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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1931.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

"The Churchman."

WE take this opportunity at the beginning of a new year to thank our readers for their constant support and for the appreciation which so many have expressed of our efforts to represent in the pages of THE CHURCHMAN matters of general interest to Evangelical Churchpeople. We have been able during the past year to adopt several valuable suggestions which have been made to us, and to supply our readers with articles by many competent writers containing information which has proved useful. We hope in the year before us to continue to render service to those whose interests we represent, and we ask for the continuance of the support and help of our readers. We enclose in the present number a form of annual subscription and we ask for assistance in increasing our circulation. We believe that there is a greater opportunity than ever before Evangelical Churchpeople to-day to make the principles of the Reformation as they are represented in the Prayer Book and the formularies of our Church effective in the life of the nation. THE CHURCHMAN is one of the means of securing this desirable result, as it helps to set forth the point of view of those who interpret the Christian faith in the light of the teaching of our Lord and the Early Church and are therefore the "sober, peaceful and truly conscientious Sons of the Church of England."

The Discussion of the Lambeth Conference Report.

Since our last issue the discussion of the Report of the Lambeth Conference has proceeded apace and the lines of criticism have become fairly set. We have already referred to the disappointment felt by the representatives of the non-Episcopal Churches as to the attitude of the Conference towards the statements laid before the Committee on Unity on their behalf. Special exception has been taken by the Nonconformist leaders to the silence of the Conference on the declaration of the Joint Conference of 1923 on the status of the Free Church Ministry. The Anglican representatives at that meeting declared: "It seems to us to be in accordance with the

Lambeth Appeal to say, as we are prepared to say, that the ministries which we have in view in this memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and to administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church." The representatives of the Free Churches who accepted the invitation to attend the Lambeth Committee on Unity laid special emphasis on this declaration and desired that the Conference should express its agreement with it. They came away with the impression that the Report would contain special reference to it, but to their surprise and disappointment the statement is passed over in silence. The conclusion which they draw is that the Conference does not accept the declaration, and some of their leaders regard this as a complete set-back to any further progress towards reunion, especially as the Lambeth Report gives special prominence to the negotiations with the Orthodox and old Catholic Communions.

The Archbishop of York's Explanation.

The Archbishop of York as Chairman of the Committee on Unity has sought to explain the silence of the Conference. He stated that the declaration was limited by various phrases in the document which contained it. These spoke of the need of regularizing such ministries and of the limitation implied in the words " their several spheres." Dr. Carnegie Simpson, who is one of the chief protagonists of the Free Churches, takes the Archbishop severely to task for his explanation, which he regards as " neither well informed nor wisely considered." The Archbishop was not present at the original Conference and was therefore unaware of the very definite and clear conditions in which the declaration was made. In fact Archbishop Davidson declared that it might " bring a hornet's nest about their ears." As to the limiting words " within their several spheres," Dr. Carnegie Simpson asks is this to be applied to Christ's Sacrament. If so, he inquires of the Archbishop as a theologian—" If he holds that Christ's Sacrament—a Sacrament where Christ is the Celebrant—is or ever can be denominationally limited ? Surely Christ's Sacrament is always and everywhere Catholic. . . . He speaks of their Sacraments. There are no *their* Sacraments. There are no Sacraments of the Presbyterians or of the Anglicans—though I have heard Anglo-Catholics talk of our altars. There is only *His* Sacrament. This, the Declaration unmistakably and explicitly says, (certain) Free Church ministers administer. Well, if so, they administer what essentially is Catholic." This argument seems unanswerable. It will be accepted by Evangelical Churchpeople with the implications involved in it in regard to Intercommunion. It is regrettable that the Lambeth resolutions have raised this unfortunate controversy, and we trust that it will not retard the progress of the reunion movement in South India and other parts of the Mission Field.

Conditions in the Mission Field and Intercommunion.

We are enabled through the kindness of Dr. Linton, Bishop in Persia, to give from the position of the Churches in that country some idea of the urgency of unity in foreign lands where our Church is working side by side with the missions of other Churches. Attention is naturally centred on South India and the stage which the movement for unity has reached in that portion of the Mission Field. The Bishop in Persia shows that the same problems have to be faced in his diocese, and important decisions have to be made within a comparatively short time which will have far-reaching effects upon the future of Christianity in Persia. His references to Intercommunion also deserve special attention. No one desires to advocate "indiscriminate or purposeless intercommunion," but the experience of those who have had the opportunity of joining in united Communion Services in special circumstances where they have been "a sealing of the will to unity" bear testimony that such occasions are a very real means of securing that spirit of oneness which must underlie all approaches to a fuller unity. The sanction given by Lambeth to the partaking of Holy Communion by members of our Communion in the Churches of the non-Episcopal Churches —largely due, we are told, to the conditions which exist in Persia —has marked a stage of advance towards a better understanding from which there can be no retreat. Even if it is only allowable in exceptional circumstances, a principle is involved of which Evangelical Churchpeople heartily approve. The breadth of view shown in the Mission Field must ultimately react on the Church at home and destroy the narrowing prejudices which at present hamper advance.

The Claims of the Church of Rome.

The Lambeth Conference resolutions on Marriage and Sex Problems have given rise to much acrimonious discussion. They have given opportunity for the old cry to be raised that the Church of Rome is the sole guardian of Christian morality at the present time. Those who are familiar to any extent with the history of the methods of the Roman Church in dealing with all such matters are aware how little real foundation there is for the claim. The subtle devices by which the most rigid enactments can be evaded, when sufficient reasons for doing so arise, are known to those who follow the story of the cases that crop up. There is no divorce, but a declaration of nullity of marriage is not unknown for those whose position and means make it desirable. In this number of THE CHURCHMAN Mr. Poynter deals with some of the claims of the Roman Church and shows that the teaching of that Church is not so consistent as some of its supporters desire to make out. The Bishop of Liverpool, in his recent correspondence with the Roman Archbishop, experienced some of the controversial methods of the members of that Communion. He brought to the notice of the Archbishop a number of well-attested instances of the persecution

suffered by those who had entered into mixed marriages with Romanists. The only reply was that Dr. David did not realize the teaching of the Roman Church on the difference between the law of the State and the law of the Church on marriage. Those acquainted with the controversial methods of Rome are aware that there is no satisfaction to be gained by appealing to Roman ecclesiastics on any grounds of reason. The experiences of Dr. Coulton show that there is little to be expected from Roman controversialists when they have to face an expert whose knowledge gives them no opportunity of shirking the real issues.

Editorial.

In addition to the articles referred to in the preceding notes, we invite the attention of our readers to Dr. Sydney Carter's fresh examination of the questions connected with "The Elizabethan Bishops and Non-Episcopal Orders." The recent attack upon Archdeacon Hunkin in the *Church Quarterly Review* shows the persistence with which the facts are misrepresented and the research work of Evangelical Scholars treated with disparagement by those who set themselves up as infallible authorities on all ecclesiastical matters, but who, to their sad discomfiture, are frequently proved to be like their Roman confreres, whom they seem to emulate, guilty of gross errors. Dr. Carter gives the facts which show the accuracy of Archdeacon Hunkin's contention. Dr. Mullins contributes a further selection of his interesting reminiscences in which he recalls the Church life of Cheltenham and Oxford. Mr. John Knipe's study of some of the psychological elements in the characters of the authors of the Gunpowder Plot concludes an interpretation of "Conspiracy and Conscience" at an important period in the history of England. Dr. Whately's article on "Eucharistic Doctrine and the True Road to Harmony" contains a number of suggestive thoughts which will be appreciated by students. In "Mastership and Brotherhood" the Rev. W. Southam gives an exegetical study of an important passage of Scripture. Our Reviews of Books this quarter deal at some length with important works recently published on the doctrine of Holy Communion to which subject Evangelical students are at present devoting special attention. Among other important works of which notices appear are "Archbishop Leighton's Life" by Bishop Knox, which has been received by competent authorities as a valuable addition to the literature on the period, as as well as an important study of the Archbishop himself. Canon Grensted's Bampton Lectures, Bishop Gore's Gifford Lectures and Dean Inge's last work on Christian Ethics and Modern Problems.

LAMBETH AND RE-UNION IN PERSIA.

By the Right Rev. J. H. Linton, Bishop in Persia.

ONE really must begin with Henry Martyn, and for the simple reason that the biggest factor in the movement for a United Church of Persia is nothing more nor less than the place the Scriptures have in the life and practice of the Persian Church. Martyn offered as a missionary to the C.M.S. in 1802, the first Englishman to offer to the Society, for work as a foreign missionary. His friends in Cambridge thought it a most improper step that he should leave the University to preach the Gospel to the heathen. Anyone could do that! Martyn's gifts were too valuable to be thus wasted! How history has annihilated that criticism, for if one of the predominant causes for the decay of the early Christian Church in Persia was the fact that it had not the Scriptures in the vernacular, surely the emphasis on the Scriptures has been the life of the Church in Persia in these later days. And Martyn gave Persia the New Testament. In 1806 Martyn arrived in Madras to take up an appointment under the East India Company, and three years later we find him in Cawnpore translating the New Testament into Hindustani, Arabic and Persian. Realizing the need of a more idiomatic translation into Persian, Martyn came to Shiraz in 1811, and, to the Christian Church, Shiraz is not so much the city of the poets Hafez and Sa'adi, as the city of Henry Martyn, and the birthplace of the Persian New Testament. In eight months he had completed the New Testament and had also translated the Psalms. Cambridge grudged him to the East, but Sir James Morier, afterwards Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of Persia, wrote of Martyn: "Martyr at 31 years of age, the highest title of Henry Martyn to everlasting remembrance is that he gave the Persians in their own tongue the Testament of the one Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and the Hebrew Psalms." Martyn died on October 16, 1812, at Tokat in Armenia, disappointed in not being permitted to present in person to the Shah a copy of the Scriptures. But the British Ambassador, Sir Gore Ouseley, promised Martyn that he would himself do so, and he fulfilled his promise. The Shah graciously received the beautifully transcribed copy which Martyn had had prepared. The Armenian clergy at Tokat laid God's saint to rest. To-day, that "corn of wheat" is "bearing much fruit."

Half a century passed by, and Colonel Stewart, a Christian officer in the Indian Army, riding through Persia in disguise, was filled with the desire to see the Gospel preached in Persia. It was he who inspired Robert Bruce, an Irishman from Cork, then a missionary in India, to visit Persia. Bruce's visit in 1869 coincided with the great famine, and he stayed on to help in famine relief for the Persians and Armenians in Isfahan. In 1875 the C.M.S.

formally adopted the work as a mission of the Society. Bruce applied himself to the translation of the Old Testament and revised Martyn's translation of the New Testament. In 1811 Martyn wrote: "Persia is in many respects a ripe field for the harvest," but he saw how the Persians, though willing to listen and susceptible to the message of the Gospel, held back from open faith because of the terrors of the Law of Apostasy. Bruce saw the beginning of organized work among the Moslems of Isfahan, the establishment of hospital and school work, and the first-fruits of his labours in the baptism of several converts from Islam. But it was too soon yet to speak of a Persian Church. Indeed, Bruce's constant phrase was "we are as yet hardly sowing seed. We are only gathering out stones."

Meanwhile, the American Board had begun to explore North-West Persia and in 1833 had actually opened work in Urumia. This was soon followed by work in Tabriz, and to-day that mission has also important stations in Teheran, Hamadan, Doulatabad, Kermanshah, Resht, Meshed and Zinjan. C.M.S. occupies Isfahan, Yezd, Kerman and Shiraz, in each of which there is a flourishing church composed of converts from Islam. The B.C.M.S. has recently opened work in Duzdab and Seistan, and there is a most interesting and successful bit of work in Rafsenjan carried on entirely by Persian Christians.

One satisfactory feature in all this work has ever been the practical unity that has existed in the missions in the field, and their essential oneness in the proclamation of the Gospel. The Church in the North is Presbyterian in character. It is a Presbyterian Mission that founded and carries on the work in that area. Similarly the work in the South is Episcopal. But neither in the North nor in the South has the emphasis ever been on the outward form of organization, but on the preaching of the Gospel, on winning men and women to a living faith in the Crucified risen, living Saviour. The unifying factor has been "the message of the Cross." But there is a strong "Church" feeling, and this it is that is emphasizing in the mind of the Persian Christians the need for unity. For the Church is His Body. There has always been in the two missions a real fellowship. It is both inward and spiritual and also outward and actual. Let theologians and ecclesiastics in the secluded quiet of their studies say what they will about such fellowship, we, in the circumstances of our work in Persia, have never seriously questioned our custom of sharing with each other all the fellowship that our Lord bequeathed to His Church in the Ministry of the Word and the Sacraments. It is our conviction that such is for us, and for His Church in Persia, the will of God. This unity of the spirit is also a reality in the whole Church in Persia and is bound to issue at length in some form of united organization.

In 1925 an Inter-Church Conference was held at Hamadan. I think it was probably at this conference that Persian Christians first seriously understood that they were organically a divided Church. It came to them in the nature of a shock. They naturally

asked questions. Why were they divided? Who had divided them? And, with some shame, we missionaries had to accept the responsibility. We tried to explain the historical reasons that lay behind our home divisions, but this made no appeal to Persian Christians, who felt that they were not implicated in our history and were not prepared to accept the consequences of our past divisions. They would, therefore, at once unite! So they appointed a Committee of fourteen members "to draw up rules of union." Of this committee ten were Persians, and these alone had the power of voting. Four non-Persians, of whom I was one, had only advisory power. I was Chairman of the Committee. The whole situation was difficult. Whether they themselves grasped the fact or not, the Persian Church was in real need of teaching as to what was involved in the proposal to form a United Church of Persia. So we got things slowed down a bit. It was planned to hold a second conference at Isfahan in 1927. This was fully representative of all the local Evangelical Churches in Persia. The Committee on Unity prepared a series of Findings which the whole conference accepted. The Persian Church would fain have gone forward at once on the basis of these "Fundamental Principles." Again, much against the desire of my own heart, I had to put the brake on: "*I* have an oath of canonical obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and I must consult my Church before I go forward." Then someone asked, "But *who* is the Archbishop of Canterbury? And why should he want to hinder us in our desire to have a United Church?" We tried to explain. But England is very far away from Persia, and at times the link is felt to be very slender indeed! Moreover, in some other spheres, English shares are not worth a great deal in Persia, and this, too, affects matters in the Church. And so the clause was inserted asking for "independence from the See of Canterbury" and similarly from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in U.S.A. We may be inclined to criticize this as petulant, but no one who understands the strong national spirit that is stirring the whole of the East at this time, and is as strong within the Church as outside it, can fail to grasp the significance of that request. The Inter-Church Conference in Isfahan expressed its willingness to wait till after Lambeth, 1930, but then——!

Comment has been made in various quarters on the fact that in the Persia proposals for a United Church, they put Church Order rather a long way down. The explanation may perhaps be found in another fact, viz., the emphasis on the Holy Scriptures and the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Henry Martyn used to say of his method in disputes: "I bring forward no arguments, but calmly refer them to the Holy Scriptures." It is worth noting that while the Persian Church recorded its acceptance of Episcopacy, it did not base its acceptance on the decrees of Councils, nor on the evidence of history, but on the Word of God. It was not prepared to commit itself to any particular form of Episcopacy, and it just as clearly accepted the place of the Presbyter, and on

the same authority. The emphasis is everywhere on the authority of the Scriptures and the guidance of the Spirit of God. For which we thank God and take courage.

I was commissioned by the Persian Church to present their case to Lambeth, and I tried to do so as honestly as I could.

There were 73 members on the Unity Committee, representing every point of view in our very comprehensive Church of England. The most important item on our programme was, of course, the South India Scheme. Readers of the CHURCHMAN will readily call to mind the attitude of the Anglo-Catholic press in the days prior to Lambeth to the whole Unity movement. Now we had all that in concentrated form present at Lambeth ; and the Anglo-Catholic constituency looked to its leaders to see that what they regarded as " catholic principles " were not jeopardized. But there were also present those of us to whom this question of Unity in our own area is a matter of life and death for the Church. And there were others, English and Colonial diocesans, whose sympathies were on the side of greater liberty in the matter of inter-communion and Re-union. Visualize it, and you will realize, as we did, that some miracle of the Holy Spirit had to happen if open cleavage was to be avoided. No wonder we " feared as we entered the cloud." Moreover, it was useless to produce a Report which would simply be a watered-down, innocuous statement of our common faith, or an ambiguously worded compromise which could be read one way by one group, and quite differently by another. There were also negotiations with the Eastern Churches to be taken into account. There is no point in minimising how serious it was at times, and, indeed, some wondered whether it was any longer possible to preserve the " Synthesis " of such opposing traditions and ideals in the Anglican Communion. Must we, after all, each go our separate ways ? If that had to be,—if we were clearly and unequivocally convinced that this was the will of God for us, we would have faced up to it, even though it was with breaking hearts. The Anglo-Catholics were feeling this, I believe, just as sincerely and as keenly as we were. Then—something happened. It was, I am convinced, God's answer to world-wide prayer. It was the Spirit of God Himself who came upon us, revealing to us individually and corporately what was His will for us at this present time. There was a giving in and a giving up on both sides : not, I believe, of essential principles—but a giving up of the effort and strife to get all our own way at any cost. We all feel, from our respective standpoints, that we have not got all we wanted, nor all we had hoped for. But we thank God for what has been accomplished in some matters, and for signposts indicating the line of future progress in others.

With regard to the Persia proposals in particular, I think a great part of the Conference had not previously grasped our situation. But the reception of the proposals was certainly cordial, and some who for various reasons had previously opposed our scheme, gave us their willing support. The Committee unanimously passed the following paragraphs :

We have received the Proposals for a United Church of Persia as approved by the Inter-Church Conference held at Isfahan, July 23 to August 5, 1927.

We rejoice to hear of the growth of this Young Church in a Moslem land, and its zeal in the evangelization of Islam ; and desire to express our sympathy with the fervent desire of the Persian Church to be organically united.

We note that the Church in Persia is, for different reasons set forth in the Proposals, not yet ready for formal Union. We encourage the Church in Persia, however, to go forward towards this goal, carefully studying present movements in other parts towards Church Unity, and, in particular, the Scheme for a united Church of South India.

We regard it as essential for the Unity of the Church that the Historic Episcopate, in a constitutional form, should be definitely aimed at as the Order of the United Church of Persia. By this we do not mean that it should be an Anglican Church ; indeed, we hope that the Church of Persia, developing along the lines of its own genius, will have some particular contribution of its own to bring into the Catholic Church. But we urge that, if the Church of Persia is to be a vital part of the great Re-united Church, it should go forward along the lines of the threefold historic Ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, on which lines the Church is so clearly moving to-day.

We sympathize with the Church of Persia in its natural desire to be independent of external jurisdiction, and we look forward to the time when it will be completely free to develop according to its own national genius as a Province of the Church Universal. In the meantime, while steps are being taken to reach this goal, we gladly place at the disposal of the Persian Church all the experience that the Anglican Communion has gathered during the course of its history.

We have given sympathetic regard to the proposal that, at future ordinations in the two divisions in the Church, prior to the Consummation of Union, two ordained ministers from the Northern (Presbyterian) Churches join in the Laying-on of Hands at the ordination of an Episcopal minister ; and, similarly, that the Bishop should take part in the Laying-on of Hands at the ordination of a minister in the Presbyterian Church. We recognize that there are inherent difficulties in this proposal, but recommend that in view of the situation existing in the Church in Persia, due enquiry be made with a view to discovering whether some Scheme of Joint Ordination be possible, always providing, on our part, that the essentially Episcopal nature of the ordination be properly safeguarded.

and the Conference gave its general approval to this section of the Report.

There are just two points in the above on which I propose to comment :

1. The Archbishop of Canterbury in a personal talk with me expressed his sympathy with the desire of the Persian Church to be freed from external control, and he indicated the degree of progress in the Church of Persia which he would feel to be adequate to justify him in relinquishing his control. He also graciously promised to give me a letter on that subject to be read to the Persian Church. This will, I am sure, give real satisfaction to the Church in Persia.

2. With regard to the proposal for Joint Ordination in the meantime, until such time as the Church in Persia is organically united. Some time ago, the Presbyterian Church in North Persia handed over to me one of their candidates for ordination, that he should receive his training at our hands. That act in itself indicates the spirit of mutual trust that exists. The question will now at

once arise whether I will take part in his ordination. This will have to be faced, and on the answer much will depend which will be of far-reaching importance for the Church of Persia. It is probable that the ordination will be timed to take place during the next Inter-Church Conference which is to be held in 1931.

The subject of inter-communion between non-episcopal and episcopal churches is one that vitally affects us in Persia, and our circumstances had much to do with the passing of Resolution 42 headed " Special Areas." Many of us looked forward to something much more generous than the very carefully guarded permission given in this resolution, doubly safe-guarded by an explanatory note. For instance, I find it simply impossible to believe that we have to wait till all else has been accomplished in the way of Re-union before we can share in the fellowship of the Lord's Table with our non-episcopal brethren. I am no advocate of indiscriminate or purposeless inter-communion. Where there is a " will to schism " it seems incongruous to ask for this act of fellowship. But, on the other hand, many of us have proved it to be a factor in producing and sealing the " will to unity," and it is vain to ask us to deny our experience. Again, it would be unthinkable in Persia to deny to our episcopal church members who travel North the privilege of fellowship in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the Presbyterian Church in North Persia. That would be a position to which I could not possibly subscribe. I also welcome to the Holy Communion such baptized communicant members of the Presbyterian Church who come to us. Lambeth has now given its sanction to this, and it is a considerable advance on anything previously admitted by a Lambeth Conference. But we went even further than this. At big conventions and international missionary conferences there have been times when the " Unity of the Spirit " has been such a real experience that the desire to seal this Spirit of Unity in our Lord's own great act of Fellowship has been felt to be overwhelming. Resolution 42 shows that we faced frankly what was involved. There are all sorts of barbed-wire fences, hedges and high walls indicating that only " very special circumstances " are considered, and the " regulations " are certainly " very strict " ! But, for those who are convinced that God is leading them to brave the thorns and barbed wire in such " very special circumstances," the Bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who may in his discretion, exercised in accordance with the terms of the Resolution, sanction an exception to the general rule in such circumstances as those which obtain, say, in Persia, or in other special or temporary circumstances. Those " special or temporary circumstances " cover such an inter-communion as that in which I took part at the Jerusalem Conference or the Keswick Convention. But they would not cover anything in the nature of indiscriminate " gadding about " from one church to another whenever the fancy dictates. God is a God of order, and order in the Church is essential to its well-being.

It is too soon yet to express an opinion as to how the Persian

Church will receive the action of Lambeth on its proposals. It will come officially before the Church at the Inter-Church Conference to be held, D.V., at Teheran in 1931. What we pray for, and look forward to, is that we may be able to accomplish such an organic unity in the Persian Church as shall preserve at the same time our present fellowship in the Churches which have brought to Persia the message of the Gospel. Our God is sufficient for these things.

A FAITH FOR TO-DAY. By the Rev. George S. Marr, M.A., B.D., D.Litt., M.B., Ch.B. *London: H. R. Allenson, Ltd.* 2s. 6d. net.

The author of this treatise is a Presbyterian Minister in Edinburgh, and as he tells us in his preface he writes with a definite object in view—he feels that a re-united Church calls for a re-constituted Creed. His endeavour is to furnish such a re-statement with the conviction that it has been long overdue. We must confess to being a little doubtful as to the necessity for such a reconstruction, but Dr. Marr states clearly and courageously some of the opinions which are held by the majority of thinking men and women at the present time. We suspect that many of our readers may find themselves unable to follow him along some of the ways he is prepared to go. He is prepared, for example, to scrap the "literal inerrancy of the Bible," and he says "there are passages in St. Paul's Epistles which are entirely foreign to our modern outlook on life and to which we simply cannot subscribe." In much the same way Dr. Marr regards those views on the Atonement which are what most of us would describe as "Orthodox"—they are supposed to alienate "thinking men," and we are told that "the Church should boldly declare that while these theories no doubt served their day and generation they must be acknowledged to-day to be exploded, because they are quite inadequate to satisfy the modern mind and outlook. Let them go." Our business is not to discover what is agreeable to the modern mind but what is TRUTH. This is the most important. We might buy even so great a blessing as reunion at too high a price, and we cannot afford to sacrifice the fundamental doctrines of our faith even to secure consolidation. In order to show that we have not misunderstood Dr. Marr's purpose let us close with a suggestion from his last page, where he asks, "Is it not possible, therefore, for those who are interested in the matter of a frank re-statement of the Church's belief, to unite and form a party resembling in some respects at least the Modernist party in the Church of England?" We look for better things and a more uncompromising fidelity in Scotland! S. R. C.

ROMAN CATHOLIC MORAL THEOLOGY.

By J. W. Poynter.

THE recent pronouncements of the Lambeth Conference, on some controverted points of morality, have given rise to a good deal of discussion. In some quarters there is a disposition to suggest that some of those decisions compare unfavourably with the more fixed and uncompromising teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. It may be well, therefore, to devote an article to examining the basis and to some extent the superstructure of the moral theology of that Church. Of course, in a brief article only an outline can be attempted; but it may be possible to make that outline useful as giving an accurate idea of the whole of a vast subject. Let it also be understood once for all that this article is not "an attack." It aims only at giving informative statements.

As one of the first essentials to any discussion is to have a careful definition of the words we use, so we must here define clearly what we mean by "morality," "ethics," "moral philosophy," and "moral theology." "It is necessary," says *The Catholic Encyclopaedia* (x, 559), "at the outset to distinguish between morality and ethics: terms not seldom employed synonymously. Morality is antecedent to ethics: it denotes those concrete activities of which ethics is the science." "Moral philosophy" is another term for "philosophical ethics," and (*Cath. Ency.*, v, 556): "Ethics may be defined as the science of the moral rectitude of human acts in accordance with the first principles of natural reason." "Moral theology," on the other hand, (*Cath. Ency.*, xiv, 601), "includes everything relating to man's free actions and the last, or supreme, end to be attained through them, as far as we know the same by Divine Revelation." Thus, ethics is the natural science of which morality is the art; and moral philosophy and moral theology are the natural and the supernaturally revealed (respectively) doctrines of ethics and morality.

The whole outlook of the Roman Catholic Church on these subjects, as on all others, is, of course, dominated by that Church's claim to be the one authentic and infallible teacher of religious knowledge. "The Eternal Pastor and Bishop of our souls, in order to continue for ever the lifegiving work of His Redemption, determined to build up a holy Church, wherein, as in the house of the living God, all believers might be one in the bond of one faith and one charity": (Vatican Council, constitution *Pastor Æternus*). "The Church cannot err in what she teaches as to faith or morals, for she is our infallible guide in both": (English Roman Catholic Catechism, question 100).

It would thus at first sight seem that Roman Catholics have a fixed and certain guide to their moral actions, such as cannot be possessed by people who do not believe in an infallible Church.

On closer inspection, however, that fixity and certainty turn out to be to a great extent apparent rather than real.

First of all, precisely to what facts and doctrines does the infallibility of the Church extend? The Vatican Council defined the Papal infallibility as existing "when he [the Pope] speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Church universal"; and it stated that that infallibility was the same as that "with which the Divine Redeemer willed His Church to be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals." It did not, however, give any precise criterion as to when that infallibility exists, and Roman Catholic theologians are still divided on that essential question. In his recent book, *The Vatican Council*, Dom Cuthbert Butler dwells candidly on those diversities, and, referring to Cardinal Manning, says (pp. 215–16):

> "In his elaborate explanation of the force of the infallibility decree he extends its scope so as to include dogmatic facts, censures less than heresy, canonizations of saints, approbations of religious orders: all this is roundly asserted; even though Bishop Gasser, as official spokesman of the deputation *de Fide*, had laid down positively that the theological questions at issue over these matters were not touched by the definition, but were left in the state of theological opinion in which they were before the Council—and still are."

True, Dom Butler says that Papal utterances, even when not certainly infallible, are to be accepted. "Such adhesion to teaching not infallible is not the firm assent of faith, but a prudent assent based on a moral conviction that such teaching will be right" (p. 226). What, however, does that mean? If the teaching is not infallible, it is not revealed by God: for God cannot err. Therefore, such teaching is merely human. In that case, we should be free to receive or reject it on its merits. The only "prudent assent" we can be obliged to give it is a respectful regard to the authority of those teaching it: but that regard must be conditioned by the fact that they are merely fallible men. In short, we should be free to reject it if, after candid and respectful study, we find the evidence to be against it.

The infallibility of the Pope and Roman Church, then, is really very uncertain. If that is so even in dogmas of faith, how much more so in matters of morals—which concern the interminable complexities of human thoughts and acts all the world over day by day!

Take the question of birth control. Cardinal Bourne, speaking at Swansea on October 5, 1930, alluded to the Lambeth Conference's declaration on that subject, and described it as "this really destructive resolution," which has created "intense surprise and real scandal." He said it "abandons the unbroken traditional Christian teaching," and "the prelates who adopted this resolution have abdicated any claim which they may have been thought to possess to be authorized exponents of Christian morality." He then added that "the teaching of the [Roman] Catholic Church on

this subject" is "binding on the conscience of every man and woman."

From this one would suppose that that teaching has been definitely and infallibly set forth. That, however, is not the case. No *ex cathedra* decree of a Pope, or of an Ecumenical Council, exists on the subject. All that exist are theologians' opinions, as to which the highest that can be said is that Roman Catholics should give them the "prudent assent" referred to above. How can teaching be "binding on the conscience of every man and woman" when it has not been infallibly declared? Moreover, the teaching in question is not so unanimous as Cardinal Bourne suggests. On this subject it is useful to read *The Morality of Birth Control*, by "A Priest of the Church of England" (London: Bale and Danielson, 1924). Dealing with Roman Catholic teaching on these matters, the author shows (pp. 75, 161–2) that it is logically inconsistent; that (pp. 55–6) one chief argument in it is based on a textual error in Bible-interpretation; that (p. 91) it involves grave evils of its own; and that (pp. 76, 158–9) in fact it allows some contraceptive methods. To sum up this matter, then: Roman Catholic teaching on contraception is far from as clear as it is generally thought to be; and, in any case, it is open in some respects to serious moral objections; while at very best it is non-infallible, and therefore no Roman Catholic can be sure (even on his own grounds) that it may not be wrong. Whatever our opinions on this perplexing question may be, then, it is a fact that Rome has no real logical advantage over Lambeth. Indeed, in reality, Roman Catholic current teaching is inferior to that of Lambeth in one respect at least: although Roman teaching is non-infallible on this matter, the Roman clergy are binding their people to it on pain of mortal sin. Is that not a grave excess of jurisdiction? In this article I express no opinion on birth control itself; I merely challenge the current Roman Catholic assumption of superiority.

A similar assumption of superiority is made in regard to Roman Catholic teaching as to marriage itself. The Council of Trent (session 24) declared that matrimony "is to be numbered among the sacraments of the New Law"; and it passed the canon saying: "If anyone saith that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the evangelical law, instituted by Christ the Lord, . . . let him be anathema."

Certainly, at first sight it would seem that a teaching which says marriage is one of Christ's sacraments must be superior to teaching which says it is not. It is dangerous, however, to trust too readily to first appearances. What, in Roman Catholic teaching, is a sacrament? There are (Trent, session 7, canon 1) seven sacraments; they (canon 8) confer grace "through the act performed" (*ex opere operato*); to their proper administration "the intention at least of doing what the Church does" is necessary (canon 11). In regard to matrimony, it is distinctly laid down (Trent, sess. 24, canons 3, 4, and 12) that the Church can dispense from some degrees otherwise prohibitory of marriage, and establish others; that it is

heresy to say "that the Church could not establish impediments dissolving marriage, or that she has erred in establishing them"; and that it is heresy to say, "matrimonial causes do not belong to the ecclesiastical judges."

In declaring matrimony a Christian sacrament, therefore, what the Roman Church is really saying is this: that matrimony is a means by which grace is received *ex opere operato*; that the rules of its reception are subject to the legislation of the Roman Church; and that that Church can vary those rules. To say the least, it by no means follows that that teaching is morally superior to teaching which says that Divine grace may be received by any person who is married according to the laws of his or her country and remains faithful to the obligations thereof. Indeed, the Roman teaching introduces positive elements of harm. The *Ne Temere* decree of 1907 declares that any so-called marriage, both or one of the parties to which is a Roman Catholic, is null and void if not contracted according to the laws of the Council of Trent; and it is definitely added that

"the above laws are binding on all persons baptized in the Catholic Church and on those who have been converted to it from heresy or schism (even when either the latter or the former have fallen away afterwards from the Church), whenever they contract either betrothal or marriage with one another."

The possibilities of misery, breaking up of families, and bastardization of children, involved in such legislation, are obvious: especially when the clause about those who "fall away from the Church" is understood—for the clause applies to people baptized Roman Catholics as babies though afterwards never brought up as such. Finally, we must note that, by claiming right to impose or remove impediments as she sees well (irrespective of civil laws), the Roman Church introduces a grave source of confusion and even moral abuse. On the whole, the Roman teaching on matrimony cannot rightly claim any moral or religious superiority over teaching which says God's blessing is not conditioned by ecclesiastical regulations. (*N.B.*—It should be noted that the *Ne Temere* decree does not affect marriages to which neither party is a Roman Catholic. The decree says: "Non-Catholics, whether baptized or unbaptized, who contract among themselves, are nowhere bound to observe the Catholic form of betrothal or marriage." This mitigation, however, does not do away with the other evils.)

To turn to other aspects of Roman Catholic moral theology: One of the most important elements in it is the distinction between "mortal" and "venial" sins.

"Mortal sins are against the very end of the Law, which is the love of God; they utterly destroy charity and grace, cause the death of the soul, and deserve eternal punishment. Venial sin, though it disposes to that which is mortal, and is the greatest of all evils except mortal sin, still does not annihilate the friendship of the soul with God. Venial sin is a disease of the soul, not its death, and grace is still left by which the sin may be repaired." (Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, 1917, p. 777).

It is not needful in this article to go into the merits of this distinction. The object now in view is to examine the assumption that (even granting its own premisses) Roman Catholic moral theology is socially or/and individually more beneficial than that of "non-Catholics." In that connection, what has to be realized is that the distinction between mortal and venial sins is often the reverse of clear.

"It is very hard to decide in particular what is or is not mortal sin. . . . Some sins, such as those of blasphemy, perjury, impurity, are, if deliberate, always mortal; others—*e.g.* theft—though mortal in their own nature, are venial if the amount of the wrong done is very small. Others, again, are venial in their own nature, and become mortal only under superadded circumstances." (Addis, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 777).

Surely, no Protestant system of moral teaching can be more full of uncertainty than this; yet this is part of the very basis of Roman moral theology as regards directing consciences.

Every Roman Catholic priest will be aware of the problem of "scruples." Confessors find "scrupulous persons" one of the most troublesome features of their ministry. "Scrupulous persons" are those who worry unduly over their sins or the nature of those sins. "Scrupulosity, in general, is an ill-founded fear of committing sin," said the late Father Wm. Doyle, S.J. (*Scruples*; "Irish Messenger" Office, 1928, p. 1). Such persons torture themselves as to whether this or that is a sin; whether, if so, it is mortal or venial; whether their previous confessions have been bad and therefore invalid; in short, such persons "do not know where they are."

"Scrupulosity," said Father Doyle (p. 3), "completely warps the judgment in moral matters. It takes away one's common sense. It places before the eye of conscience a magnifying glass, which enlarges the slightest cause of alarm, and makes a timid soul see a thousand phantom sins, whilst by specious reasoning it seeks to persuade it that these are undoubted faults."

"A scrupulous man," said the late Father F. W. Faber (*Growth in Holiness*, 1872, p. 315), "teases God, irritates his neighbours, torments himself, and oppresses his director." Yet, after all, is not this disease of "Scruples" a natural product of a system of compulsory auricular confession of which a great part is the habit of analysing sins so as to distinguish between mortal and venial? In any case, all this does not testify to any pre-eminent moral or spiritual *certitude*!

A further element of uncertainty, in Roman Catholic moral theology, is found in the discussions about "probabilism" and its rival theories. Probabilism teaches that, when there are opposed opinions as to the rightness or otherwise of an action, the opinion may be followed which, after inquiry, seems best, even though it is doubtful. In short, a "probable opinion" is one for which some reputable authority can be quoted. It may be adopted even if other authorities differ. The "probabiliorists" (= "advocates of the *more probable* view"), on the other hand, hold that that view ought to be followed which has *the greatest weight* of evidence. The

history of these theories has shown striking vicissitudes. To quote Addis and Arnold (*Cath. Dict.*, p. 605):

"From 1580 till about 1650 Probabilism, as even Billuart does not venture to deny, held possession of the schools. . . . From about 1650 a powerful reaction set in. In France, Zaccaria writes, Probabilism was hated as 'the pest of morality. . . .' Nor must it be thought that this hostility was peculiar to French ecclesiastics or to Gallicans. Most, according to Billuart, of the Dominicans, some distinguished Jesuits (*e.g.* Gonzalez, general of the Society), and many Italian writers (*e.g.* the Dominican Concina, the brothers Peter and Jerome Ballerini, Berti, Fagnanus, many years secretary of the Congregation of the Council) were in the hostile ranks. [Pope] Benedict XIV made the moral theology of the Jesuit Antoine (in the Roman edition of the Franciscan Carbognano)—an author rigid among the Probabiliorists—the textbook at the Propaganda [College]. . . . The proportion is now reversed, and Probabilism is the popular theory throughout the Church. It may, indeed, be regarded as the only existent theory."

Be it remembered that these questions concern sacramental confession, and thus (according to Roman teaching) the eternal salvation or loss of souls. Surely we may conclude that (even apart from positive evils) Roman moral theology has no claim to pre-eminent certitude which may place it on a pedestal of superiority.

Selections from the Commentaries and Homilies of Origin, translated by Canon R. B. Tollinton, D.D. (S.P.C.K., 10*s.* net), is a book that will appeal to all who are interested in the study of the Fathers. The selection has been made with a view to giving the modern reader who has not time for a fuller study of the original an English version of such portions of Origen's extant expositions of Scripture as may enable him to understand Origen's point of view in regard to subjects which retain their interest for us in spite of changed conditions and the lapse of years. A useful essay on Origen as Exegete is prefixed.

Tales of India (Church Missionary Society, 1*s.*). This is a series of short, lively stories contributed by people who have lived in India. While they illustrate the work of the missionaries in schools, villages and hospitals, they will be appreciated just as much by those who know nothing of this special work for God in India. Stories of the tribes on the North-West Frontier are of topical interest at the present time, and "Jimmy's Diary" will appeal to all dog lovers. The book is well got up and illustrated with photographs taken on the spot, and is a capital gift-book for young people.

THE ELIZABETHAN BISHOPS AND NON-EPISCOPAL ORDERS.

By C. Sydney Carter, F.R.Hist.S.

ALMOST unjustifiable attack on the integrity and good faith of a well-trusted Evangelical scholar and writer has again brought into prominence the question of the precise attitude of the Elizabethan Bishops towards foreign Presbyterian Orders. The Archdeacon of Coventry was recently most unmercifully castigated by the Editor of the *Church Quarterly Review* (July, 1930) and virtually accused of deliberately falsifying and misrepresenting historical evidence in order to establish the fact that Elizabethan Bishops did not deny the validity of foreign non-episcopal Orders. The case in point is the interesting one of Robert Wright, a rather prominent, popular and able Puritan preacher.

But before examining carefully this special case it is well to remember the precise position of the Bishops in this reign, otherwise it is not always easy to understand their actions. At that time there was no idea of toleration of differing forms of belief or practice in the same Nation. Elizabeth had "established" the Reformed English Liturgy for universal use under penalties, and definite rules had been laid down for Episcopal Ordination for ministry in England. Every other form of ordination was therefore a defiance of the laws of the Land and as such liable to punishment. Religion at this period was legislated for on the principle of *nationality*. Accordingly Elizabethan churchmen did not condemn the custom of other countries, like Scotland, Holland or Switzerland, where a Presbyterian system of Church polity prevailed. If any Minister ordained by these foreign Churches wanted to live in England and exercise his ministry, exceptions were made in his favour from the National rule for Ordination and his foreign Orders were allowed and supposed to be specially covered by an Act of Parliament (1571). But these were naturally rare and exceptional cases. It was quite different, however, when *English* men, out of a dislike for the established religious system of their own country, sought to evade its requirements by a visit to the Continent in order to secure a Presbyterian ordination which they preferred and then return and exercise this Ministry in England. Much natural resentment was caused by such an underhand and questionable procedure, and it is not surprising that the Bishops were not anxious to permit these men to exercise their ministry, especially as they were usually extreme Puritans who inveighed in their preaching against the Liturgy and ceremonies of the Reformed Church, if not also against its episcopal Ministry. They usually, therefore, made most careful inquiry in such cases as to whether the alleged Minister had been really and properly ordained by the foreign Presbyterian Church, and in one case at least, that of

Walter Travers (who was stirring up strife and controversy against Richard Hooker, his fellow-preacher at the Temple), they objected that such Ordination did not give a just or legal title for an *Englishman* to minister in England. But they never questioned the *spiritual* validity of such Orders, only their strict "legality," and if such Ministers were peaceable and loyal to the discipline and ceremonies of the Church they were not in the least likely to be disturbed or questioned on the score of their Presbyterian Orders. But this deliberate attempt to defy the established laws of the "Church and realm" naturally incensed the Bishops, and it would not have been surprising if they had rigidly refused to recognize all those extreme Puritans who adopted this disloyal method of securing Orders. This situation enables us better to understand the peculiar case of Robert Wright.

He was born in Edward VI's reign in 1550 and at the age of fifteen he went to Christ's College, Cambridge, and he took his degree there three years later and his M.A. in 1572. He then commenced preaching and was allowed to do so "by Order of Her Majesty's Injunctions" in the University, according to his own account, with "approbation." Apparently he remained another seven years at Cambridge, since he tells Lord Burleigh that he lived there "about 14 years amongst Ministers—the Master and Fellows of Christ's College—who with one consent would testify" to his orderly behaviour. There is little doubt, however, that he held very strong Puritan convictions and was evidently one of the irreconcilable sort of "Precisians" who gave the Elizabethan Bishops so much trouble with their determined "nonconformities" to the religious settlement. In spite of his later protestations, there seems little doubt that he really disliked the liturgical services, and was evidently too prone to conclude that the regular use of Church services and ceremonies was a mark of slackness and unspirituality. Like all Puritans, he laid great stress on preaching and most likely rejoiced in the "Prophesyings" so disliked by the Queen. He would therefore be inclined to denounce clergy not favouring these "exercises" as "dumb dogs" and "clogs of anti-Christ." We can well picture this zealous young Puritan, with no love for bishops, "lovingly admonishing" all negligent parsons and seizing the opportunity to preach and catechize privately in the families of the country squires of Puritan leanings with "the full purpose," as he tells us, "of serving in the Ministry when God should call him thereunto."

Towards the end of the year 1579 the opportunity of more permanent employment came his way. He left Cambridge and was invited into the family of Lord Rich at Rochford Hall. He evidently gave such satisfaction there that he was soon appointed private Chaplain to this peer. Wright told Burleigh in May, 1582, that he "continued" with Lord Rich's family "from Christmas was two years till last Michaelmas." But we can judge of the strong Puritan convictions of Lord Rich when Wright tells us that he called his household together and first secured their

approval before inviting him to act as private Chaplain to the family. Wright was, however, no Anabaptist, and he had a full belief in a regularly ordained Ministry. Consequently he says that he did not regard this " call " " by the Flock " as ordination, and so when a fitting opportunity occurred on a visit abroad some eighteen months later he secured ordination from the Presbytery at Antwerp. Until this event, he says, " he took not himself to be any other than a private man to do them some good till they might have a sufficient Pastor." Even after this clandestine foreign ordination he declares that " he did only the duty of a private man and neither preached publicly nor ministered any Sacrament." There was at this time no law against even a layman acting as *private* chaplain in a nobleman's household. Lord Rich, however, naturally desired his zealous and efficient Chaplain to have a wider sphere of influence and service, and so he petitioned the Bishop of London, Aylmer, to grant Wright a public licence to preach. But as this was before his ordination at Antwerp, Aylmer refused the request " when he understood I was no minister." After Wright had laboured in this capacity some fourteen months his patron died in February, 1581, but Wright was continued in his office under his successor, who seems to have been as zealous a Puritan as his father.

This new Lord Rich also promised to secure Wright a public preaching licence, and consequently he and a bastard uncle, also named Rich, visited the Bishop at Fulham for this purpose and evidently used much plain, if not exactly polite, speech to the Bishop on the subject. This was apparently after Wright's ordination, for Aylmer " did not utterly deny a licence but asked first to see some testimony that the said Minister was ordained Minister," and further he utterly refused to license him " unless he would subscribe to the orders of the Church." Aylmer was not ignorant of Wright's strong Puritan opinions and of his reported denunciations of the Prayer Book and of the Bishops and Vicars for their supposed worldliness and slackness. Moreover, just at this time a serious accusation against Wright was reported to him. It was asserted that he had denounced the solemnizing of the Queen's birthday as equivalent to creating a new holy day and " making her an idol." Elizabeth had heard this report and was furious, and asked Burleigh to urge Aylmer to deal with Wright forthwith. With much difficulty Aylmer succeeded in getting Wright up from Essex for examination in the Consistory Court in October, 1581, and again on November 7. He was accused before the Bishop and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of this serious offence, for which the Bishop told him " he deserved to lie in prison for seven years." As a result, " for this offence " and also " for rejecting the Book and many other disorders," he was committed to the Gatehouse prison. But like Joseph he found a friend in prison in the Keeper, who was inclined to Puritanism. Consequently a few months later the Keeper allowed Wright to visit his wife in Essex on the occasion of her confinement. Un-

fortunately on this journey Wright was seen by the lawyer who had appeared against him at his trial, and this man informed the Bishop, who threatened to report the Keeper to the Queen.

Wright then wrote a letter from prison in May, 1582, to Lord Burleigh complaining of this harsh form of persecution and appealing for his interest on his behalf. In reply Burleigh sent Wright a copy of the Charges made against him at his trial, together with his own replies to them as officially recorded at the time. He also sent him a copy of the Depositions made by six Sworn Witnesses who examined Wright on a " special Commission " while he was in prison. Wright then wrote a long explanation to Burleigh denying or modifying nearly all these charges, and declaring that the testimony of the Sworn Witnesses was unreliable, since they were his known enemies and specially chosen " to serve a turn " of securing a case against him. In particular he denied that he had reviled the Prayer Book and declared that he thought it " good and godly " and that he had used it and resorted to churches for prayers and Sacraments. He declared that he had never said " there were no lawful ministers in England " or that all were " dumb dogs," but that he had always reverenced all " watchful and godly ministers."

He then gave Burleigh an account of his association with the two Lords Rich and mentions his visit to Antwerp when he was ordained, although he denied that he went there for that specific purpose, but rather " to see the churches from whence idolatry had been lately driven." Apparently this explanation satisfied Burleigh, for Strype in his *Life of Aylmer* tells us that in September, 1582, Wright became willing to subscribe to two articles—to his good allowance of the ministry of the Church of England and to the Book of Common Prayer, and he also required him to be bound over not to preach anything against the Ministry or the Prayer Book, and then " he did not mislike that he should have further favour so that the Queen were made privy thereunto, whom this offence did chiefly concern." Whether this " further favour " merely consisted in his release from prison, or as seems more likely in the granting of a licence to preach, is not clear, but it would seem superfluous to extort promises not to " preach against the Ministry or the Prayer Book " from a man who was to remain in prison, whereas this is perfectly natural from a man who is to be granted a licence to preach. In any case the last we hear of Wright is that seven years later he was instituted to a living in the diocese of Norwich.

Now the conduct of the Bishop concerning Wright seems quite straightforward and exactly what we should expect in view of the troubles with the Puritan opposition at the time. He first refuses him a licence before he was ordained, and then after his Presbyterian ordination he demands evidence of this illegal method of evading episcopal ordination, and meanwhile he imprisons him on the serious charges of insulting the Queen and open disaffection to the Church government. There is no evidence from Strype's

original documents that Aylmer ever condemned the validity of foreign non-episcopal Orders or that he refused Wright a licence on this account.

But his case has been needlessly complicated by a definite statement made by the Puritan historian Neal that Aylmer " always refused him a preacher's licence, because he was no minister, i.e. had only been ordained among the foreign Churches " (Vol. I, 310, 1822). Now the only authority which Neal quotes for his delineation of Wright's history is a footnote to Strype's *Annals*, and as we read his account it is obvious he is paraphrasing Strype's story, although he has badly muddled and confused it and made other definite statements or misstatements which are not borne out by Strype and for which he gives no other authority.

But it is on the basis of this second-hand evidence of Neal's that the Editor of the *Church Quarterly Review* condemns Archdeacon Hunkin and that Bishop Frere asserts that " Wright was convented in 1582 for taking upon himself to minister, having only received Presbyterian Orders at Antwerp " (*Hist. of Eng.*, Ch. 230). The only foundation for Neal's statement about Aylmer's refusal to license Wright is the fact that when " the lord Rich that dead is," as Wright describes the Lord Rich who died in 1581, applied to Aylmer for a licence, Aylmer refused it " because he understood that I was no minister." But there is no evidence that Aylmer called him " no minister because he had *only received Presbyterian Orders.*" The question therefore to be settled is, Was Wright ordained when the Bishop called him " no minister " ? And the evidence is practically conclusive that he was *not*, and that this ordination at Antwerp is practically conclusive that he was *not*, and that this ordination at Antwerp did not take place till the summer of 1581, whereas the " old Lord Rich that dead is " died in February, 1581. This evidence comes out clearly in Wright's replies at his trial and also in his letter of defence and explanation in May, 1582, to Lord Burleigh. Although there is no record that Wright's possession of foreign Orders was made a charge against him either at his trial before the Bishop in November, 1581, or at the later examination before the special Commission while he was in prison, it is fairly certain that on both occasions he was asked whether he was ordained or " by what authority he preached." In fact, the Sworn Witnesses deposed that Wright answered this question by declaring that " he was called by the Reformed Church." In his letter to Burleigh, Wright denies that any " magistrate ever examined him by what authority he preached," and he adds, " neither is it set down where or when I spake the words " (that is, that " I was called by the Reformed Church "). And then he discloses the period, although not the actual date of his ordination, when he adds, " If I said any such thing in private speech *within the last year* (which I remember not) I might *justly say it*, though I took not upon me *thereby* to do any public duty." (That is, not having received the necessary Bishop's licence to do any public duty he did not exercise his Ministry publicly.) Wright wrote this

in May or June, 1582, and so we know that his ordination at Antwerp must have taken place "within the year" past, that is, since May, 1581. Now since "my lord Rich that dead is" died in *February*, 1581, Wright clearly was not ordained when that lord Rich "laboured" with Aylmer for his public licence and was refused because Aylmer "understood that he was no minister." This statement also narrows down the date of Wright's ordination to the period from May to November, 1581, when he was imprisoned. Some time during this interval he must have visited Antwerp and while there have been ordained, as he tells us, by Villiers (who was Chaplain to William of Orange) and other Presbyterian ministers. It was after the Pacification of Ghent (1576), when toleration of worship was declared in Antwerp, that English merchants returned there and the Presbyterian Thomas Cartwright for a time was Chaplain to them. As the Reformed worship was thereafter permitted for some years they could safely remain there at least till the Reformers, becoming more powerful, altogether proscribed the Romish worship in Antwerp in July, 1581. It is therefore most probable that it was in this or the following month that Wright paid his visit to Antwerp, since he expressly says that "he went there to see the churches from whence idolatry had *been lately driven*," which would correctly describe the state of many Antwerp churches where the Romanists had now been forbidden to celebrate their worship.

But we have also further proof of this approximate date for Wright's ordination since in his Answers at his Trial in November, 1581, Wright expressly says that it was "since the death of the old lord" (Rich) that he had been "called unto the Ministry." He says he did not regard the Rich household as his "Flock" "by virtue of his former choice" when the "old Lord" had got him "elected" by the household as private Chaplain, but because of this later Ordination at Antwerp. Evidently the expression the "old Lord" is equivalent to the "late lord," although as a fact that lord was only forty-two at his death. But Wright did not go to Rochford into the Rich household till late in the year 1579, and therefore "the former choice" of him as private Chaplain procured by the "old Lord" Rich must refer to the Lord Rich who died in February, 1581. It could not possibly refer to the previous Lord Rich[1] who died in 1567 when Wright was a youthful undergraduate of seventeen at Cambridge and certainly not acting as private Chaplain to anyone.

There is no evidence anywhere that *after* this Ordination, in the summer or autumn of 1581, Aylmer ever declared that "he was no minister" or refused him a licence on that score. In fact, although they might well have been made so, as contravening the laws of the Land concerning Ordination, there is no evidence to show that Wright's foreign Orders were ever made a charge against him at his trials.

The foregoing account and quotations in it are taken from Strype, *Annals*, III, 125–6 and Appendices 23 and 24, pp. 40–2 (1728), and Strype, *Aylmer*, pp. 54–6 (1821).

[1] A most unlikely suggestion advanced by the Editor of the *Church Quarterly Review*.

SOME MEMORIES OF MY YOUTH.

By the Rev. J. D. Mullins, D.D.

MY earliest recollection of a church is of a vast corrugated-iron structure which stood on the site of the present St. Matthew's Church, Cheltenham. At some previous date the ancient parish church of St. Mary had been closed for repairs, including the removal of its galleries, which had perhaps become dangerous. The "Temporary Church," as it was called, could hold considerably over a thousand people, and continued to be used long after the repairs were finished because the reduced accommodation of St. Mary's was not nearly sufficient for the congregations which crowded the other. It had a two-decker pulpit, the prayers being read from the lower and the sermon preached from the upper "deck." The preachers always wore the black gown and bands.

The face I most remember is that of the benign and venerable-looking Dr. Walker. He had succeeded the famous Francis Close in 1857, being then only thirty-four, and became Rector instead of Perpetual Curate when the chancel was purchased six years later. I have called him venerable looking; he was not really old, for he died at the age of forty-nine.

I have no hesitation in saying that no succeeding rector has been worshipped as was Dr. Walker. The long inscription to his memory in the old Parish Church is evidently the tribute not of conventional respect but of ardent love struggling to find words strong enough to express itself. It speaks of him as:

> "A Pastor to whom a sweet and powerful character, an active and penetrating mind and many eminent gifts and graces gave a rare and abiding influence and whose work, carried on with unsparing self-denial and unwearied zeal, in conscientious adherence to the doctrine and discipline of the Reformed Church of England, was marked in a special manner by the presence of power from on high.
>
> "This tablet is erected by attached parishioners and friends who glorify God for his holy life and peaceful death."

Then follow a long string of texts to the same effect. The inscription continues:

> "His remains were followed to the grave by thousands of his mourning fellow-townsmen."

This was literally true. I believe that all denominations and institutions were represented in that great procession. I myself was one of the followers, probably as one of the representatives of the Sunday School. I remember that about that time I was kept behind one Sunday afternoon and presented with a framed portrait of the Rector; why, I have forgotten, but the choice was a small but significant evidence of the honour in which the teachers held him.

As a small boy—he died when I had just entered my teens—I could not of course know at first hand of all his manifold activities, but I remember some. For instance, he conducted schoolroom

lectures on such subjects as the Miracles and the Parables, to which I was taken by my mother. I got into sad disgrace by complaining that whatever was the subject with which the lecture began, it always came round to the same thing in the end, and that was some presentation of "the plan of salvation" as it used to be called. In those days it was considered essential that every address should contain the gospel message of salvation.

I also remember a wooden pulpit being carried out in the summer evenings to one or other of the poorer streets in turn, when great crowds would assemble to hear the Rector preach.

He was a staunch Protestant, too, and the Roman controversy was much studied under him. Withal he stoutly defended the Irish Church against the assaults of the local Dissenters, for Gladstone was in process of disestablishing it, and the Rector had debates with the leading Congregationalist minister on the subject.

Dr. Walker must have had a touch of humour, for years afterwards the Rev. William Gray, the India Secretary of the C.M.S., told me that when the C.M.S. Committee, searching for a successor to the great Henry Venn, sent round to their leading supporters a description of the qualities they desired in an honorary secretary, Dr. Walker replied that they had better apply to the Archangel Gabriel, for nowhere on earth would they find a man with such a combination of gifts.

The shock of his death at the early age of forty-nine was intensified by the fact that his eldest son, a promising young clergyman, had died only a month before. The affection of the townsfolk took the practical form of a subscription of about £3,000 for the Rector's widow. This sum James Walker, the surviving son, very honourably returned to the town authorities after his mother's death, and it became a fund for charitable objects.

I came to know James Walker quite well in later years. He was a strange character. At Oxford he had swept the board of all the University prizes in the theological school except the Kennicott Hebrew Scholarship, which a flaw in its statutes enabled a middle-aged Presbyterian minister to carry off. Walker was so profound a Hebrew scholar that when, as I struggled with the Hebrew text of the early chapters of Genesis for my ordination examination, I took my difficulties to him, he was quite unable to see what those difficulties were. With all his learning his critical powers must have been weak, for he once produced for my inspection a trumpery paper-backed book of American "spook" stories and spoke of it with gravity as if it had been a work of authentic narratives. Under the influence of his friend Henry Bazely, whom I mentioned in a previous article, Walker left the Church of England and joined the Established Church of Scotland. He had a little tin tabernacle on the Prestbury Road, and used also to hold services in one of the Cotswold villages, travelling over lonely roads at night with his dog. In addition to this he was for years the chaplain to the local fever hospital, which he visited fearlessly. With this inherited devotion he combined some curious idiosyncrasies. Thus he told me that he esteemed it a favour

to be allowed to go and sit beside the dead. He continued his unobtrusive labours for many years and died so recently as 1911.

THE REV. ARTHUR HOSKINS.

Sometime after the great Rector's death, my father went to live in the parish of St. Peter, one of the poorest in the town. Thus, first as a school boy and a young Sunday School teacher, and more intimately as I grew older, I came to know the Rev. Arthur Hoskins, its vicar. He was a character who might have belonged to a former generation. He never wore a collar but always a soft white neck-cloth or cravat wound twice round the neck and the ends tied in the ordinary clerical white tie. Anyone can see the like in clerical portraits of about a hundred years ago. His deeply lined, clean-shaven face was grave in repose, but lighted up with a whimsical smile as he told one of his numerous old-time stories. He lived alone in a large vicarage, so large that he could have separate rooms for use in summer and in winter. He had been Curate to old Canon Linton at St. Peter-le-Bailey, Oxford, where his fame as a preacher was such that, as Bishop Chavasse told me later, heads of colleges would attend his afternoon sermons. He was in terror of women; but I often thought there must have been a tragedy in his life, for when showing me a family group of the Lintons, naming each in turn, he paused at one face and said, "And she was a very charming person, and she died."

He showed me many kindnesses. When I was to go up to Oxford to sit for my scholarship he offered to take me, telling my father that as he knew Oxford he could make arrangements for me more easily than my father could. So he went up with me, and quartered me on the Rev. Sidney Linton, the son of his own old rector and now himself Rector of Holy Trinity, one of the poor parishes of the city. Sidney Linton was a fine, upstanding, athletic man, and I remember my astonishment at seeing a football in a corner of the sitting-room, for a sport-loving parson was a species previously unknown to me. A year afterwards he was appointed Bishop of Riverina, New South Wales, a most trying bush diocese.

When at home during my undergraduate life I saw a good deal of Mr. Hoskins, for Oxford and the classics gave us many topics in common. Whilst that intercourse gave me great pleasure, I have no doubt that he on his side enjoyed being able to discuss literature with some one, and tell his old classical stories, for his parishioners were all uneducated folk and he saw very few others. It was he who first introduced me to George Herbert and who lent me Quarles' *Emblems*. As I write that name, two little quotations come back to my mind:

> Man is man's A B C. There's none that can
> Read God aright, unless he first spell man.

and

> Man is the stairs by which his knowledge climbs
> To God although it often-times
> Stumbles for want of light.

The quotations may be inaccurate, for I have never met the book since then.

Mr. Hoskins was at Oxford about the year 1850, but he could tell of still older days. He mentioned a man who had been scholar of Balliol, when Balliol was unimportant, and Fellow of Worcester when Worcester was the leading college of the university: but times changed, and the good man lived to boast of having been scholar of Balliol and to drop allusions to his Fellowship of Worcester.

He told me legends of the centenarian Vice-Chancellor Routh, who was said to have married a lady born in the very year in which he became President of Magdalen. Towards the end of his life the old man was asked by some admirer—was it Burgon or Rigaud?—for an aphorism:

"Could you tell me, sir, of any maxim which in the course of your life you have found to be a guiding principle?"

The old man replied, "Verify your references."

The same story, I understand, is told of Bentley. Perhaps Dr. Routh merely passed it on.

Less valuable was Dr. Routh's reply to another question: "How, sir, would you recommend anyone to begin the study of theology?"

"I think," he answered, "yes—I think I should advise him to begin with the study of St. Matthew's Gospel."

"And then, sir?"

"Well, after that I think—yes, I certainly think—he should proceed to study St. Mark."

And so on to the other Gospels. Elementary, of course, but perhaps some of our modern theologians would have benefited by a deeper study of those works. *Bonus textuarius, bonus theologus* was an ancient proverb.

This reminds me that my friend himself laid strong emphasis on Bible study. I remember his quoting to me the lines:

> This verse marks that, and both do make a motion
> Towards a third, which ten leaves off doth lie.

The services at St. Peter's were of the simplest kind. The choir, of course unsurpliced, sat in the chancel, going straight to their places as they came in, for I do not think there was then a choir vestry. I fancy the psalms were read. As was usual in those days, besides Morning Prayer and the Ante-Communion, the Litany always formed part of the morning service. It is curious that I remember Mr. Hoskins making a slip in reading it for several Sundays in succession, saying, "From all *civy consprivacy* and rebellion." No one noticed the slip but my unregenerate self. Of course it would now be called a "Spoonerism," which is really an unconscious mental process to which everyone is liable.

His preaching was always in simple language. Years afterwards, when he had left St. Peter's for St. James' Church, where there was a more well-to-do and educated congregation, this character of his sermons was remarked upon. Old Mr. Thomas Mozley, a famous

Times correspondent of a former day, said to him, "They tell me that your sermons are full of Saxon English." That was true, and the Saxon English, due to Mr. Hoskins' anxiety to be understood by his humbler hearers Sunday after Sunday for seventeen years, had become an ingrained characteristic.

My intercourse with Mr. Hoskins continued throughout my undergraduate life, but after I took my degree I lived in London, and my visits to Cheltenham became fewer. His removal to a church nearly two miles away from my home made it difficult to see much of him even during those visits. After I became ordained in 1886 I was seldom in Cheltenham, though I remember having once read the service for my old friend. Thus I gradually lost touch with him, and we had never corresponded. In 1895 he gave up his living and I hardly heard of him again. He was always a reserved and solitary man, and I never heard of his having any relatives. Also he used to express his horror at the idea of a clergyman's dying rich, and I sometimes fear that his generosity may have left him in poor circumstances before the end. He died in a boarding house at Alsager in Cheshire about 1904. But he lives in my memory as a devout, scholarly, courteous, quietly humorous and generous soul.

I have jotted down some of my old friend's classical stories at the close of this article.

A Scene in St. Peter's.

Soon after Mr. Hoskins had been preferred to a distant church as above mentioned, I happened to be in Cheltenham on a Sunday and to witness a curious scene at St. Peter's. It must have been the first "Communion Sunday" after the arrival of the new vicar.

It had been Mr. Hoskins' old-fashioned custom to pronounce the Benediction from the pulpit and thus close the service. The non-communicating congregation then left. Collections then and at all other times were made at the church door, the churchwardens standing on either side, plate in hand. The doorway being a broad one, it was easy for the economically minded to keep in the middle with their eyes straight in front of them and fail to see either plate. When all of them had gone, the service of Holy Communion began with the Prayer for the Church Militant.

The new vicar proposed to alter all this. He explained in his sermon that morning that collections would in future be made from pew to pew, and that the morning service would be ended with the Church Militant Prayer. Alas! the congregation failed to take in the news, which seemed to have been sprung on them thus for the first time. The sermon over, a hymn was given out, and behold! there were the churchwardens beginning to pass round the plates from pew to pew! Some persons, struck with panic, gathered up their belongings and fled before the plate could reach them. Others, hardier souls, awaited the shock, passed the plate firmly, and then made their way to the doors. The hymn being finished, the vicar was seen to be at the Holy Table and was heard beginning the Church

Militant Prayer. At once the remainder of the congregation became convinced that they were being let in for Holy Communion! With one accord they streamed out of the church, choir and all. I can still see in my mind's eye the startled face of the vicar as he looked up at the tramp of the feet and saw the exodus. By the time he had finished the prayer hardly a soul besides myself was left in the church: they were all in the churchyard excitedly discussing the—doubtless Popish—innovations of the vicar. I fear it took the poor man a long time to recover from the effects of that unfortunate sermon.

Mr. Hoskins' Stories.

In former times, it seems "Moderations" consisted in a formal debate in the presence of a don known as a moderator, who sat to listen to a pair of examinees arguing before him in Latin on some given topic, and passed or ploughed them according to their proficiency. A certain pair were thus debating when they observed that the moderator was nodding. So one, having exhausted the topic in hand, to keep up the conversation, said:

"*Video quosdam homines longos nasos habentes.*"

Whereupon the other replied:

"*At ego, quosdam shortos nasos habentes.*"

At which very unfamiliar word the old don woke up. I think this must have been a venerable chestnut of a much earlier generation.

Dean Gaisford of Christ Church, to whom Oxford owes the Gaisford Greek Prize, was a man to whose favour Greek scholarship was a sure passport. This bias led him to urge his daughter Ann to accept a suitor whom she did not like.

"But, my dear," said the Dean, "he has a perfect knowledge of the particle '*an*.'"

"No doubt, sir," replied his daughter, "but I may claim to have a knowledge of the particle '*men*.'"

Here is a story based on the old Latin Grammar, written itself in Latin:

In the early part of the last century there was a member of the Cabinet named Colonel Sibthorp, who was conspicuous in a clean-shaven House of Commons for his "walrus" or "Old Bill" moustache. A fatuous M.P. one day accosted him:

"I say, Sibthorp, do you know—of course, one can't help one's thoughts, can one?—but you always remind me of *propria quæ maribus*."

"Indeed," replied Sibthorp. "Well, as you say, one can't help one's thoughts. Whenever I see you I can't help thinking of *as in presenti*."

Here is another. A doctor and a clergyman had met at a funeral, and the doctor, to improve the occasion and perhaps also to show that he had not forgotten his Latin, remarked, "Ah, well! *Favet fortuna fortibus*."

" Don't you mean," replied the clergyman, " the next example in the Latin Grammar, ' *Mors est communis omnibus* ' ? "

In those days every educated person was supposed to be acquainted with Horace and Virgil, not to say the other classical authors. They were quoted frequently, and a false quantity was a crime unpardonable. It was, I think, in an Irish law court that an unfortunate man mispronounced the word *nimirum*, to the horror of all who heard him. But Curran good naturedly came to his aid :

" Don't you remember, my lud," he said to the judge, " that even in Rome only one person understood the word, for Horace says ' Septimius, Claudi, nimirum intelligit unus ' ? "

[In Horace's *Epp.* i. 9, the words " Quanti me facias," which follow, make all the difference to the meaning.]

Another Horatian story. Lord North, one of George the Third's ministers, had a rather extravagant son who was trying to get an additional allowance out of his father :

" Do you know, sir," said he, " I'm so hard up that I have had to sell my mare."

" You shouldn't have done that," replied his father. " Don't you remember what Horace says : ' *Equam* memento rebus in arduis servare ' ? "

Readers who have not the second book of Horace's *Odes* at hand may be reminded that the actual text is :

" *Aequam* memento rebus in arduis servare *mentem*."

No doubt this was the Lord North before whom a cleric had to preach who wanted to get a vacant bishopric. So by way of a broad hint the preacher took for his text, " Promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south."

ETERNAL TRUTH IN THE ETERNAL CITY. By the Rev. J. Cynddylan Jones, D.D. *London : Foyle's Welsh Press, Charing Cross Road, W.C.* 5*s*.

A few weeks after the publication of this volume, the gifted author " passed over." Born in 1841 and called to the ministry in 1865 he had for many years occupied a front-rank position among Welsh preachers. For a time he ministered in London at Bedford Chapel, Bloomsbury, but he returned to Wales eventually. It is significant that Dr. T. T. Lucius Morgan, who contributes the Foreword to this volume of sermons, tells us that " the Welsh Renaissance, symbolized by the founding of the University of Wales, has affected the Welsh pulpit adversely . . . the New Learning has deprived the pulpit of much of its distinctive Celtic expression—the intensity of which was an element of power ; and the theological position in Wales has changed." He says again : " These pages present the sunset splendours of a great ministry, unclouded by shadows of Modernism." They certainly ring true to the old Evangel and will be welcomed by many preachers.

CONSPIRACY AND CONSCIENCE.

A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE GUNPOWDER PLOT.

By John Knipe.

PART III. DEFEAT.

Lord Monteagle and the Anonymous Letter. October 26, 1605.

"The giving Warning to One overthrew us All."
Confession of Guy Fawkes (Nov. 6th).

"NO incident of the Gunpowder Plot has taken so strong a hold upon the popular imagination as has the famous warning Letter to Lord Monteagle." I should be inclined to add that no character in the whole story is more perplexing and difficult to analyse, for his lordship's actions and motives are curious as well as obscure.

William Parker, Lord Monteagle, was kinsman by blood or by marriage to most of the chief conspirators. He held his title by courtesy through his mother, Elizabeth (*née* Stanley), she being the heiress of Lord Monteagle, who belonged to a younger branch of the Stanleys of Derby. Her mother, Anne, Lady Monteagle, was a firm friend of the English Jesuits.

His father, *Edward Parker, Baron Morley*, went abroad as a Recusant under Elizabeth, but he returned, having made his peace, and apparently he conformed. He made the somewhat peculiar exchange of his hereditary office of Lord Marshal of Ireland for the publishing rights of his book *God and the King*, a Children's Manual for Instruction in the Oath of Allegiance. It is perhaps the earliest-known example of that kind of political tract. The Queen was pleased to show him favour and Lord Morley was appointed a Royal Commissioner at two famous State Trials: Mary Queen of Scots, and Philip Earl of Arundel. He arranged a family match for his son, then under eighteen, with Elizabeth, fourth daughter of Sir Thomas Tresham and Muriel, the heiress of Sir Robert Throgmorton of Coughton. (Anne, Lady Catesby, was Lady Tresham's sister.)

Like his father, Monteagle changed sides and opinions. He chose soldiering and he was knighted for his service under Essex in Ireland (1599) and next year he was a Gentleman Volunteer in the Flanders Expedition. January, 1601, saw him "out" hotly for Essex, and sharing his friend Catesby's imprisonment in the Tower. Monteagle was only released after paying the very heavy fine of £8,000, exacted by the Star-Chamber, which the Queen seems to have partly granted to Bacon.

This did not impoverish Monteagle, for he had two Town houses; Monteagle House in Southwark, and his Hoxton Manor in the

village street, then pleasant open country at the foot of the Northern Heights. He kept prudently on good terms with his father, and frequently stayed at Halling Morley in Essex, the family seat. Monteagle was the patron of Thomas Winter before he also took to soldiering in Flanders, and Winter had his Town Lodging in Monteagle Close, Southwark, to the end. Probably Winter persuaded him to finance the secret Mission to Madrid of himself and Greenway (1602). His private secretary, or " confidential gentleman," was Thomas Warde, the relative of Winter and the Wrights, and the former's friend. Warde was " in " with the Jesuit Party. Monteagle's warm friendship with Catesby, the " deare Robin " of his letter, has been noticed, in whose company he visited " the House in Essex " to see Garnet, and made a guarded reply evading the Jesuit's question whether the time was ripe for a Catholic Rising.

In spite of fierce accusations that Monteagle was either an *agent provocateur* or at least a trusted spy of Cecil I have not found any trustworthy evidence to support the charge of such perfidy. It rests mainly on these grounds : Monteagle's concurrence in the Spanish Treason aforesaid, his letter to Catesby, " My loving Kinsman," inviting him to meet the writer at Bath, and that he sent letters to Rome by Baynham (1605), finally that he was Francis Tresham's cousin and confidant. For the aid given to the Jesuit Mission after the Essex Revolt in Elizabeth's Reign it was fully condoned by the general amnesty granted at the King's Accession ; there is no proof that Monteagle did meet Catesby at Bath, and if he did, that would not imply that he joined in the secret counsels of the archplotters, Catesby, Percy and Winter : it was not a treasonable offence to send letters to Rome, for James himself sent messages to the Pope through his French Ambassador ; and Monteagle cannot be blamed for being Tresham's brother-in-law and favourite cousin !

There is one point where the evidence presses nearer, but it was made by Garnet, who publicly asserted " Equivocation is lawful, how and when I have shown." And, though I have searched carefully all available contemporary documents, there is *nothing*, not a single fact to suggest that Robert Catesby dared trust Monteagle with the perilous secret. He told no man, except Garnet through Greenway and the latter in confession, who had not first taken the Oath of Secrecy. This rests on the testimony of them all. Therefore Monteagle cannot have " turned King's Evidence," as some suspected from the marks of royal favour shown him.

He had earned them, for he joined Southampton in securing the Tower for the King (1603), and he witnessed the Duke of York's Charter (January, 1605). That same year he wrote a remarkable letter to King James on Religion, which is the best guide perhaps to explain his lordship's motives. " He thanks the King humbly for his tender and fatherly Love and Care of his Soul's Good. He assures his Majesty's Wisdom that he will live and die in that Religion which he has now resolved to profess. Bred up

in the Romish Religion he has not suddenly changed. He has solemnly sought the Divine Guidance and he has conferred with learned men. He finds their (Romish) foundations weak: the Papacy being opposed to Holy Scripture has tried his Doubts. His Motives are God's true Service and his own Salvation: not Gain, nor Honour, nor the highly valued Favour of the King. He is not afraid of Blame, being enlightened by seeing Truth. His Desire is to serve and rest His Majesty's most loyal and obedient Servant, William Mownteagle."

SUMMONS TO PARLIAMENT, 1605. ARRIVAL AT HOXTON MANOR.

The King was not slow to respond, for after his letter Monteagle conformed publicly. He received a Summons to attend Parliament as a Peer of the Realm, his courtesy title being confirmed by Royal Patent. Much ado has been made of Monteagle's preference for his Hoxton Manor when his larger house in Southwark was more fashionable and convenient. It has been supposed that he chose a quiet neighbourhood which was also near Tresham's place at "Hogsden" and his Clerkenwell Lodging. This is pure speculation. It is just as easy to suppose that Monteagle preferred the north side of the Thames to going round by London Bridge, and that he desired to hunt with the Court at Royston Chace.

The latter is probable, for he had last stayed at Hoxton in the autumn of 1604, when deer-hunting was in season. Tresham had gone down to Rushton Hall the day before, unless he returned secretly, which is hard to square with his business as recorded in North Hants and his pledge to Catesby that he would return through Barnet on the 28th or 29th. And Tresham's movements were closely watched by Catesby's spies when he left for Rushton.

It was dusk on the Saturday of October 26th when "an unknown man of indifferent stature" appeared; some accounts add "his face muffled in a cloak," and accosted Monteagle's lackey who had been sent across the road on some errand. This stranger—certainly not Tresham—offered a letter to the servant, enjoining him to put it at once into my Lord Monteagle's own hands, and having received a ready promise of compliance the unknown vanished into the shadows.

Within the hall, at supper, presumably in his lady's absence, Monteagle glanced up at the stir caused by his footman's refusal to deliver the letter to another servant who would have handed it to Mr. Thomas Warde. My lord called forward the honest fellow and took the letter. He observed in curiosity that it was unsealed, and merely folded. Inside the letter was undated and unsigned. "False Pasquils" were often sent to Privy Councillors, and Monteagle treated the letter with a show of disdain, passed it to Warde and bade him read it aloud. Monteagle listened with keen attention nevertheless, for he was "greatly perplexed, suspecting some device of his enemies to deter him from his attendance at Parliament." (Contemp. Acct.)

Did he suspect Catesby when he handed the Warning Letter

to Warde who was Winter's near friend? Did Monteagle guess that somehow Tresham might have contrived to send it? Wait a little. We shall see that he suspected someone else. He knew them *all*, we must remember, and was intimate with others beside Tresham, Catesby and Winter.

His lordship kept his own counsel, ordered his horse, rose from table and "notwithstanding the lateness and darkness of the night, he went presently (*i.e.* at once) to Whitehall."

The King was away, hunting in his Royal Chace at Royston, and Lord Salisbury received him civilly and waived aside the formal apologies which Monteagle offered for importuning the Secretary of State so late on what might be a trivial matter. Cecil was himself at supper, but Monteagle "drew him into a room apart" and the Minister listened with perfect courtesy and grave attention.

His private secretary, Mr. Levinus Munck, has left a detailed account of this interview, written in his own handwriting, and I prefer to relate it as it stands because of the curious intimate touches which make it read like what actually happened. Munck was more in Cecil's confidence than any other man.

Monteagle held out the Letter, "Using only these words: 'although he would not take upon him to urge the importance of this Advertisement (warning) more or less, but rather leave the judgment to his Majesty and those with whom he did use to communicate his Affairs; yet he would do himself so much right as to profess that he would no other Intention of showing this Letter received in such a Fashion but only to manifest his Love and Duty to His Majesty's Person and State, more dearer to him than his Life and wherein (howsoever others might go before him in Power) yet in true Faith and Zeal he would not be found Second to any.'"

Lord Salisbury nodded, murmured a vague civility and unfolded the Letter, "written in a Hand disguised without Date or Name," but superscribed on the back: "To the right honorable The Lord mowteagle." Under the candles in their silver sconces in the wall Robert Cecil read the Letter carefully and deliberately while his keen brain seized the salient points. He noted that it was ill-spelt, but the composition showed the writer to be well-educated; it gave facts but avoided the mention of names or places.

"The excited feelings under which the Letter was written and desire to keep the middle ground between telling too little and telling too much, may account for the obscurity of the style." (Gardiner.)

Turning to Monteagle the Minister said calmly: "Your Lordship has done like a discreet nobleman not to conceal a matter of such nature whatsoever the consequences may prove, because ofttimes such loose advertisements have grounds unfit to be neglected, though the quality of the informer, or the sudden apprehension of great and terrible things may make them be delivered in such a style or in such a manner as may blemish the credit of their honesty."

And Cecil added cordially: "In that respect I have always found your Lordship full of duty and love to His Majesty."

Monteagle bowed his acknowledgments and Salisbury continued: "The Council know that the priests and laymen abroad are full of practice and conspiracy with most of the Papists of this Kingdom, seeking still to lay some new Plot for procuring at this Parliament exercise of their Religion."

Monteagle was struck by these comments as compared with the warning.

"Yes," mused Cecil; "We know of a Petition to the King then among their projects." And by another account he added, "Which Petition should so cunningly be delivered and strongly backed as the King would be loth to refuse their requests."

He fell silent awhile, thinking, and then he concluded in a decided tone: "This matter is worthy of consideration and I shall immediately communicate it to some of the Lords of the Council."

Apparently Monteagle took the hint and his formal leave. He left Whitehall well satisfied.

I believe the foregoing is a fair report of what passed between them, and if some challenge it as coming from Court documents I would ask them, 'Who else was present during the interview, and what better authority can we have than Levinus Munck who must have heard it from Cecil's lips?'

Those who blacken Monteagle ought to consider that if he had simply held his tongue and concealed or destroyed the Letter he would have incurred the dreaded penalties of "Misprision (Contempt) of Treason," which included at least a very heavy fine by the Star-Chamber and might entail lifelong imprisonment in the Tower with forfeiture of all his goods. Had he taken any direct action to warn those whom he suspected he would have been guilty of High Treason, as Accessory before Fact. Cecil showed the Letter first to his fellow-Councillor in the Palace, Thomas Howard Earl of Suffolk, the Lord High Chamberlain. Salisbury in his official report to the Foreign Ambassadors generously gives full credit to Suffolk, who remarked instantly "that the matter concerned his Office, as well in places of the King's usual repair as otherwise."

This remark shows how natural Suffolk's presence was at Whitehall that night, since his Court duties required him to be in residence a few days before James' return to Town.

"And, therefore, did the said two Counsellors conclude that they should join unto themselves three more of the Council, to wit, the Lord Admiral (the Earl of Nottingham), the Earls of Worcester and Northampton."

There is again nothing surprising in the fact of Salisbury's colleagues being at Whitehall. In the King's absence, and when Parliament was not sitting, the Government of the country was of course regularly carried on by the Privy Council, which then answered to our modern Cabinet. I must here express my own astonishment that none of the eminent authorities who have criticized Cecil's action and raised so many suspicions and doubts appear to have observed the obvious fact. *Five members of the Council formed a Quorum for Emergency Business of State.* Salisbury simply did

his duty when he hastily called together an urgent meeting of the Privy Council to lay the Letter before them and discuss it with His Majesty's advisers.

The Council sat late, examining and debating the question. Finally they put on record the following unanimous decision: "Notwithstanding the slightness of the Letter at its first appearance, and their daily knowing of scandalous Libels in Court and City to disturb the King and State, *many of them purporting more danger than this did*, they concluded it was not absolutely to be contemned." There the matter was officially left until the King's return.

I think from Cecil's words to Monteagle that Sir Edmund Baynham's Secret Mission had come to the ears of the Spanish Governor, Juan de Velasco, Constable of Castile. He would naturally connect it with Mr. Thomas Winter's formal request in the spring of 1604. Spain was very anxious to show herself friendly to the new King. Foreign relations under Cecil's diplomacy were generally good, and even the Papacy was not openly hostile.

The Letter and the Conspirators.

Lord Monteagle's proceedings are questionable on one point. Why, if he considered the Letter ought to be given to Cecil, did he first hand it to Thomas Warde and bid him read it aloud for all to hear? I think that Monteagle had a double motive. He dared not hold his tongue for the reason that I have shown, but he must surely have suspected that it concerned some fresh mad scheme of his friend Catesby's doing, for he knew his record as a schemer and rebel. One must remember the horrible barbarities of the Treason Law, and the ties of blood and alliance as of friendship which bound Monteagle to the conspirators. The Letter might be a Squib, but that was open to grave doubts.

Finally, there is of course the possibility that Monteagle expected some definite warning from Garnet through Tresham, or *vice versa*. The handwriting of the Letter does not resemble Tresham's if examined without bias. It might be any "clerk's hand"—I state this opinion with due diffidence. But the Anonymous Letter is there, in a glass case at the British Museum for all to see, and Tresham's writing can be compared with it. I have my own theory of the Letter, which is independent of those I have read, but I cannot state it here and hope to do so in a more suitable way another time. Another point has been overlooked. The abbreviation mark over the "w" in "mowteagle" betrays a practised hand.

A Friend visits Thomas Winter at Night in Monteagle Close.

"Sunday at night (October 27) in came one to my chamber, and told me that a letter had been given to my Lord Monteagle to this effect, that he wished his Lordship's absence from the Parliament, because a Blow would there be given, which Letter he presently carried to my Lord of Salisbury." (Winter's Confession.)

The unnamed friend was surely Thomas Warde who probably acted on Monteagle's hint without asking his leave. Although greatly disturbed, Winter retained his usual composure and it was not until the next morning that he crossed London Bridge and rode to inform Catesby at White Webbs. In Percy's absence in the North collecting his cousin's rentals Winter shared with Keyes and Fawkes the surveillance of the " Bloody Cellar," which they appeared to neglect but watched in turn. I account for Winter staying at his Southwark lodging because by the Bridge he reached the Great North Road, and also because they all made it appear that they carried on their lawful occasions in their usual abodes. He writes frankly of this interview with Catesby : " On the morrow I went to White Webbs and told it to Mr. Catesby, assuring him withal that the matter was disclosed and wishing him in any wise to forsake his country. He told me he would see further as yet and resolved to send Mr. Fawkes to try the uttermost, protesting if the part belonged to myself he would try the same adventure."

This remark of Catesby's reads as if Winter had reproached him on the score of the great risk to Fawkes. But Catesby had demanded if any *names* were given in the Letter and when Winter reassured him he said, " Cecil would never guess the secret." Winter adds:

" On Wednesday Mr. Fawkes went and returned at night, of which we were very glad."

Winter stayed with Catesby at White Webbs, so that if Fawkes did not return the rest should either attempt to escape, or ride to Digby in the Midlands. It is evident that they doubted if Fawkes would return. He reported that he had examined the Cellar and found by " certain secret marks " of his own that the stack of fuel was untouched. Tresham was now overdue at White Webbs, having promised to meet them by Tuesday (29th), but though they watched the Barnet Road he did not appear.

TRESHAM RETURNS SECRETLY TO CLERKENWELL. OCTOBER 29–30.

Catesby's suspicions of Tresham grew keener when the laggard did not return as he had promised them, and on Thursday he sent Winter back to London to find if Tresham had passed White Webbs or left the Great North Road by some détour. They doubted if Tresham would linger at Rushton Hall, although it would have seemed an act of common prudence on his part. Possibly they thought he meant to escape in the ship he had hired for Fawkes. Winter guessed that Tresham would be near Hoxton and " On the morning of the 31st Tresham was surprised by the detested face of Winter at his Clerkenwell lodging." (Gardiner.)

However, Tresham readily excused himself. He had been selling Stock in North Hants to find the money he had promised, but the sale had not realized enough, and the chief buyer for Sir William Turpin, one Mr. John Borne, had turned suspicious when asked to pay in ready coin, and Tresham dared not urge him further. Thus his return had been delayed and he had ridden

through Barnet late the previous night. He feared to draw suspicion if he visited White Webbs then, and he might obtain more money in the City.

Winter listened and professed himself satisfied, and took from Tresham all he could get; he said that Catesby required Mr. Tresham's presence at White Webbs. Naturally Winter breathed no word of the Letter. It is remarkable, but Winter's own account continues: "Friday (November 1) Mr. Tresham, Mr. Catesby and I met at Barnet."

Certainly Winter took care that Tresham accompanied him to White Webbs, which lay on the edge of Enfield Chace, by the village of Barnet. And he would of course keep a sharp eye on Tresham's movements. Still it is strange that Catesby let twenty-four hours elapse before he summoned Tresham. I suppose that their fortunes were so desperate that if the latter, as I venture to suggest, offered to borrow a large sum in Town, Winter was prepared to stake another hazard on Tresham's appearance.

Catesby accuses Tresham at White Webbs. November 1.

"Where we questioned how this Letter should be sent to my Lord Monteagle." The pretence of civility is maintained in Winter's account, but Tresham was taken to a back room where Catesby and Winter faced him with drawn poniards. No others were present when Robert Catesby charged Francis Tresham with treachery and perjury in sending the Warning Letter. Tresham kept cool although he perceived that they were desperate men and his life was in imminent danger. He swore every oath which Catesby forced upon him at the dagger-point. He asserted that he had never heard of such a Letter and knew naught of its contents. But he begged Catesby earnestly to fly while there was time, and let all but Fawkes escape in the ship, who being unknown could remain hidden in London. Fervently protesting his affection Tresham swore that "Catesby should always live on his purse."

Catesby replied curtly that he would wait until Percy arrived from the North, and he suffered Tresham to depart unscathed while Winter adds tersely: "But could not conceive, for Mr. Tresham forsware it, whom we only suspected."

It is not clear if Winter meant that Tresham was the only suspected confederate, or that Catesby did not care to kill his friend on bare suspicion. Surely if he had betrayed them Tresham showed himself the most subtle villain of the three.

Salisbury sees the King in Private Audience. Whitehall. Allhalloween.

"The Earl of Salisbury alone in the Privy Gallery acquainted the King who having read the Letter paused awhile, then read it again and said he thought it was not to be contemned for the style seemed to be more quick and pithy than was usual in superfluities of idle brains." (Contemp. Acct.)

Cecil knew that James must be recollecting the horrible fate of his father Lord Darnley, who perished when Bothwell blew up his Lodging at Kirk o' Field. But the Secretary diplomatically asked: "Who but a fool would have written 'The danger is past as soon as you have burnt the Letter'?"

Probably the writer meant the danger to Monteagle for receiving his warning. But James, "walking and musing in the Gallery," said the attempt could only be made by Gunpowder. He read "as soon as" to be the equivalent of *eftsoons*, which was a common expression for "as quickly"—a sudden act like burning the paper.

Cecil admired the royal argument. James was nicknamed "Solomon" at Court, and he was a shrewd, calculating Scot. He warmed to his theme and asserted that such peril could only be caused by "one traitor in some dark and secret place about the Parliament House"; and he desired "there should be presently a very secret and exact search, in the Parliament House and of all other rooms and lodgings there adjoining." But Cecil deferentially pointed out that the danger was not imminent and distant from Whitehall. He objected to the alarm being given and he persuaded the King to follow his counsel.

The Cipher Letter Discovered. November 2.

A Second Letter fell into the hands of Cecil's spies. It is endorsed "*A Letter fownd in the Streete.*" There exists no completely deciphered copy, but this Other Letter has been overlooked by those who attack Monteagle's letter as a faked warning, connived by Cecil's cunning. I call it "*The Cipher Letter*" to distinguish it from that, and from yet another which followed it: although not anonymous the names are obviously assumed, for no such persons are known. It begins: "E. F. Mak to Richard Bankes. Hopes for the Success of their Proceedings." Then follows this pregnant phrase: "The Gallery, with the Passage therto yieldeth the best of Assurance and a Safety of the Actors themselves."

Now Fawkes' escape was planned to be from *under the "Long Gallery,"* or Robing-Room of the Bishops, where was the Passage which connected Percy's House and the Powder Cellar. The unknown "Mak" further enjoins strict secrecy, promises "he and his company will come over," and refers to his hopes "to behold the tiranous heretique confounded in his cruell pleasures." The rest is undeciphered, or obscure.

Surely it is an amazing coincidence that this *Cipher Letter* was found just a week after Monteagle received the anonymous warning.

Tresham again warns Catesby and Winter. November 2 and 3.

"On Saturday night," writes Winter, "I met Mr. Tresham again in Lincoln's Inn Walks, where he told such speeches that my Lord of Salisbury should use to the King, as I gave it lost a second time, and repeated the same to Mr. Catesby, who hereupon

was resolved to be gone, but staid to have Master Percy come up, whose consent herein we wanted."

Catesby was bound by the Oath of Secrecy which ran: "Nor desist from the execution thereof until the rest shall give you leave."

By next day fresh warning had come from Warde, and Catesby met Tresham with Winter and Fawkes in "the house behind Clement's Inn," which was where Fawkes lodged, and must have been the one hired by Father Gerard, in which he, innocently, gave the first five plotters the Sacrament after their secret Oath.

Tresham frantically offered Catesby money, and provision for life in exile. But Catesby maintained that a Catholic Rising and the seizure of the Princess Elizabeth offered fair chances and he refused to desert Digby and other friends in the Shires.

Now if, as some state, this second meeting with Tresham confirmed Catesby's suspicions of him as the sender of the Anonymous Letter, how came Catesby to discuss his plans before a traitor, accept more money from him and let him know that he himself meant to wait for Percy at White Webbs? Also why did Winter declare, "*This suspicion of all hands put us in such confusion*"?

Thomas Percy rides South. November 2–3.

After he left Alnwick, and his cousin Northumberland's great estates, Percy was disagreeably surprised to find that his position as the Earl's Steward no further protected him. From Gainsborough he wrote three Letters, two of which were to under-agents or bailiffs of his kinsman, and one which he sent under cover to his own servant.

"*Thomas Percy to Mr. Wm. Wicliff at York.*

"Sir; I am advised from those that well know my lord of York his intent not to come any more in the town for if they had not reckoned of my longer stay I had been taken the night I was there. . . ."

The rest concerns his business affairs. He repeats the same news "To my assured friend Mr. Wm. Stockdale at York"; adding:

"Which I will prevent if I may and therefore I am resolved to meet you at Doncaster, upon Tuesday at night . . . if you be not so soon at Doncaster . . . I will stay your coming."

In this letter Percy asks Mr. Stockdale to accept his servant's "acquittance . . . as my own for this discharge." (More of the Earl's rents!) And he asks his friend to "speak to my man to be careful of all things that concern my charge." He signs, "I am and will now rest yr. faithful and true friend." Under this cover Percy sent a very strong "charge to be careful of all things" to his servant Walker in York, bidding him "Let no man take charge of the money but yrself." He repeats the order to "meet him at Doncaster." Signed "Your loving master, Thos. Percy."

These repeated exhortations of fidelity and prudence are curious when Percy was not only busily engaged in wholesale embezzlement of his noble cousin's revenues, but deceiving his friend Mr.

Stockdale who was in a like position of trust. And probably, like Catesby and others, Percy's swordhilt was piously engraved "With the Passion of Our Lord." And yet these men, bloodthirsty and horribly cruel, were faithful friends and their family life was without reproach.

Both Mr. Stockdale and Walker met Percy as it appears in a later letter from Northumberland's head bailiff, Mr. Fotherley; who also reports: "Mr. Percy left a horse at Doncaster, at his coming to London to be kept in debt till his coming back."

"On Sunday night (November 3) came Mr. Percy (to White Webbs) and no 'Nay,' but would abide the uttermost trial."

By his own account Winter clearly wished Catesby to accept Tresham's offers, and Rookwood probably agreed, but Percy seems to have had the rest on his side. Fawkes and the two Wrights, with Keyes, were resolute, and Kit Wright advised Percy to see Northumberland on the morrow as the Earl knew of his arrival. How that nobleman knew is a mystery. But Percy may have been recognized on the Great North Road.[1]

"Mr. Catesby resolved to go down into the country the Monday that Mr. Percy went to Sion (House) and Mr. Percy resolved to follow the same night or early next morning."

The rest stayed; Fawkes in the coal-cellar, Keyes at Lambeth, the Wrights and Rookwood with Winter in Southwark.

Sir Everard Digby shuts up Gothurst and rents Coughton Hall. Allhallowtide.

Digby took Coughton Hall (Warwickshire) from Mr. Thomas Throckmorton from the end of October and sent Lady Digby and the two boys there, where they were joined by Fathers Garnet and Greenway, and the Vaux family; Garnet having promised to celebrate the Allhallows Mass. Sir Everard's hunting-party was invited to the Meet on Dunsmoor, near Combe Abbey, the seat of Lord Harrington, the guardian of the Princess Elizabeth, whom Catesby hoped to seize, and proclaim Queen (*vide* Digby's Letter to his Wife from the Tower. Paper IX).

Thus on November 2 Father Gerard, jogging peacefully through Gothurst Park, was amazed to see flocks of cattle and sheep being driven from Digby's broad acres, beside the Ouse. Digby himself met Gerard at the hall door and his manner was cold and embarrassed. Gerard had come to say his All Souls' Mass at his "brother's" house. Digby regretted he could not offer him hospitality; he was leaving and selling cattle and sheep to his neighbours, Mr. Harefoot and Sir William Turpin. Gerard drew Digby aside and asked earnestly: "Has my brother something in hand for the Catholic Cause?" Digby denied it, but Gerard

[1] I think so. *Vide* following: "We have found out . . . that on Saturday (Sunday?) night (Nov. 3rd) he (Percy) came post out of the north; that this man (Fawkes) rid to meet him by the way."—Cecil to Ambassador Sir G. Cornwallis at Madrid.

knew him for a careful man, unlikely to understock his farms. He warned him " lest he hurt both himself and the Cause. . . Was help expected from abroad ? " Digby lifted a scornful finger. He "would not venture so much in hope thereof." Gerard grew more anxious ; " I pray God you follow Counsel (Spiritual Direction) in your doings." He pressed Digby to say " If Mr. Walley (Garnet) knew of it ? " Digby betrayed himself by a hesitating denial and Father Gerard admonished him : " In truth, Sir Everard Digby, if there *should* be Anything in hand and if you retire into safety yourself (meaning at Coughton) you do not perform the part of a friend to your neighbours who deserve every respect and to whom you have professed much friendship . . . that they are left behind without warning as were needful . . . to defend themselves from rogues."

Digby answered curtly : " I warrant you it shall not need." And Father Gerard " shortly rode away," greatly troubled.

Digby remained, collecting arms and horses and money, until Monday the 4th, when he locked up his house, and rode for Dunchurch, with his page Ellis, and Richard Day his receiver (bailiff), " one Hollis an undercook leading the trunk-horse," which bore two large trunks filled with armour, clothes and money.

That night Digby supped alone at Dunchurch Inn.

Lord Monteagle at Whitehall and Westminster. November 4 (afternoon).

The same day Monteagle received a Second Anonymous Letter, which referred to the previous one, and was also in a disguised hand. Tresham would not have sent it, for he well knew there was no cause. And when Lord Chamberlain Suffolk " privately and after he had seen all other places in the Parliament House he took a slight occasion to peruse that vault " ; and inquired of Whinniard " Who ought that wood ? " It was Monteagle who alone accompanied Suffolk " (Ld M.) being curious to see the event of that accident " (i.e. Letter) and he also heard the replies of both the Keeper of the Wardrobe and the unknown " Johnson, Mr. Percy's man." " I suspect the Letter came from my old friend Thomas Percy," whispered Monteagle, sharply to Suffolk, as they passed out into the passage, leading to Parliament Place.

Fawkes got a warning word to Percy who had dined with the cheated Northumberland at Sion House ; probably he crossed in his boat to Lambeth and saw Keyes, for the latter was the last of them who stole into Whynniard's garden " about nine at night," and brought Fawkes a silver watch from Percy, and bade him " God Speed," departing with muffled oars, the tide being at half-ebb, to join the rest in Monteagle Close. Fawkes, we know, had his small wherry lying on the mud, above high-water mark, outside Percy's Lodging.

THOMAS PERCY PROCLAIMED FOR HIGH TREASON. NOVEMBER 5 (EARLY MORNING).

"About 5 o'clock," relates Winter, "came the younger Wright (Christopher) to my chamber and told me that a nobleman called (summoned) the Lord Monteagle," (who must have been then at Monteagle House in the Close) "saying: 'Rise and come along to Essex House, for I am going to call up my Lord of Northumberland,' saying withal: 'The matter is discovered.'" "Go back, Mr. Wright," quoth I; "and learn what you can at Essex Gate." "Shortly he returned and said: 'Surely all is lost, for Leyton is got on horseback at Essex door, and as he parted he asked "If their lordships would have (required) any more with him?" and being answered "No," is rode as fast up Fleet Street as he can ride.'" Monteagle House adjoined the Close and stood near Winchester House, not far from the Globe Theatre.

I take Leyton for a Sheriff's officer who went to bid the Lord Mayor call out the Trainbands and close the City Gates. Since Christopher Wright "returned shortly," having twice covered the distance from Winter's Lodging near S. Mary Overy to Essex House, Strand, crossing London Bridge, he may have stabled his horse near the Bridge. He mingled in the crowd afoot by the Essex Gate or by the Holbein Gate just south of Charing Cross, and was joined by Ambrose[1] Rookwood, for eye-witnesses later testified that they had "marked two gentlemen by the Gate who were aghast and chapfallen and heard one say to the other: "All is lost! Alack! We are undone!'" But Winter at least remained cool. "Go you then," quoth I, "to Mr. Percy, for sure it is for him they seek, and bid him begone: I will stay and see the uttermost."

Winter guessed right. The search was hot for Percy and the ink was scarce dry on the "Royal Proclamation for Percy's Apprehension." Rumours chased him north and south. Archbishop Bancroft wrote Percy had been seen near Croydon, and Lord Chief Justice Popham reported "a hot rider" (Percy?) on the Gravesend Road. This item makes one wonder if Fawkes's ship was not anchored near Gravesend. Northumberland admitted Percy dined at Sion on Monday but left about 1 p.m. Winter proves how ignorant the Government were of their names, for he declares how he "went to the Court (Whitehall) Gates, and found them straitly guarded as nobody could enter. From thence I went towards the Parliament House, and in the middle of King Street found the Guard standing that would not let me pass, and as I returned I heard one say: 'There is a Treason discovered in which the King and the Lords should have been blown up,' so then I was fully satisfied that all was known, and went to the stable where my gelding stood and rode into the country."

King Street was then the highway from Charing Cross to Westminster, and it was the old road of Hubert de Burgh, repaired by

[1] It must have been Rookwood—the rest had gone.—J. K.

Wolsey and Henry VIII. Winter passed coolly through the Holbein Gate, down the narrow highway of King Street and was stopped half-way to the King's Gate. It is remarkable that he, a known Recusant and Percy's near friend, could thus mix freely with the horrified citizens crowding the street so near Parliament Place, all talking of "the discovered Treason at the Parliament House," and "Percy's Plot," and yet he showed no fear of being "stayed and apprehended." I confess to some admiration of Mr. Thomas Winter, who deserved a better fate for his staunch and fearless attitude in the face of danger and imminent arrest.

Flight of the Conspirators.

Tresham alone remained quietly in his Clerkenwell Lodging while the rest spurred for their lives on the Great North Road. Kit Wright met Percy, who had probably halted for the night between Hampstead and Barnet. A green rise on The Heath overlooking Westminster, used to be called "Traitors' Mount" some years ago, and local tradition said that some of them watched from thence for the smoke of Fawkes's powder-barrels. If so, it would have been Catesby, with his servant Bates, and John Wright. Percy had passed them in the darkness. Kit Wright was a bold rider and he threw off his cloak to ride faster, but Ambrose Rookwood won the race for Ledgers Ashby, having posted fresh mounts from his stud at inns along the Great North Road. He reached Lady Catesby's house in less than eight hours, riding eighty miles without a halt! He passed first Keyes who rode off when Wright warned him, overtook Catesby and John Wright at Brick Hill Bucks, and left Kit Wright and Percy behind him a few miles further on.

Meanwhile that fiery gentleman Mr. John Grant, with his younger brother Francis, and other rash gentlemen had broken into Warwick Castle at 3 a.m. and forcibly removed "the strong horses in the care of one Benocke, a rider (trainer)" dashing on after for "Ledgers Ashby," startling the countryside; and they, with Lady Catesby and Robert Winter, were at supper when the fugitives arrived. Whose coming soon came to the ears of Daventry, and to His Majesty's Justices of the Peace there, Sir Eusebie Andrew and Sir Thomas Burnaby, who lost no time in taking the sworn depositions of eye-witnesses: while in Warwickshire Sir Richard Verney, Sir John Ferrers, and Mr. William Coombe for their part acted with admirable promptness and vigour on the complaint of the outraged Trainer Benocke and his clients, those gentry whose horses had been insolently seized by such known Recusants.

Part III. Defeat.

The stir in the Shires is described in the Daventry magistrates' letter to Salisbury as follows:

Right Honourable,

We having been informed of a great concourse of horsemen on Tuesday the fifth of November at Ledgers Ashby in the County

of Northampton, between four and ten of the clock in the afternoon, and likewise of the intended treason about the Parliament house, as also of five gentlemen who came posting down from London very suspiciously into our Country, and as far as we can gather by Examinations went presently to the said Ledgers Ashby but there did not stay: Whereupon we having taken divers Examinations, we thought it our duty to send the account thereof unto your lordship: And so referring ourselves wholly to your honoured discretion, we humbly take our leaves. Daventrie in Northam. this VIIIth day of Novem: 1605.

Your honours in all duty,

EUSEBIE ANDREWE.
THO. BURNABYE.

Dr. J. Wesley Bready has written a delightful and most readable life of *Dr. Barnardo, Physician, Pioneer and Prophet* (George Allen & Unwin), 7*s.* 6*d.* in which we have a picture drawn of the man and his marvellous work. Somehow we do not see Barnardo as much of a physician, but we see him as something more than a pioneer and less than a prophet. He was a man with a consuming passion as an Evangelist, a rescuer and emancipator of childhood, and a matchless organizer whose thought gave birth to institutions that have revolutionized the care of the abandoned waifs and strays of our modern life. To see Barnardo in true perspective we have to compare what was being done for these jetsam and flotsam of humanity when he began his work and what is now universally recognized as a state and Christian duty. Barnardo was a man with all the ebullient enthusiasm of his Irish forbears and with a strong practical common sense which enabled him to avoid being led astray by will-o'-the-wisp ideas in the pursuit of his ends. He knew what was needed, and from the small beginnings of a shed saw Garden Cities for boys and girls, training homes and other institutions, spring into active being. The man was indomitable in his gift of facing and overcoming difficulties, he was inspired with a master passion to serve his Lord and with a fearlessness in carrying out his task. Dr. Bready has grasped the broad outlines of his work, he has picturesquely described its growth, and he has made it and him live in the minds of his readers. We sincerely hope that this Life will do much to increase the affection and confidence which the name Barnardo has inspired in all who wish to see the children of the abyss rescued from lives that can only be a disgrace and a menace to civilization and our common Christianity. The book is breezily and brightly written and its illustrations are well chosen.

EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE: THE TRUE ROAD TO HARMONY.

By the Rev. A. R. Whately, D.D.

THAT the Sacrament of unity should have been for so long one of the chief occasions of division is a tragic anomaly that has impressed many minds. And often an intended eirenicon only gives occasion for new forms of difference. It is much easier to slur the rival formulas than to transcend them. A recent example of these attempts is to be found in an article by the Rev. E. G. Swann,[1] which will perhaps afford a basis for constructive criticism of some current cross-purpose reasoning. With certain things in the article we should almost all agree; but I wish to suggest that his general view is defective, both as a conception of the nature of Christian thought and as a diagnosis of the real meaning of our sacramental differences.

I

Mr. Swann regards the various conflicting essays at doctrinal formulation, at least on this special subject, as efforts to express, with differences of detail and emphasis, essentially the same thing. This is so, in his view, at least where the presented result is strongly positive and emotionally rich. "The natural and proper language of religion is poetry, and especially must this be so in regard to such elusive and ineffable mysteries as we are here concerned with." About these "our language must be either misty or untrue. . . . Of course there is no mistiness," he adds, "in our apprehension of the fundamental fact, the objective presence and the objective gift." He has already given, earlier in the article, instances of how, in the mood of devotion, divines of different schools seem to think almost exactly alike.

If the true language of religion is poetry, then those of us who are not poetical seem to be in a bad way. And even those who are have different susceptibilities. But, without pressing this particular saying too hard, there is a real issue upon the relation of "mistiness" to mystery. Henry Drummond, in a brief but memorable passage, says that true mystery casts no shadows: that its edge, though irregular, is sharp. This, I think, is profoundly true. We are apt to think otherwise, because we rightly feel how impervious the higher mysteries are to "abstract metaphysical speculations," and yet feel impelled to grope a little way. But, when we have ruled out speculation altogether, we still find ourselves confronted by the demands of an exacting philosophy of another sort, the critical analysis of our own ideas. If we think

[1] *The Review of the Churches.* July, 1930.

at all, we cannot escape the responsibility for lucid and coherent thinking. We cannot merely, as it were, think to music.

Now in the first place, it is not enough to show that in the language of devotion men of different schools largely agree. Even if we disregard the amount of disagreement, it does not follow, because they agree in devotion and differ in theory, that the different theories are only superficially different, or that theory is unimportant. And we must not assume that the ideas are as similar as the language. Mr. Swann alludes to the well-known suggestion of Bishop Moule of Durham, to the effect that if our eyes were opened, we should see Christ as the true Consecrator in the Holy Communion, and to Lord Halifax's approval of it. It happens that, in the days when thoughts about the Holy Communion from Moule's pen were appearing from time to time, I used to read them with interest, because I was always looking for something in them that I did not find. It seemed to me that, unconsciously, he always missed any real conception of Christ as objectively self-imparted in the Sacrament, quite apart from his rejection of what is technically known as the Real Presence. The sign and the thing signified were parallel to the end: they did not interlock. I am therefore inclined to think that neither Lord Halifax nor Mr. Swann have properly understood his meaning. The latent subjectivism of his sacramental teaching was considerably veiled by the spiritual fervour of a very saintly man, and by his somewhat emotional and exuberant style. But, after all, if *theological* harmony needs to be exhibited by translating it out of the language of devotion into that of precise thought —and how else can it be done ?—the moral is rather that we should, in the given cases, revise the theory than that we should despise theory as such. It is quite right to insist on this unity in devotion ; but devotion is devotion and theology is theology. Many very spiritual men have been strong dogmatists, like Bernard of Clairvaux, or hard thinkers, like Anselm. It may be unfortunate that we are not as united in thinking as we are (sometimes) in worship ; but it does not follow from this fact that we ought to compel ourselves to think in terms of worship, or restrict our thinking to the direct needs of worship.

Far be it from us to disparage the place of intuition in religious —and indeed in all—thought. And it is partly because reason itself and as such is, to my mind, so involved in it that I have a greater respect for hard thinking than Mr. Swann appears to have, and am less willing to skim lightly over the differences inseparable from it. But this is too large a subject to be pursued here. That intuition may often let itself go, as in poetry, worship, and some forms of meditation, must also be freely admitted. Like him, I would not for a moment confuse contemplation and science, but I draw the line, not—in this context—between Religion and Science, but between religious contemplation and the Science of Religion.[1]

[1] The ultimate reference of our ideas to the bed-rock of Revelation is throughout this article pre-supposed.

II

All through his discussion, Mr. Swann treats the doctrine of Holy Communion as isolable from the general range of religious ideas. Of course he does not mean that it has no connections except with those main truths of the faith that it directly presupposes. But his plea would have been of a different character if he had adequately realized the interdependence of idea upon idea.

On page 386 a paragraph begins which contains a reference to a "total view of religion." If anyone, sharing the standpoint of the present writer, were to catch sight of this paragraph, with the reference, in advance of reading it, he would welcome the prospect of an enlargement of the too narrow stream of the argument. He would be glad to see that the Evangelical point of view as a whole is after all to be taken into some account. And then he would be grievously let down. All that is said about this total view is that it "tends to narrow down its scope and outlook to an over-severe view, whose severity is always in danger of becoming utterly harsh and repellent," with a little more to the same effect. Surely it is fatal even in theological *controversy*—to say nothing of theological arbitration—to employ only a negative conception of any type of thought. Frankly, this feature of the article has alienated much of the sympathy that I should have felt with it, in spite of differences of opinion. This lack of any attempt at sympathetic understanding is a serious disqualification for its task. If we seek sympathy, we must show it.

But it is the failure to appreciate the influence of total views of religion—positively regarded, epithets apart—upon particular religious views that is here so evident. The question may be approached from the side of spiritual experience and from the side of logical coherence.

Can it possibly be maintained in cold blood that Evangelicalism has as such no positive *motif*, no meaning as a spiritual phenomenon, no determining idea that, however elusive, controls the orbit of its teaching? Why is it there at all? Is it an enemy that hath done this? Mr. Swann would hardly subscribe to these negations, but there is little in his article that might not have been written by one who did.

Closely connected with this is his failure, noted above, to take proper account of the interconnection of religious ideas; and with this his disparagement of close thinking. Logic in itself certainly cannot build up constructive systems, but it is vitally necessary to prevent us from feeding our souls upon ambiguities. It *reveals* the internal harmony of experience. But the experience of each finds expression not only in thoughts that agree with those of others, but in thoughts that differ. It is a commonplace to say that we cannot all see the whole truth, and that we are complementary one to another. But we have failed to attain to the full meaning of this commonplace if we are satisfied to concentrate only on what we share.

We had better frankly face the fact that experience often clashes with experience (not, indeed, in its pure character as spiritual revelation from on high : but in that character it cannot enter the arena of controversy at all), and that thought, which is potentially at least controversial, is necessary to the very life of experience. It is not always that worship itself is so hospitable in its appeal as in the instances that Mr. Swann gives. But a still more important point is this : that such special utterances as those he quotes, however they may express unity among different types, do not express the unity of each type within itself, and therefore yield very imperfect evidence of the limits of their mutual difference. What we have to consider, when we approach these types on the side of experience, is their *general* feeling-tone, the essential nature of the faith that strives to find expression in them. Certainly it is the ideas that disclose this : ideas so regarded ever tend to overtop logic, yet it is not to logic alone that they owe their mutual incompatibilities : logic could never create these. All this is overlooked in his eirenicon, and that is a fatal defect.

The difference between the real Evangelical and the " Catholic " is, fundamentally, a difference in *centre of gravity*. When the Evangelical is called upon to say what is his special contribution as such to the fulness of truth, it is not easy to give an answer that does not call forth the reply : " Well, but that is what we always teach ; and not only teach but emphasize." For if, on the other hand, the answer to the enquiry is controversial, it will not be accepted as a " contribution." The primary contribution that each type makes is just itself. We all may and must learn from one another ; but the patient waiting for " that which is perfect " is better than mere eclecticism. The Divine purpose that makes for the Divine unity may work itself out by revealing differences as well as harmonies.

In short, the experiential, or intuitional, character of religious thought and knowledge is *not* to be understood in relation to particular doctrines—such as that of the Holy Communion—considered by themselves. It is related to " total views of religion " ; and the totality is to be grasped by sympathetic insight on the one hand and logical analysis on the other. To disparage dissentients will neither make friends of them nor keep them off the path. We may now offer a very brief and slight application of the above remarks to the question of Eucharistic doctrine.

III

Mr. Swann, as one would expect, objects to close definitions of the nature of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament. In a sense, I certainly agree ; but, though we cannot speculatively interpret it, yet we must understand the implications of the words we use to formulate our belief. Otherwise, instead of making language subservient to intuition, we may only make ourselves the dupes of language. In referring to the " change " in the elements, he is inclined to recommend the phrase " a higher spiritual status," and

adds " this is practically equivalent to Latimer's statement, ' The change is not in the nature but in the dignity.' Perhaps it is wisest to confine ourselves to such statements as these " (p. 383). He would probably apply to his view the term Transvaluation, which he uses elsewhere, and regrets that it is itself tending to be speculatively elaborated.

Now the attribute of value, thus used, (and the same applies to status, dignity, and the like), affords, to my mind, not so much an unambitious and mediating answer to the question as the delusive appearance of an answer. To say that a thing undergoes the change of being made valuable is meaningless. To explain the value of the elements on the ground that value is added to them takes us nowhere. More pronounced theories of the Real Presence have at least the advantage here. Such a view as this, however, has been adduced in support of the *epiclesis* in the New Prayer Book. It has been said that a change of this kind must *ex hypothesi* take place, and therefore why not invoke it? One would have thought that the natural question would have been, therefore why invoke it?

The fact is, that, from another point of view, this theory *has* its significance, but not what the author thinks. It affirms—while trying to avoid entangling itself in liabilities—that the mediation of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament is effected primarily by the elements and not by the rite. The issue is between two directions of thought, implying two starting-points. Value, therefore, which we all agree in attributing to the Sacrament, is made to play the rôle of a quality conferred antecedently upon the elements in order to make the reception to be what (in consistency) it would not otherwise be, the covenantal act intended by Christ. This view is not, except in a superficial sense, an eirenicon at all. It just indicates, with a minimum of complications, the real dividing-line between two types of thought.

Let me endeavour to adumbrate, by means of an illustration, a very different conception of sacramental grace, in which also the objectivity of the gift is quite essential. Think of a stretch of rocky and irregular coast-line, along which the tide is coming in. Think of the sea as, in itself, regular and even in its advance along this particular line. None the less it advances further at some points than at others. It takes the outline of the various inlets and caves. It has many a " special presence," but all are to be understood in terms of the broad fact of the incoming sea, taken together with the configuration of the shore upon which it advances. Let the flowing tide represent the grace of God as issuing directly from the supreme inclusive Event of Redemption. Let the shore represent the human race, or human nature, in every form of its possible receptivity. Some particular inlet will stand for the Holy Communion. The presence of the sea when it has entered that inlet is certainly a real presence. It is not subjective to the inlet. It is the very definite result of what the sea does and is. It is also a unique presence, for the inlet *is* an inlet, and is not just like the

other inlets. The differentiation is on the side of the shore; but the sea could not refuse to fill the inlet without a modification of the *general* fact of what it is doing, a special absence.

To this view, the Sacrament occupies an essential, but not a central, place in the theology that thus conceives it. And, *just for this reason*, it speaks, not only of the completeness of Redemption, but of "the beauty of the earth, the glory of the skies." The universal sacrament of nature circulates through it,—without, as it were, a special licence—neither checked nor drained.

It is well to affirm, directly and firmly, that, for the genuine Evangelical, faith and thought find their centre of gravity in the super-sacramental Christ. Spirit uses matter for its instrument: but, after all, material objects are limited by place, time, and occasion. Their instrumentality is circumscribed. Catholicism has its hardnesses and narrownesses—yes, and its negations—as truly as Protestantism. Either is apt to be cold and repellent to the other. And the Evangelical at least need not trouble if outsiders think his sacramentalism in itself "thin." To him what it loses in "richness" it gains both in loftiness and in intimacy. The plain glass window reveals "the beauty of the earth, the glory of the skies."

One important point must be noted. "There is a curious antagonism," says Mr. Swann, "on the part of nearly all Evangelicals, even of those most anxious to describe themselves as 'Liberal,' to any bringing in of our Lord's glorified humanity in connection with the Eucharist" (p. 385). Any opinion is curious if regarded as a rock in the sky. The complaint, too, is a little vague. But, if true at all to fact, it must surely refer to the definition of the *res sacramenti*—the Gift as such—in terms of the glorified humanity, not to the resultant deepening of our union with the glorified *Person*. If so, this antagonism—or *non possumus*, as I should say—belongs, whether conscious or intuitive, to the very meaning of the positive conception of the Eucharist to which it belongs. This is a wide subject, and a slight indication must suffice. The Incarnation, for us who take this standpoint, is interpreted in and through its inclusion in the comprehensive fact of Redemption. We may regard Redemption specially on this particular side when the context of our thought demands it, just as we may from the other sides. But we can find no room for anything covered by the phrase "extension of the Incarnation." The Church and the Eucharist are no extension of it, but presuppose and are involved in it. We are certainly not committed by this to the view that the redemptive events are *merely* temporal, as ordinary events are: but their time-order must surely mean something; and we, for ourselves, cannot view the Incarnation as "extended" on this side of the Death and Ascension. The institution of the Eucharist is the consecration of all succeeding celebrations, and *therefore* of the elements employed. What, then, is given? Clearly the fruit of the completed work as such, the Divine grace and life that realizes under time conditions the victory of the glorified Lord through union with His Person.

The motive of the doctrine of a divine-*human* life imparted in the Sacrament seems rather a response to the demand of the sacramental ideal and instinct than a necessity of thought leading up to the Sacrament. For it is obvious that we *have* human nature already. The two terms that need to be united are "human" and "divine," not "human" and "divine-human." So put, the redundancy is obvious. We do not water our gardens with wet earth, but with water. At least, there *is* an Evangelical philosophy.

One more brief quotation. "The liturgy," says Mr. Swann, "just before the culminating point of the whole action, warns us 'Lift up your hearts!' We must not think to 'bring the Lord Christ down,' so as to make Him, in effect, the object of sense. Rather we are to think of the congregation as being caught up to 'sit with Christ in the heavenlies,' and of the heavenly world as thrown open to our soul's gaze, through all the accompaniments of the action, but especially through the holy bread and the blessed cup." This thought, in its main purport, any Evangelical might, I think, gladly accept. Indeed, it seems, on one side at least, more consonant with the theology that denies that Christ is "present on our altars" than with that which affirms it. But I quote it because I do not want to dwell only on differences.

In conclusion, the true way to harmony lies, not in skipping our differences, but in probing them. Unity through differentiation runs through God's works. All but flat contradiction may be reconciled: all but the core of the Gospel may split apart. There are doctrines that, like some plants, must be nurtured under glass before they can contribute to the united beauty of the garden. A passionate devotion to that which our own experience reveals, even where it is inevitably distinctive rather than universal, is the true ground of sympathy with all genuine conviction as such. And even where spiritual insight is really distorted by prejudice, who shall say where the one ends and the other begins? There are those who are kept within the pastures not by reason or conscious discrimination, but simply by this—that they know not the voice of strangers.

COME UP THE ROAD TO BETHLEHEM. By Eleanor Vellacott Wood. *London: Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, E.C.* 1s. net.

It is quite in accordance with the fitness of things that Mrs. Wood, who is sister-in-law to the Brothers Frederick and Arthur Wood, of the National Young Life Campaign, should be engaged in writing books that make a strong appeal to young people. In this attractive booklet the story of Bethlehem is told again. We are called up the road (1) to see, (2) to offer, and (3) to come down the road from Bethlehem "to make it known." The brief concluding message is entitled, "Concerning the road." This pleasing little gift-book will certainly find a cordial welcome.

MASTERSHIP AND BROTHERHOOD.

By the Rev. Walter J. Southam, B.D.,
Vicar of St. Stephen's, Wandsworth.

"One is your Master, even Christ: and all ye are brethren."—*Matthew* xxiii. 8.

THESE are personal veins—if you cut them they bleed, Jesus Christ claims the supreme position as Sovereign Master of Life. He is the Person of the "invincible supremacy." The ultimate authority over life lies not in the Christian consciousness nor in the Church, nor even in the Bible, but in the Christ of God. I link up with the Church because it is His agency for carrying out His purpose and plans; I accept the Bible because it comes from Him and leads infallibly to Him, but the supremacy over life and all life is vested in and claimed by Jesus Christ our Lord. He is Lanier's "Sovereign Seer of time," the Fujiyama of history, peerless, commanding, absolute in His authority and power. This being so, like Charles Lamb, if Solomon, Solon, Shakespeare or any of the world's worthies came into the room where I write I should rise, but if Jesus Christ came in I should kneel in adoration and worship and as an acknowledgment of His claim of Mastership and Lordship.

A simple study of this word Master as used of our Blessed Lord reveals helpful facts known to most of the readers of this magazine, and therefore the briefest reference only is necessary as a background.

The English word is used as the translation of five different Greek words in the Gospels as the Concordance will show.

1. "διδάσκαλος" = Teacher, as in Matthew viii. 19. "Master, I will follow Thee whithersoever Thou goest." This word is used forty-six times in the Gospels concerning Christ.

2. "ἐπιστάτης" = Superintendent—one who stands over, as in Luke viii. 24. "Master, Master, we perish." Used six times.

3. "κύριος" = Lord or Sir, as in Matthew vi. 24. "No man can serve two masters." Used five times.

4. "ῥαββί" = my Teacher (from the Hebrew), as in Mark ix. 5. "Master, it is good for us to be here." Used eight times.

5. "καθηγητής" = *Leader* and *Guide*. Matthew xxiii. 8 and 10, the key verse at the head of this article. This is the only place where this word is used.

All these words are needed to show forth the power and authority of the commanding Personality of Christ.

Look at the implications in the words "Leader" and "Guide."

(*a*) *Leader*. This suggests a Campaign and a Battlefield. "I have given Him for a Witness to the people, a Leader and Commander to the people" (Isaiah lv. 4). He is the Master of strategy. He alone has the plan of battle—knows the power of the enemy—the secret of victory. Therefore He is our Commander with complete authority who calls for absolute obedience.

(β) *Guide.* We think of a Pilgrimage over an unknown way with unknown perils. HE alone knows the way and the perils, yea, HE is the Way who provides us with His unerring Chart, the Bible, and His perfect Pilot—the Holy Spirit. Therefore implicit trust and submission are necessary. His way moreover is a Way of Glory and a Path of Service. HE alone can reveal the glories of the way and the opportunities for service.

All that Mastership means, is included in this word καθηγητής —Leader—Guide—Owner—Commander—Teacher with all its implications and demands. "One is your Master, even Christ: and all ye are brethren." The long debate is over. With such a claim there is no argument. Silence and obedience are imperative. Let us seek to fix our gaze on this Personality in Whom is vested final and complete authority as we consider the Result or Demand of Christ's Mastership in the realm of relations.

BROTHERHOOD.

"All ye are brethren." Brotherhood is a word much in vogue to-day, not always rightly understood or expressed, but *if* rightly interpreted and practically applied it meets the fundamental need of the world to-day: it is the solution of the supreme problem confronting the Church.

Let us consider then the *Meaning*, the *Need*, the *Secret*, and the *Expression* of Brotherhood.

1. *The Meaning.* This carries us to a very narrow and a very sacred circle in the nature of the case, does it not? Yes! to the smallest and most sacred circle, where we have the common tie of blood, a common relationship to a common father, and where there should be the expression of a common spirit manifesting itself in all the details and concerns of life. While Love perhaps is the larger and more comprehensive term, yet for our purpose here Love and Brotherhood may be used interchangeably. Listen, then, once again to that incomparable definition which St. Paul gives in 1 Corinthians xiii. And may I change the word for a moment? "'*Brotherhood*' suffereth long and is kind; brotherhood envieth not; brotherhood vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. '*Brotherhood*' never faileth." When we accept this conception of Brotherhood and project it into all life's relationships: individual—family—racial—national—international—social and religious—we are made to realize that we have the essential principle of life which if applied will be the solvent of our problems. Brotherhood is the spirit of love at work, impelling, compelling, restraining, constraining, and is essentially a Christian virtue.

2. *The Need.* It is almost superfluous to dwell on this point. Does this old world of ours need the principle of Brotherhood?—this war-scarred earth with its wars and rumours of wars, with

its hatreds, its small nationalisms, its misunderstandings: with its unnatural social and class distinctions, its industrial and economic problems? One of my most thrilling experiences was in connection with the General Strike in Winnipeg during the spring of 1919. As president of the Christian Men's Federation of the city it fell to my lot to have dealings with those representing both sides in that struggle. It was admitted by striker and capitalist that the spirit of Brotherhood was absent, and when the issue was faced it was recognized that such strikes could only be prevented by the application of that same spirit of Brotherhood. Yes! the world certainly needs Brotherhood.

And what of the Church?—does not the Church need a baptism of Brotherhood?—with her differences and divisions, her antagonisms and her jealousies, her economic waste, her failure to accomplish speedily her world-wide purpose of witnessing to a sin-cursed world, and her frequent misrepresentations of her Saviour and Lord?

Brotherhood is the fundamental need of the Church at this present moment. Is not this the initial step in the direction of that Unity which our Master desires and for which He prayed? Is not this the spirit that will quicken the Missionary Vision of the Church, intensify her missionary activities and unify them? Is not this the supreme apologetic of the Christian Church—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples if ye love one another"? Is not this the spirit in which the Church is to express herself and deliver the truth—"to speak the truth in love"? and is not this the final testimony of the world to the Church—"see how these Christians love one another"?

A ministerial friend of mine was once conducting a series of special services in his church. One night he had visions in which God spoke to him and revealed the wondrous beauty of John iii. 16, as he had never seen it before. This friend is a calm, sane, well-balanced man, but his sleep was disturbed by this revelation and his emotions overcame him as he understood the expression of God's marvellous love in that verse. The next morning he said to himself, "What does this mean?" He thought of several men in his community who had broken away from the Church and from God. "I think it means," said he, "that I ought to go and see these men personally." He went to a chemist in his laboratory, an engineer in the round-house, a business man in his office, and spoke to each in the spirit of John iii. 16, and can you wonder that these men came back not only to the Church but to Christ? Brotherhood won. Whichever way we look—at the individual, the Church or the world—above all other needs stands this—imperious in its demands, universal in its application, glorious in its results—the need for Brotherhood.

3. *The Secret.* Does the secret lie in natural affections and relationships? It ought to and I believe in the plan of God was intended to, but sin has laid its hand on even the most sacred of relationships of life and spoiled them. Cain and Abel were brothers in the flesh, but that did not prevent Cain from murdering his

brother. Abraham and Lot were more like father and son than uncle and nephew, for Lot owed everything he possessed to Abraham, but notwithstanding he acted with unspeakable meanness to his uncle. Esau and Jacob were brothers, but that did not prevent Jacob from acting in a despicable way towards his brother, nor Esau from planning the murder of Jacob. No! a new revelation of Brotherhood was needed, and it is given in the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ. Brotherhood to be real, vital and effective must be religious. But not all religions express themselves in Brotherhood. When as a youth I went to North-West Canada and lived for three years alone among the Indians, I believe I was possessed with the desire to recognize whatever of good there was in their religions. It became quite obvious that brotherhood was not a characteristic of those beliefs. And when, after my graduation and ordination, I went to South China to work among the students and other young men, I was possessed with the same desire to see the good in the religions of China, but in the light of facts the spirit of brotherhood was not there as a controlling principle. We are driven to the conclusion that the religion of Christ is the only one which contains the secret of Brotherhood, yea, that Christ Himself is the Secret.

There is much talk in these days concerning the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man, but I am convinced that in many cases the supreme factor is left out and the theory becomes a delusion and a snare. That Supreme Factor is Jesus Christ our Saviour and Elder Brother. When I come to the place where I as a son of man recognize that I have broken with Father and Home, and have wandered into a far country and lost my way back—and when by the grace of God I find that the only way back is through my Saviour and Elder Brother—and when I believe in Jesus "the Way, the Truth and the Life" and so come Home, it seems to me that then I get a real conception of what the Fatherhood of God means and what the Brotherhood of man means. When I look around upon the sons of men they become my brothers in a newer and deeper sense. Lost? Yes! Strayed away? Yes! But they are my brothers because His children, not only by creation, but by right of purchase; and what He wants me to be and do is to live and love and labour that, through me and other redeemed children, the brotherliness of Christ may be so manifested that these lost sons may be brought back to a Father's Home and a Father's Love. Therefore the Secret of Brotherhood is not in natural relationships; it is a supernatural Grace—not simply natural affection but "the Fruit of the Spirit which is Love."

4. *The Expression.* This principle of Brotherhood is for life in all its relationships. Our eyes turn again to Jesus our Master and Elder Brother, who made that incomparable claim, "One is your Master, even Christ"; and I listen again as I hear Him say, "I am among you as He that serveth." *The World's Master is the World's Servant.* This gives a new meaning and understanding to service. Service becomes a Divine and Christlike thing, spiritual

in its motive, sacrificial in its expression, and saving in its results.

There are three currents in every life—the inward, the outward, and the upward—" inward, youward and Godward "—and these three currents were in the human life of Jesus our Master. We ask, which were the three keynotes of His life of service along these currents? For these must be our keynotes. " It is enough for the disciple that he be as his Master." Christlikeness can never be gainsaid. Our message is our character and Christ says to you and to me, " Through Me God is your Father: in Me ye are all brothers: in My love go and serve one another."

The first keynote in its application to *Himself* is just this:

(*α*) *Self-denial.* The Master denied Himself. Of course as Son of God and Revealer of the Father He made certain tremendous and fundamental claims, but as man, brother and servant He denied Himself. There is nothing self-assertive about the Man from Nazareth. There is no egotism about Jesus the Son of Mary. Yet, though the meekest of men, He was the strongest and most forceful. " Let this mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus." That mind that led Him unto death, even the death of the Cross.

Is not this the first demand to-day? The inward application of this supreme principle of self-denial? " Let him deny himself," is the expression of discipleship and brotherhood.

What was the keynote of our Lord's service in regard to *Others*?

(*β*) *Self-sacrifice.* You cannot read the life of our Lord without learning that His attitude to others was one of unstinted generous love. There was a tenderness of touch and a gentleness of voice, a sympathy of heart that characterized all His relationships. His life was the perfect illustration of His own declared purpose—" the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister." That spirit of self-sacrifice reached its climax and its crown on the Cross when He gave Himself for the Redemption and Regeneration of man. And is not this the urgent need of to-day? Is not self-love the greatest of all problems? Probably you remember that striking illustration which the Bishop of Ripon used when as Canon Burroughs he wrote one of his prophetic war books—" The Valley of Decision." He tells us the familiar story concerning London, how that in 1666 after the fire Sir Christopher Wren was asked to prepare a plan for the reconstruction of a new London to centre in St. Paul's Cathedral from which broad highways would radiate in all directions. The plan was accepted by the powers that be but never carried out. Why? Because of the selfishness of men. Because individual citizens insisted on having their own little houses in their own little plots built exactly as they had been before the fire. And as a result you have London with its crooked and narrow streets to-day instead of broad roads radiating from a common centre. And so where is that great wave of selflessness which we thought would sweep over our own land after the Great War which should express itself in self-sacrifice? Only through such a spirit will our cities, towns and villages approximate

to the City of God, with their broad highways of truth and righteousness and brotherhood, all radiating from and centring in the Worship of the Triune God.

And the last thought is this. What was the keynote of our Lord's ministry in relation to *God*?

(γ) *Self-Surrender.* Jesus surrendered His life to the Father and consequently He was Spirit-controlled from first to last. This is the Source of the Stream. This is the secret of His self-denial and self-sacrifice. And that must be your secret and mine.

Is this Ideal too great? Does it seem too far above us? Remember that Divine precepts are backed up by Divine power. "God's commands are His enablings," and all that He asks is the surrendered life, so that He may take possession and express Himself through us in self-denial and self-sacrifice. Let us acknowledge afresh His Mastership and Supreme Authority, and let there be an act of self-surrender, so that we may go forth to our life and service possessed by the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of Brotherhood, and so help bring in the Day of the Lord when the Mastership of Christ and the Brotherhood of Man shall be universal.

SIX MAXIMS TREASURED BY HIS MAJESTY THE KING. London: *Williams & Norgate, Ltd.* 1930. (2*s.* and 3*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The Reverend F. J. Baker, Vicar of St. Stephen, Coleman Street, E.C., has taken Six Maxims which hang upon the walls of the King's Library and business room at Sandringham, and with His Majesty's permission, used them as texts for a Course of Sermons during last Lent. Sir William A. Waterlow, the ex-Lord Mayor of London, has prefixed a Foreword to the Series of Addresses. With undoubted skill Mr. Baker has interwoven his own reflections upon such already clear maxims as "Teach me to be obedient to the rules of the game"; "Teach me to distinguish between sentiment and sentimentality, admiring the one and despising the other"; "Teach me neither to proffer nor to receive cheap praise"; "Neither to cry for the moon nor over spilt milk." His practical suggestions are useful, and the book is dedicated to his former Vicar at Holy Trinity, Brighton, Canon R. J. Campbell.

The British Broadcasting Corporation has issued a collection of Forms of Prayer under the title of *Services for Broadcasting* (1*s.* and 2*s.* net). A wide selection has been made of Prayers from our own Services in the Church of England, and to these has been added a collection of special Prayers dealing with particular subjects and occasions. Those who are familiar with the services from the Broadcasting Stations will know how carefully these services are drawn up, and how effective they are. The volume is well produced in good type and will be welcomed by many.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

MESSRS. W. HEFFER AND SON, of Cambridge, issue a book of unusual interest to all who study the subject of Reservation and the problems connected with it. The title is *Westcott's Fear* (6*s*. net) and the anonymous author describes himself as "A Disciple." His purpose is to give an account of the great Bishop's views on important subjects connected with the sacrament of Holy Communion and to show their bearing upon the practice of Reservation, thus illustrating at once the teaching of the Primitive Church and that of the Church of England. Familiar with the well-known instance given by Justin Martyr, of the Elements being carried to Communicants unable to be present at the actual service, the Bishop gave permission to two clergymen in his diocese to adopt the same practice. To his astonishment this permission was quoted at the Lambeth Hearing on Reservation as a precedent for the adoption of the practice of Reservation. On learning this the Bishop wrote: "I have just seen with great surprise that Mr. Hansell stated in his address at Lambeth that I have authorized Reservation in certain cases. I have not done anything of the kind. What I have done is that I have endeavoured to show how the cases in which Reservation is declared to be necessary may be met without Reservation. . . . There is indeed no question on which I feel more strongly, and I cannot understand how my action has been misinterpreted." Around this incident "A Disciple" has gathered an immense quantity of really important information showing the development of the practice, the theories which underlie it, the views of Lutheran and other Communions, and the doctrines represented in the various editions of our own Prayer Book. It may not be generally known that the Lutheran doctrine of "Consubstantiation" excludes the possibility of Reservation. "Luther and his followers after him held that the Consubstantiation does not take place until the bread and wine are received by the Communicant, and only while they are received; thus whatever we may say as to the accordance of this restriction with Luther's mode of understanding our Lord's words, all claim is cut off for the advent of the Lord's body and blood into the bread and wine at the repetition of the Lord's words by the priest, and all claim for the presence of these in such of the bread and wine as is not bestowed, thus cutting off all reason for Reservation." An examination of the Bennett Judgment shows, as all students know and as the Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in 1906 pointed out, that the Judges in that case did not hold that our formularies allowed the doctrine of a Presence in the Elements. Bishop Westcott's views are well known. They are stated clearly in two letters to the Archbishop of York (given on pages 112, 113): "I shrink with my whole nature from speaking of such a mystery, but it seems to me vital to guard against the thought of the Presence of the Lord 'in or under the forms of bread and wine.' From this the greatest

practical errors follow." There is much more of interest and value in this useful study of the subject, but from this brief outline it will be possible to gather something of the importance and instructiveness of the contents of an unusual and original volume.

Professor F. C. Burkitt has contributed to a series on *The Christian Religion, its Origin and Progress,* issued by the Cambridge University Press, an important study on Christian Worship. It is Part II of a volume entitled *The Church of To-day* (*7s. 6d.* net) to which the other contributors are the Rev. P. Gardner-Smith, B.D., on " The Church's Faith " and Canon C. E. Raven on " The Church's Task in the World." Both of these contributions are thought-provoking, but Professor Burkitt's treatment of Christian Worship stands out as an exceedingly useful and informing account of the history and interpretation of the public worship of the Church from its beginning. The Worship of the Early Church is presented in its simple form, and the developments during the Dark Ages are traced to their various sources. The history of the Anaphora or Eucharistic Canon, with its various elements, is shown. Transubstantiation involves a change which " if it really happens, must be miraculous, and for a man to perform it would be magic." (Yet a Roman Catholic Archbishop recently claimed that the priests of his Church could perform this miracle.) The structure and principles of the Reformed Liturgies are explained, and incidentally many little-known points are made clear. The origin of the Chantry priest, for example, began with a plausible process of thought, but " at the end of the process we have a priest running through the fixed words of a service originally designed for the worship of a united community, and an alleviation of the trials of a person now dead, of whom the priest can only know the bare name." To such a complete perversion of its original purpose can the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper be brought ! In our Prayer Book " the recitation of the Psalter is the germ of the whole ' office ' of Mattins," next, importance is attached to " the continuous reading of the Bible all through." Professor Burkitt's comment on this is, " if both reader and congregation accustomed themselves to look up beforehand what is said in a good commentary about the passages selected we should all find the lessons more interesting." There are interesting chapters on Hymns and Hymn Singing, and on the form of our English Parish Churches. These conclude a volume filled with useful information with which every English Churchman should be familiar.

There is a wide circle of readers interested in Missionary literature and to them I can heartily recommend two recent books. I do not mean to imply that these books will not be interesting to others as well as those interested in missionary work, for they are full of the spirit of enterprise and adventure and the " moving action " which attracts the general reader. They both deal with Africa and recount the adventurous undertakings of pioneers who

brought the message of the Gospel to regions where it was unknown before. *The Romance of the Black River*, by F. Deaville Walker (C.M.S., 5*s*. net), is "The Story of the C.M.S. Nigeria Mission." The story is in itself a fascinating one, but in the skilful hands of Mr. Walker it is told with an unusually attractive vividness. The opening up of Africa to the impacts of Western commerce, civilization and education is changing the Dark Continent, and as the Rev. W. Wilson Cash says in his Foreword: "In Nigeria these changes have inaugurated for good or ill a new era which is rapidly shaping the destiny of this great tract of Africa." The C.M.S. is having a large share in this work of transformation. Beginning with the time when the country was unexplored and the people lived in the midst of fears and miseries, inter-tribal wars that threatened extermination and the horrors of slavery, it traces the slow but steady and persevering work of devoted and heroic missionaries who prepared the way for the development of the Church to the stage which it has reached to-day, when it is the most important element in the life of the people. It would be impossible to follow the various steps in the evangelization of the numerous tribes. The interest of the reader is carried on from the visit of Henry Townsend to Abeokuta in 1843, through the periods represented by devoted workers—among the best known of them was Bishop Crowther who "for half a century was the outstanding figure of the Nigeria Mission, and to a remarkable degree the story was the story of his life." Bishop Tugwell, Bishop Oluwole, Bishop Phillips are names that call up memories of faithful service, while Bishop Melville Jones and Bishop Lasbrey have seen the enormous growth which the work of their predecessors made possible. The problem of to-day is the instruction of the multitudes within the folds of the Church and the deepening of their spiritual and moral life.

The other Missionary volume is *Wanderings in Widest Africa*, by Dugald Campbell, F.R.G.S. (Religious Tract Society, 7*s*. 6*d*. net). Mr. Campbell is an agent of the National Bible Society of Scotland. His work lies in the unreached parts of West Africa where he has been the first to introduce the Scriptures among wild and untouched tribes. He has the spirit of the wanderer and never seems happier than when he is facing the perils of the desert. He tells of his adventurous journeys through little-known regions, and the wonderful reception he met with in the distribution of the Scriptures to remote tribes. He has many interesting things to tell of the peoples whom he has visited, and gives many striking instances of conversion and of faithful perseverance in the midst of overwhelming difficulties. The reader follows the story with enthusiasm and shares the pleasures and pains of this intrepid pioneer. The book is copiously illustrated, and the pictures give a vivid impression of the varied peoples and scenes with which the author came in contact during his desert journeys.

George Fox, the Founder of the Quakers, was an outstanding figure in the religious life of England in the seventeenth century. "Too little is known by the general public, however, about this early champion of ideals which the world now accepts without question but which, in his days, were dangerous to hold and still more so to propagate." Dr. Rufus Jones, Professor of Philosophy in Haverford College, has written a sympathetic account of this remarkable man—*George Fox, Seeker and Friend* (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 5*s*. net). Dr. Jones is well known as a writer on many aspects of mysticism and is well qualified to portray the peculiar qualities of this "Apostle of the divine in man." Although not a mystic of the ordinary type, the early training and surroundings of Fox developed the mystical tendency which has since distinguished the members of the Society of Friends. Its importance and value are seen in the type of character produced and by the unflinching adherence to the inner light which has given the Quakers a unique position in the Christian world. The imprisonment and sufferings of Fox, his travels in America, his interviews with Cromwell and the other outstanding events in his life are depicted, and the source of his influence is clearly indicated. "Truth and sincerity were the two guardian angels who attended Fox's steps. He was a fallible man, like the rest of us, and he was not always wise, but this can be said : he minded the light in his soul and he *did* what he dared to dream of." This life of Fox should be read by all who wish to understand the origin and spirit of the Quaker movement.

The thoughts of Christians in the Dark Ages were largely occupied with the other world. Dante's great visions are the outstanding example of a class of literature which flourished during many centuries. Ireland affords a number of them. "The two best known and most widely circulated of all the medieval visions prior to Dante came from Ireland." Archdeacon Seymour, Litt.D., M.R.I.A., of Cashel, has studied all that remains of these early documents and has given a scholarly account of them in *Irish Visions of the Other World*, A Contribution to the Study of Medieval Visions (S.P.C.K., 6*s*. net). He makes a careful examination of the fragments ranging from the Vision of Furza in the seventh century to that of Adamnan, and after an account of their contents, he is able to trace the development of their eschatological doctrine. About the twelfth century a reformation in Ireland produced a distinction between Hell and Purgatory which had hitherto been unknown. To those interested in vision literature this careful study will be a reliable guide to an important section of the subject.

Dr. Henry Barclay Swete's *Church Services and Service Books Before the Reformation* has been issued in a revised edition by the Right Reverend A. J. Maclean, D.D., Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness (*S.P.C.K.*, 5*s*. net). Dr. Swete's book is well known as a standard work on the early Liturgies of the Church. As one of

the old High Churchmen he had great regard for liturgical forms and yet was a great lover of our English services and appreciated their special characteristics. Dr. Maclean has added new matter relating to discoveries made since Dr. Swete's work was first issued. He speaks of the permissive use that has been given to the revised form of the Prayer Book rejected by Parliament in 1928, which, of course, has no legal standing. Dr. Swete's wide knowledge of the Service Books makes his testimony to our English forms of Service exceptionally valuable, especially his frequently quoted testimony to the Prayer Book of 1559. "The Communion Service of 1549 was as a whole a revised Sarum ; it belonged to the Roman family of liturgies. This can scarcely be said of the present English liturgy ; while it makes large use of Sarum and other ancient materials, in its structure it follows an order peculiar to itself. In other words, it heads a new liturgical family, and one which already has taken root, in slightly divergent forms, wherever the English tongue is spoken. There is no reason why English Churchmen should regret the fact, or pine for a restoration of the Roman Mass. It was fitting that the Church of England should possess not merely an uniform use, but one which, while in accordance with ancient precedent in things essential, should proclaim her independence of foreign dictation in the order of her worship. It would have been a grave misfortune if the English race had been tied for all time to customs and forms which rest ultimately upon the local traditions of an Italian Church. While we are far from claiming either perfection or finality for the present English liturgy, we regard it with the loyal affection due to a national rite which has commended itself to the conscience of devout Englishmen for more than three centuries, and which is destined, as we believe, to surpass even the Roman Mass in the extent of its influence upon mankind."

The Reverend T. C. Hammond, M.A., General Superintendent Irish Church Missions, has published in book form a series of Articles which appeared originally in the *Church of Ireland Gazette*. The title is *Concerning Penal Laws* (Thynne & Co., Ltd. London, 1s. net). In eighteen chapters he traces the origin and development of Penal Laws ; he shows the attitude of the Church of Rome during the medieval period, and traces the whole position on both sides since the days of the Reformation. The important place in the subsequent history of the Papal Bull of 1570 deposing Queen Elizabeth, is clearly shown. Special reference is naturally made to Ireland, and the special conditions which existed there until the removal of the Roman Catholic disabilities in 1829. Mr. Hammond's intimate acquaintance with the whole subject renders this study specially useful, and it will serve as a valuable handbook to an important aspect of historical study.

G. F. I.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

PSYCHOLOGY AND RELIGION.

PSYCHOLOGY AND GOD. By the Rev. L. W. Grensted. *Longmans.* 10s 6*d*.

The Bampton Lectures for 1930 discuss the implications of recent psychology for religious belief and practice, and they do so in a thoroughly helpful manner. In our opinion this is the best book on Religion and Psychology that has yet been published in English and we are glad to find that our opinion is shared by those who have written on the subject. The old Psychology was looked upon as a branch of philosophy and dealt with the mind in action and the interrelations between Thought, Emotion and Will. It might be Christian as in the case of Hamilton, or definitely materialistic as in the case of Bain. But it did not aspire to be considered a science that dealt with ultimate reality or a method of explaining the existence and character of God. It was simply descriptive, and when it endeavoured to pass beyond what was known as its legitimate sphere it was taken up by philosophy which kept it in its place. To-day the New Psychology believes itself in the hands of many of its teachers to be the key that unlocks the mysteries of thought and belief, and reduces everything to mechanical processes that take place in the Unconscious and manifest themselves in the conscious mind. God Himself is a projection of the mind, and instead of His being the Creator He is the created Whom man worships after having made Him.

The real battle-ground is found on the differences between subjectivism and objectivity—the presuppositions that are maintained by the New Psychology " must if pressed to their logical conclusion, tend either to the weakening of the grounds of faith or to a lowering of the level of Christian conduct." We are forced to meet our enemy at the gate and discover what is true in his contentions and see how far they are compatible with Faith and reject what is false. Mr. Grensted enables us to tread our way through the maze of thought and he does so by insisting on the fact of freedom, the reality of otherness and the differences in the value of our judgments. The fault of the behaviourist schools—so common in America and now becoming domiciled here—is their neglect of fundamental facts and their building a philosophy of life and thought on only a partial foundation, which is seen to be unable to sustain the superstructure. The anti-Christian Psychologists attack the mental processes on which our fundamental arguments for faith depend, and they can only do so successfully by ignoring the reality of the processes and the persons in whom they take place, by non-recognition of historical facts that cannot be reduced to mental processes, and by going back to what has been inherited by the race as the source of what thought and religion teach. All this is expounded with clearness by Mr. Grensted, who goes on to deal with the questions raised by Faith and Worship. Prayer is not merely a cry of grief that finds relief in

utterance—it is communion between the human person and the Divine. In an extremely interesting chapter he deals with mental and spiritual healing and his remarks on Lourdes are characterized by a finely balanced appreciation of all the factors. In discussing sin he is forcible and illuminating, and incidentally he informs us that the original view of the Anglican Reformers is that the function of the priest is to declare God's forgiveness. The exhortation inserted into the Communion Service is an intentional reply to the claim of the Council of Trent that the priest not only confers a benefit but acts as a judge. The conception of the Church is reviewed and the objectivity of God is insisted upon as in accord with sound psychology, reason and experience. Christian Theism is vindicated in pages which assert that "in history the crucial case stands obvious for our choosing. Jesus of Nazareth holds a place unquestionably supreme, and we make no unnatural choice when we see in Him the test-experiment by which we may hope best to read the full significance of our human life, and its relation to that creative reality, from which, as we must needs suppose, we have sprung." The Lecturer is definitely Christian in his outlook, he knows where he stands, and no unprejudiced student can read his book without being impressed by the breadth of his reading and the strong personal conviction that is behind his arguments.

BISHOP GORE'S GIFFORD LECTURES.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE GOOD LIFE. By Charles Gore, D.D. *John Murray.* 10s. 6*d.*

Dr. Gore gives us in this book a real contribution to Christian ethics. He does not write an apology for Christianity, but he surveys the history of conceptions of God and shows that all that is good in the great world religions is embraced in the Christian thought of God, and that the Revelation of God in His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, once and for all makes clear the character of God to those who seek to know Him. If man is to live the good life its character will be determined by the highest thought of goodness he possesses. The appeal to human history as to what constitutes goodness and how it is attainable must be made. Wherever man believes himself to be in communion with a Power not himself to Whom he owes allegiance, we have to discover what the ultimate basis of the attitude connotes and see whether or not it meets the needs of human nature. We can never afford to forget that man was religious before he became a philosopher, and the philosopher deals with the data given him in religious experience, and strives to co-ordinate it and bring it under categories that are intelligible and interrelated.

The necessarily brief surveys of Parseeism, Buddhism, Confucianism and Mahommedanism are extraordinarily comprehensive, for Dr. Gore has a masterly gift of summarizing his conclusions and giving them in a balanced form. Many will be surprised to find him giving such high praise to Zarathustra, but readers of Dr. Moulton on the

subject will find him just as warm as the Bishop in commendation. " If Christianity be taken as the fulfilment of Judaism, Judaism is a strictly national religion, which at last expanded to be universal, but Zoroastrianism is at starting a universal religion for man as man which ultimately narrowed into an intensely national form in the Persian religion and Parseeism. But both are alike in making the essence of the good life for man to be correspondence with the purpose and character of God, and in finding the knowledge of his character and purpose to depend not on the labours of the human intellect but on his own self-revelation." It is remarkable that the Parsees are to-day a small Indian people whereas Christianity is a world-wide religion.

We see Bishop Gore at his best and, may we say so, at his worst, in his strange exclusiveness in the noble chapter on Jesus the Christ. In a note he modifies by insistence on the careful distinction between the idea of the Covenant of Salvation and the acceptance of the individual in the judgment of God, the exclusiveness, and, we venture to say, non-Scriptural ideal when he writes : " We should notice that so deeply was it impressed upon the mind of the primitive Church that Jesus (if the expression may be pardoned) staked His all on the Church, that there does not appear the least suggestion in the New Testament that His great salvation or His covenant of grace is to be found outside it. There is, in other words, no idea to be found there of a membership of Christ which is not also membership of the Church which is the New Israel." This is perfectly true, but is there to be found anywhere in the New Testament the ideal of a sacerdotal Church with a caste Priesthood who alone have the power of admitting to the Church and consecrating a valid Eucharist? Is not the New Testament ideal that union with Christ constitutes membership of the Church and that this makes the Christian partaker of the Covenant blessings and a member of the New Israel ? When Dr. Gore deals with our Lord and His ethical teaching as well as His Gospel of salvation we find ourselves in agreement with him. " Morally speaking, the value of right action and the guilt of wrong action lie simply in the will in ' the heart of man.' In the regard of Jesus humanity is undoubtedly a fallen being needing in every individual specimen repentance and a new birth. But the sin which binds him and dooms him lies not in the body or anything which properly belongs to his nature as God made him (there is not a trace of dualism in the teaching of Jesus), but it lies simply in the perverted will—in ' the heart of man.' Let that turn to God—to the Father—and all will be well ; for the redemption which Jesus brought was redemption of the whole man." We cannot do more than point out the emphasis laid by Bishop Gore on the need of a rational faith. In an age when we are advised to consider religion as something that has not to do with the intellect, but with that which is outside intellectual apprehension, it is good to find him writing as he has written. We must not be considered whole-hearted followers of the Bishop when we say that this book deserves the serious consideration of all those who are struck by the contrast

between the morals of popular teaching and the ethic of the Gospel. Dr. Gore gives us firm ground on which we can stand and weapons with which we can defeat the modern godless moralists.

DEAN INGE ON CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS AND MODERN PROBLEMS. By W. R. Inge, D.D. *Hodder and Stoughton.* 15*s.*

Dean Inge tells us that this will probably be the last considerable book that he will have time to write and his many readers will regret the fulfilment of his thought, for however much they may disagree with the lightning flashes of epigram and satire from St. Paul's, they know that they are in touch with a vigorous mind that is never afraid to say honestly what it thinks. Contemporary ethics are, to say the least, in a tangle, and the straight line which our fathers believed they should follow in obedience to Christian teaching has lost its authority for teachers, who have other ideals than doing the will of God and following what is true though it may involve self-sacrifice and hardship. They preach the duty of self-expression and find reasons for wiping off the list of wrong doings, much that Christianity in its most characteristic teaching believes to be prohibited. This has invaded the Church and the protests against a religion of taboos have founded themselves on the current thinking that repression is wrong, expression is right. Of course other reasons are given for the placing of the Ten Words on the list of antiquated pronouncements, as all true ethical teaching must be positive. But then human nature is anything but a practical exhibition ground of the motto, " We needs must love the highest when we see it," for " we see and approve what is good, we follow what is worse."

The Dean rightly tells us that the battle-ground to-day is the relation between the Gospel of Christ and conduct. " If the authority of Christ were rejected in this field, what would be left of Christianity would not be worth quarrelling over. For the Christian revelation is of a standard of values resting on an unveiling of the character of God and of our relation to Him ; on this alone depends the whole scheme of Christian Ethics, which in their turn postulate the truth of the revelation in Christ." The Dean appeals to the New Testament as the standard by which conduct must be judged, and he strives in all his discussion of morals to bring everything to the test of the Gospel. " The Ethics of the Gospel set up a most exacting ideal of conduct. They appeal to those who are children in malice, but full-grown men in understanding. '*Ego sum cibus grandium*' ; as St. Augustine heard the Lord saying to him ; ' be a man and thou shalt feed upon me.' " There is no attempt made by the Dean to soften the sternness of the teaching of the New Testament, and although he protests against the extremes of asceticism, he sees that life needs discipline.

With that deadly logic and breadth of view which we associate

with the Dean, he attacks the Theocratic Imperialism of the Roman Church and shows how it has done much to lower the real standards of Christian Ethics by its exclusiveness and its claims that are unhistorical. He briefly describes the work of the Inquisition, and the story is simply terrible. " These examples are selected from a vast number which might be cited. Even now there is very little sign of any change of heart." He instances the Ferrer case in Spain, which he considers the last time any coup of this class will be made. " Public opinion was quick to recognize that the priests had claimed another victim and in the twentieth century." He is frank in his exposition of the intolerance which early Protestantism had taken over from the spirit of the age. Few students of history and the Scriptures will be found to disagree with his contention. " There is not the smallest reason to think that Christ ever contemplated the evolution of His little flock into a theocratic empire. The universal Church and the universal Empire are parallel ideas, which belong to a state of society that has long passed away."

The greater part of the book is occupied in the discussion of Problems of Social and Personal Ethics, and here we find ourselves in disagreement with the Dean on a number of points. He defends suicide under certain circumstances, but " at the same time I hope, inconsistently perhaps, that if I were attacked by a painful illness I should have patience to wait for the end, and I do not think I should wish any one dear and near to me to act otherwise." A memory of Kant's Categorical Imperative might have saved the Dean writing some things which give his readers a painful shock. And much as we sympathize with a good deal of his reasoning on hard cases we should be indeed sorry for the State and the Church to have two kinds of marriage. Nothing would be more injurious to Society generally than a conflict on vital points in connexion with marriage. It may come, but it is the duty of both Church and State to see clearly what the Law of Christ is and what the needs of the community demand. We believe that both are reconcilable, if the extreme demands on both sides be left out of account. The whole book deserves close attention. It may not be as systematic as other Ethical treatises, but it loses nothing on this account, for the ground to be covered is so wide that systematic treatment is frequently more dissatisfying than the honest convictions of a good and wise man frankly expressed. And we have these in the Dean's pages.

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE.

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE. By Canon T. Guy Rogers. *Sampson Low. 7s. 6d.*

Canon Guy Rogers tells us that he has written this book at white heat, but he does not scribble unadvisedly with his pen. Some books are all the better for coming from a full heart apart from the checks and hesitations inseparable from work in a Library. But the white-hot books, as a rule, do not live. They have their

day and soon cease to be, only to be rescued from oblivion by the historian who knows when an author reflects a dominating thought of his day and is not merely a tight-rope performer attracting attention by his dexterous use of words and phrases. Whatever some may think of the Rector of Birmingham no one can deny that he is deadly earnest and that he speaks for a very great number of Churchmen. And herein lies the real value of the book, whose occasion is the Lambeth Conference and whose spirit is that of a man who expected greater things and failed to obtain them. We are not now concerned with the chapters that are the republication, or the first appearance, of Essays written some time back. We wish to face the fresh messages of the volume.

He has a vision of unity, which is not far removed from that of Dr. Carnegie Simpson. " If the Church of England is in any sense to be the Bridge Church of the Future, some one at least must pass over it. At present it resembles too much a road under repair blocked at both ends. Nor is it very sensible to say that the Bridge cannot be used unless there is equal traffic from either side ; in other words, that unless Catholics and Protestants in equal numbers are baptized into the Anglican tradition, the *status quo* must be preserved. . . . So long as the ' Bridge ' idea dominates the mind, we shall instinctively think in future in terms of Anglicanism, and, although we may not actually insist on other Churches passing over it, we shall certainly be tempted to set up toll gates and exact tribute from passengers on the King's Highway." There is much wisdom in these sentences. He would have the Establishment broadened and hopes that the Report of the Archbishop's Commission on Church and State will be held back until some progress has been made with Home Reunion. We wish we could think that the present temper of those responsible for English Church policy will so change as to secure this end, but we fear that the joint result of the silences of Lambeth concerning what the Nonconformists expected and the utterances on the Greek and Old Catholic Churches are at present obstacles in the way.

A good many pages are devoted to the discussion of Sex Problems and we neither agree with the insistence on them nor with some of the conclusions reached. We have to face the questions raised, but we believe that the large slice of the book given to the subject might with advantage have been decreased. As is to be expected, when we pass into the definite discussion of Home Reunion we find ourselves in hearty accord with the author, who plainly tells us that large numbers of loyal Churchmen cannot accept the statement as it stands that " after communion the consecrated elements remaining are regarded sacramentally as the Body and Blood of Christ." Here and elsewhere the Canon speaks with an emphasis that rejoices his many old friends and we can overlook the comparatively few statements with which we disagree in his definite assertion of principles for which the Church of England stands as Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed and Protestant—for he recognizes that the National Church has these four characteristics.

BISHOP KNOX'S LIFE OF LEIGHTON.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF ARCHBISHOP LEIGHTON. By E. A. KNOX, D.D. (Bishop). Forewords by Mr. John Buchan, M.P., and the Rev. Professor Main, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Glasgow. *Messrs. James Clarke & Co.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

Bishop Knox's literary activity since his retirement reminds of Dr. Plummer's. His new work on Archbishop Leighton not only gives a full account of his life and a careful study of his writings, but sets forth clearly the successive stages and movements in Scottish Church history from the Reformation down to Leighton's death, showing the origin and the greatness of the difficulties confronting him in his episcopate. The early course of the Reformation was so different in England and in Scotland, that the aim, shared by both sides in turn, to establish one form of Church government in both, was bound to fail unless very carefully modified and limited in one case or the other. England was largely Erastian; Scotland, following Calvin, Knox and Melvil, held strongly to the independence of the Church. In practice, the General Assembly was the most representative gathering of the nation. James I, by his persistent policy, did indeed something to assimilate Scotland to England, especially by the re-establishment of Episcopacy (1610) and the Articles of Perth (1618). But these were only partially observed and little enforced; James knew where to stop! This earlier history is not generally familiar to Englishmen, but it explains the later.

Under the Long Parliament it was the turn of Scotland to force its form of Church polity upon England. The support of the Scots in the war against the King was only secured by the acceptance by the English of the "Solemn League and Covenant." This was ordered to be taken everywhere; we still find it in some parish registers; many clergy were sequestered for refusing. In the Westminster Assembly the Scots Commissioners had, like the Independents, influence out of all proportion to their numbers. Of this Assembly the Bishop says, "This great ecclesiastical council is as epoch-making in the history of the English-speaking world as Nicaea in the Eastern and Trent in the Western Church."

Robert Leighton is by consent of contemporaries and of later times in the first rank of British saints. As scholar, minister, principal of a university, and bishop, he strove to serve his generation while whole-heartedly walking in communion with God. "If saints are infallible, his story is unintelligible. If we admit their fallibility, the record of their mistakes as well as of their virtues is profitable to us who have still to serve God by trying to translate ideals into working principles."

Robert Leighton was born in 1611, second son of Alexander Leighton, who was cruelly punished in 1630 for writing *Zion's Plea against Prelacy*. After graduating at Edinburgh in 1631, he seems

to have lived abroad for nearly ten years, possibly at the Scots College at Paris. In 1641 he became minister of Newbattle, near Dalkeith, Midlothian. In 1652 he was nominated by Cromwell Principal of Edinburgh University. In 1662 he became Bishop of Dunblane, and for a few years held the Archbishopric of Glasgow. He retired in 1674 and lived with his sister at Broadhurst Manor, Horsted Keynes, Sussex; he died in 1684.

His position during the various political changes from 1650 may be described as that of a Pietistic Erastian. Erastianism means the subordination of the Church to the State; this is Pietistic when its supporters advocate it with a sincere desire for the promotion of true religion. Leighton's Erastianism was a readiness to submit to the civil government as having the authority of God at least by permission; in order that the soul might concentrate its attention on spiritual life. In his action at the Restoration he may fairly be charged with two great errors: (1) "He was not sufficiently sensitive of the character of the political agents with whom he was associated, and of his inability to restrain their misconduct; (2) He had not the political discernment to be aware of the deep seated evils of arbitrary power." Further, the two sides of his character struggled with one another:—his love of meditation and retirement with his desire to serve his own generation, and a "love of Utopian experiments." This last led him, greatly against his personal inclination, to accept a bishopric; the other led him to choose the smallest and poorest one. But by so choosing he lost opportunity of influencing the Government, or of setting an example in an important diocese. Dunblane might be peaceful, but it was only a backwater. His Glasgow episcopate came far too late. His great misfortune was the reckless misgovernment of Scotland after the Restoration, largely at first by a group of drunkards.

It is not easy for an Englishman to appreciate the bitter opposition of the Covenanters. They were not required, as the Puritans were in England, to declare their unfeigned assent and consent to everything in a new service-book; nor to use or allow the use of "the ceremonies"—the surplice, the sign of the Cross in baptism, kneeling at Communion; nor to submit to reordination. But they were, as in England, called upon to repudiate the Covenant, which had been much more a religious matter in Scotland. But their great revolt was against the interference in Church matters by King, Privy Council or Parliament, particularly against the Royal claim to have absolute control of the Church. Bishop Knox draws the lesson that the history and ideals of the Churches of England and of Scotland are so different that the Scottish example of self-government is no precedent for England, especially as the "Episcopal idea" is opposed to the popular government of the Church.

Leighton left his library to the Cathedral Church of Dunblane, where it is still preserved. From his writings we can determine his favourite authors: they are Seneca, St. Augustine, St. Bernard,

Thomas à Kempis. But he is also strongly influenced by St. Francis de Sales, who represents 'devout Humanism'—belief in the essential goodness of man combined with an earnest desire for personal holiness and likeness to God in Jesus Christ; also by the Port-Royalists, St. Cyran and Arnauld. He has also great affinities with the Cambridge Platonists, especially John Smith and Henry More. Puritan writers are not at all strongly represented in his library, which bears a marked resemblance to that of his friends the Scougals of Aberdeen—Patrick the Bishop and his son John, author of *The Life of God in the Soul of Man.*

The book closes with a full account of Leighton's teaching, especially devotional and practical. It should be read by all who have found help in Leighton's writings, e.g., his *Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Peter*; and by all interested in the Church history both of England and Scotland. It is based upon extensive reading and is well documented.

THE EUCHARISTIC CANON. By John Blomfield. *S.P.C.K.* 7*s.* 6*d.*
THE STRUCTURE OF THE LITURGY. By H. T. Knight, M.A. *S.P.C.K.* 1*s.* 6*d.*
THE FULLNESS OF SACRIFICE. By F. C. N. Hicks, D.D. *Macmillan.* 15*s.*

The " science of liturgiology " is a phrase which has come into a wide currency of late years, partly, perhaps, because so many investigators are without much science in the broader sense. The more capable writers on art and literature have not set up a " science of art," or a " science of literature," because, no doubt, they understand better the borderland between science and art. If science were concerned solely with the classification and comparison of phenomena, no doubt we might justly speak of a science of liturgiology. But science is more properly occupied with the investigation and apprehension of the laws controlling phenomena and there are no laws operating behind the liturgies. The development of the liturgies took place in response to local needs, and in their variation they express local feeling and temperament. Liturgiology, therefore, is an art like literature or painting or music, which are the expression of individual and national genius, not the manifestation in phenomena of the operation of law.

The late Rev. John Blomfield wisely did not use the term. He has written a book for the expert, but the compact chapters and ample tables do not place *The Eucharistic Canon* beyond the reach of the man who demands a small book. The text amounts only to 141 pages, and these are followed by 40 more pages devoted to suggestions for the reform of the Communion Service, beautifully printed, as though taken directly from an Oxford Prayer Book. With true historical insight and knowledge Mr. Blomfield did not place the appearance of formal liturgies too early. We have, indeed, no evidence of them before the third century, although Justin Martyr showed what was coming. The inclination, current in Anglican Catholic circles towards Eastern rather than Roman

usages, is pronounced both in this book, and in that of Canon Knight, and Mr. Blomfield is abreast of modern opinion when he states that " the actual words and deeds of our Blessed Lord when He consecrated the first Eucharist have not been preserved to us." Passing notice is taken of the influence of Augustine, whose " teaching held in check for some centuries in the West the newer developments which from the fourth century onwards tended to emphasize the conversion of the elements and a ' localized ' view of the eucharistic presence." This should have been expanded, and Batiffol's work up to 1905 should have been quoted. His interpretation of Chrysostom in a similar manner is reminiscent of Loofs,[1] and even the Gregorian Canon can be read in a " symbolical sense."

Mr. Blomfield's book has been written with the desire for reunion, and he rightly turns to the Holy Spirit as the agent of harmony. " Cannot we all accept the primitive oblation (*The Apostolic Tradition*) of ' this bread and this cup ' as a memorial of our Lord's death and sacrifice, and cease to argue as to its nature and mystical meaning "? . . . " If those who call themselves ' Evangelicals ' can rise to this ideal, and if those who claim to be Catholics will emphasize the truth that the Holy Spirit is the Consecrator . . . by their loyal acceptance of the Epiclesis . . . our ranks will be closed up, our disputes will be silenced. . . ." But this is not the real difficulty. Anglican Catholics are not opposed to the adoption of an Epiclesis of the Holy Spirit, but they are influenced by the desire to move the defence of the " real presence " on to new ground. On the other hand, there is some misunderstanding of the true motif of the Epiclesis in the minds of Evangelicals. It is not always realized that an appeal to the Spirit to undertake whatever consecration means, lifts the mystery on to an altogether higher spiritual level than that maintained by Latin medieval theories of consecration, provided that the caution already suggested is observed. Of course the Epiclesis is not primitive, as Mr. Blomfield shows. There is no clear evidence of its use before the *Apostolic Tradition* (earliest form *c.* 225) although an invocation of the Word is to be found so early as Irenaeus. But this probably reflects the confusion between the functions of Word and Spirit, and the Binitarian notions of early theology. Again, the Epiclesis is unknown in early Western Fathers save, possibly, in one passage of Augustine (*De Trin.* III, 4) and in Fulgentius. It appears in the Gallican and Mozarabic rites, but these were influenced by the East. The Roman Canon receives heavy criticism from Mr. Blomfield: it is " altogether out of proportion, ill-balanced and top-heavy with tradition." We may add that the canon of the Prayer Book of 1559 is derived from this usage, and the clearest breach with medieval antecedents would be effected if we could introduce an Epiclesis with proper safeguards. This was apparently Cranmer's wish, but he was over-

[1] Yet if Mr. Blomfield does not support his statements from Continental authorities, nothing but praise can be offered for the work of one, who until late in life was a layman, and then took up pioneer work in Australia.

borne. Mr. Blomfield accurately appreciates the present situation when he asks whether " the English Church can hope for reunion with the East, or indeed, with any other part of the Church," while the present English rite is so closely dependent on the Roman ?

Like the late Mr. Blomfield, Canon Knight is a busy parish clergyman, and if his little book of sixty-two pages is not accompanied by the scholarship of the former writer, it offers a creditable survey of the history of our Liturgy leading up to the Revised Prayer Book of 1927. Yet this little work, *The Structure of the 1928 Liturgy*, shows the defects as well as the merits of the " day of the small book." The surrender to the demand for the small book, which, by the way, the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement is fostering, reacts on scholarship, and a class of writers is developing, who are not, like some of their leaders and forerunners, able to pull the cream off the deeps of their knowledge; they have little cream at all to offer, and show that they have themselves only looked over the edge of the well of knowledge.

Canon Knight thinks that there was a daily breaking of the bread by the Apostles. Later Eastern custom, especially in the monasteries, where the Eucharist was celebrated only once, or at the most twice weekly, suggests the contrary. He finds a trace of the use of " lights " in St. Paul's time. By manipulating Jewish and Roman rules as to the first hour of the day, he is able to contend " the Lord's own service has thus always been held at the beginning of the day." St. Paul, he says, separated the Eucharist from the Agape at Corinth, and yet has to admit that the title " Lord's Supper " in St. Paul's writings means the combination of both. He hints that Romans xiii. 11, 12; Eph. iv. 14 and other passages, may have been liturgical hymns. " The significance of Consecration, as effecting some kind of real change, was clearly recognized from the beginning." We must disagree with most if not all of these statements. Indeed a study of the Evangelical trend of eucharistic teaching in early centuries, coming down from primitive New Testament sources, would have made some of them impossible.

Canon Knight is not aware of the Binitarian confusion between the Logos and the Holy Spirit during the first three or four centuries, and he accounts for the vacillation between the two in the Invocations of the mid-fourth century, on the ground that dogmatic controversy had not yet arisen ! Nor has he noticed that the withdrawal of the cup from the laity began in the twelfth century, long before it was regularized at Constance in 1415 (not, as he says, at Florence in 1439). He refuses to see that if we are to have reunion with our Free Church brethren, we shall have to take notice of the Puritan demands of 1660. It is not everyone, even in his own circle, who will agree that " our churches . . . have been erected for one dominant purpose—viz., to house the Action of the liturgy."

Yet, it is a lucid and well-phrased little book. He admits that the phrase " primitive liturgy " is misleading, that the original forms were many and various, and accompanied by extempore prayer. Possibly a too keen desire to popularize the Book of 1928 deflected

him from this sound beginning for a well-balanced interpretation of the history, which, in the main, he recounts accurately.

The Bishop of Gibraltar's book is entirely different in character and method. It is an extensive discussion of the idea of sacrifice in practice and worship from Old Testament times to the present day. One quarter of the book is devoted to the Old Testament, but the somewhat cumbersome transit through the records makes that section seem longer than it is. Emphasizing the fact that in the Hebrew conception of sacrifice, the stress is not laid on the death of the victim, but upon the life released for the benefit of the offerer, and the fact that the priest did not actually perform the act of sacrifice, he builds up the superstructure of his thesis with conclusions which are certainly fresh, even if not entirely new. The sin-offering was concerned with atonement, the burnt-offering with the work of self-dedication, and the peace-offering with the enjoyment of God's gift. Sacrifice was always accompanied by feeding. Thus, when he says that the Epistle to the Hebrews shows that the Christian sacrifice involved Communion, he is able to trace a direct connection between the Old Testament sacrifices and the Holy Communion, and to prove his contention that Christ came not to destroy but to fulfil the temple sacrifices. "The rule is that the work of the priest does not begin until after the death. . . . The sacrifice indeed begins before the work of the Priest. But the Cross is not itself the Sacrifice. It stands in its place—and that an essential place—in the whole course of the sacrificial action, but is not either its beginning or its end."

There is much in all this to which we can give assent. The Bishop has certainly released the notion of sacrifice from its medieval associations. He points out that the range of the sacrificial idea was wide in early Christian centuries, but that it was hardened by later definitions, so that to us, if we believe that the words pronounced over the elements "produce an 'objective effect,' we are nearer magic than we sometimes realize." This hardened conception of sacrifice was followed by a materialist notion of the Presence. "It is inevitable . . . that where belief in the Presence is fully and unquestioningly accepted there should be danger of materialism"; the Reformers were justified in the attitude which they adopted; and "men shrink—and rightly shrink—from believing in a Presence bound up with the Elements."

But having abandoned so much, and having, by separating it from death, given so entirely different a meaning to the term sacrifice, it is difficult to see why the Bishop has not discarded the notion of sacrifice altogether in his theory of the Eucharist. The Epistle to the Hebrews teaches that sacrifice ended with the completion of the offering on Calvary. Dr. Hicks admits that Christ's priesthood is now Melchizedechean and not Aaronic, a priesthood of intercession and not of sacrifice, indeed in one place he confuses prayer with sacrifice. Why, then, retain the term sacrifice at all for that which is a fellowship meal, a memorial of a sacrifice completed once for all, and a channel of the communication of the divine

life to the worthy recipient, in fulfilment of the words of Him who said, in this connection, "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, they are life"? The normal feeding of the soul is on the Word, which is the bread of life. The feeding in the fellowship meal of Holy Communion is only a specialized form, recalling the great drama of sacrifice, which, in turn, was the medium by which the Word was made available for our nourishment, and by which the teaching was sealed. Christ came not to fulfil the temple sacrifices, as Dr. Hicks contends, but to destroy the necessity for them, and the sacrifices with the necessity. What He came to fulfil was the law.

Some minor statements need adjustment. If the *Didache* was not a liturgy, it is hardly true to say that it was a book of private devotions. It clearly indicates development towards a liturgy. Nor is it accurate to confine early ideas of the Eucharist to offering and thanksgiving. There was the Ignatian medicine of immortality derived from St. John, and always the notion of the fellowship meal, accompanied by the symbolism of feeding on the Word. Radbert's doctrine appeared in the ninth century, not the tenth, but this error, which is stated again, is corrected elsewhere by a quotation of accurate dates for Paschius Radbert. The epoch-making controversy raised by Berengar in the eleventh century is not noticed, and we have the old suggestion that Transubstantiation was first formulated by Thomas Aquinas, whereas it sprang directly and immediately from the Berengarian dispute. Zwingli did not teach bare symbolism, he was not a mere memorialist, and Harnack's theory of Greek symbolism has been displaced for a decade or two.

Yet this book is a magnificent piece of eirenical writing. In no modern work on the Eucharist, issuing from Catholic circles, does the Evangelical attitude receive such sympathetic treatment. Moreover, it is abreast of modern investigation. It takes note of the uncertainty as to the actual words used by Christ at the institution. It emphasizes the importance of the teaching of St. John's Gospel, and of the necessity for relating the function of the Holy Spirit to the sacrament. It is a book which places every reader under a debt of gratitude to its author.

THE HISTORY OF THE CREEDS. By F. J. Badcock, D.D. *S.P.C.K.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

This is a book for students, and it is full of good and new things. It makes obsolete the historical sections of all previous works on the Creeds. Dr. Badcock presents a new theory of the origin of the Apostles' Creed, which has been developed in the last few years. Its final form, the "Textus Receptus," consists of an expansion of an already enlarged Roman baptismal creed, which took place at or near Lake Constance before the year 615. It was accepted at Rome before A.D. 900.

In his account of the Nicene Creed, Dr. Badcock takes a knowledge of Arianism and of the Christological controversies for granted.

The creed drawn up at Nicæa (325) was not derived solely from the Creed of Cæsarea, but from the creeds of all the leading Eastern churches—Cæsarea, Alexandria, Jerusalem and Antioch. The most revolutionary suggestion here lies in the inclusion of Arianizing Antioch as a source for orthodox creed-making. At Constantinople (381) not the Creed of Jerusalem, but a revised Creed of Constantinople was amalgamated with the earlier Nicene symbol, in order to meet the teaching of Apollinarius, Macedonius and Marcellus. Chalcedon (451) was content to confirm the Constantinopolitan symbol, which thus became our Nicene Creed, after certain clauses like the " filioque " had been added or amended in later times. The Nicene Creed was not officially sung in the Eucharist at Rome until 1014.

The author of the so-called Athanasian Creed was not Vincent of Lérins, but probably Ambrose. It could not have been drawn up much later than Ambrose's time because there is no reference to Nestorianism in it. But is this so ? If Nestorianism defined two persons in Christ as well as two natures and two essences, is there not a direct allusion to Nestorianism in the phrase " by unity of Person," and in the earlier phrase " yet he is not two, but one Christ " ? Moreover, may not the phrase " not by confusion of substance " reflect the influence of Eutychianism, which set up the one-nature doctrine, although, of course, substance did not mean nature ? If these suggestions are allowed, then the " Athanasian " statement, which may well have issued originally from Ambrose, was revised later, and perhaps in South Gaul at Lérins. It was not used at Rome until the eleventh century.

The book closes with a learned explanation of the phrase " the Communion of Saints." This means not communion with the saints, nor the fellowship of the church militant with the church triumphant, but the communion of the saints round the table of the Lord, and so with the reference to baptism in the Nicene Creed, brings the sacraments within the credal statements. No serious student can afford to overlook this book, although for devotional purposes Dr. Harold Smith's book on the creeds must still be read.

THE EVANGELICAL DOCTRINE OF HOLY COMMUNION. Edited by the Rev. A. J. Macdonald, D.D. Pp. vii + 330. *Heffer, Cambridge. 7s. 6d.*

This is a volume of historical and doctrinal essays of unique value and importance. The work has the marks of true scholarship. The reader is directed to first-hand sources of information, both in general at the close of each essay, and in detail in footnotes. The clearly expressed Evangelical view of each contributor is balanced by statements and examination of other views.

The first Essay (39 pp.), upon the New Testament evidence, is by the Ven. J. W. Hunkin, D.D., Archdeacon of Coventry. The writer examines afresh all the material. He shows the progress from the idea of a fellowship meal in the Synoptists and in Acts to the " sacred drama " in St. Paul by which is proclaimed the Lord's

We have here a strictly scientific study of Hebrew Religion, and no less than one hundred odd pages are devoted to its background, where the animistic and the polytheistic stages of religious development are discussed and their remnants in the Old Testament pointed out. The influence of Totemism, Ancestor Worship, Demonology and other primitive ideas is also debated. Much that is here written is disputed by various critics, but for further information we are referred to the standard treatises on the subjects dealt with.

In the second part of the book (pp. 131–224) we have an exposition of Israelite Religion from Moses to the Exile. This might well have been amplified, the treatment being disproportionate to the rest of the book; but the footnotes will help the student to sources which will supplement the slight sketch here given. Dr. Robinson is cautious in his treatment, a fair sample of which caution may be seen in his remarks on the Book of Deuteronomy (pp. 213–15). The final portion of the book deals with Judaism, and is mainly the work of Dr. Oesterley, who is thoroughly at home in his treatment of the subject to which he has devoted so long a study. The chapter on "The Priest-Prophet Ezekiel" is illuminating and makes us wish that he would contribute a long-wanted commentary on that prophet's book for English readers. His remarks on the results of Pharisaic influence and of the development of the Law as shown in the New Testament are singularly apt (pp. 363–66).

We recommend the book as a useful introduction to the study of the problems it deals with as well as those, not few in number, which it raises; and we are confident that the writers' hope that it may help to an understanding of the process of divine revelation which culminated in Jesus Christ will be fulfilled.

A. W. G.

The value of Fellowship has been increasingly recognized in recent years. Its systematic use has been tested by a body of thinkers and workers, and the result of the experience is given in the volume *Fellowship Principles and Practice*, by a Fellowship Group. Edited by Malcolm Spencer and H. S. Hewish (*George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.*, 7*s.* 6*d.* net). The volume has been in course of construction for three or four years, and has been submitted to rigid tests and criticisms by many friends and collaborators. It, therefore, presents what we may regard as the latest and best guide on the theory and practice of Fellowship. It embraces Fellowship of various kinds, but treats more particularly of the Fellowship of Christian Workers in dealing with problems of Church life and social progress. In a valuable series of Appendices, useful hints are given which serve as a guide to those who are anxious to adopt the Fellowship method in any Church or Community. It is recognized that through Fellowship far greater results can be achieved than in any other way, and the value of this book will be recognized by those who desire to adopt the Fellowship method.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

7, WINE OFFICE COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

A New Almanack.—For the first time the Church Book Room have published an Almanack, entitled the National Church Almanack, which they hope will have a wide circulation. The Almanack contains the full Tables of Lessons according to the Lectionary of 1871, and also according to the alternative Revised Lectionary of 1922. The introductory matter contains notes on the Constitution of the Church, Synods, the Church Assembly, Parochial Church Councils, etc. The frontispiece is an excellent photograph of the interior of Norwich Cathedral. Considerable care has been taken in the Calendar itself and dates of important Church events are given. It is published at 4*d.* net (postage 1*d.*).

Sermons.—A little volume of sermons entitled *Thoughts for Sundays*, by the Rev. Francis Wilson, M.A., has just been published through the Church Book Room. The sermons were originally preached in village churches in England, and Mr. Wilson has compiled the present volume with a view to its circulation in Canada and other overseas Dominions in the hope that it may be of help and comfort to some of our countrymen now living there. The book is published at the nominal price of 2*s.* net (postage 4*d*)., is well printed in good clear type, and contains thirty sermons. We welcome the advent of this book, as we feel sure that it will not only be of service in the field for which it is intended, but also to a large number of those at home who wish for a really good devotional book of this kind. It will also be a help to young clergy and others in preparing addresses.

In addition to this book two excellent volumes of sermons have just been published, *The Harvest of the River and Other Sermons*, by the Bishop of Barking (5*s.* net), and *Parables of Jesus ; Their Art and Use*, by Dr. A. T. Cadoux (6*s.* net).

Devotional Commentaries.—Our readers will be glad to learn that the second volume of the Rev. T. W. Gilbert's *Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John* has now been issued (3*s.* 6*d.* net), and in the same series we welcome a volume on *Deuteronomy* by the Ven. A. R. Buckland (3*s.* 6*d.* net, postage 4*d.*).

Gift Books.—Many of our readers may wish to present their clergyman with a New Year's gift, and the following are of outstanding importance : *The Principles of Theology*, by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., 12*s.* 6*d.* ; Bishop Knox's new book, *Robert Leighton, Archbishop of Glasgow*, a study of his life, times and writings, with an introduction by John Buchan, M.A., 12*s.* 6*d.* ; *The Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion*, containing articles by Archdeacon Hunkin, the Rev. T. C. Hammond, the Rev. Dr. Harold Smith, the Rev. Canon W. H. Mackean, D.D., the Rev. H. W. Harrison, D.D., the Rev. Canon V. F. Storr, and the Rev. A. J. Macdonald, D.D. (who is also the Editor), 7*s.* 6*d.* ; *The Sumerians*, by C. Leonard Woolley, and his new book just issued, *Digging up the Past*, 6*s.* each ; *The Faith of an English Churchman*, by Mr. Albert Mitchell, 2*s.* 6*d.* ; *Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation in relation to Inter-Communion and Re-Union*, by Archdeacon Hunkin, 2*s.* 6*d.* ; *A Chain of Prayer Across the Ages*, forty centuries of Prayer, 2000 B.C.–A.D. 1923, compiled and arranged for daily use by

Selina Fitzherbert Fox, M.D., B.S., leather, 5*s.*; *The Accuracy of the Old Testament*, the historical narratives in the light of recent Palestinian Archæology, by J. Garrow Duncan, B.D., 6*s.*; *A New Biography of Dr. Barnardo*, by J. Wesley Bready, 7*s.* 6*d.*, and *Francis James Chavasse*, by Canon Lancelot, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Protestant Pamphlets.—An excellent little pamphlet entitled *Anne Askew; Her Life and Martyrdom*, by Mary E. T. Stirling, who is a descendant of the martyr, has just been published at 2*d.* net. We trust that the pamphlet will have a wide circulation. We also name a series of eight pamphlets which have just been re-printed at 1*d.* each under the title of *The Palm and Crown* Series. They are as follows: *The Flight of the Huguenots; The Fortified Crown; The Monk that Shook the World; The Gunpowder Plot; The Tragedy of St. Bartholomew's Day; The Protestants; The Bohemian Witness; The Good Parson of Lutterworth.* The pamphlets are well printed and attractively got up. The matter is also attractively written.

Devotional.—A new issue of *Daily Help for Daily Duty*, a series of Bible Readings with hymns for every day in the year, has just been published, price 3*s.* 6*d.* net, cloth covers, and 5*s.* 6*d.* net, leather. The readings are carefully selected and suitable alike for private meditation and family worship, and the endeavour of the compiler has been to include a short Scripture reading of about ten or twelve connected and, wherever possible, consecutive verses which shall be a source of help, guidance and encouragement for the battle of daily life and of comfort and consolation in time of trial and affliction. The usefulness of the volume has been much enhanced by the inclusion of a hymn for each day.

A Life of Our Lord.—A new book by Basil Matthews, entitled *A Life of Jesus*, has just been published at 7*s.* 6*d.* net. The author states in his preface that after coming back sixteen years ago for the first time from the land where Jesus lived he started to try and write down the story of His Life so that it should be at least real to himself, and also to write it in language real and living for a boy or girl who has never even read or heard anything about Him. The book is a fascinating one and is illustrated with a large number of beautiful plates, including two reproductions of water-colours by W. Holman Hunt. It is divided into six parts, *The Young Child; The Boy; The Master; The Gathering Storm; Towards Jerusalem; The King.*

In mentioning this we may also remind our readers of the very excellent book written a few years ago by the Bishop of Chelmsford, entitled *The Master and His Friends*, 5*s.* net. The basis of this book is the Gospel story around which the author has built up a narrative written from the point of view of two children who might have lived at the time of our Lord and have known Him personally.

Dr. Coulton.—Dr. Coulton's new work, *The Medieval Scene*, 5*s.* net, is partly a reproduction of his Broadcast talks last year, and he gives in this book a brilliant picture of the characteristic features of Medieval life.