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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1931.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Lambeth and the Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches.

THE attitude of the Lambeth Conference towards Reunion is standing out more clearly as time goes on, and is arousing considerable conflict of opinion. Definite steps have been taken in the approach to the Orthodox Church and the Old Catholics by the appointment of Commissions to meet representatives of these Churches. Considerable disappointment has been expressed that Evangelical Churchmanship has been very inadequately represented on these Commissions. Without such representation it is difficult to believe that the teaching of our Church will be presented as clearly as it ought to be to the delegates of the Orthodox and Old Catholics. The statements of Archbishop Germanos at the Church Congress at Cheltenham, and the references to doctrine in the Lambeth Conference Report, seem to indicate that there is considerable misunderstanding on the part of these foreign Churches as to the real teaching of the Church of England. We are indebted to the Rev. Thomas J. Pulvertaft for an important review of the whole situation in the present number of THE CHURCHMAN. It will be seen from his lucid examination of the facts that there is considerable danger of our Church being placed in a false position by the endeavour to produce a harmony of doctrine with the un-reformed teaching of these Churches. There must be a much more complete examination of the points of difference, and of the true significance of some of the technical terms used, before Evangelical Churchpeople can be satisfied that the Reformation teaching of our Church is fully understood by the Orthodox Church, and that our doctrine as set forth in the XXXIX Articles is not compromised by any acceptance of teaching not to be found in our formularies and definitely rejected over three hundred years ago.

Lambeth and the Non-Episcopal Churches.

While there is little interest among Churchpeople in general in regard to Reunion with those Churches abroad with which there is little contact, there is a growing feeling that some definite steps should be taken to draw closer to our brethren of the Non-Episcopal

Churches at home. A remarkable " United Service of Witness " recently held at the Parish Church, Birmingham, gives striking evidence of the development of this desire. At this united service, representatives of the Church of England and of the Free Churches took part, and important addresses were given by Dr. Carnegie Simpson and the Rev. Paul Gibson. Dr. Carnegie Simpson was one of the representatives of the Free Churches who took a leading part in the negotiations which followed the Lambeth Conference of 1920. He has expressed his keen disappointment more than once that the Lambeth Conference of 1930 practically shelved any further discussion. At Birmingham, he frankly stated that the *entente* begun in 1920 had a sharp set-back in 1930, yet he was convinced that " the interests of religion in England need, and even demand, that the forces of the Anglican tradition and those of the Free Church traditions must be united; and we must see how the danger of their drifting apart is to be counteracted." He regrets the summary dismissal in half a dozen lines of negotiations with the Free Churches, but he regards even more seriously " the swing of the Lambeth mind in the direction of unreformed Eastern Orthodoxy." As he points out, " the Church of England can only meet and satisfy Eastern Orthodox doctrinal requirements by magnifying all the elements in Anglican doctrine which are remote from and even antagonistic to those elements in it which have an Evangelical and Reformed character."

Some Practical Steps.

The Lambeth appeal of 1920 was made to " All Christian people," but the 1930 Conference has magnified its relationships in one direction and minimized them in another, so that there is not an adequate expression of the Catholicity of the original Appeal. Union with the Orthodox Eastern Churches would hardly at all affect the work of Evangelization of the world, and would contribute little or nothing to the solution of the problems of Christian life and thought with which we have to deal. Dr. Carnegie Simpson lays down several practical steps which can be taken, and Evangelical Churchpeople will heartily support his views. First, he advises acts of unity between Churches up and down the country. " The Union Movement between the Church of England and the Free Churches has been surfeited with documents and been not sufficiently nourished with deeds." The interchange of pulpits and intercommunion are not, as some think, calculated to stereotype our differences, but tend to produce the better feeling necessary for ultimate unity. These acts of unity must be inspired by a sense of the urgency of the needs of the work of the Kingdom of God. This has inspired the Reunion Movements already achieved. The leading of the Spirit of God is to be followed, and this will do more for organic Union than all the efforts of ecclesiastical statesmanship. The Holy Spirit's Work is as clearly evinced in the Ministries of the Non-Episcopal Churches as in those of the Episcopal. These clear statements on the whole question of Reunion may well serve

as a guide to further thought and action. It is not out of place to add from the recent statement of the Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich the words, " I feel myself, too, that we ought to take more frequent steps than we are disposed to, to join in common worship with one another and in one another's assemblies."

The Commission on Church and State.

Nothing has, so far, been heard of the work of the Commission appointed to consider the relations between Church and State. Our readers will remember that when the Commission was appointed, Lord Brentford and the Bishop of Norwich expressed their surprise that as the appointment of the Commission was almost directly due to the Prayer Book controversy, no representative was appointed of the very large body within the Church who are opposed to the new book. Even those who do not altogether sympathize with the opposition to the Revised Prayer Book, regret that the Commission is not fully representative of the Church. The matter has been widely considered, and expression has been given to the view that without adequate representation of all important sections within the Church, the conclusions of such a Commission cannot be expected to command widespread acceptance. In the meantime, the Bishop of Durham continues his solitary campaign for disestablishment, although it is clear to the great majority of Churchpeople that disestablishment would mean a serious injury to the religious life of the Nation. It is unlikely that disestablishment would be carried through without an extensive measure of disendowment. The Church is severely handicapped at present by lack of adequate financial resources, but it would be absolutely crippled by the loss of the sources from which a large number of the Clergy in the country parishes receive their income, while in town parishes the adequate maintenance of a staff of Curates would become an impossibility. It has been pointed out that there is no conflict between Church and State to demand such a severance as disestablishment would mean. We are thankful to know that it can still truthfully be said, " We are a definitely Christian country, governed by a Christian King, and a Christian Parliament."

Affairs in Malta.

Affairs in Malta show no sign of improvement. The attitude taken up by the ecclesiastical authorities of the Roman Church in the Island is not only maintained but has shown further developments. Lord Strickland recently drew attention in the House of Lords to the new measures adopted by the Bishops to lay an ecclesiastical ban on those who support his party. An announcement was made in the Churches of Malta on February 15 that the Sacraments would be refused to all who frequented or who paid subscriptions to Clubs of the Constitutional Party, or of the Labour Party ; and subsequently the members of an Imperial Club were refused the Sacraments. Little help to settle the matter has been obtained

from the Vatican, and although the Lenten Pastoral this year was, " as it were, an olive-branch carried by a dove, at a secret meeting of the Parish Priests held in St. John's Church, the Archbishop directed that the Pastoral should have as a postscript, verbally delivered and to please the ultra-clericals, a new declaration of war delivered apart from faith or morals." Mr. Henderson declared last year that no outside authority would be allowed to dictate, either in Malta or elsewhere, the dismissal or punishment of British Ministers appointed in the Empire Overseas in the name of the King. This declaration had in practice been watered down almost to disappearing-point, and the pledges given that Maltese Ministers would be retained in a consultative capacity, has been interpreted against them in a manner that would astonish any lawyer who read the Maltese Constitution. The Secretary of the Colonies in reply to Lord Strickland said that His Majesty's Government had not received any assistance from the Vatican in endeavouring to bring about the resumption of the normal state of things.

The Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen.

The Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen (in continuation of the Cheltenham Conference) is to be held in St. Peter's Hall, Oxford, on April 13, 14 and 15. The general subject is: " The Basis of Anglican Doctrine and Fellowship." The Committee has decided to make the Conference an opportunity of passing under review the Report of the Lambeth Conference on the Position of the Anglican Communion. They point out that a new view of the Anglican Communion has been accepted, and its relation to the Unreformed, Reformed, and the new Missionary Churches has, in consequence, received a new orientation. It is a matter, therefore, of primary moment, that Evangelicals should grasp clearly what is involved in the new outlook, as some of the proposals can only be adopted by the acceptance of changes in our historic attitude to the Reformation, and to the reformed and unreformed Churches. The Programme will therefore be of special interest and will cover the principal points, including " The World Position of the Anglican Communion." The Basis of our Doctrine, (1) as set forth in the XXXIX Articles (2) in relation to the Orthodox Eastern Church, (3) in relation to the Old Catholic Church, and (4) in relation to the other Reformed Churches. " The Church of England and the New Missionary Churches " will also be considered. We hope to publish the full text of the Papers read at the Conference in the next number of THE CHURCHMAN.

THE RECOVERY OF A LOST SACRAMENT AND THE LOSS OF A GREAT OPPORTUNITY.

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

THOUGH Rome taught the doctrine of Seven Sacraments, she had, at the time of the Reformation, practically only six, so far as the laity were concerned. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper had been transformed into the Sacrifice of the Mass. Masses were said daily, but only once in the year, as a general rule, did the layman receive the Holy Communion, and then only in one kind. That which he received was not a Sacrament, if by a Sacrament we understand an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace. He was taught that he received not the sign, but the thing signified. It might appear to be bread, but it was not bread. His eyes, touch, and taste were all deceived by appearances. The true nature of that which he received was the body and blood of Christ, the very same body that was sacrificed upon the Cross, and the effect of receiving it was the strengthening of spiritual life by union with Christ. On the other hand, unworthy reception was full of spiritual danger, and even worthy communicants received in it forgiveness of only venial sins. The whole matter of pardon of sin really lay outside the receiving of the Sacrament, and belonged to the realm of Confession, Absolution, Penance, Purgatory and Indulgence. Only in a very modified sense could the Communicant believe that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was communion with Christ for the pardon of sin.

The Sacrifice of the Mass.

Divergence of the Reformers' Attacks.

It was to be expected that an attack upon the central act of the worship of the Church, and upon the outstanding element in the power of her priesthood, should be approached from more than one point of view, and should not be confined always within the same limits. The Reformers were not, at all events at first, a school of doctrinaires working out an abstract theological system. While three great personalities, those of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, occupy the foreground, each of them begins his anti-Roman controversy from a different point of view, is interested in the development of that view to its legitimate consequences, is misunderstood by his opponents, and often by his own followers. Differences of view arise, some of which prove to be irreconcilable. As contrasted with the rigid and inflexible definitions of the Council of Trent, the "variations" of Protestant doctrine have an air of weakness. They are repellent to the mind, if it can be called a mind, which demands: "Tell me exactly what I am to believe, and tell it me

with absolute assurance." To those, however who are content to accept the responsibility laid upon the Church of Christ of seeking ever for fuller knowledge of Him Who is the Truth, the doubts, difficulties, and questionings of the Reformed Churches will not argue any failure of the Divine Promise, but will be accepted as part of our probation, as part of the demand for faith, the faith which believes though it cannot see, and is content to wait for absolute certainty, until we see Him Who is invisible, and know even as we are known.

Lutheran Attack.

So far as the Sacrifice of the Mass is concerned, there is absolute unanimity of opposition to it in the three great schools of the Reformation. Such difference as there is appears not in any indulgence towards it, but in the grounds of repudiation. Luther regards it as the most "iniquitous" of all the three forms of the "Babylonish captivity," as being the performance of a supposedly meritorious work, which demands the attention and favour of God, and procures that favour in virtue of the valid ordination and the right intention of the Priest who offers it. It is thus contrary to the whole purpose of Christ, Who intended by the Lord's Supper not a sacrifice but a Testament and bequest of that which His Sacrifice of Himself effected: "Behold, condemned sinner, out of pure grace, I promise thee, before thou hast merited anything, the forgiveness of all thy sins and eternal life. In order that thou mayest be sure of this, I will surrender My body and My blood, by which means, I will, by death, confirm My promises. I will leave behind Me both My body and My blood as a sign and memorial to thee of this My promise. As oft as ye do this, remember Me, extol My love." Luther points out that even Christ at the Institution of the Lord's Supper did not offer Himself as a Sacrifice to God, but sitting at the Table, He announced to His disciples the Testament, and offered to them the sign. The more closely our celebrations conform to the original Institution, the more Christian they are. The root objection, however, from Luther's point of view to the Sacrifice of the Mass is that it promises Justification by works, and those the works not of the penitent but of the Priest.

The faith for which it calls is not trust in the promises of God, but trust in the efficacy of a sacrifice offered by man. Luther does not question the power of God to unite the body and blood of The Crucified with the consecrated elements. In a modified form he accepts the miracle by which the body and blood of Christ are received by the bodily organs of the communicant: Only he insists that the Sacrament must be received, received in both kinds, received with faith in the promises of God. For it is this faith alone that justifies. "The Mass is a promise; and, as such, it applies to none but the believer, and to him alone by virtue of his Faith" (*De Captivitate Babylonica*). Although Luther allowed the elevation of the bread and wine, and even adoration, in his "Order of the Mass" after the Sermon, we read, "The Offertory is to be

disused"—meaning by Offertory the offering of the Host—"All that abomination to which all that has gone before in the Mass has had to give way—the Offertory as it is called. In the middle of which the words of life and salvation are placed like the ark of the Lord in a temple of idols, side by side with Dagon."

It has been necessary to present Luther's condemnation of the Sacrifice of the Mass at some length that readers may realize the difficulty which he found in coming even into Conference with the Zwinglians. The position which was held in his experience by Faith in the Word of God, made him shrink from any appearance of questioning the literal truth of the Words of Institution, or of suggesting that Christ offered to us in the Eucharist anything less than the Substance of His body and blood. Nor could he free himself from the material associations of that most unhappy word, Substance.

Zwinglian Attack.

The main difference between Luther's and Zwingli's attack on the Mass is that while Luther's is anti-judaistic, Zwingli's is anti-pagan. Luther finds in it the doctrine of salvation by works. Zwingli, the friend, for a time, and follower of Erasmus, steeped in classical literature, applies to theology the classical principle of examining sources, and, finding no trace of such Sacrifice in the New Testament, condemns it as borrowed from Paganism. It is after a series of lectures on the Acts of the Apostles that his attack becomes most vigorous. The New Testament contains no hint that our Lord intended to establish a new sacrifice or order of sacrificing Priests. Still less does it suggest that He conferred on anyone the power of making God. What Zwingli finds there is the memorial of the absent Lord. But this memorial is also a Covenant. A fierce conflict with Anabaptist teachers whose teaching was severely individualistic, evokes from Zwingli a defence of the two Sacraments as bonds of union between the Church and her Lord, and between all the members of his body. These are the two outstanding features of Zwingli's teaching, and it would not be impossible to quote from his works sentences in support of the idea that in them was contained the whole of his belief, the teaching, in fact, which ordinarily passes by the name of Zwinglianism. Yet it would be more true to say of his doctrine as a whole that, in the popular sense, Zwingli was no Zwinglian.

Zwingli's First Period.

To obtain a correct idea of his position as a whole we must discriminate between three periods in his life, the period of his conflict with Luther, and the periods which preceded and followed that conflict. In the first period attention must be paid to his conception of faith. With Zwingli faith was neither acceptance of doctrine as with the Romans, nor acceptance of pardon as with Luther, but it was the surrender of the entire self to God. Zwingli has not Luther's stages of (1) justification, (2) works, the fruit of

justification, (3) sanctification, (4) mystical union with Christ. His faith embraces all these elements. By faith the believer possesses God. In the Lord's Supper, according to Zwingli, the Atonement, once for all offered to God by Christ, is accepted by the believer, through the life of Christ which is in him by faith, and the soul is nourished and strengthened by the spiritual food of which it is there a partaker.

Perhaps the best evidence of Zwingli's teaching in this period is contained in a prayer in his Order of the Mass (1523):

"Do Thou feed our hungering souls with heavenly food. Our souls are spiritual, made in Thine image; therefore they can be refreshed with spiritual food. That food can be administered by Thy word alone. In vain would we eat the flesh of Thy Son, did we not firmly believe that Thy Son had atoned for our sins. Do Thou, therefore, if our faith falters, increase our faith. Grant that, as Thy Son restored to us Thy grace through the shame and bitterness of the Cross, we also, with Him as guide, may conquer the hardships and afflictions of the world, while we eat and drink His body and His blood. Grant that we may approach Thy Son's most Holy feast, of which He is the Host and also the Food. Grant, O most merciful Father, through Thy Son Jesus Christ, that we may express Him in our deeds, so that the image destroyed in Adam may be restored in His likeness."

In the same Canon of the Mass, the form of administration is specially noteworthy. It is often said that in our own service the first half of the words of administration is Lutheran, and the second Zwinglian. But when we turn to Zwingli's own service we find that the words of administration are: "The body (the blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ avail thee for eternal life." Though Zwingli taught that the Mass is a commemoration of a Sacrifice, he also taught that it was a participation of the body and blood of Christ.

Zwingli's Second Period.

Conflict with Luther.

The controversy between Luther and Zwingli during the years 1525 to 1529 was between two personalities of unequal stature. Although Luther betrayed discourtesy, petulance, and obstinacy, he remained the giant personality through whom a great Reformation was wrought—a work to which Zwingli was unequal. The details of the controversy need not be set forth here. To most of our readers they would probably be uninteresting and unedifying. It was found that while the dispute seemed to start from the meaning of the word "is" ("This *is* My body"), whether "is" means "is one with," or means "signifies," and while both sides professed to argue entirely from the Scriptural record, they were soon involved in mysterious speculations as to the Person of our Blessed Lord, His Divinity and Humanity, and His Session at the Right Hand of God. Metaphysical subtleties, on which Scripture is silent, came into the foreground, and especially the profound mystery of the nature of the Body of the Glorified Christ. He is at the Right Hand of the Father—but God is not in one place but everywhere. Does it then follow that the Body of Christ is everywhere? If that

is so, can a body that is everywhere be a true human body? and can that body be orally received and consumed? and if so, can it be thus consumed by unbelievers? From inquiries like these the devout, but non-theological layman turns aside, not without some sense of pain. He prefers to say with Richard Hooker: "Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this, 'O my God, Thou art true; O my soul, thou art happy.'"

After painful controversy in writing, Luther and Zwingli were brought face to face at Marburg in 1529 by their respective patrons, the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse. All the world is familiar with the figure of Luther sitting stubbornly in front of the words, "Hoc est Corpus Meum," which he had chalked on the table before him. He looked on Zwingli as a heretic and fanatic to whom he would make no concession. "This is My body," urged Luther. "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life," replied Zwingli's friend Œcolumpadius. "Your text forbids gross, oral manducation, not sublime and spiritual manducation, though it be with the mouth," answered Luther. "Where does Scripture distinguish between different kinds of manducation?" was Œcolumpadius's rejoinder. So the debate went on. We must hasten to the result. Agreement and difference were summed up as follows:

Agreement: (1) Communion must be in both kinds. (2) The Mass is not a means whereby one obtains pardon for another. (3) The Sacrament is the Sacrament of the very body and blood of Christ. (4) Spiritual manducation is required of every true Christian. (5) The Sacrament is ordained of God that weak consciences may be stirred to faith and charity.

Difference: Whether the real body and blood of Christ are corporeally present in the bread and wine.

Both parties were to cherish Christian charity to each other so far as the conscience of each permits, and to suspend controversy.

The result of the Conference was decidedly satisfactory on the surface. For the point of difference was simply as to the mode of Christ's presence, and it would not appear difficult to go one step farther and to agree that Christ was *really* present. A presence may be real which is not corporeal. Luther wrote to his wife: "We agreed on almost all points but that our opponents stand for bread only in the Lord's Supper, while admitting a spiritual Presence therein."

But the real difference lay far deeper down than that—deeper than the opponents, in their effort to reach agreement, were aware. Luther answered the question, "What is it that wins salvation for man?" by saying, "Not works but faith"; Zwingli and Calvin more emphatically after him, replied, "It is the fore-ordaining and determining will of God."

The Eucharistic controversy was, in fact, really superficial. Behind it lay the problem of the soul's union with God.

Zwingli's Third Period.

After the Marburg Conference Zwingli fell increasingly under the influence of Bucer, and returned to his original teaching, of which the last exemplar was his letter to Francis I in 1531, which Zwingli wrote shortly before his death on the field of Kapel. In that letter he says:

"We believe that Christ is truly present in the Lord's Supper; yea, we believe that there is no communion without such Presence. . . . But that His body is literally eaten is far from truth: because He Himself says, 'I am no more in the world,' and, 'The flesh profiteth nothing.' It is contrary to faith (I mean the holy and true faith), because faith embraces love, fear of God and reverence, which abhor such gross and carnal eating. . . . We believe that the true body of Christ is eaten in the Communion, not in a gross and carnal manner, but in a sacramental and spiritual manner by the religious, believing, and pious heart."

Calvin on the Lord's Supper.

Luther and Zwingli both taught, so to speak, under the shadow of the Mass. The Mass, as a name of the Sacrament, virtually disappears from the writings of Calvin, except when he is criticizing the Roman Catholic Mass. Again, both Luther and Zwingli are feeling their way gradually out of the old doctrine. There are degrees and stages in their emancipation, and limits to it. But the central teaching of Calvin appears in the first edition of his Institutes (A.D. 1536), and in spite of some development, it remains perfectly consistent through the whole of his career. He proves to be a mediator—not by skill in devising ambiguous formulæ, but by his grasp, his profound grasp, of the reality which lies at the heart of the great mystery, the mystical union between Christ and His people, the reality, that is, as well as the spirituality of that union. His words deserve the most careful consideration:

"The other Sacrament of the Christian Church is the bread sanctified in Christ's body, and the wine sanctified in His blood." (Note how carefully its exact form is given to the word "Sacrament.") "We call it either the Lord's Supper or the Eucharist (note, no longer the Mass), because in it we are fed spiritually by the kindness of God, and we, on our part, give thanks for His goodness. . . . As we see the bread given to us as a sign of Christ's body, we must endeavour to understand the following comparison. I mean as that the bread nourishes the life of the body, upholds and supports it, so the body of Christ is the food and support of our spiritual life. Since the wine is the symbol of the blood, so do we believe that Christ acts spiritually on the soul, as wine acts on the body. . . . But let us believe that the Sacrament is spiritual—a something whereby God will feed our soul, not our stomach. Let us seek Christ, not as He is seen and apprehended by the bodily senses, but as He is recognized by His Presence in our soul. . . . Christ having ascended with His own proper body into Heaven, there sits at the right hand of the Father, that is, He rules in the might, power and glory of the Father. . . . This Kingdom is bounded by no limits of space and is circumscribed by no dimensions. He exercises His dominion in Heaven and on earth. By this He shows His presence in power and virtue. He is ever with His People. He lives in them. He upholds, strengthens, and defends them, and this no less manifestly than if He were present in the body." (The attentive reader will notice how the difficulties presented by

material or semi-material conceptions of the body of Christ are overcome. For Calvin the spiritual is the real.)

The triumph of Calvin's interpretation is that he has reconciled a true belief in the risen, glorified body of Christ with the conception of a mystical union that is not corporeal or material. In another passage the nature of this union is more fully developed:

"The Holy Spirit alone does not enter into us, while Christ remains outside us. Nor does Christ enter into us without the agency of the Holy Spirit. The union with Christ is a real union. He communicates His whole being to us with all its spiritual and psychical power, and penetrates with His sanctifying influence our whole being, body, soul, and spirit. But it is an inner union. The body of Christ as physical substance is not bound with the substance of our body, in this communicating of Christ's spiritual and psychical powers to us. But the Holy Spirit, Who has made Christ to be born in us, perfects continually the further appropriation of Christ, that is, He brings, not indirectly through the illumination of our thoughts, but directly through His Divine Power, Christ really into us. The act of union is not an act of local descent, but an Almighty act, which is outside all categories of space, and can only be comprehended under the category of eternity. It is not a question of mechanical commingling, but of organic birth and power. The Divine-human power of Christ enters into the centre of our spiritual and psychical life (not into our thoughts, still less into our bodies)."

Luther died in 1546, and was succeeded by Melancthon, whom the Conference of Marburg had deeply impressed. His was now the greatest mind on the Lutheran side, but he could not be described as the Lutheran leader. Bullinger, highly esteemed afterward by the English Reformers, was, with Bucer, the acknowledged leader of the Zwinglians. Calvin, as soon as he was firmly established at Geneva, opened up negotiations with Bullinger, with a view to reaching some agreement on the question of the Eucharist, and that agreement took shape eventually in the

Consensus Tigurinus.

This Consensus was a body of Articles drawn up in 1549, by which the Churches of Geneva were brought into harmony with those of Zurich. It reconciled Zwinglians and Calvinists, and found favour with some of the Lutherans, notably with Melancthon. Bucer, who was in England, in close touch with the English Reformers, expressed his hearty approval of it. The agreement is too long even to admit of summary in this Article, but its value is expressed by a competent authority (Planck), who says:

"It had hitherto been a matter of doubt whether the Swiss, *i.e.* the Zwinglians and Calvinists, in partaking of the Sacrament recognized the actual Presence of the body of Christ. But every kind of suspicion on the subject was now removed. The Formulary sets forth the idea of a real Presence, and of an actual participation of the body of Christ in this Sacrament. But it explains at the same time the nature and manner of this Presence. According to Luther's doctrine, the body of Christ is miraculously present in the Sacrament, and brought into such union with the outward sign of bread and wine, that it is not only received at the same time with these, but *in* these and *under* these, so that it is therefore partaken of with the *mouth* by everyone who receives the sign, though he is an unbeliever. According to

Calvin's opinion, on the contrary, the body of Christ is not brought down into the Sacrament, but the soul of him who partakes thereof is raised by faith towards heaven, and is there brought into contact with the body of Christ, and thus made partaker of the divine life."

It should be added that the Articles affirm that: "Believers, before, and without, the use of the Sacrament, communicate with Christ, nor do the Sacraments confer grace." "But God does use them to seal the secret communion which we have with Him."

The agreement reached comes out more clearly still when considered in the light of the bitter opposition offered to it by the extreme Lutherans, headed by Westphal. From this controversy it is seen that Calvin was far, very far indeed, from regarding the Lord's Supper as superfluous, or without real spiritual efficacy.

In that controversy he made it plain that:

1. In the Lord's Supper there is a real objective communication of Christ.
2. The bread and wine are pledges of the certainty of communion.
3. That which is communicated is Christ Himself.
4. From the glorified body of Christ proceeds a real, living energy into the very centre of our being.
5. This communication is not locally but by an act of the Holy Ghost.
6. The objective communication is not by an act of faith, but by an act of Christ and of the Holy Ghost.
7. It takes place even if the communicant is godless.
8. Only those who are in a state of grace receive Christ.
9. The godly are advanced in faith by the communication of Christ to them in the Sacrament.

These conclusions should be carefully compared with our Catechism, and with the 28th Article of our Church. In the Catechism we are taught that the body and blood of Christ are "verily and indeed *taken* and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Again in the 28th Article we read that: "The Body of Christ is *given, taken,* and eaten, in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." It is sometimes argued that the words "given" and "taken" must imply association of the body and blood with the consecrated elements. But it is clear from the foregoing summary that the gift is the act of the Holy Ghost, and that the godless do not take it when offered to them, but repel it by unbelief. This interpretation is confirmed by the apparently superfluous sentence: "The mean whereby the Body of Christ is taken and received is faith." Is not this mere surplusage? Is it not already stated in the foregoing words, "given, taken, and eaten only after a heavenly and spiritual manner"? Not at all. The "gift" is the act of the Holy Ghost. It is not dependent on faith. It is offered to the unbelieving after a heavenly and spiritual manner, and the whole transaction is after a heavenly and spiritual manner. It is no mechanical transaction effected by a mere delivery of consecrated bread and wine. Christ,

through the Holy Ghost, gives His body and blood. The faithful by faith take and receive the gift. The unbelieving refuse it.

This interpretation is confirmed by Dr. Ryder Smith in a discussion of Calvin's view, which he states as follows, not having the doctrine of our Church in mind at the time, but the position of Calvin as exponent of the doctrine of the Atonement.

> " For Calvin, the body of Christ in that new order of existence to which it has been advanced by the Resurrection is no longer under law to Nature as before. It has become all Spirit and Life, having its place, indeed, in heaven, but in such a way as to be capable of reaching forth at once, over all outward limits, with its inmost substance and force to the souls of His people (and so to their bodies also) in every part of the world. To express all this he avoids carefully every word that might imply locality or matter, but he insists with all the more stress on all that is included in the conception of its invisible and dynamic nature."

In this careful insistence on combination of the actual and objective with the spiritual and real, we may find the true explanation of the " kneeling " in reception of Holy Communion. There is more in that Sacrament than our prayers, our thoughts, more even than our faith. There is the gift of Himself bestowed by our Blessed Lord through the Holy Ghost, and that gift deserves our reverence. But not to any Presence of Christ in the Bread and Wine do we kneel. We kneel because we are partakers in a heavenly and spiritual transaction, of which the reality is in a supramundane sphere.

To return, then, to the Consensus Tigurinus and its immediate effect on the history of our Church.

The effect of the Consensus Tigurinus on England is seen by contrasting the First Prayer Book of Edward VI (1549) with the Second (1552). The usual reason assigned for the difference between the two Books is the influence of foreigners. The First Book is said to represent the English, the Second the Continental Reformation. The truth is that in the earlier stages of the Reformation movement in England, Lutheran influences were dominant. The First Prayer Book was a Mass with a Communion attached—closely resembling Luther's. The Zwinglians had hitherto passed for heretics and fanatics. The Consensus Tigurinus held out a glorious prospect of a union of the Protestant or Lutheran Churches with the Reformed or Genevan. Cranmer and Ridley studied Ratramnus whose teaching had influenced Calvin. It was felt to be absurd, almost criminal, that England should not cast in her lot with so promising an opening for reconciliation : and still worse that she should support the die-hard Lutherans, who represented all the obstinacy of Luther without his spiritual power. The Second Prayer Book was no more the work of foreigners than the First, though it followed the lead of the great reconcilers of Protestant thought. The final triumph of the Second Prayer Book on the accession of Elizabeth must be attributed in no small measure to the cruelty of the Lutheran die-hards, who, in the depth of winter, drove the English refugees from Marian persecution away from Helsingfors, Hamburg, and other

Lutheran ports, on the ground that " they were martyrs of the devil." It was not likely that when those refugees returned this criminal offence would be overlooked. The extreme Lutherans—Protestants, as they were called—alienated the sympathies of England, and confirmed Calvin in the veneration of Englishmen for many years to follow.

Disastrous Consequences of Lutheran Refusal.

But it was not only in England that the disastrous consequences of Lutheran obstinacy made themselves felt. Those consequences cannot be summed up in better words than those of Doumergue in his Calvin (Vol. VI, p. 576):

" Ecclesiastical history records few faults so saddening and so grievous as that of the post-Lutherans. The progress of Protestantism was arrested: the Counter Reformation was facilitated, and, humanly speaking, the lot of the modern world was changed. ' The further development of the German Reformation,' says Professor Stähelin, ' was checked at one blow.' The Reformation lost the chance of the Imperial Crown, when the pious Maximilian II, while fully admitting the great truths of that Reformation, could not overcome the disgust aroused by its divisions and strifes. And it was not only that progress was arrested. The great loss which the German Reformation underwent, its obliteration in the Austrian Provinces, and particularly in Bohemia, during the Thirty Years' War, arose entirely—humanly speaking—from the separation between the Lutherans and the Reformed, and their mutual hostilities. For the same reason, the Lutheran Church, weakened and divided, was obliged to have recourse to foreign help and to invite into the Empire Swedes and Frenchmen, and to put into their hands the negotiations for the Peace of Münster. Many Lutheran communities were utterly destroyed, country districts and towns were placed under the yoke of the Pope, and Alsace was lost. Such was the curse which Westphal and the zealots brought down on their country and their Church."

[Acknowledgment is due and is hereby made to A. Barclay's *Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, a book which should be found in the library of every English Theological College.]

Foreshewings Of Christ is a series of " Old Testament Studies in the Preparation for the Advent " (*S.P.C.K.*, 5*s.* net). These deal with the characters of some of the prominent personages in the Old Testament, including Balaam, Joshua, Jephthah's Daughter, Saul, Jeroboam the Son of Nebat, Elisha, Hosea, Josiah, Jeremiah and Job. The author's wide range of knowledge is brought to bear upon these representatives of the Revelation of the olden time, and he shows how our Lord summed up in Himself the great qualities of His Forerunners. It is an interesting and suggestive study, and helpful in many ways to an understanding of important aspects of Old Testament literature.

CANTERBURY, UTRECHT AND ALEXANDRIA.

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

AMONG the many problems raised by the Report of the Lambeth Conference none is of more far-reaching importance than that concerned with Reunion with the Unreformed Episcopal Churches. And when the adjective "Unreformed" is employed it is at once seen to be only partially adequate, for the Old Catholics of Utrecht do not stand where they stood before 1870, and it would be wrong to generalize and say that all the Members of the Eastern Family of Churches have equally been opposed to the penetration of those Scriptural and Primitive principles that the Reformation restored to the Church. In the main, however, it is correct to say that the Churches represented by Utrecht and Alexandria hold fast by traditions that have been rejected by the Churches of the Reformation and have an ethos that is not similar to that of the Church of England before Tractarian ideals proclaimed themselves to be the teaching of the Church. In one respect Canterbury, Utrecht and Alexandria march hand in hand. They reject the nineteenth-century innovations of the Church of Rome, they refuse to accept the universal jurisdiction *jure Divino* of the Pope and cannot believe the dogma of Infallibility of the Pope to be in accord with Scripture, History or Reason.

Many who consider the situation created by the Lambeth decisions to be fraught with peril to the Protestant and Reformed character of our Church are just as keen as the Bishops for Intercommunion between our Church and the Old Catholics and Easterns. We hold that Intercommunion does not necessarily imply unity in all doctrinal details, much less uniformity in ceremonial. We are prepared to accept as brethren in Christ, and to meet with them at the Table of the Lord, members of Churches that hold dogmatic beliefs we reject and practise ceremonies that for us are connotative of erroneous teaching. We believe that those who profess and call themselves Christians and strive to follow in newness of Life our Blessed Lord and Saviour are one with us in Him. And we are convinced that the acts of intercommunion that take place will foster a spirit of brotherhood that will lead to a better understanding and the rejection of what can be proved to be false and the acceptance of what can be established as true. We make our own the words of Dr. Ellicott spoken in his Cathedral on December 10, 1875:

"Will the ancient Church of the East remain unaffected by the course of events that now seem mysteriously disclosing themselves each year as it passes by? May it not be fore-ordained by God that this ancient and slumbering Church shall soon awaken, as it were, to a new life, rise to a higher

and purer standard of doctrine, cast aside its superstitions and corruptions, and become that light to the waiting nations of the East that it once was in the earlier and purer days of its splendid history ? "

For—unpopular as it is to say so—we have to admit that the Eastern Church is not free from corruptions and superstitions, and we are convinced that when these are abandoned it will have a great future. We can never forget that the development of religious thought and worship in the East owes much to the soil in which it took place, and a good deal that is foreign to us Westerns is commonplace to Orientals. We have no desire to force our Formularies on the Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches.

Everything depends on the terms of Reunion and Intercommunion. At the present time Commissions are sitting preparing for discussions with the Eastern and Old Catholic Churches. We are told that in connection with the East nothing more is contemplated than the arrangement of terms of Intercommunion for Anglican strangers in Orthodox lands and the Eastern *diaspora* in Western lands. On the other hand, it is definitely said by a member of the Lambeth Committee that in connection with the Old Catholics " it seems not unreasonable to anticipate that quite close relations may be established with the Old Catholics at an early date." The words of the Lambeth Encyclical are clear :

" The Conference has asked the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint Commissions of theologians to confer with similar Commissions, if appointed by the authorities of the Orthodox and the Old Catholics, and it is hoped that these Commissions may find such a unity of faith and such a similarity in practice to exist between the Churches, that restoration of communion may become possible as soon as the appropriate assemblies of the various Churches may meet."

The Anglican Commissions have been appointed and they are official in the strictest sense. It is vain to argue that what they determine has no authority outside themselves. They have on them men who know that they represent officially the Anglican Communion and that what they decide will have the greatest weight with the Authorities of the Communion. It is hard to think that the Anglican Churches (we are now concerned specially with the Mother Church of England which represents considerably more than half the communicants and adherents of the Anglican Communion) will consider as not binding any concordat reached in so official a manner with the Orthodox and Old Catholic representatives. It is apparent to all who are familiar with the personnel of the Commissions that they are weak in the representation of the traditional Protestantism of the Church of England and that Anglo-Catholicism is strongly to the front.

It is perfectly true that the Chairman of both Commissions is Dr. Headlam, who in October 1922 (*Church Quarterly Review*) was charged with using " very bitter and even offensive expressions regarding the Orthodox Church, which can be excused only on account of the desperate position of their author, for I have encountered nothing similar in recent years even in pamphlets of a

distinctly polemical character." So wrote Professor Glubokovesky of Petrograd, and it now appears that Dr. Headlam was responsible for the "Terms of Intercommunion" drafted in 1920, with their acceptance of the teaching of the Second Council of Nicaea on the worship of Images, and "that neither Church should accuse the other of false teaching." In these "Terms of Intercommunion" there is not a word said about the XXXIX Articles.

But at the same time discussions took place with Greek Ecclesiastics, presided over by the then Bishop of Gloucester, who said, in reply to the suggestion from the Orthodox that the XXXIX Articles should be abolished:

"They were no Articles of faith, but Articles of a practical public State confession, as is shown by their vague character. There is no branch of the Church which has not forms that might be rejected, yet are difficult to reject. In the last fifty years the Thirty-nine Articles have fallen, while the Creeds have risen in public estimation." "We understand that the Abolition of the Thirty-nine Articles would be an advantage. It is true that with us these have much less force than the Prayer Book and the Catechism. In some sections of the English Church they are not used at all."

The last sentence requires elucidation. It is true that the Scottish Church, a Chinese Church and, it is said, the South African Church do not use the Articles, but all the greater and older Churches do, and the recent effort to abolish them in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States failed. And Dr. Headlam says they are obsolete! (*Doctrine of the Church and Reunion*, 202.) No one wishes them to be imposed on other Churches which desire to be in communion with us, but is that any reason why other Churches should ask us to abolish them as a condition precedent to union?

But it may be said that the Lambeth Résumé of the Conversations between Anglican and Orthodox Ecclesiastics does not do this. The Anglican Bishops state there "that the Doctrine of the Anglican Church is authoritatively expressed in the Book of Common Prayer, and that the meaning of the XXXIX Articles must be interpreted in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer." And the entire Conference endorsed this as part of a "sufficient" account of the Doctrine of our Church. Let it not be forgotten that the Articles were designedly framed to interpret the Religion of the Church of England, they were compiled when the Book of Common Prayer was in existence—in practically its present form—and their interpretative value was endorsed by Charles I and Archbishop Laud. It is clear that the Protestantism of the Articles is the stone of offence in the eyes of the Easterns, and if we, or the Commission now sitting, to confer with Eastern delegates, affirm that the Articles can be considered "as a document of secondary importance concerned with local controversies of the sixteenth century, and to be interpreted in accordance with the faith of that universal Church of which the English Church is but a part," it is very easy for the Easterns to consider the rest of the English Church Union Statement, which we quote, addressed to them to be a "sufficient" or "genuine" account of English Church teaching.

The Lambeth Résumé also contains the words, " after Communion the consecrated elements remaining are regarded sacramentally as the Body and Blood of Christ." No wonder a Missionary Bishop writing on the subject is unable to explain words he does not like and believes capable of some theological explication. It also has the sentences, " in the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice the Anglican Church prays that ' by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion ' as including the whole company of faithful people, living and departed."

We have to bear in mind that the Greeks received from the English Church Union a Memorial, signed by Bishop Gore, the Rev. J. A. Douglas and 3,713 Anglican Priests, which said:

" We the undersigned, therefore, hold that our Lord, through the ministry of the successors of the Apostles, has conferred on us and on all the members of the clergy of the Anglican Communion the Sacrament of the Order, with the purpose that we who are priests should . . . (inter alia). *b.* offer the unbloody sacrifice of the Eucharist for both the living and the departed." " We affirm that by consecration in the Eucharist the bread and wine, being blessed by the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit, are changed and become the true body and the true blood of Christ, and as such are given and received by the faithful. We hold, therefore, that Christ thus present is to be adored."

When Dr. Henson, in 1922, read this declaration he wrote: " Can we rightly approach Protestant Churches with one standard of doctrine and the Eastern Church with another ? " We certainly in the Résumé approach the Eastern Church with a standard that is not that of the XXXIX Articles in those very points which up to the rise of Tractarianism and the spread of Anglo-Catholicism we were in agreement with them and in disagreement with the Eastern Churches. It is important to discover how the Résumé has been received. The Patriarch Meletios of Alexandria, when Patriarch of Constantinople in 1922, acknowledged the validity of Anglican Orders. The Patriarch of Alexandria and his Synod then entered a caveat or " precautionary negative." Now, after hearing the narrative of the proceedings in Lambeth, 1930, as a " genuine " account of the teaching of the Anglican Communion, the Synod welcomes the Summary (Résumé) as a notable step towards the Union of the two Churches. " And since in these declarations which were endorsed by the Lambeth Conference, complete and satisfying assurance is found as to the Apostolic Succession, as to a real reception of the Lord's Body and Blood, as to the Eucharist being *thusia hilasterios* and as to Ordination being a mystery " the Church of Alexandria acknowledges the validity of Anglican orders.

Something important had happened between the two Synods of Alexandria. A new Patriarch occupied the Chair and this in itself counted for much, but the all-important factor was the Lambeth Declaration. It is therefore necesssary for us to inquire what is the Eastern Doctrine of the change wrought in the Elements by

Consecration and what is the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice. We have seen how the English Church Union defined for the Constantinople Synod the "genuine teaching of the Church of England." The Patriarch of Alexandria refers to the genuine teaching of the Anglican Communion and finds it as defined by Lambeth. The Orthodox declare that they cannot have *communio in sacris* where the totality of faith is absent. And what is this totality? We are told on the one hand that it has been "precised" by the Oecumenical Councils, and yet the subjects to which reference is made in the Patriarch's letter were not dealt with by these Councils as acknowledged by the Eastern Church. Then we are told that on matters that are not of primary importance what is known as economy comes into operation and then we are informed (*Report of Archbishops' Committee on Faith and Order*, 134) "it is impossible either to state precisely the scope or the organs of its exercise." All are agreed that Dogma does not come within its scope, and between a dogma and a theologoumenon it is at times hard to decide. We do not believe that any Orthodox Theologian would maintain that only beliefs "precised" by the seven Councils are dogmas. If this were the case then the XXXIX Articles would have importance only on the question of worshipping images.

"A Real reception of the Body and Blood" at once raises the question, Is Transubstantiation a belief, a dogma of the Orthodox Churches? Wilbois in *Russia and Reunion* tells us that the Russian word used as a translation of "metousiosis" must not be translated transubstantiation. This was the opinion of the Metropolitan Philaret, but Wilbois says that transubstantiation is identical with the Greek word, but the Orthodox reject the scholastic theory. Dr. Headlam informs us that the Greeks use the word (*The Doctrine of the Church*, p. 298). The Rev. C. Canellopulos, quoting Dositheos, says he used the term Metousiosis as a synonym for the terms used by the ancient Church. "The Bread is transmuted, transubstantiated, converted and transformed into the true Body itself of the Lord." We have read a catena of references and believe that Dr. Darwell Stone is in the main right when he says:

> "The main fact to be noticed in the history of Eucharistic doctrine in the East from the sixth century to the present time is the continuance and unanimity of the teaching that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ, that the consecration is effected by the work of the Holy Ghost, elicited by the invocation of Him in the Liturgy, and that the Eucharist is a sacrificial presentation of Christ to God. In the earliest part of the period and often afterwards there is a tendency to confuse the outward and the inward parts of the Sacraments; from the eighth century onwards a distinction is clearly made that before consecration the elements are the image of the body of Christ, and that on becoming His actual body at the consecration they cease to be the image; in the fifteenth and later centuries elaborate distinctions are found between the substance and the accidents and between the natural and sacramental presence of Christ, and the word Transubstantiation is used" (*The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, vol. i. 192).

The practice of infant communion sheds a light upon the teaching of the Eastern Church on the character of the consecrated elements.

This being the case, we naturally ask, did the Patriarch Meletios consider the teaching of the Anglican Church defined in the Résumé to be identical with that of his own Church? If so, is that the teaching of the Formularies of the Anglican Communion? The English Church Union plainly says it is. We do not think that it can be substantiated by any fair reading of the Articles and the Book of Common Prayer.

When we come to the question of the "Eucharistic Sacrifice" Canon Douglas is in a difficulty. He transliterated the words *thusia hilasterios* and in a footnote adds, "We do not translate it by propitiatory sacrifice or expiatory sacrifice, because, as generally used, these terms present conceptions which are not attached by the Orthodox to *thusia hilasterios*." Yet Canon Douglas signed the English Church Union declaration to the Orthodox Church that he believes we "offer the unbloody sacrifice of the Eucharist for both the living and the dead" and this to the average reader implies an expiatory sacrifice. Cyril Lucar was refuted by the teaching of the Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church in 1610. This Confession says: "This mystery is a propitiation and atonement with God for our sins both of the living and the dead," and it is offered on behalf of all orthodox Christians living and dead. The confession of Dositheos says: "It is a real and propitiatory sacrifice offered for all the orthodox, living and dead, and for the benefit of all." Makarios writes:

"In the Eucharist the body and the blood of the Saviour, which are offered to us as food, are offered also as a sacrifice to God for men. The sacrifice offered to God in the Eucharist is in its nature exactly the same as that of the cross; for to-day we still offer on the altars of the Church, the same Lamb of God who offered Himself of old on the cross for the sins of the world, the same flesh infinitely pure which suffered then, the same blood infinitely precious which was poured out. To-day also this mysterious oblation is invisibly accomplished by the same eternal High Priest who offered Himself on the Cross."

These quotations, which can be multiplied, are taken from Dr. Stone's work. In summing up his history on the subject, Dr. Stone tells us that

"the Eucharist is a sacrificial presentation of Christ to God. . . . The idea of the sacrifice during the greater part of the period is that of one sacrifice pleaded on the Cross in heaven, and on the altar, though in the latter part of it (from the sixth century to the present time) the connection between our Lord's heavenly offering and the offering of the Eucharist is but seldom expressed."

It is hard in the face of these facts to see how *thusia hilasterios* does not mean a propitiatory or expiatory sacrifice in the Orthodox Church. No other words can satisfactorily translate the terms. The task of the Archbishop's Commission will not be easy if it faces squarely and all along the line the vital ambiguities that, at present, are evident to the student of theology.

The Old Catholics deserve the sympathy of all who love freedom and believe in religious liberty. They are a small body, but the

numbers of a community are not the only question that arises when Reunion is considered. The Church in Utrecht was until comparatively recent years a Church that accepted the Roman position in doctrine and outlook without the Papacy. In the nineteenth century the cleavage with Rome became more pronounced, and on the publication of the Vatican Decrees a number of Swiss, German and other Continental Roman Catholics found themselves excommunicated, because they could not conscientiously accept the definition of Infallibility. They had the sympathy of the great historian Döllinger, who never joined them, but helped them in every way, and in proportion to their numbers they had attached to them a considerable number of the intelligentsia in these lands. The Old Catholic Church consecrated Bishops for them. The drift from Rome increased and when the Declaration of Utrecht—to be distinguished from the Pact of Utrecht which forbids the Consecration of Bishops without the consent of Utrecht—was drafted, the Churches had a definite orientation. There is a strong spirit of Protestantism about the Declaration, with reference to the specific doctrines rejected. But it lays down:

"Considering that the Holy Eucharist has always been the true central point of Catholic worship, we consider it our duty to declare that we maintain with perfect fidelity the ancient Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, by believing that we receive the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ under the species of bread and wine."

What this means may be judged, that it is the practice of the Utrecht Church to communicate the laity in one kind and to give Benediction with the Reserved consecrated bread. The Church will have nothing to do with the XXXIX Articles, which it considers to be opposed to Catholic teaching.

In a Memorandum on Reunion with the Old Catholic Churches (*Archbishops' Committee on Faith and Order*, p. 148) the writer compares the Declaration of Utrecht with the Preamble to the Canons of the Church of Ireland which says, "The Church of Ireland . . . doth hereby affirm its constant witness against all those innovations in doctrine and worship, whereby the primitive faith hath been from time to time overlaid," but he does not quote "and which at the Reformation this Church did disown and reject." Neither did he mention the acceptance by our Sister Church of the XXXIX Articles. And he did not quote the well-known words from the Preface to the Irish Book of Common Prayer:

"As concerning the Holy Communion, some of our brethren were at first earnest that we should remove from the Prayer Book certain expressions which they thought might seem to lend some pretext for the teaching of doctrine, concerning the Presence of Christ in that Sacrament, repugnant to that set forth in the Articles of Religion, wherein it is expressly stated that the Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner and that the mean whereby it is therein received and eaten is Faith; but upon a full and impartial review, we have not found in the Formularies any just warrant for such teaching, and therefore in this behalf, we have made no other change than to add to the Catechism one question, with an answer taken out of the Twenty-eighth of the

said Articles. As for the error of those who have taught that Christ has given Himself or His Body and Blood in this Sacrament, to be reserved, lifted up, carried about or worshipped under the Veils of Bread and Wine, we have already in the Canons prohibited such acts and gestures as might be grounded on it, or lead thereto."

Are these quotations the reason for the strange change from " the Anglican Communion " to the Church of England in the third paragraph of Resolution 35 of the Lambeth Conference ? " The Conference agrees that there is nothing in the Declaration of Utrecht inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of England." There certainly is more than one thing in the interpretation of the teaching inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of Ireland. Intercommunion with the Old Catholics is desirable, but it can never be considered justified as long as they adopt their attitude concerning the XXXIX Articles and we accept that attitude as consistent with our teaching.

It is essential to notice two other statements in the Utrecht Declaration. Tradition is placed on a plane higher than we admit in the Church of England. It has been argued that the Tradition accepted by the Utrecht Church is so limited as to include nothing that cannot be proved by Holy Scripture. If so, why does the Utrecht Church normally administer the Holy Communion in one kind and admit Benediction ? The position of the Church of England is clearly defined as to the unique authority of Holy Scripture, and the statements in the Articles on this question are plain and unambiguous.

The statement on the " Eucharistic celebration in the Church " is based on an interpretation of Hebrews ix. 11, 12 and Hebrews ix. 24 which has never been accepted by the Church of England and has been rejected by our best theologians. It is satisfactory to note that the Declaration explicitly denies that it is a continual repetition or a renewal of the expiatory sacrifice offered upon the Cross, but when it affirms that it is a representation of the one offering which our Lord makes in Heaven it adopts a view that has not the support of Holy Scripture, according to a natural interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the New Testament as a whole.

Our aim in this paper has not been to say anything that would depreciate the growth of friendship and the inter-relation of the Church of England and the Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches, so long as such intercommunion does not demand from us the sacrifice of our own historical and Scriptural position. The Lambeth Résumé and Reports demand this as the basis, and we therefore are compelled to oppose any such step when it involves the sacrifice of our history and teaching. If we follow the lead of the Résumé, we shall find ourselves more isolated in Christendom than we have ever been, for we shall have replaced the drawing together of the Church of England and the Non-Episcopal Communions with whom we are in daily contact, for intercommunion with Churches that we seldom or never touch in so far as the life of the Church of England

at home and in the greater part of the Anglican Communion is concerned. But it is not so much on this account—serious as it is from the practical world religious standpoint—that we have been compelled to criticize, but from the conviction that the carrying through of the Lambeth policy involves, for us, the surrender of much that is of primary importance in our Protestant and Reformed teaching and an entire change in the ecclesiastical orientation of our Church. It is hateful for many of us to appear to oppose Christian Union in any form, but when we see the astounding ignorance of what the Old Catholics and Orthodox stand for, of the place they hold in Christendom and of the real character of the issues at stake, we pray that the Commissions now sitting may see that the time has come to cry halt, in the process of surrender, and to make it plain to the two Foreign Churches that the position adopted by Lambeth does not represent the real attitude of the Church of England and the Anglican Communion, as a whole, but is, at the most, only sectional, and the result of the growth of a movement less than a hundred years old.

And we may add that so far from the XXXIX Articles being obsolete the Prayer Book Measure, 1928, has the clause (7, 3), "Every supplementary order or form of public prayer to which this section applies shall be in conformity with the doctrine of the Church of England as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and the Book of Common Prayer." It is hard to reconcile this declaration with the statements to which we have referred in depreciation of the authority of the Articles.

From Camoldi to Christ (The Harrison Trust, 1*s.* 6*d.* net) is an account by Mr. Stephen Ouseley, formerly of the Order of Camoldi, and the Canons Regular of the Lateran, of the steps by which he was led to leave the Monastery and to renounce Romanism. The account which is given of the conditions of Monastic life in an Italian Monastery situated in a remote part of the Apennine Hills about thirty miles from Florence is far from attractive, and does not impress the reader with a sense of any deep or real piety on the part of the members of the Community. For an Englishman, the conditions of the life must have been specially irksome, and the pettiness of the regulations and the system of punishments must have proved abhorrent to a spirit not absolutely broken by the character of the discipline. The reading of the Bible proved in his case, as in the case of so many others, the means of his release from the superstitions of the Roman system. No doubt there are many inside the walls of Monasteries and Convents who would welcome release from the life, but they are probably unaware of any means by which they could support themselves if they came out. The Roman Church has a fund in England for the purpose of helping those who join their Church from the Protestant Churches. Many would be glad to know that there was similar support for those who leave the Church of Rome and become Protestants.

THE FACT AND DOCTRINE OF THE ASCENSION.

By Albert Mitchell.

THE recognition by the Church of the place and importance of the Resurrection of our Blessed Lord is witnessed by the observance of Easter Day: the realisation by the Church of the significance and value of His Ascension is measured by the neglect of Ascension Day.

§ The Fact of the Ascension.

The fact has its place in the earliest extant Christian Creed (1 Tim. iii. 16):

He who was manifested in [the] flesh:
Justified in [the] Spirit:
Seen of [the] angels:
Preached in [the] nations:
Believed on in [the] world:
Received up in [the] Glory.

All the phrases are anarthrous: if you supply (as you must) the definite article in some phrases you must do so in all. "The Glory" is a following of the late Jewish use in substituting that, or some similar periphrasis, for the unspeakable Name (cf. Psalm lxxxv. 9, "that the Glory may dwell in our land"). Hence the phrase "Received up in [the] Glory" is obviously equivalent to "Received up into the Godhead." Whether we read with most authorities **ΟC** for the opening nominative, or with the few **ΘC**, the meaning and implication of the whole credal confession are unchanged.

If we turn to the actual narratives of the Ascension we find the first in the addendum to S. Mark's Gospel (xvi. 19): but it has been suggested that the words there, "So then the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken unto them, was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God," do not necessarily imply an eye-witness and are reminiscent of Old Testament passages; so we pass to the more graphic words of S. Luke (xxiv. 51): "And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he parted (*diestē*) from them, and was carried up (*anephereto*) into the heaven." (I leave to the next section the consideration of the variations in MSS.) Rather fuller is the narrative in the Acts (i. 9–11): "And when he had said these things, as they were looking, he was taken up (*epērthē*), and a cloud received him from their eyes. And while they were looking stedfastly into the heaven as he went, behold also two men stood by them in white apparel, who also said, Men of Galilee, why stand ye looking into the heaven? This Jesus who was received (*analēmphtheis*) from you into the heaven shall so come in-like-manner-as (*hon tropon*) ye beheld him going into the heaven." The

bald simplicity of the narrative indicates an eye-witness who has no "theory" to offer.

We look at later references: Acts ii. 32, 33: "This JESUS . . . by the right hand of God exalted" (*hypsōtheis*): v. 34, "For David ascended not into the heavens" (cf. Ps. cx. 1): Acts iii. 21: "Christ JESUS whom the heaven must receive until . . ." : and the vision of Stephen in vii. 35. Passing to the Epistles, we cite S. Peter: 1 Ep. iii. 22: "Who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven": S. Paul: Rom. viii. 24: "who is at the right hand of God"; Eph. i. 20: "Made-him-to-sit at his right hand in the heavenly [places] far above . . ."; iv. 10: "that ascended (*anabas*) far above all the heavens"; Phil. ii. 9: "God highly exalted him" (*hyperypsōsen*). In the great treatise "to the Hebrews": iv. 14: "who hath passed through the heavens"; viii. 1: "Who sat down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens"; ix. 12: "entered-in once-for-all into the holy place"; v. 24: "into heaven itself, now to appear-before (*emphanisthēnai*) the face of God for us" (*hyper hēmōn*); x. 12: "he sat down . . . expecting"; xii. 2: "he hath sat down at the right hand (*en dexia*) of the throne of God."

Nor must we overlook three references in the Fourth Gospel: vi. 62: "What then if ye should behold the Son of Man ascending where he was before" (*ēn to proteron*)? xvi. 5: "Now I go unto him that sent me" (v. 10, "I go to the Father"); and xx. 17: "I am not yet ascended . . . but . . . I ascend [am ascending?]." We have arrived at phraseology which may be interpretative, but it is interpretative of fact that is not conceived of as challengeable. Whatever the interpretation, the fact is certain.

§ THE NATURE OF THE ASCENSION.

[Here we must examine the text of Luke xxiv. 51. All MSS. have the first half of the statement: *diestē ap' autōn*: "he parted . . . withdrew . . . stood apart . . . from them." But the words *Kai anephereto eis ton ouranon*: "and was carried up (borne) into the heaven," are lacking in Aleph (Cod. Sinaiticus) and D (Bezae) and half a dozen cursives. But they are present in B (Vaticanus), A (Alexandrinus) and most of the other primary uncials and a few cursives. They have been inserted in Aleph by a later hand; they lie behind the text of the Vulgate and some other versions. The words fall into the class known as "Western non-interpolations": so William Sanday thinks their omission "probably right," as he inclines to the "Western primitive text." But Alfred Plummer (S. Luke, 566, 7) gives weighty reasons and authority for rejecting the whole theory of "Western non-interpolations." It is very probable that Luke's Gospel circulated in more than one "edition": that the text of Aleph (our second-best MS.) represents the "first edition," or rough-draft, and the text of B (the best MS. of all, Plummer, "facile princeps") is the "second edition" or fair-copy, both derived from the hand of the original Evangelist. This would account for the more widely diffused text of B; and entitle us

to regard the whole passage as primitive. The reticence of the "rough-draft" must, of course, be read with the context, and as Plummer says "a *final* departure is meant."]

Modern theologians are cautious of dogmatism as to the *nature* of our Lord's Ascension. John Charles Ryle says: "Where our Lord's body went when so carried up, is an unprofitable speculation." Brooke Foss Westcott: "We are not to think of the Ascension of Christ as of a change of position, of a going immeasurably far from us. It is rather a change of a mode of existence, a passing to God, of whom we cannot say that He is 'there' rather than 'here.'" Frederick William Farrar: "Heaven is a state, not a locality." William Sanday: "It is sometimes necessary that a symbol should be acted as well as written or spoken." And Henry Barclay Swete: "As the Incarnation was not a physical descent, so the return of the Incarnate to the Father was not a physical elevation."

Yet we need to be careful. We speak *Kat' anthrōpinon* after-the-manner-of-men. But we must guard against any idea that the Ascension was merely a subjective phenomenon. It was an objective fact: and our interpretation must take count of that. The teaching of Holy Scripture is precise: the flesh of the Christ did not "see corruption": that phrase cannot be limited to the period between entombment and resurrection, or the apostle's argument fails. And our Church is emphatic: "The natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven and not here": and again (Art. iv): "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature; *wherewith he ascended* into Heaven, and there sitteth, until he return to judge all Men at the last day." It is easy to say lightly that such words are alien to modern theological conceptions: but it is not so easy to ignore interpretations that the Church throughout its history has, with awe and wonder and humble devotion, clung to as part of the Faith. We must recognise that not only human words, but also human thoughts, are wellnigh helpless in the contemplation of God, and that we are driven from prose to poetry—poetry is often truer than prose, and we are apt to overlook how much of Scriptural language is poetry—so that we may be thankful indeed to Arthur Penrhyn Stanley for his gracious words:

> He is gone—beyond the skies,
> A cloud receives Him from our eyes:
> Gone beyond the highest height
> Of mortal gaze or angel's flight;
> Through the veils of Time and Space,
> Passed into the Holiest Place;
> All the toil, the sorrow, done,
> All the battle fought and won.

Yet, somehow, the human body of Christ, which saw no corruption, was not sublimated but passed "to God"—was "received up in the glory"; and there *remaineth* until "He shall come again with

glory" as the Church confesses "to judge both the quick and the dead." A few years ago scientists might smile at the idea of "anywhere" beyond the starry space: to-day astronomical science tells us that space is not infinite, but doubles back upon itself (see James Jeans). We know that beyond the limits of space there remains —God. However inadequate our thought, the humanity—the human body—of Christ is still *with God*—existent with, in, the Godhead.

§ PLACE OF THE ASCENSION IN OUR LORD'S LIFE.

It has been well said that all lives of Christ are incomplete. "The days of his flesh" do not exhaust the life of the Son of Man. Henry Barclay Swete has written: "The Ascension was the coronation of the Christ, and the Session His enthronement. In the Synoptic Gospels JESUS is the King's Son, rather than the King. . . . The Kingdom was received at the Ascension."

In writing to the Romans, S. Paul indeed put his emphasis on the Resurrection and says that "JESUS Christ," carefully defining him as both the "historical JESUS" and also "the Christ of the Scriptures," was "declared"—*oristhentos*—"to be the Son of God . . . by the Resurrection of the dead": but this is the personal vindication. In his later letter to the Philippians he seems to pass lightly by the resurrection to put his weight on the Ascension: "Wherefore" (i.e. because of the death of the cross) "also God highly exalted him and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of JESUS every knee should bow . . . and that every tongue should confess. . . ." (Cf. Apoc. v. 12.) In his letter to the Ephesians he correlates the two facts (i. 20): "He raised him from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand. . . ."

It is in the great Epistle to the Hebrews that we find our key: cap. ii. 9. "We behold [JESUS], because of the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God he should taste of death for every man" (*hopōs chariti Theou hyper pantos geusētai thanatou*). Westcott comments: "The suffering of death —the endurance of the uttermost penalty of sin—was the ground of the Lord's exaltation in His humanity." Again he writes: "the particle (*hopōs*) is not strictly connected with *estephanōmenon* alone, but refers to all that precedes—to the Passion crowned by the Ascension. The glory that followed the death marked its universal efficacy." We are almost trespassing on our next section, as is inevitable: but at least we recognise that it is the Ascension, not the Resurrection, that is the climax. And is that not seen to be necessary: how could we even conceive of the Resurrection without the following Ascension?

§ PLACE OF THE ASCENSION IN OUR LORD'S WORK.

(*a*) *In the economy of the Atonement.*

Under the old Covenant the ritual and ceremonial of the Day of Atonement is set out in Lev. xvi. Westcott has (in *Heb.*, pp.

279, 280) a convenient summary, taking note of some later usages. But it is to be noted that the High Priest made two entries into "the unseen": the first (under a cloud of incense) after he had made and completed an offering for his own sins "that he die not" (vv. 2, 11, 12) to present himself before the presence of the Lord; the second (without mention of incense) after he, now accepted for himself (vv. 12, 13), had slain the sin-offering for the people, to present himself "for the people" to the Divine gaze. See also Nathaniel Dimock: "Our One Priest on High" (pp. 27, 28, 29): "His right to enter depends upon the offering past. He is admitted not that he may offer a sin-offering, but because his sin-offering has been offered and accepted." Westcott's comment is valuable: "Thus in a figure year by year the people had access to the Presence of God in the person of the High-priest. The fellowship between God and the people, established by the Covenant but marred by sins against its conditions, was restored. By the virtue of an offered life communion became possible. To this end there was a double sacrifice for the High-priest and for the people, and a double representation of the people by the High-priest and by the sin-offering; and till the atonement was made for the High-priest he could only enter the Holy of Holies under the cloud of incense. It is needless to point out the general fulfilment of the type by Christ. One point only, which appears to have been left unnoticed, may be suggested for consideration. The High-priest entered 'the unseen' twice, once for himself, once for the people. May we not see in this a foreshadowing of the two entrances of Christ into 'the unseen'? Once He entered, and came back victorious over death, ready in His glorified humanity to fulfil His work for His people. Again He entered the unseen 'to appear (*emphanisthēnai*) before the face of God for us,' and hereafter returning thence 'He shall appear (*ophthēsetai*) a second time to them that wait for him.'"

There is, then, a most intimate relation between the Atonement and the Ascension. The Ascension is no part of the sacrifice, or the offering. But the offering, the sacrifice, being complete—finished (*tetelestai*), and accepted; there is the presentation to the gaze of God of redeemed humanity. "That which bears [God's] regard is accepted by Him. . . ." "In [Christ] humanity obtains its true harmony with God, and in Him it can bear the full light of God" (Westcott).

So then, in Christ Man is formally shown without spot before God, because of the sacrifice completed on the Cross, attested by the Resurrection, and now in the Ascension noted in the Courts of heaven. Henceforth *Paraklēton echomen proston Patera* (1 John ii. 2). The offering (on Calvary) and the entrance (in the Ascension) together complete the work typified in the Aaronic priesthood. Henceforth "there is no more offering for sin" (*ouketi prosphora peri amartias* (Heb. x. 18))."

(*b*) *The present, continuing, work of Christ: The Session.*

The offering is past: the Aaronic priesthood abrogated: but

there emerges and remains the kingly priesthood after the order of Melchisedek: "When he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever (*eis to diēnekes*) he sat down on the right hand of God; henceforth expecting. . . ." Again Westcott: "By His offering of Himself He has *made purification of Sins*: He has applied the virtue of His Blood, to speak in earthly language, to the scene of the worship of redeemed humanity (ix. 23): He has taken His seat upon the throne, entering in His humanity upon the full enjoyment of every privilege won by His perfect fulfilment of the will of God. Henceforth He applies for the benefit of men the fruits of the Atonement which He has completed."

The present King-priestly work of our Lord includes:

1. Intercession: Heb. vii. 25, 27; ix. 24. It is only in Christ that man can bear God's gaze: 1 John ii. 2. It is as our paraclete that He intercedes. "Prevalent He intercedes": as the result of past and complete restoration of right relations between man and God: there is no continuance of pleading. "His glorified humanity is the eternal pledge of the absolute efficacy of His accomplished work. . . . Meanwhile, men on earth in union with Him enjoy continually through His blood what was before the privilege of one man on one day in the year" (Westcott).

2. Articulation: Heb. xiii. 15. (Cf. Rom. viii. 26 in the light of vv. 9, 10.) "The fruit of lips which make confession to his Name . . ." "through Him" (*di' autou*). It is only through Christ that articulate utterance of our prayer and praise is feasible and audible in heaven: that is true even of those who do not consciously own His Name: for the work of the Christ is far-reaching beyond human conception. But it is in the "confession to His Name" that the privilege is specifically granted.

3. Mediation of access: Heb. iv. 16; x. 19. In each of these passages the keynote is "boldness" (*parrēsia*)—"with eye open" (Syriac Pesh.). We are bold to draw near to the throne: to enter into the most sacred place: because "Man with God is on the throne." "Cast not away therefore your boldness" (x. 35). "Whence this boldness?" (Chrysostom). "From the forgiveness" (v. 18: cf. v. 12). Cf. also Rom. v. 10 and Heb. ix. 14. (See also 1 John ii. 2 (*hilasmos estin*). It is interesting that the old Latin Sacramentaries spoke of "propitiatione perpetua," which our Reformers wisely paraphrased "thy perpetual mercy," a felicitous translation copied in the Roman Catholic English Liturgy for Lay folk.)

(*c*) *The Mission of the Spirit.*

The Spirit is sent by the Father in Christ's Name, John xiv. 26. But also by Christ from the Father (*para tou patros*), John xv. 26. The condition is Christ's removal, as Man, from Earth, xvi. 7. The gift was not possible till JESUS was glorified, vii. 39. It is therefore because of the Ascension that the outpouring of the Spirit is possible. Westcott: "He sent the Spirit by virtue of his ascended Manhood." Till God and Man were reconciled the Spirit could not dwell in Man.

For the presence of the Spirit "is twofold, in the Society, and in the individual: He 'abideth beside' us in the Church: and He 'is' in each believer." So Westcott writes, reading *esti* in place of the *estai* of the common text. The relation of the Spirit with the individual believer is more intimate than His relationship with the Community. There is much to be learned from this significant fact.

(*d*) *The Future.*

Here we can say but little: yet (Heb. vi. 20) it is as a "forerunner" (*prodomos*) that JESUS entered "within the veil" . . . "for us" (*hyper hēmōn*). In the older Covenant the people did not follow their representative. But we shall follow the Christ: this is our "boldness." And we are brought back to Acts i. 11 (*houtos ho Jēsous . . . houtōs eleusetai hon tropon*), "Shall so come in like manner."

Shall we not better observe Holy Thursday—the Ascension Day—the crown of the Christian year?

How immeasurable, incomprehensible, inexhaustible, is our JESUS.

THE AFTER-LIFE IN THE UNSEEN WORLD. By the Rev. Euston Nurse, M.A., F.R.G.S., Rector of Windermere, C.F. *London: Skeffington & Son, Ltd., Paternoster House, E.C.*4. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

The greater part of this volume of sermons is devoted to the subject of the After-Life. It is unlikely that the author will carry all his readers with him and lead them to the conclusions at which he has himself arrived. He quotes, apparently with entire approval, the familiar hymn which says "Soul and body meet again," in spite of St. Paul's words, "Thou sowest not that body that shall be." In the address on Prayers for the Departed he says "it seems quite clear that Onesiphorus was not alive" at the time St. Paul wrote. But Dr. Handley Moule tells us "there is no need at all to assume that Onesiphorus had died."

Sermons follow upon other subjects—e.g. Harvest Festivals, Hospital Sunday, Armistice Day, the British Legion and Foreign Missions. In the latter Mr. Nurse tells the story of Bishop Lloyd's work in Western Canada, and he gives a brief account of the activities of the S.P.G., C.M.S., Zenana and Colonial and Continental Church Societies, but he has passed without notice the undertakings in South America of the S.A.M.S. The story of the establishment of the Parochial Church Councils, the Diocesan Quota and other recent legislation is told in the closing address, and there is much that tends to stimulate the efforts of Churchpeople to make their witness effective.

S. R. C.

KARL BARTH AND THE PROTESTANT REVIVAL.

By the Rev. R. Birch Hoyle, Author of "The Teaching of Karl Barth."

"PROTESTANTISM has only about fifty years of life left to it," said a Catholic Tutor at Münster, Westphalia, to Karl Barth once. "You may be deceived," was the reply; "the providence of God will still rule." If we may judge by the rapid extension of Barth's influence over Europe, reaching to America and even India, there seems good warrant for Count Keyserling's statement, "Barth has saved Protestantism on the Continent." Professor Adolph Keller, of Geneva, when making a tour of the Evangelical Churches in the Baltic lands, reported:

"Protestantism is undergoing a kind of revival, which may not only be due to the hardship of the time, but also to the deepening influence of the theology of Karl Barth which is sweeping all over the countries." [1]

Barth's name occurs frequently now in British theological literature. Canon Kenneth Mozley recently paid tribute to the growing influence of Barth.

"Germany has a way of producing theologians who evoke passionate enthusiasm and equally passionate dissent. . . . These are early days for any estimate of the theology of Karl Barth likely to stand the test of time, especially as Barth may have still much to say. But this is quite clear: Barth's doctrine of Christ is first of all a doctrine of Christ the Redeemer." [2]

Dr. Cave, of Cheshunt College, Cambridge, in his latest book, *The Doctrines of the Christian Faith*, writes:

"It says much for the violence of the reaction against pre-war theology that a book as extreme as Barth's *Commentary on Romans* (*Der Römerbrief*) should have so greatly influenced many of the younger men in German-speaking Protestantism" (p. 20).

Dr. A. E. Garvie admits that "one of the most popular theological movements on the Continent is the Barthian. Of it I can say that the more I learn of it the less I like it." [3] But a reviewer in *The Guardian* goes so far as to say that "the man and the movement have done more, perhaps, to set a new orientation to German religious thought than anything that has happened there since Goethe, perhaps, even since Luther." [4] Even in India the influence is being marked among the Christian tutors. Dr. Bridge, of St. Paul's College, Calcutta, thinks that Barth's teaching is needed, for

"so much of Indian religious thought is coloured by an over-emphasis on the immanence of God, that a presentation of the attribute of transcendence will correct the exaggeration of Indian mystics."

[1] *British Weekly*, November 14, 1929.
[2] *Mysterium Christi*, p. 184.
[3] *The Christian Ideal*, p. 465.
[4] August 8, 1930.

The theologians are the first to feel the force of the new breeze: it is to be hoped that it may blow through our Churches as a "breath from the Lord." In the past British Protestantism gained much from the Continent. We need only think of the influence of Luther and Bucer on the Anglican Reformation in the sixteenth century: of Moravianism, in its action and reaction thereto on John Wesley in the seventeenth century, the warm impulses from Monod and Alexander Vinet on the leaders of the Evangelical movement a century ago, not to mention the deep impress of Calvin, through John Knox, upon Scotland and New England. The "new-Calvinism" Barth teaches bids fair to exercise an influence in this century as forceful as any of those eminent predecessors. For, as St. Augustine wrote, the Christian Church is always tempted to "crumble back again into the world" which it professes to have renounced by its baptismal vow, and she is set to be the perpetual protest against "worldliness," the secularism which to-day is the rival, if not the foe of spiritual evangelicalism. She has ever to protest against "things as they are," even as Jesus opposed Judaism, Paul Pharisaism, John "the world that lieth in the Evil one," Luther against Romanism, and the Evangelicals against the moderatism and indifferentism of the past century and a half.

At bottom, the movement which bears, against his desire, the name of Barth is a protest against modern Protestant theology since Schleiermacher, which, in Barth's phrase, "has transformed theology into anthropology." This a product of the Cartesian philosophy which turned man's attention to his inward life and has made "the proper study of mankind, man" instead of God. The centre has been shifted from the authority of God speaking in and through His Word: man is made the measure of all things in heaven and earth, until we hear men like C. E. M. Joad and Bertrand Russell saying, as did Feuerbach two generations ago, that God is a mere projection of man's fancies. As a consequence men have lost a sense of the presence of God: the sense of sin has been weakened: man has made himself as God, with all the misery of the war as gruesome commentary on "the divinity of man." Barth has analysed and traced the declension of Protestantism during the past century. At the Reformation the position held was that through the Word of God speaking in Scripture, aided by the inner witness of the Holy Spirit, believers heard *God* speaking. Later

"people began to surround the witness of the Holy Spirit with other reasons for belief in order to support a proof in which they no longer had perfect trust. . . . When historical criticism began objecting to the antiquity, the genuineness, the historical reliability of Biblical literature . . . we lost the wonder of *God*; the great misery of Protestantism began. Doctrine, parted from its life-giving source, hardened into Orthodoxy: Christian experience, confusing itself with this source, took refuge in Pietism, truth shrivelled into the moral and sentimental maxims of the Enlightenment; and, finally, Christian experience was reduced by Schleiermacher and his

successors to the hypothesis of being the highest expression of a religious instinct common to all men." [1]

And the recent studies in psychology have sought to trace religion to primal instincts derived from man's animal ancestry, and not from the creative breath and speech of God making him " a living soul."

Before we attempt to present the principles from which Barth develops his teaching, a few words about the man himself and his works should be said. Born in 1886, the son of a theological Professor at Basle and having two brothers Professors, Barth passed through the Universities at Berne, Berlin, Tübingen and Marburg. At Marburg he sat under Natorp and Cohen, Neo-Kantians, and his thinking bears marks of the Kantian philosophy : he was strongly influenced by Wilhelm Herrmann in dogmatics. After graduating, for a year or two he assisted Martin Rade on the " Liberal " theology's paper, *Die Christliche Welt* ; at 23 he entered the ministry of the Reform Church and at Safenwil, in Switzerland, from 1911 he was Pastor of a Church in the industrial area. Imbued with Socialistic notions, and a strong pacifist as regards war, he sought the " coming of God's Kingdom " in association with the Christian Socialist movement under the leadership of H. Kutter in Basle and of Ragaz. Soon he found that the theology he had learned under Herrmann gave him no message wherewith to face the fatalism and unbelief rife near the battlefields. He says :

" I sought to find my way between the problem of human life on the one hand and the content of the Bible on the other. As a minister I wanted to speak to the people in the infinite contradiction of their life, but to speak on the no less infinite message of the Bible, which was as much of a riddle as life."

And as Luther found in St. Paul's Epistles the message for his day, so Barth found in Romans, with its great opening chapters putting man " in the dock " before a righteous God, the message for war and post-war conditions. " What at first," he says, " was to be only an essay to help me to know my own mind grew into ' my theology,' or let us rather say ' Theology of Correction.' " [2] Soon Barth was called to speak at religious conferences and gatherings of ministers : he spoke with a force and flame that kindled enthusiasm everywhere, and in 1921 he was placed in the Professor's Chair at Göttingen : then translated to the Reformed Church's Chair of Theology at Münster in Westphalia, and since 1929 Barth has occupied the Chair at Bonn and drawn to his classes hundreds of youths from all over Europe.

His book on Romans gave him a Continental reputation. It was first published in 1918, it has run through several editions, and its effect, as a Roman Catholic writer put it, was " as a bomb falling on a playground." It was attacked by historians of eminence, Harnack and Jülicher : by theologians, as Wobbermin : by " liberals " such as Rade and Bultmann (the latter is now with

[1] *Word of God and Word of Man*, Engl. tr., p. 245 f.
[2] *ib.*, p. 103.

Barth): by Fundamentalists, Lutheran, Pietists and Roman Catholics alike. Since then other works have come from his fluent pen: two collections of Essays and Addresses, one of which, under the title *The Word of God and The Word of Man*, has been put into "American"-English: the other, *Die Theologie und Die Kirche*, gives us Barth's views of theologians, preachers and Church systems: two commentaries, in addition to his Romans, one of them on 1 Corinthians xv, on (in English) "The Resurrection of the Dead," the other on Philippians (*Erklärung des Philipperbrief*); some sermons and many articles in the paper of the Movement, *Zwischen den Zeiten* (Between the Ages), and lastly, his *Dogmatik I*; *Die Lehre vom Worte Gottes*, issued in 1927. It is a misfortune that only two of his works have been rendered into English, one, *The Word of God*, just mentioned, another, *The Christian Life* on Romans xii. 1 f., which hardly conveys the strength of Barth's message. Perhaps mention may be made of the present writer's book, *The Teaching of Karl Barth, An Exposition*, which has had a kindly reception (S.C.M., 7*s.* 6*d.* net). It is a crying shame that the *Römerbrief*, which first gave Barth's name such prominence abroad, has not been put into an English dress: would that some publisher would do the whole religious world and especially Evangelical Christianity this service!

Dr. Cave has well described the book and its contents.

"Few modern books are so deeply moving as Barth's book on Romans. . . . It is an amazing book—500 closely-packed pages of violent paradox. . . . Barth had looked to the rise of Christian democracy to secure for the world peace and progress. The war showed him how vain was this hope: he lost all trust in man's thoughts and plans. No lasting good can come from any of man's activities. If we are to be saved it must be by God's act alone. The only light we have is given us by Christ's death. . . . Religion cannot help men, for that, too, is human. The one liberating word which 'religion' can never find is this: God sent His own Son. And since God sent His own Son because of sin, this liberating word is (to quote Barth) to be described only in strong negations, to be preached only as a paradox, to be apprehended only as the 'absurd' which, as such, is the 'credible,' for it is the Divine reaction against sin. The offence, the vexation which it causes us is the reflexion of the offence, the vexation which we men are to God." [1]

And Dr. R. S. Franks, of Bristol, has succinctly put its main theme thus:

"According to Barth, Christ is simply the point where the Infinite world breaks across into the world of the finite, and the Cross is just the moment in Divine revelation through Christ when the condemnation of all things finite is pronounced. Hence Faith is avowing the Divine No and awaiting the Divine Yes."

Since the Professor exchanged the Genevan gown for the professor's robes, the language of paradox, flaming rhetoric and Carlylean thunder has undergone some change. He speaks in terms of scholastic erudition—he is well-versed in the Medieval Schoolmen, as becomes one working alongside of Roman Catholics

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 19 f.; citing *Römbf.*, p. 259.

trained in St. Thomas Aquinas—but at times the volcanic fire bursts out in flame. It is difficult to summarize his teaching because, as a "Theology of Correction" it is a kind of marginal comment on theories some knowledge of which is presupposed by the reader. All current psychological theories of religion, such as Otto's on the "Numinöse" and Freud's and Jung's; all modern historical research on the Gospel narratives, and on the history of Christian doctrines, as given by Harnack, Ritschl (A.) and Troeltsch, are grist to his mill, and his keen analytical powers are turned on the practices as well as the ideas prevailing in the various religious circles of German Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. And to present adequately Barth's doctrines demands also some knowledge of the social, political and economic conditions amidst which he labours. As Professor Niebergall rightly said, "Many volumes would be required to deal with his criticisms," so far flung is his line of attack. Within our limits perhaps the most useful course to take is to present his central principle and from that to work out to his message to Protestantism to-day.

In the Preface to Romans he wrote:

> "If I have a 'system' it consists in that I hold steadfastly in sight what Soeren Kierkegaard called 'The infinitively qualitative difference of time and eternity': in its negative and positive significance. 'God is in heaven and thou on earth.' The relation of *this* God to *this* man and *vice versa* is for me the theme of the Bible and the sum of philosophy in one. Philosophers call this crisis of human knowing, the Origin or Source (Ger. Ursprung)."

Enfolded there, as *in nuce*, lies the heart of Barth's theology. If we unfold those theses we see in "the infinitively qualitative difference of time and eternity" the profound problems of the relation of time to what is *not* time, but precedes and follows time, eternity; which, since Einstein taught, has become a problem taxing our ablest minds to the utmost. Put in St. Paul's words, "The things which are seen are temporal," and so, changing, passing, "under condemnation" of God and doomed to extinction. But "the things which are not seen are eternal": abiding, unchanging, partaking in God's endless life. The eternal *negates* the temporal. And put in spatial terms, we have the difference between the transcendental and the immanental.

Here Barth attacks current modes of thought which view the temporal as a preliminary stage ascending to the eternal. Such a view is thinking in terms of quantity: the temporal as a lesser amount of which the eternal is the total sum, the temporal being a fragment, a fraction continuous with the eternal. Such a view is in line with the evolutionary idea in biology and the idea held in sociology where the final stage of things issues automatically in fulness of life in the individual and the Kingdom of God in society. In such a view the eternal is already in time: the divine is inherent in man: man being "but little lower than God," God a little higher than man, immanent in man. Not so, says Barth. Time is not continuous with eternity: time, on earth, is "the broken arc,"

eternity, "in the heaven the perfect round" is not true, for no prolongation of the line will ever round to a circle.

Then the natures of God and man are "infinitively different" in "quality." God is in heaven, nothing qualifies, circumscribes or limits Him: man, on earth, is "cribbed, cabined and confined" in an environment he did not make, and can only slightly modify. He is finite, and, according to the axiom of the Reformed Church theology in which Barth was reared, "the finite has no capacity for the infinite." In terms of ethical quality the difference that exists between God and man is that between the Holy and the sinful, the Creator and the creature, the Sovereign and the subject. It is more than a difference in abstract quality; it is a difference in personality. God is not an abstraction, an *idea* which man can form by generalizing; that indeed would make God man's creation, as Feuerbach and B. Russell assert. And the ethical judgment follows that the only virtue man can have before God is unfaltering obedience, "to do His will." *Dis*obedience is flat rebellion, sin, and sin has affected man and all creatures on earth "at the very core of their being": it is Kant's "*radikal Böse.*"

When Barth says this "infinite difference is the theme of the Bible and philosophy in one," he indicates the two lines along which man comes to realize his finitude. From philosophy man learns that he is an "I" over against a "Not-I" in nature and creatures beneath himself. He throws the mantle of thought over Nature and interprets it in terms of his own thought, much as Sir J. Jeans finds Nature's Maker to be a mathematician. But in nature man can never find God: *finitum non capax infiniti.* Even Nature may be only a "projection of man over things about him": according to Kant we never know "the thing in itself."

On the other line, through the Bible, a Voice speaks to man, "the Word of God speaking," as Barth says, and only as man hears that voice does he come to perfect personal responsibility. The Divine "Thou" addresses man's "I" and puts man "in Crisis." "In conscience God enters time," says Barth, but speaking and requiring assent and response. This is "the one theme of the Bible" to Barth, and in the *Dogmatik* he adds that this relation between *this* God addressing man and *this* man so taken in claim should be the one theme of Christian preaching. Here we are at the *source*, the primal origin. It starts with God, not with man, and the gravamen of Barth's polemic against present-day theologians is that they start with man to try to reach God. There is no way up, says Barth, only the way down from God to man: and this makes the relation between God and man. The relation is that of the Creator to the creature, of Sovereign to subject, and the latter lives in utter dependence on his Maker: "in Him we live, move, and have our being." Though God and man come into relation there is no infringement of the Divine Sovereignty. God conditions man, but though He relativates Himself, He never parts with His sovereignty. Man can never acquire a claim upon God or arrange terms of accommodation with Him, for God's

sovereignty would thereby be encroached upon. And even when man resents that sovereignty and disobeys, that Sovereign claim still persists: with doom, for God is "The Determiner of Destiny."

So from philosophy man learns that he is more than a bit of nature: he can never be at home there: nor in human society either, for it is ever in flux and he with it. As Barth said:

"Man is found in this world in prison. His creatureliness is a fetter: his sin a liability: his death is his fate. His world is a shapeless chaos, moving to and fro, of natural, psychical and some other forces. His life is an illusion; this is his condition."

And from God's Word man finds that "God stands to man in contradiction as the *impossible* to the possible, as *death* is contrary to life, as *eternity* over against time."[1] God is the "Everlasting No" to man in *this* world; but the No in which is concealed His Yes. And the Yes is seen only at the in-breaking of the Eternal world into time at the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

"In Jesus Christ," he says, "two worlds meet and diverge. The first is the world we know, the world created by God—and 'fallen': the world of the flesh needing salvation, 'our world.' This world is cut into by another world, the unknown world, the world of the Father's original creation and of final salvation. The point of intersection of these two worlds is Jesus of Nazareth, the Jesus of history. In Him a vertical line falls plumb on the horizontal line of history. The resurrection of Christ manifests this 'new world,' the world of the Holy Spirit, which here touches this world at a tangent: touches but not entering. In Christ, the Word of the Creator marks the confines of history, its limits, and at the Resurrection is where God reveals Himself—whilst remaining concealed!"[2]

This revelation puts man "in Crisis." God becomes more than an object to contemplate: He is a demand which man has to concede or reject, and thus it is a turning-point, where life takes new direction; it requires a decision, after which "life is never the same again"; it is destiny, election or reprobation; "there is a great gulph fixed."

Barth's strength is put forth to develop realistically the contradiction between God and man, and between man as he is and as he knows he was meant to be. Man is "in the depths" and cannot get out: he can cry to be rescued "de profundis," but no man, not even a human Jesus can rescue him: only God can do that. And God in the Logos, the God-man, has done that already at the Cross. There the contradiction is sovereignly overcome and the apprehension of that fact and truth is vouchsafed to man through God's outpouring of the Holy Spirit, Who is the subjective "efficient" within man, revealing the "meaning" of the objective revelation seen in the Incarnation of the Son of God. The human Jesus, "of the seed of David after the flesh, is declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead."[3] He is the "bridge from eternity to time"; God revealing His condemnation of sin, and God in wondrous grace restoring "fallen" man to fellowship with Himself.

[1] *Römbf.*, p. 12 f. [2] *ib.*, p. 5 f. [3] Rom. i. 4 f.

The "work is all Divine"; man can only receive it, and only hears of it through the Word of God.

We need not stay to show how in this unfolding of Barth's central idea there is implicit the recognition of the Chalcedonian formula of the Two Natures—"that glorious paradox," as he calls it: the "plan of salvation," as Reformers described it: and the acknowledgment of the Personality of God the Holy Ghost, as Evangelicals delight to own and confess. Nor need we attempt to explain the difficulties inherent in paradox and in the dialectical method of thinking involved when things in relation and antithesis have to be resolved. A fellow-worker of Barth's, E. Brunner, of Zürich, has expounded lucidly the "Theology of Crisis" in a book now Englished, under that title (Scribners), and perhaps for dialectic the reader may be referred to the Chapter XIII in *The Teaching of Karl Barth.* We must confine ourselves to Barth's exposition of the principles of the Reformation. He has brought the great watchwords of the Reformation, Luther's Justification by Faith, Calvin's The Absolute Sovereignty of God, The Word of God as source and standard of Christian Preaching and Theology, into current coin again and focussed attention on the realities these slogans indicate.

The *Dogmatik I* is completely devoted to expounding the place of The Word of God as fountain-head of all Dogmatics. The Word of God comes to us in three forms, in all of which the Speaker is God. Starting from the preacher's office and function Barth shows how that "Word" contained in preaching is the third stage at which it comes to the hearer. The one thing that makes a Church is "God speaking": nothing else, not sacraments, social meetings, nor groups of persons like-minded in ideas. The preacher's word has been mediated to him through the Church as custodian of the written Word of God contained in the Bible. But the written record, in broken human speech, goes back to the final, first stage, God's immediate revelation to prophets and Apostles. The primal revelation was not immanent in prophets and Apostles; the "Word" has "to come"; it is not of this earthly sphere, or history: it is trans-history, coming into history and qualifying history, but not losing its transcendent force.

On the relation of this spoken Word of God's—*Deus dixit*—to the written word, Scripture, Barth says, "That Revelation produces the testimony of Scripture and in Scripture speaks for itself; this makes the Scripture to be the Word of God." Elsewhere he puts it: "The Word of God appears even to-day in the Bible and apart from this event, viz. His speaking, it (the Bible) is not the Word of God but one book as other books." And again: "Scripture is the Word of God so far as it witnesses to revelation." [1] He allows the "lower" and "higher" criticisms to do their proper work in fixing the best texts and allowing for the human element in writing and transmitting the "revelation" into human words: theology begins when they have done, and there remains God's

[1] *Dg.*, pp. 45, 63, 134.

Word, challenging men and calling them to the eternal world and also creating them new creatures in Christ. Barth stands there with Luther who said in 1522: John's Gospel and 1st Epistle, Paul's Epistles, and 1st Peter, these are

"the books which show Christ to thee and teach all that it is necessary and blessed for thee to know, even if thou sawest not nor heard any other book or teaching. . . . The Epistle of St. James is a right strawy Epistle, for it is not of an evangelical sort." [1]

We saw earlier how Barth challenged the theologians for taking "man as the measure of things," including revelation. Since Schleiermacher's *Glaubenslehre*, which took as its starting-point for theology, "the states of soul of the pious Christian when feeling his absolute dependence on God," Barth holds that the wrong way has been taken. Man again has been put as the object of his reflection. As an orthodox theologian of the Erlangen school put it, "I myself as a Christian am to myself, as a theologian, the supreme object of theological science." Even Seeberg, in his *Christian Dogmatics*, says the object to be seen is "the subjective setting of the will experienced in Christian faith" (p. 227). This is akin to the pietism which is measuring its salvation by its gusts of inner feeling with but little reference to the August Being who may have evoked such emotion. Thus Barth sets himself against any search in *man* for the ground of theology: not even faith is a "ground" for religion. And the modern psychology of religion has given us much psychology but desperately little of God. Barth says the mode of procedure is to start with the Word of God, and not with the faith, the inner states of consciousness of man when in religious relation. Faith is not man's doing initially: "It is the gift of God, as the living presence of the Holy Ghost in man." [2] God never becomes an "object" for the religious consciousness: he is, and ever remains, the Subject, "the First Person Speaking," and man is always God's object addressed and knows nothing of God till God has spoken. To stay at man's end of the matter is to have our feet on sand ever shifting: to be in the relative and the uncertain: faith is grounded in God, "The Rock of Ages." To put faith first and the Word second, is, says Barth, "falsification upon falsification on the whole line and at all points. Dogmatics is not an hour-glass which can be reversed and run on just the same." [3] Instead of starting with God's Word modern theologians begin with generalizing on religion generally, "the science of religion" it is called, and the voice of God is drowned; theology has become "anthropocentric" and thereby, as Schaeder says, "there has been belittlement of God. Little man has cast upon God his own shadow."

Towards Roman Catholicism Barth directs his criticism, and his positive views about the Reformation can be best seen in an Essay on "Roman Catholicism as a Problem for the Protestant Church." [4]

[1] *Pref. to New Test.* [2] *Dg.*, p. 89. [3] *Dg.*, p. 87.
[4] In *Theologie und Kirche*, p. 329 *et seq.*

This is not violent assault on the Roman views: Barth recognizes much of God's working in that Church, but lays his finger on weak spots. To the contention of Romanists that Protestantism is but a negative, a protest, Barth rejoins that the Reformation was not a revolution but a restoration, for the Church is "the place where God's Word has place and is received and is served by men: the fellowship is made on the basis of God's call heard." Romanists, on the other hand, regard the Church as "theirs, not God's": "man's" presence makes the Church, the priesthood is the "visible" making known and impartation of grace: man secures an *opus operatum*, man secures reconciliation through the priest, and the Pontifex Romanus is nothing more nor less than Christ on earth. Here again, as in theology, man has thrust himself in the place of God. Genuine Protestantism, says Barth, is

"a restoration of the absolute individuality of the person, of the absolute non-repeatability of the work of the Lord; restoration of the absolute irreversibility of the relation of the Word and flesh: subject and predicate; restoration of the correlation of the Divine reality of revelation to the equally Divine reality of faith. So it is affirmation not negation, strengthening and sharpening, not weakening or removing of the thought of mediation, of the idea of service; restoration of the understanding that the Church is *God's* house."

"Protestantism holds that 'God's presence is not shut up in a sacramental-house'; He is present as grace in the shoemaker's shop, the factory, laboratory and mine." "Protestantism signifies the restoration of God's authority in contrast with that of the Church, and thereby the restoration of freedom of conscience," but that conscience is "under law unto God."

"The Reformation has restored the Church as the Church of The Word. Word is the revelation and self-impartation of another Person to us, meeting us, and if this Person is God's Person it is the expression of His Sovereignty—not of His might, but of His Sovereignty over us. Might would treat us as things, not as persons. If God meets me in His Word this denotes that He seeks me, rules me through His command and through His promise, and that I have to believe and obey Him. If God meets us in and through His Word, we know ourselves as sinners before God. Word of God means God's judgment. If God is sovereign then man is His servant—in the concrete, a fallible, unfaithful and disloyal servant, to the very core of our being."

"The Church as we view it is the restoration of the Church as the Church of sinners. The Word of God that secures and constitutes the relation between Him and us, is essentially, actually, Word of grace. This is the place of reconciliation. Jesus receives sinners. He names them 'His own': He tells us that we are all 'right' to Him: this is our justification. And He takes us in claim, our faith and obedience: this is our sanctification. And both without our 'doing,' without a preceding or succeeding 'Merit.'"

"The Reformation was the restoration of the Church as the

Church of the mercy of God. We miss this in the Roman Church, viz., that we live in the Church of God's mercy (lit., warmheartedness), and altogether and utterly and in no wise live we by anything else."

Such are some of the points in that brilliant address. Barth has a message, and a ring that is sore needed to-day. Here sounds the trumpet-note of a herald announcing glad tidings, for he has heard a Word of the Lord, though he modestly disclaims such an exalted office. Here we feel the presence of a messenger with just the word to man in the infinite contradiction of his existence in Europe; yea, anywhere in the world to-day. "God has spoken in His holiness: I will exult." Well may Protestantism in these isles welcome this voice from German Switzerland with the old cries, *Gratia Dei sola, fidei sola, soli gloria Dei.*

POEMS OF LIFE. By Rev. T. H. Collinson, M.A. *London: The C. W. Daniel Company, Ltd.* 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Mr. Collinson has brought out four volumes of poems. He has now to be congratulated upon a fifth and single volume, consisting of choice selections from his earlier books, although they are mostly and hitherto unpublished poems, interpreting Nature and Religion. The collection is divided into four parts—Poems of Youth, A Student's Love Songs, Lakeland Poems, and Poems of Nature and Life. Of course, it goes without saying that there are poems *and* poems. Mr. Collinson, however, is no mere versifier, but one of those poets who are born and not made. There is indeed ample proof of this in the book itself.

THE CHILD'S RELIGION. By Pierre Bovet, Directeur de l'Institut Jean Jacques Rousseau. Translated by George H. Green, M.A., Ph.D., B.Sc. *London: J. M. Dent & Co., Ltd.* 6*s.* net.

The author of this treatise, M. Pierre Bovet, is Professor of Education in the University of Geneva, and is, consequently, an expert in the realm of pedagogy, and the translations of several works from his pen have already established his reputation, so that he can rely upon any further contribution to the study of education being well received. He is virtually in agreement with William James, believing that there is no specific "religious instinct," but that the beginnings of religious behaviour and of a religious attitude must be sought in the behaviour and attitude of the child to its parents. This study is a work of the first importance for all persons who are in any way connected with the training of the young.

S. R. C.

REMINISCENCES OF OXFORD IN THE EARLY "NINETIES."

By Canon Le B. E. ffrench, B.A., Rector of St. John's, Ballinasloe, Co. Galway, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Killaloe.

> Forty years on, when afar and asunder
> Parted are those who are singing to-day,
> When you look back, and forgetfully wonder
> What you were like in your work and your play.

SO we used to sing at Balliol, and it comes as a shock to realize that it is just forty years since I went up to Oxford with an Exhibition from Trent College. The words quoted are from "The Harrow Football Song," which has been appropriated by Balliol, probably since Mr. John Farmer, who composed the well-known tune, moved on as Organist from the School to the College, which claims to be the second oldest in the University. "Come to Balliol, Mr. Farmer, and we will build you an organ." This, according to tradition, was Jowett's invitation. Already "the Master" has been mentioned. How could it be otherwise in notes written by one of those who sat at his feet? The memorial to him in the College Chapel has inscribed on it only the name "Jowett"—"*verbum non amplius*," and this is fitting. To all who studied under him his will always be "*clarum et venerabile nomen.*" "*Immanis pecoris custos, immanior ipse*"! Many would say that "*domus Balliolensis*" owes its peculiar reputation to him, but there were Greeks before Agamemnon, and he only carried on the work of his distinguished predecessors, Parsons, Jenkyns, and Scott. At his death in 1893 it was said that "Balliolism pervaded the University," and at that time eight heads of other Colleges were Balliol men. In other ways his direct personal influence outside his own College in his later years was probably not great, though the vigour with which he once discharged the office of Vice-Chancellor was not forgotten. His reputation as a theologian was ephemeral, and at Cambridge it is reported that they said, "Oxford suffered under the disadvantage of having a Regius Professor of Greek who did not know the difference between the Greek particles," a remark which may be taken as illustrating the difference which, broadly speaking, exists between Oxford and Cambridge ideals of scholarship. This difference was noted by the late Dr. Sanday in an article in *The Expositor* soon after the publication of the Revised New Testament. He observed that "as Cambridge had a large preponderance of members on the New Testament Company (thirteen as against five of Oxford), the Revised Version leaned more to the side of exact literalism than of polished style."

Here it may not be amiss to observe that Jowett's aim in his strict supervision of both tutors and students was not to produce

men remarkable for their erudition, but rather such as would be "good all round" (as I once heard Horace's phrase "*teres et rotundus*" delightfully translated), useful members of society in whatever environment they might be placed. One hopes that the sentiment attributed to the late Lord Oxford (one of Jowett's pupils) is fictitious, though the sentence has a distinctly Asquithian ring, that the chief characteristic of Balliol men is "a tranquil consciousness of effortless superiority." It has been said with equal truth (or falsehood) that the difference between the typical Cambridge and the typical Oxford man is that "the Cambridge man looks as if the whole world belonged to him, and the Oxford man as if he did not care whether it did or not."

Jowett's appearance was striking. He had a countenance suggestive of one of Reynolds' cherubs, and a wide forehead crowned with beautiful white hair. He habitually wore, even in the daytime, a "swallow-tail" coat with low waist-coat and white tie. But if his dress recalled the days past there was nothing old-fashioned in his speech. Most of the stories with which the world has been bored about him are doubtless apocryphal, but he had cultivated the habit of saying caustic things in an epigrammatic manner, as when he informed one of my own acquaintances at the terminal "Hand-shaking," "Your mediocrity is not golden, but leaden." More trying to some was his "*terribile silentium,*" which a former public orator, Dr. Merry, the Rector of Lincoln College, recalled to memory in his Latin speech at the "Encænia" in 1894.

There was, however, a side to his awe-inspiring personality not always suspected. Bishop Chavasse liked to recall a day during his time at St. Peter-le-Bailey when to his surprise "The Master of Balliol" was announced. Jowett called on that occasion to enlist the Rector's sympathy on behalf of a College Scout who was ill, and to promise such material help as might be needed. Just after I had come through Classical "Mods," "Death's bright angel" entered my home in the midlands of Ireland. My father's health had been failing for some time, and my mother was prostrate with grief. Other members of the family were obliged to return to posts of duty, and under the circumstances I plucked up courage to write to the Master, who was a rigid disciplinarian, to ask permission to stay at home for a term. Early in the day on which he received my letter he replied by wire, "Yes, if you think it best." The implied trust in an obscure member of the College may help to explain his success in dealing with young men. The College discipline was the strictest in Oxford, and as regards attendance in Chapel a high example was set by its Head, who never, unless prevented by illness or a call of duty elsewhere, failed to be in his seat twice a day. On Sundays he always "celebrated" at the 8 o'clock Communion Service, but as a rule preached only twice a term. His sermons, delivered in a voice of bell-like tone, were written in the choicest English, and are delightful to read as specimens of a chaste prose style, but they certainly did not conform to any recognized standard of orthodoxy. He sometimes expressed himself rather

quaintly, perhaps from a lack of a sense of humour. Thus in a sermon on " I have been young and now am old," etc., when summing up the feelings with which one " who had spent fifty years in this place " would look back upon his early years, he caused some amusement by the remark, " He would think that the Providence which looks after little children and drunken people had taken special care of him." He always used the Collect for Quinquagesima Sunday before preaching, and at the end of his days, when his heart manifestly went out in fatherly love to the College he had served so well, always pronounced a double benediction at the end of the Service,—" The Lord bless you and keep you . . ." ; " The peace of God . . ."

Some of his *obiter dicta* are worth recalling. " Read Pope and Dryden," he said to some of us who had been reading essays to him, " they will do you more good than anything that is written in these days " ; " Mr. Browning was the only learned English poet, except perhaps Gray." His opinion of Browning's place among the poets was, " I think he deserves a shady First." I once heard him refer to a change which he had noticed in the style of sermons preached in Scotland (referring, I think, to the Presbyterian Church). He said that though in his young days they were perhaps long and dry, they contained definite doctrine ; " but now they are always about the character of Jeroboam, or something of that sort, and I do not think it is an improvement." He expressed his approval of the opinion shyly hazarded by one of his class that the object of a sermon should be to present Christ to the congregation.

One evening when he had invited me to join him at dessert (an honour which was also an ordeal), I told him the advice which was given to the Trent boys by the Bishop who confirmed me—a good, but pompous man. In an informal address when we were on parade, Dr. Trollope pointed us to the example of his brothers and himself : " The first is a Peer of the Realm, the second was a Commander-in-Chief, and the third is a Bishop." " Absurd nonsense ; what a fool ! " was the Master's comment.

In the days with which these notes are concerned Canon Fremantle (afterwards Dean of Ripon) was Chaplain and Theological Tutor, and I read under him for the Final Honour School of Theology. It must be admitted that ours was not a good College for the study of Theology, and Fremantle did not appear to be quite happy in his position, nor was he in touch with " the Schools." As a preacher his trumpet sounded an even vaguer note than Jowett's. He seldom or never touched on points of doctrine, but gave us discourses on philanthropic and ethical subjects. I recall one on " How to conduct an argument " ! He was personally of a kindly disposition, and no bitter or sarcastic word fell from his lips. He conscientiously tried in various ways to influence the undergraduates ; he had, *e.g.*, a class for the study of the Greek Testament in his house on Sunday evenings ; and before the mid-term Communion Service, which was open to all denominations, he sometimes invited some well-known clergyman to address those who hoped to attend.

Mr. Chavasse spoke at one of these gatherings in the Library. He was at all times a "Loud Speaker," and "the Canon's roar" was a byword.

Jowett was sometimes called a "Tuft-hunter," but if he was, it was in the interests of the College. One thing for which some of us, looking back, feel grateful to him was his habit of inviting distinguished preachers, some of whom were far removed from his own school of thought, to preach in Chapel. Among these were Bishop Boyd-Carpenter (the Master's favourite preacher), whom I heard twice, Bishop Welldon (then Head Master of Harrow), Bishop Gore (Head of Pusey House), the late Archbishop Temple (then Bishop of London), and the present Archbishop of Canterbury (Vicar of St. Mary's). Dr. Temple also preached on the first Sunday of the term after the Master's death, and took as his text Hebrews xi. 1. His eyesight was so bad that he had to be guided to and from his place in the Chapel. In Jowett's lifetime it was touching to see the two old men in their robes coming in and going out arm-in-arm.

When the Master's seat was draped in black, the Dean (Mr. Strachan-Davidson, who was subsequently Master) led the Bishop by the hand. It was an act of true faith and courage on the part of Dr. Temple to accept the Primacy of the Church some three years later, despite this serious disability.

Courage of a different kind was shown by Dr. Welldon and Dr. Lang in the sermons which were preached by them on "We walk by faith, not by sight," and "Lord, to whom shall we go?" . . . Each expressed unmistakably the doctrine of the true divinity of Our Lord. The former, standing almost beside Jowett (for there was no pulpit), argued most impressively that if all the criticism of the previous fifty years had done nothing else it had at least shown that the personality of Christ could not be brought down to the level of ordinary men. The latter stated his feeling that when a man came back to attempt to teach others in the place where he had been taught, he should have something to teach, and then proceeded to point to Christ as alone "the Way, the Truth, and the Life." The echoes of these sermons have not yet passed away.

Among eminent preachers whom we had the privilege of hearing outside the College Chapel mention may be made of Archbishop Benson, who preached the "Humility Sermon" at St. Mary's one year, and Bishop King of Lincoln, Canon Gore, and Dean Paget (afterwards Bishop of Oxford). Dr. King was noted for his apt use of homely illustrations, and one instance of this may be given. One Sunday on which he had preached the University Sermon earlier in the day, he addressed a large meeting in Christ Church Hall in the evening. Speaking of the need of wisdom in efforts to reach the "submerged classes," he took up a box of matches which lay upon the table, with the words "Rub lightly" printed on the cover, and then used them to point the moral.

A powerful influence was exerted on the young life of the University, as well as upon theological thought in higher circles,

by Charles Gore. *Lux Mundi*, of which he was the editor, had been published in 1889, and created a sensation comparable to that caused by *Essays and Reviews* in an earlier generation. His own essay on "The Holy Spirit and Inspiration" was particularly criticized. His Bampton Lectures in 1891 on "The Incarnation of the Son of God" attracted wide attention when published, and (unlike most discourses of the kind) were a treat to hear, delivered as they were with perfect enunciation in a clear, ringing voice. I had the privilege of listening to them all, and stood for an hour to hear one. No preacher in my time drew the undergraduates like Gore, and none spoke so plainly on matters which affected their daily lives. When he was announced to preach on "Sin," "The Saviour," or "The Control of the Body," on a Sunday evening at St. Mary's, young men flocked from all the Colleges to hang upon his words. I remember in particular one sermon to which perhaps nearly a thousand listened with rapt attention while the preacher held up Christ crucified, and expounded the doctrine of an objective Atonement. There was something magnetic in his personality, and of all preachers I have ever heard he seemed most to lose himself in his message. If one word more than any other could characterize his pulpit utterances in those days it should, I think, be Earnestness. Such preachers are few in number, but when they arise an audience is never wanting. Totally different in style was Dean Paget, who was making his reputation as the best preacher of written sermons in the Church of England. They required sustained attention, but well repaid the effort. His published sermons show that he employed sentences that now and again almost cover a page of printing. One useful asset of a preacher which he possessed in common with Canon Gore (who in after years succeeded him in the see of Oxford), was a strong, resonant voice which easily filled the Cathedral in which he generally preached. In appearance he looked like a mediæval ascetic who had in some way strayed from the bygone centuries into the cloisters of Christ Church, but there was something very attractive in his countenance, which was probably due to the impress of character, as he was not "good-looking" in the ordinary sense. One member of "the House" whom I knew was a daily worshipper in the Cathedral, and testified that he "liked to look at Paget."

A preacher who drew large congregations every Lent to the Church in which he annually preached a course of sermons, was Canon Knox-Little. He had a special gift for metaphor, and was extraordinarily eloquent, but sometimes forgot the dignity of the pulpit, as when he referred, in quite a pathetic tone, to "my miserable little balance at my bankers." The preacher who helped me most was Mr. Chavasse, but to him I have been permitted to bear my humble testimony in an earlier number of this magazine.

There was more of active religious life in our College than might be imagined by some. Prayer Meetings were not unknown, and we had our own Church Society, of which the present writer was Vice-President, and at which helpful words were spoken to us from

time to time by Canons Gore and Ottley, and Mr. Chavasse. A leading member was G. W. Hockley (now Archdeacon of Truro). Others were Frank Fletcher, Head Master of Charterhouse, and the sitting member for St. Alban's, Col. F. E. Fremantle.

One who seldom joined in debate was F. C. N. Hicks, the present Bishop of Gibraltar. But, though at present both Primates of the Church of England are Balliol men, churchmanship has never been a strong feature in a College which on account of its liberal outlook draws many Nonconformists to its fold. Some of my own friends were frequenters of Mansfield College Chapel, where I have heard instructive sermons from the Rev. John Watson ("Ian Maclaren") and Mr. Hugh Price Hughes. The widow and family of the latter were in later days constant visitors at a house in the parish in King's Co. which was for several years the sphere of my ministry, and when there always attended the Church Services.

The house founded by John de Balliol "and Dervorguilla his wife" has always naturally been a favourite place of study for Scotsmen, who are not as a rule rabid Churchmen. Three of Jowett's four successors in office have been Scotsmen. One of my own "set" was J. E. MacFadyen, now one of the Professors at the United Free Church College, Glasgow, whose writings on the Old Testament need no advertisement.

Among the dons a somewhat unusual type was Sir John Conroy, the Science Tutor. His name recalled Queen Victoria's earlier years, as the first baronet (also "Sir John") was the young Princess's tutor at Kensington Palace. Conroy was a fine specimen of a Christian gentleman, truly religious, a faithful son of the Church of England, and, in manner, of unfailing politeness towards all. It was he who, referring to his own undergraduate days, said of the well-known Rector of St. Aldate's, "Christopher was the only one who seemed to remember that I had a soul to be saved." Another of the Fellows was E. J. Palmer, until lately Bishop of Bombay, whose earnest advocacy of the proposed scheme for reunion in Southern India, which has just received the unanimous approval of the Bishops assembled at Lambeth, is known to all.

In the Theological School I attended lectures on the Old Testament by both Professors Driver and Cheyne. The former had a habit of repeating his sentences which, though slightly irritating, made it easier to take notes of them. The latter's style of lecturing must have been a surprise to those who knew with what vigour he could "go the whole hog" in destructive criticism in his writings. He had a shy, nervous manner, and appeared to wish to hide behind his desk.

In the domain of New Testament exegesis Dr. Walter Lock was one to whom it was my good fortune to listen, but, doubtless owing to some perversity of taste on my part, I did not find him so interesting as he had formerly been when expounding the mysteries of the Greek Drama. Canon Ottley was a singularly clear and helpful teacher. There must be not a few who can still testify that his learned, lucid, and carefully arranged

lectures on the doctrine of the Incarnation taught them much. But of all of whom I had experience I would give the palm for ability as a lecturer to Canon Bright, Professor of Ecclesiastical History. He enjoyed his own task, and was an adept at exciting and holding the interest of his class. Two illustrations of his method abide in the memory. Describing the appearance of the great protagonist of the Faith at Nicæa, he informed us, " My predecessor in this Chair, the late Dean Stanley, himself a very small man (this with obvious enjoyment), was fond of making a list of little men who became famous in history, and he always began with Athanasius." At another time, speaking of the same Father, he introduced the story of Arsenius by saying in a dramatic manner, " And now we come to The Mystery of the Dead Man's Hand."

Of course, even a classical and theological student does not spend all his time " poring over miserable books " and hearing words of wisdom, but, even if space permitted, the pages of a Church quarterly are not the place in which to describe the lighter side of University life. One recollection of " the Union " may be permitted. I heard F. E. Smith (Lord Birkenhead) make his maiden speech in a debate on " Local Option," at which the late Sir Wilfred Lawson was the guest of the evening, and A. V. Magee (son of a former Archbishop of York) was in the Chair. It was a notable effort, which gave promise of his subsequent brilliant career.

After I had taken my degree I migrated from the College of which John Wycliffe was once Master, and which cherishes an ancient portrait of " the morning star of the Reformation," to Wycliffe Hall, where I had the great advantage of a year's training under the late Bishop of Liverpool. The Vice-Principal was the Rev. J. Walmsley, who was afterwards Bishop of Sierra Leone, in which arduous post he succeeded E. H. Elwin, another Wycliffe man. Among my friends there was Cyril Bardsley, now Bishop of Leicester (and formerly of Peterborough).

For many years the writer of these notes has been unable to revisit his Alma Mater, and now his " daily course " runs not by the Isis but the Suck (a tributary of the Shannon). There is perhaps little of the spirit of Oxford in what most readers of " The Churchman " would, no doubt, call " the wilds of Connacht " (though the Rector of an adjoining parish was a pupil of Dean Inge at Hertford College). But this only serves to make more fragrant the memory of days spent there.

" *Quo semel est imbuta receus servabit odorem testa diu.*"

"OLD SERMONS."

By E. J. W.

THE psychological effects of repetition are varied and indeed often contradictory. On the one hand, the recurrence of some things is productive of the greatest pleasure. A favourite song, or other musical item is often demanded over and over again, and always received with welcoming applause. Indeed, we are being told that the "encore" habit has become a nuisance and concert programmes of popular items are demanded, not infrequently, practically twice over. So, too, a favourite poem or other quotation continues to please, no matter how often repeated—a beautiful piece of scenery, a picture or other work of art, which appeals to us, never seems to lose its power of attraction by familiarity—rather the pleasure it affords grows with each fresh renewal of acquaintance and hitherto unseen beauties reveal themselves.

But, on the other hand, a speech, a good story (except in the case of children who vigorously demand that their favourite stories shall be repeated with unfailing verbal accuracy), a sermon will not bear repetition; but must, to be effective, come red-hot, so to speak, from the anvil of its creation. A speech, however good, will lose a large part of its effectiveness, if some one says, "I've heard him say all that before." To call a story a "chestnut" robs it at once of its piquancy. There are few stories which achieve the lasting fame and laughter-provoking power as that of "Ould goose in the gun-room" which, according to Diggory, "we have laughed at these twenty years." But perhaps of these varied repetitions "Old Sermons" come in for most general condemnation. It is not uncommon to hear it said of a clergyman, "He has taken to preaching his old sermons," and it acts like a douche of cold water on the finest pulpit effort to remark, "An excellent sermon, but I've heard him preach it before," and the impression is created that if the preacher has not done something actually wrong, he has been guilty of something which takes away from the value of his address. Why it should be so, why there should be this difference in the psychological effect of repetition, we do not pretend to say and are not now concerned to inquire; we merely propose to comment upon the fact as it affects the preacher.

The first thought which strikes us in this connection is the suggestion of waste which seems to be incurred in the preparation of a sermon if it is only to be used once. This does not, of course, apply to itinerating clergy who are preaching constantly to different congregations, often separated by wide distances, or to, say, the confirmation addresses of bishops, which are not, as a rule, published in the Press or addressed more than once to the same hearers. A bishop, now deceased, indeed, told the writer that it was his habit to prepare only one new address each year and to deliver it to each set of

candidates he confirmed that year, but the thought must often be very present to the mind of the ordinary parish priest, who preaches to the same set of hearers perhaps twice each Sunday, year in, year out, and that for probably years on end. The amount of reading, research and thought which a conscientious parson must give to the preparation of his sermons is very considerable, although certainly such preparation is by no means all lost, for a store of knowledge is thus acquired which is always available. It was a true answer which an old and experienced preacher gave to a young colleague who asked him, "How long did it take you to prepare that sermon?" when he said "Sixty-four years," giving his own age and meaning, of course, that the learning and experience of his whole life had contributed to the preparation of the address. Still, every preacher, if in view only of the manuscript expenditure, will often wish that he could use, more than just once, in the exact form in which he has it at hand, former satisfactory work, and yet escape the charge of "preaching his old sermons"!

In the experience of the writer this desire has found expression in a variety of ways and many subterfuges have, within his knowledge, been resorted to, in order to escape detection in using old material.

One clerical friend provided himself with a set of manuscript sermons covering a three-years' course and preached them regularly in the order in which they were stored on his study shelves, confident, one may suppose, that they were not of such a striking character as to be recognized after a lapse of time. There was, of course, need that topical allusions should be carefully noted and omitted, or brought up to date. The cleric in question related how on one occasion he almost "fell into a hole," only just saving himself from referring a couple of years after her death to Queen Victoria as if she were still alive and reigning.

Another clerical friend kept and used his old sermons, making selections from the accumulation of many years, adding a few new ones from time to time. The old ones he freshened and brought up to date by a process he called, "adding new collars and cuffs," by changing, that is to say, the text, prefixing a new opening or adding a fresh peroration. He asserted, and, we think with considerable justice, that the ordinary hearer remembers a sermon, unless it be an exceptionally striking one, only by the text or perhaps by the opening or closing sentences which are more likely to be noted than other parts of the sermon unless indeed illustrations, which are often remembered when the point they were meant to illustrate is forgotten.

Some listeners make a point of marking in the margin of their Bibles the date when a text was used and the initials of the preacher. A friend on going to a new parish was warned that his squire was in the habit of doing this with a view to catching the vicar in preaching old sermons. After a time the squire remarked one day—"I notice, Mr. A., that you never use the same text twice. How is that?" "Oh," said A., "it has just so happened, I suppose, for I often do." Then he chose what he called a "meaty" text and for several successive Sundays preached a series of sermons upon it which could

not be held to resemble each other. Thenceforward he felt at liberty to preach his old sermons whenever he chose without any dread of being called over the coals, at any rate, by the Squire.

One wonders why, apart from the suggestion of laziness involved, the preaching of old sermons should be considered derogatory. In view of the fact that the aim of all preaching must differ but little from time to time; the same sins of commission or of omission have to be condemned; the same ideals of conduct have to be upheld; the same appeals to service and to generosity have to be made; the same correspondence between professed creed and practice has to be urged. So there was justice in the retort of the parson to a member of his congregation who complained that he had preached the same sermon several times: "Well, when I see you people beginning to carry out what I do preach, it will be time enough to set you fresh tasks"!

In this connection one of the great difficulties of the preacher's office is just this—to present in fresh and varying ways the same thoughts, and to view the same truths from different angles, thus "bringing out of his treasure things new and old."

The writer in the course of a long ministry has evolved, for himself at any rate, a fairly satisfactory solution. For the first twelve years or so of his ministry he wrote out all his sermons in full and read them from the manuscript. Then for some ten years he reduced the written sermon to pretty full notes for use in the pulpit. These notes consisted chiefly of headings with some sentences, especially the opening one, written *in extenso*. A half-sheet of note-paper generally sufficed for each sermon. Now for more than twenty years no note whatever has been used in the pulpit. The outline is prepared and thought out carefully; but the wording is left to the moment of delivery—Some may object—"I have not the fluency of language to trust myself to do this. I should stick for words." The belief of the writer is that the trouble is not poverty of words but of Thought. If there is in the mind a clear conception of something to be said the necessary expression will not be wanting, but the speaker must use the words that naturally present themselves and not hesitate and hunt about for what may seem the most perfect vehicle of the thought. Generally speaking, the words that occur most readily to your mind will best convey your thought to others. At any rate, using a mental outline only, it is found that the same sermon if preached again even the same day would not appear to be the same. The subject-matter would, no doubt, be the same, but the wording and the manner of presentation could be made, and most probably would be, naturally, different.

The writer was led by degrees to adopt the procedure he now follows by the experience that often a sermon written a few days previous to delivery, being read at the time of delivery in quite another state of mind from that in which it was composed, failed to represent the feelings of the preacher as he read it, and seemed almost like the work of somebody else, and its delivery tended to become stilted and unnatural. There was also the constant temptation to

leave the manuscript and interpolate some fresh thought, illustration or mode of presentation, with the possible consequent danger of not being able to return smoothly to the manuscript at the point of departure. The use of notes, to a certain extent, and now the thought-out outline obviate both these difficulties. There is room for expansion or curtailment, and the freedom in the choice of language allows the address to reproduce fully the feelings of the moment. Besides, there can be but little doubt that, given matter of equal quality, that which is delivered without manuscript and apparently spoken as the utterance of concurrent thought, is much more acceptable to and effective for the generality of listeners.

In speaking of "Old Sermons" we have hitherto had in mind only the productions of the preacher himself; but the phrase suggests also a reference to the sermons of other men. That there is a legitimate use for the pulpit of others' sermons we think must be unquestioned. The published sermons of others are as legitimate and profitable a grazing-ground for the preacher as any books of reference, commentaries and so forth, it being of course understood that due acknowledgment is made where this can be done without appearing pedantic. Even the most original thinkers will not only benefit by, but at times feel the necessity for, some help, not only in the choice of a subject but as to the best method of dealing with it. The late Rev. C. H. Spurgeon has some appropriate remarks in this connection, in the preface to his Sermon Notes.

"It is not always" [he writes] "easy to select themes for sermons. Even those who are able to give all their time to reading and study are sometimes glad of a suggestion by which they are directed to a topic. . . . I have prepared these frame-works not to encourage indolence but to help bewildered industry: and I hope I have not written so much as to enable any man to preach without thought, nor so little as to leave a wearied mind without help."

And later, speaking of the use of notes generally, he remarks:

"The preachers who can do without notes (in the pulpit) must be few. Some go on crutches and read almost all the sermon; this, as a rule, must be a lame business: yet the most of us need to carry a staff even if we do not often lean on it. The perfectly able man requires nothing of the kind. I am not one of these first-class brethren. With my staff, I passed over this Jordan and I hereby lend it to any who feel they can pursue their journey with it."

There must, we suspect, be a somewhat considerable number of men who either from indolence or incompetency do not preach their own sermons. We say this advisedly, for unless there were a remunerative market for these wares there would not continue to be offered manuscript sermons to the extent which exists. One clerical friend made no secret of buying his sermons. "Better preach another man's sense than my own nonsense," he used to say, and he would quote with a certain amount of self-depreciation—

They broke into my dwelling,
Stole my silver and my store,
But they couldn't steal my Sermons
For they were stole before.

Some preachers have even gone so far in labour-saving as to bring a volume of sermons into the pulpit and unblushingly read from the printed page. There is on record an instance of Nemesis in the form of detection overtaking one such malefactor. He kept a set of *Blair's Sermons* in his pulpit and when hard pressed for material would read one of them. Unfortunately for him a maiden lady of his congregation was also possessed of " Blair " and happened one Sunday afternoon to read the identical sermon she had heard in Church that morning. Thenceforward she kept her " Blair " in a box in her pew and as soon as the text was given out turned at once to the index to see if it were amongst those contained in her volumes. The culprit kept off Blair for a long time ; but one day, being especially hard pressed, he fell back upon his " stand by." The lady found the text in her " Blair," " but," said the parson, recounting the incident afterwards, " I got the better of her that time, for I began three pages on and she never caught me all the way through." Some readers may also have heard of the impostor—a professed convert from Rome who, now a good many years ago, was for a while a great vogue in Evangelical circles in Dublin, whose preaching attracted considerable attention and large congregations until the bubble was pricked by someone with a knowledge of homiletic literature who discovered his sermons to be those of Canon Liddon !

The mention of Blair, who was evidently very highly thought of as a preacher in his own day, causes us to wonder what the effect of one of his sermons would be on a modern congregation. The reading of it would assuredly provoke two criticisms. It would be dubbed " prosy " and " outrageously long " (Borrow's Sermon on " The King's Happy Return " runs to 14,000 words) and it would probably seem all the longer because of its dullness. And yet these old sermons, although their form may be archaic and their mode of presentation unattractive to present-day taste, contain valuable matter and are interesting as showing what changes have come over homiletic matter and method, and while, of course, it would be a fatal mistake to attempt to use these old sermons as they stand, their substance, if assimilated and reproduced in a modern dress, might prove very useful.

Bishop Walsham How has somewhere a word of warm praise for a sermon he heard preached by a young clergyman, which was a modernized version of one of Bishop Butler's sermons. Yet those of us who in days gone by had, for our sins, to make up Butler's Sermons for examination purposes would not readily turn to them as fountains of inspiration for addresses to our congregations to-day.

One wonders what purpose the many volumes of printed sermons which were to be found in many libraries two or three generations ago really served. Were they at all as widely read as they seem to have been printed and bought ? The father of the writer was a parish priest and a scholar of some eminence, his shelves contained many such books well bound in calf—Blair, Atterbury, Beveridge, Secker, etc., etc., some of them college prizes ; but a careful study of his manuscript sermons failed to show any trace of indebtedness

to any of these authors, and the sermons were nowhere pencil-marked as many of his other books were for reference or quotation. Indeed, the condition of the volumes suggested that they had been little handled and apparently not much studied, if at all. There are many old sermons which still merit the title "famous," but they draw their fame mostly from some historic fact or result connected with them or less frequently from some unusual quality in themselves of remarkable eloquence or spiritual power. "Sermons that mould history, epoch-making deliveries are probably," it has been said, "things of the past, the great prophetic preaching which shakes not only consciences but realms needs the Evangelic trumpet of a St. Bernard, a Savonarola or a Massillon, on the one hand and a listening nation on the other." The age of the pulpit has gone by, not indeed for pastoral purposes, but certainly as an engine of national or even of ecclesiastical conflict. Two causes have been at work, it would seem, in this direction. To-day the Press very largely discharges the office formerly filled by the pulpit. The part played in the struggles of the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries by Paul's Cross and other public preachments was immense but can never recur, and in a later age the tractarians were somewhat disposed to disparage preaching, disliking emotionalism and the common overshadowing of the altar, the font, the lectern and the prayer-desk by the pulpit. The latter influence seems still to be at work in many Anglo-Catholic circles, though by no means all, where elaboration of ritual and attention to detail of ceremonial tend to place the sermon in the background. We believe, however, that the pulpit has, in spite of many hindrances to its fullest usefulness, still a great place in the religious life of our time. There is still need for the living voice of the spirit mediated through holy minds to quicken the written page of the Bible, to make it the sharp two-edged sword it should be. There is still need of the living human voice uttering the emotions of a heart beating with sympathy for the needs, the sorrows, the trials of humanity, to utter with persuasive tenderness the loving invitation to cast the care and sorrow where they will be assuaged and to point with personal assurance to the Cross, where the heaviest burdens of sin and sorrow may be left.

If we have seemed to write in the earlier part of this paper a little flippantly perhaps on this important subject of preaching, it is not that we think lightly of its sacred importance and the duty of its due discharge, but that perhaps the contrast of the performance of the great opportunity as it is sometimes found with its best ideal may lead us to think more deeply, and so attempt more earnestly and successfully to use to the utmost the great responsibility the pulpit lays upon us in seeking to "divide rightly the Word of God."

THE MORAVIAN CHAPEL IN FETTER LANE.

By A. J. Smith.

SIXTY years before Luther nailed his famous Theses to the door of Wittenberg Church, the Community of the United Brethren (Unitas Fratrum) was founded in Moravia in 1457. This was the beginning of the Moravian Church, now a world-wide organization operating in distant parts of the mission field, as well as in several European countries. Its ministry consists of Bishops and Pastors, framed on the lines of the Methodist Episcopal Church of America, which through Wesley has some connection with the Moravian Church.

The primitive Moravian community sprang from the Hussite Movement, which in turn was inspired by Wyclif's teaching, carried to Bohemia from this country. The Moravian Church survived the Wars of Religion of the seventeenth century and the campaigns of Gustavus Adolphus, Wallenstein and Tilly, and in the eighteenth century rapidly increased its influence, largely through the efforts of Count Zinzendorf, who repaid the debt to England by assisting with the foundation of the community in this country at Fetter Lane. The Chapel is situated in the two parishes of St. Bride and St. Dunstan. The minister preaches in the former, while the congregation sit in the latter. The parochial boundary tablets can be seen on the walls in Chapel Place, Nevill's Court, property which formerly belonged to the Moravian Chapel.

The Chapel was opened on November 10th, 1742, when John and Charles Wesley attended the ceremony. The contact of the Wesleys with the Moravian community had been established some years before; indeed, the Moravians exerted a decisive influence upon the conversion of John Wesley and his brother. After his return from America, John Wesley made his way one day into a little meeting of devout people in Aldersgate Street. Browning also once entered an Evangelical meeting-house, and if the visit left its mark on the poem entitled "Christmas Eve," it does not seem to have appealed to any spiritual chord in his nature. At Aldersgate Street Wesley met Peter Böhler, and in later years attributed his conversion to Böhler's influence. This decisive event in his life is recorded on a tablet, placed on the railings of the church of St. Botolph Without, Aldersgate Street, by the International Methodist Historical Union, on May 24th, 1926.

The house, mentioned on this inscription, may have been the place where Wesley first met Böhler, situated in Little Britain, near St. Bartholomew's Hospital. It appears to have been owned by a Dutch merchant named Weinantz, a friend of Peter Böhler. The inscription also says that the site of the meeting-room was No. 28, Aldersgate Street, now occupied by Barclays Bank, where another tablet also records the conversion of John Wesley. It says:

"The probable site where on May 24th, 1738, John Wesley felt his heart strangely warmed. This experience of grace was the beginning of Methodism. This tablet is gratefully placed here by the Drew Theological Seminary of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Madison, New Jersey, U.S.A., August 1926."

But the authorities have come to no definite conclusion on the actual site of Wesley's conversion.

In the middle of the eighteenth century a close connection was formed between Fetter Lane Chapel and Chelsea. Here Count Zinzendorf lived for a time at Lindsay House, which was sold in 1774. For nearly two centuries the members of the London Congregation were buried in the Moravian Burial Ground, King's Road, Chelsea, now known as the Moravian Close. Quite early in its history the Fetter Lane community established the custom of walking in procession to the burial ground at Chelsea on Easter Sunday. It is reported that on April 7th, 1765, they started at 3 a.m. After arriving at the burial ground, the Brethren and Sisters sang hymns in the chapel or hall. They then formed a circle round the ground, while their friends and strangers remained standing behind them. The Easter Morning Litany was recited, and was followed by a Love-Feast, when the account of the Resurrection was read from the Gospel, interspersed with suitable verses. In the Address the meaning and purpose of the Litany were explained. The procession from Fetter Lane and the ceremony at Chelsea were witnessed towards the end of last century by a relative of the writer of this article.

Many notable Moravians were buried at Chelsea, including Christian Renatus, the son of Count Zinzendorf (1752); John Cennick, the Moravian Evangelist, who sometimes preached at Whitefield's Tabernacle, and died at the age of thirty-six, in 1755, in the room later used as the vestry of the Fetter Lane Chapel. Over eight hundred people attended his funeral at Chelsea. In 1775 Peter Böhler was buried there; in 1794 David Kriegelstein, the Labrador missionary; in 1795 James Hutton, one of the founders of the Moravian Church in Great Britain. During the nineteenth century Benjamin Beck, the Fetter Lane minister, was buried at Chelsea in 1849; Charles Hindley, M.P. for Ashton-under-Lyne, and his daughter, Hannah Woods (both in 1857); John Andrew Porter, minister at Fetter Lane for seventeen years (1900). Another minister, Joseph Templeton Waugh, who died suddenly in the Chapel after conducting a service, was buried at Chelsea on August 7th, 1904.

The first wedding took place in Fetter Lane Chapel on June 22nd, 1750, although a wedding licence had been issued before that date to Miss Mary Badham. She was presented with a Bible by the congregation. Until 1750 members of the Moravian Chapel were married in the neighbouring parish churches of St. Dunstan and St. Bride.

The Watch Night Service, on December 31st, was held by the Moravians before the Wesleyans adopted it; but this service is no longer continued at Fetter Lane Chapel. Another institution of

the past was the Young Men's Breakfast. This was held monthly at 9 a.m. on Sundays, at a long table inside the Chapel. The meal consisted of eggs, white and brown bread, marmalade and coffee, and must have been eagerly welcomed by many a poor lad struggling to live in Fleet Street in those days. After breakfast a paper was read by one of the members, or by a missionary on furlough. For several years a flourishing Christian Endeavour Society, known as the Fetter Lane Society, met weekly in the Church hall. Its first Anniversary tea and service were crowded, not only by members of the Moravian Church, but by representatives of most other Christian bodies, including the Church of England. Much could be written about the Festivals, held periodically, for single Brethren, single Sisters, for married people and widows; but past and present are linked together by the old Moravian Love-Feast, which forms the most characteristic feature of Moravian Church-life to-day.

The Love-Feast is held at 3 o'clock in the afternoon and begins with the beautiful Liturgy, which is read by the minister. The Liturgy opens with the words, "O come, let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the Lord our Maker." The congregation respond, "For He is our God, we are the people of His pasture, and the sheep of His hand." A number of hymns are sung, among them one for sick and absent members. During the service tea and buns are handed round by a Sister and a Brother. At one time the Brethren and Sisters sat separately on either side of the Chapel. Moravian texts are read from a book—which is now in its two hundred and first year of issue—together with passages from the Old and New Testaments, with verses of hymns. A chapter from the Bible follows, and the minister gives a short Sermon or Address.

The Communion takes place after the Address about 4 p.m. The bread and cup are handed round among the people, preceded by the recital of the words of institution, which are, however, combined from various passages in the New Testament, and not from any one Gospel. The Communion begins with a hymn sung kneeling:

"Most Holy Lord and God,
Holy Almighty God,
Holy and most merciful Saviour,
Thou eternal God,
Grant that we may never
Lose the comforts from Thy death,
Have mercy, O Lord."

At the close of the service another hymn is sung:

"We who here together are assembled
Joining hearts and hands in one,
Bind ourselves with love that's undissembled,
Christ to love and serve alone:
O! may our imperfect songs and praises
Be well-pleasing unto Thee, Lord Jesus,
Say, 'My peace I leave with you.'
Amen, Amen, be it so."

The presiding minister, or the Bishop, then turns to his neighbour and shakes hands, and each person present does the same. By the act of handshaking the Communion or fellowship of all the members, with each other, and with the unseen Lord, is symbolized. The service ends with the blessing, " The Lord bless thee and keep thee," and the congregation reply, singing, " In the name of Jesus, Amen."

The tea for the Love-Feasts was formerly prepared in the Chapel. It is now made ready in the lobby. In earlier days, also, a special children's Love-Feast was held at Christmas, when the Chapel was decorated and oranges and apples were distributed to the children. The modern survival of the children's Love-Feast takes the form of a simple little service, modelled on the German ceremony of Christmas Eve. The Chapel is decorated, a large star, lighted by electricity, being the chief feature. A simple Christmas tree is adorned with lighted candles. The children sing " Heilige Nacht " and receive oranges in which a little candle is inserted. The Love-Feast at Fetter Lane was made memorable on one occasion, some years ago, by the attendance of a party of Esquimaux, converts of the Moravian Labrador Mission.

The present congregation is small and consists chiefly of adults. It is drawn from all parts of London and the suburbs. The service is held at 3 p.m., and members of other Christian churches receive a welcome. But, if they are few, the present generation of Moravians meets at Fetter Lane Chapel with the memories of the great days of its history portrayed all around. Portraits of the famous men of older times hang on the walls. The splendid chairs presented by Countess Zinzendorf are there, and, until 1920, the Snetzler organ, built in 1743, enlarged in 1796, and rebuilt in 1845 and again in 1896, was in use. It is reported that Mendelssohn played on this organ on a visit to London.

The Moravian contribution to hymnology has been large, and many Moravian hymns have entered the hymn-books of other churches. James Montgomery, the Editor of the *Sheffield Iris* (1794), who received a pension on the Civil List in 1833, wrote " For ever with the Lord," " Hail to the Lord's Anointed," " Songs of Praise the Angels sang," " Lord, teach us how to pray aright," and many other hymns. The first Moravian Minister at Fetter Lane Chapel was James Holland, and the long list of Pastors since his time includes John Gambold (1744), Benjamin La Trobe (1780), Christian La Trobe (1792), Ignatius Montgomery (1811), Henry, 55th Count Reuss (1813), Leonard Hassé (1891). The present Minister is the Rev. J. Norman Libbey, M.A.

In no sphere of Christian activity has the Moravian Church been more conspicuous than in the work of foreign missions, and the Fetter Lane community has taken a large share in supporting this work. The recent Lambeth Conference Report on the Unity of the Church says: " Although they are a very small body, yet their enthusiasm for missionary work makes our relations with them most important in the Mission Field." The Moravian membership in the foreign field comprises 132,794 converts, and the Moravian

Brethren have issued their 138th Report of Missionary Work. A distinguished modern Moravian missionary was Samuel Skene, or Skeen, who was born at 10, Nevill's Court, Fetter Lane. After serving in the West Indies he joined the Church of England. His first curacy was at Bromley-by-Bow, and in 1909 he resigned the benefice of Laneham, Retford, Notts. His seven sons all became clergymen of the Church of England.

The father of Samuel Skene, the great-grandfather of the present writer, was Steward of the Fetter Lane congregation for many years. He wrote a book entitled *The Unsealed Prophecy*, which was delivered in the form of twenty-three lectures in the Chapel in 1853. So past and present are linked together in this small community, not only by an illustrious history, but by intimate family ties. The Moravians began as a community of brethren, and much of their success in the mission field to-day is due not only to a simple evangelical piety, but to the strong family and fraternal connections which have always been a marked feature in Moravian life and organization.

PRAYER STORIES. By Vera E. Walker. *London: S.P.C.K.* 1s. net.

Does God answer prayer? The nine brief stories contained in this unpretentious little book, furnish an overwhelmingly affirmative answer to this question. The stories belong to the living present as well as to the past. Here are experiences from *A Thousand Miles of Miracle*—the experiences in China of Mr. and Mrs. A. E. Glover. Here, too, will be found some of the wonderful deliverances God effected for Livingstone, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Theresa of Avila, etc., etc. They prove that God can protect and bless His own dear Children—in answer to the prayer of faith.

S. R. C.

THE REST THAT REMAINETH. By the Rev. W. F. Pelton, M.A., Vicar of Ullenhall. *London: A. H. Stockwell, Ltd.* 2s. 6d. net.

For the purpose of this exposition Mr. Pelton has rearranged the letter to the Hebrews—to bring out the meaning but not to reconstruct the text after the manner of the Higher Critics. The object of his treatise is to show how we who believe do enter into rest. The Saints of God have always rejoiced in this epistle with its clear setting-forth of the Redeemer's Person and Work, and this study will be found, with its helpful analysis, a useful Commentary on this clear-cut statement of a great truth.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

DURING the early years of the War considerable interest was aroused by a series of articles which appeared in *The Spectator* by "A Student in Arms." They gave vivid sketches not only of war scenes, but of unusual aspects of character and depths of thought and emotion brought out in the War. They showed the keen insight of a student and a deeply religious spirit. The author was Donald Hankey, a young soldier who was killed in October, 1916. The Rev. K. G. Budd has written *The Story of Donald Hankey* (Student Christian Movement Press, 4s. net). This sympathetic biography reveals him as "a man of heroic and prophetic mould, a voice crying in the wilderness, a writer with spiritual vision and the power to record it in telling prose." He was born in 1884, the youngest of a family of six, and at fourteen he went to Rugby. The death of an elder brother at the Battle of Paardeberg in 1900, and the loss of his mother in the same year, made a profound impression on him. The following year he entered the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich and two years later received a Commission in the Garrison Artillery. He spent two years in Mauritius, and while there he came to the decision that he should take Holy Orders. He spent a short time in the Rugby Mission in Notting Dale, and at the age of twenty-two he went up to Corpus Christi, Oxford. On taking his degree he went to Leeds Clergy School, but he soon left as he found the atmosphere uncongenial. In a letter to Canon Cremer he says: "I was violently put off being ordained by the evasive teaching and the attempt to substitute devotional discipline for honest thought." To another friend he wrote: "Personally I don't think I learnt anything at a clergy school except a horror of clerical shop, clerical professionalism, clerical phraseology, and the clerical manner, also clerical timidity, fear of truth and disingenuousness." This did not, however, deter him from Christian service. He joined the Oxford Mission in Bermondsey started by Dr. Stansfeld in 1896, and there came into close touch with the lives of the poor. Feeling the need of still closer experience he travelled steerage to Australia, and for a time lived the life of an ordinary emigrant in the western province. Home again in January, 1914, he returned to Bermondsey. When the War broke out he enlisted as a private in the Rifle Brigade. He was made a sergeant at once on account of his previous military experience. In May, 1915, he went to France, but soon returned wounded. He went out again as a Lieutenant in the Warwickshire Regiment and was killed at the Somme in October, 1916. This is, in brief, the record of a life of wonderful promise cut off, as so many others were, before it had reached its fruition. It gives little idea of the character of the man as depicted by Mr. Budd in his interesting story. What he would have become we cannot say, but he brought to the problems of life the valuable qualities of intense sincerity, passionate love of truth, a strong determination to seek

reality at all costs, to avoid all shams and to persevere in the pursuit of the highest. His strong sense of duty, his loyalty to Christ, and his ideal of the necessity of living out the Christian life in its fulness were all a contribution to that Christian service which the world needs. His influence would undoubtedly have been widely felt. We are grateful to Mr. Budd for this picture of a life so full of promise.

Paterson of Hebron was a name well known throughout Palestine in the days before the War. Dr. W. M. Ewing, M.C., has written an account of his work which will be welcomed by a wide circle of readers (James Clarke & Co., 8*s.* 6*d.* net). Dr. Paterson held a unique position in Hebron, which was at one time the most fanatical Moslem centre in Palestine, where no Christian was safe from insult. Practically through the medical mission work of Dr. Paterson, a great change was effected, until he became one of the most trusted and respected Europeans throughout the whole district. A man of strong character and dauntless courage he faced and overcame difficulties which few would dare to encounter. Often in danger of his life he pursued his work, and won by his fearlessness the respect and at last the affection of the people. As one of many who enjoyed the hospitality of his home in Hebron, and had the opportunity of realizing the difficulties of the work, and the success which attended it in spite of almost insuperable opposition, it is a pleasure to bear testimony to the value of the life-work depicted in this sympathetic biography. It was a matter for great regret to many that the Home Committee of the Hebron Mission decided after the War to close the Hospital, which Dr. Paterson had succeeded in erecting in spite of intense opposition on the part of interested natives skilled in all the devices of Eastern intrigue. Dr. Paterson's withdrawal from Hebron was a heavy blow to Christian prestige in a district where he had won an unique position by his strength, integrity and manly Christian qualities. Dr. Ewing's account of the work of both Dr. and Mrs. Paterson is a fitting tribute to lives of devotion and remarkable service. From personal experience we can endorse Dr. Ewing's statement. "In this somewhat remote and formidable town, where brows darkened ominously at the presence of strangers, the house of Dr. and Mrs. Paterson was a haven of comfort and refreshment to many weary travellers. Visitors from the home land were received with warmth of welcome and generous hospitality not soon to be forgotten. They were happy to whom Paterson found time to act as *cicerone*. A walk with him in the town, and a ride over the mountains was as instructive as a course of lectures on Biblical Antiquities and History, and far more interesting."

The Reality of the Resurrection is the attractive title of an interesting book by Mr. G. R. H. Shafto, published by the Student Christian Movement Press (Paper Cover, 2*s.* net). The fact of the Resurrection has been frequently questioned and as frequently

defended. The arguments on both sides have been stated many times at great length. The theories of those who deny the reality of our Lord's Resurrection from the grave have been set out in a variety of forms and have, no doubt, been received by some as satisfactory. None of them has, however, proved to be an adequate explanation of the great change which belief in the Resurrection wrought in the lives and characters of the earliest disciples, and was the most potent agency in the preaching of the Gospel and in the expansion of the Church. Mr. Shafto has brought together within the compass of a hundred pages the essential facts which substantiate the reality of the Resurrection, and show that nothing else can take its place as the most reasonable interpretation of all the facts. He devotes chapters to the consideration of Jesus of Nazareth and the Risen Lord; The Empty Tomb; The Appearances on Easter Day; The Later Appearances; The Proclamation of the Resurrection; The Facts and Their Meaning. He examines the various difficulties that have been raised in regard to each point as it arises, and after making due allowance for the difficulties in the different narratives, he shows the essential strength of the accepted belief. Of the stories of the appearances in Matthew, Luke and John, he says: "To arrange these stories into a definite sequence is impossible; to harmonize them with one another seems almost as impossible. Probably if they could be so harmonized it would be argued that they all sprang from one source! The alleged differences are largely due to the fact that the several writers give accounts of different manifestations. Where there are discrepancies they are in details not of first importance, and all support the substantial truth of Luke's summary—He showed Himself alive after His passion by many proofs." We recommend those who wish for a brief study of the subject this convincing answer to some of the problems which are puzzling inquiring minds at the present time.

Prayer and its Psychology, by the Rev. Alexander Hodge, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., London, (S.P.C.K. 6s. net), is his Thesis approved for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of London. Dr. W. B. Selbie commends Dr. Hodge as a really reliable guide who writes not only with full technical knowledge, but with saving common sense. Most of us are aware of the attitude adopted by the exponents of the New Psychology in regard to religion in general, and more particularly in respect to belief in God and the nature of prayer. Dr. Hodge deals with these views with fulness and convincing clearness, and his purpose is to furnish a contribution toward the vindication of the Christian Gospel in terms of modern Psychological thought. The book is divided into three parts. In the first he deals with the nature and evolution of prayer and traces its origin in the religious consciousness. He shows from the study of comparative religion the stages of its development. In the second part he deals with Psychological conditions, and shows the threefold aspect of prayer which he describes as the Cognitive, the Volitional, and the Affective. He then deals more particularly

with the theories of the New Psychology, and maintains his belief that " The Christian Cause stands to gain and not to lose by candid and well-reasoned recognition of the substantial nucleus of truth in modern psychology." The main arguments of the New Psychology rest upon the idea of Suggestion, Projection, and Reflex action. With the various exponents of these views he deals at length, and shows that Psychology does not invalidate the claims of the religious consciousness to the objectivity and reality of the Deity. The third part is Philosophical and deals with " Prayer and the Nature of the Soul," and " Prayer and the Idea of God." It will be seen from this brief statement of the contents of this scholarly book that the author is well equipped by his extensive reading for the task which he has undertaken, and his book will be a substantial aid to those who have to deal with the problems raised by the New Psychology.

Although Lent is over and the Bishop of London's Lent Book was not issued in time for notice in our last number, some of our readers may be glad to have their attention drawn to it. It is entitled *Personal Discipleship and the Way of Prayer*, and is written by Canon John C. H. How, Rector of Liverpool (Longmans, Green & Co., 3*s.* 6*d.* net). The Bishop of London in his Introduction gives a brief description of its contents. It is divided into two parts. In the first there are vivid pictures of the call of the first disciples, with due emphasis on the previous preparation which had preceded what might be regarded as a sudden call. In the same way men and women are prepared for their vocation and are able to answer the call when it comes to them. The second part deals with prayer and shows that the power of praying may be developed until its full beauty and effect is realized. Although there are several points on which we cannot follow the author in his views, there is much in the book which will be found helpful by all who are seeking the experience of a fuller life of prayer.

Dr. A. P. Graves has edited a volume of *Selected Poems* of William Alexander, Archbishop of Armagh, and of Cecil Frances Alexander (*S.P.C.K.*, 3*s.* 6*d.* net). This charming volume contains much that is familiar from the verses and hymns of Mrs. Alexander, whose contributions to our collections of English hymns has been a real enrichment. Her poem on the Burial of Moses is considered one of the finest in our language, and her hymns have the merits peculiar to the work of the best hymn-writers. The Archbishop's own poems are represented by an interesting selection, including the Ode addressed to the Earl of Derby at his Installation as Chancellor of the University of Oxford in 1853. Those who treasure the memory of these two gifted writers will welcome this admirable selection from their work. An extract from the Oxford " Sacred Prize Poem : Ishmael," by the Archbishop's eldest son, is added to the collection.

G. F. I.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

DR. BRILIOTH ON THE HOLY COMMUNION.

EUCHARISTIC FAITH AND PRACTICE, EVANGELICAL AND CATHOLIC. By Yngve Brilioth. *S.P.C.K.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

Dr. Brilioth needs no introduction to English readers, for his book on *The Anglican Revival* is widely acknowledged to be one of the most discriminating studies, by a foreigner, on the Tractarian and Anglo-Catholic movement. In the present work, written after he had published his book on the present state of our Church, he strives to trace the history of Eucharistic Faith and Practice throughout the ages, and if we find ourselves at times unable to accept conclusions drawn by him, we give him full credit for competent knowledge and honesty of purpose. Where we are most in disagreement with his views, is in the sections dealing with English matters, and we are not surprised when we gather that as far as our Church is concerned he learned most from one who was closely associated with Pusey House. It is almost impossible for a foreigner, no matter how keen he is in his search for facts, to arrive at them in perspective, and this is seen in his comments on the teaching of the Congregationalists, in which he attributes apparent importance to the "Free Catholic movement," which in spite of its many publications represents only a minute fragment of Free Churchmen without any influence whatever among the great body. And at times some of his references to isolated passages from Anglican writers mislead the reader. Even English authors are not free from the fallacy of "single instances," and a brilliant foreigner is specially liable to fall into the snare.

His book is timely when our relation to the Orthodox Church is under discussion. He tells us plainly that it is impossible to make the rite instituted at the Last Supper into a sacrifice (in the ordinary sense), except by rendering "Do this" as "Offer this"; an interpretation which is quite needless, even though there is no doubt that the word *poiein* sometimes bears this meaning. He brushes aside the popular interpretations in Anglo-Catholic circles of passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews with the remark that no theory of the Eucharistic sacrifice held any place in the writer's thought, and the history of the growth of the idea of Eucharistic sacrifice as expiatory or propitiatory is faithfully presented. And when he comes to the doctrine of the Greek Church on the character of the change in the Elements following consecration he states what we believe to be strictly in accordance with the facts: "The Greek view of the sacred elements as possessing a substantial holiness of their own passed over to the West, and became a decisive factor in the subsequent development, side by side with the Western idea of the sacrifice. Later on, it was the turn of the East to receive the idea of the Real Presence back from the West in the materialized

form of transubstantiation (*metousiosis*), and this doctrine in large measure took the place of the less definite conversion doctrine (*metapoiesis*) of John of Damascene, which would otherwise be the final point in the development of the early church in the East." In all discussions of Eucharistic teaching it is essential to bear in mind the two aspects of Sacrifice and Elements, for the characters of both are so interconnected that it is impossible to separate them. The effort to keep them apart and explain their innocence—so to speak—when sundered, must be resisted as giving an entirely wrong idea as to what the word Mass, which combines both, connotes.

In his description of Eucharistic teaching in our Church it is clear that his sympathies are Anglo-Catholic, although as a Lutheran he is disturbed by the practice of Reservation, which involves the risk of a " paganizing " of Christian worship. He is most enthusiastic on the Canon found in the Deposited Book, on which he writes : " In spite of the criticisms of the Canon of the New Prayer Book, which have been made by some of the most eminent English liturgical scholars, the foreign observer may be allowed to express the opinion that if it should come into general and authorized use, the Church of England will possess one of the noblest of all evangelical Eucharistic liturgies." All we have to say on this is, that whatever may be the merits of the Canon in the eyes of Dr. Brilioth the remarkable fact remains that no feature of the Deposited Book has been less welcomed by its supporters, for Diocesans have announced that they have received very few applications for permission to use it at the services of the Church.

When we pass from the Church of England to the Swedish Church we find our author most informing, and are interested to note that the word Mass has quite a different meaning in Sweden to what it has with us. It is used for a service generally in conformity with our Morning Prayer without any Eucharistic addition. We well remember how during the Copec meetings many English observers were amazed to find High Mass as part of the official services of the Congress—an illusion due to their ignorance of Swedish usage. Here, on the contrary, the introduction of the word Mass has a definite significance concerning the Eucharistic Presence in the Elements and the Sacrifice of the Host. In all these matters—even in reading this most attractive volume—we have to avoid the danger of giving the same word always the same meaning.

THE HISTORIC JESUS.

THE HISTORIC JESUS. By James Mackinnon. *Longmans.* 16*s.*

We approached the study of this book with feelings of gratitude to its writer for his great work on Luther, and we have to confess to a feeling of profound disappointment with the conclusions Dr. Mackinnon reaches concerning the Person and miracles of our Lord. As was to be expected, Dr. Mackinnon illustrates the teaching and life of our Lord with a wealth of historical knowledge and the fruit of a well-trained mind. The description of the time in which our

Lord lived, the sketches of the environment and the study of the chronology of His ministry—latent though it frequently is—are most helpful to the Bible Student. The same may be said of the reverent spirit that breathes through his pages. He concludes concerning our Lord's Person : " No abstraction He, as the orthodox theologians have too often made of Him. But whilst His human existence is that of ourselves, it touches the sublime and leaves us by contrast on the lower level of aspiration, of discipleship, of adoration of the divine in Him, in Whom the Father-God has manifested Himself and come nigh unto us and imparted the power to rise above and overcome the sin and the sorrow, the darkness and the dread of this life in the flesh." Yes : our Lord is all this, and we too have at times revolted against the abstractions of some writers, who, however, in their emphasis on the Deity of our Lord, were much nearer the right conception of His Person than, we believe, Dr. Mackinnon is. The human mind is strange, and we have more than once in reading this book felt that at heart Dr. Mackinnon rises above the feeling he gives of holding, as central, the thought of an " all too human Christ."

We have read carefully what Dr. Mackinnon says on the three crucial incidents—the Virgin Birth, the raising of Lazarus and the physical Resurrection of our Lord. On all three he adopts an attitude of the rejection of their historicity. He traces the first to the growth of a legend : " True, the belief in the natural generation of the Divine Saviour might well consort with a very elevated conception of him in the thought of Paul and even the fourth Gospel. To the more naïve type of mind, reflected in the nativity stories, this generation was evidently incompatible with the person and function of the Messiah." And the naïve type has triumphed to the detriment of historical fact. Again, in writing of the raising of Lazarus he says " the story, though wonderfully dramatic, cannot be regarded, in some respects, true to life." It manifestly reflects the hand of the writer who, skilful as he undoubtedly is, never quite succeeds in obliterating himself, and therefore begets the suspicion that as an historian he does not know the difference between history and allegory, though the allegory may have some basis in the traditions relating to Jesus' psychic power over disease. And the miracle is not historical.

On the Resurrection he comes to the same conclusion : " Had Joseph, after the conclusion of the Sabbath on the previous evening, removed the body, which had been hastily buried in his own tomb, to another, and did Mary, after all, ground her belief in the resurrection, not on the empty tomb, but on the appearance of Jesus, which the writer regards as a bodily one ? The inference of the extraction of the body is not necessarily a modern assumption. It has at least the impression of the first visitant to the tomb to support it." He offers as an alternative theory the growth of a visionary experience of overstrained women. We can only regard such efforts of explaining away as desperate attempts to retain the Easter Faith by rejecting the Easter Message, in spite of the fact that the whole

teaching of the early Church was based on the Message. If the Message be untrue, then we are of all men most miserable, for we have founded our faith on historical untruth and have been the deluded victims of a mirage.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

THE PROBLEM OF RIGHT CONDUCT. A Text-book of Christian Ethics. By Canon Peter Green. 6s.

We have read a great number of books on Christian Ethics, We have studied the history of Ethics from the academic standpoint and like most students have found ourselves at times bewildered by the effort to confuse what, to our untutored mind, seemed to be self-evident, and at times we have felt that the effort to frame Ethics into a living whole as distinct from the consciousness of right-doing which comes from the study of the Gospels and communion with God through Christ, is an impossibility. We have inherited a Christian tradition of conduct which has been the basis of our modern life, and until half a century ago it was the custom of rationalists to praise as highly the Christian Ethic as they condemned often ferociously the absurdity of the Christian Faith. To-day on all sides we see not only the authority but the utilitarian expediency of the Christian Ethic challenged, and the need for sound, healthy guidance has become a necessity. Few men are able to write a book that will be satisfactory to the professional student and the Christian worker. Canon Green boldly essayed the task, and having read his book from cover to cover we unhesitatingly recommend it to all who wish to know why they act Christianly and to learn the consequences of violating the morality of the New Testament.

Ethics have a definite basis in human nature, in society and in man's relation to God. We can never neglect any one of these three factors, and Christianity emphasizes the dependence of right conduct on right ideals. The revelation of God in Christ gives us an example of what our ideal ought to be, and Canon Green is never blind to this fact. He knows the stock and even the exceptional apologies given for moral aberrations, and he has a healthy regard for the part reason has to play in meeting plausible objections. He knows that mathematical proof cannot be given of the right solution to many hard questions, but he can point to the right approach and the means of securing that practical certitude which we must have when we start on a definite course of right action. There is hardly a leading problem of conduct that has to be faced by the average man or woman that does not come under discussion, and if it does not, Canon Green gives us the principles that ought to guide us. He is not blind to the difficulties good men have, not in choosing between what they know to be right and wrong, but in determining what good they should follow when competing goodnesses have to be faced and one or other rejected. He truly tells us that the Christian way is the right way. " You cannot, so to speak, add a top varnish of Christianity to a non-Christian philo-

sophy. Especially the doctrine of sacrifice exemplified in the Cross (and, incidentally, also in all saints, heroes, mothers and other saviours of men) must go to the very roots of human conduct. This, the way of sacrifice, must be *the* way. This, of course, is what St. Paul meant when he said, 'God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ'; God forbid, that is to say, that I should have confidence in any course of conduct other than that which is exemplified in the Cross of Christ. This principle of the power of Sacrifice, this truth that mankind can have anything for which someone is prepared to pay the price, is the greatest practical importance in Ethics." Here we close with the remark that valuing the book most highly, we by no means agree with some of the Canon's conclusions. But then, if we did agree, there would never be any conflict between the "goods" and life would not be enriched by the different choices of equally honest men.

ENGLISH PURITANISM.

STUDIES IN ENGLISH PURITANISM FROM THE RESTORATION TO THE REVOLUTION, 1660–1688. By C. E. Whiting, D.D., B.C.L. *S.P.C.K.* 21*s.*

A few years ago the Bishop of Truro declared that the "Church of England took an enormous risk" when at the Reformation "it put the Bible in the hands of the public." Certainly this "risk" was greatly increased when at the same time it allowed the individual Christian to exercise the right of private judgment in matters of Faith. When the Homily on "The Knowledge of Holy Scripture" counselled the "humble man" "to search any truth boldly in the Scriptures," and if ignorant, to search the more "to bring him out of ignorance," it opened wide the door to liberty of thought and interpretation which had been so rigidly closed for several centuries previously. Undoubtedly it was a courageous policy involving "risks," but as the result proved, these "risks" were small compared with the alternative of the intellectual stagnation which so largely prevailed when liberty of thought was so carefully confined, hampered and restricted within the bounds of medieval orthodoxy. With the Bible practically a "new book," in the mother-tongue, and eagerly read by all classes, it was only natural that the succeeding century would witness to very diverse results from this new liberty of private interpretation of the Scriptures. The general disorganization and the increased license of the times of the Civil War and the Commonwealth only intensified and accelerated this tendency, and consequently in this respect there is a fruitful field to be examined during the Restoration period. Sufficient time had, however, now elapsed to furnish the best opportunity of estimating the "ravages" which this exercise of an unlimited right of private judgment had produced.

Dr. Whiting examines this changeful and fascinating period of history with a fullness of knowledge and detail which at once excites the admiration, if not the despair, of most students. In his ex-

haustive study of the subject scarcely a phase of English Puritanism is neglected, and as a result he gives us a most comprehensive survey of the history of the whole movement and of the fortunes of the various sects which flourished at the time, coupled with an amazing amount of reliable information concerning the treatment of the ejected Nonconformists, and especially of the fortunes and fates of their leading ministers. It was a generation of remarkable contrasts, of darkness and light. There was the shameless worldliness and licentiousness of the Court party, the sober and solid learning and devotion of many of the clergy, and the pronounced piety and religious, even if at times fanatical, fervour of the "sectaries," as evidenced in their transparently holy and self-denying lives.

From the original documents, which he cites freely, we are able to form a correct estimate of the extent of the persecution and of the sufferings which these Dissenters "for conscience' sake" endured, and also to compare them with the privations inflicted on Churchmen during the Commonwealth régime. It is an unprofitable task which only makes us thankful that we live in a more tolerant age when the "odium theologicum" does not produce such distressing and direful results. There is little doubt that under both régimes the unfortunate Quakers, who were hated by all parties, fared far worse than the more organized regular Dissenting bodies, like the Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists. Undoubtedly numbers of Quakers died from the effects of the severe persecution, while over 12,000 suffered imprisonments, fines and prosecutions between 1660 and 1680. In fact, the account of the shameful brutalities and inhumanities used towards these largely inoffensive and harmless sufferers is revolting and scarcely credible. It is a striking testimony to their faith and zeal that even during this most troubled period they were conspicuous in their apostolic missionary labours.

In an instructive chapter on "The Minor Sects," the author gives us much curious and even startling information concerning the wild and often loose and immoral views and teaching of the many insignificant sects, the very names of which few people to-day have even heard of. The total numbers of these dangerously fanatical people were very small and almost negligible compared to the main body of the orthodox Dissenters, and they furnish evidence that the "risks" of unrestricted liberty of thought had not led to any very disastrous consequences. Dr. Whiting gives us a most informative account of "Dissenting Life and Institutions," in which we learn much about the numerous Dissenting Academies which existed in different parts of the country where famous Ministers and even often future Church dignitaries received a really good and liberal education. There is a most interesting chapter on "The Foreign Protestants in England," especially in connection with the refugees from the persecution in France owing to the "Revocation of the Edict of Nantes." Even before this time there is evidence that the French congregations in England used the French translations of the English Liturgy, and refugees on reaching England

immediately conformed to the usages of our Church, and these French and foreign churches accepted the episcopal control of the Bishop of London. In this way we get abundant illustration of the real fellowship and intercourse which existed between Churchmen and the French Protestants at this time, and it is valuable evidence of the continuance of that close relationship which was maintained between Anglican Churchmen and their Reformed brethren on the Continent from the reign of Edward VI. It is a little difficult, therefore, to justify Dr. Whiting's statement that after 1662 the "Anglican Church had nothing to do with the Protestant Churches of the Continent," especially when we recall the close intercourse which Bishop Cosin had with the French Huguenots, and the cordial spirit displayed towards the Foreign Reformed Churches later on by Archbishops Sharp and Wake.

The facts which Dr. Whiting has so laboriously collected are often most illuminating and instructive, but his comments on them occasionally betray, and are coloured by, his own special ecclesiastical outlook and prejudices, and he would find it very difficult to substantiate the accuracy of some of his *obiter dicta*. He does not, for instance, cite the rubric which could establish his assertion that "the Prayer Book orders Holy Communion on all Sundays and Holy Days"? It is also surely a misuse and confusion of historical terminology to call *at this time* the Churchmen "Catholics" and the Nonconformists "Puritan and Protestant." Since the antithesis was then drawn between "Puritan" and "Protestant," and at least up to 1662 all churchmen were ranged in the latter class, and the clear-cut divisions were those of "Papist," "Protestant," and "Puritan." He himself quotes an Anglican writer in 1674 who identifies the "Protestant Religion and the Church of England" (p. 409), while the Bishops declared in the House of Lords in 1673 that the "Protestant Religion" is "comprehended in the Thirty-Nine Articles" and the other Formularies of the Church of England. Neither is it accurate to declare that the Puritans who remained in the Church after 1662 became "the Low Church party," since this designation was more properly applied to the Latitudinarian, who, as Dr. Sacheverell declared in his *Low Churchman's Creed*, "believed in little or no Revelation, and had rather lay his faith upon the substantial evidence of his own reason than the precarious authority of Divine Testimony"—a Creed which was certainly not that of the Puritan!

Again our author contradicts himself when in one place he declares that the Dissenters had no quarrel with Church *doctrine* (p. 45), and yet in another he asserts that they objected "to the Anglican system in its *doctrine*" (p. 490). Certainly the latter statement is incorrect as regards the main body of the Nonconformists, since they willingly subscribed to all the *doctrinal* Articles as required by the terms of the Toleration Act of 1689, while Baxter expressly declared that they had no quarrel "with the *doctrines* of the Prayer Book." In view of the definite contemporary evidence, it would be interesting to see how Dr. Whiting would substantiate

his categorical assertion that "the Anglican Church refused to recognize Presbyterian ordination" (p. 491). He himself gives several quotations from the writings of prominent Churchmen testifying that the "Church of England did not unchurch the foreign Protestants" (p. 517), while the actual proposal of the Bishops at the "Jerusalem Chamber Conference," 1689, was to allow foreign divines to minister in England *without further ordination* (Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, 412). Numerous Caroline bishops, including Bramhall, Cosin, Sharp, Hall, Ferne and Wake, definitely repudiated this intolerant position. Dean Sherlock expressly declared "the Church of England does not deny but that in case of necessity the ordination of presbyters may be valid." But the fact that the revived Scotch Episcopal Church in 1662 permitted all the existing Presbyterian ministers, willing to do so, to retain their cures *without re-ordination* is a sufficient practical refutation of this unfounded assertion of the Anglican denial of Presbyterian Orders.

In spite of the mass of detail and the numerous quotations which are necessarily contained in these 580 closely printed pages, Dr. Whiting's story is well related and makes, not dull, but most interesting reading. He has certainly given us the fruits of a most laborious and valuable research work, which obviously must have taken several years of close and patient study to compile. It constitutes a veritable storehouse of facts and varied information for the historical student of this period.

C. S. C.

THE ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY.

A HISTORY OF THE ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY. By E. J. Martin, D.D. *S.P.C.K.* 16*s*.

This book is ably written, well printed and well bound. It forms not only a remarkable volume in the publications of the new Church Historical Society, but a notable contribution to our knowledge of Byzantine history. The work of Bury has not been in vain. Yet the price is far too high for a book which has been published by a powerful and well-supported Christian agency. If the S.P.C.K. is really to help the spread of knowledge and to encourage reading, it must reduce the price of future works in the Church Historical Society series. The book has a poor index.

Dr. Martin pays a tribute to Neander, whose work on this period is still valuable. Iconoclasm sprang from the conviction of the Isaurian Emperors and was sustained by the policy of their successors, the Armenians. It was inspired by the breath of nearer Oriental hostility towards idolatry. From the same source came the teaching of Muhammed, a fact which Dr. Martin merely notices in passing. He might have stressed the point that Muhammed would never have been necessary as a scourge of the Church, if Eastern Christianity had remained free from image-worship. In the first Christian centuries art was merely symbolic, but with the

appearance of pictorial art came the development of superstition in worship. The most extraordinary powers were attributed to the images. A deliverer arose in the person of Leo the Isaurian, who flung back the Saracens from the walls of Constantinople in 718 —a victory comparable in effect with that of Charles Martel at Poitiers (732). The high-water mark of the movement was reached in the time of Constantine V (Copronymous), who assembled the Council of 753. The controversy played a larger part in the East than in the West because it was interwoven with the Christological dispute. It was argued that the worship of images either mingled the Godhead with the manhood, and so ended in a Monophysite view of the Person of Christ, or divided Christ into two Persons, and so became the heresy called Nestorianism. Dr. Martin thinks that this criticism was unsound. The Council of Constantinople (753) condemned the worship of images, but not the invocation of saints, although this was prohibited later.

Between the two phases of Iconoclasm came a reaction inspired by the Empress Irene, and the Council of Constantinople of 786 reversed the decisions of the Council of 753. The greatest of the later Greek theologians, John of Damascus, co-ordinated the orthodox defence, and his influence was mainly responsible for the failure of the second attempt of the Iconoclasts to rescue the work of their predecessors.

Policy rather than conviction inspired the revived Iconoclasm of Leo V, the Armenian. Image-worship was not allowed, but pictures might be placed high up on the walls of the churches, provided that lights and incense were not burned before them. The Council of 815 did no more than confirm the canons of 753. We may note in passing that the murder of Leo V by Michael the Stammerer was an act of self-defence, and so explains the friendly attitude of Pope Pascal I. However, the Seventh General Council of 786 and not those of 753 and 815 fixed the doctrine of the Eastern Church, and left it in the stereotyped form which John of Damascus had outlined. Yet the Iconoclastic movement was not without result. The image was displaced by the icon in Eastern Christianity, bas-relief took the place of statues, and there was a renascence of art which returned to primitive models.

Iconoclasm in the West followed a different course. Here it was much more closely interlocked with papal and imperial politics. The Papacy opposed the movement in the course of its quarrel with the Eastern Emperors. Charles the Great espoused it in the course of his opposition to Irene, who failed to respond to his political flirtation. Yet Dr. Martin hardly emphasizes sufficiently the natural antipathy of the Frankish rulers, allied with the common sense of Carolingian learning, towards the excesses of image-worship, and it is doubtful whether he allows enough weight to the writings of Claudius of Turin, Jonas of Orleans, Walafrid Strabo, or even Hincmar as true expressions of the best minds of the West. Possibly this bias, which appears from time to time, in favour of image-worship, although in contradiction with some of his most

telling paragraphs, prevents him from allowing, with Bastgen, that Alcuin, not Charles the Great, wrote the so-called *Caroline Books*. Certainly, if this had been allowed, he must have placed greater stress on the work of the other Carolingian writers. But he truly observes that the Papacy was compelled to tolerate in Charles what it opposed in the Isaurian and Armenian Emperors, and we are heartily in accord with his observation that pictures and images increased in the West when the learning of the Carolingians faded, " Medieval heresy " (and Iconoclasm was regarded as a heresy) " is usually an effort towards intellectual liberty . . . all the sporadic outbursts from Iconoclasm to Wyclif are related to each other " ; and he admits that Claudius of Turin had " curious affinities with the sixteenth-century reformers," yet without allowing that there is any fundamental resemblance between Iconoclasm and the Reformation. Again, we may agree with him that Iconoclasm hastened the loss of Oriental imperial dominion in North Italy, and quickened the rise of the temporal power of the Papacy, but it is too much to argue that it was the main cause of the separation between the Eastern and Western Churches. The *Cambridge Medieval History* (Vol. IV) has shown that the causes of fissure were mainly political and geographical. But this is a book for which Evangelicals may be grateful to its lucid and learned writer.

SCIENTIFIC DOGMATISM.

THE FLIGHT FROM REASON. By Arnold Lunn. *Eyre and Spottiswoode.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Mr. Arnold Lunn has done something which required at once courage and a sound judgment as well as wide reading. We have so long been under the domination of catchwords that are supposed to represent the last words of scientific thought that we have been unconsciously accepting materialistic views. These opinions have come to be looked upon as final and authoritative, whereas in fact they are simply the heritage of those who came into the legacy of a type of nineteenth-century thought that has ceased to hold its own where men think and reason.

We have here set forth certain conceptions of Evolution, certain presuppositions of materialism and certain widely held fallacies associated with the pugnacious and proud " science " that dethroned God, abolished mind and left no room for purpose in nature. With rare skill Mr. Lunn selects typical statements and shows how irrational they really are and how wrong they are seen to be in the light of fuller knowledge. He notes that the writers whom he assails close their eyes to inconvenient facts and assume what they believe will fit in with their conclusions. Occasionally he drifts into the extreme of thinking, that because he has exposed a certain type of scientific thought, he must be considered to have killed all cognate ideas. For example, the abandonment of Darwinism does not imply, in the minds of those who have abandoned it, the rejection of the whole idea of Evolution. And again he is much more sym-

pathetic than we believe he is bound to be with spiritualism and its beliefs. Certainly we cannot account for all the phenomena that he describes, but then we have long since passed the post which declares we must know the causes of what we know. Taken as a whole, *The Flight from Reason* should be read by those who wish to see in right perspective the real position of much that passes for scientific and to understand why many believe that there are at least as many unfounded dogmas in the creed of the Victorian Scientist—and most men in the street who talk of science do so in Victorian terms—as there are unprovable dogmas in the Christian Creed which they so glibly attack.

THE HOLY SPIRIT.

THE HOLY SPIRIT. By Raymond Calkins. *Student Christian Movement Press*, 1931. 5*s*.

The American edition of this book appeared in 1930. But it does not maintain the high standard of the Student Christian Movement publications. The author rightly draws attention, on two occasions, to the neglect of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit by the Church, yet the reader will learn little about that doctrine here. Indeed, the title of the book might well be exchanged for something more general such as "Modern Christianity" or "The Lack of Spiritual Enthusiasm in the Church." Such a title would at least indicate more accurately the contents of the book. The author concentrates attention in these addresses on many obvious defects of modern Christian life and organization, without offering, in his constructive passages, more than vague appeals for a revival of spiritual religion. No attempt is made to grapple with the doctrine of the Spirit, to relate it to the doctrine of the Father and the Son, and then to distinguish the special function of the Spirit in the soul and in the Church and the world.

But he has written with undoubted zeal and has produced some interesting passages. He draws attention to the actual phraseology of some of the New Testament references to the Spirit. The Holy Spirit descended on Jesus at His Baptism "*like* a dove." At Pentecost a sound was heard "*as* of a rushing mighty wind," and He appeared in the form of tongues "*like as* of fire." So, also, the derivation of the word Comforter from "confortare," "to strengthen," is a useful piece of exegesis. Words of wisdom are written when we are warned that the disciples were Christians before they were baptized by the Spirit, and that a *vivid* personal experience of the Spirit's descent upon the individual is not an essential experience. In some cases the Spirit comes quietly and imperceptibly. But there must be fire in personal Christian life. The result will be an effective witness for Christ, and he quotes some striking lines from the *Panama Canal Digger's* song:

> "Got any rivers that are uncrossable?
> Got any mountains you can't tunnel through?
> We specialize in the wholly impossible,
> Doing the thing that no man can do."

THE CHALLENGE TO THE CHURCH. By Bernard Herklots, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Wimborne. *London: Skeffington & Son, Ltd., Paternoster House, St. Paul's, E.C.4.* 4s. 6d. net.

This vigorous treatise is described as "a dispassionate investigation of the Church's position and prospects," and the author's endeavour has been to find points of contact between different schools of thought, and to suggest that the Challenge which comes to the Anglican Church from many sources and in many ways should prove a factor for unity, as well as a stimulus to leave controversy behind, and bend its united energies to a great constructive task. The Challenge is dealt with in seventeen chapters—consequently a great deal of ground is covered. Seeing that no religious questions divide Christendom like those connected with the Holy Eucharist, we turn with special interest to the chapter headed "The Challenge of the Holy Sacrament." In it we find Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical invited to lay on one side, not as something discredited but as something for the moment superfluous, the whole doctrinal armoury and library and paraphernalia of controversy over Eucharist and Mass and the like, and celebrate the Lord's Supper in such fashion as each feels will give fullest expression to a single and overpowering sense of the inexplicable wonder of the Divine Presence. Mr. Herklots would like to see collected in one spot in one immense colossal pile every book that was ever written about the Holy Communion, and he would have the Archbishops and the Pope, Free Church divines and the heads of all the Churches of the world, set fire to the great pile! Other aspects of the Challenge—in connection with Science, the Bible, Reunion Proposals, etc., etc.—bring us into the arena where we can discuss the subject seriously and calmly. It would be idle to pretend that all the members of any "party" within the English Church will find his fellows in complete agreement with the author, but it is probable that we may grow more tolerant of each other as the answer to the clear and insistent "World call" is heard more plainly. We commend Mr. Herklots' forceful message to the members of the Anglican Communion. S. R. C.

A HISTORY OF VICARAGES IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By R. A. R. Hartridge. *Cambridge University Press.* 15s.

In this work Dr. Hartridge's main, though not exclusive, concern is with our own country. The happy result of this treatment is that he has not dissipated his energies over too vast a field, and is able to support what he says by a thorough and exhaustive examination of examples and statistics.

The book is mainly concerned with the appropriation of tithes by authority, long before A.D. 1000, and papal and episcopal afterwards; also with the adequacy or inadequacy (mainly, it appears, the latter) with which the substituted "vicarages" were endowed and carried on.

The author traces the growth and power of the legal mind in the Church, paramount in the thirteenth century, but spoilt even

then, and in an increasing degree later, by the fact that though the laws of the Church were good, the administrators of them marred their effectiveness by their fickle inconsistency. Nevertheless, he would have the reader remember that " Innocent III's influence was the power that ensured a reasonable service of the parish churches of medieval England " (p. 35).

In the fourteenth century, mainly because of its many calamities, there first came into prominence an abuse which was destined to grow until the Reformation. The monasteries, pleading distress, began to appropriate churches on a large scale. The habit was bound to grow with snowball rapidity, as the tithes were never restored to their previous owners, and, with inevitable expansion, more would constantly be required. The reader is not, therefore, surprised to find, a few pages later (p. 122), that " the whole period 1300–1400 is one of unceasing appropriations and rapid encroachment on the part of the monasteries on the parishes."

The fifteenth century, nevertheless, contained possibilities, and opened with a reasonable hope that all might yet be well, " for not until the Conciliar Movement failed was hope abandoned and the Reformation made inevitable " (p. 127).

In this later period Dr. Hartridge admits the very great evils which followed upon the Dissolution, but maintains that the Monasteries, though they " gave great alms," undoubtedly " took much greater." It was not until the later years of Queen Elizabeth that the law began seriously to take cognisance of the new difficulties.

This is but to touch upon the fringes of a work replete with valuable and well-documented matter. It may be especially recommended to students of that vexed problem, the Dissolution of the Monasteries.

THE CHURCH AND THE CHURCHMAN IN ENGLISH DRAMATIC LITERATURE BEFORE 1642. By Dr. C. Van der Spek. *H. J. Paris, Amsterdam.* 6*s.*

In his Introduction to this book, Dr. C. Van der Spek clearly states that, within this period, his objects are to determine how far contemporary dramatic literature reflects the social and political position of the English clergy ; to analyse the attitude taken up by dramatists toward the Clergy and Church ; and to consider the religious influence of the stage.

Until the Reformation, dramatic criticism is directed, with increasing freedom, against obvious abuses. The author is, however, careful to emphasize in his concluding chapter, that it is the priests and clergy who are attacked, while " the Church as such is unimpeachable, no attack on her intrinsic being is tolerated " (p. 173).

Immediately after the Reformation it might well be expected that the attacks would be yet more virulent and unconcealed ; and, indeed, they apparently became recognized weapons of controversy. The anti-papal feeling was, of course, strengthened by the national menace from Spain. It is, therefore, all the more

refreshing to find in the writings of Shakespeare a broader and more tolerant view. That the bias was merely quiescent is, however, proved by the fresh outburst of feeling aroused by the Spanish Marriage Project.

Nevertheless, this did not mean that the new Anglican clergy were to be exempt from criticism. At first they appear to have retained all the pre-Reformation abuses under the new forms of religion. The dramatists were quick to hold them up to scorn, but at the same time showed a prudent, though hardly creditable, tendency to confine their attacks to the lower ranks of the clergy. Exceptions to this line of procedure, such as are found in Chaucer's saintly priest, were apparently rare, and the reader is left to take comfort from Professor Trevelyan's spirited defence, quoted by the author, of the " poor parish priests " of the two centuries preceding the Reformation.

Dr. Van der Spek's businesslike treatment of the subject does not call for complexity or waste of words, and his concise style is enlivened here and there by touches of dry humour. His use of the curious word " impopular " is inclined to catch the eye.

The book is attractively " got up," with a stiff paper back, wide margins, and delightfully large print. Messrs. Blackwell, Ltd., Broad Street, Oxford, are the English agents for the publication.

THE REIGN OF GOD. A Drama. By Sir Francis Younghusband. *London: John Murray.* 5*s.* net.

The author of this drama has been described in *The Times* as possessing a singularly receptive and thoughtful mind, and of this there is certainly further evidence in this attempt to portray the life of Christ through a drama in which the main emphasis has been laid upon the vision of the Kingdom of God, because it was that vision which actuated our Lord throughout. In the preface he tells us that as a young man the life of Jesus made no appeal to him, but that through the last forty years its significance has been growing upon him. This is largely due to the influence of Seeley's *Ecce Homo*, though he feels, as others have done, that Seeley had not caught " the full significance of Jesus' life." In an introduction we have a further unfolding of the purpose of this drama. We cannot pretend to agree with Sir Francis on all points. We wonder, for instance, what justification he has for saying that the New Testament is not a precisely accurate record of the utterances and doings of Jesus. He is on safer ground when he says that Jesus was able to produce such an impression on His disciples that " because of it, they have influenced the whole course of human history." Elsewhere we read, " Jesus was not God Himself. He never claimed to be," and again, " Jesus may justly be regarded not as God Himself, but as the supreme representative of God—as the supreme embodiment of the Creative Spirit of the universe." Has he forgotten that Jesus said, " He that hath seen Me hath see the Father " ?

"Emphasis has been put on the Baptism of Jesus by the Holy Ghost, rather than on the Crucifixion because . . . it was in that solemn moment by the Jordan that He touched absolute perfection." But was there ever a moment in which He did not touch absolute perfection and when He was not "most intimately in touch with the Holy Spirit which animates the world"?

However, the drama may be either staged or read, and will in either case present a telling picture of Jesus as He was in the days of His flesh. S. R. C.

WHERE GO THE DEAD? By Rev. C. W. Hale-Amos, M.A., D.D. *London: Thynne & Co., Ltd.* 3s. 6d. net.

There can be no doubt that the war created a demand for books on the after-life, that that demand still exists and is being met by the frequent appearance of treatises on immortality and kindred subjects. Having read a good many of them we can confidently say that they belong to the three classes—good, bad and indifferent! Last year Dr. Hale-Amos's *Flashlights and Certainties* met with even more than a favourable reception, and we give a cordial welcome to the second and enlarged edition which lies before us. A glance at the index shows how many-sided is this subject. Here will be found Christadelphianism, Christian Science, Russellism, Spiritualism, Conditional Immortality, Universalism, etc.—these and other topics are treated in these pages. Well bound and printed, it will be welcomed by the general reader and the Bible Student. There should be a copy on the Book Table in every Church. And, by the way, there should be such a table in every Church.

S. R. C.

PASSION PERSONALITIES. By the Rev. Alfred Thomas, M.A., F.R.S.L. *London: Skeffington & Son, Ltd., Paternoster House, E.C.4.* 3s. 6d. net.

Bishop Welldon, the Dean of Durham, contributes a Foreword to this suggestive volume of addresses on the personalities connected with the Passion, and the author has drawn out their characters in such a way as to invest the drama of our Lord's trial and death with a fresh reality—the result is a thrilling story and, as Dr. Welldon says, Mr. Thomas has carried out a happily conceived idea with true sympathy and reverence. Preachers in search of material for Holy Week addresses will welcome this latest attempt to analyse the characters and conduct of the Actors in our Lord's Passion.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. By the Rev. Clovis G. Chappell, D.D. *London: Williams & Norgate, Ltd.* 5s. net.

A delightful collection of vigorous and vivid addresses, and we have no hesitation in saying that since Bishop Gore published his work on the Sermon on the Mount there has been nothing so arresting as this. It undoubtedly takes its place in the forefront among the really masterful expositions that deal with the pressing problems of

present-day Christianity in the light of New Testament teaching. They are all alive with humour and pathos, vivacity and profound scholarship. Every preacher should possess himself of this book, with its wealth of suggestion and its plentiful store of apt illustrative matter. He will find it difficult to find a more profitable investment.

S. R. C.

SIMON THE ZEALOT. By Rev. John S. Hoyland, M.A., F.R.Hist.S. *London: Williams & Norgate, Ltd.* 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Here is a delightful volume quite out of the ordinary. Its purpose, in the first place, is to show how the Ministry of Christ must have looked to the Jewish Nationalists of His day, but especially to the man in the inner circle of His disciples, whom we know from his name—Simon the Zealot—to have been a strong nationalist. In the second place, the purpose of the book is to show the practical implications of Christ's ideal of Reconciliation for the concrete problems of His own day, which in many ways are strikingly similar to the concrete problems of the modern world. By the Jews as a whole and by the Nationalists in particular, the advent of Christ was mainly regarded from the political standpoint. To them the Messiah meant emancipation from the hated Roman yoke. As they gradually discovered that He had no message save one of peace, no Kingdom but that of His Father in heaven, their hopes were dashed to the ground and they crucified Him. The book consists, in the main, of brief lectures or talks given day by day to Hindu students, many of whom—the author tells us—were clad in the white homespun of the out-and-out Indian nationalist. The first section is entitled "Beginnings." In the second and larger section the Zealot tells his story, or rather his stories—of parables, miracles, interviews, instructions and happenings in the life of the Redeemer. The short chapters will be found full of helpful suggestion, free from fanciful extravagances and based on the Gospel narratives. Some of the familiar stories Mr. Hoyland has revivified, and he can hardly fail to set his readers thinking.

S. R. C.

"THE CHURCH" AND "THE KINGDOM" SCRIPTURALLY CONSIDERED. By the Rev. William C. Procter, B.D. *London: Thynne and Jarvis, Ltd.* 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Mr. Procter, with his usual careful analytical method, has set out the various passages which deal with the Church and the Kingdom. He seems to assume the two are always distinct—a view that creates more difficulties than it solves. One of his propositions is that the Church was not founded until after the Lord's death, Resurrection and Ascension. During the Great Forty Days (Acts i. 3) "to the apostles whom He had chosen" the Lord was "speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God." Was *that* the Church which Mr. Procter says was not yet founded? And if the "Kingdom" was not "the Church," then what was it? And what

was the nature of the commandments He had previously given to the apostles? Does Mr. Procter think they had nothing to do with the life of the Church. Then presumably it was not the Church —for it was not yet founded—to which our Lord gave the Sacrament of our Redemption. No: we wonder has Mr. Procter ever read the late Canon Hammond's *What does the Bible say about the Church?*

FANNY JANE BUTLER, PIONEER MEDICAL MISSIONARY. By E. M. Tonge. *Church of England Zenana Missionary Society.* 1s.

Many a noble, unselfish life has been lived "unhonoured and unsung" in the Mission Field. We are glad to have this brief record of one of the Pioneers of Medical Mission work in India. With no exceptional opportunities for self-development or education, but with a deep love for the Master, Fanny Jane Butler patiently and perseveringly worked for the realization of the life-work to which she had dedicated herself, and her efforts resulted in splendid achievement. It is just the book to place in the hands of young girls.

TWENTY DIALOGUES ON UNIVERSAL RELIGION BETWEEN SEEKER AND FINDER. By Walter Walsh, D.D. *London: Williams and Norgate, Ltd.* 2s.

Christian people will do well to leave this little book severely alone. It emanates from a strange community known as the Free Religious Movement, of which Dr. Walsh is described as the Leader. Many forms of religious faith and practice are treated of in its pages. If they are all equally true, it follows (as a great thinker is credited with having said) that they must be all equally false. However, this Free Religious Leader tells us that no kind of religion is entirely false and none entirely true. We are told that the life of our Lord has behind it a mass "of marvels and miracles, myths and legends," and that "the time has come to set aside" the distinctive doctrines of the Gospel and the Sacraments—"two symbolic or magical rites." These have indeed been already abandoned by this precious "Movement." Our Religion is said to have been inherited from various older sources, and Bible infallibility is a "monstrous notion . . . the greatest obstacle to religious and social progress." Our Lord is spoken of as "the vanished Jesus." What will happen to this "Movement"? In a few years it will be forgotten—it will vanish—but Jesus will still be the Leader and Guide.

S. R. C.

AT THE WELL OF BETHLEHEM. By Mona Swann. *London: Leopold B. Hill,* 101, *Gt. Russell Street, W.C.* 2s. net.

A narrative Drama in three parts—Ruth the Gleaner, David the Shepherd, Mary the Mother—arranged from the Authorized Version of the Bible with a Foreword giving full directions for production.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

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

Parochial Church Councils.—After Easter there will be many new Parochial Church Councillors in parishes all over the country, and we should like to remind our readers of the two handbooks by Mr. Albert Mitchell, which, according to one of the Diocesan Magazines, " all Parochial Church Councillors are advised to obtain "—*The Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure*, with complete Text, Introduction and Notes; and *The Enabling Act*, with complete Text and the Constitution of the National Assembly of the Church of England and the Representation of the Laity Measure, 1929, with Notes, Introduction, and " Ladder of Lay Representation," and other Addenda including Diocesan Conferences Regulation. They are published at 1*s*. each.

Sunday School Lesson Books.—It will be of interest to our readers to learn that two new Sunday School Lesson Books are contemplated for the autumn. The Rev. Ll. E. L. Roberts, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Whitehall Park, N., and joint-author with the Rev. Dr. Flecker of *Sunday School Lessons on the Collects*, has in hand a book on the Prayer Book, suitable for scholars of 9–14 years, and Mrs. J. M. Macdougall Ferguson, the author of *Bible Tales for Little Folk*, published last year, is writing a companion volume for the Infant School. Further particulars of the two books will appear in subsequent issues of THE CHURCHMAN.

The Thirty-Nine Articles.—The Rev. B. C. Jackson's little manual on *The Thirty-Nine Articles* (3*d*.) may be mentioned in view of the present discussion in regard to them. The manual has reached its second edition, and is a short and simple statement of the meaning of the Articles. It is hoped to publish shortly a series of pamphlets dealing with the subject.

The Church Catechism.—A new and revised edition of the Rev. T. C. Hammond's pamphlet, *A Catechism on the Church Catechism*, has recently been published at 6*d*. The manual is intended for Confirmation candidates and senior classes in the Sunday School, and has been described as " remarkably clear and forceful, containing much positive teaching of the right kind." To add to its usefulness there are forty pages of " Teachers' Notes " at the end of the book.

Family Prayers.—Inquiries are constantly being received for small books suitable for using at Family Prayers, and mention may be made of a third and revised edition of *About the Feet of God*, or *Brief Daily Prayers*, by Canon E. R. Price Devereux, which has recently been issued at 3*d*. The new edition contains several additional prayers for special occasions, and the daily prayers are rearranged and added to.

In addition to *Helps to the Study of the Ephesians*, which the Rev. W. Wilson Cash published recently at 1*s*., a little manual entitled *Helps for the Quiet Hour* has made its appearance and is on sale in the Book Room at 6*d*.

It is designed to give a meditation on intercessory prayer for each day of the month, and a blank page is given for each day on which special subjects for prayer can be written.

Is Rome Right?—The substance of Dr. G. G. Coulton's lectures in Liverpool has been issued by the Joint Board of Divinity of Liverpool in 1*d.* pamphlets under the title of *Is Rome Right?* The Bishop of Liverpool says that he believes these will be found of use by those who are liable to be involved in arguments about Roman authority and Roman claims. The first three pamphlets are now ready, viz. No. 1, *Some Questions and Answers*; No. 2, *Marriage*; No. 3, *Infallibility and the Bible*, and can be obtained from the Book Room.

Rome and England.—Another useful pamphlet on the subject has recently been written by Canon W. J. Elsley, M.A., and published by the S.P.C.K. at 2*d.*, entitled *Rome and England: Some Questions at Issue.* The Bishop of Liverpool states in his Preface, "This pamphlet attempts an exposition in simple form of some points in which we differ from the Church of Rome in our presentation of the Catholic Faith. It has arisen out of a desire in a particular Diocese to lift these differences on to a higher level than that on which they have hitherto been displayed, and with that object it meets not a need only, but also a demand."

Confirmation Class Notes.—An addition has just been made to the Class Notes Series issued by the Church Book Room. It is entitled *The Christian Fellowship*, and is written by the Rev. C. H. E. Freeman, Vicar of St. Silas', Blackburn. The "Notes" appear under the following headings:—1. Confirmation: What it is; 2. Baptism: What it Means; 3. Admission in the Christian Fellowship; 4. Repentance; 5. Faith; 6. The Articles of the Christian Faith; 7. Obedience; 8. Our Prayer Life; 9. The Christian and his Bible; 10. The Holy Eucharist: Remembrance and Intercession; 11. The Holy Eucharist: Communion and Service; 12. Every Christian a Missionary. The price of the pamphlet is 2*d.* or 14*s.* per 100.
