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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1928.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Making Church History.

DURING the last few months the Church of England has been passing through a series of events unparalleled in the experience of any of us. After twenty years of discussion on the revision of the Prayer Book by various bodies representing the clergy and laity of the Church, both before and since the passing of the Enabling Act, the Bishops drew up the final forms in which the proposals were to be presented to the Houses of Parliament. These proposals received the approval of the Church Assembly and of the two Houses of Convocation, but some changes made at the last moment in their form seemed to indicate that there was even then an element of haste in the final presentation of the Measure for the acceptance of the nation in Parliament. Most careful preparations had however been made to secure the support of the Press and to influence public opinion throughout the country. Everything seemed to point to the success of the plan. "All the great organs of opinion in the United Kingdom supported the Book, the recognized leaders of non-Episcopal Churches took the line of neutrality, two-thirds of the House of Lords were in its favour and it was confidently held that a majority of between fifty and a hundred was assured in the House of Commons." Prominent leaders of the Government in both Houses were supporters of the Book, and nothing apparently stood in the way of its receiving the Royal Assent before the end of the year.

The Prayer Book Measure in the House of Commons.

The House of Lords accepted the Measure by 241 to 88 votes. On December 15 it came before the House of Commons, and after one of the most memorable debates in the history of that House, to the surprise of nearly everyone, the voting resulted in the defeat of the Measure by 238 to 205 votes. Many efforts have been made to minimize the significance of this decision. The opposition to the Book was led by the Home Secretary, Sir William Joynson-Hicks, in an impressive speech. His great interest in Church affairs, his long and intimate acquaintance with the intricacies of the theological problems involved, the depth and sincerity of his own religious convictions combined to raise the discussion to a

high level and to produce a profound effect upon the House. He was ably supported by members from all sections of the House. Sir John Simon, Sir Martin Conway, Colonel Applin, Sir Douglas Hogg, Sir M. Macnaghten, Sir Thomas Inskip were among the speakers who on various grounds spoke against the Measure. Sir Thomas Inskip presented the case in particular against the alternative Communion Service and the permission of the reservation of the elements. He voiced the opinions of many who were prepared to accept the greater part of the Book, but were opposed to those portions which they believed make a fundamental change in the doctrine of the Church.

Press Opinion on the Debate.

No thoughtful person has paid any attention to the prejudiced partisans who described these speeches as "No-Popery rhetoric," or as the outcome of "Protestant ignorance." Not even the view of the Bishops that they were due to "avoidable misapprehensions" is applicable. The Press of the country formed a more correct estimate of the debate.

The *Manchester Guardian* said: "Some of the speeches made against the Measure were indeed brilliant and produced an unmistakable effect, but their appeal lay not in the compelling force of argument or rhetoric, but in the fact that they touched some deep chord in the very make-up of the average Englishman—his common sense, his independence, his dislike of all extravagance or pretentiousness, particularly in matters of religion; above all, his sturdy adherence to the Protestantism of the Protestant religion."

The *Daily Telegraph* said: "The House of Commons, despite all that may be said to the contrary, is in touch with popular feeling, and that feeling showed itself in an astonishing resurgence of deeply ingrained Protestantism."

The *Morning Post* in describing the debate said: "Admittedly there has not been in our time, in either House, a debate more entirely worthy of Parliament, and there has not been an occasion on which men have spoken with greater eloquence, and voted with more sincerity, and with clearer conviction."

Quotations such as these could be multiplied. They show sufficiently that those who seek to belittle the supporters of Protestantism only succeed in rendering themselves absurd.

The Significance of the Vote.

The House of Commons was clearly convinced that the new Prayer Book meant a change in the doctrine of the Church—in spite of the declaration of the Bishops that they intended no such change. The vote also indicated distrust of the Bishops. The Bishops claimed that the Book was necessary for the restoration of order in the Church. In view of the fact that the Bishops had done little in the past to restrain the law-breakers, but on the contrary had promoted them or secured their promotion to positions of emolument and influence, and that the chief effect of the passing

of the disputed portions of the new Book would be to render legal the illegalities which the Bishops had failed to put down, and also that there was no guarantee that the position gained by the legalizing of these practices would not be used as a starting-point for further advances in a Romeward direction, the House of Commons recorded its decision. No responsible person has questioned the right of the Commons to express its opinion on the character of the Book submitted to it, nor has anyone whose judgment on the subject carries weight in the country sought to ignore the decision as a determination to resist the return to medievalism in the Church of England. Any sincere straightforward effort to adapt our Prayer Book to the needs of the twentieth century would, we are convinced, have met with the hearty support of all sections of the House of Commons.

The Future of Religion in the Country.

It is obvious that the issues presented to Parliament were no mere trifles about the position of an aumbry. They touched the very foundations of the religious life of the country and the future character of its religion. As Professor Burkitt said in *The Cambridge Review*: "It was evident to all persons except the promoters of this new Book that the express legalization of the practice of Reservation sanctioned the belief that a peculiar virtue and sanctity clung to consecrated bread and wine, even apart from the Communion Service: such express legalization made very difficult the position of those English Churchmen who have all along refused to believe that this peculiar virtue and sanctity ever was in the bread and the wine. For myself I do not much mind. . . . But I am thinking of my grandchildren. I do not wish to sanction legislation the effect of which would be that, when they were of age to be confirmed, if they did not bow before the Red Lamp they would be regarded by their contemporaries as irreverent, and if they presented themselves for Holy Communion after breakfast, they would think themselves sinful. Or—to put forward a still more probable alternative—knowing that such was the opinion of 'good Churchmen,' if the young folk were unwilling to comply that they would absent themselves altogether, even from 'attendance at Mass.'" These sentences indicate some of the future effects of the proposed legislation.

Narrowing the Church.

The Bishops, in the fresh proposals which they have adopted since the House of Commons rejected the previous Measure, have not receded on any material point from their former position. Perpetual Reservation, the Alternative Communion Services, Prayers for the Dead, the observance of All Souls' Day, and the opening for the keeping of the festival of Corpus Christi are retained. A few modifications have been made by the Houses of Clergy and Laity. The Houses of Convocation will have met before these notes

are published to consider the final draft which the Bishops have arranged to submit to them on March 28. The intention is to hurry the revision through, in order that it may be again submitted to Parliament before Whitsuntide. The Bishops are evidently hopeful that they will be able to secure the passing of the Measure in its new form. Yet there is evidence that the feeling of Church-people and of the Country against the Measure is steadily growing. The plea of comprehensiveness is seen to be a specious one, for the ultimate result of the revision would be to narrow the Church and to drive a wedge between it and the great mass of the people. The introduction of the Epiclesis into the canon of the Communion Service has been shown by the Dean of Wells to be a narrowing of the teaching of our Church. The same process is evident throughout. The new Prayer Book departs from the old principle of our Church—to maintain the minimum of requirements in public worship, whatever latitude might be allowed to private opinions.

Misrepresentations.

So many statements have been circulated about the misrepresentations made by the opponents of the Book, it may be well to indicate that some of the supporters of the Book can be convicted of most flagrant indulgence in the same offence. Here is an example that can be illustrated briefly and effectively. In a letter in *The Yorkshire Post* the following statement was made :—

> "In the discussion for general approval, the Opposition appeared to be somewhat acrimonious, but after the most conclusive speeches of Lord Phillimore and Sir Lewis Dibdin, two of the greatest legal authorities, who declared that Reservation was not illegal, and admitted the present-day need for it—all argument seemed to collapse."

The following two passages from the reports of the speeches of Sir Lewis Dibdin and Lord Phillimore show the character of this statement.

> *Sir Lewis Dibdin :* "I speak with diffidence on this because I am the Ecclesiastical Judge ; but so far as I am aware, there is no doubt at all really as to the unlawfulness of Reservation at the present time in the Prayer Book. You will see the delicacy of my position. It has been a matter of repeated dicta and of a judgment in recent years of which I can say no more than that I delivered it. As far as I know, and I have had very ample opportunity of studying the subject (I argued the case at length before Archbishop Temple and Archbishop Maclagan, and I at any rate ought to know about it), there is no doubt whatever about it. There has been no conflict of authority that in the Prayer Book as it is now it is unlawful. . . . I do not think my friend, Lord Phillimore, will seriously differ about that. At the present moment it is unlawful."
>
> *Lord Phillimore :* "I want to say, because he (Sir Lewis

Dibdin) rather appealed to me to say whether I agreed, that I agree with him that at this moment there is no question, that, as a matter of pure positive law Reservation has been held by the only authorities that have dealt with it to be illegal."

The Malines Conversations.

From beginning to end there has been an air of mystery about the Malines Conversations. They began in secrecy. They were continued under conditions which gave rise to many questions as to their real character. There was uncertainty up to the end as to the exact relation of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Pope to the Conversations. When the Report of the meetings was drawn up and was ready for publication early in the year 1927, its issue was postponed. Lord Halifax gave as the reason for this delay that "the Archbishop of Canterbury wished the publication postponed till the Revised Prayer Book had been submitted to Parliament." Lord Halifax added that "another postponement of uncertain length has been occasioned by the rejection of the Prayer Book Measure," and he therefore issued a booklet of *Notes on the Conversations at Malines*. In this he told of an interview which he had with the Pope. The Roman Catholic press questioned the accuracy of some of the statements made as to the Pope's dealings with Lord Halifax. This did not tend to dispel the cloud of doubt which hangs over everything connected with these meetings. Almost immediately after the appearance of the pamphlet by Lord Halifax, the Report was released for publication. Its importance was however completely neutralized by the appearance a few days earlier of an Encyclical by the Pope on the whole subject of reunion. In this he declared that the Apostolic See cannot on any terms take part in any assemblies (of non-Catholics) that would treat with Rome on equal terms, nor is it lawful for Catholics to support or work for such enterprises. "The union of Christians can only be furthered by promoting the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who have separated from it." Thus, as it has been expressed, the Pope has "banged, bolted and barred" the door against reunion.

Malines and the Revised Prayer Book.

The Report of the Conversations showed that the Anglican representatives were prepared to go to great lengths in their concessions to the Romanists, while the Romanists, true to their character, would not yield an iota of their claims for the authority of the Pope or the necessity of accepting the distinctive doctrines of their Church. The Thirty-Nine Articles were apparently represented to the Romanists as negligible, so that they could say in their Report that the Articles "are not the insurmountable obstacle in the way of an understanding between the two Churches which the Roman Catholics had feared might be the case. In fact, some theologians believe that these Articles are susceptible of an interpretation which would reconcile them with the teaching of the

Council of Trent." Bishop Knox in a pamphlet, *The Malines Conference and the Deposited Book*, has examined the significance of these amazing admissions and has shown their bearing on the doctrines contained in the Deposited Book. He shows that the Anglican representatives unchurch all non-episcopalians, teach the presence of Christ in the elements, represent the sacrifice of the Eucharist as the same as that of the Cross, but offered in a mystical and sacramental manner, declare the Church of England practises the Sacrament of Penance, requires the Church's interpretation of Scripture, is willing to acknowledge " a primacy of honour " in the papacy. In the new Prayer Book " many of the concessions and surrenders made at Malines are found to have been confirmed at Lambeth." This will be used later to further reunion with Rome—that must mean submission.

Editorial Note.

In this number of THE CHURCHMAN several subjects of special current interest are presented to our readers, as well as others with an indirect bearing on problems of to-day. In view of recent discussions on the meaning of the word Protestant, Professor W. Alison Phillips shows, from the historical point of view, the correct interpretation of the term, and its application to the Church of England. In a study of St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians Bishop Knox brings out in a fresh light the significance of the personal references to the Apostle, and also shows the value of the conception of Atonement and Grace contained in the Epistle. The Rev. Thos. J. Pulvertaft's account of the Malines Conversations will be found a useful history of these mysterious conferences and a summary of their significance for our Church. Richard Hooker was regarded until recent years as the representative English Churchman. Canon Dawson-Walker's study of his writings will serve to indicate their value as a corrective of various extravagances of doctrine which have developed in our Church. The Rev. Alfred Fawkes considers the Danger of Disestablishment which some believe to have arisen through the rejection of the Deposited Book by the House of Commons. The Church Assembly recently appointed a Commission to report on the reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts. The findings of this Commission are the subject of a careful examination by Mr. H. F. Walker, in which he points out some of the results that the recommendations put forward will produce. The Archdeacon of Chester's article on " In Christ " in the January number of THE CHURCHMAN aroused lively interest. We have given an opportunity for the discussion of some of the points raised by a Correspondent. We are sorry that the pressure on our space has curtailed the number of our reviews of books.

THE PROTESTANT REFORMED CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

AN HISTORICAL RETROSPECT.

By Professor W. Alison Phillips, M.A.,
Lecky Professor of Modern History in the University of Dublin.

IN a letter to *The Times*, published on December 30 last, Canon Goudge, Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, sought to show that the rejection of the Deposited Book of Common Prayer by the House of Commons was due to a fundamental misunderstanding of the word "Protestant" as applied to the Church of England. The original meaning of the word, he said truly enough, had become obscured by the transference of the accent from the second to the first syllable, and he argued that it is only in its original sense of "protestant" that it can properly be applied to the Church of England. To Protestantism in the now commonly accepted sense of the word, i.e., as applied to religious communities differing from the Catholic Church in such matters as the Church, the ministry and the sacraments, the Church of England, he said, "has never committed itself in any way." In the sixteenth century it "took a line of its own, a line which enabled it to include those who accepted Protestantism, in the better sense of the word, and those who did not." "It is, as they say on the Continent," he concludes, "a Bridge-Church, and to reject Protestantism is perfectly consistent with loyalty to the Church of England."

The validity of this view, of course, depends on what is meant by "Catholic" and "Protestant" respectively. Certainly the Church of England has always claimed to be part of the Catholic Church; equally certainly it from the first refused to include those who clung to the outward observance of the "old religion" (the Sacrifice of the Mass, etc.) and those who objected to its own "popish" Church order and ritual. As for the first of these exclusions, it is so germane to the subject of the present discussions that a little historical light on it may be serviceable.

I have already, in this Review, pointed out the stages by which, during the Reformation in England, the Mass was converted into the Communion. Here it must suffice to emphasise the fact that what drove the "papists" into persecuted secession was not the abolition by Elizabeth of the papal jurisdiction in England, but the fundamental breach with what they regarded the central Catholic doctrine by the abolition of the Mass.[1] Bishops Bonner and Gardiner, for

[1] The "Catholic Committee," formed in the eighties of the eighteenth century to negotiate with the Government with a view to Catholic Relief, represented views which would now be considered moderately "Anglo-Catholic." It aimed at the establishment of a national hierarchy in only nominal dependence on the Pope, and advocated the substitution of English for Latin in the ser-

instance, had both been active in forwarding the divorce of Henry VIII; both had accepted without protest his proclamation of the royal supremacy; it was not till Elizabeth and her advisers proceeded to abolish the Mass that they proved recalcitrant and were deprived. Doubtless, Queen Elizabeth would have liked to build a Bridge-Church between the "old religion" and the "new," but the conflicting theological currents were too strong for any such enterprise to succeed. The most that can be said is that, for three centuries, the Church of England acted as some sort of bridge between the divergent schools within what was to be called Protestantism. Apart from the feeble and transient efforts made in the seventeenth century, there was, until the rise of the Tractarian movement a hundred years ago, no attempt made to bridge the gap between Canterbury and Rome. The Church of England remained consciously and contentedly *Pro*testant.

To understand exactly what is, and what is not, implied by this fact we must know what is meant by Protestantism. Now it is perfectly true that nowhere in its formularies does the Church of England style itself Protestant, though its daughter Church in America is so styled; but the same is true of other Protestant Churches. The truth is that, at the outset, none of the Reformers, whatever school they belonged to, regarded themselves as the founders of separate Churches. For them the Church was *one*—that founded by Christ, and their aim was simply to reform it by appealing from "the traditions of men" to the supreme authority of the Gospel itself. Therefore they called themselves *Evangelici*, Evangelicals, as opposed to the *Pontificii*, Papists, who upheld the Pope as the fountain of authority. When they spoke of *nostra ecclesia*, or, later, of *nostra ecclesia reformata*, the reference was not to a separate Church, as we should conceive it, but to the local Church which had accepted the evangelical doctrine and so proved itself a member of the "true Church." It is notable, for instance, that in the Confession of Augsburg, which was a distinct effort to find some avenue to an accommodation with the Romanists, there is no naming of a separate reformed organisation; the articles are introduced by the formula "we teach"; it is the manifesto, not of a separate Church, but of a school of thought within the Church universal.

The same is true of the Church of England. It never occurred to the English Reformers, even the most extreme of them, that they were founding a new Church. No new name was necessary; for that of *ecclesia anglicana* had long been in use; nor in the creeds and prayers was the word Catholic shunned, since the Reformers believed

vices of the Church. In the "Protest," signed by 1,500 bishops, priests and laymen, which did much to influence the passing of the Relief Act of 1791, occurs the phrase "we acknowledge no infallibility in the Pope." Up to Cardinal Wiseman's time English Roman Catholics retained the traditional English vestments and rites, and knew nothing of some of the modern Roman cults and "devotions" which certain Anglo-Catholics have introduced into their churches. See generally Monsignor Bernard Ward's *Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England* and *The Eve of Catholic Emancipation*.

in the Catholic Church and held firmly that their doctrine was rooted not only in Holy Scripture but in the teaching of the Catholic Fathers. Not they, but the Papists, were the "heretics." How could it be otherwise, since the sole appeal was to Scripture, and by the plain words of Scripture "the errors of Rome" stood condemned?

How, then, did the name Protestant come to be applied as a generic term covering all the various groups and schools of Reformers? The origin of the name is clear enough. It is derived from the *Protestatio*, handed in at the second Diet of Spires (April 19/25, 1529) by the greater number of the evangelical Estates of the Empire, against the decisions of the Romanist majority, according to which the dissemination of the reformed doctrines was to be suspended, toleration was to be denied to "sectaries" (i.e., Baptists and the like), and the Mass was everywhere to be freely celebrated.

Now the idea that underlay this protest was political rather than religious, and it was in this sense that the *protestantes* were first spoken of, not by themselves but by their opponents. The word, however, soon came into more general use; for it was in itself confessionally colourless and therefore convenient as a general term covering all the various schools of those who appealed to Scripture as the rule of faith, in opposition to the claims and teaching of Rome. But the term Protestant, though of German origin, was less commonly used in Germany than abroad. As the logic of events increased the cleavage between the reformed Churches and the Roman Catholic Church, and also the division among themselves, new names came into use to designate them. It was only during the Thirty Years' War, however, that the Calvinists began to arrogate to themselves alone the title of "the Reformed Church," while those who adhered to the Augsburg Confession began to be known as "Lutherans." The distinction was formally embodied in the Treaty of Westphalia, in 1648. In Article VI, § 1, the *Evangelici* are divided into those who are described as *Augustanæ Confessioni addicti* and those *qui inter illos Reformati vocantur.*

Protestantism was thus divided into two groups, clearly defined by differences in sacramental doctrine and Church order. In what relation did, and does, the Church of England stand to these groups?

Canon Goudge holds that it belongs to neither, but is a group apart, standing as a sort of *puissance médiatrice* between Protestantism and Romanism, and having stronger affinities with the latter than with the former. This view, which is that of the Tractarians, has but slight historical foundation, and it is not held by Continental scholars—or at least some of them—who have made a special study of Anglican history. The author of the article on the Anglican Church in Herzog-Hauck's great *Realencyklopädie*, for instance, places the Church of England among the "Reformed" Churches. It differs from them, he says, in its episcopal constitution and in its acceptance of the royal supremacy; but in doctrine, owing to the influence of Bucer, it became closely related to Calvinism, closer than to Lutheranism which, of all the evangelical

Churches, most nearly approximated to Roman Catholicism in its sacramental teachings, though not in Church order. Anglo-Catholics will be surprised to hear that in the article "Protestantismus" the same authority, Dr. F. Kattenbusch, includes them, with Presbyterians, Wesleyans and Baptists, among the 120 million or so of Christians who make up the Reformed Church.

However absurd this classification may now appear, it can be justified both by the formularies of the Church of England and its history. It is a commonplace to speak of the XXXIX Articles as Calvinistic. The Elizabethan Church, which drew them up in their definite form, was consciously Calvinistic, even when—in characteristic English fashion—it sought to veil the change of doctrine under some of the old forms. That the majority of the bishops were Calvinists, till Arminianism made entry in the seventeenth century, is matter of history. That Queen Elizabeth herself held the Anglican Church to belong to the Reformed group is shown by an interesting letter preserved in the public Records and published in 1869 in a volume of Appendices to Rymer's *Foedera*. The letter, which is in Latin, is dated August 21, and is addressed by the Queen to Ludwig, Duke of Würtemberg and Teck. She had heard, she writes, that in October a congress of Electors and other princes was to be held at Magdeburg, for the purpose of passing certain decrees against those who seem to differ from the Augsburg Confession (*qui ab Augustana Confessione videntur alieni*). In view of the afflictions of Christians in the Netherlands and France, such a conflict was fraught with peril "to those who profess the Gospel." "We princes who profess the truth of the Gospel against the errors and heresies of the papists may in a moment inflict a wound both on ourselves and on Christ." She urges that now is not the time for these princes to quarrel among themselves, that they should defer the matters in dispute and unite in a holy alliance against the papists (*pontificios*), "whose power grows and madness rages to excess." Finally, she begs that, if and when the congress should meet, she may not be excluded, since "we are also a member of the Church of God."

This letter is conclusive proof, if any were needed, that Queen Elizabeth—in spite of her taste for copes and altar-candles—thought of herself as belonging to that "true Church" which was coming to be collectively known as Protestant. It is also proof that she was regarded by the "Lutherans" as a Calvinist. Finally, it is conclusive proof that, if she regarded the Church of England as a Bridge-Church, it was certainly not as a bridge between Protestantism and Rome, but as one between the two great groups of those who "professed the Gospel."

The term "Protestant" began to come into fairly common use in England after the middle of the sixteenth century, at first as a term of contempt applied by papists to the reformers, but later adopted by the latter as an honourable indication—as Archbishop Laud was to put it—that they did but "protest the sincerity of their faith against the doctrinal corruption which hath invaded the great

sacrament of the Eucharist, and other parts of real religion." By the opening of the seventeenth century all England, with the exception of the small remnant of Roman Catholics, was fiercely Protestant, how fiercely the attitude of the people, and of their representatives in Parliament, towards the "Romanizers" in the Church of England was presently to show.

Yet Archbishop Laud, the chief victim of the popular wrath, was no Romanizer in the sense of which this term can be used of the extremer "Anglo-Catholics" of to-day. For all his excusable or inexcusable ritualism, he did not anticipate the Tractarians in the attempt to minimise the fundamental differences between Anglican and Roman doctrine. He represented, it is true, a reaction from the uncompromising Calvinism of the Elizabethan Church, but this reaction had its origin in Protestant Holland, and he himself remained Protestant to the last.

This is proved, above all, by his attitude towards the distinctively Roman doctrines which were the chief rocks of offence to the Reformers—Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass. He repudiated utterly the Tridentine conception of the Eucharist as a propitiatory sacrifice, conferring grace *ex opere operato*; for him it was the memorial of the Sacrifice offered once for all. "'Tis one thing," he said, "to offer up his body, and another to offer up the memorial of his body, with our praise and thanksgiving for that infinite blessing" (Works, iii. 345). Accused at his trial of having introduced into the Scottish office from the Roman missal the words "that they may become to us the Body and Blood," he replied in words which have a peculiar interest at the present moment:—

"Now, for the good of Christendom, I would with all my heart that these words, *ut fiant nobis*—that these elements might be 'to us' worthy receivers, the blessed Body and Blood of our Saviour,—were the worst error of the Mass. For then I could hope that the great controversy, which to all men that are out of the Church is the shame, and among all that are within the Church is the division of Christendom, might have some good accommodation. For if it be only *ut fiant nobis*, 'that they may be to us' the Body and Blood of Christ; it implies clearly that they 'are to us,' but are not transubstantiated in themselves into the Body and Blood of Christ, nor that there is any corporal presence in or under the elements. And then nothing can more cross the doctrine of the present Church of Rome than their own service . . . the words cannot well be understood otherwise, than to imply, not the corporal substance, but the real, and yet the spiritual use of them" (Works, iii. 353–355).[1]

Laud's essentially Protestant attitude towards the central

[1] The words "may be unto us" were included in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI, but were excluded from the second Prayer Book and that of Elizabeth. The reason for the exclusion was given by Bishop Guest in a letter to Cecil (1559). They made, he said, for "a doctrine that hath caused much idolatrie." See J. H. Round, "The Sacrifice of the Mass" in *The Nineteenth Century* for May, 1897 (No. 243, p. 849, note).

doctrine of the Mass is further evidenced by the introduction into the Scottish office of the exceedingly strong denunciation of non-communicating attendance, which was contained in Elizabeth's Prayer Book, but omitted from that of 1662, presumably because the practice had ceased. Indeed, there is no need to labour the proof of Laud's Protestantism. "I desire it may be remembered," he said on the scaffold, "I have always lived in the Protestant religion established in England, and in that I come now to die."

But though Laud was a Protestant, his Protestantism was mild compared with that of the Church and people he had attempted to rule. For them, in spite of his disclaimers, he was a Romanizer, and they passionately objected to being romanized. The objection took form in the Protestation made, in May, 1641, by all the members present in the House of Commons, and all the peers—including seventeen bishops—present in the House of Lords, in the following form :

"I, A.B., do in the presence of God promise, vow, and protest, to maintain and defend, as far as I lawfully may, with my life, power, and estate, the true reformed Protestant religion expressed in the doctrine of the Church of England, against all popery and popish innovations."

If this expressed the mind of churchmen before the Great Rebellion, it equally expressed it after the Restoration. The alterations made in the revised Prayer Book of 1662 represented, it is true, a mildly "Catholic" tendency, and so led to the great non-conformist secession. But the tendency was not Romeward, and the "high churchmen" did not, any more than the "low churchmen," think of themselves as separated from the Protestant Churches abroad. This is made perfectly clear by the Last Will of Bishop Cosin—a beautiful expression of a tolerant spirit far in advance of his times :—

"In what part of the world soever any Churches are extant bearing the name of Christ and professing the true Catholic faith and religion, . . . if I be now hindered actually to join with them, either by distance of countries, or variance amongst men, or by any hindrance whatsoever ; yet always in my mind and affection I join and unite with them ; which I desire to be chiefly understood of Protestants and the best reformed Churches."

That should be conclusive evidence that the Restoration Church, like the Elizabethan Church, was Protestant, even though its Protestantism has taken a somewhat different colour. But there is stronger evidence yet. The fact that the heir to the throne was a Romanist excited misgivings both in Church and Parliament, misgivings fully justified by James II's activities as King. In 1678, accordingly, an Act of Parliament imposed on all bishops, when taking their seats in the House of Lords, the obligation of making the following declaration :—

"I, A.B., doe solemnly and sincerely in the presence of God professe, testifie, and declare that I doe believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the

Elements of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ at or after the Consecration thereof by any person whatsoever. And that the Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other saint and the Sacrifice of the Masse, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I doe solemnly in the presence of God professe, testifie, and declare that I doe make this Declaration and every part thereof in the plaine and ordinary sence of the Words read unto me as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any Evasion, Equivocation, or Mentall Reservation whatever." [1]

This is a declaration the plain meaning it would have been difficult even for the casuistry of the author of Tract XC to misinterpret! And for a century and a half, i.e., until the Relief Act of 1829, it was made by every Anglican Bishop on taking his seat in the House of Lords. It can scarcely be said to strengthen the contention that the English Church is a bridge between the "professors of the Gospel" and Rome!

The Revolution of 1688 made still more evident the Protestant character of the English Church. In the service at the coronation of William and Mary (April 9, 1689) the following question and answer were introduced:—

The Archbishop or Bishop: Will you, to the utmost of your power, maintain the law of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed religion established by law?

King and Queen: All this I promise to do.

As for the view generally held of the relation of the Anglican Church to the Protestant communions on the Continent, that is made clear by the Speech from the Throne at the opening of Parliament on October 19, 1689, in which reference was made to "the Protestant religion in general, of which the Church of England is one of the greatest supporters," and yet more clear by the reply of Convocation to the royal address summoning it (December 12), in which the clergy return their humble acknowledgments "for the pious zeal and care your Majesty is pleased to express for the honour, peace, advantage and establishment 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 the better secured under the influence of your Majesty's government and protection." [2] Thus not only Parliament, but the clergy through their representative body, asserted the Church of England's position as the sister and ally of the great Protestant Churches abroad.

Finally, if any further proof be needed, we have the Act of Settlement of 1701, which established the Protestant succession to the throne. In framing this Act Parliament took care that there should be no misunderstanding as to its meaning. From this time onward every sovereign of England, until the accession of his present Majesty, had at his or her coronation to make the same declaration as that imposed upon the bishops in 1678. Even now, though

[1] 30 Car. II. (1678), cap. 1 (*Statutes of the Realm*, vol. v, p. 894).
[2] Cardwell, *Synodalia*, ii, 698.

the denunciation of the Mass as "superstitious and idolatrous" has been excised, as needlessly offensive to the King's loyal Roman Catholic subjects, the new sovereign has still to declare his adhesion to the Protestant Reformed religion as by law established.

The Church of England, then, so far as the decisions of both ecclesiastical and secular authority can make it so, is Protestant and Reformed. The question next arises of what is meant by these terms. Of the general meaning of Protestant I have said enough: in its application to the Anglican Church it implies, in my opinion, no more than the alignment of this Church with the other Churches, whether "Lutheran" or "Calvinist," which reject the claims and certain distinctive doctrines of the Papacy as unscriptural. The name Protestant in itself may, as we have seen, cover a considerable variety of faith and practice.

The epithet "Reformed" presents rather more difficulty. In view of the classification of the Anglican Church as belonging to the group of the Reformed (Calvinistic) Churches, it might be argued that it was originally consciously applied in this narrower sense. But, as we have seen, it was only during the Thirty Years' War that the word began to be used in this sense, and it was not till 1648 that this use received, as it were, official sanction under the Treaty of Westphalia. When, therefore, the Protestation of 1641 speaks of the "true reformed Protestant religion," the word "reformed" may or may not have been used in this special sense. It is, however, I think, very improbable that any such meaning was attached to it in the later formulæ devised by Parliament for the safeguarding of the Protestant character of the Church. It is true that William III was a Calvinist; but in the search for an heir who should satisfy the provisions of the Act of Settlement the question of the shade of Protestantism did not arise, and the succession fell to a Lutheran prince. My own view is—and I think it is borne out by history—that the Church of England was styled "reformed" in the sense of the original *ecclesia reformata*, a name which implied no exclusive claims and embraced all those who "professed the Gospel."

ABDUL RAHIM. London: *Zenana Missionary Society*. 9*d*. net.

This charming booklet is in reality the story of two lives. First the consecrated life of an Indian Officer whose genuine piety made an indelible impression on his native servant,—indeed to such an extent that he became a Christian. The other life, then, is his,—he was a Christian in more than name. At length he found his way into the ministry of our Church and served with such devotion that in the end his self-forgetfulness cost him his life. We see the tremendous power of example illustrated in these pages, and those who imagine that all native converts and servants are miserable humbugs will observe that this is a wild and unjustifiable exaggeration.

S. R. C.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS: A STUDY.

By the Right Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D.

THE old saying ran "Speak that I may see thee." The modern demand is "Let me see thee, that I may hear thee." A photograph of the writer is almost indispensable for the success of an Article or Open Letter. But who shall procure us a photograph of St. Paul? Our nearest approach to it is in the Acts of Paul and Thekla—a document of the latter half of the second century: "A man small in size, with meeting eyebrows, with a rather large nose, bald-headed, bow-legged, strongly built, full of grace, for at times he looked like a man, and at times he had the face of an angel." This likeness St. Paul reduces, quoting his adversaries' words, to the brief comment, "his bodily presence is weak." Is it a matter of any importance?

Careful readers of 2 Corinthians, who wish to discover the kind of criticism to which that letter is a reply will not think it unimportant. For the great difficulty in understanding the Epistle is the want of any definite clue to the conditions which evoked it. True, it is an assertion of St. Paul's apostolic authority. But on what grounds were his opponents questioning that authority? There is no trace of the parties of Apollos and Cephas, which we find in the first Epistle. There is a Christ-party, apparently furnished with letters from eyewitnesses of our Lord's ministry: men who were preaching another Jesus, another Spirit, and another gospel. But on the contents of that gospel we have no light. They were making money out of it (ii. 17), even swindling over it (ii. 2), and attributing St. Paul's free preaching to a consciousness that his message was unauthorized, and worth no more than what he asked for it (xi. 7 and xii. 16). These charges, for what they were worth, had already been dealt with in the first Epistle. Now we are on the track, not so much of a school—though several were implicated as being false Apostles and emissaries of Satan (xi. 14)—but rather on the track of some special wrongdoer (vii. 12), whose offence has been outrageous and personal—St. Paul is undoubtedly "the wronged one" (vii. 12). This malicious opponent has drawn from the Apostle a letter so bitter, and so involving the whole Church in his offence, that there is grave reason to fear that a permanent breach has been made between the converts and their teacher. In his restlessness and distress (vii. 5) the Apostle has been unable even to take advantage of a favourable opening for preaching the gospel in Troas (ii. 12), and has, under feverish anxiety, been even at death's door (i. 9). The disturbing effect of this antagonism is not to be equalled in any other part of the Apostle's life. The care of all the Churches was a daily burden (xii. 28). The folly of the Galatians, the nearest parallel, was heartbreaking enough.

But there was no one who so nearly killed St. Paul by his work as this Corinthian offender. We cannot read the letter without trying to form some conception of the nature of his attack. But the letter throws no direct light upon it. We are left to conjecture.

Before proceeding to do so we must notice, however briefly, the suggestion that 2 Corinthians is a composite letter, a MS. combination, some say, of three letters, others of two. There is no authority for the suggestion in any MS. extant. It is losing favour in Germany, the home of its origin. It depends largely on the marked difference of tone and attitude of the portion before chapter ix. from the part that follows: the first part full of joy and confidence in the Corinthians, the second indignant, severe, menacing. The difference is not imaginary. If we were compelled to believe that the whole letter was dictated at a single session it would be inexplicable. But there is no such necessity. An interval, even of days, between the two parts is quite possible. Was the change of tone, then, due to fresh tidings from Corinth, or to some alteration in the Apostle's condition? As there is no evidence for the former hypothesis, we must fall back on the latter. But is such an explanation consistent with the idea of inspiration? Those who repudiate it, must reconcile 2 Corinthians ix.–end with 1 Corinthians xiii. Beyond a doubt St. Paul wrote both. He, who denounced false Apostles transforming themselves into angels of light, wrote also of the love that beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. We may dislike the idea of moods or mental states in an inspired writer. We may hold that the occasion justified the vehemence of the indictment. If so, we need not refuse to accept the idea of inspiration working even in a body shattered by illness, and in a mind suffering from severe prostration.

Now Sir W. M. Ramsay, in his *Church in the Roman Empire*, writes (p. 63): "A bad attack of malarial fever, such as we suppose to have befallen St. Paul in Pamphylia, could not be described better than in the words in which Lightfoot . . . sums up the physical infirmity implied in the Epistle" (to the Galatians): "'A return of his old malady, "the thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet him," some sharp and violent attack it would appear which humiliated him and prostrated his physical strength'". "I appeal" (continues Ramsay) "to all who have experience, whether this is not a singular and apt description of that fever, which has such an annoying and tormenting habit of catching one by the heel in the midst of some great effort, and on the eve of some serious crisis, when all one's energies are specially needed." In the second half of the Epistle St. Paul seems almost pointedly to suggest the presence of this tormenting foe, paralysing him at the end of chapter viii., turning all his sunshine into cloud, and especially bitter because of the triumph which it gave to his adversary and his adversary's followers, because of its affording them the advantage of pressing home their accusations that a man who could not miraculously heal himself of this tormenting ailment could not be an Apostle of

God. The connexion of disease with Divine disfavour was still deeply rooted in popular imagination. Also, we must not forget the popular worship of Aesculapius and the miracles claimed for his power. Have we not extant a tablet of Imperial date in which a certain Apella, using the very same phrase as St. Paul, says, "I besought the Lord" (i.e. Aesculapius) "and he healed me"? Paul's fervent beseeching brought him indeed a message of peace, a message for all time, but it did not bring him healing. His adversary would not fail to drive home the contrast as proof of St. Paul's lack of Apostolic authority.

From this point of view an attack on St. Paul's bodily appearance accompanied by scathing criticisms on his ailment ceases to be a purely personal affair. It has been said very truly that the idea of his resenting any such personal attack shows a radical misunderstanding of his character. That is quite true. It would be true also to say that no such attack could have been a theme for inspiration. On the other hand place the Apostle, in a city of athletes, in a city of noble statues modelled on noble figures, a city of sharp and caustic wit, and we shall feel a new force in the words "We have this treasure in earthen vessels." Amid these statuesque Corinthians St. Paul moves as a bit of rough pottery destined for the rubbish heap. "What can there be more pitiful than an earthen potsherd?" The prophet in his emphatic irony could think of no image more apt to describe man's nothingness than that of "a potsherd among potsherds." "Woe unto him that striveth with his Maker! a potsherd among the potsherds of the earth" (Isaiah xliv. 9). A perishable potsherd by the side of immortal marbles! Yes, and that potsherd scarred and defaced by scourging, stoning, fasting, shipwreck, by every form of peril and pain that could deface a man's body, tortured by malignant disease, and wasting day by day. If you follow the letter closely you will constantly come upon fresh indignities which the Apostle heaps on his poor worn-out and haggard frame. But for all that he claims that even now it is lit up by glory, greater than that which rested on the face of Moses, glory of the Lord, brilliant and increasing. "We with unveiled face reflecting the glory of the Lord are being changed from glory to glory." "At times he looked like a man, and at times he had the face of an angel."

The poor potsherd reflecting heavenly glory! But there was more to be said. This earthly body was awaiting a moment in which it would be swallowed up in an eternal and renovated heavenly body, a moment when the mortal should put on immortality. The phrases recall, of course, the fifteenth chapter of the first Epistle. But they do more. They suggest that the disbelievers in the resurrection of the body had pointed to the poor "potsherd," and made mock of the resurrection of such a poor body as that. So the personal attack, the caricature, it may be, had become an attack on doctrine, on a dearly prized hope, on the very foundation of faith. For "if in this life only we have hope, we are of all men most miserable." The Greek hope of immortality was almost

anathema to the Apostle—the idea, that is, of a disembodied soul wandering for ever in regions of gloom, and cut off from all that share of personality which attaches to the body. Nor is he content with a period of unconscious waiting for the coming of the Lord, which the Corinthians may have inferred, as some even now infer it, from his first Epistle. "Asleep to the world we are," yet "at home with the Lord." Parted from the body we are utterly, not disembodied but clothed upon with the heavenly body. For the believer death is a defeated foe. His falling asleep to earth is a waking to glory.

A brief résumé of the allusions to the body, the flesh, and bodily appearance in this Epistle cannot fail to enforce the suggestion that *the adversary*, as distinct from parties and factions, the adversary whose attack had called forth the severe letter, had envenomed his attack on the resurrection of the dead by contemptuous reference to St. Paul's bodily appearance and disfigurements, and illnesses. From the allusion in the very first chapter to "God Who raises the dead," we pass on to "the veil on the face of Moses," to the "unveiled reflection of Christ in the believer's countenance," to "the earthen potsherds," the "bearing about in the *body* the dying of Jesus," the "manifestation in our *bodies* of the life of Jesus," its "manifestation again in our mortal flesh," the "wasting of the outer man," the "earthly dwelling of this tabernacle," "we that are in this tabernacle," while "we are at home in this tabernacle," the "receiving of the awards for things done in the body," "knowing Christ after the flesh," the "allusions to stripes and imprisonments," the "putting away pollution of the flesh," the "lowly bodily appearance of the Apostle," who though "he walks in the flesh does not war according to the flesh"; once more "the weakness of his bodily appearance," his determination "to boast, as others do, according to the flesh," the return to the "exceeding sufferings of beatings, scourgings, stonings," to the "visions received whether out of the body or in the body," and finally "to the thorn in the flesh." It is undeniable that this theme of the body, not in a generalized way as in other Epistles, but with close and constant reference to St. Paul's own body, runs as a connecting thread through the whole letter. There are fifteen references in the first half to seven in the second. Indeed, this thread is only absent in the chapters about the collection, and in the conclusion. Apart from these it is interwoven with every part of the Apostle's argument. It is hardly ever absent from his mind. In this respect the second Epistle to the Corinthians is quite unique. Can we account for these references to his own body, evidently most distasteful to St. Paul otherwise than by connecting them with the attack made on him? Or is there any better method of explaining first, the violent reaction against the offender that followed the receipt of the sharp epistle, and the complete and prompt forgiveness—to whom ye forgive, I forgive also—and the fear that punishment had been overdone. It is not easy to agree with commentators who hold that it was some grave moral sin,

in respect of which St. Paul pleaded for a lighter punishment, passed over so quickly upon repentance.

While, however, the foreground of the Epistle is occupied by this arch-agitator and his misdeeds, now happily past, forgiven and forgotten, there stand behind him the Judaizing opponents who dog the Apostle's footsteps from Church to Church. They are distinct from the Jewish colony, which St. Paul had exasperated by shaking out his garment and crying, "Your blood be on you and on your children." Over these had been won a conspicuous victory when Gallio drove them from his judgment seat and thereby gave a charter of toleration to Christianity at Corinth. These were the men who plotted to kill him, and forced him to alter the course of his journey. Quite distinct from these were the Judaizers who came with letters of commendation, probably from Jerusalem, preaching another Jesus and another gospel. Haughtily and not without violence they thrust themselves into another man's mission-field. They boasted their Apostolic commission, their personal knowledge of Jesus Christ. They transformed themselves into Apostles of Christ, and plundered the congregation as a sign of their Apostolic authority. To exhaust the story of their wrong-doing is unnecessary and unprofitable. It is enough. Our attention must be fastened on the reason of St. Paul's strenuous opposition to them. No specific doctrinal error is alleged against them, such as insistence on circumcision, or observance of the law of Moses, though a passage in the third chapter points in that direction. Still that passage is probably directed rather against the Jews than against the Judaizers. There is none of the combative Rabbinic argument which we find in the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans. We hear more of the men, of their doings, and of their character than of their doctrine. The Apostle silences them by enunciation of a profound, positive truth, which occupies the centre of his Epistle, the very heart and core of his message to Corinth. Let us hear it first in the Apostle's own words.

"Whether we be mad, it is to God, or are sane, it is for you. For the love which Christ displayed constrains us, deeming, as we do, that one died for all. Then all died. And He died for all that they who live should no longer live for themselves, but for Him Who died and rose again. So that henceforth we know no one after the flesh (i.e., by any personal distinction or rank). Yea, even though we have known Christ after the flesh (as the Master and Teacher of His disciples on earth), yet now we know Him in that capacity no more. So that, if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation. The old is past. Behold it has become new. And the whole is from God Who reconciled us to Himself through Christ, and gave to us the ministry of reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not reckoning to them their transgressions, and putting in our mouths the message of reconciliation. On Christ's behalf, therefore, are we deputies, as though God were entreating you through us, we pray you, be reconciled to God. Him that knew not sin, for our sakes He

made sin, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him."

We are told sometimes that St. Paul did scanty justice to his Judaizing opponents—that his teaching must have appeared to them an encouragement of lawlessness—almost of sin. We are reminded of the grave disorders in this very Church of Corinth, the daring licentiousness, the drunkenness at their Eucharists, the party strife, the disorderly public worship. To Jewish Christians (so it is said), brought up under the discipline of the Law, and regarding it as their fence and protection against the criminal self-indulgence of surrounding Hellenism, St. Paul's attitude to the law must have come perilously near to blasphemy. Could He, Who insisted on a righteousness exceeding the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, be satisfied with a standard that hardly rose above the Gentile level? Ought it to be said of Christians, as the writer of the Epistle to Diognetus said, not long after St. Paul's time: "Christians are distinguished from other men neither by country, nor by language, nor by customs. For nowhere do they inhabit cities of their own, nor do they make use of any exceptional dialect, nor do they practise a conspicuous mode of life." They had not even a Ghetto to preserve them from the contamination of the world.

Now St. Paul's answer to all such accusations as this is plain enough. "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers, for what share hath righteousness with lawlessness, or what fellowship hath light with darkness? What agreement hath Christ with Belial, or what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever? And what covenant hath God with idols? For we are a shrine of the living God."

St. Paul's quarrel with the Judaizers was not because of their demand for a high moral standard, but because they set and were satisfied with an attainable standard, and an attainable standard must always become a conventional standard, and again a conventional standard means an otiose or dead God. St. Paul was on fire with the living God. "In Him we live, and move, and have our being." It was in reality, and St. Paul knew that it was, a battle between life and death. Hence the violence of his opposition to the Judaizers. Whatever letters of commendation they may have brought, they were not true emissaries of the Apostles at Jerusalem. With Peter and John and the rest of the Apostolic College, St. Paul was in full agreement. But these emissaries of Satan under cover of the dead Rabbi, Jesus of Nazareth, were restoring a racial Judaism. They boasted of their being Hebrews, Israelites, the seed of Abraham. They would have made their proselytes tenfold children of Gehenna, under pretence of making them Jews.

Against these impostors St. Paul raised the standard of a living, loving God in a living, loving Christ: not loving in the sense of making light of sin, for in that case He would have been no God at all. He preached a God Who is Love, and Who carried Love to its furthest act of self-sacrifice, that is of self-identification with sinners through the Incarnate Christ. Not that St. Paul used these long abstract nouns in which we reason out our theology. He was

not a professor of theology, but the *Legatus* of God. Slave of Christ, Apostle of Christ, he rises to a higher title now. He is the *deputy* of the living God, charged with an embassage from Him, an embassage of love, an urgent embassage—"to-day." "Now is the accepted time. Now is the day of salvation." Listen then to this ministry of reconciliation. God was in Christ, and made Him to be sin for us, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.

The righteousness of God. The Law and the Prophets had confronted the world with a living God of infinite holiness—a God Who stood out in sublime contrast with the impure Gods of the Graeco-Roman world. The tidings of that God found their way through men like Seneca (the brother of Gallio at Corinth) into the Imperial Palace, and the homes of the aristocracy, and through the synagogue and its proselytizing activity into the *forum* and the *agora*. Side by side with the lofty, unapproachable majesty of Jehovah acting upon the heathen conscience, there came also the message of the mystery religions insisting on the necessity of purification from sin. But there was wanting the message of reconciliation between the All Holy Jehovah, and the sin-burdened conscience of a world sick to death of its own profligacy, and swift to discern the imposture of the relief held out by the mysteries. Into that world came the Legatus of God, the persecuted, ugly little Jew, with the face "now of a man and now of an angel." He came proclaiming Christ crucified, in Whom all died, for the Cross was the death sentence of a world of sinners: proclaiming also Christ risen and living, that they who rise with Him from the death of sin should henceforth live not unto themselves, but unto Him that died and rose again. But the gospel was more, far more, than a call or motive to unselfishness. Motives have no power over a nature that cannot respond to them. They even irritate and exasperate as suggestions from without. How often has the world witnessed the tragedy of an unselfish mother mourning over selfish children! The gospel was a gospel of power, the gospel of a Redeemer, and that, a gospel which made its appeal specially to the poorest. A. Deissman points out how the titles of Christ were all such as "could domicile in the souls of the poor and the simple." But even he, in a very stirring passage on this theme, falls short of the sublimity of the message of "the righteousness of God." For this is a message which transforms a world of failure into a world of triumphs. Against the tragic ruin of ancient civilization, and equally against the facile optimism of a God Who, as Bernard Shaw tells us, is blundering out on the road of evolution to a far distant success, this message of the righteousness of God gives us the All Holy God, saying to our poor sinful souls to-day: "All that is Mine is thine," thine by right of union with Me in Him Who was made sin for thee, thine by the indwelling power of His Spirit. For the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

It is impossible, within the limits of such a paper as this, to do justice to the wonderful conception of the Atonement contained in this passage. In a few words, volumes of criticism and objection

are met and set aside. Is it argued that the idea of Atonement is the placating of an angry God? St. Paul answers God was in Christ. The God of Love not only gave His only begotten Son, but was in Him in the act of redemption. Or is it objected that the substitution of the innocent for the guilty is immoral? Again St. Paul answers that what is called substitution should rather be called identification. Christ died for all, because He died with all making their sins His own. He made the sin of the world His own, not by becoming sinful, for He knew no sin, but by sharing with us all that sin entailed, and draining to the dregs the cup of separation from God. Yet was God in Christ even when He made Christ to be sin for us. Do men scoff at a doctrine of imputed righteousness? St. Paul answers that we become the righteousness of God in Christ: not apart from Him as outsiders watching an unreal transaction, but we become the righteousness of God by a vivid experience of the unreality of any righteousness that we can offer, and by acceptance of the righteousness of Christ, a gift which entails the putting on of Christ. The garment of Christian righteousness is ours not that we may boast of it, or store it away for use in Heaven, but that we may wear it here and now. The whole gospel is in these few lines and we can never regret the heart agony out of which this Epistle was won.

We may well pause and ask ourselves what we know of this experience, of which John Bunyan wrote as follows:

"One day as I was passing in the field, and that too with some dashes of Conscience, fearing lest yet all was not right, suddenly this sentence fell upon my soul, Thy righteousness is in Heaven; and methought withal, I saw with the eyes of my soul Jesus Christ at God's right hand. There I saw was my righteousness; so that wherever I was, or whatever I was adoing, God could not say of me, He wants my righteousness, for that was just before Him. I also saw, moreover, that it was not my good frame of heart that made my righteousness better, nor yet my bad frame that made my righteousness worse; for my righteousness was Jesus Christ Himself, the same yesterday and to-day and forever. Now did my chains fall from my legs indeed; I was loosed from my affliction and irons; my temptations also fled away; so that from that time those dreadful scriptures left off to trouble me; now went I home rejoicing for the grace and love of God."

Space does not permit us to follow out the working of this theme in reference to the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem. It is enough to notice that the contribution is treated from first to last as a question of grace. The grace that was in Christ Jesus, Who, though He was rich, for our sakes became poor, wrought in the Churches of Achaia, so that they gave themselves to God first, and consequently out of the depths of their poverty were rich in liberality. That same grace God was able to make to abound to the Corinthians, that they having all sufficiency for all things might abound to every good work. We have a hint here that the collection for the Jerusalem saints was only one of many charitable activi-

ties in the primitive Church—and, possibly, in a Gentile Church the least popular. Undoubtedly the season of St. Paul's unpopularity had affected it adversely, and he is conscious that nothing short of a miracle of grace will revive it.

Here we must part from the Church at Corinth. The attempt to bring from the obscurity in which St. Paul deliberately buried them those adversaries, who forced from him this Apologia, has left on our minds an unduly unfavourable impression of the Church as a whole. We must not forget that the Corinthian Christians were living Epistles read and known of all men, letters from God in the midst of an impure, avaricious and dishonest city. On their hearts, tables of flesh, were inscribed the message of God, as legibly and plainly as were Imperial rescripts engraved on stone. For them were penned our earliest tradition of the Eucharist, the Hymn of Love, the Ode of the Resurrection, and the marvellous gospel in miniature on which we have been dwelling. The Church for which these were written can never fail to stand high in the annals of Christendom. "Annihilated for ever, the magnificence of Nero's Corinth lies buried to-day beneath silent rubbish mounds and green vineyards on the terraces between the mass of the Acro-Corinthus and the shore of the shining Gulf: nothing but ruin, ghastly remnants, destruction. The words of paeans (i.e., 1 Cor. xiii.), however, have outlived the marble and the bronze of the Empire, because they had an unassailable refuge in the secret depths of the soul of the people" (A. Deissman, *Light from the East*, p. 391). The weary, wayworn, storm-tossed world is hunting for those inscriptions on our hearts and lives to-day.

The Rev. G. R. Balleine's books of Sunday School Lessons, issued by "Home Words" Printing & Publishing Co., are so well known to all interested in Sunday School work that they need no commendation. His exceptional gifts in the compilation of helpful guidance for teachers have contributed greatly to improve the standard of teaching in our Sunday Schools. The series of lessons for this year is on "God and Ourselves," and presents the many excellent features which have already made its predecessors the favourite handbooks in so many schools. The lessons are divided into four series—the Unveiling of God, the Proof of our Love, Some Gifts of God, Adventuring with God.

At the request of the Church Book Room his series of lessons on the Acts of the Apostles has been reprinted. It is one of the most popular of these books. Although there are fewer illustrations drawn from outside sources, the narrative of the Acts provides all the incidents that are required to give the lessons the vividness and interest necessary to retain the attention of the young people. Practical advice, the outcome of long experience, is given which will be specially helpful to teachers who are new to the work. The course is arranged for a year.

THE MALINES CONVERSATIONS.

By the Rev. Thos. J. Pulvertaft, M.A.

"IF it be argued that Anglican approaches to Rome—of which the 'Conversations' at Malines are the latest, and in some respects the most astonishing example—should rather be regarded as evidences of an advancing progress of inner change, which is quickly transforming the Church of England itself, and that submission to Rome is ceasing to be as inconceivable as the standards and traditions of Anglicanism suggest, it must be answered that the National Church no longer reflects the mind of the nation, that the Church itself is deeply divided, and that the Romeward drift, though rapidly gathering force, is still mainly clerical. The Anglo-Catholic movement, which now claims to include at least one-third of the parochial incumbents, can only end, as the Tractarians ended, in Rome" (*Edinburgh Review*, April, 1924). These are the words of the Bishop of Durham, and all who read the authorized Report of *The Conversations at Malines*, 1921–25 (Oxford University Press, 2*s.* 6*d.*), can see for themselves how far the drift has gone and the dangers to which the Church of England is exposed. This danger is not removed by the condemnation by the Pope in his Encyclical "On the Fostering of True Religious Unity" of future Malines Conferences. *Roma locuta est, causa finita est* is true of Conferences of accommodation. Rome cannot accommodate her doctrine and discipline to meet the needs of Anglicans in a hurry for Reunion on their terms, but Rome can still say, when her Cardinal writes to an Archbishop of Canterbury, "Reunion is not our work and we may be unable to achieve it, but it is within our power, and consequently within our duty, to prepare it and pave the way for it." The way has been paved by doctrinal concessions and disciplinary explanations that can only end in submission when the "urge to Union" is so strong as it is in many Anglo-Catholic quarters. Let it be noted that in the Conversations, the word Union in French is translated "Reunion" in English, whereas the word Reunion employed in the English document is translated *entente* in the French. This is a small matter in itself, but it is a proof that what may seem, in an English document Reunion, means for the Roman Catholics absorption. Rome even in Malines never met the Anglicans as members of a Church—it met them as a body seeking an *entente* that would end in submission.

It is well to trace the history of the Conversations. Lord Halifax has had as the ruling passion of his long and consistent ecclesiastical life, Reunion with Rome. His position is thus defined: "I hope and believe that I would gladly die rather than any action of mine should cast a doubt upon those Sacraments (of the Church of England), or the purposes of God in regard to the Church of

England. It is because of the absolute security I feel as a member of that Church, that I do not hesitate to advocate the duty of our endeavouring to recognize the need of a visible centre for the Catholic Church throughout the world." In pursuit of this ideal, Lord Halifax made a descent on Archbishop Benson at Canterbury and with Abbé Portal had an interview with His Grace who was much disconcerted by the unwelcome visit. An effort was made to obtain from Rome a formal admission of the validity of Anglican Orders. The project ended in total failure. And the Papacy has refused in the most determined manner to reopen the question. A library has been written on the subject. We have no doubt whatever that we hold the Commission of Christ for the office and work of the ministry. Rome holds that our Clergy are mere laymen, and although her hierarchy pays us the deference, due by contemporary courtesy, of using the titles, she considers that we have usurped without legal or moral right, she has not retreated from her attitude and shows no intention of so doing.

Lord Halifax was not dismayed by this failure. He has the patient expectancy of a man who believes that he has a mission which he must fulfil. The Lambeth Conference of 1920 met with the shadow of a possible disruption of the Anglican Communion. Kikuyu was then a word that had much dynamite in it. A marked cleavage was known to exist among the Bishops on the subject of Protestant Reunion and Intercommunion, and it was believed that the late Bishop of Zanzibar would head a party that would make it impossible for the Anglican Communion to take any step forward in the path of the Reunion of Anglican and non-Episcopal Christendom without creating a split that would make itself evident to the world. By a striking unanimity—not in any way spoiled by the small minority—the Conference envisaged a world Christian Unity—the creation of a Great Church with unity without uniformity. What was chiefly in the minds of the Bishops was Reunion with non-Episcopal Christianity. The presence of Greek Prelates at consultations and Services—other than those of the Holy Communion when all present communicated—made plain the desire for a wider Unity, and the possibility of Rome coming into the new Unity was not absent from some hopeful minds. "Within this unity Christian Communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled" ("The Lambeth Appeal").

In England we had official Conferences with Representatives of the Free Churches. These were held in Lambeth and ended through inability to agree on questions concerning the ministerial "Commission of Christ." The local leaders of the Church of Rome made it plain that they would have nothing to do with Reunion negotiations on the basis of the Lambeth Encyclical. For most men this would have been decisive, but Lord Halifax was not dismayed. He knew of the noble patriotism of Cardinal Mercier, his reputation as

a progressive philosophical thinker and his kindness to Father Tyrrell. He asked on his leaving England for Malines in 1921 a letter of commendation from the Archbishop of Canterbury, who had been in correspondence with the Cardinal on the subject of Christian Union. Apparently this refers to the forwarding of the Lambeth Encyclical to the Metropolitans of the Roman Church, and his Grace gave him a letter vouching for his position as one interested in English Church life and unlikely to take advantage of any civility the Cardinal might show him. Armed with this letter Lord Halifax called with his old friend the Abbé Portal on the great Cardinal, who received them cordially and proved his keenness for the Unity of Christendom. It may well be that a Belgian ecclesiastic who remembered how Britain came into the Great War on account of the violation of Belgian territory, believed Lord Halifax to be the bearer of a great hope, that the Dowry of Mary might through his agency be restored to the Papacy.

This was the genesis of the famous Conversations. Lord Halifax wrote a memorandum which formed the basis of a Conversation between the Cardinal Archbishop of Malines, Mgr. Van Roey—now Archbishop of Malines—and Abbé Portal, Roman Catholics, and Viscount Halifax, who had persuaded the Dean of Wells (Dr. Armitage Robinson) and the Superior of the Community of the Resurrection (The Rev. W. H. Frere, now Bishop of Truro) to accompany him. The Archbishop of Canterbury says that he had no responsibility for this Conference, which he might have stamped out or at least refused to know anything about it. To act in this fashion would have been "a sin against God." At the second Conference the same six persons met with the friendly cognizance of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Roman Catholics (generally called in the French Version *les catholiques*) with the knowledge of the Holy See. Then it was felt that the number attending the Conferences should be increased, and as the question of Papal Authority as a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church "was about to be handled, his Grace recommended the selection of Bishop Gore and Dr. Kidd as theologians who had given much attention to the subject." He urged the necessity of its "being made clear what is our well-established and coherent Anglican position as set forth by our great divines." In so doing he followed what had been done in the case of the Lambeth discussions with Free Churchmen. At the third and fourth Conferences Mgr. Batiffol and M. Hemmer joined the Roman Catholic group, and the ten conversationalists devoted themselves principally to the question of the Papacy and its relation to the Episcopate and the Church. The Fifth Meeting took place on October 11 and 12, 1926, after the deaths of the Cardinal and the Abbé Portal and in the absence of Bishop Gore and the Dean of Wells. The English members conclude their Report with the wish that similar conferences may be continued in the future. The Roman Catholic members say nothing of future Conferences, which we now know have been definitely forbidden by the Pope, although Cardinal Mercier in October, 1925, looked for-

ward to their resumption in January, 1926. The Report of the Conversations published in January, 1928, is dated July, 1927.

In an Introduction to his *Notes on the Conversations*, dated Feast of the Epiphany, 1928, Lord Halifax wrote that after seeing the Pope in the Autumn (1927) he visited Cardinal Van Roey at Malines, who " expressed his willingness at a suitable date to preside at such future Conversations as might be arranged on similar lines to those held under the presidency of Cardinal Mercier. On my return to England, both the English and the French Reports, which had been for some time in the printer's hands, would have been published had not the Archbishop of Canterbury wished the publication postponed till the Revised Prayer Book had been submitted to Parliament. Another postponement of uncertain length has been occasioned by the rejection of the Prayer Book Measure." Shortly after the appearance of this statement the official Report was published. And in the *Tablet* of February 4 an official statement from the Archiepiscopal Residence in Malines, states that on November 17 he gave Lord Halifax to understand that the resumption of the Conversations was impossible and that in consequence of the state of public opinion in England the Cardinal asked that no account of the Conversations should be published.

It was necessary to set forth the above facts in order to remove many misunderstandings that exist. Whatever hopes of future Conferences may have been cherished, they have been killed by the Papal Encyclical which bluntly condemns them and makes the following statement : " All who are truly Christ's believe the Conception of the Mother of God without stain of original sin with the same faith as they believe the mystery of the August Trinity, and the Incarnation of our Lord just as they do the infallible teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, according to the sense in which it was defined by the Œcumenical Council of the Vatican." Men in a more humble and less well-informed position than the Archbishop of Canterbury knew that this was and is the attitude of Rome. Is it strange that they regret the temporary loss of astuteness shown by the Archbishop of Canterbury when His Grace permitted himself to be influenced by Lord Halifax ? The discussions with the Nonconformists took place with Englishmen in their own land. The Lambeth Appeal had been sent to Cardinal Bourne and it was left to Lord Halifax to win the cognizance of the Archbishop for his conversations with foreign Roman Catholics. Making all allowances for the internationalism of Romanism the proceedings *ab initio* were doomed to failure. We have in other matters seen how ill informed Roman Catholics of one country are of the practices of other lands and the readiness with which they submit themselves to the authority of their superiors who have the power to command. It has always been a mystery to us how one so versed in diplomacy as Dr. Davidson could have construed refusal to converse into a sin ! Conversation with a view to Reunion means paving the way to Submission with the intention of Union. On this point no instructed Protestant, much less an instructed Roman Catholic, has any doubt.

And the Pope's Encyclical has shown the opinion of the Curia as well as his own conviction on the whole matter. It is quite true that the Lambeth Conference of 1920 repeated the view of the Conference of 1908 that Reunion must ultimately include Rome, "with which our history has been so closely associated in the past, and to which we are bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. But . . . any advance in this direction is at present barred by obstacles which we have not ourselves created, and which we cannot of ourselves remove." Knowing what these obstacles are, knowing the kind of *rapprochement* for which Lord Halifax stood, we believe that His Grace made a grave mistake. Until the rise of Tractarianism the English Church regarded the Protestant Churches of the Continent as Sister Churches and looked upon Rome as in a different category. Our theologians agreed in believing that the *semper eadem* policy of Rome forbade our considering Union with her. And they were not mistaken.

It is remarkable that the discussions of the First Meeting, which largely concerned doctrine, are not disclosed in the Anglican Report, that is devoted to the elucidation of the meaning of the Lambeth Appeal and the supposed readiness of the Anglican Bishops and Clergy to submit to Roman Ordination if agreement had first been reached upon the large questions which at present separate the Churches. Elsewhere the Anglican Report, referring to the questions concerning the doctrine of the sacraments handled briefly in the First Conversation, states, "we say no more here because they are sufficiently treated in the French Report with which we are in substantial agreement, and also because there is an opening for further discussion which, we think, would be profitable, and would lead not only to a better understanding but also to a greater measure of general agreement upon the matters in question." The importance of this paragraph will be seen when the terms of the French Report are considered. They are in our opinion by far the most important passages in the book, for doctrine determines the entire outlook. We do not accept the confident assertion that "the real obstacle is clearly revealed; it is the jurisdiction of the Pope." The break in the reign of Henry VIII was caused by this "obstacle," but the doctrinal development due to the acceptance of Reformation and Scriptural teaching made the breach much deeper and wider. It has been the custom of a school of Anglo-Catholics to rest the whole case against Rome on this aspect of the divergence between the Churches, and most of the discussion at Malines centred on Papal Supremacy and all it involved. Even here the Conversationalists made concessions that are opposed to our history. A primacy of honour and a primacy of responsibility are said to be the prerogative of Rome. It is suggested that Papal control should be limited to dealing directly with Metropolitans, and it is characteristic of the whole tendency of the Report that the well-known passage in the Article, "The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England," is watered down to "the well-known axiom, 'No foreign Potentate hath any jurisdiction in this realm of Eng-

land'"! We leave the subject of jurisdiction with another quotation: "In accordance with the teaching common to both Churches, the hierarchy must derive in the direct line of the Apostles, by an uninterrupted succession of Bishops, their heirs and successors. The institution of Bishops is of divine right." Here is a full-blown theory of Apostolical Succession shared in the opinion of the Conversationalists by the two Churches. It certainly is the view of the Anglo-Catholics, but we have yet to discover where it is set forth as the teaching of the Church of England, which is founded on the teaching of Holy Scripture, and Scripture is silent on the subject.

Before dealing with the Sacramental concord set forth in the French Report, it is well to bear in mind that the Church of Rome in keeping with Uniat precedents would be ready to sanction the retention of certain characteristic Anglican customs; as for example: "(*a*) The use of the vernacular of the English rite; (*b*) Communion in both kinds; (*c*) Permission of marriage of the clergy." These are said—as others have informed us—to be questions of discipline, although it seems hard to conceive how discipline can have any power to reverse, as it has done in the Church of Rome, the command of our Lord, "Drink ye all of it," and the uniform practice of the Primitive Church. The French Report says, "Anglicans and Roman Catholics agree that Holy Scripture needs to be interpreted, and that it belongs to the Church alone to give an authoritative interpretation of it in matters affecting faith and morals. For guidance in this task the Church has recourse to the works of the Fathers of the Church." We presume that it is under this assumption that the Church of Rome justifies the withholding of the Cup from the laity and the Anglicans consider this not to be a matter of doctrine. The doctrine of concomitance, which lays down that the whole Christ is to be found under each particle of either species when consecrated, explains the entrance of discipline as superior to a command of Christ. A man-defined doctrine overthrows what the Gospel definitely commands.

It is necessary to quote at length (with our own brief comments) the remarkable passages dealing with the XXXIX Articles. The French Report reads: "From explanations given to us it is clear that the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion are not the insurmountable obstacle in the way of an understanding between the two Churches which the Roman Catholics had feared might be the case. In fact, some Anglican theologians believe that those articles are susceptible of an interpretation which would reconcile them with the teaching of the Council of Trent. Dr. Pusey, for example, was of this opinion, and Dr. Forbes, late Bishop of Brechin. Furthermore, the Anglican clergy in assenting to these Articles are no longer bound, as formerly, to accept all and each of the propositions which they contain. In fact, many Anglicans and more particularly the members of the Episcopal Church of America, consider the Articles as practically obsolete." Lord Halifax had made a similar statement in Paris in 1896—*Further Considerations on behalf of Reunion*

(p. 41), but he placed in the list of English Theologians Cardinal Newman and Tract 90! This passage disappears from the French Report. It was quite proper in their opinion for Anglicans to accuse the framers of the Articles of saying one thing and meaning the reverse, but the reference to Tract 90 would imply that such reasoning was a *tour de force*, for it would awaken memories of the consequences of that Tract. In Paris Lord Halifax was frank on one point. He said that the chief difficulties in the way of Reunion with Rome lay in the serious divisions that prevailed in the Church of England. To-day, as thirty-two years ago, the Church of England believes its formularies to have been the work of honest men and holds that it is impossible to make them teach the very doctrines they were written to condemn.

The Conversationalists reached an agreement on the following points:

1. "Baptism constitutes the means of entry into the Church, and the initiation which baptism inaugurates ought to develop within an organized social life." This has been rightly held to acknowledge the validity of Anglican Baptism, but it has to be remembered that adult Anglicans who do not communicate with the Church of Rome, are, in its opinion, outside the organized social life of the Church.

2. "The social life of Christians is organized round an episcopal hierarchy." This excludes all non-Episcopalian Christians from the Church, and as the Pope, according to the Roman Catholic view, is *jure divino* head of this hierarchy, those who do not acknowledge his position are also excluded from the Church.

3. "This social and organized life finds expression within the Church in the existence and the use of the sacraments." But as the sacraments depend for their validity on the validity of the Orders of those who administer them and Anglican Orders are not valid, the social life of the Church cannot find expression in the Anglican Communion.

4. "In the Eucharist the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are verily given, taken and received by the faithful. By consecration the Bread and Wine become the Body and Blood of Christ." Lord Halifax, in his *Call to Reunion* (p. 9), writes that these "the actual words of the Catechism supplemented by the 28th Article excited no comment beyond that, if the members of the Church of England accept as true that, by reason of consecration, a change whereby the Bread and Wine become the Body and Blood of Christ, this, in the view of Roman Catholics, is the meaning of Transubstantiation." But Lord Halifax and the French Report fail to quote the words of the Article which state, "The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith."

5. "The Sacrifice of the Eucharist is the same sacrifice as that of the cross, but offered in a mystical and sacramental manner. On the subject of eucharistic doctrine the Anglicans made particular

reference to the letter published by the English Archbishops in reply to the Encyclical Letter of Leo XIII on Anglican Orders." This is the doctrine of the Mass and the Archbishops founded their argument on the Prayer of Oblation, which is presumed to be said before, not after, Communion.

6. "Communion in both kinds was once the practice of the whole Church, but in the West, communion came to be limited in one kind for practical reasons dependent on circumstances. Consequently in our view, communion in both kinds is not a matter of doctrine, but one of ecclesiastical discipline." We have already commented on this statement (p. 111).

7. "In both Churches provision exists for a ministry and a discipline of penitence, whereby the sinner is reconciled to God through the sacramental absolution which the priest pronounces upon the sinner. Although the use of the Sacrament of penance and of sacramental absolution is much more widespread in the Roman Catholic Church" (the French here and elsewhere has *catholique*), "yet the formula given in the Prayer Book for the Order of Communion and for the Visitation of the Sick leave no doubt as to the belief of the Anglican Church in this respect, or as to the opportunity given to its members to have recourse to sacramental absolution for the purpose of their reconciliation with God, if they have fallen into any grave sin." The document here again does not quote the words of the Article. "These five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony and Extreme Unction are not, to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not the nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."

8. "In regard to the anointing of the sick, it is true that there is less agreement; but it is to be noticed that there is a tendency among Anglicans to revive the ancient custom of anointing the sick." The silence on the words of the above-quoted Article is noticeable.

No wonder that after reaching this agreement the French Report writes: "Further meetings between Anglicans and Roman Catholics" (again *catholiques* in the French Report) "are much to be desired in order to elucidate further these general statements, and to secure that there should be no ambiguity or misunderstanding with regard to their deepest significance. In any case the result of this interchange of explanations is a very hopeful impression that a satisfactory accommodation may be reached with regard to the doctrine of the sacraments regarded as means of grace and spiritual life." How much easier this would have been for the Anglicans had they had before them the Text of the Deposited Book!

On one other point comment is needed. The re-Ordination of Priests and Bishops by the Roman Catholics is a *sine qua non*, for the "Catholic Church" (here the word is *catholique* in French) "always

takes the line of greatest security in regard to the sacraments." "Such prudent precautions do not imply any mistrust of the persons concerned, but are simply a measure of security adopted for the sake of the laity. The Anglican Bishops have opened a way for the practical solution of a very thorny question, and the Roman Catholics (*catholiques*) recognize the lofty spirit which has inspired the Anglican Episcopate in this matter, and their readiness to make sacrifices on behalf of reunion" (*son esprit de sacrifier en vue de l'union*). The French document always speaks of union, and the reference is to the Anglican pronouncement "supposing always that all matters relating to doctrine and discipline had been already settled, and an agreement had been reached upon a system of discipline, no difficulty would be made by the Anglican Bishops about consenting to such an adjustment in regard to Ordination as might seem necessary to the Roman Church in order to place beyond doubt in the eyes of all the validity of their ministry."

We have quoted at length the crucial passages in the Conversations as disclosed, which it must be understood give only the points of agreement, not the points of disagreement, for in the words of Cardinal Mercier, "Negative conclusions, whatever they may be, would necessarily provoke polemics in the Press, awaken ancient animosities and accentuate divisions, thus harming the cause to which we have resolved to devote ourselves." The positive conclusions are sufficiently startling to all who have believed themselves bound by the teaching of the Church which has always been considered Protestant until the growth of Anglo-Catholicism founded upon the excesses of the Tractarians.

We conclude by giving the view of one of the ablest and most learned Bishops of the Anglican Communion—the Primate of All Ireland, who always weighs his words.

> Having read and pondered the summaries of the report of the Malines Conversations which have appeared in the public Press, I feel compelled to give some expression to the conclusions to which I have been led. It is startlingly clear that a successful outcome of the Malines movement would destroy the Protestant character of the Church of England. It would also completely alter the position of all the Churches in communion with that Church. Such Churches are specially mentioned in the report, and are within its purview. The Malines movement is, therefore, no mere domestic affair of the Church of England.
>
> Now, consider what this means. Protestantism is no mere negation. It is the positive affirmation of the two most precious possessions of the human race. These are—the message of Divine Love and Salvation given directly by Christ to all who will hear His voice; and, secondly, the right of every man to the free exercise of his own mind and will. Protestantism stands for Christian liberty.
>
> Now, as I read the report of the Malines Conversations, I find that the choice, as regards authority, lies between the Pope and the Bishops conjointly on the one hand, and the Pope as

sole supreme dictator on the other. The people, apparently, are to be so much "dumb driven cattle," with no voice, no independent mind and will of their own. The one modifying idea which entered the minds of these learned theologians was that the Archbishop of Canterbury might become a sort of buffer between the Roman authority and the Anglican Bishops. How strangely these learned men forgot that in the early Church the decisions of the Councils of Bishops had no validity until they were accepted by the acquiescence of the whole body of the laity!

Now, I am quite sure that the Church of Ireland, an essentially Protestant Church, will have nothing to do with negotiations of the Malines type. I am also confident that the people of England will recognize that the Anglican representatives at Malines were ready to give away those liberties which men of the British race prize more dearly than life itself. If history has any lesson to teach, it is surely this, that the people of England, while very tolerant and slow to move, will never surrender their freedom and bend their necks beneath a spiritual despotism.

Have the English Primates no advice to give their people at a time like the present? Is it to be said once more *Episcopi Anglicani semper pavidi* in the presence of an aggressive faction that has claimed to be the voice of the Church? A crisis has arisen and the Church of England wishes to know whether its leaders look to Protestant Christendom to give expression to true catholicity or strive for a reconciliation which means submission by them to and absorption of their people in the Church of Rome? We need to know whether Malines Anglicanism or the historic Anglicanism of our Church represents the Faith held and taught by the Church of England.

On the Continent, England is considered the leading Protestant State and her Church the great bulwark against Roman advance. The Malines Conversations have had their repercussions in many lands. There the conversion of England to Romanism is now considered by Roman Catholics to be merely a matter of time, and Protestant Minorities that are known to have friendly relations with English Protestants have been subjected to fresh attacks and bitter reproaches. In the modern world steps that are conceived by many as merely local are looked upon as of world importance, and the fact that English Ecclesiastics entered into Conversations with Continental Roman Catholics is considered as at once the acknowledgment of the solidarity and unity of the Roman Church—*Securus judicat Orbis Terrarum*—and the desire of the Church of England for absorption by submission. There the claims of Rome have never been watered to the extent that they are believed to be minimized in England. The whole transaction, however creditable it may seem to the hearts of some, has had disastrous consequences that cannot easily be estimated.

RICHARD HOOKER.

By the Rev. D. Dawson-Walker, D.D., Canon of Durham Cathedral, and Professor of Divinity, Durham University.

THE reign of Queen Elizabeth stands out in the annals of our country with something of the glory of a golden age. It was an epoch of high achievement in statesmanship, in commercial enterprise, in world-wide travel, in romantic adventures beyond the seas. But chief amongst its splendours will always be reckoned its surpassing triumphs in the field of literature. In a short space of ten years' time—the last decade of the sixteenth century—there were published, Spenser's *Faery Queene*, Bacon's *Essays* and the earlier plays and poems of Shakespeare. Within the same period of time were published Five Books of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* of Richard Hooker. It will be evident from the very name of his treatise that it could not have so wide or so intimate an appeal as the poems, dramas and essays of the others. But, in its own field, it stands supreme; and its author, whether he be regarded as writer or as thinker, has his place secure in the foremost ranks of the Elizabethan worthies.

The book is a vindication of the equilibrium in which the Church of England had come to rest in the later years of Elizabeth's reign, after the violent oscillations of the earlier Reformation period. As the composition of it arose out of the immediate events of the time, it may be useful to recall for a moment the outlines of the ecclesiastical position.

In the reign of Edward VI the English Church had advanced far on the path of reform—though not so far as some of the more ardent spirits, inspired by the continental reformation, could have wished. In Mary's reign there was a stern and drastic reaction. It was her ideal to bring England—at any cost—back in humble obedience to the Papal See. The queen's frantic efforts not only alienated the mass of the people at home, but drove into exile many churchmen, who at Zurich, Frankfort, Geneva and other rallying grounds, imbibed still more deeply the principles of the continental reformation both in doctrine and in discipline. The result was, that on the accession of Elizabeth there was a great influx of returning exiles, animated by a zeal not only for Calvin's theology but also for his system of church government.

To adopt these would have meant, for the Church of England, a complete departure from all its ancient traditions—a departure abhorrent to the minds of Elizabeth and her ecclesiastical advisers. The problem for them was to steer the ship between Rome on the one hand and Geneva on the other—between the Scylla of Romanism and the Charybdis of Puritanism. By Puritanism, it should be remembered is not meant something analogous to the Nonconformity of our own time—the Chapel as distinct from the Church. The

Puritans at this stage were a body of men within the Church of England who hoped radically to transform it, both in the externals of worship and in the form of its constitution. In contrast with Romanism, which was an external foe, Puritanism was a disturbing element within the household.

Elizabeth and her advisers had no great difficulty in rallying the people as against Rome. The recollections of Mary's reign, the Bull of Excommunication launched against Elizabeth by Pius V in 1570, the various attempts to assassinate the Queen, the attack of the Spanish Armada in 1588, all helped to harden the people in a spirit of anti-papal patriotism.

In this spirit Puritan churchmen heartily participated. They loathed both Spain and Rome with a fervent hatred. But from Elizabeth's point of view, they too formed an exceedingly intractable element. In the earlier days of the reign, their attention was chiefly focused on details of ritual. They wished to reduce all worship to "purer" forms. Everything that recalled the old régime was to go—even the surplice being regarded as a "papistical rag." In a reformed church nothing must be allowed to remain that could not produce the express warrant of Holy Scripture. After 1570 disputes about ecclesiastical dress receded into the background, yielding place to a larger controversy on the question of church government. Episcopacy was the enemy attacked, and the object was to remodel the church on Presbyterian lines—lines which they held to be discoverable in Holy Scripture.

It is perhaps only fair to the Puritans to say that there were many practical abuses of the time that rightly deserved their censure. To discuss these lies outside the scope of this paper. But their attack on the ritual and constitution of the church, as framed by Elizabeth and her advisers, was a formidable thing. What the church needed was a champion who should give such an answer for her to the Puritans, as Bishop Jewel's *Apology* had given to the Romans. She found the champion she needed in Richard Hooker. No stronger weapon has ever been forged in her defence than his treatise on the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity.*

Our information about Hooker's personal history is chiefly derived from Isaac Walton's attractive biography. Walton, in spite of the quaint simplicity of his style, was a skilled artist, and we have to bear this in mind rather carefully when we survey the details of his picture. In depicting Hooker as the humble saint, the scholar and the thinker, he may somewhat have intensified the light and shade of the background against which he stands, as well as that of some of the subsidiary figures in the picture.

We learn from him that Hooker was born at Heavitree near Exeter, about March (1552) according to our present reckoning 1554. In earlier generations his family had been of repute and importance in the city of Exeter; but his father was so poorly off that he intended to apprentice Richard to some trade. The boy, however, showed such capacity and high promise for the future that his

schoolmaster pleaded earnestly for his being sent forward to the University. Persuaded by his arguments, an uncle named John Hooker, a leading citizen of Exeter, undertook the charge of the boy's further education, enlisting in addition the sympathy and help of his friend Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury. Jewel himself was a distinguished alumnus of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, a foundation wholly devoted to the advancement of the New Learning. By his influence Hooker was admitted to a "clerk's place" at Corpus in 1569, in the fifteenth year of his age. He became successively scholar and fellow of his College. He evidently gained a reputation in the University for the wide range of his learning, because on the illness of the Professor of Hebrew, he was appointed to act as substitute and read the lecture. One of the most delightful features of his University life was the devoted friendship that sprang up between him and two pupils committed to his care, Edwin Sandys, son of Sandys who was then Bishop of London and afterwards Archbishop of York; and George Cranmer, a grandnephew of the Archbishop of that name. These became the chief friends of his after life and to their criticism he submitted his projected works.

In due course he took orders and about 1581 was invited to preach at St. Paul's Cross. His visit to London for that purpose is important in his life because it led immediately to his marriage.

According to Walton's account, his marriage was unfortunate. It is here, however, that we may perhaps suspect his picture of being somewhat overdrawn. It is obviously his purpose to depict Hooker as the good man bearing adversity with meekness; and behaviour on Mrs. Hooker's part, that to a dispassionate observer does not seem aggressive or unkind, is recorded as calling for our sympathy. It is also to be remembered that Walton drew his information from a highly prejudiced source. It seems to have come, ultimately, from the two pupils, Sandys and Cranmer, who conceived, after a visit paid to Hooker in his country parsonage, an intense antipathy to Mrs. Hooker.

Walton's version, in brief, is this. That when Hooker went to London, to preach at St. Paul's Cross, he stayed with a certain Mrs. Churchman, who not only made him very comfortable but nursed him to health during a brief ailment. This home comfort kindled in him a desire for its continuance in a perpetual form. In fact, Mrs. Churchman strongly urged that, in view of his "tender constitution," he ought to have a wife. He, therefore, not remembering that "the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light," and like a true Nathanael, "fearing no guile," besought Mrs. Churchman to seek out a suitable wife for him. Without undue loss of time she discharged her commission by providing her own daughter Joan, who brought him "neither beauty nor portion," so that the good man had no reason to "rejoice in the wife of his youth," but too just cause to say with the holy prophet, "Woe is me, that I am constrained to have my habitation in the tents of Kedar."

He goes on to relate how Cranmer and Sandys paid a visit to

their old tutor in his country living of Drayton Beauchamp, and found him watching his small flock of sheep in the field, with a copy of the *Odes* of Horace in his hand. On being released from this task, he was summoned to the house " to rock the cradle." There is no great hardship in either of these occupations, though they were both somewhat removed from the academic atmosphere his visitors had shared with him at Oxford.

They evidently sympathized with him as a hardly used man, and it is possible that his marriage was an ill-assorted one. Still, as Professor Dowden truly says, " The wife of an exalted scholar cannot always maintain the adoring attitude assumed by her husband's passing admirers," and it is significant that Hooker so far trusted his wife's judgment that he made her his sole executrix and residuary legatee.

The visit of his two pupils had an important result for Hooker's future life. Edwin Sandys pressed on his father, now Archbishop of York, the urgent need for some advancement and change of life for his old tutor. It was in consequence of this that the Mastership of the Temple was offered to Hooker, which, with some real reluctance, he eventually accepted. The following events are very familiar to all readers of English Church History. Hooker found himself in close association with Walter Travers, one of the ablest and most uncompromising Puritan leaders, who held the Readership of the Temple. It was customary, then, as now, for the Master to preach in the morning, and the Reader in the afternoon. A wide divergence of ecclesiastical outlook between the two very quickly revealed itself. The Reader lost no time in controverting the teaching of the Master, and so the same pulpit, in Fuller's famous phrase, "spake pure Canterbury in the morning and Geneva in the afternoon." Or, as Walton puts it: " At the building of Solomon's temple neither hammer, nor axe, nor tool of iron was heard therein ; whereas, alas, in this temple, not only much knocking was heard, but (which was the worst) the nails and pins which one master builder drave in, were driven out by the other." It is pleasing, however, to remember that the controversy was purely doctrinal, and was waged without any cessation of warm personal regard between the two men. Still, the situation was an impossible one, and Whitgift, the Archbishop of Canterbury, did what he could to end it by discovering pretexts to remove Travers from the Readership. Hooker, for his part, conceived the design of a work which should survey the whole field of the controversy and reinterpret its details in the light of fundamental first principles.

He began his work at the Temple, but found the surroundings there so uncongenial that he besought the Archbishop to transfer him to the country. In 1591 he removed to the living of Boscombe, near Salisbury, where he completed the first four of the projected eight books of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. In 1595 he accepted the Crown living of Bishopsborne near Canterbury, which he held till his early death in 1600 at the age of forty-six.

Our chief concern here is with Hooker's published work. But

the interest of the work is enhanced when we recall something of the appearance and character of the writer. To do this adequately would involve a recital of a large part of Walton's *Life*. It must suffice for our present purpose to say briefly that he depicts for us a man of poor clothes, of mean stature and stooping, with a somewhat unhealthy appearance, due to lack of exercise and sedentary life. His eyesight was weak and his humility of character so great that neither in early days nor in his later life did he ever willingly look any man in the face. He was " of so mild and humble a nature that his poor parish clerk and he did never talk but with both their hats on, or both off, at the same time." This humility of demeanour was part of his reasoned theory of life. " There will come a time," he wrote, " when three words uttered with charity and meekness shall receive a far more blessed reward than three thousand volumes written with disdainful sharpness of wit." The words remind us of a sentence in Professor Mackintosh's appreciation of the late Professor Denney : " He wrote no paradoxes : to him all epigrams had falsehood written on their face." In the pulpit, too, Hooker had no arts of persuasive eloquence. His eyes, when he was preaching, remained from first to last fixed on one spot. He seemed to be thinking as he spoke, and the prolonged sentences in which he uttered his thought often seemed to his hearers tedious and obscure. Yet, with all this, his fame for learning was so great that scholars constantly turned out of their way, simply to see him in the seclusion of his country home. He probably neglected all the laws of health, as we now understand them, with the result that a severe chill acting on a frame that had little power of resistance, carried him off in the early years of middle life.

The treatise on which his fame rests is *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, Eight Books*. Of these, the first four were issued in 1594 ; the fifth book, which itself is longer than the whole of the previous four, was published under Hooker's supervision, in 1597. These five books only were published during the author's lifetime. Of the three remaining books, the so-called sixth one, and the eighth, were published half a century afterwards, in 1648. The sixth book, as a matter of fact, though derived from Hooker's notes, can hardly with fairness be called his at all. The seventh, which was not issued till 1662, is Hooker's work, but it has been mutilated, possibly by Mrs. Hooker's Puritan friends and relations. The eighth book, which was in a fragmentary condition, has been restored by Keble after a comparison of various manuscripts. It will thus be seen that only in the first five books have we Hooker's work as he himself gave it to the world.

The idea of the treatise was suggested to Hooker by the Puritan controversy in general, and more particularly by his own disputes with Travers at the Temple. It is well known how the Protestantism of the age, after the repudiation of Rome's infallibility, threw itself on the infallibility of Scripture, and how, consequently, the cardinal principle of Hooker's Puritan opponents was the sole and exclusive

authority of Scripture. All laws found in Scripture are of permanent and universal force; no law derived from any other source can be of permanent obligation. Hooker held this exaggerated theory of the purpose and function of Scripture to be a fundamental error. The theory he opposed to it was, that the true rule of life is not to be drawn from one source alone even if that source be Holy Scripture, but from all the various sources of light and truth by which our life is encompassed. As Dean Church puts it: "Take which you please, reason or Scripture, your own reason or that of others, private judgment, or general consent, one presupposes the existence of others, and it is not intended to do its work of illumination and guidance without them; and the man who elects to go by one alone will assuredly find in the end that he has gone wrong."

In other words, over against the principle of Scripture as the sole law, Hooker sets the larger conception of law as a whole—in the widest, most inclusive sense of the term. Accordingly, in his first book he undertook an investigation of the ground and origin of all law, the law which rules the universe as a whole; which rules, too, in the realm of nature, as well as in the sphere of human society; hoping by the investigation to show which laws are of permanent obligation, and which have only temporary effect. There is something majestic and sublime in this first book—a survey of the whole world as under a reign of law, and that law both in its general principles and its detailed application an expression of the Divine Will. The book is philosophical rather than theological in character, and it is the one book in the treatise that has a permanent interest for all readers, being not merely ecclesiastical, but speculative in its character and outlook.

It should be remembered, of course, that Hooker's outlook is fundamentally theistic. He begins by treating law as a manifestation of the Divine Will. A spirit of reverent humility controls all his speculation. We cannot fully comprehend the Most High

> "Whom, although to know be life, and joy to make mention of His name, yet our soundest knowledge is to know that we know Him not as indeed He is, neither can know Him; and our safest eloquence concerning Him is our silence, when we confess without confession that His glory is inexplicable, His greatness above our capacity and reach. He is above, and we upon the earth; therefore it behoveth our words to be wary and few."

So far, however, as we can understand God at all, it must be from the point of view of our own highest faculties. We must conceive of Him as essentially Will with Reason as its rule. This Reason, or Wisdom, which is the rule of God's own being, is called by Hooker the "First Law Eternal." When that same Divine Wisdom rules all the created universe, it is called the "Second Law Eternal."

How does this divine law operate in its application to the human spirit? Hooker's answer is, in effect, the answer which Browning

gives in some of his most characteristic poems. It is the law of man's being to aspire constantly to perfection, to be reaching ever upwards towards God. His intellect seeks after knowledge and his will aspires to goodness. But how are we to recognize goodness? By means of reason, says Hooker, including our own private judgment, always however supplemented and corrected by the general reason of mankind. For no man can attain to perfection in solitude or isolation. He is essentially a social being and needs the aid of his fellows. Hence arise communities, both political and ecclesiastical. The particular form of the community is a matter of common consent. Hooker is quite innocent of any doctrine of the divine right of kings.

The laws which govern our relations with God are delivered to us by revealed religion. But reason is not thereby displaced. It is reason which warrants our acceptance of the claims of revelation. It is reason which enables us to draw the distinction between "natural" laws which are of permanent obligation, both for individuals and societies, and "positive" laws, which though equally divine in origin, are not necessarily invariable. Here we reach the point that touches Hooker's immediate controversy with the Puritans. Under the head of "positive law" he distinguishes between those which, once they have been promulgated, have universal and permanent authority, and those which, referring to temporary conditions, are only of temporary application.

The Puritans asserted that no law which is not found in Scripture can be of permanent obligation. Hooker replies that there are many "natural laws" discoverable by human reason, which are of permanent obligation. The Puritans asserted that every rule and regulation found in Scripture is a law for all time. Hooker replies that such rules and regulations may be permanent, or they may be temporary. If they deal with things unchanging, they are themselves unchanging; if they deal with what is transitory, they also are transitory.

In other words, the Divine Reason is manifested not only in revelation but in human reason. To set up Scripture as the sole rule of life and to degrade reason has the appearance of humble piety. It is, in truth, disguised arrogance, because in the very process it opposes the human will to the Divine.

I have tried to sketch in outline the argument of the First Book. It would be beside our present purpose to follow out its detailed application in Book II, which refutes the Puritan thesis that Scripture is the only rule of all things which man may do in this life; or in Book III, where he applies his principles to Church Government, showing that government by Bishops was primitive and was practically excellent, though not indispensable; or in Book IV, which vindicates the moderation of the English Reformation against the Puritans, who held that the Church of England still needed to be cleansed of many Popish orders, rites, and ceremonials; or in Book V, in which he vindicates our Anglican Prayer Book worship, with its orders, its occasional services and its sacraments. I can

only say that those who are interested in the discussion of these subjects will find our Church of England worship expounded and defended with calmness, dignity and persuasive reasoning.

Our present interest is with the form rather than with the matter of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. In the history of English literature Hooker holds a high and conspicuous place. As Dean Church has said: the book "first revealed to the nation what English prose might be: its power of grappling with difficult conceptions and subtle reasonings, of bringing imagination and passion to animate and illuminate severe thought, of suiting itself to the immense variety of lights and moods and feelings which really surround and accompany the work of the mind; its power of attracting and charming like poetry, its capacity for a most delicate or most lofty music. The men who first read the early books of Hooker must have felt that their mother-tongue had suddenly appeared in a form which might bear comparison with the great classical models for force or beauty." Dean Church goes on to refer to the verdict of Hallam, in the chapter on the literature of Europe, in his *Constitutional History*, an often quoted passage which will bear repetition.

> "(Hooker) has abundant claims to be counted among the luminaries of English literature. He not only opened the mine, but explored the depths of our native eloquence. So stately and graceful is the march of his periods, so various the fall of his musical cadences upon the ear, so rich in images, so condensed in sentences, so grave and noble his diction, so little is there of vulgarity in his racy idiom, of pedantry in his learned phrase, that I know not whether any later writer has more admirably displayed the capacities of our language, or produced passages more worthy of comparison with the splendid monuments of antiquity."

Hallam, too, in his *Introduction to the Literature of Europe*, does not hesitate to assert that "the finest, as well as the most philosophical writer of the Elizabethan period is Hooker. The first book of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* is, at this day, one of the masterpieces of English eloquence."[1]

Estimates such as these, from critics so well equipped to pronounce judgment, may reveal to us something of the greatness of Hooker's work; how in wealth and stateliness and strength of diction, he stands indisputably in the very first rank of English writers. It must be admitted, indeed, that to the modern reader Hooker's English would not seem easy. The reading of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*—like matrimony, is "not by any to be enterprised nor taken in hand unadvisedly, lightly or wantonly." The reason for this does not lie in the fact that his vocabulary is archaic. It is true that, when it serves his purpose, he can use quite homely expressions. He speaks of a "mingle-mangle"[2] of religion and superstition. When referring to the affected atheism of some men, he speaks of the "spit venom"[3] of their poisoned hearts. But the

[1] Vol. II, Part II, Chap. VII, Section I, § 16.
[2] Sermons V, 7. [3] *Eccl. Pol.*, V, 2, 2.

difficulty for the modern reader does not lie in expressions like these. It lies rather in the fact that Hooker's prose was largely influenced by the Latin models with which he, like the other learned men of his day, was so intimately familiar. Following these examples, he arrays his words in an order which, while it corresponds most closely to the sequence of the thought, seems to us rather artificial and unnatural. And yet, what appears to be an almost perverse intricacy, is really a fitting arrangement of all the component parts, which are so hinged together as to give compactness and strength.

One characteristic in which he differs from our present habits of writing is, that he uses the long sentence, composed of many dependent clauses, linked together by a large variety of connecting words, each clause related to the other in a proper subordination. Sometimes he reverses the order of a sentence, with a view to placing the emphatic word in the emphatic place. He will put the object or the predicate early, as suits his purpose, and often he will reserve the verb, which completes the meaning of the passage, to the very last place in the sentence. He will even so far imitate Latin, as to separate the relative from its antecedent, putting the relative first. His sermons were similarly constructed, and Fuller, speaking of them, says, "His style was long and pithy, drawing on a whole flock of clauses before he came to the close of a sentence," and he goes on to say that while many found him obscure, "such who would patiently attend and give credit to all the reading or hearing of his sentences, had their expectation ever paid at the close thereof."

This kind of writing and speaking, in the hands of a smaller man, might have led to inextricable confusion and hopeless pedantry. But Hooker was master of his own style; he could wield the language into the exact expression of his thought. And above all, he had a most exquisite ear for rhythm. His prose is always melodious, and often rises to absolute majesty in passages of uplifted eloquence.

The fact is, Hooker is the last author in the world to be skipped. He requires in his reader sustained thought and sustained attention, and, as Bishop Paget has well said: [1]

> "In the present day, when not only he who reads must run, but also he who writes is generally running too, there is a wholesome discipline and also an unusual satisfaction to be found in studying an author whose every sentence has been thoroughly and conscientiously thought out, who is never slovenly or tautologous, and for whose work the most noble language seems somehow the most serviceable and appropriate."

The epitaph composed for Hooker by Sir William Cowper contains in its opening lines the famous adjective by which he has become known to succeeding ages:

> "Though nothing can be spoke worthy his fame,
> Or the remembrance of that precious name,

[1] Introduction, p. 4.

Judicious Hooker; though this cost be spent
On him that hath a lasting monument
In his own Books, yet ought we to express
If not his worth, yet our respectfulness."

"Judicious" is a fitting epithet. It does not mean cold, unemotional or detached. He was the very reverse of all that. It means that he was a man of wide reading and profound thought. The writers to whom, in the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, he makes allusion—not only Fathers and Schoolmen, but Aristotle, Plato, Sophocles, Euripides, Demosthenes, Polybius, Philo, Pliny, Tacitus—show the range of his erudition. They show too how in him the spirit of the Renaissance, that liberal spirit which does honour to every human faculty, had modified the stricter temper of the Reformation. From his earliest days he had been laborious, and for the most part he laboured in despite of ill health and adverse circumstance. His work was in a sense unfinished. But what he has given us is an eternal possession for those who love the English language and those who love the English Church. And the spirit of his writing is greater even than the work itself—a spirit always serious, always reverent, always devout, and yet, with reverence and devotion, always paying the fullest honour to human reason. In his method and temper, he represents:

> "nothing less than the better mind of England; its courage and its prudence; its audacity and its spirit of reverence; its regard for principles and its dislike of doctrinaire abstractions; its capacity for speculation controlled by its consideration of circumstances; its respect for the past and its readiness for new developments; its practical tendency; its lofty common sense." [1]

[1] Dowden, *Puritan and Anglican*, p. 96.

THE DATE OF EASTER AND OTHER CHRISTIAN FESTIVALS. By David R. Fotheringham, M.A., F.R.A.S., Vicar of Charing. London: *S.P.C.K.* Paper, 1*s.* 6*d.* Cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lord Desborough contributes a Preface to this book which is the result of long and patient research in which Mr. Fotheringham has had the assistance of competent authorities. He possesses an intimate knowledge of astronomy and of Holy Scripture and is thus well equipped for the task he has undertaken. He sets out his reasons for regarding Friday, April 7, A.D. 30, as the date of the Crucifixion, and he suggests as the date for a fixed Easter, April 9, or the Sunday next after. The difficulty is that there would have to be agreement among the Christian Churches before the change could be effected and it is by no means certain that the proposal would be favourably regarded. This, however, in no degree lessens the value of Mr. Fotheringham's careful work.

S. R. C.

THE DANGER OF DISESTABLISHMENT.

By the Rev. Alfred Fawkes, M.A., Vicar of Ashby St. Ledgers.

NOT long ago a lively writer in the *Spectator* taxed me with holding that Establishment was "The Church's One Foundation." I am inclined to reply, with the Schoolmen, *Distinguo*. There are circumstances under which it may be so; and I am not sure that the Church of England does not find itself in such circumstances to-day. "Let us not be ashamed to be Erastian with St. Paul," said Dean Stanley, speaking of the Apostle's appeal to Caesar.[1] He had seen enough of hierarchies to distrust them; he would rather be judged by Festus than by Ananias; and preferred Roman justice to the sanctified malice of priests. It has been said that one of the great merits of the Church of England is that her supreme Court of Appeal is mainly composed of elderly lawyers whose attitude towards most ecclesiastical disputes is one of slightly cynical impartiality. It is so; and long may it so remain.

It would be an immense gain to clearness of thought if people who use the word "Church" would tell us, in each case, the sense in which they do so. For no word is used more loosely; and I confess that I sense a fallacy when I hear it. Is it the Church of England that is meant? Or the Roman Catholic Church? Or Convocation? Or the Church Assembly? Or the *Guardian*? Or the *Church Times*? Or is it an abstraction?—such as the "unanimous consent of the Fathers"? Or the "Undivided Church"? Or the Six—or is it Eight?—General Councils? Or the Primitive Church? Let us make it clear to which we refer. Since the memorable vote of the House of Commons last December the Revision Controversy has entered upon a new phase. It was originally liturgical and ceremonial, though with a theological background: the disputants argued over what Hobbes calls "insignificant speech"—i.e. over ambiguous terms which can be taken in various senses—grammatical, historical, mystical and the like.

Such discussions are interminable:

> "Figure and phrase which bent all ways
> Duns Scotus liked to twist 'em."

There is no sufficient reason why they should either begin or end. "This is what theologians call 'Prevenient' grace," said an Eton tutor to his pupils, speaking of Romans viii. "But the less we know of these things the better," he added. May we not say the same of the "Objective" Presence? the "Memorial" Sacrifice? the "autonomy" and "inherent spiritual authority" of the Church? These phrases recall the Provincial Letters: the grace which was at once "sufficient" and "insufficient"; the power which was at once "proximate" and "remote." Pascal's comment is—*Heureux les peuples qui l'ignorent.*

[1] *Essays on Church and State*, p. 371.

The issue has now been transferred to the concrete ground of politics: it is being represented as one between Church and State. Is the distinction a real one? Is the contrast between them more than a figure of speech?

"An alliance between Church and State in a Christian commonwealth is, in my opinion [says Burke], an idle and fanciful speculation."[1] The same may be said of their separation. An alliance and a distinction are between two things that are in their nature distinct and independent, such as between two sovereign states. But, "in a Christian Commonwealth, the Church and the State are one and the same thing, being different integral parts of the same whole." For the Church has always been divided into two parts, the Clergy and the Laity; of which the latter is as much an essential part as the former. "What is the Laity?" it has been asked. "The Church," it has been answered, "minus the Clergy."[2] The definition is at once happy and just. How much the State owes to the Church! it is said. Yes; and how much the Church to the State! "The dumb ass rebuked the madness of the prophet": how narrowly only a few weeks since the lay State saved the English Church and English religion from imminent peril! It was taking a gambler's chance to throw the Prayer Book into the melting-pot at a time when the theological atmosphere is as charged with electricity as at present. Surely no more unsuitable moment could be chosen for the difficult and delicate task of its reconstruction. "Why can't you let it alone?"

We are told to "trust the Bishops." In their official capacity, we do so: confidence is the basis and link of society. As legislators and judges, it is another matter: legislation is for the legislature; the administration of justice is for the courts of law. We are reminded of the amount of prayer of which the Deposited Book is the outcome. How (it is asked), if we believe in prayer, can we fail to see in this at once a manifest answer to prayer and the evidence of the Divine Will? The argument is unconvincing. The Bishops of Norwich and Birmingham have also presumably prayed, and done so on other lines than those of the Bishops of Durham and Gloucester. Which is Israel and which is Amalek? Which "has had power with God and has prevailed"? In his inimitable *Reminiscences of Scottish Life and Character* Dean Ramsay tells us of a certain notable Miss Carnegie, who during the Napoleonic wars was accustomed to account for the British victories by the piety of the British army: "the British aye say their prayers before the battle." A friend of inquiring mind suggested a difficulty: "Canna the French say their prayers too?" The reply was silencing: "Hoot, jabbering bodies! Wha could understand *them*?"

It has been argued that, had the Church Assembly accepted the proposal to drop the rubrics in the Alternative Use which permit perpetual Reservation, "the spiritual authority of the Church would have been destroyed." The Assembly did not do so; and

[1] Speech on the Petition of the Unitarians.
[2] *Life and Letters of Dr. Arnold*, Stanley, p. 360.

what action Parliament may take remains to be seen. But I am reminded of Walpole's Excise Scheme of 1733. It was unpopular; and he withdrew it. At a later date he was suspected of a design to re-introduce it in a slightly disguised form. He had no such design, he replied. "I thought the Bill a good one; and I think so still. But I am not foolish enough to oppose so strongly expressed a judgment of the House and the country. As far as I am concerned, the Bill is dead." Walpole was a strong man; and the Assembly might have been better advised had it followed his example. It acted at its own risk, and must take the consequences; there is no more to be said.

What is meant by "the inherent spiritual authority of the Church"? A Roman Catholic will give you as a reply the concrete and traditional interpretation of "Thou art Peter," and "Here are two swords." It is an intelligible, if an erroneous, answer. An Anglican can give you no answer at all. Hook's once famous sermon before Queen Victoria on "Hear the Church" will be remembered; and the Oxford divines of his time pressed the duty of doing so. Arnold dealt with it characteristically. "I am satisfied that Church authority, early or late, is as rotten a staff as ever was Pharaoh King of Egypt—it will go into a man's hand to pierce him!" The Church of England, in particular, has such authority as has been given it by Parliament; the Prayer Book itself is a schedule of the Act of Uniformity.—"The powers that be are ordained of God"; and, for us, the Church is one of them. But its authority is of the same order as theirs. Do not let us see it out of proportion. When Mr. Collins, in *Pride and Prejudice*, professes himself "ever ready to perform those rites and ceremonies which are instituted by the Church of England," Elizabeth is struck "by his kind intention of christening, marrying and burying his parishioners whenever it was required." "Can he be a sensible man?" she asked her father. "No, my dear; I think not. I have great hopes of finding him quite the reverse." Which proved to be the case.

The authority of the Church referred to in Article XX is not the *Charisma veritatis*. With regard to disputed points of theology Bishop Thirlwall, the wisest of English Bishops, said that the Bishops could not decide them; and he rejoiced that there was no authority which could. If the Churches of Rome, Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch "have erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith," our own can scarcely claim exemption. It was said, indeed, of a late excellent but arbitrary Bishop of Gloucester, "What is the difference between the Pope and Bishop Baring?" the answer being, "The Pope never *can* be wrong; but the Bishop of Gloucester never *is*." But, probably, neither his clergy nor his colleagues would have accepted this view of the matter. Nor can the authority of which we are in search be found in General Councils: "The sea said, It is not in me." In the first place, these Councils "may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes": and, in the

second, "forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the spirit and word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining to God."

"Is he a Churchman? Then he's fond of power,"

says an eighteenth century poet. Diotrephes, "who loveth to have the pre-eminence," is still with us; and humility is not one of his virtues. "Is he not a humble man?" it was asked of a late well-known clergyman. "He thinks himself so," was the reply. An instance of this displeasing temper is the outcry that has been raised in the Church Press and by a section of the clergy over the refusal of Parliament to limit its functions with regard to the Revision Measure to saying "ditto" to the Bishops' Bill. This Bill was not exclusively, or even mainly, an ecclesiastical one. It involved the repeal of an Act of Parliament—that of Uniformity, 1662; and by no lesser authority than that of Parliament can this be effected. When the authority of the Pope was repudiated by the nation under Henry VIII and Elizabeth, it was not transferred to the Bishops and clergy of the National Church: nor did that typical product of post-war mentality, the Enabling Act, affect either the Supremacy of the Crown or the authority of Parliament; the Sovereign is still "in all causes and over all persons, whether ecclesiastical or civil within these his dominions supreme." This Reign of Law is our safeguard against arbitrary Bishops and tumultuous synods; against revolutionary change either in Church or State. To enthusiasts this State Control, as exercised whether in legislation by Parliament or in law by the lay courts, appears anomalous and degrading. "For my part," says Bishop Thirlwall, "I heartily rejoice that it is so. I consider it a ground for the deepest thankfulness, as one of the most precious privileges of the Church of England, that principles which I believe to be grounded in justice, equity and common sense are still the rule of judgement in ecclesiastical causes. I earnestly hope that she may not be deprived of this blessing by the misguided zeal of some of her friends, from whom, I believe, she has at present more to fear than from the bitterest of her enemies."[1]

The most important pronouncement which has been made on this, which is by far the gravest, aspect of the present controversy, was that of the Cambridge Divinity Professors.[2]

> "The cry of State versus Church that has been raised in the discussions on the Prayer Book seems to us so misleading that we ask you to allow us to say so in *The Times*. The vote in the House of Commons was indeed a vote on a spiritual issue—an issue which we believe to be momentous for the religion of the people of England. But it was not an attempt to force on the Church of England a form of religion against the will of the Church. On the contrary, we are convinced that the

[1] Charge of the Bishop of St. David's, 1866.
[2] *The Times*, February 4.

majority of the House of Commons reflected the religious sense and the spiritual judgement of a large majority of Church people.

"The Revised Prayer Book is the product of diplomatic arrangements made by Bishops and other officials of the Church, in the course of which we are sure that fundamental spiritual issues were blurred. These issues are clearer to some of those who had no part in the negotiations than they were to some of the negotiators. In some of the provisions of the Revised Prayer Book the people of the Church of England scent a form of religion which their forefathers at the Reformation repudiated. They do not want it for themselves or their children. This is the really spiritual issue, and on it the House of Commons gauged the spiritual convictions of the English Church better than the majority of the Bishops and the Church Assembly hitherto have done. If we are right in our reading of the facts, the arguments that are being used to inflame the minds of Church people against State interference in spiritual concerns are as false as they are mischievous and subversive of the religious well-being of the people of England."

The " God or Caesar " alternative is irrelevant. Neither Parliament nor the courts define doctrine; the former makes, the latter interpret, law. It is, no doubt, conceivable that circumstances should arise under which disobedience to the law would be a moral duty. But such circumstances are rare. And the reason why sensible people are predisposed to take the side of the law against those who come into conflict with it on the pretext of religion is that, with few, very few exceptions, the law is right and they are wrong. The policy of the modern State is one of non-intervention. The courts are slow to intervene in the internal affairs of corporations; and there is perhaps an excessive deference paid to the pretext of conscience—however absurd both the pretext and the conscience may be. Sunday after Sunday, e.g., we have seen " Father " Lauria turn his church into a bear-garden, and fill Darwen with a mob of howling fanatics; Sunday after Sunday to keep the peace during Divine Service the police are called out by the score. All that the Bishop and the Mayor can say is, " I wish you wouldn't; I really do." The " Father " makes short work of their bleating. " I will have my way," said a clergyman of this school, " even if the church is empty." He had his way; and the church *is* empty. Better so than the scene of a weekly riot. But—" Will they not say that ye are mad? "

Few words are as misleading as " Church " and " Churchmen." The insertion of a marginal reading—"Community " and "Christian "—would clear the air. No greater misfortune could befall religion than to be identified with sectional or party interests; the Church, if she is to retain her hold on the nation, must be nothing less than the nation on its religious side. The same men and women who constitute the one constitute the other also; the accent differs, the content is the same. What is the Church of England? Not

Convocation; not those who describe themselves as "good Churchmen"; least of all, the Church Assembly—*Monstrum horrendium, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.*—No, but all Christian Englishmen. The objection that the country is no longer Christian is the merest sophistry. If its Protestantism was not affected by the repeal of the Penal Laws against Catholics, its Christianity is even less so by the admission of a handful of Jews and secularists to citizenship. The greater absorbs the less. As a fact, since the removal of these disabilities, Parliament has given us legislation in advance of the public opinion of the Churches; philanthropy—which, after all, has something to do with religion—has reached a higher level without than it has within the fold. While there are greater divergencies of opinion between Churchmen and Churchmen than between Churchmen and Christians of other denominations, the sect argument breaks down on its own ground. A Church rests on a broader basis. The Church of England, in particular, is established not because it teaches a particular theology, or possesses a particular succession, but because it represents the best mind and conscience of the community—the working, in philosophical language, of Reason, in religious language, of the Spirit, in the world and among men. If it ceases to do this, if it reflects a sectional mind and a denominational conscience, the sufficient reason for its establishment disappears. Only by the frank acceptance of the national, as distinct from the merely denominational, standpoint can the Church "as by law established," the Church as we and our fathers have known it, be retained. Religion would be the poorer for its loss: a time-honoured home of "true religion and useful learning"—values not lightly to be dissociated—would have passed away. Were Disestablishment brought about under existing circumstances, it would be attended by two notable results; (1) the strengthening of the Romanizing tendencies among Anglicans, and so (indirectly) of the Roman Catholic Church; and (2) the spiritual destitution of country districts, which would be left without adequate provision for their religious needs. Whether our rural populations could, or could not, supply these needs for themselves, it is certain that they would not do so; and that they would be deprived of a humanizing and civilizing influence were they not supplied. "In the event of Disestablishment the person about whom I am uneasy [says Macaulay] is the working man." In every community a large proportion of the citizens are intellectually and morally minors. The State stands to them in *loco parentis*; and it performs only half its duty if it overlooks the ideal side of their lives. The present danger is twofold: the first being the apathy of the community to ideas; the second the chance that the position may be rushed by some sudden panic or passion, some revolutionary outbreak of fanaticism such as that which, in connection with the present unhappy Revision controversy, seems to have taken possession of ordinarily reasonable, sober and moderate men. This over, we may awake to find that we have "loosely, through silence, permitted things to pass away as in a dream."

THE REFORM OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

By H. F. Walker.

THE crisis in the Church of England arising out of the rejection of the Prayer Book Measure by the House of Commons has raised a fundamental issue. Precisely the same issue is involved in relation to the question of the reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts. In both cases it arises out of the conditions of the Establishment in England. Let us then be quite clear as to the meaning of Establishment in this country, for it is of the utmost importance that there should be no misunderstanding or misconception on this point when the subject of Ecclesiastical Courts is under consideration. "The Establishment of the Church by law consists essentially in the incorporation of the law of the Church into that of the realm, as a branch of the general law of the realm, though limited as to the causes to which, and the persons to whom it applies; in the public recognition of its Courts and Judges, as having proper legal jurisdiction; and in the enforcement of the sentences of those courts, when duly pronounced according to law, by the civil power." In the words just quoted the meaning of Establishment is plainly and concisely explained by a great authority, viz., Lord Selborne, in his well-known book entitled *A Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment.*

The Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England have by statute been incorporated into the law of the Realm. Now the law of the Realm has to be construed by Courts to which the necessary jurisdiction has been granted and cannot be altered otherwise than by the authority of Parliament. From this position flow two results of fundamental significance and importance in relation to the ecclesiastical law of the Realm. One is that that law must be finally determined by a Court appointed by the Crown and the other is that Church legislation must be finally approved by Parliament. In other words, the conditions of Establishment in England are such that the judicial and legislative system of the Church are subject to the final control of lay and secular authorities. Whether this ought to be so or not is entirely a matter of opinion. The point is that it is so, and that position was accepted by the Church from the time of the Reformation.

But during the latter half of the nineteenth century, as the "Catholic" movement began to grow and spread among the clergy, a revolt against these cardinal principles of Establishment began. The movement was directed first against the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council which was and is the Final Appellate Tribunal in ecclesiastical causes. The clerical rebels professed to

repudiate the jurisdiction of this Court, and claimed to act in disregard of its judgments in decided cases.

The same thing is happening in relation to the authority of Parliament now that the House of Commons has exercised its undoubted constitutional right to reject a Church Measure of the first importance. The authority of Parliament is challenged in the name of the (so-called) spiritual freedom of the Church. In both cases the Church is faced with the question whether or not it will continue to conform to the legal conditions of establishment or whether it will seek disestablishment. This is the fundamental issue which has now been raised.

With the question of the Church's position in relation to Parliament we are not further concerned in this article. But on the question of the Courts a Commission of the Church Assembly has proposed a scheme which is intended to operate within the Establishment in such a way as to satisfy the Church, and it is the main principles of this scheme which we are concerned here to examine.

Bearing in mind that the ecclesiastical law of the Realm is, as we have already seen, just a special branch of the general law which has to be construed and administered by properly constituted Courts, it is interesting to recall that in pre-Norman days there was no well-defined or separate system of ecclesiastical courts and that the civil and spiritual judges sat together in one court administering there civil and ecclesiastical justice. This system has been described by the great lawyer Blackstone as "moderate and rational," and it is most interesting to note that in 1898 Parliament, for a special purpose, in effect revived the system when it established the Court under the Benefices Act, 1898. In this court the judges are the Archbishop of the Province and a Judge of the Supreme Court nominated by the Lord Chancellor. The latter decides all questions of law and finds as to the facts alleged as grounds of unfitness in the presentee of the benefice, and such decision and findings are binding on the Archbishop. The Archbishop directs institution or admission if the Judge finds that no fact exists sufficient in law to be a reason of unfitness or disqualification or, if the Judge finds that any such fact exists, decides, if necessary, whether by reason thereof the presentee is unfit for the discharge of his duties and determines whether institution or admission ought in the circumstances to be refused; and in either case gives judgment accordingly, and that judgment is final.

The Anglo-Saxon system, however, in which Bishop and Sheriff had presided together over the Shire Court where both spiritual and secular causes came up for decision, was abolished by William the Conqueror, who directed that ecclesiastical causes should be heard and determined in exclusively ecclesiastical courts. There were three such courts, viz., the Court of the Archdeacon, the Court of the Bishop, otherwise called the Diocesan or Consistory Court, and the Court of the Archbishop, otherwise called the Provincial Court. Of these, the Court of the Archdeacon is, for judicial

purposes, dormant, though it has a legal existence and could be revived. Whether with a simple procedure it could be made to serve a useful purpose in disposing quickly of minor matters is perhaps worth consideration. The Diocesan and Provincial Courts are the two important ecclesiastical courts, and it is necessary to note carefully why these courts are recognized by the Church as "spiritual" courts properly so called. The reason is that they derive their authority from the Bishop and Archbishop respectively, and it matters not whether the Bishop or Archbishop sits as sole judge or whether his "Official" or Chancellor sits for him, inasmuch as, in either case, the Court is acknowledged as a spiritual court by reason of the Episcopal source of its authority.

It is not the purpose of this article to discuss questions of procedure. It may well be that there is much room for reform in the procedure of the Church Courts, and provided that any changes which may be made are not inconsistent with the general principles of English justice they should be welcomed.

Apart from questions of procedure there is not much difficulty or controversy about the two Courts now under consideration. As spiritual Courts they have always been acceptable to the Church and they have been recognized by the State. Opinion may differ as to whether the Bishop himself should sit as Judge having his "Official" or Chancellor with him as an Assessor to keep him right on questions of law and evidence or whether the "Official" or Chancellor should sit as Judge, having the Bishop with him as an Assessor in relation to theological and liturgical questions. These alternatives are discussed in the Report of the Church Assembly Commission (C.A. 200), pp. 10–15.

With regard to the Diocesan Court the Commission itself recommends that the Chancellor should be the Judge, but that the Bishop should be at liberty, when he sees fit, to sit in lieu of the Chancellor, in which case the latter should act as legal assessor, and there should also be a theological assessor. In the case of the Provincial Courts the Commission recommends that the Archbishop should have the right in all cases to decide whether he himself or the "Official Principal" shall sit as Judge. If he sits himself the "Official Principal" should be his legal assessor, and in either case each should have the right to request the attendance of theological assessors.

No important question of principle seems to arise out of these recommendations, which we therefore think may be generally accepted.

The next stage in the matter is the consideration of the appellate system in ecclesiastical causes, and here very serious questions of principle do arise. From the Diocesan Court an appeal lies to the Provincial Court and from that Court the appeal is to the Crown. This, of course, is the final appeal, and it is an appeal to the King in Council. This means that the appeal is heard by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and technically their judgment is a report of advice to the King. This Court, as it may be conveniently

termed, is the highest Court of Appeal in the British Empire and is of equal standing with the House of Lords, from which it differs only in point of jurisdiction and in certain matters of procedure. The Law Lords are also members of the Judicial Committee, and in substance the two tribunals are one except that certain distinguished judges or ex-judges, both English and Dominion, who are not peers, are members of the Judicial Committee. No ecclesiastical test is imposed on the members of the Committee when they sit to hear ecclesiastical cases, but they are required to have with them certain Episcopal Assessors who, however, act in an advisory capacity only, take no part in the decision, and are not therefore responsible for it. The Court is as completely unfettered in ecclesiastical as in any other causes within its jurisdiction.

Under the present system, then, the Church has the right to have ecclesiastical appeals heard and determined by the greatest Law Court in the world. But the following objections are taken: it is said that this Court is not a spiritual Court, for it derives its authority from the Crown; that the right of declaring the teaching and use of the Church belongs to the authorities of the Church and not to a State Court; that as the decisions of the Final Court are binding upon the inferior Provincial and Diocesan Courts the decisions of the latter may be infected with a non-spiritual element; and that the members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have not the requisite knowledge of ecclesiastical and theological matters to fit them to be judges in cases where these questions arise. The result is that the Anglo-Catholics on these, and possibly other grounds, repudiate the jurisdiction of this Court, which it is said, for this reason, does not possess the moral authority which a court should have if its judgments are to be effective. The Church Assembly Commission has committed itself to the view that the breakdown in the operation and enforcement of ecclesiastical law is due to the existence of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as the Final Court of Appeal and that the vindication of the law cannot be secured unless a change is made in the present constitution of the Final Court.

Before we consider the proposals which the Church Assembly Commission recommends to remedy the mischiefs which are alleged to exist in relation to the Final Court of Appeal it is desirable to bear in mind the following most important points, viz.: (1) While the Church remains Established and subject to the Royal Supremacy the final appeal must be to the Crown and therefore the Final Court of Appeal never can be a spiritual Court; (2) that spiritual authority cannot of itself confer legal competence; (3) that the principle that the decision of a superior Court is binding upon an inferior Court is fundamental to the English judicial system, for only so can uniformity, certainty and consistency in the law be obtained; (4) that in the English judicial system it is not required as a matter of principle, though it may be in some cases as a matter of convenience, that a judge shall be an expert in any one branch

of the law. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council itself, for example, has to deal with many systems of law within the British Empire, but no rational person suggests that it is incompetent to adjudicate upon a case involving a different system of law, because that particular system is not one in which the Judges themselves have been trained; and (5) that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council "has no jurisdiction or authority to settle matters of faith, or to determine what ought in any particular to be the doctrine of the Church of England. Its duty extends only to the consideration of that which is by law established to be the doctrine of the Church of England upon the true and legal construction of her Articles and Formularies." In other words, with regard to controverted opinions the question which the Court has to decide "is not whether they are theologically sound or unsound—not whether upon some of the doctrines comprised in the opinions, other opinions opposite to them may or may not be held with equal or even greater reason by other learned and pious ministers of the Church, but whether these opinions . . . are contrary or repugnant to the doctrines which the Church of England, by its Articles, Formularies and Rubrics requires to be held by its ministers." The passages just quoted are taken from the judgment of the Court itself in the case of Gorham *v.* The Bishop of Exeter,[1] and it is of the utmost importance that they should be carefully noted and clearly understood.

We turn now to the actual proposals of the Church Assembly Commission. They require careful examination because they present a plausible appearance to the uninstructed layman. The Commission admits that the final appeal must be to the Crown, and that the authority and jurisdiction of the Court must be derived from the Crown, with the result that the Court will be a non-spiritual Court. They further agree that the Judges must be appointed by the Crown, and they propose that they shall be selected from among existing Judges, whether judicial members of the House of Lords, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council or the Supreme Court, and persons learned in ecclesiastical law. They propose that a new Court, so constituted, shall be established to be called the Court of Appeal to the Crown. So far there appears to be no difference in principle between the proposals of the Commission and the present system, and it is this that makes the scheme so plausible. But consider now the further proposals. The first departure from the pure standard of the English judicial system is in the imposition of an ecclesiastical test in a Crown Court. The Judges are to be required to declare themselves to be members of the Church of England as by law established. This in itself is sufficiently serious, for its only effect can be to narrow the area of choice of the judges. It might exclude some of the ablest among them. Obviously it cannot convert the Court into a "spiritual" Court. Even the Church Assembly Commission are constrained

[1] Brodrick and Fremantle's *Ecclesiastical Judgments of the Privy Council*, p. 64.

to admit that they " cannot consider that this is a matter of vital principle " ; but they 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." In our submission the imposition of this test is thoroughly unsound and ought to be rejected.

But far more serious is the next proposal, and this is the vital point of the whole scheme. We must quote the actual words of the Report of the Commission as follows: " We . . . . recommend that where in an appeal before the 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 Court having taken such opinion into their 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. For the purpose of this paragraph the expression ' Acts of Parliament ' does not include the Book of Common Prayer or the Thirty-nine Articles."

We can only regard this as an astounding recommendation, and we are completely at a loss to understand how the legal members of the Commission were induced to assent to it. Nor do we think that some of the other members of the Commission can have realized what they were doing. In our submission the proposal, in substance, amounts to nothing less than the setting-up of a " spiritual " Court as the Final Court of Appeal. The form of a Crown Court is retained, but the substance of the matter is that in all questions relating to the doctrine, discipline or use of the Church of England, including the construction of the Book of Common Prayer and Thirty-nine Articles, which are documents having statutory effect, the Court is completely subordinated to the Episcopate. This recommendation of the Commission is as astute as it is plausible. If there is to be any pretence of retaining the appearance of a Crown Court, then the Anglo-Catholics could ask for nothing more except that the Crown should be deprived of the right of appointing Bishops. That the construction of any branch of the general law of the Realm of which the Prayer Book and Articles form part should be withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the Crown Judges is a recommendation as intolerable as it is revolutionary, and we cannot think that such a departure from the English judicial system could ever receive the sanction of Parliament.

We must pass now to the consideration of a third recommendation of the Commission which is open to the most serious objection. The Commission has thrown over the great principle that the judgment of a superior Court must be binding on an inferior Court, for the Commission recommends with regard to the decisions

of the Crown Court " that the actual decree alone shall be of binding authority, and shall not form a precedent." We submit that this will reduce ecclesiastical law to chaos and absurdity. The objections to such a proposal were stated in measured language by a great lawyer (Lord Penzance) in his separate report as a member of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission of 1883. He there said: " Such a system, if adopted, would result in this, that no case would become a precedent for the decision of cases arising after it, except those in which every circumstance was identical. No legal principle would be asserted or established, no general interpretation of the terms and directions involved in the Rubrics of the Prayer Book, or of the language in which the doctrine or the ceremonial of the Church has been expressed by lawful authority could be arrived at or ascertained. Every fresh point, though in reality falling under a general category with which the Court had previously dealt, would become necessarily the subject of a fresh suit to settle it, and until it was brought to adjudication no man would be able to tell what the law might be held to be. In a word, such a system, if acted upon for half a century, would destroy the ascertained law altogether; and had it been maintained in the temporal courts from early times, it is not too much to say that what is known as the common law of the land could have had no existence."

We may safely leave the proposal that the decision of the Court shall only be binding in the particular case to the condemnation of Lord St. Leonards and proceed to some concluding observations.

There are other matters of importance that might be referred to in connection with the subject of Ecclesiastical Courts. The historical aspect of the matter is very relevant to an understanding of the true constitutional position and there is the Bishops' veto on legal proceedings which should certainly be abolished. The purpose of this article, however, has been to select three of the proposals of the Church Assembly Commission which seem to raise fundamental questions of principle and on these points to challenge their recommendations.

We submit that there is really no half-way house for the Church between accepting frankly and fully the well-established principles of the English constitution and judicial system and disestablishment under which the Church can have any fancy system of " spiritual " courts which it cares to set up.

Apart from disestablishment, when the whole question of Ecclesiastical Courts would cease to concern the State, the only alternatives to the present system are, we suggest, as follows:

The total abolition of the Ecclesiastical Courts and the substitution therefor of:

(*a*) The system adopted for the Court under the Benefices Act, 1898, with an appeal from the Judge on questions of law to the Court of Appeal and House of Lords, or

(*b*) The Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice with

the usual right of appeal to the Court of Appeal and House of Lords.

In ecclesiastical appeals the House of Lords should have the right to consult the Bishops who are members of the House just as the House has the right to consult the Judges. But the judicial discretion of the House should be absolutely unfettered and the opinions of the Bishops should not be binding upon it. So far as the Final Court of Appeal is concerned there is obviously little to choose between the House of Lords with the Bishops as consultants and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council with its Episcopal Assessors. But that one or other of these Tribunals should, so long as the Church remains established, be the Final Court of Appeal in ecclesiastical causes is, we are persuaded, a matter of vital importance to both Evangelical and Liberal Churchmen.

The Altar on the Hearth, by the Rev. George Townshend, Canon of Clonfert (The Talbot Press, Ltd., 2*s.* 6*d.* net), is a book of prayers and meditations which as Bishop Plunket says in his Introduction fills a gap because it " strives to uplift the everyday life of home and family towards a definitely spiritual plane." Canon Townshend emphasizes the truth that happiness is only to be attained through conscious communion with God, and he illuminates it and illustrates it by a collection of prayers dealing with the needs of life on many sides. They are full of spiritual insight and of deep sympathy with sorrow and suffering.

Messrs. Thynne and Jarvis have issued a verbatim report of the 101st Islington Clerical Conference under the title *Evangelicals in the Church of England* (1*s.* net). Those who heard these papers will be glad to have them in this permanent form, and those who did not have the privilege of being present at the Conference will be well advised to read this account of the past work, future prospects and aims of the Evangelical School. It ought to prove an inspiration to fresh effort in the service of Christ, and in consecration to the spread of the Gospel.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE PHRASE "IN CHRIST."

To the Editor of "The Churchman."

SIR,—

We are all immensely indebted to Archdeacon Paige Cox for his magnificent service in the matter of Prayer Book Revision. But some of us may find some hesitation in agreeing with part of what he says in his article which applies the phrase "in Christ" to the doctrine of the Atonement, and with the conclusions he draws regarding the application of his view to the Communion Service.

The objections which I venture to suggest are the following:—

1. His argument practically implies (although not in so objectionable a form as some other views) that something remains to be done by the sinner in regard to the reconciling work of the Atonement. It is, of course, true that the sinner has his part to play; and to that extent it is right enough to speak of "man's part" as well as "God's part." But the part of simple and passive acceptance with the empty hand of helpless faith is a very different thing from the part of active self-surrender and self-dedication; although self-renunciation is perhaps an essential element in the passive acceptance of the gift. I have long felt that a weakness in Evangelical preaching, which possibly helps to explain the comparative paucity of decisive spiritual results in many an Evangelical ministry, is the emphasis laid on "giving oneself to Christ" rather than on "receiving Christ," upon which, St. John tells us" (i. 12), He confers the "right to become children of God." Some may feel that the distinction is subtle; but may it not be vital? In some cases it may not be so in practice; but in others it may mean the difference between helpless acceptance by faith and a lingering idea of something which the sinner can do to help himself. Incidentally, one may point out that "receiving Christ" in helpless faith involves that union with Christ which satisfies the phrase "in Christ," upon which the Archdeacon lays stress.

2. Arising directly in connection with this is the point that self-surrender is the grateful response of the sinner to the gift already received, as distinguished from the idea of an essential step towards obtaining the gift. Till the sinner is reconciled, he has neither the power nor the will to give himself. The representation of the matter for which I plead does not belittle self-dedication: it only puts it in the right place.

3. The Archdeacon practically reproduces the current libel on the "old-fashioned" Evangelical view of God! His picture is a travesty of that view, at least in so far as it is too sweeping a generalization. The Fatherhood and love of God can be as fully taught under it as he could possibly wish: there is by no means the essential misrepresentation which he implies. In fact, many of

us may feel that God's goodness and love are more fully emphasized when absolutely everything in the reconciling process is ascribed to Him. I shrewdly suspect that our Evangelical forefathers knew much more about the love of God, and preached much more about His Fatherhood, than some current representations of their beliefs allow. I will add that though I am quite certain the Archdeacon does not mean to hurt anyone's feelings, his adoption of the modern catch-phrase " Sultan-God " is unfair and disturbing. That phrase is one of the most objectionable in all modern question-begging terminology.

4. So far from the Archdeacon's view assisting a true interpretation of our present Communion Service, I believe it might hinder it. Self-dedication, in that service, follows naturally as the grateful *response* to renewed appreciation and appropriation of the merits of the one " full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice." It thus falls into its right place. The Archdeacon himself, in fact, refers to it as " this complete surrender of the self in response to God's forgiving Love." My point, all through, is that this surrender is, literally and solely, "*in response.*" Moreover, renewed appreciation of union seems to be a truer idea than being " reunited to Christ " in that service, and one still further removed from the Roman idea of renewed sacrifice and reconciliation. Nevertheless, these points, as thus amended, are helpful suggestions for which I should like to thank the Archdeacon.

One of the most prominent of our leaders in the present crisis, only a few days before I write, has suggested that a certain point (of a different kind) in the proposed Prayer Book shows " a lack of faith, a lingering idea of some sanctity of our own—which is to be added to the righteousness of Christ, by way of completing it." He characterizes this as an idea almost blasphemous; and adds —" Can a Protestant nation go back on the doctrine of justification by faith ? "

Archdeacon Paige Cox, I am sure, does not want to do that. Nor do I suggest that he feels it necessary to " complete " what our Lord did, in that sense. But I question whether his argument may not have the logical effect of diminishing the sense of the completeness of that finished work, and encouraging a subtle form —a " lingering idea "—of reliance on self.

Yours faithfully,

W. S. HOOTON.

HARROGATE,
February 6, 1928.

Through the courtesy of the Editor I have been allowed to see Mr. Hooton's letter before its appearance in print, and thus I have the opportunity of making one or two comments upon it.

I desire to thank Mr. Hooton most warmly for his more than kind personal reference to myself. I am sorry to find myself differing, even though slightly, from one with whom I have obviously so much in common.

Mr. Hooton quite misunderstands me when he speaks of my reproducing "the current libel on the old-fashioned Evangelical view of God," and when he refers to my use of the term "Sultan-God" as though it were a slight to Evangelicals. What I had in mind was the popular medieval conception of God the Father, and my words were, "The prominent feature of the service of the Mass was the propitiation of the 'Sultan-God' by the offering to Him of the Body and Blood of Christ." It has been admitted by "Anglo-Catholic" scholars that this semi-pagan element entered into the conception of God in the Middle Ages and tended to give its peculiar character to the Mass. I certainly would have included Evangelicals in the "we" of the following sentence,—"Most happily for the English Church we recovered in the sixteenth century the true conception of the Fatherhood of God."

Mr. Hooton and I agree in our wholehearted adhesion to the doctrine of justification by faith. If he demurs to some language I have used in reference to our acceptance of the benefits of Christ's redemptive work, he will hardly differ from me when I say that the faith by which we are justified is not static but dynamic—a faith "which worketh by love."

Mr. Hooton has, I think, overlooked the words in which I spoke of "the entirely satisfying view of the Atonement which magnifies the holiness and love of God, *attributing all the merit of our salvation to Him*, and at the same time commends itself to our moral sense by insisting on the surrender of the whole man to Christ in joyful faith."

Though my language might be in part open to misconstruction, it is something of a surprise to me that Mr. Hooton should apparently not hold that general view of the Atonement which I have endeavoured to outline. I had thought that the whole trend of present-day scholarship was in that direction. Since writing my article I have been reading Dr. Anderson Scott's *Christianity according to St. Paul*, perhaps the most important book on St. Paul's theology which has appeared recently. I am more than content to adopt Dr. Anderson Scott's words in setting forth the points I desired to emphasize.

"When reconciliation is spoken of in St. Paul, the subject is always God, and the object always man. . . . We never read that God has been reconciled. He was engaged in Christ in reconciling the World unto Himself."

"The faith that saves is something which along with other characteristics has this which is of vital import, namely, that it attaches the subject of it to its object; it attaches one moral personality to another, in the bond which is called love. In a word, it sets up what is called a 'mystical union' between the believer and Christ."

"This is the key-note which we may hear sounding through all the Apostle's letters, in which he is constantly depicting his relation to the Cross of Christ. It is never a relation of mere objective theory, but always and at the same time a relation of the

subjective union of the inmost feelings with the Crucified, a mystic communion with the death on the Cross and with the life of Christ risen." [1] May I just add this? The old popular doctrine of the Atonement has been a stumbling-block to many in these days. It has been a relief to such persons to note that there is no *theory* of the Atonement in the Prayer Book, just as there is no theory of the Inspiration of the Bible. This is not the case with the Deposited Book. In the alternative canon there occur the words, "We do celebrate and set forth before Thy Divine Majesty with these Thy holy gifts the memorial which He hath willed us to make." This implies that the object of the memorial which Christ instituted was to placate God the Father by bringing to His remembrance the sacrifice of the Son. If this is not intended by some who have accepted the canon, the words suggest it, and could be quoted in favour of it. That is one of the reasons why many of us have opposed the Deposited Book. There may be varying views of the Atonement, but a Book of Common Prayer should be neutral in such matters. It should not dogmatize about things that are not revealed or give dubious or equivocal interpretations to the language of Holy Writ. If the alternative canon is finally authorized in its present form it will, I fear, not only divide Church worshippers at the Holy Communion, but will tend to widen the gulf between us and that already large number of thoughtful people who are drifting away from institutional religion, though they are sincerely Christian in disposition and will.

W. L. PAIGE COX.

[1] Pp. 79, 107 and 112.

Messrs. Seeley, Service & Co. have issued a useful volume for amateur gardeners: *Gardening Without Worry*, Simple and Comprehensive Information for the Amateur Gardener, by George Barlow (3*s*. 6*d*. net). A simple account is given of soils and their properties, of manures and their various uses. Garden structures and their fittings are described and illustrated by diagrams. Instruction is given as to the formation of new gardens, and the best classes of flowers and shrubs to use in them. Garden tools and their use, including the best methods of digging, are adequately dealt with, and the practice of gardening described in detail. A special chapter is devoted to the herbaceous border, and careful instruction given for its formation. Various classes of flowers are considered in detail, and hints are given on greenhouse management. The chief foes of the gardener are described and pictures given of the worst pests. The growing of vegetables with the best succession of crops, and the care of fruit trees receive full attention. A good index completes a volume that will be a useful guide to those who are beginning the fascinating employment of their leisure time in the cultivation of flowers and vegetables. All the advice is practical and definite.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

THE Lenten season usually brings a number of books specially written to aid the development of spiritual life, and the formation of the highest type of Christian character. The common characteristic of these books is a strong emphasis on the necessity of reality in our religion, and a practical application of Christian teaching in the common duties of everyday life. For some years past the Bishop of London has arranged for the issue of a special book of devotional help and instruction for the people of his diocese. Many of these books have been singularly instructive and have deservedly had a wide circulation throughout the Church. This year the task of writing the book has been entrusted to Canon C. S. Woodward, of Westminster, who has taken as his subject, *Christ in the Common Ways of Life* (Longmans, Green & Co., *2s. 6d.* net). His aim is very definite. There are many books suitable for those advanced in spiritual experience, "but there are comparatively few books about religion written on the level of the ordinary man," and he aims at setting out the life and teaching of Jesus Christ, when properly understood, as meeting all this need. We must first define our relationship to Jesus Christ, and this involves an answer to the question, "What think ye of Christ?" The New Testament account of His life brings us to His Divinity, —to faith in Him and acceptance of His teaching as the rule of life. His teaching was marked by simplicity. It was so plain that a child could understand it. Religion was just the art of loving God and your fellow-men. The records of His teaching have little to say about ceremonial or liturgy. It is difficult to believe that ritual and ceremonial attracted Him. He relied upon personality, His own and that of His followers, for the building of the Kingdom. What a man thinks about God determines all his thoughts and actions, and in the teaching of Jesus, God comes absolutely first. Love is the primary duty of man towards his Maker. This love must find its expression in action—the offering of self. This must be done in the childlike spirit. The four characteristics of this spirit are: freedom from worry and anxiety, idealism or hopefulness, imperviousness to criticism, and freshness and spontaneity. Jesus bade His disciples to cultivate the childlike spirit. It springs from a genuine trust in God which is expressed in joyousness, hopefulness, a carelessness of the opinion of the world and a courageous facing of the future. "Is it not rather true that the spirit of middle age has captured the Church and expelled the childlike spirit?" The spirit of service is essential. It is more than philanthropy. Service consists not so much in what we do as the spirit in which we do it. It requires humility; but humility is not self-depreciation, it is the entire absence of self-seeking. In applying all this to daily life a Christian ought to be known not only by the fact that he goes to church on Sunday, but by the difference between him and non-Christians during the

week, for work is a debt we owe to God, to other men and to ourselves. Amusements have taken too large a place in the life of the young. Pleasure is no longer a side-show. Amusement and recreation should be regarded as synonymous. The austerity of the Puritan is to be admired, but Christ never taught that asceticism is to be the rule of life. Nothing is so self-revealing as our attitude towards money. We must be as scrupulous in the getting of it as in the spending of it. Some adequate return must be made for it, and we must never receive it at the cost of injury to others. In regard to citizenship, the Christian must be in the van of the fight against cruelty and selfishness. The Kingdom of God is not concerned only with the souls of men. For all this " the Enabling Spirit " is needed, for we have no power to help ourselves. The vision of the Kingdom is before us. Love and self-sacrifice are the materials out of which it must be built. Whole-hearted allegiance to Christ is the only source and motive power. Canon Woodward has shown the wide range of the power of Christ in the life of men, and has given much valuable practical advice on Christian conduct.

Another book for Lent reading is Canon Peter Green's *Our Lord and Saviour* : A Study of the Person and Doctrine of Jesus Christ (Longmans, Green & Co., 2*s*. 6*d*. paper, 4*s*. cloth). Here, again, the desire to make Christian experience an intense reality is the inspiring purpose of the writer, and his sincerity and earnestness leave a deep impression on the reader. He also begins with the question, " What is Christ to me ? " and he goes back to the New Testament record, for many sincere Christians, or people who sincerely desire to be Christians, really know very little of their Lord and Saviour. We need a great revival of religion, nothing else can save the world from catastrophe, and only two things can lead to such a revival—more intense prayer and a fresh vision of our Lord and Saviour. This book is to help people to obtain that knowledge of Jesus Christ which they desire. Love and obedience are the qualifications for that knowledge. The threefold path to this knowledge is first by vision, then by understanding, and lastly by discipleship. Each of these is illustrated by telling narratives from the writer's own experience, and especially from his intercourse with young men of varying degrees of religious development. Canon Green is a Churchman of the Anglo-Catholic school, and the terms used by that school are often to be found in his pages, but they are not essential and do not interfere with the real Evangelical fervour and conviction revealed throughout. Even his references to the Real Presence show that the experience of Christ's presence by the faithful communicant need not be associated with any presence in the Elements. The personal knowledge of our Saviour, upon which he rightly insists, is not dependent on the Sacraments, though they are naturally a means of realizing Christ more fully. From the practical aspect of the reality of the experience of Christ he passes to consider some of the doctrines connected with Christ's person. He shows the grounds on which he accepts

the Virgin birth, and the reasons which can be urged for the vicarious nature of the Atonement. His chapter on the Atonement is one of the most useful in the book, and states several important truths with special clearness. The chapter on the Resurrection is again a summary of Christian teaching of special value. He claims for Ascension Day that it, rather than Whitsun Day, is the beginning of the new dispensation. We do not, of course, agree with his representation of the Holy Communion as the offering to God of the timeless and Eternal Sacrifice in Heaven, but apart from these few points of doctrine the book deserves to be read as a vivid and inspiring presentation of Christ as Saviour.

The Rev. T. A. Gurney, M.A., LL.B., has written a useful volume of "Studies in the Manifestations of the Risen Lord," which has been issued by the Religious Tract Society under the title *Alive for Evermore* (*7s. 6d.* net). The Resurrection of our Lord is a subject which will never cease to attract the attention of students. New points are constantly being raised. New views are constantly being put forward. Every detail of the New Testament narrative receives fresh consideration both from those who accept them as statements of historical fact, and from those who endeavour to explain them away. It is well, therefore, that there should be those who, with knowledge of the latest views put forward on both sides, are able to give general readers an adequate presentation of any fresh light which illuminates these fundamental facts essential as a basis of our Christian faith. Mr. Gurney's studies provide such a fresh examination of the facts. They give preachers and teachers and all interested in Bible study a fresh insight into the events connected with the Resurrection of our Lord. He examines the evidence for each point, shows the intimate connection between all the portions of the narrative, and draws out the conclusions which alone form the adequate result of the whole in view of all that has arisen from them. He is convinced that we are in a position to pronounce a final opinion upon all that really matters in connection with the Resurrection of our Lord, and that it answers the need of our day. "Let witness be borne clearly to the heart and mind of this wistful, after-war world of the truth and certainty of His resurrection, as confirmed by every fresh revelation of thought, by every new experience of life, by the deepest desires of souls, by the plainest readings of history, by the shadowings forth of an ever-widening science, and by the victory —in spite of our weakness—of His great cause among the nations." "Christ is risen" is the essential fact. That is the dominating fact in all life and labour, and it needs "to be restored, through the mind of the Church, to the mind of Humanity."

In following out the story of the Resurrection and the appearances of our Lord to His disciples, Mr. Gurney adds to the explanation of each event an appropriate title illustrating the main theme associated with it. In this way he provides preachers with sug-

gestive subjects. The Resurrection is a revelation of power and of love. Love is the pledge and prophecy of immortality. The Resurrection is a revelation of identity and transfiguration. In his treatment of the spiritual body of our Lord he follows the teaching of Origen and the Alexandrians, who held that the identity did not depend on physical conditions, and did not consist in any material continuity of particles, but "in the continuity or permanence of the spirit which gives the law to its constitution and moulds or fashions it to be the fitting vehicle of its manifestations under varying conditions." As a revelation of fulfilment, the Resurrection is the only adequate interpretation of Sin, Redemption and the Kingdom, and it interprets the Mission and Authority of the Church. He holds that, "with the Resurrection, the official, the external, the ecclesiastical, the political are replaced for all time by the inward and spiritual as the true features of the Kingdom." On the much misunderstood words, "Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained," and the mistaken ideas of priestly power based on them, he shows that the history of the early Church reveals how the authority was exercised. The Church made known to men the conditions of the great salvation. It had no powers belonging exclusively to a caste or specialized priesthood, and nothing to justify papal infallibility, priestly autocracy or political dominion. The manifestations to St. Thomas, to the disciples in Galilee, and the problems connected with them, are carefully examined and adequately explained. The effect of the manifestations is clearly set out, and the dependence of the growth of the Kingdom on the fact is maintained. Similar attention is given to the events of the day of the Ascension. The further manifestations of our Lord to St. Paul and to St. John at Patmos are treated in their appropriate setting. The whole series of studies form a fresh and useful treatment of a subject of supreme importance in the light of the latest knowledge and of the special conditions of thought of to-day.

Dr. Rufus M. Jones, Professor of Philosophy in Haverford College, is one of the most prominent of the small band of writers who have set themselves to interpret Mysticism to the present generation. His latest work on the subject is *New Studies in Mystical Religion* (Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 7*s.* 6*d.* net), and contains the Ely Lectures delivered at Union Theological Seminary, New York. The Dedication of the volume is interesting; it runs: "To the beautiful memory of my friend, Baron Friedrich von Hügel, the foremost interpreter of mystical religion in this generation, who strikingly illustrated the meaning of radiance in religion, and who made me see more clearly than anyone else what it means to be a member of the invisible Church." Von Hügel was himself the author of a book on the subject, *The Mystical Element in Religion*, but, in spite of his friendliness towards those of other religious communions, he could be guilty of ecclesiastical intolerance through his loyalty to Rome. As a writer on his Letters in *The Expository*

Times recently said: "Hügel was a man with a most winning personality and he had friends in all communions. But we are brought up short with a sense of dismay when we find that, sitting on the Committee in 1917 on the Army and Religion, although he could go a little further than Shylock and eat and drink with his fellow-members, he could not pray with them."

One of the chief tasks of writers on Mysticism at the present time is to defend it from misrepresentation. The principal attack in recent years has come from the psychologists, who regard mystic experiences as purely subjective without any objective reality. Dr. Jones devotes his Introduction to meeting this objection. As the psychologist finds no ground for objective validity in any experience of values, he can legitimately have nothing to say as to the ultimate metaphysical ground of the spiritual values of mystical experiences. He also pleads that mysticism should no longer be used as an alias for what is uncanny and obscurantist. "Mysticism is not a synonym for the 'mysterious.' It does not mean something 'occult' or 'esoteric,' or 'gnostic' or 'pseudo-psychic.' It only means that the soul of man has dealings with realities of a different order from that with which senses deal." The successive chapters are an explanation of this true character of mysticism, and a defence of its essential nature from some of the abnormalities frequently associated with it. There is a fellowship with an environment much larger than the visible and tangible one. Several instances are given of this experience, which show that our spirits "cannot be sounded with the plummet of the utilitarian nor meted out by the measuring-rod of the materialist." Asceticism is not a peculiarity of mysticism, "it has attached to every form and type of religious faith," and the greatest mystics have passed beyond it in their immediate knowledge of God. But mysticism requires education. "We neglect the cultivation of the capacity to see the *invisible*, which is essential to art, to poetry, and to religion." He criticizes severely our Sunday schools and their methods as inadequate centres of spiritual culture. The training of the clergy fails when it does not lead to a first-hand acquaintance and fellowship with God. Ecclesiastical organization fails also when it neglects "the Galilean type of religion—the religion of life." All true religion is a way of life. Luther and Calvin did not escape the influence of organization and ecclesiastical system. What is wanted now is "direct correspondence between religious experience and its expression in forms of thought and organization." A chapter is devoted to the nature of the organization and polity which fits best with mystical religion, and the final chapter on "The Testimony of the Soul" brings together the experiences of eminent mystics and others to show that it is the mystical capacity which underlies all our highest moral and religious attainments. Dr. Jones gives us an inspiring ideal of religious experience, which is a necessary corrective in an age which seems at times content to rest upon ritual and ceremonies, and the outward observances of religion, and to ignore the inward

and spiritual without which they tend to degenerate from the sacramental to the magical.

This is the Tercentenary year of John Bunyan, and to mark the occasion the Religious Tract Society has brought out an edition of *The Pilgrim's Progress*, as John Bunyan wrote it, at the extraordinarily low price of 6*d*. The edition is illustrated with a number of coloured reproductions of Harold Copping's pictures. The type is excellent. In an Appendix to this Tercentenary Edition, under the title "The Triumph of a Great Book," an account is given of "the part which the Religious Tract Society has played in making the book popular, not only in our own islands, but throughout the length and breadth of the world." The Society may be justly proud of its work in making known this masterpiece of literature and religious teaching. It has issued it wholly or in part in 120 languages. Many testimonies are quoted as to the value of John Bunyan's work. Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, said: "His *Pilgrim's Progress* seems to be a complete reflection of Scripture." Samuel Smith, M.P., knew it almost by heart, and said: "It was in almost every Scottish home, and we cannot estimate what the nation owes to it." It influenced Henry Martyn, Spurgeon, Moody, R. L. Stevenson. Many instances are given of humbler mortals who owe their conversion to this book.

G. F. I.

S.P.C.K. publishes for the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement three booklets of a new series at one penny each.

Canon F. W. Head writes on *What the Church stands for.* His conclusion is that the Church of England stands for Jesus Christ as Englishmen have learnt to know Him in the past, and strive to interpret Him to the generations yet to come.

Canon E. S. Woods gives some useful advice on praying in *How to say your Prayers.* The Rev. W. H. Heaton-Renshaw in *Religion and my Job* shows that it does not matter so much what a man's occupation is as the spirit in which he carries it out.

Mr. J. Ellis Barker, who is the author of several books dealing with matters of health, and has written specially on Cancer, has brought out a volume on Chronic Constipation which he describes as "the most insidious and the most deadly of diseases." He treats of its cause, consequences, and natural cure. Sir William Milligan, M.D., writes a preface recommending Mr. Barker's work as "a sound, readable and scientific volume dealing with one of the commonest and most insidious complaints to which mankind is subject." (John Murray, 7*s*. 6*d*. net.)

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE MODERN PARSON.

THE MODERN PARSON. By G. K. A. Bell, D.D. *Student Christian Movement.* 4*s.*

This is a new departure in Pastoral Theology. The Dean of Canterbury who, with the exception of two years, has spent all his life in other departments of Church work, writes a book on "The Modern Parson." And what is more remarkable he tells the ordinand what he should know and, as a rule, will never learn unless he has been informed by a man who knows the facts and can describe them faithfully. Dr. Bell is convinced that the calling of a clergyman is a great calling which needs the highest gifts and demands the best that man has to give to God. The age is said to be materialistic, and so it is, but the spiritual side of man still exists and it is the duty of the Church to insist on its supreme value. How to do this is not easily learned by those who are immersed in a thousand and one interests of a material or semi-material character, and it is true even of the clergy that the world is too much with them. They cannot escape from the pressure of the world, and it is their duty to do this.

They must know the environment in which they work. Dr. Bell gives statistics that prove the decay of Church attendance, and we believe that if he had had more recent figures at his disposal the decay would be much more marked. He is strong on the duty of Reunion, and we are in entire agreement with him, but the best stimulus to Reunion is the increased activity and progress of the Churches as they exist. Reunion will never make dead or failing Churches living Churches. Nothing can do this but the Spirit of God working in them. The organization which is essential need not be elaborate, but it must be alive, and on its vitality everything depends. When a Church is so alive we shall have the co-operation with local authorities and all other bodies that make for the well-being of the people, but the Parson and the Church must be themselves on fire if their spirit is to be contagious and a help to all that is best in state betterment.

Dr. Bell says, "Churchgoing is not an end in itself—but it is a means to communion with God which very few can afford to neglect." It is more than a help to the religious attitude and a safeguard against individualism. It is sacramental in its outward expression of the inward and spiritual desire to be members of the Body of Christ and as members to share in the life of His Body. We view with deep concern the falling off of Churchgoing, for it is a prelude, if not stopped, to the loss of Christian influence on the community. It is not the lack of opportunities for sacramental confession or the lack of brighter services that keep men from Church. It is the want of a conscious need and of the satisfaction of that need which lies at the root of the emptiness of our Churches.

Dr. Bell describes the many useful channels open to ordained men, and devotes a chapter and appendix to the discussion of Clerical Subscription. We may not agree with his remarks on the "crucial points of the Virgin Birth," on which "no direct expression is found in the writings of the two great teachers who, above all others, have expounded the doctrine of the Incarnation—St. Paul and St. John," for teachers have obligations which hearers have not. We all, however, are heartily with him when he concludes "the great thing is that we should all sincerely, humbly, and in the spirit of prayer, be seeking to make Him the real Master of our lives, and seeking also as pastors and teachers to lead others to Him and the more abundant life He gives." The whole book is crammed with facts and counsel that cannot fail to appeal to thoughtful men.

SCIENCE AND FAITH.

ADVENTURE: THE FAITH OF SCIENCE AND THE SCIENCE OF FAITH. By Canon Streeter, Catherine M. Chilcott, John MacMurray and Alex. S. Russell. *Macmillan.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Some books cannot be reviewed in the ordinary manner. *Adventure* is one of those rare volumes that must be read to be appreciated, and can only be justly valued after re-reading. It is the outcome of co-operative thinking which has not killed individuality of expression. It comes as a heartening message to many who disagree with a great deal in its pages, but will be strengthened in their faith by its robustness of thought and fearless facing of facts that disturb many and are a challenge to others to have greater faith. We live in an age when materialism has broken down in the study and reigns in the street. A time when the idol science is known to the philosopher to have feet of clay and is believed by the multitude to have destroyed religion. A time when a new School has to its own satisfaction proved that the object of man's worship is only a projection from his own thought—an imagination created by himself for himself. An age when outspokenness on sexual morality seems to carry with it a dearth of decent conversation and the break-up of all that has passed for Christian morality.

Here Canon Streeter and his friends intervene. The book proves to us that at the back of Science and Religion lies the same spirit of trusting adventure. The Scientist believes in the unverifiable persistence of the uniformity of Nature—the religious man believes in the equally intellectually unprovable existence and character of God. Both put their faith to the test and both find that it is verifiable in experience. The writers are convinced that the warfare between Science and Religion, or, to be accurate, between Scientists and Theologians, is passing away to make place for a fundamental reconciliation which will embrace both in one great whole. The Scientist is now seeking fresh worlds and has broken free from the inherited obsessions of his class. The Christian has

no longer taken as his motto "Safety First," but "Live dangerously; live constructively." "He who loses his life findeth it," has too long been a forgotten Gospel maxim.

The chapter by Mr. MacMurray, with the title "Beyond Knowledge," demands the attention of all who are disturbed by the dogmas of the New Psychology. It is the best statement in brief form of the Objectivity of the Supreme Object of Faith. Miss Chilcott is most suggestive in her pages on "Myth and Reality"—a subject that is as often misunderstood as it is discussed. But the ordinary reader will be most attracted by the remarkable and sane discussion of Christian Sexual Ethics. Unfortunately we have read and had to pass without notice quite a library of books on this subject, which has been the despair of reviewers who wish to commend a book that is wholesome and sensible. We have not the least hesitation in recommending *Adventure* to all who wish to see how a very delicate subject can be handled with frankness and without giving offence. No Christian leader or thinker can afford to overlook the chapter of this book devoted to Marriage and cognate matters. Canon Streeter has read the outstanding books on the subject and gives advice to Ethical Teachers which is as Christian as it is unambiguous. No man or woman who has read and thought over the pages can be in doubt as to the action he should take when consulted by those in perplexity, or when called upon to speak his mind clearly. If only for the guidance given on a subject that clamours for straight and honest dealing, the book would be worth buying. As it is, the hints given as to the attitude that we should adopt on fundamental principles of thought and practice are as intellectually satisfying as the moral guidance is ethically sound and straightforward.

GIVING AND RECEIVING.

GIVING AND RECEIVING. By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D. *Murray.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Dean of Wells has published six plain Sermons on the Holy Eucharist. They are plain in the sense that their language is simple, but they are not plain in their exposition of the theology of the New Testament and the Church of England. With much that they set forward we are in complete agreement and are glad that he writes with such unambiguous firmness on the wrongness of paying adoration to the Reserved Sacramental Elements. "We may not safely go beyond the revealed purpose of the Sacrament. No words and no actions which go outside that purpose find any sanction either in Holy Scripture or in the acts or language of the early Christian centuries. Our own Prayer Book gives no justification at all for such words or action." And it may be as confidently said that neither Holy Scripture nor the Prayer Book gives any justification whatever for the Reservation of the Sacramental Elements in any sense, and the early Church History allusions refer

to something like concurrent or extended Communion. Sir Lewis Dibdin, with the full approval of Lord Phillimore, in the House of Laity made it clear that Reservation in any form is illegal in the Church of England.

Dr. Robinson considers that Hooker's view is too subjective and was due to the exigencies of controversy in his age. Dr. Robinson does not think Hooker would object to the " given-ness," " the given or objective reality—apart from our acceptance—of that which is here offered to us." And he quotes in support of this contention the words, " The Body of Christ is given, taken and received only after a heavenly and spiritual manner," but he neglects to finish the quotation. " And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith." We have neither the intellectual nor the spiritual power to discern where and when the timeless and spaceless Christ comes into contact with the timeless and spaceless personality of man. The whole transaction is experiential—man in Christ meeting Christ in man and it never entered into the thought of those in the Upper Room who beheld with the eye of sense the Christ they knew to be the Son of God holding in His sacred hands the Bread and Wine to identify them with their Present Lord and Master. To think otherwise, is to interpret by a *tour de force* the plain meaning of Holy Writ and we confess the ingenuity of theologians does not commend itself to us.

Then the Dean writes : " Our thoughts of God are very dim : we are shadowed about with mystery, when we try to lift up our hearts. But here, in the Holy Eucharist, heaven comes down and touches earth ; or, if you will, earth rises up to heaven. Material symbols are transfigured with a spiritual glory. The simple gifts we offer are received and taken up to the heavenly altar and are given back to us as more than angels' food." This is an echo of the Canon of the Mass : " We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command these things to be brought up by the hands of Thy holy Angel to Thy altar on high in the sight of Thy divine Majesty." Where do we find Scriptural authority for this ? There is mystery everywhere—but the concrete imagery by which a mystery is attempted to be explained is more mysterious than the feeding by Faith on Christ our Redeemer ; and the consequences that follow the imagery have led to false teaching. We are aware that many hold —and we largely share their contention—that the Canon of the Mass is capable of an Evangelical interpretation, but it is incapable of this interpretation when associated with its use in the dogma of sacerdotalism and the ceremonies that imply the time descent of Christ into the Elements, which then become the object or the focus of adoration. The Elements are solemnly set apart and hallowed for the supreme purpose of Holy Communion with our Lord and Saviour. This does not mean that as such even during the service they become the focus of adoration—the supreme purpose is fulfilled and only fulfilled when the communicant by Faith spiritually feeds in a heavenly manner upon the broken Body and

the shed Blood. The whole dynamic of the Communion is personal, and the Unseen Omnipresent Christ meets in the heart—the person of His servant, who adores as He receives. This is the catholic teaching of our Church, and those who localize, or "focus," go beyond Scripture and have no Scriptural grounds for their belief. So although we can accept much of what Dr. Robinson has so beautifully written, we are compelled to dissent from his main position.

THE REFORMATION AND ITS DOCTRINE.

LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION. Vol. II. By James Mackinnon. *Longmans.* 16*s.*

THE PROTESTANT DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER. By Alexander Barclay. Glasgow: *Jackson, Wylie & Co.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

We bracket these volumes on account of their dealing with the critical period in Luther's life, when he was brought face to face with the doctrine of Sacramental grace and the later developments on the part of Zwingli and Calvin. It is necessary that English students of the Reformation period should have clear ideas on the subject, and the best way of studying it is historically, under the guidance of men whose judgment can be trusted and capacity for honest thinking is unquestioned. Dr. Barclay sets forth in detail the stages of Luther's development, and shows how Zwingli separated himself from him by his inability to accept Consubstantiation. The swing of the pendulum went too far, and in his later writings Zwingli came to accept the view put forward by Calvin, who afterwards had independently arrived at it. Luther, too, had receded from his scholastic position, and the merit of Dr. Barclay lies in the able and impartial way in which he proves that fundamentally all three Reformers were at one. The three rejected the sacerdotal conception of the Priesthood. This was the root negation of their outlook. The positive side was the belief that our Lord instituted the Supper for the benefit of His flock, and that all who drew near in faith fed on Him in their hearts by faith. In fact, there is very little difference between the view of Hooker and the main conception of the chief continental Reformers. As Dr. Barclay gives definite quotations and allows us to follow the working of the minds of all three, we have learned a great deal from his pages and shall return to them from time to time. The argument is excellently arranged and the writing is never obscure. We hope that many will read the book and by so doing be able to controvert the many misleading opinions now confidently asserted.

We spoke highly of the previous volume of the monumental work of Dr. Mackinnon, whose researches make him one of the most learned of historians. He is never heavy in his descriptions and is always accurate in his presentation of the thought of Luther and his opponents. We feel as we study his pages and compare them with those of other writers that he can be implicitly trusted and is never a mere advocate. He sees the faults of Luther as well as the good points of his opponents, and is never sparing of

criticism when he believes the facts require it. As the book deals with "The Breach with Rome (1517–21)," it covers the crucial period of the Reformer's life and gives us information which puts in a true light the growth of his own conviction and the development of local and Papal opposition. We can test the truth of Luther's contention that he had learned much from his opponents, for their stressing certain aspects of Roman teaching and insisting on them as binding drove Luther to look into the matter for himself and to reach conclusions which led to the inevitable excommunication and break.

Luther had no idea that he was becoming a heretic or schismatic. He looked upon the Roman Church as something greater than the Papal Church and considered that time would vindicate his position and establish his declarations as true. Even Indulgences were considered by him to be a merely improper accident of the Church's teaching. He looked forward to their condemnation. Dr. Mackinnon proves beyond a shadow of doubt that the present-day vindication of Indulgences, based on a misunderstanding by Luther of their real character, is contrary to fact. Luther rightly grasped the facts, and his accusations are justified to the full by the knowledge we now possess. The Reformation began with challenging an abuse that struck at the root of the Christian doctrine of forgiveness; it went on step by step to emphasizing the Pauline teaching of justification by faith and the jettisoning of the sacerdotal view of the Christian Ministry. The last point was the really essential denial, for the key of the whole position of the Medieval Church was the Priesthood. At first Luther was inclined to accept this in a mitigated form, but he found that there is no middle way between Sacerdotalism and the New Testament teaching on the Ministry. He held firmly by the Priesthood of the Laity. The office of the Christian minister is to preach the Gospel and dispense the Sacraments of Baptism and the Supper, "and all attempts to prove from the New Testament an indelible distinction between clergy and laity and to erect this ministry into an ecclesiastical caste, on which the bondage and the questionable institution of celibacy is imposed, are vain."

We cannot enter into the many other theological questions raised, or comment on the historical scenes described with a vigour and picturesqueness that makes us feel at times in the presence of disputants and princes. The character sketches of the leading personalities are vivid and fair. Dr. Mackinnon always sees conviction where it is held and can enter into the conflicting motives that sway men's minds. We have been so deeply indebted to our author for light on obscure points and for accurate guidance through mazes of documents and disputed situations, that we look forward with eagerness to the two concluding volumes of a work which will long remain the standard treatise on Luther and the German Reformation, for he gathers together all that his predecessors have discovered and adds to their studies the fruits of his own extensive learning.

CHRISTIANITY IN INDIA.

CHRIST AT THE ROUND TABLE. By E. Stanley Jones. *Hodder & Stoughton.* 5*s.*

Mr. Stanley Jones is a Wesleyan American missionary in India. He has a picturesque style, a reproductive imagination and a winning manner which attracts readers. His former book was the missionary best-seller, and, while it excited interest, it also gave rise to comment. He raised the curtain of one side of Indian religious life, and experienced missionaries say that it is as out of perspective as *Mother India*, which takes quite a different viewpoint. Whether this be so or not, we believe that since the days of Paton no missionary writer has secured a wider circle of readers in England and in the United States. Therefore a new work from his pen is sure of a friendly reception and starts with an expectant body of admirers.

From one angle it is a better book than its predecessor. It does not give the impression that all India is about to be won for Christ through the attraction His character has for some of her best minds. He explains, without seeking to do so, why so many thoughtful Christian workers came under the spell of Hindu philosophy and insensibly approach Christianity through Pantheistic ideals. This has given rise to much misunderstanding, but students will find unconsciously in this work the reason for this strange change of attitude. Hinduism has a noble as well as degrading side. Its best sons are attracted by what is noble, and spiritually interpret what to the multitude is idolatry. As the interpretation is very largely, if not altogether, Pantheistic, missionaries who desire to enter into the Hindu mind are impressed by the contrast, and in their admiration unconsciously absorb a kind of higher Pantheism which is very different from Christian Theism. Mr. Jones has, we believe, escaped this danger, but he shows us how men fall into it.

It was his custom to invite men of differing religious views—Buddhists, Hindus, Moslems and others—to meet together and to discuss fundamental religious experiences. It was a kind of Class Meeting of the old-time Methodist type at which many men of many religions gave their experiences. All had been to some extent brought into connection with Christianity—some slightly, some to a very large degree. The quotations from their experiences are very striking. "The great prophets did not count much: Jesus, Buddha and Mohammed. It is God who really matters." "When I sing hymns to gods and goddesses I feel a sense of satisfaction." "The finite cannot grasp the Infinite. I cannot grasp God intellectually, but I hold on to God spiritually by an inward conviction of faith." Thus spoke a Moslem, a Hindu and a Parsee. The words come from Oriental lips, but the thought underlying them we have heard from our friends as we talked intimately of religion and life. It may be said that fundamentally all religions deal with the same problems and there is no difference in experience. That

is not so, but it has struck us that, given the milieu in which these utterances were made, it is very difficult to separate the Christian colouring from the general type of statement. We do not forget that the leader of the groups was a Christian, and those who took part were—we believe—able to talk English, which means a background of Christian thought. These opinions would be much more valuable if we had the setting of the jewels of thought set forth by Mr. Jones.

The greater part of the book consists of discussions of great Christian themes as illustrated by Indian experience. "The Cross the Key of Life" is a practical exposition of the Atonement. The Christian teacher showed how God sent His Son to redeem mankind, and the student replied: "Oh, if you put it that way, I do not see how God could keep out of it. And, moreover, I do not see how I can keep out of it. That is the meaning of the Cross. We being what we are, and God being what He is, He could not keep out of it. And since God has gone into life as deeply as a Cross, we too must catch the Divine Passion—we must know the Cross by sharing it." And there are many similar illuminating passages which touch the heart. It is plain to all that Gandhi is the hero of Mr. Jones. He has been his guest, he has admired his self-abnegation and has been impressed by his influence on all who come under his personal sway. We do not think that he sees Gandhi as a whole, but looks upon him as a religious leader who, by his honesty and devotion, has won India to her better self. But has he? Has his influence on the whole been beneficial to his fellow-countrymen? Has he not been the occasion—to use no stronger word—of letting loose passions that have done great harm in his country without conferring on it any compensating good? We have never doubted his sincerity—we have the gravest doubts of his wisdom and capacity as a leader. But let no one turn aside from this book because Gandhi is something to Mr. Jones, that he is not to many who know India even better than the talented author.

RELIGIOUS PSYCHOLOGY.

THE RELIGIOUS ATTITUDE. By A. S. Woodburne. *Macmillan*, 10s. 6*d*.

THE RELIGIOUS MIND. By C. K. Mahoney. *Macmillan*. 8s. 6*d*.

Since William James wrote his great work on "The Varieties of Religious Experience," America has specialized in religious psychology. We cannot say that all the works issued there are first class or have been founded on inductions that stand the test of examination. America stands for tabulation. The Questionnaire has been and is a favourite method of inquiry, and few things are more fallacious than the records of subjective experience on matters which are to a certain, if not a large extent, emotional. The abnormal rush into details at length—the normal are reticent, and we have often thought that the pathology of religious experience is enshrined in volumes

that are considered records of the ordinary religious life. We are passing from the phase of misleading groupings and the two books before us are thoughtful, sober productions by men who weigh their words and refrain from generalizations.

Professor Woodhouse publishes a thesis for a Doctorate, and, as Dr. Shailer Mathews says, it is more than a mere thesis, for he has added to his academic knowledge personal experience in India as well as knowledge of Christian history and experience. He proceeds scientifically, if psychological methods can claim to be stabilized into a science, and all he tells us on the relation between Religion and Magic, Science, Art and Morality is well worth reading. He is largely in agreement with Boutroux. The consciousness of a social converse between man and God is what gives to us our enthusiasm and power, for the attainment of those ideals or values that we posit by faith. There is the forward look, the ideal and the propelling force. In other words, we have Faith, Hope and Charity.

Professor Mahoney gives us the lectures he has been accustomed to deliver to his students. At least this is our opinion, after reading the book. They are fruitfully suggestive, clear and painstakingly compiled. The Bibliography is excellent and the generous extracts in his pages will send many to the authorities quoted. The arrangement is good, and we are sure that those who possess the book will find it most useful in clearing their own mind of difficulties and in enabling them to understand the thoughts and outlook of others.

THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

TEXTUAL DISCOVERIES IN PROVERBS, PSALMS, AND ISAIAH. By Melville Scott, D.D. *S.P.C.K.* 1927. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Dr. Melville Scott is already favourably known by his book on Hosea, the text of which he manfully tries to amend, and that with no slight success. His present volume is an essay which gained for him the degree of Doctor of Theology in the University of Strasbourg, and comes therefore to us with a very high testimonial. In it he describes his method of investigating the text more fully than in his Hosea, and illustrates it from passages in Proverbs, Psalms, and Isaiah.

He is very emphatic that it is not that of merely arbitrary conjecture, made in each case because a better sense is obtained than that given by the Masoretic Text. On the contrary, his one great principle is the same throughout, viz., that certain Hebrew letters are easily confounded with others, and he has certainly discovered many passages where the application of this principle amends the text so as to give an easier and very plausible reading.

His book, however, is limited to examples of such changes in the ordinary script, and it is strange that he makes no attempt to go behind this. For there is no doubt, one would suppose, that all but the very latest parts of the Old Testament were written in the older script, such as is given in the first columns of the table of alphabets in Gesenius-Kautzsch's Grammar, taken from coins and

early monuments. Another volume by Dr. Melville Scott working on these lines would be very welcome.

Three examples of his method, chosen for their brevity, must suffice to give the reader some idea of the book, premising that for printer's reasons the Hebrew words have been transliterated.

(1) " Proverbs x. 9. *He that walketh uprightly walketh surely, But he that perverteth his ways shall be known.* R.V. The lack of contrast between the two lines, and the foolishness of the second line, renders ' shall be known ' very doubtful. The error is a very simple one, the confusion between R and D. Thus for YWD' read YRW' ; *cf.* xi. 15 ; xiii. 20. *He that perverteth his ways shall suffer hurt.*"

(2) " Psalm xxxv. 12. *They reward me evil for good,* (To) *the bereaving of my soul.* R.V. The word ShKWL seems singularly inappropriate, and is condemned by most editors. It is at least possible that we should read YKShYLW, *i.e.* ' They cause my soul to stumble.' The mistake would thus be the careless inversion of the order of two consonants."

(3) " Isaiah viii. 19. *Should not a people seek unto their God ? On behalf of the living should* (they seek unto) *the dead ?* R.V. The interpolated words show that there is some uncertainty in the text. The doubtful word is B'D (' on behalf of '), a word which has been peculiarly unfortunate in its transmission ; *cf.* my note on Proverbs vi. 26. Here there can be very little doubt that we should read B'W. This verb is used of inquiring of a prophet, Isaiah xxi. 12. The word is rare, and, therefore, likely to be missed. The slightest lengthening of the top stroke in a W renders that letter liable to be read as a D. The sentence will now read : *Shall the living inquire of the dead ?* "

A. L. W.

LUCERNA DEI (THE LAMP OF GOD). By the Rev. F. G. Llewellin, B.D. *Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd.* 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

At a time when many questions are being raised as to the authority of the Bible, a fresh examination of the value and authority of the Scriptures will be welcomed by many. In this volume Mr. Llewellin has answered many of the questions which are presenting themselves to thoughtful minds. It is divided into three sections. The first deals with the Bible as a guide of life and gives reasons for the acceptance of it as adequate for this purpose; the second examines the whole " Plan of Salvation," and the third gives a statement of the teaching of our Church on the Holy Communion.

In treating of " the Bible as the Lamp of God," help is given to a right understanding of such important matters as the need of a Divine Revelation and its character, the use of the Old Testament by our Lord, the relation of the Bible and the Church, the Seat of Authority, the place of tradition, the teaching of the Early Fathers of the Church, and the permanent value of the Scriptures.

These various topics are illustrated by quotations from well-known and authoritative teachers.

Although the term "Plan of Salvation" is regarded by some as old-fashioned, it cannot be improved upon when used to represent the various aspects of man's redemption. It covers the five chief elements: Ruin, Redemption, Reception, Regeneration, and Responsibility. The New Testament teaching is closely followed, and it is shown that to justify means "to reckon as righteous," that regeneration is the act of the Holy Spirit and has nothing of a mechanical or magical nature in it, and that the true nature of faith was stated by John Calvin when he said, "It is faith alone that justifies, but the faith that justifies is never alone." The teaching of the Roman Catholic Church is shown to be quite different from that of our own Church on these matters, and the place given to the Virgin Mary as Mediatrix has no Scriptural authority. Auricular Confession is unnecessary, as every soul has free access to God.

The section on the Holy Communion contains clear statements on all the points of controversy raised by those who add a sacrificial character to the simple spiritual service instituted by our Lord. No Church has maintained the balance of truth regarding the Lord's Supper better than our own. The proposals for the revision of the Communion Service will destroy the balance which our Reformers, with their intimate knowledge of the errors of the Roman system, were so well qualified to express. In this section numerous quotations are given which readers will be glad to find brought together in handy form for reference. The doctrine of the true presence of Christ in the Holy Communion is presented clearly. The question of Reservation is placed in its true perspective. On these and many other important points Mr. Llewellin brings together a mass of evidence which shows that the Evangelical interpretation is the only one that satisfies the requirements of Scriptural teaching, and therefore the doctrine of our Church.

CONCERNING THE BIBLE. By Conrad A. Skinner, M.A. London: *Sampson Low, Ltd.* 5*s.* net.

The publishers' wrapper describes this as "a most romantic book." That no doubt is true, but it is much more than merely romantic, it is really *important.* Dr. Paterson Smyth (to whom Mr. Skinner acknowledges his indebtedness) commends it in a graceful Foreword,—describing it as "a fine piece of work" and promising to watch its career with much interest,—this prepares the reader for a work that is brimful of valuable information. Difficulties are dealt with, with fine courage and sound common sense. For instance, when the story of the formation of the Canon has been told, with some account of the labours of notables like Wyclif, Erasmus and Tyndale, the author passes on to the consideration of such subjects as Revelation, Inspiration and Authority. Those who find themselves able to hold on to the theory of Verbal Inspiration will prob-

ably want to cross swords with Mr. Skinner, but they will find him a skilful protagonist! The synoptic problem is treated fully and lucidly along modern lines, and a glance at the table of Contents and at the Index will suffice to show that the whole subject has been dealt with exhaustively. While it is well fitted for the use of the student as a text-book, it is equally suitable for the general reader, and the attractiveness of the book is not lessened by the introduction of some excellent illustrations and diagrams.

S. R. C.

CIVILIZATION REMADE BY CHRIST: OR SOCIAL APPLICATION OF THE MORAL TEACHING OF OUR LORD. By Frederick A. M. Spencer, B.D. London: *George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.* 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Mr. Spencer, the Chaplain of Brasenose (Oxford), has made the study of Christian Ethics his own and he has already given us a thoughtful and comprehensive treatise on "The Ethics of the Gospel"—a valuable compendium full of material likely to be serviceable to preachers and teachers. In the present volume will be found candid and orderly discussions on such important matters as war and peace, methods of government, the treatment of criminals, the use and abuse of wealth, marriage and divorce, the spiritual value of education, etc. Sometimes the author boldly leaves the beaten track and blazes a new trail,—as, for instance, where he deals with "Eugenics" and suggests how the national and racial decadence threatened by the remarkably higher fertility of inferior stocks may be averted. He is so far up to date that he refers to the Revised Prayer Book and the fact that it affords "considerable opportunity" for "adapting public worship to social life," seeing that it permits the minister, at his discretion, after the conclusion of Morning or Evening Prayer, to "offer prayer in his own words." This liberty is, however, not without its perils, but there is no doubt that there is, in some of the prayers which have been inserted, the recognition of social duty. Whether one does or does not agree with the author on every point, there can be no doubt that the work is the product of one who is both a reader and a thinker, and taken as a whole it makes a strong appeal for social service,—a subject that is, happily, coming more and more to the front, and which may, in the future, be regarded as more important than dogma.

S. R. C.

CHANCE AND CHOICE: OR THE WAY OF LIVING. By J. C. Wright. London: *A. M. Philpot, Ltd., Gt. Russell Street, W.C.* 2*s.* net.

The general get-up of this little book, with its attractive cover, leaves nothing to be desired and we only wish we could say the same about its contents. While the author presses into service many writers—from Goethe to Dean Inge—to illustrate pleasantly written chapters that contain much that is helpful, there is yet something missing, and that something is the Cross. We suspect that from the writer's point of view there would seem to be no need

for the redemptive work of Christ at all. The fact is, there are at the present time several cults—like New Thought—that are being vigorously pushed. Though they disown and are disowned by Christian Science, they have yet many things in common with it, chiefly, however, this—that they teach a doctrine of mind-dominance. That there is a substratum of truth underlying this, we cannot doubt, when we observe the way in which mind and body act and react upon each other, but it will never do to substitute this for the Good News of the Gospel. A perusal of these pages leaves us in no doubt that it stands for one or other of these "cults" and we observe that it contains an advertisement of a book entitled *The Science of Mind*, a popular exposition of these opinions. We recommend our readers to leave it severely alone. It is not within the scope of this notice to refute the tenets of what St. Paul would, no doubt, describe as "another Gospel."

S. R. C.

BOOKLETS, PAMPHLETS, SERMONS, ETC.

Bishop Knox has made an examination of the significance of the admissions and concessions of the Anglican representations at Malines in *The Malines Conference and the Deposited Book* (Church Book Room, 2*d.*). He exposes the yielding to the Romanists of some of the foundations of our Church, and the consequences as seen at present in the tendencies of the Revised Prayer Book, and as they will be if the next Lambeth Conference is induced to accept the point of view set out as representative of the teaching of our Church. These warnings are timely.

The Bible, Evolution and the Fall of Man, by the Rev. E. L. Langston (3*d.*), and *A Perverted Church*, by Charles Ford (2*d.*), are two booklets dealing with questions of current interest (Chas. J. Thynne & Jarvis).

The Rev. A. H. Rhodes, Vicar of the Holy Apostles, Cheltenham, has printed a sermon, *The Deposited Book, What Next?* It contains some useful points on the present situation created by the rejection of the revised Prayer Book by the House of Commons.

Why should we take Holy Communion? is "a homely talk to those who are about to be confirmed or who have been confirmed," by Canon Oswald W. Scott, M.A., Private Chaplain to the Bishop of Down (2*d.*). Five good reasons are given which emphasize the place of the Lord's Supper in our spiritual life.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

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

Gift Books.—Some excellent gift books can be found in Messrs. Seeley's "Books on Travel." These books contain interesting descriptions by famous explorers, sportsmen, soldiers, scientists and others of savage and semi-civilized tribes in little-known regions. The last of this series is *On the Trail of the Veiled Tuareg*, which is an account of those mystic nomadic warriors whose home is the trackless desert and whose history fades into the far past. The author, Mr. Dugald Campbell, presents a fascinating story and the book is well illustrated and has an excellent map. Its price is 21*s.* net.

Another book, also published by Messrs. Seeley, is entitled *Crooks and Crime*, by Mr. J. Kenneth Ferrier, C.I.D., formerly Detective-Inspector at Scotland Yard. This book describes the methods of criminals from the area-sneak to the professional card-sharper, forger or murderer, and the various ways in which they are circumvented and captured. There are many interesting illustrations and photographs in the book, which is issued at 18*s.* net.

A number of books originally issued at 6*s.* and 7*s.* 6*d.* by Messrs. Morgan & Scott, under the general title of *Stories of High Purpose*, have now been issued at 3*s.* 6*d.* net (postage 6*d.*) and can be thoroughly recommended. The books include: *The Call of the Night-Rider*, A Tale of the Days of William Tyndale, by Mr. Albert Lee, one of the finest of modern historical romances, with four coloured and four half-tone illustrations; *Under Coligny's Banner*, also by Mr. Lee, giving a vivid picture of a momentous period in French history; *The Sapphire Button*, A Romance of the Road in Stuart Days, by Miss Florence Bone, is enriched with many quotations from George Herbert's writings and is full of plots and counterplots between the Puritans and the Royalists; *The Dawn of Hope*, A Tale of the Days of St. Paul, by Morice Gerard. *The British Weekly* says of it: "This graceful and tender romance is really a study of the Gospel of the Resurrection as it appealed to those who first heard it under the magnetic influence of St. Paul." Other books in this series of high standard, but not of historical interest, are *Mrs. Desmond's Daughter*, by E. Everett-Green; *The Girls of Clare Hall*, by Esther E. Enock; *Isobel's Winnowing*, by A. D. Stewart; *Dudley Napier's Daughters* and *Terrie's Moorland Home*, by Amy Le Feuvre.

Christian Inscriptions in Ancient Rome: Their Message for To-day, by Prebendary H. E. Fox, with a preface by the late Dean of Canterbury, has been re-issued at 2*s.* 6*d.* net. This book affords us all the means of becoming acquainted with one of the most interesting and most valuable records of early Christian life.

Sunday School Lesson Books.—We are glad to be able to announce the re-issue of two Sunday School Lesson Books by the Rev. G. R. Balleine: *Boys and Girls of the Bible; For the Sundays of the Church's Year in the School or Home.* The object of these lessons is to give the children a bird's-eye view of the whole Bible story from Abraham to St. Paul. In order to keep in touch with the Church Seasons, we begin with the New Testament. After two introductory lessons illustrating the world's need of Christ, we have a lesson on St. John the Baptist, then seven lessons on our Lord's Childhood,

ten lessons on our Lord's Ministry, and five from the Acts of the Apostles. Then we turn back to the Old Testament, taking two stories of the days of Abraham, one of Joseph, two of Moses, one of Joshua, two of the Judges, four of David, one of Solomon, one of Elijah, three of Elisha, four of the later Kings, two of the Captivity, one of Nehemiah, and one of Esther. The incidents have been selected with the thought that children are always interested in children, and, as the titles show, every lesson in this course is a story about a child.

The second book, *Lessons on the Acts of the Apostles*, provides the teacher with three things which will help to make the lessons interesting. (1) A quite definite aim for each Sunday. (2) A way of breaking the lesson into convenient headings. (3) A large amount of explanatory or illustrative matter. The Forewords to both books are full of useful and helpful hints to teachers. They are published at 2*s.* net each (postage 3*d.*).

Prayer Book Revision.—The Official Report of the Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) on the Prayer Book in the House of Commons on Thursday, December 15th, can be obtained at 6*d.* (7*d.* post free) from the Book Room. The reports of the House of Lords' Debate on the 12th, 13th and 14th December can also be obtained at 6*d.* each.

Bishop Knox has issued a little pamphlet entitled *The Malines Conference and the Deposited Book*, price 2*d.*, in which he emphasizes the close relations between the two.

The Rev. W. C. Procter has issued a short supplement to his book, *The Bible and the Composite Prayer Book*, which is inserted in each copy. To those who have already purchased the book, the supplement will be gladly sent on application to Messrs. Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd., 28–30, Whitefriars Street, E.C.4

Manuals for Communicants.—For presentation to Confirmees we again recommend the following books: *Helps to the Christian Life* (3rd edition), by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D. (cloth gilt 1*s.* 6*d.*, cloth 1*s.*, paper 6*d.*). This manual, containing advice and suggestions on Prayer and Bible Study, and also instructions and devotions before, at the time of and after Holy Communion, has been found a real help to the young and to the adult communicant; *My First Communion*, by the Rev. A. R. Runnels-Moss, M.A. (price, cloth gilt 1*s.* 3*d.*, cloth 1*s.*), has already reached a third edition and is a simple explanation of the Sacrament and Office, together with the Service. A devotional section has been added to the third edition, which has greatly enhanced the value of the book. Bishop Knox says of it: "I cannot doubt that this manual will find an extensive circulation, since it is both instructive and inspiring, and I have much pleasure in commending it to the notice of Evangelical clergy for the use of their communicants." A third edition of Canon Barnes-Lawrence's valuable manual, *The Holy Communion: Its Institution, Purpose, Privilege*, has been issued in three forms (cloth gilt 2*s.*, cloth limp 1*s.*, paper 9*d.*). The body of the book is largely devotional and some instruction on difficult points is given in an appendix. It is particularly useful for presentation to Public School boys and girls.

At the Lord's Table, by Canon H. A. Wilson (cloth gilt 1*s.* 6*d.*, cloth 1*s.*). The "preparation" is very practical and shows a true appreciation of the life and thought of the younger generation. The Self-Examination portion is not overdone and is on original lines. It has three lines of thought—one based on the Fruit of the Spirit in Galatians v.; one on the Beatitudes, and one on the Shorter Exhortation. The book possesses positive merits of a special character.