

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:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<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 Advertiser.

JANUARY, 1935.

To send back the Gospel to the Lands that gave it to us.

For 80 years this has been our aim in 13 countries comprising the Lands of the Bible.

Over 100 Mission Stations and objects helped last year.

BUT New Doors of Opportunity are open. They will shut if the servants of Jesus Christ do not enter. **Many Stations** are calling.

IF Funds fail, faithful native workers must be dismissed, an Evangelist here, or a Bible woman there.

Come over and help us.



LONDON, S.W.1

**Thanksgiving
Extension Fund,
Bible Lands Mis-
sions' Aid Society.**

HARRY FEAR, J.P.,
Treasurer,

Rev. S. W. GENTLE-CACKETT,
Secretary.

PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCILS, FORMS, ETC.

THE PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCILS (POWERS) MEASURE,
with complete Text, Introduction and Notes. By ALBERT MITCHELL.
Fourth Edition. 1s.

THE ENABLING ACT with complete Text and the Constitution of
the National Assembly of the Church of England and the Repre-
sentation of the Laity Measure, 1929, with Notes, Introduction, and
other Addenda including Diocesan Conferences Regulation. By
ALBERT MITCHELL. New Edition. 1s.

PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCILS. By ALBERT MITCHELL. A
leaflet for distribution amongst P.C.C. members. 3s. per 100.

PAROCHIAL ELECTORS' ROLL BOOK, containing 100 sheets
and with alphabetical index cut through. 3s. 6d.

N.C.L. No. 1A. **APPLICATION FOR ENROLMENT ON ELEC-
TORAL ROLL.** 1s. per 100.

„ 1B. **DITTO.** Printed on card for Card Index System.
1s. 6d. per 100.

„ 2. **NOTICE OF ENROLMENT OF A NON-RESI-
DENT.** 10d. per 100.

„ 3. **NOTICE TO CANCEL ENTRY IN ANOTHER
PARISH.** 10d. per 100.

„ 4. **NOTICE OF REMOVAL.** 10d. per 100.

„ 5. **NOTICE OF REVISION OF ELECTORAL ROLL.**
1d. each; 9d. per dozen.

„ 6. **NOTICE OF ANNUAL P.C. MEETING.** 1d.
each; 9d. per dozen.

„ 7. **NOTICE OF JOINT MEETING FOR ELECTING
CHURCHWARDENS.** 1d. each; 9d. per dozen.

„ 8. **NOTICE OF P.C.C. MEETING (for Church Door).**
3d. per dozen.

„ 9. **NOTICE OF P.C.C. MEETING WITH AGENDA.**
1s. 6d. per 100.

„ 10B. **FORM OF PAROCHIAL VOTING PAPER,** with
space for forty names. 2s. 6d. per 100.

„ 11. **ELECTORAL ROLL SHEETS.** 2s. per 100.

„ 12. **NOMINATION FORMS TO DIOCESAN CON-
FERENCE.** 6d. per dozen.

„ 13. **NOMINATION FORMS TO HOUSE OF LAITY.**
6d. per dozen.

„ 14. **NOMINATION FORMS TO P.C.C.** 1s. per 100.

Sample packet of above leaflets and forms, 3d. post free.

THE CHURCH BOOK ROOM,

7 Wine Office Court, London, E.C.4.

THE CHURCH HYMNAL FOR THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

APPROVED BY A REPRESENTATIVE COMMITTEE OF CLERGY.

MUSICAL EDITORS:

HUGH BLAIR, M.A., MUS. DOC. CANTAB.

LISTER R. PEACE, M.A., A.R.C.O.

MUSIC EDITIONS.

Net Prices.

Enlarged, No. 1. Complete Indexes. Cloth	7s. 6d.
Enlarged, No. 2. For Choir Use. Cloth	6s. 0d.

WORDS EDITIONS.

Medium Type, with musical expression marks. For Choir Boys and General Use. Cloth	2s. 6d.
Large Type. Cloth	2s. 6d.
Small Type. Cloth	1s. 6d.

CHILDREN'S SUPPLEMENT, SEPARATELY.

Music Edition, Cloth, 2s. 3d. Words only, Limp Cloth, 6d. Paper Covers, 3d.

PUBLISHERS:

NOVELLO & COMPANY, LTD.

MARSHALL, MORGAN & SCOTT, LTD.

Special grants are made to Churches for the purpose of introducing this book for general use. Application should be made to the Secretary, NATIONAL CHURCH LEAGUE, 7 Wine Office Court, London, E.C.4.

" WORDS OF COMFORT "

By MATHETES

Oxford Blue Cloth, 2/6 in box,
2/9 post free.

An Ideal Gift Book.

"Invaluable to clergy and teachers . . . ought to be read by all who are weary and heavy laden."—*Dean Inge*.

"An admirable little book."—*The Guardian*.

"Full of gentle strengthening, and comforting wisdom."—*Rochester Diocesan Chronicle*.

"Can be read by every anxious, troubled, perplexed soul with great profit."—*British Weekly*.

"Full of mature wisdom and helpful suggestions."—*Baptist Times*.

"A straightforward deal on questions that are affecting the daily lives of tens of thousands of people."—*Warrington Guardian*.

Of all Booksellers, or from
The Publisher,

"THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
NEWSPAPER,"

17 TAVISTOCK ST., LONDON, W.C.2

A Popular Re-issue at 1/-

THE FAITH OF AN ENGLISH CHURCHMAN

By

ALBERT MITCHELL

Paper cover, 1/- Cloth, 2/6.

"We recommend this book to our readers. It contains the essential Evangelical truths which the present age sadly needs."—*The Record*.

THE CHURCH BOOK ROOM,
7 WINE OFFICE COURT, LONDON, E.C.4.

A Pagan Civilization

could easily result in any country where spiritual life is not maintained. That danger exists in Canada. In the southern prairies drought for the sixth year destroyed all promise of crops.

Canada has been too hardly hit to support, adequately, the work of the Church and sorely needs the help of us, with our far greater privileges, in the Homeland.

Come to the aid of the highest welfare of our own people overseas by sending a gift to the Secretary

THE
COLONIAL
AND
CONTINENTAL
 CHURCH SOCIETY
 9 SERJEANTS' INN, FLEET ST, LONDON, E.C.4

Two Books on the Prayer Book

THE STORY OF THE ENGLISH PRAYER BOOK : Its Origin and Developments. With special chapters on the Scottish, Irish, American and Canadian Prayer books. By Canon DYSON HAGUE, D.D. Second Edition, Revised and Indexed, 1930. 3s. 6d. (Post 4d.)

"It is much more interesting than most of the works on the Prayer Book, as it dwells more upon the motives and objects of the compilers than upon the material and contents of the Service Books that preceded the Prayer Book. It is written with pellucid clearness, and gives points for discussion which are a great help to an intelligent appreciation of the Prayer Book."—*Norwich Diocesan Gazette.*

THROUGH THE PRAYER BOOK. By Canon DYSON HAGUE, D.D. 3s. 6d. (Post 5d.)

"An exposition of its teaching and language, the origins and contents of its services. . . . This detailed and enthusiastic exposition of the Book of Common Prayer should do much to stimulate a more intelligent appreciation of the letter and spirit of its services."—*Parents' Review.*

THE CHURCH BOOK ROOM

7, Wine Office Court, E.C.4.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
NOTES AND COMMENTS	I
"The Churchman." "An Interim Rite." Reservation of the Sacrament. A Truce of God. Our Contributors.	
UNION WITH ROME IMPOSSIBLE. By the Rev. F. R. Mont- gomery Hitchcock, D.D.	5
CRANMER'S CONVERSION. By W. Prescott Upton	17
SOME RECENT CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT By the Rev. H. P. V. Nunn, M.A.	29
RELIGION IN EUROPE (1215-1540). By the Rev. R. Mercer Wilson, M.A.	41
CHRISTIAN LITERATURE IN SPAIN AND LATIN AMERICA. By Juan Orts Gonzalez	51
WOMEN AND THE MINISTRY. By the Rev. E. Hirst, M.A... .. .	57
REVIEWS OF BOOKS	62
Vale. The Church's Real Work. Recent Developments in German Protestantism. The Church Controversy in Germany. The Bible is True. The Holiness of Jesus. John, Peter, and the Fourth Gospel. Spiritual Liberty. Christianity as History and Faith. Not as the Scribes. A Christian Manifesto. The Basis of Christian Faith. Challenge to Death. Conscious and Unconscious Sin. Psychology and Sacraments. John Wesley and the Church of England. Sunrise on the Nilgiris.	
NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS	77

All articles appearing in THE CHURCHMAN are the copyright of the Proprietors and must not be reprinted without permission.

The debt of the Churches to the Moravian Missions

All denominations of the Protestant Church owe much to the example of the Moravian Missionaries who

for over two hundred years

have gladly chosen the most difficult fields of labour in earth's darkest places. The work is much hampered by its inadequate income. Please help soon and generously by sending your contribution to

CHARLES HOBDAY, Esq.,
Chairman and Hon. Sec.,
70a Basinghall Street,
London, E.C.2.

President:
SIR GEORGE H. HUME,
J.P., M.P., L.C.C.

London Association in aid of
MORAVIAN MISSIONS

THE LUTTERWORTH LIBRARY

"BOOKS WITH A RARE ATMOSPHERE."

RELIGION AND THE EUROPEAN MIND

6s. net

By **ADOLF KELLER, D.D., LL.D.**

The only book in English setting forth the spiritual problem which underlies the German Church Revolution, and its universal significance.

"No one is better equipped than Dr. Keller for interpreting the religious struggles in Europe. . . . The book is most valuable; indeed, indispensable to all who wish to grasp the meaning of the intense struggle . . . a matter affecting the whole Christian world."
—*The British Weekly*.

THE MEDIATOR

20s. net

A study of the central doctrine of the Christian Faith

By **EMIL BRUNNER**. Translated by Olive Wyon

With introductory notes by Canon J. K. Mosley and Prof. H. R. MacIntosh.

This masterly book has been eagerly awaited by many English readers.

A veritable mine of information for preachers and teachers as they seek to deal with that which constitutes the very heart of the Gospel.

"A really great book. . . . A treatment of the Atonement and of the person of the Mediator which has life and meaning. This book is vital for the revival of religion in our day. . . ."—*The Manchester Guardian*.

"One of the ablest expositions of the Scripture doctrine of the Person and the work of our Lord which this country has seen."—*The Church Times*.

KARL BARTH AND CHRISTIAN UNITY

10s. 6d. net

By **ADOLF KELLER, D.D., LL.D.**

Translated by Petermann and Manrodt, and revised by A. J. Macdonald.

This book serves excellently as an introduction to the theology of Karl Barth and the Barthian School.

"Professor Keller knows more, perhaps, about the state of Christianity throughout the world than any other authority."—*The Times*.

THE ORIGINAL JESUS

12s. 6d. net

By **OTTO BORCHERT, D.D.** Translated by L. M. Stalker.

A book with a rare atmosphere and a mine of information for preachers.

"This age is rich in lives of Christ, but this is different and greater than them all."—*The Guardian*.

THE LUTTERWORTH PRESS
4, Bouverie Street, London, E.C.4

L.P.

THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1935.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

"The Churchman."

WE take the opportunity of the beginning of another year to thank our readers for the generous support which they have accorded to us in the past. We may remind them of the important place that THE CHURCHMAN holds as representing the spiritual outlook of the Evangelical School in the Church. For many years THE CHURCHMAN has represented Evangelical opinion, and has maintained its place among the quarterly Reviews as the representative of the principles of the Reformation for which the Evangelical School stands. At the present time a determined effort is being made to undermine those principles, and in various subtle ways the character of the Church of England is being steadily changed. We have authority for the statement that the future of the Anglican Communion is to be altered so that our Church may be made to represent a species of Catholicism not altogether Roman, but so transformed that it cannot be regarded as Protestant. It is important, therefore, that every means should be used to maintain the truths that are embodied in the formularies of the Church of England. We desire to continue our work in the interests of loyalty to the spirit of the English Reformation. Our continued success must depend upon the support of Evangelical Churchmen and of all those who are interested in the maintenance of Protestantism as the best and truest exposition of the religion of the New Testament. We therefore appeal to our readers to give us their help in our efforts to further the cause of Evangelical truth, and to secure for us the support of others. An increase in the number of subscribers will enable us to increase the usefulness of our Evangelical Quarterly.

"An Interim Rite."

It was suggested at the time of the revision of the Prayer Book in 1927 and 1928 that the form of Communion Service provided in the Revised Book would meet all the requirements of the Anglo-Catholics. It has since transpired that the revised form of the Communion Service has proved unsatisfactory not only to the

experts in liturgiology, but also to the Anglo-Catholics. The introduction of the Invocation into the revised form has proved objectionable to the Anglo-Catholics, mainly, we presume, because it is not found in the Roman Mass. The Anglo-Catholics are now expressing their fear lest the 1928 Prayer Book Service should become the normal English version. They have expressed their determination to secure a service which will be in their view thoroughly Catholic. Various hints are given as to the method by which this is to be secured. The most significant fact is that a form has been drawn up, and it is said that an endeavour is being made to introduce it into parishes throughout the country. The Bishop of Chichester had occasion recently to call attention to the introduction of a service described as an "Interim Rite" into churches in his diocese. It consisted of a complete rearrangement of the order and sequence of the Communion Service of 1662. The Bishop reminded the clergy of his diocese that the revision of the Church's Liturgy belongs to the Synods of the Church, and that it is a breach of Catholic order for private persons to take it in hand. He further reminded them that the promise to "use the form in the said book prescribed" is a promise not merely to use the prayers contained in the book, but to use them in that order and sequence which is prescribed in the book. It has been suggested that the aim of the clergy in introducing these illegal forms of Service is to secure their adoption in a large number of churches, and then to face the Bishops with a situation that it will be impossible for them to alter. This is quite consistent with the methods adopted in the past to introduce into the Church the illegalities which at present abound.

Reservation of the Sacrament.

Another indication of the growing tendency to introduce the methods of the Roman Catholic Church is seen in the determination to introduce the Reserved Sacrament wherever possible. One of the most strenuously opposed innovations in the Revised Prayer Book of 1928 was the permission to reserve the Elements for the purpose of communicating the sick. Every endeavour was made to secure that the Elements so reserved should not be used for any other purpose whatever, except the communion of the sick. The consecrated Bread and Wine set apart were to be reserved in an aumbry or safe. This was to be set in the north or south wall of the Sanctuary of the church, or in some other part, provided it was not immediately behind or above the Holy Table. The safe was only to be opened when it was necessary to move or replace the consecrated Elements for the purposes of Communion or renewal. There was to be no service or ceremony in connection with the Sacrament so reserved, nor was it to be exposed or removed except in order to be received in Communion or otherwise reverently consumed. The futility of these regulations as a safeguard against abuse was urged at the time. Those who are determined to use the Elements for purposes of adoration will not be deterred by any restrictions however strongly laid down. Some recent cases have shown that this

surmise is correct. Permission was recently given for Reservation in a church in the diocese of Canterbury, and the Rector immediately instructed his people that when the Blessed Sacrament is reserved they were always to bow the knee when they entered or left the church. A white light was to be burnt before the Reserved Sacrament, day and night. To mark the introduction, a service described as Pontifical High Mass was held, and a retired overseas Bishop, who pontificated, preached a sermon on the Real Presence and the great help Reservation was to a Church and congregation. The Reserved Sacrament has also recently been introduced into Winchester Cathedral, and this has caused widespread distress throughout the diocese. It is obvious that Reservation cannot be allowed without a definite breach of English Church teaching and practice.

A Truce of God.

While these conditions prevail and a constant advance is being made in the Romanising of our Church, an appeal for a "Truce of God" has been issued. A Committee on Evangelistic work set up by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York has stated that party strife is the most formidable obstacle to the revival of Religion throughout the country. They ask that the whole Church as a united body, irrespective of party, will meet the crisis of the present time with a solemn and sustained challenge to the people of England in the name of Jesus Christ. They are convinced that "the things on which we agree overwhelm in their importance the things on which we differ, and that we must concentrate on the first and for the time being deliberately set the second on one side in order that we may advance together to take our share in the Conversion of England." Evangelical Churchpeople are more than willing to take their part in any endeavour that is made for the Conversion of England, but many of them find it difficult to take united action with those whose conception of the Conversion of England in no way resembles their own. The Roman Catholics say they desire the Conversion of England, and they are working hard to secure it. Evangelical Churchmen have no desire that England should submit to the Pope, or that the Roman Catholic conception of Christianity should be adopted in this country. They are anxious that our country should be won to the spiritual service of Christ in the freedom that was secured for the people of this country at the time of the Reformation. The ultimate aim of the Anglo-Catholics is to inflict upon the country a religious system resembling that of the Church of Rome, and it is difficult for those who value the freedom of the Gospel to unite with those whose aims are so completely diverse from their own.

Our Contributors.

In this issue of THE CHURCHMAN we are able to give our readers a number of articles dealing with some current problems of special interest and also some dealing with events in the history of the past that have a special bearing on questions of to-day. Dr. Montgomery

Hitchcock discusses some of the recent *rapprochements* between some members of our own Church and the Church of Rome, and shows "Union with Rome Impossible" while that Church remains unchanged. Mr. W. Prescott Upton has made a special study of the Reformation Age and shows the changes made in Sacramental doctrine in an article on "Cranmer's Conversion." In "Some Recent Criticism of the New Testament," the Rev. H. P. V. Nunn deals with the views put forward by Loisy in France and supported by Dr. Jacks in this country. The Rev. R. Mercer Wilson gives an account of various developments of "Religion in Europe (1215-1540)." Those who had the opportunity of hearing Dr. Juan Orts Gonzalez, the learned Spanish writer, during his recent visit to England, will read with special interest his account of "Christian Literature in Spain and Latin America." The Rev. E. Hirst discusses the position of women in the Early Church in an article on "Women and the Ministry."

Prebendary Wilson Cash has written an account of the Swanwick Conference held last September to consider the present situation of the Church Missionary Society's work. The title of his book is *The Responsibility of Success* (C.M.S., 1s. net), which indicates the leading thought running throughout his book. The work of the Society has been so successful during recent years that many of the Missions have reached a stage where the retrenchments necessitated by financial stress are in danger of producing disastrous results. A vivid picture is given of the needs in many of the fields and the urgency of the appeal for increased support is shown. The book ought to be widely read and passed on to those whose interest in the work of the Church Overseas is not as strong as it should be.

The Addresses given at the last Cromer Convention have been issued under the title, *Newness of Life* (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d. net). The opening address by the Archdeacon of Warwick was on the text "Behold, I make all things new." The three morning addresses were "God as Transcendent," by Dean Matthews, "God as Imminent," by Dr. Anderson Scott, and "God as Creator," by the Rev. Theodore Lunt. The evening addresses were "Man's Need of New Life," by the Rev. Havelock Davidson, "How to Find the New Life," by the Rev. J. P. Gibson, "Living the New Life" and "Expressing the New Life in 1934," both by Canon G. C. Lunt. The Bible Readings were given by Archdeacon Storr, and their subject was Newness of Life in the Old Testament, in Christ's Teaching, and in The Early Church. As an alternative to the morning Session a devotional course on Prayer was given by the Rev. R. R. Williams. These, however, are not printed in the volume. Those who were present at the Convention will be glad to have this Report of the addresses, and others will find them a challenging and suggestive treatment of the essential features of the Christian Life.

UNION WITH ROME IMPOSSIBLE.

BY THE REV. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

IN a letter dated May 28, 1932, published in the *Irish Times*, Cardinal MacRory, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, revived the burning question of the Union of the Church in reply to a sermon by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Gregg. The words of the Cardinal are to be noted by all who are interested in the idea of the Unity of the Church. He lays down emphatically the often-repeated Roman principle that those Churches which are not in communion with the Roman Church are no part of Christ's Church. His words regarding the Eastern Orthodox Church and the Protestant bodies of Western Christianity are as follows: "I refused to regard them as any part of Christ's Church: I regarded them and regard them as the Church at all times—and never more than in the first ten centuries—regarded heretical and schismatical bodies, as severed branches no longer nourished by the vital sap." He quotes with approval a letter from a co-religionist who asks: "Can any Anglican explain to us to-day how their position differs essentially from that of the Arians, Nestorians and others, let us say, of the year 500?" and who defends the Roman method of preserving unity by expelling those who differed from it. And he proceeds: "If then in proving in my Pastoral the Church's Unity, I took no notice of the Eastern Orthodox Church or the countless Protestant religious bodies, the reason is because they are outside Christ's Church. . . . Their existence, however sad and deplorable, in no way destroys or impairs the Church's Unity." This is the logical consequence of their initial fallacy that they and no other Church constitute the Christian Church, outside of which there is no salvation. I trust that those Anglicans who are hoping for reunion with Rome will realise the actual position of affairs, and discontinue those efforts which are thus regarded with pity and contempt by those with whom they desire to be reunited. The papally discredited Conversations at Malines are unpleasantly recalled to our minds.

Ten years ago, February 6, 1924, the late Archbishop Davidson described how "it came about almost fortuitously that a gathering was arranged in which a few leading Roman Catholic Churchmen should meet a few Anglicans for conversation about the differences which separate our churches." To stamp out "an endeavour to discuss, thus privately, our differences would, I say it unhesitatingly, have seemed to be a sin against God."¹ In view of the fact that "chance" has been eliminated from the New Testament, doubtless because "Fortune" was worshipped by many pagans, it must strike us as odd that the spurning of a *fortuitous* offer should seem a sin against God to any Christian, although Horace advises "nec fortuitum spernere caespitem" (*Od.* ii. xv). However, it was

¹ *The Conversations at Malines*, 1921-5, Oxford Press, p. 54.

probably deemed a clever stroke of diplomacy to take advantage of the gratitude of the Belgian Cardinal to the British troops to have this question of the Roman conditions of recognising Anglicans as members of the Church of Christ discussed. The result of this private and unauthorised Conference was not, however, one to fill the hearts of the Anglican members of the Conference with elation. The Archbishop said: "the point at issue, or at least one of the great and far-reaching matters, which I was anxious should be adequately handled, was the question of papal authority as a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church" (p. 56). This was startling to many of us, who understood that the Vatican Council of 1870 had settled that matter once and for all. A study of the decrees of that Council would have made clear to him the eternal position of the Roman Church. Dr. Jackson, writing in 1626, repudiated its claims to *supremacy* and *infallibility*. The Vatican Council simply reiterated what it has been saying for centuries.

Here is what it said in 1870 regarding the authority of the Pope: "If any one say that the Roman pontiff has not the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church, not only in matters of faith and morals, but also as regards discipline and the government of the Church throughout the world, or that he has only the principal portion and not the plenitude of that supreme power, or that his power is not ordinary and immediate, as much over each and every Church, as over each and every pastor and believer—let him be *anathema*." The Pope claims authority not only over Canterbury, but over the English clergy and laity. And I fail to see how this is not clear to every one who has read this decree.

Dr. Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church* would also have made very clear to him what is the permanent attitude of the Church of England to such claims based upon the so-called Petrine texts, which have been understood in a different way from the Roman by the greatest theologians, and buttressed upon the confessedly false decretals. When the Vatican Council—1870—published the constitution, *Pastor Aeternus*, declaring that the Pope has infallibility in matters of doctrine and supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church, it meant that Ultramontanism, or the Roman theocracy, was sounding forth its triumph over the Universal episcopate. For many years there had been a conflict in France and Germany between the Roman Curia and the national episcopates. Gallicanism in France was a protest against the autocracy of the Pope. It began in the thirteenth century, when the popes claimed that they had a right to interfere in the secular affairs of a nation and to depose sovereigns. The Gallican theory was enunciated by Richer (1559-1631) during the Reformation. Bossuet (1682), in the declaration of the French clergy, maintained that the temporal sovereignty of Kings is independent of the Pope, that General Councils are above the Pope, and that the infallible teaching and authority of the Church belongs to the Pope and bishops conjointly, and that the papal decrees require the consent of the Church.

This placed infallibility in the Church diffusive or at large. Febronianism (called after a writer who wrote under that name on the state of the Church and the legitimate power of the Pope) was the name of the corresponding movement within the Roman Catholic Church in Germany, and is still strong in the Universities. It was directed against the monarchical power claimed by the Pope over the episcopate. The theory was that the Church is based upon the collective episcopate, the Pope being only "primus inter pares," and subject to General Councils, and without the power to summon them.

They did not regard the Pope as much their enemy as the Curia, which they held should be fought by thorough popular education—"the first remedy against the abuse of ecclesiastical power," and by national and provincial synods. The *principatus* of the Pope was not one of jurisdiction but "of order and consociation" (*ordinis et consociationis*), they declared.

Both these movements, Gallicanism and Febronianism,¹ were the outcome of a strong national feeling for independence. It has always been the policy of the Roman Curia to crush such national feeling. They were also the last rallying efforts of the Roman Catholic episcopate against the papacy, before it lay crushed completely by the Vatican Council of 1870. Proceeding on the principle of Cyprian that the unity of the Church is in the collective episcopate, they had withstood the growing intolerance and assumptions of the papacy—by which they were eventually overshadowed. So Ultramontanism triumphed. Its principle was enunciated by Von Dollinger, who opposed it (1865): "the pope is the supreme, the infallible, and consequently the sole authority in all that concerns religion, the Church, and morality, and each of his utterances on these topics demands unconditional submission, internal no less than external" (*Encycl. Brit.*, "Ultramontanism," vol 27, 577). Thus the Roman Curia triumphed over the Roman episcopate, and the Roman bishops are no longer independent officers, but merely papal delegates.

The Anglicans who took part in these peculiar conversations at Malines and who signed the report, in both languages, the Bishop of Truro, Dr. Frere, Bishop Gore, Dean Armitage Robinson, Dr. B. J. Kidd and Lord Halifax, can only be described as the Archbishop's emissaries. They were by no means representative of the Church of England and had received no authority from that Church to act in its name. When the Anglicans² insisted (*les Anglicans soulignèrent*, p. 35) that the papacy had not merely a "Primacy of Honour," but also a "Primacy of Responsibility," it was a surrender to Ultramontanism, a confession that the Pope was one like St. Paul "who had the care of all the churches" (2 Cor. xi. 28)—a care St. Peter never had. They retreated from the Cyprianic

¹ See articles "Febronianism" and "Gallicanism" (*Encycl. Brit.*).

² The English report suppresses the word "Anglicans." It has only the words "It was insisted." See the French report, also signed by the Anglicans.

position that the unity of the Church is centred in the collective episcopate by acknowledging that it lies in the Roman pontiff. Was not this a betrayal of the Anglican Church, which has contended for its freedom and independence since the days of Magna Charta (1215), when it was laid down that "the Anglican Church shall be free and have its rights and liberties unimpaired"—a charter that was declared null and void by a bull of Innocent III, published two months afterwards? It was nothing less than an attempt to undo the work of the Reformation and to set back the clock. So every fair-minded member of the Church of England must regard it. The Lambeth Appeal cannot be legally or logically cited for these conversations. It gave no authority for action, it merely expressed a hope. "We cherish the earnest hope that all these communions (in east and west and non-episcopal) may be led by the Spirit into the Unity of the Faith."

It is a good thing to define one's terms in controversy. What is "the unity of the Faith" for the Roman Catholic? It is the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. See Cardinal Mercier's letter, p. 63—"The return of England to the Unity." (I would point out, *en passant*, the frequent inaccuracy of the English rendering.) *L'unité*¹ here is *the* unity, not unity. This inaccuracy conceals the Roman claim. "The return of England to *the* Unity would be such a beautiful and such an edifying spectacle that one could not procure soon enough for the religious souls the comfort they expect from it." This means the return of England to Rome. See the Bull of Pope Pius V excommunicating Elizabeth and her supporters, declaring that they are cut off from the unity of the Body of Christ, "*a Christi corporis unitate praecisos*" (1570). See the apostolic letter of Pope Leo XIII, 1895: "We have not ceased to pray and still humbly pray for the return of Christian nations now divided from us to the unity of former days" (p. 11). He tells of a holy league for the conversion of England—"a society of pious people to pray for the return of the English nation to the Church" (p. 5). He is gratified to see "how the number of those religious and discreet men who sincerely labour for reunion with the Catholic Church is increasing." He urges English Catholics to use a prayer for the conversion of their brethren, for England is "the Dowry of Mary" (p. 16). They are to use this prayer—"O sorrowful Mother! intercede for our separated brethren, that with us in the one true fold they may be united to the Supreme Shepherd, the Vicar of thy Son," presumably that he may say to them on their return to his fold: "Ye were as sheep going astray, but are now returned to the shepherd and bishop of your souls" (1 Peter ii. 25). For him—the Pope—salvation in the Unity of the Faith, means salvation in the Roman Church. He reminds us that in pre-Reformation days "the English race was wholly devoted to this centre of Christian unity divinely constituted in the Roman bishops"—an advance beyond Cyprian's principle that "the tangible

¹ Le retour de l'Angleterre a l'unité (The English translation has "The return of England to unity").

bond of the Church's unity is her one united episcopate, an apostleship universal yet only one, the authority of every bishop perfect in itself and independent, held individually and in their corporate capacity by all." ¹

The Roman Catholics thus regard the Pope as the centre of Christian Unity. To return to his fold is to return to the unity of the faith. In the Roman Catholic Summary of the points of doctrine agreed upon by the Anglicans and themselves, we have this very point conceded by the former, "that the pope should be in fact a centre of unity and a head exercising authority over all" (p. 89). They end by expressing gratification "that Anglicans have learned to appreciate that unity—from which they have suffered a long and sorrowful separation." Is this cynical and ironical description true of the four centuries of education, religious happiness and freedom from superstition and advance since we threw off the yoke of Rome?

Where is this thing going to stop? "The Anglicans," the report says in conclusion (p. 95), "are ready to make sacrifices for the cause of union." There are no doubt a number of advanced men who would sacrifice much (of what is not theirs to sacrifice) to be in union with Rome, and to have a Roman acknowledgment of the validity of their orders. But they may rest assured of one thing, that Rome will never recognise the validity of Anglican orders. She would stultify herself more than she would venture to do. History is not her strong point, but she remembers that she excommunicated Elizabeth and her adherents, and has declared English orders to be heretical and schismatical. In Rome there is the Holy Office, "a sacred congregation of the Roman and Universal Inquisition," still watching keenly the affairs of us "heretics," as we are called. It was established in 1542 by Paul III. Though it dare not employ the methods of the sixteenth century, it is able to embitter the lives of "non-Romans." ² It insists on rebaptising converts who have already been baptised. As baptism by heretics is invalid through defect of form or matter or even of intention (!), the rite must be administered. ³ In cases of mixed marriages the papal decree of 1908, *Ne Temere*, has aggravated the feud between the churches by requiring that the rite shall be performed by a Roman priest and that the children shall be brought up Roman Catholics. This decree has operated harshly, in Ireland especially, and has been at work in England as well. Our Bishops have had to protest against it. ⁴ The Roman Curia also claims the right to annul marriage, as in the notorious Marlborough case, on the most petty pleas, to oblige the rich. The

¹ *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, C. 5 (Benson's *Cyprian*, p. 182).

² The Roman Church calls them "non-Catholics." Her own claim to catholicity owing to her adoption of uncatholic doctrines is ridiculous.

³ I have known a case where they insisted on the Protestant husband who had been baptised in the Church of Ireland submitting to rebaptism. This is nothing but the heresy of Anabaptism.

⁴ The Bishop of Chelmsford, for example, at the recent Diocesan Conference (1934).

Roman Catholic religion favours the rich, who can pay for masses for the souls in purgatory, where the poor, who have no friends to pay for masses, must perforce remain. The doctrine of "intention" is not only dangerous but suicidal. There is no consecration where the priest does not intend to consecrate, no marriage where the priest or one of the contracting parties does not intend that there should be a marriage. The final appeal is "subjective." The differences between the Anglican Church and the Roman are not therefore only doctrinal, they are also moral. To return to the Unity—that is to the Pope—would involve greater sacrifices than the English people will permit. This retrograde step might be taken in a docile age, but the present age is impatient of such subjects of discussion as the apostolic continuity of Rome, knowing that the chain of descent is only as strong as the weakest link, and aware that there are many rotten links in that chain. There is only need to glance through the pages of Platina's *Lives of the Popes*, a work dedicated to a Pope, Sixtus IV, and approved by the Roman cardinals, to realise the terrible character of some of these "vicars of Christ," whose deeds are unprintable, but which must be remembered when their successors speak with arrogant claim to be "the mouthpieces of God." Among them we find evil creatures like Alexander VI, John XII, John XXII, to mention a few out of many, worldly infidels like Leo X, and anti-popes not a few. The popes themselves who took measures—we dare not describe them—to annul the acts and rescind the ordinations of their predecessors, proved themselves to be unworthy to be linked in any line of respectable, much less apostolical, descent. Others who were condemned as heretics by General Councils are proof that the Roman Church is not the depository of sound doctrine. Rome is unchanging and unrepentant. Leo XIII, a pious bishop, thus refers to the papal attempts to crush the Reformation. "Our predecessors made every prudent effort to put an end to it." Among these prudent efforts may be numbered the burning of hundreds of English men and women, an archbishop and bishops among them, the fomenting of rebellion in Ireland and England, the inciting of foolish persons to murder their Queen. "Whosoever sends her out of the world will not sin, but will acquire merit."¹ So runs a letter of 1580 from the Cardinal of Como, conveying the Pope's decision to the nuncio Sega. It was the same Pope, Gregory XIII, who struck the medal "Strages Ugonottorum" and ordered a "*Te Deum*" to be sung to commemorate the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. The unrepentant Roman Church will never acknowledge that such methods and actions were follies, much less sins.

Why mention such deeds of horror and infamy? To remind our people and the Church of England of the history and character of the papacy, which some Anglicans, e.g. those of the Malines Conversations, attempted to exalt into a super-prelatical authority responsible to God for the whole of Christendom, churches and individuals, completely ignoring its history, and what Roman writers

¹ Meyer's *England and the Catholic Church*, Eng. Trans., p. 491.

like Platina, Du Pin, Baronius, Guicciardini, and others have been compelled in the interests of truth to say about the popes.

It does not surprise those who have read this report that its publication was held back for several years by the Archbishop of Canterbury, lest it should imperil the passing of the Prayer Book Measure. It is the Pope's bull of condemnation that has saved us for the moment from the indignity of further Malines conversations. Dr. D'Arcy, the Primate of all Ireland, an outstanding figure of the British episcopate, said of these conversations: "I am confident that the people of England will recognise that the Anglican representatives at Malines were ready to give away those liberties which men of the British race prize more dearly than life itself." No document reveals more plainly the wide divergence of views between the Anglican bishops who approved of these Conversations and the great mass of the English people, who disapproved of them. Recent secessions among the Anglican clergy and others to Rome prove that the movement is steadily advancing, and that our people require to be educated in the particulars of this controversy lest they should be impressed by external attractions and extravagant claims and drawn away by specious arguments and pretensions from the spiritual faith of their forefathers.

The claims of the Roman Curia are immense and unbounded. Every state must be subordinate to the Pope, who claimed from the eighth century the power of granting kingdoms and deposing monarchs. Legislation that conflicted with his interests was invalid. For example, a pope annulled Magna Charta, and another condemned the ecclesiastical law of Prussia (1875), while the Spanish people, to secure their freedom, were recently compelled to throw off the papal yoke altogether. The State might be disobeyed, if it conflicted with the Roman Church, which is herself in conflict with religion, freedom, education, enlightenment and progress, and by setting up one super-mundane tribunal aimed at crushing out the spirit of every individual and the soul of every nation. In 1870 episcopacy made its last stand against papalism. Instead of the brotherly union of coequal authorities, the essence of episcopacy—we have the autocracy of one—in a system which is not episcopal but papal. This is an object lesson for the Church of England. The centralisation of this Church is proceeding apace. The present Bishop of Norwich¹ said "the Church of England ought to recognise the fact that it has been passing more and more under the immediate supervision of Lambeth." He refers to many matters which tend to transfer the larger responsibilities of the bishops to "one permanent centre." What is the meaning of the boast of the Anglicans at Malines of the 368 Bishops summoned to the Lambeth Conference "looking to Canterbury as their centre" (p. 20)? What is the idea? Is it to obtain the position of patriarch for him? A western patriarchate with the primate as patriarch on one side, and an eastern patriarchate on the other, supporting and buttressing up a great central Church, a super-Church, may

¹ THE CHURCHMAN, 1929, Jan., p. 31.

be an attractive idea to a certain class of mind, but what would St. Paul have thought of it? The validity of his orders was questioned: but that did not trouble him. What would St. Paul have thought of the claims of the successors of the apostle whom he withstood, because he was condemned? What would St. John, who denounced Diotrephes, "who loveth to have the pre-eminence"?

Again, what was the object of dangling before the eyes of the Anglicans the advantages the Uniat Churches enjoy in the Roman communion? (p. 24), and which the Anglicans would enjoy if they became a Uniat Church in the Roman fold?

- (a) The use of the vernacular and the English rite.
- (b) Communion in both kinds.
- (c) Permission for clergy to marry.

These were not even promised by the Roman Catholic representatives. They said that "precedents exist which partially are in agreement with the desires expressed by the Anglicans, but that such precedents come from the Uniat Churches of the East. There is no absolute bar to the granting of these desires, at any rate in part, but the Roman Catholics present¹ were not in a position to anticipate what judgment the Holy See would pass on the motives that prompt these requests."

I suppose we ought to be obliged to these emissaries of the Archbishop of Canterbury for asking permission for us to retain our wives, and the use of the vernacular and the English rite, but we want to know, why are we not to be allowed to retain our Bible? We are to be allowed, then, certain privileges conditionally, and as a vast concession from Rome, for owning her sway, returning to her fold, recognising her supreme dominion and infallibility—privileges that our ancestors wrested from the popes, after much suffering and persecution, but the Bible is to be taken away from us. Forsooth, the *Anglicana Ecclesia* and all Churches depending on her are to be reduced to the condition of the Uniat communities living in subjection to Rome.

Among the tracts published by the Alcuin Club, of which the late Dr. Gore was president, is one "*On the Uniats and their Rites*" (1924, Mowbray). The writer, Mr. Stephen Gaselee, asks: "Should we for the sake of unity feel any repugnance in forming a Uniat Church, keeping our own rites and canon law, in communion with the Pope?" (p. 14). He admits that he "should not hesitate for an instant." He asserts that, "granting certain premises, no question of principle would be involved," and dangles before us, as an incentive to accept, the possibility that "we and the Uniats might form common ground for a *rapprochement* of Rome and Constantinople" (p. 14). This means that, when we have bent our necks beneath the same spiritual despotism, which he admits the Uniats are feeling, we, with other vassals of Rome, will then be in a better position to induce the Orthodox Church to do likewise. The fable of the fox who had lost his tail occurs to our minds.

¹ Bell wrongly renders "Roman Catholic representatives." (They were not "representatives." The French is "*présents*.")

Less partisan accounts of the Uniats, and supported by authorities, are given in Margaret Dampier's *Orthodox Church in Austria* (London, 1905, p. 47), Kattenbusch's *Unierte Orientalen*, Herzog's *Real Encyclopädie*, 3rd ed., and various articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

Ever since the fall of the Greek empire, the popes have tried to get the oriental Churches to submit to their jurisdiction. In some places they succeeded in inducing Greek communities to submit to their claims, by granting them many privileges, and by allowing them to retain their own rites, liturgies, wives and beards. These are called Uniat Churches, being in absolute dependence on the Pope. The individuality of these dismembered Churches, thus taken away from their own Orthodox Church, was gradually effaced, while those who would not accept the Union, like many of the Roumanians, were harshly treated. In 1700, the Roumanian Church of Transylvania was united with Rome, the emperor offering to set those who accepted free of taxation. In that Act of Union the bishop, arch-priests, and clergy of the Roumanian Church in Transylvania bound themselves "to accept, acknowledge, and believe all that Rome accepts, acknowledges and believes." "We desire," they said, "to be reckoned members of the same Church." Is the *Anglicana Ecclesia* to be forced by Anglican bishops or their emissaries into making this submission to Rome, into becoming Roman Catholic? For to become a Uniat is the same as becoming Roman Catholic. The Transylvanian primate Athanasius, who effected this union in 1700, doubtless a polished gentleman, was a perjured traitor; but he was well rewarded by Rome. Many of the Roumanians who have been forced against their will into the Union were Protestants. It may doubtless give joy to some to look forward to the time when they will have a Roman Catholic theologian, a "causarum generalis auditor," attending the conferences and synods of the Anglican Uniat Church; and when a Uniat Archbishop of Canterbury will be forbidden to correspond with a non-Uniat Archbishop of Armagh, just as the Roumanian Archbishop is forbidden to correspond with the Greek or Serbian bishops (Dampier, p. 49).

Is all this beside the question? Should anyone think so, let him read the Encyclical letter of Pope Pius XI (1923), printed among Dr. Bell's *Documents on Christian Unity* (Oxford University Press, 1924, pp. 32-48), and which contains eleven pages of eulogy of St. Josaphat, who devoted himself to the work of making his countrymen submit to the supremacy and enter "the one fold" (p. 35). (The infallible Roman Catholic will persist in this erroneous translation. It seems that the Greek Testament is "tabu" with them. The words of our Lord are "one flock," not "one fold," John x. 16.) To St. Josaphat himself, who proselytised so successfully for Rome, the Pope makes a long prayer, and asks the assistance of his prayers for the furtherance of this union with the papal see. This document at any rate serves the purpose of showing what great honours—canonisation and the prayers of

popes—await those who labour to make their countrymen members of a Roman Uniate Church.

This encyclical is followed by that of the Patriarch of Constantinople complaining of these very proselytising efforts of the Roman Church among the members of the Greek Church. "No one ignores what is taking place even now, disturbing the internal peace of the Churches, and especially those in the East, on which new afflictions and trials are thus brought through their own co-religionists" (p. 45). When the Anglican Church has been made a Uniate Church, it may not feel much pressure at first; but it will in the course of time. It all depends upon the moving spirit of the *Curia*. And it is possible that a spirit may break out at any time with a distinctly hostile pressure, squeezing those who will not submit, even out of their native land.

In an article on the Uniat Churches in Chambers's *Encyclopædia* we read, "when circumstances permitted, more stringent rules were imposed." "The Union, as the pact is styled, is not uniform in aught else but the unremitting efforts of the Propaganda to efface the individuality of these dismembered churches."

For example, Pope Pius IX in 1862 established a special congregation at Rome (*de propaganda fide pro negotiis ritus orientalis*) for settling the affairs of the Greek Christians. He began to interfere in a Romanising manner with the rites of the Armenians and Chaldeans by his Bull "Reversurus," 1867, and his intolerance brought about a schism. Leo XIII in 1894 adopted milder methods, only requiring a full and perfect union in the faith, and going so far as to recognise three patriarchs of Antioch.

But Pius IX's methods may be revived at any time, as one pope does not feel bound by another pope's arrangements.

Therefore, instead of joining the number of these flabby Uniat Churches, whose soul is in the safe keeping of the Pope, now when it is suggested that the times are favourable for the Anglicans and that the Pope may write another letter permitting these conversations to be resumed in some other place, and under some other cover, we should make a common stand with other Christians who are struggling for their religious liberty with the common enemy of spiritual freedom, Bible Societies and Protestant Churches and organisations.

Those Anglicans who are working to bring us into the servile condition of the Uniate Churches can hardly, with sincerity, lay this flattering unction to their souls that they are "setting a great example of Christian humility and making a real sacrifice for the sake of unity" (Report, p. 16); when they are but following, no doubt unconsciously, the example of Athanasius—not the Saint, but the Transylvanian primate—who solemnly swore before the Patriarch of Jerusalem to maintain the ancient liberties of the Transylvanian Church (1698), and when securely in his See, proceeded to carry out unification with Rome at the Synod of Karlsburg (1700). They themselves know what sacrifices they are making and that such sophisms are easily exposed. Every one who

reads her books and decrees must see, unless he is blind, and hear unless he is deaf, and understand unless he is a fool, that the Roman Catholic Church holds as an article of faith that submission to the authority of the infallible Pope is essential to membership of the Christian Church. She stands there, holding out her arms and saying : " Come unto me all ye that are wandering in the wilderness of Protestantism ; my poor sheep that I had to drive out from the Unity of the Faith for the good of your souls. Return, and I will give you rest. Your brain, restless through freedom of private judgment, will be set free from that freedom. Your souls stained with the sin of apostasy will be purged and redeemed from the sinful, sorrowful past, and will have the assurance of that salvation which I alone can bestow."

That is the attitude of that bishop who claims to be the " universal bishop." When that claim of being " œcumenical bishop " was first made by John, Patriarch of Constantinople, 585, Gregory the Great said of him : " Whosoever calls himself a universal bishop is by his own choice the precursor of anti-Christ," and himself declined the title.

We can have no reunion with Rome until she has withdrawn her claims of supremacy and infallibility based on erroneous interpretation of Scripture and false decretals, and has reformed her methods. We acknowledge no earthly headship of universal Christendom. That, as Dr. Swete said, " would be equally subversive of peace and liberty, whether it had its seat at Constantinople, or Canterbury, or Moscow, or Rome. Such an endeavour can only end in a speedy failure or in the creation of a spiritual autocracy."

Our last reunion with Rome, in 1554, cost us over 300 martyrs—an Archbishop of Canterbury among them—and a great scholar to boot. We can only be reunited with her when she has changed her heart and methods and ceases to interfere in the affairs of the nations ; as she did in Ireland during the Great War, putting her ban upon conscription.

Finally, the question arises, " Will Rome last for ever ? " Will she eventually dominate the world, or will the advance of humanity, knowledge, freedom and Christianity in the various countries now unhappily under her sway, sweep her power away ? Will Rome, the persecuting Church that has attained her present power not by the charity and hospitality of the early centuries, but by the cruelty and craft of later times, be superseded by a Church that will be truly catholic, that will be characterised by faith, love and truth, a Church that will recognise but one Head—Christ, and will permit no bishop to usurp the title of His Vicar, but in which every one who loves the Lord Jesus in sincerity and truth, may find a home for his spirit and a rest for his soul ? 'Tis a consummation devoutly to be wish'd, for in such a Church there would be a bond of spiritual union stronger than death and unbreakable, because formed by love, which is " more precious than knowledge, more illustrious than prophecy, and more excellent than all other gifts " (Irenæus),

and such a Church would be both universal and spiritual, as Irenaeus sang again, "The Glorious Church is everywhere, because they who receive the Spirit are everywhere."¹

Out of this incident in the drama of Christian diplomacy the papacy emerges with increased dignity. Although not a friend of the Church of England, it acted the part of a friendly power in ordering the cessation of conversations which, on one side, savoured of disloyal intrigue.

OLD TREASURE. By the Earl of Lytton. *George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.* 3s. 6d. net.

This is an Anthology of passages from the Bible, including some from the Apocrypha. It is designed to be read consecutively, and it has a definite aim. The aim is to illustrate from the Bible the Love of God as revealed in Nature as well in direct communication with His chosen ones.

The compiler has—wisely and rightly for his purpose—allowed himself freedom in using the A.V., or the Prayer Book version (in the case of the Psalms), or even in some cases other versions of his choice. Many no doubt would dispute the assumption that some parts of the Bible contradict others and that therefore some parts are to be discarded. But no one can find fault with this selection of passages, all of which speak in living tones of love and power to human hearts. The books chiefly drawn upon are Job, Psalms, Isaiah and the Gospels. Apart from its intrinsic merits many will value this compilation on account of Lord Lytton's personality. It is interesting to have such a beautiful appraisal of Holy Scripture from so distinguished a statesman and administrator.

GRACE DARLING. By Constance Smedley. *R.T.S.* 1s. 6d. net.

This account of Grace Darling contains nearly 200 pages of very readable narrative. It was written for Elizabeth Ann Collett, granddaughter of the ex-Lord Mayor of London. It is a story worth telling and worth reading, and is a remarkably cheap production.

CIVILISATION AND THE UNEMPLOYED. By A. M. Cameron, M.A. *Student Christian Movement.* 3s. 6d. net.

It is easier to engage in practical work amongst the unemployed than to write in a satisfactory way about the problem of Unemployment. Miss Cameron has devoted much time and attention to it, and in this book she records her experiences and makes many suggestions. Social workers will find much to think about, much to be thankful for, and doubtless some statements and assumptions from which they will dissent.

¹ *Irenaeus of Lugdunum* (Cambridge University Press), by F. R. M. Hitchcock, pp. 246 f.

CRANMER'S CONVERSION.

BY W. PRESCOTT UPTON.

THE principal issue of the Reformation, practically considered, was whether the Eucharist was to continue as the Sacrifice of the Mass or be brought back to its Scriptural character as the "Lord's Supper." Doubtless the supreme *logical* issue was the Sufficiency of Scripture, and the supreme *theological* issue the doctrine of Justification; and yet, intensely practical as were both of these in a certain sense, they did not so immediately touch the daily religious life and its expression in outward observance.

The reform of the Eucharist, however, raised at once both of the other cardinal issues. If the Tradition and Authority of the existing Catholic Church could not be trusted to have preserved inviolate the Eucharist, which by its weekly celebration had been the common property of the whole Church from the Apostles' times, there was plainly no doctrine at all upon which the existing Church could claim to speak with commanding voice and intrinsic authority; all must depend upon what support existed elsewhere for the statements of the "Church." Then, why *should* the Eucharist be brought back to the limits of Scripture, except it be agreed that the entire Divine Revelation is wholly contained within the covers of the Canonical Books?

And if there is "No Gospel like this feast," where Christ the Lord—let us waive for the moment the vexed question of interpretation and concentrate upon the actual words of the Master—proffers what "is" His body broken, and His blood shed "for you and for many ("for" or) unto the remission of sins," there can be no evading of the question of Justification. May we, then and there, by simple reliance on these words of Christ—"the promise of God made unto us in *this* Sacrament"—take hold once again of covenanted peace with God and every other blessing which "the New Testament" purchased and sealed in the blood of His Son? May we thus "eat and drink" so efficaciously that, as its divinely ordained pledges become bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, a humble yet steadfast confidence of our acceptance with God for Christ's sake is wrought by the Holy Ghost into the very fibres of our spiritual being? Are we to listen to the "Lord's Supper" as it bears this message of peace to our weary hearts?

Or must we forsake the words of our only Saviour, and blindly accept the "other Gospel" of Rome, where "Justification" is an almost material "quality," which "priests" (reciting by rote the due formulæ and administering the prescribed "matter") can infuse into the souls of all those who have the merely negative disposition of not consciously "opposing any obstacle" to its reception? Is this the ideal of Justification? An indefinable something imparted indeed at Baptism, but lost on the commission of our first "mortal sin"; after which it can only be recovered by the priest's absolution

in the "Sacrament of Penance"; and must this priest-made "Justification" always be secured *before* the Eucharist dare be received?

The Council of Trent had no doubt as to the answer to these questions: "If anyone shall say that the principal fruit of the most holy Eucharist is the remission of sins . . . let him be anathema" (Sess. xiv. can. 4). "If anyone shall say that only faith is a sufficient preparation for receiving the Sacrament of the most holy Eucharist: let him be anathema. And, lest so great a Sacrament be received unworthily, and so unto death and damnation, the holy Synod doth ordain and declare, that for those whose conscience is burdened with mortal sin (no matter howsoever contrite they may deem themselves) Sacramental Confession must of necessity precede communicating, if a Confessor can be had" (canon 11).

The substitution of the Lord's Supper for the Mass was therefore not only in itself a direct reconstruction of the public observance of religion and of the every-day Church life of the people, it went far towards realising the wish of the Roman tyrant that all his enemies had but one neck which he might break at a blow. The reform of the Eucharist meant assertion of the Supremacy and Sufficiency of Scripture as against "Tradition" and "Church Authority." It meant Justification by Faith instead of Justification by the priest. It set up against a false "Sacramental Absolution" given in the Confessional, the true Sacramental Absolution openly and visibly sealed by the true Priest Himself, in the true Sacrament of the Supper, "to all them that with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto Him." It therefore cut the ground from under the delusion of Purgatory and propitiatory Masses. In the light of its comforting assurance to returning penitents of perfect acceptation before God in Christ, the notion of approach to the Throne of Grace through an endless concourse of mediating intercessors, fell as Dagon before the Ark of the Lord.

English people are naturally slow to realise what an immense change was made even amongst the Lutherans in relation to the Lord's Supper. We know that Luther retained a belief in a "real presence" (although strictly limited to the actual moment of the elements being eaten and drunk), that he left the old vestments and a good deal of the old ceremonial unchanged in the belief that it would gradually die away before the preaching of the Gospel, and that he continued to use the name of "Sacrament of the Altar" and even "Mass" for the service. The intense Protestantism of the English race, bred on an island where "Lutheranism" has been a mere name, has nothing of the forbearing understanding towards Lutheranism in spite of immense provocation prevalent amongst the "Reformed" on the Continent. Most English people admit that the Lutherans are Protestant after a fashion, but, by their doctrine of the Lord's Supper, are nearly half-way to Popery. It is therefore electrifying to us when we realise what Luther really held about the Popish Mass, and how by resting the souls of com-

municants on Finished Redemption and the Word of Promise, he went far towards neutralising his own errors.

To give no more than a single illustration, in his Smalcaldic Articles of 1537, after laying down as his first article on the Office and Work of Christ, our Redemption by His Death, he proceeded to assert, "That the Mass in the Papacy is the greatest and most horrible abomination, openly and as an enemy fighting diametrically against the first article; and yet it was above all the other Popish idolatries, the chiefest and most cunningly devised." After which he goes on to show how "this 'tail of the dragon' (I mean the Mass) hath brought forth manifold abominations and idolatries," specifying Purgatory, apparitions of dead persons, pilgrimages, monkish fraternities, the abuse of relics and indulgences (Von Hase, *Lib. Symb.*, pp. 304-10: Leipzig, 1846).

In England the controversy on the Lord's Supper may be said to have swallowed up all the others. The idea that we were concerned mainly with vindicating our insular independence of Rome is a myth. The breach with Rome was effected by Henry in 1534; but it was not until *fifteen years later*, two years after his death, that it was possible to secure reformation of the Church services. It was not Protestants, as Archbishop Bramhall pointed out, who made the breach with Rome; they found it ready to hand made for them many years before, by a Roman Catholic King and a Roman Catholic Parliament, that continued to use after their rejection of the Pope the old Latin services and to burn Protestants as "heretics." But with the Protestants so little did the Papal Claims enter into the matter that it would be as difficult to light upon a treatise by any of our Reformers which was devoted to the question of the Papacy, as it would be to find one of their works which does not emphatically and prominently attack the Mass.

Now it was Cranmer who shaped the English Reformation, and who wrote the great treatise which above all others moulded English thought concerning the Lord's Supper. Those who desire to sophisticate the story of the English Reformation will ever and anon claim this or that (usually obscure) writer as their own, but they have to give up Cranmer. No one can read his *True and Catholic Doctrine*, 1550, and his overwhelming reply to Gardiner in the following year, without seeing that by that time Cranmer was most definitely on the "Reformed" side, and that at least as early as 1550, he had abandoned any notion of a "real presence" in the sacramental elements. Now as the *First Prayer Book* was (like the Second, which is substantially the existing one) clearly the work of Cranmer more than anyone else, it becomes a matter of urgency to those who hold the "real presence" to make out that—though the year *after* the Prayer Book saw the light, Cranmer had gone over to the "Reformed"—he was still a believer in that doctrine when he was compiling the Book. The result has been that the date and circumstances of Cranmer's conversion have been involved in considerable confusion.

We must allow Cranmer himself to be the first to give evidence,

notwithstanding a prevalent tendency to correct him as to his own sentiments by the testimony of private letters from other people. In 1551, Cranmer in replying to the "Preface" of Dr. Richard Smith, formerly Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, says that Smith did not understand a catechism which Cranmer published in the summer of 1548 (*Orig. Lett.*, ii. 381).

"And therefore untruly reporteth of me that in that book I did set forth the real presence ¹ of Christ's body in the Sacrament. . . . But this I confess of myself, that *not long before* I wrote the said catechism, I *was* in that error of the real presence, as I was *many years past* in divers *other* errors, as of transubstantiation, of the sacrifice propitiatory of the priests in the mass," etc. (Cranmer, *Lord's Supper*, p. 374).

We see here that Cranmer distinctly asserts that he abandoned the doctrine of the "real presence" BEFORE, though "not long before" the summer of 1548, that is to say, *before* the First Prayer Book was drafted. That is a fatal difficulty for those who imagine that the First Prayer Book was intended to teach and maintain the "real presence."²

Let us notice also that Cranmer in 1551, having stated that "not long before" 1548 he had held the "real presence," proceeds to say that "*many years past*" he had been in that "other error" of transubstantiation. The steps of his spiritual pilgrimage were therefore (1) the common Romish belief in transubstantiation and the real presence; (2) abandonment, "many years" before 1551, of transubstantiation, but retention still of the real presence; and (3) abandonment of the real presence "not long before" 1548.

Another of his statements enables us to ascertain further circumstances. It occurs in his "Examination" on September 12, 1555, at Oxford, before Brokes, Bishop of Gloucester, acting as sub-delegate for Cardinal de Puteo, the Pope's Judge and Commissary, where we find this dialogue:

"*Martin*.—For you, master Cranmer, have taught in this high Sacrament of the Altar three contrary doctrines, and yet you pretended in every one of them *verbum Domini*.

¹ The term "real presence" first occurs in the year 1504, and is then used to express the Romish doctrine (Browne, *Fascic. Rerum*, London, 1690); it was therefore *usually* repudiated by the Reformers as one of the "new terms" which the Romanists had coined in order to express their new doctrine (Latimer, *Romains*, pp. 251-2; Ridley, *Works*, p. 238; Jewel, ii. 449). Yet in a sense, Protestants may claim the name for their own doctrine, which being true, can alone have just claim to be "real."

² It is not here contended that there was no intention to allow the doctrine in question to have a temporary *shelter* under some expressions in that book. There probably was; and this method of procedure was both charitable and prudent in the first attempt to secure reformation of much inveterate error. But after Gardiner made capital out of these dubious passages for the maintenance of the old superstitions, and after the Council of Trent, October 11, 1551, defined the Roman doctrine of the Eucharist, "irenic" ambiguities were no longer tolerable. They were accordingly all swept away at the revision of 1552, which made the Communion Service practically word for word as we have it to-day, for the revision of 1661-2, as far as it touched the Communion, was almost entirely confined to some alterations of the *rubrics*.

Cranmer.—Nay, I taught but two contrary doctrines in the same.

Martin.—What doctrine taught you when you condemned Lambert the Sacramentary in the King's presence in Whitehall? [Lambert was burnt, Nov. 20, 1538.]

Cranmer.—I maintained then the Papists' doctrine.

Martin.—That is to say, the Catholic and universal doctrine of Christ's Church. And how when King Henry died? Did you not translate Justus Jonas's book?

Cranmer.—I did so.

Martin.—Then you defended another doctrine touching the Sacrament, by the same token that you sent to Lynne your printer; that whereas in the first print there was an affirmative, that is to say, Christ's body really in the Sacrament, you sent then to your printer to put in a 'not,' whereby it came miraculously to pass, that Christ's body was clean conveyed out of the Sacrament.

Cranmer.—I remember there were two printers of my said book; but where the same 'not' was put in, I cannot tell.

Martin.—Then from a Lutheran ye became a Zwinglian, which is the vilest heresy of all in the high mystery of the Sacrament; and for the same heresy you did help to burn Lambert the Sacramentary, which you now call the Catholic Faith and God's Word.

Cranmer.—I grant that then I believed otherwise than I do now; and so I did until my Lord of London, Doctor Ridley, did confer with me, and by sundry persuasions and authorities of doctors quite drew me from my opinion."

(*Cranmer, Remains*, pp. 217-18.)

The statement of Martin as to a change in the wording of Cranmer's Catechism does not seem to be correct. No copy of the work with the "not" inserted is known to exist, or even to have existed. Cranmer gives us here the information that as late as the end of 1538 he had held "the Papists' doctrine." He apparently contradicts what he said against Smith, by saying that he had only taught "two contrary doctrines" on the matter, which Wordsworth (*Eccl. Biog.*, iii. 550), and some others of later date, think is decisive against the general impression that Cranmer once held the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The laborious Dr. Jenkins, to whose learned edition of Cranmer all subsequent students are indebted, held that there is reason to suppose that this conversation has not been reported accurately (*Cranmer's Works*, iv. 95 n.: Oxford, 1830). But the true explanation may lie rather in a different direction.

In dealing with Smith, the Archbishop is reciting the course of *his own opinions* from Romanism to the "real presence" only, and then to the Reformed view. "Smith untruly reporteth that I *did set forth* the real presence." Cranmer here denies, as he denied to Martin, that the Catechism *taught* the doctrine. But before this he says simply "I *was in* that error," and earlier still "I *was . . . in* divers other errors," merely speaking of the state of *his own mind*, not of "teaching."

On the other hand, when before Brokes Cranmer was standing for his life on the charge of heresy, "You have *taught* three contrary doctrines," Cranmer replies, "Nay, I *taught* but two contrary doctrines in the same." This is perfectly true. First he "maintained" Rome's teaching all his life up till (and after) 1538. Then

in 1550, in his book the *True and Catholic Doctrine*, he taught the Reformed view. But he had never *taught* the Lutheran doctrine of "the real presence," for he denied (and truly, as can be proved) that in his Catechism he had meant this doctrine. Hence although he had never "taught" it, there is every probability that his mind had passed through the stage of *holding* it, until Ridley "*quite drew* him from that opinion." And this is strongly confirmed by the statement found in the preface to the Latin edition of the *True and Catholic Doctrine*, printed at Emden in 1557, that Cranmer was "by the instruction of one single blessed martyr, Ridley, Bishop of London, brought at long last (to wit, in the year '46) to this opinion which he here maintains" (Cranmer, *Lord's Supper*, second pagination, p. 6).

If Cranmer was brought over by Ridley in 1546 to the Reformed doctrine, the reason why Cranmer never "taught" the Lutheran doctrine he was then "holding" is obvious. Henry was still alive in 1546, and enforcing the Six Articles which decreed death at the stake against anyone who should "hold any opinion" that the substances of bread and wine remained after consecration. Cranmer passed into and out of his Lutheran phase during the last few years of Henry, when to have divulged his views would have been death. Thus while he had *entertained* at different times *three* doctrines, he had never *taught* but two.

We have seen that Cranmer himself dates his conversion by Ridley to "not long before" the summer of 1548; and that the Emden edition of his book, published the year after his martyrdom, states the exact year to have been 1546. Only a resolute mind in severe controversial straits can well refuse to accept the fact. But as the word of Cranmer himself is set aside, it may be well to prove by collateral evidence that what he said about himself was true.

The *True and Catholic Doctrine* is sufficient to prove that in 1550 Cranmer was already on the Reformed side; or was what Martin, and those who share his Romish views to-day, would call a "Zwinglian." We may work back from this date.

On December 27, 1549, Hooper writes to Bullinger :

"The Archbishop of Canterbury entertains right views as to the nature of Christ's presence in the Supper, and is now very friendly towards myself. He has some *Articles of Religion* to which all preachers and lecturers in divinity are required to subscribe, or else a license for teaching is not granted them; and in these his sentiments respecting the eucharist are pure, religious, and similar to yours in Switzerland" (*Orig. Lett.*, i. 71-2; *Ep. Tig.*, p. 46, "ubi pure, et religiose, ac Helvetice sentit de eucharistia").

With this may be compared what he writes towards the close of this letter :

"Believe me, all the English who are free from Popish tyranny and Romish craftiness entertain correct views respecting the Supper."

And what he writes on February 5, 1550 :

"The Bishops of Canterbury, Rochester (Ridley), Ely (Goodrich), St. David's (Ferrar), Lincoln (Holbeche), and Bath (Barlow) are all favourable

to the cause of Christ, and as far as I know entertain right opinions on the matter of the Eucharist. I have freely conversed with *all of them* upon this subject, and have discovered nothing but what is pure and holy. The Archbishop . . . [requires preachers before he licenses them, to] subscribe certain Articles, which, if possible, I will send you; one of which respecting the Eucharist is plainly the true one, and that which you maintain in Switzerland" (*Ibid.*, p. 76; *Ep. Tig.*, p. 48, "plane verus et Helveticus est").

It was a proclamation dated April 24, 1548, whereby preaching was forbidden except under Cranmer's own licence. The "articles" which he prescribed to preachers afterwards became, having been revised more than once, our Thirty-nine Articles. Hooper's evidence shows that Cranmer was on the "Swiss" or "Reformed" side *before the end of 1549*.

What completely overthrows the Romanising contention is the report (probably drawn up by Sir John Cheke, the King's tutor) of the Great Parliamentary Debate on the Sacrament, held December 15 to 19, 1548, in order to clear the way for the introduction of the First Prayer Book. The battle whether there should be this reformation of the services or not, very properly turned upon the master-question, the Communion Service, and therefore upon the doctrine of that Sacrament. Cranmer took the lead for the Reformers; he denied the Mass and transubstantiation, he upheld the spiritual reception by means of faith, denied reception by the wicked (Article XXIX) and adoration of the Host, and from the standpoint of the Black Rubric maintained the *impossibility* of any "real presence" in the elements. No summary of what are themselves but terse notes of the speeches would do justice to the argument. The entire document, reprinted from the original MS. verbatim, literatim, and folio by folio, with introduction and notes by the late Mr. Tomlinson, can still be obtained from the Church Association for sixpence. It proves to demonstration that our Reformers *before* they so much as laid the *First Prayer Book* before Parliament, had already in their own minds reached the doctrinal position of the Second, and gave the clearest and most honest declaration of their mind in open Parliament.

This, however, was not the first intimation Cranmer had given of his opinions. There had been need of the utmost caution under Henry, and even when Henry was dead, the Six Articles remained on the Statute-Book till Christmas Eve, 1547, though not permitted by the Government to be put into operation. By acting with caution Cranmer was able to win from Convocation late in that November a grudging agreement to the restoration of the Cup to the Laity. For the actual communion of the people the following Easter, an "Order of the Communion" was published, March 8, 1548, which consisted of the Confession, Absolution, Words of Administration, and so on in English, to be interpolated into the still unchanged Latin Mass, which, of course, made no provision for the Communion of the people.

The change having once been made, the demand for complete English services could not be denied, and it seems that something

of the kind was established early in May at the Abbey and at St. Paul's. About this time, or soon after, came the issue of Cranmer's Catechism. To the average man it appeared to sound strongly of Lutheranism. When, however, a comparison is made of Cranmer's English with the Latin original, as was done by its learned editor, Dr. Burton, a century ago, it becomes clear that Cranmer eliminated from his version the strongest and clearest statements in favour of the "real" presence, and left only what he regarded as reconcilable with the holding of none other than a *spiritual* reception (compare Cranmer's *Lord's Supper*, p. 227). To give but a single instance of what was done in this direction—Jonas wrote :

"When (God) calls and names a thing which was not before, then at once that very thing comes into being as He names it. Therefore when He takes bread and says, 'This is my body,' then immediately there is the body of our Lord. And when He takes the cup and says, 'This is my blood,' then immediately His blood is present" (Burton, *Latin*, p. 177).

When Cranmer came to this passage, he cut out the first sentence altogether, and then went on :

"Wherefore when Christ takes bread and saith, 'Take, eat, this is my body,' we ought not to doubt but *we eat* His body; and when He takes the cup and saith, 'Take, drink, this is my blood,' we ought to think assuredly that *we drink* His very blood" (Ibid., *English*, p. 207).

To us who know such things about the *Catechism* of 1548, it is a document proving that Cranmer was already on the Reformed side before he published it, yet it does not follow that in 1548 it so appeared to the popular mind. We know that it did not.

England had for 150 years witnessed the persecution of Lollards, and this mainly on account of their irreconcilable hostility to the Romish doctrine of the "Sacrament of the Altar." When the Reformation came, the English Gospellers would sit at the feet of Luther to hear the glad tidings of free Justification; but they turned a deaf ear to him when he would have them spare and cherish "the real presence." The result was (as we have seen from Hooper) that every Englishman who favoured the Reformation was set against this tenet of Lutheranism, as well as against the more extended errors of Romanism. An English Protestant did not like, and still does not like (true and legitimate as in a certain sense it is) reference to eating "without doubt" the body and "assuredly" drinking the "very" blood of Christ. He admits that the teaching, with Cranmer's added word "*spiritually*," is in agreement with Scripture; but being essentially matter-of-fact he does not love the exaggeration and hardening of metaphors, and is likely to ask the sensible question, "Very well; only if you meant 'spiritually,' why did you not use the word and save misunderstanding?"

Therefore Cranmer's Catechism created a false impression in the minds of Protestants. A young Swiss student then at Oxford, writes on August 15, 1548, to Bullinger, telling him :

"This Thomas had fallen into so heavy a slumber that we entertain but a very cold hope that he will be aroused even by your most learned letter.

For he has lately published a *Catechism*, in which he has only just failed to approve (*tantum non . . . approbavit*) that foul and sacrilegious transubstantiation of the Papists in the holy Supper of our Saviour; but for the rest, (*ceterum*) all the dreams of Luther seem to him to be sufficiently well-grounded, perspicuous and lucid" (*Orig. Lett.*, ii. 381; *Ep. Tig.*, p. 251).

On August 1, Bartholomew Traheron, a minor Reformer of some importance in his way, who was then—though a clergyman—a member of the House of Commons, and the following year became Dean of Wells, also wrote to Bullinger:

"All our countrymen who are sincerely favourable to the restoration of truth, entertain in all respects *like opinions with you*; and not only those who are placed at the summit of honour, but those who are ranked in the number of men of learning. *I except*, the Archbishop of Canterbury and Latimer, and a very few learned men besides; for from among the nobility I know of not one whose opinions are otherwise than what they ought to be. As for Canterbury, he conducts himself in such a way, I know not how, as that the people do not think much of him, and the nobility regard him as lukewarm. In other respects he is a kind and good-natured man" (*Orig. Lett.*, i. 320).

Affairs, however, were coming to a head, and whether it was a *ballon d'essai* or not, Cranmer must have found his *Catechism* very useful as evoking these manifestations of the solidity with which the reforming party was arrayed against any sort of "real presence."

Early in September the King summoned certain of the Bishops and learned men to Chertsey and Windsor, where the English Services which the Reformers had been drafting seem to have come under discussion. "Also at that time (about September 23) was many battles made of divers parties against the Blessed Sacrament, one against another" (*Grey Friar's Chronicle*, pp. 56 and 57: *Mon. Fran.*, ii. 217). The French ambassador also writes September 30, "that there are daily fights in the London Churches and elsewhere in the kingdom whether there shall be Mass or not" (Odet de Selve, *Inventaire*, p. 453). The meetings at Chertsey rendered it impossible for Cranmer any longer to keep to himself his own views on the matter.

Accordingly we find that by September 28, when Traheron writes again to Bullinger, he is able to say:

"But that you may add more to your praises of God, you must know that Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the Eucharist, together with the *Archbishop of Canterbury* and the other bishops, who heretofore *seemed* to be Lutherans" (*Orig. Lett.*, i. 322).

Then on December 31, twelve days after the close of the "Great Parliamentary Debate," he thus writes to Bullinger about it:

"The Archbishop of Canterbury contrary to general expectation most firmly, openly, and learnedly maintained your opinion upon this subject. His arguments were as follows. The body of Christ was taken up from us into heaven. Christ has left the world. Ye have the poor always with you, but me ye have not always, etc. Next followed the Bishop of Rochester (Ridley), who handled the matter with so much eloquence, perspicuity, erudition and power, as to stop the mouth of that most zealous Papist the

Bishop of Worcester (Heath). The truth never obtained a more brilliant victory amongst us. I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism, now that those who were *considered* its principal, *and almost only* supporters, have altogether come over to our side" (Ibid., p. 323).

The reader will note here again as in the writings of Bishop Hooper, and indeed in those of the Reformers at large, how little there was of "*Lutheranism*" properly so called in England. There were "the Papists" who held to the entire mediæval doctrine of the Mass. There were the "Gospellers" who rejected it root and branch. There was no third party, rejecting some Romish extravagances such as "transubstantiation," while retaining and defending the notion of "the real presence."

Traheron in August had regretfully to say how little the Protestants thought of the Archbishop, doubtless through the publication of that temporising *Catechism*: but he had no doubt of the solidarity of the English Protestants against the "real presence." By the end of September the Chertsey conferences had drawn a clear line of demarcation between the contending theologians, and a man of Traheron's position in the conflict could see that Cranmer and his band of reforming Bishops who "heretofore *seemed to be* Lutherans" were now definitely ranged with English Lollardy and the Swiss Bullinger against any variant of the "real presence in the elements." By the end of the year, what had taken place in these private conferences had been publicly repeated in Parliament; and there with the brilliant result that the Reformers had routed their antagonists and so brought the Prayer Book into the Legislature, which enacted it within the next month.

There is one story which needs to be dealt with, because it is made the ground for exhibiting Cranmer as having shown weakness in the matter at this critical time, and also for the untenable assertion that he was really converted by the Polish Reformer of Emden, John a Lasco, whose noble family, by the way, may have been a cadet branch of the English de Lacy line of the Earls of Lincoln. John a Lasco was a man from whom even a Cranmer might not disdain to learn: but the pertinacious manner in which the story is repeated without the least examination of the evidence, is an example of the way in which slipshod and uncritical methods will seriously pervert history. For there can be no question that to Ridley belongs the honour of leading Cranmer into the glorious liberty of disillusionment from the "real presence."

The sole basis of the other view is that John ab Ulmis writes from Oxford to Bullinger on November 27, 1548:

"The Bishops entertain right and excellent opinions respecting the holy Supper of Jesus Christ. That abominable error and silly opinion of a carnal eating has been long since banished and done away. Even that Thomas himself, about whom I wrote to you when I was in London, by the goodness of God and the instrumentality of that most upright and judicious man, Master John a Lasco, is in a great measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy" (*Orig. Lett.*, ii. 383).

A century ago the requisite correction was given by the well-weighed

remark of Dr. Jenkyns in his Preface to Cranmer's Works (p. lxxx) :

" John ab Ulmis is a competent witness respecting the time when the change in Cranmer's opinions *became known*, but he was mistaken with regard to the *person* by whom it was effected."

It is nevertheless necessary to-day to break this butterfly upon the wheel, and show by formal proof that the story is destitute of credit.

John ab Ulmis was a clever young man, and his letters are valuable as a light on the English Reformation, provided they are used with discretion, for this letter was written when he had not been in this country six months and when he had not yet come into that intimate contact with influential patrons that gives weight to his later letters. What has happened is evidently this. He has heard of the favourable results of the Chertsey conferences, and that the Reforming side which had won was—including Cranmer—opposed to the " real presence." He had heard that a Lasco had come on a visit to Cranmer, and he puts two and two together. The guess was very natural, although we know it was incorrect. Cranmer had not meant to support but to eliminate the " real presence " from his *Catechism*. He therefore had no need to be recovered by a Lasco from a " lethargy " into which he had not fallen. And his stand for the Reformed doctrine of the Eucharist was made *before* he had met a Lasco.

A Lasco arrived in London, September 21, when Cranmer was away (at Chertsey) and was not expected back for eight days (De Kuyper, *John a Lasco*, ii. 619). Before this date of return Traheron wrote to Bullinger about Cranmer having upheld the Swiss doctrine. There is nothing surprising in the fact that while an important man like Traheron knew of Cranmer's conversion *before* the Primate could have met a Lasco, the young foreign student at Oxford should say that the change was owing to a Lasco. It may be added that Cranmer was in London on October 2, and at Windsor again by October 20 (*Orig. Lett.*, i. 20, 32). It would seem that he came back to Lambeth for a few days and then returned to the Court at Windsor, taking with him a Lasco, who soon fell desperately ill and had to be left there when the Court returned to London for the opening of Parliament towards the end of November, for a Lasco's letter recounting his illness to Calvin is dated at Windsor on December 14 (Kuyper, ii. 620-2). Therefore as a matter of fact a Lasco was probably able to be of little or no assistance to Cranmer at the critical moments, though Cranmer had evidently desired to make use of him.

To Traheron's letter of December 31, John ab Ulmis was permitted to append a short postscript, the last sentence of which is, " The foolish bishops have made a marvellous recantation." The meaning of this is not that the *Reforming* bishops had recanted. The note must be explained by what he wrote on November 27, thinking that the Bishops *as a body* (shades of Bonner, Day, and Heath!) had become orthodox on the Supper. So that when he learned from the Debate that half of them had fought tooth and

nail for Popery, he was naturally of opinion that *these* "silly Bishops have made a marvellous recantation."

The emphasis laid on the share of John a Lasco in changing the opinions of Cranmer is part and parcel of the oft-repeated statement that Cranmer was a weakling who was practically bullied out of "the real presence" by foreign Reformers then in England. The contention itself is a thinly disguised appeal to that insular conceit which makes so many people quite sure that anything coming from a foreigner is altogether contemptible.

Cranmer himself had *invited* a Lasco, pressing him three or four times to come to England to assist in settling for us the Sacramental controversy (*Orig. Lett.*, i. 17: Gorham, *Ref. Gleanings*, p. 21). He also invited Melanchthon, whose toning down of the "real presence" on every possible occasion offended Luther. He brought over Peter Martyr and Bernardine Oechino; Martin Bucer and Paul Fagius, Francis Dryander, Martin Micronius, and Walram Pullain. He desired to have Caspar Hedio, Wolfgang Musculus, Albert Hardenburg, and more of the same character. These were the men Cranmer was bringing to England in 1548, to settle the Sacramentarian Controversy.

The absurdity of the contention that Cranmer was subsequently talked out of his views on the "real presence" by a number of foreign reformers who had taken refuge in England becomes apparent when we remember that Cranmer himself invited them to come over here. Their mere names as given above show the kind of assistance he hoped to obtain from them and sufficiently suggest the bent of his own mind when he issued the invitations. We see here Cranmer striving to settle the Eucharistic controversy by drawing up a formula that would unite Protestants: and whom does he invite to assist in framing it? Not a single Lutheran—with the more than doubtful exception of Melanchthon. There is not a Westphal, an Illyrius a Brentius or a Heshaus to be found in the whole list. Cranmer empanels a jury which it is certain will condemn the doctrine of the "real presence" out of hand, and does not provide so much as a solitary man who would even state a plea for it. Instead of these foreign reformers having beguiled him from the path of Catholic or even Anglo-Catholic orthodoxy, their very names are proof positive that at least as early as 1548, the Archbishop had already thought himself out of any idea of a "presence" in the sacramental elements and had rightly placed it, as did St. Paul, in the heart of the faithful recipient (Eph. iii. 17).

SOME RECENT CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY THE REV. H. P. V. NUNN, M.A.

AT the last conference of Modern Churchmen one of the speakers is reported to have said that the older Modernists were not abreast with the most recent developments of New Testament criticism. How far this is so may be judged by studying the latest book by the ex-abbé Loisy, *La Naissance du Christianisme*, and the appreciative articles on it that have appeared in recent numbers of the *Hibbert Journal* by Dr. Jacks.

These writings will be hereafter referred to under the letters N.C. and H.J.

In the opinion of M. Loisy we do not even know when or where Jesus was born (N.C., p. 84). He was one of the numerous agitators who disturbed the Roman administration of Palestine between A.D. 6 and A.D. 70. He represented himself as an envoy sent to prepare for the *immediate* coming of the Kingdom of God and declared that repentance was necessary to secure admission to it. He was a disciple and probably, later in his career, a rival of John the Baptist. He also seems to have regarded himself as the predestined Messiah of the Kingdom when it came. But, although he seems to have been morally superior to Theudas and the fanatics who claimed to be the destined deliverers of Israel, he was not less deluded than they were. (N.C., pp. 85, 96-8.) After a very short ministry he was put to death by the Romans as a disturber of the peace and his body was, "without doubt," thrown into the pit reserved for criminals. (N.C., pp. 111-13.)

The few followers that he had gathered among the peasants of Galilee abandoned him as soon as he was arrested. They were not witnesses of the ignominy and horror of his death and had no share in his burial.¹ (N.C., p. 111.)

But he had inspired them with such obstinate fanaticism that even this disaster did nothing to quench their faith in the coming of the Kingdom. "To spirits familiar with the belief in a resurrection and immortality death is an incident without significance." (N.C., p. 121.) So when they had recovered from the shock that his death had admittedly given them, they began first to hope and then to believe that he would soon come again as the Messiah of the promised reign of God.

Peter imagined that he saw his Master alive again (he probably dreamed this). He imparted his dreams to his companions and they all began to dream. Such simple people would never think of asking for proofs that their faith was well founded.

Their enthusiastic faith invented all the proofs which were neces-

¹ Dr. Jacks considers this "a point of much importance." (H.J., 1934, p. 503.) Of course, the whole idea is absolutely imaginary.

sary for its conservation. (N.C., pp. 120-2, 129, 131.) They came back to Jerusalem to wait for the return of the Lord. They had no intention of founding a Church or sending missionaries to the Gentiles, but these things followed inevitably, in spite of the disapproval of the original disciples. (N.C., pp. 131, 132.)

The Hellenistic community at Jerusalem produced the first missionaries.

When this story of a Galilean prophet who was dead, but who was expected soon to appear on earth again, reached Greek communities where people were rather more educated and sceptical, more cogent proofs of the greatness of his person and the reality of his claims were (not unnaturally) demanded.

A faith of this kind could be neither proved nor disproved, but as time went on and Jesus did not come again, an attempt was made to turn attention to his life on earth and to the mystical efficacy of his death.

Certain "prophets" who imagined that they were inspired by the Spirit of Jesus uttered sayings and commands which were subsequently put into his mouth by the Evangelists when men began to ask what sort of a man this Jesus was and what he had taught.

But most of what passes for his teaching was taken from the sayings of the Rabbis and some was "judeohellenic." (N.C., p. 89.) His real teaching had never been collected. Why should it have been? Men were not interested at first in his life as a man. The immediate expectation of the coming of the Kingdom had turned their minds from this. (N.C., p. 88.)

Even the sayings that such extreme sceptics as Schmiedel considered authentic, on the ground that they were of such a nature that no one in the early Church would have invented them, are now assigned by Loisy to the Community or its Prophets. (N.C., p. 90.)

As the first disciples required no proof of the reality of the survival of Jesus (for to call the event a Resurrection is to anticipate the ideas of a later date), nothing was heard about the story of the empty tomb until the Second Gospel was published at an unknown, but certainly late, date, and then a lame apology was made for it by the insertion of the statement that the women said nothing about it at the time. (N.C., p. 115.)

The early community had customs such as ceremonial washings and meals out of which the Sacraments were afterwards developed, but the Lord's supper in its present form is not even Apostolic. The "Apostles" were not a body of men commissioned by Jesus. They were the leaders of the Community at Jerusalem. The myth that they were chosen by Jesus was invented after Paul laid claim to be "an Apostle of Jesus Christ." (N.C., pp. 136-8.) Paul only made this claim after he had been rejected as the Apostle of the Community. (N.C., p. 140.)

He had nothing to do with the death of Stephen and the story of his conversion in the Acts is quite mythical.

Jerusalem was no place for the proclamation of Jesus as the Messiah, for most of the Jews considered that the man who had

been crucified on Golgotha was quite unworthy of that position. (N.C., pp. 132, 140.)

So Christianity, as we know it, was the product of the contact of the simple ideas of the fanatical peasants of Galilee with Hellenistic communities whom this crude eschatology did not altogether satisfy.

The book that gives us the best idea of the teaching of the first Christian missionaries is the Apocalypse, which is supposed to support the contention of the critics that the early Church took no interest in the details of the earthly life of Jesus, except in the fact of his death, the fable of his resurrection and his expected return. (N.C., p. 37.)

Some of the matter in the Epistles of Paul is early. But all the christological and mystical passages are to be ascribed to "preheretical Gnosis" of the second or third generation. (N.C., p. 9.)

The Gospels are "liturgic catechisms." "*Ils renferment la légende cultuelle du Seigneur Jésus-Christ.*"¹ They do not announce any other content or claim any other quality." (N.C., p. 8.)

We may conveniently sum up the whole theory by saying that all that is historically certain about Jesus may be better learnt from Tacitus than from the Gospels.

M. Loisy "humbly avows" that he has not discovered that Jesus never existed. In his opinion this hypothesis fails to explain the origin of Christianity. (N.C., p. 5.)

With this comparatively unimportant exception it is hard to see how radical criticism of the New Testament can go further than it has gone in this book.

We may be inclined to dismiss all these extravagancies with the words of Father Lagrange that it is impossible that the highest religion, the purest morality and the greatest spiritual force that the world has ever known should have had their origin in "*un fait divers de la Gazette des Tribunaux en Judée,*" or with the still more trenchant words of the Book of Job, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?"

But when we have to deal with theories that a man recently asked to preach in Liverpool Cathedral receives not only with respect, but with enthusiasm, although he admits that their acceptance would endanger the whole fabric of historic Christianity, we feel that the pressure that they exercise on us is "immediate," to use Dr. Jacks' own phrase. (H.J., pp. 322-4.) We have no space

¹ We have ventured to leave this sentence untranslated. We would suggest as a paraphrase for it "the legends to which the cult of the Lord Jesus Christ gave birth," but the defect of this paraphrase is that it does not suggest that, according to the theory, the legends were not only produced by the cult of Jesus, but also produced it.

With regard to what follows, we must always be on our guard against the assumption that the Gospels are put outside the category of historical documents because their authors believed that Jesus was the Christ and wrote to confirm or produce this belief. The assumption that inspires this type of criticism is that no support for matters of faith can be found in history and that, consequently, works written by believers in any kind of historical religion *must* be unhistorical.

here to examine his convincing demonstration of the extent to which modern criticism has demolished that popular form of half-belief which would exalt Jesus into the position of the best and wisest of teachers, while regarding him as a mere man, by representing this as the faith of the early Church.

The Gospels, he points out, were intended "to give preciser form and content to a faith already in being, the general character of which may be gathered from the Pauline Epistles." (H.J., p. 327.)

It is now generally admitted that the attempt to find a purely human Jesus, even in the Second Gospel, has failed. The Evangelists present us with a Figure who demands that men should believe primarily on himself and obey his moral teaching not only because of its intrinsic excellence, but because it is his will that they should do so. The difference between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists is a difference in degree and not in kind. (H.J., p. 329.)

The Liberal Protestants believed that Jesus was far above the heads of his reporters. Loisy, rather imprudently, is still content to regard the first followers of Jesus as simple and illiterate persons and even to say that the Gospels could not have been written by romancers of genius, for the Evangelists had no genius. (*A propos de l'histoire des religions*, p. 289.)

But Dr. Jacks is unable to account for the origin of Christianity without finding a genius somewhere.

Jesus is obviously out of the question. Therefore Dr. Jacks is compelled to assume that "the faith centred on the risen and glorified Christ was a creative force."

He admits that we do not *know* that the Evangelists were men of genius, but he asks, "What do we know about them?"

The answer of the Modern Critical School must be, "Nothing."

Dr. Jacks is also compelled to admit that the Evangelists would themselves have endorsed the opinion that the Church has held of them, namely that they were, as mere human reporters of a divine manifestation, on a much lower level than Jesus.

They were, however, in his opinion, deluded by their antecedent belief in the divinity of Jesus. The rationalistic critic, who does not share their views as to the possibility of an incarnation, has not their justification for regarding Jesus as immeasurably superior to those who recorded his life.

If, like Dr. Martineau, he says that "acts and words which transcend the moral level of the narrators authenticate themselves as coming from Jesus," he is in danger of doing in the twentieth century what the Evangelists did in the first, that is, of making Jesus the object of a cult. (H.J., pp. 330-2.)

From this danger we should now be delivered, thanks to M. Loisy. Therefore, as we know nothing about the Evangelists, except that they wrote under the influence of a baseless supposition, we are justified in believing that they were geniuses.

"The creative faith that transformed Jesus into the Saviour of mankind was surely not incapable of making him the speaker of

original and exalted sayings appropriate to the character assigned to him." (H.J., p. 229.)

No documentary evidence, says Dr. Jacks, can prove that anyone was the greatest man that ever lived. This superlative excellence belongs to God alone. (H.J., p. 331.)

Certainly : but what if the *Évangelists* were right in their belief that the life of Jesus was a manifestation of the life of God ?

This leads us to consider how we ought to regard the theories about the origin of Christianity which are put forward by men who regard as inadmissible the solution of the problem which has commended itself to a number of persons who are at least their equals in learning and character.

Loisy cannot even say that superlative excellence belongs to God alone, for he is a pantheist and finds excellence, if he finds it anywhere, in the Spirit of Humanity.

With regard to his views of human nature and of the relationship between man and whatever superior force there may be in the universe we find an illuminating quotation from his "Religion of Israel" in the *Hibbert Journal*.

"Universal life is an immense abyss in which our feeble existence is swallowed up. The history of mankind, taken by itself, is beyond our comprehension. Everything in the infinitude which presses on us from all sides is, in a sense, a mystery to us. It is perhaps very presumptuous to represent the hidden force which has produced all this as familiarly known to us and to regard it as having much to do with the vermin which crawls on our globe." (*Op. cit.*, p. 8.)

In his autobiography he boasted, while he was still a priest, that he was one of those who had earned the right not to believe in the supernatural.

Dr. Jacks nevertheless assures us that he is "a scientific investigator without *parti pris*." (H.J., p. 323.)

But it is obvious that a man who holds such views about God and man can hardly regard contending theories about the origins of Christianity in quite the same way as even those Modernists who believe in an incarnation in the sense that man at his best is of the same nature as God.

Further, Loisy is the obedient servant of the "Historical Method." Those who have never looked into the question may imagine that the Historical Method is the harmless and praiseworthy process of examining and sifting evidence of an alleged past event and the attempt to describe it as it actually occurred without prejudice.

But Mr. R. Hanson in a valuable book of essays entitled *Dogma* has defined it as follows :

"The Historical Method is a good enough servant to Theology. It is a very bad master. If it is not strictly limited and controlled by faith in a superior source of knowledge, . . . there is an end to any claim on the part of theology to be the guardian and exponent of a unique and final revelation.

"The Historical Method has done its work when it acknowledges, as its most competent and sincere exponents do acknowledge, that the Jesus of History is an enigma.

" But the fact that the claims of Jesus are to the natural man enigmatical is not, in the first instance, a discovery of science ; it is part of the Gospel story.

" The Historical Method depends wholly on the hypothesis that the course of history is uniform, the events are always the natural outcome of antecedent events in a purely natural order. If any break in the sequence of natural events has in fact occurred, it is clearly beyond the competence of the Historical Method even to recognize its occurrence. To recognize the occurrence is *ipso facto* to abandon the method.

" It is not a question of the amount or quality of the evidence. It is a question of the nature of the facts to which the evidence purports to bear witness. Virgin birth and physical resurrection do not occur in ordinary human experience, nor are they consonant with the known nature of man. Therefore any belief or statement that such events have occurred must be mistaken. The test of truth is verisimilitude.

" It is a perfectly legitimate and very valuable method as applied to the ordinary events of secular history. But in regard to the possibility of a truth that transcends verisimilitude and the possible occurrence of events which are outside the ordinary course of human experience, *it begs the whole question at the outset.* [Italics ours.]

" It is not that the evidence is weighed and deliberately rejected : it is never admitted. What is really in dispute is not the nature of evidence, but the nature of God.

" The fact is that for most scientific historians and for many modern theologians the Historical Method is not merely the testing of a hypothesis justified, as other scientific hypotheses, by the success of its works, but the ruthless application of a dogma which must be made to work at all costs.

" The sole justification for raising the presupposition of the uniformity of experience from the status of a tentative hypothesis to that of a fundamental dogma is the conviction that all experience is ultimately reducible to the experience of a highly trained scientific intellect. Further, that all reality, all experience—God, to use the theological expression, is exhaustively expressed or is achieving exhaustive expression in the historical process, conceived as the concatenation of purely natural events. 'History' so conceived is the only expression of God." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 99, 100.)

The " results " of New Testament criticism are always presented to us as the product of purely scientific investigation by experts, and the plain man is either openly or implicitly warned off the field.

But it cannot be too often stated that in reality they are no more than hypotheses invented, for the most part, by men to whose conception of history the description given above applies in every particular.

Further, these hypotheses no longer depend for their validity on an accurate estimate of the significance of the synoptic problem where the need for a highly trained intellect might make itself felt to determine how the Gospels came to be as they are. Now they are all dismissed as the products of the cult of a well-meaning fanatic in its transference from the ignorant peasantry of Judea to the more cultured people of the Middle East.

Here we are faced with a problem of human conduct which the plain man should be fairly well fitted to deal with.

What has to be decided is the probability that if an unknown Galilean announced for a few months that the reign of God was about to be established on earth immediately and that he was to be the vicegerent of God when this was accomplished, the Christian Church with its exalted morality and its theology which has satisfied so many of the greatest intellects of the world would be the natural

product of this commonplace event, in such a place and at such a time.

To imagine that such a theory as this can be *proved* from the available evidence is absurd.

It owes whatever plausibility it may possess for certain minds simply to the fact that it is the only way in which the unquestioned rise and existence of Christianity can be explained without admitting the possibility of a personal God who cares for His creatures, an incarnation and the existence of a man who was a messenger from God and whose personality was a revelation of His nature.

We deliberately leave on one side the question of the nature of the resurrection and that of miracles, because if the existence of a God who can and will communicate with man is put out of question it is a waste of time to discuss whether the resurrection was more than an hallucination or miracles more than the influence of one human mind on another.

Those who see in the action of the disciples after the death of Jesus nothing more than the triumph of the human will that would not give up its hopes of a reversal of the present order of things and the establishment of one nearer to its heart's desire are bound to tear the New Testament to shreds, and to imagine for its composition a method which is improbable to the very last degree.

The extremely subjective character of the most recent theories may be judged by a few examples.

The saying of Jesus prohibiting the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles used to be considered by the most advanced critics as certainly authentic, since the missionary church would never have invented it. But now it is attributed to "a prophet" who disliked the inclusion of the Gentiles in the Church and who produced it from his inner consciousness "in all good faith" as a saying of Jesus. (H.J., 1934, p. 510.)

The saying that John the Baptist was a prophet and more than a prophet was never uttered by Jesus, but was a saying of the Johannine sect. (Loisy, N.C., p. 78.)

But the procedure of composing the Gospels was not all so innocent as this: "it is incredible that John should have discredited his own baptism in advance and exalted Christian baptism. . . . This was put into the mouth of John in order not to be obliged to admit that the Christians borrowed their rite from the Johannine sect. All these little frauds are significant . . ." etc. etc. (p. 79).

In his former books Loisy represented the burial of Jesus in a common pit as a possibility: now it is represented as a certainty (p. 113) and it is insinuated that tradition had an interest in dissimulating the true circumstances of the burial (p. 104). The name of John was added to that of Peter in the story of the healing of the lame man in the Temple in the interests of the "Ephesian Legend" (p. 134).

The difficulty of dealing with theories like this is that there is no common ground from which the argument can be conducted. If anything is found in the New Testament which contradicts the

theory, it is immediately dismissed as an apologetic expedient. The absence of any documentary evidence for the statements made by the critics is not regarded as being of the least importance and the fact that the documents contradict many of them formally is regarded as a proof that they must be true, for the Gospels were written with the express purpose of supplying evidence where none existed and in some cases of concealing the truth.

In fact, the modern critic in his enthusiasm for the Historical Method, as he conceives it, is just as indifferent to the absence of evidence for his theories as he supposes the early Christians to have been.

Speaking of their state of mind he tells us that "Faith unconsciously procures for itself all the illusions which are necessary for its preservation and progress."

Can there be any greater illusion than to suppose that the change in human life and thought that beyond all question owes its origin to the preaching of the disciples of Jesus was caused by an illusion?

Dr. Mackinnon, a critic not to be suspected of unreasoning orthodoxy, says that the Resurrection Faith must have been founded on personal experience of contact with a real spiritual world. It could not have been an illusion produced by religious excitement. The records reveal not this, but mental shock and disillusion. The assumed condition did not exist. (*Gospel in the Early Church*, pp. 8, 9.)

Loisy, who does not believe that a spiritual world, in this sense, exists, tacitly supports Dr. Mackinnon's contention that the records do *not* bear witness to any such enthusiasm as could produce such an illusion by regarding them as deliberately falsified to produce this impression.

He also asks us to believe that the disciples regarded the death of their Master as of no importance at all and as no hindrance to the coming of the Kingdom partly because they believed in a resurrection and immortality and partly because they did not regard Jesus as the Messiah, but only as the Messiah to be. The first of these suppositions contradicts not only all the records, but also all that we know of human nature; the second is a pure conjecture.

The faith of the disciples is supposed to explain everything. "No one," says Loisy, "who is acquainted with the nature of religious faith will be surprised that it could produce such a result in the minds of enthusiasts."

But surely Loisy and those who think with him are not the only persons who understand what religious faith is.

Most people are surprised at, and continue to invent explanations for, an event which we are here told should occasion no surprise in those who know.

Even Dr. Jacks finds it difficult to explain how the "Simple men" who were led on a disastrous adventure to Jerusalem by a "Youthful Prophet" who swiftly came to an inglorious end came

to think that he had been exalted to heaven as the Immortal Christ. (H.J., p. 500.)

Loisy has a definition of religious faith which will hardly appeal to everybody; hence, probably, his special understanding of the problem.

Religious faith is "an effort of the whole mind, imagination, intelligence and will to break through the framework of natural conditions, apparently inescapable, by which our existence seems to be mechanically determined" (p. 122).

Religion is not "the conscious domination of life by aspiration towards an absolute and abiding good which is recognised as being also the supreme reality upon which the aspirant is utterly dependent." Still less is it "love towards an infinite and eternal thing," as Dr. Taylor defines it. (*Faith of a Moralist*, II, p. 156.) It is merely an attempt to get away from what is unpleasant. This idea is further enforced by the statement that the Disciples and their followers expected the coming of the Kingdom to deliver them from the burdens and miseries of life and from the last enemy, death, and to involve the extermination of their enemies. (H.J., pp. 496, 497.)

This message, we are told, was easy to deliver and was eagerly accepted.

The whole idea was thoroughly Jewish, there was no sign of a new religion even after the "resurrection."

It is further asserted that it was quite an obvious step from the belief in the coming of a deliverer to the deification of the deliverer as soon as the message was proclaimed among people who were accustomed to deify their deliverers.

It has to be admitted that even Peter and the other Disciples believed that Jesus had entered "so to speak into the sphere of divinity by his resurrection which had set him at the right hand of God." (N.C., p. 350.)

The difference between this belief and the belief in mere survival, especially when it is supposed to have originated among Jews, is slurred over and the advance from this to a belief in the full divinity of Jesus is treated as if it were so perfectly natural, that even Pagans would be ready to make a God of a Jew who had made promises that were never performed.

So Christianity in all its essentials is represented as springing from nothing more than an unreasoning and invincible hope of deliverance from temporal ills, slightly moralised by the fear of total destruction under the coming régime for those who did not repent. (H.J., p. 497.)

But if there is any truth at all in the New Testament it is certain that what the Christian religion promised was not deliverance from temporal evil, but deliverance from sin, and that it made peace of mind and the hope of immortality depend on this essential condition.

It was so far from promising deliverance from tribulation that it deliberately stated that this would be the lot of the Christian in this world.

Dr. Jacks would have us believe that the Christian message was "relatively easy to deliver," but he can only do this by misrepresenting the content of the message. (H.J., pp. 509, 510.)

Deliverance from sin and the obligation to observe a code of morals not only higher than, but also different from, that in common use among men is not attractive to the many. When it involves certain contempt and ostracism and probable death, it becomes still more unpopular.

But this is what Christianity involved on the testimony not only of the New Testament, but on that of Pagan authors as well.

It used to be asserted that the moral code of Christianity was evolved in view of the approaching end of the age and that its impracticable character was due to the opinions of its first teachers. But now we are told that it must be attributed to a body of teachers who were trying to replace the fading hope of a catastrophic regeneration of mankind with a moral code borrowed from their surroundings. It is certainly strange that when the Church was in danger of losing the popularity which the message of immediate deliverance and vengeance is supposed to have produced, it should have deliberately made itself still more unpopular by the enforcement of such morality.

The whole history of other religions and indeed of the Christian Church itself goes to show that moral codes tend to become relaxed as they are more and more removed from the enthusiasm of first beginnings.

Probability is altogether on the side of the representation of the course of events in the New Testament, namely, that the hope of temporal deliverance was found among the disciples and friends of Jesus in the early days of his mission and was gradually replaced, under his influence, by the idea of deliverance from sin.

It is not for nothing that the message of the angel to Joseph promised one who should save his people from their *sins*, while the song of Zacharias and even the Magnificat are full of the thought of the reversal of social conditions and deliverance from enemies.

Loisy magnifies the power of religious faith, but, as we have seen, he does not mean by this what most men do.

It is one thing to say with the earlier school of Modernists that the resurrection appearances, though only psychic, nevertheless put the Disciples in touch with "the supreme reality" and revealed the truth that Jesus had conquered death and was alive for evermore. The men who maintained this view were not irreligious, although they deceived themselves into thinking that they had got rid of "miracle." On this view whatever moral awakening followed the "resurrection" had an adequate cause.

It is quite another thing to say that the highest morality and the most powerful spiritual force that the world has known had its origin in a delusion and in a fanatical expectation of an improvement in temporal conditions that was never realised, but rather completely falsified.

To try to explain this by the use of the expression "religious faith" used in a sense which is not commonly attached to these

words is simply an ingenious way of disguising the fact that an apparently sufficient cause is being alleged, where in reality no adequate cause was in operation. Even if we are pleased to consider men as no better than "vermin that crawl the earth" it is undoubtedly true that these vermin have been able to use their intellects to such good purpose as to discover a good deal of truth about their physical environment. All these discoveries have been inspired by the belief that the universe is intelligible because there is such a thing as ultimate truth. If the intellectual efforts of men are thus crowned with success in the physical sphere, we are surely justified in withholding our immediate assent when we are told, on such very slender grounds that the findings of Historical Science are that men's highest moral and spiritual attainments are founded on a complete delusion.

If this were so, the "truth" which we have now attained should enable men to rise still higher in the moral sphere with a rapidity equal to that with which their attainment of a measure of truth in the physical sciences has enabled them to advance.

In spite of what Dr. Jacks calls M. Loisy's lifelong toil "for the spiritual progress of humanity," we can see little sign of this advance.

* * * * *

When we come to the question of the composition of the Gospels and the Acts we see that it follows from what has been said that in all essentials they completely misrepresent the true story of what happened.

Loisy admits this openly in the case of the Acts as we now have it. Dr. Jacks sums up his opinion by calling it "an apologetic artefact of a somewhat reprehensible type," written by a second-century compiler "with an axe to grind and more unscrupulous than most in the means he took to grind it." (H.J., p. 500.)

The original history which, wonderful to say, is supposed to have been written by Luke has been altered and submerged by "audacious fictions" by this compiler.

This language, if not elegant, is at least refreshingly candid. A curious lingering respect for tradition keeps these critics from referring to the Gospels as "reprehensible artefacts" or, in plain language, impudent forgeries, but the whole theory presupposes that this is what they are, in spite of repeated assertions that they were written in all good faith. (H.J., p. 510.)

Ex hypothesi the Evangelists started with little or no information about the insignificant fanatic who had fired the enthusiasm of a few Galilean peasants into believing that death had not put an end to his career, but that he would soon come again to earth to gratify their wishes for improved social conditions and for vengeance on their enemies without any proof at all or any desire for proof.

Their task was to provide service books and manuals of controversy for a mixed judeohellenic community which had come to regard this man as a God. For we must never forget that it was not the picture in the Gospels or anything like it that inspired

the worship of Jesus, but the worship of Jesus that made the picture necessary.

They had to describe a being who was at once God and man such as would at once satisfy Jews who regarded God as endowed with unapproachable majesty and holiness and Gentiles who were not altogether uneducated and who had long had sufficient philosophical training to make them capable of asking awkward questions. This they succeeded in doing, not in one book, but in four, partly (we are told) out of the utterances of prophets who imagined in all good faith that they were speaking in the Spirit of Jesus, and partly out of their own imagination inspired by a shrewd appreciation of what was needed.

For example, the Evangelists described the Galilean disciples (in direct contradiction with the truth which some of them must have known) as dull and cowardly men of little faith who were completely disheartened by the death of Jesus. This they did partly to satisfy the jealousy of Paul and his followers and partly because such a misrepresentation was a particularly ingenious proof of the reality of the resurrection, a proof of which Christian preachers have not been slow to take advantage ever since.

Those who will not admit that there is any moral and spiritual force in the world except the Spirit of Humanity will, no doubt, continue to believe, as indeed they are compelled to believe, that the highest moral and spiritual influence that the world has ever known was founded, not only on a delusion, but on an elaborate system of falsehood.

When they imagine that this Spirit owes whatever advance it made in the first century of our era to the kind of process which they believe was at work in the production of the Gospels, they are reducing all that appertains to the moral and even to the rational side of our nature to a state of chaos which makes their assumption that there is such a thing as truth a mere absurdity.

A NEW HIGHWAY. By T. Wigley, M.A. *George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.* 8s. 6d.

It is impossible within the limits of our space to examine adequately this Modernist Apologia. For that is what it is. Little of orthodox belief will remain if the reader goes far on this new highway. At every stage of the journey he will revise his opinions, and at the end he will wonder where he is. Although the book is not intended for professional students, but for thoughtful men and women who desire to bring their religious beliefs and expressions into line with newer ideas in science and philosophy, it will not be easy for those who have had no technical training to assimilate what is set before them. Those who have read some theology will find much to criticise. What the good people at Blackheath who "sit under" Mr. Wigley think about it all we do not know. Certainly anyone who reads through these pages will know whither we are tending in these modern days.

RELIGION IN EUROPE (1215-1540).

BY THE REV. R. MERCER WILSON, M.A. (sometime Professor of Church History, Wycliffe Coll., Toronto).

KARL HEIM, in his essay on Time and Eternity, points out that whereas in the ancient world history was a marking-time or a movement in a circle like the changes of vegetation which repeat themselves annually, in the New Testament history is vectoral, standing under the symbol of a straight line which receives its direction from an end-point, the *τέλος*. "Now is salvation nearer to us than when we first believed." Every time has its own place on the straight line which leads up to the *τέλος*, and this place cannot be compared with any other. The important thing in each situation is to find the "Word of the Hour." Each time requires its own ethic. The present hour has a different distance from the last hour than that of every earlier Time. It all depends on our knowing the hour in which we find ourselves (*εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν*). We cannot reiterate without change for our time what Athanasius or Bernard of Clairvaux or Francis of Assisi or Wycliffe or Calvin or Luther has said. We must find the word for this hour. We must fulfil our destiny, which is to be children of this time. Hence the foolishness and futility of looking back to the excellencies and splendours of pre-Reformation days, which is such a habit with Romanist writers. Hilaire Belloc deserves to be made a Count of the Roman Empire for the annual regularity with which he publishes a biographical sketch to illustrate the harm which the Reformation has done to England in his opinion. Wyndham Lewis, in his book on Charles V, traces to the same source all the jingoistic nationalist wars of the last four centuries, implying that if Charles V's dream of a united empire had materialised, the growth of national competition, with all its attendant ills, would have been impossible. Rome was the bulwark of culture in the Dark and Middle Ages when the barbarians almost submerged the old Roman Imperium. If we want to find a twentieth-century replica of the Huns, we are pointed to the Soviet dictatorship. Other writers find in Luther the political forerunner of Lenin. But may it not be said that the ideals of Lenin are nearer to Charles V than to Luther? Communism is an international and centrally organised force, something poles asunder from the *cujus regio ejus religio* of Luther, which is the forerunner of Protestant Liberalism. It is a remarkable tribute to Luther, making him another Augustine—"two men in one skin"—if he is to be held responsible for the programme of Communism and for the national competitions of the centuries since the Reformation.

WHY ROME FAILED.

Karl Heim's essay also suggests the explanation of the decline and fall of the medieval papacy; it was because she knew not the day of her visitation, because she had not the message for the time,

that ecclesiastical Rome fell. As Dr. Elliott Binns puts it in his recent volume, *Decline and Fall of Medieval Papacy* :

"In face of a changing world the Papacy held close to the old ways. The Church may at times be impervious to new ideas; it seldom fails to exhibit readiness in finding fresh expedients for defending the old. So in the previous (fifteenth) century it had turned back the Conciliar Movement and other efforts after reform. The truth was that the abuses had become so interwoven with the structure, that to abolish them seemed tantamount to the demolition of the whole building. Moreover the Papacy was, by this time, a decaying institution, without the necessary vigour and energy, so it seemed, to reform itself. In the end it invited the fate of the man who, as Balzac somewhere says, repairs the roof of an outhouse by the light of his own burning homestead."

In a debate at Ottawa on the motion that Canada should withdraw from the League of Nations, Senator Hughes is reported as painting a glowing picture of the Middle Ages in which he described the thirteenth century as the greatest of all the centuries and the popes as the only disinterested authorities capable of intervening between princes and peoples and of giving fair decisions. Certainly when the Lateran Council met in 1215 it seemed to many that a new era was about to dawn in the life of the Church. Innocent III is a name to conjure with. It may be questioned whether any man possessed such power as he wielded in 1215. He decided who was to wear the crown of Germany. The Kings of Aragon and Bulgaria were his vassals. He compelled Philip II of France to cancel his divorce. From him the English King received his kingdom as a fief. Byzantium became part of the Latin world. The Lateran Council comprised 71 Archbishops and patriarchs, those of Constantinople and Jerusalem being present in person, those of Antioch and Alexandria by proxy, and altogether 412 bishops, 800 abbots and priors. With all this magnificence there was a deterioration, however, which became more evident as time went on. Before this century closes we see a secular ruler, Louis IX of France, as the real leader of Christendom. Witness the number of appeals that were submitted to him for arbitration. Questions from Flanders, from Achaia and from England were referred to his judgment, and even the Canons of Lyons Cathedral consulted him in a case in which they were engaged. If Senator Hughes was correct, all these matters should have been referred to the Pope; but the Senator has looked at the thirteenth century through rose-coloured glasses.

THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

Of course, this criticism makes no denial of the fact that the thirteenth century was a brilliant period. We have only to think of such men as Innocent III, Francis and Dominic, Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, to realise that it was an age of great personalities. In architecture, in the social order, in the economic system, it was a time of change, and in religion it was a time of activity and revival, an age of enthusiasm which might be described as an age of faith but still more of superstition. If there was in many earnest souls a consciousness of the nearness of the divine presence,

there was still more widespread a most vivid and constant terror of the devil and his innumerable agencies. We are liable to forget that "the life of the Middle Ages dissevered from its superstition would be," as Heywood says in his *History of Perugia*, "as incomprehensible as the *Iliad* without its contending deities or *Paradise Lost* without its Satan." It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the medieval believer might be paralleled in his outlook on life by what we read in such a modern Chinese book as *Pastor Hsi* or by the Central Africans for whom the R.T.S. publishes *Christ the Conqueror of all our Fears*. It was an age when moral considerations were far from predominant and the magic of the Devil was met and countered by the magic of saints and angels. Many illustrations of this may be found in the original documents presented to the reader in Professor G. G. Coulton's *Life in the Middle Ages*, vol. i.

THE PARAMOUR AND THE WAFER.

Let us take as examples one from Cæsarius of Heisterbach and one from Matthew Paris. Cæsarius became Prior and Teacher of the Novices in the Cistercian monastery of Heisterbach and his *Dialogus Miraculorum* was written between 1220 and 1235. In "The Sacrament as a Charm" he relates how a certain priest who doubted of the Sacrament of Christ's Body was reciting the canon of the Mass when the Lord showed him raw flesh in the host. This was also seen by Widekind, a noble standing behind his back. . . . This same Widekind had to wife the daughter of Siegfried of Runkel, a niece of the Abbess of Rheindorf, who told me this vision last year. Wouldst thou also know what the Lord shows to priests of evil life, for that He is crucified by them? . . . A certain lecherous priest wooed a woman; and unable to contain her consent, he kept the most pure body of the Lord in his mouth after Mass, hoping that, if he thus kissed her, her will would be bent to his desire by the force of the Sacrament. But the Lord . . . thus hindered his evil doing. When he would fain have gone forth from the Church door, he seemed to himself to grow so huge that he struck his head against the ceiling. The wretched man was so startled that he drew the host from his mouth and buried it. But fearing the swift vengeance of God, he confessed the sacrilege to a priest, his familiar friend. So they went together to the place and threw back the dust, where they found not the appearance of bread, but the shape, though small, of a man hanging on the cross, fleshy and blood-stained. What was afterwards done with it, or what the priest did, I forget, for it is long since this was told me by Hermann our Cantor, to whom the story was fairly well known. . . . A certain priest inquired of the devil that was in a demoniac girl, a laywoman, why Hartdyfa of Cochem had been so cruelly tormented for so long a time; and the demon answered through the girl's mouth, "Why? she hath well and abundantly deserved it, for she sowed the Most High in her cabbage-beds." The priest understood not this saying, nor would the devil explain it further; he therefore sought out the woman Hartdyfa and told her of the devil's words, warning her not

to deny if she understood them. She confessed her fault forthwith, saying, "I understand only too well; but I have never yet told it to any man. When I was young and had got me a garden plot to till, I took in a wandering woman one night as my guest, to whom when I complained of the ravage of my garden, telling how my cabbages were eaten up with caterpillars, she replied, 'I will teach thee a good remedy. Take thou the Lord's Body and crumble it up and sprinkle the crumbs over thy cabbages; so shall that plague cease forthwith.' I, wretched woman, caring more for my garden than for the Sacrament, having received the Lord's Body at Easter, took it from my mouth and used it as she had taught me, which did indeed turn to the comfort of my cabbages, but to mine own torment, as the devil hath said."

THE BOWING CRUCIFIX.

So much for superstition and credulity in Cæsarius of Heisterbach. The other example is from Matthew Paris, monk of St. Albans and Historiographer Royal to Henry III. He was the greatest of English medieval chroniclers and died early in the second half of the thirteenth century. In "The Knight and the Crucifix" Matthew Paris relates how a certain knight in the New Forest, having been convicted of stealing the King's deer, was sentenced by Richard I to banishment, so that he who had before rejoiced in choice delicacies had to beg his bread among strangers. After a while he thought to implore the King's mercy; wherefore, coming to the King in Normandy, he found him at early morn in a certain Church, whither he was come to hear Mass. Into which Church he entered trembling, not daring to raise his eyes to the King, who, being one of the comeliest of men to see, was yet terrible to behold at such times. The Knight therefore betook himself to the Crucifix, before which he bowed again and again on his knees with bitter tears, beseeching that Crucified One with all humility that He might mercifully restore him to the King's grace. The King, seeing how earnestly the knight prayed, beheld in him a marvel worthy of record. For as often as the Knight bowed his knees to adore that image, the Crucifix for his part inclined his head and neck most humbly to his genuflexions; which the King marvelled to see again and again, and was moved to admiration. When therefore the Mass was ended, the King straightway summoned that knight to speak with him, and inquired closely who and whence he might be. To whom he answered trembling, "My lord, I am your liegeman as were all my ancestors," and told in order how he had been caught stealing the deer and deprived of his inheritance, and banished with his family. Then said the King, "Didst thou ever in thy life any good deed for reverence and honour of the Holy Cross?" The Knight replied telling the King what he had once done in such reverence, how on a Good Friday he had spared his father's murderer. Whereupon the King, calling the Bishops and Barons who were there present, revealed to all men the vision he had seen: to wit, how the Crucifix had humbly bent his head and neck at each

genuflexion of the Knight. By royal command the Knight was restored to all his lands and privileges from which he had been banished; and (as we believe) this merciful act of pious King Richard, with other deeds of his, freed him from the peril of damnation and released him the sooner from torment.

All this kind of fear and superstition encouraged the mechanical in religion, and it is impossible to appreciate the religious life of Europe in the Middle Ages without remembering that the ideal of life then was asceticism, monasticism. The reforms instituted at Clugny about 900, at Citeaux about 1100, by the orders of mendicant friars about 1200, redounded to the advantage of the whole Church. "Orders" sprang up and developed a constitution which, side by side with that of the hierarchy, first gave monasticism its full power in the world. In former times, when the secularisation of the Church was completed after Constantine, the old ideal of a holy community living apart from the world sought refuge in monasticism. But in the Middle Ages a remarkable change took place: the secular Church became monasticised, the greatest popes were monks, and the highest demand made by asceticism, the celibacy which cuts men off from the life of the family and the people, was made of all priests and was actually attained, if we disregard the innumerable exceptions which proved the rule. Of course, the whole idea of the ascetic life as so much above the ordinary Christian was quite wrong. For one thing, it tended to give the monk a false superiority complex; for another thing, it made asceticism an end in itself, which brought its own inevitable punishment. At the end of the twelfth century the importance of those great capitalistic institutions known as monasteries was more political and economic than religious.

THE COMING OF THE FRIARS.

The more active and public mode of asceticism linked with the names of Francis and Dominic attracted the lay-world to its own ideal in a different way. Francis lived in a real sense *in* the world; he could appreciate its natural beauty just as he could deplore the misery of men. Whereas the Cistercians had sought places of solitude and had transformed them into centres of civilisation, the orders of mendicants went to the busy centres of life, and in places like Milan and Lyons they preached in the streets the Gospel of voluntary poverty. From the twelfth century onwards a number of half-monastic modes of life came into evidence: knightly orders, Tertiaries, Beguines, brotherhoods, and this system of half-ascetic clubs penetrated the life of many a town. In these individual brotherhoods, no doubt, many an honest citizen was able to do something for the salvation of his own soul. But the early ideals were lost to view in an astonishingly brief space of time. In justice to St. Francis it is only fair to remember that his last instructions laid down that friars should be taught a trade. The term *mendicant* friars has obscured this healthy point of view. Indeed, Francis's successors and admirers have obscured or suppressed some of the

healthier and more natural elements of a saint as exemplified in the actual life of their hero. The nudists and scantily clothed advocates of health and sunshine who are condemned by ecclesiastical authorities might claim St. Francis as their patron with some measure of truth. In other words, he was no mere ascetic. His death-bed desire for a visit from Jacoba di Settesoli with her soothing presence and her favourite marzipan cakes shows him to be a very human person.

Likewise his plainness and simplicity are often overlooked. Goethe relates that when he visited Assisi in 1786 he passed by the Church of St. Francis with disgust to visit the Temple of Minerva. St. Francis was in some respects a forerunner of the Puritans. This is not to deny that the coming of the friars witnessed a wave of revival and that their preaching struck a fresh note. Moreover, the admission of many of the poorer classes gave the new orders a link with the democracy which was lacking in the case of the long-established and aristocratic monasteries. Indeed, it has been suggested that by elevating poverty into a virtue the friars helped to stave off some revolutionary outbreaks, just as the Evangelical Revival under Wesley and Whitefield is credited with having helped to save England from the horrors which drenched France with blood in the eighteenth century. But the growth of the new orders was so rapid, corruption set in very quickly and the original ideals were smothered by subsequent developments. The century which began with great promise ended in bitterness, disillusionment and loss. In the expressive words of Professor Gwatkin—

“the panorama of events is magnificent—the capture of Constantinople, the breaking of the Moorish power in Spain at Navas de Tolosa, King John’s submission and the Charter, the extirpation of the Albigenses, the rise of the mendicants, the Mongol devastations, the last and mightiest struggle of the Hohenstaufen Empire, the Barons’ War in England, the loss of Antioch and Acre, and the rise of France to a position in Europe almost as commanding as Napoleon’s. This was the age of the schoolmen, the age of Roger Bacon, the age of the great Cathedrals. A wave ran through the world, from the Irrawaddy to the Scottish borders, from the gold and silver temples of Pagán to the minsters of York and Lincoln. So glorious was the start of the young nations of Europe.”

But in the fourteenth century the only wave which ran through the world was the Black Death. This century of change and decay has for its landmarks

“the decisive defeat of the Papacy under Boniface VIII by the new nations, its Babylonish Captivity at Avignon, and following this the Great Schism and the rise of Lollardism in England. . . . The scandals of the thirteenth century were followed by subjection to France and greater scandals in the fourteenth century; and the culminating scandals of the Great Schism made irresistible the cry for reformation of the Church in head and members.”

THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.

Before saying a word in conclusion concerning Spain it may not be amiss to remark in this year which witnesses the celebration of the centenary of the emancipation of the slaves that the condition of the villains or serfs on the estates, whether lay or monastic, in

the Middle Ages did not receive any amelioration through the action of ecclesiastical authorities. We are prone to forget in these days that the average man of the Middle Ages was a serf, who could not call either his soul or his body his own. Lord Acton has often been quoted where he points out "Medieval liberty differs from modern in this, that it depended on property."¹ The serf had no property at all and at the hey-day of monasticism more than half the population of England and Scotland was in servitude. They slaved in fields not their own, they were liable to the overseer's rod if they slackened their efforts, they crawled, tired out at the end of the day, to the shelter of a mud hovel and stretched their weary limbs on an evil-smelling straw pallet, after having partaken of black broth and ryebread. The phrase "eating humble pie" reminds us that they were dependent on the bounty of the hunter for the portions of the deer which he disdained; they had to go and fight at their lord's bidding and leave their loved ones to possibilities which we should not care to contemplate. Neither bondman nor bondwoman was free to marry. If a serf married, he had to pay his lord a fine; and if he took his partner from another manor he paid a second fine, for diminishing the prospective stock of labour on the manor to which he belonged. Sometimes the lord claimed the right of making, as well as forbidding, marriages. And when death came it made things worse. The peasant's widow and children saw their best movable goods going as "heriot" to the lord of the manor and as "mortuary" to the priest; unless the monk was both landlord and parson, in which case the double benefit of "heriot" and "mortuary" fell into the same hands. Undoubtedly the custom of "mortuary," together with the law of tithes, mass-penny and other ecclesiastical dues, arrayed the clerical interest almost as definitely as those of the lay-lord against the serf. No doubt, there were considerate clerical landlords as well as lay ones. But the Church was generally on the lord's side (with a small l) and looked down on the peasantry.

It is indeed true that the Black Death made a big difference when it came. This appalling scourge hastened the decay of the manorial system and gave the labourers an advantage which their own well-grounded complaints never gained for them. It probably marked an economic change in the Middle Ages almost as violent as the Great War marks in our time. But the peasant was the pariah of medieval society, as is illustrated for us in the satirical "Peasant Catechism" written by a fifteenth-century graduate of the University of Vienna:

"What part of speech is peasant (*rusticus*)? A noun. What sort of noun? Jewish. Wherefore? Because he is as silly and ugly as a Jew. . . . What gender? The asinine gender; for in all his deeds and works he is ever like unto an ass . . . the backs of all peasants are bowed like the back of an ox. . . . The peasant grieves that the clerks make free with his wife and live on his labours."²

¹ *Letters*, p. 272.

² P. Lehmann, *Parodistische Texte*, 1924, p. 21.

Even St. Thomas Aquinas followed Aristotle more than Holy Scripture in his attitude to the serf, when he judged the ideal state to be one in which the peasants are strong of arm, dull of intellect, and divided among themselves by mutual distrust so as to give less trouble to their masters.¹ When we look for a vigorous protest from the Schoolmen against the conditions of serfdom, we do not find it till we come to heretical, condemned, Bible-translating John Wycliffe, who was not only the last of the Schoolmen but also the first of the Reformers.

THE SPANISH REFORMERS.

In referring to Spain, Dr. Elliott Binns dismisses the subject of the Renaissance with a brief reference to the Greek Testament produced by Cardinal Ximenes, but in a footnote he suggests that the Spanish Renaissance had more reality than is generally allowed. This modified attitude is wise, in the light of modern investigations. Cervantes died in the same year as Shakespeare, 1616. But a hundred years before this date the brothers, Alfonso and Juan de Valdes, exercised a considerable influence both within and without the Peninsula. We know that the works of Erasmus as well as Luther were read and favoured in Spain. So much so, that official action was taken prohibiting their sale or perusal; briefs were issued to this effect in 1521 and 1527. "How I am to be pitied!" exclaims Erasmus (in *Epistolae* 884 and 907), "the Lutherans attack me as a convicted papist, and the Catholics run me down as a friend of Luther." But the influence of the Reformed doctrines in Spain is traceable to earlier sources than Luther. Alfonso de Valdes was a young man of talents who accompanied Charles V as secretary to his coronation in 1520, and was later on accused before the Holy Office as a suspected Lutheran. His brother Juan de Valdes was also attached to the Court, but quitted Spain about 1535 in the company of Charles V, who sent him to Naples to act as Secretary to the Viceroy. Some of the writings of this eminent Spanish scholar have come down to us; and if they could be republished to-day they would show Spain and the Latin Republics of South America that the doctrines of the Reformation are not foreign to the best scholarship and the noblest literary traditions of Spain. Juan de Valdes' *Advice on the Interpreters of Holy Scripture* was originally sent in the form of a letter to his friend Bartolomé Carranza, afterwards Archbishop of Toledo. Indeed, this tract in the Primate's possession formed one of the gravest articles of the charge against that distinguished prelate. The "Advice" allowed that the interpretations of the Fathers are not indispensable to a right understanding of Holy Writ, that we are justified by a lively faith in the passion of our Saviour and that it is possible to know that we have been justified. These truths de Valdes seems to have gleaned from the *Christian Institutes* of Tauler, one of the German mystics of the fourteenth century, who had no great enthusiasm for institutional religion but laid much stress on meditation and con-

¹ *Comment. in Polit.*, lib. VII. lect. VIII.

templation. A Spanish translation of the *Imitatio Christi*, and of another similar work, the *Ladder of Paradise*, were published at the close of the fifteenth century. Juan de Avila, Luis de Granada, Confessor to the Queen Regent of Portugal and St. Francis de Borgia, Duke of Gandia, third General of the Jesuits, were the authors of works for which they were prosecuted before the Inquisition as mystics and illuminati: the illuminati of Spain seem to have resembled the Quakers more than the Quietists of France, as far as may be judged from the inquisitors' accounts of them.

JUAN DE VALDES AT NAPLES.

Without taking into account the Vaudois and their influence, the doctrines of Luther were supposed to have been introduced into Naples by the German soldiers who, after the sack of Rome, obliged the French to raise the siege of Naples. The Germans garrisoned the city for some time. But the Germans were succeeded by an individual who is credited by a contemporary historian¹ with having "caused a far greater slaughter of souls than all the thousands of heretical soldiery." This is an eloquent tribute to the evangelical zeal of Juan de Valdes, secretary to Don Petro de Toledo the Viceroy. He is a shining example of the great influence for good which may be wielded by a cultured and learned Christian layman. Fortunately for him, the Spanish Inquisition had not yet been established in Naples. His enthusiasm for the best literature became infectious, his evangelical zeal attracted some of the choicest spirits in Italy; Flaminio and Carnesecchi, Occhino, Peter Martyr Vermiglio and the beautiful Julia Gonzaga, Duchess of Trajetto, became his disciples or associates. His *Christian Alphabet* is a dialogue between him and the Duchess, in which he teaches her how to walk in newness of life. He wrote in 1533 a truly classical work, his *Dialogue on the Spanish Language*. His translation of the Psalms, with Spanish commentary, has been lost. His *Commentaries on Rom. and I Cor.* show that he contemplated a larger work, perhaps the whole New Testament. His *Catechism*, earlier than Luther's *Catechism*, has recently been discovered in a French Library. He deserves honour as the first person to undertake a translation of the Scriptures from the original languages into Spanish. He wrote a pamphlet on "Teaching Children Christianity" which is known only in a Latin translation as *Lac Spirituale*, three tracts on Justification by Faith and one on the Believer's Assurance of Justification and Glorification. The Spanish original of his *One Hundred and Ten Considerations* is lost, but twelve editions of translations have been published. From Italian they have been translated into five other languages. Three editions appeared in English. To the Editor of the first English edition George Herbert wrote in 1638:

"I wish you by all means to publish it, for these three eminent things observable therein: (1) That God in the midst of Popery should open the eyes of one to understand and express so clearly and excellently the intent

¹ Caraccioli, *Collect. de Vita Pauli*, IV, p. 239.

of the Gospel in the acceptation of Christ's righteousness (as he sheweth through all his Considerations), a thing strangely buried and darkened by the adversaries, and their great stumbling-block. (2) The great honour and reverence which he bears everywhere towards our dear Master and Lord, setting His merit forth so piously, for which I do so love him, that, were there nothing else, I would print it, that with it the honour of my Lord might be published. (3) The many pious rules about ordering our life, about mortification and observation of God's kingdom within us and the working thereof. These three things are very eminent in the author and overweigh the defects towards the publishing thereof." ¹

These works of Valdeso are, to use Milton's expression, "the precious life-blood of a master spirit," of an apostle, as it were, to the aristocracy of birth and intellect of his day; whom the Inquisition and the Roman Court feared and hated as an heresiarch, but who was acknowledged and honoured of the Holy Spirit to be the father in Christ of such personages as Guilia Gonzaga and Vittoria Colonna, of Peter Martyr Vemiglio and of Galezzo Caraccioli.

Peter Martyr Vemiglio, as Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, appointed by Cranmer interpreter of the Holy Scripture, began his career at the University by expounding 1 Cor.—a book on which Juan de Valdes had written a commentary.

At the death of Edward VI Peter Martyr Vemiglio, to escape the persecution of Mary, had to fly England and filled Protestant chairs both at Strasburg and Zurich; his friend and pupil, Bishop Jewel, sought safety in exile likewise, and during many years was received as a member in Peter Martyr's household, living at his table.

The *Zurich Letters* witness with what reverence both Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Jewel held Peter Martyr as the master spirit in Israel; and "can it be otherwise than deeply interesting to the English reader to study the sentiments of Juan de Valdes who moulded the mind, in Evangelical doctrine, of Peter Martyr, the arch-counsellor of the recognised founders of the English Church?"

In 1540 he fell asleep in Christ, deeply honoured by many noble friends who owned him as their spiritual father. "One of the rarest men in Europe," says Bonfadio. The Churches which arose out of the circle which he formed were soon scattered after his death and sadly reduced by persecution.

If, in the next few years, Spain and Latin America discover for themselves and appropriate the spiritual principles set forth in the works of their own sixteenth-century mystical and Christian scholars, such as *La Guia de Pecadores* of Friar Luis de Granada, and *The One Hundred and Ten Considerations* of Juan de Valdes, while Germany is rediscovering, through the works of Karl Barth and Emil Brunner, and to a considerable degree in Karl Heim also, the best elements of the Evangelical principles of Calvin and Luther, whereby the faithfulness of the Pastors' Emergency League to the great principles of New Testament teaching, in opposition to the political ecclesiastical Nazi dictation, is both fortified and purified, then we may see in all the tangled Continental complications of to-day some indications of the promise of a new and better age.

¹ Taken from the Oxford edition de Valdes' *Considerations*.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE IN SPAIN AND LATIN AMERICA.

BY JUAN ORTOS GONZALEZ.

ONE of the greatest changes produced by the Republic has been to awaken the desire in the Spanish people for reading serious books, especially among the middle and labour classes. The Republic has discouraged very much bull-fights, lotteries and books of fiction. Republican leaders have said to the common people: "Spain was the most backward country in Europe, because it was a country with few schools and with few readers of good books. Every Spaniard who wishes to see better days for Spain ought to be willing to ask for more schools, and to read more and better books." And the Spanish people have taken to heart the advice of the Republican leaders. You cannot visit any Public Library to-day without seeing that every seat is taken and some are reading standing up because there is no more room for sitting, and this is all the more astonishing because the Republic has established more than 400 new Public Libraries.

Also, you will find all the Public Schools overcrowded in spite of the fact that the Republic has, in the last three years, opened more than 13,000 new schools. Another surprise that will strike every foreigner, and even Spaniard, is that books of fiction are not in demand, only books about sociology, history, philosophy and so forth. These form the majority of books which you will see in the hands of readers. Another fact which ought to be taken into consideration by every author who wishes his works to be read is, that the Spanish mind to-day is a very questioning one. The Spaniard has been cheated so much by bad authors and has been misled for so long by political as well as religious leaders that he does not take anything for granted; he wants to examine facts and reasons and form his own judgment and opinion. This, although a very encouraging sign, is at the same time a great handicap, because Marxists and Communists have, since the beginning of the Republic, inundated the mind of the worker (and I am speaking particularly of the masses) with atheistic literature, and such literature has been taken by the ignorant labouring classes as the most scientific and final. To me, looking from the standpoint both of religion and science, the greatest hope for succeeding in arousing religious interest is, not only by showing that the type of Marxism and Communism in Russia is anti-religious, but also anti-scientific. But we shall speak later in this paper about these points.

We cannot speak of general types of books for all Spaniards for the simple reason that there are a great many different types of Spaniards, and therefore they have different needs to be met by books. Let me give briefly a classification of the problem as

I see it. First of all, let us divide the whole of Spain into two groups, Catholics and non-Catholics—I do not want to say anti-Catholics because then many will not be included in these two groups. The Catholics can be divided into three classes, loyal, indifferent and nominal. Loyal Catholics are very few in Spain. I do not think I exaggerate when I say that less than 10 per cent. are men and less than 40 per cent. are women. For these we can do very little, because every pamphlet or book about religion which has not at the beginning these words, "With the approval of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical authorities," it will be considered a sin to read. No religious book can be written even in defence of the Roman Catholic Church, and no religious book can be read in defence of the Roman Catholic Church without committing a mortal sin if it lacks the approval in print of the Roman Catholic authorities.

The indifferent Catholics are those who go to Church only at such times as Holy Week and Christmas and now and then to hear a special sermon, or to accompany friends at baptisms, marriages, funerals and so forth, which always take place in the Church. They, with the nominal Catholics, constitute the majority, probably more than 70 per cent. men and more than 40 per cent. women. The difference I make between nominal and indifferent Catholics is, that the former scarcely visit the Church, some of them never going to a service for years. This large group of indifferent and nominal Catholics is usually liberal-minded. They will welcome any book which may happen to interest them whether it has the approval of the Roman Catholic authorities or not. For the majority of them the prohibition of the Roman Catholic authorities will stimulate them to read the books.

Among the non-Catholics, the first group to consider is the anti-Catholic. This group does not consist of many intellectuals but of a very large part of the labour classes. The majority of them are not only aggressive anti-Catholics, but aggressive against any form of positive religion, no matter whether that religion is Catholic, Protestant or Jewish. A point of interest to authors about this class is that, while they claim to be scientific, they are anti-Catholic and anti-religious because they are convinced that true science repudiates every type of religion. Then comes a small group, but a very representative one, of Theosophists. A larger group, but of a very low type of culture, are the Spiritists. A very special group, probably less than two or three hundred in the whole of Spain, are real believers without any Church whatever. Some belonging to this group have been in the past, and are to-day, the most influential leaders in education and literature. Here are some of them: Azcarate, Gines de los Rios (both dead), Unamuno, Zuleta and Fernando de los Rios. Then the Protestants and their sympathisers.

This classification is very far from being complete, but for our purpose it represents, I think, quite correctly the intellectual and spiritual needs which have to be met by books. For all of the first

three groups the most important thing is to write books in which Christianity is presented in its primitive purity. The true religious soul of Spain is such, that in its conception of the present life and the life to come, and about the divine inspiration of the Bible, and particularly of the Gospels, writings without an ecclesiastical or theological setting will appeal to them. I have not time to enlarge on this point, but my book, *El Destino de los Pueblos Ibericos*, gives reasons and facts to prove this.

To reach these classes, books ought, first of all, to have an imprint which is not ecclesiastical. Secondly, the terminology or vocabulary ought not to be theological; ecclesiastical garb and theological dress are abhorrent to them. Thirdly, in substance and style they ought to be as perfect as possible. Anglo-Saxons care more for facts and good reasoning than for beautiful words and eloquent style, but Spaniards and Latin Americans, although recently they are changing and acquiring the Anglo-Saxon point of view, require a high standard in the choice of words and in style.

For anti-Catholics and unbelievers the appeal ought to be made on the basis of the last word in science, quoting the testimonies of the best scholars in science—no other authority will have any appeal to this type; moreover, the titles of the books ought to be of a challenging nature. Let me illustrate what I mean. I am preparing now a book entitled *The Credulity of Unbelievers*. I hope also to prepare pamphlets such as, *Why it has been rightly said that religion is opium to the masses, Ecclesiasticism is the source of Unbelief, Believers who are practically Atheists, Unbelievers who practically live as Believers*. For the common people I am preparing a book entitled *Religion within the Reach of All*.

For all types of Roman Catholics, we have to write pamphlets and books presenting our doctrines in an appealing way. The ignorance of Roman Catholics on the subject of Protestantism is appalling. For the loyal Roman Catholics, we have to write in such a way that they may see that we believe in all the great and fundamental truths in which they believe; and we must demonstrate the fact that our difference from themselves lies in our belief in Christ not only as the Founder of the Christian Church but as superior to her, in His sacrifice as sufficient and complete and His intercession as supreme, and that these beliefs are founded on the Gospel and Apostolic History. In all books and pamphlets prepared for loyal Roman Catholics, we should aim not to persuade them to give up what they have, but to look more and more exclusively to Christ and His Gospel.

For the Protestants, we need above all more and better devotional and preaching literature. It is almost a tragedy that, having so much good devotional and preaching literature in the works of some of the Spanish reformers and mystics, scarcely any use has been made of it by Spanish Protestants. To me, it is very significant that the only two missionaries who have benefited by the use of such literature have been Rev. H. G. Smith of England, and Dr. John A. Mackay formerly of Scotland but now of New York.

The former told me: "Next to the Bible, *La Guia de Pecadores* of Friar Luis de Granada is my favourite book for preaching material"; and the latter reveals his appreciation of that literature in his splendid book, *The Other Spanish Christ*. I am glad that the Religious Tract Society, London, is considering the publication of *The 110 Considerations of Juan Valdes*, which is a real treasure for preachers and spiritually-minded men.

We ought also to publish pamphlets and books about personal work, self-support, and similar subjects. Above all, we ought to publish literature which will demonstrate to Spaniards and Latin Americans that what Germans, Englishmen and others did in the sixteenth century they can do to-day. I am gathering facts and reasons, and making notes about them, for a book dealing with that subject, and hope to interest some Latin American to help me with it, in order that the book may appeal to both Spaniards and Latin Americans.

PREPARATION, PRESENTATION, AND DISTRIBUTION.

As much as possible, all religious literature ought to be prepared by nationals, either of Spain or of Latin America. Only exceptional religious books ought to be translated; and even those should be freely translated or well adapted to the Spanish and Latin American mind. To-day, if we take into account Latin America as well as Spain, there are a great many who could prepare leaflets, pamphlets and good books. Of course, they will need some help and leisure to enable them to do this. The best writers are usually overcrowded with other work, and are without the necessary secretarial help for the preparation of manuscripts. If a well-planned and comprehensive programme could be arranged and made known to all the missionary boards and national leaders of Spain and Latin America, requesting their co-operation by means of whatever books, pamphlets or leaflets each one could prepare, in a very short time we could have abundant and satisfactory literature. Since leaving my position as official translator of Spanish books in the Committee on Co-operation in Latin America, which is made up of about forty-five Boards having work in Latin America, and going to Spain where I hope to live and work for many years, I have been thinking about and planning such a programme of literature.

PRESENTATION.

So far, the Protestant religious books available in both Spain and Latin America have been lacking in the matter of good presentation. Paper, binding and printing have been poor and unattractive; and such presentation is a greater handicap because the Spanish and Latin American people are very fond of art and beauty. When one knows and can compare the Protestant literature with other literary publications, it can easily be seen how deficient is our presentation. Also, we have to avoid anything redolent of ecclesiasticism in our titles or imprint.

DISTRIBUTION.

In this more than in any other aspect, our literature programme has been altogether deficient.

First of all, we ought to have in view distribution in Spanish-speaking countries as a whole. There are more than twenty of them, but the middle and cultured classes of all have an identical cultural soul and require the same type of literature, no matter what foreign critics and writers have said to the contrary. A university man from Bolivia thinks and speaks like a university man from Argentina or from Spain, reads almost the same books, and has identical views about individual and social life. Not long ago, an Oxford professor (whose name I do not now recall) wrote a history of Argentina, in which he states that the French influence there is very superficial (by some foreign critics, Argentina has been considered more French than Spanish), and that the real influence is altogether Spanish, as can be demonstrated by the best and most widely read books and authors. Only the uncultured Indians constitute a body by themselves; but even the cultured Indian is identical with the cultured Spaniard in his cultural background, and we ought to keep in mind that to-day there are a great many cultured Indians in Mexico, Chile and Peru. By cultured Indians, I mean university men.

Spain is the best centre for distribution. Books published in one or another of the Spanish republics will encounter prejudices which do not affect Spain. Besides, the cost of mailing is less from Spain than from many of the South American Republics. This opinion can be corroborated by the testimony of the best missionaries and nationals who are well acquainted with the selling of books in Latin America.

Our books so far have not reached outsiders in any considerable number because our way of announcing them is practically of no value. We have to publish our material and present it in such a way that it can be sent to the best newspapers and magazines for review and to the best booksellers for exhibition and sale. In this respect, Protestants have done almost nothing. Without some kind of publicity, we cannot expect good sales, no matter how good is our material. In this matter, also, I hope to render good service, when I secure competent Spanish stenographic help.

URGENCY.

The eagerness of the Spaniard to read—and of the Latin American also on a smaller scale—has enabled the Marxist and the atheist to flood Spain and Latin America with books advocating unbelief and communism. If we delay undertaking a greater campaign for the publication of more and better books, pamphlets and leaflets, we shall soon find the field fully occupied by bad literature which will make our task more difficult. To-day in both Spain and Latin America, the written word is more needed, more important and more influential than the spoken word. Often it is

difficult to gather a crowd to listen to a speaker ; but the written word can easily go everywhere and reach everybody. I believe that—great as is the need for good evangelists and lecturers, and I myself plan to preach and lecture and help others to do the same—without doubt the written word is to-day the most imperative need.

The foregoing has been written after witnessing the most awful revolutionary strike in Madrid, where I do not know how many were killed and wounded, both civilians and soldiers ; where I heard the sound of many bombs and innumerable rifle shots ; where two bullets passed through my own hotel room, fortunately without touching me, though in the room below a man was killed and a woman wounded, and on the floor above more than thirty bullets were afterwards found.

I am finishing this paper in Valencia, where from my own room I can see cannon and machine guns ready to be fired, and hundreds of soldiers and police marching about. And yet, I feel as sure as ever that religious freedom in Spain will continue, no matter what may be the final outcome of the present struggle ; that the monarchy is not likely to be restored ; and that we loyal evangelicals ought to aid in this great crisis by helping Spain to recover her lost Spanish religious soul. Oh ! may our friends in England help us to do this.

VALENCIA, SPAIN,
October 10, 1934.

[This paper is the property of the Rev. R. Mercer Wilson, the Religious Tract Society, London, acting on behalf of the author.]

THE LIFE OF T. R. MATTHEWS. By Thomas Wright. *C. J. Farncombe & Sons, Ltd.* £1 1s.

Many interesting sidelights are thrown upon contemporary life in this memoir of T. R. Matthews, a powerful Evangelical preacher, who was born in the Isle of Ely in 1795. The value of faithful testimony in dark days is illustrated by the lives of the Evangelical stalwarts. Matthews came under Simeon's influence at Cambridge. He was a friend of Edward Fitzgerald, upon whose brother John the mantle of Matthews fell. It is interesting to read that the first edition of Omar Khayyám did not sell at 2s. 6d. It was reduced to 1s. 3d. and ultimately to 1d. By good fortune Swinburne saw one. This led to the fame of Edward Fitzgerald's work. Matthews exercised a great influence, principally in the Home Counties. Many of his sayings are recorded. Here is one on "Bowling Naamans." He laments the fact the Church still had bowing Naamans—those who would conciliate the Church of Rome, adding, "and more will yet arise, alias Puseyites."

We commend this volume by Mr. Thomas Wright of "Cowper" fame to all who cherish the memory of our Evangelical forefathers. The facts connected with them are all too little known.

WOMEN AND THE MINISTRY.

BY THE REV. E. HIRST, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Stockport.

IT is reported that Dr. Johnson once remarked, "Sir, a woman preaching is like a dog walking on his hind legs. It is not done well; but you are surprised to find it done at all." Yet there have been notable women preachers in the past, even as there are successful female preachers in our own days. The Evangelical Revival afforded an opportunity of soul-winning by preaching, and women played no unimportant part in it. That movement is rich in the names of women who helped to change the religious life of England by their ministry.

This activity is the direct outcome of the elevated position of women under Christianity. No movement, religious or social, has ever raised women to a level equal to that on which the Christian faith has placed them. There may be isolated instances of a higher position reached by them or given to them, such as the mothers of Sparta and the women rulers of antiquity. The Queen of Sheba and Candace of Ethiopia, to instance but two, are outstanding examples; but the ordinary level was low. There can be no doubt that by His teaching and example Christ put women on to a much higher plane than they had previously occupied. He broke down many barriers and destroyed many prejudices, as in His conversation with the woman at the well of Sychar, and that unfortunate woman taken in adultery. By emphasising the value of personality in God's sight, Our Lord proclaimed the equality of the sexes. This is noticeable in His dealings with divorce, for He left nothing to man's caprice. Both husband and wife were equally bound by the moral law.¹

Following his Lord, St. Paul emphasised the fact of equality in Christ. "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus."² This was a tremendous advance, especially for St. Paul, whose outlook sometimes seems stern. It is indeed as Dr. Inge says: "The most radical difference, that implanted by nature herself in distinguishing the sexes, is seen to be irrelevant when our business is with immortal souls."³

This spiritual equality before God is further emphasised when one considers that the priestly functions of the priestly people of God are the prerogative of the whole Church. Within that body all are equal, and each member of Christ has a ministry which is peculiarly his own. The parable of the Talents shows this, and in addition there is His word, "ye shall be my witnesses."⁴ Here is a ministry for all believers, men and women alike; the ministry of witness.

Ministry may mean either the act of ministering, serving, aiding

¹ See St. Matt. v. 31-2; xix. 3-12.

² Gal. iii. 28.

³ *Christian Ethics and Modern Problems*, p. 287.

⁴ Acts i. 8.

or helping, or the office or function of a minister of the Gospel. The term comes to us from the Greek through the Latin, and originally implied waiting at table, so its central thought is that of service. Consequently, ministry may be either of a general nature, or of a particular kind as that to which one is set apart by ordination.

It is well known that women frequently exercised certain forms of ministry in pagan systems, but those offices were often of a nature which degraded rather than elevated their holders. There were the Vestal Virgins who were a kind of priestesses to Vesta, the goddess of the domestic hearth. Their duties were to keep the sacred fires burning and offer prayers daily for the Roman state. Among the Papyri discovered in Memphis are letters from two girls, twins, who acted as attendants in the Serapeum, and show that they had certain offices and duties given to them within the Temple.

In the Old Testament we do not read of women performing priestly functions. There were periods of degeneracy when pagan influences wrought harm amongst the people of Israel, and the prophets condemned these with no uncertain voice, for they were frequently related to forms of oriental nature worships in which women played a part, and led to spiritual and moral decay. The prophetic office was held occasionally by women, and one woman figures amongst the Judges.¹

The New Testament mentions various types of ministries. Some are quite general in scope, others are more particularly defined. During our Lord's lifetime there were the women who ministered of their substance both to Him and His disciples.² This was a general kind of ministry in which all could share. A more specialised ministry, in that its scope was clearly defined, is to be found in that to which both the twelve and the seventy were appointed.³ After the Ascension, when the Church began to expand, its ministries were all regarded as contributing to one great purpose, whether they were general ministries or more specially defined spheres of activity. All were given "for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ."⁴ It is noticeable, however, that there were no women apostles and that the elders of the Church were all men. This was in accordance with the invariable custom of the Synagogues, on which model the Christian services and administration largely were developed. There were prophetesses in the early church as instanced by Philip's daughters,⁵ and St. Paul's regulations for prophesying within the Church in his first letter to the Corinthians.⁶ Some women evidently found a ministry in the instruction of converts, for we find Priscilla helping her husband Aquila in that work, but it does not appear to have been a ministry conferred by ordination. There was evidently an order of Widows and an order of Deaconesses in the Apostolic Church. Of these, little beyond the general fact of their

¹ Ezekiel viii. 14; Jeremiah xlv.

² St. Luke ix. 1, x. 1.

³ Acts xxi. 9.

⁴ St. Luke viii. 3.

⁵ Eph. iv. 12.

⁶ 1 Cor. xi. 5 and Chap. xiv.

existence is known. Some have thought that Phœbe, who is mentioned in Rom. xvi. 1, was a deaconess, but her duties seem to have been those of a general ministry to the needs of the Church, similar to the work of those who ministered to the Saviour and His disciples. This thought is strengthened by the fact that St. Paul speaks of her ministry in terms similar to that of his appreciation of Stephanas and his household in Corinth.¹ Bishop Lightfoot looked on the female diaconate as being quite as definite an institution as that of the male diaconate. In his Dissertation on "The Christian Ministry" he says, "we find St. Paul in the First Epistle to Timothy giving express directions as to the qualifications of men-deacons and women-deacons alike."² He also reminds us that the reason for the admission of women into the diaconate was because of "the strict seclusion of the female sex in Greece and in some Oriental countries" which "necessarily debarred them from the ministrations of men."³ In thinking on this matter it is well to bear in mind that the office of deacon was largely of a secular character; we shall thus avoid some possible confusion.

How far the order of widows and the order of deaconesses were merged one into the other is not quite clear at first, but in the *Pastoral Epistles* they appear to be quite separate. Originally the widows seem to have been dependents or pensioners; people who would now be living in almshouses. But in the first epistle to Timothy they are spoken of as having been enrolled as Church servants, and the qualifications for enrolment are clearly defined.⁴ The widows figured largely in the sub-apostolic age. "They were maintained by the Church; and in return served it by instant prayer and works of charity."⁵ At a later period it seems that, as an order, the widows were merged into that of deaconesses.

It is striking that so great an advance was made in the apostolic age. The leaders of the Christian Church were reared in an atmosphere of Judaism where women were despised to some extent, and the Rabbis regarded it as a disgrace to be seen talking with them. The New Testament as a whole, including St. Paul, places women on a very high level, but the thought of a female apostolate or presbyterate would have been abhorrent to the Apostle. In his general attitude with regard to the activity of women within the Church and its worship, we must remember that he was most probably influenced by the thought of his time.

In the first Christian centuries deaconesses must have been very active, especially in the exercise of good works amongst their own sex. This was noticeable to Christians and Non-Christians alike. Writing to the Emperor Trajan from Bithynia, Pliny says: "I thought it the more necessary, therefore, to find out what truth there was in these statements by submitting two women, who were called deaconesses, to the torture, but I found nothing but a debased superstition carried to great lengths." Evidences of their work

¹ 1 Cor. xvi. 15-17.

² Phil., p. 191.

³ Horton, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 126.

⁴ Phil., p. 191.

⁵ 1 Tim. v. 9-16.

are frequently found in the writings of the Fathers, and some advanced to positions of high distinction in the churches of the Eastern Empire. Their work would be very necessary in the baptism of women, especially adults, where the whole body was anointed. They also carried the elements at Communion to the sick, as did the men deacons. This was the custom, for Justin writes in his apology, "there is a distribution, and a partaking by everyone of the Eucharistic elements; and to those who are not present they are taken by the hands of the deacons." When a period of decline overtook the Church, we find that the deaconesses extended their sphere of labours and encroached upon the ministerial duties of the Christian Priesthood. "Amongst other indications of the confusion and demoralisation characteristic of the fifth century must be included that of laxity of Church discipline which permitted the performance of public religious rites to be sometimes entrusted to women."¹ This was a period of decadence in Christian history, and the fact that women were allowed to act as priests at the altars shows the state of contempt into which religion had fallen. Complaints against the practice go to show that such a custom was a new thing, and not the normal function of women. With the foundation of nunneries, and the enforced celibacy of the "religious," nuns were placed on a higher level than that of the married women, even though marriage was declared to be a sacrament.

The Reformation wrought a great change, and married life came to be viewed as the natural sphere in which a woman could realise her true vocation in God's service. Most women find their calling within the home, and blessed is that home over which a Christian mother presides along with a Christian father. No one will attempt to deny the great contribution which sanctified womanhood has given to the world through the Christian home.

An outcome of the Evangelical Revival, however, has been the opening up of fresh fields of Christian service for women. Wesley said: "God owns women in the conversion of sinners, and who am I that I should withstand God." Throughout the nineteenth century and up to our own day the sphere of women's work has been widening, but it has largely been a lay ministry. The Free Churches have opened the ranks of their ordained ministry to women, and to-day a woman presides over the destinies of the Salvation Army.

During the Industrial Revolution, the exodus from country to town created a problem for our own Church. Dense masses in our towns were largely unshepherded. Here was an opportunity for women free from outside claims to exercise a kind of pastoral ministry, and in 1862 Elizabeth Ferard was ordained by Bishop Tait of London. Since that time Bishops have ordained women to the female Diaconate. To-day, the order is recognised throughout the whole Church of England and the Lambeth Conference of 1920 gave the lead in that recognition. Colleges for the training of deaconesses are now in existence and recognised examinations have

¹ Art. "Women" in *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*.

been drawn up to ensure a standard of education before ordination. The Diaconate is looked upon as a life-long dedication to God, and whilst marriage is not forbidden nor celibacy enjoined, it is evident that such a state is not contemplated. Further, the Diaconate is not looked upon as a step to the Priesthood as it is with men.

A vast sphere of ministry is now open to Women. It is found in teaching, nursing, prison work, rescue work, various forms of after care, social work, women's fellowships, Mothers' Union, district visiting, secretaryships, and countless more in committee work within the parish, rural deanery, diocese and National Assembly. In the Mission Field opportunities for service are almost legion, especially in Moslem and Hindu regions where women are accessible only by women.

With regard to the ordained ministry some would have the Church open up every avenue to women. Our Church has gone no further than the recognition of the female diaconate, saying that it is "for women the only order of the ministry which has the stamp of apostolic approval, and is for women the only order of the ministry which . . . the Church of England as a branch of the Catholic Church can recognise and use." Looking at the matter from every point of view this seems to be a wise provision. Without going into further details, it might be pointed out that the best practical way of approach to the matter seems to be from the complementary character of the sexes toward each other, and not the defence of the one, nor yet the claims or possible encroachments of the other. The whole question of women's work within the Church does not appear to be one of office or doctrine, but of manners, seemliness and actual need. Whatever avenues of activity are available, the work involved should be framed on womanly and comely lines "unto the building up of the body of Christ."

BEFORE JESUS CAME. Old Testament stories for little children.
By Noël E. Nicholl. *Lutterworth Press.* 2s. 6d.

The most delightful and helpful book that has ever been written for really little people. The stories are so beautifully told, and the teaching contained in each one quite intelligible to three- and four-year olds.

FIRST THINGS. A book for Mothers and Babies. By Myra Morony.
Oxford University Press. 2s. 6d.

All lovers of little ones, and teachers, as well as mothers, and those very responsible people the "Nannies" of our more fortunate little people, will welcome Mrs. Morony's fascinating book on *First Things*. A book for the use of educated and thoughtful people, rather than for use in humbler spheres.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

VALE. By the Very Rev. William Ralph Inge, K.C.V.O., D.D.,
Dean of St. Paul's, 1911-34. *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 3s. 6d.
net.

On his retirement from the Deanery of St. Paul's, Dr. Inge has written a small volume of reminiscences which contains many interesting comments on the life and thought of the period covered by his long life. The references to his early days are altogether too brief. We should like to have been told much more of that happy home in the North Riding of Yorkshire and of the family life which he and the other children of the household enjoyed. The old Tractarianism of his father and grandfather is well described, and it is made quite clear that it has no resemblance to the development which is known to-day as Anglo-Catholicism. The ritualism of this movement is frankly borrowed from Rome, and the Tractarians regarded these externals with distrust and contempt. The doctrine of Apostolic Succession, on which, he says, the movement was based, only serves the purpose of dividing all other Christians into those who un-church them or those whom they un-church. It is fatal to the doctrine that it is historically untenable; the first links in the chain are broken or rather never existed. The test of a true Church is not external and mechanical but moral and spiritual. The possession of the Mind of Christ is the criterion whether we are true to the intention of the divine head of the Church; a society of the Apostolical succession may fall away from grace and become heretical and corrupt, while a dissentient body may exhibit the Fruits of the Spirit. Reservation marks a still further departure from Anglican tradition, and those who dislike it are tempted to talk of magic and materialism. Anglican services have been changed to Roman against the wishes of the congregation, and this policy of deliberate law-breaking has been only too successful. He has been associated with both Universities, and Oxford led him to be interested in philosophy and to seek a sound intellectual basis for his religious belief. It was in this way that he came to study Christian Mysticism, with which his name as a scholar is most intimately associated. The chief problem was that of authority and religion. The idea of infallibility in an institutional Church seems almost monstrous. "Nothing can be more fantastic than the Tractarian theory that the General Councils were infallibly guided, but that the gift of infallibility went into abeyance when the Church was divided, like an old English peerage when there is more than one daughter but no son. Plenary authority, according to this theory, belongs to a council which can never meet. It is much as if no act of Parliament were valid which had not been voted at a joint session of the House of Commons and the American Congress." The mystical tradition in Christian thought may also be described as the Platonic tradition, and this led the Dean to the study of Platinus, the greatest

of all mystical philosophers, whose writings have had an extensive influence on Christian thought down to the present day. The Dean tells of the circumstances which led to his appointment to the deanery of St. Paul's, and the shock which he received when he learnt that some changes which he hoped to make were impossible, for he was told "that as long as Canons X and Y are both here, you are not going to be allowed to do anything." He sought to maintain Prayer Book or central Churchmanship, so that no loyal Anglican who came to worship in St. Paul's would find anything to distress or to disturb him. The Dean tells of his interest in Eugenic subjects, and his outspoken Essays as well as his contributions to the newspapers show the wide range of his interests. His well-founded dislike of Romanism has been a source of annoyance to some of his friends, but he is to be congratulated on being one of the few Clergy of the Church of England in a prominent position who has had the courage to say what he thinks about the Roman system. The Dean has been fortunate in realising so many of his ambitions, but as he himself says and as he has found, "domestic happiness is the greatest of all good gifts." Next to that he places wisdom, which may be defined as a right judgment of the relative value of things. The good wishes of many who owe a deep debt to the Dean for his instruction on many points and for his consistent maintenance of the ideals of Protestantism will follow him into his retirement, and we still hope for some further guidance from him on the problems of our day.

THE CHURCH'S REAL WORK (for Clergy and Laity). By R. C. Joynt, M.A., Canon Residentiary and Chancellor of Southwark Cathedral, lately Archdeacon of Kingston-on-Thames. With a Foreword by the Bishop of Winchester. *Longmans, Green & Co.* 2s. 6d. net.

There is considerable danger to both the clergy and the devout laity of becoming "unduly occupied with the multiplied machinery of organisation which is one of the most prominent features in the Church Life of to-day. The development of committees, central, diocesan, and parochial, is making serious inroads on the time, interest, and energy of the Church's workers, and are unaccompanied by any great growth in the Church's Spiritual achievements if these can be even approximately gauged by Church attendance, Confirmations, Sunday Observance, and, in general, a desire to live a Godly, righteous, and sober life." This is the problem with which we are faced as stated by Canon Joynt in his Preface. The Bishop of Winchester in the Foreword, in which he strongly recommends the book, as sure to be a great help to many, refers to the same problem. He recalls that Canon Joynt was one of his Archdeacons in the diocese of Southwark and that he has rendered many years of great service to the diocese, and from his long experience is well qualified to give valuable advice both to clergy and laity. Canon Joynt advises them to put first things first, and, as the Bishop says, "The book covers a wide field; it is clearly and attractively written.

It is full of practical advice, quiet humour, and trenchant sayings." The book covers so wide a field that it is impossible to refer to all the points with which it deals. We may say that every important aspect of Church life is noted and some useful advice is given upon each of them. There are sixteen chapters and they go systematically through the various stages of Church life to-day. They begin with the Commission of the Church. The decrease in Church attendance and its remedies, with the duty of the laity who are called to take their share in the Church's work, are dealt with. "The Ideals of Service" are strongly emphasised, and in a chapter entitled "Behind the Closed Door" he shows the secret source of power in prayer and in study. Practical hints are given on the best use of time. The most important part of a clergyman's duty is the conducting of the services of the Church, and here again a number of practical hints are given, and emphasis is laid upon the true atmosphere of worship. There is need for the advice given as to the importance of articulate reading of the services. In regard to "Things Temporal" there is some special advice to the laity, and some hints as to finances and particularly as to the stipends of the clergy are given. There is much complaint at present of the neglect of parochial visiting. Emphasis is here laid on its value. A special chapter deals with work among men. Preparation for Confirmation is an important part of parochial work, and attention is drawn to the best method to be adopted, while the after-care of the Confirmed is treated with special consideration. Work in the Day Schools and Sunday Schools and work among young people, generally, make special claim upon the attention of the younger clergy. These are some of the chief points in a book which may well be placed in the hands of the newly ordained and of the lay people who are willing to assist in the work of the Church.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN GERMAN PROTESTANTISM. By Otto Piper, D.D., formerly Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Göttingen and Münster, with an introduction by H. G. Wood, M.A., Lecturer at the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. *Student Christian Movement Press*. 4s. net.

THE CHURCH CONTROVERSY IN GERMANY, THE POSITION OF THE EVANGELICAL CHURCH IN THE THIRD EMPIRE. By Anders Nygren, Professor in the University of Lund, Sweden, Author of *Agape and Eros*, etc., translated by the Rev. G. C. Richards, D.D., Canon of Durham. *Student Christian Movement Press*. 2s. 6d. net.

Special interest attaches to Dr. Piper's account of German Protestantism. He was appointed Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Münster in succession to Karl Barth. When Hitler came into power he was dismissed from his chair and has been spending the last few years in England. He was invited to give a course of lectures in Manchester University, and these have

been published under the title, *Recent Developments in German Protestantism*. His absence from Germany has enabled him to obtain a clearer survey of events, but he finds it difficult to give a picture of a situation which changes its aspect from day to day. He seeks to discover the general tendencies behind the perplexing details of the religious conflict. For this purpose he devotes the first lecture to an account of "The Historical Development of Protestant Theology." Luther's chief feature was the discovery of faith, but since his day there has been a gradual corruption of his work until three main misinterpretations have arisen: Quietism, Individualism, and Subjectivism. Dr. Piper sees in these misinterpretations the work of Satan, who is always counteracting the progress of the Gospel. In fact, the whole situation is represented as a conflict between Christ and Satan which has to be fought out not merely in Germany but throughout the world. The second lecture is on the influence of the War and its effect on the German character. After the War many new theories developed, and later produced what he describes as the New Theology. This New Theology of the younger generation is the subject of the third lecture. It presents two different tendencies. One he describes as conservative, which is the stronger, and the other, progressive. There is a new understanding of Luther, and his teaching on the Glory of God and the meaning of Revelation, but no understanding of Luther is complete unless his belief in the tremendous power of Satan is taken seriously. The Progressive Theology is associated with the Youth Movement and its teaching is analysed. Among its leaders is Karl Barth, but his theology has changed its character. The teaching of other leaders less known in this country is also analysed, and again reference is made to the power of Satan and his reign in this world. The last lecture deals with "The Historical Importance of the New Theology," and tells of the rise of several rival movements. The chief of these is the Faith Movement of the German Christians, which alters the whole character of Christianity. In the closing section on the significance of the present situation he maintains that there a decisive stage has now been reached in the conflict between Satan and Christ, and that Germany does not realise how serious is the Spiritual situation because Satan proceeds in such a subtle manner. He believes, however, that one day Christ, Who is working within German Protestantism, will reveal Himself as the Judge of those who fight against Him and of those who deny Him through their false teaching.

This account of the German situation is written with the analytical power characteristic of German theologians, and gives an insight into the inner workings of the German mind, which is in many ways dissimilar from that of our own thinkers. It will, however, be found a useful survey of German thought during the last three centuries, although in some points it is exaggerated.

The second book is by the Swedish Professor who is already known in this country as the author of *Agape and Eros*. He has had the advantage of being in close contact with some of the leaders

in Germany and is able to write with the detachment of a foreigner although his sympathies are obviously with the members of the Confessional Synod. He also recognises the difficulty of giving any clear account of a situation which is constantly changing. He devotes a chapter to explaining the conditions in the New Germany, and then goes on to explain how the controversy arose. The Faith Movement is obsessed with the idea of a special type of German Christianity. One of its chief features is the maintenance of Race Purity; this has led to the "Aryan Paragraph" and the consequent persecution of the Jews. The opposition to this conception of Christianity has led to the movement of the Confessional Synod, and the Pastors' Emergency League. The later stages of the conflict with the Reich Bishop, Müller, are indicated, but since this book was written there have been still further developments which have rendered the position of those opposed to the State Church more difficult. His general conclusion is that "The present government of the German Church has betrayed Christianity to the powers of this world. . . . But just as God once protected His Church from the persecutions of the High Priest, so will He once again—in spite of Reich Bishop and ecclesiastical government—protect His persecuted Church which, like the Apostolic Christians, has observed the command 'We ought to obey God rather than men.'" This is one of the clearest and most useful accounts of the German struggle. The work of translation has been well done by Dr. Richards.

THE BIBLE IS TRUE. The Lessons of the 1925-1934 Excavations in Bible Lands Summarised and Explained. By Sir Charles Marston, F.S.A. *Eyre & Spottiswoode.* 7s. 6d. net.

Although Sir Charles Marston's *The New Knowledge About the Old Testament* was only published little more than a year ago, he finds that already it requires a sequel, partly to record the fresh discoveries and partly to revise previous conclusions in the light of them. He has, therefore, produced this book, which is a fascinating volume, written with knowledge and charm, to show the further progress that has been made in archæological discovery and to make an examination of the methods and assumptions of the higher criticism. This work, he says, is "the fruit of a lifetime of study of the Bible and conclusions concerning its contents whether critical or archæological." In 1924 he participated actively in the expedition of the Palestine Exploration Fund at the excavations at Ophel. In connection with Professor Garstang he has helped in the organisation of five expeditions to Jericho and "the excavations made at this spot are of the first importance since they provide a key position for Old Testament history." He pays a special tribute to the value for Biblical archæology of our veteran British excavator and Egyptologist, Sir Flinders Petrie. Sir Charles Marston had as his object that which he says should be the object of all educated and intelligent men and women—"to seek the Truth; and having regard to the great part the Bible has played in our history to accord

it fair play." He points out that the methods of the Higher Critics in dissecting the various details of authorship of the Pentateuch could not stand the test of a modern law court, as was shown in a case recently dealt with in the Canadian courts and ultimately brought to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London for decision. Interesting accounts are given of the results of recent excavations in various portions of the Bible lands. The discovery of pottery of various periods has given a valuable clue to the interpretation of the history of various regions in those lands. The excavations at Ur of the Chaldees by Dr. Woolley have thrown light upon the Deluge. Excavations in Egypt have produced important knowledge as to the duration of the power of the Shepherd Kings. The Ras Shamra discoveries have brought to light useful facts in regard to Phœnician origins. Evidence about Abraham has been forthcoming from various researches, and these are brought together in an interesting chapter which illustrates the life of the period and shows that "the Old Testament chronology is as correct as the Bible Geography." Sir Charles Marston has been specially interested in the excavations at Jericho, and several chapters are devoted to them and the light that they throw upon the date of the Exodus. The life of Moses is considered in the light of these latest excavations, and the condition of religion before his time is considered in the light of the various tablets that indicate the beliefs of that age. In a chapter dealing with his conclusions he sets out twenty-four points which illustrate the validity of the Old Testament narrative. Critics who tell us that there is no evidence for the existence of Moses or for the long period of the residence of the Hebrew people in Egypt would find it hard to maintain their case in view of the evidence which is provided in this book. One of its most interesting features is the series of photographic reproductions illustrating the results of the excavations.

THE HOLINESS OF JESUS. By A. D. Martin. *George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.* 10s. 6d. net.

This interesting volume is original in character. In his Preface the Author says, "at the present time the Character of Jesus is not regarded by all His professed followers as beyond damaging criticism, and the consequence of the hesitation noticeable in certain quarters is confusion in faith and weakness in ethics. I have attempted to meet this position in the following pages on lines which are independent of traditional theology." His method is to lay emphasis upon the Holiness of Jesus, having first given an appreciation of Professor Rudolph Otto's *The Idea of the Holy*, emphasising the ethical element in holiness. He examines the Synoptic Gospels and accepts them as reliable witnesses. After this he proceeds to examine the character of Jesus Christ. He deals with some of the objections raised by modern criticism, especially those that would impugn the sinlessness of Our Lord, and maintain the limitations of His knowledge. He meets these objections by a detailed examina-

tion of the Gospel narratives and reminds us of the saying of the late Professor Kennett : " It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that the serious differences of belief and outlook among religious people at the present day are in most cases due to a literalising and a consequent misunderstanding of Hebraic figures of speech, which in their original connection were understood by those to whom they were addressed as not intended to be taken *au pied de la lettre*." The conduct and judgment of Jesus are examined at some length. A chapter is devoted to His inner life and His significant sayings are discussed. Finally, He sees in Holiness " the coalescence of a perfectly good mind with a fully energetic will, the coincidence of the Ideal with the Real in continuous activity. As applied to a human being it necessarily involves sinlessness. In applying this to Jesus we have a discriminating test of vital Christianity." As far as this is adaptable to practical Christianity it leads to the laying on one side the traditional Theology of Chalcedon, but rejecting at the same time the views of modern Unitarians and Liberal Jews. He maintains the Pauline faith. " To me to live is Christ. I live ; and yet no longer I but Christ liveth in me." On many points the Author will not satisfy all his readers, but most of them will find his thesis and its exposition full of suggestion.

JOHN, PETER, AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL. By Gerald Webb Broomfield, M.A., Canon of Christ's Church, Zanzibar. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d. net.

There are some of us sufficiently old-fashioned still to believe that the arguments of Bishop Westcott in favour of the traditional authorship of the Fourth Gospel have never been answered. Whatever difficulties there may be in accepting the Apostle St. John as the author of the Gospel assigned to him, they are small in comparison to those of any other theory. The case of the traditional view has been stated with great force by the Rev. H. V. Nunn in his book, *The Son of Zebedee and the Fourth Gospel*, and the Archbishop of York in the preface to that work stated that he was convinced " that prejudice has obscured the judgment of even great authorities." Dr. C. F. Nolloth's great work, *The Fourth Evangelist*, maintained the same view, and now Canon Gerald Webb Broomfield of Christ's Church Cathedral, Zanzibar, comes forward to champion the same view in his book, *John, Peter, and the Fourth Gospel*. Canon Goudge, Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, in a preface speaks of the difficulty of rejecting the authorship of St. John, the son of Zebedee. He says : " Somebody must have written the book and it is idle to set aside the traditional authorship, supported as it is by the massive arguments of Bishop Westcott and others, unless some more probable authorship can be suggested to take its place. This is just what never is done." And he adds, " The reason, I think, why so many English students to-day are inclined to return to the traditional view is, not that they have solved its difficulties, but that they find them less serious

than those of any other view." Canon Broomfield does not profess to write as a professional scholar. He is more than a thousand miles away from any up-to-date theological library, and he has had to manage with comparatively few books of reference. He thinks that it is possible to throw some fresh light on New Testament problems from experiences in the Mission field. In the first part of his book he examines the account of John, the son of Zebedee, in the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts. He throws some interesting light on the relationship between Peter and James and John. He finds that the Fourth Gospel gives support to the synoptic picture of him, and explains a number of otherwise puzzling features of the Fourth Gospel showing some quite extraordinary coincidences if St. John is not the author. The second portion of the book gives the evidence by which he supports his view of the authorship. One of his chief points is that through his acquaintance with St. Luke and his Gospel, St. John wrote his own. He summarises his views in a clear statement that shows the weight of the evidence that he has been able to adduce. New Testament students will find much to interest them in this work, and although they may not agree with all the points of view that are set out, they will value it as a fresh and suggestive study of one of the great problems of the New Testament. Opinions will remain sharply divided upon it, but it is clear, as Canon Goudge has pointed out, that the trend of English thought is towards the acceptance of the traditional view.

SPIRITUAL LIBERTY. A Study of Liberal Evangelicalism. By Vernon F. Storr, M.A., Archdeacon of Westminster, President of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement. *Student Christian Movement Press*. 4s. net.

There is a wide range in the comprehensiveness of the Church of England, and there are doubts in the minds of some as to the legitimate bounds of comprehension. There are, on the one side, Anglo-Catholics who are Roman in practically all their beliefs except the acceptance of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. On the other side, there are those who are spoken of as "Extreme Protestants," and many are unkind enough to say that they are "no Churchmen" because they do not accept some special theory of Episcopacy. Others describe them as Fundamentalists. There is practically no point of contact between these two sections, although both the extremes are agreed in accepting such a fundamental doctrine as the Divinity of Christ. They differ, practically, in their whole interpretation of the Christian Faith. Between these extremes there are those who are variously described as "Conservative Evangelicals," "Liberal Evangelicals," "Central Churchmen," "Moderate High-Churchmen," and "Advanced High-Churchmen." There is a great desire at the present time to draw together as far as possible these various sections of Churchmen so as to strengthen the Church and to enable it to carry out more effectively its spiritual mission. It is sometimes difficult to mark the line of divergence

between these various sections. There are Evangelicals who might be described as both Conservative and Liberal, for on some important points they hold views that are similar. There are some who might be described as Central Churchmen, for they desire to co-operate as far as they possibly can with moderate High-Churchmen. While some of these latter, although they do not share the views of the Anglo-Catholics, view their particular tenets with a lenient eye, and refrain from any antagonism towards them, although they may have doubts as to the loyalty of some sections of Anglo-Catholics to the Church of England.

One of the first requisites for a clear understanding of the exact position in the Church of any of these sections, is a definite statement of their beliefs, and in this book Archdeacon Storr has set out the teaching of the Liberal Evangelicals. At the very heart of Evangelicalism, he sees a belief in the spiritual freedom of man. "Evangelicalism at all times has laid stress on the soul's privilege of direct and immediate access to God, because it has jealously guarded the right of man as a spiritual being." He gives a brief survey of the work of the early Evangelicals, and repudiates the frequently repeated slander that they "were not thinkers and lacked brains." "The party contained men of the highest intellectual eminence." They shared with their fellow Churchmen the limitations of the knowledge of their age, and as knowledge has advanced so progress of thought has developed. The Archdeacon claims liberty of thought as an essential feature of the Evangelical school. The principal lines of development of thought in recent years have been through scientific advance and the use of historical method. Liberal Evangelicals claim the right to use these for the interpretation of their Faith. They find that the Anglo-Catholics make a number of assumptions about the character of the Church, and endeavour to make their interpretation of history fit in with them. The Liberal Evangelicals consequently feel bound to reject the main elements of Anglo-Catholic teaching that depend upon their theory of the Church. They believe that the historical method must also be applied to the interpretation of the Bible, and they regard some of the views of Fundamentalists as incompatible with the results of the historical method. They do not, however, regard this freedom of thought as altering the essentials of Evangelical teaching, and they claim that they represent the spirit of the Evangelical school of the past, and the principles of the Reformation. The principal difference between the various types of Evangelicals might be described as consisting in a disagreement as to the extent to which the theories which are regarded as the assured results of scientific research and the historical method can be accepted. Many conservative Evangelicals entertain a suspicion that the Liberals are too willing to accept as assured results theories that are not adequately proved, and it is felt by some that they are too ready to accept the ecclesiastical practices of High-Churchmen without due consideration of their significance in their desire to promote peace in the Church. These are regarded as signs of

weakness that do not make for the real strength of the Church and its witness to the essential truths of the Gospel. The future of the Church would be enormously strengthened if all sections of the Evangelical school could come to agreement and make a united advance in the endeavour to win souls and to maintain the freedom of the Gospel which all alike cherish.

CHRISTIANITY AS HISTORY AND FAITH. By Arthur C. McGiffert.
Pp. 322. *Charles Scribner's Sons.* 7s. 6d. net.

Dr. McGiffert's many contributions to the history of Christian thought and practice won for him a high place and an international reputation. Yet, apart from what may be gathered incidentally from his books, his own personal religious faith and outlook had never been definitely and clearly stated. This lack has now been remedied by his son, Professor McGiffert, who has in this volume gathered together papers left by his father and hitherto unpublished.

The book takes an unusual form. It is neither a history of the Christian religion nor a biographical history. There are in it valuable historical studies. There are whole chapters where Dr. McGiffert's own interpretation of Christianity is set forth. A "Historical Approach to Christianity" is followed by "Christianity Old and New," "Jesus," "God," "The Christian Life" and "Social Implications."

It can be said, at once, that the result is a volume of absorbing interest. It will provoke discussion; it will irritate; it may astonish, but it will never cease to interest the reader. It reveals the writer as intensely devout, passionately concerned for the things of the Kingdom, with a breadth of sympathy and outlook that charm even when they astound.

Dr. McGiffert saw much that is good in Catholicism and Protestantism. He can probe, too, their weaknesses. His leaning was towards a Modernism that regards religion as "another thing than science altogether, equally at home with any scientific fact or theory," a Modernism that knows no need of forgiveness, that throws over the doctrine of atonement, and that need not be interested in the question of immortality or of personal salvation.

Enough has been said to suggest that large sections of the volume will meet with the opposition and criticism of Evangelicals, but the book cannot be lightly passed over. It displays a depth of thought and vision that should make it welcome. The less controversial chapters are excellent. Especially, we commend to the notice of readers the chapters on "The Unsearchable Riches of Christ" based upon the thought: "We cannot make Christ known to the world unless we know him; nor his wealth known unless we know him richly": the chapter on "Vision," and the final chapter on "The Kingdom of God."

F. B.

NOT AS THE SCRIBES: A Study in the Authority of Jesus. By H. G. G. Herklots. *S.C.M.* 3s. 6d. net.

There are few subjects of greater moment to the thoughtful follower of Christ to-day than that of the nature and the seat of Authority in religion. Biblical criticism has shaken the belief that we have an infallible guide in the pages of Holy Writ; while, on the other hand, the Protestant is quite unable to admit the claim of the Papacy to be the final authority in matters of faith and morals. Yet few generations have felt so keenly as the present the need for a reliable (if not an infallible) authority in the life of the spirit; and the hitherto failure of the Church of England to supply this need has been the cause of more than one secession to Rome.

Those who expect to find in these pages a contribution to the subject comparable with the late Bishop Gore's distinction between "paternal" and "despotic" authority, or Dr. N. P. Williams's more recent thesis that there exist "degrees" of authority, may at first be disappointed. It is not within the scope of the author to pursue an exhaustive enquiry into the nature or the seat of religious authority, though in the Introduction he does venture the suggestion that "authority is becoming what commends itself to the individual conscience, with the support of a consensus of Christian opinion"—a conception which might well be developed in a later volume. The object of the present volume is "to consider the sources of this attested authority" (sc. of Jesus) "and to suggest that, in our day, Christian leaders and teachers can from the same source draw a similar power."

Here is an object of the greatest practical importance, and the theme is developed in an admirable way. The author's condemnation of the past and present failure of the Church to "speak with authority" is bold and unsparing, and at the same time free from the bitterness and prejudice that so often mars such works. Indeed, his deep attachment to the Church of England is apparent throughout, and his criticism is always constructive. He lays bare faults only that he may prescribe a remedy. Here are some of his prescriptions: "He" (sc. Jesus) "did not go visiting and talk about the garden and leave it at that. He spoke of a spiritual growth, a heavenly kingdom. Just where we are timid, he was bold; yet the parable of the seed growing secretly is a perpetual reminder that boldness does not mean anxiety" (p. 35). "Sometimes one feels that the world's chief need to-day is for a plentiful supply of sackcloth and ashes. From the fictions in which men are steeped they need to be forced back on to realities. When the Church's speaking and the Church's life has attained Christ's note of realism, the world will hear her knocking at the door" (p. 88). "Jesus never went on the principle of the sugared pill. He stated the facts, stern facts, calling out men's best. Modern politics, and modern religion too, are marred with subtle bribery. . . . The Church has spent thousands, millions, in sugaring the pill. . . ." (p. 120).

These passages are chosen at random: there is not one of the 135 pages of the book that does not contain observations equally

discerning. Indeed, this is a book which no one who has the welfare of the Church at heart can afford to miss.

A CHRISTIAN MANIFESTO. By Edwin Lewis. S.C.M. 6s.

This is an important book by Dr. Lewis, a well-known American theologian who was born in England. Since 1920 he has been Professor of Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion in Drew University in the United States. He was one of the Editors of the *Abingdon Bible Commentary*. His general standpoint with regard to the fundamental facts of Christianity had been what we must call, for want of a better name, modernist. But in the fall of 1933 he wrote a magazine article entitled "The Fatal Apostasy of the Modern Church" which made his friends regard him as a man who had "slipped back into orthodoxy." The present volume is a plea that those who restate Christianity should retain the fundamental *thought* even if the *form* in which it is expressed be new. It is a timely protest against that habit of mind which obsesses so many leaders of Christian thought to-day. "We have a faith. Let us be done with for ever half-heartedly apologising for it, and instead let us aggressively, confidently and self-forgetfully proclaim it. To the Church of Christ has been entrusted a living whole of truth, and if it be dismembered it will lose its power." Again, "To see the husk and not the kernel—that is the error, and it has been common enough." It is a striking plea for an affirmative faith and it comes from the impassioned heart of one who has been led to see that Christianity means supernaturalism and that Christ died for all men. This is the book to give to all ministerial or other "wobblers" who are uncertain of the great fundamentals of the faith.

A. W. P.

THE BASIS OF CHRISTIAN FAITH. By F. E. Hamilton. *Morgan & Scott*. 7s. 6d.

The author is Professor of Bible in the Union Christian College, Pyengyang, Korea, and in eighteen well-written and carefully thought-out chapters he gives us a defence of the Christian Religion. During his first year in a State University, he passed through the experience of losing his faith in the Bible, in Jesus Christ and in a personal God. There can be no doubt in anyone's mind that he has come right back to the things that matter. In this book he gives us the reasons why we must believe in God. He discusses the origin of the world, the reasonableness of supernaturalism and the cause of the growth of the great religions of the world and of the early spread of Christianity. There are seven chapters on the Bible in which, *inter alia*, he treats such subjects as its unity, historicity, integrity, criticism, alleged discrepancies and doctrinal difficulties. Chapters follow on the resurrection of Jesus Christ, the fulfilment of prophecy and the argument from Christian experience. There is a very full index and a valuable

bibliography. An eminent theologian recently complained of what he called "the present reaction in theology." We believe that at the present time there is a widespread feeling that the decline in Church attendance and the general apathy in religious matters are signs that the rationalistic criticism and modernistic preaching of the past twenty-five years no longer hold the attention of those who are interested in religion. Clergy who desire to bring themselves quickly into accord with the widespread desire for instructed certainty in their presentation of Christian truth will find this book from Korea one of "the return values of Christian Missions." It is designed by its author for the use of those who have little or no technical knowledge or training to fit them to make a direct investigation of the evidence in support of Christianity for themselves. We commend it as a most useful *vade mecum* of Christian Evidences.

A. W. P.

CHALLENGE TO DEATH. By Viscount Cecil, P. Noel Baker, etc.
Pp. 343. Constable & Co. 5s. net.

A tragic feature of this year of grace is the reappearance in so many parts of the world of conditions that make war, not only possible, but, failing a change of temper, almost inevitable. Viscount Cecil would seem to be right when he asserts in the preface of this book: "Unless the nations of Europe abandon their present attitude and make a determined effort to re-invigorate the machinery of peace, it is only a question of time before the slaughter and suffering of those four terrible years are repeated with added horrors."

Believing that and yet convinced that war would be contrary to the wishes, hopes, and interests of humanity generally, the writers of this book have collaborated in giving their views on the whole question of war and peace. Their names are sufficient guarantee that what they write is worth reading. While they are all agreed that war would be a crime against the world, they approach the subject from varying angles.

The book suffers from the fact that each writer wrote without knowledge of the contents of the other chapters. The result is considerable overlapping and reiteration. The chapters, too, vary in value. Some are powerful and incontrovertible. Others are less forceful. There are not wanting passages and statements which are decidedly open to question. Yet with its limitations the book is a mine of information and thought.

An admirable contribution on the "Roots of War" is written by G. E. S. Catlin. Vera Britain, who charmed the world with her *Testament of Youth*, writes persuasively on the collective ownership of armaments, and advocates an international police force as an intermediate state. Philip Noel Baker is too severe on Britain as being responsible for the failure of the disarmament plans. Several of the writers deal with the question of armaments, including Vernon Bartlett. Striking figures are given, but we are

not prepared to believe all that is alleged about the eagerness with which armament firms foment a warlike spirit. One of the most useful contributions is that of Julian Huxley on "Peace through Science."

We hope it may be accepted as a sign of the times that such a book can be published with the assurance that it will be purchased and carefully studied. One of the hopes on which peace rests is that people will bring their reason to bear on the subject of war.

F. B.

CONSCIOUS AND UNCONSCIOUS SIN: A STUDY IN PRACTICAL CHRISTIANITY. By Robert E. D. Clark, M.A., Ph.D. Pp. 186. *Williams and Norgate, Ltd.* 4s. 6d. net.

Dr. Clark has produced a very able and searching volume of considerable practical value to those who are seeking to enrich their own spiritual life. It should be in the hands of all teachers and preachers.

The whole book centres round the problem of "conscious" and "unconscious" sin, or as the author prefers to call it, "provoked" and "unprovoked" sin. He endeavours to show the vast importance in the spiritual life of "unprovoked" sin. In the healthy development of Christian character there should be a double process, unprovoked sins becoming provoked and the conquering of provoked sin. In following out his arguments valuable chapters are devoted to the development of conscience, doubt, free-will, responsibility, religious reticence, etc.

A valuable little treatise to be added to our shelves!

F. B.

PSYCHOLOGY AND SACRAMENTS. By Frank C. Carter, B.D. Pp. 124. *Williams and Norgate, Ltd.* 3s. 6d. net.

The author of this book, a curate in Guildford, was formerly in the Nonconformist Ministry. Finding that the Church of England was very widely divided on the question of Sacraments, he had to decide where he himself stood. He made careful search along the lines of Psychology and found that he stood—where? A reader of the book will find it difficult to say.

The earlier portion of the volume is intended to give the necessary introduction, and psychological background, to a discussion of the whole subject of Sacraments. The reader will soon become aware that the author is using the word "Sacrament" in a special and very wide sense. "Created things are God's sacraments." "The sacraments are His suggestions, His affirmations." Concerning Holy Communion: "He focused God's whole sacramental method in this one great Sacrament just as God had focused all His Self-giving in the Eternal Word becoming flesh." "This Sacrament is composed of a number of minor sacraments that all add to the power with which the supreme affirmation reaches the recipient."

The final chapter is devoted to "The Parish Priest and the Sacramental Equipment." There is in it much that is good, but we

cannot believe that the advice given to incumbents of churches, in single church areas, would have any other effect than to empty their churches.

Occasionally, the author is grossly unfair in his statement of a case. Of those who believe in direct confession to God he writes: "There are those who think that, if they say the General Confession twice every Sunday, by so doing they have confessed their sins adequately. If at times they realise that something is wrong with their spiritual life, being conscious that they do not enjoy real Christian peace, but on the other hand constantly trail behind their former sins; yet they would never think of changing their method, for with their particular school of churchmanship another mode of confession simply 'Isn't done.'"

F. B.

JOHN WESLEY AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. Pp. 98. *S.P.C.K.* 3s. 6d. net.

Behind this publication, put forth by the Literature Association of the Church Union, is the desire for a better understanding of the things that separate Wesleyan Methodists from the Church of England. Anything that promotes the possibility of reunion is welcome.

Will this book help? The volume is largely concerned with a detailed consideration of Wesley's teaching and practice with regard to the Church, the Sacraments, and the Christian Ministry. That he lived and died a Churchman is common knowledge. The author of this book, which consists chiefly of quotations from Wesley himself and from later Wesleyan authorities, has no difficulty in showing that Wesley's Churchmanship was not of the orthodox type and that his teaching had in it seeds which blossomed inevitably into separation. Wesley's own action in connection with the American Methodists was seen by his brother Charles to be a step fraught with consequences against which both he and John had throughout set their faces.

Some little space is devoted to the problem of reunion. The author feels that one of the main difficulties centres round the differing conceptions of the Church and the Christian ministry. At the moment the gulf between the Methodist conception and that of the High Anglican appears unbridgable.

F. B.

SUNRISE ON THE NILGIRIS. By Catherine F. Ling. *The Zenith Press.* 1s. 6d.

The story of Miss Ling's work among the Todas, a little-known tribe of the Nilgiri Hills, is the history of a remarkable pioneer work, and the narrative is full of interest. Physically strong and beautiful, these people are addicted to many degrading customs, to which they cling tenaciously; but after the labour of many years there is now a Christian community among them of seventy people, a splendid testimony to the love and devotion of Miss Ling and those who have worked with her in this beautiful part of India.

NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS.

IN five lectures delivered at one of the American Divinity Schools, Dr. Shirley Jackson Case dealt with the *Social Triumph of the Ancient Church* (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 6s. net). In the first lecture he shows the religious background of the heathen society into which the Christian preachers came with their message of Divine love and human brotherhood. In the second lecture on "Christianity and Worldly Goods" he goes on to show how the growth of Christianity brought about a new method of valuing earthly possessions. With the acquirement of property and the growth in wealth of the Christian community new problems arose. The third lecture on "Christianity and Social Prestige" shows how the members of the Church were placed in regard to their relationship to their non-Christian relatives and friends. The fourth lecture carries on the subject into the connection between "Christianity and Politics," and illustrates the attitude of the authorities of the Empire towards the Christian communities. The last lecture on "The Social Task of a Triumphant Church" brings out the necessity of applying the Christian method to the solution of the social problems of the world to-day. This shows that the power of the Church is weakened by disunion and inertia, and by the exaggerated individualism of the Protestant attitude of the past. The Church must, if its work is to be effective, take an active part in practical ways of helpful procedure in dealing with actual conditions. Dr. Case has told his story in a most interesting way, and with an extensive knowledge of all the relevant facts, so that he has no difficulty in applying apt illustrations.

Dr. Kenneth E. Kirk's *Bampton Lectures for 1928* on the "Vision of God: The Christian Doctrine of the Summum Bonum" has been issued in an abridged edition (Longmans, Green & Co., 7s. 6d. net). The omitted portions contained passages referring to the history of Penance. These were quite apart from the main subject of the book, so that the abridged edition is complete in itself, and traces out the various forms which the Vision of God has taken in different ages. Some of the phases dealt with are the Vision of God in Pre-Christian Thought, the view presented in the New Testament, the development of formalism, and the codification of Christian Morality, the Rigorism which developed in the Monastic System both in regard to discipline and doctrine. The eighth lecture deals with the "Law and Promise," and criticises the theories of Protestantism and Catholicism, with special emphasis on the defects of the former. The main thesis of the book is that worship is the mainspring of the moral life and is not simply a pleasant recreation for pious souls: it is the source of all true Christian Morality.

To meet the increasing demand for Sunday School lessons which will be at once Spiritual, Scriptural, and Evangelical in their teach-

ings, and at the same time constructed along the lines of modern Sunday School methods, the Church Book Room has issued a book of Sunday School Lessons for the Church's year on the Collects, illustrated from the Epistles and Gospels, by the Rev. Llewelyn E. L. Roberts, M.A., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Whitehall Park. From his extensive experience of Sunday School work, Mr. Roberts is able to make the most appropriate use of the wide range of material at his disposal. Each Sunday has its appropriate subject associated with the Collect for the day and illustrating one definite thought or lesson. Missionary illustrations have been used as often as possible to give a Missionary atmosphere to the teaching. The dominating thought throughout the lessons is to bring the child into a personal and saving knowledge of Jesus Christ. Clergy and Sunday School Superintendents are recommended to examine these interesting Notes as they are so admirably suited for general use.

Canon H. T. Powell, D.D., publishes the dissertation which was accepted by the University of Durham for his Doctor's degree. He chose the difficult subject of *The Fall of Man* (S.P.C.K., 5s. net), and aims at giving an account of its place in modern thought. Dean Matthews contributes a Foreword in which he says that Dr. Powell has tackled a difficult subject with complete intellectual honesty, that he is not seeking to find reasons for preconceived conclusions, and is not concerned to rehabilitate ancient formulas. As a result Dr. Powell expresses some opinions that have not found general acceptance with theologians of the past, and probably many will not agree with his conclusions to-day. Yet the point of view which he puts forward has to be seriously considered, as many of the difficulties of the subject still remain. He examines the teaching of our Lord and concludes that it does not imply the truth of Original Sin. After a reference to the teaching of St. Paul, he considers the doctrine of the Fall in relation to the idea of God and the idea of Creation. He does not accept the theory of a disaster subverting God's plans, as that is incompatible with the idea of His imminence and with the view of Creation as a continuous evolution. The views of recent writers on the problem of Evil are considered. The last chapter is a re-statement considered and tested, and his conclusion is that the doctrine of the Fall based on premisses no longer to be admitted cannot be retained.

We are pleased to note a new edition of Lieut.-Colonel W. H. Turton's well-known work of Christian apologetics, *The Truth of Christianity* (Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., 2s.). It is not necessary to remind readers of the merits of a book which has reached its twelfth edition and has been translated into four languages. The careful sifting of the evidence, the cogency of the arguments, and the clarity of the style have made it well known as one of the standard works of its kind. It has been thoroughly revised for the new edition. Additional arguments have been introduced in the chapters

on "God's Character," "Revelation," "The Resurrection," and "The Creeds," while in his treatment of the Exodus and Jewish miracles the author has taken full account of the recent excavations in Jericho, Ras Shamra, etc. The publishers are to be congratulated on producing the book at an amazingly low price (2s. for a volume of 512 pages), and on thus rendering the book accessible to all who desire to acquaint themselves with the foundations of the Christian faith. It seems almost churlish to suggest any improvement; but would it not be possible in the next edition (and we are convinced that there will be a next edition) to provide a general index of subjects and of works of reference?

Those who are interested in the cinematograph as a potential means of evangelisation will welcome *The Cinema for Christ*, by R. G. Burnett (Religious Tract Society, 1s.). The author makes out a strong case for a wider use of the moving picture in presenting the message of Christ to the present generation, and gives us a vivid account of the progress made, especially in missions in industrial areas. The style is chatty and entertaining, and, if some of the statements are exaggerated or ill-informed, the reader will not find it difficult to forgive the author for allowing his enthusiasm to run away with him. The book contains much valuable information and advice on the different types of cinematograph apparatus available and on how to procure a regular supply of films which many should find useful. It is good to know that the supply of films suitable to evangelistic purposes is increasing, but we should have liked some assurance as to the quality of such films. If the Church is to make her appeal through the screen, the films shown must be not one whit inferior to those shown in the cinema next door. The general public is critical; and if the Church were to exhibit films which fell far short of those shown outside much harm might be done.

The appearance of a new introduction to the study of the Old Testament is always an event of interest to Biblical students. In recent times there have been several smaller books on the subject, and now the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., and the Rev. Theodore H. Robinson, D.D., have collaborated in producing *An Introduction to the Books of The Old Testament* (S.P.C.K., 10s. 6d. net) which is designed to be "A mean between the exhaustive work of Driver, and the necessarily restricted volumes, for example, of Gray or McFadyen." The authors have already worked together in producing their volume on the "Hebrew Religion." They have given special attention to the historical background of the books, and have emphasised the importance of the Septuagint and the poetical form of some of the prophetic books. Their general point of view is so generally known that it is not necessary to refer to it at length. The book will no doubt find a place in the curriculum of Theological Colleges and Divinity Schools, and students will be taught the modern view of the construction of the Pentateuch with the minute analyses of its detailed sections that is now cus-

tomary. There is a general introduction to the prophetic literature explaining its various forms, and special attention is paid to the historical background of each book without which the full significance of the writer's message cannot be grasped. A threefold authorship is assigned to Isaiah. The last section, of ten chapters, is probably the most valuable portion of the book, and is devoted to the Prophets. Students will be glad of the opportunity of making use of the results of recent research as set out in this volume and to compare them with the earlier views maintained by the older school.

Dr. Orchard since his reception into the Church of Rome has continued his literary activity and is naturally using his powers as a writer in support of his new-found Faith. His latest work is *The Way of Simplicity* (Putnam, 5s. net), which he describes as "A Guide for the Perplexed." This is a seductive sub-title in days when so many are troubled with doubts and questionings and when the Church of Rome is set out by its members as furnishing the one sure retreat for the distressed. There are naturally portions of this book that Protestants can read with agreement, but when we come to the "Catholic" way, we seem to see that simplicity is lost. We are told, for example, that "in all Catholic Churches the Sacrament is reserved, which means that Christ's presence is there, not merely a spiritual presence, but in some sense as He was present in the days of His flesh. There is no doubt that this sacramental presence makes it easier to realise His spiritual presence everywhere, and within our hearts." There is little simplicity about a presence that is more than spiritual in the reserved sacrament, and it is not easy to understand in what a sacramental presence consists or how it can be different from any other kind of presence. Such additions to the Christian faith, so far from simplifying it, only make it more difficult and probably in the end tend to produce that loosening of all belief that is so noticeable in countries where the Roman Catholic Church is predominant.

Anglo-Catholicism, by the Rev. F. G. Llewellyn, B.D. (Protestant Truth Society, 1s.), gives a review of the development of Anglo-Catholicism during the last hundred years and sets out the distinctive characteristics of its teaching, showing its divergence from the doctrine of the Church of England since the days of the Reformation. Those who are interested in maintaining the Reformation principles of the Church will find it a store-house of useful information.

Thynne & Co., Ltd., issue *The Pathway of Light, or, How God Enfolds and Unfolds the Mysteries of Creation*, by C. D. Jennings (2s. net). The subject of the book is described as "Divine revealing, as distinct from that which the mind of man has power to unravel, and especially of that which concerns man's origin and destiny." It is a series of spiritual meditations on the Creation and on man's place in it in relation to God.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

WINE OFFICE COURT, LONDON, E.C.4.

Book Racks.—A new Book Rack has been designed for pamphlets, parish magazines, etc., to be placed in the Church porch or parish hall. The Rack is in polished or unpolished oak. It is substantially made and fitted with a strong money-box with lock and key. Its size is 24 × 20 × 8 in., and it has been specially designed to show the maximum number of pamphlets to the best advantage. The Rack can be obtained from the Book Room at 21s., or with a hundred assorted Manuals at 26s. (carriage and packing, 2s. 6d.).

Sunday School Prizes.—A list of Sunday School Prizes has been posted to clerical members of the League.

A special feature this year is the publication of two Certificates of Merit drawn from a special design. They are published at 3d. and 6d. each. We have had many inquiries for a not too expensive card of this kind in past years, and we feel sure that those we have been able to publish will be found most attractive.

An excellent series of sixpenny tracing and painting books have been published by Messrs. Raphael Tuck & Sons, and are on sale in the Book Room. They contain sixteen pages of black and white pictures, sixteen pages of tracing paper, and picture cover back and front. The paper is especially good and substantial and the pictures can be both traced and painted. There are four books in this series. Another sixpenny painting book, also published by Messrs. Raphael Tuck, contains six pages of coloured pictures and six pages of outline. There are eight books in this series, animals, birds and flowers.

St. John's Gospel.—Dr. Gilbert's little book, *The Miracles in St. John's Gospel and their Teaching on Eternal Life*, has been issued in a paper cover at 6d. (post 2d.). We hope that it will have a large circulation in this form. It contains the substance of a series of lectures given at Oxford under the auspices of the Oxford Diocesan Church Tutorial Classes. They open up in a simple, straightforward way a subject of which too many are, no doubt, wholly unaware: they invite discussion and question, and above all they stimulate the desire to pursue the study of the subject deeper and further.

Registers.—In addition to the Confirmation Register for names and addresses of candidates (8 × 12 in.) which was published a short time ago by the Book Room in two sizes, 5s. for a hundred names, 7s. 6d. for a thousand names, we have now published a Register of Services the same size containing sixty ruled pages at 7s. 6d. (post 6d.). The Registers are bound in cloth with red basil on the spine and corners.

Family Prayers.—We would like to draw attention to the Rev. A. F. Thornhill's *Family Prayers*, originally published in the English Church Manuals Series. Price 2d. This little manual aims at providing a simple form of prayer for busy households. The services are brief and broken up into separate acts or parts of worship, such as confession, praise, thanksgiving, prayer, or intercession. The pamphlet has had a very large circulation in the past and is still in great demand.

A third edition has also been published of another little book of Family Prayers entitled *About the Feet of God*, by Canon Price Devereux, price 3d. This little book contains prayers for a week. All the collects are short and simple and many of them are from the Book of Common Prayer. The booklet has been specially prepared as an outline of daily devotion for use in the home or in the school.

The Church Book Room also published early last year a volume of Prayers entitled *Ask What I Shall Give Thee*, price 2s. 6d. (post 3d.), compiled by the Rev. T. S. Hall, B.D. The prayers are for morning and evening for four weeks, and are mainly a selection of prayers, ancient and modern, arranged after the manner of the Lord's Prayer for family and personal use. They have been selected with much care and prayer, and are not meant to supersede but rather to supplement private devotions. The Archbishop of Armagh states in a Foreword: "In this little book are brought together, and ordered for our use in the way our Lord has taught us, the words in which the deepest longings of human hearts have found expression in their seeking after God. All the centuries of spiritual experience speak in these words. I thank the compiler for his labour of love."

Sunday Schools.—Miss Dorothy M. Graves's excellent little book entitled *Boys Together: A Study in the Lives of Jesus Christ, John the Baptist and St. Paul* (1s.) was specially mentioned and recommended at the Sunday School Exhibition held at Dean Wace House in November last. It contains eight excellent reproductions of photographs taken by the author in Palestine, and is intended for the help of young Sunday School teachers and young people who are witnessing for Jesus Christ, many of whom have limited time for Bible reading and study. It is through the "eye-gate," as well as the "ear-gate," that the work of Bible teaching must be done, and children are usually interested in the children who live "over the sea," and the fact that Bible lands and customs are in many respects as they were in New and even Old Testament days makes the picturing of the Bible background not so difficult as some may suppose.

We also recommend the Rev. Ll. E. L. Roberts's *Sunday School Lessons on the Collects*, which is published at 1s. 6d. (post 2d.). *The English Churchman* says of it: "A very welcome addition to the list of Sunday School Lesson Books, and one which will satisfy a long-felt need. The Collects form a very important part of the rich liturgical wealth which the Church of England provides for her members. Mr. Roberts's treatment of their contents is scriptural, spiritual and practical, with many suitable anecdotal illustrations. Each Collect has its particular aim indicated, and the treatment consists of Introduction, Presentation and Application, with suggestions for Expression work."

We are glad to announce that Sunday Gospel stamps in connection with this Lesson Book have been prepared, price 6d. a set of fifty-two stamps for the year. Albums are supplied at 1d.

The Transfiguration.—Canon J. B. Lancelot has just published through the Church Book Room a little manual entitled *The Transfiguration*. It is divided into seven chapters: Introductory, The Purpose—the Site—the Company, The Event, Moses and Elijah, "Good for us to be Here," The Cloud—the Voice—the Bidding, The Return—Conclusion. It is obtainable at 1s. 6d. (postage 2d.).