows some confusion of things which are different. The author evidently regards the Elizabethan Settlement as a compromise, which in one respect no doubt it was. The following passage shows the sense in which it may properly be regarded as a via media between two opposing extremes:—

"Elizabeth approached religion in the modernist spirit of Colet and Erasmus; but two generations after their time, to a mind of their disposition, Rome of the Jesuits was abhorrent and transubstantiation incredible. The Church of Geneva attracted her as little, with its usurpation of the province of the State and its democratic republicanism. If it was left to her successor to say 'No Bishop, no King,' she had thought it and acted on it long before."

But if it is regarded as a compromise on the theological questions which divided Protestant and Papist, as Mr. Trevelyan seems to think, then the case can scarcely be established. He says that

"Cranmer's revived Prayer Book was the golden mean. It served well on board Drake's ships before and after battle with the idolaters, and in parish churches where Bernard Gilpin and other earnest Protestant clergy laboured to instil the new religion into rustic ignorance. Yet the concealed Catholic, doubtfully attending church to avoid the twelvepenny fine, was often less shocked than he feared, and could remind himself that they were still the old prayers, though in English. The book was a chameleon which could mean different things to different people."

But the average "concealed Catholic" possessed very little doctrinal knowledge, and except for its outward show had very little enthusiasm for the older religion, and he had none for the

priesthood. When, however, we come to the bishops, the men who understood, they all, with one solitary exception, preferred to resign their sees rather than accept the new Prayer Book, which was the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. Had it been the first Prayer Book, we may feel sure that many of the bishops would have accepted it, for *that* Prayer Book was certainly a compromise; it was certainly "a chameleon, which could mean different things to different people"; but the Protestantism of the second Prayer Book, which the Elizabethan Settlement restored, was patent to everybody at the time who knew anything of the meaning of the points in dispute.

With regard to Elizabeth's views, it is possible that she was, as Mr. Trevelyan tells us, a child of the Renaissance rather than of the Reformation. At the same time, Mr. Trevelyan observes that she was influenced by such men as Vermigli and Ochino, who were thoroughgoing Protestants, even though they were more philosophers than zealots; and the failure of the Church of Geneva to attract her was not its extreme of Protestant theology, but its "usurpation of the province of the State and its democratic republicanism." It may have suited Elizabeth to hoodwink the Spanish and French ambassadors by throwing on her bishops the responsibility for the Protestant direction in which she was moving, and they were probably too discreet to ask her why she invariably chose to appoint such bishops. The Queen who, just after she came to the throne, hurried away from the Mass in order that she should not be present at the elevation, even though under the then unrepealed Marian statutes it was still legal, must have had some definite convictions of a Protestant kind of her own.

In the matter of bibliography the author shows a judicious and commendable restraint. We are given the names of books for reference or further study, but they are few and carefully chosen, and are at the end of each chapter or section. Any reader who has made use of them will soon learn where further information may be sought. There are several useful maps and a good index to the book, which, considering that it consists of over 700 pages, is a marvel of cheapness in these days. It ought to be in the hands of every teacher and of all who claim to have an intelligent interest in English history.

W. G. J.

A GREAT ENGLISH STATESMAN.

BENJAMIN DISRAELI: The Romance of a Great Career, 1804–1881. By the Right Honourable Sir Edward Clarke, K.C. London: *John Murray*. 10*s*. 6*d*.

We congratulate Sir Edward Clarke very heartily on his life of Benjamin Disraeli. It is written with all the vigour and clearness of a youthful mind, and at the same time with the knowledge and judgment of age and ripe experience. The subject was congenial. Disraeli attained the highest position in English political

life, yet began his career without any of the advantages of social position, friends, and University education. He had the additional disadvantage of belonging to a race less tolerantly regarded in the earlier years of the last century, and less ably represented in circles of influence, than at the present time. He had also in his youth peculiarities of manner and of dress calculated to create prejudice against him. There was even in the days of his age a feeling that there was some mystery attached to him, yet in spite of all these his career was one of extraordinary brilliance. He succeeded in winning the affection of his sovereign, whose fastidiousness was not easily overcome. In Sir Edward Clarke's picture of him, he is presented as a man of strong and firm principles, of great courage, of amazing ability and versatility, and withal of modest and even humble disposition. He never allowed his personal ambition to stand in the way of the great causes which he had at heart. He championed them with the utmost vigour, and was prepared for immense sacrifices for the sake of his party. With enthusiasm for his hero Sir Edward writes in his preface :—

" Every boy will be the better for having before him this great example of industry, courage, and patience.

" Every Conservative will find his political faith refreshed and strengthened by having at hand the golden sayings of the greatest of Conservative leaders.

" And every student of history must be interested in the brilliant and romantic career of the greatest Englishman who was born and died in the nineteenth century."

The formative period in the lives of all great men are specially interesting. We see unfolded before us the influences which moulded their characters and developed their powers. These are briefly but adequately sketched in this volume. Disraeli's father was the well-known author of *The Curiosities of Literature,* a book which had a wide circulation in its day. Probably from his father the future novelist derived his interest in letters. His education was practically confined to the classics, and he had to make long and sustained efforts to supplement the defects of this training by nights of arduous study even when he was engaged in the irksome routine of a solicitor's office. Some opportunities of foreign travel opened his eyes to the wealth of beauty and interest in the world, and his imagination was specially fired by the life of the East. The results are seen in the novels written between the years 1824 and 1837. As soon as he had decided on a political career he showed the sagacity necessary to achieve his purpose. He had ambition backed by unusual ability, but these would have failed him had he not had also those qualities essential to an unknown man who is determined to climb the ladder. He knew how to use his opportunities. Much depends on making the right friends and keeping them. In this Disraeli showed no little skill. He rapidly secured the entrée into the houses of the influential people of his party. He cultivated them with assiduity, and adopted the wise plan of making himself indispensable to them. He was fortunate in his marriage, and the union was one of close

companionship and mutual interests. Mrs. Wyndham Lewis had also the advantage of bringing him wealth, which placed him in a favourable position for the prosecution of his aims. Already, as he confessed to Lord Melbourne, his desire was some day to be Prime Minister.

His first speech in the House of Commons was a failure, but his confidence in himself is shown by its closing sentence, in which he declared, " Though you won't hear me now, the time will come when I will make you hear me," and he fully justified his declaration, and that within a very brief period. As an orator he formed a contrast with his great rival, Gladstone. On one occasion he used in a transient phase of indignation some words regarding Gladstone's oratory which have become classic. He described him as " a sophistical rhetorician, inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity, and gifted with an egotistical imagination that can at all times command an interminable and inconsistent series of arguments to malign an opponent and to glorify himself." An orator has little scope for displaying some of the most effective qualities of speech if he has not a strong adversary to oppose. Probably this may account for the decadence of much of our pulpit oratory. Opposition gives scope for invective and sarcasm, and these Disraeli could wield with unusual effect. He could also build up effective arguments with ease and clearness. His indefatigable industry enabled him to enrich his speeches with a wealth of illustration. He compared on one occasion the rapid change in his opponents' views to the conversion of the Saxons by Charlemagne :—" How were they converted ? In battalions. The old chronicle informs us that they were converted in battalions and baptized in platoons." In the same speech he used these remarkable similes :—" It may be vain now, in the midnight of their intoxication, to tell them that there will be an awakening of bitterness ; it may be idle now, in the springtide of their economic frenzy, to warn them that there may be an ebb of trouble. But the dark and inevitable hour will arrive. Then, when their spirits are softened by misfortune, they will recur to those principles that made England great, and which, in our belief, will only keep England great."

We have only been able to touch upon a very few of the interesting points which this fascinating biography suggests. There are a host of others which our readers must find for themselves. We cannot refrain from mentioning the characteristic actions of the Irish Roman Catholic episcopate on two occasions. Cardinal Manning, on their behalf, had conducted negotiations with the Government and had secured all that they desired, when, at the last moment, to the astonishment of all concerned, the Irish bishops repudiated the agreements. A fine description is given of the scenes connected with the Peace with Honour Conference, the greatest event in an eventful career. The testimonies on the closing page indicate, as Sir Edward Clarke well says, that there was true greatness in the man of whom such things were said. The ability to appreciate the powers of a great man is in itself an attribute of greatness.

A NEW BOOK ON CRANMER.

CRANMER AND THE REFORMATION UNDER EDWARD VI. By C. H. Smyth. *Cambridge University Press.* 10s. 6d.

This book is the Thirlwall and Gladstone Prize Essay for 1925, though very considerably reduced in length for purposes of publication. The author considers that his book has gained rather than lost by compression. This very probably is the case, although many documents which would have been quoted in full had to be summarized, and some conjectures and deductions had to be given with only the slightest indication of the evidence on which they are based. Mr. Smyth has obviously given an immense deal of thought and labour to the production of this Essay. He has gone direct to the primary sources for his information and has produced a lively, original and very interesting book.

Here and there he may be suspected of pulling the reader's leg, as when he writes that "It may be a comforting reflection for a Roman Catholic that at least two-thirds of the martyrs who were burnt by Queen Mary would almost undoubtedly, had Edward VI survived, have been burnt in the normal course by the Church of England" (p. 3). It is enough to remember that there were very few executions in Edward's reign; and that for the first ten or fifteen years of Elizabeth's reign, i.e. until the popish plots against the Queen's life rendered strong action necessary, no one was put to death for his religious opinions. But we need not take the statement seriously.

One merit of Mr. Smyth's Essay is that he does not join in the chorus of vilification which Tractarian and "Anglo-Catholic" writers endeavour to pass off as history. He notes what has been said against Cranmer, but is not impressed. Of the grave lapse which disfigures Lord Macaulay's references to Cranmer in the Essay on Ranke's History of the Popes, Mr. Smyth writes "this tirade affords a better sample of Macaulay's instinct for invective than of his sense of justice" (p. 28).

Another feature of great interest in this book is the amount of detailed information, both individual and collective, which it contains respecting the various eminent Reformers from the Continent, who visited or settled in England and influenced the progress of the Reformation here, though to a much less extent than is popularly supposed. We are given a good deal of biographical detail which clothes with life what too often are mere names, and we can think of them as real persons and not as mere abstractions. It is a common mistake to represent these foreign Reformers as dominating Cranmer and his colleagues. Mr. Smyth gives the material for the correction of this error, though we think that he somewhat over-estimates the extent to which Cranmer personally was influenced by them. It is, however, something to get a portrait even if only in outline of Bucer, Martyr, Alasco, Traheron, Ab Ulmis and many more who for a longer or shorter period found a home in England. A whole chapter is given to Peter Martyr

and Oxford; another to Bucer and Cambridge; another to John Alasco and the Strangers' Church in London. We are given also many particulars of the English visitors abroad and of the hospitality shown to them, but it is hinted that those who could afford to pay liberally for their lodging were the most welcome.

We do not, however, think that Mr. Smyth is right in his contention that Cranmer's doctrine of the Sacrament, which he learned from Bucer, differed materially from that of the Reformers of the Swiss school. We think that the different language used by the various sections or members of the "Reformed" party on the Sacrament has led Mr. Smyth to suppose that there was some radical difference in their essential beliefs regarding it. In truth these differences have been greatly exaggerated. The real line of distinction was and still is between those who attached Christ's presence to the consecrated bread and wine, and those who did not. On the one side were the Romanists with their doctrine of transubstantiation and the Lutherans with consubstantiation; on the other were the various sections of the "Reformed," as they were called. Calvin, Zwingli, Bullinger, Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, and a little later, Jewel and Hooker were of this school. Some of the "Reformed" used highly figurative language, such as we find in Wesley's and other hymns of the eighteenth century: others were more careful and restrained. Some, moreover, used one method of expression at one time, and another at another time. All this has given rise to charges of inconsistency and of divergence of opinion. But a closer analysis of what the writers really meant by the words they used will show that between the various members or groups of the "Reformed"—Swiss, Anglican, French or any other—there was an essential and fundamental agreement; while between the Roman and Lutheran and the "Reformed" there was on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper an essential and fundamental division. The reader may not follow Mr. Smyth in all his conclusions, but he can hardly fail to learn much from this account of the men by whom the doctrinal course of the Reformation was in the short reign of Edward VI principally directed.

W. G. J.

THE INFLUENCE OF FAITH ON LIFE.

FAITH AND SUCCESS. By Basil King. *George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

A number of writers in the United States are seeking to give a practical application of Christianity to life in ways hitherto not sufficiently regarded. They are probably influenced by the claims made for Christian Science, New Thought and similar religious movements developed in America. Their main purpose is to show that a real Christian faith ought to produce far greater results on character, mode of life, intellectual outlook, efficiency and happiness than it does in the great majority of cases at present. A new and

wider application of Christian truth is necessary in order to secure its full effects. These writers are performing a useful service, and their books are in many ways inspiring, even though strong criticism is sometimes expressed on the Churches and the limitations of present Church methods. Mr. King writes with an engaging and discursive frankness. He gives his own experiences and traces the development of his own new conception of Faith. Faith is more than trust, because " to do, to aspire, to scale heights are the motives of its being." It is not merely " allegiance to certain opinions about God " ; it is " the power that co-operates with God." Many things tend to choke the channels of communication of God with man. These must be kept clear not by spasmodic efforts but by constant and right use. Faith proves its efficiency in the elevation of character and the easing of the human lot. Larger and better conceptions are gained of conduct, worship, prayer and the certainty of God. Man's mentality is enlarged, and the power of a true imagination added to memory and reason leads on, as it works with God, to success. Success is not " in the vulgar sense, the gaining of money and position." It is in the work more than in the reward. It is " the full expansion of myself in work for the common good." Such a bare outline of an interesting theme does injustice to the spirit and atmosphere with which it is all worked out. The just criticism of past inadequacies reproves points of failure with kindly but just severity. The application of the view put forward to various kinds of work and the spirit in which they should be undertaken must be left to the reader, who will not fail to share the author's inspiring zest and enthusiasm. We welcome such an interpretation of aspects of Christian power apt to be neglected, and do not doubt that there is much to be learnt of the fuller meaning of both Faith and Success.

THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE PEOPLE AND THE BOOK. Essays on the Old Testament. Edited by Arthur S. Peake, Hon. D.D. Oxford and Aberdeen, Rylands Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the University of Manchester. Oxford: *At the Clarendon Press.* 1925. Pp. xx + 508. 10s. net.

It is many years since so important a book as this has appeared, representing as it does the whole field of O.T. research right up to date. Different readers will take various views as to the value of some of the theories, but all alike will appreciate the facts and material. Professor Peake has taken great pains personally to plan and carry through this volume: the result is the very antithesis of a mere binding together of miscellaneous essays preceded by an editorial foreword. The volume is the work of certain members of the British Society for O.T. Study. It is dedicated to the lamented George Buchanan Gray, whose presidential address of 1922 is printed as the concluding essay of the series.

Dr. Hall of the British Museum opens with 40 pages upon

Israel and the Surrounding Nations. Dr. S. A. Cook (Cambridge University Lecturer in Comparative Religion and Part Editor of the Cambridge Ancient History) follows with an account of the *Religious Environment of Israel.* Mr. G. R. Driver, son of the late Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, writes nearly 50 pages upon the *Study of Hebrew* in the light of other Semitic languages. Professor Adam Welch gives a summary of modern investigations into Hebrew *History.* Dr. Welch's opinions, though by no means unduly advanced, may be a surprise to any who have come to regard him from some of his writings as a rather conservative scholar. Dr. T. H. Robinson (Sec. of the Society) has a useful chapter upon the *Methods* of Higher Criticism ; which is followed by an invaluable essay by Professor McFadyen giving its latest *Results.* Then come three chapters upon *Hebrew Religion* by Professor (now Principal) Lofthouse, Professors Peake and W. Emery Barnes. At this point follow naturally chapters upon *Worship and Ritual* by Canon Oesterley and *Hebrew Psychology* by Principal Wheeler Robinson. The *Contribution of the O.T. to the Religious Development of Mankind* is dealt with by Professor Kennett. From a scholar not noted for conservatism the following words seem significant (p. 395) : " The O.T. is not a compendium of moral rules, but a record of God's revelation to Israel. That revelation is unique." The late Dr. Abrahams (whose works have often been reviewed in this Journal) writes upon the *Jewish Interpretation* of the O.T. The logical sequence in the essays culminates in a chapter upon *The Old Testament in Relation to the New* by Canon Box, formerly Professor at King's College, now Samuel Davidson Professor of O.T. in the University of London. In conclusion it should be stated that there are systematized Bibliographies and an excellent Index.

For those who, whether or not they agree with its principles, desire to know the latest things in O.T. criticism, no cheaper 508 pages could be procured in these days. There is a certain variety among the essays, some being for less advanced students than others.

It is not possible to deal with even one of these essays at length ; but attention might perhaps be called to a view advocated by Principal Lofthouse. " The earlier prophets speak as if sacrifices were no part of the religion revealed in the desert. . . . Such a religion has no need of shrines, priests, or ritual. On these, indeed, Moses appears to have been silent " (pp. 235, 236). The reference of course is to Am. v. 25 ; Jer. vii. 22, 23. It has, however, always seemed to us that, while it is true that God wants the spiritual rather than the mechanical, He *does* desire worship ; and organized worship requires (and even more in ancient times must have required) definite apparatus, even though it may be simple. The point is—mere Ethics is not religion ; and it is extremely improbable that Moses equated the two. " They . . . must worship " (St. John iv. 24).

R. S. C.

SHORTER NOTICES.

PERSONALITY AND RELIGION. By Dr. Morgan-Smith. *Skeffington.* 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Conscience, Temptation, Pain, and Revelation in their respective connection with Personality are discussed in this very well printed book published at 2*s.* 6*d.* With some of what is written we cordially agree. But a discussion on Religion which ignores the Cross does not satisfy. Nor is the absence of any allusion to the Bible in the chapter on " Personality and Revelation " reassuring. Dr. Morgan-Smith believes Temptation and Pain necessary for the development of Personality. Perhaps his general position is best indicated by the following quotation : " The *spirit* of Christianity is fast superseding the *letter*, and the time is probably approaching when men of all shades of opinion will find their point of unity in the spirit of love, the bond of peace and in righteousness of life. There are indications of the dawn of this higher and more spiritual Christianity, in which doctrinal differences will not be allowed to separate those who are knit together in the spirit of Christ. H. D.

" The Living Church " series, issued by Messrs. James Clarke & Co., has already reached goodly proportions, and is notable for the wide range of its subjects. The latest addition is *The Church and the Sex Question* by John W. Coutts, M.A. (6*s.* net). The author deals with a difficult subject with necessary boldness and due reticence: The scope of his treatment is indicated by the titles of his chapters: Sex, Marriage, Divorce, Birth Control and The Church and its Discipline. Nearly a hundred pages are devoted to the general consideration of the fundamental Christian attitude towards the fact of sex. The Christian ideal of marriage is set out clearly. In dealing with the question of divorce more difficult problems are faced. On the whole, in our opinion, Mr. Coutts follows a line of thought which will commend itself to great numbers of Christian people as a true expression of the mind of Christ on the subject. The consideration of Birth Control involves many problems upon which it may not yet be possible to arrive at definite conclusions. There are points on which the medical profession have not so far expressed any united opinion, and it is difficult until these and other of the underlying factors are adequately considered to lay down full rules. Mr. Coutts has done all that is in his power in stating facts so far as they are available, and in indicating the attitude which he thinks Christian people should adopt. His account of Church discipline covers the most important of the points to be considered, setting out the relative claims of mercy and law.

How to be Healthy, Happy and Wise. A Word to the Young by Gordon Aull (The Simpson Company, 15 Piccadilly, Manchester), is a little booklet of practical advice to young people under nine

headings: Money, Spending and Thrift, Debt and Borrowing, Straightness, Prudence, Foresight, Diligence, Making Friends, The Care of Health. The excellent suggestions given are all that the due regard for the ordinary welfare of the individual would indicate. They are the dictates of common sense, and would probably come under the head of that self-love which Bishop Butler commended as essential. They remind us of the principles put forward many years ago by Samuel Smiles in his well-known book *Self Help*. There are numbers of young people for whom such hints, so admirably expressed, would be of the utmost importance. And yet in the end we feel that even after exercising every care to provide for old age, and to exercise prudence and foresight, to live the best life there is something more. Our lives are in God's hands, and the unforeseen may happen and destroy the best-laid plans. There is an appeal to which youth responds which ought perhaps to be placed first. It is the appeal of the great adventure of faith. The true attitude of the Christian youth must be: When God calls I must obey; where He sends me I must go; there must be the sublime confidence that if He demands He will also provide. That represents the highest ideal of life. Our Lord's command was, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God."

What happened at the Reformation.

To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—In my pamphet published under the above title, which originally appeared in your issue of October last, I mention the parish *registers* as contemporary sources of evidence as to changes in religion. In doing so I regret to say that I inadvertently made some confusion. On p. 274 of your Vol. XXXIX, No. 4, and pp. 27 and 28 of the pamphlet, "parish registers" should read "parish accounts."

The registers also sometimes contain "incidental entries" (see J. W. Garrett-Pegge, Introduction to the *Chesham Parish Register*, 1904), and these may also occasionally supply the desired evidence. The parish register of Much Wenlock, for instance, contained most interesting entries illustrating the changes of religion (see J. Charles Cox, *The Parish Registers of England*, 1910). But the published Registers, to which I refer on p. 32 of my pamphlet, do not appear to contain any such incidental entries. They are confined to the record of births, marriages and deaths. The originals may, or may not, contain other entries. The old parish account-books are comparatively rare, but many must still lie hidden in the cupboards and chests of the parish churches.

Your obedient servant,

W. ALISON PHILLIPS.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

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

The Church Congress.—As in previous years there will be a large stall at the Church Congress Exhibition at the Winter Gardens, Southport, 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 "N"), 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. The Exhibition will be open from October 2 to October 8.

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 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.*

The Church and the Future.—The papers read at the Cheltenham Conference this year, and which were published in the July number of THE CHURCHMAN, have now been published in book form with a preface by the Chairman of the Conference, Canon H. A. Wilson, price 1*s.* 6*d.* It was felt that owing to the unusual importance of the subject discussed this year, it would be well to publish a report of the main speeches, as they will probably be found of value to many. They deserve wide circulation and full consideration from all who are interested in the future of religion, and especially from those who desire to see the Church of England take its proper place of leadership in the advance of Christianity throughout the world.

The Word and Sacraments.—Under this title the Archdeacon of Chester has just published in pamphlet form four sermons on current Church questions preached by him in Chester Cathedral. The object of the publication of these sermons, which have valuable notes appended to them, is to provide for general readers a description of the main characteristics of the doctrinal position of the Church of England as set forth in the Prayer Book and Articles, and to show how that position is substantiated by our modern knowledge. The pamphlet is published at the low price of 1*s.* and should be of immense value at the present time.

Britons Beware Leaflets.—Bishop Knox has prepared a series of popular Leaflets for insertion in Parish Magazines. They are issued under the general heading of "Britons Beware Leaflets," and are as follows: (1) Guard Your Church—from Idols; (2) Guard Your Prayer Book—from corruption by false doctrine; (3) Guard Your Parson—from becoming a Sacrificing Priest; (4) Guard Your Sacrament—from incense, gongs, bowing and scraping, and idolatrous adoration; (5) Guard Your Home—from the confessional; (6) Guard Your Children—from false teaching in Day and Sunday Schools; (7) Guard Your Country—from the rule of the Pope; (8) Guard Your M.P.—from voting for the ruin of your Church. Copies of these leaflets can be obtained from the offices of the League at 1*s.* per 100.

To parishes taking quantities of the whole set a considerable reduction will be made on application.

Leaflets.—Two leaflets by the Archdeacon of Macclesfield have just been published at 1*d.* each or 6*s.* per 100, and are reprints from articles which appeared in his Parish Magazine. The first, *The Mutilated Eucharist*, deals particularly with the Sacrament of Holy Communion and the Roman position as compared with that of the Church of England. The second, entitled *St. Peter and the Pope*, has reference to the assertion of the Roman Church that the Church of England is no part of the Catholic Church and has no clergy nor sacraments, and that the Roman Church alone is the sole Church of God. These pamphlets will be found useful for circulation in places where Roman Catholic Missions are being held. The Archdeacon of Macclesfield has also written a little pamphlet on *Convent Schools*, which is published at 1½*d.*, or 1*s.* 8*d.* per dozen, post free. As this is a matter about which there cannot be too many warnings, the booklet is likely to be of real service. It is faithful, reasonable and convincing in its statements. It is attractively printed, and can be enclosed in an ordinary envelope.

The English Reformation.—We are glad to announce that Messrs. Putnam have published a new edition of *Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation*, by Professor A. F. Pollard, at 7*s.* 6*d.* net. The Committee of the League feel that this publication is a very important and useful one, and have purchased a considerable number of copies for sale in the Book Room. The original copies have been out of print for some time, and copies are almost unobtainable second-hand. Professor Pollard in his preface states: "Cranmer chose the better part, but it was one of labour and sorrow. He is the storm-tossed plaything of forces which even Henry VIII could not control; and his soul is expressed in the beautiful and plaintive strains of his Litany, which appealed to men's hearts in those troublous times with a directness now scarcely conceivable. His story is that of a conscience in the grip of a stronger power; but, unless I misread his mind, he surveyed his life's work in the hour of death and was satisfied."

Primitive Church Teaching.—A few years ago the National Church League published a new edition of *Primitive Church Teaching on the Holy Communion*, by the late Dean Goulburn, and copies are still obtainable from the Church Book Room at 1*s.* net (postage 3*d.*). Dean Goulburn enjoyed during his lifetime the reputation of a helpful, devotional writer, and he had a strong realization of the Church as Reformed and Protestant, and felt it his duty to write and speak plainly on the introduction of practices and doctrines that are medieval and were deliberately rejected by our Reformers. In this book he discussed, frankly and fully, Fasting Communion, Non-communicating Attendance, Auricular Confession, The Doctrine of Sacrifice, and The Eucharistic Sacrifice. We have recently received letters strongly recommending the book and congratulating us on its publication, the hope also being expressed that we should endeavour to make it more widely known.