Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1934.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Church Union in South India.

THE *Record* recently contained an interesting résumé of the present position of the Church Union Scheme in South India by the Rt. Rev. E. R. M. Waller, D.D., Bishop of Madras. After a brief description of the character and strength of the three Churches involved—the Anglican Church in the dioceses of Madras, Travancore, Tinnevelly and Dornakal; the South India United Church, consisting of Presbyterians and Congregationalists; and the Methodist Church—he went on to deal at length with the problems of the Episcopate which form the crux of the negotiations. Agreement has apparently been at last reached as to the best way of bringing the various elements to an acceptance not merely of the principle of episcopacy, but also as to the method of its practical application especially in regard to the consecration of new bishops. Various Committees are still at work on the scheme. While all three Churches have given general approval to it, the process of giving final approval must take two or three years, even if there is no hitch. Two-third majorities are required of the diocesan councils, and two years are allowed for further examination, so that there can be no final vote at the meeting of the General Council in 1935. The Bishop adds: "There is still much need of patience and prayer."

Religious Affairs in Germany.

It is almost impossible to write anything definite about the condition of Religion in Germany as the changes in the outlook are so constant and so rapid. "Periodical crises" are reported and the situation seems to develop increasing difficulties for the National Confessional Synod of the Evangelical Church and the 7,000 pastors whom it represents. One of the most serious elements in the situation recently was the demand of the Reich Primate's National Synod that the pastors should take an oath in which they were to swear to be "loyal to the Führer of the German people and State, Adolf Hitler." The pastors of the Confessional Synod were unwilling to take this form of oath as they felt they could not conscientiously do

so. The form was regarded as an attempt on the part of Bishop Müller to put the resisting pastors in a position of opposition to Herr Hitler if they refused to take it, and thus expose them to penalties for disloyalty and antagonism to the totalitarian State. Some who have met with German people on the Continent this summer have heard many varied expressions of opinion, and not a few of them have been in emphatic condemnation of the tyranny at present existing. " The resisting pastors are the greatest heroes in Germany to-day, and there would be many more of them were it not for the dread of bringing their dependants to want," was one opinion.

Dean Inge's Reminiscences.

Dean Inge, who retired from the Deanery of St. Paul's last month, has been writing his reminiscences, and they contain many interesting reflections upon the Church life of the last seventy years. His references to the Tractarian Movement and the later Anglo-Catholic developments are of special interest. He was brought up in a Tractarian home, and lived for many years under the influence of the teaching of the Movement, but he makes quite clear that the conception of Catholicism which now prevails in Anglo-Catholic circles would have shocked the old Tractarians. It has no real connection with all that they stood for, and it derives its inspiration from the Roman Church and its methods. The ritual now adopted is borrowed from that Church, and is entirely foreign to the whole conception of the early Tractarians, some of whom never even wore a cassock and were content with the simplest forms of service in conformity with the older English tradition. In regard to their teaching it is significant that one of Keble's chief literary efforts was his edition of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Many of the modern Anglo-Catholics would repudiate some of the teaching of that great Anglican classic, if they were familiar with it, but it is doubtful if they have ever taken the trouble to study the work which the Tractarians regarded as the standard work of Anglican theology.

Baroness Burdett Coutts and South Africa.

The letters of the Baroness Burdett Coutts in regard to her generous gifts for the endowment of a Church of England bishopric in Capetown have recently been published. She makes quite clear that she intended her gifts to be strictly governed by the conditions which held good in regard to the established Church at home, and she desired that effect should be given " to an order of things calculated to secure that the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England by law established should be maintained in their completeness amongst the congregations of our own Communion in those Colonies." She pointed out that the actions of the Bishops in South Africa in severing the connection with the established Church in England was an attempt to cast themselves off from their firm anchorage ground, and to risk the drifting away of their Church

from the Church of England in the vague condition of a voluntary association, requested from time to time by the vote of the ruling majority, and she goes on to say that this " seems to me to imply a departure from the principles which they maintained when they accepted their appointments and to be quite irreconcilable with the common understanding under which the funds for the endowment of additional bishoprics in the Colonies have been provided." Writing in 1872—some twenty-five years after her gifts were accepted—she points out that " the late Bishop (Dr. Gray) while continuing to receive the income of the endowment, adopted a policy of which the effect was to create a new Church in the Colony free from the laws and control which govern the Mother Church of England. . . . I do not think that the endowment given and accepted for one purpose should be applied to the advancement of a wholly different one." In her Will she said that such endowments and gifts as she had made were not to an Independent Voluntary Association but to the Protestant Church of England as by law established under the Supremacy of the Crown being Protestant. The recent decision which under the principle of *cy près* has allowed funds given for one purpose to be used for a purpose definitely opposed to the wishes of the donors may well have unforeseen consequences in preventing people of strong Protestant principles from giving gifts for Church purposes, or from leaving legacies which may be used for the propagation of teaching diametrically opposed to that which the donor or testator desires to promote.

The Future of Church Day Schools.

The future of Church Day Schools is a source of considerable anxiety to many Churchmen who are interested in the religious education of the young. It is reported that the number of Church Schools is constantly decreasing, while on the other hand the Roman Catholics are making strenuous efforts and spending large sums of money in providing new schools and in securing increased accommodation for their pupils. For some reason Churchpeople are not as interested in their schools as they were formerly, and are not prepared to provide the funds for the upkeep of the school buildings. Some feel that the Church Schools do not give an adequate return for the outlay involved. While the Church teaching given in the majority of the schools is excellent, and the influence on the children is good, many of the teachers seem to regard their duty to the parish with which their school is connected as confined to the routine of school work. In large towns, especially, many of the teachers live at a distance from their work and have no connection with the parish and its interests outside their official duties. It has been suggested that the Heads of the Church Training Colleges should take this matter into consideration, and should endeavour to impress upon Church teachers the importance of assisting the Church's work in every way in their power, as they have special opportunities of usefulness.

Convent Schools.

In regard to Secondary education, the increase in the number of Roman Catholic Convent Schools is also a source of anxiety in view of the support given to them by Protestant parents who provide the chief source of their income. These schools do not exist merely for the benefit of the members of the Roman Catholic Church. Many of them would soon cease to exist if they were dependent upon the adherents of the Roman Catholic Communion. Many Protestants do not realise that these institutions must of necessity be centres of propaganda, and that the children who attend them must be subjected to the subtle influence of their surroundings, even when promises are made that there will be no interference with the religion of the pupils. Many also do not realise that the cheapness of the education in many of these schools is due to the fact that the teaching is in the hands of nuns who receive no payment for their work. An unfair competition is thus created with the High Schools, where the teachers are highly trained University women who naturally are paid well according to the high qualifications which they possess.

Our Contributors.

We are enabled to offer our readers in this number of THE CHURCHMAN a number of articles of wide and varied interest. Bishop Knox, in " The Sacred Duty of Doubting," examines a correspondence between Cardinal Newman and William Froude which has a very human interest, and it is shown at the same time to have a practical bearing on the problem of authority. Dr. W. Brown's paper at the Oxford Conference on " Psychology and Confession " shows the difference between the methods employed by Psycho-analysis and those of the Confessional. The Rev. E. Hirst contributes a study of Wycliffe and the Lollards and notes their contribution to the Reformation movement. Dr. Sydney Carter tells the story of John Dury who was a seventeenth-century apostle of reunion. Dr. Dyson Hague examines a recent theory of creation and shows the inadequacy of any mere materialistic view of the origin of the universe. An interesting selection of notes by Mr. E. H. Blakeney under the title " Miscellanea Critica " illustrates a number of points of scholarship which should prove attractive to those who have pleasure in the by-paths of literature. Some important aspects of Reunion are dealt with by the Rev.G. F. Handel Elvey, who appeals for the exclusion of the spirit of exclusiveness. Biblical students will be interested in the views of the " Marriages of Hosea " set out by the Rev. T. C. Lawson, and his examination of the various theories that have been maintained regarding them. We are always glad to receive suggestions from our readers, and to consider any contributions sent to us on subjects likely to interest Evangelical Churchpeople or to advance the cause of Evangelical Churchmanship.

"THE SACRED DUTY OF DOUBTING."

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

THE John Hopkins Press has published this year a volume of the deepest interest to all students of the Tractarian Movement. It is entitled *Cardinal Newman and William Froude, F.R.S., a correspondence, by Gordon Huntington Harper.* The book has a far wider appeal than its title suggests. It is the record of a conflict between two correspondents of supreme literary ability and profound moral earnestness, of whom one held fast to the sacred duty of believing and the other to the sacred duty of doubting. The book is all the more interesting as it is in no sense a faked correspondence. Nor is it a controversy in the ordinary sense of the word. A controversy carries with it the idea of a dispute in public. The lists are set. The seats of spectators or hearers are crowded. Cut and thrust are delivered with an eye, not merely to the combatants' defeat or victory, but with a yet more earnest desire to influence the "gallery," to win applause, to gain adherents. But the correspondence before us is between two intimate friends, sincerely attached each to the other, each desirous of the other's spiritual welfare, each writing with full consciousness of responsibility to God and to Him only. From first to last there is not one trace of loss of temper, of cheap scorings by verbal tricks of rhetoric. The cost at which the contest is maintained is almost heart-rending. William Froude, never wavering in his affection for Newman, and tenderly attached to his own family, sees first his wife, then two sons and a daughter, won over to the Church of Rome by Newman's persuasion, and is acutely sensible of the gulf opening up between him and his dearest. Yet he never utters a word of reproach. He understands that, from Newman's point of view, the wounds which he suffers are wounds that Newman's duty compels him to inflict. It would have been so easy for Froude to follow his wife and children for peace' sake. Yet it was so impossible. For Froude, like Job of old, wraps himself in his own integrity. He dares not to betray the sacred trust committed to him of absolute fidelity to reason, the duty of not forcing himself to believe, or affecting to believe, what reason does not allow him to infer from the premises before him. There is probably no record of controversy that has moved on a higher plane, of a doubter more sincere, who paid more dearly for his doubts, whose sense of obligation to an unseen, unknown God was more humble, more loyal, more deeply moving, with perhaps the one exception of Job in his darkest hours.

William Froude was the youngest of three brothers, Richard Hurrell, James Anthony, and William, sons of the Archdeacon of Totnes in the opening years of the nineteenth century. The father was an old-fashioned High Churchman, who, but for his sons, would have hardly figured on the pages of history. Of the

three sons, Richard Hurrell (pupil of John Keble), had he lived longer, might, perhaps, have brought the Tractarian Movement to a more abrupt conclusion. He was daring in thought, recklessly outspoken in utterance, an avowed hater of the Reformers and of the Reformation, and strongly attracted by the Roman Catholic type of piety. It was he who asked the fatal question which has never yet been answered from the Tractarian point of view, "What right had the English Convocations to depart from the Catholic faith?" Of him and his influence on Newman it is not necessary to say more at present. James Anthony passed from under Tractarian influence to avowed agnosticism. He shared Hurrell's reckless and bitter denunciation of opponents, and in this respect differed widely from William. William was, or rather became, a very distinguished scientist, a Fellow of the Royal Society, to whom their Gold Medal was awarded. His investigations were on the motion of ships in waves. They profoundly affected naval designing. From these investigations William drew the conclusion that the achievement of permanent and final certainty is impossible, and that it is a moral obligation not to profess a certainty which is in fact beyond our reach. All three brothers accepted Butler's axiom that probability is the guide of life, but drew from it very different conclusions. Hurrell Froude turned for certainty towards a Church which claimed to be infallible; Anthony regarded all religious faith as self-delusion; William would not acquiesce in any claim to certainty which shut the door in the face of revision and re-examination of conclusions, however firmly they seemed to be established. His correspondence with Newman has this special interest, that it forced Newman to examine the grounds of all certitude in his *Grammar of Assent.*

The correspondence in this volume falls between the years 1844 and 1879. It is, necessarily, incomplete, and some of it is to be found either in the *Apologia* or in W. Ward's *Life of Newman*; but a large portion has been hitherto unpublished, and it is to this that we naturally turn with chief interest. It opens with a vivid picture of Newman in doubt and perplexity, attracted by Rome, but waiting for the decisive call, which will make his passing over an imperative duty. He is conscious that the Church of England was not justified in its breach with the Papacy. But he is not less sensitive of the corruptions of Rome. His attempt to heal the breach between the two Churches by Tract XC has been repudiated by the Bishops and by his University. There is no hope of what he most desired, the unification of the two Churches, and he has even begun to fix the date of his submission to Rome. While he was in that state, William Froude, an ex-pupil of Newman at Oriel, perceiving that the foundations of his own religious belief were unstable, wrote to Newman for guidance, and Newman replied in a series of letters to Mrs. Froude, who was, in fact, in advance of Newman on the Romeward journey. These letters are an anticipation of the *Apologia*, but written with a different purpose. The *Apologia* was written to vindicate Newman's truthfulness. These

letters were written to show the inevitableness of the change that was so imminent. The object of this Article is to approach them as a revelation of Newman's thirst for certitude, for an authority which could command his unwavering and indefectible assent. To a great extent these letters, where they differ from the *Apologia* (and they do differ in some cases), are historically more trustworthy. For they are contemporary documents, written to intimate friends, without any *arrière-pensée* of the effect that they might have on the public mind.

One point of the greatest importance emerges. The storm centre of the Tractarian Movement was, of course, that one Article of the Creed: "I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church." How could the Church of England profess this belief, if, as the Tractarians contended, the Roman and Eastern Churches were also true Churches, superstitious and corrupt, no doubt, but true Churches for all that?

"The Anglicans," writes Newman, "consider it (the Church) a succession, propagated through different countries, independent in each country, and claiming the adherence of Christians in this or that country to itself as it exists in this or that country. Each bishop is isolated from every other and supreme in his own diocese, and, if he unites with others, it is only as the civil power or his own choice happens to unite him. He claims obedience without claiming to be a depository and transmitter of true doctrine, the succession being a point of order, not a condition and witness of the faith. And all other bishops or religious bodies acting in his diocese without his leave are schismatical. Now, if this be so, the question occurs, in what sense do Anglicans consider the Church one? In what sense are Rome and England one?

"If Rome and England are one, what is meant by the common phrase 'the Church of our baptism.' Baptism is one, and admits into the 'one body,' not into any local society. A child baptised by a clergyman of Oxford is not admitted into that *Church* or *Diocese*, but into the Catholic body, which is diffused the world throughout, and which is the real 'Church of his baptism.' It puzzled me to make out in what sense, on the hypothesis that Rome and England formed one Church, a man changed his Church who went from the English to the Roman branch, any more than he changed it if he communicated here with the Church of Oxford, there with the Church of London. He changed his *faith* indeed, but that is another matter; but how could he change his Church, when there was no other Church to change to?"

It is obvious how serious this reasoning became to a mind that had learned under Tractarian influences to rest its faith, not on the authority of Scripture, but on the authority of the interpretation given to Scripture by the Church. If the Church is one, and if it is to the Church that we look as our Teacher, what becomes of our Faith when the Church speaks with two flatly antagonistic voices? Where shall the soul find certitude if she depends on the Church to tell her what doctrines she is to deduce from Scripture? Certainly Newman was in no position to help William Froude to restore the foundations of his belief—that is, from his own point of view—until he could put before him the authoritative voice of a Church which could expound a self-consistent Creed.

Here, may a digression from the Correspondence be forgiven,

while an effort is made to trace the development of Anglo-Catholic teaching on this highly important issue? For nearly half a century the Tractarians and their successors taught the doctrine concerning the Unity of the Church which Newman found so unconvincing. To-day many Anglo-Catholics have renounced this form of teaching, and frankly admit that though the Church ought to be one, it is not one, and go on to say that there is no Church gifted with power of infallible teaching. They are forced into this position by the fact that a section of them, now by far the largest, most learned and most influential, has accepted the findings of Higher Criticism, on the Old and New Testaments. Manifestly, Higher Criticism, while professing finality in its negations, cannot pretend to finality in its affirmations. Higher Criticism may be quite sure that Moses did *not* write the Pentateuch, but it cannot say positively how many authors or redactors gave us the sacred Torah. It may be quite sure that Mark did *not* write the last few verses of his Gospel, but it cannot be quite sure how many writers are to be detected in the pages of the Acts of the Apostles. In other words, according to the views of these Anglo-Catholics, the teaching of the Pre-Reformation Church concerning Scripture is not to be trusted, and it would seem, though we have not seen it admitted, that it is exceedingly doubtful whether Scripture can be regarded as an authority even for the authority or necessity of the Episcopate. The axe is laid to the very roots of the Tractarian Movement. The only *certitude* which Anglo-Catholicism professes to offer is that some beliefs and practices have for many centuries nurtured a type of piety which its adherents believe to be the highest type. But what if this claim for the excellence of Anglo-Catholic piety be not accepted? What, if, for instance, the Society of Friends claims that without Priesthood, without sacrifice, without Sacrament it has nurtured a more Christ-like spirit, given birth to a higher type of altruism? There is room of course for argument, but there is no room for finality, no prospect at all of certitude.

The object of this digression has been to show the perplexities which Tractarianism has encountered in its attempt to establish a position of certitude and a consequent claim of authority. Confronted with the divergences of Protestant teaching and attributing those divergences to the unbounded exercise of private judgment, Tractarianism set up against these disunited forces the unjust authority of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church. But presently, how, asked Hurrell Froude, how, asked Newman, can the *One* Church condemn Purgatory in London, and proclaim it as the teaching of Christ in Rome? The object of Tract XC was to show that Purgatory was not condemned in London. But the more successful Pusey and his followers were in assimilating their interpretation of the doctrine of the Church of England to that of Rome, the more inexcusable was the schism between the two Churches. So, under cover of Higher Criticism and reconciliation with the modern scientific mind, Anglo-Catholicism, the heir of Tractarianism, has abandoned authority, and therewith has abandoned certitude,

leaving Rome in possession of the claim for finality, which many consciences regard as an inalienable property of faith.

Thus, for instance, Newman writes: "From the age of fifteen dogma has been the fundamental principle of my religion. I know no other religion, I cannot enter into the idea of any other religion; religion as a mere sentiment is to me a dream and mockery."

Now dogma is belief accepted on the basis of infallible authority; belief that admits of no denial, and resents any kind of question or examination. There are minds, not a few, constituted like Newman's, and attracted by the worship and practices of the Pre-Reformation Church, minds to which Tractarianism by its confident dogmatic tone made a strong appeal. Anglo-Catholicism, having abandoned dogma, has no message for them.

To return to the Froude correspondence. Newman, having joined the Church of Rome, and rejoicing in the unwavering dogmatic certitude gained by so doing, set himself to bring his more intimate friends into the peace and happiness which he enjoyed. He was not a "scalp-hunter" like Manning, "gauging his usefulness by the number and prominence of his converts." But his affection for his friends compelled him to desire their conversion passionately. Now the more positive Newman was in his faith, the more repulsive was his proselytism to William Froude. To him it seemed grossly unfair that Newman should take advantage of Mrs. Froude's romantic inclinations to manœuvre her into a conviction that her husband was a lost soul. Froude remonstrated, and received from Newman a promise: "Your dear wife has said she would not write to me again, and I assure you, my dearest William, I shall not write to her,—but you can't hinder me (nor wish to hinder me) praying, whatever prayers are worth." Yet it was not a month after this, that Newman wrote to Mrs. Froude:

> "Do not fancy you can put me in a painful position to dear William; I don't mind differing with him. I don't mind giving you advice in which he would not concur. But I wish to be sure I tell him, when I do it. He is so true and tender, but I leave you safely to him. But I never can disguise from him what I think and feel about you."

This singularly ill-expressed letter (for Newman could write shockingly bad English) was followed by several others in which the dominant note is still "the certainty" that is enjoyed by Catholics. The following note, added by Newman to one of these letters is very characteristic. "My argument is that against the probability adverse to Catholicism arising from the *prima facie* incompleteness of its proof must be put the *prima facie* probability in its behalf arising from 'the certainty' of Catholics." Froude sees the blow impending and tries to avert it, not by pressure on Mrs. Froude, whose Romeward leanings were more temperamental than rational, but by efforts to weaken Newman's faith in his religious certainty. A long letter which Froude had written to Newman, while he was in Rome after his conversion, failed to reach its destination. (Was it suppressed?) But other letters survive which show Froude endeavouring to persuade Newman that even

men of science cannot attain certitude, far less make dogmatic statements which shall convey to all who listen to them precisely the same meanings. If dogmatism, within so limited and purely rational a sphere, is unattainable, how much less can it be reached in realms confessedly supra-rational and supernatural?

The painful record of Newman's persistent pressure on Mrs. Froude is crowned at last on March 19, 1857, with the following letter:

"MY DEAR SIR,—

"I know you will be glad to hear that I was received into the Catholic Church this morning. It is strange that you are the only person whom I now venture to tell of the great blessing which God has given me—not even my dearest William. . . . My heart aches for *him*; for he is miserable at the idea of our virtual separation—and he has nothing to fall back on, whereas I could not be unhappy if I tried, even with all my sorrow for him. I must tell you how from my heart I thank you for what you have done to help me—other Catholics always seemed to be 'making a case' when they said things to me—you always contrived to say exactly what soothed my mind."

What was it then that Newman had said? So far as the letters in this correspondence show, he had never argued with her after he joined the Church of Rome as to the demerits of the Anglican or merits of the Roman Church. He had treated her speculative doubts as unimportant compared with the duty of obeying her conscience, which commanded her to join the Church of Rome. He had promised her "absolute certainty of faith in the truth of what the Church conveyed to her from God." He had bidden her "throw herself on the Power, Love and Faithfulness of Him Who called her." He had told her that it "was his distinct judgment that she was bound to join the Church at once." Taking advantage, it would appear, of the scrupulosity of her husband, he had promised her absolute release from all doubts and scruples, absolute peace and happiness. Would Mrs. Froude have acted otherwise if William had had, for instance, the assurance of a Methodist, or the spiritual peace of a William Wilberforce? Such questions cannot be answered. But it is evident that Newman took advantage of William Froude's conscientious refusal to pretend to a certainty which he (Froude) had not attained. His position was that of Thomas during the eight days after the Resurrection. Yet his extraordinary patience with Newman, and his humility, the very antipodes of some forms of scientific assuredness, make a strong appeal to us, an appeal also, may we not believe, to his Master?

Some light on the nature of William Froude's difficulties is shown by his sending to Newman a copy of Fitz-James Stephen's criticism of the *Apologia* in *Fraser's Magazine* for September, 1864. In doing so Froude said that, while he deprecated the roughness of tone, he found that "the substance of the views which the writer expresses is more nearly that which he has always felt a wish to express, than anything which he has elsewhere fallen in with." This Article may therefore be confidently accepted as reflecting the nature of William Froude's doubts. Reference to it shows that, as

we should have expected, Fitz-James Stephen does not champion the agnosticism of Huxley, for instance, or of Herbert Spencer. On the contrary, he professes throughout faith in Christianity, and, though his attitude to Scripture is not that of an Evangelical, yet it is reverent, and very different from the tone current in the agnostic circles of his time. His object is not to instil doubt, but to show the overwhelming obstacles to faith produced by Newman's passion for certitude. It is strictly relevant to perusal of the correspondence before us to examine the general line followed in this Article, for it gives us a much clearer idea of William Froude's position than we should gain from perusal of the correspondence without it.

The Article in *Fraser's Magazine* makes it plain that the faith demanded by Newman was faith in the Roman Catholic Church. "Cease to believe in Catholicism, and you become Protestant, Unitarian, Deist, Pantheist, Sceptic, in a dreadful but infallible succession." Newman, in fact, tried to rush the religiously minded into Roman Catholicism by presenting Atheism as the only alternative. Faith for him meant faith in the infallible Church, which

> "claimed to have a sure guidance into the very meaning of every portion of the Divine message in detail, which was committed by our Lord to the Apostles. The Church claims to know its own limits and to decide what it can determine absolutely and what not. It claims, moreover, to have a hold upon statements not directly religious so far as this is to determine directly whether they relate to religion, and, according to its own definitive judgment to pronounce whether or not, in a particular sense they are consistent with revealed truth. It claims to decide magisterially, whether infallibly or not, that such and such statements are or are not prejudicial to the apostolic *depositum* of faith in their spirit or in their consequences, and to allow them or to condemn and forbid them accordingly. It claims to impose silence at will on any matter or controversies of doctrine which on its own *ipse dixit* it pronounces to be dangerous or inexpedient or inopportune. It claims that whatever the judgments of Catholics upon such acts, these acts should be received by them—with . . . outward marks of reverence, submission, and loyalty."

After this, Newman found no difficulty in insisting on belief in such doctrine as transubstantiation. A man who has once taken the great step of believing in God at the bidding of the Church is unreasonable if his faith fails him over mysteries of far less seriousness or importance. "Why should not transubstantiation be true? What is to hinder it? What do I know of substance or matter?" His sermons abounded in glorification of the doctrine of transubstantiation, clinging to this belief, in spite of its being based on subtle conceptions of scholastic philosophy which have no meaning to either science or philosophy to-day. To William Froude, whose life work consisted of delicate and profoundly careful investigation into properties of material objects, who treated them with reverence as in a sense Divine revelations, it could not fail to be a surrender of reason and a treachery to God to assume that the Church could, on its own authority and in defiance of the witness of the senses, make pronouncements which would be valid only if our senses were given us to deceive us.

There is abundant proof in this Article, which William Froude so heartily accepted as consonant with his own opinions, that the sacred duty of doubting on which he insisted was fully justified by the demands which Newman made on his faith. Still, it would seem from the letters that passed between them that Froude abstained from criticising the more outrageous demands of Roman Catholicism. His home would have been no home to him, if he had not kept silence and borne patiently with some of the extravagances of Roman claims. Surely his patience must also have been strained, when his son Hurrell, being unable, as a Roman Catholic, to enter any Oxford College, and having to take refuge in the household of Professor Donkin, got over the still further obstacle of attending Protestant family prayers, by attending them "carrying a crucifix," and "with full mental reservation." With great dignity and nobility of soul Froude moved in his arguments on the higher plane of the possibility of certitude in reaching conclusions, and in the duty of "religiously keeping before our eyes the fallibility of processes of thought," and "instead of saying this is my honest belief and so help me God it ever shall be, the duty of saying, this is for the present the best conclusion I can come to, but in the sight of God I declare that I shall be at all times ready to reconsider it, if reasonably called on to do so."

By resolutely adhering to this course Froude drove Newman to write his *Grammar of Assent*, in which an attempt is made on scientific principles to show how the human mind reaches conclusions and gives its assent to them. The result of the inquiry was that Newman came to the conclusion that certainty is not to be reached by reason, and that in matters which are beyond the grasp of reason, we have to use the "illative" sense, a "thinking with our whole being," which bridges the gap that separates reason from things and beings beyond the reach of reason. The result was to reduce "certitude" to a mental state.

"Those propositions," wrote Newman, "I call certain which are such that I am certain of them. Reason never bids us be certain except on absolute proof, and such proof can never be furnished to us by any logic of words; for as certitude is of the mind, so is the act of inference which leads to it. Everyone who reasons is his own centre. . . . The sole and final judgment on the validity of an inference in concrete matters is committed to the personal action of the ratiocinative faculty, the perfection of which I have called the 'illative sense,' parallel to our use of it in 'good sense,' 'common sense,' 'a sense of beauty,' etc."

Of course it follows that a man may be without the 'illative sense,' as he may be without a sense of beauty, and then he will, like William Froude, be justified in insisting on 'the sacred duty of doubting,' but he will perish everlastingly.

It was a singular conclusion to reach, if we look back to the starting-point of the early Tractarian days. Then all was plain and straightforward. There was a Church that taught us what we were to believe, a Church of England, which gradually gave place, in the case of Newman and others, to the more confidently

self-asserting Church of Rome. But, as questionings arose, and the demands on faith became more and more exacting, the result of self-analysis was to show that we believe what we choose to believe, and in a world of probability we reach certainty not by reason but by a resolute act of the will. What then is the difference between this decision and the accursed private judgment of the Protestants, except that the Romanist calls in un-reason to assist him after he has made his final decision?

To end with such an *argumentum ad hominum* would be an unsatisfactory conclusion, even if it were all that this correspondence legitimately required of us. We cannot help asking ourselves which of the two writers came nearer to the truth—he who insisted on the sacred duty of believing, or he who pleaded for the sacred duty of doubting? Nor shall we be satisfied by affirming that Froude was by conscience, as well as by reason, compelled to refuse assent to what Newman required him to believe. A large issue has been raised, and, even if it is one that cannot be settled in a few lines at the end of a long article, we can hardly leave it without at least some plain statement of our own experience, or preferably, of that which we have gathered from Scripture, and verified in our own lives.

There is a certitude which is obtainable by man. S. Paul calls it (1 Cor. ii. 4) "the certitude of the Holy Ghost." The late Bishop Robertson's comment on these words is that "certitude" means "stringent proof." "Aristotle distinguishes it," he adds, "from the Syllogism. The latter proves that a certain conclusion follows from premises which may or may not be true. In 'certitude' the premises are known to be true." "S. Paul is not dealing with scientific certainty; but he claims that the certitude of religious truth to the believer is as complete and as objective—equal in degree though different in kind—as the certitude of scientific truth to the scientific mind. Mere human wisdom may dazzle and overwhelm and seem to be unanswerable—but it does not penetrate to those depths of the soul which are the decisions of a lifetime. It is distinguished from the wisdom of men in this, that a clever argument is at the mercy of a cleverer argument; but Faith, which is at its root personal trust, springs from the vital connection of human personality with Divine." The sacred duty of believing is the surrender of the soul to the keeping of a Divine Personality. It cannot be shaken, because it knows "on Whom it has believed." On the other hand, one feature that distinguishes it from mere self-assurance, from mere emotionalism, from the confidence of insanity or semi-insanity is this, that the living Lord in Whom we have believed has given us two gifts, we may call them two *talents*, of which He will require an account. If we use them not, we are dishonest stewards. These gifts, or talents, are "reason" and "the Word of God addressed to us in Holy Scripture." By use of these two tests we distinguish "the certitude of the Holy Ghost" from the certitude promised to us by false spirits. Any spirit which promises us certitude in plain defiance of reason, or on condition

of neglecting, corrupting, or defying the plain Word of God, is a false spirit. To such a spirit we oppose the sacred duty of doubting. We challenge it with the sword of the Spirit. We answer it by the sacred duty laid on us of "loving the Lord our God with all our *mind*." We are saved from bare individualism by the fact that the Holy Ghost, Who gave us the Word, guides the mind of the whole Fellowship created by His indwelling. He, Who creates the most profound, most absolute of all certitudes within us by revealing to us the Christ, relieves us from all fear that we are victims of self-imposture by bringing us into harmony with the Spirit-guided Church of God. Hence we have a Kingdom that cannot be shaken, a confidence that hath a great reward. The personal certitude or faith, which is ours by revelation through the Spirit of "the love which God hath towards us," being found also in the Spirit-guided Fellowship of the Saints, is at once a living union with God, and an experience shared with others. It is a spiritual experience, which is capable of intellectual expression and communication. The personal faith of the believer is expressed in the faith once for all delivered to the Saints.

Certitude is not submission to an external authority, human in fact, whatever higher claim it may advance on its behalf. Certitude is not secured by stifling reason, nor by allowing others to interpret for us the revelation which God has put into our hands. But it is the meeting of the soul with God, a fact more certain than any in the world of sense that lies around us. God is more certain to us than the world that passeth away. But the vision is confirmed by His Word conveyed to us through reason not fettered but free, reason that is the Spirit-enlightened Spirit-guided gift of Him Who is Truth as well as Love.

Dr. J. R. Mott contributes a Foreword to Mr. Alexander McLeish's "*Jesus Christ and World Evangelization, Missionary Principles: Christ's or Ours*," (Lutterworth Press, 2*s*. net), in which he recommends this study as a challenge to the present generation to use the marvellous opportunity for great adventure. A work more like that which on earth occupied Christ Himself than any other service known among men. The author takes his principles from the New Testament, and applies them with great force and directness to the Evangelism of the Church in the present day.

THE ADVENTURES OF ELIZABETH GRAY. By Isabel Cameron. *Religious Tract Society*. 3*s*. 6*d*.

This is a bright and entertaining record of the various adventures of a lively, happy-spirited woman, who is ready to help any lame dogs whom her love and sympathy can reach. Humour and pathos mark all these little life-sketches of the friends of Elizabeth Gray, and in the end her own story reaches a happy conclusion.

PSYCHOLOGY AND CONFESSION.

By William Brown, M.D., D.Sc., F.R.C.P., Wilde Reader in Mental Philosophy at Oxford University.

The following article contains the substance of the address given at the recent Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen. The general subject of the Conference was "The Ministry of Reconciliation." Dr. Brown was specially invited as an expert on Psychology, to give the Conference the benefit of his valuable experience in the use of Psycho-Analysis.—Editor.

I CANNOT imagine a more important subject matter of discourse than this question of psychology and confession. When Mr. Chavasse invited me to speak under this title, I simply could not refuse, because my experience now for many years has convinced me that it really is one of the fundamental problems of psychology as well as of religion. What exactly do we mean by confession? What happens when confession occurs? In speaking to you, I want to say definitely that I am speaking as a psychologist, not necessarily as a philosopher or a theologian. I am speaking entirely from the psychological point of view. Psychology is in a difficult position. It is about to assume very much more power than it at present possesses. Its future is assured. It is like a young adolescent who has a great future before him, but who is, on occasions, over-impressed and over-stimulated by the thought of his future, and is tempted at times to presume upon his future and to anticipate it. That is the danger the psychologist runs at the present day. Another danger is that psychology, because of its importance, will trespass on other domains. As long as psychology keeps its place it has a fundamental work to do. What is the task of psychology? It is the task of bringing scientific order into the temporal sequence of mental processes as observed in individuals. It is, as James Ward said, the science of experience, and experience is always individual experience and is something that goes on in time. Besides that aspect, there is the eternal aspect of experience, the aspect of values, and these values are classified under the headings, the good, the beautiful and the true which, in their essence, are beyond time but not out of time. The eternal is not something which occurs all at once, but something which, in some mysterious way, takes time into itself. We have that occurring in the individual mind. It is not a mystery which has to be accepted without being understood at all. In our ordinary life we are already rising above the immediate present, we are already rising into an eternal sphere, and so for the individual, the life of the eternal is there. I would not dream of making distinctions between the mind and the spirit because I think all mind is spiritual. The distinction I would make is between the events occurring in time and the value of those events. You cannot say they are all of the same level. Psychology has to deal with value, and the determination of value from the

point of view of psychology is not the same as that from the point of view of philosophy and religion.

It is because so many psychologists have no training in philosophy that there is so much confusion in this matter at the present time. The majority of psychologists are untrained in philosophy. They come to the subject from the point of view of mental processes in connection with physical processes (in the brain), and no wonder they tend to explain everything in terms of what has gone before, and treat the mind in the way of a closed system.

To have inspiration means nothing objective to them because they cannot treat objective inspiration scientifically. We carry our science as far as possible, but we don't pre-judge and prejudice the whole situation by giving our own inadequate account of reality. That is obviously the case in the writings of Freud in *The Future of an Illusion*. It is quite easy in that book to discover the original fallacy when you find him referring to reality. He uses the word " reality " in a way no philosopher would. He seems to assume that religion is a mixture of egotism, greed and fear. The way to refute a doctrine like that is to give a more adequate psychological analysis of religious experience and its philosophic implications.

Confession and psycho-analysis.—For years now, people who have approached psycho-analysis and other forms of analytical psychology from the religious side have tended to think of analysis as a development of the practice of confession. Although there are similarities the differences are still greater. The differences are differences of point of view and of purpose. In confession the idea is to get the individual to admit that he has been wrong, to change his mental attitude and to get him to wish to be better and to be ready to make restitution for what he has done wrong. In analysis the purpose is quite a different one. It is to go over the individual's past in order to see how one mental process has led on to another in his life, until the present situation is reached. Psycho-analysis was devised to help patients suffering from nervous and mental symptoms. Confession deals more with normal people than with abnormal people.

But although there is a dividing line, a difference in quality between the normal and pathological, in actual experience there is no complete separation. The most normal person has pathological trends which need to be tracked down and eliminated in a scientific way. The difference in point of view here between confession in religious practice and analysis in psycho-therapy is in the adequate training and education of the normal person. In the case of confession, advice may be given at the end ; in the case of analysis, advice is not part of the analysis. Analysis enables the individual to rectify past wrong mental attitudes. Analysis has discovered various mental mechanisms, mental reactions in the face of difficulties of one kind or another that are met with in the course of life. Such mental reactions are the reaction of compensation, the reaction of projection, the reaction of introjection and the reaction of regres-

sion. The process of regression is a process of stepping back to an earlier or more infantile mental attitude towards life. This is apparent in most cases of patients suffering from mental illness.

This process of regression is important for religion because the process can take place in certain instances and produce a religious experience (such as an experience of "conversion") whose true validity is not quite the same as its apparent validity. The individual, if he is allowed to put too much weight upon that unthinkingly and blindly, may be hindering himself in his own true religious development, and he may, in a great emotional experience, be tending to fix himself at an infantile level. Besides regression, the process of compensation is generally admitted to be of frequent occurrence in the life of mental patients. The mind tends to rectify itself in face of a difficulty, but when inadequate to its task it may develop symptoms, i.e. morbid reactions of one kind or another.

Partly by endeavouring not to see one's deficiency, one may run in different directions. Sometimes, one may run to dogmatic agnosticism to escape duties which one does not feel equal to. At other times, one may endeavour to emphasise other abilities one may possess and magnify one's pretended power in those directions to hide from oneself one's religious deficiencies. Analysis is a process of encouraging a patient to talk out his life for an hour at a time without any reference to righting a wrong or confession or absolution, but just letting his feelings come out. That is a very important process, because it enables him to work off repressions that have driven him into this false position. If you make a frontal attack on him you may make him entrench himself in that false position still more firmly, and he may even use religion itself to the further entrenching of himself. In that sense analysis is needed to prepare the way for adequate confession.

I cannot identify confession with analysis. I have had patients for varying periods of analysis; my longest patient was for six years, and they talk at every level of conscious reaction and unconscious reaction. You find mental processes that do get outlet, and if they had not obtained that outlet, they would have produced distorted reactions in the conscious mind which would have continued to mystify the individual and those around him. The normal person, as such, does not need analysis. We only need analysis so long as there is something pathological in us; something which is not adapted in a scientific way to our environment.

When I say I don't distinguish the mind from the spirit, it does not mean that I don't distinguish our mental environment and our spiritual environment. We can make a distinction for any ordinary subject, and we have to choose as we make a distinction between mental illness and moral illness, although they run into one another. Although it is true that analysis is different from confession, I have found in almost every case I have dealt with, that sooner or later my patient has wanted to confess to me. They seem to feel the need for real confession. It is when one gets confession in the process of analysis that one sees the real difference between the two.

Here we must take into account Freud's recent doctrine of the "super-ego." The super-ego is the beginnings of individual conscience, the taking up into the individual mind in early years of parental authority, of parental veto, or the veto of society. We have to allow for that in analysis. It is a further complication. When the patient begins to confess to you, you have to ask yourself: Is this blaming of himself just a mechanical action of his own super-ego, working unconsciously, but with a conscious reflection so that he is blaming himself when he really should not? That can happen. A patient can, in the course of an analysis, begin to say, "Really, I don't deserve to get better. I am rotten to the core."

If he takes that line, one has to go on helping him. If one says, "Yes, you are a miserable sinner, you have to confess," one may be putting too great a load on his shoulders. One may be taking things at their face value which should not be taken at their face value. All psychology which is based on deep analysis emphasises the fact that things are not always what they seem. It is true that many people who do this work seem sometimes in danger of forgetting that there is a conscious mind at all. That is an obvious mistake. The unconscious mind is always working mechanically at the back of the conscious mind, in the form of a blind driving towards instinctive goals, of which the most fundamental are the "will to live" and the "will to power."

The psychologist has to be fully aware of all that while he is listening to his patient. He listens, he does not talk. He tries to get the patient's confidence so that the patient can talk to him, but sooner or later the confession element does come in and the expert psychologist is able to distinguish between the true confession and the pseudo-confession due to the working of this primitive infantile conscience. Ultimately, he has to explain to his patient the difference, so that the patient can gradually unravel it himself. But the patient must not think this is all super-ego, that it is all convention, or what not. He needs to be sustained in his search for an ethical standard, and we find that later on a logical standard comes clear and ultimately a religious standard.

Again, speaking entirely on a basis of observed fact, I find that patients get a deeper view of religion through analysis instead of becoming sceptical of religion.

In analysis, we are dealing with what is in our own individual minds all the time, but when we come to the true confession side, we are passing beyond that. As scientists we feel it is our duty to allow as fully as possible for what has come through our past experience, but we are not justified in denying the possibility of spiritual help and inspiration from a higher source.

To sum up my short address, I would say that, for psychology, deep analysis of every kind is different from confession; but that if deep analysis is adequate, it may ultimately lead to confession, to a need in the individual for absolution and for a reorganising of life in relation to a spiritual universe and in relation to religious experience. I have not yet met a single patient who has ultimately discarded

religion as a result of analysis. They may say at the beginning, " Religion doesn't mean much to me, I have drifted away, I don't seem to need it," but, after a long analysis where they have had to face fundamentals and the deeper metaphysical implications of existence, they admit, without exception, that religion is ultimately the one important thing in life.

The other matter in regard to psychology and confession is that we must always remember the existence of the unconscious mind as well as the existence of the conscious mind.

Finally, you may be wondering what application this has to modern methods of group confession. The conclusion can be drawn from what I have said, except that I have omitted consideration of the factor of transference.. It is a transferring of emotional tendencies of early years to the person to whom you confess, or to whom you bare your mind. Transference occurs at once if anything is going to happen at all. It may be positive or it may be negative. If it is positive then the doctor or the physician has a great responsibility on his shoulders. If there is transference in the case of any form of confession, there again, the whole personality of the priest is of the utmost importance. If you have multiple confession you have a complication of the whole situation which may sometimes be helpful, but which may be the reverse. You have uncontrolled transference. One of the things we have to learn in analysis is to know how to control the transference.

THE LITTLE REFORMATION.

WYCLIFFE AND THE LOLLARDS.

By the Rev. E. Hirst, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Stockport.

IT is a matter for some surprise that the reforming spirit which was so active in England during the fourteenth century did not effect a Reformation in the Church of that age, as did the revived activity of the same spirit in the sixteenth century. One can only conclude that "the fulness of time" had not come. But, as inquiry is made into that remarkable movement begun by Wycliffe and continued by his followers, one realises that the ground was prepared by these people, the seed was scattered, and at last their labours were rewarded at harvest time.

In order to understand this movement, it is necessary to have some knowledge of the historical background of the fourteenth century. Above all, we must know something of Wycliffe's work and teaching, for the Lollards were his professed followers.

The thirteenth century had been an age of great activity. The Friars had set out on their task inspired by noble ideals. Their efforts had been crowned with a measure of success. Society as a whole had been uplifted by their labours. Further, it was an age of glorious Church architecture. The Papacy was at the height of its power. Learning had been graced by such men as Thomas Aquinas and Roger Bacon. However, this state of things did not endure. A period of decline set in with the early years of the fourteenth century. By this time the Friars had lost their first fervour and forgotten their foundation vows. The Papacy was discredited in the eyes of Europe because of the Babylonish Captivity which began in 1305. As Professor Von Schubert says, "while France was deriving political advantages simply from a Pope who was French in sentiment but put forward absolute claims, as he had done before from Rome, the morally fettered representative of God was completely forfeiting the sympathies of the other princes. A national pope was obviously no pope at all." [1] Besides this fact, the temporal and financial aims of the Papacy presented a shameful scene of abuse.

English ecclesiastical and political life was bound up with that of the Continent. Our land had her part to play in the drama of those days, for she had possessions in France, and the Hundred Years' War had begun. The internal policy of the first three Edwards produced legislation which showed that England repudiated the idea of a papal supremacy in Church and State alike. That this tendency gained momentum is not surprising, for the end of the Babylonish Captivity saw the commencement of the Great Schism. A lamentable spectacle indeed!

[1] *Outlines of Church History*, p. 233.

Into such a world came John Wycliffe (1324–84). Of his early years little is known beyond the fact of his Yorkshire origin. In the University of Oxford, even as a young man he "stood without a rival."[1] He became Fellow and afterwards Master of Balliol. Occupying several livings in turn, he died as incumbent of Lutterworth in Leicestershire. These livings were held in succession, not together, as was the custom in those days, but he obtained permission to spend a number of years in study at Oxford, having first made provision for the spiritual needs of his benefice. His activities were varied. For his learning, he was far famed, even on the Continent. But he was eventually swept into the stream of public life. Papal abuses had become a vital topic in the country. Although repressive legislation had been introduced, the old abuses lasted on. The Commons, however, were determined to investigate the whole matter, and in 1374 envoys were sent to Bruges, amongst them Wycliffe, to deal with the questions in dispute. Unfortunately, the conference produced no satisfactory results. Another event in 1366 had brought Wycliffe into prominence. It was when the Pope demanded the arrears of tribute, payment of which had been suspended for over thirty years. This was the occasion of another outburst of anti-papal feeling. Wycliffe's part was prominent, for he penned a pamphlet on the topic. The whole country was united in declaring that any attempt to enforce payment should be resisted by the King. Wycliffe's activity on this matter brought his other work into prominence, and the Pope issued five Bulls demanding proceedings against his teaching. These were addressed to the King, the Archbishop, the Bishop of London and Oxford University. At the Bishop of London's instigation (Courtenay) the seemingly reluctant Primate assembled with his bishops in 1377 to inquire into Wycliffe's public utterances. The trial ended in great commotion, for the Reformer was supported by John of Gaunt, Earl Marshal Lord Percy and four learned friars. But not only so, the Londoners broke into the already confused assembly in support of Wycliffe. Though they hated the Duke of Lancaster, Gaunt, they loved Wycliffe. A second trial was held in the following year. This seems to have been in answer to the Pope's Bulls. It was no more successful than its predecessor. Once again, the crowds stopped the proceedings. Wycliffe's influence at the Court, in the University and in London was indeed potent. Another council was held in 1382. By now, the Reformer had attacked the Papacy, denouncing it as Anti-Christ. He had also condemned the doctrine of Transubstantiation. This seemed too much for many people. In addition, some wrongly attributed the cause of the Peasants' Revolt of 1381 to his writings. It was at this point that certain of his friends deserted him, in particular, John of Gaunt. Twenty-four "articles" were examined by the Council. Of these, ten were condemned as heretical. Fourteen were censured. The chancellor and proctors of Oxford were compelled to join in the condemnation, and it was ordered that no one

[1] Green, *A Short History of the English People*, p. 229.

should teach or lecture on them. The Wycliffite party, however, was so strong in the University, that until the King brought pressure to bear, no follower of the Reformer was suspended. In spite of this condemnation, Wycliffe was allowed to end his days in peace at Lutterworth. Not until 1428 was his body disturbed. When no further harm could be done to him, his remains were disinterred, burnt heretic-wise, and his ashes cast into the river. A futile deed of fierce fanaticism!

What of his teaching? Viewing the state of Christendom shown in the corrupt state of the Papacy, the worldliness of the higher clergy, the degeneracy of the friars and the decayed and lax condition of monasticism, he called for a return to Apostolic poverty. With his piercing perception he perceived that the mercenary spirit within was the cause of decay; so he called for a thorough policy of Church disendowment. It was in this that John of Gaunt was interested. He and his followers coveted the riches of the Church, wanting a share of ecclesiastical plunder. Wycliffe was too high souled to see the self-seeking of these unnatural allies. Shocked by the spectacle of a disgraced Papacy he attacked the basic claim of the primacy of St. Peter, maintaining that the Papal power was not wielded as St. Peter's successor, nor yet as Christ's Vicar on earth, but that it was obtained from the Cæsars. In all these, he appealed to Scripture for authority.

In his work, *De dominio*, he maintained that all "dominion" which was God's prerogative, was founded upon grace. Developing the idea in feudal terms, he maintained that the possession of "dominion" was always subject to the rendering of due service to God. Mortal sin was a breach of tenure and so incurred forfeiture. This was evidently conceived of as in an ideal state, so Wycliffe made certain reservations. Whilst "dominion" belonged to the righteous man alone, "lordship" might be held by the wicked, but only by God's permission. This doctrine contained high explosive. It would seem to have been ignited in the Peasants' Revolt. But it must be remembered that these unlettered men had not the fine distinctions of the philosopher in their minds. Whilst Wycliffe had no part in the revolt, his enemies laid the blame at his door. An examination of the circumstances will show that the results of the Black Death and the Statutes of Labourers were largely responsible for the upheaval. As Workman says, it was but "the rude translation into the world of practice of a theory of 'dominion' that destroyed the 'lordship' of the wicked."[1] Wycliffe had a deep sympathy with the unfortunate victims of the revolt. This sympathy is like the leit-motiv of a piece of music that runs all through his work and "redeems his fiercest denunciations and his most impossible dreams." Wycliffe showed how he had been influenced by Archbishop Fitzralph and William of Ockham as he elaborated his theories on "dominion."

In the treatise, *De officio Regis*, he maintained that the kingly office was derived immediately from God; from this he concluded

[1] *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. XII, p. 819.

that the King was over the clergy. By His obedience to Pilate, he said that Christ had shown that even tyrants should be obeyed. If Henry VIII had been aware of this work, he could not have followed its outline more thoroughly. The Stuarts could not have sought a more clear statement of "The Divine Right of Kings."

The Babylonish Captivity and the Great Schism led him to attack the papacy as Anti-Christ. Afterwards he declared the doctrine of transubstantiation to be absurd. Most of this work was destructive, but on the constructive side we find his insistence on the authority of Holy Scripture. This found expression in two ways. First, in his organisation of the Poor Preachers. These men, armed with translations of short portions of scripture, carried his teaching into the West Country, the Midlands, East Anglia and a great portion of the South. Secondly, and perhaps his greatest work was his translation of the Bible into English. This was a great achievement, for he had no knowledge of Hebrew or Greek, and translated from the often faulty Vulgate. In this work he was ably assisted by several of the more learned of his followers. His plan was opposed by the hierarchy, and licences are still extant which prove their opposition. However, his method of spreading the truth is well vindicated by to-day's circulation of the Scriptures in hundreds of tongues, and by their presence in castle and cottage alike. Such was the work of John Wycliffe who has been styled "The Evangelical Doctor," "The Morning Star of the Reformation," "The first English Reformer and Father of English prose," and "The last of the Great Schoolmen." It is astonishing that he effected so much in those darkened days. Green's words seem to be apt. "The spare emaciated frame of Wycliffe, weakened by study and asceticism, hardly promised a Reformer who would carry on the stormy work of Ockham; but within this frail form lay a temper quick and restless, an immense energy, an immovable conviction, an unconquerable pride. The personal charm which ever accompanies real greatness also deepened the influence he derived from the spotless purity of his life."[1]

Although Wycliffe's followers were called Lollards, the name is not peculiar to them. There was an almost contemporary movement in Brabant, though a little prior to that in England, whose supporters were nicknamed Lollards. The name is Dutch in origin and means "to sing softly," "to lull," "to drone." These, like the Waldenses and the "Spiritual Friars" before them, were inspired by the example of apostolic poverty. They devoted themselves to deeds of Christian kindness, and were conspicuous for their self-denial and devotion to others during the Plague of Antwerp in 1350. Although we must not confuse the continental movement with that within our coasts, it goes to prove that the stirrings of the Spirit were being felt in Europe as a whole.

Lollardry in England began when Wycliffe sent out his poor preachers, clad in their russet robes, bearing their Evangelical message. It soon became a power in the land, for these preachers

[1] Green, *ut supra*, p. 229.

of the Gospel found a public eager to hear. Oxford became the centre of the movement. London heard the news gladly. Other centres of activity sprung up as already mentioned. There can be no doubt that Wycliffe was the most effective preacher of his day, and the Lollards spread his teaching. The spreading of his attacks on the Political Prelates aroused the anger of the bishops. He and his followers were marked men. The bishops were further alarmed at the Lollard preaching of a system of Church Order that was largely framed on Presbyterian lines.

With Courtenay's appointment to Canterbury we can well imagine that severe action would be taken against the Lollards. There was much that was commendable in the new Archbishop's character, but it must be remembered that he had a long score to settle with Wycliffe. Doubtless he was embittered by the recollection of his previous failure to silence the Reformer. Opposition had stiffened, and what had once been mere ecclesiastical scorn, now was changed into vigorous action. The " Earthquake Council " of 1382 secured the condemnation of certain tenets of Wycliffite teaching as heretical. Being successful in this attack, an onslaught was made on Oxford as the seat of Wycliffism. At first it seemed as though this attempt to purge the University would fail. Although the Commons refused to follow the lead of the Lords who had allowed repressive measures against the Lollards, the King had given powers to the prelates to proceed against them. At first the Archbishop's mandate to suppress the new teaching was treated with contempt. Yet, such pressure was later exerted that Dr. Rugge, the Chancellor, was subdued, Philip Repyngdon and John Aston recanted, and Nicholas of Hereford fled. The astonishing thing is, that Wycliffe was allowed to remain at Lutterworth in peace. Successful as this attempt to suppress the new movement might seem, it did not effect its purpose. Several factors contributed to its failure. Political circumstances fanned discontent. Then there was the failure of the " crusade " headed by the militant Bishop of Norwich in 1383. This " crusade " was in favour of Pope Urban against the followers of the anti-pope. There was an anti-papal and anti-clerical feeling abroad throughout the land. It showed itself in anti-papal measures and in opposition to the " Cæsarian Prelates." Another factor in favour of the movement was the interest of Richard's Consort, Anne of Bohemia, who appreciated the evangelical elements in Wycliffe's creed. Later, papal demands were so exacting that the anti-papal legislation of the Edwards was renewed. Supported by these circumstances the Lollards increased, and in 1395, in an emboldened moment presented a memorial to Parliament asking help in reform. For the first time, the House was asked to pronounce upon doctrinal issues. The tenets of Lollardry were set forth in the Memorial. These largely followed Wycliffe's teaching, but on certain doctrinal points they showed a marked advance on their leader's position. The subjects touched upon in its twelve " conclusions " included the position of the Papacy in Christendom, the ministry, clerical celibacy, transubstantiation, vows, warfare and the blessing of

material things. The old issues were raised again, and in particular the cry against statesmen-bishops. The appeal did not move Parliament, so the document was posted on the doors of St. Paul's and the Abbey. The King was in Ireland at the time. On his return he subdued the knights who had presented the petition. Pressing the matter still further, Oxford was subjected to another attack on Lollardry.

The movement now began to decline. No leader of worth was at hand to follow Wycliffe. Courtenay's persecution robbed it of the support of Oxford. Thus, its intellectual spring was severed at its source. As Green says: "From that moment Lollardism ceased to be in any sense an organised movement, and crumbled into a general spirit of revolt. All the religious and social discontents of the time floated instinctively to the new centre." [1] Yet it seems that this very lack of organisation allowed the movement to penetrate far and wide.

More strenuous times were ahead. Arundel was now on the throne of Augustine. He was chancellor as well. Henry IV had been assisted to the throne by the bishops, who demanded his support in purging the country of the religious discontents and in defending the rights of the clergy. The result was the statute of 1401, "De Haeretico Comburendo," which armed the bishops with terrible powers. Even before the statute came into operation, William Sawtre, chaplain of St. Osyth, Walbrook, suffered at the stake. Wycliffe's Oxford friends were tried. Some wavered, some recanted. John Badby, a tailor of Evesham, was made of sterner stuff and suffered for his faith. William Thorpe, another layman, died in prison. Events showed that Oxford was not yet purged of the new religion, for despite the statute and its terrors, the University still bore traces of Lollardry. Yet Arundel was more thorough in his attack on Oxford than was Courtenay. In 1411 the University was purged, freedom of thought suppressed, and a bonfire made of the works condemned as heretical. In the following reign persecution continued. Sir John Oldcastle bore the brunt of the offensive. After examination by Arundel he was handed over to the secular power as a heretic. The Lollards rose in revolt to assist him. Their effort was quelled by force, but Oldcastle escaped and lived in hiding for three years. At last he was caught and put to death. Of his helpers, some were hanged and afterwards burnt as heretics. Lollardry was now driven underground. Yet the movement survived in hiding. Right on into the sixteenth century we find a succession of Lollard martyrs. Although the movement had been cut off at its intellectual source and subdued by persecution, it had centres of influence. This is shown by the activities of the Bishop of Norwich in his prosecutions for heresy. Some recanted. Others suffered. In 1455 Bishop Pecock paid attention to the movement in his *Repressor of overmuch blaming of the Clergy*. In spite of all this, the Lollards were active right on to the Reformation and gained a new vitality with the spread of Luther's teaching.

[1] Green, *ut supra*, pp. 251–2.

The chain of reformation was thus completed. It began with Wycliffe, then passed on to Huss, afterward to Luther, thence to our own Reformers. If evidence is needed, it is provided by one of Bishop Tunstall's letters to Erasmus, written in 1534. The Bishop wrote: "It is no question of pernicious novelty, it is only that new arms are being added to the great band of Wycliffite heretics."

It remains to inquire as to what contribution this "little reformation" made to the later movement which effected so much, and, why it seemingly failed where the other succeeded.

Wycliffe certainly foreshadowed the later successful policy. King and Parliament effected the Reformation. Papal authority was repudiated. The King was acknowledged as head of the Church. Ecclesiastical possessions were confiscated in certain quarters, though a thorough policy of disendowment was not pursued. The Bible became the authoritative court of appeal, and was available to all. Trevelyan is clear on this point. "Every important aspect of the English Reformation was of Native origin. All can be traced back as far as Wycliffe, and some farther." [1]

The apparent failure of the movement would seem to be due to several causes. Wycliffe died at a time when what had been largely work of destruction might have been turned to constructive effort. Further, there was no able successor to carry on his work. Added to this, the first generation of Lollards were not, as a whole, of the stuff that martyrs are made of. It must also be remembered that the suppression of thought in Oxford was like a blight which lasted for a century. Above all, whilst the Church was in a position of some measure of subjection to the Papacy with all its evils, corruption, and internal disorders, the Church of England was "in no position to reform herself had she wished, because she had no independence, and indeed no corporate existence." In that period the political struggles were of such a nature that the throne was by no means safe, and the Lollards were often misrepresented by their enemies as politically dangerous. The movement, however, made a definite contribution to the work of reform. As has been well said, the Lollards "were sentinels against an army of enemies till God sent Luther to relieve them." [2]

[1] *History of England*, p. 250. [2] Fuller.

A SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY APOSTLE OF REUNION.

By the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, D.D., F.R.Hist.S., Principal of Clifton Theological College.

TO-DAY with our different organisations actively working for the achievement of Christian Unity—with our "Lambeth Appeals," our "World Conferences on Faith and Order," our "South India Church Scheme"—it is especially interesting to recall the sincere and untiring efforts in this cause made by a little-known, but most remarkable seventeenth-century "Apostle of Reunion." John Dury consecrated practically all his life as an enthusiastic pioneer in the cause of Christian Reunion. His one consistent aim and effort was to promote full intercommunion and fellowship between all the Evangelical Churches of Christendom which embraced the principles of the Reformation; and it has been asserted that he "did and suffered more for the cause of peace than probably any other man." He was born in Edinburgh towards the close of the sixteenth century. His father was an ex-monk who became so polemical and political that he incurred the anger of the Government. Prudence therefore dictated flight to Holland, and he became a pastor at Leyden. His son John was educated there and embraced "Separatist" or "Independent" views, probably on account of intercourse with the English "Separatist" exile congregations then in Holland, some of whom in 1620 became the "Pilgrim Fathers" of the *Mayflower*. This "guess" becomes almost a certainty when we recall the fact that Leyden was the chief centre of "Separatist" or "Brownist" activities at the time, and that the "Separatist" or Independent Church there was under the pastorate of the celebrated John Robinson.

In 1628 John Dury accepted the post of pastor to the English factory at Elbing in Prussia, which at the time formed part of the dominions of Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden. Here he became very intimate with one of the Swedish Privy Councillors—Dr. Godeman—who suggested to him the urgent need of achieving fellowship and intercommunion between all Protestants. Dury was enthused with the project and devoted the rest of his long life with the most self-denying zeal to this laudable endeavour. Sir Thomas Rowe, who had seconded the similar efforts of Cyril Lucar when he was ambassador at Constantinople, heard of Dury's design and recommended it warmly to the Swedish Chancellor.

Oxenstein and Rowe both agreed that the project should receive the support of Gustavus and Charles I. Sir T. Rowe then interested many influential people in England on the subject, so that Dury gladly accepted an invitation to visit England and advocate the

cause there. He was most cordially received by both Archbishop Abbot and Bishop Laud, who counselled him to see both Gustavus and the Protestant Princes of Germany and to take such action as they advised to carry out the design. Fortified by a Commendatory letter signed by thirty-eight English divines, Dury saw Gustavus in 1631, at a time when, owing to the Battle of Leipsic, he was the Protestant dictator of Europe. Gustavus strongly supported the scheme, but all that was then accomplished was a recommendation to divines to prepare for such unity by suitable sermons.

Dury next turned his attention to the Calvinists and visited the Palatinate and the Wetterau and brought about a colloquy between the Lutherans and Calvinists at Leipsic in March, 1631. But the fall of Gustavus at Lutzen in 1632 was a great set-back to the movement, and Dury again appealed for help to Abbot and Laud; and he represented England at a general meeting of the Protestant States at Heilebron. By this time considerable interest was aroused throughout Europe, and there were many friends of the movement in Switzerland, France and Germany. Dury then tried to gain over the Dutch pastors in Holland. In the autumn of 1633 he returned to England to find that Laud had become Archbishop of Canterbury. He was received most kindly and Laud inquired from whom he had received Holy Orders? Dury, whose one consuming passion was the achievement of Protestant intercommunion, did not concern himself overmuch with questions of Church polity. But he admitted to Laud that he had always had scruples as to the validity of "Independent" ordination. These "scruples" were certainly shared by Laud and the Anglicans generally, since the English "Separatists" or Independents had from the first denied the validity of Anglican Orders and sacraments and had created their own Ministry in a decidedly "irregular" manner. "The godly," said Henry Barrowe, "ought speedily and without delay forsake those disordered and ungodly synagogues of these times as they generally stand in England." This of course referred to the ordinary parishes in England then. A prominent Anglican divine therefore advised Dury to obtain Anglican Orders and thus secure a wider field of service. He was quite agreeable to this proposal, since, as he said, he "looked upon the Church of England as a Church of Christ, true in respect of the doctrine professed therein, and eminent for all spiritual gifts bestowed upon it, that I judged the government thereof by bishops with indifference, and that I *took them as men commissioned by the King to be his delegates*," an Erastian view of Orders which although it might be quite acceptable to the Caroline supporters of the "divine right" of kings, would be so to few others! It furnishes us, however, with additional evidence of Dury's early association with the Leyden Separatist Church, and it tells us that he still retained the views of episcopacy which these Independents propounded. For in 1617 the Leyden Brownists sent "Seven Articles" of their Faith to the Council of the English Virginia Company, and it is interesting to notice that

their language concerning the King's ecclesiastical authority is practically identical with that used by Dury. "The authority of the present bishops in the land we acknowledge, so far as *the same is indeed derived from His Majesty unto them and as they proceed in his name.*"

Dury was accordingly ordained priest by Bishop Joseph Hall at Exeter in February, 1634. There is no record of his ordination to the diaconate, and possibly this step was dispensed with in view of his previous "call" to the Independent Ministry! But it should be noticed that this is not a case of a re-ordination of a regular foreign Reformed (Presbyterian) divine, in which, it is certain, Bishop Hall—any more than Bishop Morton—would "have had no hand."

Laud presented him to a living in Devonshire, giving him a special licence of non-residence so that "thus you may be able to pursue your negotiations with more effect." He now sought for further testimonials and further definite encouragement from prominent Anglican bishops for his great undertaking. Laud wrote a sort of circular letter to both the divided and contending parties. In his letter of February 10, 1634, for the Calvinists, Laud praises Dury's great zeal in his self-imposed task, and adds: "Assuredly as soon as I heard there was a hope conceived of the peace of the Reformed Churches I was filled with joy and my daily prayers are not lacking beseeching the God of peace to bring to fruition any hope whatever of a harvest so glorious and fruitful. . . . As far as I am concerned, I will strive with all my might not to seem lacking in a work so worthy of the name of Christ. Moreover, I know honestly that this undertaking will be most acceptable to the Anglican Church." His letter to Dury for the Lutherans is couched in a similar strain. "I approve up to the hilt," he says, "of this desire for Christian peace . . . greet in my name these brethren beloved in Christ and let them know that I am and always will be most eager for Christian reconciliation. . . . I commend to you and to them this undertaking with my utmost earnestness."

Dury also appealed to his episcopal supporters to publish their "Opinions" as to the best methods of securing this Protestant unity and intercommunion. One result of this appeal was a tractate by Bishop J. Davenant called "An Exhortation to brotherly Communion betwixt the Protestant Churches." In his "Introduction," Davenant discusses what are the essential "fundamentals" of the Catholic Faith, and he is most eager to give some advice "which may serve to advance so holy a work" as Dury's. He wisely declares that a full and *perfect* agreement between the opinions of divines is not to be expected, but that this should not prevent a "brotherly holy communion" between them, and he instances the Concordat recently achieved in the Polonian Churches. He longs that they should "bid farewell to all dissensions and establish so near a Communion betwixt themselves that they refuse not to admit each other into their congregations either to the hearing of the Word preached or receiving of the sacraments." He further asserts that the three obstacles to unity are—

(1) The tyrannical jurisdiction of one Church lording it over the Faith of others.

(2) The approving of idolatrous worship on one side and detesting it on the other, although he adds that there was no fear of the least "spot or stain of idolatry" on either side in the Reformed Churches.

(3) The assertion of a Fundamental Article necessary to salvation. He declares that the common faith is sufficiently set forth in the Apostles' Creed. "Other differences of opinion and interpretations of the Scripture are not sufficient to cause a break in Communion between one Church and another." He concludes that none of these obstacles really block the way to union between the Lutheran and "Reformed" or Calvinistic Churches. Such "brotherly Communion" he declares to be incumbent on all Christians; and he adds that "I doubt not at all that the Saxon and Helvetian Churches . . . acknowledge to have and to desire to retain brotherly communion with the English, Scottish, Irish and other foreign Reformed Churches. Surely as concerning us, although we consent not with them in all points and titles of controversial divinity, yet we acknowledge them as Brethren in Christ and protest ourselves to have a brotherly and holy communion with them." "If," Davenant concludes, "they are like-minded towards us, why do they (the Lutherans and Calvinists) deprive each other of that brotherly communion?"

He then advises a peaceable Conference between the divines, and the disuse of bitter terms such as "heretic," and adds a plea which all sincere disciples of reunion will re-echo to-day, that "it were to be wished that those surnames of Lutherans, Zwinglians and Calvinists were packed away and utterly abolished which are rather ensigns of faction than badges of brotherly union."

Dury also secured Opinions from Bishop Morton and Bishop Bedell of Kilmore, and the latter allowed him a pension for the rest of his life to prosecute his mission. Bishop Hall, in a Tract entitled *Good Counsells for the Peace of the Reformed Churches*, declared that "the Articles of religion wherein the Divines of both sides do *fully agree* are abundantly sufficient for the establishing of a firm and lasting peace in the Churches of God." In the same Tractate we find a Sermon preached before King James I by Archbishop Usher, wherein the same sensible advice is given. If, said Usher, we leave the points wherein Christians differ from one another, and "gather into one body the rest of the articles wherein they do generally *agree*, we should find, that in those propositions which without all controversy are universally received in the whole Christian World, so much truth is contained, as being joined with holy obedience may be sufficient to bring a man into everlasting salvation."

It is interesting to discover that learned and pious divines three hundred years ago had such a breadth and charity of outlook and such a true Christian vision, and that they were then advocating the same healing principles for achieving Christian unity, which are to-day, in our Reunion efforts, being propounded as "fresh and enlightened" views, by modern pioneers in the cause.

We must follow the persistent and sincere efforts of Dury a little further, although they are largely the record of the difficult and disheartening nature of attempts to secure religious Concordats, and the healing of the broken Fellowship of Christendom, of which we have had many examples in past years. In 1634 he returned to the Continent and he held repeated Conferences with Protestant States and divines. He also pleaded the cause in Scotland and in the Netherlands before Dutch Synods, and in most places he received many fair words and resolutions of sympathy, which, however, resulted in no practical action.

Special mention must be made of his effort with the Church in Sweden, where he went in July, 1636. The Chancellor Oxenstein accompanied him on a tour throughout the kingdom, and he attended a large Synod of divines at Stockholm. The Swedish Church was not only Lutheran but it had also retained the ancient episcopal government. We have, however, sufficient evidence to prove that it held no rigid theory of the essential necessity of episcopal polity. On the other hand its official actions, at times, certainly go to prove that it regarded this ancient, catholic and scriptural Order with singular laxity. On various occasions or emergencies the Swedish Church practically assumed the identity of the offices of bishop and priest even to the extent of ordination. Thus in 1758, 1764 and 1775 the Dean of Upsala, during the vacancy of the See, ordained numbers of candidates to the ministry of the priesthood. There was not, therefore, any barrier on the score of "Order" which hindered the Swedish Church from furthering Dury's scheme of general Protestant Intercommunion, and in fact the main obstacle centred round the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist. The Swedish churchmen demanded that the "Reformed" should accept fully the teaching of the Confession of Augsburg, and although Dury tried to prove that the difference was mainly one of words, he was unsuccessful. In February, 1638, he was told that his proposals were quite unacceptable, and a Royal Edict expelled him from the country, declaring that "he had resided some time not without the great scandal of our ecclesiastics and he should depart without delay." The effect of this great disappointment was such that Dury became seriously ill in Stockholm, but vowed that if spared he would devote the rest of his life to this sacred cause. He recovered, and continued his difficult and often disappointing task. He visited many German States and Princes and also the German Lutheran Universities of Wittenberg, Jena, Leipsic and Bremen. He then advocated his Mission in Denmark and Holland. But although much approval was given to the Scheme no real progress was effected.

He returned to England in 1640 and was selected as Tutor to the Princess Royal at The Hague, where he remained till 1643, when he was invited to the "Westminster Assembly" of Divines. The Prince of Orange refused to allow him to accept this invitation, and so Dury resigned his post and became Chaplain to a Merchant Adventurers' Company at Rotterdam. He returned to England in

1645 and pleaded the cause of Christian Unity before the House of Commons. He remained in England for the next nine years, during which time he married a lady with comfortable means—a fact which must have greatly facilitated his Mission. He exerted his utmost efforts to save Charles I, but he was able to accept both the "Covenant" and the "Engagement." In 1654 he secured recommendations from Cromwell and the English divines, and he then pleaded his cause before the Swiss Protestant Cantons. He visited Germany again in 1655, but his association with Cromwell rendered him unacceptable to the Elector Palatine. He visited many cities and attended Synods in Holland, and in spite often of a lukewarm reception, he doggedly persisted in his efforts to bring about Conferences between the Lutherans and the "Reformed." He even tried again in vain to interest the Prince of Sweden in his Mission. Returning to England in 1657, at the Restoration he endeavoured to secure the sympathy of Charles II, who was already secretly a Romanist. It was not therefore surprising that he received no reply. He appealed to Archbishop Juxon, who although most sympathetic, declined to move unless the foreign Princes would ask for the mediation of the Anglican Church. Baffled in this attempt, but still persevering, Dury, now an old man, revisited Holland, Sweden, Belgium and Switzerland, always ceaselessly and strenuously advocating his cause. In 1664 he settled in Cassel and from there visited many States, but in the end he found that he could make very little progress with the Lutherans. In 1672 he published an "Eirenicon," in which he reduced the necessary terms of belief to the "Apostles' Creed," and he was apparently, on this basis, willing to embrace even the Roman Catholics in his scheme of reconciliation. In 1678 he was visited by the Quaker—William Penn—but beyond this date there is no authentic record of his career. He is supposed to have lived till 1680.

NO CREATION WITHOUT A CREATOR.

By Dr. Dyson Hague, Wycliffe College, Toronto.

IN the June number of *Pearson's Magazine* there is an article entitled "Was there a Creation?" by John Langdon-Davies, the author of *Man and the Universe*. It is a curious mixture of sarcasm, spectroscopic science and atheism. At the outset this scientist frankly states that his creed is the creed of Topsy, "Nobody made me, specs I growed." He thinks that the universe was not born, but "it just growed." Creation, he avers, was a series of explosions. Nobody knows the how or the why, but we do know, he states very confidently, that creation meant "the explosion of the universe at the moment it was born." Again he states very confidently: "This was about 10,000,000,000,000 years ago." We can set this definite time "the date of creation." It has been checked up by mathematics through the laws of mechanics and the telescope and spectroscope, and all the calculations give the same answer. "We can calculate within a few million years when this happened. We know that Creation began about ten million million years ago." So creation was an explosion. It took place ten million million years ago. That's sure; that's settled!

But when we come to the most important of all the questions, the cause of the Creation, John Langdon-Davies is not quite so cocksure. We must admit, he says, that "the actual cause of the Creation of the universe is a mystery. It is an incredible mystery." However, when he comes to the creation of the earth, he seems to tread on solid ground again. It was an accident. An accident? Yes. An accident. It was "the accidental approach of a wandering star which set up such a tidal wave upon our sun as to turn it into a cigar-shaped object which broke up into separate pieces, and our earth was formed out of one of these pieces."

And this is the last and up-to-date dictum of most modern science: Creation a series of explosions, and the solar system an accident. It is the simplest thing in the world, and accurately calculated within five million or ten million years! We don't know very much but we are certain of that, says John Langdon-Davies. Now against all this almost omniscient infallibility our reason, our heart, and a consensus of all true scientists cries out aloud. Creation an explosion? No. No. We have read of explosions, and seen explosions. The results are invariably the same; chaos, ruin, a mass of dishevelled debris, confusion worse confounded; shapeless masses of scattered fragments as at the Halifax or Hellgate explosions. An explosion, or a myriad explosions (for according to John Langdon-Davies the universe is still going on exploding), would ever produce chaos, chaos, chaos. And we say no with a negative as defiant as his positive cocksureness. For this universe of ours, this infinite of nebulæ and stellar worlds is the most marvel-

lous piece of order and mathematical accuracy that the mind can conceive. The greatest of scientific thinkers, men like Newton, and Herschel, and Kelvin, and others are unanimous with regard to the symmetry of the revolutions, the exactitude of the timing of the days and hours and seconds, so that the transit of Venus, to use a well-known illustration, can be calculated to an hour for centuries before. Everything that modern science has revealed tells of an order, a symmetry, a mysterious harmony that dispels from thought the idea of a universe beginning with an explosion ten billion years ago and still going on exploding.

And further. For this is really the important thing, the heart of it all, the appeal to reason that is final and irresistible—creation involves a Creator. There is and can be no creation without a creator. There can be nothing made without a maker. Nothing is or can be builded without an architect and builder. Explosion and accident will ever give chaos, but the construction of a Cathedral or of a world, or worlds, demands the mind of a designer and the power to design. This is a self-evident proposition. It is the basic category of thought. And this is just where the Truth comes in with its authoritative explanation of the origin of all things by Divine revelation. Instead of the old heathen theory that the world and the stars are just the result of a fortuitous concourse of atoms, or the fantastic theory of modern atheism, that they are the result of the accidental jostling of protons and electrons and evolved by chemical combinations from star dust or the Almighty Atom derided by Marie Corelli, or the still more fantastic view of John Langdon-Davies, the view of Topsy the poor black ignoramus, that "the universe just growed," it brings us back to common sense and reason. "I had rather believe," said Lord Bacon (*Essay on Atheism*), "all the fables in the legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran than that this universal frame is without a mind."

We stand with Paul as he faced that agnostic world of science and philosophy in Athens, and with such splendid audacity declared that the universe and everything in it, the Cosmos, the material universe of perfect order and beauty was made by God, the Lord of heaven and earth, and that man too is the creation of God (Acts xvii. 18, 24, 26).

We stand with Paul as he uses that remarkable illustration of the architect in the designing and constructing of an edifice, planning the plan, preparing the form. "Every house," he says, "is builded by some one," or, every house has a builder (Weymouth). (Heb. iii. 4.) It is a self-evident proposition. It needs no proof. And from that premise unassailable he proceeds to his sublime deduction, glorious in its logic and revelation. "But he that built all things"—as the Great Architect conceived the plan and as the Great Builder performed the work—"is God"!

We stand with Paul in that profound revelation of Hebrews xi. 3, and with the insight which faith brings we also declare: we know the universe (the word he uses is the aeons, an Aramaism for the visible universe) did not come into being or was made as

by any mechanical or materialistic evolution from things visible, but by the Word of God. It is a parallel perhaps to that marvellous statement of John i. 3: "All things were made by Him (that is, the Word, Christ Jesus); and without Him was not anything made that was made." Or to that equally glorious declaration of Psalm xxxiii. 6: "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth."

We stand with David in that majestic revelation of Psalm xix. 1: "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth His handywork," so finely paraphrased by Addison:

> "The spacious firmament on high,
> And all the blue ethereal sky
> The spangled heavens, a shining frame,
> Their great Original proclaim.
>
> In Reason's ear they all rejoice
> And utter forth a glorious voice
> Forever singing as they shine
> The Hand that made us is Divine."

We stand with Isaiah in that matchless appeal (Isaiah xl. 26–28): "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number; He calleth them all by names by the greatness of His might, for that He is strong in power; not one faileth. Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of His understanding;" and with the Apostle in the light of the later revelation of the Holy Spirit, Colossians i. 16: "For by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him."

We stand with St. John in that sublime revelation of the Enthroned Lord in Revelation iv. 10–11, when the great ascription of glory by the leaders of the heavenly hosts and the downcasting of their crowns before the throne is to God as the *Creator*: "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for Thou hast *created* all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were *created*."

No. No. I would rather believe and receive the first verse of the Bible in its majesty of brevity and verity, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," than follow a thousand disagreeing scientists whose jostling theories are mutually destructive. I would rather take the first three verses of St. John with its monosyllabic simplicity and profundity: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made," than accept the discordant findings of a thousand mathematicians and geologists.

Rather than accept the antiquated superstitions of heathen philosophy with regard to the origin of the universe from a fortuitous concourse of atoms, or believe with science falsely so called that the universe was created by explosions, and the world by an accident, I would rather take my stand for time and eternity with the ten thousand times ten thousand believers in the grand old creed of the Church:

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.

These boasted findings of materialistic modern science will pass away as a morning cloud, and the early dew. Their efforts to dismiss with a pooh-pooh the old argument from design which postulates and proves the Great Designer will be in vain. "No longer can Herbert Spencer's Unknowable First Cause be regarded as a sufficient explanation of the work of creation. To-day we have the explanations offered by leading astronomers who find in the universe evidence of *the mind of a great mathematician*" (THE CHURCHMAN, July, 1934, p. 236). Their atheistic determination to accept any or every theory that will do away with God, and exclude the idea of a Creator, will be shown to be the demonstration of folly. The only theory that can explain the origin and unity and continuity (Heb. i. 3; Col. i. 17) is the rational and Divinely authoritative revelation of Genesis i. 1. "For the invisible things of God from His creation of the world (the Cosmos, the material universe) are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made (constructed as by a workman—the idea of Psalm xix. 1), that is, His eternal power and Godhead" (His Deity) (Rom. i. 20). "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thy Hands" (Psalm cii. 25). By that faith our fathers stood. By and for that we will stand.

MISCELLANEA CRITICA.

By E. H. Blakeney, M.A.

FOR one person that reads Spenser's prose, a hundred will read his verse: in fact there are quite a number of people who have barely heard of "our sage and serious Spenser" as a prose-writer at all. Perhaps this is not altogether surprising, as—unlike Milton, who wrote more prose than poetry—Spenser's contribution to our prose literature is practically confined to a single tractate—though a long one—his *View of the present state of Ireland*. This piece, written towards the close of the sixteenth century, is well worth studying, not only as marking a particular moment in the development of English prose, but as furnishing an important commentary on contemporary affairs in the (so-called) Sister Isle. This historical essay does not read like the work of the great poet that Spenser was: it is a plain business-like description, by an eye-witness, of the miserable state of affairs in Ireland during the latter part of Elizabeth's reign, intermingled with many pithy observations, some harsh judgments, and some practicable suggestions. It is difficult to resist the reflection that the "tribal Irish" have not changed much, in essentials, since the poet's day. The following passage, taken from the beginning of the dialogue—for it is in dialogue form that the whole essay is written—might have been composed any time these last few years: not only is it valuable in itself but gives a very fair idea of Spenser's prose as a whole:

"There have been many divers good plots devised, and wise counsels cast already about reformation of that realm; but they say it is the fatal destiny of that land that no purposes, whatever are meant for her good, will prosper or take good effect, which, whether it proceed from the very genius of the soil, or influence of the stars, or that Almighty God hath not yet appointed the time of her reformation, or that He reserveth her in this unquiet state still for some secret scourge which shall by her come unto England, it is hard to be known, but yet much to be feared."

It is interesting to compare such a sentence as this with well-known passages from Hooker or Milton. If Spenser's prose has, generally speaking, little of Hooker's unadorned gravity of style, it possesses something of its strength, though it is less stiffly Latinised in construction; at the same time it is free from Milton's gorgeous rhetoric, his splendour of imagery, or his unmeasured vituperation. It is still somewhat hampered by the model of the periodic sentences which we find in Cicero, whom so many of our Tudor (and later) writers loved to imitate, forgetting that such sentences are alien from the proper genius of our own language. We had to wait till Dryden showed us a more excellent way, despite the fact that, in the Prayer Book and the Authorised version of the Bible, this proper genius had already found due and faultless expression.

Two other passages from the *View* shall be quoted, for they lay stress on great political truths :

" Laws ought to be fashioned unto the manners and conditions of the people to whom they are meant, and not to be imposed unto them according to the simple rule of right ; for else, instead of good they may work ill, and pervert justice to extreme injustice."

If politicians had but remembered this, how much anguish and vexation might have been spared ! Spenser himself, such is human inconsistency, not seldom overlooked his own aphorism.

" Regard and moderation ought to be had in tempering and managing this stubborn nation of the Irish, to bring them from that delight of licentious barbarism unto the love of goodness and civility."

It is interesting to mark the policy advocated by Spenser for the final pacification of the country. He firmly advocated the methods employed by his political superior, Lord Grey ; that is, he would grant no concessions to rebels but beat them down until, for sheer misery, they were compelled to yield to *force majeure*. There were, indeed, those who urged Reformation, which would (they imagined) be followed by willing subjection. Spenser and his friends judged otherwise ; they would first secure subjection, and then, and not till then, proceed to a reformation. To the leaders of revolt no mercy ought to be shown, but their unhappy dupes, if completely submissive, might be suffered to live in places, chosen by the Government, where they could cause no further trouble. The lands should be assigned to English settlers ; under each settler some Irish would remain, as tenants, at a fixed rent ; the whole country to be garrisoned to secure tranquillity for the future. Such a course the poet justified by the practice of ancient Rome in her conquest of England. Spenser, stout Protestant that he was, had little doubt that much of the Irish imbroglio was due to Popish teaching and intrigues ; and perhaps it is not unlikely that, had the Protestant Reformation succeeded in Ireland, as it did in Scotland, the problem of government would have been shorn of its perpetual difficulty.

There is now no excuse for neglecting Spenser's historical work, as a finely printed edition of the whole of it has recently been issued.[1] The editor, Professor Renwick, has done his work with scrupulous care ; and his notes are, so far as they go, most valuable. Yet it seems a little doubtful whether his method of editing the text will commend itself to ordinary readers, as distinct from specialists : and for this reason. He reproduces the text with all its Tudor spelling unmodernised, and its wretched punctuation unchanged. Result : the page, as presented to us, is not nearly as legible as it might be. Imagine the A.V. of the Bible printed to-day as it was printed in 1611 ; it would be an effort to read it. However, it seems the fashion nowadays to gratify bibliophile purists in these

[1] *A view of the present state of Ireland*, by Edmund Spenser (Vol. IV of Spenser's complete works). Edited by W. L. Renwick, M.A., Litt.D. Eric Partridge, Ltd., at the Scholartis Press, London. 1934. Price 10*s*. 6*d*.

matters, at the cost of irritating ordinary readers. And Professor Renwick's work, for all its editorial scrupulosity, is left unindexed—not without detriment to the work. None the less, we are grateful to him for his exact labours, and to his publishers for issuing the book in so handsome a "format."

* * * * *

Among the lost epistles attributed to Saint Paul, the so-called "Letter to the Laodiceans" holds a place. But it is spurious. The author of it evidently had in mind the words of the Apostle in Colossians iv. 16, but he misunderstood their meaning. Originally written in Greek, this Letter was, for centuries, occasionally inserted among the Canonical epistles, without any hint that it was other than genuine. Yet it may have some slight interest, even to-day, if only as showing how far the Pauline spirit had influenced the early Church. Jerome denounced the Letter as apocryphal, though it was largely read in the Eastern Churches. It is found in quite a number of ancient manuscripts, but the precise date of composition is unknown: possibly it may belong to the second century. The Greek original having been lost, we know it to-day only in a Latin version. I do not remember ever having seen an English translation, so I venture to give one here, duly noting that the text of the sentence marked with a dagger is obviously corrupt: I have endeavoured, however, to give the sense approximately.

"Paul, an apostle, not indeed of men or through man, but through Jesus Christ, to the brethren in Laodicea: grace be unto you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

"I give thanks to Christ in all my prayers, in that ye abide steadfast in Him and constant in His work, waiting for the promise at the Judgement Day. Be not deceived by the vain speaking of some who would turn you aside from the truth of the Gospel that I preach. Now shall God bring it to pass that the things taught by me for the advancement of the truth, may by you be wrought, to the end ye may attain unto life eternal.†

"Already are my bonds manifest unto all, even those bonds which I suffer in Christ: wherein I greatly rejoice. And this, for me, is to everlasting salvation, which thing hath been accomplished by your prayers and by the ministry of the Holy Spirit, whether in life or death. For unto me Christ is life, and death is joy. And this end shall He bring to pass in you, that ye may possess the same love and be of one will.

"Therefore, beloved, even as ye have heard from me when I was present with you, so also do, unceasingly, in the fear of God; and it shall be unto you life for evermore, seeing it is God that worketh in you. And whatsoever ye do, do without wavering.

"For the rest, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord, and eschew them that defile themselves with lust of gain. Let all your supplications lie open before God, and continue immovable in the mind of Christ. And whatsoever is true and pure and chaste and just and worthy to be loved, that keep. And what ye have heard and have received, treasure in your hearts, and peace shall be with you.

"All the Saints salute you. The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit.

"See to it that my letter to the Colossians be read also among you."

* * * * *

Years ago, when I happened to be spending an hour or two in the company of that great scholar, the late Professor J. E. B. Mayor,

he frankly lamented the fact that English scholars, while producing edition after edition of familiar classics, were singularly neglectful of books really important in their way but unfamiliar to the majority. Certainly we have far more commentaries on Virgil, Homer, Horace, and so on, than we know what to do with; nor will future commentators be able, probably, to throw much further light upon these writers. The Professor mentioned one writer in particular whose claims on our attention had been, for so long, overlooked—Jerome in his letters. True, during the past year, a beginning has been made by way of rectifying this neglect; in the Loeb Library you will find now a volume of selections from the correspondence, with an English version. But this is not enough. Jerome's letters contain a wealth of information on all sorts of interesting topics; but, for a just understanding of them, a full exegesis is required. But nothing is being done. Again, it is surprising that such an historian as Ammianus Marcellinus is still left unedited, though the Germans have supplied us with a good (unannotated) text; and there are no translations available, apart from the old Bohn version —long since out of print—and the fine Tudor rendering by that "translator general of the age," Philemon Holland; and this huge folio is not easy to come by. English scholarship has done little or nothing for Ammianus. Another book that imperatively demands attention is the *Divine Institutes* of Lactantius, who, if not a deep thinker, had a clear grasp of his subject, and wrote in admirable Latin. No complete annotated edition of Lactantius appears to have been issued since Büneman's two volumes, and these are close on two hundred years old. Among Greek works, we look in vain for a commentary on Plutarch's once famous *Moralia*—a perfect mine of good things. And for a complete rendering we still have to consult the pages of (yet again) old Philemon Holland. The great scholars of the Renaissance, and later, had a far ampler reach than our specialists of to-day; and it would be a pious task to reprint their annotations, after winnowing out the wheat from the chaff, and revise their oftentimes inadequate texts. Gataker's edition of the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius is a model edition which others might endeavour to imitate: his commentary, alike for fullness and erudition, has never been surpassed, yet it is getting on for three hundred years old. Those old scholars had a grasp of antiquity, in all its parts, which modern scholars, not seldom so departmental in their outlook, seem to lack.[1]

* * * * *

It appears to be little known to most people that the cruel practice of *Suttee* (the English form of the native "sati" = a virtuous wife) is frequently alluded to in the Greek and Latin classics. As I am not aware that the passages, where the rite is mentioned, have so far been collected, I propose to set out, for the convenience of students, the chief of those passages. The earliest authority is

[1] Read Mayor's preface to the fourth edition of his Juvenal, pp. xi, xii (Vol. I, 1886).

HERODOTUS (v, 5), who writes as follows: "Among the Thracians the following custom is observed. Each man among them has many wives; no sooner does a husband die than a sharp rivalry takes place among his consorts on the question which of them the husband loved best. She to whom the honour is adjudged, after receiving the praises of men and women, is slain over the grave by the hand of her nearest relative, and is then buried with her husband. But the others deem it a great calamity, for nothing is considered a worse disgrace." Here, as we see, inhumation takes the place of the Indian concremation, but the principle is the same.

In the *Supplices* of EURIPIDES (1058–65) Evadne's story is introduced:

IPHIS. And dost thou then appear near both tomb and pyre?
EV. Aye, for I am come here as a glorious conqueror.
IPH. What is this victory of thine? I would fain hear.
EV. A victory over all women beholden by the sun.
IPH. In the works of Athena, or in wisdom of mind?
EV. In virtue; for, dying, I shall lie close by my husband.

To this episode the Roman poet MARTIAL (iv, 75), refers: "arserit Euadne flammis injecta mariti"; and OVID (*Tristia*, V, xiv, 37) has this distich:

> "Mark how the wives of Hector and Admetus,
> And how Evadne, steeled their hearts to mount
> The kindled pyres."

STRABO (first century B.C.) writes as follows (700, 714): "when the husbands [in Cathay] die, their wives are burned along with them"; and he gives, as a reason for the custom, that it was to prevent women from poisoning their husbands, adding that "the women were said to come voluntarily (*ἀσμένας*) to the pyre while those that hang back are held in dishonour." In DIODORUS SICULUS (xvii, 91) it is said that "there is a regular custom among these people that wives should be burned together with their [dead] husbands," and assigns to the custom the same reason alleged by Strabo. Diodorus in another passage (xix, 33) declares that this rule (*τὸ δόγμα*) of concremation applied to all women except those who were pregnant at the time, or were mothers already; a woman who refused such self-immolation was for ever debarred from the customary rites and sacrifices *ὡς ἀσεβοῦσαν*, as guilty of impiety.

There is a well-known passage in the poems of PROPERTIUS (III, xiii, 15–22) which may be roughly translated as follows: "Happy the funeral rites for eastern husbands, whom the blushing Dawn dyes with her steeds. For so soon as the last torch has been laid to the pyre, a crowd of devotees stand around with unbound hair, and strife arises about who shall die and follow her lord, alive; they deem it a disgrace not to be permitted so to do. Victoriously they burn, and yield themselves to the flame, and lay their scorched faces on their husband's bodies." CICERO, in his *Tusculan Disputations* (V, xxvii, 78) writes in similar fashion: "Women in India, when the husband of any one of them is dead, compete with one

another to decide whom the husband loved best (for each man has more than one wife, as a rule); and she who is victorious, followed by her kinsfolk, goes joyfully to lay herself alongside her husband on the pyre; the conquered rival goes sadly away."—The careful reader will note the words "certamen" and "victrix," which appear in many of these extracts.

The brief statement of VALERIUS MAXIMUS (first century A.D.) differs little from that of other writers: "Indian women, inasmuch as by ancestral custom several are married to the same man, on the death of the husband fall to great *strife*, to decide which of them he loved most. The *victorious* wife, exulting in her joy, is escorted to the pyre by friends and kinsmen all wearing cheerful looks, and casts herself upon the flaming pyre, and is burned together with the husband as if she were the luckiest of women. The surviving wives, with sorrow and in mourning, remain alive" (II, vi, 14).

Next we come to AELIAN (second century A.D.): "Among the Indians, when the husbands die, their wives submit to the same funeral pyre. This is an object of ambition among the women, and the one chosen by lot is cremated [alive] with the man." PLUTARCH, in the *Moralia*, 499 *c.*, also speaks of the practice thus: "The honest and chaste dames of the Indians, such as entirely love their husbands, strive and are ready to fight with one another about the funeral fire; and as for her who obtaineth the victory and is burned therein together with the dead corpse of her husband, all the rest do deem right happy and testify so much in their hymns and songs" (Phil: Holland's version, 1603). EUSEBIUS, in the *Praeparatio Evangelica* (277D) thus briefly alludes to "suttee": "Indians burn their dead, and with them burn their wives with their own consent (ἑκούσας)." It is remarkable how constantly (though not always) this point of their willingness to undergo the fearful ordeal is stressed. See quotations from Strabo and Valerius Maximus.

Later on we find that Jerome, in his diatribe against Jovinian (I, xliii), has more than one chapter dealing with "suttee": one paragraph here will suffice: "The Indians and almost all barbarians have a plurality of wives. It is a law with them that the favourite wife must be burned with her dead husband. The wives therefore vie with one another for the husband's love, and the highest ambition of the rivals, and the proof of chastity, is to be considered worthy of death. So then, she that is victorious (cf. 'victrix' above), having put on her former dress and adornments, lies down beside the corpse, embracing it, and to the glory of chastity despises the flames as they burn beneath her." Cf. Marco Polo, *Travels*, III, 20.

In later times we find plenty of allusions to this rite of concremation, e.g. Montaigne, *Essays*, II, 29, and Tennyson, *Death of Œnone*:

> "And muffling up her comely head, and crying
> 'Husband!' she leapt upon the funeral pile,
> And mixt herself with him, and past in fire."

It is perhaps worth remarking, in reference to this last passage, that Apollodorus, III, xii, 5, gives a slightly different account; according

to him Œnone died another death by her own hand after the death of Paris : *ἑαυτὴν ἀνήρτησεν*, she hanged herself.

The late Professor Max Müller (*Chips from a German Workshop*, vol. iv) [1] shows that " suttee " never formed a part of Indian religion in its older and purer form, but that the practice was justified through a flagrant corruption of the Vedic text by priests. " Tantum *relligio* potuit suadere malorum."

[1] Cf. Monier Williams, *Indian Wisdom*, p. 252 ; E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, Vol. I, p. 465.

REUNION.

AN APPEAL FOR THE EXCLUSION OF EXCLUSIVENESS.

By the Rev. G. F. Handel Elvey, M.A., Vicar of Willingdon.

FOR many years now, the subject of Christian Unity has been to the fore, but it must be admitted that with a few notable and honourable exceptions, progress has been extraordinarily slow. Scottish Clergy and English Free Church Ministers have certainly occupied some of our pulpits, but often not without protest, such as that which broke out in the Exeter Diocese recently. And yet the prospects of union among the English and Scottish Reformed Churches should be extremely bright. With few exceptions, we hold the same Faith, have the same Sacraments, and broadly the same methods of worship. We read the same books, and sit at the feet of the same Theological Teachers. We have a common heritage of Church Music and especially hymns. We have a common heritage of religious and ethical ideas. Why cannot we have Inter-communion at once, as a step towards interchangeability of clergy and more complete union later on? The barriers are already happily being broken down by individuals, but why not make the breaking down of the barriers official? What is the obstacle that blocks the way?

The answer to this question is in itself simple. There is a body of opinion in the Anglican Communion extremely vociferous and mainly clerical that all ordination to the Ministry, other than Episcopal Ordination is, to say the least, irregular, and that the Sacraments administered by non-episcopally ordained clergy are probably invalid. In practice this harsh view is usually softened by the admission that the Non-Episcopal Ministries often have been and are "God-blest." This concession, however, does nothing to remove the obstacle. It is not Episcopacy, of course, as a method of Church government that blocks the path of union; but Episcopacy regarded as a means of the transmission of Grace. Those who hold this view claim that inasmuch as the English Church retained her Episcopate at the Reformation she remained part of the Catholic Church, while the other Reformed Churches and our own Free Churches, in setting aside the Episcopate, lost their inheritance in the Catholic Church. It may be remarked in passing that it is an ecclesiastical curiosity that though "Catholic" means "Universal" those most fond of using the term invariably want to exclude somebody.

Officially, the Church of England contents herself by vigorously emphasising the regularity of her own Episcopal Ordinations, and ruling that in all cases her own clergy shall be Episcopally ordained; but carefully refrains from passing any judgment on others. Moreover, from the Reformation to the Restoration non-episcopal orders

were allowed, and the change to a more rigid rule was made only as a part of the extremely human but utterly unchristian and vengeful legislation, known as the "Clarendon Code."

But opposition to Inter-communion certainly does not come from any undue respect for the Law of the Church as contained in the Act of Uniformity, and the Prayer Book Rubrics which are legally a part of that Act. Those who use Restoration Law as a barrier against Inter-communion have been the first in other matters to treat both Act and Rubrics with contempt. The trouble is not a matter of law at all, but the belief that the continuation of the Episcopate as a guarantee of the validity of Ordinations and Sacraments is essential to make good the claim of any body of Christians large or small to be part of the Universal or Catholic Church of Christ in the world. According to this view, the Roman, Eastern Orthodox, Anglican and a few other Episcopal Churches form the Catholic Church, and all the Non-Episcopal Churches are excluded. Obviously this is a tremendous claim to make, and if it were generally accepted in the Church of England and carried to its logical conclusion, it would make the cause of Inter-communion quite hopeless; since the Non-Episcopal Reformed Churches—and especially the Church of Scotland, with its strong sense of corporate Church life—claim with as much insistence as the Anglican Church that they are true parts of the Catholic Church. The Church of Scotland—whose standard of scholarship is, to say the least, as high as our own—has already bluntly informed the Church of England that she claims to be on equal terms with her. Therefore, because of the momentous nature and tremendous consequences of the claim that the Episcopal Churches form exclusively the Catholic or Universal Church in the world to-day, it is nothing less than our duty to submit this view to thorough examination and searching tests.

To start with, the Roman Church utterly repudiates this theory and denies the Catholicity of the Church of England.

The Anglo-Catholics, of course, who are the special exponents of this view, counter this by suggesting that Rome beaten in her attempt to prove that the succession of our Bishops was broken at the Reformation, has taken refuge in the Doctrine of "Intention" as a last defence against the recognition of Anglican Orders, and that this defence is weak, not to say frivolous! In actual fact, Rome's reason for denying the validity of Anglican Orders, far from being weak or frivolous, is overwhelmingly strong and perfectly logical. The Doctrine of Intention means this: that according to the Roman view, the supreme duty and privilege of a Priest is to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass. A Roman Bishop ordains a Priest for this supreme purpose. But at the Reformation, the Church in England repudiated the Sacrifice of the Mass, and for some three hundred years Protestant Bishops ordained Protestant Ministers. In declining to recognise such a Succession, Rome is not only logical, but honest and spiritual. Our Bishops may be crowned with mitres, wear the most gorgeous copes, and have

pages to carry their trains; they may even adopt Roman Catholic phraseology, but that Protestant gap still remains, and can neither be bridged nor camouflaged!

The fact is, whether the Reformation was a glorious event or a terrible disaster, what actually happened cannot be explained away or glossed over! And what happened was this: the English provinces of Canterbury and York repudiated the authority of Rome, and were thus separated from the other provinces of the Western Church, being still the Church of England, but under the protection of the Crown! And the English Church was then, and is still, regarded as schismatic and heretical by the Roman Church. Except by distorting facts, it cannot be contended that the Protestant Episcopate has the sacerdotal character of the Medieval Episcopate under the authority of the Pope!

After all, Augustine came armed with Papal authority. He haughtily endeavoured to bring the British Bishops into subjection to Papal authority. The two provinces of Canterbury and York were formed under Papal authority; and under Papal authority they remained until the Reformation; and until the Reformation each Bishop received his spiritual authority from the Pope.

In answer to this, of course, the following contention will be put forward:

It will be asserted that in the first few centuries of Christianity all Bishops were equal, and that the additional prestige enjoyed by the Bishop of Rome was merely that of a first among equals—owing to Rome being the Capital of the world; and that the later domination of the Bishops of Rome was, and is, an unjustifiable usurpation! It will be urged then that the English Bishops, at the Reformation, were perfectly justified in returning to the equality of the early centuries, and that in so doing Catholic continuity was by no means lost. This is a contention that as members of the Church of England we are bound to agree with! It is a contention that we stand by. But the trouble is that it proves a great deal more than many who advance it wish to prove. For if we claim that the English Bishops at the Reformation were justified in returning to the equality of the early centuries of Christianity, and that in doing so they by no means lost the Catholic continuity of our Church, we are bound also to allow that the Scottish and Continental Reformed Churches, and our own Free Churches, were justified in appealing to the still earlier days—the days of the Book of Acts, and of the Apostles themselves, and remodelling their systems accordingly—that is, returning to the time when Bishop and Presbyter were equal, and merely different names for the same office; and that in so doing *they* did not lose their place in the Catholic Church.

The Roman point of view that the English provinces broke from the main body of the Church of the West and lost their Catholic continuity is both logical and comprehensible; but the view, seemingly held by some in our Church, that it is legitimate to appeal to the early centuries of Christianity, but illegitimate to appeal to the

New Testament and the days of the Apostles themselves, is neither!

Strange to say, there is an attitude of mind prevalent in our Church at the moment, which delights to exalt everything that can be justified by Medieval thought and practice, but declines either to go forward to the Reformation or back to the New Testament. But delight in Medieval thought and practice, the introduction of frankly Roman services and terminology, are absolutely of no avail whatever to bridge the Protestant gap made by the Reformation and make the Church of England "Catholic" in the eyes of Rome! From the early days of the Oxford Movement until now, courageous and logically minded men have realised this; and so beginning with Newman and Manning, many High Churchmen or Anglo-Catholics, as they like now to be called, have drifted to Rome.

Our line of argument then leads to this conclusion, that the contention that the Roman Church, the Eastern Orthodox Church, the Anglican Church, and certain other Episcopal Churches form exclusively the Holy Catholic Church in the world to-day completely breaks down, since on the premises on which Rome bases her judgment, she is perfectly justified in denying our claim to be a part of the Catholic Church; while on the premises on which we make our claim, namely the right to appeal to an earlier and purer tradition, we are not justified in excluding the Non-Episcopal Reformed Churches.

We must not allow the Anglo-Catholics to put us into the foolish and undignified position of the man who tries to grasp the hand of one who deliberately withholds it—while he refuses the hand of one who cordially extends it.

In spite of the unfortunate rigidity of Restoration Law, already referred to, our Church gives no official sanction to the exclusively Episcopal conception of the composition of the Catholic Church. Moreover, none of her greatest leaders prior to the Oxford Movement would have subscribed to that view.

Article VI declares the supremacy of the Scriptures (the Title Deeds of the Faith): "So that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to Salvation. . . ." Thereby proclaiming the right of appeal to the Scriptures.

Article XIX declares that: "The Visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same. . . ." Thereby proclaiming a liberal and wide view of the Catholic Church.

Article XXIII declares that we ought to judge those to be lawfully ordained to the Ministry "which be chosen and called to this work by men, who have publick authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard." These words pass no judgment as to "Apostolical

Succession " either as a historical fact, or an Ecclesiastical Theory. They apply as easily to Scottish Presbyteries as to English Bishops ; and make valid ordination depend not on the past, but—on having authority in the Church as the whole body of Christian people to-day.

I have kept the New Testament test to the last. It is exceedingly simple and to the point. " By their fruits ye shall know them."

Is it possible to maintain that the Episcopal Churches are any way ahead of the Non-Episcopal in the type of Christianity produced ? Can anyone possibly maintain that the Roman Church in Italy, or France, or Spain, or Mexico, or South America can produce greater piety and care for righteousness than—say, for example—the Scottish Church and the Churches allied to her ? Take one example, " Mercy to animals." In this matter the standard in Protestant countries is definitely higher than the standard in Roman Catholic countries, in some of which kindness to animals seems hardly to have been thought of. Then—to take another example—is it possible to maintain that the achievements of the Church of England—which has preserved Episcopacy—are more fruitful and more heroic in the Mission Field than those of the Church of Scotland—which is Presbyterian.

I submit then that the view of the Catholic Church as consisting exclusively of the Episcopal Churches cannot be reasonably maintained. I plead that we should have the courage to go forward on the path of reunion. And I plead that those of us who hold liberal views on this and other matters should be no less courageous in emphasising them in word *and action* than the Anglo-Catholics are. And I dare to hope that some day the Catholic Church, the whole Catholic Church, will be reunited. But—if this hope is ever to be realised—exclusiveness must be excluded.

MARRIAGES OF HOSEA.

By the Rev. T. C. Lawson, M.A.

Thesis.

That Hosea records two marriages, and that each is to a woman of pure, devout and honourable character and therefore consistent with the righteous laws of God.

The Scheme.

I To state the various interpretations.
II The Inconsistency of these views with
  α. The Holiness of God.
  β. The Divine Laws of Marriage.
  γ. The Honour of the Prophetic Office.
III The Meaning and Application of the words "whoredoms" and "adulteress."
  α. The Literal.
  β. The Allegorical: (1) Religious, (2) Political.
  γ. The Application to Gomer and the Purchased Woman.
IV The Lessons are not in the Marriages, but in
  α. The Names of the Children.
  β. The Separation of the Woman.
V This Interpretation enforces the Message which the Prophet has to convey to the People, and avoids all Moral Difficulty.

I. To State the Various Interpretations.

The first message which came to the prophet Hosea from God was a command to "take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms," so he "went and took Gomer the daughter of Diblaim." There were three children of the marriage to whom Hosea, instructed by God, gave strange-sounding names significant of future disaster to "the kingdom of the house of Israel" in relation to God. The firstborn was a son whom Hosea named "Jezreel," signifying that God would cause the kingdom to cease. The second child was a daughter who was given the name "Lo-ruhamah," meaning "not having obtained mercy" and signifying that God would no more have mercy upon the people to deliver than from the enemies that might come against them. This was to be a great contrast with God's purpose to save the Kingdom of Judah. The third child was a boy and received the name "Lo-ammi," meaning "not My people." For God would no longer recognise them as His own people nor be their God. In the third chapter Hosea records that God commanded him to "love a woman beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress." Accordingly he purchased a woman whom he took and treated as for ceremonial cleansing, significant of the future of the Kingdom of Israel in being without a King and their ceremonial religion.

These acts of Hosea have received a variety of interpretation by commentators. It is impossible to say that "the critics are agreed" or that they have arrived at "assured results." The

real problem does not lie in the literal fact of the marriage, but in the meaning and application of the words "whoredoms" and "adulteress"; for taking them, as most writers do, in their literal and physical sense of harlotry, and as a description of the natural and personal character of Gomer, and the woman whom he purchased, it seems to imply that God commanded His servant to do what, in ordinary circumstances, appears sinful and unwise, and bound to lead to a great tragedy of domestic unhappiness and shame in his life. It is asserted that God thereby purposed to teach Hosea through his own bitter personal experience how He Himself felt towards the people in spite of their want of trust in Him and their corrupt worship. For as Hosea was commanded to love an "adulteress," and thereby learned to love his unfaithful and erring wife and so reclaimed her from the depths of iniquity into which she had sunk (which act "developed in him the most wonderful capacity of unselfish affection"), so God loved His people and would reclaim them. Hosea "had to learn . . . that the essence of Divine nature was not justice but love." He therefore proclaims God's love: "I will betroth thee unto Me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving kindness, and in mercies. I will even betroth thee unto Me in faithfulness, and thou shalt know the Lord" (ii. 19–20). And again such yearning as expressed in these words: "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? Mine heart is touched within Me. My repentings are kindled together" (xi. 8). This view is well expressed by Dr. Campbell Morgan in his book on Hosea, *The Heart and Holiness of God.*

Those who interpret the words "whoredoms" and "adulteress" literally of the personal character of Gomer, vary as to the precise application and meaning. The most extreme view is that she was a grossly licentious woman with children born before her marriage to Hosea. Some think that the statement in the third chapter is a prelude to what is stated in the first chapter, and that it is a description of the character of Gomer and the methods by which Hosea proceeded to obey God's command. "According to this Hosea knowingly married a woman of unchaste character who was not only living with a paramour, but that he did this only after a period of probation." Dr. Pusey says: "Hosea, then, at God's command united to himself in marriage one who . . . had fallen manifoldly into fleshly sin" (*Minor Prophets*, p. 4), so that by "wife of whoredoms is meant one who up to that time had again and again been guilty of that sin" (*ibid.*, p. 7). And by "children of whoredoms is meant children born to her after marriage and begotten by another than the prophet" (Harper, *International Com.*, p. 206). Another writer says: "They were the offspring after marriage so designated because their mother's profligacy would make their legitimacy appear doubtful" (*Speakers' Com.*, p. 462). For this reason Hosea gives the children their names to indicate his repudiation of them as his own.

Few hold this view. It is objected that it is not parallel with

Israel who was pure at first when God took them to be His own special people, when He said of them: "Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me above all people . . . ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation" (Exod. xix. 5–6). And of whom Balaam is made to proclaim: "He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob neither hath He seen perverseness in Israel" (Num. xxiii. 21). It is therefore suggested that "whoredoms," according to Hebrew idiom, need only "mean a woman of unchaste disposition, one who, although chaste at the time of marriage had in her a tendency to impurity which later manifested itself" (Harper, p. 206). Another writer says that Gomer was called a wife of whoredoms proleptically, but, after bearing three children, became unfaithful, and they share their mother's disgrace, and so are called children of whoredoms. The writer of the article on Hosea in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* says "there is no reason to suppose that Hosea knowingly married a woman of profligate character. The point in the allegory is plainly infidelity after marriage as parallel to Israel's departure from the covenant God; a profligate wife is not the same thing as an open prostitute."

The writer of the article in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* does not go so far as to think that Gomer was "a woman with a propensity to unchastity, a sense which the words could not bear. A 'wife of whoredoms' is explained by 'children of whoredoms.' The children did not yet exist, they were born in the prophet's house, for Hosea did not marry a woman with a family; and in like manner the woman when taken was not yet that which she afterwards became. If the events be real, the words were written from a much later period in the prophet's history."

If, then, Gomer was pure when Hosea married her, and she be regarded as the same woman of chapter iii, the question arises, when did she begin the downward career? Dr. Peake, in *The People and the Book*, says that Hosea "after the birth of the second or third child discovered the infidelity of his wife. The names of the second and third child may declare Hosea's knowledge of Gomer's guilt. Whether she left him or whether he sent her away is not clear."

Dr. Brown, however, thinks that she became unfaithful after the birth of the third child. It is thought that then she either left her husband or was driven away by him, and so sank into the depth of iniquity of a slave concubine ("from which Hosea with tender affection and encouraged by Divine command bought her back and restored her to his home"). "The prophet was compelled by his love of Gomer, faithless as she was, to purchase her out of the depths of infamy into which she had fallen, at the price of a slave" (Harper, p. 215).

The advantage of this view is, so it is said, that "it accepts the narrative as the recital of historical facts and does away with the moral difficulties." "It furnishes a reasonable basis for Hosea's evident love for his wife." This view is arrived at by assigning to

the terms " whoredoms " and " adulteress " their natural physical meaning as applicable to the personal character of Gomer, and assuming that she is the same woman of chapter iii.

The difficulty is not so easily escaped. If it removes the moral difficulty of the first command by regarding Gomer as pure and the words spoken of her and the children as only " proleptical," there yet remains the moral difficulty of the second command which seems, to say the least, to involve God in commanding a man to do what certainly, in ordinary circumstances, would be considered morally wrong. As Calvin says, " that this was done by the prophet seems very improbable." Some regard it as " an extraordinary command of God." In which case Calvin suggests that the prophet ought to hide himself. The excuse is made that God may command what in ordinary cases could not be lawful, and " what no man would dare to do except at God's bidding." But as Dr. Gill remarks, " this would look like God countenancing whoredoms."

In order to avoid this moral difficulty it is suggested that " whoredoms " and " adulteress " refer not to the natural but to the spiritual, to the idolatry which was so rampant in the land, and that whilst Gomer personally was morally pure, yet she was a worshipper of idols which also involved her children. But this again would imply that God, to some extent, favoured union with an idolatrous woman which is scarcely conceivable, since the whole purpose of the prophet was to denounce the sin of idolatry and the evils which arose out of it, and because of which he foretold the punishment upon the nation which would be shown no further mercy and which would be disowned.

To escape these dilemmas the events are interpreted as being not real actual facts, but parabolical, that " the course enjoined upon Hosea is related solely with reference to a symbolical meaning." It " is in all probability purely parabolical " (*Students' Com.*, p. 329), and is therefore " not a relation of actual occurrence, but imaginary, rendered in a high degree probable by the moral incongruity." But, says Canon Box, " Gomer was a real person and not an allegorical figment." " The old interpretation as pure allegory may rightly be dismissed."

Others, however, regard it as a mere vision. " Almost all Hebrews agree in this opinion that he did not actually marry a wife, but that he was bidden to do so in a vision." Bishop Horsely says, " this is in truth a question of little importance to the interpretation of the prophecy, for the act was equally emblematical whether it was real or visionary only; and the signification of the emblem whether the act were done in reality or in vision, will be the same." This view certainly excludes the idea of any actual moral wrong on the part of Hosea, or incongruous idolatrous marriage. But there are objections to this view in that " what is morally objectionable in practice become no more defensible by being prescribed in vision." And besides there is no indication given by the prophet that it is either related as a parable or only

seen in a vision. There are many details lacking. We are not told " how Gomer committed adultery and became a slave." We are not told that Gomer is the same woman mentioned in chapter iii. In all the above interpretations too many details have to be invented in order to make the story hang together as a whole.

II. The Inconsistencies of these Views with

α. The Holiness of God.
β. The Divine Laws of Marriage.
γ. The Honour of the Prophetic Office.

α. *The Holiness of God.*

Various objections have been raised against particular views in the foregoing statements. But none is really fatal to the idea that Gomer became a wicked woman and brought tragedy into the life and experience of the prophet, and that in some measure God countenanced a marriage alliance with an evil woman.

The facts of the marriage of Gomer at God's command, the birth and names of the children, the taking and buying a wife and isolating her as for purification, cannot be disputed. But when the words " whoredoms " and " adulteress " are taken literally as the personal character of Gomer at some period of her married life: and that God commanded Hosea, as in chapter iii, to love and take such a woman for a wife, then the story becomes somewhat revolting to the moral sense, which is not altogether set at ease by taking the story as allegorical or a vision. For " a transaction which is repugnant to the moral sense is just as repugnant when chosen as the subject of a vision or allegory, the moral difficulty is not removed " (Dr. Brown, p. 33).

If we broaden our outlook and lift up our eyes to the wider horizon of God's previous dealings with the people of Israel we shall find definite principles for rejecting the interpretation that maligns the personal character of Gomer and involves Hosea in a marriage to a woman of evil repute. Such a transaction would be inconsistent with the Holiness of God. The whole of the ceremonial laws were designed to teach the awfulness of sin of all kinds, and to avoid all appearance of evil in the light of the Holiness of God, by the constant need of cleansing from defilement caused by certain foods, flesh, disease and proximity to dead bodies, and most particularly sex relation. The cleansing and the injunction of abstinence were enjoined by this command reiterated on several occasions. " Be ye holy for I am holy." It was enforced by various ceremonies performed in the consecration of Aaron and his sons to the office of the priesthood. Upon his garments were emblazoned the words " Holiness to the Lord." These requirements were never relaxed in the service of God. By this Holiness God swore to punish sin (Amos iv. 2). Such a marriage would have profaned the Holiness of the Lord. " For Juda hath profaned the holiness of the Lord which he loved, and hath married the daughter of a strange god " (Mal. ii. 11). So that if Gomer were really of

such a character, then to marry her was contrary to God's Holiness, a Holiness we conceive to be required in the prophet who was sent to preach righteousness.

There is a second objection. Such action on the part of Hosea would be contrary to the marriage laws. It was unlawful for the high priest to marry "a widow, or a divorced woman, or profane, or an harlot; these he shall not take" (Lev. xxi. 14). The ordinary priest was under the same restriction (Lev. xxi. 7). "Profane" means to pollute one's self, to make common, and in verse 9 is explained as "playing the whore."

Since a prophet is a teacher of righteousness and his purpose is to call the people to obey God's laws (as was also the duty of the priest, Cap. iv. 6, 9) may we not assume that God would require a like regard in the conduct of His prophet in respect of marriage? It was forbidden to the ordinary man to take a wife back whom he had sent away (Deut. xxiv. 4). If Hosea found his wife to be unfaithful, as is assumed, then there lay before him but one course of action, which was to have both her and her paramour stoned to death (Deut. xxii. 22). Even if Gomer were merely an idolatrous worshipper of Baal we might justly infer, from the fact of God forbidding marriage alliances with the heathen on this very ground, that the marriage with her would be equally distasteful (Deut. vii. 3–4). The reason given for this is that the people were holy unto the Lord (Deut. vii. 6–7). Some may seek to justify Hosea by reference to the action of Samson; but here it is not said that God commanded him to do what he did. And in the case of Rahab it is now known that the word is used in the sense of an "Inn Keeper" or one that took in guests.

The third objection is an inference rather than a direct negative. Such action would be against the Honour of the prophetic office. His actions would be just as well known as his preaching, and any wrong conduct on the part of his wife, any neglect on his part to enforce the law, would be sure to have a repercussion upon the people, and, to a large extent, nullify the purpose of his message. The priests were to be living witnesses to, and teachers of, God's Holiness, and no less so the prophets who were His messengers and preachers of His word. The very requirements laid down by St. Paul for the qualification of the ministerial office also show how a bishop must be such that nothing can be laid to his charge even after a public examination; neither must he be open to attack at any point in his character. Also he must not be a bigamist, and must be "one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity." It is not sufficient to be popular with the congregation, but he must needs "have a good report of them which are without." We need only to use our imagination a little to conceive what the effect would be in a village or town were the wife of the pastor to act wrongly. It would destroy almost all the good he had tried to do, and his influence for good would be gone. Whilst there might possibly be some sympathy on the

part of devout Christians, yet the world would point the finger of scorn, and the message of a call to righteousness would go unheeded. In raising these objections we have followed the principle that "it is not lawful to so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another."

III. The Meaning and Application of the words "Whoredoms" and "Adulteress."

α. The Literal.

β. The Allegorical: (1) Religious, (2) Political.

γ. The Application to Gomer and the Purchased Woman.

In the literal sense the words describe the personal character indicated by such unlawful intercourse outside the marriage vows. The Hebrew word for "whoredom" is used primarily with reference to the woman, whilst the Hebrew word for "adulteress" in chapter iii. 1, has reference to the case where one or both persons are married and is used of either the man or the woman according to its masculine or feminine form. In this sense they express the personal character of the guilty, and for which severe penalties were enacted to make amends, and in certain cases the death penalty (Lev. xx. 10; xix. 29; Deut. xxii. 20). The reason advanced precludes so far our reckoning Gomer or the woman to be of this character personally.

The sin of idolatry was so heinous an offence against God that these terms are used to express His abhorrence of it. The people were specially chosen; to them God showed His tender mercies and loving kindness. Of them He said: "For thou art an Holy People unto the Lord thy God; the Lord thy God has chosen thee to be a special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. The Lord did not set His love upon you, nor choose you because ye were more in number than any people; but because the Lord loved you, and because He would keep the oath which He had sworn to our fathers" (Deut. vii. 6–8). Again: "Thou hast avouched the Lord this day to be thy God . . . And the Lord hath avouched thee this day to be His peculiar people" (Deut. xxvi. 17). They were bound by the closest ties made by solemn oaths. They were given and accepted laws superior to those of all other nations, laws embracing their social conduct, religious worship, and moral rectitude. They were strictly forbidden to imitate or associate in the worship of the gods of the nations. Thus: "Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee. But ye shall destroy their altars, break their images, cut down their groves: For the Lord, Whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God: Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land and they go a *whoring* after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and one call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice; and thou take of their daughters unto thy sons, and their daughters go a *whoring* after their gods, and thy sons go a *whoring* after their gods" (Exod. xxxiv. 12–16, cf. Deut. xxxi. 16;

Judges, ii. 17). "Worship of him (Baal) is, therefore, adultery against Javeh, their true God, who led them out of Egypt and loved them in the wilderness. They have committed adultery against Him ever since they left the desert and first set foot on Canaanitish soil (ix. 10). Adultery, unfaithfulness, and desertion of their true husband—these are the pictures which Hosea uses to describe the popular worship of his day, and they are nowhere painted so beautifully as in that early poem, which seems to have been composed with the cult only in the mind and without reference to the political events described in the later chapters (ii. 2–13). (Dr. Brown, Preface, p. xxiii; see also Hosea iv. 12–13; v. 3; vi. 10.) Not only are these terms applied to the nation in regard to their idolatry but also in respect to their political alliances with other nations for their own protection and security. God had promised absolute safety upon their obedience and forbade alliances. But they disobeyed His Laws and then, when other nations came against them, they sought help from one or other of the world powers—Egypt, Syria and Assyria, whichever suited their purpose (see chapters v. 13; vii. 11; xii. 1). These are called lovers in viii. 9. This, too, was abhorrent to God and is characterised by the same terms in Ezekiel xvi. 25 ff. The words therefore apply to, and are descriptive of, the national character as a whole, both religiously and politically as conducted by their rulers and politicians. They had forsaken God their true Husband and joined in worshipping false gods, and were putting their trust in the help of foreign nations, whose help was vain and to no purpose.

This sense and application of the words is confirmed by the latter part of verse i. 2, which explains the meaning of "whoredoms." "For the land hath committed great whoredoms, departing from the Lord." It therefore denotes, not the personal character of Gomer, but the character of the Northern tribes, to which she belonged, and therefore her origin. The children are also designated by the same term since they also by birth belong to the same kingdom. There is no reason, therefore, to suppose that Gomer was in any way other than a godly matron and of honourable conduct. For however much a nation through its rulers may have departed from God, as in the case of the Northern Kingdom commencing with Jeroboam (who set up the calves the one in Dan and the other at Bethel, and said: "Behold thy gods O Israel which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" . . . and this thing became a sin, for the people went to worship before the one, even to Dan (1 Kings xii. 28–30). Yet there are always those in a nation "who have not bowed the knee to Baal nor kissed him." Italy is a Roman Catholic country, but to marry an Italian does not mean that one necessarily marries a Roman Catholic; or that one who marries an Hindu marries an idolater. So there were some whom God had reserved to Himself of whom Hosea was certainly one and no doubt Gomer was another. Why not? since there is no definite charge against her.

It might be urged that the word "adulteress" in iii. 1. is definite

and cannot be so easily disposed of. In the absence of details and definite statements that Gomer is the same woman, we are at liberty to put another construction upon the verse than the one generally accepted and which we have stated in the first part of this article.

The facts given in iii. 1 should be viewed as a second marriage. We may suppose Gomer to have died and later Hosea contemplates marrying again. Many years have passed by since he gave such ominous names to his children who were constant living witnesses of the warnings and threatenings to the nation expressed again and again by the prophet. His warnings, his threatenings, his exhortations fell on deaf ears. They failed to produce any sign of repentance or reform. The rulers despised his words, and mocked the messenger. Their sin became more and more pronounced, their idolatry deeper, their alliances broader, and when Hosea seeks a second marriage he is restricted again to a woman of the Northern tribes, whom God, to mark His greater displeasure at their determination to adhere to their own ways, now uses a stronger term, a word that applies to the more heinous sin where one party is married. This is confirmed by the phrase, "Who look to other gods and love flagons of wine." They expected prosperity from the worshipping of false gods and making alliances with other nations.

Who and what was this woman whom Hosea wishes to marry, for which marriage he receives God's permission? According to Hebrew law, a person who became poor might sell himself to a Hebrew, but he was not to be treated as a bond servant. He might sell himself to a rich stranger from whence he might be redeemed by relatives or by himself, the price being fixed according to the date between the commencement of service and the year of jubilee (Lev. xx. 25, 39 ff.). It was also permitted to a man to sell his daughter and she to become the wife of the purchaser (Exod. xxi. 7 ff.). We can imagine that in the Kingdom during the interregnum of at least twenty-two years after the death of Jeroboam, followed by several revolutions and by regicide (2 Kings xv. 8 ff.) many families would become poor and so needy and ready to sell a daughter at such price as Hosea states. There is no reason, therefore, to suppose but that this woman, too, was pure, honourable and devout, and not at all the mistress of any paramour.

In both the above explanations Hosea in his conduct, and the character of the women, are in the sphere of law and order, and moral rectitude as required by the laws and regulations given by God Himself for the guidance of His people. For the neglect of which the prophet severely and unreservedly condemns the nation. He who preaches and teaches the law must himself be a doer of the law, otherwise his message will lose all its power and influence. The expression, "Do as I say and not as I do," would be as disdainfully rejected then as now in these enlightened days.

IV. THE LESSONS ARE NOT IN THE MARRIAGES BUT IN

α. The Names of the Children.

β. The Separation of the Second Wife.

Such phrases as these, "Prodigal wife," "Unfaithful and thankless," "Sold herself for money," "Tragedy of the prophet's life," "She proved unfaithful to his trust," "Fled to her paramour," are utterly beside the mark, and do not apply to Gomer, nor was there any tragedy in the marriage. There is no reason to suppose such to be the case: for the lesson does not lie in the marriage, but in the names given to the children. The marriage to Gomer is the necessary preliminary to the existence of the children. It is necessarily recorded to make it clear that the prophecy applies entirely to the Northern tribes. Hosea belonged by birth to them, Gomer must also be the same by birth, so that the children shall be reckoned wholly and entirely of the same. They thereby become fully representative, and leave no room to divert the lesson from its direct application which might have been the case if the woman had been a native of Judah.

The naming of the children would be of very great interest to relatives and friends, as is seen in naming of John the Baptist. They all remonstrated with his mother for calling him John, saying, "there is none of thy kindred that is called by this name," and appealed to the father, and when in answer he wrote, "His name is John, and they all marvelled" (Luke i. 63). Names, too, often carry with them something of special note and significance as Esau and Jacob (Gen. xxv. 24–26). So also the change of the names of Abram to Abraham and Jacob to Israel, whereby God, associating His name with theirs, assured each of His blessing, His presence, His purpose. The names given to Hosea's children under Divine guidance are to be significant of the future of the nation, living witnesses moving daily among the people, so that friends and neighbours would be astonished, report the strangeness of it and thus it would be made known far and wide along with the significant message. Nor could the message be forgotten, for not only the contemporaries of Hosea, but those of the children (for children are keen to note anything strange about each other's names), and even the succeeding generation so long as the children lived would those names be witnesses and call attention to the prophecy and purpose of God as did the children of Isaiah in Judah at a later age, assure Judah of a deliverance from the threatened danger from Syria (Isa. vii. 3 ff.; viii. 7 ff.).

The first child named Jezreel was significant of avenging wrong and causing the kingdom to cease. The final conflict would be in the valley of Jezreel. The name is associated historically with the committal of crime, injustice and its punishment. It recalls to mind how Saul perished in this valley (1 Sam. xxix–xxx.) for the sin of inquiring of a woman with a familiar spirit and not of God (1 Chron. x. 13–14). He had forsaken God and failed to trust Him, so God forsook him and he perished. It was here that Ahab put

to death Naboth at the instigation of his wife Jezebel, and possessed his vineyard inherited by Divine right and inalienable (1 Kings viii. 28–29). It was here that Jezebel perished (2 Kings ix). Here also the Baal worshippers were destroyed (2 Kings x). Hence the name wherever and whenever heard was singularly ominous of coming disaster for wrongdoing. It indicated the fall of Samaria and the captivity of the people recorded in 2 Kings xvii. 6, which came to pass some seventy-five years after the child was named and the prophecy uttered. Thus ended the dynasty of Jehu in the fourth generation (2 Kings xv. 10–12). And the Kingdom of the house of Israel ceased, its power was broken in the valley of Jezreel.

The name of the second child was Lo-ruhamah, "Not-having-obtained-mercy," or as some translate, "unpitied," which was to signify that God would not again have mercy upon the nation. He would not pity them when He saw their distress through oppression of foreign nations. He would leave them to their fate, to be taken captive by their enemies. This would stand in marked contrast with God's mercy upon the House of Judah which would be spared and saved by direct Divine intervention. The name therefore kept before the minds of the people for three generations this ignominious end. The fulfilment is clearly seen in the historical record of the events when Sennacherib's army overran the country, took Samaria and deported the people. Yet while that same army overran the cities of Judah and surrounded Jerusalem it perished by the unseen hand of God in a night. . . . And so Judah was saved not by her own power, but by God (2 Kings xviii–xix).

God had in the past spared the nation on several occasions and under the prophecy of Jonah, King Jeroboam II had prospered, recovered cities and strengthened his defences. But now the end must inevitably follow by God withdrawing His pitying mercy. The day of grace was past owing to their persistent sin of idolatry and alliances.

The third child was a son and received the name Lo-ammi, meaning, "Not My people." They were to be disowned and God would not be their God. The nation being deported would forfeit its special relationship to God as belonging to Him above all people. Thus the Kingdom of Israel would come to an end of which Our Lord's words are an echo over Jerusalem: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stoned them which were sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate." He disowned the Temple, no longer His but "yours" (Matt. xxiii. 37–38). Such is the significant meaning and application of the names of the children explained by Hosea himself. They helped to enforce his prophecies as constant reminders. The historical events confirm the prophecies.

We now turn to the second marriage. We have given reasons for considering this woman not to be the same with Gomer, and

an event much later in the prophet's life. If she had been impure it would have been no strange thing for the prophet to put her away in seclusion. There was no reason in law to do so except in the case of a captive taken from another nation (Deut. xxi. 13). It is this extraordinary act which was intended to cause a sensation among the neighbours as in the case of the names of the children. It is similar to Ezekiel when he refrained from mourning for his wife. It served to call attention of the people to his prophetic utterances (Ezek. xxiv. 15 ff.). As then this woman was excluded from all social ordinary intercourse and from her husband, so the people would be deprived of their kingdom and all religious ceremonies, and yet they would not be absorbed into any other nation. They would remain for God in the Gospel days.

V.

This interpretation enforces the message which the prophet has to convey to the people, and avoids all moral difficulties, and renders the whole story consonant with the honour and glory of God.

The marriage of Gomer, the names of the children, the purchase of the woman, her seclusion, are all literal facts as stated, but the names of the children, and the seclusion of the woman are symbolical acts of God's purposes and dealings with the nation. The terms " whoredoms " and " adulteress " are both explained in their own context as allegorical of the national character in having forsaken God, like a woman who had forsaken her husband.

In all this we do not detract the least from the message of God's love to the people. The nation as such had failed; but arising as it were out of the ashes, Phœnix-like, there is to be a new united kingdom under one head, even the Lord Jesus Christ, Who succeeds to the throne of His father David in the Gospel dispensation (Luke i. 32, 33). Then Jew and Gentile alike will be ruled over by Him, when Israel and Judah shall be as one. " Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim " (Isa. xi. 13). This kingdom lies on a higher plane and stands on a wider basis. It rises to the height of the spiritual and embraces all nations. It points to the Gospel dispensation when the people shall be gathered under one appointed Head. Hosea looks into the dim future. He sees the glory of Christ and His Kingdom, chapters i. 10–ii. 1 and iii. 5. St. Paul and St. Peter confirm this by quoting these words and applying them to the gospel (Rom. ix. 25–27; Peter ii. 10).

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE IDEA OF PERFECTION IN CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. AN HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE CHRISTIAN IDEAL FOR THE PRESENT LIFE. By R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D. (Oxon), Tutor and Lecturer in New Testament Language and Literature, Wesley House, Cambridge. *Oxford University Press.* Humphrey Milford, 1934. Pp. xv + 422. 15*s.*

"The doctrine of Christian perfection—understood not as an assertion that a final attainment of the goal of the Christian life is possible in this world, but as a declaration that a supernatural destiny, a relative attainment of the goal which does not exclude growth, is the will of God for us in this world and is attainable—lies not merely upon the by-paths of Christian Theology, but upon the high road" (p. 397, cf. p. xii).

Dr. Flew's treatise is inspiring on its devotional and practical side and arresting because of its wealth of historical and theological material. It is a book for the preacher and the humble Christian as well as for the student of the New Testament and Church history. Dr. Flew maintains "that the seeking of an ideal that is realisable in this world is essential to Christianity. . . . It is essential to the individual Christian that the goal set before him should be not merely conversion, not merely a life of service, but perfection. Or if the term is disliked, let it be Wesley's phrase—'perfect love,' or 'sanctity' or 'holiness.'" And as holiness is given in response to faith it follows that the ideal life is a "moment-by-moment" holiness. There remains a consciousness of personal unworthiness, indeed it is part of the ideal life itself to have this (p. 409). That we are necessarily *unprofitable* servants is perhaps untrue. It may well be maintained, as by the author, that the Greek of St. Luke xvii. 10 means "unworthy"; certainly the epithet *'αχρεῖος* in 2 Samuel vi. 22, LXX, cannot mean "useless."

We have allowed ourselves to quote freely from the chapter of practical "Conclusions," but it is time to sketch the treatise itself. One of the many fresh and valuable contributions of this book is the placing of a doctrine of "perfection" in the setting of Christ's own teaching in the Gospels. The proclamation of the reign of God carried with it a doctrine of the ideal life which might be lived out in this present world (p. 3); and this ultimate ideal of man is the pure gift of God. Forgiveness, communion with God, a life of love among men, a life lived on the level of miracle—all flow from the infinite love of the Father.

St. Paul writes: "Sin shall not have dominion over you." "The Apostle does not speak of himself as sinless after his conversion . . . but we meet no heartfelt utterances of deep contrition for present sin such as are common in Evangelical piety" (p. 54).

St. John's First Epistle contains, of course, a *locus classicus* (Chap. iii). Dr. Flew is right in interpreting that many of those

addressed have passed through the experience of deliverance from habits of sinning (p. 112). The picture of human life is in black and white. The writer of the present review cannot help feeling that in the Old Testament is to be found an analogy to not a little of the New Testament language which has been made to bear the strain of a doctrine of sinless and absolute perfection. The writer of Psalm cxix who describes the Law as "perfect" and who believes that there are men whose moral and religious life is the same (verses 1–3) is but contrasting religious ideals and habits with those of men who avowedly despise the right and persecute the man who sincerely gives himself to following the will of God. The very term "perfect" in Semitic idiom contained necessarily no idea of absolute moral excellence. Thus the "perfection" and "uprightness" of Job are explained by the (relative) expressions of "fearing God" and "eschewing evil" (i. 1). Phrases tend to be comparative and even conventional. St. Luke would have been very surprised if a friend, looking over his MS., had told him that in the centuries after his death his words in i. 6 as the general character of Zacharias and Elizabeth would be taken to mean that these people (one of whom had to be struck dumb for unbelief) actually observed *all* God's commandments and were in God's sight literally "blameless." When the words of St. John in 1 John iii. are being interpreted by modern readers no harm could come from bearing in mind the words in the Gospel (ix. 3), "neither did this man sin, nor his parents."

But to resume, to the present writer the strength of Dr. Flew's argument throughout his treatise is in his catching and interpreting what seem to have been the ideas of the New Testament, irrespective of certain words and phrases contained therein. Note how more than once our author refuses to discuss the problem of perfection within the limits of "sinlessness."

It is impossible even to summarise the tour by which the learned guide takes us through the apologists, Clement of Alexandria (whose treatise upon the Perfect Christian influenced John Wesley), Origen and the pioneers of the Monastic Movements. A chapter is given to St. Thomas Aquinas and another to the views of the Reformers. (Luther's doctrine is a divergence from that of St. Paul. "Luther taught that sin was unconquerable in this life. St. Paul assumes that the Christian need not sin.") The Pietists, the Quakers, Wm. Law, are all dealt with. The Wesleys and the early Methodists took the doctrine of Christian Perfection quite seriously. Some of the limitations of Methodist theology are criticised by this loyal and learned Methodist. Chapters are devoted to Ritchl and Schleiermacher.

In the final chapter the author gathers together his conclusions in a masterly summary. Some points from these are stated in the beginning of this review. It is long since the present reviewer has enjoyed such a piece of reading as this. This is a book for libraries, but it is also a veritable *vade mecum* upon this subject of profoundest moment. The style is clear and cogent. There are

no printer's slips. The index is good—but the treatise merits a second index, of references to the many New Testament passages upon which light is shed. The writer's touch is true, his judgment balanced; his knowledge of the authorities wide and deep. Flew's "Perfection" will be the standard book for a long time to come.

R. S. C.

CALAMY REVISED: BEING A REVISION OF EDMUND CALAMY'S ACCOUNT OF THE MINISTERS AND OTHERS EJECTED AND SILENCED, 1660–2. By A. G. Matthews, M.A. *Oxford: Clarendon Press*, 1934. 40s. net.

Edmund Calamy, the historian of Nonconformity, was the third of his name. His grandfather, for a short time Rector of Rochford, was ejected by the Act of Uniformity from St. Mary Aldermanbury, London, as his son was from Moreton, near Ongar. Calamy's work as a historian began with his "*Abridgment*" of Baxter's History of his life and times, 1702. The ninth chapter of this gave an account of many ministers ejected since the Restoration. A second edition appeared in 1713, when this "*Account*" swelled to a second volume with its own title. In 1727 appeared his "*Continuation*"—a number of additions and corrections to his "*Account*," in two volumes.

The arrangement is by counties; but under each county no order is observed; the names come anyhow, just as Calamy found them in some of his lists. The "*Continuation*" takes the form of a series of references to the "*Account*."

The desirability for arrangement and combination was recognised by Samuel Palmer, whose *Nonconformists' Memorial* (two volumes, 1775; three volumes, 1802) unites the information in the two books, and arranges alphabetically the places of ejection in each county.

But much information has since come to light, and many official and other documents are far more accessible. Therefore, on the one hand, Calamy's list can be carefully criticised; on the other much more is known about some of his personages. In particular, the ejections in 1660 and in 1662 can be better distinguished. The traditional number of Nonconformists has long been 2,000, which is sufficiently accurate as a round number; but it is often said that all that number were *ejected from livings* in 1662, whereas a large number (including Richard Baxter) had been ejected in 1660, either by the restoration of a sequestered predecessor, or because appointed by other than the lawful patron, or, perhaps, on political grounds. The only religious ground would be the repudiation of Infant Baptism. Calamy rightly includes men silenced for their nonconformity in 1662 as well as those *ejected* then; but the two sets are often confused, and some of those given by him are not known to have been Nonconformists.

His list may also be reduced by the omission of clergy who died before the Act of Uniformity came into force; and, though he did his best to avoid duplicates, and made many corrections as he

went on, there are still some cases of men being given twice over under different counties. On the other hand, a few additions may be made to his list. Mr. Matthews adds forty-one. He gives a total of 1,760 ejections—695 in 1660, 936 in 1662, and 129 at uncertain dates; adding 149 ejections for universities and schools, we reach 1,909. When a man was ejected from one living in 1660 and from another, perhaps in another county, in 1662, only the second ejection is counted; thus Mark Mott, ejected from Chelmsford in 1660 and from Great Wratting, Suffolk, in 1662, reckons for Suffolk and not Essex. (He is only a name, or rather two names, to Calamy and Palmer.)

Calamy had in Essex, as in some other counties, a large number of cases where he knew nothing but the bare surname. Davids threw light on many of these; but now almost all have been certainly or probably identified, though not all as Nonconformists.

Mr. Matthews summarises some particulars. Of those ministers who remained Nonconformists at least 1,285 had had a university education—733 at Cambridge. At least 420 were in full episcopal orders before the Civil War. Seventy-two of them had held the livings from which they were ejected before 1640, the senior being Thomas Nuttall, of Saxmundham, Suffolk, instituted 1615. Essex has several early cases. John Bedle had been at Barnston since 1632, previously at Little Leighs from 1623. John Willis had been at Ingatestone from 1630, previously at Hockley from 1619; George Wilson had been at Elsenham since 1622. Whereas these ejected in 1660 may fairly be described as "intruders," this does not apply to those ejected in 1662.

The book which gives biographical notes in summary form, drawn largely from unpublished sources, should be read by all those interested in the Ecclesiastical settlement of the Restoration, or in the history of the ejected Nonconformists.

H. S.

THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE PRESENT DAY. Edited by Walter Alison Phillips, Litt.D., M.R.I.A., Lecky Professor of Modern History in the University of Dublin. Volume II. The Movement towards Rome. The Medieval Church and The Reformation. Volume III. The Modern Church. *Oxford University Press.* 31*s.* 6*d.* Three volumes.

These are the second and third volumes of the *History of the Church of Ireland*, the first volume of which was reviewed in the April number of THE CHURCHMAN. We then explained the origin and purpose of the undertaking and offered our congratulations to the Church of Ireland in having such a record of its work and in possessing a band of native scholars who have so successfully undertaken the task of threading their way through the mass of conflicts that mark the history and the conflicting evidence regarding them. We observe that the third volume bears the date 1933, and the second

1934, which seem to indicate that the writers of the last volume had finished their task before those who had to deal with the more stormy period preceding the Stewarts.

The first chapter of the second volume covers in about eighty pages a period of over four hundred years from 800 to 1216, and deals with "The Scandinavian Inroads and the Movement towards Rome." The author, Dr. Goddard H. Orpen, depicts the centuries of constant turmoil and frequent pillaging under which the monastic institutions suffered sorely so that the schools of learning for which the country had once been famous had dwindled away, and instead of receiving students from abroad many Irishmen betook themselves to the Continent as students and missionaries. With the English invasion began the movement towards Rome, although the old Celtic system had broken down before then. The Irish Church surrendered its independence "with the result that for nearly four hundred years it was led by the Church of Rome; and not until seven centuries were completed did the Church of Ireland once more recover her complete independence." From that time onward the history of the country with which the history of the Church is at all times very intimately associated, is a record of a constant conflict between widely differing interests, and religion suffered severely in consequence.

Two chapters on the Medieval Church are contributed by Archdeacon Seymour. The period was marked by the conflict between the races and "the age was a rough and turbulent one." The "mere Irish" were excluded from high ecclesiastical office, and from some of the monastic houses. The picture is drawn with much detail and the Archdeacon gives some interesting sidelights on a period to which he has devoted much attention. The remainder of the volume is the work of Canon G. V. Jourdan, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin. This is the most controversial period as it covers the Reformation age. Roman Catholic historians have endeavoured to represent the Church of Ireland as having lost the episcopal succession at that time, and considerable attention has been given to changes in the sees, from which it is clear that the Roman Catholic claim cannot be maintained. Dr. Jourdan paints a dark picture of the moral condition of the country at the time. There was a lamentable neglect on the part of the Church to inculcate the principles of morality, the condition of religion was painfully low and a state of ignorance prevailed among the ordinary clergy. Incompetence, selfish greed, and short-sightedness marked the entire Anglo-Irish colony and its government. The rise of recusancy was due to the "belief that the Bishop of Rome had the right to interfere in the domestic affairs of Ireland and to exercise a jurisdiction within the realm that made the royal government impossible." This fact is often forgotten when reference is made to the so-called persecution of the Romanists. The foundation of Trinity College, Dublin, in the year 1592 marked the beginning of a better state of things. "From the very first, it exerted an extraordinary power for the betterment of religion

not only in reforming circles but even among the Roman Catholics." Such a change was needed, for " from the religious point of view there was little difference between the conditions in the Church of Ireland in 1515 and in 1603." One of the most flagrant scandals in the country at this time and for many years after, was the plundering of Church property by those who were bold enough or mean enough to lay hands on it. The plantation of Ulster brought a new set of problems and difficulties for the Church, but the reign of James I was only the lull before the storm which was soon to burst. The mass of detail which Dr. Jourdan gives concerning these events will prove of the greatest value to students of history and his fairness may be relied upon.

The third volume begins with the reign of Charles I and this chapter is again the work of Dr. Jourdan. A favourable picture is given of the work of Wentworth for the Church, but there was the usual failure to take effective measures to ensure the success of any efforts either for the welfare of the country or of the Church. The years following the Insurrection of 1641 were marked by the miserable plight of the Church and the clergy. With the Restoration began the efforts of Bramhall and Jeremy Taylor to bring order out of chaos. These chapters are written by Canon R. H. Murray and tell of the rise of the new spirit in the time of William III. Much has been made of the severity of the Penal Laws in Ireland, but it is clear that they were never so severely pressed as the penal laws against the Huguenots in France. Dr. Chart takes up the story of the eighteenth century when the alliance between Church and State became very close. " Many of the ills of the eighteenth-century Church can be traced to the preoccupation of many of its leading men with politics. Most of the bishops were Englishmen, many of them came over in the train of the Lords-Lieutenant as chaplains and a bishopric was their usual reward. Some of them seem to have regarded their sees as a means of acquiring wealth for themselves and their friends, and the Church suffered severely in consequence. The tithe struggle was one of the most painful features of the Church life of the last period of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth, until legislation altered the whole system. Dr. Emerson's account of the nineteenth century is of special interest as it includes the events leading up to the disestablishment. Dean Webster concludes the story with an account of the Reconstruction of the Church after disestablishment and the condition of the Church during the sixty years since then. The reconstruction was the work of men of exceptional ability and great credit is due to them and to the unselfish clergy of the Church who turned into a triumph what might easily have been a disaster.

The writers of these volumes have done their work well and have produced a history which will be a standard work of reference for years to come. Numerous appendices give an account of the documents on which many of the facts are based and form a valuable feature of the volumes for students. The Bibliography is an extended one containing the names of all the important writers on

Irish history of every nationality. The indexes are full and tables of the Bishops from the earliest times, and also specially of the episcopal successions, from the accession of Elizabeth to the tenth year of the reign of James I are provided.

GOD AT WORK. A Study in the Supernatural. By William Adams Brown, Ph.D., D.D. *Student Christian Movement Press.* 6s. net.

Dr. Brown's purpose in this book is to reinterpret the supernatural factor in religion, not from the abstract and theoretical viewpoint which has been controlling in many recent discussions of the subject, but in its bearing upon the personal religious life. He takes a wide survey of the meaning of the word supernatural and its place in religion. The supernatural is the basic conception of religion and to believe in the supernatural means to believe in a God at Work. That there is an ultimate good which sets the standard for all our striving, and that God is making Himself known to us in definite and recognisable ways. Religion is response to God's approach to man and the goal of religion is sainthood. Faith is the essential characteristic of religion. The contrast of the supernatural and the natural brings out the spiritual, creative, and perfect elements of the former, and leads to the thought of personality as the essential characteristic of the supernatural. The supernatural has found expression in various ways in human life. In recent times Karl Barth has discovered " a strange new world in the Bible," the Anglo-Catholics have found God in the Church, the Group Movement has discovered something thrilling and adventurous in religion, and Toyohiko Kagawa has awakened Japan to a fresh sense of the supernatural. All these different movements Dr. Brown regards as part of one great movement in which God is recalling our generation to Himself, and the future of the Church, if not of civilisation itself, will depend upon our rediscovery in the midst of the confusion and heartbreak of our time of the Living God at Work. The surrender of self is the essential element in these movements, and that is faith as " an act of the will by which in response to an inward constraint a man gives himself to God only to discover that by that act he has become for the first time truly free." The supernatural life is the life of faith. The four sections of the second part are devoted to the consideration of this life of faith. There are many problems arising from miracles and science, the mystery of evil, and the inequalities of religious experience. These are dealt with and emphasis is laid upon the place of " crisis," which we call " conversion " : " Conversion is an experience in which vision leads to consecration and consecration brings assurance." The third part is an examination of what faith finds in God. God is the mysterious and the meaningful. He is, therefore, the All-sufficient and thus brings satisfaction to the deepest desire of the human heart for beauty and righteousness. Again, consideration is given to the subject of miracles, and it is

shown that contemporary philosophy is changing " So that in our modern world the position of nature and the supernatural has been almost exactly reversed. It has been shown us that nature, at first a comparatively narrow realm, surrounded by the bounded sea of the supernatural, has now become for many modern writers a comprehensive term which includes all reality, actual as well as possible ; and the supernatural, where admitted at all, stands for a particular and so far forth limited aspect of that all-embracing reality." Miracle, therefore, is the expression in the larger field of the Universe of that creative aspect of things which meets us whenever we touch life, and most clearly of all in personality. To Christians, " the Miracle of Miracles is Jesus." He is God's supreme and final revelation to our race. The fourth part reaches the summit of the relationship of Man to God which has thus so far been described, and this is summed up in the term " Sainthood." Dr. Brown sets out two contrasted ideals of Sainthood ; in what he describes as " Catholic piety " he discovers contemplation as the chief element. Protestants conceive the saintly life as the active life. He considers the Bible and the Church as the most direct and immediate helps in the cultivation of the saintly life, but he gives an emphasis to Catholic conceptions which Protestants will not generally allow. There is as much of the supernatural evidenced in Protestant experience as in that of any other Communion.

REVELATION AND THE HOLY SPIRIT. An Essay in Barthian Theology. By F. W. Camfield, M.A., D.D. *Elliot Stock.* *7s. 6d.* net.

The writings of Professor Karl Barth are not easy reading for English students, and the same may be said of the works of his English followers and commentators. The present " Essay in Barthian Theology " presents the whole subject of Revelation in a new light consequent upon the author's study of the works of the German professor. Dr. J. McConnachie, who is himself an exponent of the Barthian teaching, writes a Foreword in which he says he regards the book as a real contribution on the doctrine of Revelation. He bespeaks a warm welcome for " this able and scholarly volume " as the Barthian theology is in his opinion the only one that is taking seriously at the present moment the rethinking of the doctrine of revelation. Dr. Camfield's purpose is to think through again the Christian idea of revelation from the standpoint of the New Testament conception of the Holy Spirit. His main thesis is that " Revelation brings its own category of interpretation. It shines in its own light. It is seen in and through itself. It does not need to be correlated with the forms and categories of man's natural reason, for that would make a rational principle the ' locale ' of revelation and revelation, as it is essentially dynamic and creative, brings with it the principle of its own interpretation."

His first chapter is a criticism of the views of those who would

place the autonomy of religion in any process of the reason. Reality is not reached by any process of man's advance towards it, but by an approach of reality to man. The witness to this revelation is Jesus Christ, but the New Testament is astonishingly indifferent to the historical Jesus as such, and we have to distinguish between the story of his life and the New Testament witness of him as the revelation of God. " Jesus in the ground of his being stands discontinuous with the rest of humanity and can only be understood after a divine and transcendent manner, through that which the New Testament calls the Holy Spirit. Thus man discovers the immediacy of God to him. No rational explanation of the atonement is possible. Rationally it must for ever remain a mystery. But to faith its secret is disclosed, because faith is the work of the Holy Spirit, the transcendent, supra-temporal, super-rational understanding, which links man's consciousness on to the deed of revelation." Faith is a miracle, the deed and gift of God, it is the Holy Spirit as seen from the human side. Criticism is offered from this point of view to the views of Dr. Cairns in *The Faith that Rebels*, to Schraeder's *Das Geistproblem der Theologie*, to Dr. Tennant, to Professor Alexander's *Space Time and Deity* and to Spengler's *The Decline of the West* mainly on the ground of the place which is assigned to reason. Troeltsch is also condemned for the inadequacy of his theories. Great value is placed on Barth's idea of *Urgeschichte*, for which no adequate equivalent English word has been found. It indicates the point at which the super-historical which is the essential element in revelation comes into contact with actual history. Chapters on " The Spirit and God " and " The Holy Spirit and the Incarnation " bring us to the thought of the Trinity. Various defects in the ordinary method of explaining the orthodox view of Christology are indicated. " What has brought Orthodox Christology, which still in its deepest meaning holds the promise of the future, into a condition of stalemate, is that men have so much concerned themselves with the task of uniting abstract natures, instead of focussing their attention on the great divine events of death and resurrection." It is through these that " to a world in discontinuity with, alienation from, God, a world in its creatureliness and a world in its sin and its fall, has come the word of reconciliation and redemption."

This general criticism of the theology of the past from the point of view of the Barthian teaching leaves us with the perplexities which so much of that teaching produces by its practical repudiation of the powers of reason to assist us towards our apprehension of God, and thus placing a ban upon the mental powers which we have always been led to believe God had bestowed upon mankind for the purpose of reaching out to a fuller apprehension of Him. There is no doubt that rational processes are limited and can only help us to a certain extent, but, as in the case of Otto's " numinous," we feel that there is a haze of vagueness which the ordinary man can never fathom. At the same time any effort is to be welcomed that can help our great thinkers to approach the problems of Reality,

and to secure for us all that in Dr. Camfield's view philosophy has failed to gain and must from its very nature fail to gain. The author's whole treatment of the subject will be found stimulating, and it opens out lines of thought which students of theology will find profitable for still further consideration.

JESUS IN THE LIVES OF MEN. *Australian Book Company.* 3*s.* 6*d.*
TRUTH AND TRADITION. *Australian Book Company.* 4*s.* 6*d.* By S. Angus, M.A., D.D., Lit.D., Ph.D., Professor, St. Andrew's College, University of Sydney.

It is difficult to frame a satisfactory definition of Modernism, but in Professor Angus we believe we have a typical Modernist. In these two publications the issues between Traditionalism and Modernism are definitely raised. Limitations of space preclude adequate examination—we must be content to state that very little of orthodox belief remains after Dr. Angus has passed it through the crucible of his refining mind.

We cannot help feeling that in some respects the modern outlook is intolerant, unfair, and mistaken.

It is intolerant because it implies, if it does not assert, that those who adopt the orthodox position are morally and mentally deficient.

It is unfair because it contrasts acceptance of a creed with the spirit of love, and suggests that orthodoxy stresses the former and ignores the latter.

It is mistaken in its frequent assertions that all thinking people share its view and desire its nostrums. These are fallacies which go far to vitiate the position of the Modernist.

The mere Traditionalist has certainly no claim to be called a true representative of Christianity. But it remains true that the best contributions to the welfare of mankind have been made, and the most beautiful lives have been lived, by those who have surrendered themselves to the Living Christ after having found forgiveness and new life through the Crucified Saviour.

We gladly acknowledge the beauty and force of much of what Dr. Angus says in *Jesus in the Lives of Men.* Something is lacking however, and that something is the Cross, which looms so large in the Gospels, is specially commemorated in the one ordinance which the Saviour enjoined for continuous usage, and without which S. Paul's arguments in his expositions of Christian doctrine fall to the ground.

We recognise with appreciation the candour, courage, and clarity with which Dr. Angus expresses his views in *Truth and Tradition.*

The time may come—perhaps has come—for a recasting of the Creeds. Let it be a more adequate expression of vital truth, not an evacuation. We are not concerned to defend the domestic documents of Presbyterianism, but we can understand the agitation of our friends of that Communion when faced with the alternative of the Westminster Confession or Dr. Angus.

H. D.

CONVICTIONS. Edited by Leonard Hodgson. Pp. 256. *Student Christian Movement Press.* 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

For an understanding of the problems, which those who are labouring for the re-union of Christendom are called upon to face, *Convictions* is invaluable. The great conference on Faith and Order, held at Lausanne in 1927, issued a report embodying seven sectional reports dealing with " The Call to Unity," " The Church's Message to the World—the Gospel," " The Nature of the Church," " The Church's Common Confession of Faith," " The Ministry of the Church," " The Sacraments," and " The Unity of Christendom and the Relation thereto of Existing Churches." This report was submitted to the various Churches throughout the world—the Roman Catholic Church, of course, being excluded. Forty-two different Churches, through their official representatives, responded with comments and statements. The present volume contains a selection from these responses.

The claim that " nowhere else is there to be found so comprehensive a collection of these differing Christian convictions, which must somehow be reconciled if there is to be a genuinely reunited Christendom," is probably well grounded. From the reports it is obvious that the way is long and arduous: the hopeful feature is the general determination to regard Lausanne as the beginning of a fellowship which must be developed until the desired end is achieved.

How far is the end is made painfully apparent in the response of the Church of England. Appended to this response are five notes more or less dissenting from sections of the response, all tending to reveal how wide are our own unhappy divisions. It would be interesting to know the thoughts of the other Churches about the uncertain voice of the Anglican Church.

F. B.

THE MEDIATOR: A STUDY OF THE CENTRAL DOCTRINE OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By Emil Brunner. Pp. 622. *Lutterworth Press.* 20*s.* net.

This, the third volume of the Lutterworth Library, is a book of such supreme importance that means should be found to place it in the hands of all Christian teachers. One has already learned to expect from the Lutterworth Library nothing but the best. Its standard is enhanced by Dr. Brunner's great work.

Originally written in German, the book loses little, we imagine, in being translated by so capable a person as Miss Wyon. The difficulties presented by the necessary use of so many technical terms have been carefully and successfully met.

The book, as the sub-title suggests, is the work of one who is profoundly convinced that " to be a Christian means precisely to trust in the Mediator. . . . There is no other possibility of being a Christian than through faith in that which took place once for all, revelation and atonement through the Mediator." The

author does not claim that the book is a doctrine of Christ; it is but an introduction to the subject. He modestly disclaims the intention to give the world a scholarly work, but thinkers and scholars will surely agree that, whatever the intention may have been, the result is a masterly presentment of the mediatorial work of Christ.

The volume is divided into three parts. The first part deals with " preliminary considerations." First, there is pointed out the distinction between general and special revelations, a distinction which in modern theology tends to be obliterated. The result is that in the liberalism of the day Christ ceases to be divine: He becomes one, even if the greatest, among many prophets. Dr. Brunner is among those who feel profoundly that there cannot be any deep and abiding spiritual revival with its attendant passion for the extension of Christ's Kingdom until we return to a soul conviction of the fact of sin and of the need of Christ the Mediator.

The author passes on to a consideration of the work and results of historical research and its relation to saving faith in a redeeming Christ. While fully appreciative of the work of research, he requests the historian " to listen to the systematic theologian when he again and again points out the philosophical limitations attaching to all historical work."

The second part of the book is devoted to " the person of the Mediator," His deity, the incarnation of the Son of God, and the humanity of the Son. The third portion, under the headings of " The Revelation," " Reconciliation " and " The Dominion of God," is of outstanding worth. Its detailed and accurate consideration of the Person, work and teaching of Christ; of the necessity for reconciliation; of the theories and face of the Atonement, etc., distinguish the whole volume as one that should occupy a place upon the shelves of all ministers of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

F. B.

NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS.

THE English people are proud of their Cathedrals, but many of them are little acquainted with their history and the special features of their architecture. This defect can be remedied in the easiest and most pleasant way possible by obtaining "*The Cathedrals of England*," by Harry Batsford, Hon. A.R.I.B.A., and Charles Fry (B. T. Batsford, Ltd., *7s. 6d.* net). The volume is admirably illustrated by 133 photographs and 32 attractive sketches by Brian Cook. These constitute in themselves a valuable record of the chief beauties of the Cathedrals. They represent the most important features of the chief exteriors and many remarkable features in the interiors. There are a number of excellent plans illustrating the growth and development of the buildings and their surroundings. In addition to the pictures the actual accounts of the buildings are equally well done. Each Cathedral is described in as simple language as possible, and a glossary is provided of the technical terms employed. It would be impossible to choose out any one of them for special mention, but after Canterbury Cathedral and York Minster, Gloucester presents the greatest variety of architectural features for the student. Its cloisters, as is well known, are the finest and best preserved in England, and their fan vaulting is of peculiar beauty and interest. Some space is given to the new Cathedrals or parish churches that have been set apart as the Cathedrals of new dioceses. Mr. Hugh Walpole contributes a Foreword in which he tells of what the Cathedrals mean to one who has lived nearly all his life in Cathedral towns, and he says that the wonderful photographs of this beautiful book bring home to him the patience, industry, passion for beauty, personal worship, and harsh discipline that have gone to the raising of these edifices. Many will share his delight in this "splendid record of the beauty and dignity of the Cathedrals of England."

S.P.C.K. publishes in its Churchman's Popular Library a small book on a great subject, *The Gift of The Spirit*, by Edward C. Rich, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Chief Diocesan Inspector of Schools (*1s. 6d.* net). His aim is to treat his subject from a practical point of view, and constantly to bear in mind the Christian principle that the Spirit of God is made known to us in the fullness of His Power and effect in corporate sharing. As the addresses were originally intended for the members of the Mothers' Union in connection with the Call to Renewal, they were kept as free as possible from technical discussions, and they are written in the belief that the first step in Spiritual renewal for the Church will be found in the rediscovery of the meaning of the words, "I believe in the Holy Ghost." He deals with various theories regarding the world and God's relationship to it; and passes on to the more definite meaning of the Spirit and the gift of the Spirit. This in turn

leads to the Spirit's mode of working. He notes some of the errors that have been prevalent at times in regard to the use of the term "Grace," which came "to be looked upon as an impersonal force on a lower plane than the gift of the Holy Spirit. This view lies behind the words of Newman's hymn when he speaks of a 'Higher gift than Grace, God's Presence all Divine.'" The institutionalist who emphasises the Sacraments as means of grace often suffers from the danger of regarding the Church not as a means, but as an end in itself; and he succumbs to mechanical views of religion so that words and actions which originally were the expression of life and reality become stereotyped and barren. He follows Dr. N. P. Williams in making a frank equation of Grace with the Person of the Holy Spirit, so that Grace is not a quasi-material, something deposited in the soul by the Holy Spirit. When the Spirit was given to the Church at Pentecost, a new order of things in the process of creative evolution was produced, and that was a fellowship in which the Spirit manifested His Presence in the gift of love. Love is, therefore, the chief manifestation of the Spirit's work and the guided life is a life of love. This should manifest itself in service, and members of the Church "so far from needing more Spiritual shepherding ought to be stepping out into the light with a conviction that God has equipped us for action. Most congregations are suffering from Spiritual indigestion because of a lack of exercise." There are some points on which we cannot agree with the writer's interpretation of Catholic Order, but apart from this as a short treatment of a great subject the book will be found suggestive and inspiring.

Has the Christian Church a Future? is the question which the Rev. S. Tetley, M.A., Vicar of Wortley-de-Leeds (William & Norgate, Ltd., 6*s.* net), sets out to answer in a book with this title. Although he is somewhat discursive in his style, the author presents many useful considerations upon the present position of the Church and its future prospects. He faces some of the tendencies of the time which seriously threaten the future welfare of Christianity. He exposes mercilessly some of the defects to be found in every section of Christendom to-day. He quotes widely from the modern literature of the various subjects upon which he touches. He finds in the theory of "the power of the Keys" a source of weakness that has greatly injured the effectiveness of Christianity, especially through the powers claimed by the Roman Church. Of this Church he says: "It is more a system of discipline or a political society than a Church, and at present it is as a political factor that it counts rather than as an intellectual or spiritual force." The last chapter but one deals largely with the various theories of the psychologists, and the last chapter with the theories of Socialists and Communists. It closes with the question—"Can the Church recover its first fine careless rapture in a fresh understanding of its unique message?" and the author leaves us in some doubt as to the answer that should be given.

Dr. A. Herbert Gray is the author of several books which aim at the guidance of young people, especially in Christian conduct. His last book, *About People*, is described as a book for Parents, Teachers, Ministers, and the people themselves (Student Christian Movement Press, 3*s.* 6*d.* net). We are told on the jacket that Dr. Gray has had intimate contacts with more people of more varied kinds than fall to the lot of most writers, that he has been the confidant and adviser of all sorts and conditions of men and women, and that his book is written out of his deep sympathy and wide knowledge. The first part on the religious life and its phases and difficulties is largely occupied with the various stages of thought and emotion through which people pass, the difficulties they have to face, and the psychological explanations and remedies that can be provided. There is much that is practical and useful to be learnt from Dr. Gray's vigorous method of dealing with complexes. The second part deals with the sex life and some of its problems, and is mainly in the style that has become popular in recent years in dealing with these matters. There is probably something to be gained from the laying aside of Victorian reticence and bold dealing with the abnormal conditions which have made life miserable for many. The third part is specially intended for ministers, and contains advice to young ministers to make themselves accessible, to prepare themselves for dealing with the psychological needs of people, and especially to learn the best method of treating women who seek advice.

Toyohiko Kagawa is the best-known figure in the Christian life of Japan at the present time. He is the leader of The Kingdom of God Movement which is a great Christian campaign throughout that country. His life story is briefly told by the Rev. W. H. Murray Walton in the introduction to *The Religion of Jesus*, the translation of which is published by the Student Christian Movement Press in their one shilling series of Religion and Life books. In five chapters Kagawa sets out the Christian position in "The Teaching of Jesus about God," about prayer, and about the death of Jesus. The religion of Jesus is experience of God in action, and if we watch Jesus's love and devotion we will experience a revelation of God. Jesus Christ is a Teacher of love.

The same thought is treated in a more extended way in Kagawa's book, *Love, the Law of Life*, which is now published in a second edition in the S.C.M. Torch Library (3*s.* 6*d.* net). This is a remarkable book, in which he traces out the meaning of love in every aspect of life, and illustrates his points from a remarkably extensive acquaintance with the literature of both the western and eastern worlds. It is an inspiring fact that Japanese thinkers are provided with such a comprehensive and convincing statement of the meaning of Christian faith.

Another book about Japan in the S.C.M. Religion and Life books is the interesting story of Tokichi Ishii told by Caroline MacDonald. When this book was originally published under the

title *A Gentleman in Prison* it created a profound sensation, and we recommend our readers to secure a copy, if they have not already done so, in order to realise what the Grace of God can accomplish in the life of a man practically abandoned to sin.

A small booklet issued at the price of threepence dealing with *The Church of England and The Free Churches* and *The Road to Reunion* deserves the attention of our readers. Archdeacon Hunkin writes on the Historic Position of the Church of England in relation to other Evangelical Churches, and on the English Bishops and Intercommunion: The Present Official Position. He sets out in historical form the most important facts which show that a long succession of Anglican authorities recognise the Reformed Non-Episcopal Churches on the Continent as true Churches, and their Ministers as proper Ministers. He makes clear that the official position on Intercommunion allows for the admission of Nonconformists to our Communion. An account of the South Indian Unity scheme is given by Dr. Norman Tubbs, Bishop of Rangoon. This is a useful statement of the progress that has been made, and of the necessity of the Union for the future of Christianity in India. Canon Guy Rogers shows the various steps by which Reunion is to be achieved.

One of the most interesting of recent autobiographies is that of the Ven. G. M. Davies, sometime Archdeacon of Nagpur. It is entitled *A Chaplain in India* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 5*s*.) and gives an interesting and instructive account of life in that country from the year 1887 to the year 1908. During those twenty-one years he had many remarkable experiences, and his account of them provides an inspiring record of Christian work both among our own people and the natives, for the Archdeacon had the true Missionary spirit, and was always willing to assist the workers of the Missionary Societies. The closing chapters tell of his work in England since his return, and are interesting as showing the impressions of a Missionary on the conditions in the homeland after a long period of residence elsewhere.

Missionary methods have been a subject of considerable discussion in recent times. This has led to several careful re-examinations of the whole subject. Mr. Alexander McNeish has made a contribution that deserves careful attention in his book, *Jesus Christ and World Evangelization, Missionary Principles: Christ's or Ours* (Lutterworth Press, 2*s*. net). He carefully examines the New Testament evidence and seeks to get back to the Bible and to let the Bible explain itself. Dr. J. R. Mott contributes a Foreword in which he commends the penetrating thought and spiritual insight with which Mr. McNeish summons us to make dominant in plan and action in our day that which was unmistakably the Purpose of God as revealed in the selfconsciousness of Christ in His day.

Outlines of Teaching Sermons for a Third Year, being a continuation of "Outlines of Teaching Sermons for a Year" and "Outlines of Teaching Sermons for a Second Year," has been issued by George Allen & Unwin (2*s.* net). They are prepared by a Church sub-committee dealing with adult religious education in the diocese of St. Albans, and are edited by the Rev. C. E. Hudson, Hon. Canon of St. Albans. There are four divisions. The first is on the Nature of Man, the second is on The Redeemer, the third on the Church, and the fourth on the Life of Prayer. The outlines are short and will require supplementing from the list of books recommended. Evangelical Churchpeople will not find the teaching on the Sacraments in accordance with their view of the teaching of the doctrine of the Prayer Book. Apart from this and the fact that the books recommended on the subjects are all of the advanced type, there is much helpful matter in the outlines.

Epochs in the Life of Simon Peter, by Dr. A. T. Robertson, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky (Charles Scribner's Sons, 7*s.* 6*d.* net), is an interesting study of the life of the Apostle. It follows the lines of two previous works by the same author—*Epochs in the Life of Jesus,* and *Epochs in the Life of Paul.* In plan it is a simple commentary on St. Peter's life, illustrating its various points and adding notes and criticisms from the writings of other commentators. St. Peter is presented as a man of charm with a winsome impulsive personality, eager and daring but with the limitations and weaknesses of his nature. He is the Rock that is to be. He is to be the Fisher of men. He is trained to be Christ's champion. He is chosen to be with Our Lord on the Mount of Privilege at the Transfiguration. He indulges in confident boasting, though warned by Christ. He fails in the crisis in the garden; he is a coward in the court; but as a humble penitent he is forgiven, and after the Resurrection he is "the dynamo in action," and from that time onward he is a strong leader of the Church. In connection with each of these phases of his life various problems are considered as, for example, the much-discussed interpretation of the passage "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." Dr. Robertson accepts the view that the reference to "binding" and "losing" and the "keys of the Kingdom" is not confined to Peter or to the other Apostles, but includes "every disciple of Jesus who knows how to show to any sinner the way to Him." For a course of addresses on the life of St. Peter this study provides suitable material.

Every aspect of the life of the primitive Church has been subjected to fresh examination and many new theories have been put forward in regard to its life and worship. Some of these concern the forms of worship of the earliest Christians and more particularly the method of holding the Lord's Supper. The Rev. Alexander B. Macdonald, Minister at Dron, Perthshire, has given the results of

his study of the subject in *Christian Worship in the Primitive Church* (T. & T. Clark, 7*s.* 6*d.* net.). Dr. Vernon Bartlett commends the work as not only a useful historical study but also as presenting the subject of Worship in the Primitive Church as related to the spiritual experiences of the worshippers. The first part describes the general features of primitive Christian worship, emphasising its warm human fellowship, its freedom and its enthusiasm. With the waning of enthusiasm, the standardisation of worship began. In the second part the two types of worship which developed are dealt with. The first was the "Word of God Service" based on the worship of the Jewish synagogue. Its elements were the reading and interpretation of Scripture, preaching, prayer and praise. An even more detailed treatment is given of the Sacraments, and it is of special interest as it presents some of the views that have in recent times been set out in Germany as to the connection of the Breaking of Bread with the Eucharist and the two types of service of which it is said that traces can be found in the early liturgies. The second of these is called the Pauline type of Lord's Supper. Dr. Macdonald follows Lietzmann's view that Jesus at the last Supper did not institute a rite for the Church and that the connection of the Eucharist with the death of Christ was a Pauline development. Brilioth, in his *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic*, examines this view and does not accept it, and it has not been received with favour by many other scholars. The case has been as strongly presented by Dr. Macdonald as it could be, but the subject will have to receive much further study and research before any definite conclusions can be maintained in regard to it. Archdeacon Hunkin, in *The Evangelical Doctrine of the Holy Communion*, says that "the details of the original institution and of the subsequent history of its observance in the earliest times are far from certain, and it would be most unwise to base anything that we regard as fundamental for our religion upon uncertain details of this kind. Indeed it is plain—the evidence, in the providence of God, being so scanty—that we are not intended to do so." Dr. Macdonald has no sympathy with the distinctive system of thought that lies behind the Roman Mass. There was no trace of it in the earliest days. "Indeed in Jewish belief, no material thing could be a vehicle of spiritual grace." This view is very often forgotten by some of those who hold the theory of a presence in the elements.

The Revelation of the Holy Spirit, by E. L. Strong, M.A., Priest of the Brotherhood of the Epiphany, Calcutta (S.P.C.K., 6*s.* net), is a careful study of the Scriptural teaching on the Holy Spirit. It gives a thoughtful interpretation of all the important passages bearing on the subject, and makes constant and useful reference to other works relating to it. As the writer is a member of a religious order and is writing for the members of a religious order, there are statements which Evangelical Churchpeople cannot accept, but it is

surprising that there is so little to which objection might be taken. We might have expected long references to the Holy Spirit and the Church and the Sacraments, but these are not dealt with. Although he says that "it is right and good to ask Mary and the Saints to help us, as it is right to ask people on earth," he recognises the danger of the practice and adds, "those who by praying to the Saints get into the habit of relying on them rather than on God are doing what makes it impossible that the Saints' intercessions can avail for them." He recognises that the true unity of Christendom cannot depend on unity of organisation but upon unity of spirit. He recognises that the conversion of the Roman Empire brought into the Church many who were pagan at heart who overwhelmed its true life. The result was the setting up of religious communities, and although it is natural that he should praise such institutions, he sees that they have resulted in an unfortunate division of life into "religious" and "secular," and the setting up of two standards. "The fundamental mistake was the supposition that the life of those who left the world and became Religious was in itself a higher one than the life of the disciple in the world." On the main theme the author's work is distinctly helpful.

An interesting survey of the present world conditions and the importance of Christianity in the solution of its problems is contained in *The Christian Message for the World To-day* (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 5*s*. net). It is described as "A Joint Statement of the World-Wide Mission of the Christian Church," and mainly represents the American point of view. The first section sets out the two forces of Nationalism and Communism as faiths that have the essential characteristic of religion in that they proclaim a doctrine and a way of salvation. The authors of this summary are Henry P. Van Dusen, Basil Matthews, Francis P. Miller and Francis J. McConnell. The second section sets out the Christian Message. Some interesting personal experiences give special effect to the interpretation of the Gospel in our generation. An account of the other world religions shows that they are not retaining their hold upon the nations which once accepted them. There is a world reach in Christianity which the others do not possess, and the Purpose of Missions is to bring the power of Christianity to bear upon the life of all the peoples of East and West. Unity is necessary to carry out this work effectively, but difficulties are created by emphasis upon matters of secondary importance. The Gospel is primary and to forget that is to fall into legalism and institutionalism. The authors of this section are John A. Mackay, William Paton, Kenneth Scott Lalowette, Luther Allan Weigle and E. Stanley Jones.

The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus has for the first time been translated into English with introduction and notes by Dr.

Burton Scott Easton, the well-known American theologian, and students will be grateful to him for this scholarly piece of work (Cambridge University Press, *7s. 6d.* net). The work dates from the beginning of the third century and has been described by Harnack as the richest source we possess in any form for the earliest Church polity. The Introduction contains a useful account of the chief Church Orders, including the Didache, the Apostolic Constitutions and Church Order and Canons and relates the circumstances of the life of Hippolytus showing the position which he held in the Roman Church. His work gives instructions for Christians in various duties, and is specially of value in regard to the Holy Communion as it illustrates the method of conducting the service at his time. His order is taken as representing the Breaking of Bread type rather than the Supper of the Pauline type which represents the main stream of Church practice. Many interesting points will be found in regard to the ministry of the early Church and the stages by which the presbyterate developed into the later form of the monarchical episcopate with the chief presbyter assuming powers apart from his fellows.

Christ Triumphant (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 5*s.* net) is "An Anthology of Great Christian Experiences" compiled by N. G. The compiler is inspired by the Oxford Group Movement and seeks by this collection of the Christian experiences of a great variety of thinkers to further its aim. He indicates this aim in the Preface, in these words: "From these records I have collected evidence that cannot but inspire hope in our spiritual quest. I feel confident that this anthology will help and encourage those who strive to reorganise their lives in such a manner that the Christ-like life may be formed in them." The Rev. Geoffrey Allen contributes a Foreword; he says that the compiler has chosen passages with an insight which shows his knowledge of many stretches of the road of the pilgrims on life's way. It is a wide and varied collection well answering this description, and will serve to carry out the purpose for which it is designed.

A Catholic Plea for Reunion, which was reviewed in the July number of THE CHURCHMAN, is published by Messrs. Williams & Norgate, Ltd. (28–30, Little Russell Street, W.C.1), at 3*s.* We regret that these particulars were omitted from the notice of the book.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

DEAN WACE HOUSE, WINE OFFICE COURT, LONDON, E.C.4.

Thomas Cranmer.—We are glad to be able to announce that Messrs. Putnam have published a new edition of *Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation*, by Professor E. F. Pollard, in their Black and White Library, at the price of 5*s*. This publication is a very important and useful one. It was first published in 1905 at 12*s*. 6*d*., reprinted in 1906, and a new edition published in May, 1926, at 7*s*. 6*d*.

Professor Pollard in his Preface states: "Cranmer chose the better part, but it was one of labour and sorrow. He is the storm-tossed plaything of forces which even Henry VIII could not control; and his soul is expressed in the beautiful and plaintive strains of his Litany, which appealed to men's hearts in those troublous times with a directness now scarcely conceivable. His story is that of a conscience in the grip of a stronger power; but, unless I misread his mind, he surveyed his life's work in the hour of death and was satisfied."

Confirmation.—To those who are making preparation for Confirmation Classes, we would recommend the sample packet of pamphlets obtainable from the Church Book Room at 1*s*. post free. This contains seven courses of instruction for the use of candidates and a series of leaflets by the Bishops of Chelmsford and Leicester, Bishop Knox and others.

Manuals recommended by the Book Room are as follows: *Confirming and Being Confirmed*, by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D. (1*s*.). Bishop Chavasse wrote of it that "it contains clear, forcible and Scriptural teaching." It consists of eight lectures preceded by an excellent summary and followed by a set of five or six questions on its subject matter. The order is mainly that of the Church Catechism, special attention being directed to the meaning of Confirmation and Holy Communion. *The Christian Fellowship*, by the Rev. C. H. E. Freeman, M.A., Vicar of St. Silas's, Blackburn, contains twelve talks in preparation for Confirmation. The Bishop of Worcester has contributed a foreword in which he says: "The author has produced an unusually valuable set of talks which will enable not only inexperienced clergy, but those of some standing in the ministry, to give solid and well-illustrated teaching to their candidates." This book is also published at 1*s*., and in connection with it a manual containing a series of twelve Class Notes has also been prepared, price 2*d*., or 14*s*. per 100. The Notes are perforated and can be distributed to the candidates after each lecture.

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

Confirmation Register.—Owing to several communications on this matter the Church Book Room has published a Confirmation Register, as

so many of those in existence do not contain sufficient room for the necessary particulars. This, we hope, has been rectified by the new Register which is now on sale. The size is 8 inches by 12 inches, and the price 5*s.* for 500 names, and 7*s.* 6*d.* for 1,000 names (postage 6*d.*).

Parochial Church Councils.—In view of the forthcoming elections we mention the following forms and books which have been issued by the Church Book Room: *The Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure,* with complete Text, Introduction, and Notes, by Albert Mitchell, 1*s.*; *The Enabling Act,* with complete Text and the Constitution of the National Assembly of the Church of England, with Notes, Introduction, and "Ladder of Lay Representation," and other Appendices, including Diocesan Conferences Regulation, 1922, Representation of the Laity Measure, 1929, etc., by Albert Mitchell, 1*s.*; *Parochial Church Councils,* a leaflet for distribution amongst P.C.C. members, by Albert Mitchell, 3*s.* per 100; *Parochial Electors' Roll Book,* containing 100 sheets and with alphabetical index cut through, 3*s.* 6*d.*; *Application for Enrolment on Church Electoral Roll,* 1*s.* per 100; also printed on card for Card Index System, 1*s.* 6*d.* per 100; *Notice of Enrolment of a Non-Resident,* 10*d.* per 100; *Notice to Cancel Entry in another Parish,* 10*d.* per 100; *Notice of Removal to another Parish,* 10*d.* per 100; *Notice of Revision of Church Electoral Roll,* 1*d.* each, 9*d.* per dozen; *Notice of Annual Parochial Church Meeting,* 1*d.* each, 9*d.* per dozen; *Notice of Joint Meeting for electing Churchwardens,* 1*d.* each, 9*d.* per dozen; *Notice of Parochial Church Council Meeting* (for Church Door), 3*d.* per dozen; *Notice of Parochial Church Council Meeting with Agenda,* 1*s.* 6*d.* per 100; *Form of Parochial Voting Papers,* with space for 40 names, 2*s.* 6*d.* per 100; *Electoral Roll Sheets,* 2*s.* per 100; *Nomination Forms to Diocesan Conference,* 6*d.* per dozen; *Nomination Forms to House of Laity,* 6*d.* per dozen; *Nomination Forms to Parochial Church Council,* 1*s.* per 100. Sample packets of the above leaflets and forms can be supplied on application, price 3*d.* post free.

Church Accounts and Schedules.—Many enquiries have been received of late for an Account and Schedule of Church Property commonly called a "Terrier." Mr. Albert Mitchell has very kindly prepared a form, which is printed and published by the Church Book Room, price 1*s.* net (postage 2*d.*). This is supplied in an endorsed envelope, and we feel sure that it will be found of very great use by Churchwardens and others.

Women's Services.—A special service entitled *Short Liturgies for Women's Services,* by the Rev. W. E. Daniels, Vicar of St. George's, Deal, has just been published, price 2*d.* net, or 12*s.* per 100. The Services are compiled, with a few exceptions, from existing material, and an appendix is added as useful for mothers to teach their children.

National Church Almanack.—The Almanack for 1935 is in preparation, and will be ready in October, price 2*d.* We should be glad to receive advance orders and to have enquiries as to special rates for distribution. The Almanack is an excellent booklet to place in the hands of Churchpeople generally, and is especially useful to members of the Parochial Church Council.

Catalogue.—A General Catalogue of the Publications of the Church Book Room and Theological Books recommended and on sale in the Book Room has just been issued, and will be sent on application.