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

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

The Churchman Advertiser.

APRIL, 1932.

CONTENTS.

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1932.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Protestantism.

PROTESTANTISM was the subject considered at the Islington Clerical Conference in January. The papers read have been issued in book form and present a statement of the fundamental features of Protestantism which Evangelical churchpeople will find useful. It has become the fashion under the influence of the biassed misrepresentation of those who wrongly assume for themselves the title of "Catholic" to decry Protestantism as negative and colourless. The Islington Conference papers show that on the contrary Protestantism is the only really progressive form of Christianity. It presents a great vision of the future of the Christian Faith in its power to win the world. But this can only be achieved when the trammels of ecclesiastical institutionalism foreign to the whole spirit of Christ are rejected. The "Catholic" conception of Christianity leads to narrowness and exclusiveness. It creates unnecessary divisions among Christian people. It sets up unlawful terms of communion, and tends to produce a deadening formalism. Protestants must rise to the height of the vision which is presented to them by the ideals of Christian teaching contained in Protestantism when rightly understood and seen in its true light as the proper interpretation of the New Testament.

The Thirty-Nine Articles.

Canon Brooke Gwynne, in his interesting article on "The Mentality of Newman" in the present number of THE CHURCHMAN, refers to the treatment of the Thirty-Nine Articles in Tract Ninety. Since that time the Articles have been the subject of attack from many quarters. New life has been given to the attack by recent statements to the effect that they are one of the chief causes of the hesitancy on the part of numbers of University men to enter the ministry of the Church. But this is just as stoutly denied as it is affirmed. Another ground of attack upon the Articles is the outcome of the negotiations for intercommunion with the Orthodox Eastern Church. The Easterns object to some of the statements in the Articles, and they are practically told to pay little attention to them, as the Articles are not taken seriously by Churchmen.

They merely represent a sixteenth-century phase of religious thought, and will soon be completely ignored. In any case they are told that they are to be interpreted by the Book of Common Prayer. Whatever differences there may be in sixteenth-century phraseology from that of our own day, the Articles are still the recognized standard of doctrine in our Church, and represent in the main our Church of England position to-day as clearly as ever.

Relations with the Orthodox Eastern Church.

The Report of the Joint Doctrinal Commission on points of agreement and difference between the Anglican and the Eastern Orthodox Churches does not alter the situation and cannot help forward intercommunion. The Orthodox representatives laid down as firmly as ever that there can be no intercommunion until there is complete agreement in doctrine. The Metropolitan of Thyateira laid it down that "Sacramental Communion will follow as the last step of the process when complete dogmatic agreement has been established and unity has taken place." As there are grave divergences of doctrine between our Communion and theirs, there can be little hope of intercommunion as long as the Orthodox Church maintains the necessity of holding tradition as of equal authority with Holy Scripture, and teaches that there are seven Sacraments necessary to the spiritual life of the Christian and consequently to his salvation. There are other points of doctrine and practice indicating a wide divergence in spirit which it is impossible to regard as mere matters of detail unaffecting the general position. Evangelical churchpeople have already expressed their views on the demands of the Eastern Church.

Relations with Old Catholics and Nonconformists.

At the sessions of Convocation held in February, intercommunion with the Old Catholics was accepted under certain conditions. The chief of these is that "intercommunion does not require from either Communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian Faith." This is quite a different matter from the relationship with the Eastern Orthodox Church, but it raises the question of our relationship with the Non-Episcopal Churches. When this subject came up, it was relegated to a Committee for further consideration, and the representatives of the Free Churches are naturally indignant. They hold that there is no ground for different treatment to be meted out to them, and point out quite clearly that they have not come as suppliants to be admitted to Communion with us. The difficulty arises from the conception of the ministry which the Anglo-Catholics are seeking to fasten upon our Church, although it is not found in any of our formularies.

THE MENTALITY OF J. H. NEWMAN.

By the Rev. Canon C. Brooke Gwynne, M.A.

WHAT was Newman's mentality? What took Newman to Rome?

No mind in recent years has perplexed Englishmen more than the mind of Newman. In the last century he was both loved and hated. He attracted hundreds, if not thousands, to himself: he repelled many thousands more. He perplexed and infuriated the Oxford of his day, and he perplexed also the authorities of the Papal Church to which he went as a convert. At the time of his secession to Rome men thought that a deadly blow had been given to the English Church, and the Papists thought they had received into their fold a champion who would be to them a tower of strength. But the Church of England has not succumbed. Rome has been disappointed. It is clear that, if English Churchmen were puzzled by the subtlety of Newman's arguments and bewildered by his tortuous actions, the Romans were not less puzzled and bewildered when they got him. It would not be untrue to say that they never knew quite what to do with him; and, if the Oxford dons of his day treated him harshly and unwisely, his new friends were certainly not more kind or more wise. He was suspected there as he was here. He was thwarted in scheme after scheme by his new friends; and, although, to the world, he bore a brave exterior, his writings reveal his keen disappointment at his treatment. It was only when his relentless enemy, Manning, had lost his power at Rome, and not till then, that the Papal Court gave the broken and weary old man any adequate recognition.

Many who have only a casual acquaintance with Newman's career will speak of him as a subtle and deliberately dishonest worker for Rome; others will think of him as a man of brilliant talents for whom the English Church could find no niche. Neither conception would seem to be the true one. His *Apologia*—and it is only fair to hear what a man has himself to say in defence of his writings and actions, before judging him—is perhaps the best guide we have to his mentality, and a study of the *Apologia* will, we believe, convince a careful reader that, if Newman's brilliant talents did tend towards deception, he deceived himself as much as, if not more than, he deceived others.

It may help us to form some idea why Newman appeared to so many men of his day as un-English in his mentality if we remember that he was English only from the fact of his being born in England. His paternal ancestors were Dutch and Hebrew, and his mother was French.[1] The charge of dishonesty, which again and again has been made against Newman, becomes more intelligible if we remember

[1] *Modern Rome in Modern England*, p. 41, note 1. Professor N. G. D. White, *John Henry Newman*, p. 19.

his ancestry. The purely English method is blunt and direct, avoiding all subtlety. Englishmen become at once suspicious at any sign of subtlety. That Newman had a most peculiar method of logic any unprejudiced reader of the *Apologia* will probably frankly acknowledge; that his arguments are subtle almost to the point of disingenuousness must strike any reader. And yet, somehow, one cannot but believe that he really did not mean to deceive. He seemed to have the capacity, which many other distinguished men have possessed, of deceiving himself, and by subtle and sometimes puerile arguments convincing himself that he was right, even though he had, at different periods, taken diametrically opposing views on the same subject. With all the suavity of his phraseology and the easy charm of his writing, Newman was not a level-headed man. We all have a right to change our point of view. Most of us change by way of development, by the modifying of our youthful opinions through more knowledge, and the experience of life. Most men move forward slowly, changing direction only slightly, almost imperceptibly. But Newman proceeds by mental gymnastics. You find him returning by the same way he came, serenely confident that he was as right when he was going north, as when he was going south. He convinces himself that Rome is anti-Christ, and in ten years goes back upon every word and seeks his salvation in Rome—a complete and rapid change in direction, surely! He who at one time was the champion of the Anglican Church, in ten years turns round and, however sweet his words, scoffs at her, smites her hip and thigh. It is the custom of to-day to condemn the Oxford authorities for their manner of dealing with Newman, but, looking back, we can at least understand the confusion and bewilderment caused by his policy and writings. Newman complained of Manning: "I hardly know whether I stand on my head or my heels when I have active relations with you." The Oxford dons might justly have said the same thing of Newman. After he seceded from the Church of England his new friends were puzzled and afraid of him. The Papal Court thought him dangerous, and Father Perronne declared that "Newman confuses everything." If would be equally true to say of Newman that he confused himself. If Gladstone was "inebriated by the exuberance of his own verbosity," Newman was bewildered and bewildering by the subtlety of his own feelings, which he too often mistook for logic. He had the mentality of a clever woman, who is unable to free herself from her emotions when she should be using her reason. Perhaps the English Church has, on the whole, benefited by his secession. He certainly was dangerous to us and, according to Roman authorities, he proved dangerous to them. This man who *denied* the right of the *individual* to *reason concerning the faith* has, in the opinion of Dean Inge, proved himself the father of French and Anglican modernism, which is, in its extreme form, a strong rationalistic movement. Surely Newman could never have meant to originate such a movement—yet, there it is!

It is fashionable nowadays to condemn Kingsley for his blunt and (in the particular instance) his inaccurate attack upon Newman.

Although Kingsley was wrong in the particulars of the charge he brought, his English instincts were right.[1] Nothing that Kingsley said about Newman was one half so harsh as what his Roman brother, Lord Acton, said of him. "Newman," said Lord Acton, "is a sophist, a *manipulator* of, *not* a seeker after, truth." Carlyle impatiently, but inaccurately, declared that Newman had "no more intellect than a rabbit." Canon Meyrick seems nearer the truth when he says that "Newman was never guided by his reason, but always by his emotions." Archbishop Tait, who was in the middle of the Oxford Movement and could speak from personal experience, declared that Newman made up his mind first and then used his subtle intellect to prove that he was right. We may admire Newman's unworldliness, we may sympathise with the pathetic figure he becomes in the Papal Church, with all his grievous disappointments and persecution; but, after a fresh perusal of his *Apologia*, one feels that, as a guide in the sphere of history or theology, he is both unreliable and dangerous. His mind was as unbalanced as it was subtle. He was at his best as a preacher and, had he been content to place before his hearers the great ideals of the Christian faith, he would probably have been the greatest preacher of his generation. Here his emotion and eloquence would have had full scope.

It is impossible in a short paper to do more than recall briefly some of the questions that Newman mentions as influencing him in the direction of Rome. After his earlier outbursts against Rome, he seems to have felt the need for some sound historic and doctrinal basis for the claims of the Church of England. He sees it in the "Via media" principle, but Newman's idea of the "Via media" principle does not appear to be the same as that of the great English divines. He seems to confuse it with compromise and opportunism. No wonder then that, with his changing feelings towards Rome, such a principle failed him. But is the "Via media" a principle either of compromise or opportunism? Any student of the early period of the Reformation must see that the sudden break—not with the Catholic Church, but with the Papacy—wrought an enormous change. Men had to take stock of the new position. They had, to a large extent, to reconstruct their theology. It would be a revelation to many if they would read Pollard's book on Cranmer. Those who have always belittled the English Church have made much ado over what they call Cranmer's inconsistency or opportunism. The fact is that the whole task of reconstruction was practically in the hands of one man, and that man was Cranmer. Henry was in doctrine, to all intents and purposes, still a Roman. Cranmer was surrounded on the one hand by men who clung to the Pope, and on the other by men who hated the Pope—by men who wished to retain distinctive Roman doctrines, and by men who would have thrown over every link with the past except the Bible. Cranmer was only a man. He

[1] See Dean Stanley's remarks on the Controversy, Kingsley's *Life*, p. 228, Edition 1885; also on p. 229: "Last but not least a pamphlet was published by the Revd. Frederick Meyrick entitled 'But is not Mr. Kingsley right after all?' This pamphlet was never answered."

must have found it difficult, almost to impossibility, to place himself in the position of one who must be free from all prejudice, and strong and steadfast in his pursuit after truth. He was compassed by people who not only had been nurtured under the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but under all the vital consequences of that doctrine as well. You cannot shake these things off in a day. Cranmer's inconsistencies and hesitations are not surprising. They are just what anyone with an unprejudiced mind and knowledge of the facts would expect. Follow the changes in Edward's reign. Imagine the position of Elizabeth, isolated from Europe and yet unprepared for war, with a population seething with religious controversy. On top of that the Papal Bull was issued, which relieved Elizabeth's Papal subjects of loyalty, encouraged them to assassinate her and, further, invited Philip of Spain to attack England with a powerful force. Politics and religion were hopelessly intermingled, and the Pope was the main cause. Have we no sympathy then with Reformers struggling to do their work honestly under such hard conditions? And let us not forget that the Reformation was not settled for us until 1662, and that, during the period covered by the Reformation, we had produced liturgists, historians, and theologians, who have not been surpassed in any period of the Church's history.[1] That there were Papists and Protestants acting and reacting on each other all through this period we freely admit, but at the same time it must be borne in mind that the leaders of the Reformation in England never ceased to keep before them the principles upon which they worked—the Bible, the Primitive Church, and the Four Great Councils. The Prayer Book never once mentions the word "Protestant." While the compilers of the Prayer Book protest against the errors of Rome, they never lost sight of the true ideals of the Catholic Faith. To say that the Reformers were merely engaged on the work of "accommodating," at one time to the Protestant and at another to the Roman party, would not only be not true, but in direct contradiction to what the Reformers themselves said was their aim and object. This Newman entirely misunderstands or misrepresents. He makes great play with the phrase "Via media." If his subtle and refined satire had been supported by the facts of history, he would have dealt a deadly blow to the English Church; but, with all his brilliant genius, he was lacking in the most essential faculty of a really great man, lacking in that spirit which first makes sure of the facts and then exercises cool and impartial judgment upon them. Newman's charge against the Church of England is both untrue and unfair. Of all the nations concerned in the Reformation, England alone took a thoroughly courageous and independent line. She refused to recognise any longer the usurpations of the Bishop of Rome; she rejected Rome's novelties of doctrine and her gross superstitions; but she did not commit any breach of Catholic principle. When she had turned from the work of sweeping out the unwholesome and uncatholic accretions of medievalism, she set herself about to organise her new position, to

[1] See Lecky's *Map of Life*, 1913 Edition, pp. 209–14, 215.

set her house in order. In seeking the truth she was willing to learn from both sides—from the Continental Protestants on the one hand, and from those who were Papists on the other. Dr. Collins, who followed Bishop Creighton as Chairman of the Church Historical Association, puts the question of the "Via media" very well. Speaking of the early results of the Reformation, he says:

"In the South, the bonds (that is, the bonds of Papal tyranny) were knit yet closer, in the North, schism was the result; while England strove at least to realise that true 'Via media,' which is not so much an intermediate between two extremes as the larger truth which includes all that is true in both." [1]

The English Church and nation broke the bonds of Papal tyranny without making any attempt or having any wish to withdraw from the communion of the Catholic Church. At the same time they purposed to restore to the laity their proper place and prerogatives in the Christian society, without in any way impugning the apostolic doctrine or the rightful position of the Christian ministry.

We next come to Newman's changing attitude towards Rome. It reminds one of a certain novel, in which the heroine of the story meets a man whom she at first cordially dislikes. His company is distasteful to her, but he presses his suit. Her dislike increases. Then he keeps away from her. She misses him. She welcomes his return and, although she still thinks she dislikes him, his powerful personality wins her against her reason. All through the *Apologia* there runs this strain of femininity. Newman thinks he hates Rome; he piles up arguments, one on the top of the other, against Rome; and yet all the time he is yearning for Rome. He does not like Rome, but he wants Rome. His emotions are dominating his reason. He only wants a little more to be said against his old love and he will go over to the new. He has not long to wait. Cardinal Wiseman writes an article in the *Dublin Review* on the Monophysite heresy. Without entering too much into detail, we may point out the salient facts of the controversy. In the middle of the fifth century the Eastern Church was full of metaphysical speculations, and this particular controversy largely centred round the Nestorian heresy, the point of which was that Christ was filled with divinity in the same manner as the prophets of old, only to a greater degree. Here came in the danger of the heresy of two Persons in Christ. The controversy raged and was carried on in anything but a Christian spirit. Eutyches denied that our Lord had two Natures after His Incarnation. He was condemned and excommunicated by Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople. Leo of Rome asked for a General Council over which he wished to preside. His presidency was rejected but he wrote a letter in which he controverted the doctrine that Christ had but one Nature. His statement that Christ had two Natures in one Person was, after disgraceful scenes, accepted by the Council. Here, said Newman in effect, you find the Bishop of Rome in the right: therefore Rome is *always* in the right!

This is one of the occasions when we are absolutely bewildered by Newman's mentality. No student of history would deny that,

[1] *The English Reformation and its Consequences*, C.H.S., p. 12.

although intellect was at this period more generally on the side of the Easterns, the Bishops of Rome possessed a kind of common sense that was an enormous help to the Church at large; but Newman seemed to be utterly oblivious of the Rome of later ages. As Dean Church has said, Newman thought that the Rome of the Middle Ages and of modern times was the Rome of the fifth century. It is almost impossible to believe that he could have been influenced by such an argument. His *Apologia* itself supplies the reason. He wanted to go to his new love, and here was an excuse to move a step nearer.

We now come to "Tract 90," which caused an unprecedented commotion in the Church of England. We need only, here, indicate the principles which underlie this Tract. Newman's point was that the Thirty-Nine Articles referred only to the errors of Rome before the Council of Trent; that they could be interpreted in a Catholic manner (or what he considered to be a "Catholic manner"); and that they in no way conflicted with Catholic Tradition (or what he considered "Catholic Tradition"). He then set himself to prove exactly the opposite to what the Articles were written to declare! The Articles were written by men who claimed that they were out to maintain the Catholic faith as set forth by the Scriptures, the great Creeds, and the Primitive Church. That was their sole object. Their purpose was to cleanse the Church from the errors of Medievalism, and also from the wild errors of the Continental reformers. But at this period Newman's idea of Catholicism was more than tinged with Rome's colour. He had *his* view of Catholicism, and the Church of England had *her* view. Unfortunately they did not agree.

For an English Churchman, the definition of Catholicism is settled once and for all time. It is to be found in the doctrines of the Book of Common Prayer. The objective of the Prayer Book is clearly stated in the Preface: it is to remove accretions which did not belong to the Catholic faith and to restore its primitive teaching. We must never forget that the Reformation in England was no sudden, isolated, or hasty settlement. It took one hundred and twenty years to effect it and in that period, as Lecky says, the Church of England had theologians and scholars unsurpassed in the history of Christendom. If she discarded some things which some men still think it would have been wise to retain, we must remember that these discarded doctrines had brought in their train many and grave abuses—doctrines which, were they to be restored, would be as likely to be abused to-day as they were in the Medieval Church. It would be difficult to deny that, wherever Newman's reason might be leading him, his sentiments were decidedly Romeward. The extraordinary argument that, *because* a Roman Bishop's suggestion, based on the Nicene Creed, was accepted at Chalcedon, *therefore* Rome must always be right—that extraordinary argument seems to have given Newman a fresh impetus towards Rome. He acknowledges himself that his teaching is leading men to Rome. He says:

"I fear I must allow that, whether I will or no, I am disposing them (his hearers) towards Rome. First, because Rome is the only representative of the Primitive Church besides ourselves: in proportion then as they are loosened from the one, they will go to the other. Next, many doctrines which I have held have far greater, or their only scope, in the Roman system."

Then follows a sentence which shows how completely Newman was able to blind himself to historic facts when they were not to the credit of Rome. He says:

"And moreover, if, as is not unlikely, we have in process of time heretical Bishops or teachers, an evil which *ipso facto* infects the whole community to which they belong, . . . strong temptation will be placed in the way of individuals already imbued with a tone of thought congenial to Rome to join her communion."

Here Newman seems quite oblivious of the fact that Bishops of Rome have themselves been heretics and inventors of dogmas quite unknown to the Primitive Church, of which he speaks so frequently. In one of his admirable historical essays, Bishop Browne, late Bishop of Bristol, imagines Augustine, the Missionary, coming to England to-day and finding himself, in doctrine, more Anglican than modern Roman Catholic.[1] Such a point of view of history seems never to have struck Newman. The dictum of St. Vincent of Lerins (fifth century): "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus," was accepted by the whole Church in theory for centuries. How could Newman accept that dictum and still believe that the Papal Church was more Catholic than the English Church? He speaks of modern Rome representing the Primitive Church—but he never proves it. The fact is that, with all her faults, the Church of England set out, as she has stated in her formularies, to reform herself on the pattern of the Primitive Church, and it is difficult to imagine any unprejudiced student of history denying the general success of her endeavours. While Newman spoke of the Primitive Church, what he really had in mind, and what he really loved, was the Medieval Church and its accompanying novelties. And so, when he sought to give his followers (whom he had brought to the very threshold of Rome) some fresh reason for remaining in the English Church, he set himself to prove that the Thirty-Nine Articles could be interpreted in a "Catholic sense." Quite so. That was exactly what the Reformers had in mind, but their idea of Catholicism differed from Newman's. To quote Newman's own words: "I have asserted a great principle—that the Articles are to be interpreted *not according to the meaning of the writers*, but (as far as the wording will allow) according to the sense of the Catholic Church."

Now, the meaning of the writers was, as we have shown, to clear away abuses and accretions and to restore the Primitive faith. We have then this extraordinary proposition—we must interpret the Articles to mean what they were not intended to mean! The Church of England thought that she had built up a breakwater against error. Newman, with the imagination of a poet, the

[1] *The St. Augustine Commemoration*, Ch.Hist.S. Tract xxix.

simplicity of a child, and the subtle logic of the Jesuit, declares that the Church has not built up a breakwater. Nothing of the kind. She has opened a door! The Heads of Colleges at Oxford were startled and shocked, and well they might have been. They characterised his interpretation as "evasive." Newman says to a friend that this term did not hurt him; but, surely, most honest men would have been hurt. One of his intimate friends, W. G. Ward, gave the whole case away, however, by declaring that Newman had interpreted the Articles in a "non-natural" sense, and that he (Ward) approved of this method.

We all know the effect of the famous "Tract 90." Oxford Heads were furious, and their hasty action has been condemned. It has been said that, if Newman had been given twelve hours' respite, he might have so modified or so defended his views as to prevent the storm bursting; but Newman's mind was Romeward. Rome was pulling at his heart, and it only wanted some further excuse for him to make the plunge. This excuse came by the ill-starred policy of placing an Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem to look after the interests, not only of Anglicans, but Lutherans as well.[1] The scheme was inaugurated by the then King of Prussia, but unfortunately our two Archbishops consented without first consulting the Church. Here again Newman cannot swallow that gnat, though he eagerly gulps down the camel. He overlooked a much graver breach of Catholic principle, and that a fundamental principle, in the invasion of dioceses of the English Church by the Italian Mission. From this time onwards Newman's mind was so antagonistic to the Church of England, and so drawn to the Church of Rome, that the fatal step of secession could no longer be prevented. After his departure in 1845 all force and vigour seem to have left him. He says himself that his best work was done in the English Church, and later on he says that he longed for the praise of his old friends. The story of his return to Littlemore, told by Strachey in his sketch of Manning in *Eminent Victorians*, is, if true, profoundly touching. Think what one may of the tergiversations of Newman's mind, we cannot withhold our pity from him. It has been said that Rome can always find a nook for the outstanding man. They were not very successful with Savonarola, nor with Luther; nor did they fare much better with Newman. He passed from the English atmosphere to the Italian, and found himself in a maze of intrigue and persecution. We are told that we only know a small part of what he suffered. Purcell's book on Manning was very roughly handled by the censor before it saw light, but we are permitted to see enough to be sorry, very sorry for Newman. His belated honour, at the age of seventy-four, gave him great consolation, but his powers to use it were passed.

To sum up. No one will doubt the religious character of Newman. His Evangelical training gave him a spiritual outlook which he retained to the end. He undoubtedly possessed an extraordinarily magnetic personality. He was utterly unworldly and

[1] Though it had its "warm apologists such as Mr. F. Maurice and Dr. Hook."—Dean Church, *The Oxford Movement*, p. 317, Edition 1892.

without one sordid ambition. He was, notwithstanding distrust and hesitancy, a brave man. Under his meekness there lay the heart of the fighter. Mixed with a certain sweetness of disposition there was also a certain refined cruelty. He has in his suave and charming manner said the most biting things against the Church of his birth. As we have already noticed, his ancestry may account for what we cannot better describe than as a rather " un-English " character. He was passionately fond of music and, as far as we know, had no recreations other than his violin. His mentality has perplexed friends and foes alike. We have already spoken of his topsy-turvy view of Church history, but what perplexes most of all is his capacity for what we have called " mental gymnastics." He starts by declaring that the Papacy is Babylon of the Apocalypse ; in due course he knocks at the gates of Rome and thankfully enters in. In his misconceived principle of the " Via media " he thinks he finds a rock of defence against Rome ; later he explodes it himself. He affirms that an appeal to the Primitive Church cannot avail the English Church, because the Monophysites appealed to the Primitive Church and Leo quashed the appeal. He ignores the fact that it was not the Bishop of Rome *per se*, but an Œcumenical Council, which rejected the heresy. But he says it was Rome ; therefore what Rome says to-day against England's appeal to the Primitive Church is final. Was ever there such reasoning from the mind of an educated man ?

Then, with almost humorous audacity, he solemnly declares that the Articles mean exactly the opposite of what they were meant to mean. He moreover asserts that they were written *before* the Council of Trent, and therefore could not have condemned the dogmas promulgated at that Council. The assertion is not true. It is not borne out by *facts*. The Canons of the Council of Trent were confirmed by Pope Pius IV in 1564, whereas the Thirty-Nine Articles were finally revised and passed by Convocation in 1571. These dates, therefore, conclusively prove that the Church of England has deliberately set her imprimatur upon the Articles on at least two separate occasions subsequent to the promulgation of the Tridentine dogmas.

And then, because he thought the Church of England permitted a political bargain to be made over her head in the case of the Jerusalem Bishopric, she had committed an unpardonable sin ! Newman forgot that the whole history of the Papacy, down to and as late as the reign of the Emperor Napoleon even, is mixed up with political bargainings, some of them of a not very reputable nature.

In 1841 he tells us :

" I could not go to Rome while she suffered honours to be paid to the Blessed Virgin and Saints which I thought *in my conscience* to be incompatible with the Supreme Incommunicable Glory of the One Infinite and Eternal."

Four years afterwards, without apparently a twinge of conscience, he accepts the whole thing—and his beloved St. Philip de Neri ; and, moreover, he, as a member of the Roman Church, was committed to the blasphemous exaggerations of the *Glories of Mary*, written by that famous canonised doctor, St. Alphonso Liguori. Some sort

of disease seemed to have attacked his mind in later years. For example, after leaving Naples he visited Loretto and inspected the House of the Holy Family which, as is known to the faithful, was transported thither in three hops from Palestine.

"I went to Loretto," he tells us, "with a simple faith, believing what I still more believed when I saw it. I have no doubt now. If you ask me why I believe it, it is because *everyone* believes it at Rome; cautious as they are and sceptical about some things. I have no antecedent difficulty in this matter."

What can one think of a man of his standing making a statement such as that? If that is "simple faith," what then is superstition? He seems to have surrendered his reasoning powers to Rome, without reserve. Speaking of the Anglican Succession, he says:

"As to its possession of an episcopal succession from the time of the Apostles, well, it may have it and, if the Holy See ever so decide, I will believe it as being the decision of a higher judgment than my own; but, for myself, I must have St. Philip's gift, who saw the sacerdotal character on the forehead of a gaily attired youngster, before I can by my own wit acquiesce in it, for antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts."

With the interesting and instructive Life by W. G. Ward and the kindly yet critical essays by Dean Church, who to the end maintained his friendship with, and a great regard for, Newman, one would have thought that the world of to-day would have lost interest in Newman's career, but Dean Inge has written a brilliant Essay on Newman's curious attitude towards intellect as a factor in religion.[1] Lytton Strachey has also given us an interesting sketch of his life, and some intimate details of his early life have been given us in a book by Sidney on *Modern Rome in Modern England.* Recently the S.P.C.K. has published an able and sympathetic Life by Professor White, *John Henry Newman.* Why is it then that Newman, if he does not influence, still interests men? There were more learned men than he at the Oxford of his time; there have been more learned men in the Church of England since: such as Tait, Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort, or Temple, with Wilberforce, John Wordsworth, Stubbs, or Creighton. Why is it? It really seems to have been the charm of his writing, the tragedy of his life and, perhaps most of all, the mystery of his character. Men are apt to be drawn to anything in the nature of a mystery. He tells us that he did not sometimes understand himself and, if that be so, we can hardly be surprised if the rest of the world should be perplexed.

It is difficult to estimate Newman's influence on the English Church of the present day. The Tractarians undoubtedly awakened the Church to a sense of her corporate existence. They drew attention to the Catholic claims of the Book of Common Prayer and to the importance of the Sacraments. There has been a great improvement in the outward forms of worship. But do we not also see an awakening of what might be called "the Newman spirit"? For there does appear to be, nowadays, something of the same kind of logic and a like disposition to revive doctrines which have been

[1] *Outspoken Essays*, First Series.

rejected. It has been said that, had Newman lived to-day, he would not have gone to Rome. It may be so; because the very doctrines for which he contended—doctrines which it would be difficult, if not impossible, to harmonise with the Book of Common Prayer and her Articles—are now being openly taught by certain extreme sections of the Church, whose position seems to be Romanism without the Pope. How long such people will be able to remain in that position it is difficult to say. How long the authorities of the Church will tolerate them may be a more pertinent question. But, on the face of it, it would appear probable that the revival of this "Newman spirit" must eventually lead to Rome.

If the Book of Common Prayer and her Articles represent the minds of the great Anglican divines, then the great Anglican divines differ very vitally from Newman in their conception of the Primitive Church and what the Primitive Church taught. Sooner or later the matter will have to be fought out. And it would be well for the clergy (and laity also) to enter once more upon the study of the Scriptures in relation to the Primitive Fathers, and upon a thorough re-study of the Reformation—say, from the reign of Henry VIII to the Restoration. It is a very serious question; and we owe it to our Church, to ourselves, and perhaps, with all his faults, we owe it to John Henry Newman too, not to rest satisfied till we have probed it to the very bottom. Only let us beware of putting our emotions before our intellects, or our theories before our facts, else each one of us may become what Lord Acton said Newman had become—"a sophist, a manipulator of, and not a seeker after, Truth."

THE BONDAGE OF THE WILL. By Martin Luther.

The Sovereign Grace Union has added to their publications Martin Luther's greatest work—his famous reply to Erasmus and published by the Union at 10*s.* 6*d.*, with the object of maintaining a testimony against Arminianism, Rationalism, Modernism, Sacerdotalism, and advocating Reformation principles. Cole's translation has been used, some use being made of Thomas Vaughan's translation. This is considered to be Luther's "masterpiece" and to be fitted to stand alongside such standard works as Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church, Archbishop Cranmer On the Lord's Supper* and other Protestant writings, and Mr. Atherton is to be congratulated on this readable English edition. Those who have never studied Calvinism as against Arminianism should get into touch with the S.G. Union through the Hon. Secretary,—Mr. Atherton. Here is a controversy that still lies behind our differences of opinion.

THE CONVERSION OF SIMON FISH.

By John Knipe.

1. THE CHRISTMAS GAME AT GRAY'S INN.

IN the reign of Henry VIII there was kept up merrily the pleasant and venerable Yule-tide custom of holding of Mumming Plays, Masks, and Lords of Misrule and the Election and Sermon of the Boy Bishop at Paul's. Some saucy mockery of the great was winked at in these privileged "Christmas Games." Now Christmas, 1526, saw the Great Cardinal's power waning over the King, and the Londoners, who hated his Eminence, were quick to perceive signs of coming fall, while the Thames Watermen, great gossipers all, had whispered how in the dog-days the Cardinal, taking his barge at the King's Bridge, Westminster, answered the Bishop with him who mopped his brow and complained of the heat—"Aye, my Lord. And had ye been so shrewdly chafed as I at the Council this morning ye might well feel hot!" All men knew that his Eminence glanced at the King himself in this saying, and other tales passed from lip to lip until certain daring spirits—young Law Students of Gray's Inn—resolved to take advantage of the Christmas Game for some subtle and witty attack upon Wolsey himself in a manner which he could not well resent openly for fear of public ridicule. The chief instigator in this bold business was one Simon Fish, a student in his Second Year, whose barbed wit and liveliness in his ready retorts had made him popular and feared, and already he excelled his seniors at the Inn. He was betrothed to a fair and well-dowered maid, Margery, daughter of a City wine merchant, and he looked to be married in perhaps four to five years as soon as he received his Call to the Bar. By his brilliant studies young Fish attracted the notice of the authorities of the Inn, especially of Master Edward Hall, a graduate of King's College, Cambridge, who was in the Rota of the Serjeants, and the Master-Serjeant Roo, his tutor, who greatly favoured Simon Fish, for he even admitted him to his private chambers and let him make free with his cherished books.

Thus ranging over parchments and volumes, Simon discovered an old pamphlet written some score of years ago, which he opened in idle curiosity, seeing it was an unknown work of more than common interest. And he was soon deep in reading this work. After supper-time Master Roo returned to his chambers laden with sheepskins and papers, and his weary deep-lined face lit up at the sight of his favourite pupil seated on a stool reading under an oil lamp.

"Ha! Simon!" he said—and he clapped him familiarly on the shoulder—"What hast thou there, lad? Been a-browsing in my poor library? Take heed, my son, there may be forbidden fruit on those shelves. Here's the Cardinal swearing he's a mind to burn all heretic books for a public example before the Northern Rood o' Paul's."

Young Fish smiled and tossed back his thick brown hair.

"Why, Master-Serjeant," he said modestly, yet speaking freely as one who knew his privileges, "I could scarce be accused of reading a heretic book when 'tis one of your own making."

Master-Serjeant flung aside his coif and took his greasy skull-cap from a peg by the door.

"So! Mine, ha?" he chuckled. "Let me see it, boy . . . Aye! Ye've found my old *Interlude*! Saint Mary! How long is't since I wrote that! . . ." He coughed and read aloud in high delight—"'*A Merry and Pleasant Interlude of Good and Evil Governance*'—Aye! 'Twas in 1505—the days of his Grace's father—King Henry Seventh—that I wrote this. I think it glanced at the misgovernment of the late usurper Richard of Gloucester . . . Well! Well! Times change, *tempora et mores*, ha? Like it, lad?"

"Very well, sir," replied Simon. "I could not put it down until I finished it, and I had just begun to read part over again."

Master Roo nodded and dropped his short, fat body into a chair.

"Why, I thought it good myself at the time," he said complacently. "But with Richard gone 'twere flogging a dead horse to play it."

"There are other discontents," replied Simon subtly.

Master Roo smiled and wagged his head.

"Now, lad, what mischief lurks in your secret heart?" he inquired indulgently. "Ye mean?"

Simon's narrow finger sketched a capital letter in the air. "So!" muttered the Serjeant, his eyes gleaming under his thick grey brows. He shook his head slowly—regretfully, as Fish saw. "Dangerous," he said. "The man has much power yet."

"Power over our Christmas Game? Here in our own Hall?" asked Fish.

"By Saint Paul!" gasped Master Roo, half in protest and half in the author's quick rapture. "Nay! My modest *Interlude* is not worthy to be lifted to such perilous place of honour."

"Listen to me, sir," begged Fish. "I found your play soon after dinner and read in it until near supper-time. Then I returned to ask your leave to borrow it since ye allow not your books to be taken from your chambers. Well, ye found me here—still reading this *Merry Interlude* and I did laugh heartily over it."

Roo stretched his thick legs and smiled. He observed his pupil. Simon Fish was taller than most men in Gray's Inn and a personable youth, his features regular, his blue-grey eyes large, wide and flashing, his brow broad and thoughtful, and his mouth had a sardonic, humorous twist, while his long nose was finely shaped and his chin jutted sharply under the sensitive lips. The eyes were set too wide apart for perfection of line, and the chin was over-sharp, but the fire in his eyes and the clear, pleasant ring of his voice surely marked him out to dominate his fellows. His dress was neat and plain.

Master Roo, easy, good man, somewhat slovenly and untidy, had the sudden hot temper of the scholar which sparked when he was

roused, but was soon appeased. He had been chafed that day, as Simon was quick to observe. His pupil's deference and admiring manner gratified him, and he began to yield the point towards which he saw the skill of Simon's arguments tended.

"Well," he mused, rubbing his finger over a stubbly chin, and his broad red face had a considering look. "'Twould need to be altered, Simon, and made over anew. I've scant time for such toys."

Young Fish bent insinuatingly over his tutor.

"Sir, if I helped ye—in the copying out of the Parts—and as your humble scribe."

"Faith! Simon, ye make bold to tilt against dignitaries. I may be doing ye a shrewd turn if I consent. Hum!"

Master Roo's plump hand went out for the pamphlet and Fish slid it gently before him as the Serjeant pulled his chair in at an ink-spotted table of oak. The lawyer turned pages lovingly and he nodded.

"'Tis a pleasant piece—Satire or no," he commented. "Maybe as the ill-governors are in couples my Lord Cardinal would have no private jealousy, ha?"

"Surely his Eminence could have no cause," argued Simon, "when he learns how it was written by yourself some twenty years back. And we can turn it into a gamesome play with music and dancing."

Master Roo meditated awhile, scanning his play, torn between doubt, prudence and the author's proud longing.

Suddenly he smote the table with his heavy fist.

"My Lord Cardinal slighted the Inns of Court and us the lawyers —he called us 'picking crows' yesterday at York Place before my good Lord of Canterbury's face. Have at the butcher's dog, Simon, but cunningly so that he can spy no offence!" . . .

"By your good leave, if we change the title or add some words——"

"Aye! And add to the cast—there be seven Principals, my lad. For the new title . . ."

"Call it thus . . ." proposed Simon.

And they worked at the *Interlude* until near midnight.

Simon Fish had joined a circle of First and Second Year men who shared in the growing discontent of Wolsey's rule, and they were all agog to help forward in rehearsing and dressing the new Christmas *Interlude* by their popular Serjeant-Master Roo. So eager did they become that the flattered tutor hastened to obtain the sanction of the Reverend Master of Gray's Inn. This was readily granted and every facility was offered for the production in their Hall on Twelfth Night. Relatives and friends loaned rich and costly stuffs, masks and instruments of music. The authorities invited a splendid company of guests, including the Lord Mayor and the City Fathers, with noblemen of the Court and leading merchants.

Young Thomas Moyle, a great friend of Simon Fish, accepted the second-best rôle, for Master Roo's choice of Simon as the chief

player all thought his bare due, after his hard work and diligent assistance of lesser players. Roo himself agreed to deliver the Epilogue. Simon threw himself heart and soul into the production, and he enjoined strict secrecy on his actors, which was marvellously well kept, for the elder ones feared the lash of his bitter tongue and as Roo observed humorously: "No wenches were among 'em save the smooth-faced boys whom Simon and Moyle would swinge if they prattled." But the threat of losing their parts kept order without trouble. The whole company revelled in the work. One person alone showed some aversion. Mistress Margery disliked to see Simon so little on Sundays and she cared nothing for such things. She was of a grave, sweet disposition, affectionate and truly devoted to the lively youth, and of high courage, for she belonged, young as she was, to the proscribed Society of the "*Christian Brethren*" which had been founded about a year ago to give Wyclif's Bible to the common people. The members were enrolled, had their password, paid their agents, and kept audited accounts for modest but steady supplies of money. They accepted such as were willing to join them, and dared risk the horrible penalties of heresy.

A week before Christmas Margery sent word to her betrothed begging him to meet her at the house of Master Humphrey Monmouth, the rich clothier who lived in All Hallows' parish, hard by the Tower. Simon went there to dinner, and he soon showed his sweetheart that he was not turned cold as she half-feared.

Being Margery's godfather, Master Monmouth took a keen interest in the proposed play, and he promised to attend it when Simon offered to obtain him an invitation as his guest.

"Bring Margery, I pray you, Master Monmouth," he proposed.

She was reluctant until her lover frowned and kindly Master Monmouth winked and nodded that she ought to accept.

"I love not these new stage-plays," she said primly; "but if it will please ye, Simon."

He laughed, well-pleased at her yielding to his will.

"Why, sweeting, 'tis no new play. I found it in Master Roo's old folio script of the last reign. 'Tis a kind of Morality on Good and Bad Government of a Realm, Master Monmouth. They have chosen it for this Year's Christmas Game."

"And so ye'll take the chief part, ha?" asked the genial clothier. "There was a wind that it would aim a shaft or so at a certain lord in a red hat, and this scared our gentle wench, I think."

Simon laughed heartily and he glanced round the cosy prosperous parlour, and Madam Monmouth, a quiet kindly hospitable soul, said that she thought there could be no harm in a Christmas Game allowed by the Master and Benchers and she would go and so none could blame Margery for being present.

And after dinner Simon persuaded his betrothed to promise her troth should be given before witnesses, at a solemn Plighting at her widowed mother's house on Christmas Eve.

Margery was not a beautiful girl, but her clear brown eyes were tender and kind, and she was fresh complexioned, young and active

and very pleasant to look upon, for she dressed becomingly and had dainty ways that pleased Simon's fastidious taste.

In spite of secret qualms of doubt Margery was happy and excited as she sat in a good place, a front side-bench, and gazed at the red curtains from behind which Simon was presently to appear.

"The Lord likes His People to be merry," she thought as the singers and musicians came before the curtains and struck up sweetly the ancient Carol, "God rest ye merry, gentlemen," and all the fine company in the Hall joined in the refrain.

The curtains parted and a slender child in white, wearing a garland of silver roses—Innocence—stepped forward, and he piped out a pretty Prologue, begging their gentleness to favour this "*Goodly Disguising*" which was "merry and pleasant for the Christmas Game." Smiling Innocence vanished and a troop of maskers in green and blue—Shepherds and Shepherdesses—ran in waving their crooks garlanded in young green and driving their sheep—which baaed and gambolled finely as they danced for spring—summer followed, youths and maids clad in cloth of gold and wreathed in red roses—autumn, with men, lads and gleaners who bore grapes and sheaves of corn—and winter came in merrily, young and old alike dragging in the yule-log. All danced until a huge black Wolf with ravening red jaws rushed in and scattered the pretty show, rending and devouring those who had not fled. And again the curtains closed.

They rose upon a splendid room—and the *Lord Duke Governance* (Simon) sat upon his throne, and his gracious Consort *Lady Public Weal* at his side. But *Dissipation* (Thomas Moyle) and *Negligence* as humble black-gowned clerks crept in and whispered slanders and the sweet *Public Weal* was put away, and she wept until her people rose, headed by *Inward Grudge* and *Disdain of Wanton Sovereignty*, bold nobles in glittering armour, and *Rumor Populi* raised a tumult and joined them, and then they came to the *Lord Governance*, who listened to their humble remonstrance, and repented, so both his *Evil Counsellors* were judged, raging and defiant and casting insults at Judge and People, and seized, and put in chains by the *Lord Governance's* command, and he condemned them in a mighty fine speech, and took back sweet *Lady Public Weal* to bed and board and sent *Dissipation* and *Negligence* to the common gibbet as traitors to his Laws. And a grand Rejoicing followed, *Lord Governance* leading his *Lady Public Weal* in a stately maze, and a splendid Chorus ended the "*Merry and Pleasant Interlude.*" The *Wolf* himself returned alone and recited his new Epilogue—hitting shrewdly in elegant Latin at "One whose blacks turned red."

Such a magnificent show had never been seen before in the Inns of Court, and Simon's brave, witty and fiery speeches rang boldly through the Hall, loudly applauded by everyone, from the Lord Mayor and Reverend Master of Gray's Inn to the humble porters of the gates.

Thomas Moyle was a desperate and crafty *Dissipation*, and he had a look of the hated Cardinal which was more apparent in his

purple and furred Counsellor's robe, while Master Roo himself played the *Wolf*, and rent and slavered in a very savage fashion while the Hall rang with shouts of mirth. He came and ducked and bowed with the wolf-skin hanging from his fat neck, and Simon in his Ducal robes and Tom Moyle in chains followed. But it was Simon whom all admired most, and the Reverend Master whispered the Lord Mayor that he was a young man of great parts and would surely rise high in the world.

Margery clapped until her palms were sore, and Master Monmouth laughed loudly at each witty word or merry jest.

At supper Simon could not sit beside them, for his place was next Master Roo, but he snatched a minute to say a parting word.

"Well, sweet, didst like the Disguising?" he whispered in her ear.

Margery's eyes were shining proudly and she nodded. "It was a brave, noble piece and ye were much the best there," she answered.

Simon demurred, but he looked well pleased.

The Cardinal said nothing for some days until the Season of Mirth ended, then suddenly he let out his hoarded-up spite in great fury and bitterness. Master Roo was sent for and he went to York Place and did not come back. A word arose that my Lord Cardinal had got the King's ear—that good easy Master-Serjeant had been committed to the Tower for a Contempt. Gossip ran that the Reverend Master had been himself severely blamed and both Simon Fish and Thomas Moyle were arrested. They had disappeared in the night after Master-Serjeant was taken.

The Master called benchers and students into the Hall and one of Wolsey's clerks—Master Thomas Cromwell—sat by his chair, and he listened while the Master told them all how he was sorry the *Interlude* had offended the Lord Cardinal, and worse, and he read out a list of names of all those young gentlemen who had played in the Disguising, and they were bidden stand up and answer and prepare to follow Master Cromwell to York Place, and appear before my Lord there. Thomas Moyle was in the Hall but not Simon Fish. It was whispered he was in the Tower with Master Roo.

The offending players were kept waiting in the Lobby more than an hour before they were called into the Council Chamber, and brought before the Cardinal sitting in state on a gilded chair, and he eyed them sternly enough. Wolsey rebuked the young gentlemen harshly and told them that their insolent Disguising had highly displeased his Grace the King. They were forced to beg pardon of his Eminence on their knees. But he refused to forgive Thomas Moyle, whose mimicry had stung Wolsey's pride, and he sent him to the Fleet for an example to the rest. The young men were thunderstruck, for Wolsey declared he had the King's command.

Young Moyle implored mercy and swore he meant no offence, but he was harshly silenced. They learned how Master-Serjeant himself had had his coif taken from him. The rest were told to conduct themselves gravely and humbly and not rail against dignitaries or the King's Grace. Wolsey demanded for Simon Fish to be brought—

and examined the law-students closely, but they all replied that he was gone and none knew whither, so the Cardinal let them go.

But late that night Margery heard a-tapping on her window-pane and a serving-man of Master Monmouth whispered her to open a casement. She pushed back the bar softly—the house was in Candlewick Street—and she leaned out, thinking it was some business of the Christian Brethren which she was pledged to help. But to her grief she heard how Simon had hardly escaped the Cardinal's clutches and he was now on board a ship in the Pool and would sail at morning tide.

She longed to go down to the Customs Wharf and watch for a glimpse of his face on the deck; even perhaps row in a swift wherry across the Pool and cry out a farewell word of love. But the home discipline was strict, and girls who ran off to bid loving farewells even to their betrothed husbands, if they dared venture beyond the door without their parents' leave, knew what to expect; when the rod hung over the wall-shelf, for parents thought it protected best a girl's honour, and courting was kept to settle or bench under their eyes. She hesitated awhile, between love and her sense of duty. She longed to go so much that she would willingly have borne a whipping after for Simon's sake, but her mother stirred in the next room from the great bed with the younger children and called her sharply by name. Margery shut the window noiselessly and slipped back into bed, and kept very still; she lay awake the rest of the night weeping and praying for him, but though her pale cheeks and heavy eyes betrayed her, the widow only looked keenly at her daughter and said nothing. Later she heard the news of Simon Fish and was highly indignant, and forbade the girl to think or talk of him more.

"Good mother, I will obey your will," Margery said in a soft little voice, "but I have promised to marry Simon, and given him my solemn troth, and he has plighted his to me. I cannot do less than remain his promised wife until he releases me from my bond. For I vowed it before God and our friends. So be not angry, sweet mother, that I must keep faith with the man whom I love."

Widow Necton, a kindly good-humoured soul by nature, was nonplussed.

"The young man is a good-for-nothing rebel," she returned, "and he would doubtless make ye the same. I ought to take the rod to ye for at seventeen ye defy your own mother! But I allowed the trothplight and it may hold for the year. Ye'll not write to Simon Fish nor receive his letters. Let him forget ye and if ye've sense, forget him."

Diplomat in her love Margery answered only by kissing her mother's hand, who relented so far as to embrace her daughter and assure her—most exasperating of words—she was strict for her good.

And Simon himself, sailing down Thames Mouth in a trading brig, had time to reflect in the cold grey January mist whether his brief splendour in the "Goodly Disguising" was worth such humiliating flight, the wrecking of his profession, since he knew that

he would never be suffered to enter the gates of Gray's Inn once he fled, and added contumacy to his offence—and the loss of his devoted promised bride. Within a couple of hours acute pangs of seasickness in an exceedingly rough passage further increased his misery, while the master of the brig sent him some horrible-tasting and evil-smelling Dutch *schnapps*, and the seaman who offered it said bluntly that he was lucky to cheat the gallows.

After a dreadful tossing the ship reached Flushing that night and Antwerp the next day, where Simon, feeling more dead than alive, crawled ashore, and was fortunate enough to meet a friendly merchant who pitied his wretched forlorn state and for charity took him back to his house. He was called Christopher van Endhoven and spoke English very well, while Simon discovered to his great comfort that his host knew by repute Margery's godfather, Master Humphrey Monmouth. Now Van Endhoven was a printer by trade and he printed English books, so he offered young Fish a small place as reader and reviser, finding that Simon knew Latin and French. And humbled by adversity the young lawyer was glad to accept, and being by nature honest he made a clean breast of the trouble which had driven him into exile. He found Van Endhoven a sympathetic listener and as Simon worked zealously, and his neat ways pleased the Vrow Endhoven, he settled to his new life in Flanders and won the confidence of his master by his skill, ability and quickness to learn, until after some months Endhoven called Simon into his private parlour and inquired if he would help him in printing forbidden books.

"The Scriptures?" asked Simon quietly. "Yes, willingly, for both Master Monmouth and certain good friends of mine have told me of this great longing at home to read the Gospels in English."

Endhoven said Master Fish should first read the book.

"I am willing," repeated Simon.

He was very curious to read this heretic book which the Cardinal and his bishops hated and condemned. He knew that Tunstal, Bishop of London, had said such books ought to be burned, for it was not good to give Holy Scripture to be read by common unlearned folk in the vulgar tongue.

Then Van Endhoven gave young Simon Fish the proscribed book, telling him to lock it up and keep it safely in his own bedchamber, and Simon thanked him and took the black leather volume, which was rather small as books were then, and he locked his door and lit his lamp and got into his bed to keep warm, for it was March and the nights were cold.

So Simon Fish, the disgraced student of Gray's Inn and fugitive exile from Cardinal Wolsey's anger, opened a book which was thought tenfold more dangerous than any Satire or *Interlude* of Master Roo, or any other man—indeed he read that night a book of which he knew but a little in the Vulgate—and had never seen or heard of in his mother tongue—the book which the prudent Van Endhoven was ready to risk his life to print and to publish for Englishmen to read.

Until a very late hour Simon read eagerly the Book of the Gospels —for it was indeed the New Testament of William Tyndale. And as he read the whole world changed for him, since he himself was becoming a changed man.

(*To be continued*)

The Historic Jesus in the New Testament, by R. H. Strachan, D.D. (Student Christian Movement Press, 7*s.* 6*d.* net), deals with the influence of the Pauline conception of Christ as emphasising the Risen Lord rather than the Sayings and Doings of Jesus of Nazareth. Dr. Strachan finds a reaction in primitive Christianity from the Pauline attitude, as it was found necessary to give the story of the human life of Jesus a central place in the Christian Gospel. He traces the movement in the Epistle to the Hebrews where the life on earth is a prelude to the heavenly activity of Christ as High Priest, and in the Fourth Gospel where the human life becomes the full Revelation of which Jesus had come to be in the faith of the Church. The distinction between these two conceptions is indicated by the use of the term "The Historical Jesus" for the former, and the "Historic or Human Jesus" of the latter. A careful and close examination is made of the Pauline doctrine of Christ, and its value is noted, especially in regard to the exalted Christ and the pre-existent Christ. The teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews is subjected to a similar examination, and the Logos doctrine of the Fourth Gospel is treated at considerable length and the Gospel is shown as the final revaluation of the Historic Jesus. The book is full of useful suggestions although there may not be absolute agreement with some of the author's presuppositions. On such points as the authorship of the Ephesians and the Pastoral Letters as well as of the Fourth Gospel itself his view may not appear well grounded, but his central purpose of emphasising the value of the Life of Our Lord on earth will be fully appreciated by all his readers.

CHILD LIFE AND RELIGION. By Ilse Forest. *London: Williams & Norgate, Ltd.* 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

What shall I tell my child? This is a question with which parents are constantly confronted. Here is an interesting and suggestive treatment, on modern lines, of this vital problem of the upbringing and education of children. It is mainly concerned with religious training, but sex instruction is not passed over and a chapter on "Fact and Symbol" will be found most useful and suggestive. We commend this thoughtful book to the notice of parents and teachers. The Bibliography gives a list of useful books on religion in relation to child-life.

THE GODWARD ASPECT OF THE ATONEMENT.

By the Rev. W. H. Rigg, D.D.

PART II.

HAVING sought to discover the mind of Christ upon the Atonement, we must now endeavour to frame a theory which, first and foremost, will be agreeable to His teaching, and which will also do justice to religious experience, and be in harmony with the deliverances of the thoroughly awakened and enlightened Christian conscience.

In order to avoid any misunderstanding, let it be stated at the outset that no thought of any division between the Father and the Son can be entertained for one single moment. The Father was not angry with His Son ; in Dante's words, " He ever gazeth on His Son with love which the One and the Other breathes eternally."

Archdeacon Storr has protested against the idea of anger in connection with God at all, as too anthropomorphic and personal in character, and would rather use the New Testament word " wrath." [1] Far more important than the terminology we use, is that we should be quite sure as to the particular meaning we attach to our words. Whether anger or wrath is used seems to us quite immaterial provided that no idea of personal caprice is associated with either term, and that to us, when either word is used, it should always signify the reaction of holy love in contact with sin. " There is nothing inexorable but love," as Carlyle once said, and God's attitude towards sin is not passive, but active hostility, because He is essential Love in all its perfectness and wholeness.

We now come across another phrase which demands even more our closest scrutiny, as in this case opinion is very far from being unanimous with regard to its true nature and character. We refer to the ideas underlying punishment. Our theory of the Atonement will be very much affected by our attitude towards punishment. In what sense, if any, can it be said that God punishes at all ? Archdeacon Storr would banish from our religious vocabulary altogether the idea of punishment.[2] This suggestion seems to us to contradict the plain teaching of Our Lord, not to speak of the New Testament as a whole. Christ prayed, " Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," and St. Stephen, " Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." The heir in the parable of the wicked husbandmen is wrongfully cast out of the vineyard and is killed ; Christ immediately proceeds to ask the question, " What will the lord of the vineyard (that is, God) do ? He will

[1] *The Problem of the Cross* (London, S.C.M. 1924), pp. 78–80.
[2] *ibid.*, p. 81 ff.

come and destroy these husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others." If this is not punishment, it is difficult to see what other word can be used to take its place. The same applies to such parables as the unmerciful servant, the talents and the pounds.[1]

Doubtless most of us would shrink from uttering such a bald statement as that the Great War was brought on by God as a punishment for the widespread sin and unbelief of Europe. And yet we believe that this saying can in a certain sense be justified. Nations in their relations with each other had entirely ignored spiritual principles. Some even went so far as to endorse the cynical view expressed in those famous lines,

> "Conscience amiable in individuals,
> Childish weakness in a nation."

The result was that national egoism and self-assertion prevailed, with the inevitable consequence that when a conflict of strong national interests arose the appeal was made to force with all the horrors attendant upon it. This is only another way of saying that the world has been so constituted by God that when men and nations alike give rein to their egoistic impulses uncontrolled by any higher considerations, it follows as the night the day that destruction and death on a vast scale must sooner or later ensue. The wages of sin is death, and it is God who has ordained this result. The laws of the universe are the result of His direct personal activity, and embody His will and purpose.

Equally important for our purpose is it to examine the nature of punishment itself. If we consider it, as it is usually understood, three ideas are associated with it which for the sake of clearness may be distinguished but which all form part of an unbreakable threefold cord. Let us take as our example the case of a man who has broken the law of the land, and is undergoing his sentence of imprisonment, bearing in mind the inadequacy of all human analogies as applied to God. Why is the man punished? We reply, to protect society from a repetition of similar offences. Society must safeguard herself in order to prevent the particular individual from causing any further harm to the community, and also as a warning to others who might be tempted to commit a similar offence she incarcerates him within the four walls of a building, depriving him of freedom. This is the deterrent side of punishment.

Then there is the individual himself; he has lost his self-respect, and by his crime has injured himself; his will has become enfeebled in certain directions and his moral sense impaired. Applicable to him, as indeed to us all, are those terrifying words of the late Professor James:

> "Every smallest stroke of virtue or of vice leaves its never so little scar. The drunken Rip van Winkle, in Jefferson's play, excuses himself for every fresh dereliction by saying, 'I won't count this time!' Well! he may not count it, and a kind Heaven may not count it; but it is being

[1] cf. St. John, v. 14.

counted none the less. Down among his nerve-cells and fibres the molecules are counting it, registering and storing it up to be used against him when the next temptation comes. Nothing we ever do is, in strict literalness, wiped out." [1]

Punishment, especially in its modern form, has more and more for its object a remedial purpose, so that at the end of the punishment the person undergoing it may be a better character than at its commencement. This second element in punishment is claiming an increased attention on the part of all social reformers, partly because the responsibility for the criminal's misdeeds do not lie entirely with himself, but also with his social conditions, for which society is responsible.

But there is yet a third element in punishment involving retribution, and it is this third element which has a special bearing upon our view of the Atonement. This is the vindication of the law. Nothwithstanding that the law has been violated the principles embodied in it retain their validity.[2] The late Dr. Rashdall has subjected the theory of retribution in his great work on the *Theory of Good and Evil* to a very severe criticism, denying that it should have any place in punishment at all. His main contention may be stated in a few words. Granted that the criminal is reformed, and that consequently the particular offence will not be repeated, and that sufficient pain has been inflicted on the individual as to deter others from following his example, nothing more is required, since punishment has performed its perfect work. Unfortunately the persons against whom he has levelled his criticisms are Kant and Mr. Bradley, who in their theory of punishment have singled out the element of retribution to the exclusion of every other. As stated by Kant, this is very far from satisfying the moral consciousness in its best moments:

"Juridical punishment can never be administered merely as a means for promoting another's good, either with regard to the criminal himself or to civil society, but must in all cases be imposed only because the individual on whom it is inflicted has committed a crime. . . . The penal law is a categorical imperative; and woe to him who creeps through the serpent-windings of utilitarianism to discover some advantage that may discharge him from the justice of punishment, or even from the due measure of it."

A far better way of expressing the theory of retribution is to say that when the offender beholds the justice of his punishment, his higher nature recognises that the sentence he receives is the only one he is entitled to, and then it is that the punishment will

[1] *The Principles of Psychology*, vol. i, p. 127.

[2] Rashdall, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 421: "The substitutionary doctrine, or, indeed, any doctrine which regards the death of Christ as expiatory, implies at bottom the retributive theory of punishment." Cf. what Professor A. E. Taylor says in his *Gifford Lectures, The Faith of a Moralist*, Series I (Macmillan & Co., Ltd., London, 1931), p. 183: "The retributive character of punishment; a doctrine really indispensable to sound ethics." Cf. *The Theory of Morals*, by E. F. Carritt (Oxford University Press, 1928), p. 110: "To deny the retributive element in punishment is to deny any meaning to the words desert, merit, justice, and, I think, forgiveness."

begin to have a reforming effect upon him, so that he may even wish to suffer. Otherwise so long as he has no inkling of the justice of his punishment he may be deterred from committing the offence again for fear of the consequences, but his punishment is incomplete. Given a favourable opportunity he would only be too glad to repeat it. As Dr. Caird has stated it :

" For the highest educational result of punishment is to awake a consciousness, not simply that the crime gets or will get punishment, but that it is *worthy* of punishment. It is to make men fear the guilt, and not the penalty." [1]

Nor must the question be prejudged by the assertion that the retributive theory is a mere survival of bygone modes of thought such as the instinct of revenge.[2] But as Professor Taylor has said :

" Revenge is essentially a *personal* gratification to be enjoyed by a party who conceives himself to have been in some way aggrieved or damaged. It follows, therefore, that if punishment is mere vengeance, its proper measure is the material detriment, or the sentimental grievance felt by the party who has been damaged or affronted. If he feels no deep resentment, or is ready to compromise his resentment for some material or sentimental offset, there can be no reason why the revenge should be exacted. The detriment or affront is his own personal affair, with which no one but himself is deeply concerned. We have only to look at the way in which a society becomes more and more moralized, the development of a satisfactory system of penal law depends on the withdrawal of the initiative in bringing offences to punishment from the parties immediately concerned and the lodging of it with bodies representative of the community at large, as well as on the substitution of a reasonable and ' objective ' for a personal and arbitrary standard of penalties, to see that throughout the whole process retribution becomes more prominent and more certain in proportion as the feature of satisfaction for the desire of personal vengeance sinks into the background." [3]

The ideal example of the retributive theory of punishment is that of the Penitent Thief. When he and his associate in crime were enduring the punishment of crucifixion, their terrible sufferings would doubtless deter some of the spectators who might be tempted to embark on a similar course of action. But so far as the actual criminals were concerned, the punishment at first had no effect. The curses and execrations falling from their lips proclaimed that this was so. But it was when one of them beheld the patient suffering of the Christ in their midst that the agonising punishment began really to take effect ; hitherto to him it had been pain and nothing more.[4] Now the majesty of the moral law in all its glory began to be revealed to him in the form of the apparently helpless

[1] *The Critical Philosophy of Immanuel Kant*, vol. ii, p. 377.

[2] Cf. Rashdall, *op. cit.*, p. 422, and *The Theory of Good and Evil* ; vol. i, pp. 285, 291 ff.

[3] *op. cit.*, pp. 103, 184.

[4] Dr. Rashdall says that " the essence of punishment is the endurance of pain or some other evil." This ignores the difference between punishment as such and suffering, e.g. due to cancer or to rheumatoid arthritis.

Christ. At the sight of His Divine patience the thief confesses that his punishment is a vindication of that law. "Dost thou not fear God, seeing that thou art in the same condemnation? and we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss." Forthwith his punishment begins to have a remedial effect. He placed himself under the most powerful operative influence for good that existed in the world. He placed his poor maimed life into the hands of the Christ. Could he now have been let free, he would have been a reformed character. It might be contended that it was not the punishment as such which worked in him the sense of retribution; that this was caused entirely by seeing the blamelessness of Christ in contrast to the blameworthiness of himself and the other. This contention is true judged from a purely human standpoint, but the penitent thief's place on the Cross beside Our Lord contributed to his being led to see the utter contrast between himself and his Saviour. Hence it follows that in the case of the penitent thief punishment did fulfil the highest function it was intended, not by the Romans, but by the verdict of conscience, to perform. So that it cannot be said in this case that vindicating the moral law, asserting its majesty, is a hackneyed phrase.

Up to now we have been discussing the subject of punishment mainly from the point of view of criminal procedure and our notions of justice and punishment, but can we apply our theory of punishment, and in particular its retributive element, to Almighty God?

It may be taken for granted that the Cross of Christ has been the most powerful agency for good the world has ever seen. Sinful men and women in countless numbers have been transformed as they have come under the power of the crucified and living Lord. God came Himself in the person of His Eternal Son. The Incarnation, which is another name for God the Son living under our human conditions, to save mankind by refusing to save Himself, giving His body to be broken for us upon the Cross that we might break with sin, is not "a mere episode" in the life and being of God, "it is a revealing episode." The whole range of Christ's earthly life, including the shedding of His most precious blood, "is the measure of that love which has throbbed in the Divine heart from all eternity," to quote Dr. Temple's words.

The Cross is the great magnet drawing man, not against his will, but with the full desire of his heart and soul, to God. No man can be made good against his will. To reach his will an appeal must be made to his better nature, and power working from within must make him strong to do what he knows to be right. This is what the love of God has effected in the case of countless lives. Those conscious of their estrangement from God have been reconciled, and made to live at peace with God, by the constraining power of the Sacrifice of Christ and His love and the indwelling Spirit. All this may be admitted, but, it will be urged, without our believing in any sense that there is a retributive element in

the Cross of Christ corresponding in the least to our theory of punishment.

Let us again quote Archdeacon Storr, who first states the retributive view in a very fair way.

"The heinousness of the offence must be brought home to the offender by clothing the punishment in the robes of retribution, no wreaking of vengeance, but only the emphasising of the majesty of an impersonal moral order."

He then proceeds to contrast this as follows, and we wish to state what he says in his own words in order to face this objection quite fairly.

"But this is, surely, just where the theory fails in its application to God. For God is not impersonal, but intensely personal, and His relations with men are those of a Father with His children. Can the divine love be thought of as wanting to exact retribution?" [1]

At the outset let us freely and unreservedly make the admission that in our opinion an impersonal order is a contradiction in terms. Morality cannot be considered apart from personal life. A stone, a tree, a machine, a planet, the law of relativity cannot have attributed to them except in a very loose manner what we mean when we use in an ethical sense the terms good and evil. Each of these instances is non-moral. Only of a being who is a self-conscious, self-determining personality can we say that he is the subject of moral duties and claims. If, then, the distinction between right and wrong is something more than a man-made theory and convention, not just simply the product of human experience, it must be grounded in the structure of reality, which in turn is the expression of absolute will, purpose and love.

Alongside of this we would place another statement of the writer who has just been quoted—namely, that "morality is not an arbitrary expression of the Divine will but a necessary expression of the Divine character." [2] Of the Cross we may also say, "it was not an arbitrary expression of the Divine will but a necessary expression of the Divine character." The moral order of the universe, imperfectly as we understand it, is a revelation also of the being and character of God. What is highest and best in ourselves we may postulate as being real intimations of the Divine. Morality involves the principle of limitation. Even the great Medieval Scholastics, to whom such attributes as unity, infinity and perfection are fundamental in their conception of God, would consider that He cannot make a false proposition true, or make virtue vice, or annihilate Himself. This does not really contradict the Divine omnipotence when rightly understood, since God's Almighty power can only be construed in accordance with His absolute perfection. The sum and substance of the whole matter is that God can only act in accordance with the laws of His own being.

When the further step is made—and it is with relief that we turn

[1] *op. cit.*, p. 85. [2] *ibid.*, p. 82.

our eyes away from considering what God is "in Himself," a subject far too dazzling for mortal eyes for long to behold, and endeavour to know Him as He reveals Himself in the universe around us, His dealings with mankind, and His life within the human soul—we are confronted with His love in all its depth and majesty.

Very rightly we must be very jealous of any theory of the Atonement which is inconsistent with God's Fatherly love, and indeed, nobody who knows anything at all of the history of the doctrine, or how the Atonement is even yet taught by certain religious bodies, will contend that the warning is not still needed. Nevertheless, such a change has come over popular thought, that even a greater need exists to-day to scrutinise the meaning of God's love. Our danger is to interpret God's love in such a way as to deprive it of all moral content. The humanitarian feelings of the age—and we cannot rate them at too high a value—are very sensitive to the call of suffering and intolerant of cruelty, but even so they suffer from the defect of their virtues; not only do they often degenerate into pure sentimentality, but also obliterate moral distinctions altogether, or if that is an exaggeration, deem them of little account. Justice and righteousness have their claims.

The Holy God has nothing in common with sin. He cannot treat sin as if it were of small account. As He views it He cannot suffer its presence; therefore if sinful man is to be brought into the closest contact with Him, how can that be possible, for "who among us can dwell with everlasting burnings?" (Isa. xxxiii. 14). God's holiness may be compared unto a furnace which sinners approach at their peril. "Our God is a consuming fire." Forgiveness is very real and very thorough, but how can the past be undone? The offender may be truly repentant and turn to a new life, but the evil deed has been done, and nothing can alter the fact that it has been done. The revelation of Christ, by deepening our sense of guilt, only heightens the difficulty. In one sense the gulf between the Holy God and guilty man is made immeasurably wider. This incidentally comes out in the parable of the merciless servant (St. Matt. xviii. 23–35). If we forgive our fellowmen it is as though a man forgives his debtor a hundred pence, or about £4, some insignificant sum, but when this is placed side by side with the cost of the Divine forgiveness the latter is compared to ten thousand talents, nearly £4,500,000 in our money. The quantitative comparison must not be pressed too far—indeed, the difference is so vast that we are lifted into another region altogether, away from debtor and creditor; we are transferred to the kingdom of grace. The observation has often been made that the modern man does not bother about his sins, so continually has it been made that with many the statement has been taken for granted, and were it true we should reply "so much the worse for him," but social evils, sins which lower a man in his own eyes, are very much his concern. What, however, we are not facing to-day as we ought to do, is the problem of guilt. It is a strange fact that in the index

to the late Dr. Rashdall's great work on the idea of the Atonement in Christian Theology, should anyone wish to find how that great and profound thinker has handled the burning question of guilt, he will look in vain; the word does not occur, nor is it to be found in the first chapter, which is concerned with Our Lord's teaching on forgiveness. Now it is perfectly true that none of us have a right to depreciate God's gift of reason, but the fact of sin is the most baffling problem we have to face, and along with it the misuse of our moral freedom.[1] To the thoroughly awakened conscience the plea of ignorance and external influences is of no avail whatsoever. Its possessor must in the last resort confess: "I have sinned in thought, word and deed, by my fault, by my own fault, by my own most grievous thought. Why did we sin against Him Who is perfect love is beyond our comprehension, but none the less it is a fact which points its self-accusing finger against us, and which in the last resort no philosopher can explain."

Thus does our guilt strike us, and if our eyes are open to spiritual realities we know that as moral beings we are responsible, and have not only fallen short of God's requirements of us, but have actively resisted and rebelled against His Holy Love. Forgiveness, then, must bridge the gulf between us and Him. "He will forgive our iniquity, and our sin will He remember no more" (Jer. xxxi. 34, cf. Heb. viii. 12, x. 17).

We believe that it is not true to experience to dwell only on our sense of alienation from God, that were indeed to regard the whole question from a far too anthropocentric point of view, but the very fact of our feeling of guilt bears witness to the truth that we have incurred His displeasure, and for that reason our hearts condemn us. It is quite the smallest part of His displeasure which manifests itself in the suffering and pain which our sins have justly brought upon us in comparison with the result that He should have with-

[1] We make no pretension to a full understanding of the Barthian Theology, but its assertion that it is a corrective Theology, even more "a critical footnote to be put under all theological and ecclesiastical activity," is justified. Of this E. Brunner's constant insistence on man's guilt in his book *Der Mittler* is an excellent example. "We are not merely far from God, our life is not only unlike God's, God must not only overcome a distance in order to come unto us. It is not merely the different mode of being, the finitude, that separates us from God. That would be something merely negative: something we lacked. Rather it is something *between* us and God, a block in the way, which we cannot push aside. It is sin, rather, the guilt of sin. For guilt is that about sin by which it belongs unalterably to the past, and as this unalterable fatally determines every present. In guilt the past—the 'not-again-to-make-good' of sin—is installed as a factor in the reckoning of every present. Therefore we first grasp our life as totality when we see it together in this dark shadow of guilt. The consciousness of guilt is the break through of seriousness. This guilt . . . is wholly personal, the perverted attitude to God, therefore something utterly infinite, as the soul, as the relation to God itself" (pp. 399, 400, cf. pp. 98–128).

We have followed Mr. R. B. Hoyle's translation (*The Teaching of Karl Barth*, p. 176), except we have always translated "Die Schuld" guilt and not as he has done sometimes sin (Die Sünde) and sometimes guilt.

drawn His Presence from us, that the loving intercourse between God and ourselves has been interfered with and broken, and that He can no longer trust us. To those whose souls are athirst for the living God, who can faintly re-echo the Psalmist's words, "Whom have I in Heaven but Thee, there is none on earth I desire in comparison with Thee," what they need to know is, not whether they have the sense of forgiveness, but how God views them. The Atonement wrought by God the Father in the person of His Son and witnessed to in our hearts by the Holy Spirit is creative. It is a creative forgiveness, transcendent in its nature, and mysterious in its effects. None of us can explain it, not only because it is beyond our comprehension, but also because we are not good enough.[1] Men find difficulty in believing in miracles, but the greatest miracle of all is the forgiveness of sin. That to the awakened conscience is the hardest clause in the creed to believe. The wonder of wonders is that in the Cross the Holy God has stooped down to us in all our helplessness and misery and lifted us up into the closest union and fellowship with Himself. To know that in spite of our sin God loves us and holds communion with us, and in the Person of His Son has brought us into an abiding fellowship with Himself, that is the core of forgiveness; whether suffering may be our lot because of our past is quite a secondary matter. Our best selves may expect and even welcome the chastening of the Lord provided that we do not fall out of His hands.

Hard words have been said about those who hold the doctrine of substitution, and in some of its forms it is quite impossible to defend it, but that God in Christ did something on our behalf which we could never have done for ourselves is the grateful confession of adoring multitudes throughout the ages. In our experience, and we can only speak of those we know, even the upholders of the somewhat extreme doctrine of substitution have been some of the most strenuous Christians it has been our privilege to meet; they have ever been ready to take up their cross and spend and be spent in their Master's service.

Although we cannot explain the Divine Forgiveness, yet it is on the Cross that we behold the agelong struggle between God and sin, and the power of darkness brought to a successful issue; and great as the divisions are which separate Christendom into rival camps, and the interests of truth prevent us from minimising them, still this is the conviction which underlies the Christian Church as a whole, and is the mainspring of her life and activity. Great as is the mystery of Divine Forgiveness, that does not preclude us from endeavouring to dwell upon certain aspects of it even though, as we have already said, it will for ever elude our understanding. At least this may be said—that the Divine Forgiveness does not imply the condonation of sin. In the Cross there is revealed the judgment of sin.

[1] Cf. H. R. Mackintosh, *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness* (Nisbet & Co., London, 1927), chap. iii.

The world was prepared for the coming of Christ, and the particular century in which He was born and the land where He dwelt were foreordained according to the Divine plan. Throughout His earthly life the Lord ever sought His Father's glory. In every situation which confronted Him He sought not His own will, but the will of Him that sent Him. This He did regardless of consequences. Quite early in His ministry there were distinct murmurs of opposition, and as time went on they increased in volume, but still He pursued the way appointed to Him of the Father, until at length the storm broke. Those whose animosity He awakened were each of them free agents, they were willing actors in the events in which they took part. The people who cried out " Crucify Him, crucify Him," the Priests and Pharisees who hounded them on, Pilate the Governor, all of them of their own accord took an active part in bringing about the Saviour's death. Goodness always awakens opposition. Hence it is not surprising that perfect Love and Holiness Incarnate should call forth all that is evil in man, and that there should be arrayed against the Son of Man all the powers of darkness. They would gather round Him and endeavour to do their worst (cf. Col. ii. 13–15). The expression of their hatred and malice took the dramatic and most degrading form of Crucifixion, to which the Saviour submitted in perfect surrender to His Father. The opposition of another age might have taken another form, e.g. imprisonment, indifference or an ordinary death, outwardly less terrible, and therefore less discernible for those who have eyes to see. That is partly why the first century A.D. was chosen and not another.

The Saviour faced the worst rather than refuse to drink of the cup presented to Him by the Father. His identification with us sinners was complete even to the extent of submitting to the veiling of His Father's Presence. Hitherto He had never been alone, because the Father was with Him. Deserted by His friends, misunderstood by His enemies, betrayed by His disciple, yet He ever enjoyed uninterrupted converse with His Father, but when the supreme hour arrived that last and highest consolation was to be denied Him. And this the Father's love ordained and the Son endured for the sake of us men and our salvation. Thus do we behold the heinousness of sin and the greatness of the Divine Love which went to the utmost length to remove it.

Dr. Garvie asks:

" Is the inexorable reaction of God against sin in death a necessity of the very perfection of God? Is it so inexorable that in bringing to men the forgiveness of God, the Son of Man could not, and would not even if He could, escape the reaction? Was it a necessity for love itself to share with, as well as for, man that reaction to its very consummation in death, and death apprehended as divine judgment? "

Dr. Garvie unhesitatingly answers in the affirmative, though he adds:

" It is impossible to offer any logical demonstration; all that we can do

is to confess an ultimate moral intuition which it would be as perilous to challenge as the authority of conscience itself." [1]

We may then say that the Godward aspect of the Atonement includes just that retributive element without which no forgiveness would be possible or worth having. From the moralist point of view Professor A. E. Taylor maintains that

"a God who lets us off . . . would be a God who despised us, and with whom we could have no vivifying relations. . . . Thus the Christian paradox that God is at once the supremely just, and also the great forgiver of iniquities, so far from creating an ethical difficulty, is exactly what we should expect to find in a religion which has one of its roots in the ethical conviction of the absoluteness of moral values." [2]

By an inner necessity, God, being what He is, before accepting fallen mankind into fellowship with Himself, cannot overlook the exceeding sinfulness of sin. Even in our case our own sense of justice can be violated, and not from any feeling of vindictiveness needs to be satisfied, though the analogy between human and Divine Forgiveness may be pressed too far. In our case, however much we have been wronged, we are sinners standing in dire need of pardon; not so the Holy God. With far more reason must His own Holiness be vindicated. He thus makes an act of self-reparatory holiness eternal in its nature and character, which manifests itself in time and is shown forth in the supreme sacrifice of Himself in the Person of His Son. In the giving of His only Begotten Son He makes the sacrifice at infinite cost to Himself. The violated moral order, in other words the world in opposition to the Divine Will, is rectified, but it is a Divine act throughout and is dictated by perfect love. The Incarnation is the supreme gift of the Father to mankind, which finds its consummation in the Cross. We are going to venture, however, to pursue the thought of the Divine necessity which led to the Cross somewhat further, even though we must admit that we are treading on very debatable ground, and what will be said will be only of a very tentative character.

It has been very forcibly argued that had there been no fall of man the Incarnation would have taken place, only it would not have involved any suffering, and the Lord's earthly life would have been without the shadow of the Cross. In the thirteenth century it was one of the recognised questions of the schools as to whether the Incarnation would have taken place had not Adam sinned. Some years ago Dorner in Germany and our own great Bishop Westcott in England brought the subject again to the front, and the latter in his essay on the Gospel of Creation strongly advocated the view that the Incarnation was in essence independent of the Fall.

Now we reject this view, and in its place would urge that creation and redemption form one organic whole. This seems to have real scriptural support. In the book of the Revelation the Seer speaks

[1] *The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead*, pp. 179, 180.
[2] *op. cit.*, pp. 189–191.

of "the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. xiii. 8), words which indicate that creation and redemption formed part of the eternal counsels of God (cf. 1 St. Peter i. 10). This appears also to be a legitimate inference from our Lord's teaching concerning the last day when He addresses those placed on the right hand, "Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" (St. Matt. xxv. 34). The same thought underlies St. Paul's opening words in the epistle to the Ephesians: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ; even as He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world" (Eph. i. 3, 4). There is to our minds one insuperable objection to Dr. Westcott's theory, and that is, it assumes that in the creation of the world of finite spirits the Eternal God did not know that sin would make its appearance, that the Fall was a surprise, and consequently that redemption was an afterthought to meet a contingency which had not at first been contemplated.[1] In any case what might have happened and yet did not happen is a very insecure basis on which to erect any Christian doctrine; as it is, we only know Christ as the Redeemer. Surely God in creating His world knew that sin would arise and that He must redeem man from it.

Why God allowed evil to exist is a very great mystery. That He was the direct author of it is an impossible thought to a Christian, he can only exclaim, *μὴ γένοιτο*, God forbid. So far as our own very limited vision enables us to see, part of His purpose in creating the world was that He should have the service of free spirits, capable of loving Him not of necessity, but of choice, and that together with the gift of freedom there came with it the dread possibility of refusing to serve and love Him. Love which is forced love is a contradiction in terms, it is not love. And if this life is "the vale of soul-making," we do not see how it could be otherwise than that man should be exposed to temptation, with the possibility of either overcoming or yielding to it.

On the other hand, God was the indirect author of evil—that is to say, He created the conditions which made it both possible and probable for sin to arise. With very deep reverence it may be said that God is responsible for the sin of the world and its continuance, though His responsibility is absolutely different to our own.[2] What we plead for is that the act of self-reparatory holiness wrought by God on the Cross vindicates His responsibility for the world He has made and is ever making, though when we look at

[1] Cf. *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*, by Dr. H. R. Mackintosh. (Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1912), p. 442.

[2] We are glad to find that such a deep thinker and truly Christian believer as the late Dr. Fairbairn says: "We ought not to shrink from affirming what we have called the responsibility of God; we do not think, if we may reverently so speak, that He Himself would deny it; certainly it is an idea that lies at the root of the New Testament, and especially of its doctrine touching redemption and grace."—*The Philosophy of the Christian Religion* (London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1902), p. 133.

it, it is His love and self-sacrifice which stand forth most clearly in our minds. Many of us who are weighed down at times by the sin and suffering of the world find unspeakable comfort in the Cross, for it is here that the Creator manifests Himself as the Redeemer, and we know that He bears the whole burden of the mystery of existence, with its evil and sorrow, upon His heart.

We must now touch upon the Godward aspect of the Atonement in so far as it attributes suffering to the Godhead, which has been designated as the modern reaction against the doctrine of impassibility. Previous to the nineteenth century the tradition in Christian Theology has been almost unbroken that all suffering, and even the potentiality of suffering, should be excluded from the Divine nature. Whilst we are not of those who wish to bow down to modern thought and make an idol of it, and whilst we consider that " the last word " is not necessarily " the truest word," yet if what has been written in this article is on more or less sound lines, our sympathies are strongly in favour of the Divine Passibility. In this respect modern theology is in distinct advance of the old. Doubtless exaggerated statements have been made upon the subject of Divine suffering, but, then, the same objection can be brought against every belief of the Christian faith which has engaged the attention of man. The reason why the belief in the Impassibility of God was universal amongst Theologians till within modern times, is that the Christian doctrine of God was based on the Platonic-Aristotelean philosophy which reached its most systematic expression in the Scholastic theology of the thirteenth century, and is still living and effective in the Roman Catholic Church. Its determining ideas, as we have already noted, are those of infinity, unity, simplicity, perfection.[1] These metaphysical attributes are taken as giving us the nature of God " in Himself." If these are rigorously pressed to their logical conclusion, they seem difficult to reconcile with the Gospel account of God, that He is angry with sin, that He loves the world and the souls He has made. It follows, then, that we are debarred from applying such phrases as " the awful cost it meant to God to redeem us from sin," or even that sin in any sense whatsoever grieves Him. Thus the Cross loses its appeal. What are we to understand by the words " God so loved the world that He gave His only Begotten Son," unless by them we are intended to see the tremendous length God our Father went to redeem His world, the phrase " His *only* Begotten Son " revealing the infinite sacrifice of God.

We are in the presence of a profound mystery, and anyone who has read Canon Mozley's most valuable book on the *Impassibility of God*,[2] and, especially, tries to consider the six necessary questions with which he closes his essay, cannot but speak with very great hesitation. To us the Danish thinker, Bishop Martensen, gives the best solution of it, and even then " solution " is hardly the

[1] Cf. *God in Christian Thought and Experience*, by Dr. W. R. Matthews (London, Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1930), chap. v.

[2] Published by the S.P.C.K.

right word to express what transcends our reason. The Eternal God has a twofold life. As distinct from the world, in His Divine Transcendence He lives a life of perfect blessedness, the eternal peace of love in all its joy and perfection. In certain moods we dwell upon this, and adore Him as the source of all true joy, being Himself joy, " unplumbed, unplumbable, with not one drop of evil within it." We shall be sustained by it, and we shall look forward to realise it far more in the world beyond than is possible for us here on earth, as it will form part of our eternal blessedness to adore Him who was, and is, and is to come. With this life there is another Life, as lived in and with His Creation, God submitting to the conditions of finitude, where He allows His power to be limited and thwarted by the sinful wills of men. And thus we come to regard Him as the Divine Sufferer, ever by His Holy Spirit striving with man, wounded, and set at naught, but through it all ever victorious and triumphant. It seems to us that we must hold both facts together, God's infinite bliss and happiness, and God's infinite sorrow, believing that the latter will contribute to His ultimate glory when all things shall have been put under His feet, and God will be all in all.

We have tried to state what we believe to be the Godward aspect of the Atonement, and in so doing none are more conscious than we are how imperfectly we have expressed our belief, and how inadequate are our thoughts, but we do believe that such terms as ransom, substitution and punishment cannot be eliminated from the concept of God which Our Lord embodies and reveals.

It remains for us to mention a book written by a Swedish Theologian, Dr. Aulén, and which has been translated into English, called *Christus Victor*,[1] wherein is given an historical study of three main types of the Atonement, and we do this as in our attitude towards them it will enable us to clarify our position.

The three types are as follows: the Latin type, the subjective type, and what Dr. Aulén calls, and which he himself seems to favour, the classic type.

The first appears fully developed in Anselm's famous work *Cur Deus Homo*, an epoch-making book, in which the older and more " physical " idea of salvation is replaced by a teaching of a deliverance from the guilt of sin; and above all, the " objective " character of the Atonement is taught, according to which God is the object of Christ's atoning work, and is reconciled through the satisfaction made to His justice, the satisfaction being offered by Christ as the sinless Man on behalf of sinful mankind. The sacrifice of Christ as Man is of infinite worth because of the perfect union of His humanity with His Divine nature, and thus rendered Him capable of discharging the infinite debt which sinful mankind owed to God.

The second is associated with Abelard, and is commonly contrasted with the first as the " subjective " doctrine of the Atonement. Stress is laid almost entirely on the moral effects which the sacrifice

[1] Translated by A. G. Hebert and published by the S.P.C.K., 1931.

of Christ has made on mankind; the change which has taken place is in man and not in God's attitude towards him. Christ has taught us to think of God as a Father Who will forgive men their sins, if and in proportion as they have repented of them, and what greater incentive to repentance can be derived than the contemplation of Christ's life of sacrifice and service culminating in the Cross!

The last, the classic type, is the idea of the Atonement as a Divine conflict and victory; Christ—*Christus Victor*—fights against and triumphs over the evil powers of the world, and in Him God reconciles the world to Himself. The background of the idea is dualistic, the word dualistic being used not in a metaphysical sense, but solely with an ethical meaning, the world as opposed to the Divine will. God is pictured as in Christ carrying through a victorious conflict against the powers of evil which are hostile to His will. A change is brought about by the Atonement in the relation between God and the world, and a change also in God's own attitude. Dr. Aulén is most emphatic that the work of reconciliation is from first to last a work of God Himself, a continuous Divine work, and He would claim that this classic type best represents the teaching of the New Testament, and is really what underlies the teaching of St. Irenæus and the Fathers generally, and is in all its essentials upheld by Martin Luther.

We gladly confess that we are very much impressed by Dr. Aulén's exposition and by his insistence upon the necessity of the "classic" type claiming our attention alongside of the other two. We would, however, venture to assert that the theory adopted in this article endeavours to do justice to the positive side of all three types, and possesses therefore the merit of inclusiveness, and declines to over-simplify the problem.

With Dr. Aulén we wholeheartedly agree that the Atonement was the work of God Himself, a continuous Divine work, from first to last the work of God Himself. The Atonement was demanded by the Son, Who carried it out as absolutely as by the Father. Both were of one mind in this necessity.

The Death of Christ must also not be viewed as an isolated act, but as a summing up of what went before; in other words, it must not be detached from the Incarnation. All through His earthly life Christ was the Redeemer, but His redemptive activity reached its completion upon the Cross. Without His earthly ministry we should not know the worth of Him Who made the Sacrifice nor the character and will of the Father Whom He revealed. The Cross is not only the Crown and completion of the Saviour's life work, but also an epitome of what He was and is. Nor do we desire to divorce the Cross from the Resurrection and Ascension and the coming of His Blessed Spirit. Being freed from earthly limitations, His saving Death is rendered available for all mankind.

Again the so-called subjective view is ours; Christ for us and Christ in us are inseparably united. He Who died on our behalf

is by our acceptance of Him ever working within us, and bringing forth the fruits of our redemption.

But we believe that behind St. Irenæus's view and that of the ancient Fathers as well as Martin Luther, and most of all in the New Testament, however crudely in some cases it was expressed, there lay the conviction that an inner Divine necessity actuated the Atonement. Death is the inexorable fruit of sin; this had to be made manifest to men and angels. God had to vindicate His inevitable law—namely, that sin always involves death. He underwent that vindication to proclaim His own just law. Thus was sin judged, and at the same time it was an act of self-reparatory holiness actuated throughout by His love for us men and for our salvation.

ON SECOND THOUGHTS. Henry Bett. *The Epworth Press.* 2s.

A bundle of twelve short essays on religious subjects, marked by "sanctified common sense," and wide reading; this latter is evidenced by the number of quotations, as for instance in the six pages of the essay on Extremes, nine different authors are cited. The thoughts expressed are not very deep, and sometimes confused; e.g. the writer has little use for Authority, but urges that we must learn the lessons of History; again, Emotion is necessary to religion, but Sentimentality is dangerous.

For a Christian, there is one serious omission; Professor Bett does not once mention the Person or Work of the Holy Spirit; he seems to regard the Church of Christ as an agglomeration of human organisations rather than a divine organism. Therefore in Essay V, on Unity, he is suspicious of union (perhaps he means uniformity), and desires "unity of spirit," which is not the same as "endeavouring to maintain the unity of the Spirit" as a given state.

In treating of Symbols, only words, not actions or persons or places, seem to be considered as having symbolic value; it seems as if the subjects had not been fully thought out, and we must look forward to his "Third Thoughts," if such should come, as showing a fuller grasp of the religion of the Incarnation.

PATERNOSTER TALES. By Vera E. Walker. *London: S.P.C.K.* 1s.

Stories based on the Lord's Prayer. Most of them take us back to the times of the Saints, including St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Cyprian of Carthage, St. Cuthbert of Lindisfarne, St. Chrysostom of Constantinople, and others. At the end will be found a note to Teachers and Story-tellers—to help to trace the sources of the Stories.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE CELTIC CHURCH.

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

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND: ITS CONNECTION WITH THE EAST; ITS DIFFERENCES FROM THE CHURCH OF ROME; ITS INDEPENDENCE.

THE Church of Ireland until the twelfth century, generally speaking, for six centuries, was a free and a national Church. It had many points of contact with the Eastern Church which suggest an Eastern origin, and as many points of difference from the Roman Church which make a Roman origin impossible.

In the first place, we shall briefly summarize the points of contact with the East. With regard to the monastic habitations, they resemble in plan, i.e. a group of small huts surrounded by a *cashel*, the communities of the East, like that of Mount Tabor, after which they were modelled.[1] The ascetic practices of the Irish hermit, such as suspending oneself by the armpits from hooks,[2] were imitations of the devices in self-torture discovered by the anchorites of the Syrian desert, probably in imitation of the Indian fakir's methods of self-torture. The smallness of the churches reminded travellers of those of Mount Athos and Asia Minor; and the group of seven churches, e.g. at Glendalough and Clonmacnois suggests the "Seven Churches of Asia." The shape of the doors of the hermitages of SS. Flannan and Molua at Killaloe, broader at the threshold than at the head, resembles Egyptian style of architecture. The circle of the Irish cross is probably the loop of the *crux ansata* of the Egyptians, their circle of life being an emblem of immortality. The swathed form of Christ in Irish sculpture may have been modelled after the mummified figures of the Egyptians. While Mr. F. E. Warren[3] points out (1) that the Celtic designs in the *Book of Kells* resemble nothing in Italian MS. or ornamentation of that time, but have a considerable likeness to Egyptian fresco painting; (2) that the peculiarity of the Greek style of writing, in which the written letters depend from the line above, instead of resting on the line beneath, is found in the Stowe Missal (ff. 18, 20–4); and (3) that the serpent, a common design in Celtic calligraphy, which reaches its perfection in the serpentine decoration of the shrine of St. Patrick's Bell,[4] is of Egyptian origin, recalling the feats of Moses before Pharaoh and the serpent in the wilderness. The serpentine formation of the pastoral staff of Eastern bishops has been noted.[5] The Eastern monks were as careful as the Irish in preserving their manuscripts in stamped leather satchels or

[1] Reeves' *Columba*, p. 360.
[2] *Life of Finnchu*, Dict. Nat. Biog.
[3] *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, p. 51.
[4] Reeves, *Description of St. Patrick's Bell*, Belfast, 1850.
[5] Goar, *Euchology*, p. 115.

"polaires" and hanging them on pegs or slinging them on their shoulders by their straps.

That there should be something in common between Ireland and the East, when we consider the early connection between the two, which is proved by the visits of Irish monks to Egypt such as that mentioned in *The Survey of the World* by Dicuil, in which Fidelis explained the Pyramids as the barns built by Joseph, and the visits of Egyptian monks to Ireland, seven of whom, according to the Litany of Œngus the Culdee, are buried in Desert Ulidh, is not surprising. But this intercourse would hardly be sufficient in itself to explain other points of resemblance. For instance, the Irish and Eastern bishops wore crowns,[1] not mitres, doubtless out of respect for the Apostle John, who was placed by them far above SS. Peter and Paul, and who is described by Eusebius [2] as wearing a *petalum* or plate. They also, like the Eastern Church, suspended crowns over shrines. The Irish Church also, like the Greek, used unleavened bread for the Holy Communion, fasted on Wednesdays and Fridays, a custom declared by Ussher [3] to be "agreeable to the custom of the Grecian rather than of the Roman Church." An Irish Penitential ordered the women to be veiled when receiving the Sacrament,[4] like the Eastern and Gallican Churches. From Adamnan's *Columba* (i, 44) Döllinger inferred that they gave the episcopal benediction, like the ancient Gallican and Mozarabic liturgies, between the Consecration and the Communion of the People. It was given in the Oriental manner, that is, with the right hand, first, second and fourth fingers extended and the third closed over the palm, the Roman mode being to raise the thumb, fore and middle fingers and bend the other two. Again, the sacred monogram I.H.S., which was much used in the East, is found in Irish illuminative work, and is properly explained as the first three letters of the Greek name of Jesus in the glossary of Cormac, who was also a Greek scholar of some importance, the celebrated Bishop-King of Cashel, not as the initial letters of the title "Jesus hominum salvator." One might also refer to the resemblance between the Creed of Patrick given in his Confession and the symbols in the *Treatise* of Irenæus [5] who came from the East to Gaul. Extensive passages in the Stowe Missal have been borrowed from the Gallican Liturgy. Now Gallican Christianity seems to have come originally from Syria and the East via the Greek colony of Massilia (Marseilles), through Pothinus and Irenæus. Gaul also derived its monastic

[1] Warren, *Celtic Church*, p. 120. [2] *H.E.* v, 24.

[3] *Opera* iv, 305. The fast on Wednesday and Friday is ordered in the Eastern rule of St. Antony.

[4] *The Apostolic Constitutions*, II, 57, St. Basil, and the Council of Auxerre made a similar rule (42nd canon).

[5] See Creeds of SS. Irenæus and Patrick, *Hermathena*, vol. xiii, p. 41 *et seq.*, by present writer. Chiefly note the Assumption instead of Ascension, the Spirit as "the pledge of immortality," Christ's "power above every name," "one God in the Trinity of the Sacred Name." Cf. Irenæus III. 18, 3, "In Christi nomine subauditur qui unxit et ipse qui unctus est, et ipsa unctio in quâ unctus est."

system from the East. And it was from the Gallican Church, so greatly subject to Eastern influences, that the Irish Church derived its special character, both before Patrick's day and in his time and after.

There was a constant intercourse between the Churches of Armorica and Brittany and the Christians of Britain, Cornwall and Wales between A.D. 450 and 600. British bishops were present at the Councils of Tours A.D. 461, Vannes 465, Orleans 511, Paris 555. Mansuetus, the first Bishop of Toul, was an Irishman, and Beatus, Bishop of Lausanne and Apostle of Switzerland, was also Irish. Eliphius and Eucherius, martyrs in France of the fourth century, were Irish. According to Diodorus Siculus, tin was exported from Britain to Gaul and transported through Gaul to the mouth of the Rhone. Strabo also mentions the commerce between Britain and Gaul. Columbanus was ordered to be shipped off from Nantes in an Irish merchant vessel. Irish wolfhounds were exported to Gaul in the days of Patrick. And the *Life* of Kiaran describes a visit of Gallic traders to Clonmacnois A.D. 548.

The following Gallican bishops had considerable connection with Britain, if not with Ireland, between A.D. 390 and 590: Martin of Tours, said to be the great-uncle of Patrick, Hilary of Poictiers, one of whose hymns is in the ancient Irish "Book of Hymns," Victricius of Rouen, Germanus of Auxerre, Lupus of Troyes, Severus of Treves, and Gregory of Tours. Celtic churches were dedicated to saints of Gaul: for instance, ancient churches at Canterbury and Whithern are dedicated to St. Martin; many in Cornwall and Wales to St. Germanus, and two in Glamorganshire to St. Lupus under the name of St. Bleiddian (little wolf). That there was a marked difference between the Roman and the Gallican liturgy may be inferred from Augustine's question to Pope Gregory: "Why is one form of Mass observed in the holy Roman Church and another in the Gallican Church?" [1]

We shall now consider some points of difference between the Celtic and the Roman Churches in these early days. That there were many is to be inferred from the words of Augustine to the British bishops at Bangor: "Because in many things you are acting contrary to our custom, nay, contrary to the whole Church." [2] The difference in the calculation of Easter was really the main point of the controversy.[3] It was not a theological question, but an astro-

[1] Bede, *H.E.*, i, 27. Gregory's reply was moderate and wise. "It pleases me," he said, "that if you have found any thing either in the Roman or the Gallican or *any other Church* which may be more acceptable to God, you carefully make choice of the same and carefully teach the Church of the English, which as yet is new in the faith, what you can gather from the several Churches." [2] Bede, *History*, ii, 2.

[3] The Celtic Churches of Britain and Ireland still adhered to the earliest Easter table, which had in the meanwhile been altered several times for astronomical reasons by the Church on the Continent. Augustine's stipulations at the conference with the British bishops were reduced to three points, the keeping of the Roman Easter, and Baptism, and the preaching of the Gospel to the English. But the British bishops refused all three especially the last. Therefore missionaries were sent from Ireland to convert the Angles and Saxons.

nomical point that had been debated at the Synod of Whitby. One party kept Easter on the fourteenth day after the Vernal equinox, Sunday or no. The other party on the Sunday which fell on or between the fourteenth and twentieth day of the moon next after the Vernal equinox. But it had become a party badge, and that it was displayed with all the bitterness of a political contest may be seen from the letter (A.D. 634) of Cummian, who advocated the Roman Easter, to Segene, Abbot of Hy, in which he denounced an Abbot Finan who opposed Rome as "the whited wall," and expressed the pious hope that God would smite him (Finan). That there was some foundation for Cummian's sarcastic remark, "Rome is wrong, Jerusalem is wrong, Alexandria is wrong, Antioch is wrong, the whole world is wrong; only the Irish, Scotch and the Britons are right" is clear, but we cannot but express the wish —a little more pious than Cummian's—that Rome had left us to find out our mistake and correct it ourselves. It was the attempt to force them to correct the mistake without giving them the time to see it, that made the Celts resent what they justly considered unwarranted and arrogant interference. For they clearly saw that the acceptance of the Roman Easter meant the acceptance of Roman doctrine and influence.

The tonsure was another point of difference, the British tonsure being the old Druid style of shaving the front of the head "from ear to ear," and letting all the rest grow, the Roman being the so-called "corona" or crown, in imitation of our Lord's "crown of thorns," and the Greek being a complete tonsure of the whole head. The Synod of Whitby also accepted the Roman tonsure. But many of the Irish clergy regarded their own tonsure as a sign of their independence, and persisted in retaining it. This gave rise to the proverb, *Cosmail Mael do Caplait*,[1] which means that the native tonsure is as good as the Roman. This is in the *Tripartite Life* (Rolls ed. 104). A similar *mot*—"similis est calvus contra caplit" is in Tirechán's Memoir. Another point was in connection with the Ordinal. For it was the custom of the British and Irish bishops [2] to receive consecration at the hands of *one* bishop; but the general, though not the universal, rule in the Roman Church was to have three bishops to consecrate. It was one of the Canons of the Council of Arles (A.D. 314) that three bishops at least and seven, if possible, should assist at consecrations. This question had not been raised in the case of St. Patrick, who used to consecrate bishops without any other bishop to assist him; but seems to have been pressed just at the time when the Italian mission of the seventh century was endeavouring to drive the Irish clergy out of England. Consecration by a single bishop had been recognized

[1] *Mael* being the man with native and *Caplait* (Capillatus) the man with Roman tonsure. See Bury, *Life of St. Patrick*, p. 241.

[2] "The King and clergy of the Cambrian region having summoned *one* bishop from Ireland, according to the custom of the Britons and Irish, made him (Kentigern) be consecrated bishop."—*Life of St. Kentigern*, c. xii (by Jocelin).

as valid by Pope Gregory (A.D. 601) in his answer to Augustine, in which he ignores the existence of the British bishops, of whose existence, however, he suddenly became aware in his answer to Augustine's seventh question, in which he commits the British bishops to his control.[1] "Truly," he said, "in the Church of the English, in which as yet you are found the only bishop, you cannot consecrate a bishop otherwise than single-handed."[2] What was wrong in the case of an Irishman was thus made right in the case of an Italian.

An instance of the arrogance of the foreign mission is the treatment of Chad, Bishop of York, who had been consecrated by Wini, Bishop of Winchester, and two British bishops (A.D. 665). But Wilfrid, the champion of the Roman cause, had in the meantime gone abroad to be consecrated Bishop of York, refusing to be consecrated by Irish bishops, "whose communion the Catholic see spurned,"[3] and on his return found that Chad had been put in his place. He then set the mischievous example of appealing to Rome, and is said to have procured by influence or other means a Papal decree in his favour, as Geraldus Cambrensis tried in vain to do at a later date. The consecration of Chad was then alleged to be invalid. But Theodore, the first Archbishop by consent of the English Church, afterwards (A.D. 669) completed his ordination after "the Catholic manner."[4] And the rule was made that "such as have received ordination from the bishops of the Scots (Irish) or Britons, who are not Catholics in the matters of Easter and tonsure, are not in union with the Church, and must again be confirmed by laying-on-of-hands by a Catholic bishop."[5] This was done in order to compel the Irish and British clergy to accept the new calculation of Easter and the "coronal" or crown-like tonsure. We might mention here the dying injunction of St. Cuthbert, a convert to the Roman view (A.D. 687), to his followers: "With those that err from the unity of Catholic peace, either by not celebrating Easter at the proper time or by living perversely, have no communion"; and the resolution of the Council of Celcyth (A.D. 816) which called in question the Orders of the Irish clergy and the efficacy of the Sacraments administered by them, and banned their services both in Baptism and Eucharist. This proves the independence of the Celtic Church. And in Ireland some time afterwards

[1] Bede, *H.E.*, i, 27. "We entrust to your fraternity all the bishops of the Britains" (Britanniarum).

[2] *Ibid.*, i, 27.

[3] So William of Malmesbury *da Gestis Pontif.* lib. iii quoted by Ussher, iv, 348, "Quorum communionem sedes aspernaretur Catholica." Eddius the biographer of Wilfrid quotes a speech of Wilfrid in which he states that "there are many Quartodecimans like the Britons and Scots (Irish) in Britain, and begs to be allowed to be consecrated in France where were many Catholic bishops."

[4] Bede, *H.E.*, iv, 2. "Ordinationem ejus denuo catholica ratione consummavit." Compare the canons of Nicæa (325) regarding those ordained by the schismatic Meletius Bishop of Lycopolis.

[5] The *Penitential* of Theodore, ii, 9.

two canons [1] were drawn up by the Roman party, and falsely ascribed to Patrick and his companions Auxilius and Iserninus, condemning the native custom of consecration by a single bishop and the native tonsure. Nevertheless, the Irish Church pursued the even tenor of her way, and we find both Lanfranc (1070–89) and Anselm (1093–1114) of Canterbury, complaining of episcopal consecration by a single bishop [2] in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Another point of difference was the marriage of the Irish clergy. Patrick himself was the son of a deacon and the grandson of a priest.[3] In the Book of Canons ascribed to him but belonging to the eighth century there is a canon to the effect that "if a clergyman is not tonsured after the Roman fashion, and if *his wife* does not veil her head when she walks out, they shall be despised by the laity and separated from the Church." This implies the existence of a married clergy. The words of Gildas [4] (A.D. 547), on the text "the husband of one wife," addressed to the clergy imply the existence of a married clergy in Britain. The Brehon laws (Senchus Mor, i, 55) also distinguished between a married and unmarried clergy, prescribing different penalties for sin in either case, much less for the married than the celibate bishop. The fact that Pope Innocent III (A.D. 1198–1216), who excommunicated King John of England, wrote to his legate in Ireland to abolish the custom there by which the sons and grandsons used to succeed their fathers and grandfathers in their ecclesiastical benefices,[5] proves that the Irish clung to their custom with all the more tenacity to show their independence of Rome. And in the *Book of Leinster* (p. 369) there are two lists, one of the sons (189) [6] of the Irish saints, and the other of their daughters (102), which would scarcely have been given if there had been anything improper in the fact of a married clergy. Geraldus Cambrensis tells us how unwilling the Welsh

[1] To be found in the collection of Irish Canons called the *Hibernensis*, edited by Wasserschleben, and "put together, it is generally agreed, at the end of the seventh or in the first years of the eighth century" (Bury, *Life of St. Patrick*, p. 235). Adamnan who died A.D. 704 is quoted. The canon ascribed to Patricius runs: "PATRICK: If any cleric is not tonsured in the Roman way he ought to be excommunicated." The preceding canon (lii. 6) ascribes the Irish tonsure to Simon Magus.

[2] Ussher, *Opera* iv. Letters 27, 35, 36, to Kings Turlough (A.D. 1074) and Murtough (A.D. 1100).

[3] *Confession* (an authentic work): Patrem habui Calpurnium filium quemdam Potiti presbyteri.

[4] Ussher, iv, 294. Ussher collected many of the important letters which throw a light on the history of the early Irish Church.

[5] Ussher, Works, iv, 296.

[6] Tirechán in his memoir tries to father the rule of celibacy on St. Patrick. But in those days celibacy was not the rule. The proposal that clergy should separate from their wives was opposed at the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325). The Council of Anjou (A.D. 433) permitted the clergy to marry, and the Council of Trullo (A.D. 692) did likewise. On the other hand, Pope Siricius (A.D. 385) wrote a decretal to a Spanish bishop maintaining the necessity of celibacy. There are, however, allusions to married clergy in the inscriptions in the Catacombs under the years 404, 405. See De Rossi.

clergy of the twelfth century were to give up marriage and their hereditary claim upon Church livings. "Their sons," he says, "after the death of their fathers succeed to the Church benefices, not by election but by the right of inheritance." [1]

Clerical celibacy did not become the law of the Church of England until 1102, when the Council of Westminster,[2] under Anselm's presidency, declared that "no archdeacon, presbyter, deacon or canon should marry or retain his wife, and that no one was to be ordained to the sub-diaconate without profession of chastity." But in 1549, clerical marriage was legalized by Act of Parliament. In the meantime, the Irish clergy continued to marry. We find the Bishop of Connor informing Pope Gregory IX that he had been elected to the see, being "the son of a priest and begotten in priesthood," [3] by the Irish canons, who were most eager to have him as Bishop, but he was compelled to resign by the Pope. In *Primate Cotton's Visitation* (A.D. 1400) there is an interesting account of the Primate's visit to *Dubhregles* or Black Abbey, founded by Columcille at Derry, where a married man, Odo O'Dogherty, was instituted as Abbot in the Primate's presence. He had been elected by the canons, in whose eyes his marriage did not make any difference, but the Primate sternly expelled poor Katherine from her home. From the Annals of the *Four Masters* we learn that Conn, Bishop of Clonmacnois, was a married man, and that his father, grandfather and great-grandfather had been in holy orders (A.D. 1022, 1031, 1056, 1079, 1103, 1128).

The question of clerical celibacy is not a question of what is right, but of what is expedient. In the New Testament there is nothing against the marriage of the clergy. St. Peter the Apostle was a married man. St. Paul claimed the right to "lead about a wife as well as other apostles and as the brethren of the Lord and Kephas," [4] and in his letter to Timothy [5] laid down the rule that "a bishop should be the husband of one wife." In the Catacombs [6] of Rome we find inscriptions which prove that there were married clergy in the fourth and fifth centuries in Rome. In the Würzburg Glosses (Irish) on the Pauline Epistles the Irish Scribe, writing on 1 Cor. vii. 28, says, "He manifests here the difference

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Documents*, gives a record under year 961 which describes the opposition of the Welsh clergy to the rule of celibacy, "so that it was considered best to permit the clergy to marry."

[2] Dunstan (A.D. 978) and the British clergy discussed the matter, and the latter refused to yield, with consequences fatal to themselves as the story goes. The Council of Westminster (A.D. 1076) passed laws on the subject in the days of Hildebrand (Gregory VII), who thought that a celibate priesthood would be more likely to be devoted to the Papacy—a spiritual empire under the Pope—than a married clergy.

[3] Theiner, *Vetera Monumenta Hiberniæ*, Letter 70, p. 28.

[4] 1 Cor. ix. 5. [5] 1 Tim. iii. 1.

[6] De Rossi, *Inscriptiones Christianæ*. Sub. ann. 404, 405. Among them are records of Stephen, son of a priest, Melon, and of Philip, son of a priest, Alypius. J. S. Northcote (*Epitaphs of the Catacombs*, p. 117) mentions inscriptions of Roman priests and deacons whose wives were buried with them, up to the end of the fourth century.

between marriage and celibacy, for when of the married it is said (v. 36) 'he sinneth not,' of the celibate he says, 'he doeth well.' And when he says of the married, 'he doeth well,' he says of the celibate, 'he doeth better.'" The matter is one of expediency. No hard and fast rule, therefore, can be laid down; no other, in fact, than that which hath been laid down by the Master: "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

But the Irish clergy not only married, they and their people married within the prohibited degrees of relationship. See the complaint of Lanfranc (A.D. 1074) in his letter to Turlough, King of Ireland. But it is to be observed that the Celtic clergy did not consider themselves bound by the Canon Law but by the Mosaic Law in this matter; and, therefore, they married within degrees generally prohibited, but sometimes permitted by the Roman Church, when it served their purpose, as in the case of Henry VIII's marriage with Catherine of Aragon. The Synod of Cashel (A.D. 1172) passed a resolution against these marriages. When we read the charges of incest made by the Roman against the Irish clergy, we must remember that they denounced marriage between people in spiritual affinity, such as sponsors, as incest.

Lanfranc also alludes to the omission of chrism at Baptism in the Celtic Church. Chrism was never, indeed, an essential part of Baptism. And it was often difficult to obtain oil in Ireland. St. Patrick speaks of his neophytes with the oil fresh on their brows [1] and robed in their white garment (the *chrisom*); and the earliest extant Irish Baptismal Service in the Stowe Missal prescribes three separate acts of unction, on breast, and shoulders before Baptism, and brow after. The Irish practised immersion (single), to judge from the large fonts at St. Brecan's Bed (sixth century) and King Cormac's Chapel at Cashel (twelfth century). Trine immersion, with the alternative of aspersion (sprinkling), is ordered in the Stowe Missal (ciii. 14), which strangely omits the formula of Baptism in that office. Compare the Würzburg Gloss on Colossians ii. 14, "Three waves pass over us in Baptism because He was three days in the sepulchre." Benedict (Abbas) of Peterborough, in describing the proceedings of the Synod of Cashel (A.D. 1172), remarks that it was ordered that the baptism of infants should be performed in church and by the priests "in the Name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit," [2] and mentions that there was a custom in different parts of Ireland, in the case of a rich man's child, for the father or someone else to plunge it three times in milk, otherwise, three times in water. Lanigan denied this, but

[1] Letter to Coroticus (2). "Crismati neophyti in veste candida, dum fides flagrabat in fronte ipsorum." See also *Book of Armagh* (f. 12), the daughters of Leary were clothed in white after Baptism.

[2] Fergil (Vergil), abbot of Aghabo, who left Ireland in A.D. 745 and became Abbot of Salzburgh, was ordered by Archbishop Boniface to rebaptize a person because the priest used ungrammatical Latin. He refused, and the Pope upheld him because the priest had intended to baptize in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

the Life of St. Brigit in the *Book of Lismore* states that she was after birth bathed in milk which was in accordance with Brigit's merit.

The Pedilavium, or washing of feet after Baptism, was a rite practised in the Celtic and Gallican Churches, after John xiii. 4–7, but is not found in any Roman Office. Theodore of Canterbury in his *Penitential* did not recognize British or Celtic ordinations or consecration of churches, and even expressed doubts as to the validity of its Baptism. The same hostility was shown to the Celtic clergy by the Roman party on the Continent as well as by Bede and Eddius. Gregory III (A.D. 731–741) wrote letters to the Bishops of Bavaria against the " teaching and ritual of the Gentiles," and of " the Britons who went there " and of " other false priests or heretics "—a clause which doubtless referred to Irish missionaries. The bitterness was shown in other ways. Boniface, the " Apostle of Germany," denounced Vergilius, who had been Ferghal of Aghabo in Ireland, and was then the " Apostle of Carinthia," and Sidonius, to Pope Zachary (A.D. 746), for the manner in which they administered Baptism, and not being able to effect his purpose, had them condemned for teaching the sphericity of the earth. Other Irishmen on the Continent were subjected to ill-treatment and persecution by the Roman party. [1]

With regard to the practice of Confession in the Celtic Church, auricular Confession is not mentioned in the *Book of Armagh*. Mr. F. E. Warren [2] points out that it was public rather than private, and optional rather than compulsory, and therefore dropped into disuse. Instead of a father confessor the Irish consulted, as in the well-known case of Columba, an Anmchara or soul-friend, who advised them what steps they should take to atone, but gave no absolution. With regard to incense, Mr. Warren writes [3]: " We have been unable to discover any passage referring to the use of incense in the Celtic Church." And as regards the style and character of the music of the Celtic Church, we know very little beyond the fact that the services were sung,[4] and that they were not sung in the Gregorian or any other Roman chant, but most probably in the Alexandrian course introduced into the monasteries of Lérins and Marseilles.[5]

In the Eucharist unleavened bread was used by the Irish Church as by the African Church of Cyprian, and the Saxon Church of Theodore ; the chalice was mixed, and there was probably a daily celebration,[6] but there was *Communion in both kinds*, as we shall show from the following instances. In the Rule of Columbanus

[1] Warren, *Liturgy of Celtic Church*, p. 45, quotes authorities.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 149. Malachi of Armagh, circ. 1123, sought to introduce and make compulsory auricular confession.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 127.

[4] Columba's voice could be heard chanting (*decantans*) a mile off (Adamnan).

[5] Mabillon, *De Gallican Cursu*, p. 381.

[6] The Würzburg Gloss (Irish) on Eph. i. 7, speaks of " the Spiritual Blood which is offered *every day* upon the altar."

there was a penalty of six lashes attached to injuring the chalice with the teeth. In Sechnall's *Hymn* (before A.D. 447) St. Patrick is described as "giving drink to the people of God in *a spiritual cup*" (propinansque Dei plebem spirituali poculo). In the later *Lives* of the Saints we read such passages as—"When the girl had received the Body of Christ and His Blood, she died without grief." Cogitosus in his *Life of St. Brigit* tells us that Brigit "the Abbess passed through another door with her maidens and widows to enjoy the banquet of the *Body* and *Blood* of Jesus Christ." The Antiphonary of Bangor (seventh century) contains the Communion Hymn of the Church of Ireland in which there are many allusions to the Chalice. It is known in Neale's version in Hymns Ancient and Modern (313): "Draw nigh and take the Body of the Lord, And drink the holy Blood for you outpoured."

Cuthbert, who had adopted the Roman usage, was, as Bede tells us, requested by an officer of Egfrid to visit his wife before her death and give her "the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ." [1] The Irish rule of the Culdees spoke of "giving the chalice," and of "going to the chalice" i.e. Holy Communion.[2] The chalice was held by the deacon; while the priest administered the Bread. The size of the Ardagh chalice (now in the Royal Irish Academy) shows that in its time the cup had not been taken from the laity. In the passages quoted we notice not only a distinct difference from the Roman use of withholding the cup from the laity, but also a spiritual interpretation of the Holy Communion which is contrary to the doctrine of Transubstantiation. On this point we may compare with advantage the Post Communion Collect: "the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son" with the Irish (Würzburg) Gloss on Eph. i. 7: "the *spiritual* Blood which is offered every day upon the altar," and the Post-Communion Collect in the Rosslyn Missal (thirteenth century, Irish), "that we who offer the spiritual sacrifice, etc." [3]

A strange Irish custom was for two priests to consecrate together; it being the privilege of a bishop to consecrate singly. Adamnan [4] tells us of a bishop who concealed his rank when staying with Columba at Iona, and that Columba, in order to honour him, invited him to join in the consecration; but on discovering his rank, said: "Christ bless thee, brother, break this bread alone as a bishop." In the Stowe Missal, which was saved when the Danes burnt the Abbey of Lorrha (A.D. 834), and is the earliest form of Liturgy in the Irish Church, we also notice that there is no sign of the *cross* at the words of Institution, and that the three Orders —Bishops, Priests and Deacons alone, and none of the minor orders —deacon, subdeacon, reader, exorcist and ostiarius are mentioned. See Warren's account of this Missal (*op. cit.*, pp. 198–267). It also has the pedilavium after Baptism.

The charge made by Lanfranc to King Turlough that money

[1] Bede, *Life of Cuthbert*, c. 15.
[2] Reeves' edition, p. 86.
[3] Warren's *Celtic Ritual*, p. 269.
[4] *Vita S. Columbæ*, i, 44.

was received by Irish bishops for ordination would not apply at least to St. Patrick, who declared in his *Confession* that he never received the half of a scruple for Baptism nor the price of his shoe for ordination. Neither orders, nor dispensations, nor decrees have ever been publicly or privately sold in the Church of Ireland, as the latter have been and are, without question, sold by the Church of Rome.

There were a number of other points of difference in ritual and liturgy between the Celtic [1] and the Roman Church, specially in the ordination of clergy and the consecration of churches,[2] but the main points of difference, which may be classed as (1) the Method of Calculating Easter; (2) the Style of Tonsure; (3) Consecration by one Bishop; (4) the Marriage of the Clergy; (5) Absence of Incense; (6) Communion in Both Kinds; (7) Spiritual Interpretation of the Holy Communion, are sufficient to attest the independence of the Irish Church.

In conclusion, we may add that the Irish clergy were not slow in asserting that independence on occasions. For instance, we find Columbanus, who defended the Celtic mode of calculating Easter by appealing to the authority of Anatolius of Laodicea (A.D. 270), writing letters to Pope Boniface IV in which he says: "I grieve over the *infamy* of the chair of St. Peter. . . . Watch, and again I say watch, Pope, because they say Vigilius [3] did not keep good watch, and he is condemned as the source of the *scandal* by those who blame you. . . . Watch first of all for the faith . . . that you may purge the chair of Peter from all error. . . . A very grievous thing it would be if the Catholic faith was not held in an Apostolic see. . . . I entreat you, because many doubt the *purity of your faith.*" He freely criticizes the Church of Rome, and warns it of the risk it runs of losing the keys, an authority which can only last as long as it is rightly and reasonably used; and of the danger of arrogance and pride, which the Lord will surely humble; and he is grieved to say the name of God is blasphemed among the heathen on account of the quarrels of the Italian bishops. He also makes the uncomplimentary remark that "a living dog is better than a dead lion" (Leo), when urging the Pope to remove the errors his predecessors had left uncorrected. This is proof that Columbanus did not believe in the infallibility of Rome or its Bishop. And on the other hand, we find him asserting in his fourth Letter to Boniface (A.D. 612) that the Celtic Church was neither schismatical nor heretic, that it received "nothing but the evangelical and apostolic doctrine," that "not one of us has been heretic, Jew or schismatic," and that "the *Catholic faith* is maintained unshaken by us as by you, the successors, forsooth,[4] of the

[1] Comprising the British, Scottish, Armorican as well as the Irish Church.
[2] Warren's *Celtic Church*, pp. 69–82.
[3] Pope A.D. 537–55. His vacillations over the Three Chapters which he accepted and then anathematized, and then again changed his opinion about them, causing much dissension in the West by his action in the matter.
[4] The *scilicet* in this passage is clearly ironical.

holy Apostles." The Roman faith was not necessarily the Catholic faith in his eyes.

This was no vain boast of Columbanus. Seventy years later (A.D. 680) Wilfrid of York, whom we have already met as a determined enemy of the Celtic Church in Britain, speaking at Rome, "for all the northern part of Britain and Ireland, and the Islands which were occupied by the Angles, Britons, Scots (Irish) and Picts," stated that the true and Catholic faith was held by them, and subscribed to that statement.[1] The hostile attitude of Wilfrid and his chronicler Eddius to the Celtic Church gives all the more weight to his words.

And if we find converts to Romanism like Cuthbert of Melrose, and Romanizers like Aldhelm of Malmesbury, denouncing the Celts who would not adopt the new Easter cycle and other customs, we also read a complaint [2] from Archbishop Lawrence (A.D. 604), successor of Augustine, that Dagan, an Irish bishop, would neither eat nor lodge with him; and another from Aldhelm to Geruntius, King of Damnonia, saying that "the priests of Cambria, proud of the purity of their morals, have such a horror of communication with us that they will neither pray in the churches with us . . . salute us or give us the kiss of peace." [3]

The facts given in this chapter are sufficient to prove the existence of a free and independent Celtic Church in Ireland, Britain, Wales and Scotland which claimed to be Catholic in doctrine and practice, but was bitterly attacked by, and as bitterly opposed to, the claims and usurpations of the Roman Church. This Celtic Church had her own list of Saints, in which Columbanus, the corrector of Roman abuses and the adviser of the Pope, and Colman, who opposed his efforts to Romanize Northumbria, have high places. A native liturgy, monastic rules, translation of the Scriptures, mode of consecration, Baptism, calculation of Easter and chanting serve to complete the picture of a wholly independent Church. From A.D. 700 to 1200 that autonomy or freedom to govern herself and make her own laws was gradually undermined and finally taken away, to be fully and completely recovered at the Disestablishment of 1870.

With regard to the word "Catholic," we have seen how Columbanus claimed that his Church possessed "the Catholic faith," and on the other hand, the members of the Roman party, like St. Cuthbert, denying this, and asserting that the Irish Church "erred from the unity of Catholic peace." The speech of Wilfrid [4] made when requesting that he might be consecrated bishop by some of the Gallican bishops, and not by the bishops in Britain, "whom the Apostolic Seat does not receive into its communion," testifies to this hostility of Rome and the Roman party to the Celtic Church,

[1] Eddius, *Life of Wilfrid*, c. 51.
[2] Bede, *H.E.*, ii, 4
[3] Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii, 268–73.
[4] Given by Eddius, his biographer.

an hostility which was shown to the Church of Ireland from its earliest years up to the present time.

The question is : Are we to surrender the title Catholic (Universal) to the Church of Rome, a title which our ancestors of the Church of Ireland claimed, and to which the Church of Rome of to-day has absolutely no right, since she departed from the Catholic faith and practice by her doctrines of Transubstantiation, Intention, Invocation of Saints, Mariolatry, Immaculate Conception, Works of Supererogation, Sale of Indulgences, Doctrine of Purgatory, and Papal Infallibility, which have never been held or practised by the whole or Universal Church.

Again, the spirit of the Church of Rome is the reverse of Catholic. This is noticeable from the commencement of the Romeward movement. The men who joined the Roman party in Ireland in the seventh century seem to be actuated by a new spirit. " First of all," writes Professor Zimmer,[1] " we are struck by the spirit of intolerance towards different views, and consequently by the spirit of *uncharitableness* as was shown by Augustine towards the British bishops, by Wilfrid towards Colman, and by Aldhelm in his letter to Geruntius." The same writer speaks of the spirit of *deliberate* falsification of documents in the interest of the Church which " only appears in the Irish Church after her union with that of Rome " (p. 117), and which renders worthless most of the Irish ecclesiastical records of that and the following centuries.

Such a spirit is the direct opposite of the grand old Catholic principles of faith, hope and love. Such a system is the reverse of Catholic, the very antipodes of the deep piety and sweet reasonableness of the ancient Church and early Bishops of Rome, when that see and city was " president in love," and renowned for hospitality and orthodoxy. The protest of Latimer rises to our lips. " I confess," he said, with the light of heaven upon his brow and a voice as if from another world, " I confess there is a Catholic Church to the determination of which I will stand ; but not the Church which you call Catholic, which sooner might be termed diabolic. And whereas you join together the Romish Church and the Catholic Church, stay there, I pray you. For it is one thing to say Romish Church and another thing to say Catholic Church."

[1] *Early Celtic Church*, p. 116 *et seq.* (Eng. trans.).

St. George's Service Book for Schools has been drawn up by some of the staff of St. George's School in Jerusalem for use in the services of the School (2*s.* 6*d.* net). It is arranged on the lines that are now popular, and those who are seeking new forms of service may find them helpful, even if unable to adopt them as a whole.

FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTIONS IN RELATION TO OUR LORD'S ATONEMENT.

By the Rev. A. C. Downer, M.A., D.D., Ox., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Southwark; formerly Rector of Selham.

Preliminary.

IN the remarks I am offering on this subject, I shall avoid certain recent tendencies.

First, the tendency to emphasize the Incarnation of Our Lord at the expense of His Atonement, or to speak of what is called "the extension of the Incarnation" at a moment such as that of the celebration of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, when the predominant thought is not that of Incarnation, but of Atonement.

Next, the tendency to define Atonement as the production of a mental state in which penitence renders a person capable of forgiveness, rather than as the freedom from the guilt, the conscience and the power of sin, secured for mankind by the Death of Christ and to be appropriated by faith. This, of course, is not to say that such a state of penitence is in any way excluded or to be regarded as unnecessary, but only that:

> "Could my zeal no respite know,
> Could my tears for ever flow,
> All for sin could not atone;
> Thou must save, and Thou alone."

Nor does this truth, when rightly applied, dissociate Our Lord's Death from His Incarnation, His Life in all its blessed steps, and His Resurrection from the dead. It is all part of one great whole. Although it is the Death which atones for sin, it could not do this without the life which went before the Cross, or the Resurrection, which followed it.

For my own part, I find it difficult to understand in what way the Death of Jesus Christ, under the circumstances in which it occurred, could be said to benefit mankind, nor how it could possibly produce a moral and spiritual change in the sinner, unless it was that of the willing Victim, giving Himself as a sacrifice for sin. Regarded as such a sacrifice, it has produced, and is daily producing, miracles of grace in the souls of men; and indeed there is nothing else that can produce them.

And I hope I shall adhere to the principle upon which are based Our Lord's own Teaching, the whole of Primitive Christianity, and the entire Reformation of Religion to which we owe our liberties—namely, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Covenants are the

one and only court of final appeal in all doctrines of Faith and all rules of Duty.

THE ATONEMENT.

The Rending of the Temple Veil.

In connection, then, with the Atonement, we recall that at the moment when Our Lord expired, the Synoptic Evangelists state that the Veil of the Temple, or Sanctuary, was rent in twain; and the two former add "from the top to the bottom." We recognize in this the hand of God, who, by this striking phenomenon, signified the glorious fact that there no longer remained any barrier between God and man; that, beginning from heaven and reaching to earth, Jehovah Himself had abolished the partition separating His alienated creatures from Himself, and that now nothing was left to prevent any Jew, or indeed any human being whatsoever, from approaching Him in the inmost sanctuary with boldness, on the ground and by the faith of the Death which occurred at the same moment with the sign, and which had at last brought to complete perfection the long-awaited work of atonement.

For here we recognize, in all its full-orbed glory, the revelation of the love of the Father toward His sinful children, "not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (1 John iv. 10). This is the basis of the Divine assurance through St. John that "if any man sin"—not the present tense *ἁμαρτάνῃ*, which would imply *living* in sin, but the aorist *ἁμάρτῃ*, which conveys the idea of *an act* of sin—"if any man *commit a sin*, we have a Paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation (*ἱλασμός*) for our sins" (1 John ii. 1, 2).

This, surely, is the typical import of the Mercy-seat of Exod. xxv. 17: "And thou shalt make a mercy-seat of pure gold . . . and thou shalt put the mercy-seat above upon the ark . . . and *there* I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat." It is the same word that is used in Rom. iii. 25, "whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, or *ἱλαστήριον*, through faith in his blood"; where the vital connection between the bloody death of Our Lord and the propitiation for sin is unmistakably displayed. The word *ἱλασμός* leads up directly to the unspeakably precious conception contained in the word *καταλλαγή*, translated in the A.V. of Rom. v. 11, "atonement." "Our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the reconciliation." The same word, or the closely connected verb *καταλλάσσειν*, is employed by St. Paul to convey the reconciling of the world to God through the rejection of the Jewish nation. He also uses it (1 Cor. vii. 11) to imply the return to her husband of the wife who had departed from him. Both these instances are significant as bearing upon the Atonement of Christ. St. Paul carries the conception to the zenith of its splendour when he says, "God hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. v. 18), and in Rom. v. 10, "If, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God

by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life."

"The word of reconciliation" and "the ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. v. 18, 19), by which it is made known, are embraced and expressed in the words *καταλλάσσειν* and *καταλλαγή*, that fall like Divine music on the ear of a convicted sinner in conscious need of pardon and acceptance with his Father in heaven.

The extremely able theologian Nathaniel Dimock, in his invaluable work, *The Doctrine of the Death of Christ*, says:

"It suffices for our purpose to say that the light which thus shines on the idea of propitiation constrains us to connect it only and entirely with the death of Christ. It cannot be transferred from that to any past or present offering or presentation by the ascended Saviour in heaven of the Blood which had been shed on Calvary. It cannot be shifted to any consecration to God of life raised from the dead. Viewed fairly in connection with the whole argument of the Apostle in the Epistle to the Romans, there ought to be no room for question that it is simply and only the death of Christ, which, being accepted in heaven, causes that God can be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. And therefore it is simply and only the death of Christ which is the propitiation—the atoning sacrifice for sin." [1]

And again:

"For the one true sacrifice of propitiation, we shall be constrained to see peace made by the blood of the Cross, atonement effected only by the death of the Cross, expiation made only by the shedding of the life blood of the Son of God, giving Himself for us." [2]

Consonant with this is Our Lord's own use, as applied to Himself, of the term *λύτρον*, ransom. "The Son of Man came to give His life a *λύτρον* for many" (St. Matt. xx. 28; St. Mark x. 45). This is His own view of His death, or, let us rather say, the revelation from His own lips of its true import. For in the word *λύτρον* are combined the ideas of both expiation and redemption. It expresses *the very price* which Our Lord was about to give for man's salvation—namely, *His life*. Could words be found to express with greater plainness vicarious action?

The verb *λυτροῦν*, in the middle voice *λυτροῦσθαι*, is employed by Cleopas and his companion, on the walk to Emmaus (St. Luke xxiv. 21), to denote the action of Him who, according to Old Covenant prophecy, should have redeemed Israel. It is used also by St. Paul (Titus ii. 14), where he says of Our Lord, "Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity." And in St. Peter's first Epistle (i. 18), he says that those to whom he was writing had been redeemed (*ἐλυτρώθητε*) from a vain course of life by the precious blood of Christ, as by the blood of the Passover Lamb. The Writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, speaking of Christ as the High Priest of His people, expresses by the term *λύτρωσις*, which of course is a derivative of *λύτρον*, the result of Our Lord's sacrificial work, in terms drawn from the account in Leviticus xvi. of the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement. He says: "He (Christ) entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal

[1] Chap. iii. p. 41. [2] Chap. iii. p. 46.

redemption for us." Sir Wm. Ramsay translates "entered and obtained" (Heb. ix. 12).

The compound *ἀπολύτρωσις*, employed repeatedly by St. Paul, is used by him in the two identical passages (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14): "In whom"—that is, in Christ—"we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." It will be noted that in this twice-repeated verse, forgiveness is in apposition with redemption, which renders it impossible to evade the inference that forgiveness is in effect the same thing as redemption. Here, then, we have Our Lord, Cleopas quoted by St. Luke, St. Paul repeatedly, St. Peter, and the Writer to the Hebrews, all using either *λύτρον*, or a derivative of *λύτρον*, to describe the effect of the work done by Our Lord for sinners on the Cross.

The subject of Repentance is by many very imperfectly understood. Sometimes it is confounded with penitence, or sorrow for sin. This is refuted by St. Paul's clear distinction between them in 2 Cor. vii. 10, where he says that "godly sorrow," *ἡ κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη*, "works repentance unto salvation," *μετάνοια εἰς σωτηρίαν*; and, as that which causes a phenomenon cannot be identified with the phenomenon itself, we are forced to the conclusion that sorrow, *λυπή*, must be distinguished from repentance, *μετάνοια*, however closely they are connected as cause and effect.

The original meaning, then, of Repentance is a change of mind. Our Lord used it in that sense when, speaking of the son who at first refused to comply with his father's request that he should do a day's work in the family vineyard, He added, "Afterward he repented and went." The Writer to the Hebrews does the like, when, quoting Psalm cx. 4, he says, "The LORD sware, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek."

The next stage in the meaning of the word is in its application to sin. No better definition of Repentance in this sense, nor half so good, can possibly be found than that in our incomparable Catechism, where one of the prerequisites for Baptism is said to be "Repentance, whereby we forsake sin." But the most intimate and essential idea connoted by Repentance is the all-important change of mind as to the Cross and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. At the close of St. Peter's address on the Day of Pentecost (Acts ii.), when the convicted sinners inquired, "Brethren, what shall we do?" "Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Why did not St. Peter say, "Believe," as well as "Repent"? Undoubtedly, because *they believed already*. What was wanted was that they should change their minds about their attitude to the Cross of Jesus of Nazareth and to His bodily resurrection from the dead. That was what St. Peter meant by "Repent"; and to place it beyond doubt in the eyes of all men, they were to receive baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, so definitely and finally separating themselves from the foes who had clamoured for His crucifixion and signifying their confidence that in Jesus the crucified one, rejected of man, they were receiving remission of sins and acceptance with God.

The Witness of the Two Sacraments.

We should not overlook the fact that what the two holy Sacraments present to faith is not the Incarnation of Our Lord, but His Death. As to Baptism, St. Paul says (Rom. v. 3) that men are baptized into His *death.* And those, he says, who come to eat and drink the sacred bread and cup in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper " do show *the Lord's Death* till He come " (1 Cor. xi. 26). The only memorial of Himself which Jesus Christ has left upon earth is the memorial of His death.

Fallacious Methods in Dr Rashdall's Bampton Lectures.

It is at this point that we are compelled to part company with the argument of the Bampton Lectures of 1915, on " The Idea of Atonement."

The learned lecturer, in his zeal against the truth that Our Lord died as an atoning sacrifice for the sins of man, shows, I think, indifferent reasoning power. In the first place, when he encounters in the Scriptures words which make against his theory, he says that they are probably additions to the text by some later hand ; which is a very easy method of getting rid of them, though hardly a satisfactory one. And when he argues from the fact that Our Lord taught that forgiveness of sins is granted to the sinner on his repentance, to the further conclusion that *therefore* we may safely infer that no atonement for sin is required, and hence that Our Lord's death had no relation to man's sin, his logic seems to trip. The obvious reply to this line of argument is that it is a " non sequitur." The conclusion does not follow from the premisses. In other words, it is a logical fallacy.

Conception of the Atonement.

It is surely important to form a true conception of the Atonement of Christ. It is not, as once held, a payment made by Our Lord to the Devil, nor merely and only a substitution of one Person for others, to receive punishment for sin. To my mind, it deals with the whole question of Evil. We do not know how, when, or why, Evil originated, but we do know that it is essentially and unalterably opposed to God and consequently that God is essentially opposed to it. The question then arises, Is this state of things to go on for ever ? Are we to regard it as a permanent dualism ? Surely not. We who believe in the ultimate triumph of good cannot think this. We must believe that good—and God—will at some time prevail against evil. The case of man is that, being a sinner, he has, to a fatal, though not an irretrievable, extent, identified, or at least connected, himself with evil. In this catastrophic opposition between God and evil, in which man is involved, how is it possible to deal with the situation ? Plainly, it can only be by God taking the whole burden upon Himself. He Himself must bear the whole cost of annihilating evil and, as a part of this process, must pay the entire price of recovering man from its power. It was for this cause that God became Man, that in a Personality combining the natures of both God and Man He might endure the whole stress

and burden of evil ; and, as this is death, it was necessary for Him in this Personality to die. The Godhead, of course, cannot die, but it could and did impart an infinite sufficiency to the death of the Manhood, by which the object was accomplished and sinful man redeemed.

The effects of the Atonement are not confined to the cancelling of guilt. A verse in Psalm cxvi., to my thinking, analyses and embodies the whole of present salvation. The Psalmist says, " Thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling." That is to say, salvation, which is not a future thing, but a present one, consists of three elements : (1) First, Deliverance from death, which is the effect of guilt ; or, in one word, Pardon : (2) second, Deliverance from Tears, which are the effect of a conscience burdened with sin ; or, in one word, Peace : and (3) third, Deliverance from falling, which is the effect of the working of sin in the daily life ; or, in one word, Holiness. The work of the Atonement, then, is to produce Pardon, Peace, and Holiness ; and these three, which together constitute present salvation, are all derived from the Cross of Christ. They cannot possibly be had elsewhere. Each and all of them must be received by simple faith, or trust in Our Lord Jesus Christ. All of them originate in the free love of God and issue in the Justification, Sanctification, and ultimate Glorification of Man. Does not this conception of Atonement remove the difficulties of those who demur to its being confined to the idea of vicarious suffering, which apparently they denominate " the objective theory " ? I venture to think that the true description of what I have endeavoured to set out would be " The Larger View of the Atonement," and I put it forward in the sincere hope that it will satisfy the minds of those brethren who have felt dissatisfied with the so-called " objective " theory, and so form a basis upon which we may agree.

There is another unfortunate misconception by the writer I have referred to, which I will endeavour to remove. He speaks of what he calls (p. 164) " the terrible doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews," which he imagines to be that, under the Gospel, only one repentance is possible and that post-baptismal sin cannot be repented of or forgiven. He quotes Hebrews x. 26, 27. " If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgement and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversaries." These burning words form one of five passages in this Epistle conveying earnest warning to the wavering Hebrew believers against leaving their faith in Jesus as the Messiah and reverting to Judaism. They succeed an exhortation not to forsake the gatherings for worship which were also a part of their testimony to their unbelieving Jewish brethren and the Gentile world around. To absent themselves from these meetings, as some of them appear to have done, would be a step toward apostasy. To " sin wilfully " (verse 26) does not here imply any and every kind of sin, but, as throughout this epistle, the special sin of cravenly deserting

Jesus Christ and so justifying His enemies. In that case, "there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins." There is indeed such a sacrifice, but only one. It is the sacrifice of Calvary, which avails for those who accept it. But, in the case contemplated, this sacrifice which had formerly been acknowledged, is finally rejected; *and there is no other.* "There is no longer left a sacrifice for sins." The sinner is therefore left shelterless. It is not affirmed that the sacrifice of Christ cannot atone for the sin of backsliding, but that no other sacrifice can do so; so that there is nothing to stand between the sinner and judgment if Our Lord's sacrifice be refused. The bearing of this upon the tempted and vacillating Hebrews is obvious.

So, then, let us repeat, this passage does not teach, nor does any other passage in this epistle teach, that there can be no second repentance. It affirms the far more important matter that, while Christ's sacrifice avails for any sin and all sin, there is no other sacrifice that does so.

It has been stated in the public Press that there are those, even among professed teachers of religion, who not only deny the birth of Our Lord from a virgin mother, but also reject His Resurrection, in which they have affirmed their belief in the very definite and unmistakable terms of the IVth Article of our religion, in which it is stated that "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature"; and who also deny His Second Advent, as also unequivocally affirmed in the same Article.

We ask by what jugglery with words can such persons repeat the Apostles' Creed, or sing the verses of the Te Deum, or repeat the solemn affirmation of the Prayer of Consecration in our Communion Service, that on the Cross Our Lord made "a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world"; by what treatment of the conscience they can bring themselves to imagine that they can reconcile, not contraries, but contradictories. Frank unbelief, supported by some attempt at rational argument, demands respect, when followed by consistent action. We meet with that at the Marble Arch and on Tower Hill. But to accept membership in the Church, to obtain, under the most binding pledges, its commission, to secure emoluments provided for the maintenance of the Catholic Faith, and to live in the unblushing enjoyment of these, while themselves denying that faith, argues a state of mind incomprehensible to the ordinary man. Let such lay down their offices and resign their emoluments. Then we shall listen to them with respect and confer with them, if they wish it, on equal terms.

What lies at the root of all expedients to get rid of the sacrificial, saving character of the atoning death of Our Lord, is the lack of any true conviction of sin. When that is produced in the soul by the action of the Paraclete, there will be no more carping or cavilling. Our Lord's atoning sacrifice will stand out as essential to the world's salvation. There will be no questioning as to whether

the Atonement is compatible with the glorious truth that God is Love, because the Atonement will be seen to be the highest manifestation of that love. Then those golden words will be seen inscribed upon the Cross, "Sic Deus dilexit mundum."

Conclusion.

Now that I am concluding these remarks, I will venture to cite utterances of three of God's saints, which may bring to a head what I have imperfectly endeavoured to set out.

The first is from Chrysostom.

"That death," he says, "saved the perishing world; that death united heaven with earth; that death destroyed the tyranny of the devil; it made men angels and sons of God; that death brought our nature unto the royal throne."

The second is a cablegram to a friend from the famous Cambridge cricketer, and still more famous missionary, C. T. Studd, in 1927, with reference to the state of affairs which then prevailed and still exists. He said:

"Here we dread neither death, hell, devils, nor men. We re-declare our Gospel—Jesus only, God, Saviour, King, Crucified, Risen, Glorious; here in spirit, returning soon bodily. All other gospels anathema. Trust God; pray; play the game. Laugh at impossibilities. Sweet and right it is to die for Jesus. This is our testimony to the world."

And finally, the supreme summons by the Writer to the Hebrews (x. 19, etc.):

"Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which he dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having a great priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with pure Water."

The Sacrament of Life. J. H. Grummitt. *S.C.M. Press.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Evidently the public-school boy of to-day is regarded as a more thoughtful and serious person than those who had to listen to sermons such (for instance) as Dr. Farrar's, with their anecdotes and stirring appeals.

These nine addresses seem like lay-sermons in school chapel, and demand some previous knowledge and ability to follow a reasoned train of thought if they are to be appreciated. Some of the titles are Values, Vocation, Humour, and Beauty; and the advice given is useful, but does not go very deep. The little volume may help some lads to realise what a Christian life is meant to be, and as such is recommended by the Bishop of Croydon in a Foreword.

THE MENACE TO PROTESTANTISM FROM THE WEST AND FROM THE EAST.[1]

By Professor Beresford Pite, F.R.I.B.A.

IN order to enter upon the subject of the menace to Protestantism from Rome in the west and from the Greek churches in the east, the enquiry should be made: What is this threatened Protestantism? Does the supposed menace affect anything material to the basis or practice of our spiritual life?

The recent Islington Clerical Meeting has made it clear, by recalling much that ought not to have been forgotten, that Protestantism is not merely an imperfect or partial historical reaction, only negative to the corruptions of the Medieval Church that have now been reformed away, but a self-interpretative message and gospel, and is as such effective where its consequent negative aspect to error is not brought into view.

A more complete and thorough Protestantism than is current in the Church of England at the present day is greatly to be desired, for an incomplete or partisan grasp of truths that are fundamental and essential is a menace from within that should be first realised and then strengthened.

Perhaps the most suggestive and complete definition of the reformation of the Church of England would be to describe it as the revival of Apostolic Protestantism. This is not question-begging or running away from historic controversy with Rome, but taking up the higher ground of its Scriptural basis.

The protestations of S. Paul, which are not confined to the Galatians, and of the Epistle to the Hebrews, include the setting forth of the liberty of the gospel delivering us from the guilt and power of sin, the free acceptance by grace of the assurance of eternal life and the realised presence of the Saviour in the heart effected by the Holy Spirit. As this gospel is protestant and negative to the bondage of the law, the reactions of the heart towards beggarly elements or carnal ordinances constitute internal menaces to the status of the sinner saved by the Grace of Christ alone.

The inspired Scriptures are effective remedies for the recurring sicknesses and epidemics that afflict the soul. The medicine of the Galatian Church wrought the cure of Luther sixteen centuries later, and can be prescribed for our present maladies; the leaves of this tree are for the healing of the nations. In short, the sensitive heart of Protestantism is the faith which hears the voice of God in the Scriptures and has felt it working salvation in the soul.

The double menace of to-day has opposite characteristics: the Church of Rome pursues its consistent campaign against the Protestant Church of England, while that Church on her part assumes a

[1] Address at London Meeting of Lay Churchmen, January 23, 1932.

retreat from its Protestant peculiarity towards intercommunion with the unreformed Eastern Church.

On the one hand the admirable missionary zeal of Rome is based upon a unique claim and supported by energetic propaganda, while on the other hand, our own leaders, with enthusiasm for an ideal of reunion which has woven itself into the outlook of the Church at home, enter into negotiations with the Greek Church which involve recognition and fellowship with many practices and traditional doctrines that are not in harmony with the Scriptural Protestantism of our reformers. In either case the menace exists in an imminent form. Protestants can obtain unity with the Church of Rome only by repentance and reconciliation, or by sacrificing the distinctiveness of a sole appeal to the supremacy of the word of God, effect intercommunion with the Greek Church.

It will be observed that the menace of Rome in the main affects the spiritual liberty of the individual, it appeals to him to eschew Protestantism as error. The Greek *rapprochement* menaces the status of the Church of England as a representative Protestant communion. Thus different methods of defence are implied, but in both cases the necessity will be apparent of a fundamental realisation of what is essential Protestantism.

A revival of Pauline Protestantism will, in the first case, reintegrate the soul in its liberty and in the second will secure the Scriptural foundations of the Church of England against disintegration. For this revival of Evangelical doctrine we must confidently pray and courageously work.

The self-sufficient completeness of the system of the Church of Rome offers a primary menace to current Protestantism with its proverbial want of unity. The force of this contrast it is not possible to deny and it would be futile to emulate Rome's apparently harmonious and logical position. Its effect must be admitted while its spiritual validity is repudiated.

The confident authority of an infallible Church on earth furnishes a bed-rock principle for the repose of faith. On this foundation a discipline of the intellect can be established demanding obedience which is absolute, and, by the sacrifice of the Protestant idol of the right of private judgment, it actually produces a genuine humility. It proceeds to exercise a control of the conscience which affords a substantial relief from the canker of indecision and provides a satisfying answer to the unavoidable question, "What must I do to be saved?"

The promised relief is attained by resigning all the anxieties of the soul to the proffered arms of the Church, a relief which is sufficient in most cases to hide from view the weakness of that Church's foundation. The superficial healing which may be continually renewed by penance brings the soul into a bondage which is welcomed rather than refused.

To this menacing claim of Rome—pressed to-day as ever upon the burdened conscience—the only answer which is effectually satisfying is that the real authority for the justification of the

sinner by grace remains only with God, who Himself will speak directly to the heart through His vivified word.

Further, the liberty which the Spirit of God imparts produces in the heart not only peace, but the fruits of holiness in a measure that compares (dangerous and misleading though such comparisons are) with that of modern saints or mystics, whether Baron von Hügel or S. Therese of Lisieux. The life consecrated to Christ spreads its blessedness over the whole sphere of proper activities and is richer and more blessed in its sacred joys and service than the alternatives of the specialised devotions of the contemplative Orders of the Roman system.

Among the fruits of the Spirit will be a sincere affection, derived from the Saviour, for sinners; for personal evangelism is the true Protestant answer to the menacing zeal of Rome for the conversion of England, and the need of this aggressive service is urgent. Zeal must be countered by zeal in love, and error be answered by the experience and testimony to realised truth.

A secondary but pressing menace is the attractiveness to very many minds of the tradition of a sacred splendour in the Roman practice of public worship; but this is secondary only if the underlying doctrinal intention is overlooked; for the utilisation of the arts in the worship of the Church is directed mainly to the emphasis of the Mass. The truth or falsehood of the object of the employment of the arts cannot be overlooked. It may be confidently stated that both cumulative effect and detail have meaning and reference, and that tradition governs religious art.

The values of all pure art are gifts of God's grace and as testimonies to His reality they cannot be despised, but like all other wonders are secondary in nature to the primary revelation of the truth by His Spirit. The service of music with the other arts to an untrue faith, as it would be to a sinful purpose, illustrates the maxim *corruptio optimi pessima*. The purpose of art is to stimulate emotion, and psychology teaches that emotions which do not result in right action have harmful reactions. The problem of religious art may therefore be stated by reference to the resultant actions it produces, e.g. to the influence upon the life of the beholder of a crucifix, or that of solemnizing music on the hearer. Art must have a purpose, and its danger lies in the mere enjoyment of the emotion while avoiding or suppressing its purpose. If therefore in the artistic acme of Roman worship the purpose is involved with the doctrine of the Mass, it becomes clear that the service of art is misapplied and its attractiveness menaces spiritual reality.

To offer a counter attractiveness of the same quality would seem to be impossible in Protestant worship; it suggests the evolution of a Christian counterpart of the superseded glory of the Temple ritual of Judaism. The secondary, or visible and temporary, would be invoked to the diminishing of the primary and lasting values of the spirit—we shall find ourselves facing again the protests of the New Testament, as well as of the prophets, against unreality in worship. It can be no answer to the menace to cite the most

beautiful Anglican Cathedral ritual against its Roman prototype or the feebler imitations of the parish church. The primary must precede the secondary ; the Protestant glorious liberty of the truth possessed and expressed finds for itself the proper sphere of the secondary values of order, beauty and joyous utterance, to which no limits need be put, subordinate to consistency with essentially spiritual purpose.

While the menace of Rome should incite Protestants not to avoid personal contact, but to promote the evangelisation of their brethren, the character of the menace which arises with the Eastern Churches removes it from personal to the sphere of corporate action : and to almost its full extent, for us at home, into the hands of theologians. The " mysterion " of ordination which is to be taken for granted without exact definition by Anglican and Orthodox is patient of a doctrine of apostolical succession that is not patient either of Protestantism or the history of the reformed Church of England : and the acceptance of the statement by the delegation to the Lambeth Conference, that the explanation of the Anglican doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice was agreeable to the Orthodox doctrine " if an explanation were to be set out with all clearness " fills the Protestant with fear as to the nature of such explanations.

The contacts with orthodox Christianity in the mission fields of the East, however, are practical matters in which the fundamental issues of gospel liberty and simplicity cannot be evaded or contention for the truth avoided.

It must be earnestly pressed that the tolerating light of Protestant truth is not dimmed in dealing with these two phases of what we certainly hold to be error ; that the gift of the grace of God for the ministry is not a " mysterion " attaching to a physical contact, or that the Eucharistic sacrifice involves any assimilation to the false doctrine of transubstantiation.

In both regards how much we desire for our leaders in any negotiations the clarity and faithfulness to Scripture and primitive practice of the fathers of the Reformation, so that a Church which has been so long remote and without missionary aggressiveness, may in its present era of persecution and depression be revived by the Protestantism which has been and is, thank God, still the glory of the Church of England, and that a harmony of doctrine which is not fictitious or evasive may become the basis of fellowship in the Gospel, and dissipate the menace of a lowered standard of Protestant faith and practice.

The Pigs and Other Curly Tales for Young and Old, by McEwan Lawson (Student Christian Movement, 2*s.* 6*d.* net), is a series of light sketches on a variety of subjects which will amuse and instruct many of various ages.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

THE Bishop of Norwich has issued a volume of sermons which should prove of special interest to members of the Anglican Communion throughout the world. The Mother Church of the Anglo-Saxon race has helped to mould the peoples of the Empire, and in *The Church and English Life* (Longmans Green & Co., 4*s.* 6*d.* net) the Bishop presents those special characteristics of our race which are based upon the interpretation of Christian faith and practice of our National Church. As Master of Wellington the Bishop gained an insight into our English education upon which the national character so largely depends, and we have here the important conclusions at which he has arrived. The influence of the Church upon the development of our national and civic institution has been so extensive as to produce an association of a unique character. These associations are dealt with in a series of sermons grouped under the heading " The Church and the Nation." Sections are also devoted to " Doctrine in the Church of England " and to " Worship " in which the teaching of our Church as tested by Holy Scripture, and our worship as preserving the essentials of New Testament simplicity are clearly stated. He foresees a danger that the Church may become " too much the Church of the clergy," and that the clergy may become a priestly caste away from the main stream of national life. The laity have always had a considerable influence for good upon the life of the Church, and we hope they will still continue to exercise it.

Dr. Harold Smith, of St. John's Hall, Highbury, has collected a large quantity of useful information from ancient records and other sources, and has published it under the title *The Ecclesiastical History of Essex under the Long Parliament and Commonwealth* (Benham & Co., Colchester, 15*s.*). Although the volume will appeal particularly to the church-people of Essex, it contains much of interest for all who study the past history of the Church. It gives a useful insight into the conditions which must have prevailed at the period in many parts of the country. The contents are so varied it is difficult to give any adequate account of the mass of detail represented. Some of the events of the years preceding the immediate period covered are given to illustrate the movements culminating in the Commonwealth. Particulars are given of the changes in the ministry of a large number of parishes and the methods by which they were effected. The effects of the Commonwealth legislation are shown, and events connected with the ejections and re-admissions at the Restoration. The human interest is maintained throughout in the details of incidents in the lives of the clergy and their wives. Dr. Smith has provided a storehouse for students, and we anticipate that the parishes in Essex will be glad to secure a copy of a history that tells of an interesting period of the past. Dr. Smith's research work is well known and his accuracy is thoroughly reliable.

Three Hebrew Prophets and the Passing of the Empires, by Charles Venn Pilcher, D.D. (Religious Tract Society, 6*s.* net), is a study of Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah. The attention devoted to the study of Old Testament history in recent times gives an increased value to any work upon the Minor Prophets which helps to a better understanding of their age and the conditions of the times in which they lived. Dr. Pilcher, in his office as Professor of the Old Testament at Wycliffe College, Toronto, has the advantage of interpreting to students the books of the Old Testament, and in this volume we have the benefit of his experience. The historical part is clearly indicated. Each prophet's characteristics and his message are stated with full appreciation of their value, and the devotional bearing of the prophetic utterances presented in a way that will specially appeal to preachers and teachers. Full use is made of the latest sources of information.

Those who have read Professor Rudolf Otto's well-known work, *The Idea of the Holy*, which was published a few years ago and aroused so much interest in the numinous element in religion, will be interested in the volume of *Religious Essays: A Sequel to "The Idea of the Holy,"* which has been translated by Brian Lunn and published by the Oxford University Press (7*s.* 6*d.* net). The opening essays deal with the idea of Sin and explain "What is Sin?", "The Battle between the Flesh and the Spirit," "The Christian Idea of 'Lostness'," and "The Religious Idea of Original Guilt." A Study of Isaiah's Experience of God illustrates its numinous character. A novel interpretation of "The Lord's Supper as a Numinous Fact," emphasises the central thought of the service as Golgotha, embracing the redeeming and atoning work of the Cross. A form of Service for celebrating the Lord's Supper is intended to bring out these central ideas. The second series of essays are entitled the "Science of Religion," and deal with Schleiermacher, the "Wholly Other," "A Universal Religion?" and "Darwinism and Religion." Two Appendixes contain appeals, one for a Central Council of United Protestantism throughout the world to study the problems and meet the attacks of the day; the other is an Inter-Religious League to unite all religions for purposes of human welfare.

Messrs. W. Heffer, of Cambridge, publish a little devotional book by Dr. A. H. McNeile, formerly Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin. The title is *Self* (2*s.* net), and it provides suitable subjects for self-examination in regard to the constant emergence of self-assertion even in Christian work.

G. F. I.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH AND THE PAPACY. By Z. N. Brooke. *Cambridge University Press*, 1931. 10s. 6*d*.

Mr. Brooke—one of the Editors of the *Cambridge Medieval History*—has brought his expert knowledge of European history in the eleventh and twelfth centuries to bear upon the story of the relation between the English Church and the Papacy from the Conquest to the reign of John. He begins with a thorough investigation, which had not been attempted before, of MS. collections of law, drawn up in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and surviving in the muniment rooms of our ancient cathedrals, colleges and national libraries. With this very thorough inquiry Mr. Brooke supplements the great work achieved by Fournier on early French and Italian collections in the field of Canon Law. This book easily places its author in the same category as his great predecessor. It is a masterpiece of historical investigation, acute historical penetration, and impartial historical synthesis.

The study of the English Canon Law books lead Mr. Brooke to the conclusion that the famous phrase in *Magna Carta*—"*quod Anglicana ecclesia libera sit*"—implies not the freedom of a national Church to go its own way independently of King and Pope alike, but freedom to obey the Pope without royal interference. In the second part of the book Mr. Brooke traces the development of this freedom from 1066 to 1216, and supplies a new and most illuminating treatment of English Church history from that standpoint. He contrasts the attitude of Lanfranc with that of his successors. While the general programme of Church reform was maintained by the first Norman archbishop, unlike his successors, he did not support the papal policy of interference with the royal action in relation to the Church. We may add that the tendency from Anselm onwards was always to restore and intensify the relation which had existed between the English Church and the Papacy in Saxon times, as Troeltsch and Dufourcq have shown. Consequently the era of Lanfranc and the Conqueror was an interlude which had something of the character of a reaction. This must be remembered by readers of Mr. Brooke's book.

Two or three details of criticism may be offered. On page 23 Mr. Brooke says that "in the eleventh century there was nobody in England, or elsewhere, who . . . denied that it (the Church) was under papal headship." Mr. Brooke had forgotten, for the moment, the anonymous Yorkist writer, whose theories he adequately appraises later (157 ff.). While accepting the main conclusion of the present reviewer, that Lanfranc was not guilty of the forgery of certain letters (cf. *Lanfranc, His Life Work and Writing*, Oxford, 1926), he asks why, if the documents used by Lanfranc proved his case, there was need for forgery later? Has

he noticed that I attributed this to the need for a larger body of evidence, which arose in view of the growing number of the Yorkist privileges? (Cf. *Lanfranc*, p. 281.) Again, "the great champion of orthodoxy against Berengar" was not Lanfranc, but Cardinal Humbert (cf. my *Berengar* [1] especially p. 129 ff.). But we do not wish to close a very brief review of this brilliant book on a note of criticism. It is the most masterly contribution to the study of English Church history ever made by a British scholar, and has sketched definitively the right perspective for the study of the period. No student can afford to overlook this book. After Mr. Brooke's work only stupid wrong-headedness will be able to maintain that the medieval English Church did not become an integral part of the papal system.

A. J. M.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES. By Ernst Troeltsch. Translated by Olive Wyon. 2 vols. *Geo. Allen and Unwin*, 1931. £2 2s.

The translator has done a splendid service to English readers by making available Troeltsch's massive study, which appeared in 1911. Readers who are irritated by footnotes, will find them unobtrusively placed at the end of each great section of the work. For the scholar these offer a thorough survey of the literature covered by the author. Volume One sketches the rise of Christian Social theory in the Early Church, and traces its relationship with Greek and Roman ideas; it then covers the medieval period. The attention paid to medieval sects enhances the importance of Mr. Bett's recent book on *Joachim of Flora* (Methuen, 1931). Troeltsch makes no reference to the Berengarian movement, or to the different types of Berengarian thought in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries. The beginnings of the "sect-type" are surely to be found here. Due allowance is made for the influence of Platonism and Stoicism and medieval social theory, and Dr. A. J. Carlyle's extensive work on *Medieval Political Theory in the West* receives well-merited attention. The paragraphs on the Canon Law should now be supplemented by the writings of Fournier, Z. N. Brooke, and Fliche.

Volume Two is devoted to an exhaustive examination of Protestantism from the Reformation to the end of the eighteenth century, and will therefore be of special interest to readers of THE CHURCHMAN. It closes with a sketch of social theory in the nineteenth century. The Anglican Church receives practically no treatment, possibly because Troeltsch, as a Lutheran, could not decide whether it belongs to the Catholic or Protestant type of ecclesiastical organization. But a very good estimate of the Free Churches, and their fundamental differences, is provided. The last section of the book must be supplemented by the new Barthian theology, but even without this additional study, Troeltsch's work

[1] Longmans (1930).

shows how much Barth and Brunner owe to original Reformation ideas. The whole work forms a fascinating inquiry for the historian as well as the sociologist, and constitutes a more reliable, as well as more thorough investigation into social religion than Mr. Gerald Heard's recent book.

A. J. M.

THE RELEVANCE OF CHRISTIANITY. By F. R. Barry, M.A., D.S.O. *Nisbet*, 1931. 10s. 6*d*.

If this book is an account of contemporary life and thought in relation to Christianity it tells us a good deal. If, on the other hand, it is examined from the standpoint of the Word of God coming into the world, not much inspiration or illumination is to be obtained from it. For this reason the Barthian theology is passed over, and also because, as he has confessed elsewhere, the author is not acquainted with this movement. Yet no serious account of Christianity to-day can afford to overlook the new spiritual and evangelical message coming from Switzerland. Mr. Barry's system is humanism, Christian humanism it may be, but it hardly reaches yet the height of a theology. He is very good at diagnosis, and some of his observations on the remedy for political and international difficulties are helpful. On the sex question he is not satisfactory. He desires "to have it both ways"—the ideal of the Christian law, and yet a relaxed standard of a marriage for hard cases, and to assist young people. But a choice must surely be made. Mr. Barry has read widely, but not very deeply, consequently he nearly always circles round the point of solution, and seldom thrusts in to the centre. Yet there are signs that he has been influenced by the Barthian message. He has realized that the "Jesus of History" was not sufficient. The Bible is "not a book about ethics but a book about the Christian religion." The New Testament *is* an other-worldly book—"a book about God and Christ's revelation of the Father." The concern of Jesus "was not so much to affect the relationships of men and women to one another; rather it was to redeem the relationship of all men and women to God." Christ's "significance lay in the eternal and supernatural order." The Kingdom of God "is the invasion of human history by the sovereign holiness of the living God." Christ is "not confined within the sequence of history." Having lifted these fragments from the Barthian theology, this book would have been greatly strengthened if Mr. Barry had gone on with the good work.

A. J. M.

JOHN OF SALISBURY. By Clement C. J. Webb, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A. *Methuen*, 1932. 6*s*.

This book is the third of the series entitled "Great Churchmen of the Middle Ages," edited by Dr. Elliott Binns, and it is an admirable contribution to the collection. It is still widely held that humanism did not reappear in Europe until the time of the

Renaissance. Much has been done to dispel this idea by Rand and Laistner in America, and this book continues the *éclaircissement*. Humanism never died in the Middle Ages. There would be no Latin scholarship, and probably no Greek scholarship, to-day if it had done so. In the twelfth century the leading humanist in England was John of Salisbury, secretary and confidential adviser of Archbishops Theobald and Thomas à Becket, and finally Bishop of Chartres. During the quarrel between Becket and Henry II, John of Salisbury was an exile, but although he remained consistently loyal to Becket, he by no means approved of that prelate's provocative utterances and conduct. A supporter of Alexander III against Barbarossa and a friend of Eugenius III, John was frequently in Rome, and he does not spare the worldliness and ambitions of the great churchmen of the day. His philosophical writings, the *Policraticus* and *Metalogicon*, had a great vogue in the Middle Ages, but to-day our interest lies rather in the *Historia Pontificalis*, his continuation of the History of Sigebert of Gembloux, and in his letters. The former supplies valuable information on the Becket dispute and on current political topics, especially so far as they concerned England; the letters preserve many details of the social life of the times. No other biography of John of Salisbury has yet appeared in English, and the distinguished and learned author, who some years ago edited the *Policraticus* and *Metalogicon*, has filled a gap in our historical literature. Although brief, the book is sufficient; the sources have been thoroughly digested, and the story of John of Salisbury's active life is told in an engaging manner. The calm, successive sentences which lengthen out Dr. Clement Webb's long rolling paragraphs, form a not unwelcome contrast with the more terse historical prose of the present day.

Professor Webb estimates fairly the services rendered by the Papacy to the Church and to European civilization, yet not with the surrender of a critical balance of judgment. He says that "it is arguable that in her maintenance of the principle of a Christian Church, visibly and effectively one, Rome, by her *intransigeant* attitude toward all developments of Christian thought and life which do not consist with an acknowledgment of her infallibility, has sacrificed and is sacrificing spiritual interests of Christendom at least as sacredly and intimately bound up with the example of the Gospel as that principle itself."

A. J. M.

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN BLACKBURNSHIRE. By John Eyre Winstanley Wallis, Vicar and Rural Dean of Whalley. *S.P.C.K.* 1932. *7s. 6d.*

Blackburnshire forms the north-east corner of South Lancashire, along the Yorkshire border, south of the Ribble; it was the extreme end of the ancient diocese of Lichfield. Its chief places were in old days Blackburn, Whalley with its Abbey, and Clitheroe with

its Castle. Other places of more recent growth include Accrington and Burnley. In old times the name "shire" was in the North given to an area of considerable size, composing a number of townships supporting a central town; latterly it became the equivalent of a "hundred." A marked feature in the North as distinct from the Midlands or South is the existence of huge parishes with distant ancient chapelries; thus Blackburnshire long consisted of the two parishes of Blackburn and Whalley, though Canon Wallis shows the probability that Burnley, Colne, and some other chapelries were originally independent parishes. The ecclesiastical history centres round these two churches and Whalley Abbey; maps are given of both ancient parishes, and a plan of the remains of the Abbey, which now belong to the Blackburn Diocesan Board of Finance. John Paslew, the last Abbot, was executed for his share in the "Pilgrimage of Grace" (1537). The tangled history of the medieval rectors is carefully worked out and the account of the medieval rural dean is of special interest. A full account is given of church building and development during the last 150 years, culminating in the formation of the Bishopric of Blackburn in 1926. The ancient Blackburnshire comprises now nearly 120 parishes. Industrial Lancashire has a long history behind it.

H. S.

FREDERICK THE SECOND. By Ernst Kantorowicz. Translated by E. O. Lorimer. *Constable*, 1931. 27*s*.

The growing interest in medieval history among English-speaking people is illustrated by the fact that Messrs. Constable, like Messrs. Methuen, are engaged upon the production of a series of medieval biographies. This series is entitled, "Makers of the Middle Ages," and the publication of this magnificent volume of nearly 700 pages was a striking event in the world of letters last year. This biography should easily have been given a place among the "Books of the Week." Never again will it be possible to say that a medieval biography cannot be as enthralling as any modern character. In this case an absorbingly interesting personality has been treated by a masterly hand. Professor Kantorowicz has an erudite knowledge of the history of his period; he has more, he has the gifts of a literary artist and of the born biographer. The shining qualities of his work have been faithfully reflected by his translator, and Mr. Lorimer is to be congratulated on a great achievement. This book will rank among the great biographies of English as well as German literature.

It is not a mere piece of portrait-painting, it presents a thorough account of the history of Frederick II's graphic period (1194–1250). The influence of this forerunner of the Renaissance princes upon literature, art, music, architecture and natural science is fully described. The life of the Italian Court and of the magnates of those days is vividly sketched. Frederick II was also the last of the great Germanic-Roman Emperors, in some ways their most com-

plete representative since ancient Roman days. Yet he achieved his triumphs over the Papacy with a minimum of assistance from Germany, and with the aid of Italian, supported by Saracen forces. This was something new in the history of the conflict between Papacy and Empire. Innocent III, Gregory IX and Innocent IV do not come well out of the story. Indeed, the two latter Popes ruined Frederick's attempt to found a united Italian kingdom administered by Roman law, an attempt which was not again effectively made until the days of Victor Emmanuel II, and not fully achieved until the appearance of Mussolini. Yet Frederick dealt decisive blows at the corruption of medieval Church life, and his political work was inherited by the magnates of the city-states of the Renaissance era. With armies which never mustered more than 15,000 men, and usually only reached a third of that number, he secured the flight of Innocent IV to Avignon, and was able to resist all the efforts of that Pope to have him assassinated. Frederick's power was derived from his personal influence over men, but in the absence of sufficient military force, and with little recognition of the art of war, that supremacy failed him in the end. One after another of his trusted lieutenants betrayed him—even Piero della Vigna fell away—and so slightly grounded was Frederick's dynasty, that every one of his numerous sons and their descendants rapidly came to a tragic or an obscure end. Brilliance and thundercloud, light and shade, happy fulfilment and treacherous defeat, are all vividly portrayed in these pages. The book is an epic of the last great effort of Roman imperial majesty to assert itself, but with the aid of mere communal support; and when the last page has been read there remains the picture of the Hohenstaufen and his sons singing in the hour of defeat, and smiling on the morning of their doom.

A. J. M.

THE HOLY AND THE LIVING GOD. By M. D. R. Willink, S.Th. *London: George Allen and Unwin.* 10s. net.

The title of this scholarly and elaborate compilation would most likely be more intelligible to the average reader if the two first words were printed in inverted commas, for as yet it is improbable that many are familiar with Otto's treatise on "The Holy," to which the author acknowledges her indebtedness—although she began to sketch this book in 1911. Similarly "the hallows," i.e. things and persons related to the holy, and ideograms, i.e. pictures of ideas—in which she takes the greatest interest—are still unfamiliar to most English readers.

Miss Willink endeavours to re-interpret the old symbolical pictures, actions and words in terms of to-day's thinking; and to that end makes an exhaustive study of the Old Testament religion (aided by reference to Robertson-Smith) illustrated by Fraser's pagan examples, and leading on to New Testament teaching. The awfulness of the Holy God, the danger of approaching any "hallow,"

the developing sense of sin and the need of propitiation and mediation, are themes here discussed, leading up to the Gospel of Christ and His Church. Eternal Life in conflict with Death, symbolised by light, by fire, by the Wrath of God, is characterised as the reaction of holiness on the disharmonious ; evidences of the working of this energy are accumulated from Bible and Church history. To take one aspect of this reaction, many instances may be produced of the punishment of sacrilege, i.e. the unlawful treatment of places or things appropriated to God. We surely need (as many wise men now tell us) a deeper sense of the Majesty and Holiness of God, and this thoughtful treatise should help us to gain it.

TARA : A PAGAN SANCTUARY OF ANCIENT IRELAND. By R. A. S. Macalister, Litt.D., LL.D., F.S.A. *Scribners.* 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Professor Macalister, Professor of Celtic Archæology, University of Dublin, President of the Royal Irish Academy and of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, has re-written the interesting volume which he now presents from a *Study of the Remains and Traditions of Tara*, which he read before the Royal Irish Academy and was afterwards published in the *Proceedings* of that body ; and he tells us that many things in the earlier book have been modified and others pruned away, while he has introduced some new material.

Tradition credits Tara with being the most august place in Ancient Ireland. There the Druids' High Priests sat, and there Ireland's Kings were crowned. Many tales and ballads have been written about what was undoubtedly the centre of religious worship and later of kingly power in Ancient Ireland. The author, an outstanding authority on Irish archæology, presents us with a fascinating and well-documented history which will commend itself to those interested in the subject. Some excellent illustrations are given from photographs taken by the Air Force of the Irish Free State and others.

THE WORTH OF PRAYER, and Other Essays. By Edward Grubb. *James Clarke and Co.* 5*s.*

This collection of essays and addresses seems to indicate that the " spiritual religion " of the Society of Friends is seeking an intellectual justification from the current theories of science, whether in theology, physics or psychology. They cover a wide ground, including Prayer, Revelation, the Christian idea of God, and other points of doctrine. There is nothing very new or striking, but the author's points are clearly and persuasively brought out. The difficulties and apparent contradictions in parts of the Christian religion must (as the author says) " wait for a synthesis—the call is to patience and perseverance."

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

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

The Prayer Book.—A new work on the Prayer Book by Dr. Dyson Hague will shortly be published entitled *The Prayer Book: An Exposition*, price 3*s.* 6*d.* It will be a useful companion to the author's excellent book, *The Story of the Prayer Book*, the second edition of which is now published at 3*s.* 6*d.* In this work the author endeavours to interpret the spirit as well as the letter of the Prayer Book, to explain the origins and contents of all its services, and, in short, to give an exposition of the subject-matter of the Prayer Book from cover to cover. It might be entitled "Through the Prayer Book," or as one has suggested, "Know your Prayer Book." It is intended to help not only the clergy, the student, the Sunday School teacher, but that large body of churchpeople who want to know more about their Prayer Book.

Protestantism.—The Verbatim Report of the 105th Islington Clerical Conference has been issued under the title of *Protestantism* (9*d.* paper boards, 6*d.* paper covers). It contains, in addition to the papers read at the Conference, a foreword by the Bishop of Norwich and an epilogue by Bishop Knox. Following the Islington Conference, the London Meeting of Lay Churchmen took for its subject this year "The Menace to Protestantism—from the West and from the East." In this issue of THE CHURCHMAN Professor Beresford Pite's opening address to the Conference is given.

The Reformation. It may be of interest to mention the following books and pamphlets which deal with this subject and which were mentioned during these Conferences: *The Defence of the Reformation*, by G. G. Coulton (5*s.*); *The Inquisition* (6*d.*) and *The Black Death* (6*d.*), by the same author; *Protestantism*, by Dean Inge, (6*d.*). This is a little pamphlet which was first published in 1927, and has been through several editions. It gives the meaning of Protestantism, and takes us through the transition to Catholicism through the early Protestant revolts down to present-day Modernism and Catholicism; Professor Alison Phillips' useful historical retrospect, *The Protestant Reformed Church of England* (3*d.*), gives material in regard to the Protestantism of the Church of England, while his larger pamphlet, *What Happened at the Reformation* (6*d.*), goes more fully into the subject and is a paper which originally appeared in THE CHURCHMAN in October 1925; Dr. Sydney Carter's pamphlet, *The English Church: Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, Protestant*, which is now issued at 1*d.*, is also a very serviceable and useful pamphlet, and is suitable for general circulation. Lastly we would mention *The Protestantism of the Prayer Book*, by Canon Dyson Hague, which has just been re-issued at 1*s.* 6*d.*, but some copies of the second edition can still be had at the Church Book Room at 1*s.* At a time when the assumption is made that the Prayer Book is Catholic and therefore cannot be Protestant, it is well to have at hand a book which shows so clearly that the Prayer Book is only Catholic because it is so completely Protestant. It is the habit of the pseudo-Catholic to omit, if possible, any reference to the Prayer Book of 1552. In his desire also to convince himself that there is continuity of doctrine between the medieval Missal and the English Prayer Book he has acquired a habit of closing his eyes to the essential changes that were made in the English Communion service. Such points as these, and many more to which we have not space to refer,

will be found treated with clearness and considerable fulness by Canon Dyson Hague.

Holy Communion.—Mention may be made of Canon Meyrick's work, *Doctrine of the Church of England on the Holy Communion* (2*s.* 6*d.*), a sound and positive exposition of the actual doctrine of the Church on the Lord's Supper, and one that will interest and instruct the average Churchman as well as the clergy and the scholar. Bishop Harold Browne writes in his preface to the first edition that such " a clear exposition of primitive doctrine, and of the doctrine of that Church which glories in reverting to and taking hold of primitive faith, must be useful to puzzled consciences and may assure those who are in doubt. . . . I venture to commend the treatise which has gathered into a small compass and expressed in simple language the results of intelligent study, of patient thought, and of extensive learning." Canon Meyrick's other books will also repay perusal, viz. *Scriptural and Catholic Truth and Worship*, or the Faith and Worship of the Primitive, the Medieval and the Reformed Anglican Churches (fourth edition, 1*s.* 6*d.*), and *Old Anglicanism and Modern Ritualism*, a few second-hand copies of which can still be obtained at 1*s.* 6*d.* His other book, *Sunday Observance*, is particularly useful just now when so much is being said in regard to this subject. Second-hand copies of this book can also be had at 1*s.* 6*d.*

The Fourth Gospel.—Readers of THE CHURCHMAN will remember the little book by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D., entitled *The Miracles in St. John's Gospel and their Teaching on Eternal Life*, the first edition of which was published a few years ago at the price of 2*s.* 6*d.* The present edition, which has been corrected and revised, is now issued at 1*s.* The book contains a set of lectures given to the Church Tutorial Classes in Oxford, and is a most helpful and suggestive study, showing how, from the demonstration of our Lord's power over nature in the first miracle at Cana of Galilee, to His bestowal of Life in the raising of Lazarus, there is a gradual progression in the revelation of His divine nature. The two concluding chapters on Upper Room Teaching and Confession bring the teaching of the miracles into close relation with human life and its needs in a general way. The whole study is most suggestive, scholarly and stimulating.

The Nicene Creed.—Some copies remain in the Church Book Room of *The Nicene Creed* by the late Chancellor Lias. The book was originally issued at 7*s.* 6*d.* and the remainder copies are now offered at 1*s.* Chancellor Lias, during his life, studied deeply the fundamentals of our belief. The main value of this treatise lies in its lucid and full exposition of the vital articles of our Creed, and in the firm hold on those principles of Anglicanism which have been the very warp and woof of the web of English Church life.

Historical Tales.—For some years Miss Deborah Alcock's famous story, *The Spanish Brothers*, has been out of print, and we are glad to be able to announce the immediate publication of a new edition at 3*s.* 6*d.* Those who have already read this particular story will welcome the new edition, and those who have not, it will interest as presenting a tale of Spanish life, giving a true and vivid picture of cruel and stormy times during the period of the Inquisition. In the same series two other books of Miss Alcock's have been re-issued ; *Dr. Adrian, a Tale of Old Holland*, a brilliant and powerful historical tale, giving a vivid description of the stirring days in Antwerp, of the Prince of Orange and heroic Sea Beggars ; and *Under Calvin's Spell*, which contains some very useful historical material, and an accurate description of the times.