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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1931.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The National Crisis and Religion.

OUR country has been passing through a grave crisis during recent months. The financial stability of England since Victorian days has been regarded as so firmly established that it was probably the common opinion among us that nothing but a great revolution could shake it. Recent events have rudely shattered this confidence, and have made many realize as never before the insecure foundations on which national prosperity is based. It is not our purpose to enter into a discussion of the problems involved, but we are concerned with some consequences of the crisis which may have serious effects upon the religious life of the nation. The ultimate remedies proposed for our difficulties are the increase of taxation and more effective efforts in economy. These present difficulties to those already overburdened with taxation and practising economy in every department of life. Many are suffering severe reductions in incomes, and the financial stress is being generally felt. In these circumstances it is only natural that the great Societies which represent the activities of Christian work at home and abroad should feel the strain. Many who have been able to make large and generous contributions in previous years feel themselves obliged to reduce their gifts to religious and philanthropic organizations. The great Evangelical Societies, although they have carried economy to the furthest extent compatible with efficiency, have in some instances been compelled to adopt still further economies hurtful to the effectiveness of the work, and placing a heavy and often an impossible burden on the shoulders of the workers. There are many supporters of Christian work who strive at considerable sacrifice to keep up their contribntions to the Churches and their work. But there are others who commence the practice of economy by cutting down their gifts to religious organizations. A reminder may be useful to them of the disastrous results of decreasing, especially at the present time, the power and influence of the Gospel in our own and other lands. Strength of religious life and purity of Christian faith are the greatest safeguards of the welfare of the nations. The permanent elements

in the life of any people are the moral elements which rest upon the sure foundation of the teaching of Jesus Christ. For these reasons, if for no others, it is the highest wisdom to maintain in their fullest activity at the present time all the great agencies of Christian activity. The pure teaching of Evangelical Christianity has saved our land in the past from the bloodshed and horrors of revolution. By our support of Christian work in its various branches we can assist in strengthening the basis of civilization, and in securing peace and increasing happiness throughout the world.

The Non-Episcopal Churches and Reunion.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has invited the non-Episcopal Churches of the country to send representatives to resume the Conferences on reunion which were held for some years subsequent to the meeting of the Bishops at Lambeth in 1920. The invitation has been accepted and it is anticipated that the Conferences will be held in the near future. In the previous meetings some important decisions were reached. One of the most significant was the pronouncement by a Committee of the Conference in July, 1923, that the ministries of certain of the non-Episcopal Churches were "real ministries of the Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church." It is well known that the representatives of the non-Episcopal Churches were disappointed with the practical ignoring of this pronouncement at the Lambeth Conference of 1930, and perhaps even more so with the explanations offered on behalf of the Bishops. This disappointment was accentuated by the very large share of consideration given to the representatives of the Eastern Orthodox and old Catholic Communions. The chief difficulty in the discussions has been the question of the Ministry. Members of the non-Episcopal Churches cannot accept the theories of Apostolical Succession and the sacerdotal claims of the Orthodox and old Catholic Churches. They therefore feel that little advance can be made towards any substantial measure of reunion if these theories and claims are to be regarded as those of the Church of England. They will therefore enter into the renewed discussions with quite a different spirit. They will claim freedom to review the whole question afresh and to make their position in regard to Episcopacy and the true interpretation of it more clearly defined. A prominent Free Churchman has recently indicated the new attitude of the non-Episcopal Churches. They feel that they have been too ready to accept the claims made for Episcopacy. He deals with the Bishop of Gloucester's statements that while the Episcopate was not instituted by Christ or His Apostles yet "it is the direct and natural development of Apostolic institutions and the principles laid down by our Lord." It is not, however, "the medieval bishop but the Catholic bishop of the primitive Church that the present time needs." Such a bishop, this writer maintains, has his counterpart "more truly preserved in the Moderators of Presbyterianism and the Superintendents of Methodism than in the

Bishops of the Episcopal Churches." He therefore maintains that there is no adequate justification for the claim that " for a united Church the Historic Episcopate is a necessity." It is difficult to foresee the outcome of this stiffening of attitude on the part of the non-Episcopal Churches. We can only hope that undue claims for Episcopacy will not be made, and that the truer conception of the Episcopal Office will be made clear.

"The Birmingham Dispute."

There has been widespread astonishment among all sections of Evangelical Churchmen at the Archbishop of Canterbury's action in regard to the appointment to the living of St. Aidan's, Small Heath, Birmingham. The Bishop of Birmingham in his endeavour to reduce the number of so-called " rebel " churches in his diocese, and to bring some measure of order into the parishes under his control, refused to license the nominee of the trustees as he declined to obey the Bishop's requirements. After law proceedings which transferred to the Archbishop of Canterbury the duty of licensing a fit person as Vicar of the Parish, the Archbishop licensed the clergyman whose appointment the Bishop of Birmingham felt unable to sanction. The Archbishop's plea for his action was that he found the candidate presented to him a fit person for the post. This plea has proved singularly unconvincing to a very large number of Churchpeople. They looked to the Archbishop to support one of the diocesan Bishops in his province in the maintenance of order in his diocese. The Archbishop has failed to do so, and it is widely felt that little help is to be sought from the Primate in restraining the excesses of those clergymen who are determined to persist in teaching and practices contrary to the formularies of our Church. The Bishop of Birmingham has pointed out to the Archbishop that the practices at St. Aidan's go far beyond even what was proposed in the revision of the Prayer Book in 1928. Reservation was to have been permitted for the sole purpose of ministering to the sick. At St. Aidan's, the Bishop says, " Devotions " occur weekly. " I learn that the curtains of the Tabernacle are drawn back and with Roman forms of prayer, priests, acolytes and congregation bow in adoration before the consecrated elements." The Archbishop has stated that he is not himself in favour of these forms of devotion, yet he fails to assist the Bishop of Birmingham in his endeavour to fulfil the promise which every Bishop makes at his Consecration, that he will be ready " with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word, and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same." A great number of the laity are specially concerned at this action of the Archbishop, and it is widely felt that the prestige of his high office and the future welfare of the Church have suffered severely by his failure to use this opportunity to secure a due regard for loyalty to the definite teaching of our Church and to its standards of worship.

The Doctrine of the Real Presence.

An even more serious question has been raised by the correspondence between the Bishop of Birmingham and the Archbishop of Canterbury. Do the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer teach that there is a presence of Christ in, with or under the forms of Bread and Wine in the Holy Communion? Since the Tractarian Movement a section of Churchmen have taught that at the words of consecration in the Holy Communion a change is effected in the elements and that a presence of Christ is brought into them. They claim that this is "Catholic" doctrine, and although some of them decline to denominate this change by the Roman Catholic term "Transubstantiation," for all practical purposes the teaching is the same. Those who believe in such a presence are logically justified in their claim to go on to use the elements for purposes of worship and adoration paid to Christ as present in them. It has been pointed out that this differs little from the idolatry which is condemned in the Articles. The Bishop of Birmingham definitely declares "that a spiritual presence is to be found in the consecrated elements of Holy Communion is regarded as a superstition properly rejected at the Reformation." The revised Prayer Book was disallowed in large measure "because of a fear that continuous reservation would open the way to erroneous belief in a miraculous change in the consecrated elements and to forms of worship based on it." Such a belief was practically unknown in our Church from the time of the Reformation until recent years. Eminent scholars have shown that it is not sanctioned by any of the formularies adopted at the Reformation, that it has no place in the Book of Common Prayer, that even Anglican Divines who were regarded as the High Churchmen of the Stuart period, such as Laud, Andrewes and Jeremy Taylor, did not hold the views that are now put forward. Finally, by the persistent misrepresentation of the Bennett Judgment it is claimed that this doctrine of a real presence in the elements was declared to be allowable, while it has been clearly shown that the decision in that case definitely repudiated the doctrine. This is asserted with distinct emphasis in the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, and it is only by the constant repetition of this and similar misstatements that Churchpeople have been led to believe that our Church sanctions any other belief than the doctrine maintained by Hooker that the presence of Christ in the Holy Communion is to be sought in the hearts of the faithful recipients of the Sacrament.

The Future of Religion in Spain.

The revolution in Spain has wrought a vast change in the position of the Roman Catholic Church in that country. In the past the Roman Church was the Established Church of the land. Under the dictatorship the Church was supreme, and exerted a tyrannous and persecuting power over the groups of Protestant and Evan-

gelical Christians who ventured to meet for worship according to the dictates of their conscience. The new constitution under the Republic has declared that the State is to have no official religion and that all religious Orders shall be dissolved and their property nationalized. It has also been declared that liberty of conscience and the right to profess and practise any religion whatever are guaranteed on Spanish territory, subject to the respect due to the demands of public morals. It is hoped that the freedom of worship now accorded will lead to a great forward movement in the Reformed Churches in Spain. An appeal is made for prayer and support for the Spanish Reformers in order that they may be guided in the use of the fresh opportunities thus afforded them for the furtherance of the Gospel. It is significant that while Romanism is thus losing its hold upon the peoples of the Continent, the claims of the Roman Church are being pushed with increasing aggressiveness in our own and other Protestant lands. Dr. Coulton and others have done much to expose the falsity of the Roman claims, but united action is needed to combat the organized efforts of the propagandists of Rome. Protestants on the Continent have already recognized the need for united action, and a Union has been formed of which a Branch for this country is being organized. When full particulars of the organization are announced we hope it will receive the hearty support of all who desire to see the Protestant countries saved from the subtle and insidious devices of Rome.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE EUCHARIST.

By Rev. R. Birch Hoyle, Author of "The Holy Spirit in St. Paul."

HOW rarely mention of the Holy Spirit occurs in connection with the Eucharist! To search for references to the work of the Holy Spirit in this sacrament, among the countless books extant on the Communion of the Lord's Supper, is like seeking the proverbial needle in a haystack. Attention has been centred chiefly upon the elements and the change, if any, wrought at consecration upon the species, or upon the celebrant the eyes have been turned to scan his "right" to administer the sacrament by virtue of the grace of "orders." Seldom are we directed to what, after all, is the chief thing, the presence and operation of the Holy Ghost at this, the supreme act of worship. The material elements and the human agents monopolize the transaction; the Divine agent has all too long been disregarded. It is, therefore, worth while to explore the place of the Holy Spirit in this sacrament, and the sources upon which we must draw are the liturgies and confessions of the various branches of the One Church of Christ, the references in doctrinal discussions upon the Eucharist, the experiences enjoyed by saints when "before the altar bending." It is timely, too, for the group of theologians, Anglican and Free Church, who meet with German divines, to follow up the Lausanne Conference, have under consideration the Feast of Corpus Christi; and the last Lambeth Conference, "facing to the East," brings into prominence the fact that the Eastern Churches, in their various liturgies, with the Epiclesis, the Invocation, of the Holy Ghost at the Supper, have, almost alone, place for the Spirit at the Supper.

The Scriptural basis upon which all sound doctrine must rest is meagre. Critical study of the words of institution leaves us very uncertain. John Bloomfield, in his book *The Eucharistic Canon* (S.P.C.K.), said: "The actual words and deeds of our Blessed Lord when He consecrated the first Eucharist have not been preserved to us." Archdeacon Hunkin reached the same conclusion in his recent study: "The details of the original institution of the Lord's Supper and of the subsequent history of its observance in the earliest times is far from certain" (*The Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion*, p. 37). He inclines to the view, advocated in Germany by Professor K. L. Schmidt, that in the original Lucan text, *Luke* xxii. 15–19, if Latin MSS. are followed, there was no reference to the cup at the Passover meal (*vide* art. *Abendmahl im N.T.* in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*). The result is, as Canon E. A. J. Rawlinson puts it: "If this view be correct, the direct witness of the Synoptic tradition to the authenticity of our Lord's words, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' disappears" (*Mysterium Christi*, p. 237). But whether this be so

or not, there is no reference, in the Gospel accounts of the Institution of the Supper, to the Holy Spirit. It is just possible that the work of the Paraclete, "to bring all things to your remembrance" (*John* xiv. 26), may be linked up with "Do this in remembrance of Me," the "acted parable" of the Supper furnishing the means for the Holy Spirit's "teaching all things."

When we pass to the Pauline writings, we find one possible reference connecting the Holy Spirit with the Sacrament, "we have all been imbued with one Spirit" (1 *Cor.* xii. 13: Moffatt), but this may allude to "being baptized in one Spirit" (*ibid.*) and not to the Supper at all. In the same Epistle, St. Paul mentions "spiritual food and spiritual drink" (1 *Cor.* x. 3 f.), but his reference is by analogy to the Manna, and Water from the Rock in *Exodus* (xvi. 16–25; xvii. 6). But "spiritual" (Greek, *pneumatikon*) here, in St. Paul's usage, carries no conferment of "immortality" as Ignatius of Antioch and Clement of Alexandria taught, for St. Paul adds that the patriarchal participants in *Exodus* perished. The Johannine writings have a possible reference to the Spirit's connection with the Sacrament, if we may assume that *John* vi. 56–63 deals with the Eucharist. The "hard saying," "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood," is explained by the words, "The Spirit is the Life-giver, flesh profiteth nothing: the words I speak to you are spirit and life." Evidently no change in the elements is here in view: the change is in the mind and heart of those receiving the Word. Vague as the reference may be, one clear lesson emerges; viz., that only in the light of the Ascension and Pentecost are Jesus' words to be construed. The "Word and the Spirit" go together. As Dr. R. C. Moberly well put it: "It is within the sphere of Spirit and by the power of the Spirit—and it is not except by, and within Spirit—that the Communion really is what the Communion is" (*J.T.S.*, April, 1901, p. 329).

The scanty reference of the Scriptures to the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist may have influenced the later Church, when constructing her Liturgies, to make few references to any connection. But these slight references give no warrant for the later view that the celebrant, by virtue of ordination, imparted a spiritual character to the service. It is the Spirit who makes the celebration spiritual, through the Word, to faith in those partaking thereof.

The Sub-Apostolic Age.

Students of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit are well aware that for the first three centuries great confusion existed as to the relation of the Logos, the Word, to the Spirit. This confusion is reflected in the use, now of the Word, now of the Spirit, as effecting the consecration of the elements. Thus Justin Martyr writes: "The bread and wine are consecrated through prayer of the Word . . . by the Word of prayer and of thanksgiving" (*Apol.* i. 66: i. 13). There is some controversy as to the meaning of the phrase "the prayer of the Word." Dr. Gore would interpret Word as referring to Christ as the Logos; others, as alluding to Christ's word of insti-

tution, and indicating " the Word conveying the Spirit." In favour of this latter view is the fact that Justin cites the words of institution as warrant for celebrating the Eucharist (*cf. Evangelical Doct. of Holy Com.*, p. 51, note 8). The emphasis on the Word will be seen later, when Ambrose and Augustine come into view. Justin observes too that the Eucharist is only participated in by " one who believes that the things taught by us (Christians) are true " : thus emphasizing the place of prior instruction and faith as conditioning reception. In a vague phrase he alludes to " our blood and flesh being nourished by assimilation," through the " prayer of the Word " at the thanksgiving, as though the Word affected the elements. " Not common bread nor common drink do we receive."

Irenaeus repeats Justin's thought : " No longer is bread from the earth, which receives the *epiclesis* of God, common bread, but it is eucharist consisting of two things, an earthly and an heavenly." " The bread and wine receive the word of God and the Eucharist becomes the body of Christ " (*adv. haer.* iv. 18 ; v. 2). It is the Spirit, or the Word, that makes it " heavenly, spiritual food and drink." As H. B. Swete says : " The Eucharist's spiritual significance " implies " the intervention of the Spirit of God, who alone can make material substances or human acts spiritually efficacious. The heavenly thing in it must be due to the Divine Spirit ; and it was doubtless the recognition of this truth that led the early composers of liturgies to invoke the Holy Spirit on the elements as well as on the communicants " (*Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 326). Thus we meet for the first time the word *epiclesis*, " invocation," on which Dr. Swete remarks that it " is an acknowledgement of the Spirit's work in the highest act of Christian worship " (*loc. cit.*).

The technical term, *epiclesis*, with its verb, *epikaloumai*, had associations with the magical practices of the mystery-religions and *may* have entered ecclesiastical speech from that source. Examples occur in the papyri of the second and third centuries ; e.g., " I invoke the God of the hour and of the day," " I invoke and esteem the Most High God," and the noun signifies a " spell " (*vide* Moulton and Milligan, *Vocab. of N.T. Greek*, p. 239*b*). Justin is aware of " initiations into the mysteries of Mithra " and the " institution of bread and of a cup of water " (*Apol.* i. 67), whilst Irenaeus tells us that Mark, the Valentinian gnostic, " pretended to offer thanksgiving, offering cups mixed with wine, and, spinning out at length the word of invocation, they are made to appear purple and reddish, so that through the Aeon, Charis, her very blood dripped into the cup through the invocation " with the result that " Charis (= Grace) who is before all things, transcending all knowledge and speech, should fill the inner man and increase in thee her own knowledge " (*adv. haer.* I. 13. 2). It is a moot question whether this parodies the Christian Supper or whether the technical term is borrowed and " baptized " by the Church.

Certain it is that this mode of speech was extensively used in the Greek Church. In the *Anaphora* of Hippolytus we read : " We beseech Thee that Thou wouldst send Thy Holy Spirit upon the

oblation of Thy holy Church and . . . give to all Thy faithful who partake thereof unto fulfilment with Thy Holy Spirit, for the confirmation of Thy faith in truth." And in the gnostic *Acts of Thomas* the actual words of invocation are given. " O Jesus Christ, Son of God, who didst vouchsafe to make us partakers of the Eucharist of Thy holy Body and precious Blood, we make bold to approach Thy holy Eucharist and to invoke Thy holy Name; come, now, make us partakers . . . come, Thou that knowest the mysteries of the chosen One," . . . (Ante-Nicene Library, vol. xvi, p. 416).

What is invoked is either the " word " or " the Spirit." Thus Origen says: " The Bread becomes a sacred Body through the prayer " and, again, " It is sanctified by means of the Word of God and prayer." (*Cont. Celsum* viii. 33; *in Matt.* xv. 11.) But in the *Clementine Liturgies* (end of third century) we read, " Send down Thy Holy Spirit, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, that He may make this Bread the Body of Thy Christ and this Cup the Blood of Thy Christ." The " Word " is ambiguous: it may be the equivalent of Logos, the Divine in Jesus Christ (*cf. John* i. 1–3), or the magical power conveyed in the use of " the Name." Both views may be read into the invocation as used by Sarapion (fourth century): " Let Thy Holy Word come upon this Bread, that the Bread may become the Body of the Word, and upon the Cup that the Cup may become the blood of Truth." But Sarapion also names the Holy Spirit in the invocation as well. The celebrants say: " We beseech Thee to make us living men. Give us the Spirit of Light that we may know Thee the True God. . . . Give us Holy Spirit that we may be able to tell forth and to enumerate Thy ineffable mysteries." And Cyril of Jerusalem (middle of fourth century) tells us in his Catechetical Lectures: " We call upon God to send His Holy Spirit upon the gifts lying before Him, that He may make the Bread the Body of Christ and the Wine the Blood of Christ; for whatever the Holy Ghost has touched is sanctified and changed " (cap. xxiii. 6 f.). In the *Liturgy of St. James* the invocation runs: " Send Thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these holy gifts."

Thus, either the " Word " or the Holy Spirit is invoked: the " Word " by Sarapion on the elements, the " Spirit " on the celebrants: the Spirit, in the Syrian, and Ethiopic Church Orders, the *Apostolical Constitutions* and by Cyril of Jerusalem. By Cyril and in *The Testament of the Lord*, the Invocation is addressed to the Holy Trinity.

The evidence from Eastern liturgies has been given in full: more briefly must we cite representative Eastern theologians. Gregory of Nyssa taught that, " Through the act of consecration the bread and wine are changed into the flesh and blood of the Lord in order that through partaking of them our body may be transformed into the body of Christ. . . . The power of the blessing does it " (*Cont. Eunomium*, xii.). More crassly St. John Chrysostom

depicts the celebration in which the priest, like the celebrant of the Mystery Religions, takes the leading rôle. He " stands, not bringing down fire (like Elijah), but the Holy Spirit and prays at length . . . that the grace falling on the sacrifice may, through it, inflame the Souls of all " (*de Sacerdot.* III. 4). The decisive moment is thus described. " It is not man who makes the gifts set forth to become the body and blood of Christ. . . . The priest stands filling a part, uttering these words, but the power and grace are of God. ' This is my Body,' saith he : this saying changes the gifts set forth " (*in prodit. Jud.* I. 6). The priest adds : " Let all mortal flesh keep silence. A great silence reigns when the Spirit bestows His grace, when He descends, when He broods over the holy gift." And elsewhere, after depicting the Holy Child in the manger, he says : " The Lord's Table takes the place of the crib and here also lies the Body of the Lord, not wrapped in swaddling-clothes but surrounded on all sides by the Holy Ghost " (*Hom. de beato Philogono.* 3). The Syrian Nestorian, Narsai (sixth century), completes the picture. " The priest calls to the Spirit, that He will also light down upon the assembled congregation, that by His gift it may be worthy to receive the Body and Blood. The Spirit descends upon the oblation . . . and causes the power of the Godhead to dwell in the bread and wine and completes the mystery of our Lord's resurrection from the dead. . . . The Spirit comes down at the request of the priest . . . and celebrates the Mysteries by the medium of the priest whom He has consecrated. Then the Deacon cries in that hour, ' Stand in silence and fear. . . . Let all the people be in fear at this moment in which the Holy Mysteries are being accomplished by the descent of the Holy Spirit ' " (*Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, pp. 16–22).

The Latin Church.

Few are the traces of any invocation of the Spirit at the Eucharist, in the Latin Fathers. The earliest appears to be given by Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspe (N. Africa, A.D. 507). " The Holy Spirit is asked of the Father for the consecration of the Sacrifice " (*ad Monimum* II. 7). Instead of the Holy Spirit's descent on the elements, the intervention of an angel, or angels, ascending with the gifts, is assumed. Thus, in the Mozarabic Liturgy we read : " Be present, be present, O Jesus, Thou good priest, in our midst . . . sanctify this oblation that we may receive the hallowed gifts *through Thy holy angel's hands*, O Holy Lord." In the Ordinary of the Mass of the Roman Church, when the Divine intervention is invoked, the Holy Spirit is not mentioned. In the prayers, *Hanc igitur*, *Quam oblationem*, *Supra quae*, *Supplices te*, it is said, " We most humbly beseech Thee, Omnipotent God, command these things to be carried by the hands of Thy angel to Thy altar on high, in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty." In the *de Sacramentis*, sometimes ascribed to Ambrose, *Quam oblationem* runs : " We ask and pray Thee to take up this oblation on Thy sublime altar by the hands of Thy *angels*."

The omission of the *Epiclesis* for the Holy Spirit in the Roman

Service books undoubtedly affected the communion service orders of the Lutheran, Reformed and Anglican Churches. In the 1549 Prayer Book (Ed. VIth) occurred the *Epiclesis* on Eastern lines: the Scots "Directory" has one, as follows: "We humbly beseech Thee, O Merciful Father, to vouchsafe to us Thy gracious presence and so to sanctify with Thy Word and Spirit these Thine own gifts of bread and wine," and the recent rejected Prayer Book had an *Epiclesis*.

Many conjectures have been made as to why "angel" or "angels" have taken the place of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist. Dean Brilioth thinks the Epiclesis has been ousted by the thought of the sacrifice. Others fancy that man cannot bear the Divine presence immediately, hence the "angel" is asked to transfer the "gift" to Heaven: others, again, think that the transcendent God is the background and only by a Dionysian chain of intermediaries can the blessing come upon the gift. In such a view the "Real Absence" rather than the "Real Presence" would appear to be the dominant thought.

By Ambrose, and his great pupil, Augustine, stress came to be laid upon the "Word" as effecting the consecration of the elements. Ambrose felt the Real Presence. "We have seen the Great High-Priest come to us . . . He himself is manifest among us as the Offerer, since it is His holy Word that hallows the sacrifice that is offered" (*in Ps.* xxxviii. *Enarr.* 25). By this emphasis, the perils of a magical view and the paganism of the Mystery Religions are avoided: the transaction becomes "moral," an appeal to mind and heart is possible, and with the Word the Spirit has an instrument for His work. Augustine's aphorisms express his view. "The word added to the Bread and Wine make them the body and blood of the Word" (*Tract. in Joan.* lxxx. 3). "Add the word and it becomes a sacrament, itself being, as it were, a visible word." The same thought is prominent in the *de Mysteriis* (ascribed to Ambrose), "In the Eucharist it is Christ's own word, 'This is my Body,' which changes the nature of the material elements on which it is pronounced" (ix. 52. 54). And "faith" as the subjective condition for receiving the benefits of the Eucharist is emphasized by Augustine also. "Sacraments are visible signs of divine things: one thing is seen, another understood": "believe, and thou hast eaten" (cf. *Tract. in Joan.* xxv. 12). "To believe in Him, this is to eat the living bread" (*ib.* xxvi. 1). Here Augustine restores the Pauline emphasis on "faith," the Evangelical view. "It is not that which is seen (in the Sacrament) that feeds, but that which is believed" (*Ser.* 112. 5). What "gives life" is the Spirit. "Through the flesh the Spirit did something for our salvation. Flesh was the vessel, attend to what it held, not to what it was, i.e. flesh" (*in Joan.* xxvii. 5). The last of the great Latin Fathers, Gregory I, need not detain us, though his echo of Augustine's stress on the Word, reveals his personal experience. "Through the sacred oracles," he says, "we are quickened by the gift of the Spirit, that we may reject the works that bring death: the Spirit enters when God

touches the mind of the reader by diverse ways and orders" (*Ezek.* i. *hom.* 7).

In the thousand years between Augustine and Luther the impersonal term "grace" ousted the personal term "Spirit" in discussions concerning the benefits received through the Eucharist. As Dorner says, "The Holy Spirit (was) formally represented as a person, but practically treated as a thing" (*Person of Christ* II. i, p. 272). More stress is laid upon the Spirit as a "gift" than as a Person in the Trinity, and both "grace" and "gift" are presented as a kind of force emanating from God impinging on or imparted to the soul. In Aquinas, for example, there is little sense of "infused grace" acting by psychological means upon the soul. The psychological effects, of course, are experienced. Thomas à Kempis puts them in beautiful speech. "He communicates mystically and is invisibly refreshed: as often as he devoutly calls to mind the mystery of the Incarnation and the Passion of Christ, and is kindled with love to Him" (*de imit. Xti*, IV. 10. 6).

The Reformers' Teaching.

With Martin Luther we see recourse to the Pauline-Augustinian views. Two *foci* are given by Luther; (*a*) "Not the sacrament but the faith of the recipient" conditions the Spirit's working to make the Supper "a means of grace." (*b*) The Word was restored, alongside of the Sacrament, as the direction for the latter's interpretation. To the Schoolmen's dictum, "The sacraments are efficacious signs of grace," he added, "if thou believest and no further" (cf. *Serm. de poenitentia*). By this, the Word, i.e. the sum total of the Gospel message, the officiating celebrant and the elements take their secondary place, and faith takes the primary position as the psychological condition for the effectual working of the Spirit in the Eucharist. But faith itself is no human product: it "is infused by the living Spirit," "the Spirit is in human hearts not for Himself but *for us*" (*Weimar, Ed.* vi. 95). "God is not absent from His gifts" and so faith is more than a preparation for receiving; it is actual possession. "Thou possessest just as much as thou believest" (*Weimar, Ed.* xl. 421). Through the Spirit's interpreting work, for it is "the Spirit's proper office to reveal and make Christ plain, to preach and give witness to Him" (*Erlangen, Ed.* xlviii., on *John* vii. 39), the communicant learns "How Christ with all His saints comes to thee with all His merits, His passion and His grace, that with thee He may live, act, suffer, endure and die, willing to be altogether thine and share all with thee" (*Sermon von dem hochwürdigen Sakrament*). It is the Spirit that makes the Church as such: "If the Church is not ruled by faith, charity and the rest of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, then it is not ruled nor is it a Church but a synagogue of Satan" (*Letters*, Enders' Ed., vol. III, p. 286).

We have not space for Calvin's teaching: the reader may see it presented by Bishop Knox in the April number of this periodical (pp. 93–4). Its tone is well expressed by the Heidelberg Catechism's answer to the Question (76) "What is it to eat the crucified body

and drink the shed blood of Christ ? " " It is not only to embrace with a believing heart all the sufferings and death of Christ, and thereby to obtain the forgiveness of sins and life eternal : but, moreover, to be so united more and more to His sacred body by the Holy Ghost who dwells both in Christ and in us, that, although He is in heaven and we on earth, we are nevertheless flesh of His flesh and bone of His bones, and live and are governed for ever by one Spirit as the members of our body are by one soul." And Question 79 affirms : " We are as really partakers of His true body and blood, through the working of the Holy Spirit, as we receive by the mouth these holy tokens in remembrance of Him."

Anglican divines in the Reformed Church of England repeat such wholesome teaching as to the work of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist. Thus Thos. Jackson (1579–1640) wrote : " We may consecrate the elements of bread and wine . . . and yet unless He (God) grant some actual influence of His Spirit . . . we do not really receive His body and blood " (*Works*, ix. 610). Jeremy Taylor wrote : " We (the Church of England) by the real spiritual presence of Christ do understand Christ to be present as the Spirit of Christ is present in the hearts of the faithful by blessing and grace " (vi. 1). The Prayer Book, in Articles xxviii–xxix, strongly affirms the necessity for the presence of faith in the recipient for the Eucharist to be efficacious, even as Waterland said : " The presence is not to be sought for in the sacrament but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament."

We may sum up this historical review by saying that about the fourth century the Spirit was directly invoked in the Eucharist, almost exclusively in the Eastern Churches, but in such a way as to perform some *quasi*-magical work upon the material elements, and rarely upon the minds and hearts of the recipients. In the Latin Churches the Word was invoked, but by Augustine the attention was centred more upon the subjective state of the recipient and not on the celebrant at the altar. With the Reformers stress came to be laid upon faith as the *sine qua non* of worthy reception and the place of the Spirit, acting through the Word, creating faith, becomes central.

The Faith-Experience of the Spirit.

Modern psychological analysis of the religious experience believers have of the Spirit has directed attention more and more to the connection of the Spirit with the Eucharist. Personality has been described as " the capacity of thrilling, in living response, to the movement of the Spirit : it is the aspiration, through conscious affinity, after the beauty of holiness : it is the possibility of self-realization, and effective self-expression as love : it is the prerogative of consciously reflecting, as a living mirror, the very character and being of God " (R. C. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, p. 254). This is the modern way of expressing the Saviour's meaning in the words, " He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him." The Supper is God's " visible Word " by which

the full self-revelation of His mind towards human life and sin is set forth. The whole content of the Gospel is set forth, in epitome, focused to a point, in the Eucharist. It symbolizes God's condemnation of sin, His loving provision for its removal, His pitying, redeeming love, His majestic moral claim. The Spirit is God in action upon our souls : it " is the Spirit of Christ ; in Spirit Christ is realized. The Spirit is the method of Christ's presence. Incarnate God is made real within as Spirit " (Moberly, *op. cit.*, p. 272).

How the Spirit works is beyond man's power to describe. He knows the action of the Spirit, creating, sustaining, increasing the inward reaction and response to the redeeming acts of God in Christ, symbolized in the elements. This response is faith. By faith we know ourselves " quickened " :—in Gregory First's words, " The Spirit enters when God touches the mind." God is moving us to love Himself : God is at work, i.e. we experience the Holy Ghost. We are " seized," " laid hold of," " possessed " by God ; His deepest impact upon us is made when the visible signs of His love, seen at its supremest point on Calvary, are on the Table.

Eric Schaeder well expresses the experience. " In this sacrament the point under discussion is this, that beneath the preaching of Christ's death and contemplative giving of an interest in the Dead, the Spirit of God, which is also the Spirit of Christ, comes into relation with the receiver of the Sacrament and raises him to fellowship with the Crucified and Risen One. These latter are absolutely spiritual processes and relations and Christianity, at the centre of its being, knows nothing else. It knows of faith and the Spirit " (*Das Geist problem*, p. 100). Hence this is, as Dr. Wheeler Robinson writes : " The sufficient ground for the place of the sacraments in the Church's life and thought, if in fact they intensify effectively an experience of Divine grace which is by no means confined to them " (*The Holy Spirit in Christian Experience*, p. 188).

The latter words are important. The grace received is not different in kind from that received when God's Word is heard or read : it is felt in a more intense degree. Thus there is hope for the Quaker and Salvation Army member who dispenses with the Supper. Through the Word and prayer they receive grace, though they miss the corporate manifestation of Christ's other Body, the Church. Thus the Sacrament of the Supper has its right place. It is " a means of grace," but not itself the " Grace." As N. P. Williams has recently taught us (*The Grace of God*), grace is but another name for the Spirit. The mystery of the Spirit's working, however, is that " He speaks not from Himself " : He " takes of the things of Christ, announces them, and glorifies Him " ; but never displays Himself. Thus, at the Supper, it is not to the illuminating Spirit our attention is drawn, but to " the Lamb slain for us." And when we muse on the love of Christ " tasting death on our behalf," Christ, in turn, directs us to the Father's love for the Son, " because He laid down His life." The Spirit glorifies the Son ; the Son glorifies the Father ; the Father glorifies the Son and speaks to us, saying, " This is my Beloved Son : hear *Him.*" In Calvin's words, " The Holy Spirit,

who has made Christ to be born in us, perfects continually the further appropriation of Christ, i.e., He brings directly through His Divine Power, Christ really into us. . . . The Divine-human power of Christ enters into the centre of our spiritual and psychical life." *This* is the Spirit's chief work in the Eucharist. "He that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit."

H. R. Allenson, Ltd., publish a series of studies by the late Rev. Arthur S. Peake, M.A., D.D., dealing with some of "the great questions of Life and Religion." The volume is entitled *Plain Thoughts on Great Subjects* (5*s*. net) and is edited by the Rev. Leslie S. Peake, M.A., B.Litt. It is hoped that the book will have a special value for Sunday School Teachers, Bible Class Leaders, Candidates for the Ministry and all Preachers of the Gospel. Both the subjects and the method of treatment are of unusual interest. Dr. Peake's place among theological scholars during his lifetime was well known, and his power of clear exposition is exemplified in these studies, which include such subjects as "The Atonement of Jesus Christ," "The Reunion of the Christian Churches," "Evangelism and the Intellectual Influences of the Age," "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit," "The Hope of Immortality." The others are of equal interest and importance, and in all of them there is an abundance of scholarly and striking thoughts which set out great truths needed for the better understanding of Christian teaching at the present time.

Those who are interested in the life of the English Communities on the Continent and the provision of the services of the Church of England for them will find much pleasure in reading a fascinating account of the English colony at the Hague which has been written by Mr. Fred Ouschans Dentz, a member of the congregation of the English Church there, whose devotion to its interests has led him to write the *History of the English Church at the Hague* 1586–1929 (5*s*. net). Mr. Dentz has combined with his account of the Chaplaincy the records of some of its chief supporters and of the Chaplains who have served the Church. Dr. Bate, the Secretary of the Colonial and Continental Church Society, contributes a note commending the book and speaking of the association of the Society with this and many similar chaplaincies on the Continent. The profits from the work are devoted to the maintenance of the Chaplaincy.

EVANGELICALISM IN HISTORY.

By Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D., Principal of St. John's Hall, Highbury.

IT is a commonplace of present-day discussions to say that the cause for the existence of differing schools of religious thought is primarily the existence of differing attitudes of mind. This explanation is perhaps more frequently offered by those dubbed Modernists, who in the words of Sabatier declare that "Modernism is not a new system or a new synthesis: it is an orientation." As a general statement of the influence guiding the Modernist movement, this is undoubtedly true: for the variety of opinions reflected say in the Girton Conference of 1921 and the same diversity of view which appears in the pages of *The Modern Churchman*, are a testimony to the fact that uniformity of conclusion is not the characteristic of the members of The Churchmen's Union. The distinguishing characteristic is a fearless freedom in the examination of all and sundry articles of the Faith, it is an attitude of mind which seeks always to know why it should believe, and, not content with the hope that some day certain difficulties may be resolved, it seeks here and now to bring all faith within the orbit of reasoned knowledge. This attitude of mind is not of course the exclusive possession of those termed Modernists, and the same caution must be kept in view when seeking for the attitude of mind which is characteristic of Evangelicals. Broadly speaking, however, the Evangelical is the man who in religion stands primarily for the inward and spiritual. In contrast with those who look mainly or primarily to organization, or to authority and law, in religion, he looks to the spiritual message rather than to the organization which is called into existence for conveying it. The Evangelical is in short the prophet, who sees the Invisible, and whose first object in life is to get other men to see the Invisible which is clear to himself. Other men may be more concerned with the organization which by form or ritual or symbol points to the same truth, others may become the priests to safeguard the continuance of the teaching of that truth, but the Evangelical, though he may value the rites and the priesthood, is never likely to mistake the symbol for the thing signified. A practical illustration of the two types is seen in the prophets and priests of the Old Testament, and they are well summed up in the Book of Amos. Amos, "an herdman and a gatherer of sycomore fruit," sees through the mockery of a prosperous nation which thinks it can atone for moral laxity by feast days and solemn assemblies. "Though ye offer me burnt offerings and your meat offerings, I will not accept them: neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs: for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. . . . I will not turn away the punishment of Israel: because they have sold the righteous for silver, and the needy

for a pair of shoes. . . . (Amos v. 22, 23 : ii. 6). Amos might belittle himself on the ground that he was no prophet, neither a prophet's son, but the inspired herdsman of Tekoa nevertheless had a perception of the Invisible God and of what He needed from His people. Yet when he appeared at the sanctuary of Bethel and by his message condemned the insincerity and lack of reality in the religion practised there, it is the voice of the priest, the official voice of religion in the person of Amaziah, which condemns the herdsman prophet to silence.

This is not to infer that therefore the priest is always a danger to religion, or of no value thereto. The Old Testament itself would correct such an impression, for it is the priests of the Old Testament who collect and edit the Sacred Books in addition to ordering the ritual observance. But when all allowance has been made for the value of the priest, it is the prophet who sees into the heart of things and emphasizes that to which the priestly ritual points. The Levitical Law may hedge the life of the Jew with the minutest prescriptions of outward service and ritual, and in that way force an external consent to religious obligation, but it is the Book of Psalms which " turns away from all outward forms as empty and worthless, and is content with nothing short of the deepest union with God." [1]

And this latter quotation from a former Master of Balliol may well sum up the Evangelical of the Old Testament.

Turning from the Old Testament to the New, it is noticeable again how the prophetic idea is summed up in a clearer and more perfect vision of God and His demands, than that possessed by other men. When John the Baptist proclaims the approach of the Kingdom of Heaven and teaches what is required from those who would enter the Kingdom, he is at once acclaimed as one of the prophets or even as the long-expected prophet foretold by Moses (St. John i. 21). So also when Our Lord Himself began His public ministry, the effect of His words was to impress men with His unusual knowledge and perception of God, and the result was reflected in the early designation of Him as " the prophet of Nazareth." And when " the days of His flesh " were ended, and His followers were compelled by force of circumstances to evolve a system of organization to carry on the work which their Master had left them to do, it is significant how important a place was occupied by the prophets. They rank next in importance to the apostles (1 Cor. xii. 28), and St. Paul goes so far as to declare that if Christ Himself is the corner-stone of the Christian Church, the prophets with the apostles are those who compose the foundation of it (Eph. ii. 20). It seems that before the flexible organization of the Church of the apostles was hardened into a more rigid system, the men who were looked upon as leaders with the Twelve were those who " had companied with the apostles all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, Beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that He was taken up from us " (Acts i. 21, 22). These men were as cognizant of the teaching and practice of their Master as the apostles, and by their clear insight into the essential things of the Christian faith were

[1] Edw. Caird, *Evolution of Religion*, i. 389.

looked upon with veneration as leaders. It was a priority due to inspiration and not to office, a pre-eminence due to the clearer vision of the things of Christ. In short it was the evangelically-minded follower of Our Lord who, by the power of His Spirit and taught by His Spirit, took of the things of Christ as they were revealed to him, and received from men due acknowledgment as one who had a clearer vision of Christ than others.

Such were the Evangelical prototypes, and amongst them might also be placed St. Paul, and this, not simply because of the association of certain of his doctrines, such as Justification by Faith, with the modern Evangelical school of thought. It is rather because in contradistinction to the Lucan conception in Acts, of the Twelve as an Apostolic College directing the whole Church, St. Paul looks away from men to Christ, and finds the basis of his religious experience as well as his commission to preach in the fact that " it pleased God . . . to reveal His Son in me " (Gal. i. 15, 16). It was this revelation of the invisible which made him the power that he was. To sum up, therefore, what the Bible reveals of those to whom the Evangelicals trace their spiritual ancestry, their work was to call their contemporaries to spiritual realities, to proclaim the nearness of God and the accessibility of Christ, to teach on the one hand the holiness of God and on the other the redemption of man. In the manifold activities of these Evangelical spiritual forefathers of the Old and New Testaments, their work usually brought them into disfavour with those who represented the more official side of religion, and yet in the simpler and clearer atmosphere of apostolic and sub-apostolic days the prophets have due recognition as those who have a more open vision of God than other men.[1]

Now if what has been said so far describes with accuracy those to whom Evangelicals look as the fount of their being, it can be seen that the teaching of such men and the experiences with which they met as a result of their teaching, have been repeated time and again from Biblical days down to our own. Some will see the successors of primitive Evangelicals in those to whom has been given the title of Mystics, and will find in men such as Cynewulf in the eighth century or Richard Rolle of the fourteenth century, links with the past. Such a claim could not be pressed very far, but the lives of those who are described as Mystics are at all events a protest against a mere official type of religion, and they do point to the essential truth of spirituality in religion and in life, which is one of the main characteristics of Evangelicalism.

It lies outside the scope of this essay to mention any but a few of those who, whether individually or as members of particular societies, form links in the chain which connects Evangelicals with the remote past. But in mentioning even a few of the more important, it should be borne in mind that even in the so-called Dark Ages there were always to be found some men who were carrying the light of God's truth in the midst of an age of spiritual decline.

[1] This latter point can be seen in *The Didache*, which most scholars consider to be an account of the position of the prophet in sub-apostolic days.

There were men like Peter de Bruys who lived in Dauphiny and Provence in the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth century, who, fanatical in his rejection of all discipline, ritual, and tradition, in favour of the living spirit, was at least a protest against the deadness of a Church which seemed void of spirituality. There were the " Poor men of Lyons " who came into prominence in the last few years of the twelfth century. Followers of Peter Valdez, who had secured a translation of the Bible into the vulgar tongue, they wandered about the south of France preaching repentance and the need for imitating apostolic practice. They may have had extreme social views for their day, but were near akin to Evangelical tradition in their emphasis upon the Bible and in their rejection of priestly ministration and prayers for the dead.

Or again one may find in men like Francis of Assisi, with his simple mysticism, his cheerfulness of life, his missionary enthusiasm and his straightforward, if sometimes emotional, method of preaching, the spirit for which Evangelicals have usually stood.

In our own country there follows in chronological order the " Evangelical Doctor " John Wycliffe. In his case the Evangelical type becomes more clearly defined because it is a more decided reaction against the priestly type which, as reflected in the growing corruptness of the whole ecclesiastical organization, caused Wycliffe to go to the extreme of rejecting Episcopacy as a distinct order in the Church. But the Evangelical note is sounded in his perception of the spiritual through the Bible, which caused him to enunciate the doctrine that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation. It was an accurate appreciation of Wycliffe's position which led to his being called " the morning star of the Reformation," because in spite of the fact that he differed from the sixteenth-century Reformers in some material points, he at all events summed up in himself two of the cardinal features of the Reformation, which were a revolt against a repressive priesthood, and an appeal to the Bible to find a living faith.

It is not surprising therefore that the influence of Wycliffe lived on, and became one of the factors of the Reformation in Germany and England. There has been some attempt to belittle the force of Wycliffe's influence both in Bohemia and in our own country, but closer research has only tended to re-affirm what after all the evolution of history itself shows, that even in the darkest days there have been men who saw the light and that men of the rank and file were feeling after spiritual truths which were made clear by leaders such as Wycliffe. Lindsay, for instance, in his *History of the Reformation*, I, 152, refers to an Evangelical type of religion amongst the artisans of Augsburg, Nurnberg, Strassburg and other parts of Germany, as far back as the closing years of the thirteenth century.

" They professed a simple evangelical creed : they offered a passive resistance to the hierarchical and priestly pretensions of the clergy : they were careful to educate their children in schools which they supported : they had vernacular translations of the Scriptures, and committed large portions to memory : they conducted their religious service in the vernacular, and it was

one of the accusations made against them that they alleged that the Word of God was as profitable when read in the vernacular as when studied in Latin."

The same writer refers (I, 139) to "the silent spread of a quiet, sincere, but non-ecclesiastical religion" in the last decades of the fifteenth and the earlier decades of the sixteenth century.

"Historians usually say nothing about this movement, and it is only a minute study of the town chronicles and of the records of provincial and municipal legislation that reveals its power and extent. It has always been recognized that Luther's father was a man of a deeply religious turn of mind, although he commonly despised the clergy, and thought that most monks were rogues or fools: but what is not recognized is that in this he represented thousands of quiet and pious Germans in all classes of society. We find traces of the silent, widespreading movement in the ecclesiastical legislation of German princes, in the police regulations, and in the provisions for the support of the poor among the burghers: in the constitutions and practices of the confraternities among the lower classes, and especially among the artisans of the towns: and in the numerous translations of the Vulgate into the vernacular."

What Lindsay says of the Germany of the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries is most probably true of the England of the same period, and especially in the Eastern counties where an Evangelical type of piety has usually been found. And it is in this neighbourhood that the influence of Wycliffe lived on to merge into the wider stream of influences which brought about the Reformation in England.

The more immediate point for consideration however is to note the widespread existence of a type of religion amongst the artisans of Germany and in lesser degree perhaps in England, which is alien to the existing official religion, and which, despairing of spiritual vision in the established priestly order, looked to the Bible, and found there the spiritual solace which it needed. The existence of such a widespread feeling gives the answer to several queries. It explains amongst other things why the Reformation came so easily in England. The Tudors were powerful sovereigns, but they were powerful because they did what the nation wished them to do; it was not a power secured in opposition to the desires of the people, but a power accruing to them because they did what the nation desired. The Tudors, strong as they were, could not have cut the connection with the Pope had not the people of England wished it; the Tudors, great as they were, could not have set in motion the series of statutes which turned the eyes of England from Rome to Canterbury, had it not been with the approbation of the people of England. Part of that approbation may have been due to the strong feeling of antipathy against a Church which had become increasingly anti-national since the thirteenth century, but stronger than this was the deep-seated desire for a spiritual religion, a desire always latent, but strongly developed in certain parts of the country, through the influence of Wycliffe and his followers.

So again with regard to Germany. Opinions may be divided as to the exact measure of influence which Wycliffe exercised there. Certain it is that his writings were used by John Huss the Bohemian Reformer and that in this way his influence was felt in Germany.

But the influence of Wycliffe or Huss or Luther was more informative than creative. The last-named, for instance, owes his pre-eminence not to the fact that he discovered or re-discovered for his fellow-men certain great truths which the official Church had neglected since the days of Augustine. The mere mention of Staupitz, who pointed Luther to the teaching of Justification by Faith, is sufficient to disprove this. The influence of Luther—just as of Wycliffe or Huss—was due to the fact that there was a large body of men waiting for his message; that scattered throughout the country were many men for whom he made articulate that for which their souls were craving. Luther did not create or even begin the Reformation, he was rather the strong man who voiced the feelings of others, the leader for whom an army was already in being. It is merely one more illustration of the truth seen from the days of John the Baptist down to our own day, that when the voice of God speaks through a prophet, the hearts of people at once respond. This is the measure of the greatness of the Reformers, and this is why they rank high in the Evangelical succession. It may be a Luther or Calvin, a Cranmer or a John Knox, a Ridley or a Latimer, their great work was to break through the barrier of ecclesiasticism, and to bring the individual into direct contact with Christ. They pierced the cloud of subtleties which tended to remove God out of their ken, and replaced them with the simplicity which left men face to face with their Maker. But they did it for a people who were waiting for them to do it, because deep-seated in the hearts of most men then, as at all times, was the longing for the Invisible, the desire for the open vision of God, and a craving to know how sinful man may draw near to his Creator.

So again with the English Puritans of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The one-sided criticisms which were recorded of the Puritans until the early part of the nineteenth century are summed up in the caricature of Cromwell in Sir Walter Scott's *Woodstock*. The Puritans had their limitations undoubtedly, but their defects were the result of an undue reaction against a formalism and ecclesiasticism which tended to strangle the spiritual. The true spirit of the movement in the latter half of the sixteenth century was the fear of a return to the pre-Reformation system which placed the Church between man and God; and it was only the broad teaching of Hooker on the implied Divine sanction in all forms of government in Church and State, which rallied the more moderate Puritans to a recognition of Episcopacy and to Church ceremonies. The seventeenth-century Puritan spirit was more widely diffused in so far that it was in strong opposition to the reciprocating cries of the Divine Right of Kings and Divine Right of Bishops. It was no mere accident which made the Puritans the champions of liberty in both Church and State, it was the logical reaction against principles which tended to crush out individuality, and to make the individual a mere puppet in a scheme ordered by God's vicegerents the King and his politico-religious advisers the Bishops. It was no mere opposition to Bishops that made Falkland and the members of the Long

Parliament at one in their desire for Church reforms that would reduce the Bishops to a position more in accord with primitive ideas; it was rather the Puritan spirit now deeply rooted in the nation which on the one hand wished to confine the Bishops strictly to their ecclesiastical duties, and with it to recover the primitive simplicity of worship which was the characteristic of early Christianity. This is not the place to attempt to discriminate between the various bodies who are loosely grouped under the term Puritan, or to show how one section like the Presbyterians tended to reproduce the worst faults of the medieval Papal system. It is sufficient to know that men such as Cromwell were fully aware of the lack of liberty in the Presbyterian organization, and the gradual *rapprochement* of Presbyterianism with proscribed Anglicanism during the Commonwealth is sufficient indication of where it felt its hopes lay.

But underneath all the variations of Puritanism are to be found, first and foremost, reliance on the Bible, and the application of it to daily life, and also a belief in God's nearness and approachableness. Mystics, stern moralists, men of practical wisdom, the Puritans were all these, and they learned it all from the Bible, which was in very truth for them the word of God. Men will no doubt always differ in the estimate they place upon the Puritans, and many would claim the fruits of their work without acknowledging affinity with them. It is enough to know that in an age which attempted to enforce religious uniformity and to repress individual spiritual experiences by the undue exaltation of ecclesiasticism, it was the Puritans who called men to spiritual realities and emphasized again the direct individual contact with God. The true note of Evangelical succession is found at least there.

This brings us to those who are credited with what is known as the Evangelical Revival and who in consequence are familiarly known as Evangelicals. The present generation living in the years following the world upheaval of 1914–18 is in a peculiarly favourable position to appreciate the work done by the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century. We of the present day are very conscious of the prevailing apathy and sluggishness of England towards religious matters, and are apt to attribute it to a natural reaction from the high spiritual and emotional strain of the years of the war. This at bottom seems the natural reason for the general slackness noticeable in the early years of the eighteenth century, even though to some historians it seems the grossest anthropomorphism to say so. But the prevailing note is contained in the dictum of Alexander Pope that "all that is, ought to be," and in his conception that enthusiasm was only a form of madness. The outlook of the Whig politicians of the day also contributed to the spread of this demoralizing atmosphere. Their object was to ensure the Hanoverian succession and to prevent the return of the Stuarts, and this was to be secured by the avoidance of war abroad, by the development of trade, and by a general concentration upon material success. Historians may acclaim this policy as the means by which England was furnished with the funds to carry her through the wars

which came later in the century, but the policy of " letting sleeping dogs lie," of which Walpole was the exponent, was hardly calculated to stimulate high moral sentiments ; whilst the cynicism which was characteristic of the Whig minister tended inevitably to the low tone of public morality. So Lord Hervey tells us that the ordinary man " grew ashamed to talk of right and wrong," whilst the Tory Bolingbroke in his *Patriot King* refers to his political opponents as men who " contend that it is not enough to be vicious by practice and habit, but that it is necessary to be so by principle." This latter quotation is of course open to the charge of being the exaggeration of a political partisan, but the balanced judgment of Lecky gives as his conclusion at all events that " the fault of the time was not so much the amount of vice as the defect of virtue, the general depression of motives, the unusual absence of unselfish and disinterested action." When those in authority held themselves up as apostles of the commonplace, and when purity and high motives were frowned upon, it is not to be wondered at that the general standard of morality should decline and that a spiritual famine should ensue. The result can be traced in the rationalism of the Church to which Butler's *Analogy* bears witness,[1] and to the Deism which followed in its train, and it can be seen in the low conception of duty which animated bishops and clergy. Something of this latter was of course a relic of the past and was only intensified by the spirit of the age. The purely intellectual slackness, however, was shaken ere long, and a firm foundation re-established by the work of men like Berkeley and Newton, but the spiritual and moral deadness still remained. The elder Pitt did something to purify and elevate political life, whilst George III accomplished a great deal in raising the tone of fashionable life, but what breathed a new spirit into England generally was the movement known as the Evangelical Revival. Whether it was the Wesleys and Whitfield in the earlier stages of the Revival or the Venns and Fletcher and Simeon and many others in the later stages, the whole were marked by similar features. The prevailing low level of morality made them realize the need for conversion : and the preaching of the Atonement with its corollary, Justification by Faith, was the central point in their message. The natural sequel was the emphasis upon the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit, and the great stress laid upon the work of the Holy Spirit was something of a novelty even for the leading Churchmen of that day.[2] And yet, however minutely one might go on to examine the teaching of the Evangelical Revival, the simple fact stands out that there is no new truth enunciated in the Revival. Rather there is emphasized by one and all the all-sufficiency of Christ for the needs

[1] Cf. Butler's well-known statement : " It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry, but it is now at length discovered to be fictitious : and accordingly they treat it as if . . . nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule."

[2] Bishop Butler, for instance, said to John Wesley : " Sir, this pretending to extraordinary revelation and gifts of the Holy Ghost is a horrid thing—a very horrid thing."

of men, by intense and earnest preaching men are brought face to face with Christ as a living Saviour to change their lives and to assure them of heaven. Whether we turn to Whitfield preaching to the 20,000 Bristol miners so that the tears ran down their cheeks, or whether we look at the work of a man like Daniel Wilson at Islington in the later stages of the Revival, the central truth they both proclaim is nothing new. But it is an old truth proclaimed with a new conviction and intense devotion; it is the old call to repentance, and the old promise of pardon, but set forth with a new spirit that changed the life of England. The earlier movement might be frowned upon by the ecclesiastical authorities with the ultimate result of the secession of the Wesleyans from the Established Church, and the later movement might be regarded with suspicion and animadversion by those who, like Lord Melbourne, thought it " a pretty pass things are coming to if religion is to interfere with our private life." Yet the influence of the movement was irresistible. Church Missionary Society, Religious Tract Society, British and Foreign Bible Society, Sunday Schools, Day Schools, building of new churches, these and such-like spelled out the influence on the one hand. The abolition of slavery, the initiation of the Factory Acts, the care for Child Welfare and other similar movements illustrate it in the social sphere. It is no exaggeration to assert that whatever of living power for good there was in the nineteenth century in Church or State, in politics or literature, it owed its existence consciously or unconsciously to the influence of the Evangelical Revival.

To sum up this admittedly imperfect sketch of some of those to whom Evangelicals look as their spiritual forbears, the outstanding characteristics seem to be these. They laid emphasis upon the reality of God, and in particular the revelation of Him by Christ. They see the possibility of simple man being brought into union and fellowship with his Maker by the power of Christ and His atoning sacrifice. They look to the Bible as the repository of the revelation of the will of God for man and place a reliance upon it which they will not give to priest or Church; and as a consequence they are frowned upon by ecclesiastical authorities, and in turn become themselves suspicious of authorities. Sometimes they are gloomy, like the extreme Puritans, as those for whom the sinfulness of human nature has made life a perpetual suspicion of what that nature may do; more often they are joyous with a deep-seated exultation which knows that the limitations of human nature are fully met by the redemptive influences of Christ, and they joy in God through whom they have received the atonement. Practical, and usually unknowing that they are mystics, they know at all events that their " life is hid with Christ in God," and from this hidden source, by their lives and teaching, they call their generation back to God. The Evangelical is in short the prophet of the Church.

THE SPECIAL CHARACTER OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE.

By the Rev. A. J. Macdonald, D.D., Rector of S. Dunstan-in-the-West.

SOME attempt must be made to define what we mean by the term "knowledge." Is it that which the human mind produces, or that which it receives? Do we mean by knowledge the body of ideas produced by the thinker as he meditates upon himself or upon the objective world around, and upon his relation to the world? Do we mean the correlation and explanation of the objects of nature, or the events of history, or the ideas of others, produced when the thinker confines his attention to them, paying little regard to his own feeling or thoughts about these things? In a word, is knowledge a body of ideas produced by the thinker or received by him? Or, is it a combination of both?

In ancient and medieval times, excluding the great books of Hebrew literature in the Old Testament, knowledge consisted in the thoughts of the thinker. It was a body of ideas, systematically correlated by him, according to the period and his own capacity, about men and the world, and his own relation to both. To this was added, as time passed, the accumulation of these ideas, which became a system of tradition—philosophical, legal, and in later times theological. The central fibres of this knowledge were the deductions which men drew from what they thought out, and from what they perceived, and the stress was generally laid upon what they thought out. The *a priori* or deductive process was not merely the method; it was the condition of ancient and of most medieval thought. It matters not whether you consider the pre-existent "ideas" of Plato, or the "categories" of Aristotle, in both cases you are dealing with principles of knowledge which issued from the brain of the thinker.

But Aristotle indeed laid the foundation of the modern conception of knowledge not only by his *Analytics* but by establishing the categories. Long before the *Analytics* was made known to European thinkers through the Arabic-Latin translations, men began to question with Roscelin the relevancy of the "categories" to reality. By drawing attention to the different categories in existence, Aristotle had implied the question, "Does Nature really divide up in this way?" Nominalism challenged the whole basis of the idealist or realist conception of the universe derived from Plato, and laid the foundation for the numbering and classifying, the weighing and analysing—all the processes of the crucible and the magnifying glass, as well as the mathematical analysis of modern times. So the inductive method was born, and like its predecessors became also a process. In the nineteenth century nothing was allowed to be knowledge which was not independent of the observer. Observation took the place of thought, the observer sat on the stool of the

thinker. Knowledge was received from without. It was not produced from within. It is true that some of the greatest achievements of modern science have been produced by a combination of the two methods. A brilliant idea when tested has been proved, over and over again, to correspond with observed facts, events, and in physics during the last thirty years, the combined method has been so largely used that it is somewhat doubtful whether modern physics should be included any longer among the inductive sciences. Moreover, in our own day we find even the mathematicians, if they are at all represented by Whitehead and Jeans, suggesting that even mathematics may have to resort to some sort of deduction to correct its inductive processes.

Passing, now, to the problem of religious knowledge, we must first ask into which of these two types of knowledge it falls. We at once come upon a curious criss-crossing of replies from different quarters, quite contrary in the direction which they take to the trend which you would expect them to follow. The rationalist would like to show that religious knowledge springs from sources external to the observer, but he is compelled, by his refusal to admit revelation, to assert that religious knowledge is merely the creation of a certain type of human brain. It is merely deductive. On the other hand, the traditionalist, who constructs his system upon a series of fixed principles, which he himself lays down, or receives from the past, is compelled by revelation which he admits, to allow that religious knowledge in its origin is really independent of human thought. It is really inductive. So they arrive at conclusions opposite to their principles. But what the rationalist will not allow and what the traditionalist tries to crib and cabin by his *a priori* notions is really the basis of religious knowledge, and yet it is also the very contradiction of the whole concept of human knowledge.

Let me deal with the latter point first. What do I mean when I ask whether religious knowledge does not contradict the concept of knowledge ? I think the question is answered by putting another: Is God knowable ? There can only be one answer to that. It is in the negative. Man cannot know God. This is not possible, firstly on philosophical grounds. The created, the phenomenal, cannot know the Creator, the supra-phenomenal. The contrast is so complete between God and man that the only tolerable definition which can be given of God is that He is non-being. He does not exist. The only *being* that exists is creation, which is the expression in phenomena of the mind of God. Even the mathematicians are now contending that the universe consists of the thoughts of God, creation is the expression of the thoughts of God (*cf.* Jeans, *The Mysterious Universe*). This is of course the Berkeleyan idealism which represents a refining down of the Platonic idealism, by removing from the constitution of being the second term. Plato's system combined God, the ideas or universals and the human mind, Berkeley abandoned the notion of pre-existent ideas and left man face to face with God, a revolutionary achievement which John Scotus Erigena came near to performing in the ninth century.

On philosophical grounds, then, man cannot know God, and so religious knowledge in the sense of human knowledge, namely, that which the thought of man can grasp and explain is not possible. Science is to-day saying a similar thing. Both Eddington and Jeans are warning the scientists off the field of religion, because its categories are not commensurable with the processes of scientific investigation and analysis; in a word, religion is not knowable by scientific methods.

Before I proceed, let me answer one question which would otherwise be fired at me from several quarters. I have described God as non-being. What does that mean? Well, certainly not that there is no God. Only the fool saith that. It means that God is not like anything with which human thought has to deal. He was before *being*. Before anything existed He was. So He cannot exist, He is non-being. But He *is* and always has been.

Now we must begin to qualify, not, however, with the object or necessity of withdrawing. I have said that religious knowledge is not possible. Here again it is a matter of the use of terms. Religious knowledge cannot be procured like other knowledge, because we have no data to supply a real epistemology. But we have revelation, we have revealed knowledge about God, or more properly a revealed description of God. This is necessitated on the one hand by the fact of creation, nay by the fact that God "is," and on the other, by the fact that man is incapable of knowing or of finding out anything about God. It would be unreasonable to suppose that God would create man and leave him without knowledge of Himself, and the limitation of our powers of cognizing God makes a revelation of any knowledge that man needs to be a necessity. So we have the gradual revelation of the knowledge of God in the Old and New Testaments. The special character of religious knowledge is a revealed character. Religious knowledge is a revelation. That, of course, is one of the key-notes of the Barthian system.

But we must again qualify our terms, but again without withdrawing them. Revelation is imparted by three channels, each of them human—by the channel of thought or meditation (the prophets and evangelists); by the spoken word, the voice of the Son, the Word Himself; by the written page—the page of the Bible—all human mediums, all that which is not God, not divine, and therefore merely symbolical. Human words, even of the man Jesus Christ, human writings, convey to us the body of religious knowledge, the revealed Word, which lay behind the human tones of the voice of Jesus or the accents of Peter and Paul and John.

Plenty of scope, then, is left for the ordinary instruments of human knowledge—perception, cognition, reason—to grasp, understand, explain (so far as it can) and apply this revealed Word. Thus, if fundamentally, religious knowledge consists of a body of principles or ideas revealed by God, and so is deductive in character, yet its apprehension and application call for all the processes of inductive knowledge—there must be criticism of the texts, the elimination where possible of human error, the adaptation to different epochs

of history or stages of society, all the apparatus, in fact, of linguistic, historical, critical sciences—a goodly array of opportunities and urgencies for religious knowledge on the human side. And for them also Karl Barth contends.

The medium of revelation must be symbolical. The only possible instruments for revelation are human words and human writings. Religious knowledge in its lower aspect is the correct interpretation of the symbols, aided of course by the Spirit of God whose special function is that of interpretation—not revelation, that is the function of the Son, the Word. And again, we must notice that scientific thought agrees with us. It is now frankly admitted that the statements of science, the conclusions of science are symbolical. Some years ago I gave a copy of Dr. Whitehead's work on Relativity to a colleague of mine, who secured a double-first in mathematics at Oriel College, and had been an instructor in mathematics in the Navy. He confessed that he could not understand it. I then gave it to a young mathematical student at Edinburgh, and he rejoiced in it. The symbols used by mathematicians and physicists had completely changed in thirty years! Who has seen an electron? Who ever will see it? Certainly not—because by the time they have devised an instrument capable of revealing it, physicists will be looking for something else, for some new symbol for which indeed they are already calling out. Science, according to Jeans, is not in touch with reality, and I think he suggests that it never will be. Well, John the Scot made that statement a thousand years ago when he said that God is unknowable, God is non-being.

The two central points on which we must fix our attention when we try to acquire religious knowledge are these. God "is" and God's commands are of more importance for us than God's nature. We must postulate the fact of God, or there is no religion. That is what Mr. Julian Huxley fails to see. Secondly, we can never know God's nature. The only description we have of it is symbolical. He is fatherhood, love, light—all human terms, meaning something very different in ordinary connotation. But we can know God's commands, we have an effective revelation of God's love—again in human terminology, it may be, but supported by an imperative which is independent of the terms which expresses it. If I say "Do this," I express something vastly more dynamic than if I say "I am your master." The command will be obeyed, at any rate by one who owes obedience, but he may not be at all sure that I have any right to give him an order, he may theoretically maintain that I am in no sense his master. Was it not this very urgency and effectiveness of the divine command of Jesus that impressed the Centurion? He understood the living meaning of an imperative. We are really more concerned with Christian ethics than with Christian metaphysics, though of course the two are inseparably connected. By Christian ethics I do not mean the mere behaviour of one Christian man towards another, or towards the unbeliever, but the realization, the perception that the love of God must be obeyed by men just because it issues from God. In the majesty of that conception I

shall be raised above myself to a spiritual height, nearer to the level from which it springs, even as Professor Gwatkin used to remind us, the legionary was raised above himself by the dignity of Cæsar's service. Religious knowledge, then, is the discovery of the meaning of the revealed law of God, and its application to my conduct. Religious knowledge has thus a practical dynamic. It cannot remain merely intellectual, nor even merely spiritual, it must affect and control my conduct.

One other point occurs. If religious knowledge—the knowledge of the fact of God—is revealed knowledge, how did Plato and Aristotle, and other pre-Christian non-Hebrew thinkers, arrive at the notion of God? Are we quite justified in saying that the human mind is incapable of knowing at least the fact of God—that God "is"? Yes—I think we are, for the bare fact that God "is" was a revelation from God to the ancient pre-Christian world—the only revelation until Hebrew prophets and the Word Himself came in the fullness of time to reveal the law of God, and, in symbolic terms, something of the nature of God. Otherwise revelation was not necessary, for man having acquired the idea of God, might have gone on without the Incarnation to discover more of God and His love for himself. But we believe in Jesus Christ, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, not created, who came to make known to us all that we could as men receive of the knowledge of God.

THE DOCTRINE OF ABSOLUTE PREDESTINATION STATED AND ASSERTED. Translated from the Latin of Jerom Zanchius by Augustus B. Toplady, A.B. 5s. net.

This is a further volume on Calvinism and Arminianism issued by the Sovereign Grace Union. Those who want to swim in the deepest waters of religious controversy will find ample opportunity for doing so in the pages of this book, which was written by Augustus B. Toplady at the age of 19 years. For some time it remained in manuscript and was not brought out in translated form for nine years later. It has been described as one of the best, if not the best, books ever issued on Absolute Predestination. Zanchius was born of a noble family at Bergamo on February 2, 1516, and it was in the next year that under the auspices of Luther the Reformation began to spread far and wide. Early in life Zanchy lost his father, who died of the Plague in 1528, and his mother survived her husband but three years. Later on he became acquainted with Celsus Maximian, Count of Martinengo, who from being a bigoted papist, became a burning and shining light in the Reformed Church. For some years he attached himself to this capable brother and the story of their association together is interestingly told in this volume, which is published by the Sovereign Grace Union, of which the Rev. Henry Atherton, of the Parsonage, Camberwell Grove, S.E., is the Hon. General Secretary and with whom are associated a number of prominent Churchmen and Nonconformists.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH ON THE COUNTRY.[1]

By the Venerable W. L. Paige Cox, Archdeacon of Chester.

WE are much concerned on behalf of our country at the present time. We are passing through an economic crisis, almost without precedent in our history, and it is becoming a serious question whether we shall weather the storm. It is not merely a question whether we shall be on the whole a richer or a poorer country in the future, with an increased or a diminished trade, but whether we shall be able to sustain the large population which only came into being within the last hundred and fifty years through the development of our modern industrial system. Will millions of our people, before very long, be starved out of existence? It is not a chimerical speculation, but one which comes very seriously within the range of possibility.

The national well-being must depend on the national character. If we are to weather the storm which threatens us, it can only be if we, as a people, retain the qualities which have made us strong in the past.

"Nought shall make us rue,
If England to itself do rest but true."

This is where the influence of the Church comes in. "What the soul is in a body, this the Christians are in the world. The soul is spread through all the members of the body, and Christians through the divers cities of the world." That was said in a notable apology for the Christian religion (The Epistle to Diognetus) which has come down to us from the second century. When we speak of the influence of the Church in the terms thus used, we do not think of the official Church nor of any utterances by leaders of the Church or by organizations professing to speak as organizations having the sanction of the Church. It is the influence of the mass of Christian people, mostly of the laity, that is alluded to as that of the "soul within the body"—of the commonwealth as a whole. No Bishop in our time has given a wiser attention to social questions than the late Bishop Westcott, and in his last charge to the Diocese of Durham, he spoke of the need to call into "full and ordered activity, the gifts of laymen." "There is the more need," he said, "that we should do this because we have come to know that the Christian faith deals with the whole sum of human affairs. We must have therefore the benefit of every form of experience if we are to apply it rightly to the different problems which are pressed upon us."

The beneficial influence upon the national character, then, which is needed—to quote our ancient authority again—is that of "all the members of the body"—of individual Christians—"through the

[1] A Visitation Charge delivered in the Archdeaconry of Chester.

divers cities of the world." It is for the teachers of religion to give clear instruction about principles, leaving the application of those principles in particular cases mainly to those who have the necessary expert knowledge.

The prospect of Christian service in this form is the more hopeful as the ground-stuff of the national character, so to speak, is still so good. This was proved in the Great War. Shortly after the war was over I had a conversation with the General who at that time was at the head of the Western Command. There had been much talk during the war of the respective qualities of the soldiers of different nationalities and of different parts of the British Empire, and I asked the General which soldiers on the whole did the best. He answered without hesitation, " The soldiers of the English county regiments." A week later I put the same question to another General whom I met in a different part of the country, and he at once gave me the same answer. I was a little surprised, as we had heard less about the English soldiers than about others. They had, so to speak, not been advertised at all. It was explained to me that the men who came from the English country-side, and indeed, in many instances, from the towns as well, were found in the long run to be the most reliable of all. They took the discipline especially well. They could be depended upon for steadiness in attack and in retreat; and they never knew when they were beaten.

It is something to know that the British soldier, take him for all in all, take him for his good humour, his chivalry, and his stubborn gallantry, is unsurpassed by any soldier in the world. And we are not, relatively to others, a quarrelsome people, and we have no inclination towards what is called militarism. All this is worth noting, not with a foolish national pride, but as a ground for hope in regard to the strain which is now being put upon us as a people; for the qualities of a people are most noticeably tested in war. This has always been so in the long history of the human race. The best nations always conquered the worst. It was the nations that had the qualities of courage, endurance, respect for law and discipline, and a readiness to act with one another in a common cause, that came to the front everywhere. Human progress has been largely bound up with the success of the best warrior nations. It is the law of the survival of the fittest as illustrated in human history.

It is instructive to notice how this law is recognized in the earlier books of the Bible, which treat of times when war was more or less prevalent everywhere. The opening verses of the third chapter of Judges, for instance, represent it as the will of Jehovah that the Israelites, on their entrance into Canaan, should not settle down in ease and softness without experience of the discipline of warfare. " These are the nations," so the narrative runs, " which the Lord left to prove Israel by them, even as many as had not known all the wars of Canaan; only that the generations of the children of Israel might know to teach them war."

What is the moral of this? That we should wish that wars should continue in these days on account of the toughening and test-

ing effect of warfare on human character? Most certainly that is not the lesson we have to learn from this record of the past, though it does teach a lesson of great importance which we are in danger of forgetting.

We have fully reached the stage in human development when wars should cease. We have learnt so much of the horror and wastefulness of war, that we should do our utmost in every honourable way to avoid war and to stop it. Time has demonstrated the reasonableness and the possibility of bringing to the fore in international relations those qualities of justice and peaceableness and enlightened consideration for others, which should make the appeal to arms the last possible resort when international misunderstandings arise. We have had much experience of recent years of the settlement of differences and of the removal of possible causes of difference by friendly negotiation, and it is by the putting into practice of Christian principles in dealings between nations that we may look eventually for the almost total disappearance of war.

There is a danger, however, in periods like the present of going to extremes, which may lead to the cruellest and the most costly results. It has been pointed out recently that when the Napoleonic War closed with the victory of Waterloo the nation went peace-mad, and the soldiers who had won us the victory were cursed as plagues. A General could not ride down Piccadilly in uniform without it being regarded as a flaunting of militarism, and everything was done to shame and dishonour the armed forces of the Crown.

Time went on and we blundered into the Crimean War: almost immediately afterwards the Indian Mutiny was upon us. Everything was mismanaged at home, especially in the Russian War, but the magnificent British soldier pulled us through. Yet, as the historian of the British Army, the Hon. Sir J. W. Fortesque, has told us (Vol. XIII, 230), "the long service soldier at the time of the Crimean War was by repute almost outside the pale of civil society." He was despised "chiefly because he was a disciplined man," and "the public of that day preferred the navvy, simply because he had not, to his great misfortune, been taught to obey."

"Englishmen," it has been said, "are never quite as great as during the continuance of a dangerous war, never quite so silly as when it has come to an end." Such silliness is upon us now. The year before last when Armistice Day was being observed at Chester, some zealots for peace went in and out among the crowd who were standing round the War Memorial and tried to distribute leaflets in favour of disarmament. It was deeply resented by those who were mourning for their gallant dead, as casting a slur on their memory. It was not meant so: it was just silliness; it was so utterly inopportune. If these men at such a time had tried to penetrate into Russia and distributed their leaflets there, where a propaganda for the disuse of armed force is so greatly needed, they would have been brave as well as wise.

We have been told several times in public lately what a fine thing it would be if this country were to make a gesture of peace to other

nations, including Russia, by abolishing all its armaments. We might as well make a gesture of peace to the burglars, motor-thieves, and gunmen in this country by abolishing our police.

These people imagine possibly that in this they are recommending the practice of Christian principle. They are doing nothing of the kind. Christianity teaches us indeed not to resent personal injuries. We are to be so generous and self-restrained in our private lives as to be kind even to " the unthankful and the evil." Christ was that. He never resented any wrong done to Himself. But He could be almost fiercely angry with those who did wrong to others, and He Himself used violence in cleansing the temple.

Those persons are grossly and dangerously misrepresenting Christianity, who teach that it flouts our natural instincts to protect the weak and to defend the hearth and home. A religion of that sort would merit nothing but contempt and neglect. Christianity is very different from that. It teaches emphatically that there is a God that judgeth in the earth, Whose face is set against all evil-doing. We may not usurp the Divine function by avenging ourselves, we must on the contrary in our private relations be long-suffering and gentle ; but on behalf of others it is different. We have no Christian law to sacrifice others—our nation, for instance—as well as ourselves. On the contrary the nation—the State—has a function of its own on God's behalf to act as " an avenger for the punishment of evil-doers and the protection of them that do well." This is an absolutely clear and incontrovertible Christian precept as taught in various passages in the New Testament, though much overlooked.

Take the case of India, for example. It is a moral obligation on the Government of this country to maintain security of life and property in that diversely peopled continent. Every life taken by violence there brings a responsibility upon us. Every incitement to violence, in speech or writing, is a crime that we should punish at once. This is a matter that has nothing whatever to do with negotiations for constitutional change in India. Crime is crime throughout it all, and we too are guilty of crime—we bring innocent blood upon ourselves if we do not take all necessary measures for the prevention and punishment of crime.

It has become a very serious question whether we have not reduced our armaments so far that we cannot adequately discharge our Christian duty in this regard in different parts of the Empire—at any rate by keeping ourselves in readiness to meet emergencies that might come upon us at any time.

We are spending millions upon millions of pounds on the dole, for which we get no equivalent in work from the recipients. We should be well advised, as a Christian people, if we were to spend a part of this money on military training for at least some of the able-bodied young men among the unemployed, so that, if the need arose, they might make a return to their country in protective service on behalf of the weak and defenceless persons who are under our care.

There are between two and three millions of men in this country

who are out of employment. The necessity of the dole is admitted by all. It is a Christian duty—a duty of justice and of charity—to provide at the present time for those who cannot get work through no fault of their own. But it is equally a Christian duty on the part of the nation to see that the dole is administered most economically and without abuse. We have learnt the practice of charitable relief from the Christians of the First Days. From them too we have to learn that none must be relieved but those who are ready to help themselves. It was St. Paul himself who laid down the rule, " If a man will not work, he shall not eat " (2 Thess. iii. 10, R.V.). Such a man must be allowed to suffer hunger for the good of his soul—that he may learn the bracing lesson of honest, steady work, without which true manhood is impossible. Always the effect on character must be kept in view by those who would do their duty by their fellow-men.

We have been suffering in the past from the prevalence in some quarters of false economic theories derived from foreign and un-Christian sources, and perhaps there is a danger still of vindictive legislation in memory of bygone wrongs. None now are a party to those old wrongs, and none are responsible for them. We are learning, or should be learning, that the true well-being of one class in the community is bound up with the well-being of all. We English people are members of one body in such a way that if one of the members suffers all the members suffer with it. It is along the lines of this grand, true Christian principle that we must look in the future for the solution of our difficulties. All classes have had their faults in the past; and we must now come together as one people with the resolve to be just and fair one towards another in all our industrial relations and to work together single-heartedly for the common good.

It is a testing and an anxious time, but it gives us a unique opportunity of applying our Christianity to the ordering of our social life as it has never been applied before; and in the light of the principles of our religion and in the moral strength to be derived from it we shall come out in the long run a happier, a wiser, and a more united people.

We end where we began. It is the qualities of the good soldier that we want among us, but for peace and not for war. We want among our people the patriotism of the good soldier and his devotion to his country's service. Yet it is one of the sillinesses of the time that patriotism is disparaged, almost as though it were an evil thing. Certainly that is not the teaching of Christianity. Christ Himself was a patriot. As Son of Man, indeed, His work was for all people and for all time. But He had a passionate love for Jerusalem as the city of His fathers. He wept bitterly at the prospect of its impending destruction. He confined His personal Ministry to the " lost sheep " of the house of Israel; and when He gave His missionary instructions to His disciples He told them to be witnesses to Him in Jerusalem, in Judæa, in Samaria, and so onward and outward to the uttermost parts of the earth.

The Apostles followed their Master exactly in this. One and all of them laid down their lives in the Missionary cause, but they taught consistently that nearer duties come before more distant duties, and feelings for kith and kin should be stronger than for the world outside. " Let us do good unto all men," said St. Paul, " and especially unto them that are of the household of faith." " Honour all men," said St. Peter, " love the brotherhood." " No lukewarm relative," said Burke, " ever made a good citizen," and we may equally add that no lukewarm patriot is likely to show much devotion to mankind.

" He best will serve the race of men
Who loves his native country best."

That is a law of nature, fully endorsed by the religion of Christ. So we must teach our children patriotism. An important part of the instruction given to them in the schools provided for them by the nation must be to show them what the nation has done for them, what an inheritance they have from their forefathers of liberty and enlightened institutions, and what a civilizing and emancipatory mission in the world their country has been enabled to fulfil; so that they may grow up with the desire to serve their country in return and to carry forward its beneficent influence among other nations.

And we must try to imbue our children with the good soldier's *esprit de corps*, with his sense of being one among others who are banded together in a common cause; and to that end we must teach them discipline, the readiness and quickness to march and stand and act with others, and the care for physical and mental efficiency. We must train them thus in school, and when they leave school the officials of the Church can do no more useful work in our parishes than in giving all the support they can to organizations like Cadet Corps, Lads' Brigades, Boy Scouts, and Girl Guides. It has been noted that those who have passed through this quasi-military training in youth as a rule turn out excellently, and acquire all the main qualities requisite for good citizenship and good churchmanship.

Above all we must try to nurture in our people from their youth up the primary virtue of the good soldier, which is courage. Elementary courage of the physical sort we have among us in plenty, no doubt, but not to the same degree the courage of the higher type which will enable a man to take a firm stand when truth and principle are at stake. The worst of the good people, said Voltaire, is that they are such cowards; and so it has often been left to men like Voltaire to oppose abuses and demand justice for others when orthodox Christian people have been dumb.

We have seen splendid examples of moral as well as physical courage among our great soldiers; indeed they have all been distinguished for it; but we have not seen equal examples of it, as a general thing, among our leading men in other walks of life. It was said not long since by the Lord Chief Justice of England of an eminent lawyer and statesman now retired that " he has the quality of strength "; but it was added, " the course of history might have

been very different if some of his most conspicuous opponents had exhibited the same quality in the same degree."

It is another of the sillinesses of our time that a name given to a famous regiment for its proverbial gallantry has come to be used by some as a term of reproach. When I was sitting in the Church Assembly not long since a person got up to speak who had taken an active part previously in defence of some doctrinal principles to which all were pledged but which some seemed to regard lightly. My neighbour remarked to me under his breath: "This person is a 'die-hard.'" I felt moved to make the retort: "Christ was a die-hard." If Christ had not been a die-hard there would have been no Christian Church.

We think much, especially in these days, of the gentleness of Christ, and we cannot think too much of it. But we need to think more than we usually do of His courage, of His utter refusal on any occasion to compromise with anything that savoured of falsehood or injustice.

And so we must try to imbue our young people with the courage of Christ, we must school them to keep the Christian motive, the motive of following Christ in His disinterested fearlessness, ever in view in all their actions everywhere. That is what the country wants above all things, citizens who are touched with the spirit of heroism. The country will be saved from all the evils that may threaten it if only we can get into its different spheres of service—in Parliament, in County and Municipal Councils, in Employers' Federations, in Trades Unions, in business offices, and in workshops—men and women who, by their integrity and public spirit, by their abhorrence of that which is evil and devotion to that which is good, will bring the ideals of the religion of Christ to bear on the regulation of the varied interests of our common life.

We shall thus learn how true is that famous saying of a very famous Englishman—

"Peace hath her victories
No less renown'd than war."

CATHEDRAL STATUTES: A GROUND OF REVISION.

By the Ven. A. R. Buckland, M.A., Archdeacon of Norfolk and Canon of Norwich.

THE Cathedrals Measure is law. Some, therefore, who opposed it in its first and most imperfect form, have now to consider its application to their own Cathedrals. But there may still remain others who wonder why the regulations under which the ancient Cathedrals are understood to be governed need revision. The Statutes of one Cathedral are no sure guide to the conditions of another. Nevertheless the example of Norwich [1] may suffice to show that changes are imperatively called for. Whether the setting up of a costly Commission was the best way of obtaining these changes is a point which it would be useless now to discuss. But at least it may, in due season, have the advantage of saving the Dean and the Canons from regular violation of solemn oaths publicly taken. For at Norwich the Dean has to swear that he will "in all things observe the Statutes of this Church, in so far as they shall concern me"; and the Prebendary (Canon Residentiary) that he will "keep all the Statutes, laws, rites and laudable customs of this Church which shall concern me." There is reason to believe that one Canon felt himself bound to oppose the Cathedral's Measure because in his oath he had sworn to "resist counsels, assemblages, conspiracies, wiles, deeds or words of other men, which may cause damage or discredit to the Church." But imagination staggers at the prospect of what might happen if these oaths were well and truly kept.

The general character of the Measure is by now very widely known. A body of Commissioners is appointed, charged with power to produce schemes embodying statutes or regulations for the control and administration of any of the cathedrals except Christ Church, Oxford. But a scheme can become operative only with the consent of the Dean and Chapter and of the Bishop. The new regulations to be framed may cover all leading features of cathedral life and administration whilst saving the rights of any persons at present in office. The Measure is so far pacific as to make no suggestion that cathedrals are mismanaged, or to do no more than mildly hint by projected changes that their duty might have been more generously discharged. And if anyone had asked why, in that case, new laws for their administration were needed, the answer is that the existing statutes of ancient cathedrals are largely out of date, unworkable, and by custom freely ignored.

Take the case of Norwich. We are technically ranked as a cathedral of the New Foundation. This, of course, does not mean

[1] The substance of this article was delivered as part of a Charge to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Archdeaconry of Norfolk in May, 1931.

that we go with such modern establishments as Liverpool, Truro, Bradford, and the like. In its misleading fashion it imports that Norwich is one of the cathedrals which had existence, but were associated with monastic foundations, before the Reformation, and were refounded, with Deans and Chapters, at the Reformation. The cathedrals of the Old Foundation did not suffer this reconstitution. They existed with their deans and prebendaries before the Reformation. This distinction has led to some curious contrasts; for, whilst York is of the Old Foundation, Canterbury is of the new, and whilst Lincoln is of the old, Norwich and Ely are of the new. Our own charter is from Edward VI, our Statutes from James I, ratified and modified by Charles I; slightly modified also by Acts of Parliament. It can readily be understood, then, that arrangements made 300 years ago do not agree well with the conditions of cathedral life to-day. It could not be expected that they would. But the requirements of the Statutes are clear enough, if sometimes embarrassing.

For example, our Norwich statutes enjoin for the dean and the prebendaries (canons residentiary as they are now called) and other *ministri* of the cathedral a sort of community existence. A prebendary, who has not "from other sources besides the stipend of the Church, forty pounds a year of fixed rents," is not compelled to maintain his family separately, but is to be granted the choice of lodging with the dean or with any one of the prebendaries whom he shall select. In the same brotherly spirit it is ordered that the minor canons, organist, lay clerks, and choristers "eat and feast together in the common hall." This custom, the Statute says, had "by the carelessness if not impiety of certain persons," become obsolete, but was firmly re-established. By Statute the stipends of the Dean and Prebendaries are—perhaps not unwisely or unfairly—to depend largely on their regular attendance at the daily services. The Minor Canons (six is the proper number; we now have only one and two Assistants) are to be fined a penny if they come into service after the *Venite* at Morning Prayer or after the first Psalm at Evening Prayer. The Precentor is charged with the duty of noting "truly and without any malicious deceit"—a most unpleasant reflection on Precentors—any absence of the Dean and Prebendaries from services. He is also to cast a careful eye over the conduct of lay clerks and singing boys, particularly to "rebuke and calm those who make a disturbance, and those who run up and down the Choir in a disorderly fashion."

Community life of course demanded a domestic establishment. Accordingly the Statutes ordain that "there shall be perpetually," not only a Dean, Prebendaries, and Minor Canons, but also "six Poor Men to be nourished at the expense of the said Church," two cooks, one butler, one caterer, and other helpers, including a keeper of the ferry. Many of these laws have long been neglected. There is no common table, no cook, no butler, no caterer; but the six Poor Men are still "nourished," and the keeper of the ferry survives. The six Poor Men have one advantage over the Dean and

Canons. The imposing document which confers on each of them his office bears the sign manual of the King himself and not that of a mere Secretary of State or other official. Possibly this stimulates them to the more careful discharge of their duty to "pray sedulously for the King's Majesty."

There are other and more serious details in which the Statutes need amendment along the lines laid down in the Cathedrals Measure. The position of the Bishop must be dealt with. At present the relation of a Bishop to his cathedral church is one of difficulty. With us the Bishop cannot claim the right to hold an ordination or any other service in the cathedral. He has no control over the services, ceremonial, or ornaments of the Church. He has, however, the unusual privilege of appointing the preachers at all of the morning services save those which are expressly reserved by Statute. But for the courtesy of the Bishop, the Dean would preach on only two Sunday mornings, and the four Canons only on the Sundays in Lent with an additional Sunday for the Archdeacon-Canon. The Bishop has, it is true, some powers as visitor, but those seem only to touch the composing of strife or failure in morals and in duty on the part of the clergy. There is no record of the exercise of these powers in recent times; but I understand that at another ancient cathedral the Bishop as visitor was called in solemnly to adjust a dispute as to whether a silver mace should be borne before the Dean only or before the Canons also.

The position of the Dean justly receives attention in the Measure. For the actual facts at any cathedral rarely agree with the popular conception of his powers and authority. Our own Statutes confer an unusual degree of responsibility on the Dean of Norwich, for he can of his own motion choose the Minor Canons, the organist, and some others of the Cathedral staff. But, as not the Dean but the Dean and Chapter fix and pay their stipends, the privilege is severely limited. Possibly it is for this reason that the Measure contemplates the transfer of such appointments to the Dean and Chapter. Another change is obviously needed. By Statute the Dean should be "adorned with a title of learning, that is, a Professor of Sacred Theology or Bachelor of the same." The older Universities have now fully recognized the low esteem into which the degree of D.D. had fallen by their kindly conferment of this "title of learning" upon many a person who could hardly be described even as "mediocritur doctus." But to-day there are other "titles of learning" which suggest as fit a qualification for the modern Dean. Perhaps, also, it should be stipulated that a Deanery is a "whole time job"; a law which might also apply to Bishops.

The position of the Prebendaries, or Canons Residentiary, also calls for some clearer definition or readjustment, particularly as to the one who is "in course" or as is commonly said, "in residence." Here also it should be enacted that no benefice be held with the Canonry. No such requirement at present exists at Norwich, but not so many years ago some of the Canons were also incumbents of important parishes. The Hon. Canons do not appear in the

Statutes. They are a modern invention, created under an Act of Parliament of 1840. Any scheme prepared under the Measure will doubtless bring them into closer relations with the Cathedral and its administrative Chapter. At one time it looked as though changes proposed in regard to the position and powers of the Hon. Canons might, if effected, lead to strife, and tend to impair rather than strengthen the administrative life of the Cathedrals. There was a danger also lest the fanciful notions of joyous idealists, full of zeal, but themselves unacquainted with the working of Cathedral life, should sow the seed for a crop of new perplexities. Even as the Measure now stands a new Scheme might easily provide for a waste and not an economy of the Cathedral endowments. But since no Scheme could come into operation against the will of the Dean and Chapter, we may assume that such perils will be avoided, and that reforms or readjustments will be directed mainly to the removal of such anomalies as have been indicated.

There are many other details, some of great importance, in Norwich Statutes which can apply only to the conditions of other days. But possibly enough has been said to show that changes are needed unless Cathedrals are to be governed by variable custom and not by law.

THE LITTLE BOY OF NAZARETH. By Edna Madison Bonser. London: *Student Christian Movement Press.* 6s. net.

This interesting and instructive book was published in America in 1930 and the first British Edition appeared in April 1931. Psychologists tell us that the very early years of a child's life are of almost inestimable importance in shaping his character, which, in its essential tendencies, is formed by the time he is six years old. Presuming this to be true, it goes without saying that intelligent attention should be paid to his early social, economic and religious environment. This is precisely what the writer of this book has tried to do with the childhood of Jesus. The stories contained in it make no claim to be true in the sense that they actually occurred, but yet they are true in the sense that the life of Jesus must have gone on in some such fashion as this. The author deals with her subject in a fresh and sympathetic way, and she has certainly succeeded in making of the childhood of Jesus a very real and living picture. She has certainly given us a charming book in which young people will simply "revel." Parents and teachers will discover in it a delightful gift-book, and we rather suspect they will want to read it themselves before they part with it. The suggestions to teachers at the end of the book contain much that will help them to use the book in a practical way.

THE CLERGY AND THE DECLARATION OF INDULGENCE, 1688.

By the Rev. Harold Smith, D.D., St. John's Hall, Highbury.

In the ordinary accounts all the stress is laid on the action of the Seven Bishops—Bishop Compton, of London, being quite overlooked. He shared with the rest in drawing up the Petition, and did not sign it simply because he had already been suspended for not suspending Dr. Sharp without a hearing, in compliance with the King's wish. Also the part taken by the London clergy is usually quite subordinated to that of the bishops. But it would be more correct to say that the clergy made up their minds and pushed the bishops in front of them.

Simon Patrick, afterwards Bishop of Ely, was then Rector of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, and Canon of Westminster, as well as Dean of Peterborough. He was very intimate with Thomas Tenison, then Vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. In his autobiography he says that in May, 1688:

"we were in great perplexity about reading the declaration for liberty of conscience, which all my acquaintance seemed to abhor. We had many meetings about it, twice at Ely House with the Bishop, and on the 11th of May at the Temple, where at the Master's house we came to this resolution, that the Bishops should be desired to address to the King, but not upon any address of ours to them. For we judged it best that they should lead the way and we follow them. And on the 13th we met there again, every one resolving for some reason or other, not to read the Declaration. There were near twenty of us, as I remember, who were desired to feel the pulse of all the ministers in London, how they stood affected; and if they were generally so resolved as we were, His Grace of Canterbury promised to petition the King not to exact it of us. Accordingly Dr. Tenison and myself were appointed to go to all the ministers at one end of the town, and know their mind; and others undertook to go into other parts of the city. And on Thursday, May 17th, we met at a house in St. Paul's Churchyard, and an account was given of near seventy who promised not to read it. Some could not be found, and a few spoke dubiously. I wrote a list of those who promised not to read it, fairly, with my own hand, and carried it to the Bishop of Peterborough, who lodged hard by at Mr. Clavel's, to be delivered to my Lord of Canterbury. He [Bishop White] was not within, so I sealed it up and desired that it might be given him as soon as he came in, and he carried it to Lambeth that night. Upon this the Archbishop sent to all the bishops in town or near, to come to Lambeth on Friday morning, and gave notice to Dr. Tenison and me, that it was fit we should keep it as a day of fasting and prayer to beg God's direction and a blessing on what was intended. I gave notice of it to some others, and between ten and eleven Dr. Tenison, Dr. Grove and I went over to Lambeth, where we found five bishops with Dr. Stillingfleet and Dr. Tillotson. After morning prayer we entered into consultation, about an address to the King, and at last it was agreed it should be by way of petition from his Grace and the bishops present with him, and in behalf of their brethren and the clergy of their dioceses. About two o'clock came another bishop. . . . They went over to Whitehall a little after six o'clock . . . but it was nine o'clock before they could have audience, the King being abroad and not returning till that time. . . ."

It is clear from all this that the delay till Friday in petitioning the King was only partly due to the desire to gather as many bishops as possible; another more serious reason was that the bishops were wanting to know clearly whether any large number of clergy were likely to refuse to read it; they would not act till they knew this.

Patrick continues:

"The next Sunday it was not read by any considerable person; but our Dean [Bishop Spratt] sent it to one of the Petty Canons to read it in the Abbey. But at St. Margaret's and the new Chapel [Christ Church, Broadway] it was refused. The middle of that week I went to keep my residence at Peterborough, where I did what I was able to prevent the reading of it; which was not difficult to persuade them unto, they being generally everywhere inclined to follow the example of the London clergy. And I look upon it as a great providence that the clergy were not enjoined all to read it on the same day, but those of London on the 20th of May and those in the country on the Sunday fortnight after; whereby they had opportunity to hear what those in London had generally done, and their reasons for their refusal, which were everywhere published."

But the Declaration was ordered to be read on May 20 not only in London itself, but in all churches within ten miles. The clergy of the outlying parishes were naturally not fully in touch with the resolutions of their London brethren. The correspondence of John Strype, the historian, vicar of Leyton, throws light on the doubts, discussions and ultimate action of those of the south-west corner of Essex. (These letters are among the Baumgartner MSS. at Cambridge; copies by William Cole are in the British Museum.)

Joshua Stanley, vicar of West Ham, was apparently rural dean of Barking, a deanery extending from Hornchurch to Epping and Waltham Abbey. Some of these parishes lay beyond the ten-mile radius, but a number lay within it. He writes to Strype:

"Sir, My resolution is not to read it, because it does not come from the bishops according to the order of Council; but chiefly because I am verily persuaded that there is much more than the bare reading in the reading of it so solemnly. Dr. Mills, Mr. Copping, Mr. White of Bow, and I think Mr. Robins and Mr. Rust, are of the same mind. Use your discretion. I judge no man. The Lord have mercy upon us all."

Strype endorses the letter: "This was about King James' Declaration . . . I read it not."

Dr. Mills, rector of Wanstead, was also rector of St. Olave's, Hart Street, where he is often mentioned by his parishioner, Samuel Pepys. Thomas Copping was his curate, and succeeded him at St. Olave's. It would seem that Mills, knowing the attitude of the London clergy, persuaded his country colleagues also to adopt this. Edward Rust was vicar of East Ham; Stephen Robins, rector of Little Ilford. Dr. Mills had held his London living since 1657; he had been ordained by Ralph Brownrigg, Bishop of Exeter, on March 13, 1655–6. When Sion College was burnt in the Great Fire, he contributed well to its rebuilding, and induced Pepys to give a large sum.

Two other clergy of the district call for notice. Isaac Wright of Walthamstow wrote to Strype:

"I was wavering and uncertain till last night when I had Mr. Stanley's reasons. . . . God direct and keep us fast to Him, and then the wrath of men shall praise Him. I heartily thank you for this."

Cole suggests: "It is probable that Strype sent Mr. Stanley's letter to this wavering brother."

At Barking, Bishop Cartwright, of Chester, was still vicar. His curate, John Chisenhale, like his neighbours, did not read the Declaration, and was accordingly dismissed by Cartwright. An entry in the register there after June 17, 1688, runs: "Mr. John Chisenhale exit for not reading the Declaration. R. Hall, Curate." But we find in the following February: "Exit Mr. Hall; restaur. John Chisenhale."

Patrick says later:

"I cannot but here remember with what joy the news of their (the Bishops) being cleared was received at Peterborough. The bells rang from three o'clock in the morning till night, when several bonfires were made, with tabor and pipe and drum, and a great part of the night was spent in rejoicing, and all of their own accord; whereas the day before, which was a thanksgiving for the birth of the Prince of Wales, the bells did not stir till twelve o'clock. So great a difference there is between that which is constrained and that which is done voluntarily."

Patrick's account of his ordinations is interesting. He was Fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge, where he came under the influence of John Smith, whose funeral sermon he preached.

"After this I had occasion to go to London, and being bound by the statutes of the College to enter into holy orders when I was two years Master of Arts, I knew no better than to go to a classis of presbyters who then sat, and was examined by them and afterwards received the imposition of their hands. This afterwards troubled me very much, when not long after I met with Dr. Hammond upon *Ignatius's Epistles* and Mr. Thorndike's *Primitive Government of the Church*; whereby I was fully convinced of the necessity of episcopal ordination. This made me inquire after a bishop to whom I might resort; and hearing that Bishop Hall lived not far from Norwich, of which he was bishop, thither I went with two other fellows of our college and a gentleman, Mr. Gore, with whom I had contracted a great friendship, as a companion and witness of what we did. There we were received with great kindness by that reverend old bishop, who examined us and gave us many good exhortations, and then ordained us in his own parlour at Heigham, about a mile from Norwich, 5 April, 1654."

Patrick carefully preserved the certificate of his ordination by the London Classis; it is now among the Tanner MSS. in the Bodleian. We learn from it that the date was April 8, 1653, and the place St. Alban, Wood Street. It was the Sixth London Classis, comprising the clergy of the parishes north of Cheapside; the signatories are Simeon Ashe, then of St. Michael Bassishaw; Edmund Calamy, of St. Mary Aldermanbury; George Smalwood, of St. Mildred, Poultry; Thomas Case, of St. Mary Magdalen, Milk Street; John Wells, of St. Olave Jewry; Samuel Balmford, of St. Alban, Wood Street. Few if any other original certificates survive, though there are copies of some given by Calamy. The Presbyterian system having been very imperfectly set up, especially in the eastern side of the country, there were many counties where there were no

possibilities of local ordination; hence it was ordered that the London Classes should hold ordinations in turn for candidates for all parts. Thus the records of the Fourth Classis shows the ordination of many fellows of colleges.

We have the names of at least fifty men ordained by Bishop Joseph Hall of Norwich, between 1649 and his death in 1656; this is probably well short of the true number. Most histories do not notice the number of men ordained under the Commonwealth by Bishops Hall, Brownrigg of Exeter, and King of Chichester, besides two Irish bishops, Maxwell of Kilmore and Fulwar or Fuller of Ardfert and Aghadoe. Ordinations by Duppa of Salisbury and Skinner of Oxford are much better known. Bishop Hall's house—now the Dolphin Inn—still exists near the river; it ought to be carefully preserved as the scene of so many ordinations during the Troubles.

THE SIGN OF FAITH. By Philip Carrington. London: *S.P.C.K. and St. Christopher's Press.* 1s. net.

We are told that this is the first section of a work called "A Little Outline of Christianity." It is the old Historical Christianity in its English form—so presented as to appeal to young people of both sexes. It is to follow the structure of the Catechism—this section being based on the first part, while the remaining two sections will cover the rest of the Catechism. A most useful booklet for those whose work it is to instruct young people in their Religion.

S. R. C.

REALITY IN RELIGION AND OTHER ESSAYS IN CHRISTIANITY. By Harold Ford, M.A., LL.D., D.C.L. London: *Thynne and Co., Ltd.* 5s.

Dr. Harold Ford, whose works on Extempore Speaking and The Art of Preaching are so well known, gives us in this volume ten helpful addresses. Each of these is prefaced by an analysis characteristic of the author's practical method, and while we are told in the preface that they have been primarily written for the Clergy, the hope is expressed that they will make an appeal to that larger public who "eagerly respond to any sincere interpretation of the Sayings of Jesus." The subjects are very varied in character: The Sacredness of Womanhood—Is the Bible Inspired?—Does God Answer Prayer?—The Mystery of Suffering and the Poets—etc. Downright and orderly Dr. Ford maintains his reputation in this latest of his writings. S. R. C.

IN MY FIRST CURACY.

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

IN the parish to which I was ordained, now many years ago, there came to live near the church three elderly maiden sisters, who seemed even then to be survivals from an earlier age. A large house had been left to the youngest, and they had come up from the country to live in it.

They and all their set have long since passed away, but they have left behind a memory of quaint ways and sayings, not quite like those of any other people that I have ever met.

The three had been people of some consequence in their village home, and still carried themselves with an air. Blunt, outspoken, good-natured, but utterly unsentimental, given to strange phrases, but unconscious of their oddities, they soon established themselves as one of the institutions of the parish.

Their forbears had been of the "Squarson" type, rather like some of Anthony Trollope's clergy, I imagine. Their father had been something of a scholar. "There have always been clergy in our family until the present generation," they would say. They were of an uncertain age; Miss Lav, though sensitive on the point, referred to their contemporaries as "elderly gals like us." (I feel confident that she said "gals," not "gayels.") Their names were the Misses Elizabeth, Lavinia, and Isabella Keene—that was not their surname, but it will serve. In the circle of the Church workers they soon became known as Miss Liz, Miss Lav, and Miss Bella, for it was by these names that they referred to each other.

Miss Liz was the oldest of the three—tall, gaunt, and grey-haired. She was very deaf, and always carried a vulcanite fan, which she pressed against her teeth and presented towards you when she wished to hear what you had to say. Otherwise she heard never a word, yet it seemed to be an odd fatality that when any topic had been broached and disposed of in a general conversation, poor Miss Liz was sure to break in with it afresh and put up her fan for replies. Telepathy, I suppose.

The face of Miss Lav, the second of the three, faintly resembled the portraits of George Eliot. She was the most original of them all; in fact, the most piquant of the sayings I remember came from her.

Once, by way of kindly notice of the junior curate, she said to me: "We heard your siren voice in church on Sunday, Mr. Mullins."

"Oh, Miss Lav," I replied, "don't you remember that the Sirens lured people to destruction?"

"You know quite well what I mean!" she said, with a toss of her head. I scorn the ribald suggestion that Miss Lav meant a *steam* siren.

She was also the most adventurous of the sisters, for once she

set out by herself on a tour up the Rhine. To go up the Rhine had been one of the correct tours in her youth, no doubt. In recounting her experiences, the one which stood out in her memory was that she had been confronted by a demand of some hotel-keeper that she should enter in the hotel register certain particulars about herself.

"What do you think?" she would exclaim indignantly. "They actually asked me to put down my age! Well, I put myself down at a fancy price!"

When anyone had been narrating a story at some length, or when some argument had reached its climax, Miss Lav would add, "And then the horse went to be shaved." The meaning of this cryptic utterance seemed to be something like the modern slang phrase "That put the lid on it," or "So that's that."

One of Miss Lav's oddest actions was done as a kindness to my fellow-curate. She heard that he had been known to go out on a journey and find when miles away from home that he had not enough money even for a bus fare. On one such occasion a friendly policeman had come to his rescue with a loan of two half-crowns. With a view to such an emergency in the future, Miss Lav surreptitiously secured one of his overcoats, cut off the buttons, and replaced them with florins sewn up in cloth, so that at a pinch my colleague might cut one off and apply it to relieve his necessities!

Miss Bella, the youngest sister, had perhaps not reached fifty. She was buxom, and had a hearty laugh. I remember her saying that she liked to see a red spot in a landscape, and certainly every winter she provided one in her own person by wearing always a scarlet cloak. I owed to her one of the great privileges of my life, for she used to lend me *Macmillan's Magazine.* Though long since defunct, it was once a rival of *Cornhill* and *Blackwood.* When handing it to me one month—I cannot recall the exact date, but it was in the late eighties—she mentioned that there was a story in that number by a new writer which she thought might please me. It did indeed. It was "The Head of the District," by Rudyard Kipling, a name then quite unknown to me. Soon afterwards came "The Incarnation of Krishna Mulvany." It is the fashion at such crises to refer to the peak of Darien, and to astronomers into whose ken new planets swim. Without labouring that hackneyed quotation, it was the opening of a new vision to me, and I have been an ardent Kiplingite ever since.

All three sisters were cultivated people, though they read little of contemporary literature. They were familiar with the more obvious of the English classics, and would introduce allusions to Shakespeare and Scott. I am afraid I was once guilty of playing upon this weakness of theirs, for having led the conversation to the subject of sleep I said: "You remember what Shakespeare said—

> "'Sleep that knits up the ravelled sleave of care,
> And makes each particular hair to stand on end,
> Like quills upon the fretful porcupine.'"

I contrived to keep from smiling, and although puzzled by the Shakespearean words, they did not discover the sacrilegious patchwork. No doubt my readers can place the several parts of the quotation.

In a lighter vein they would sometimes revert to a habit of their youth, when it had been ladylike to collect and put in an album riddles of a genteel type, and would propound them. Two of these remain in my memory:

"Where does Neptune stable his horses?"

Answer: "Where the seamews are," and

"Of what religion were Adam and Eve in Paradise?"

Answer: "Adam thought Eve angelical."

The Keenes' method of housekeeping was practical and original. Miss Liz was the housekeeper of the party. Whenever money was needed she announced the fact, when each of the three put a five-pound note into the common fund.

Each had her private sitting-room, in which she could entertain her own friends. Miss Lav had her harp and Miss Bella a piano in their respective boudoirs. Both of them, by the way, were really competent performers. But the three were nearly always at home to their general circle of friends at tea-time.

Tea was with the Keenes a serious meal. All three appeared in their bonnets and gloves, and the fingers of the latter were pinched out so as to extend beyond the fingers of the hand inside. A tablecloth was laid, and everyone sat up to the table. They were very attentive and sometimes embarrassing hostesses. I remember once a shy male being overwhelmed with confusion when Miss Lav said in what she meant for a gracious manner: "Now come and sit next to this fascinating young lady."

The sisters considered it the correct thing to do more than offer their viands. "Let me press you to a piece of this cake," "Let me press you to another cup of tea," were typical forms of invitation, in which they felt obliged to persist so long as a guest showed any sign of going on. My fellow-curate was one of those very polite men who are always anxious to oblige. Consequently he found it difficult to refuse the food repeatedly pressed upon him, and used to complain that he always left these tea-tables in a dreadful state of repletion.

The days when the church was to be decorated, as for Christmas, Easter, or the Harvest Festival, were great times for the Keenes' tea-table. The whole of the decorators were made free of it, including some who at ordinary times were outside the pale, such as "people who had been in trade."

As I have said, they have long since passed away. Miss Lav, who survived her two sisters, was practical and unromantic to the last, for she left a thousand pounds, the interest of which was to be used on repairs to the church.

THE GRACE OF DISCERNMENT: A STUDY IN THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

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

A FEW years ago a greatly respected bishop distributed the prizes on Speech-day at a certain Grammar School. At the close of an admirable address to the boys he quoted St. Paul's words: "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things"; and then made the comment: "Modern psychology, of which we hear so much, has nothing to add to these words." This is doubtless true, in the sense in which the words are generally understood. The verse is almost always interpreted as meaning, Give your mind to whatever is morally good and clean, and whatever is worthy of praise; "if 'virtue,' if 'honour' have a real meaning for you, on these things meditate."[1] Bishop Lightfoot, for instance, speaks of it as enumerating "the proper subjects of meditation."[2] This, of course, is excellent advice, and "Modern psychology stresses the value of it. The breeding-place of good habits is within the mind."[3] "As he thinketh in his heart, so is he." Our Lord Himself has taught us, "Out of the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications," etc. In another epistle, written about the same time as that to the Philippians, St. Paul gives even higher advice of this kind: "Seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God. Set your mind on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth." And indeed no more helpful advice for guiding in the spiritual life could be given to recent converts to the Faith and immature disciples, such as composed the Church addressed. St. Paul would have endorsed the words of Marcus Aurelius: "Such as are thy habitual thoughts, such also will be the character of thy mind; for the soul is dyed by the thoughts"; and of John Ruskin: "Do you know what fairy palaces you may build of beautiful thoughts, proof against all adversity?", and of George Tyrrell, "It is what we think about and what we love that matters most, and that makes us what we really are in God's eyes." He would have cordially approved of the advice of Bishop Steere, "Do not think that what

[1] *Farrar, Life and Work of St. Paul*, in loc.
[2] *Lightfoot* on the Epistle to the Philippians, in loc.
[3] *Gore's Commentary*, in loc.

your thoughts dwell upon is of no matter. Your thoughts are making you"; and of John Henry Newman,

> "Prune thou thy words, thy thoughts control
> That o'er thee swell and throng;
> They will condense within thy soul,
> And change to purpose strong."

But excellent as the advice undoubtedly is, it does not upon closer examination appear to be the real meaning of this oft-quoted verse. The lesson is good, but, like the moral of many a sermon, it does not come out of the text. When St. Paul wishes to encourage believers to "set their mind on" particular objects, or to cultivate particular habits of mind, he or his amanuensis uses the verb *φρονεῖτε*, as in Colossians iii. 2, and in this epistle in Ch. ii. 5, "have this mind in you"; cf. iii. 15, "let us be thus minded" (*τοῦτο φρονῶμεν*); and iii. 19, "who mind earthly things" (*τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες*). (With the last sentence we may compare Our Lord's rebuke to St. Peter in St. Matthew xvi. 23, "thou mindest (*φρονεῖς*) not the things of God, but the things of men.") But *λογίζεσθε*, which we find in the verse now under consideration, denotes rather to "take into account, to consider"; and, indeed, the R.V. margin notes, "Gr., take account of." This word is used, among other passages, in 1 Corinthians xiii. 5, "Charity *taketh not account of* evil"; and 2 Corinthians v. 19, "*Not reckoning* unto them their trespasses"; and in St. John xi. 50, "Nor do ye *take account* that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people." In other respects the language of this verse is unusual, and appears to be carefully chosen for a set purpose. The list of good qualities commended "is unique in St. Paul's writings, resembling the catalogues of Greek moralists."[1] "He selects words more often found in the classics to designate Pagan excellences."[2] One word —that translated "virtue"—is found here only in the Pauline writings, though it occurs three times in the Petrine epistles, "in all which passages," Bishop Lightfoot observes, "it seems to have some special sense." It is "a common heathen term for moral excellence." At this point, one commentator states, "St. Paul passes into the region of natural ethics, and uses terms common in Greek philosophy."[3] He is, another remarks, "seeking common ethical ground as between the Church and Gentile society."[1] His meaning is that "the Christian man must prize every fragment of human worth, claiming it for God."[1] We may translate the verse, "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are real, whatsoever things are aweful, whatsoever things are just, pure, amiable, winning (or 'gracious,' R.V.), . . . *take account of these things*."

What we gather from the epistle of the character of the Church at Philippi makes more apparent the force of this advice, when understood in the sense indicated. It was a small and young Christian community in "a Roman colony," which was naturally a

[1] *Dummelow's Commentary*, in loc.
[2] *Peake's Commentary*, in loc. [3] *Gore's Commentary*, in loc.

centre of Roman influence, to which St. Paul sent from his prison at Rome, about A.D. 60, a letter which conveyed to its members praise, instruction, and exhortation. Though there is scarcely a word of blame, still two faults are noticed. (1) The lack of Unity among them leads the Apostle to exhort two influential ladies, Euodia and Syntache, "to be of the same mind in the Lord," and to express the hope that all the disciples will "stand fast in one spirit, with one soul striving for the faith of the gospel." (2) The Church was "intellectually narrow," and this defect was probably aggravated by persecution, for we do not, as a rule, see much good in those who are treating us badly. Experience of their unkindness excites in us a rankling sense of injustice, and warps our judgment concerning them, and perhaps concerning others also. And so St. Paul prays for the Philippians that "their love may abound yet more and more in knowledge *and all discernment* (' *Πάσῃ αἰσθήσει* '); so that they may prove the things that differ; that they may be sincere and void of offence unto the day of Christ." (It makes little difference to the present argument if the old translation be preferred —" that ye may approve the things that are excellent ".) This grace of "Discernment," the capacity to "prove the things that differ," is a comparatively rare gift, and perhaps that is the reason why the word *αἰσθησις* occurs here only in the New Testament, though *αἰσθητήρια* "is used similarly to denote the organs of moral sense" [1] in Hebrews v. 14—" those who by reason of use have *their senses* exercised to discern good and evil"; and a cognate verb is employed by St. Luke to tell of the inability of Our Lord's disciples to "perceive" one of His "hard sayings" (St. Luke ix. 45). The phrase *δοκιμάζειν τὰ διαφέροντα* occurs also in Romans ii. 18, where the American Committee of Revisers suggest the marginal rendering, "*dost distinguish* the things that differ." St. Paul employs the same verb in his advice to the Thessalonians, "Prove all things," and St. John, when he says, "Prove the spirits, whether they are of God." As the gift of Discernment is rare, so it is of great value, and one which the Christian disciple should "desire earnestly." It is "the mark of moral and spiritual maturity in a man, as its absence is characteristic of the child (Deut. i. 39; Isa. vii. 16); its presence qualifies him to be an ideal ruler and judge (1 Kings iii. 9), and likens him to the angels (2 Sam. xiv. 17), and indeed to God Himself (Gen. iii. 22)." [2] Many good persons, endowed with other "spiritual gifts," are without this. Accordingly the Apostle prays at the beginning of his letter that it may be given to the Philippian Christians, and at the end, using the word "Finally," he charges them to exercise it, as who should say: Your lot is a difficult one; many temptations beset you; you are called to a separated life; the great majority around you have no sympathy with your aims and aspirations; nay, they are actively hostile to them. All this you must expect. "It is the way the Master went." Nevertheless do not make the mistake of imagining that everything that

[1] *Lightfoot* on the Epistle to the Philippians, in loc.
[2] *Gore's Commentary*, note on Hebrews v. 14.

is not according to your own ideas is necessarily wrong. You have no monopoly of goodness. Even in that common sink of all uncleanness which the heathen world appears to be there is much that is admirable and worthy of imitation. Many who are not Christians have before them high ideals of Purity and Self-control; many are groping after the Truth, "seeking God, if haply they may feel after Him and find Him"; and many too "touch God's right hand in that darkness." Athens has had its Socrates; Rome, its Cato; yea, even "in my bonds" my heart has been refreshed by hearing from my guards, and from the saints in the imperial household, of the influence for good which has been exercised upon some of the wise and noble by one called Seneca. Do not forget these things; and in your relations with "them that are without" "take into account" whatever of Goodness and Truth may be manifest to your observant gaze. That St. Paul's "righteous soul," like Lot in Sodom, was "tormented by the lascivious life of the wicked," and that he saw much to call down "the wrath of God" in the heathen world of his day, his scathing language in Romans i. shows; but in the passage before us, writing not to but from Rome, he strikes a different note, which he sounds elsewhere in a minor key. In his speech at Athens he quotes with approval Aratus and Cleanthes, and in his other epistles twice quotes other heathen poets, not pedantically, but seeking common ground with his audience and readers, and also as being ready to acknowledge "whatsoever things were true" in "that hard Pagan world." In the generations that followed his day two opposing lines of thought were apparent on this subject in the Church. Most Christians, no doubt, thought of "the World," from which they had been mercifully "delivered," as "lying in wickedness," but there were a few, like Clement of Alexandria, who tried to "distil out some soul of goodness" from classical literature, and who perceived that "the heathen in his blindness" was not without strong glimmers of light. The Apostle's point is of perennial interest. Not all is evil that upon a superficial view appears so; at least (to transpose the Article), "the good is ever mingled with the evil." Our "estrangéd faces" miss much of the "many splendour'd" spiritual beauty that is close to us, and our preconceived ideas often lead us to judge men and things by imperfect standards. Everything that is strange to us, or even at first startling, is not necessarily wholly bad; sometimes indeed it may be good. We need the grace of Discernment, the capacity to "prove the things that differ." The Mission Field affords an obvious illustration. When our brethren and sisters go from guarded Christian homes to the dark quarters of the earth, where "Satan's throne" and "the habitations of cruelty" are, they are often sickened by the foulness and bestiality around them. The air they breathe seems thick with miasmic germs. They are conscious, as many have testified, of diabolical powers working mightily where the rays of "the Sun of Righteousness" have not penetrated. At times (and this we too often forget), they are in danger of being swept away by the unclean "Floods of Hades." For all that, the

man of " a wise and an understanding heart," who has the grace of Discernment, not seldom sees, upon reflection, in the lives of " the sullen, helpless peoples " among whom his lot is cast, not a little that is " honourable, just, pure, and lovely," and in the heathen religions (especially in the East), much that is " true " and worthy of " praise." This is encouraging to him, for he knows that all that is good and true has come through " the Spirit of Truth " from " the true Light which lighteth every man." Matthew Arnold has been, with good cause, styled the " free-thinking poet," but to some the mind of Christ finds utterance in the words,

> " Children of men ! the unseen Power whose eye
> For ever doth accompany mankind,
> Hath look'd on no religion scornfully
> That men did ever find.
> Which has not taught weak wills how much they can ?
> Which has not fall'n on the dry heart like rain ?
> Which has not cried to sunk, self-weary man
> *Thou must be born again ?* "

Some distinguished writers in the present day teach much the same lesson. The author [1] of *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion* remarks :

" A Christian need not abate his claim for the supreme position of Christianity because he treats with respect the other great religions of mankind, or because he acknowledges the glimpses of truth, the rudimentary endeavours after a better life, which may accompany the practice of an otherwise barbaric creed and ritual, and which gave that creed its vitality while it lived. . . . As a Christian missionary recently expressed himself in an address to students : —' They had realized that the missionary must make a sympathetic study of the religions of the people among whom he laboured. The mere iconoclast would not reach their hearts and convince their minds. They must realize what their religions meant to them, *find points of contact*, and lead them on to the religion in which their deepest needs would be perfectly satisfied.' Such an utterance is as satisfactory from an intellectual point of view as it is full of promise for the future progress of missionary effort. And, it may be added, those who take this wise advice are themselves likely, in the process, to recognize more clearly what is essential and non-essential in the Christian faith."

In other words, it will help them to " prove the things that differ."

The Archbishop of Armagh writes in *The Christian Outlook in the Modern World*,

" It is confessed now at the great conferences where missionaries of various Christian Churches assemble for consultation, that it is altogether wrong to regard the beliefs of the great peoples of the East as altogether evil. In the Middle Ages every religion but Christianity was held to be the work of demons. Now the Christian missionary looks for the elements of good, and finds many of them. Even the African animist, low in the scale though his ideas are, yet possesses that first essential element of a true faith, belief in unseen spiritual powers, which, when purified and elevated, enables him to rise to the glorious Faith in One Supreme Good and Holy God, which scatters, like the rising of the sun, the dark and terrible shadows of his hereditary creed."

A simple story may clench these quotations. We are told that two Christian Ministers of Religion, one a Roman Catholic and the

[1] *A. Seth Pringle-Pattison.*

other a Protestant, once stood within a Mahometan Mosque listening to the impressive prayers from the Koran, and that the Roman Catholic said to the Protestant, " Men who pray like this cannot be far from the Kingdom of God."

But let us try to bring St. Paul's advice (if in this essay it be correctly interpreted), closer to ourselves. It is an overworked commonplace to observe that we are living in difficult times. Old-established standards of conduct are widely disregarded, and beliefs and conventions long unquestioned are set at naught in all classes of society, especially by " Modern Youth." What we of the elder generation have always looked upon as axiomatic laws of Christian living are not now taken for granted. It is not, we know, open to question that it is the plain duty of Christ's disciple to fight and protest against Vice and Error, under whatever guise they appear, and those who have the grace of true Discernment are not quickly " led away with the error of the wicked," even when " Satan fashioneth himself into an angel of light." The point now insisted on is simply that we should try to have correct standards before our minds. " Right is Right, since God is God," but it is only Ignorance or Prejudice which leads us hastily to condemn opinions or ways of life merely because they are unusual, or hitherto to us unknown. " Omne ignotum " need not always be taken " pro horrifico." Moreover, in those who, as we think, order their lives according to false standards, and perhaps " follow wandering fires," we sometimes see, upon closer examination, much that is " true, honourable, just, pure, and attractive." Some whom we sadly miss from the Church Services, who sit loose to " Institutional Religion," may be walking in the fear of God, and not entirely without the love of Christ in their hearts. There is " faith in honest doubt," and many professed " Free-thinkers " or " Agnostics " are living lives of the straitest morality, and are " true and just in all their dealing." Many too who appear to be among the most careless and unbalanced of " Modern Youth " are not destitute of a serious thoughtfulness, often unsuspected, which may yet by the breath of the Spirit of God be fanned into a bright flame of personal religion. As evidence of this one may point to the great success which is said to have attended the Archbishop of York's recent Mission to the undergraduates at Oxford, where, if reports be true, there have been marked signs of decadence in the post-war years.

And if we take a wider view, and compare existing ideas and standards of conduct with the sentiments and habits which prevailed only a hundred years or so ago, we note an immense improvement in some matters which affect deeply the national life. A few quotations are adduced to substantiate this statement.

(1) The first is from a recent number of *The Spectator*, which has for some time been giving interesting extracts from its columns of " A hundred years ago." Under the date May 28, 1831, it reproduces these sentences:

" Two men were hanged on Wednesday; one for sheep-stealing, the other for stealing in a dwelling-house. It was alleged, in aggravation of the

crime of the former, that his character was bad—he was what the French call a *mauvais sujet*; it does not appear that he had ever been tried before; the thefts of the latter had been numerous and extensive."

(2) The second is from a leading article in *The Irish Times* a little more than a year and a half ago:

"In its issue of October 26, 1829, *The Times* quoted an advertisement from an American newspaper. The advertisement was for a runaway slave; it requested that he might be 'delivered at Liberty Hall'; and it added: 'Will may be known by the incisions of the whip on his back, and I suppose he has taken the road to Coosahatchie, where he has a wife, and five children whom I sold last week to Mr. Gellispir.' The abominations which these few lines compress were to continue for thirty years. Only one hundred years ago in England young boys were hanged for sheep-stealing, and men were alive who had seen witches burned at the stake."

To extend our backward view over a considerably wider space of time, Mr. Bernard Shaw has stated that a woman was burnt on St. Stephen's Green, Dublin, for coining only a hundred years before he was born; and an extract, lately published in *The Church of Ireland Gazette*, from the Vestry Records of a parish in the North of Ireland, under date December 26, 1699, speaks for itself:

"It is agreed that all High and Petty Constables shall . . . make a private search every fortnight, or oftener if need require, in houses, barns, out-houses, and suspected places in ye night-time for ye finding out and apprehending of rogues, vagabonds, wandering persons, and to secure all such; also all sole persons who shall travel with forged or counterfeited papers. All such whom they shall find begging or wandering out of their limits, ye said Constable with ye assistance of ye Parish shall cause to be striped naked from ye middle upward, and to be openly whipt till their bodys shall be bloody, or to be put in ye stocks two days and two nights, and to have only bread and water."

And is it much more than a century since the young "bucks" of London Society used to form parties to enjoy the spectacle of a public execution, like "the multitudes that," on the day of the World's Supreme Tragedy, "came together to this sight"? We thank God that such a form of amusement is now inconceivable, and we cry with a shudder, "O tempora! Omores!" It is not here claimed that there is in these signs of improvement in thought and manners any ground of boasting or self-gratulation. It may be that, as *The Irish Times* suggests,

"to our great-grandchildren we may appear as callous as now our great-grandfathers appear to us. The future, for instance, will proclaim the rights of children and animals; . . . Newspapers of 2,029, quoting century-old descriptions of Dublin's one-room tenements, will excite the same wondering anger which the story of the Charleston slave excites to-day."

But it is submitted that he who attempts to form a just estimate of the days in which we live, manifold as are the powers of Evil abroad in the world at present, must "take account of these things." We may not easily recapture the early faith of the great Victorian poet:

"Yet I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widen'd with the process of the suns."

We may agree with Dean Inge in his criticism of the sentiment expressed by another poet of that day, that there is no good in saying, "All's right with the world," when there is manifestly a great deal wrong with it; but it will hardly be denied that in some important respects the times that are going over us are not worse, even from the standpoint of Religion, but better than those of the generations past. And we should "take account of these things." The words which follow this verse are worthy of a moment's notice. To counsel concerning the disciples' mental attitude to the World is added a word of advice touching their "proper line of action," and a promise: "The things which ye both learned and received and heard and saw in me, these things do: and the God of peace shall be with you." "Of peace!" The epithet is not an otiose one. The grace of Discernment helps us to cultivate a truly charitable spirit; and he who possesses "that most excellent gift of Charity," and is loyal to the best he knows, "dwells in God's peace amid all storms." He "proves the things that differ." He learns to "distinguish" between what is essential to what the Biblical writers call Righteousness and what does not greatly matter. "He sees life steadily, and sees it whole"; and so he is "not quickly shaken from his mind, nor yet troubled," amid whatever conflict of ideals and clash of opinions he moves. To him the promise is fulfilled, "Thou shalt keep them secretly in a pavilion from the strife of tongues."

A SPIRITUALIST OF NERO'S DAY.

By the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D.

THE life of Apollonius of Tyana, a contemporary of St. Paul, is told by Philostratus, a Regius professor in the university of Athens. The professor received from his imperial patroness, the Syrian wife of Severus, certain documents said to have been compiled by one Damis, a companion of Apollonius, who had apparently both the gifts and failings of Dr. Johnson's Boswell. The work is a curious blend of fact and fiction. There is no doubt that the man lived, and taught in the reigns of Nero and Domitian. There is a great deal of amusing exaggeration as well of interesting adventure and speculation in the pages of Philostratus which makes his book pleasant reading. Apollonius comes into personal contact with many important personages—Nero, Nerva, Vespasian, Domitian, Emperors, and the Prætorian prefects, Tigellinus and Aelianus, and the consul Telesinus—and valuable sidelights are thrown not only upon their characters and doings, but also upon the history and law of the latter half of the first century. The Church Fathers Origen, Chrysostom, Augustine and others, as well as Lucian the critic of the second century, do not speak very highly of Apollonius. Chrysostom, in fact, says plainly that all the miraculous works attributed to him are "lies and imagination." And Lucian called him "The Egregious one with his mummery." He happened to be made a rallying symbol in the struggle between the Empire and the Church. It became the fashion for authors of the ruling class to write books in his praise in prose and poetry. Hierocles, a proconsul of Bithynia, an instigator of Diocletian's persecution about A.D. 303, made one of the final attacks on Christianity in his "True words against the Christians," in which he instituted a comparison between the Gospel miracles and those of Apollonius. Eusebius, the Church historian, answered him in a tract in which he criticized Philostratus as "having culture but not regard for truth," and, in effect, says that he had spoiled the life of Apollonius, who probably was a philosopher, but was converted by his biographer into a mountebank. This did not, however, annihilate the sage, for Eunapius, an enemy of Christianity, said Philostratus' *Life* should be called "A God's visit to men." We shall now take up and read this book thus diversely described.

The interesting point to begin at is when the sage is approaching Rome. He had been all over the East, India, Egypt, Asia, Greece. He had taught in Athens; he had visited Crete. In fact, he had been a globe-trotter on no mean scale. He declared that his purpose was to improve himself and his hearers in science, and to expose the ignorance of the hierophant. He was a philosopher of the Pythagorean school, but many of his feats remind one of

spiritualism. This modern touch may interest some. Well in the year A.D. 66 he is on his way to Rome where Nero was lording it in no uncertain manner, Nero, who our author says with a quiet humour, "had nothing in common with philosophy." At Aricia he fell in with another philosopher Philolaus, who warned him not to visit the city as philosophy was taboo there. "And here you are," he said, "with a band of philosophers in your train, advancing in a barefaced manner, and you are not aware that Nero has men posted at the gates to arrest you all before you enter this town." A discussion on Nero's methods followed. "The emperor fights as a gladiator and kills his man too; he also is a charioteer," said the other. "Oh," said the sage, "it would be pleasant to see Nero turning into the plaything of man, whereas Plato has said that man was the plaything of the gods." "You would pay dearly for that sight," retorted the other, "if you should be arrested and put to death. Why, Nero would eat you raw."

The result of the discussion was that some of the sage's followers considered that discretion was the better part of valour, and declined to proceed. The remaining eight the sage entertained with a description of Nero as—"the beast that is called a tyrant," and with the cutting remark, "lions, panthers and other wild beasts do not devour their mothers like Nero"—a very dangerous remark to make, if he did make it. But this is in the narrative said to be supplied by Damis, the Boswell of Apollonius.

Encouraged by this and other remarks, the gallant band advanced to the gate of the city, where the tall guardsmen took note of their strange dress and appearance, but evidently considering them poor specimens let them pass. So having made their entrance into the great city, they sought rest and refreshment in a tavern not far from the gates. There they were pestered by a tipsy stroller who persisted in singing Nero's songs, and appeared to be authorized to take note of all who would not applause or pay. He evidently took the measure of the new-comers for he sang for their special benefit airs from the various dramas in which Nero acted, giving them Nero's turns and trills, but he met with no response. But before he left them, he made himself somewhat unpleasant, vilifying them as "enemies of the divine voice," and "guilty of sacrilege against Nero." The result of the rascal's interference was that Apollonius received a summons to appear before Telesinus the consul, who questioned him about his science and religion, and deeming his answers satisfactory, or himself harmless, gave him permission to teach in the temples.

Shortly afterwards, Demetrius the cynic arrived in Rome, and as he happened to think well of Apollonius, and not so well of Nero, and gave utterance to his thoughts, suspicion fell upon Apollonius. The climax came when Nero opened the new baths and the cynic took the opportunity of making a stump oration against the bathers, whom he described, as they were,—a putrid crowd. Nero, however, took no notice, for he was happily engaged singing in a tavern, naked to the waist, and in excellent voice.

Tigellinus, on the other hand, the prætorian prefect, who could not be described quite as Nero's "angel," expelled the eloquent one from Rome for having "blown up the baths with his tongue," and gave orders to shadow Apollonius. This was done in no half-hearted manner. "For all the eyes the government sees with were turned upon him. His discourses, and his silences, his sitting and his walking, whether he sacrificed or did not. All was reported." Philosophers were indeed living "dangerously," as the writer remarks. However, one thing was in this philosopher's favour. Tigellinus, who evidently had a bad conscience, when he heard of some of the man's performances, became nervous, and would not indict him openly, through fear of something happening to himself. And Telesinus, the consul, who seems to have been interested in philosophy, took pleasure in discussing various subjects with him. However, Tigellinus's tactics were eventually rewarded, for one of his secret police came to him one day with the information that the sage had said, "pardon the gods for finding amusement in buffoons"—a palpable hit at Nero. So he despatched soldiers to make the arrest, and informed the sage that he would be charged with impiety against Nero. The public prosecutor was briefed against him, and he brandished his brief, as a sword, over the head of the accused for some time. But then as he proceeded to unroll it, the words of the indictment had vanished from the paper! Nervous as Tigellinus was before, that finished him. So he ordered the sage to be conveyed to his own private court, where the gravest charges were tried in secrecy, and questioned him especially about his power over spirits.

In the course of conversation the prefect, who was becoming more and more impressed by the confident assurance of the sage, demanded, "with regard to the spirits and apparitions of ghosts, how do you detect them?" To this the sage returned the bold and adroit answer, "In the very same way that I detect bloodstained and impious men." This answer evidently went home, for Tigellinus, chief instructor of crimes to Nero, said, "You may go, you have only to find securities for your appearance." The other said, "Who will go bail for the body, which none shall imprison?" "Go," said the Prefect, unwilling to fight with the gods, "my power is unable to control you." So the sage withdrew free. He had owed his victory partly to the fact that he was a good-living man, and was contending with one possessed by an evil conscience.

But when Nero was leaving for Greece in the autumn of A.D. 66, he issued an order forbidding anyone to teach philosophy in Rome, simply because he knew the philosophers, chiefly the Stoics, were hostile to his rule, and had been implicated in Piso's rebellion of the previous year. Accordingly, Apollonius had to seek fresh fields for his "science," and elected to visit Spain, because he heard the people of that country favoured philosophy and religion. So he and his followers spent some time in Gades, the most voluptuous city in Spain. There news of Nero's victories with song and chariot

at Olympia reached him. All through, however, he is credited with the gift of second sight. Some people were discussing Nero's antics, and one said, "I wonder what he is doing now," and the sage answered, "He is being crowned for his victories." The sage hated Nero, and busied himself in enlisting people in the cause of Vindex, who was preparing to rise against the absent tyrant. He was also devoted both to Nerva and Vespasian. He won the esteem of Vespasian, who appears to have been devoted to him, and listened to a discourse from him on self-control. The sage had spoken up for Vespasian when some philosophers were discussing him unfavourably, and Euphrates, the man who afterwards informed against Apollonius, was enlarging upon his ambition.

It was in Domitian's reign that the sage found himself in trouble, but he showed the same undaunted spirit. Domitian was not warmly disposed to philosophers, for they were busily engaged in turning the young men against him. Ever since the days of Socrates the philosophers appealed to the youth, whom they were charged by their enemies with corrupting. Apollonius was bolder than others. He made no attempt to conceal his feelings. And the story of his relations with Domitian throws a light upon the legal procedure in vogue in those days, and the spiritualistic power attributed to the sage. At this time Apollonius was in Ephesus inciting the youth and the officials to rise, and quoting such classic examples as the assassination of the tyrant Hipparchus by Harmodius and Aristogiton in Athens, and was also intriguing with friends in Rome in the interests of Nerva, who did in time don the purple and prove a wise ruler. But the sage was too wary a bird to put anything on paper. He denounced epistolary communications as unsafe, since many had been betrayed by their slaves, friends and even wives. "In those days," the writer says, "no house could keep a secret." It was all done by word of mouth. At last, however, the spies were rewarded. Euphrates hovered round him relentlessly, and one day observed him as he stood before a statue of Domitian, and heard, or said he heard, him say—"Thou fool, it is little thou knowest of the fates or necessity. The man that is destined to succeed thee, though thou put him to death, will come to life." Euphrates had much joy in reporting this terrible sentence to the tyrant, who at once summoned the delinquent to his presence to answer for his secret dealings with his foes, thinking that he could condemn and execute him with a semblance of legality. The governor of Asia was ordered by letter to have the sage arrested and conveyed to Rome for trial. But before the summons could reach him, the sage was already on his way to Rome. He had foreseen by his gift what was coming. So he sailed at once for Corinth and thence to Italy, and in Cicero's historic villa of Cumamum had a heart-to-heart talk with Demetrius, another philosopher, who had managed to escape from Rome, and now urged Apollonius to retire, telling him that Domitian would implicate him in his charges against Nerva. He also informed him that the indictment against him contained among other charges,

that he had sacrificed a boy, and that he was worshipped. But the sage would not listen to the other as he pointed out that this would be a squalid fiasco, not a philosopher's martyrdom, as there would be only the semblance of a trial. The sage replied that there were two kinds of tyrants, the one that kills without a trial, and the other who apparently uses legal forms. The latter he considered the more dangerous, as he deprived his victims of public sympathy. This throws a light on the legal methods of Nero and Domitian.

The sage decided that he was bound to face his trial in Rome rather than allow his associates to fall under suspicion and be ruined. He said, "If I play false to my friends, conscience will convict me." Accordingly he sailed for Ostia with his friend Damis. Arrived in Rome, he waited the summons of the prefect Aelianus, who exerted his influence on his behalf all through the anxious time that followed. He said that many years before the sage had foretold to him his present position, which he now regarded, however, as a vexation. Even before the sage arrived, he had sought to turn Domitian from his determination to execute him. His method was ridicule. "The philosophers were only 'gas-bags.' They are fed-up with life and are set on death. They provoke the magistrates to use the sword. Nero knew this. So he would not oblige Demetrius or Musonius by putting them to death." In this way, the Prefect tried to fill Domitian with an easy contempt for Apollonius, and when he heard the sage was in Rome, summoned him to his office. The sage said in the interview that he was thinking of running away to a place, where men were more godloving, where there were no legal processes, but dreaded the charge of being a "traitor," if he ran away from his defence. And when in the preliminary investigation of the charges against him, which was held in the prefect's court, the prosecutor charged the sage with being a sorcerer and a magician, the latter said, "If I am a magician, how am I on my trial; and if I am on my trial, how am I a magician?" which was a poser. Aelianus bid the sage then reserve his defence for the imperial court, and saying that he wished to examine the accused privately, withdrew to his private office where he told the sage that he really wished to save him because of what he had done for him many years before. "The emperor," he said, "wishes to condemn you, but fears to do it on a false charge. He is really aiming through you at men of the highest rank. And I must pretend to be against you, otherwise I too shall be ruined." A good deal of dramatic element is introduced into these scenes. Aelianus was an actor of parts. After telling the sage to cheer up, he summoned his officers and said in angry tones—"I order you to detain this man until the emperor has been informed of his arrival and statement." Then he withdrew to attend to other matters, and the officer, evidently a wag, entered into talk with the sage: "I have prepared a fine defence for you," he said, and offered there and then to oblige the philosopher by cutting off his head. "If your head is cut off, you are not a magician, but if my arm is unable to lift

my sword, you are." As they were discussing this suggestion, the order came that the sage should be lodged in the Free Prison until the emperor should have an interview with him. There he was rejoined by Damis, who when he heard all that had passed knelt down, saying—" Some god is holding his hand over us." " Nonsense," cried Apollonius, " science dominates the world ; the man we have come to is suffering from swelled-head."

In this prison they met interesting people as Pickwick did in the Fleet. One man was in prison because his riches brought him under suspicion. Another, because when governor of Tarentum, he had omitted in the public prayers to describe Domitian as Athena's son. Another, because he lived in a lonely isle, and was suspected of having committed some awful crime. The sage proceeded to comfort these and the others with the philosophic reflections, that the soul was in prison in the body, and that those who live in palaces are closer prisoners than those they imprison.

The next day, he noticed a stranger deeply interested in his conversation, who said he was in grave peril, but learning that he was a spy sent to observe and record, he changed his line of talk, and discoursed about his travels, giving the spy to understand that if he wished to say anything against the emperor he would not inform against him. Aelianus, in the meantime, managed to send him timely warning to prepare for the interview, which the sage did not appear, however, to dread. When a clerk of the imperial court arrived with the summons, the other said, " Let us be off, then." He was escorted to the palace by four Prætorian guardsmen, and was the observed of all observers because of his strange appearance and dress. As they approached the palace, and saw the people passing in and out, some saluting, others saluted, he remarked to Damis, as Dr. Johnson might have to Boswell, " This is like the public baths, those inside are in a hurry to pass out, and those outside are struggling to pass in, just like the washed and the unwashed." Damis evidently thought the joke rather frigid, for he is rallied on his pale cheeks by the sage, who takes the opportunity of expressing his readiness for death. The sage is then ushered into the presence by Aelianus. Damis was not admitted. Indeed, he had no desire to enter. Now the entertainment begins. The " Lion," as the sage described him, was discovered crowned with a wreath of olives in the court of Adonis, which resembled a modern conservatory. There he had just finished a sacrifice to his " mother " Athena. The " Lion," startled by the peculiar appearance of the sage, shouted, " Aelianus, what devil have you brought to me ? " After some insulting questions and equally cool replies, Domitian demanded of the sage how he could clear himself of complicity with Nerva's designs. The sage, taken off his guard, launched into an eulogy of Nerva, and his friends. Domitian retorted that they were " abominable scoundrels," and that the sage was " a magician, an impudent impostor, and money-grabber." The other replied that it was disgraceful for a man to sit to judge a case he had already prejudged. This remark did

not help matters. Domitian was not accustomed to get such replies. In answer to his threat of bonds, the sage answered, "If I am a magician, how will you bind me? and if you bind me, how am I a magician?" "You shall not escape me," cried the tyrant, "unless you turn into water or a beast or a tree." "I shall submit to anything you can do to my body," replied the sage, "until I can make a defence for those men." "And who is it," asked the other, "that will make a defence for you?" "Time and the judgment of good men," was the answer.

Domitian evidently thought the sage wanted a cooling, for he at once transferred him to the prison, where the lowest criminals were kept, and had his beard cut and his legs put in chains. After a couple of days, a stranger arrived in the prison, who said he had had to give a big tip to the jailer, and had come to advise him how to regain his liberty. But he got nothing out of the sage, who received his remarks in stony silence. Seeing that he could make nothing of him, he expressed his amazement at seeing the sage's hair cut and his legs in chains, and wondered what it felt like. But he withdrew when he failed to provoke the man. Aelianus, in the meanwhile, had succeeded in making Domitian see his injustice, and he consented to allow the sage to be removed to the Free Prison, and to be notified that the trial would take place in four days. The sage was, accordingly, brought back to his first prison, where he was welcomed by his former friends, who never expected to see him again. This meeting is described with real feeling. Like children around their father, these poor fellows crowded round the sage welcoming him, and saying how much he had helped them by his words of counsel, and he ceased not giving them good advice. One young fellow told him when there that death would be a release for him from dishonour. The boy was a slave, but maintained that he was master of his own body. This throws a sidelight on the sufferings of that age.

We now pass into the law court where the sage has to make his defence. We may be sure that the learning and accuracy of Philostratus are a guarantee for the correct setting of this scene. It is sunrise, and the favoured ones are taking their seats. The Emperor is said to be too busy with the case to take his meal. He shows his temper as he turns over the brief in anger and perplexity. Apollonius, on the other hand, looked more like a man going to deliver a lecture, than one about to be tried for his life. "Against whom am I to plead?" he demanded of the clerk. "Against your accuser, and the Emperor will give the sentence," was the reply. "How much water will you require for your speech?" (a reference to the clepsydra used in courts to measure time) asked the clerk. "All the water in the Tiber, if justice is to be done," retorted the other. And then, as another usher detained them in front of the court saying, "You must strip before entering," he exclaimed, "Are we going to a bath or to a trial?" The other stiffly answered, "The order does not refer to clothing, but you must not bring any amulet, or book, or tablet into the Emperor's court." "What,"

cried the sage with ready wit, "not even a rod for his foolish advisers?" "By the Emperor's majesty," shouted the accuser, who overheard, "the sorcerer threatens me with stripes."

Inside, the court was arranged as for a public oration. The Emperor was seated as judge on the tribunal, and many of the aristocracy were there, for Domitian wished to have as many people as possible present at the conviction of the sage for his complicity in the plots of Nerva. When Apollonius was conducted to his place in the court the prosecuting counsel ordered him to look towards "the God of all mankind," meaning Domitian, whereupon the sage promptly threw up his eyes to the roof, towards the sun! The other, then addressing the judge, requested him not to give the defendant all the time he could claim, for he would weary them to death if he did. "I hold this brief" (little book), he said, "which contains the charges against him, and order him to reply to them seriatim." The accuser, having obtained the judge's consent, put the four leading questions to the sage, who answered them calmly, and then confused his adversary by demanding evidence for his statements. At this there was applause, and the Emperor said, "I acquit you of the charges, but you must wait for a private interview." "No," said the sage, "you shall shackle neither my body nor my soul." And after a few more words, "you shall not kill me, for that is not my fate," *he vanished from the court!*

Philostratus says this is the account he had found of the trial and that the sage had written an elaborate apology but was not allowed to deliver it. In it he attacked pseudo-science and sorcery as a profession of money-grabbers. As to the charge of being worshipped, he did not deny it, but said man had communications with God, that our virtues came from the Godward-side of us, and those who partook of them are near to the Gods and Godlike. He declared his belief in a universal Creator, whose goodness made Him think of creating man. In the course of his defence he did not plead an alibi, but admitted that he was in Rome at the time. "What, informer, was I doing that night? If you should ask me what you were doing I should say—preparing trials and accusations for honest men, to destroy the innocent and win the Emperor's approval by falsehood, to advance yourself, to disgrace him."

Apollonius next appears to his friends in Puteoli, where he had told Damis, who was not admitted to the court, to meet him. There he proved himself alive by permitting them to touch his body, saying, "If I elude you, I am a ghost." They could no longer disbelieve, but rose up and embraced him, and questioned him about his defence. "I have made my defence," he said, "and we are the winners." Damis had told the other that when he saw Apollonius removing his legs from the shackles in prison, he knew he was *divine*. And now to this *divine person*, who had in this miraculous manner transferred his body from the imperial court in Rome to a villa by the sea in Puteoli, he says—"Your name will be proscribed, you will be cut off from every avenue of escape. He will have you arrested." And while poor Damis

was imagining every moment that he heard the horsemen in pursuit of the "divine" person, that person was taking it calmly. "I shall sail to Greece," he said. "A dangerous destination," said the other, "everything is known there, you could not hide from him even in the dark." "I am not afraid of that," said the sage, "but do you know of a ship sailing to Sicily?" "Yes," said Damis, "we are not lodging by the sea for nothing. The 'bosun' is near the door, and they are getting ready the ship, as I understand from the shouts of the men and the rattling of the chains." "Let us aboard then and sail for Sicily and the Peloponnesus." They succeeded in reaching Greece eventually. Thence they passed to Ephesus where a curious coincidence is recorded by Dio Cassius, which suggests that Apollonius had remarkable powers of telepathy. He was standing on a stone, when he seemed to see Stephanus strike Domitian with his dagger, and the sage was heard shouting, "Well done, Stephanus, strike the dirty tyrant." This was the first intimation the people in that district had of the murder of Domitian (Sept. 18, A.D. 96). But the greatest "miracle" of all is his "Ascension." The Cretans claim that he ascended from Crete. He was staying there, more respected than ever in his old age, and had entered into the temple of Dictynna (Artemis) at Cydonia, when suddenly the doors closed behind him and girlish voices were heard singing, "Leave the earth, go to heaven, pass up from the earth." This is told with a deal of claptrap about temple guardians, who tried to bind him as a robber and sorcerer, and fierce dogs, who would not bark at him.

To return to Domitian, what was the effect upon him of that marvellous disappearance, that feat of body-transference? He was so bewildered that he could not attend to the details of the next case and actually forgot the names!

Apollonius had certain gifts. He claimed like modern spiritualists, that he could hold converse with the dead. He called up the spirit of Achilles and put certain questions to him about the Trojan War, and said that the god Proteus had appeared to his mother before his birth. Philostratus denied that he was a sorcerer, as his powers lay not in obstructing but in foreseeing the course of destiny. Apollonius was a vegetarian and wore flax, not wool. He is not to be confused with Peregrinus Proteus who was a clever charlatan, and immolated himself at the Olympian games in A.D. 165. Lucian tells his story in his *de morte Peregrini*. But Apollonius was a more serious person; and if we cannot believe a great deal that was said of him, there is yet a great deal to be admired and more to interest in this account of one who would now be called a spiritualist, but was then described as a "magician." That was the usual name in those days for spiritualists. Nero tried to recall the spirit of his murdered mother and appease her "by *magicians*," Suetonius,[1] the historian, tells us. But the word should be rendered "spiritualists."

[1] Suetonius. *Nero*. c. 34: "facto per Magos sacro evocare Manes et exorare temptavit."

"MODERN SERMONS."

By E. J. W.

" SERMONS that mould history, epoch-making deliveries, are probably 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, a Massillon, on the one hand and a listening nation on the other."

So I quoted in a recent number of THE CHURCHMAN,[1] and I suggested some of the causes which have tended to what is often spoken of as " the decay of the pulpit."

I propose now to examine these a little more closely and to suggest where as it seems to me the modern sermon, speaking generally, is lacking.

One great cause of the " decay " (by which I imagine is meant the ineffectiveness of present-day sermons to produce upon their hearers the intended effect), is the advance in education. In the days of the great English preachers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries education was not widespread and the means of self-instruction by the printed page were not so readily accessible as to-day, and the general public largely received through the pulpit the information and instruction which is now supplied by the press and by books.

The change was gradual. " The topical sermon," it has been said, " was succeeded by the pamphlet, and the pamphlet by the leading article, and the leading article by the platform speech, disseminated everywhere." In the sixteenth century the influence exerted on the public mind by the preachings at St. Paul's Cross and other homes of public oratory, and not least, by the University pulpit, was immense.

The topicalness of the sermons of those days, which no doubt gave them much of their interest and influence, was due in a great degree to the intermingling of religion and politics, the interpenetration of the one with the other—a condition to which we are strangers to-day. As things are now, it would be fatal for the pulpit to descend into the questionable arena of party politics. At the same time the enclosing of these two great interests of human life in water-tight compartments, so to speak, and thus breaking the homogeneity of life, is a distinct loss.

A second cause of the decay, more recent in its growth than that just considered, was ecclesiastical in its origin, and dates from the Tractarian movement. The greater emphasis which this movement laid upon ritual and ceremony tended to discount the sermon. The importance which the Puritans have always bestowed upon the sermon, was calculated in the estimation of the Tractarians

[1] April, 1931, p. 136.

to lead to the overshadowing of "the altar," the prayer-desk and the lectern, by the pulpit.

The result of this attitude is still seen to-day. In the majority of Anglo-Catholic churches the sermon is apparently of little importance—little care is bestowed upon it—the place of premier importance being accorded to "the Service of the Mass" or "the Sung Eucharist." This however is not universally true; some of the finest and most attractive preachers in the Church of England to-day are Anglo-Catholics; but it is sufficiently widespread to place the sermon, generally speaking, in an almost negligible position and thus act as a cause of the decay of preaching. What is not greatly valued will not receive great attention, or care, in producing it.

Yet another cause may be found in the marked characteristic of modern times—haste. We are straining every effort to increase the speed of things to-day—telegraph, telephone, motors, aeroplanes! We must cram as much as possible into every day and we are restive of anything which demands meditation, inactivity, quiescence. In accord with this attitude towards life there is a strong demand to cut down the length of the Sunday service. Dr. Shepherd's "Impatience of a Parson" could well be matched by the "Impatience of the Pew." Statutes require a certain amount of time for the Liturgical portion of the service, and even when we have gone to the limit of our consciences in "cutting down" the service the cry is still "Don't keep us so long." So in the economy of time the sermon is reduced to ten or fifteen, or at most twenty minutes, with, it has been said, "a leaning to mercy."

The difficulty of condensing a message worth delivering, and so worth listening to, into such limits must be apparent, and it is little wonder that under these conditions the temptation to give as little time as possible to preparation, so as just to get through the task fairly decently, is very great.

This question of the length of the sermon and the relative place it should claim in the Sunday services, is attracting a good deal of attention in various quarters to-day.

The Archbishop of York, in the Preface to his primary charge, "Thoughts on some problems of the day," evidently impressed by the value of the sermon, suggests that it should last at least thirty minutes. At the same time he recognizes the fact that people will not give the time necessary for such an exercise attached to the ordinary Morning or Evening Prayer, and therefore proposes a rearrangement of the Sunday programme providing for a service consisting of "Sermon (thirty minutes at least) with hymn and short prayers." This service to be at 11 a.m. Shortened Mattins at 8.45, and "Holy Communion (sung by the congregation), 9 a.m."

I am doubtful, however, if the general body of Church-people would take kindly to this alteration. Ingrained habits are difficult to alter, and those who are accustomed to, and like a service of combined prayer and preaching, would not readily accept a service containing only one of these features, and certainly would be most

unlikely to attend all the three a.m. services proposed by Dr. Temple, which they would have to do to get all the elements of worship they are now accustomed to. At the same time there is much to be said for a service where the sermon is the main feature. Many men's services with which I am acquainted consist of hymns, a few prayers and a sermon, the latter often extending to three-quarters of an hour without adverse comment on the part of those attending. Similar sectional services are also not unknown, so it is plain that there is an audience for such sermons where too great a demand for concentration is not made by a preceding or succeeding lengthy liturgy.

In a memorandum which has recently reached me on "Youth—what Youth is thinking and saying," which is a précis of the findings of a number of "Youth Conferences," compiled by R. Bevington of Bournemouth, it is stated in the findings of the Lay groups:

"Two groups dealt with the proper length of sermons. It is noteworthy that the group which dwelt most on the lack of Gospel teaching and preaching laid down that a sermon should not be of more than ten or at most of fifteen minutes' duration.

"Another group, while itself in favour of short sermons, recognized that there are people who like long sermons. It held that the clergyman should take pains to discover the feelings of his people on this matter."

But I note that no help is given the unfortunate clergyman as to how he should act when he found, as he would be sure to, his congregation divided on this thorny question. Perhaps he might cut the Gordian knot by announcing "Next Sunday will be long-sermon Sunday" or "short" as the case might be!

From the same leaflet I cull from among the findings of the Clerical groups the statement:

"That there was great difficulty in catering for the tastes and ideas of young and old people at the same time. This difficulty was especially serious in the matter of sermons. What would please the young would not please the old and vice versa. Old people, as a rule, were rigidly opposed to discussion in the pulpit of such questions as Evolution and the influence of modern thought and science on the Christian position."

In both sets of groups, some were found to advocate the establishment of a special order of preachers on the ground it would appear that the same man did not always possess the pastoral and preaching gifts required for the due discharge of his office.

Whatever remedy may be proposed, it is at any rate clear that the present influence of the pulpit is not all it might and therefore ought to be, and pulpit oratory as an art is being neglected.

To the same result tends the increasing multiplicity of present-day organizations, so that much of the time which used to be devoted to reading and preparation is given to running about to attend committee meetings, diocesan and parochial. The time which the great preachers of the past spent upon their sermons would put many of us to shame when compared with the time and care given to the preparation of the modern sermon. Perhaps we might answer that the time allowed for the delivery of the sermon does not encourage or justify a great expenditure of time in preparation.

Still there it is. Dr. Donne, we are told, rose at 4 a.m. every morning and studied until 10 a.m. While it is said of Lancelot Andrews that his sermons were "thrice between hammer and anvil" before being preached.

These are some of the causes of the position into which the modern sermon has fallen. Is there any remedy, and if so, what?

Why are people generally not interested in sermons to-day? I think the answer is: Because generally speaking the sermon of to-day makes no direct appeal to them.

I never heard anyone complain of the length of Canon Liddon's sermons, and some of them ran to well over the hour, yet he certainly never lacked an attentive audience. The characteristics which attracted me, and, I suppose, others, in his sermons were their literary quality and their human touch. It is the latter quality, it seems to me, the modern sermon chiefly lacks with the direct personal appeal. It is said of the preachers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that "with a simplicity of view (they seldom saw more than one side at a time) went an amazing directness of speech and outspokenness of address." The modern sermon deals too much in generalities, and aiming at no one special mark, hits none. The advocate of the law courts who deals altogether in generalities will win but few cases. "The Apostles, poor mortals," said South, "were content to use a dialect which only pierced the conscience and made the hearers cry out: 'Men and brethren, what shall we do?'"

"When I hear other preachers," said Louis XIV to Massillon, "I am well pleased with them; but when I hear you I go away displeased with myself." I reckon I have failed when a member of my congregation says: "That was a good sermon of yours this morning. It ought to do some people good." I know that in one instance at any rate it has missed its mark.

It so happens that in my Commonplace book I have, bearing on this matter, a note of the opinions of two eminent Nonconformist Americans expressed just after they had come to take charge of two of the most prominent of the London Free Churches—Dr. Len Broughton at Christ Church, Westminster Bridge Road, and Dr. A. C. Dixon at the Metropolitan Tabernacle.

Both were very emphatic in pointing out what appeared to them to be defects in our methods and organizations as compared with those that obtain in America. No doubt both are speaking chiefly, if not entirely, of the Free Churches, and also of conditions of some years ago (I have not the exact date); but I am sure their criticisms would hold good of the Church of England and of present-day conditions. Each speaks independently of the other, and they express themselves very differently, yet they are in practical agreement upon the chief defect of our methods.

Dr. Len Broughton lays especial stress on "Preaching methods and Sunday School equipment." The latter point is not germane to our present subject and we may leave on one side what he has to say thereon.

As to the other point—preaching—he thinks the ideal would be a blend of the American and English methods.

" The American preacher is almost entirely given to application." " His absorbing thought is to clinch what he says. He is like a lawyer who cares little as to his method so long as he gains the verdict." " The English preacher," on the other hand, " goes in almost entirely for exposition."

What is wanted, according to Dr. Broughton, is " good sound exposition and good sound application." " And," he concludes, " the man who gives that will get the best constituency."

I think the ideal is excellent. As to the estimate of Church of England preaching, my own experience of nearly half a century reinforced by some inquiry leads one to believe that except in the case of distinct Mission preaching, there is a very general absence of direct personal appeal in modern preaching. Indeed a young clergyman, in whom I was interested, told me that when he was examined for priest's orders in one of the London dioceses, the examiner—an Archdeacon—told him in reference to his specimen sermon that people did not want Homiletics (meaning, I gathered, personal application) in sermons, which should, he declared, be doctrinal, exegetical or simply expository in character. When the *Record* some years ago asked a few leading laymen what type of sermon they preferred, a majority, if I remember rightly, expressed a preference for the expository sermon. These were, however, principally ecclesiastically-minded laymen although Evangelicals and did not represent the " man in the street " whom we wish to draw into the pew. As to doctrinal sermons, it has been said, I think with reason, that most people do not care whether sermons are High, Low or Broad if only they are not long. Of course there is no reason why the expository sermon should not have its personal application, but I am distinctly of opinion that there is a somewhat too widespread idea amongst preachers that the personal application and individual appeal savour too much of the special Mission address, for general congregational use.

On the other hand, a lady remarked to me when trying to account for her not caring for the preaching of two clergymen, whose sermons were considered above the average : " I don't know why it is, but they don't *grip* me."

A knowledge of those preachers' methods made the reason of her feeling clear—there was nothing personal or direct in the sermons of either. They did not touch any note in her experience or appeal to her conscience in any way.

I fancy that much of the preaching in our churches to-day, while often excellent of its kind, fails to make any impression on those in the pews because so seldom any impression is aimed at or expected.

One of the worst evils in Church life to-day is the hardening effect of listening week after week with assent and complacency, but with practical unconcern, to sermons whose chief defect is that they do not do, and apparently are not calculated to do, that which should

be the primary object of the sermon—awaken the conscience of the hearer.

Dr. Dixon put the same thing in another way.

The fault he saw was "a lack of immediateness in the appeal of the preacher." "The Gospel is preached faithfully; but no one is expected to decide for Christ and confess Him now and here."

The omission is precisely the one we are dealing with—the want of personal application and appeal. Mere doctrinal exegesis or exposition "grips" no one. There is, in fact, on the part both of the pulpit and of the pew too little expectation of what the sermon might, and therefore should, do. It is too often regarded from both standpoints as a necessary duty but somewhat of a burden in its preparation and its reception, and rather a drawback to the rest of the service. Perhaps some of us need the exhortation Dr. Broughton reports a Dr. S. P. Jones to have given his students: "Boys, don't bother about your text. Stick to your crowd."

Rigorous self-judgment is absolutely the first requisite of the moral life. We need to cease talking about sin in the abstract or the mass and come down, as the phrase goes, to "brass tacks." To deal with specific sins and shortcomings as we see them and unmask them. A "lay sermon," which I read a few days ago in a leading daily journal, strikes the same note.

The text was 1 Cor. xiv. 19: "I had rather speak five words with my understanding . . ."

"The first nineteen verses of this chapter," wrote the preacher, "might well be printed separately as 'St. Paul's Epistle to the Highbrows.' They are a plea for what we need most in our religion to-day—plain speaking."

"Modern religion," he goes on, "has been too much like modern music. There has been too much scholarship about it and not enough meaning. There must be melody, a distinction in the sounds—a message, or the average man will want to know what it's all about, and that is practically the average man's reaction to the average sermon. . . . Personal testimony is demanded. Where highbrow eloquence fails, the simple language of shared experience succeeds."

This seems to me excellently said, yet how seldom does there ring through the agency of the modern pulpit in the heart and conscience of the man in the pew, complacent, self-satisfied, quite indifferent, the awakening and accusing voice: "Thou art the man"?

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

ARCHDEACON PAIGE COX is well known as a thoughtful student of the history and teaching of our Church. He has already contributed several works of importance in which while taking an independent line he sets out the teaching of our Church on a number of important points, and shows that the whole spirit and outlook of the Anglo-Catholic is contrary to the formularies, however broadly interpreted, of the Church of England. He has recently added another to his series of works in which he follows a somewhat similar line. *Reaction and Progress in Religion* is " A Historical Retrospect with Present-day Illustrations " (W. Heffer, Ltd., Cambridge, 5s. net). A Foreword is contributed by Dr. R. H. Kennett, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, in which he points out that the same religious questions which confront us to-day have presented themselves in various guise in many ages, and recommends the Archdeacon's survey as a help to the better understanding of present-day tendencies in religion and as a bold enunciation of the truth which can make us free. Dealing with the period before Christ, the Archdeacon shows the constant tendency to depart from the purity and high standard of the religion of Jehovah, through the influence of the surrounding heathen nations. After the revelation of God in Christ, a similar falling away from the purity of the faith took place. The crowds of Pagans who were brought into the Christian Church without sufficient teaching, introduced into popular religion the veneration of Saints and Martyrs to replace the old intermediary demigods and heroes. The doctrine of Transubstantiation led to the cultus of the consecrated Elements which was a distinct reaction towards Paganism, and a contrast to the early Christian faith and worship as described by Origen in his Defence of Christianity against the Pagan, Celsus. The argument that worship directed towards the Elements before consecration would be idolatrous but when the wafer is transubstantiated into Christ Himself then it was Christ Himself who is worshipped and the worship of Christ could not be idolatry, is met by a cogent argument from Archbishop Whately showing that to worship a material thing is inconceivable and is a contradiction in terms. In dealing with the Anglo-Catholic movement he shows that it is a common thing for members of the party to speak lightly of the Reformation Settlement by which the doctrine of the Church of England came to be what it is to-day. Some of them go so far as to say that the Reformation was a mistake or even a crime. He adds that " it is an altogether inscrutable mentality that is exhibited in those who have been caught into this new movement." Their uses of the word Catholic is contrary to the true meaning of that word. The whole movement represents that reactionary and retrogressive law which has prevailed in all ages, and is seen in the lowering of the standard of honour among some

of the Clergy in comparison with that which obtains in ordinary society of the better kind.

His hope for the future is that there will be a better recognition of the authority of Christ and a purging of what is demonstrably pagan. One great need is an improvement in the education of the Clergy, another is the assuring to the laity of their proper place in Church affairs. He would restrain the preponderating influence of the Bishops, which he says frankly, is not good for them. On the question of Reunion he holds that the Eastern Churches are still un-Reformed, while our brethren at home are only separated from us in polity and not in doctrine. This interesting survey of tendencies in the Church deserves careful study, as it lays bare many sources of weakness, and shows the fundamental elements necessary to secure the stability and extension of the purest form of Christianity.

The Rev. R. H. Malden, M.A., Vicar of Headingley, Leeds, gives a most attractive survey of the whole life and teaching of the Church of England in *This Church and Realm* (Oxford University Press, 7*s*. 6*d*. net). He can hardly expect either Evangelicals or Anglo-Catholics to agree with all he says, for he is somewhat severe upon them both, but more especially upon the Anglo-Catholics whose teaching he practically says is in many respects disloyal to the Church. Evangelicals, he says, are in danger of being merely negative and intent on opposing developments rather than on proclaiming any message of its own. He quotes the silly statement of the Bishop of Durham that they are an army of illiterates generalled by octogenarians, and says there is an element of truth in it. The element of truth is so small that a microscopical examination would not reveal it. What would he say of the party whose recently restored leader is a nonogenarian? Evangelicals have a positive position which more and more they are realizing and making effective in the life of the Church. In fact they can claim that Mr. Malden is with them in most of his chief positions. Although with some reservations, he maintains the supreme authority of Scripture and shows the important part the Bible has played in the education of the conscience of the English race. This is perhaps what distinguishes the members of the Protestant Churches from those of the unreformed Communions. His views on the Sacraments are not as clearly expressed as on other points. There is no miracle performed by the Priest in Holy Communion. The words of consecration have no semi-magical power. The reception of the elements is an essential part of the service. The hearing of Mass was remote from our Lord's intention. The Anglo-Catholic theory of an Apostolic Succession is an Anglican peculiarity not older than the fourth decade of the last century. Many of the Anglo-Catholics are merely imitators of the Church of Rome as far as they find convenient without accepting its concise demands and without proposing to become a member of it. He shows clearly that in regard to authority, freedom and truth there is nothing in common between

the outlook of Anglicanism and that of Romanism. The book was written before the meeting of the last Lambeth Conference, otherwise there would no doubt have been references to the recent deliberations of the Bishops. It is difficult to define Mr. Malden's churchmanship. He writes with a spirit of independence which we cannot but admire, and we find his analysis of the life of our Church an incentive to a fresh examination of the basis of Anglican doctrine and fellowship. The book had its origin in a series of group meetings for study in Mr. Malden's parish, and there could be no better method of instructing Churchpeople in the distinctive teaching of the English Church than that which has been adopted here with such good effect. In spite of our differences from him we are grateful to Mr. Malden for his sincere, frank and honest presentation of many important truths.

Canon Arthur J. Tait, D.D., in *Sacrament and Presence* (S.P.C.K., 2s. net) offers a fresh and interesting study of the important problems connected with the presence of Our Lord in the Holy Communion. He quotes with approval Bishop Westcott's well-known statement —" It seems to me vital to guard against the thought of the Presence of the Lord ' in or under the forms of bread and wine.' From this the greatest practical errors follow," and shows in explaining the Sacramental Principle that the outward part of a Sacrament is not a mere thing but an action. In Holy Baptism it is the action of baptizing and being baptized in or with water ; in Holy Communion it is the action of giving, receiving, eating and drinking the bread and the wine. The essence of the Sacramental Principle is thus a personal relationship, and the relationship between God and man finds its expression in action. The Sacraments of the Gospel are in this way a particular application of the principle that is at work in human social life. He explains the true significance of the Black Rubric, and shows that the Real Presence of Our Lord is His Presence in the Holy Spirit. This is explained more fully by an examination of New Testament teaching, and in the light of it he cannot accept any interpretation which postulates the Presence tabernacled in consecrated bread and wine. He finds support for his view in the teaching of St. Paul. The unique character of Holy Communion does not involve any unique mode of His Presence. The spiritual presence of Our Lord is not presence in the body of the Resurrection, but presence in the Holy Spirit. There is nothing in the Institution of the Holy Communion to warrant a belief in the presence in the elements. The eating of the flesh and the drinking of the blood of Christ is a spiritual act involving faith in Christ and self-surrender to Him. The act of Consecration does not involve any change in the Elements ; it is simply the setting of them apart for holy use. Our Lord is not more objectively present after the Consecration than He was before. Canon Tait has given us in this brief study a number of useful suggestions and much clear evidence as to the teaching of our Church.

Mr. J. W. Poynter has already placed us under many obligations for his exposure of the teaching and practices of the Church of Rome gained from his experiences as an active member of it. His last book, *Rome at Close Quarters* (London, The Epworth Press, 2*s.* 6*d.* and 3*s.* 6*d.*), gives "an intimate and impartial study from personal experience." He tells of the circumstances which led him from Nonconformity in which, unfortunately, he received no very definite instruction in the foundation facts of the faith, to the Roman Church which appealed to him with a romantic glamour, and the supposed certitude of infallibility which Protestantism does not provide. He made his submission in the usual form which he criticizes as obscuring many facts which should be made clear to the candidate for admission. He narrates his experiences in the Confessional and as an energetic sharer in the work of propaganda. He describes the various organizations attached to the churches of the Roman Communion. He became an active writer and published a book in defence of Roman Catholicism which was highly praised in the Roman Catholic Press. On his return to Protestantism, however, the same Press referred to him as an Apostate who found that "his brilliancy was not sufficiently appreciated in the Catholic Church and returned to Protestant mis-representation like a dog to his vomit." That is the spirit constantly shown by the Roman Catholic Church in its attitude to people who cease to believe its claims. They are represented as intellectually or morally defective. Mr. Poynter as a member of the Westminster Catholic Federation came in touch with the policy of secret and hidden manipulation, by which books used in London County Council elementary schools were to be changed so as to become, to a great extent, Roman Catholic propaganda. Secret threats and inducements to publishers to alter their books led him to realize something of the true spirit of Romanism, and caused him to secede. He has, of course, been branded as a "bad Catholic," but he is performing a useful service in opening the eyes of English people to the true condition of the Church of Rome, the outrageous nature of its claims, its obscurantism and its tyranny.

Professor Karl Barth is undoubtedly the most potent force in the religious life of Germany at the present time. His career has marked a revolution in religious thought and feeling. Born in 1886, the son of a theological professor at Basel, he studied theology at Berne and at several German universities, including Marburg, where he came under the influence of Wilhelm Herrman, the well-known author of *Communion with God*. He became a Minister of the Reformed Church in Switzerland in 1911, and as a pastor in charge of a congregation soon became dissatisfied with the type of Liberal theology popular in German circles before the War. He turned to the Epistle to the Romans, and in 1918 brought out his Commentary, which at once attracted attention by its new and startling line of thought. Careless of paradox he asserted the absolute sovereignty of God, placed man's redemption through the death of Christ at

the centre of the Christian faith, introduced in the strongest way possible the Reformation doctrine of Grace, and changed the whole course of theological thought. Although his views aroused considerable opposition he was appointed to a Professorship of Theology at Göttingen. He removed to Münster, and in 1929 he was called to the important chair of theology in Bonn, where he is now attracting immense numbers of students from every part of Europe. Only two of his books have been translated so far into English. One is a volume of essays issued under the title *The Word of God and the Word of Man.* The other, *The Christian Life,* has recently been published by the Student Christian Movement Press (1s. 6*d.* net). It contains two Bible Studies given to the Students' Christian Union at Münster in 1926. They are based on Romans xii. 1, 2. They are not easy reading and require some previous knowledge of the Professor's general line of thought. In the main, he asserts man's complete dependence upon God. Through the Holy Spirit God has begotten man who was in sin unto a lively hope that he may recognize himself as His child. " And the meaning of Baptism is just this—that we have this promise of participation in this inconceivable life of God. God's life for us in Christ—in us through its Holy Spirit—that is the Christian life." Yet St. Paul exhorts the Romans by the mercy of God, to present their bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, and to assume a new form through the renewing of their thought. There is a progress to be achieved. Man lives in a world where his ego asserts itself, and in contrast to this there is a life of a now future world, " where what is peculiar to God will prevail in everything, and above all again in man—in which, if one might put it so, what is peculiar to God takes the place of what is peculiar to the ego, since the meaning of creation was and is that the world should again be His world."

The Rev. Charles H. H. Wright, D.D., was known to a former generation of Churchmen as one of the great scholars of his time. His immense learning was devoted to the service of Protestantism and one of his best-known works was the Protestant Dictionary which he edited in conjunction with the Rev. Charles Neil. His scholarship was recognized in many seats of learning. In the University of Oxford he was Bampton Lecturer in the year 1878, and for a time he was Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint. In the University of Dublin he was Donnellan Lecturer in 1880–1. He was examiner in Hebrew in the Universities of London and Wales, and in the Victoria University. He produced many works which were standard authorities in their day. The Religious Tract Society has recently republished one of his small books, *The Service of the Mass in the Greek and Roman Churches.* It is specially useful at the present time in view of the approaches that are being made to the Orthodox Eastern Church to secure reunion. A full and minute account, with useful pictures to illustrate it, is given of the Mass in the Russian Church. A similar account is provided of the Mass in the Roman Church. The Canon of the Mass is then explained

and the development of the drama of the Mass is followed out. A comparison is made of the Order of the Mass in the two Churches, and finally, the doctrine of transubstantiation is dealt with in scholarly fashion from the authoritative documents of both Churches. His conclusion is that " the teaching of both the Roman and Greek Churches is to the same effect," although that of Rome is more subtly defined. The study of this useful book may be strongly recommended to those who are in uncertainty as to the existence of divergences between the teaching of our own Church and that of the Orthodox Eastern Church.

The Rev. Bernard C. Jackson, M.A., Diocesan Missioner of Exeter, and the Rev. S. C. Lowry, M.A., are the authors of the *Commentary on St. Matthew* in the Religious Tract Society's series of Devotional Commentaries. The volume has a special interest as it completes the series of commentaries on the New Testament which has been in course of production for the past twenty-six years. The value of the preceding volumes has been well attested by their wide circulation. They have stood out as pre-eminently useful for their special purpose. This last volume on St. Matthew will take its place with the others as a highly useful devotional handbook to the First Gospel. The authors have worked harmoniously : Mr. Jackson has contributed the notes on the first fourteen chapters, and has dealt with the main features succinctly and clearly. Mr. Lowry has in a similar way with illustrations drawn from many sources drawn out the messages in the portion from the fifteenth chapter onward.

The Rev. S. Nowell-Rostron, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Bayswater, is the writer of the *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians* in the same series which is issued under the General Editorship of the Rev. C. H. Irwin, D.D. Mr. Nowell-Rostron shows true insight into the mind of the great Apostle, and his special task in dealing with the special problems of the Corinthian Christians. From wide general reading Mr. Nowell-Rostron selects with great skill passages which illuminate many aspects of the Apostle's teaching. Many will be grateful to him for the help which they will gain from this careful study of these important portions of St. Paul's writing.

In spite of the fact that there is considerable criticism of the Revised Version at the present time, the Cambridge University Press have boldly issued a new and charming edition. It is comprised in six small volumes in a suitable case and is sold at 2*s*. each volume or 13*s*. for the set with the case. There are many students who will be glad to have this excellently printed and tastefully produced issue of the whole Version including the Apocrypha.

G. F. I.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF RELIGION. By W. Schmidt. Translated from the German by H. J. Rose, M.A. *Methuen & Co., Ltd.*, London. 15s. net.

The study of origins is a pursuit which attracts the student of science, but the study of the origins concerning man and all matters pertaining to him is a pursuit which naturally attracts the attention of all men. Whatever views a man may hold of Genesis and however firmly he may believe in the Biblical revelation, he is none the less attracted to the study of all that the world is learning of the past. As the spade of the archæologist is revealing to us the traces of civilization ten thousand years and more prior to the Christian era, or when anthropologists discover for us human remains possibly fifty thousand years or more old, we naturally speculate on the relation of suchlike facts to the revelation of God given to us in the Bible.

But the study touches us more pertinently when we investigate what the history of the human race has to tell us of the origin of religion. The last two or three generations have seen an increasing interest in the study of religious origins as the science of ethnology has gradually developed. For most readers, however, the study has had but a barren interest since the science has been so bound up with rigid evolutionary views. The presuppositions of the evolutionary view of the origin of religion have usually been tied down to the supposed axiom that the higher must always come later than the lower. The evolutionist could never see monotheism in the early history of religion, it must always come last and it must always be preceded by polytheism, which itself must be preceded by more elementary forms of belief. Thus Comte imagined that man worshipped all natural objects but without any thought of a spirit in them. This he considered was followed by the conception that natural objects had a spirit to be worshipped. From this came polytheism and then only at a later stage came monotheism. A similar theory with perhaps more elaboration was put forward by Lord Avebury, but the writer whose ideas dominated the scientific world a generation ago was Professor E. B. Tylor. The latter inferred that primitive people obtained an idea of the soul from sleep and death and from dreams and visions. This was supposedly followed by the belief that beasts and plants as well as man possessed soul as well as body. From thence came ancestor worship, and then polytheism, out of which eventually came monotheism.

A breach in this rigid evolutionary idea came when Andrew Lang enunciated the view that both higher as well as lower religious conceptions were to be found amongst primitive peoples, and the breach was widened when monotheistic ideas were found in Egypt,

Babylonia and other places. A further stage has now been reached by the publication of the important book now before us. Father Schmidt is a Professor and teacher in the University of Vienna and he has incorporated in this volume some of the work upon which he has been engaged for some years. He first of all gives in outline the methods and results of those who have been engaged in investigating the origin of religion. He brings together the main results of most of those who have attained eminence in the pursuit of the origin of civilization and of religion. For this alone the book is invaluable. The main importance, however, lies in the fact that Professor Schmidt runs counter to the still dominant evolutionary theories by asserting that belief in a Supreme Being is found wherever primitive peoples are discovered. So far from these primitive peoples being atheists or animists, they address the Supreme Being as Father, and they regard Him as Creator, Eternal, Omniscient and Omnipotent. So far from primitive people being totemistic in their ideas of God, they look upon Him not as the God of one tribe but of all men.

Professor Schmidt's work is thus revolutionary of the former evolutionary theories of the origin of religion, and it is important in that it is based not on *a priori* considerations but on the historical method and on revealed facts.

It is perhaps too early yet to dogmatize about some of his conclusions, but his work shows at all events that a belief in a "Supreme Being is to be found among all the peoples of the primitive culture, not indeed everywhere in the same form or the same vigour, but still everywhere prominent enough to make his dominant position indubitable" (p. 257). Such a statement is epoch-making and should commend Professor Schmidt's book to the attention of every serious student of religious origins.

A STUDY OF CONVERSION. By the Rev. L. Wyatt Lang, M.A., Vicar of S. Mark's, Plumstead Common. London: *Geo. Allen and Unwin, Ltd., Museum Street.* 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

In these pages Mr. Lang describes the course of spiritual development in man and the part played therein by the process of religious conversion. In his thoughtful and suggestive introduction he gives some account of the best-known works on the subject, and he has gathered into these pages many new facts and new viewpoints which will well repay their study. In his Foreword, Dr. William Brown (Wilde Reader in Oxford University) speaks of Mr. Lang's illuminating treatise as "an important contribution to the study of the development of Christian personality." There is a considerable quantity of biographical matter of which Mr. Lang makes effective use. Here will be found some account of the conversions of men and women of past ages as well as those who have been gathered in through the activities of Evangelists of more recent times. Here will be found, for example, the conversions of David Brainerd, John Bunyan, Josephine Butler, Andrew Carnegie, Dr. Talmage,

Richard Weaver and many others. Then every Christian minister will be interested in the accounts of conversions by Moody and Sankey, Torrey and Alexander, the Welsh Revivalists and the preaching of John Wesley and in the experience called by Mr. Lang Conversion-crisis and Conversion-decision. It seems strange to find no mention of the Aitkens—father and son, or of Father Benson or George Body—all of whom exercised a considerable influence in the Anglican Church. Nor is any reference made to the movement that came to be known as the Irish Revival in which Denham Smith, the Earl of Cavan and others played a conspicuous part which led to the conversion of some notable laymen. No study of Conversion can be complete without an account of their work and its fruits as well as its methods.

S. R. C.

THE REALITY OF GOD AND RELIGION AND AGNOSTICISM. BEING THE LITERARY REMAINS OF BARON FRIEDRICH VON HÜGEL. Edited by Edmund G. Gardner. *J. M. Dent & Sons.* 15*s.* net.

Baron von Hügel occupied a unique position in the religious world during his lifetime. Although he was a strict member of the Roman Church he had many intimate friends not only in other Communions but in the ranks of the agnostics with whom he engaged in frequent interchange of religious views. He was chosen by the Senate of the University of Edinburgh to fill the Gifford Lectureship for two sessions, 1924–5 and 1925–6, but a breakdown in health prevented him from delivering the lectures. His subject was to have been "The Reality of God," and he had made extensive preparations in collecting material. He continued this work but died before completing it. He was also engaged for some years in compiling material for a study of Sir Alfred Comyn Lyall, the writer on Asiatic religions. This book was also left incomplete, and the two have now been issued by Mr. Edmund G. Gardner, F.B.A., the Baron's Literary Executor. Although the material was left in a formless and tentative condition, it has been arranged as far as possible by the Editor, and it provides an excellent example of the Baron's method of work, and of his outlook upon religion, and shows the bearing of modern scientific and philosophical thought upon the basis of religion.

The scope of the first work is shown in its full title :—"Concerning the Reality of Finites and the Reality of God : a Study of their Interrelations and their Effects and Requirements within the Human Mind." His position may be described as Critical Realism. His theory of knowledge leads him away from any mere subjectivity, and he finds in nature and life an objectivity which he regards as an essential element of human thought. He follows out the development from earliest childhood of man's contact with nature and finds a real knowledge of real existence distinct from the human mind itself. This leads on to "the presence within our lives, as in the

great world of realities around us, of God, a Reality, *the* Reality, never exhaustible, never scientifically definable by us, yet a Reality the non-recognition of which leaves our best experiences unutilized, unexplained even to the degree in which they are most genuinely explicable." He deals indulgently with mysticism, and naturally as a member of the Roman Church finds that the " historical and institutional forms of religions, or rather the historical and institutional element which always appears promptly in religion, must be a most important constituent part of the whole." The book, he says, is not intended to be a demonstration of God. " It is simply intended to show to those who believe in Him, or who long to do so, how striking is the affinity between the habits of mind which man in the long run is always obliged to cultivate, and our belief in God." It is impossible to follow out the wide range of interesting thought which is followed, and the incidental criticism of Kant, Hegel and other philosophical teachers, the exposure of the limitations of materialism and Pantheism, " the Arch Enemy of religion." The biographical touches give vividness and force to the presentation of his case.

In the second part, " Religion and Agnosticism," he gives a study of Sir A. C. Lyall's attitude towards religion, and " recollections and reflections concerning the last twelve years of Lyall's life," during which period they had frequent discussion on matters of religious interest. Lyall came early in life under the influence of Hume's scepticism and never completely escaped from the turn which was thus given to all his thought. This provides Baron von Hügel with an opportunity of examining the limitations of Hume's philosophy, and the development of it in his successors. Thinkers from Descartes down to Huxley and Herbert Spencer are subjected to critical examination and the failure of their religious theories is laid bare. Lyall showed " persistent gratitude and docility towards Herbert Spencer." The Baron's comment is : " Yet Spencer was, for some quarter of a century, the international high priest of an Agnosticism, drearily monotonous and sterilizing in its content and effect and, for the most part, shoddy and unhumorous in form. But I never found this *bourgeois* mind to repel, and not, somehow, even to attract, the dainty stylist and aristocratic critic so unmistakably presented by Lyall himself." Spencer's influence was reflected in Lyall's theories as to the origin and development of the religions of the East, and here again Baron von Hügel points out the sources of error.

This is a book to which students will return again and again. Its treatment of some of the fundamental facts of experience in their bearing on religion and the conception of God will repay frequent study. Constant help will be found in it in dealing with many of the problems which have been raised in modern times by Psychology and Science.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

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

National Church Almanack.—The Almanack for 1932 is now ready, price 2*d.* (Postage 1*d.*) It contains the full Tables of Lessons according to the Lectionary of 1871, and also according to the alternative Revised Lectionary of 1922. The introductory matter contains notes on the Constitution of the Church, Synods, the Church Assembly, Parochial Church Councils, etc. The frontispiece is an excellent photograph of Durham Cathedral.

Confirmation.—The Book Room has just published a little book consisting of twelve talks in preparation for Confirmation entitled *The Christian Fellowship*, by the Rev. C. H. E. Freeman, M.A., Vicar of St. Silas, Blackburn. The Bishop of Worcester has contributed a foreword in which he says that 'To add another to the many booklets dealing with the preparation of Confirmation candidates requires real justification, but a perusal of Mr. Freeman's book will at once convince the reader that he has produced an unusually valuable set of talks which will enable not only inexperienced clergy, but those of some standing in the ministry, to give solid and well-illustrated teaching to their candidates.' The Bishop goes on to say that the book is none the worse for being quite frankly written from the point of view of a loyal Evangelical Churchman, and that he has no hesitation in commending it heartily as a most helpful little book. The book has been issued at 1*s.* in paper covers, and 1*s.* 6*d.* in cloth. (Postage 2*d.*)

In connection with this book a series of twelve Class Notes has also been prepared by Mr. Freeman, which can be obtained at 2*d.* or 14*s.* per 100. The Notes are perforated, and can be distributed to the candidates after each lecture.

The Book Room has acquired the remainder of the English edition of Canon Dyson Hague's valuable little book on Confirmation. It came to us with the high commendation of two Canadian Archbishops, and Bishop Moule introduced it to English readers with cordial words of appreciation. Having read its pages packed with argument and earnest exhortations we fully endorse all that has been said by its eminent sponsors. In terse pointed sentences it sets forth the reasons and meaning of Confirmation and what is required by those who are to be confirmed. Senior candidates will find the book most helpful and stimulating. A sample copy will be sent on receipt of a Postal Order for 6*d.*

Translations.—We are glad to be able to announce that the C.M.S. Committee in Kenya have translated one of our Confirmation Class Notes entitled *A Soldier in Christ's Army*, by Canon Price Devereux, into standardized Kiswahili. We are very glad our publications can be used in this way. *English Church Teaching*, by Canon Girlestone, Bishop Moule and Bishop Drury, has been translated into Japanese and several of our other books and pamphlets have also been translated into dialects in various parts of the world.

The XXXIX Articles.—We announced last quarter the issue of the first of the series of pamphlets on the XXXIX Articles by Dr. Harold Smith. The following have now been issued: *Authority and Character*, by the Rev.

C. Sydney Carter; *The Appeal to Scripture*, by the Ven. Archdeacon Thorpe; and *The Importance of Assent*, by the Rev. W. Dodgson Sykes. The pamphlets are published at 2*d.* each, or 14*s.* per 100 for distribution.

Baptism.—In response to suggestions from customers, we have published a letter to parents on the anniversary of their child's baptism, which we hope will supply a need. The letter has been compiled by the Rev. Ll. E. L. Roberts, and is published at 3*s.* per 100. A sample copy will gladly be sent on application. We may also mention that a similar letter is also published by us in connection with Confirmation anniversaries.

Beliefs of To-day.—Last quarter we mentioned some books under this heading. A new book has been published by the Rev. T. Wilkinson Riddle entitled *Christian Science in the Light of Holy Scripture*, price 2*s.* 6*d.* (postage 4*d.*), which we can recommend. The author has very carefully studied Mrs. Eddy's famous textbook *Science and Health* and numerous other volumes and periodicals dealing with the subject from the Christian Science standpoint, and gives a very radical criticism of Mrs. Eddy's philosophy and theology.

The Mass.—We are very glad to be able to report the reissue of Dr. C. H. H. Wright's valuable work, *The Service of the Mass in the Greek and Roman Churches* (2*s.*, post 3*d.*). The object of the author is to give a brief account of the Ritual of the Mass in both the Greek and Roman Churches so as to render that Ritual intelligible to the ordinary reader. He also seeks to give a truthful account of the doctrine underlying these Rituals. The second part of the work is controversial, and the author states that "those who uphold the doctrine of 'the real objective presence' in the Eucharistic elements will not, of course, be satisfied with the statements made in that portion of the book. On the other hand, those who realise how mischievous is the perversion of the words of Scripture in the forms of sacramental sacerdotalism will consider that portion of the treatise to be of still greater importance than the earlier chapters."

Second-hand Books.—Among the valuable books which have been added to our second-hand shelves: Walsh, *Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, 2*s.* 6*d.*; Fawkes, *Genius of the English Church*, 1*s.*; Hughes-Games, *Evening Communion*, 1*s.* 6*d.*; Orr, *Problem of the Old Testament*, 4*s.* 6*d.*; Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 1*s.*; Merrin, *Pressing Problems*, 1*s.*; Rider, *Priesthood of the Laity*, 1*s.*; Wilson, *Episcopacy and Unity*, 1*s.* 3*d.*; Trench, *Notes on the Parables*, 1*s.* 6*d.*; Cardwell, *Two Liturgies of Edward VI Compared*, 3*s.* 6*d.*; Meyrick, *Sunday Observance*, 1*s.*; Denney, *II Corinthians*, 2*s.*; Drury, *Confession and Absolution*, 5*s.*; Robinson Lees, *Life of Christ* 6*s.*; Dimock, *Doctrine concerning the Eucharistic Presence*, 2*s.* 6*d.*; Protheroe *Psalms in Human Life*, 1*s.* 6*d.*

We have also just received a copy of Bishop J. C. Ryle's *Expository Thoughts on St. Luke* containing an autograph letter from him to Dr. Spurgeon, who also has added his autograph (2 vols., 7*s.* 6*d.*).

An Appreciation.—We constantly receive a number of appreciative letters in regard to THE CHURCHMAN, and recently we have had a letter from one of the dignitaries of the Church in Canada in which he says: "It is the most valued Quarterly which I read, and I should be sorry to miss a single copy."