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

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

The Churchman Advertiser.

APRIL, 1936.

A MISSIONARY'S letter recently received reveals somewhat the sad condition of the people. She says, " I returned home from the North, where the poverty was AWFUL. I was BESIEGED by people begging me to take them back with me, and they were ALL people who were in the last depths of poverty ; so, on my return, I brought TWO very poor widows, and NINE orphan children, whose lack of clothing made them almost indecent. A neighbour gave a frock to one girl, then others did the same. It was nice, and yet amusing, to see a girl disappear behind a car, at the call of some neighbour, and then return, highly pleased, with a dress on big enough for a grown person ; or a boy with a man's coat right down to his bare feet."

Armenian Massacre Relief

at the Office of The Bible Lands Missions' Aid Society

HARRY FEAR, Esq., J.P., *Treasurer.*
The Rev. S. W. GENTLE-CACKETT, *Secretary.*

9P. TUFTON STREET, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.1

CONTENTS.

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1936.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Church and State Report.

THE Report of the Archbishops' Commission on the Relations between Church and State was published towards the end of January. For a considerable time the Report was anticipated and various conjectures were made as to what its contents would be. Many supposed that radical changes would be suggested such as would alter the whole status of the Established Church. On the other hand, more conservative estimates held that nothing would be put forward likely to loosen the bond between the Church and State. During the brief period that the Report has been before the Church its contents have been scrutinised with considerable care, and some definite conclusions have been reached on the part of Evangelical Churchpeople. The historical introduction with which the Report opens is regarded as a tendentious document leaning to the Tractarian conception of the Church and intended to prepare the way for some of the proposals which are put forward. It is realised that the present position has been reached very largely through the divisions in the Church. It is now recognised that a revision of the Prayer Book which had the full support of all sections of the Church would have had the generous approval of the House of Commons. The rejection of the 1927–8 revision was due very largely to the realisation on the part of Members of Parliament that a large section of the Church was opposed to the alteration of doctrine implied in that revision.

The First Step.

In order to meet this difficulty it is realised that the first step must be to secure as large a measure of agreement as possible before any further legislation is put forward. To secure this agreement the first recommendation is that the Archbishops by summoning a Round Table Conference should make every effort forthwith to secure an agreement between representatives of the various schools of thought, first in regard to the permissible deviations from the Order of Holy Communion in the Prayer Book of 1662, and secondly on the use and limits of Reservation. The value of such a Conference will depend upon its representative character. If the

large body of Churchpeople who opposed the revision of the Prayer Book are ignored, as they were in the selection of the Members of the Archbishops' Commission, it will be a serious mistake. Agreement can easily be reached on the changes in the Communion Service if no forms are introduced conveying the idea that the Real Presence is in the Elements as a result of the Consecration of them, and that the idea of any sacrifice made with them is not introduced.

In regard to Reservation, the difficulty is that any permission given is immediately made the occasion of introducing some form of the cultus of the Reserved Sacrament. Whatever willingness there may be on the part of Evangelical Churchmen to assent to Reservation for the Sick is frustrated by the designs of the Romanising extremists, who will only have Reservation on their own terms, viz. the use of the Elements for purposes of adoration.

Spiritual Freedom.

One of the chief problems before the Commission was to secure the "inalienable right" of the Church "to formulate its Faith in Christ and to arrange the expression of that Holy Faith in its form of worship." In order to secure this right they set out a scheme by which, when any legislation is put forward, "the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Lord Chancellor and the Speaker of the House of Commons shall certify their unanimous opinion that it relates substantially to the Spiritual concerns of the Church of England, and that civil or secular interests affected thereby may be regarded as negligible," and an assurance is given that the proposed legislation "is neither contrary to nor indicative of any departure from the fundamental doctrines and principles of the Church of England as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and in the book of Common Prayer may forthwith be presented to His Majesty for the Royal Assent." It has been pointed out that this proposal is absolutely revolutionary in character. It would in effect give the status of an Act of Parliament to a measure that has never been considered by either the House of Lords or the House of Commons. This would be an unprecedented change in the actual Constitution of the country. It would put a new responsibility upon the Sovereign, and if His Majesty's power to refuse were in any way limited it might produce a set of circumstances of an extraordinary character. It would certainly create a new relationship between the Sovereign and the Church of England.

The Evidence Before the Commission.

The substance of the evidence given before the Commission is published as a separate book and contains a large quantity of interesting matter showing wide variety of opinion. Among those who represented Evangelical opinion before the Commission were Sir Thomas Inskip, and Mr. Albert Mitchell, who represented the National Church League. We recommend our readers to study this evidence, as they will find that it presents a useful collection of statements summing up the Evangelical view of the situation. Sir Thomas

Inskip's view was expressed in the sentences: "I do not think the Church is hampered by the existing conditions of the Establishment. I think it is hampered at present by its unhappy divisions, and by giving too much attention to these political or semi-political questions. If a section of the Church feels it is hampered in getting its way by the present relationship of Church and State there seems to me to be only two alternatives. First, to submit to the inconvenience, if it be an inconvenience merely; secondly, if it be fundamental, then to say: 'We can no longer minister in the Church which submits to this.' If the section was a majority of the Church, the Church as a whole would cut itself adrift." But, he went on to say: "I believe if it were possible to take a vote of the membership of the Church, you would find that they were content with the existing legal standard of faith and doctrine in the Church." He also said: "I believe the defeat of the new Prayer Book was due to the fact that the Church was divided." The House of Commons would have passed an uncontroversial book.

The Source of our Difficulties.

The evidence of Mr. Albert Mitchell deserves special attention, as it has important historical value. He makes an interesting point in regard to the use of the words "Established Church." It is the discipline and worship of the Church that are established or stabilised by law. The phrase should be "the rites (or ceremonies) of the Church of England as by law established." In the same way, "Spiritual" is used in the sense in which it was always used by Evangelicals and not in the sense in which it is used by Medievalists. He shows how "the dice were heavily loaded against those who conscientiously opposed the Bishops' disastrous proposals" in the Prayer Book revision. Two important articles contributed by Mr. Mitchell to the *Protestant Dictionary* on "Ecclesiastical Courts" and "Royal Supremacy" are included in the evidence. In his oral evidence Mr. Mitchell stated quite frankly: "I have no hesitation in saying that the real cause of all our difficulties to-day is a decay in spiritual life which needs a further revival of spiritual religion, and that that revival of spiritual religion can only come from the more faithful proclamation of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ and the unique message of God to man as recorded and enshrined in what the old men of the sixteenth century were accustomed to call 'God's Word Written.' My point is that there is nothing in the present external relations of the Church which hinders that revival." He regarded the existence of so much indiscipline in the Church as due to the sympathy shown by some of the Bishops to the breakers of the law.

The Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen.

It is announced that the Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen for this year will be held at St. Peter's Hall, Oxford, on Thursday, Friday and Saturday, April 16th, 17th and 18th. The Committee in their invitation state that it was inevitable that

they should take as the subject of the Conference the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on the Relations of Church and State. The Report will come up for consideration at the Church Assembly in June, and it was thought well that Evangelical Churchmen should have an opportunity of considering its proposals before then. The relationship of Church and State will be considered in a number of its principal aspects, and the Committee have secured the help of a strong platform of speakers. The Rev. C. M. Chavasse, M.A., Master of St. Peter's Hall, will be the Chairman and will give the Introductory Address. "Church and State in Scripture" is the subject of the first paper, by the Rev. D. E. W. Harrison, M.A., Vice-Principal of Wycliffe Hall. "The History of the National Church" will be dealt with by the Rev. V. J. K. Brook, M.A., Censor, St. Catherine's Society, and the Bishop of Norwich will consider "The Value of the National Church." "The Life and Government of the National Church" is the subject allotted to Dr. Gilbert, the Principal of St. John's Hall, Highbury. Special interest attaches to the paper on "The Church and State Report and Evidence" by Archdeacon Storr, who was a member of the Commission. Mr. Albert Mitchell will speak on the same subject, and the Discussion will be opened by the Hon. Lancelot Joynson-Hicks. The closing paper is by the Rev. T. G. Mohan, M.A., Assistant Secretary, C.P.A., whose subject is "The Church and the People." Early application should be made, as the accommodation at St. Peter's Hall is limited to 85. We hope to publish the papers in the next number of THE CHURCHMAN.

Our Contributors.

Our contributors this quarter are all well known to our readers. Dr. Sydney Carter continues his series of historical studies on the Reformation. Mr. Blakeney, in his usual interesting way, points out some of the lessons to be learnt from the study of history. Dr. Montgomery Hitchcock has many important facts to state in regard to the relationships of the Popes to affairs in Ireland. Dr. Harold Smith gathers together a number of points in the history of our English Bible which deserve special notice. "Beta," who is a well-known Evangelical Churchman in close touch with ecclesiastical affairs, discusses the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on the Relations between Church and State and indicates some of the features that will be of special interest to Evangelical Churchpeople. We are grateful to him for giving our readers so useful a survey of the Report and of the Evidence, and we commend this article to their special attention in view of future discussion. In our Reviews of Books some of our leading Evangelicals give our readers the benefit of their opinions on some recent literature.

THE REFORMATION: ITS UNITY AND SOLIDARITY.

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

THE Reformation restored a New Testament truth, which as we have seen, had been largely forgotten or obscured throughout the Middle Ages. Men realised once more the primitive conception of the Church as a body of believers acknowledging the One Lord, and professing the One Faith in Christ as Saviour and Redeemer; and its members being baptised by One Spirit of Unity. They also learnt that they could belong to the Catholic or Universal Church of Christ far more perfectly by *not* belonging to the Church of Rome. They learnt this, not only because of the corrupt doctrines which the Roman Church had added to the Catholic Faith, but also because of its intolerant unchristlike attitude of "forbidding" those "who follow not with us." The medieval and Roman Church confined the Universal Church of Christ to "all those who profess and call themselves papalists"; the Reformers in the language of our own Liturgy and Bidding Prayer, defined the "Catholic Church" as "all who profess and call themselves Christians." And they taught us to pray for "Christ's holy Catholic Church, i.e. for all Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world."

But the Reformation was in the main a disconnected, sporadic, spontaneous movement, rather than an organised and internationally concerted revolt against medieval teaching and worship. The one great unifying link between the Reformers of different countries was their common appeal to the Scriptures as the final and divine *Rule of Faith*. It was conspicuously through this appeal to the Scriptures that the doctrinal Reformation was a return to primitive Catholic Truth. And we should not forget that in this respect Wycliffe justified the title bestowed on him of being the "Morning Star of the Reformation." For he had fully anticipated this Catholic appeal. "If," he said, "there were a hundred Popes supported by all the mendicant friars turned into Cardinals, we could only believe them in regard to matters of faith in as far as they were able to verify their words from the Bible." Exactly the same appeal was made by the German Reformers at the Diet of Spires in 1529, when they affirmed that "The Word of God is the only truth, the sure rule of all doctrine and life and can never fail or deceive us." In fact it was this historic positive "Protest" which fastened on the Reformers the title of "Protestant." And our own English Reformers also accepted it for exactly the same reason as their Lutheran brethren. "Call me 'Protestant' who listeth," said Bishop Ridley. "My 'Protestation' shall be thus, that my

[1] The third of four lectures delivered at Dean Wace House, 1935.

mind is and ever shall be, to set forth the true sense and meaning of God's most holy Word, and not to decline from the same." Unfortunately there still seems to be so much ignorance on this point, that it is necessary to emphasise the fact that "Protestant" is not a *negative* term opposed to "Catholic" in the way so many people carelessly use it. It is still not uncommon to hear even educated Churchpeople say—"I am not a Catholic, I am a Protestant." This is a deplorably ignorant blunder. For a "Protestant" is one who "witnesses *for*" the truth of Holy Scripture as the Catholic "Rule of Faith." The Protestant Reformation was primarily concerned with restoring Scriptural and Catholic Truth, and only accidentally with repudiating the medieval and Roman teaching which conflicted with primitive Truth. The "Protestant" is therefore the truest "Catholic." As Bishop Latimer said at his Trial: "I confess a Catholic Church spread through all the world in the which no man may err, but I know perfectly by God's holy Word that this Church is in all the world, and hath not its foundations in Rome only . . . whereas you join together Romish and Catholic, stay there I pray you. For it is one thing to say Romish Church and another to say Catholic Church." It is a pity that some Churchmen *to-day* are not more mindful of this most important distinction.

But it was this common acceptance of Holy Scripture as the sole Rule of Faith which was the great bond of unity amongst all the Reformers. In each country in Europe the Reformers were disciples of the One Book, and they were ever learning from its pages the way of pardon, peace and power over sin. And it was also from this appeal to Scripture that they discovered the falsity and the danger of the penitential and sacramental teaching of the Roman Church, and they were united in rejecting it.

Again it was from the free study of the Scripture that they were led into a practical *unity of doctrine*; while the common danger of persecution by their Romish opponents soon promoted a strong desire for a clear united declaration of their common Scriptural Faith. On apologetic and defensive grounds alone, the exhortation of the Apostle came home to them with special force—"I beseech you that ye all speak the same thing and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment" (1 Cor. i. 10).

For this purpose Cranmer strove earnestly to procure a Conference in England of the leading Protestant divines in Edward VI's reign, so that a concord on the main points of doctrine could be drawn up. All sections of Reformers were united in this design, and the practical success of such a Synod was assured from the fact that there were already in England, on Cranmer's invitation, both Lutheran and "Reformed" divines, who were working together most harmoniously. But Cranmer was especially anxious for an agreement to be reached on the Sacramentarian controversy, which was at this time dividing the Lutheran and Swiss Reformers. He wrote to Melancthon emphasising the importance that "the members of the true Church should agree among themselves upon

the chief heads of ecclesiastical doctrine and attest their agreements by some published document." He also impressed on Calvin the urgency of "coming to an agreement upon the doctrine of the Sacrament."

It is well here to notice that although the Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation was definitely rejected by all the other Reformers, and had occasioned a sharp division at the Conference of Marburg (1530), it did not break their fundamental solidarity. As time went on there was an increasing tendency to concentrate on the main points of common agreement, and thus present a united front to Romish antagonists. Calvin and Bullinger discovered a formula of agreement in the "Concensus Tigurinus" of 1549, and prominent Lutherans, like Melancthon, Bucer and Paul Fagius, were earnestly seeking a similar *rapprochement.* We get a conspicuous illustration of this conciliatory movement in a letter which Bishop Hooper wrote to Bucer in 1548. Hooper was a convinced Zwinglian, and therefore a strong opponent of the Lutheran teaching on the Sacrament, and so he entreats Bucer "not to burden the consciences of men with *Luther's* words on the Holy Supper"; but he readily acknowledges with thankfulness the gifts of God in Luther and says that the Zurich Ministers felt that in Luther's death "they had lost an ally and partner in their glorious work." He assures Bucer that although he differs from his doctrine of the Eucharist, this "does not make any breach in Christian love or any hostility."

Although political circumstances at the time prevented Cranmer from securing this united Conference of Protestant divines, his object was practically achieved in Elizabeth's reign when the *Harmony of Protestant Confessions of Faith* was issued in 1581, and Bishop Andrewes was able to quote this document to Cardinal Bellarmine as evidence that "we (Protestants) hold one Faith as the Harmony of our Confession showeth." Early in this same reign Bishop Jewel had told the Swiss divines that Anglican Churchmen did not differ from their doctrine by a "nail's breadth"; and in the next reign the celebrated French Reformed divine, Peter du Moulin, declared that the doctrine of the Anglican Articles was "wholly agreeable" to their Confession of Faith.

This statement of Jewel's concerning the doctrinal harmony of the Anglican and Swiss Churches is confirmed by the correspondence of the Anglican divines with the foreign Reformers in Edward VI's reign. On the Eucharist especially, their sympathies were with the Swiss and not with the Lutheran teaching. This was evidenced by the doctrine "set forth" in the "Forty-Two Articles" of 1553. An erudite effort made by Mr. C. H. Smyth in his *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI* to prove that Cranmer accepted what he calls "Suvermerian" or semi-Lutheran views—a doctrine of spiritual eating—is not altogether convincing. For it overestimates and overemphasises certain figurative and symbolical statements of Cranmer's Eucharistic teaching, to the neglect of others which are far clearer and more definite. It also ignores

the fact that Zwingli himself believed in the "spiritual eating" of Christ in the Lord's Supper. Moreover, a careful review of Cranmer's teaching on the Eucharist leads us to the conclusion that his general position practically coincides with the "receptionist" view enunciated later by Richard Hooker: that "the real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament."

But this real unity of the Reformers was not only very practically illustrated by the hospitable way in which so many refugees from the Continent were welcomed and provided for in England under Edward VI, but especially by the friendship, fellowship and help which was so generously bestowed by the Swiss and other Reformers on the English exiles while on the Continent in Mary's reign. In Edward's reign numbers of foreign divines and students sought refuge in England and Cranmer's hospitality seemed boundless. Leading foreign Reformers like Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr and Paul Fagius were given important and lucrative posts at the Universities. Students were assisted financially and received as members of the different Oxford and Cambridge Colleges. Martin Micronius, the Minister of the Flemish Church in London, told Henry Bullinger that the Archbishop of Canterbury was "the chief support and promoter of our Church." Hooper promised to help students from Zurich as far as "his slender means would allow."

In reading the records of this close intercourse we also get incidentally many friendly and domestic touches which prove that human nature is much the same in all ages and circumstances. It is interesting to learn that a grave and learned Reformed divine possessed a "sweet tooth." He troubled to write from London to the great Swiss Reformer Henry Bullinger, asking him to forward him a "spiced cake" of the same kind which he had tasted two years previously when at Zurich. This cake had evidently made a lasting impression on his palate, although the much-occupied Zurich theologian overlooked this trivial request. Consequently two years later, this same divine prefers his plea that a "*large* cake" similar to the one of such happy memories four years ago, should be sent him. Then again Mrs. Richard Hilles, a prosperous merchant's wife, asks for Bullinger's prayers for her approaching confinement, and thanks the eminent Reformer for his present of some shoes for her small boy of two years. Christopher Hales asks Rudolph Gualter to get six portraits of the leading foreign Reformers painted for him, to adorn the walls of his library; but much to his disgust, through the "Puritan" scruples of Burcher, his request is refused, for fear of "opening a door to idolatry"! One imagines that photographers would have done a poor trade under a strict Puritan régime!

This close unity and friendship was put to a severely practical test with the considerable exodus of English Protestants to the Continent to escape the fury of the Marian persecution, and the foreign Reformers bore the strain most nobly. Hooper from prison

made a pathetic appeal to the Church of Zurich to be "merciful to those wretched and unfortunate individuals who have fled from hence for the sake of the Christian religion." And this appeal did not fall on deaf ears. Bullinger received many refugees into his own house and the magistrates supplied the wants of many families, while the magistrates at Strasburg showed similar kindness and hospitality. Many godly merchants there defrayed the cost of the education of numbers of English youths studying for the Ministry. John Ponet, the future bishop, praises God for having placed over His Church in "this calamitous age," such a benefactor and teacher as Henry Bullinger; while in 1557 a number of exiles at Frankfort wrote a special letter of gratitude to Bullinger for his self-sacrificing efforts. "You," they say, "have not sought for any benefit for yourself but the comfort of the churches groaning under the Cross, placing your hand, as it were, under the burden and partaking and sympathising in our calamities."

The very intimate and affectionate correspondence which these Anglican exiles maintained with their Swiss benefactors during the earlier part of Elizabeth's reign, is proof that this striking spirit of unity and fellowship was not merely occasioned by necessity or misfortune. Moreover, we get remarkable evidence of this unity and solidarity between all the Reformers, even including the Lutherans, in a letter written to the Polish divine John à Lasco by Hierome Zanchius in January, 1559. Zanchius, the public Reader in Divinity at Strasburg, held moderate Lutheran views on the Eucharist, and he was fully aware that the "Elizabethan Settlement" of religion was not being conducted on Lutheran lines as far as Eucharistic doctrine was concerned. Yet he tells à Lasco, with reference to the English exiles who had just returned home, "I do not doubt that the Lord will make use of the services of many of them for the restoration of the Reformed Faith in England as a real support and strength to *all other branches of it* in Europe." "We are persuaded," he adds, "that the happy introduction of the kingdom of Christ into the kingdom of England would be no small help to *all other Churches* dispersed through Germany, Poland and other regions." These "Churches" were of course Lutheran, and he thus recognises that the fundamental unity between all the Reformed, especially in their basic appeal to the Scriptures, was far more important than any minor difference between the Lutheran or Swiss view of the Eucharist. Bishop Jewel probably correctly expressed Zanchius's views on this latter point when, referring to the Lutherans and Zwinglians, he said "in very deed they of both sides be Christians, good friends and brethren. They vary not betwixt themselves upon the principles and *foundations* of our religion . . . but upon one only question, which is neither *weighty* nor *great*, neither mistrust we, or make doubt at all, they will be shortly agreed."

When we turn to the doctrine of the "Church and the Ministry" we find that the teaching of all the Reformed Churches is in practical accord. Even in the tentative effort towards some doctrinal

reform seen in the *Institution of the Christian Man* in 1537, we find the Scriptural distinction between the "Visible" and the "Invisible" aspects of the Church clearly expressed. The "invisible" Church is described as the "Company of elect and faithful people of God" both here and in heaven, "ordained to everlasting life." This teaching is amplified and emphasised in Dean Nowell's *Catechism* of 1562—"This communion of Saints," says Nowell, "cannot be perceived by our senses . . . since it is the congregation of those whom God hath by His secret election adopted to Himself through Christ." Yet he adds, "there is a Church of God visible . . . the tokens or marks whereof He doth show and open to us." And Richard Hooker warns against the mistakes which have been made by failing to observe the clear difference "first between the Church of God mystical and visible, then between visible sound and corrupted," while the prayer in our Communion office definitely implies an "invisible" aspect of the Catholic Church, when it speaks of the "mystical body of Thy Son . . . which is the blessed company of all faithful people."

We find these same distinctions clearly made in the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession*, in the Calvinistic Scotch Confession, and in the Second Helvetic Confession (1566). The latter defines the "one Catholic Church" as "a company of the faithful, a communion of all saints, that is of them who do truly know and rightly worship and serve the true God in Jesus Christ the Saviour, spread abroad through all parts and quarters of the world." And it adds that this Church may "be termed invisible," because its true members "being known only to God, cannot be discerned by the judgment of man." But in its "visible" aspect it declares, "not all that are reckoned in the number of the Church are saints and lively and true members of the Church."

Neither is this Reformation "harmony" broken, when we turn to the question of the Ministry for the Visible Church. The same unity and unanimity is clearly evident regarding the necessary "Notes" of the Church. The Anglican Article defines these "Notes" as "the preaching of the pure Word of God" and "the due ministration of the sacraments," a definition which is based on the almost identical language of Article VII of the *Augsburg Confession*. The outstanding Elizabethan theologian Richard Hooker declares that "the unity of the body (the Church) consists in these three things. Its members own one Lord, profess one Faith, and are initiated by one baptism. . . . In whomsoever these things are, the Church doth acknowledge them for her children, them only she holdeth for aliens and strangers, in whom these things are not found."

It was the failure to realise this basic truth which led, as Hooker said, to the foolish question, "Where did our Church lurk . . . before the birth of Martin Luther?" "As if we were," Hooker adds scornfully, "of opinion that Luther did erect a new Church of Christ."

The French Confession and the Second Helvetic Confession,

both insist on the same two "notes" of "sincere preaching" and "ministration of the Sacraments ordained by Christ": while the Scottish Confession of 1560 adds to these two "Ecclesiastical discipline uprightly administered as God's Word prescribes."

It may of course be objected that while all this is true in *theory*, in *practice* this Reformed harmony was broken on the question of Church Polity, by the fact that the Anglican Church required episcopal ordination while almost all the Continental Reformed Churches either rejected or neglected it. But a careful examination of the facts and evidence will clearly prove that this objection cannot be maintained, since it is evident that the Anglican and all the other Reformed Churches held the common belief that there was *no obligatory divine form of polity* laid down in Scripture for the Christian Church. The Anglican Reformers, it is true, both in Edward VI's reign and also under Elizabeth, retained the ancient historic Catholic form of government and Ministry, but there is abundant evidence to prove that they did not regard episcopacy as a necessary "note" of the Church, but rather as an ancient scriptural and expedient form of Church organisation which the State had decided to retain for the Anglican Church. Cranmer had declared "that in the beginning of Christ's religion bishops and priests were no two things, but both one office, and that in the New Testament he that is appointed to be a bishop or priest needeth no consecration by the Scriptures, for election and appointing thereto is sufficient." Prebendary John Bradford, the martyr, says: "You shall not find in all the Scripture this your essential point of succession of bishops." Consequently the retention of the historic Catholic polity did not in any way interfere with the fellowship and unity of spirit and interest, shown by the early Anglican Reformers to their Continental Reformed brethren.

It should also be remembered that it was usually only the force of adverse circumstances which occasioned the abandonment of episcopal government by the Continental Reformed Churches. Melancthon in Article VII of his *Apology* states clearly: "The severity of the bishops is the cause whereby that canonical polity is dissolved anywhere, *which we very greatly desire to preserve.*" In the *Wittenberg Reformation* of 1545 the Lutheran theologians declare their willingness to accept episcopal ordination and polity if the bishops "will maintain true doctrine and the right use of the Sacraments and the abolition of private masses." Calvin and Bullinger actually wrote to Edward VI offering to have bishops in their Churches so as to illustrate the real organic unity amongst those adhering to the Reformation. Certainly the "Elizabethan Settlement" did nothing to change this spirit of unity and fellowship. The Ordinal reaffirmed the Anglican determination to "continue, and reverently esteem" the orders of bishops, priests and deacons which had existed "from the Apostles' time"; but there was no thought or wish that this "National" regulation should challenge the validity of the Ministry and sacraments of the Scotch or Continental non-episcopal Churches. It is true that the rigid

enforcement of the accepted principle of "National" or "territorial" religions, presented at times certain *legal* obstacles for the exercise of *non-episcopal* ministries in the episcopally governed National English Church. But the Act of 1571 (XIII Eliz. cap XII) was interpreted as permitting foreign presbyterian ministers to exercise their ministry and receive cures of souls in England on their acceptance of the Articles of Religion; and several availed themselves of this privilege. Accordingly Elizabethan theologians and Churchmen were most careful to express their teaching on the Ministry in merely general terms which could not be considered or construed as reflecting on the value of non-episcopal Orders. This indefinite language employed in Article XXIII is all the more significant because of the revision of the Article in 1571. It was at this very period that a new and intolerant party of English Presbyterians was arising, led by Thomas Cartwright, the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, which denied the Scripturalness of episcopal government. This was the precise time therefore, if the Anglican bishops believed in the doctrine of "No bishop, no Church," to make this teaching clear in their authorised Confession of Faith, which was then being ratified. But instead of such a pronouncement, we find only ten years later that Archbishop Grindal officially declared that a Scotch presbyterian divine had been ordained according to the "laudable form and rite of the Reformed Church of Scotland"; and he accordingly licensed him "to celebrate the divine offices and minister the Sacraments throughout the whole Province of Canterbury." We get also from the language of this licence an incidental testimony to the close accord in *doctrine*, as well as in fellowship, then acknowledged between the Churches of England and Scotland, since it states that "the congregation of that county of Lothian is conformable to the orthodox faith and sincere religion now received in this realm of England and established by public authority." This testimony is especially significant because episcopacy was at this time (1582) abrogated in the Scotch Church.

This practice of admitting foreign presbyterianly ordained divines to cures of souls in England was continued till the middle of the next century according to the contemporary testimony of such trustworthy witnesses as Bishop Cosin, Bishop Burnet, Lord Chancellor Clarendon and others.

This full expression of unity and fellowship has, however, been questioned on account of three or four special cases when it is asserted that Elizabethan Churchmen refused to accept the validity of foreign presbyterian Orders. The names usually brought forward in support of this contention are those of Dean Whittingham of Durham, Walter Travers, the Reader at the Temple Church, and Adrian Saravia, a Dutch Reformed divine, and Robert Wright, a Puritan minister. All these, except Saravia, were cases of *Englishmen* who had obtained presbyterian ordination *abroad*. And we have to remember in this connection that at this time the toleration of different religious systems or polities *in one State* was unknown,

and the "cujus regio ejus religio" principle was strictly enforced. Consequently for *Englishmen* to attempt to "contract out" of their own National system of established Church government by securing presbyterian ordination abroad, and then try to exercise this ministry in England was considered as tantamount to rebellion against the law of "Church and Realm" concerning Ordination in the English Church. For it was really an attempt to thwart the National rule for episcopal ordination which had been laid down as best suited for England. Therefore in strict "law" all *Englishmen* trying to exercise such non-episcopal ministries could have been at once refused as not *legally* qualified. But in practice, however much such attempts were discredited as clandestine and unpatriotic, this strictly "legal" policy was not pursued; and this fact is in itself another illustration of the tender regard and solicitude of the English bishops and clergy for their former friends and benefactors in the foreign Reformed Churches. They were reluctant *in any way* even to seem to reflect on their ministries. But when such "disloyal" English Puritan ministers, in addition to securing their Orders in this illegal manner, also stirred up faction and strife by reviling the Anglican Liturgy or polity and discrediting its clergy, it was not very surprising that they encountered opposition and that their professed foreign credentials were narrowly questioned.

Such was the case with William Whittingham, who obstinately refused to conform to the "habits," and was also so contentious that Archbishop Sandys was led to question whether he had really been ordained presbyterianly at Geneva. At the same time the Archbishop expressly disclaimed any intention of discrediting the Orders of the Church of Geneva. Travers was a similar case. He was, says Fuller, greatly "disaffected to the discipline," and he deliberately controverted the teaching given by Hooker, who was the Master of the Temple, where Travers was the Reader. So that, as Fuller quaintly expresses it: "The pulpit spoke pure Canterbury in the morning and Geneva in the afternoon." But here again Archbishop Whitgift clearly pointed out that it was Travers's "contempt for the Ministry of his own Church" and "the condemning of the kind of Ordering of Ministers" in England, by sneaking across to Antwerp to receive presbyterian Orders, which led his position and ministry to be questioned, at least as to its *legality*. This, in fact, was the line which Whitgift was ultimately forced to take with Travers. He himself had previously elected Travers as a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, but he soon discovered his great hostility to the established Church discipline, and he declared that he "never found any who showed less submission and humility."

Consequently when Lord Burghley petitioned the Queen to appoint Travers to the Mastership of the Temple instead of Hooker (in 1585), Whitgift warned her against him "as likely to do very much harm." He told Elizabeth that "Travers hath been and is one of the chief and principal authors of dissension

in this Church, a contemner of the Book of Prayers, an earnest seeker of innovation, and either is of no degree of ministry at all, or else ordered beyond the seas, *not according to the form in this Church of England used.*" It is well to notice here that Whitgift does not here deny the validity of this foreign presbyterian "ordering," or call it "of no degree of ministry at all"; but simply states that it is not *legally* regular or valid for an *Englishman.* All the same, a little later, Whitgift tells Burghley that if "time and years have altered" Travers's "disposition" and attitude (which he doubts), he "will be ready to do him good as any friend he hath." But as the Archbishop found that Travers, by his writings and actions, was just as obstinate and mischievous an opponent of episcopal government and discipline as ever, he determined, before he would consent to his appointment to the Mastership or any other post, to make him prove that "he is a minister ordered according to the *laws* of the Church of England." This was a most natural and sensible way of excluding men of this troublesome type. The wisdom of this policy was at once apparent, since Travers, who was then Reader at the Temple, soon made Hooker's life miserable by continually and publicly from the pulpit controverting his teaching, until at length he was suspended.

With regard to Saravia, who was admitted to preferments and benefices in England, there is no evidence to show that he was ever re-ordained by an English bishop, and the inference is entirely against any such supposition. He certainly wrote strongly in favour of episcopacy, but he expressly taught that when bishops, as in the Roman Church, "fell away into idolatry," the "episcopal government of the Church is devolved upon the pious and orthodox presbyters." He would certainly regard the Dutch Reformed Church as being in this position of "necessity."

The case of Robert Wright is more complicated and requires more detailed consideration. Bishop Frere declares that Wright was "convented in 1582 for taking upon himself to minister, having only received Presbyterian orders at Antwerp." But a careful examination of the actual evidence available will not support this assertion. There is little doubt from the statements or "Charges" made against Wright at his different "Trials" or "Examinations," that he was a very stiff and mischievous Puritan, noted for his "nonconformities" and also for his very uncharitable and sweeping criticisms of all non-Puritan clergy and dignitaries of the Church as "dumb dogs" and "clogs of anti-Christ." Wright had spent about thirteen years at Cambridge University and during the last seven years he had acted as a sort of lay Puritan preacher by reason of his status of M.A. He left Cambridge towards the end of 1578 being then of "full purpose of serving in the Ministry when God should call him thereto." Obviously from this statement he was not *then* ordained. But about this time he was welcomed into the Puritan household of the second Lord Rich at Rochford Hall in Essex. Here by a sort of "Anabaptist" "call" of the "household," Lord Rich appointed Wright as a sort of private Chaplain

and "esteemed him as his Pastor." He also actually appealed to Bishop Aylmer to grant Wright a Public Preachers' licence. Aylmer naturally refused this request, when as Wright says, "he understood I was no minister." Wright himself confesses that he did not regard this irregular "call" of the "household" as any ordination, and admits that he only "took himself to be a private man to do them some good till they might have a sufficient Pastor." But writing in May, 1582, he adds that "he had been called since the death of the old lord unto the Ministry." As the second Lord Rich died in February, 1581, this would seem good evidence to show that Wright's ordination took place *after* this date, since he also adds that "this (present) lord being desirous to use his Ministry, with promise that he would labour to have it public, and my lord of London not utterly denying Licence, but saying he would first see some testimony that the said Minister was ordained Minister." Wright in this same account also tells us the manner of his ordination with an indication of its date. He says that "being in Antwerp, whither he went to see the Churches from *whence idolatry had been lately driven*, and English Merchants desiring him to assist in the Ministry he was religiously ordained thereunto and there did execute it." At his trial in November, 1581, Wright also declared that Villiers, the Minister of a Reformed Church at Antwerp, had ordained him. Now in July, 1581, a definite Edict had suspended the exercise of the Romish religion in Antwerp, so that if Wright had been ordained there shortly after this date, his description of "Churches from whence idolatry had been lately driven" would be exactly accurate. This approximate date for his ordination is also confirmed by a reply which he made in an Examination which he underwent while in prison early in 1582. This answer implied that he had been "called by the Reformed Church" some time within the past year. As Wright was arrested and examined in October, 1581, for condemning the observance of the Queen's birthday as "making her an idol," he must have visited Antwerp and been ordained some time between July and October, 1581. In fact it was in September, 1581, that the third Lord Rich asked Aylmer to license Wright, and received the reply from the bishop that he must first receive testimony that Wright had been ordained. In addition to that evidence Aylmer refused to license Wright unless "he would subscribe to the orders of the Church." That is, that he would promise to "conform" to the Church regulations for worship. Lord Rich apparently could not at that time supply the necessary evidence of Wright's ordination at Antwerp, and so Aylmer reported that "he could not tell how or where he was ordained." In November Wright was imprisoned for "maligning the Queen and for rejecting the Book and many other disorders"; but no specific charge was made against his foreign Orders, and there is no evidence to show that Aylmer ever described Wright as "no minister" *after* he had been "called by the Reformed Church to the Ministry." The fact that seven years later he was instituted to a benefice in

Suffolk would point to the definite acceptance of his foreign presbyterian Orders. There is nothing in Aylmer's actions in this case to lead us to think that he differed materially from Archbishop Whitgift in his estimate of episcopacy or of the value of non-episcopal Orders. "We do not take upon us," said Whitgift, to Cartwright, "either to blame or to condemn other Churches, for such Orders as they have received *most fit for their estates*." "As no certain manner or form of electing ministers is prescribed in Scripture, every Church may do therein as it shall seem most expedient." "The ordering of ministers," he adds, "does not appertain only to bishops . . . and it doth not therefore follow that there must always be one kind and form of government."

Just as the Reformers generally agreed that there was no one essential divinely appointed form of Ministry, so they were in accord that there was no such thing as a necessary uniform "Catholic" order of worship and usage. The Anglicans expressed this in the language of Article XXXIV that "every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying." We find therefore a diversity of usage and services and ceremonies amongst the different Reformed Churches, but an examination of the various Reformed Liturgies will show that these divergencies only affected minor questions of ritual or ceremony and did not affect doctrine. A further careful study of these different Liturgies will also disprove a common view that while the Anglicans conserved a number of Catholic and ancient elements and customs in their worship, the other Reformed Churches completely disregarded such standards and broke away from everything which could claim the sanction of antiquity.

There is, in fact, on the other hand a surprising agreement in the general acceptance or retention of definitely ancient and Catholic rites and customs amongst the Reformed Churches. Thus the imposition of Hands in Ordination was retained in all these Churches. Fasting during Lent, special Orders and Forms of Excommunication and Absolution, as well as the use of Sponsors at Baptism and the observance of Festival and Saints' Days, were all but universal. This desire to retain as much as possible of ancient traditional ritual customs and usages was specially evident in the Swedish and other Lutheran Churches, and the *Augsburg Confession* describes it as a "calumnious falsehood that all the ceremonies, all things instituted of old, are abolished in our churches." Luther was most insistent in claiming that the German Evangelical Church "was a member of the old true Church, inasmuch as it possessed the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the power of the Keys, the Word and preaching, without any addition of man, the ancient Faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed."

Even if the distinctively "Reformed" Churches were less conservative than the Lutheran, there was also no desire in them

to discard ancient forms of worship and usage which were innocent, helpful and Scriptural. Consequently in the Scotch, Swiss, French and even Dutch Liturgies, we find many prayers and features which are similar, if not identical, to those of the Anglican Liturgy; and this is especially true of the Communion Service. A French Reformed Professor of Divinity probably accurately summed up the general attitude of the foreign Reformed Churches on this question when he said that "set forms of Liturgy were composed and prescribed by the several authors of the Reformation in the countries where they lived *varying as little as might be from the ancient forms of the Primitive Church.* And these set forms have been happily used with profit and advantage by the Reformed Churches of every Nation."

We may therefore confidently claim that as regards respect for Christian antiquity and the profitableness of ancient and primitive worship and usages, there was no real breach in the unity and solidarity of the Reformation Movement.

THE UNDYING WISDOM. Studies in the teaching of Jesus. By Frank H. Ballard, M.A. *S.C.M. Press.* 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

This is another book setting forth the Teaching of Jesus Christ and its application to the needs of to-day. The author himself, being merely human and essaying to cover a very wide field, will not find his readers in agreement with everything he says, though the studies will be found very helpful. Our Lord is shown to be the One to Whom communities and individuals alike must still turn for guidance. He is referred to throughout as Jesus—the standpoint of these Studies necessitates it—but it is plain that the author regards Him as Saviour and Lord and not merely as a magnified man.

H. D.

THE OLD TESTAMENT OMNIBUS BOOK. Collected and arranged by A. C. Hannay. *Williams & Norgate, Ltd.* 6*s.* net.

In his introduction to this *Old Testament Omnibus Book* "George A. Birmingham" pays just tribute to the intrinsic merits of the Old Testament stories, including the Apocrypha. He considers Sherlock Holmes and Lord Peter Wimsey no improvement on Daniel, in Susannah and in Bel and the Dragon; regards Samson as a first-rate "Vamp" story; and declares the Absalom story, if published to-day, would be a "best seller which would run into edition after edition." It is a mournful reflection that the criticism of recent years has done much to impair faith in the Bible. There are signs, however, that the Bible is coming into its own again and that destructive criticism has not destroyed men's faith in it so completely as some suppose. It may be that this selection of stories will lead to a further and deeper study of the inspired Word.

H. D.

SOME LESSONS FROM HISTORY.

By E. H. Blakeney, M.A.

"History is the drama in which God Himself is the protagonist, vindicating His justice and moral government on the stage of the visible world."
S. H. Butcher.

WE are accustomed to divide history into periods: thus we speak of ancient, medieval, modern history, as the case may be. Yet this is but a convention; these divisions have little real meaning, because all history is one. History began when man first appeared; it will close when human society is at an end. We may, if we choose, picture history as past politics, and present politics as history in the making. And rightly, for politics are the record of men in their active relations to one another as members of the πόλις—the city or community; and it is this that makes politics at once so important and instructive. Man, said Aristotle, is "a political animal." Yet politics are vulgar unless liberated by history, and history passes into mere literature if divorced from practice.

Why should we study history? What good does it achieve? These questions demand an answer. If, by the study of history, we mean committing to memory isolated happenings, or such scanty information, in regard to those happenings, as we find in popular text-books, such a study is of small value. These manuals do not enrich the mind, nor touch the heart, nor evoke imagination. Isolated facts are often misleading. They need to be correlated, and their implications drawn out, if they are to teach. And this is no easy task. The wealth of history, its inexhaustible subject-matter, are apt to overwhelm and to discourage the learner. Yet if we consider history as a unity in itself—the record in marble, or parchment, or paper, of the age-long travail of the human spirit—and try to grasp it in its unity, something will have been achieved. We shall witness the slow progress of human life, never in a straight line but ever in a spiral formation. Progress; yes: but only in so far as the spirit of man, wrestling with its environment, discovers by painful steps and slow the laws of Nature and of man's own being, and also learns to control those laws by obedience to them. We shall mark how the Moral Law, like a silver thread in a cord, holds good throughout the whole secular process, men disregarding it at their peril. Sometimes it appears as if disregard of ethical sanctions left things unaffected; but it is not so. The story of the nations proves, with terrible distinctness, that we must take long views.

"The mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small." Such was the dictum of a wise Greek; and the Roman poet Horace pointed the same moral, basing his words on the experience of his own countrymen. If it be true that, as St. Paul avers, "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap," then it

will be not less true of the nation, which is but the individual man writ large. The truth is that History is nothing if not full of moral lessons. Bolingbroke spoke of it as "philosophy teaching by examples," but it is more than that: it is Morality teaching by Experience. History demonstrates that there are such things as eternal truths, independent of the age in which we live, independent of the State where we find ourselves, independent of our private prejudices and thoughts; truths inherent in the order of the world, immovable as the truths of mathematics. They cannot be trifled with, any more than you can flout the laws of gravitation. And these same varieties (that lie at the throbbing heart of the whole historic record) exist but to illumine—a light to lighten the Gentiles and to guide our feet into the way of peace.

Such is the meaning (or one of the meanings) of "History"; and we do well to study it, that we may draw from the past some lesson of significance for the present, and to gather, from the follies and furies of mankind in epochs long since vanished, some sure guidance for the problems of our own time, that we may face the future with reasoned confidence. If History cannot do this, better close our text-books and cultivate our gardens.

If History be indeed a Unity, we shall expect to find in it a plan, a pattern. Events are not the work of chance; each is linked on—sometimes manifestly, sometimes obscurely—to some preceding event that has helped to mould its character. The American poet, Lowell, has a noble dictum which is justly to be held in honour: "the furrow which Time is even now turning runs through the Everlasting, and in that must we plant." The pagan doctrine of a blind fortuity has no place in the Annals of God.

Let us take a few examples (at haphazard, so to speak) from the book of Time, and see what lesson we may educe from the past, and then conjecture what hints those examples give for our conduct in the present and in the future. We will cast our thoughts back more than two thousand years, to days when Assyria was supreme in the East. What did Assyria do in her generation? She rose emergent from the mists, as it were, and by her power, the genius of her kings, and her ruthless efficiency, held half the world in fee. The Assyrians were alike first-rate warriors and competent administrators; they set themselves to weld into one the separated peoples of the East. They extended commerce; they carried their specialised civilisation far and wide. Nevertheless, the Great Empire of Assyria fell suddenly, never to rise again. Fate had hung out no warning light at the cross-roads of the nation's career. Assyria was cruel to an almost unexampled degree; she cared nothing for the liberties or well-being of her subject states; no appeal to mercy or justice deflected her from her path; moral sense she had none. And the Unseen Power that overrules the destinies of mankind waited—waited with a strange patience, and watched within the shadows. When at last the cup of the nation's iniquity was full the blow fell. So complete was the destruction of that once-proud Empire, with its imperial City, that it disappeared from the gaze

of men, only to be discovered by the investigations of archæologists less than a century ago.

I may, perhaps, pass over the record of Israel, as we find it given in the Old Testament, merely reminding you of the great lesson conveyed there—that national sin is certain, soon or late, to be followed by national undoing; that righteousness alone can exalt a state; and that unfaithfulness to the abiding principles of the Moral Law [1] brings the appropriate penalty in its train. Such is the teaching of the Old Testament, and it is given for our learning.

We may pass on to that momentous clash between East and West in the fifth century B.C., when the huge empire of Persia attempted to ride roughshod over the little country of Greece. It may be that, to-day, Marathon and Salamis seem trivial; yet at those two places the destinies of Europe were decided. Persia, an absolute monarchy, where freedom (as we know it) was non-existent, was matched in conflict with Greece where freedom was both known and cherished. The imperial armies might well have appeared invincible, at that epoch, against the insignificant forces arrayed in defence of the mother country; but those forces, riveted together by a noble patriotism, was more than equal to the loosely knit, undisciplined ranks of the Persian monarchy. And the example of Greece has not yet exhausted its meaning, if we take pains to understand it. Yet, within a century of those exploits by sea and land, the Athenian empire—established owing to the signal success which Athens, as the spear-head of resistance to Persian insolence and tyranny—fell. And why? Because, haughty in success, she herself had become tyrannical over her subject states, and lost their good-will; because, in the pride of power, she wantonly attacked Sicily, in the lust for wealth and military glory. Hence she, too, had to learn the bitterness of defeat. Once again had the moral forces that rule the destinies of nations triumphed over the machinations of political unrighteousness.[2]

Two centuries pass, and the pages of Polybius and Livy invite us to witness the fierce struggle between those two Mediterranean powers—Carthage and Rome. It was a conflict between a land and a sea power, with universal domination as the victor's prize. Semitic Carthage, despite her wealth and her culture, was, like ancient Mexico, cursed by a religion so cruel and a polity so corrupt that her triumph might well have proved a world disaster: readers of Flaubert's wonderful but terrible story *Salammbô* will need no reminder of this. Rome, with all her faults (and they were many), had great qualities; her patriotic fervour rang true; she was not yet corrupted by excessive riches, nor her life contaminated by the presence of Oriental religious cults. Slow to move, but, when she did move, irresistible in the strength of her citizen soldiery, Rome never swerved from her appointed path, and finally destroyed her

[1] Whose "seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world" (Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*).

[2] See some apt remarks in chap. viii of the late Professor S. H. Butcher's monograph on Demosthenes.

menacing rival. But, like the Assyrians of old, she exceeded her mandate: she showed no mercy, she discounted the justice that exalteth a nation; so she too had to pass, ultimately, through the fire. By a policy of repression she did, in fact, achieve world-power —but at the cost of her own soul. The wealth of the East poured into her lap; a declension in morals swiftly set in; the old-time patriotism began to buckle; civil war broke out in her own borders, for she had alienated her subjects beyond forgiveness. And that Civil war lasted until, finally, her Senate and her People lost their old republican liberties, and a new order began. The Republic might, indeed, have survived but for the growing weakness of that democracy which had been its bulwark. Selfish, incompetent, scorning reform (despite the splendid efforts of the Gracchi), the Roman Republic was to receive its death-blow. To the old and well-tried democracy succeeded Dictatorship; and the liberties of the many were lost in what ended as a soulless officialism. Such is the lesson we learn from ancient Rome; we should be wise to heed it now. Like causes produce like effects. For a while, indeed, the balance between opposing interests was rectified: the age of the Antonines was, thought Gibbon, one of the happiest periods in all history; but it was not to be so for long. Under the pressure of a despotic government, freedom ebbed, and justice was little more than a name. True, the prestige of the imperial city seemed invincible; but visible and invisible forces were at work, sapping the structure of Roman power, till, after four long centuries, it was overthrown. Then was Europe plunged into the night of those Dark Ages when civilisation itself appeared to have been destroyed from off the earth.

The causes which led to the decline and fall of the greatest of all World Empires are many, and some are obscure; but a few may be instanced. First, the decay of free labour, supplanted by slavery—that cancer at the heart of things; second, the ruin of the farmer class, which during the best days of the Republic had proved the backbone of the State; third, the colossal extravagance of the idle rich, and the increasing poverty of the landless and the poor; fourth, multiplied taxation and iniquitous tariffs; fifth, the disappearance of the simpler manlier forms of religious observance, along with the rise of strange disquieting cults which tended to sap the moral and spiritual vitality of the people generally; sixth, the condition of the governing city, its inhabitants debased by the bloody shows, and demoralized by the doles granted by the State to keep the mob quiet; finally, the loss of that political freedom apart from which no nation can truly prosper. Is there no lesson in all this for the distracted world in which we find ourselves to-day? Moral standards, too, had been destroyed, or at least degraded; the sanctity of family life was little regarded; luxury, idleness, and self-indulgence had taken the place of the old Roman "gravitas," that high seriousness which characterised an earlier, happier generation. It was not for nothing that these agonising words were wrung from the lips of Jerome when, early in the fifth century, he

wrote as follows: "the world sinks unto ruin; all things are perishing—except our sins: these alone flourish." It was from the execution ground of Calvary, and from its darkness, that there came, at length, a message of new hope for Mankind: *I am the Resurrection and the Life.*

Let us pass over two centuries more, and what do we witness? Surely a strange and unprecedented event, the coming of Islâm. In the year 622 of our era, a dreamer of the desert, in danger of his life through the machinations of his orthodox foes, fled from Mecca to Medina, where he was welcomed by a few disciples who, having listened to his message, were prepared to offer him a refuge. That flight is known as the Hejra, and has registered itself as one of the memorable dates in world annals. The story of Mohammed during the succeeding decade is universally known. Romance, war, politics, religion—all are exhibited there. At the close of this formative period the famous prophet was dead, but not the simple yet tremendous message which (so he believed) he had been divinely commissioned to preach. Within a century, or less, all Arabia had answered to the *muezzin's* cry, and the armies of Islâm were victorious in Egypt, Asia Minor, Syria, Persia, and along the whole littoral of North Africa. They threatened even the stability of the Byzantine empire itself. Nor does the formidable list of conquests end here. Spain itself had become, in great part, a Muslim fief, and the Cross had sunk before the triumphant Crescent. What is the meaning of it all? No doubt many explanations might be given; but this can hardly be gainsaid, that a nation strong in the armour of a faith that gripped the hearts and wills of men was strong enough to challenge and overthrow peoples and tribes whose religious beliefs had grown flaccid; whose faith, ceasing to be an ardent conviction, had degenerated into a facile orthodoxy or a stereotyped routine. True, the original force of Islâm, as a creed, soon lost its primitive fervour, just as the evangel of the early Church was destined to become impoverished, its original powers diminishing through neglect of the moral factor. To-day we may watch the slow dissipation of spiritual energy in the creed of Mohammed, for the moral element has never been strong, except among the mystic sects of Islâm. But in mysticism, which knows no spiritual frontiers, an ecumenical light ever burns.

There is a mighty gap between the Hejra and the day when Luther, another lonely figure, challenged the embattled might of the Medieval Church. But the movement which (in a sense) he inaugurated had long been hoped for, and in many places. Indeed, it was bound to come. Men devoted to their creed, and pathetically anxious to lay no rude hands on that majestic Church which, for a millennium, had held captive the Western world, could no longer endure the caricature which had usurped the place of the Galilean gospel. Had the wise men and Scribes of Christendom been listened to sympathetically; had the necessary changes and adjustments been made which Time and the re-orientation of men's thoughts required; had the new knowledge, advancing to claim the allegiance

of truth-lovers, been welcomed instead of excommunicated, Christendom might have remained united until now. But it was not to be. Ecclesiastics and their followers, entrenched behind the barricades of established dogma, could not—would not—recognise the truth of Lowell's words: "new Time makes ancient Good uncouth." Timely and liberal concessions to growing needs might have averted the cataclysm which we call the Reformation. When the storm broke, it destroyed much that later generations would gladly have preserved, the loss of which has permanently injured Christendom. Truth had never been the supreme ideal of the Medieval Church; what she required was orthodoxy. Falsehood was, admittedly, an Evil, but heresy a worse evil; truth was a Good, but orthodoxy a greater Good. Upon this hypothesis had been erected a whole theological system, and it was to impugn that system that the Reformation fathers fought—and suffered. The Reformers were not always faithful to the principles they believed in; but believe in them they did: those principles lay at the root of reform. When the Medieval Church was offered (as she was) the opportunity of effecting a reformation, in faith and morals, from within, she made "the grand refusal." She sealed her doom at the Council of Trent.

A great storm is sometimes followed by a treacherous calm. So it seemed after the upheaval in the sixteenth century, followed though it was by one of the most devastating wars ever known, the thirty years' War of Religion. But nothing happened comparable to what took place at the end of the eighteenth century. It is the French Revolution that marks the "great divide": this astonishing outburst is the pivotal event in modern history. We are still living in the backwash of that movement; the Revolution is still operative, however we regard it. There are those, like Burke himself, to whom it is a portent and a menace; there are others who deem it a blessing (even though a disguised one). It is no business of the historian to take sides, but to ascertain the truth as far as may be; to state the facts and relate them to their proper causes; to observe the bearing of those facts on human life; and to find, in the events of so momentous an epoch, some guiding principle of action. The commonplace text-books which profess to tell the story of the seven lurid and eventful years from 1789–96 may frequently be disregarded. They give us some of the facts, but not all; the causes which brought about the Revolution are often seriously misrepresented. But it might be desirable to insist on these words of Disraeli: "You see, my dear Coningsby, that the world is governed by very different personages from what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes." That is profoundly true. We hear plenty about the actors that strutted their brief hour on the Revolutionary stage, but what of the hidden figures that lurked in the shadows? What about the groups of *Illuminati*, the literary and philosophical séances, the strategic work of secret doctrinaires who prepared the way for the revolt, though they took but small practical part in it? A study

of the life of d'Holbach, or of men like d'Alembert, Voltaire, Helvétius and others, who were busy flooding pre-revolutionary France with teachings and theories subversive of the society in which they lived, might open the eyes of man. When I study what these men wrote, and propagated with relentless industry, I cease to be surprised at the coming of the Terror. Are we not tempted sometimes to forget the incisive words of St. Just, who said plainly "the Revolution is merely the surface of *a volcano of conspiracies*"? That great historian, Lord Acton, wrote this memorable sentence: "The appalling thing about the French Revolution is not the tumult but the *design*. Through all the fire and smoke we can discern the evidence of calculating organisation. The managers remain studiously concealed and masked, but there is no doubt whatever about their presence from the first." Debating-clubs, lodges of Orient Freemasonry, *Illuminati* circles; and, above all, the Jacobins' Club: here we get close to the secret. The mark of such societies—and their successors are alive in Europe at this moment—is that they build on formulas, and to these formulas men become enslaved. Half the mischief in Europe to-day, so far as communistic and similar destructive agencies are concerned, is hatched in secret by men bound under oath to carry out orders unhesitatingly. The snake is sometimes scotched; it is never killed. This truth emerges from history: when all else fails, treachery succeeds.

The agents of the Terror did but put into act the implied teaching of their intellectual masters, just as the agents of the Russian Revolution put into practice the theories of the Jew, Karl Marx. Hence it is our wisdom "to keep a weather eye lifting" when dangerous or subversive doctrines are being instilled into the minds of the growing generation. The young are often highly susceptible to such teaching. The seeds of revolt may lie, for a long time, apparently inoperative; but the moment comes when the intellectual theory may turn into an armed doctrine, with the usual results. There are some who would suppress such teaching by force; but no new idea—true or false—can thus be countered. Ideas can be driven out only by ideas. The positive of error (if error it be) cannot be destroyed by anything less than the positive of knowledge (if it be knowledge). Violent deterrents are of little permanent avail. Persuasion, based on understanding and controlled by reason, should be the chief weapon of our armoury. And, above all, we should seek truth, for truth is (as Locke told us) the best part of human perfection and the seed-plot of all other virtues. It is doubtless hard to see both sides of a question; but the historian should aim at no less, seeing that all intellectual improvement consists in bringing opinion into closer agreement with facts. With this comes a certain abrogation of prejudices, which may at times be wholesome, but may also, unless carefully guarded, be found in sharp collision with the truth of things.

I have given a few examples from history of the Nemesis that lies in wait for any nation that deliberately outrages the Moral

Law; the penalty is sure, though slow. One more instance may be given. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries Spain touched her meridian glory. She was powerful in the Old World; the New World lay at her feet. How did she deal with her responsibilities? The answer is not uncertain. The establishment of the Spanish Inquisition, dreadful and dreaded as it was in the Peninsula, was effective for untold evil in the Americas; the number of its victims there is probably beyond count. And this in the name of Christianity! Is it to be wondered at that the final blow to Spain's old-time domination in the New World was actually aimed at her from the very quarter of the globe where once her cruelty and rapacity were most evident? Less than forty years ago, the wheel came full circle. And it is a lesson for all time.

In the chaos of contemporary politics, are there no lessons from the past that should give guidance for the present? For fifty centuries and more the world has been subject, from time to time, to the monstrous arbitrament of war. Yet history has proved that war rarely solves our deepest problems. On the other hand, where some "sweet reasonableness" has governed the will of nations, have not the most durable results been achieved, to confound the imaginations of them that delight in war? Probably war will always be with us; but at least it should be entered upon only in defence of righteous liberties, or to thrust cruelty and injustice into the pit whence they emerged. "Peace, but adequate defence" were the words of the United States President last autumn. Not, indeed, peace "at any price." Definitely, no. That is the ideal of those that put material comfort before anything else—even honour.[1] Has not history also shown that cruelty, corruption, lust, and dishonesty never fail, in the long run, to debase and even to extinguish nations? That where religion is scorned, or abused, or made the vehicle of oppression, no sound polity can ever flourish permanently? For, in truth, religion (whatever may be asserted to the contrary) is a primary datum of the human consciousness. As de Goncourt once said: "When incredulity becomes an article of faith, it is far more unreasonable than any religion." Take away the supernatural, and what remains over is the unnatural. That, at least, is my conviction; and if only we read history to extract its lessons, and to apply them to our necessities, we may hope that, after the long labour and sorrow of ages, some sure vantage-ground may be reached where peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and righteousness, may be established among us for all generations.

[1] "There is a limit at which forbearance ceases to be a virtue" (Burke).

THE POPES AND IRELAND.

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

IN the year A.D. 1155 Henry II requested Adrian IV to sanction and bless his projected invasion of Ireland. Here was an opportunity for the Pope to show himself a friend to that island which his emissaries had just succeeded in Romanising. But the offer was too tempting to refuse. He gave his blessing to Henry at a price—Peter's pence, a silver penny a year from every house in Ireland. It is evident from Adrian's letter that Henry had represented the island as abounding in "nurseries of iniquities," and that he had proposed "to extend the borders of the Church, and to teach the truths of the Christian faith to an ignorant and rude people," and to extirpate the "nurseries of iniquities." The condition on which the papal sanction is granted to Henry to do all this is set out again in emphatic terms—"reserving to St. Peter and the Holy Roman Church the yearly payment of one denarius (a silver penny) from each house." The Pope made a good bargain for himself, but in order to gloss over it he painted a gruesome picture of Ireland as sunk in the depths of iniquity, ignorance and unbelief, and sorely in need of one like Henry II, who would "arrest the progress of wickedness, reform morals, plant virtues and increase the Christian religion in that island." This Bull was given in A.D. 1155 by Adrian, who is said to have been the pupil of an Irish scholar, Marianus, formerly a monk of the Irish monastery of Ratisbon. It was confirmed, so it is stated, afterwards by Alexander III, in A.D. 1172, for the same price—*Peter's pence*—in a Bull which describes Ireland as a "barbarous nation, full of filthiness, Christian only in name," [1] which Henry is "to clothe with the beauty of morals and to bring its church into proper form." It is said that Henry desired to bestow Ireland upon his brother, William of Anjou. At all events a man of his morals was not the person to correct the morals of others.

Now the ground on which the Pope claimed Ireland was a forged document—the donation of Constantine. He said: "As your highness acknowledgeth, Ireland and all the islands on which Christ, the Sun of righteousness, hath shed light and which have received Christian instruction belong to St. Peter and the holy Roman Church." John of Salisbury,[2] who was a friend of Adrian and had obtained this Bull *Laudabiliter* from him, writes: "At my request he granted Ireland to Henry II, the illustrious King of England, and gave it to be possessed by inheritance, as his own

[1] Contrast with this audacious libel an account of Ireland in the life of Sulgen, Bishop of St. David's (1070), by his son, who says his father, following the example of his fathers, went to the Irish "renowned for their wonderful wisdom," to study the Scriptures. After a visit of thirteen years he returned proficient in dogma, "dogmate clarus," to divide his treasures among his own people. (Ussher, Preface to *Sylloge*, IV, 394. Elrington.)

[2] *Metalogicus*, IV, 42.

letters attest. For all islands of ancient right are said to belong to the Church of Rome by the donation of Constantine." On the same ground he might have offered England to a Frenchman. Now the passage in this fictitious donation of Constantine (who had never had anything to do with Ireland, which had never been invaded by Romans) in which "islands" are mentioned, also speaks in the same connection of Judea, Greece, Asia, Thracia, and Africa, which never belonged to Peter's patrimony. Some writers attempt to represent the Bull [1] as a forgery, but to quote two out of many, P. W. Joyce, a Roman Catholic historian, says, "The evidence is overwhelming," [2] and Dr. Lanigan, another, declared, "Never did there exist a more authentic document." [3] The new *Catholic Encyclopædia* maintains it. On the other hand, the claim asserted in the Bull is based upon a universally acknowledged forgery. See *Encyclopædia Britannica*, article "Donation of Constantine," which discusses the date and the object of this concoction. Its date was not earlier than the eighth century, and its manifest object was to give a legal basis to the dominion the popes had acquired or intended to acquire. This Donation gave not only spiritual supremacy over the other patriarchates and over all matters of faith and worship, but also temporal dominion over Rome, Italy and "the provinces, places and *civitates* of the western regions." It has been admitted to be a forgery by Roman Catholics, who attribute its authorship to strangers, Baronius, for example, ascribing it to a Greek!

It is now time to say a word in answer to the charges of immorality brought so frequently by the popes against Ireland, probably as a pretext for their own treatment of the Irish. We shall summon as witness Giraldus Cambrensis, a distinguished writer, tutor and secretary of Prince John, then on a visit to Ireland. In 1186 a Dublin Synod was held under the presidency of Archbishop Comyn. On the first day the Archbishop spoke on the Sacraments, on the second day Abbot O'Mulloy of Baltinglass inveighed against the morals of the English and Welsh clergy, brought over to Ireland to reform the Church. He declared that they had their mistresses with them. On investigation it was found to be so. On the third day Giraldus pronounced a panegyric upon the good morals and devotion of the Irish clergy. "The clergy," he said, "of this country are sufficiently commendable for their attention to religion,

[1] The text of the Bull is to be found in the *Book of Leinster* (an almost contemporary work), p. 342, also in Giraldus Cambrensis, *Conquest of Ireland*, II, 5. It is asserted that there is no copy to be found in the Vatican and that it is therefore a forgery. The reply is that in Theiner's *Vetera monumenta Hibernorum* there is no document dealing with Ireland to be found there before 1215.

[2] *Concise History of Ireland*, p. 81.

[3] *Eccl. Hist.*, IV, 167. So the *Lebar Brecc.*, p. 162. "Peter's successor sold the tribute and due of Ireland to the Saxons." Ussher (IV, 548), Bossuet, Fleury, Lanigan, Dollinger regard it as genuine. Those who doubt it have to explain the fact that succeeding popes expressed approval of Henry's invasion. See *Excursus*.

and among the several virtues in which they excel their chastity is pre-eminent. They also attend vigilantly to their psalms and hours and to reading and prayer." [1] He also praised them for their attention to their religious duties, devotion to their churches, and general abstinence. As Dr. Lanigan observes with justified sarcasm—" The guilty clergymen were a sample of the missionaries, who, as Adrian IV and Alexander III had flattered themselves, were, under the auspices of Henry II, to instruct and reform the people of Ireland." [2] Now if the Irish clergy were chaste, the people also would be chaste, according to the maxim of scripture—like people like priest (Hosea iv. 9. Cf. Is. xxiv. 2 and Jer. v. 31).

In the meanwhile Henry's plans had been advanced by the treachery of Dermot, King of Leinster. In 1168 this man, a fugitive from justice—he had stolen another man's wife and the Irish did not tolerate that kind of thing—implored Henry's assistance : and the King gave him letters which permitted any of his barons or knights, who wished, to help him. Strongbow, the Fitzgeralds, Barrys and others—many of them grandsons of a licentious Welsh princess, Nesta—joined him. After a stern campaign they took Waterford and Dublin. Then Dermot died and Strongbow proclaimed himself his successor and King of Leinster, 1171. This action led to a peremptory summons to the presence of Henry, who was preparing to invade Ireland with a great army. Henry shortly afterwards landed at Waterford. His march to Dublin was a triumphal progress, the Irish chiefs and princes flocking to him in great numbers and making cheerful submission.

In 1172 a Synod was held at Cashel and various disciplinary decrees were drawn up which " do not indicate any very serious state of religious corruption in Ireland, such as had been falsely represented to the Pope." [3] The Pope, however, cannot be exonerated, for he had many satellites in Ireland who could tell him the truth, as Giraldus told it. But it was the habit of the Roman party to disparage those who would not accept Roman jurisdiction in Ireland as well as in England. The independent spirit of the Irish clerics abroad was bitterly resented by the sternly disciplined Roman clergy, and yet the former are allowed by many to have done no small things. Columban in his letter to Boniface IV, censured Pope Vigilius for his notorious vacillation over the " Three Chapters," and urged Boniface to be vigilant and to summon a Council to clear his See of the heresy of Vigilius. " I am pained," he said, " at the infamy attached to the Chair of St. Peter." It is amazing to find the Roman Catholic historian Baronius [4] abusing the Irish as schismatics because all their bishops defended the

[1] *De rebus a se gestis*, II, c. 13. See also his *Irish Topography*, III, 27, where he repeats the same eulogy on the chastity of the Irish clergy. This could not have been said of all the previous popes. See Platina, *Lives of the Popes* (Eng. Trans. Griffith & Farran).

[2] *Eccl. Hist.*, IV, 267. [3] Joyce, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

[4] *Annales Ecclesiastici*, VII, p. 557. Antwerp, 1658.

Three Chapters, after the Roman Church had condemned them. " They departed from her and joined the other schismatics in Italy, Africa and elsewhere, fondly imagining that they were standing up for the Catholic faith."[1] The passage in Columban's letter to Boniface is worthy of quotation: " The Irish are disciples of St. Peter and St. Paul, and of all the disciples, who wrote by the Holy Ghost the Divine Canon. We be men who receive nought beyond the doctrine of the evangelists and apostles." He proceeds to say, " There has been among us no Jew, nor schismatic, nor heretic." Yet in spite of the protest of Columban and others in the following centuries, the story gained ground that they were not only heretics " clean out of right rule of Christendom and right belief," but " led an evil life and sinful, worse than wild beasts."[2] So runs an old English version of the account of Henry's charges and proceedings against the Irish in Giraldus Cambrensis, of which the manuscript is in Trinity College (E. 3, 31), which also mentions that Henry *purchased* his " privilege " from Adrian, and describes a letter to the above effect sent by Henry after the Synod of Cashel to the Pope. In two other places Giraldus describes the Irish as " a race most untrained in the rudiments of the faith " (*Topography*, III, 19), and *De Rebus* (c. 14), for they do not yet pay tithes!

The story lost nothing in the telling. When we come to the reign of Edward IV we have it in the rhyming *Chronicle* of John Harding[3].

" The King Henry then conquered all Ireland
By papal doom, there of his royaltee
The profytes and revenues of ye land,
The dominacion and the soverayntee
For error which agayn the spiritualtee
They helde full long and would not been correcte
Of heresyes with wch they were infecte."

In another portion of the same work Harding, addressing Edward, said he had right also

" To Ireland also by King Henry le fytz (fils)
Of Maude daughter of firste King Henry
That conquered it *for theyr greate heresye*."

[1] The story of Vigilius is told in the *Dict. Chris. Biog.* Theodora the Empress, a Monophysite, had bribed Vigilius with the promise of the popedom and much gold to condemn " The Three Chapters," the writings of Theodore, Theodoret and Ibas, who had been acquitted of heresy by the Council of Chalcedon. At first Vigilius condemned " The Three Chapters," afterwards he supported " The Three Chapters." Then pressure was brought to bear on him by the Emperor Justinian, and he anathematised them, A.D. 553. Baronius tries to whitewash Vigilius, but see the article mentioned.

[2] A different view of Ireland and its culture is presented in the letter of Giraldus Cambrensis, who had first-hand knowledge of what he was talking about, which cannot be said of Adrian. Giraldus refers in this letter to William, Bishop of Hereford, to his own writings on Ireland, describing the morals and culture of the Irish, and " *the incomparable skill of that nation in playing musical instruments* " (Gentis ejusdem in musicis instrumentis peritia incomparabilis). See Ussher's *Sylloge*, letter 49. " A nation that had cultivated literature, poetry, and music to the extent the Irish had was not a barbarous nation."

[3] Ussher, IV, p. 365 (Harding, *Chronicle*, c. 132).

Any charge was good or bad enough to make against those who did not hold orthodox views on the papal supremacy, and who were consequently considered guilty of " error against the spirituality."

The Synod of Cashel, presided over by the papal legate, was not attended by the Irish primate or the northern bishops. It enacted many decrees regarding tithe, wills, obsequies, the clergy, the Church services and offices. The Council was acceptable to the bishops because it placed them above the abbots; to the clergy because it gave them tithes, large funeral fees, and freed them from *erics*, taxes and various exactions of money and food levied by the Chiefs. It recognised the King's supremacy, but said nothing about the supremacy of the Pope. Its regulations were chiefly disciplinary. But it drove a wedge between the Norman and the Celtic inhabitants of the island, the former the bitter partisans of the new Roman order, and the latter the faithful adherents of the ancient Celtic customs of State and Church. The old Brehon law which enacted *erics* or fines for all criminal offences and had its own elaborate rules for the settlement of property and succession at death was annulled; and it was decreed that a third portion of the property should be spent on the obsequies, which included masses, vigils and decent burial after a good confession. The decree which probably caused the most opposition was that ordering that the Church services in all parts of Ireland should henceforth be celebrated according to the observances of the Anglican Church. " For it is right that as by divine providence Ireland has obtained her lord and king from England, she should also receive a better form of living from the same source." [1]

Dr. Lanigan's assertion [2] that wherever the natives were able to maintain their independence " clergy and people followed their own ecclesiastical rules as if the Synod of Cashel had never been held," is substantiated to some extent by the Bull of Innocent VIII (Feb. 8, 1484) for the foundation of the Church of St. Nicholas, Galway, which stated " that the people of the parish of the said church of St. Nicholas did not practise the same customs as the wild people of the mountains," and owing to their hostility and opposition " were unable to hear divine service or receive the sacraments of the Church, according to the rite and custom of England, which they had always followed." Archbishop Alan, a friend of Wolsey, appointed by him when papal legate to distribute dispensations for sale, reported that there was little or no demand for such. " The Irish," he wrote (1528), " had so little sense of religion, that they married within the prohibited degrees without dispensations." Comment is unnecessary. Much depends upon one's point of view in such cases.

The Irish parliaments, in which the English lords sat, proved by no means subservient to the popes, whose encroachments were restrained by various enactments, while the native princes had little cause for gratitude to Rome. In the year 1315 Edward Bruce

[1] Giraldus Cambrensis, *Conquest of Ireland*, Book I, c. XXXIV.
[2] IV, 217.

had come to Ireland at the request of the northern chieftains, who sent a long letter to John XXII, reciting the injuries and cruelties that had been inflicted on the Irish by the English, ever since Adrian's Bull had been given to Henry II, and informing him that they wished to have Edward Bruce as their King.[1] With this letter, containing an appalling list of treacherous outrages and massacres committed on defenceless Irishmen, even at the instigation of the Cistercian monks, who preached that it was no more sin to kill an Irishman than a dog; and boasted that if they killed an Irishman they would celebrate Mass the same day, they sent a copy of Adrian's Bull, pointing out that the Normans had not carried out their part of the bargain. Instead of "implanting new virtues in the land and eradicating the nurseries of crime," they had depraved, oppressed, penalised and murdered Irishmen in their perfidious endeavour to exterminate them. The Irish Chiefs attributed all the miseries of their distressful country to the Bull which was given by Adrian upon the false and iniquitous representations of Henry, who should, they declared, have been deprived of his own kingdom for the murder of St. Thomas of Canterbury. The Pope sent this letter—which A. G. Richey described as "one of the most important documents in our history"[2]—to Edward II, with one of his own requesting the King to remove these grievances so that if the Irish should persist in their rebellion, they would convert their cause into a matter of open injustice, while he would stand excused before God and man. This letter has been described by a Roman Catholic writer[3] as "a piece of affected commiseration."

From the same Pope were issued Bulls to the Archbishops of Dublin and Cashel, excommunicating by bell, book and candle Bruce and all his followers, and pronouncing the same sentence against the Friars Minors who had preached rebellion to the Irish people.[4] In 1515 Leo X issued a Bull confirming the exclusion of the native Irish, "any royal dispensation notwithstanding," from St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin. And yet in 1577 Gregory XIII asserted in a Bull that the nation of the Irish is one which this apostolic see has ever embraced with singular love and affection." Cardinal Vannutelli, papal legate in 1904, re-echoed the same words at Killarney.[5] Well might Michael Davitt speak of "Ireland's crucifixion between the tyrannies of London and Rome." There is no space to refer to the continual exactions of the popes, who levied exorbitant taxes on Ireland for their wars, notably the twentieth of the whole land, demanded in 1240, under pain of excommunication, for a war with Frederick II.

[1] The text of this letter is in the Scotichronicon of J. Fordun at A.D. 1318. A translation is in King's *Church History of Ireland*, II, Appendix XIX.

[2] *Short History of the Irish People*, p. 189.

[3] Dr. O'Conor, *Historical Address*, I, p. 134.

[4] Rymer's *Fœdera*, tom. III (Edinburgh, 1706), *anno* 1317, contains these Bulls. John XXII, Platina tells us, "left behind him in the treasury such a mass of gold as never any Pope did before him" (Eng. Trans. (Griffith), p. 147).

[5] *Freeman's Journal*, Aug. 8.

In 1367 the Statute of Kilkenny was passed with the object of completely separating the two peoples, Norman-English and Celtic. Under pain of excommunication the former was to have no social or other intercourse with the latter, who were to be excluded from all benefices and monasteries among the English, who were ordered in 1447 to shave their upper lip if they did not wish to be taken for an Irish enemy. In 1486 Lambert Simnel, whose claims were supported by all the Irish bishops save four, was crowned in Christ Church, Dublin, by the Bishop of Meath. The Pope sent a Bull to the four bishops, Cashel, Tuam, Clogher, and Ossory, who had not joined Simnel, ordering them to excommunicate their brethren. Henry, however, proved more merciful and graciously forgave them,[1] on renewing their oath of allegiance. The Irish have often been led away by sentiment and sympathy to support a losing cause.

It is evident from the whole story of Ireland's woes, especially from the letter of the Irish Chiefs to the Pope, that the Irish regarded Adrian's Bull granting Ireland to Henry II as the source and the beginning of all their misfortunes and miseries, that the hatred for England did not begin at the Reformation, and that there was no unity even in the Roman Church in Ireland, the clergy of both races regarding one another with mutual suspicion and hatred. It was the English policy to keep important sees and the richest benefices in their own hands. Not until 1678 was an Irishman, Michael Boyle, appointed Archbishop of Dublin, whereas in 1206 we have the first papal appointment to the See of Armagh—Eugene MacGillivider, the papal nominee, who somehow overcame the opposition of John, who had chosen another man. The King, of course, could always prevent the Pope's nominee from enjoying the temporalities —the lay revenues—of the see, so that he would have to depend upon the spiritualities, such as visitation fees, for his living, unless he renounced all right to the same by virtue of papal provision.

It is also obvious from the Bull of Alexander, conveying to Henry his sanction and his permission to make any one of his sons King of Ireland, that Ireland was a kingdom before Paul IV conferred that dignity upon it in 1555. Ussher quaintly remarks: "And therefore Paul the Fourth needed not make all that noise and trouble the whole court of heaven with the matter, when in the year MDLV he took upon him by his Apostolical authority (such, I am sure, as none of the apostles of Christ did ever assume unto themselves) to erect Ireland unto the title and dignity of a Kingdom." [2] The doctrine of papal supremacy was strongly held

[1] Leland's *History of Ireland*, II, 56.

[2] IV, p. 369, the Bull is quoted. It begins: "To the praise and glory of the Omnipotent God, and his most glorious mother, the Virgin Mary, and *to the honour of the whole court of heaven*, at the supplication of King Philip and Queen Mary, by our apostolic authority, we erect the island of Ireland perpetually to the status of a kingdom." Roger Hoveden (*ad ann.* 1177) states that "he (Henry) made his son king in Ireland by the concession and confirmation of Alexander the supreme pontiff" in a council at Oxford.

by ambitious clerics, when it meant their own supremacy, but when it conflicted with their interests they opposed it. King (I, p. 669) refers to the Irish Statutes 1454 and 1475, which circumscribed that pernicious influence, and we have seen how they could act in defiance of the Pope in the case of Lambert Simnel. The views of the common people never counted in those days. What many desired was a quiet life. Those who were under native chiefs, with whom they were connected by ties of clanship and fealty, were guided by them completely; and when their chiefs preferred their own "barbarous simplicity" and native independence in Church matters to the Roman methods they followed them loyally. On the other hand, those who were under the control of prelates, and who had been impregnated with superstitious awe regarding the Pope, were too timorous to resist his demands, especially when backed up by threats of violence and excommunication. While the prelates themselves, as the Irish nobles said in their letter to John XXII, were influenced by "a slavish timidity" and observed "a scandalous silence," when they should have voiced the wrongs of their country.

In the meantime learning was languishing. The Irish parliament of 1475 sent over one James Maddock to Oxford to be educated. There was no preaching done except by the poor friars. There was no progress except in civil strife, dissensions, and conflicts, open and secret, between the two races, who were not allowed by either Church or State to live in harmony with one another. The times were maturing for a complete reformation of life and doctrine.

WE SAY "NO." By H. R. L. Sheppard. *John Murray.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Dick Sheppard's attitude towards War is well known. He is an out-and-out Pacifist. He argues that War is wicked and futile, and that in no circumstances should resort be had to arms. The commandment of God is "Thou shalt not kill" and the Christian must take it literally, apply it to himself, and obey it unflinchingly. Any other course is not only fraught with danger but bound to lead to disaster. No servant of Christ can be consistent unless he follows the Master's teaching, refusing to take arms, but being willing to endure, even unto death.

H. D.

FOR YOUTH AND THE YEARS. By Rev. T. Grigg-Smith, M.A. *Church of England Sunday School Inst.* 2*s.*

There is an immense amount of material in the 230 pages of these Studies in the Christian Faith. They are prepared with a view to Group Discussion. The range of subjects includes Religion and Science, Pain and Suffering, Sex, the Church. The Bishop of Wakefield, in his foreword, heartily commends these notes as likely to be of real service to our younger Churchpeople.

H. D.

OUR ENGLISH BIBLE.

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

(This article does not aim at giving a detailed history of the English Bible, which has been well done in accessible books; but at giving a general impression of its development, correcting some prevalent errors.)

1. Early Versions in other Languages.

THE Early Church believed thoroughly in Bible-reading, public and private. (See Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church*, ch. vii, with his quotations from Chrysostom.) Hence it was soon translated into vernacular languages; translations into Latin and into Syriac date from the second century. The Latin version was probably made originally for the Christians of North Africa—the modern Algeria and Tunis; but this was soon revised, or another translation made, for Italy. A number of other translations were made in the East; there are early versions in several Egyptian dialects, also in Ethiopic, Armenian, Georgian; but unfortunately none into Arabic before the rise of Islam. A translation was also made into Gothic, by Ulfilas, the evangelist of that nation, while they were still in the old province of Dacia (Roumania or Bulgaria); its remains are our earliest specimens of a Teutonic language.

But nothing of the kind was done in the West. Here the native languages were not literary, and were supplanted by Latin not only for literature, but in speech, as is shown by the "Romance" languages—Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, etc., all descended from a popular form of Latin. The one language which could be called literary was the Punic in North Africa. It is unfortunate that no translation into this was ever made; as the Latin influence shrank here, Christianity shrank with it. It may be taken for granted that no *British* translation was made in Roman times.

2. English Translations before Wycliffe.

There were several translations of portions into Anglo-Saxon. That of Bede has not survived. But, besides inter-lineal glosses in Latin manuscripts (the Lindisfarne and the Rushworth), we still have several manuscripts of a Wessex translation of the Gospels (about 900); and Ælfric, Abbot of Eynsham, who died in 1050, wrote a paraphrase of much of the Old Testament and homilies on the Sunday Gospels, mostly with a translation prefixed. We have also a translation of part of the Psalter.

Our language had altered greatly when Richard Rolle of Hampole made his translation of the Psalms, together with a commentary, before 1350.

The general ecclesiastical opinion in the later Middle Ages, except to some extent in Germany and the Netherlands, was against vernacular versions, except for great men. It was not thought

wrong to translate Scripture; but to popularise Bible-reading was thought most dangerous; it was so likely to be misused. Even Sir Thomas More was only in favour of the Bishop giving an English Bible, or portion, to such of the faithful laity as he thought fit, to be returned on the death of the recipient. There is something to be said for this position; the open Bible is, like most other good things, not an *unmixed* blessing; but the good side was practically ignored. In particular it would have been well if the parochial clergy, whose knowledge of Latin was often very inadequate, had been provided with an English Bible. In practice English Bible-reading, though allowed to nuns (who were not supposed to know Latin, and were under direction) as at Sion and Barking, and to the highest classes, by individual licence, was regarded as forbidden to the laity.

Sir Thomas More declared that not only was the whole Bible translated into English long before Wycliffe's days, but that he himself had seen such Bibles approved of the Bishop, and left in the hands of men and women whom he knew to be good Catholics. Cardinal Gasquet made much of this as showing that our existing manuscripts are not Wycliffite at all. But Miss Deanesly has shown conclusively that these books must have been either Anglo-Saxon Gospels, or more probably Wycliffite Bibles, without the prologue and so without suspicion of their origin. This version was from the orthodox Vulgate; there were no notes and nothing suspicious in the renderings. Her book, *The Lollard Bible*, is invaluable for its accounts (1) of the attitude of the medieval Church towards vernacular Bible study, (2) of pre-Wycliffite Bible study, and (3) the history of the Lollards and their Bible.

3. Wycliffe's English Bible.

Wycliffe's doctrine was that all men were in immediate relation to God, and owed Him righteousness and obedience; hence they needed to study His law personally. The essential novelty of the Wycliffe translations was that they were intended for a wide public and a lower social class. There are two versions; the first follows the Latin order nearly exactly, so producing obscure English in some places; the other, of which more copies are preserved, translates more freely. The first was made largely by Nicholas Hereford; perhaps John Purvey, Wycliffe's secretary, completed it. The latter was certainly by Purvey.

The provincial Council of Oxford, 1397, under Archbishop Arundel, among other constitutions dealing with Lollardy, ordained that no one should in future translate on his own authority any text of Scripture into the English or any other tongue, "nor read publicly or secretly any such composed in the time of Wycliffe or later, unless the translation be recognised and approved by the diocesan or by a provincial council." But Lollardy continued till the Reformation, as is shown by Bishops' Registers, and possession of English Biblical books was a common mark of Lollardy (see Deanesly, 366, 370).

4. Tyndale's Version.

The first translation from the original languages was made by William Tyndale. There is no room here for a full account of his life and work, for which see Demaus, *William Tyndale*. His translation of the New Testament and the first part of the Old forms the basis of ours. The New Testament was printed in 1525, at Cologne and Worms; two later editions were revised by himself at Antwerp, and there were several other editions by enterprising printers. His translation of the Pentateuch appeared in 1530–1; that of the Book of Jonah probably in 1531; and his revised New Testament of 1534 included the liturgical epistles from the Old Testament. He was arrested at Antwerp in 1535, and strangled at the stake at Vilworde, October 6, 1536. He was working at his translation to the last; in a letter from prison he asks for his Hebrew Bible, Grammar, and Dictionary. This later work is probably preserved in "Matthew's Bible."

A few points call for notice.

(*a*) Tyndale's original idea was to make his translation in the palace of the Bishop of London, Cuthbert Tonstal, no doubt hoping that it might be published with his sanction. Tyndale was at the time greatly influenced by Erasmus, and thought that Tonstal, of whom Erasmus spoke warmly, might share his views on the popularisation of the Scriptures. But Tonstal, always a cautious man, would show him no favour; he recognised afterwards that he was mistaken in his plan, and that it was providential that Tonstal would not take him in. Any translation made under these conditions would have been a very timid one; it would have had to keep close to the Vulgate; and when completed it would probably have gone no further.

(*b*) In the *Journal of Theological Studies* for October, 1935, is an article on "Tyndale's Knowledge of Hebrew," by Mr. J. F. Mozley. He examines Tyndale's renderings in his translation of Jonah, comparing with Luther, the Vulgate, and Pagninus. His conclusion is:

> "This list proves up to the hilt Tyndale's knowledge of Hebrew and his independence of the other versions. Throughout he is his own master, and what is more, he usually comes down on the right side. . . . In essential accuracy to the Hebrew he is superior to Luther, the Vulgate, and the LXX, and not inferior to Pagninus. . . . We may well honour Tyndale not only for his vision, his courage, and his constancy, but also for his scholarship."

(*c*) In his *Obedience of a Christian Man* he deals with the current objections to Bible translations into English:

> "First, God gave the children of Israel a Law by the hand of Moses in their mother tongue, and all the prophets wrote in their mother tongue, and all the Psalms were in the mother tongue. What should be the cause that we may not see as well at noon, as they did in the twilight? . . . How can we (apply) God's Word when we are violently kept from it and know it not? . . .
>
> "They will say haply, 'The Scripture requireth a pure mind and a quiet mind; and therefore the layman, because he is altogether cumbered with

worldly business, cannot understand them. If that be the cause, then it is a plain case that our prelates understand not the Scriptures themselves; for no layman is so tangled with worldly business as they are. . . .'

" ' If the Scriptures were in the mother tongue,' they will say, ' then would the lay-people understand it every man after his own ways.' Wherefore serveth the curate but to teach him the right way? Wherefore were the holy days made, but that the people should come and learn? . . . If ye would teach, how could ye do it so well and with so great profit as when the lay-people have the Scripture before them in the mother tongue? . . . But, alas! the curates themselves for the most part wot no more what the New or Old Testament meaneth, than do the Turks; neither know they of any more than that they read at Mass, Matins, and Evensong, which yet they understand not. If they will not let the layman have the Word of God in his mother tongue, yet let the priests have it; who for a great part of them do understand no Latin at all, but sing and say and patter all day with the lips only that which the heart understandeth not.

" St. Jerome translated the Bible into his mother tongue; why may not we also? They will say it cannot be translated into our tongue, it is so rude. It is not so rude as they are, false liars. For the Greek tongue agreeth more with the English than with the Latin. And the properties of the Hebrew tongue agreeth a thousand times more with the English than with the Latin. . . . In a thousand places thou needest not but to translate it into the English, word for word, when thou must seek a compass in the Latin.

" Nay, say they, Scripture is so hard that thou couldst never understand it but by the doctors. That is, I must measure the mete-yard by the cloth. Here be twenty cloths of divers lengths and of divers breaths; how shall I be sure of the length of the mete-yard by them? What is the cause that we damn some of Origen's works and allow some? how know we that some is heresy and some not? By the Scripture, I trow."

He refers to Erasmus, *Paraclesis*, and Preface to the *Paraphrase of Matthew*.

(*d*) The reasons for the bitter opposition of the authorities were:

(i) The Vulgate was " the Bible "; any variation from it was objectionable. Tyndale had translated from the original languages.

(ii) Tyndale's version was manifestly influenced by Luther; common report exaggerated this. His Prologues are largely from Luther, but without blind dependence. And some of the editions, though not most, were furnished with controversial notes.

(iii) But what roused the most opposition was the rejection of the traditional ecclesiastical terms. This was the chief point in the criticisms of More and of Robert Ridley (Pollard, 122, 126). Tyndale sought to get behind these terms and their associations, using more general terms; e.g., for " church," " priest," " grace," " charity," he had " congregation," " senior " (later " elder "), " favour," " love." More offers to show two or three false translations and that every one is more than thrice three in one, being often repeated; *priests*, the *church*, and *charity*.

5. Coverdale's Bible.

This appeared near the end of 1537, the first complete English Bible since Wycliffe. Miles Coverdale was not a scholar like Tyndale, and his work did not profess to be an independent translation from the original; it was " translated out of five sundry inter-

preters." Of these, two were Latin—the Vulgate and the new translation of Sanctes Pagninus, a Dominican, made with papal sanction; two were German—Luther's version and the German-Swiss Zurich Bible by Zwingli and Leo Juda; the fifth was probably Tyndale's translation as far as it went. Coverdale's use of each in the Psalms may be seen in Mr. Clapton's *Our Prayer Book Psalter*; he prints on one side the Psalter in Coverdale's Bible with the renderings of its sources; on the other side, that of the "Great Bible," Coverdale's revision of his own work, in which he used also a new source, the translation of Sebastian Münster, Professor at Basel, and sometimes followed the Vulgate more closely. To anticipate somewhat, the Great Bible (1540–1) was the standard Church version when the Book of Common Prayer was framed in 1549, and during its revisions of 1552 and 1559; hence its Psalms were taken from this version. It is often said that the Prayer-Book Psalter is a translation from the Vulgate; but those who assert this can never have studied the two consecutively, or indeed know much of the Vulgate Psalter. Coverdale sometimes, indeed, follows the Vulgate closely, but much more often one of his other authorities. But there are in the Great Bible, and so in the Prayer-Book, some phrases from the Vulgate without Hebrew authority; these Coverdale did not like to omit, but printed in smaller type, within parentheses. They are all in square brackets in the official books of 1662, but the brackets have since been dropped. For a list, see Driver's *Parallel Psalter*, xix–xx. They are mostly very short phrases, but include Psalm xxix. i, "bring young rams unto the Lord," another rendering of the Hebrew; and xiv. 5–9, from Romans iii. 10–12. According to Mr. Clapton, the Great Bible in the Psalms follows the Vulgate against the Hebrew in some fifty passages, whereas in over three hundred it goes against the Vulgate.

Coverdale was a master of English prose; where his version differs from the Authorised Version it is often more vigorous and fluent, though less exact. See, e.g., the last verse of Psalm cxx.; Authorised Version and Revised Version translate exactly, "I am for peace, but when I speak they are for war"; but Coverdale renders, "I labour for peace, but when I speak to them thereof, they make them ready to battle."

Coverdale's Bible was reprinted by Nicholson at Southwark in 1537 in two editions, one of them stating that it was "set forth with the King's most gracious licence." But it was very soon superseded.

6. Matthew's Bible.

In 1539 a composite Bible was printed at Antwerp. The Pentateuch and New Testament were Tyndale's translation; Ezra to the end of the Old Testament, including the Apocrypha, was Coverdale's; Joshua to 2 Chronicles was a new translation, probably from an unpublished MS. of Tyndale; this is somewhat borne out by a comparison of his renderings of some of the Epistles from the Old Testament (see Westcott, *History of the English Bible*).

There was new introductory matter, largely from Olivetan's French Bible, and a number of notes. John Rogers, who had been chaplain at Antwerp, had much to do with this edition; at least he corrected it for the press. But it was entitled "truly and purely translated into English by Thomas Matthew." This name is a mystery. One view is that "W. T.," the initials of "William Tyndale," was reversed as "T. M.," and this expanded into "Thomas Matthew"; the more usual view is that "Matthew" was a pseudonym (or possibly a by-name) of Rogers, the true editor; but it is possible that some obscure man of this name had something to do with it. Thomas Matthew of Colchester, a man of some substance, had been in trouble for Lollardy or Lutheranism in 1527–8; he had two years before purchased a New Testament in English for four shillings. He was on the Council at Colchester for many years except in 1535; this suggests he *may* have been abroad then.

This edition was dedicated to the King. Cranmer was delighted with it. He is reported to have said that the news of it did him more good than the gift of ten thousand pounds. He wrote to Cromwell August 4, 1537, asking him to exhibit the book to the King, and to obtain, if possible, a licence that it might be sold and read to all, "until such time as we, the Bishops, shall set forth a better translation, which I think will not be till a day after domesday!" Cromwell did so, and Cranmer wrote on the 13th to thank him.

Richard Grafton, one of the publishers, sent Cromwell six copies, and asked for a licence under the Privy Seal. This was thought not necessary; but he feared lest other printers should reprint and undersell him. 1500 copies had been printed, and he had laid out £500. He asked that no one should be allowed to reprint until these copies were sold; or else that every "curate" should be bound to get one, and every abbey six.

This version lies behind all later ones, though it was naturally soon replaced. As Dr. Pollard says (*Records of the English Bible*, p. 16):

> "With a light heartedness which is really amazing, official sanction was given to a Bible largely made up of the work of Tyndale, and which included his markedly Protestant prologue to Romans (based on Luther) and equally Protestant side-notes. . . . No doubt in 1537 the King had moved a long way in the direction of Protestantism—for the moment—but considering his character the whole transaction bore a remarkable resemblance to playing with gunpowder."

7. The Great Bible.

Cromwell now secured Coverdale to make the due revision for a new version, with Grafton and Whitchurch as publishers. It was to be printed in Paris, by Regnault, who had previously printed service books for England. In this revision much use was made of Münster's Latin version (see above). But about the end of 1538 a quarrel broke out with France, and the French ambassador suggested that the book should be seized as heretical. This was

done; but a few copies had been lodged with the English ambassador (Bishop Bonner). Some of the rest were burnt; others sold as waste-paper "for a haberdasher to lap in caps," but apparently bought up. But ultimately Cromwell seems to have secured the rest, and brought over skilled printers, so that the book was finished in London. The first edition appeared in April, 1539; others in 1540, and down to December, 1541. Cromwell's Injunctions, issued before the dispute with France, had enjoined that a Bible of the largest volume should be set up in every parish church. This end was secured by a Royal Proclamation, May 6, 1541; all parishes without a Bible were to procure one by All Saints' Day under penalty of the heavy fine of forty shillings a month. The price was fixed at ten shillings unbound, twelve shillings well bound and clasped. People were to read meekly and reverently, not to interrupt services by reading with a loud voice. Laymen were not to take upon them to dispute or expound, but every such layman should humbly, meekly and reverently read the same for his own edification, instruction and amendment of life.

Coverdale was very anxious to include some notes, but this was thought too risky. The title-page is said to have been designed by Holbein. The King is depicted as giving the Bible to Cranmer to distribute to the clergy, and to Cromwell to distribute to the laity, while all cry "Vivat rex!"

8. Taverner's Bible.

While the Great Bible was printing in 1539, Taverner's version appeared, apparently promoted by Cromwell in case the printing of the Great Bible failed and some attack was made on Matthew's. Richard Taverner, of the Inner Temple, a good Greek scholar, who became "Clerk of the Signet," revised "Matthew," making more use of the Vulgate; he retained the preliminary matter, but toned down the notes. Though a good version, it was quickly replaced by the Great Bible, and is not in the direct ancestry of the Authorised Version.

Taverner also edited a series of "Postils"—homilies on the liturgical epistles and Gospels—by various authors, whose names are not given; two of these were included in the *Second Book of Homilies*—those on the Passion and the Resurrection.

A reaction set in during Henry's last years. All translations bearing the name of Tyndale were proscribed; and later also Coverdale's New Testament; also most classes were forbidden to read the Bible either publicly or privately. Apparently a great destruction of Bibles now took place, and probably the Great Bible was largely ejected from churches. But under Edward VI the order for setting it up in churches was renewed, and there was great reprinting of it and other versions; there were thirteen editions of the Bible, and thirty-five of the New Testament. Under Elizabeth *three* new versions appeared, all based upon the Great Bible (or Matthew), one Puritan, one Official, and one Roman.

9. The Geneva Version.

This was the work of a company of exiles at Geneva in Mary's reign, headed by William Whittingham, afterwards Dean of Durham, who contributed largely to the "Old Version" of the Psalms (Sternhold and Hopkins). A version by him of the New Testament appeared in 1557; this was then revised and the Old Testament taken in hand with the help of Anthony Gilby and Thomas Sampson. When at Elizabeth's succession the bulk of his fellow exiles flocked to England, Whittingham remained to complete and bring out this Bible in 1560. This shared several distinguishing features with the New Testament of 1557; it was of convenient size, not intended primarily for church use; it was no longer in "black letter"; it was the first to use italics for explanatory words and phrases; and, above all, it was the first to be divided into *verses*. Our division into *chapters* was probably the work of Stephen Langton, of the University of Paris (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury), about 1200; but that into verses appeared first in Estienne's (Stephanus) Greek-Latin Testament of 1551. It was made on a ride between Paris and Lyons. This division, while most valuable for exact reference, is too often regarded as essential and sacrosanct; it encourages the tendency to make Scripture consist of detached sayings and phrases, a collection of *texts* and not one of books, and to ignore connection and context; so the introduction of the familiar feature was not an unmixed blessing. Many notes, mostly quite short, are added. "We have endeavoured," they say, "both by diligent reading of the best commentaries, and by conference with godly and learned brethren, to gather brief annotations," not only to explain what is obscure, but also "for the application of the text as may most appertain to God's glory and the edification of His church." Most of these are simple and useful, but some are controversial; James I strongly objected to two of them at the Hampton Court Conference: (1) The note on Exodus i. 17–19, "Their disobedience herein was lawful, but their dissembling evil." He objected to teaching the lawfulness of disobedience to kings. (2) On 2 Chronicles xv. 16, Asa deposed his mother or grandmother because she had made an idol: "Herein he lacked zeal, for she ought to have died, both by the Covenant and the law of God; but he gave place to foolish pity."

In the translation fresh use was made of the versions of Pagninus, Leo Juda, and Münster, and, in the New Testament, of Beza's French Testament. The Geneva version was the popular Bible for over a generation.

10. The Bishops' Bible.

Archbishop Parker now revived the project which had fallen through under Henry VIII, of an official version by the Bishops. (Actually one or two deans and prebendaries also took part.) Parker himself took all the preliminary matter, Genesis and Exodus, Matthew and Mark, and all the Pauline Epistles except Romans and 1 Corinthians. In October, 1568, he sent a bound copy to

Cecil for presentation to the Queen, enclosing a list of the revisers and a statement of the principles on which they worked. They were to follow the common English translation used in the churches (i.e., the Great Bible), and not to depart from this except where it varied manifestly from the original; to follow especially Pagninus and Münster and generally others learned in the tongues; to make no bitter notes upon any text nor yet to set down any determinations in places of controversy. The work was parcelled out among a number of independent revisers, though Parker probably exercised some supervision and made final corrections. It is said that the New Testament is done better than the Old, probably because Greek was better known than Hebrew. The book was a handsome one, with many woodcuts, and with portraits of the Queen, the Earl of Leicester, and Lord Burghley. Convocation in 1571 enjoined that every archbishop and bishop should have a copy, and deans were to have one in their cathedrals and for their households; a copy was to be placed in every church "if it could conveniently be done." Parker, having the control of Bible printing, had nothing but the Bishops' Bible printed during the rest of his life, and that apparently only in large size for churches. Immediately after his death editions of the Geneva Bible appeared under the influence of Walsingham, and the printing of the Bishops' was neglected. Under Whitgift the balance was more even, but for years the Bible read in churches differed generally from that read at home.

II. The Rheims New Testament.

This appeared in 1582, the work of members of the "English College" there. This "seminary" was originally established at Douai, but owing to political troubles moved to Rheims in 1578, returning to Douai in 1593. Both Old and New Testaments were undertaken together, but owing to shortness of funds the Old was not published till 1609–10, so that it, unlike the New Testament, had no influence upon our Authorised Version. The combined book is usually known as the Douay Bible. It was revised in 1750 and 1764 by Bishop Challoner, borrowing largely from the Authorised Version. A letter from Cardinal Allen, Head of the College, in 1578, says that they had felt the want of such a translation, as learned Catholics do not commonly have at command the text of Scripture except in Latin. Thus when they are preaching to the unlearned and are obliged on the spur of the moment to translate some passage into the vulgar tongue, they often do so inaccurately and with unpleasing hesitation, because the words of any English version do not at once occur to them; whereas our opponents have at their fingers' ends from some heretical version all the passages of Scripture which seem to make for them.

The great translator of this New Testament was Gregory Martin, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford; his version, which took him three and a half years, was corrected by Allen himself and Richard Bristow. The Preface, largely given by Dr. Pollard,

is important. They give reasons for translating from the Vulgate, not from the original. But as they also understood and used the Greek, they avoid some of the obvious dangers of translating from a translation. When there were variants in the Latin they selected those which agreed with the Greek (the authorised editions of Sixtus and Clement had not yet appeared). And when the Latin was ambiguous they let the Greek interpret; so in particular they recognise the force of the Greek article and translate it better than other versions, though there is no article in Latin. They defend themselves for sometimes retaining original words rather than translating, e.g., "Amen, amen," instead of "Verily, verily." If "Pentecost" be transliterated, why not "Pascha" (Passover), "Azymes" (unleavened bread) and "Parasceve" (preparation)? They name a number more, some of which are now familiar English, while others seem strange Latinisms. Taken as a whole, it is a much better version than it is commonly said to be; much of it being quite straightforward, and bearing a strong family likeness to the other English versions. Thus in 1 Corinthians xiii. 1, the Bishops, the Geneva and the Rhemish all have, "sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." It is furnished throughout with notes, some of them long, guarding passages against the misinterpretations of heretics.

Dr. William Fulke, Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, published in 1589 his *Text of the New Testament translated by the Papists of the traitorous Seminary at Rhemes*, giving their version and the Bishops' Bible in parallel columns, thus making comparison easy; then giving their notes in full, subjoining to each his own confutation. It was probably from this work that the translators of 1611 gained their detailed knowledge of this version, which they used freely, though without acknowledgment.

12. The Authorised Version.

The Authorised Version of 1611 had as its starting-point the Hampton Court Conference, 1603–4. The Puritan representatives there asked for a new translation, pointing out mistakes, not very important, in the older ones, e.g., Psalm cvi. 30, "Then stood up Phinees and *prayed*." Bancroft objected that if every man's humour should be followed, there would be no end of translating; but the King took up the idea warmly. (The co-existence of two rival versions was objectionable; yet neither could be expected to drive out the other.) The King required that the translation should be made by the best learned in both universities; after this to be reviewed by the Bishops and the chief learned of the Church; then to be presented to the Privy Council, and lastly to be ratified by the royal authority, and so the whole Church be bound to it and none other. Also that there should be no notes; he particularly objected to some of the Genevan.

On July 31, Bancroft wrote to the other Bishops, enclosing a letter from the King of the 22nd, that learned men to the number of fifty-four be nominated. There are various lists, but no one

of them names more than forty-seven ; others add one or two more, and fresh names occasionally crop up. Among the names are Andrewes, Overall, Saravia, Abbott, Spencer, and two of the Puritan representatives at Hampton Court, Reynolds and Chaderton. "The choice of the revisers seems to have been determined solely by their fitness, and both parties in the Church were represented by some of their best men" (Pollard).

They were divided into six companies, two meeting at Westminster, two at Oxford, and two at Cambridge. Genesis to 2 Kings was assigned to the first Westminster company; Chronicles to Canticles to the first Cambridge ; the Prophets to the first Oxford ; the Apocrypha to the second Cambridge ; the Gospels, Acts and Apocalypse to the second Oxford ; the Epistles to the second Westminster. Eighteen rules were drawn up to be observed in translating, the most important being :

(1) The ordinary Bible used in the Church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to be followed and as little altered as the truth of the original will permit.

(2) The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, e.g., the word "church" not to be translated "congregation."

(6) No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew and Greek words which cannot without some circumlocution so fitly and briefly be expressed in the text.

(8) Every man of each company to take the same chapter or chapters, and having translated or emended them severally by himself where he thinketh good, all to meet together, confer what they have done, and agree what shall stand.

(9) As any one company hath despatched any one book in this manner, they shall send it to the rest to be considered of seriously and judiciously.

(10) Any differences (finally remaining) to be compounded at the general meeting of the chief persons in each company at the end of the work.

(14) These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible,—Tindale, Matthew, Coverdale, Whitchurch [Great], Geneva.

But it does not seem that all these rules were precisely followed ; probably experience led to some modifications. Thus the rules as stated at Dort say that no notes were to be placed in the margin, but only parallel passages to be noted ; where a Hebrew or Greek word admits of two suitable meanings, one was to be expressed in the text, the other in the margin ; so with various readings in the original. The more difficult Hebraisms and Grecisms were also placed in the margin.

It is strange that we know so little of the actual course of proceedings. The Preface (by Bishop Miles Smith) tells us of the principles followed, but little of the proceedings, except that the translators took above three years and three-quarters, probably omitting the preliminary work. (Bois' biographer speaks of four

years' work, besides nine months' revision in London.) Apart from isolated notices, we have only two connected accounts:

(1) That given at the Synod of Dort (Dordrecht) 1618. One of the four English delegates there, Dr. Samuel Ward, Master of Sidney College, Cambridge, and Archdeacon of Taunton, had been one of the translators. The important points in the account are that there were seven or eight distinguished men in each of the six companies. After each section had finished its task, twelve delegates, chosen from them all, met together and reviewed and revised the whole. Finally Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, together with Miles Smith, now Bishop of Gloucester, who had been engaged in the whole work from the beginning, put the finishing touches to this version.

(2) The other account is by Anthony Walker (on whom see *Churchman*, July, 1935) in his *Life* of his grandfather, Dr. John Bois, rector of Boxworth, Cambridge, and afterwards Canon of Ely, written about 1646, though not published till long after (in Peck's *Desiderata Curiosa*). He came up to Cambridge for the work, only visiting Boxworth for the Sundays; he was entertained by his old College, St. John's. Part of the Apocrypha was allotted to him, but Walker could not remember what part. "When he had finished his own part, at the earnest request of him to whom it was assigned he undertook a second." This suggests that Rule 8 was not fully observed by this company, but that in the first place the books were divided among the members. But Walker's words have been taken to mean that the Apocrypha committee finished first, and then Bois was attached to the other Cambridge committee. "Four years were spent in this first service; at the end whereof . . . a new choice was to be made of six in all, two out of every company, to review the whole work." For this, Downes and Bois were sent for to London; Downes would not go till he was either fetched or threatened with a pursuivant. They went daily to Stationers' Hall, and in three-quarters of a year finished their task. All which time, and only then, they each had thirty shillings weekly from the Stationers' Company. "Whilst they were employed in this last business, he (Bois) and he only, took notes of their proceedings, which notes he kept unto his dying day" (Jan. 14, 1643/4). Walker seems ignorant that there were two committees in each place, and that each committee sent two members to the final revision, twelve in all. This is plain from the report to the Council of Dort. Bois and Downes were both members of the second Cambridge committee.

Besides earlier English versions, the revisers made use of the Latin translation of the Old Testament by Arias Montanus, and that of the whole Bible by Tremellius and Junius; also French, Italian and Spanish versions. These are mentioned in Selden's notice of the translation. "They met together, and one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues, or French, Spanish, Italian, etc. If they found any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on."

There are several current misconceptions of this version:

(1) That all the forty-seven members, or whatever the number was, took part at the same time and place, perhaps at one table. Actually, until the final revision, not more than seven or eight met together, and then only twelve.

(2) That it was an absolutely new translation; the title is largely responsible for this. But their instructions were to follow the Bishops' Bible as far as possible, only making changes as faithfulness to the original required, and then using, if possible, one or other of the older translations. Hence there is not much absolutely new, though they used great judgment in selecting from these sources. Speaking roughly, it may be said to be in the New Testament for the most part a revision of the Bishops' from the Genevan, with occasional use of the Rhemish.

There is no evidence that the new book received any special authorisation. It succeeded to the Bishops' Bible, which was "authorised and appointed to be read in churches." This Bible was no longer printed, and after a few years the printing of the Genevan was discountenanced; but it was not till near the middle of the century that this was finally displaced.

The Churchwardens' Account at Bishops Stortford shows that thirty shillings was paid for a new Bible in 1569 (the "Bishops'"); forty-eight shillings and eightpence in 1612 for a new Bible and its carriage from London.

13. The Revised Version

of the New Testament appeared in 1881; of the Old Testament, in 1885; of the Apocrypha, not till 1895.

The project of revision first took definite shape early in 1870 when the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury appointed a committee to go into the matter. In May a resolution was passed recognising the desirability of a revision, to include not only marginal renderings but necessary emendations in the text in the opinion of competent scholars. Convocation nominated a number of its members, eight from each House, "who should be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship to whatever nation or religious body they might belong." Nearly forty were so nominated, a few of whom declined. Approximately there were usually twenty-five members on each committee. The New Testament committee met in the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster, Bishop Ellicott being Chairman; the Old Testament at first in the Chapter Library, Bishop Wilberforce Chairman.

A breakdown was narrowly averted near the start. Dean Stanley invited all the revisers to a Celebration in Westminster Abbey; there were among them about sixteen non-Anglicans, including a Unitarian, Dr. Vance Smith. Hence arose a great outcry against the "Westminster Scandal"; there was much indignation among High Churchmen, who appealed to the Confirmation rubric. The Bishops were carried away by it, and passed a resolution that no person who denies the Godhead of Our Lord Jesus

Christ ought to be invited to join either company, and any such person now on shall cease to act. But Bishop Thirlwall regarded the resolution as mischievous and likely to discredit the honesty of the revisers' work, and sent in his resignation at once, with the effect that the obnoxious resolution was practically withdrawn.

Two similar revision companies were formed in America, and the committees on both sides of the Atlantic regularly communicated their provisional decisions to one another.

The method adopted was to go through the whole twice. At the first revision changes in the text might be made by a bare majority; but at the second only by a two-thirds majority. Hence it sometimes happens that a change approved by the majority did not get beyond the margin; which may be sometimes, especially in the Book of Job, superior to the text.

The first revision of the New Testament took six years; the second about two and a half; various delays brought the whole period to ten years and four months. The Old Testament did not appear till four years later. The expenses were borne by the University Presses in return for the assignation of the copyright; they stipulated that the Apocrypha should be included, as in all other English Bibles, including the Genevan. This was revised by four small companies of revisers after their main work was finished; it appeared in 1895, with a preface by Dr. Moulton.

The Old Testament committee held 85 sessions, most of ten days each, of about six hours a day. The New Testament, 101 of four days each and one of three, 407 in all.

The Prefaces to both the Old and the New Testament should be read, as explaining the principles followed, and the reasons for change in important words or clauses.

The Revised New Testament was received with a storm of criticism. It must be remembered that to many people the Authorised Version *is* "the Bible," and any deviation from it jars. This feeling cannot have been so strong when more than one version was in circulation. A more literary form of the same feeling is that the Authorised Version being rightly regarded as an English classic, a model of language and style, any change seems to deface it. The tendency is to forget that we are dealing with a *translation*, and to ignore the importance of faithfulness to the original.

Sir Frederic Kenyon (Schweich Lectures, 1932) says that the Revised Version, though continuing in steady use, especially by careful students of the Bible, has never become popular. But it has been attacked on two totally distinct grounds: (1) That the Greek text on which it is based is wrongly chosen; it was an error to depart from the "received text." This was the main point of Dean Burgon's attack on the version. But at the present time "it must be taken as an assured result that the text underlying the Revised Version is superior to that underlying the Authorised." (2) That in English style it is inferior to the Authorised, and is guilty of pedantic neglect of idiom and imperfect comprehension of the differences of New Testament Greek from Classical. Here

the charges are partially made out; there was a tendency to over-press tenses, and not to allow enough for the colloquial character of some books, or for the changed meaning of words in later times. (Instances will be found in Field, *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*; and Turner, *Commentary on St. Mark*.)

But much of the prejudice is due to preference of custom to truth.

There was no such outcry on the appearance of the Revised Old Testament, probably partly because the language was not so familiar, partly because the changes in the text were fewer. It is often thought that the reception of the New Testament made the revisers of the Old cautious in their final revision, so that many changes failed to get a two-thirds majority, and were relegated to the margin. This is the case with many real improvements.

A very good account of the history of the Revision and the character of the changes made is to be found in *Addresses on the Revised Version of Holy Scripture*, by Bishop C. J. Ellicott, Chairman of the New Testament Revision Company.

The New Testament revisers truly say that the foundation of our English New Testament was laid by William Tyndale. His translation was the true primary version. The Versions that followed were either substantially reproductions of Tyndale's translation in its final shape, or revisions of Versions which had been themselves almost entirely based on it.

Bishop Westcott says that it is even of less moment that by far the greater part of his translation remains intact in our present Bible, than that his spirit animates the whole.

Longmans, Green & Co. issue the *Annual Charities Register and Digest* for the year 1936 (price 8*s.* 6*d.*). This is one of the most useful books of reference for the Clergy and social workers generally. Commencing with the Charity Organisation Society it covers both home and foreign organisations. The Register then goes on to a list of the institutions for special cases, which include the Blind, the Deaf and Dumb, Cripples, Mentally Defectives, Inebriates and Epileptics. Lists are given of Hospitals, Surgical Homes, Convalescent Homes, Nursing Institutions in London, Homes for Old People, and numerous other Institutions for various departments of social work. Under the heading General and Special Relief Agencies considerable space is given to numerous Religious Institutions. The value of the work is considerably enhanced by the full Index with which it is provided.

THIS IS THE VICTORY. By Janie Langford. *Thynne & Co.* 3*d.*

The story of a young girl who by consistent faith overcomes difficulties and saves the life of the man whom she ultimately marries.

H. D.

CHURCH AND STATE.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHBISHOPS' COMMISSION.

By "Beta."

THE report of the Archbishops' Commission on the relations between Church and State, a commission appointed in pursuance of a resolution passed by the Church Assembly six years ago, is at last issued in two parts. The first contains the report and appendices, the second gives the evidence of the witnesses with one or two other documents. More will be said of each: at the moment attention should be drawn to the cost of these two volumes. Volume I is priced two shillings and sixpence; the volume of evidence, in some ways the more interesting of the two, is priced seven shillings and sixpence. It is obvious that a very small number of Churchmen will be able and willing to pay this price.

The wisdom of appointing such a commission at this particular time is widely open to question. The leaders of the Church are, almost with one voice, urging the need of Evangelism to bring back into the Churches the countless thousands who have lost touch. Leaders in religious life are insisting that the present day of opportunity for evangelism may speedily pass away. Wisdom would suggest that the whole energy of the Church should be passionately engaged in what is its supreme task. Instead of that, this commission was appointed to give time and thought to the preparation of a report which, unless it is stillborn, will divert attention from the main task, will necessitate platform campaigns, and may easily divide by still deeper chasms a Church whose need is unity. The plea made by some witnesses that the spiritual work of the Church is handicapped and hindered by the unsatisfactory relations between the Church and State has a decidedly unreal sound. There is nothing in these relations to prevent or hinder the Church's workers from giving themselves utterly and wholeheartedly to the cause of evangelism. Those who plead urgency for this particular matter on the ground that the present relations between Church and State impose an intolerable burden upon conscience present themselves in a strange light. The Archdeacon of Stafford, using what will strike most people as extravagant language, declares the acceptance of the present relations to be "disloyalty to our Lord. . . . The Church, by allowing the State to have the last word in these matters, is involving herself in the 'greater sin' which Caiaphas committed when he delivered our Lord to Pilate." The man in the street, if he ever reads this evidence, might well ask why the Archdeacon sought orders in the Established Church and more recently accepted high office in the same.

The truth is (and the report does not attempt to conceal the fact) that, while the relations between Church and State have been the

basis of conflict of thought and opinion throughout the ages, there would not have been appointed this commission to enquire and report had Parliament not twice rejected the proposed new Prayer Book. The action of Parliament, welcomed, we believe, by the bulk of English Churchmen, was held by the majority in the National Assembly to be an intolerable invasion of the right of the Church to decide for itself spiritual issues. Inspired by Archbishop Davidson's statement, made with the concurrence of the whole body of the Diocesan Bishops, that in the last resort the Church must retain its right to formulate its faith and to arrange its form of worship, the Commission was appointed. The occasion of the appointment was not wisely chosen. The book rejected by Parliament has to-day few friends. Parliament showed itself on that occasion wiser than those who would have forced the book through. The appointment of this Commission, if such a Commission were necessary, should not have followed so closely on the events of 1920, 1927 and 1928.

A great blunder was made in the selection of those who should sit on the Commission. Obviously not by accident, any person who in the Assembly gave his vote against the new Prayer Book was excluded. The Bishop of Norwich, invited to give evidence, made a courteous protest against such exclusion, adding: "It does not take many words to express my view, but I wish to state emphatically that it appears fair to consider that the direct connection existing between this Commission and the rejection of the new Prayer Book made it very desirable that in the personnel of the Commission one or two persons known to have been against the new Prayer Book should have been included, just as at least four persons who actually voted in favour of it have been included." If the aim was an unanimous report, it succeeded.

The Commission held seventeen sessions and took evidence from twenty-one individuals and from the Church Association, the Church Self-Government League, the English Church Union, the Modern Churchmen's Union, the National Church League and the Westminster Group. Of the individuals five gave evidence concerning the Church in India, South Africa, Canada, Ireland, and Wales. Three others represented Non-conformist Churches. The Bishops of Birmingham and of Durham, invited to give evidence, declined. The letters in which they declined the invitation are printed at the end of the second volume. The Bishop of Birmingham regarded the appointment of the Commission as a mistake: "I think that no changes in the present relations of Church and State are desirable. I therefore feel that the appointment of the Commission was a mistake. What is needed at the present time is that new proposals for Prayer Book revision should be put before Parliament. These should be similar to those submitted in 1927, 1928, save that they should not include changes which were then rightly regarded as concessions to unsound sacramental doctrine."

The Bishop of Durham's letter is equally definite though in the opposite direction. He stated that he had already in writings made

his position perfectly well known. Further, " If I seemed to allow that an adequate reform of the existing Establishment is really within the sphere of practical politics, I should be gravely misleading English Churchmen. In the circumstances of our modern world, I do not think that the maintenance of the Establishment is a legitimate object of Anglican effort. . . . The wide and widening discord between the Church and the Nation makes Establishment on the English model unreal, arbitrary and spiritually paralysing. . . . In casting about for proposals of legal and constitutional change which shall transform the existing Establishment, I apprehend that the Commission can but be constructing theoretical schemes, and, so far as any practical result is concerned, will be ' ploughing the sand.' "

So the Commission set itself, under the limitations already suggested, to a task of extreme difficulty and delicacy, predoomed, many thought, to failure. There is abundant evidence of careful thought and many pens in the production of the report which is now given to the world.

Now to return in mere detail to the first volume. The short opening chapter (" The Nature of the Problem ") states briefly the problem, old as Christendom itself, of adjusting the relationship between Church and State: the Church, " the Body of Christ, the organ of the will of the Divine Lord. . . . Yet in the eyes of the State . . . a voluntary society." The problem, it is pointed out, is somewhat different in this present day. It is to-day " rather the problem of adjusting the respective claims of what should be two organs of the community, engaged in a common spiritual task."

There follows an historical introduction, divided into two parts, sketching the history of the relation of Church and State in this country (α) from the earliest times to 1906, (β) from 1906 to 1928. It was probably inevitable that the earlier section of this chapter should be so general in its statements as to be of limited value to one who would be accurately informed of the effects upon Church life of the movements in the earlier part of the twentieth century. The later section is necessarily written from the point of view of one who regarded the rejection by Parliament of the new Prayer Book as a disaster. When the writer departs from the statement of actual fact his opinions are not too reliable. Is there any solid foundation for the expressed belief that order could have been restored by means of the Revised Prayer Book? This was the precise point made by the Archdeacon of Westminster when the Bishop of Norwich was giving evidence. " We (the A.E.G.M.) supported the book of 1928 solely and only because we trusted the Bishops to restore order on the basis of it. We are waiting with great anxiety, as you have just said, to find the method of a bishop that is restoring order on the basis of that 1928 book. There is growing anxiety lest we have been deceived, and that is growing in the Church very largely. I am in favour of the Prayer Book of 1928, and I want the limits of it kept. But time is slipping by and the success of the Prayer Book of 1928, as far as I understand,

is not striking." The writer of the report, while defending the action of the Bishops in agreeing not to interfere with clergy whose deviations from the Book of Common Prayer were within the limits set by the 1928 Prayer Book, draws attention to the difficult legal and moral situation in which this action placed men who had taken oaths to use in public prayer, etc., no other form than that prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer. It would have given a truer picture if he had noted the generally accepted belief that Parliament would have passed without demur all the proposed changes except those touching the Communion Office.

The third chapter, setting forth the present position, is almost entirely given over to a dissertation on the meaning which should be attached to the word " laity." Does it exclude those who belong to some body definitely separated from the Church ? Or, in the case of the established Church, are all Christian subjects members of the Church in the sense that they have the right to control doctrine and ritual ? The decision is given that only those who are, and claim to be, members of the Church of England and are not members of any religious body separated from it, can expect to be represented on the councils of the Church. This is preparatory to an attempt to meet the common objection that the House of Laity is not representative of lay opinion in the Church of England, and to a refusal to admit that Parliament can in any true sense be regarded as the " authorised mouthpiece " of the Church of England. Whatever may be said about the latter, there will remain with many a deep persuasion that the House of Laity is not representative. The fault does not lie with the leaders of the Church. No doubt honest attempts were made to ensure its representative character, but it does not adequately represent.

Still before the actual proposals are two chapters, closely associated, dealing with disestablishment and the Scottish solution. The obvious escape from the difficulties connected with the present relations between Church and State is, it is pointed out, disestablishment, which would give the Church complete freedom to develop on its own lines and to order its own affairs. " Some of us deliberately consider that disestablishment should be preferred to an indefinite continuance of the present relationship between Church and State." The pros and cons are canvassed. The bulk of evidence given by witnesses was emphatically against disestablishment. The national recognition of Christianity counts for much, particularly under present conditions in the world generally. Moreover, the Commission is fully alive to the fact that the Church cannot disestablish itself ; it can only ask to be disestablished. If it were granted, the State could make its own conditions, Questions of the possession of ancient churches and cathedrals would arise ; the Church as owner of property would find it necessary to keep within strictly defined limits ; it could easily find itself more strictly hedged in and confined as regards formularies and doctrines. Moreover, Parliament, in all probability, would insist on accompanying disestablishment by disendowment, either total or in part. The

work of the Church at home and overseas would thereby suffer a grievous blow. So the Commission decides: "Disestablishment is not to be desired, if other means can be devised of securing for the Church that freedom of action in things spiritual which is indispensable to the exercise of its functions as a spiritual society." Does that mean that failure to carry the present proposals would be followed by a request to Parliament that the Church should be disestablished? If that is the intention, we would venture a prophesy that in so doing the leaders of the Church would meet with whole-hearted opposition on the part of the laity.

Setting aside, for the moment, thoughts of disestablishment, the possibility of a solution such as the Church of Scotland found, in 1921, is considered. It was claimed that the working of the Act showed that "there is in principle no inconsistency between a national recognition of religion and the spiritual independence of the Church." Any idea that a similar solution could be found for the Church of England was quickly set on one side. The history of the two Churches has moved on entirely differing lines. Moreover, in Scotland there is little difference of opinion in doctrine and ritual. The Commission recognises the seeming impossibility of securing in the Church of England any agreed statement of fundamental doctrines. Yet the Church of Scotland Act remains for the Commission a standing evidence that spiritual freedom of the Church and Establishment are not incompatible.

Having made the way clear, the Commission states in forty pages its proposals for securing spiritual freedom to the Church of England, in its own peculiar conditions. The proposals are divided into legislative, judicial (regarding courts and restoration of discipline), an interim proposal to qualify the Declaration of Assent, and subsidiary proposals regarding the Appointment of Bishops, the Law of Marriage and the Canon Law.

The proposals are prefaced by a condition which is worth quoting in full:

"Before setting out our recommendations, we desire to state that in our opinion the two great obstacles are:

(1) The disagreement within the Church itself on certain vital matters, notably on the use and limits of Reservation, and on the permissible deviations from the Order of Holy Communion contained in the Book of Common Prayer;

(2) the want of effective guarantees that discipline will be secured and maintained in the future.

We believe that the successful framing and enactment of any new legislative machinery for spiritual measures must depend on satisfactory treatment of both these points; and we believe that they should be approached concurrently.

The foundation of our enquiry is the 'inalienable right' of the Church, 'when its mind has been fully ascertained,' to formulate its faith in Christ and to arrange the expression of that Holy Faith in its form of worship, and we make certain proposals for securing

the proper exercise of that right. But we recognise that these proposals cannot be carried out until a new and determined effort has been made to secure agreement between men and women of different schools of thought within the Church on those matters, in particular, which were mainly responsible for the rejection of the Prayer Book Measures of 1927 and 1928.

Our first recommendation, therefore, is that the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, by summoning a Round Table Confernce, or otherwise, should make every effort forthwith to secure an agreement between representatives of the various schools of thought, especially—

(*a*) on the permissible deviations from the Order of Holy Communion contained in the Prayer Book of 1662; and

(*b*) on the use and limits of Reservation."

The language is, purposely (?), vague. What is to be inferred from the phrase " or otherwise " ? What is meant by " a sufficient measure of agreement " ? Evangelicals will watch with anxiety plans made to carry out this recommendation. Already people are asking " How will the representatives be chosen ? " For the agreement to be of any value it must be made by a thoroughly representative body. Of necessity those who were opposed to the proposals in the Deposited Book will need to be adequately represented. In such a case, what prospect is there of agreement ? The convinced Anglo-Catholic will feel it a matter of conscience to insist on a freedom which the Evangelical is convinced is contrary to truth and to the standard of doctrine which he believes is the precious heritage of English Churchmen. If there is any prospect of a successful issue to such a Conference, why did it not precede the presentation to Parliament of the Deposited Book ? Wisdom would have dictated it and much time, valuable for other purposes, might have been saved. On the face of it, the report will perish in this preface.

Given agreement, legislative proposals follow. It is not considered necessary to depart from the procedure provided by the Enabling Act, as far as ordinary administrative measures are concerned. As regards spiritual measures (those touching doctrinal formulæ or the Services or Ceremonies of the Church, or the administration of the Sacraments) it is proposed to ask the State for new powers. In deciding whether any particular Measure is a Spiritual Measure or not the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Lord Chancellor and the Speaker of the House of Commons by their unanimous decision shall decide.

That decision given, it is proposed to proceed on lines indicated by a Suggested Draft Bill :

" 1. Any measure passed by the Church Assembly in accordance with Article 14 of the Constitution, as to which—

(i) the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Lord Chancellor and the Speaker of the House of Commons shall certify

their unanimous opinion that it relates substantially to the spiritual concerns of the Church of England and that any civil or secular interests affected thereby may be regarded as negligible;

(ii) the Archbishops of Canterbury and York shall certify—

(*a*) that it has been approved by resolutions passed by the Convocations of Canterbury and York;

(*b*) that it has been twice approved by resolutions passed by the Diocesan Conferences of not less than three-quarters of the dioceses within the provinces of Canterbury and York, that is to say once before and once after the revision of the Measure by the several Houses of the Church Assembly;

(*c*) that in their opinion it is neither contrary to nor indicative of any departure from the fundamental doctrines and principles of the Church of England, as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and the Book of Common Prayer;

may forthwith be presented to His Majesty for the Royal Assent."

Were such a bill desirable, the Commission realises that it is not for to-morrow, nor for the next day. "It may take some time," we suggest "a very long time," to obtain such general agreement among Churchmen as would justify an approach of this kind to Parliament, and to override the protests of a sincere and substantial majority is not a course that the Commission can advise.

In the proposed bill some points immediately demand attention. It would be possible to proceed on narrow majorities in three-quarters of the diocesan conferences and substantial majorities against the measure in the remaining quarter. If this kind of legislation had been in operation in 1928 presumably the Archbishops would have given the Prayer Book Measure the certificate required in ii (*c*). But the Book was rejected on the very deep conviction that it did involve a departure from fundamental doctrine. With regard to the concurrence of the Lord Chancellor and the Speaker, representing the House of Lords and the House of Commons, what is to prevent both of them being atheists? What then becomes of the present outcry on those very lines, against the control of Parliament? Does the King act except on the advice of his ministers? If he is to have power to refuse his consent, very considerable difficulties could ensue. Or is he to give his assent without question?

The Commission has certainly done its best to safeguard the interests of minorities and to avoid anything in the nature of ill-considered and hasty legislation, but we doubt whether their best is sufficiently good to commend itself to the laity of the Church.

Should such leglislative powers be granted by Parliament the first use to be made of them would be the passing of a measure giving effect to the agreement which the Commission hopes may result from the Round Table Conference, previously suggested, with regard to the Order of Holy Communion and the question of Reservation.

Only when the law is made less rigid, consequently more accept-

able to the consciences of Churchmen and more capable of enforcement, can the Ecclesiastical Courts be reformed, says the report. Provision having been made for the amendment of the law the report turns to judicial proposals. In an interesting chapter it details the various attempts that have been made since 1883 to deal with Ecclesiastical discipline and the Ecclesiastical Courts. In an appendix is given the report of a Commission of the Church Assembly, presided over by the present Archbishop of Canterbury, as lately as 1926. The present Commission limited its consideration to questions of doctrine, ritual and ceremony and did not adopt the recommendations in the 1926 report. It is proposed to take steps to reform, as far as they deal with questions of ritual, doctrine and ceremonial, the constitution and procedure of the Diocesan and Provincial Courts, by associating the bishop with his chancellor and by making it impossible for a bishop to disclaim responsibility for a decision of his chancellor. In Provincial Courts the Archbishop may delegate his power as judge to the official principal with whom the Archbishop may, in cases involving heresy or breach of ritual, associate not more than five theological assessors to sit with him.

The main objection has, of course, always been against the constitution of the Final Court of Appeal. Since 1832 the final appeal in ecclesiastical cases has been the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. No general objection has been made to the jurisdiction of the Privy Council in cases involving misconduct and neglect of duty. Objection has been directed to its jurisdiction in matters involving doctrine, ritual and ceremony. The proposals made in 1926 are rejected as not providing a satisfactory solution. It is now proposed that the Crown should appoint members of a special Court of Final Appeal from a panel nominated by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York with the approval of the Convocations. The panel would consist of (α) men of high judicial experience, and (β) bishops, clergy and laity specially qualified. For any particular case the Lord Chancellor would choose two from each of the two lists and a presiding judge from the first list. The qualifications for admission to the second list are not clear and the constitution of the court for any given case is somewhat vague. In any case it leaves room for considerable abuse and has no very great advantage over the present system.

A considerable innovation is suggested in the establishment of what the report calls " Pastoral Tribunals," to deal with complaints lodged by interested and responsible persons and touching ritual, doctrine and ceremonies. To check frivolous or vexatious complaints a power of veto is to be given to the Chancellor of the diocese. The bishop sitting in open court would censure or admonish rather than judicially give sentence. From this court should be appeal or reference to a provincial tribunal which again would issue directions but have no power to impose penalty. The Commission is bold to hope that by some such means the pastoral authority of the bishop, now largely lapsed, would be restored. If, the report pleads, the bishop is to be held responsible for order and discipline

in his diocese, he must be given power to enforce it. That such a scheme would be effective is open to doubt. These who set themselves to disregard the directions of their bishop are hardly likely to be brought to obedience in this way. There is a very much more effective way, but the report was hardly likely to suggest it.

One other judicial proposal appears, but it can hardly be of general interest. Persuaded that it would be invidious to propose measures to deal with disobedient and offending clergy and to say nothing about the means to deal with an individual bishop who needed correction, detailed proposals are made for a tribunal to meet the case.

The proposed legislation and the establishment of new courts will be a lengthy proceeding. Yet, says the report, there are matters that ought not to be deferred. Chief among these is the ever-recurring question of the flagrant breaking of the oath taken by clergy to use no other service than that prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer "except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." Legal judgments have denied to bishops the right to order any changes "in the form prescribed" by the Book of Common Prayer. Yet clergy and bishops are constantly and persistently making such changes. As a temporary measure it is proposed that the two Convocations should, with the approval of the Church Assembly, formally adopt a Synodical Declaration as follows:

"Whereas the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline of 1906 stated that . . .

We therefore, having regard to the spiritual welfare of the Church and to the difficulties bequeathed to us by history, solemnly declare that by making the Declaration of Assent any bishop, priest or deacon must be deemed to have subjected himself to the obligation to adhere to the Book of Common Prayer except so far as any deviation from it may be enjoined or sanctioned by the Bishop of the Diocese acting within and subject to the following requirements:

(*a*) The services of the Book of Common Prayer should always be regarded as the normal standard of worship.

(*b*) No deviation from this standard should be authorised unless in the opinion of the Convocations it was neither contrary to nor indicative of any departure from the fundamental doctrines of the Church of England as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer.

(*c*) No deviation should be sanctioned by any bishop except with the approval of, or in conformity to principles laid down by the Convocations with the approval of the Church Assembly.

(*d*) No deviation should be brought into use in any parish without the good will of the people."

If we read aright, the proposal is, without seeking Parliamentary authority, to give to the bishops power to authorise, under the above-mentioned safeguards, special services. Under that power the services contained in the 1928 Prayer Book could undoubtedly

be authorised. That way of surmounting the difficulty caused by its rejection in Parliament is just as lawless as the thought it is framed to correct. If it is possible to go to work in this way why trouble Parliament at all? In any case, the safeguard contained in (*d*) is not of very great value, and is likely to lead to wrangling, dispute, and ill-will.

The remainder of the report touches lightly upon several subjects. Of the Law of Marriage " we think that the Church should be free to determine the conditions upon which persons may be married with the Church's rite, or, after a marriage which from the Church's standpoint is irregular, may be admitted to Holy Communion," but no further recommendations are made " as the whole question has lately been considered by Joint Committees of the two Convocations, which have now made their report."

The question of such a revision of the Canon law as would bring it up to date, is raised, but the Commission did not feel able to undertake the necessary detailed and exhaustive investigation. It recommends that an authoritative commission should be set up to decide what Canon Law is still operative; what is the authority of the operative Canon Law, and what is the obligation of the clergy when Canon Law and Statutory Law diverge.

The remaining proposal concerns the appointment of bishops. The report gives, but hardly credits, the suggestion that the bishops fail to obtain universal respect for their authority because a certain section regards their appointment on the recommendation of the Prime Minister as not being of a sufficiently spiritual character.

The evidence of witnesses on this particular investigation is illuminating. Whatever objection there may be in theory to the present mode of appointment it seems to be generally agreed that the effect is to give a bench of bishops unsurpassed in ability and influence by any appointed in other ways. Emphasis was laid on what is an undoubted fact, that election by synod has not proved an unmixed blessing. The temptation to lobby and canvass is too great. Frequently two strong men of diverse sympathies have such equal support that their appointment is rendered impossible. Frequently the result is the election of a third person of no particular colour or force.

The Bishop of London in the course of his evidence on this subject gave voice to a sentence which perhaps he would modify on second thoughts. Speaking of popular election he said : " Curiously enough the layman generally goes for a strong evangelical and the clergy for a strong High Churchman, and the weaker candidate is elected for the sake of peace. That is the result of popular election as I have seen it in some parts of the world." Here he certainly gives support to the contention frequently urged that Anglo-Catholicism is not a lay movement, but decidedly clerical; that the lay people given freedom of choice would welcome an evangelical ministry.

In the whole discussion there was a suspicion of something unreal. It would be interesting to know how often the Prime

Minister has insisted on appointing his own particular candidate. It is known that there have been particular instances, but one suspects that in recent years at all events the Prime Minister has always sought advice from the leaders of the Church. It is not surprising under these circumstances that the Commission does not recommend any great change. It does object to the existing practice as to the *congé d'élire*: it proclaims that the practice is indefensible, seeing that the Chapter is charged with the right and duty of electing a bishop and at the same time is informed that it must elect a certain person under penalties of præmunire.

It is recommended that in future the Chapter should have an absolute right to reject the nominee of the Crown, but not the right to choose for itself. One nominee being rejected the Crown would then be asked to make a further nomination. Should agreement be found impossible the Crown would in the last resort appoint by letters patent. It similarly recommends that the Archbishop should, if he thought it right to do so, refuse consecration without being subject to penalties.

The Commission appointed by the Church Assembly which reported in 1929 suggested that the Prime Minister before submitting any recommendations to the King, in respect to the appointment of a bishop, should consult an advisory committee without in any way derogating from his own ultimate responsibility. This the present Commission rejects on the grounds that if the Prime Minister is to retain the right to recommend his nominee for a vacant bishopric, it is better that he should have the sole responsibility for so doing. We do not think that much weight can be given to the suggestion that if under such a system an unsuitable appointment was made no one would be able to fix responsibility for it.

The last chapter in the body of the book, with the exception of a summary of the recommendations, is a "conclusion." In it the Commission asks that the report should be studied, not piecemeal, but as a whole, suggesting that unless this is done there is a tendency to forget the larger background of the report and so to lose the significance of the parts. This suggestion that the historical section of the report should be carefully studied can be addressed only to a limited class. As might be expected there is an appeal for agreement within the Church on the limits of toleration, particularly with regard to the order of Holy Communion and Reservation. The complaint of evangelicals is that they have been barely tolerated. Sir Thomas Inskip in his evidence before the Commission did not hesitate to speak his mind about the official neglect of, and even contempt of, those of the clergy who hold definite views of a protestant and evangelical character, a neglect which he declares is not creditable to our official patrons. He points out that "extreme anglo-catholics receive a great deal of preferment; extreme protestants receive none. It is a lamentable weakness of the Church that with all the fair words that are used about the place of evangelicals in the Church, they should be almost scornfully neglected, so far as the higher preferments are concerned."

The opinion which Sir Thomas Inskip voices is held by a great many. The bishops must not be surprised if under these circumstances evangelicals regard with some suspicion these appeals for unity.

At the end of the book are appendices, chiefly reports or extracts from reports. One, however, is of particular value. It is a reprint of a paper which appeared in the historical section of the report of the Committee on Church and State in 1916. It was prepared at the request of the Committee by Sir Lewis Dibdin and Mr. A. L. Smith, late master of Balliol. The Commission adopts it without assuming responsibility for its details.

Such in broad outline is the report which has been in preparation for five years. It will be carefully studied, in detail, in conferences and in other gatherings. The Commission has done its work well, but it is embarking the Church upon a somewhat thorny path. We repeat that we consider the times unpropitious, that the energies of the Church should be given to more vital work, and that the effect of an attempt to carry these proposals will militate against the unity for which the Commission pleads.

Messrs. Thynne & Co. issue a charming book entitled *David ; The Messianic King*, by Helen N. Lawson (2s. net). The book is dedicated to all young people and in affectionate remembrance of her father, who was an Honorary Canon of Peterborough and a diocesan Inspector of Schools. Much of it was written by him and all of it was inspired by his teaching. Much of it is in the words of Scripture with connecting links between the various passages. It is all admirably arranged, and put into the hands of young people it will give them the story of David's life in a charmingly attractive fashion.

The Evangelical Quarterly, Jan., 1936. The Contents list gives the following : *Calvin, Institutio 1536–1936*, Rev. N. MacLean Watt, D.D., LL.D. ; *Must we relegate Deuteronomy to the Reign of Josiah?*, Rev. W. D. Monro, M.A. ; *Modern Dispensationalism and the Doctrine of the Unity of Scripture*, Rev. Prof. Oswald T. Allis, D.D., D.Litt. ; *The Revival of Calvinism*, Rev. John Victor, B.D., Ph.D. ; *Calvin and Missions*, Rev. C. E. Edwards ; *Selections from Kierkegaard*, Rev. W. T. Rivière ; *The Faith of Abraham*, Rev. Principal D. M. McIntyre, D.D. ; *L'Idée de Modération dans la Pensée de Calvin*, Prof. Dr. Léon Wencelius. Book Reviews. Periodical Literature. The articles on The Revival of Calvinism and on Calvin and Missions are of great interest. There is an appreciative review of Dr. C. Sydney Carter's recent book *The Reformation and Reunion*. Altogether, a very good number of this excellent magazine.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

FROM CHRIST TO CONSTANTINE. THE RISE AND GROWTH OF THE EARLY CHURCH. By James Mackinnon, Ph.D., D.D., D.Th., L.L.D., Regius Professor-Emeritus of Ecclesiastical History, University of Edinburgh. *Longmans, Green & Co.* 18s. net.

Dr. Mackinnon has employed his well-earned retirement in writing three works which represent the results of many years' study of the early history of the Church. The first was *The Historic Jesus*, in which he reviewed the Mission and Message of the Founder of the Christian community. The second was *The Gospel in the Early Church*, in which he dealt with the development of the Gospel as it took shape in the religious experience and thought of the apostolic and the sub-apostolic period. In this third volume of the trilogy on Early Christianity he has delineated the process by which the primitive community founded by Christ developed in the course of the three centuries from His death to that of Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, into the universal and highly organised religious association known as the Catholic Church. The subject is an immense one, and Dr. Mackinnon brings to it his extensive knowledge of the varied literature of the period, and a sound judgment with a strongly developed critical attitude in dealing with the value of the numerous documents to be considered. As a result he gives a clear picture of the various stages by which the spiritual forces of Christianity proved superior to the organised antagonism of even so vast a power as imperial Rome. He shows also the stages by which the Gospel became a Theology with the contributions of individual theologians and the influence of Hellenism on Christian thought.

The result is not a mere text-book but a reasoned and critical survey of the evolution of the Early Church. This evolution is a vital force such as operated in no other organism religious and secular in the ancient world, and naturally it has come down to our own day. A useful warning is given against yielding to the temptation of allowing conjecture and fancy to play too freely on the material, as well as against the danger to which the dogmatic type of mind is liable of reading into the sources ecclesiastical assumptions and prepossessions. The volume is divided into seven parts. The first deals with the environment of the Church in the Roman Empire in relation to Greek thought, the Mystery religions, and Hellenist Judaism. The second part considers the founding of the Church, its faith, and the growth and organisation of the community. Part three deals with the rise of the Gentile Church. It considers specially St. Paul's contribution, and the effect of the earliest persecution. The fourth part concerns the sub-Apostolic Church, and its expansion, with the development of the Christian ministry. With the fifth part we come to the emergence of the Catholic Church A.D. 150–300. The various developments of this

period are connected with the organisation of the Ministry, and the growth of Montanism and Gnosticism. In part six Catholicism and Culture are considered, and an interesting account is given of some of the chief Christian apologists, including Clement of Alexandria and Origen. An account is also given of the Neo-Platonists. The last part tells of the victory of the Catholic Church and the conversion of Constantine.

In a volume covering so extensive a history and literature it is impossible to deal with the wide variety of topics offered. We must therefore confine ourselves to one that seems to us among the most important. Dr. Mackinnon's critical acumen leads him to a clear examination of the development of the Christian Ministry and especially of monarchical episcopacy. It is satisfactory to note that he upholds the views which the general trend of recent scholarship has laid down. He traces the growth of the episcopate through the stage of the Presbyterate. It is only with Cyprian that the rigid theory of Apostolic Succession with the sacerdotal claims begin. This was a distinct change from earlier conceptions. It represents " a series of vehement assertions and assumptions which are not in accord with the previous development of the Church." The gradual evolution of the episcopal order is ignored and " one would never infer from his dogmatic conception that there had been a time when there was no such thing as monarchic episcopacy in the government of the Christian community." The sacerdotal theory of a sacrificing Priesthood derived from the Jewish Priesthood also is due to Cyprian, and thus the whole conception of the ministry of the Church was turned into a wrong channel from which in certain sections it has not yet escaped. The Apostolic Succession, instead of being as it was originally a guarantee of sound doctrine against the theories of the Gnostics and other heretics, was regarded as the exclusive channel of the Grace of God and the sole guarantee of the validity of the Sacrament of Holy Communion. In any case, we may learn from the sources of the Apostolic Canons that " some of the Bishops might be so illiterate that they were unable to expound the Scriptures. Mere succession is thus by no means a test of the infallible possession of truth." He also notes the case of the Church of Alexandria where down to the end of the second century there is no record of a Bishop apart from the Presbyters. It is difficult to see how the necessity of Apostolic Succession can be maintained in view of these facts. This is but one aspect of the value of this comprehensive history. Readers will find brief but illuminating accounts of the great Christian writers of the period as well as of those opponents of Christianity whom they refuted. The account of the Neo-Platonists gives a clear impression of its chief representatives and their philosophic theories. The acceptance of Christianity by Constantine led naturally to altogether different conditions in the position of the Christian Church. It is interesting to note that his conversion was not due to any purely religious impulse to find out God, nor a revulsion from Paganism on moral or spiritual grounds. It was

not any conviction of the heinousness of idolatry. It was his march on Rome with a small intrepid army and his hope that God would frustrate the machinations of his enemy and prosper his hazardous enterprise. It is not surprising that the adoption of Christianity as the religion of the Empire should have meant the introduction of elements that helped to obscure the purity of the Christian Gospel and introduced numerous superstitious practices. Dr. Mackinnon's history is a valuable contribution to the history of an important period.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE IN THE MIDDLE AGES, AND OTHER ESSAYS. By F. M. Powicke. Pp. viii + 176. 10*s*. net. *Oxford: Clarendon Press.*

So much really first-class work is being contributed nowadays to papers, magazines, volumes of essays, etc., that it is not surprising that, from time to time, authors desire to gather into a more permanent form their scattered contributions to knowledge. Professor Powicke has done this in the volume before us. All the essays with two exceptions have appeared before in one form or another. Of course it may be objected that when an essay has appeared in a volume it should not be reprinted, since that can be regarded as being already in a permanent form. This would apply to the opening essay which gives its name to the volume and is naturally printed first. This very valuable essay has already appeared in the *Legacy of the Middle Ages*, a book which will probably be already in the possession of most purchasers of this volume, and we must confess to a little surprise at seeing it reprinted quite so soon. However, it may serve to draw the attention of some new readers to a study which well deserves full consideration. We have long ago realised that anything written by the Regius Professor of History at Oxford deserves to be most carefully read and weighed. He has proved himself to be an exact historian, particularly in that department of historical investigation which he has made his own. He has a very clear conception of medieval religious life, its problems, its inconsistencies, its glories and its disappointments. He is no violent partisan of these intriguing centuries of European history. He is as well aware as Dr. Coulton of the strange paradoxes which medieval religion and life present, and he is by no means forgetful of the less satisfactory side of the religious activities of the Middle Ages. He has grasped the philosophy which underlay much of medieval life and he is fully conversant with those more recent results of historical research which have done so much to restore the balance of historical judgment on these much debated centuries of history. "We now know enough about what used to be called the 'age of faith' to discount the conception of an obedient society, orderly to a point of unnatural self-suppression in everything relating to the government, the doctrines, the worship, the artistic interest of the Church. We no longer believe in that well-behaved body of the faithful, which, though essentially barbarous and

ignorant, was always so sweetly submissive in its attitude to the mysteries of the Christian faith." This judgment deserves most careful thought as well as the paragraphs on the paganism of the Middle Ages which immediately follow, and much else in the essay.

Another interesting and important contribution is the Lecture on Pope Boniface VIII, an essay which reveals Professor Powicke as a writer both vigorous and concise, and which should be read as an introduction to Mr. Boase's larger study of which the basis of the present essay was originally a review. We are in a better position to-day to estimate aright the character and career of this strange but magnificent Pope than at any time since he passed, in Rénan's great phrase, into the security of history. In a sense the career of the great Pope represents the climax of the Papacy. Bold in conception, resolute in action, fearless of consequences, imperious of temper, Boniface embodied what he conceived of as the ideals of him who was undoubtedly to be regarded as the supreme person on earth. Yet no pope ever lived to suffer greater humiliation. His reign, which commenced with so much promise, witnessed before its close the most crushing degradation of the Vicar of Christ. His end represents not only the frustration of his plans but the nemesis of overweening ambition. During the reign of Boniface on the papal throne, a time which saw advanced the most exalted and far-reaching of papal claims, we begin to observe the beginning of those tendencies which in the end were to make a reformation inevitable. His ambitious schemes, his wars and his extravagances involved the Papacy in vast expenses which necessitated much papal taxation and which in time began to give urgency and practical significance to anti-papal clamour. Professor Powicke admirably sums him up. " He was admired by many, feared by all, loved by none."

It is impossible to refer at length to all the interesting studies in the volume. But attention ought to be drawn to a statement of special value and importance in the essay on " Some Problems in the History of the Medieval University," one of the two essays which have not hitherto been printed. Professor Powicke draws attention to the procedure adopted in the medieval university when the Masters " determined " upon various disputed subjects, and points out that " the appeal to the schools was no formality in the Middle Ages. When Thomas Cranmer . . . suggested that Henry VIII should refer the problems of the divorce to the Universities, he was not merely suggesting a way out of a difficulty. He was influenced by a tradition which had been immensely strengthened by use since, more than 250 years before, another King Henry had played with the idea of submitting his dispute with Thomas Becket to the judgment of the masters of Paris."

We have written sufficient to show our appreciation of Professor Powicke's action in giving to us in a more permanent form some of his lesser studies in medieval and ecclesiastical history.

C. J. O.

ADVERSUS JUDÆOS. A Bird's-eye View of Christian Apologiæ until the Renaissance. By A. Lukyn Williams, D.D., Hon. Canon of Ely. *Cambridge University Press*, 1935. 25*s*.

The author of this book is well known to a wide circle of readers through his commentaries, his *Justin Martyr, The Dialogue with Trypho*, and *The Hebrew-Christian Messiah*, as well as through various books on later Jewish literature, and through his *The Foundations of the Christian Faith* reviewed in the October issue of THE CHURCHMAN last year.

He brings to the production of this book a thorough knowledge of Biblical and Rabbinical literature as well as of the Fathers of Church History. The result is a book of well over 400 pages packed with information and learning. It is scarcely a book to read straight through, but to have by one for reference. This being so, it is a help to find that the author has put an asterisk against those chapters which are " of special interest."

Inscribed " In memoriam Francisci Crawford Burkitt, D.D. . . ." the book is described on the dust-cover as " a collection and survey of Christian treatises on Jews and Judaism, showing what has been written with the object of persuading Jews to Christianity, or, at least, of enabling Christians to understand and withstand the attacks of Jews upon the Christian Faith." Dr. Lukyn Williams takes as a title for his book one that has been much used down the centuries, e.g. by Tertullian *c.* A.D. 200 and by many after him.

The volume is subdivided into five books, entitled " The Anti-Nicene Fathers " ; " The Syriac Writers " ; " Greek writers, A.D. 325–1455 " ; " Spanish Writers " ; and " Latin Writers, *c.* A.D. 384–1349." The author has a happy way of summing up the contents of a work of considerable length (such as that of Dionysius bar Salibi, " Against the Jews " or " The Discussions of Archbishop Gregentius with the Jew Herban ") so as to give the reader in a few pages or paragraphs a very fair idea of its contents. The book would be valuable for this alone.

Of general interest are the writer's remarks as to catenæ of proof texts from the Old Testament, existent as early as New Testament times. He would account for the similarity between Tertullian's *Adversus Judæos* and Justin Martyr's *Trypho*, and between Evagrius's *The Discussion concerning the Law between Simon a Jew and Theophilus a Christian* and the *Discussion of Jason and Papiscus*, by the use of such catenæ and by the use of common methods of interpretation.

The view which made the Old Testament " little more than an arsenal of separate weapons for Christian warfare " gives something of a sameness to the arguments of these " Apologiæ " and tends to make the subject a little monotonous at times. But the writer takes care to draw out the differences in the authors whom he quotes, as for example between the lack of sympathy and love of the golden-mouthed preacher, Chrysostom, and the tender warmth of his slightly older contemporary, " the twice-born " Augustine.

Dr. Lukyn Williams hits out (for example, in the section on

Spanish Writers) against that which must surely make every Christian hang his head in shame, the so-called " Christian " persecution of the Jews. With reference to the Jewish lives laid down, he writes: " Happy indeed is the Judaism which has produced so many staunch confessors; miserable the Christianity which has failed to spell out even the alphabet of the life and teaching of its Master."

But perhaps the main object of his book is to show in what way the method urged in these treatises failed to accomplish its purpose, and especially to indicate in what ways the approach to the Jew should be altered to-day. He pleads for a presentation to Jews by Christians of the " gradualness of the revelation of God, the attractiveness of the Lord Jesus, His truthfulness and the greatness of His claims." In dealing with a very large number of Jews to-day, we may assume a working knowledge of the New Testament—an assumption which would have been unjustifiable in the days of these treatises. He credits the writers with being " devout and honest men, who, according to the knowledge of their day, earnestly desired to win Jews to accept the beauty and glory of the full Christian Faith." . . . " But, in general, the missionary of to-day will find little in these old writers which he can still dare to use. Modern weapons in our spiritual warfare are not only different, but, for our own day, incomparably better."

F. D. C.

DISPENSATIONS. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. *S.P.C.K.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

This is a valuable compilation upon an important subject, which is little known and understood in connection with the Church of England. There has been a regularised system of dispensations in the Roman Church since the Council of Trent. It was laid down in Sess. xxv. cap. 18 that dispensations, papal or otherwise, were only to be granted for just and urgent causes and in all cases *gratis*. This was in view of the traffic in dispensations in Rome which had come to be regarded as a papal source of income, as early as the fourteenth century. The Reformation checked that abuse in England. It was enacted by 25 Henry VIII, cap. 21, sec. 2 (1534), that neither the King nor any of his subjects should henceforth sue for licences or dispensations to the See of Rome, and vested the power of granting such in the Archbishop of Canterbury " for causes not being contrary or repugnant to the Holy Scriptures and laws of God." This power was greatly reduced by subsequent statutes. It is now confined to granting dispensations for holding two benefices at the same time, to issuing licences for non-residence and dispensing from the obligation to publish the banns. In connection with Divorce Acts and Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Act a curious position has arisen: licences for such remarriages have been issued by the Bishop's Chancellor under the Bishop's seal, the Bishop protesting the while that such are contrary to the " law of God," but that he is powerless to prevent his chancellor from

issuing them. This is what is generally known about dispensations. Accordingly, when we take up and read a work like this on the subject, we see that there is a great deal more to be said about it.

Dr. Sparrow Simpson gives an excellent historical summary of the whole position. The Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, had to take up the question, owing to the relaxation of Church law in certain cases. Augustine advocated dispensations with regard to clergy returning from the Donatist Schism, stressing the superiority of charity to severity. Cyril of Alexandria also was in favour of dispensations, on one occasion supporting a bishop who had received a person into communion against the laws of the Church in Palestine and the wishes of the Archimandrite Gennadius, saying that circumstances sometimes compel us to go beyond what is legitimate. Leo the Great laid down the principle that " as there are certain things which can in no wise be controverted, so there are many things which require to be modified, either by considerations of age or by the necessities of the case." In a word, we have to remember that circumstances alter cases, and " Dispensation is a relaxation or abrogation of the ecclesiastical law in a particular case." Divine law is not subject to such. The sphere of its operation is the Church laws. The effect of a dispensation is not a compulsion, but a permission to act—releasing from all penalties—otherwise than the law directs. The multiplication of ecclesiastical prohibitions in the medieval Church necessitated a way of escape from them, when human nature could not observe them. The subject was still further complicated by the monastic rules and manner of life. Dispensations have been granted by Councils, popes, bishops and by parish priests in minor matters. The principle was laid down by Symmachus (Pope 498–514) that " often it would be cruel to insist upon the law in cases where its observance seems prejudicial to the Church, since laws are framed with the intention to be beneficial." Gradually the power of Rome made itself felt in this matter of granting dispensations. The power of the bishops to grant such was gradually curtailed, while all the time the Roman See was enlarging its own sphere, on the plea that there was a great deal of abuse of this dispensing power by the bishops. Canonists helped forward the papal authority, some declaring that the popes were masters of the canons (" Domini Canonum "), that is, superior to them and so competent to dispense in the entire canon law. In 1682 the French Episcopate affirmed in the third Gallican Declaration that : " the exercise of Apostolic authority must be regulated by the canons enacted by the Spirit of God and consecrated by the reverence of the whole world." But in spite of the attempts of the French writers to restrict the range of the papal dispensing power and to oppose its monopoly—the author refers especially to Hericourt (1719)—the canonists successfully upheld the papal claim, one writing in 1840 that the Supreme Pontiff can dispense in all ecclesiastical regulations whether enacted by his predecessors or by a General Council, for he is equal to the former and superior to the latter." Our author says—" the most recent Roman writers restrict the dis-

pensing power of a Bishop within narrow limits, and regard it as a matter of much uncertainty." It is interesting to note that Alexander VI (1492–1573) was the first pope to grant a dispensation to marry a deceased wife's sister; and that during the Great War the Roman bishops were freely permitted to grant dispensations, when access to the Holy See was impossible.

Chapter III (dispensations affecting the clergy) gives interesting cases. In the case of Ambrose, Governor of Milan, who was still unbaptised on the day of his election as Bishop, a rule of the Council of Nicæa and an Apostolic Decree had to be dispensed with. The Senator Nectarius was selected Bishop of Constantinople by Theodosius (381), before his baptism. He was baptised and consecrated, "wearing the episcopal robes over the white dress of a neophyte."

Chapter X has an interesting account of Henry's marriage with Catharine of Aragon and of the reasons he alleged for his divorce. On page 71 there is a reference to the two Roman decrees on marriage, "Tametsi" (Council of Trent) and the "Ne Temere" of 1907. The former was not published in England, but two American Protestants resident in Paris were astonished to learn that their marriage contracted in England was declared invalid by Roman authorities. The Decree had not been framed only for Roman Catholics and ruled that marriage contracted "otherwise than in the presence of the parish priest is invalid and null." We would like to have the date of this business. The "Ne Temere" decree was not intended to apply to those who are not Roman Catholic, but as it decreed that only marriages contracted before the parish priest were valid for Roman Catholics, it put a stop to mixed marriages by compelling the Protestant party to be baptised in the Roman Church, and so caused the Roman priest to commit the sin of anabaptism, from which the Pope cannot dispense as it is a divine law—"*One Baptism.*" The chapter on dispensations concerning fasting (XII) is full of interesting matter. He quotes the Jesuit Suarez—"One thing is certain: the precept concerning the receiving of the Eucharist before all food and drink was not imposed jure divino." Pope Benedict XIV in 1756 gave a dispensation to James III, King of Great Britain—the father of Bonnie Prince Charlie—to receive the sacrament without fasting on the ground of illness. The document in which this dispensation is set out, gives historical precedents, quotes St. Augustine's rule, and refers to similar dispensations granted to priests in India and elsewhere and one to Queen Christina of Bohemia on her coronation day. The Emperor, Charles V, received a dispensation from the rule of fasting communion on the ground of ill health, after he had retired to a monastery. Night-nurses and others who are prevented by their occupation from fasting were exempted, because it is not a divine law they are breaking.

On pages 128–137 there is an important discussion on marriage with a deceased wife's sister in which Archbishop Davidson's words are quoted: "Church and State have hitherto agreed in condemning marriages with a deceased wife's sister. The State

has now changed its mind, and has sanctioned these marriages, but in doing so has left the clergy free to continue to act on their own convictions." He asks: "What ought the clergy, to whom Parliament has left a clear discretion, to do?" This is surely a case where a man must act according to his lights.

In his last chapter, "Conclusions," the author discusses four important cases for the Church of England: (1) dispensations concerning rubrics of the Prayer Book (he says it is clear that the bishop's function is to explain the rubric in question, not to dispense one from observing it); (2) dispensing from Confirmation (he notes that as dispensation is an act of jurisdiction and as the bishop has no control over a Nonconformist who is outside his jurisdiction, he, therefore, has no dispensing power regarding such); (3) dispensations concerning preachers in the English Church. This subject is clearly and firmly dealt with. He quotes the Canon XXXVI of 1604 and its modification in 1865 to show the mind of the Church of England regarding the preachers in its sacred buildings and that it is clearly against a man preaching in a Church of England pulpit, much more being ordained for her sacred ministry, who holds Unitarian doctrine. He well says: "No authority but the Church itself can allow its priests to omit or reject any portion whatever of its Creed. No individual Bishop has any authority to give a man a Dispensation enabling him not to teach a portion of the Creed of Christendom. No such power has ever been entrusted to any Diocesan Bishop anywhere. It would be entirely contrary to the Church's constitution, to the function of the Episcopate, to the very purpose for which the Church exists." Fourthly, with regard to dispensations to receive communion from ministers who are not priests, he says no proof has been given that a bishop can give a dispensation of that kind to a member of the Church of England. The right of such a member to receive the Lord's Supper from a Presbyterian or Congregationalist rests on no authoritative declaration of the Church of England in its corporate capacity. He has no authority therefore for his action. Our author would be the last to say he may not do so if he wishes. This is a matter for one's own conscience. But our author is on sure ground when he says no bishop can give a dispensation in such a case, for dispensation implies jurisdiction and he has no jurisdiction over Nonconformist chapels or Presbyterian churches.

There is a great amount of valuable and interesting matter in this excellent work which gives one furiously to think upon many pressing Church problems. Even though one may not always see eye to eye with him, he never fails to interest and instruct. One parting word, in a discussion on the late addition in the first Gospel—"except for the cause of *fornication*" (porneia), he notes that the word applies to a sin before marriage, i.e., that the woman was not a virgin, also that an old view was that it was used here in "a technical rabbinical sense for marriage within the prohibited Levitical degrees." This is, however, not convincing. It is more probable that it means "except for the cause of *prostitution*," for

porneia is the conduct of a *pornē*." And we know that in Rome under the early emperors noble matrons followed that profession (see Juvenal) and the fashion was most probably followed elsewhere. This is the more logical view, for no one could expect a man to remain tied to a prostitute, even though Hosea, for his own purpose, married one.

F. R. M. H.

HEALING. PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN. By George Gordon Dawson, M.A., B.D. (Cantab.). *S.P.C.K.* 9*s*.

Many of us who are really interested in the subject of Divine Healing have longed for a book like this. So many of those already issued on this important subject are disappointing because of their strong emotionalism or because of their bias in favour of some theory to account for, or even to ignore, pain. We venture to think that those clergy and ministers who ignore the important subject with which the present volume deals are quite wrong. The progress of medical science has brought us face to face with a curious and suggestive fact. "Filth" diseases, as they are called, are being slowly but surely vanquished, while the brilliant discoveries of scientists and medical men regarding microbes and germs, have made us hope that at no distant date all the toxic scourges of humanity will be brought under control.

But in these days of speed and rush there can be little doubt that disorders of the nervous system, ailments that are half-moral and half-physical, are spreading with remarkable rapidity. Neurotic patients everywhere seek healing. The rise in our own time of Christian Science, Faith Healing and all sorts of "Cures" show that many are seeking healing apart from medical men. Christian Science is, as I think, mistaken in its theories about pain and mortal mind, but its devotees see, what its founder saw, that there are multitudes of people who need spiritual healing. This book will help us to find our way through a very difficult subject. If we are to be guided aright it must be by someone who believes in the Powers of the Spirit. Yet he must have a real attitude towards the body. Dr. Burnet Rae describes the distress of a clergyman who had been on the point of resigning his parish because his faith had collapsed. A doctor friend persuaded him to take a month's holiday and to consume large quantities of beef tea, and his faith was restored. He was then distressed because, as he thought, his faith rested on a material foundation, since quantities of beef tea could restore it. He did not realise that an overworked, underfed clergyman was an easy prey to the devil! He had failed to adopt a real attitude to his body. But our pen is running away with us on this very interesting subject. It has been stimulated by the careful reading of this very important book.

Unless we are greatly mistaken the author is Vice-Principal of Oakhill Theological College. What is quite certain is that he is a man of very extensive knowledge and wide reading. This book bears the marks of undoubted scholarship and ability to think

clearly, impartially and spiritually. It is one of the most interesting books we have read for a long time. Mr. Dawson begins by giving us some very fine chapters on primitive conceptions of Disease and Death. He finds that disease is a phenomenon much older than man. He writes of the primitive doctor, and then of the healing art amongst the Sumerians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Egyptians, Persians, Greeks, Romans and Jews, until the time of Christ. An enthralling chapter on " Jesus Christ and Healing " leads on to a discussion of healing in Pre-Reformation, Reformation and Post-Reformation times. He discusses Christian Science, Lourdes, Psycho-analysis, and all the way through he insists that we must consciously depend upon the Living Christ. Hear how he sums it all up: " All medical agents, all surgery, all hygiene, all physical, mental, moral and spiritual education must, where valid and true, fit in with the redemptive scheme of God the Father, Who is Eternal Love, until Christ completes the final act of Divine Redemption by offering up the Kingdom to God, that He may be all in all " (p. 308). This is a book to buy. It is a mine of information and a monument of learning. It should earn for its author the title of Doctor of Divinity.

A. W. P.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOKS OF THE APOCRYPHA. By W. O. E. Oesterley. *S.P.C.K.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

The Apocrypha has of late years received a good deal of attention, as its value as a connecting link between the Old Testament and the New has been increasingly manifest. There was something unsatisfactory about the older method of leaving a gap of some four and a half centuries between the traditional date of the closing of the Old Testament and the coming of Christ. It may have satisfied an age whose outlook on life was catastrophic and which experienced no difficulty in imagining so lengthy an interval between the acts of the great drama of Redemption. But to a generation whose outlook is evolutionary and based on a belief in an orderly and progressive revelation of the divine mysteries to mankind a lengthy interval in human history such as this is unimaginable. A bridge must be found to fill the gap; and such a bridge is found in the Books of the Apocrypha.

In his latest work, Dr. Oesterley does not aspire to the transient glory of startling new theories on the origin and outlook of the different books of the Apocrypha; but rather to the more solid fame of bringing together the results of the labours of scholars during the last quarter of a century, and presenting them in a clear manner and readable form in a volume of less than 350 pages. We congratulate the author on a remarkable achievement, and dare to predict that, though in the course of time fresh research may render some of the conclusions obsolete, this work will remain for many years to come a most valuable outline of the subject for scholars who are commencing their studies in the Apocrypha. It is a worthy companion-volume to the works which the author, in collaboration

with Dr. Robinson, has given us on the Old Testament, and no higher praise can be given than this.

The volume is divided into two parts. The former deals with Prolegomena; the latter is a commentary on the different books. In his Introduction the author hints that the former section will be found the more valuable, and its wide scope is indicated by the headings of some of the chapters, such as "The Apocrypha as Literature," "A Survey of the Historical Background," "The Wisdom Literature," "The Apocalyptic Literature," "The Doctrinal Teaching of the Apocrypha," "The Importance of the Apocrypha for New Testament Study," and "The Apocrypha in the Church." One of the most interesting chapters is that which deals with the Wisdom literature. The connection between this literature and Hellenistic thought has long been recognised; but Dr. Oesterley emphasises the fact that it has affinities with other Wisdom literatures as well, and that these extraneous influences are important in its early development. "It is well to emphasise the fact," he writes, "that the Old Testament writers fully recognised the existence of Wisdom teachers outside their own borders, from quite early times. . . . It is quite clear that the Israelites were acquainted with the wisdom of Babylon, Egypt, Syria, Arabia and Edom; and so far as Babylon and Egypt are concerned, we have seen that material of the Wisdom type, with which the Hebrew sages were doubtless familiar, must have been abundant in these two countries." Hellenistic thought did not influence the Hebrew Wisdom writers till a much later date, when it was responsible for the deeper speculation we find in the Book of Wisdom. Though the limits of the book obviously render impossible any detailed treatment of the various points raised, we wish that Dr. Oesterley had been able to deal more fully with the hypostatisation of Wisdom, a subject that is raised in the closing paragraph of the Chapter.

The chapter on the Apocalyptic literature is likewise most valuable, but perhaps the most important in the volume is that which deals with the doctrinal teaching of the Apocrypha. How widely the outlook of the various writers differs is clearly demonstrated, and yet the underlying conceptions are common to all—the doctrine of God, for instance, throughout the Apocrypha, is taken for granted, being the highest form of the theology of the Old Testament. Dr. Oesterley contends that, on the subject of the Torah, most of the books are written from a Pharisaic standpoint, though a less orthodox view is expressed in the second part of Wisdom and II Esdras. The later sections on "The Hereafter," "The Resurrection," "Angelology," and "Demonology" will be found most illuminating by those who are anxious to understand the extent to which men believed in these things at the time of Our Lord.

The second part of the volume is of more particular interest to those who are concerned with the study of the different books in the Apocrypha than to those whose object it is to gain a general view of the Apocrypha as a whole. The important subjects in

each book, its date and its origin are dealt with briefly, and the views of the principal authorities expounded in a clear and impartial manner, though Dr. Oesterley does not hesitate to let us know the extent to which he is in agreement with them. At the close of each chapter is a valuable bibliography. Incidentally, this part of the volume reveals in a most striking manner the amount that has been written in recent years on the Apocrypha. Archdeacon Charles is but scarcely mentioned, although it seems but a few years ago since he was regarded as one of the principal English authorities on the subject. One cannot help wondering how long it will be before the views and theories set forth in this volume will have passed into oblivion!

THE STORY OF THE BIBLE. A POPULAR ACCOUNT OF HOW IT CAME TO US. By Sir Frederic Kenyon, G.B.E., K.C.B., F.B.A., P.S.A. *John Murray*. 3*s*. net.

For the general reader and the student alike this story of the Bible and its transmission from the early days of the Church is of special value and interest. Sir Frederic Kenyon has had a fascinating story to tell and he has told it in a thoroughly fascinating way, absorbing the reader's interest from the first page to the last. The history of the Bible is a romance of literature and the discoveries in recent years of papyri and manuscripts continue to add to the romance.

Beginning with the Old Testament the story is told of the earliest writing in Hebrew. It is now accepted that writing was well known in and about Palestine in the time of Moses. Not so very long ago there were scholars who were prepared to deny the existence of writing until many years later, but the work of the excavators has brought the truth in this and in many other matters of Biblical research to light. It is probably not generally known that the earliest Hebrew Manuscript now known of any part of the Bible dates only from the ninth century and is a copy of the Pentateuch in the British Museum. There are various copies of the Septuagint and one of the most interesting discoveries of quite recent date is that of the Chester Beatty papyri which were found in several jars in some unknown part of Egypt. They are at present being prepared for publication and we believe that the preparation and editing have been entrusted to the competent hands of the author of this *Story of the Bible*. The chapter on "How the Books of the New Testament were written" tells the story of some of the earliest of the papyri rolls and of the later use of vellum. A chapter is devoted to the changes effected by the introduction of printing and another tells the history of the English Bible. To many readers probably the most fascinating portion of the book will be that devoted to the discovery of manuscripts and the endeavours made to classify them. Some standardisation was thought to have been reached in the work of Westcott and Hort and the division of the manuscripts into groups known as the Byzantine, the Western and the Neutral texts, but the recent discovery of

earlier texts than those previously known has led to many modifications of their scheme. This is the part of the story that will be most unfamiliar to the reader and the book has special value on account of the record it contains of these recent discoveries and the modifications that they have produced. The general conclusion is that " the Alexandrian text gives us on the whole the nearest approximation to the original form of the sacred books." We welcome the assurance with which the book closes : " It is reassuring at the end to find that the general result of all these discoveries and all this study is to strengthen the proof of the authenticity of the Scriptures, and our conviction that we have in our hands in substantial integrity the veritable Word of God."

The series of plates which are provided give those who have not an opportunity of visiting the British Museum an indication of what the earliest manuscripts are like.

THE PARABLES OF THE KINGDOM. By C. H. Dodd, M.A., D.D., Norris-Hulse Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. *Nisbet & Co.* 7*s.* net.

This volume on the Parables of the Kingdom is based on a course of Shaffer lectures given in the Divinity School of Yale University, U.S.A. The method of dealing with the parables seems to indicate a critical spirit that leans heavily to the side of caution. The opening chapter is on " The Nature and Purpose of the Gospel Parables." It practically opens with the statement that there is no general agreement in the interpretation of the parables. The difference between a parable and an allegory is insisted on, and any allegorical method of interpretation is not admitted. At its simplest the parable is a simile or metaphor, and in the interpretation the most important principle to be observed is that only one single point of comparison is to be noted while in an allegory such as the *Pilgrim's Progress* each detail has a significance of its own. Another rule of interpretation is that " we must carefully scrutinise the parable itself, and attempt to relate it to the original situation so far as we can reconstruct it." This is rendered difficult as ideas which developed in the early Church have in some cases been attached to them. The second chapter goes on to consider the meaning of the expression " The Kingdom of God," and distinguishes two main uses of it : the Kingdom as present fact, and the Kingdom as something to come. In both the fundamental idea is that of divine sovereignty. After an examination of various apocalyptic passages he states as his conclusion that there is on the historical plane " no eschatology of bliss " in the sayings of Jesus. There is to be no readjustment of conditions on this earth but in the glories of a world beyond this. The third chapter is a further examination of apocalyptic ideas as suggested in the expression " The Day of the Son of Man." The theories of Form-criticism are dealt with in a chapter on the " Setting in Life," and the changes in the interpretation of several parables due to the change in conditions from the time when they were originally uttered are indicated. The

tendency was to turn sayings of Jesus uttered in reference to a particular situation into general maxims for the guidance of the Church. Two chapters are devoted to the "Parables of Crisis" and the "Parables of Growth." In conclusion Dr. Dodd feels that his insistence upon the intense particularity of the parables has reduced their value as instruments of religious teaching, and that if we wish to generalise the teaching of the parables we will do well to be guided by their original and particular application. We must say that those who seek in this volume for such guidance in the use of the parables will be disappointed. The general impression left is that it is extremely difficult to arrive at any satisfactory interpretation of them and that they cannot be applied to the one great theme for which preachers have used them constantly—the thought of the Kingdom of God in this world that would mean the ultimate sovereignty of God in the affairs of the world. The gap between the thought of our expert theologians and that of the average man is becoming as great as that between the scientist's view of the world and the popular view, but the consequences are much more serious in the case of theology.

THE GOSPEL OF GRACE. Islington Clerical Conference Papers. *The Lutterworth Press.* 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

The addresses delivered at the last Islington Clerical Conference have been published by the Lutterworth Press in attractive book form at the moderate cost of 1*s.* 6*d.* The subject of the Conference was "The Gospel of Grace," and the Rev. J. M. Hewitt, the Vicar of Islington, succeeded in gathering around him a band of scholarly writers who did full justice to the subject. The President, in his opening address, dealt more generally with Church affairs and made several frank and useful criticisms of some of their chief features. The programme was admirably arranged and commenced with the consideration of Grace in the New Testament by the Rev. J. Russell Howden, B.D. This was followed by two papers that exhibited in full measure the scholarship of younger members of the Evangelical school. The Rev. F. D. Coggan dealt with Grace and Merit from the philosophical and theological point of view. The Rev. J. E. Fison, of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, dealt in the same way with the subject of Grace and Truth. Dr. Sydney Carter, in his usual scholarly and accurate fashion, gave some practical applications of Grace in connection with Orders and Re-union. Two papers of practical value were given on the Means of Grace. The Rev. F. S. Cragg, of St. Aldate's, Oxford, dealt with Prayer and Bible Study in a thoroughly inspiring way, and the Rev. F. B. Heiser, Principal of St. Aidan's College, treated the Sacraments with a full application of the Evangelical view. The closing paper by the Rev. Bryan W. Isaac, Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, showed the intimate connection between Grace and Evangelism and the way in which they should work out in the practical life of a parish. An interesting Foreword to the published addresses is supplied by Canon L. W. Grensted. He was not present at the Conference, but his

reading of the addresses impressed him with the fact that they were not mere ephemeral productions. The subject is one of the main rocks upon which the structure of Christian theology is built. They contain, he says, no mean store of learning, and wisdom and inspiration as well. He adds some useful notes on the early use of the word Grace, and concludes with a warning against any quasi-material conception, and emphasises the great achievement of Luther and the Reformation Movement in restoring the Pauline conception of the Grace of God as a personal relationship between God and man.

THE CALL TO ACTION IN DEFENCE OF CHURCH AND STATE IN ENGLAND. By the Rev. C. W. Hale Amos, D.D. *Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd.* 5*s.* net.

Dr. Hale Amos has gathered in this volume the various papers which have been associated with his Call to Action as well as the response which it received in various parts of the country. The Challenge to Action in October, 1933, is dealt with in a chapter, where " Behind the Anglican Smoke-Screen " is given in full. The correspondence on the whole subject is continued in the following chapters, and the growing tide of support is indicated. The events of the following two years are then given, and a wide variety of opinion is focussed on the central theme. In connection with the Church and State Commission a paper on the Threatened Peril, by Dr. Amos, is given, and the call to further action is strongly emphasised, especially the call for a National Protestant Council of Action. This is followed by a chapter headed " Let Us Pray " which again represents the widespread interest aroused by Dr. Hale Amos's appeal. The following chapter is headed " The Protestant Reveille," and the last, containing extracts from the Diary of Dr. Amos, is entitled the " Will to Action." It also contains a contribution from Mr. H. Wreford Glanvill. The mass of material in this volume shows the interest that Dr. Amos has aroused, and the book is valuable as a summary of instructive information on the whole subject. The united action which he advocates will undoubtedly be of great advantage in maintaining the Protestant character of the Church of England.

JESUS, PAUL AND THE JEWS. By James Parkes, D.Phil. *S.C.M.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

Dr. Parkes has already written *The Jew and his Neighbour* and *The Church and the Synagogue.* In this book he attempts a detailed examination of the attitude of the New Testament towards Judaism and the Jews, devoting special attention to the Pharisees. Scholars of late have shown a tendency to whitewash the religious leaders of our Lord's time and to assert, as Dr. Parkes does, that " Nothing in the teaching of Jesus made necessary the separation between Judaism and Christianity." Scholars will have to deal adequately and carefully with the argument of this book. In a foreword H. M. J. Loewe, Lecturer in Rabbinics in the University of Cambridge, writes a " Haskamah " or commendation of this book to

readers of his own faith. This book is a sign of the times. In Germany Jews are being driven further away from Christianity. In this country there is a growing spirit of "Fraternisation." There is a short bibliography and an excellent index.

A. W. P.

MY PRIESTHOOD. By Walter J. Carey, D.D. *Longmans.* Cheap Edition, *2s. 6d.*

This excellent pastoral book was published in 1915 and five new impressions followed in succeeding years, the last being issued in June, 1925, and all the others during the Great War. The author and publisher have done well to reissue it in a cheaper edition. Bishop Carey, formerly of Bloemfontein, has evidently taken his ordination addresses seriously. As an undergraduate he knew men like Father Woodward of the Sacred Mission, Father Stanton and Father Dolling, and he saw in them and later in Dean Church and many others ideals of the priesthood which he has striven to follow and which he expounds in this book. He says: "It is the Catholic ideal I believe: neither ultramontane nor protestant Catholic and evangelical; orthodox yet liberal; convinced yet charitable." There is in it a burning love for souls and a real devotion to Jesus Christ. It is the best book written from its own standpoint we have seen, and the Bishop does not hesitate to write: "Yet Communion is not magic." A. W. P.

MOHAMMED, THE MAN AND HIS FAITH. By Tor Andrae. *George Allen & Unwin.* *8s. 6d.*

Professor Andrae's reputation has spread from the University of Upsala over nearly all the Continent. He has made a special study of the faith of Islam and wrote his first work on Mohammed eighteen years ago. This volume is a translation from the German by Theophil Menzil of the Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves. The book is one which will be greatly enjoyed by the average reader who is interested in the origins of religion. It is singularly free from technicalities. Dr. Tor Andrae contends that the nature of Mohammedan piety has generally been rather unjustly ignored by Western students of religion, and he gives us reasons for this prejudice. After a valuable historical chapter on Arabia at the time of Mohammed he deals with the prophet's childhood and call. He then considers his message; his doctrine of revelation; his conflict with the Koreish and after a further chapter on "The Ruler in Medina" sums up "Mohammed's Personality," in which he deals with such matters as his sensuality and polygamy—the Prophet was the husband of one wife until he had passed his fiftieth year. Nobody who really wishes to understand the rise of Islam should neglect this book. The author himself is a disciple of Soederblom, late Archbishop of Upsala, a renowned expert in the field of Comparative Religions. He has held the chair of the History and Psychology of Religion at the University of Upsala since 1929.

A. W. P.

NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS.

THE name of Toyohiko Kagawa is well known in missionary circles in this country, both through the record of his work in the slums of Japan and through his visits to this country when some of us had the privilege of meeting him. Several of his books have been translated into English and have found a wide circle of readers in English-speaking countries. A volume of poems from his pen has been translated, or interpreted as the English exponent phrases it, and is issued under the title *Songs from the Slums* (Student Christian Movement Press, 2*s.* 6*d.* net). They were mostly written during his residence in an appalling slum. They are "poignant revelations of the ghastly conditions prevailing there and of the spirit of the man who voluntarily endured them in order to serve the people." The poems may lose something of their literary quality in the translation, but nevertheless they convey sufficient of the spirit of their writer and of the terrible surroundings in which they were written. Admirers of Kagawa and his work owe a debt to Lois J. Erickson for admitting them to a fresh insight into the soul of this great Japanese Christian leader. They range from the depths of sadness produced by the sights around him to the height of joy in the message of Christ for even the most degraded people. A short account of Kagawa's conversion and his first acquaintance with the Christian faith are given, which serve to add to the impressiveness of his literary work.

For some thirty years the Bishop of London has secured from some eminent preacher a book suitable for Lent reading. It has occurred to someone to select one chapter from ten of these works and to issue them in one volume as specially suitable for Lenten study. They are issued under the title *Religion in Life* (Longmans, Green & Co., 3*s.* 6*d.* net). The Bishop of London commends the selection in a Foreword, and suggests that it may lead to the re-reading of some of the books that have been found helpful in past years. The chapters chosen are well arranged and deal for the most part with the great fundamental aspects of the Christian Life. It is only possible and it is probably sufficient to give the names of the authors and to indicate their subjects. The Rev. W. P. McCormick on "A Right Idea of God"; Bishop Brent on "The Groundwork of God's Character"; the Rev. G. A. Studdert Kennedy on "The Word became Flesh"; Bishop Woodward on "What think Ye of Christ?"; Miss Evelyn Underhill on "Crucified"; the Rev. G. F. Holden on "The Approach of the Holy Ghost"; Archbishop W. Temple on "The Primary Need—Conversion"; Dean Inge on "Self-Consecration"; Rev. W. H. Elliott on "A Defence of Credulity" and Bishop H. H. Montgomery on "Easter Morning." We have found the re-reading of some of these passages refreshing and inspiring.

A warm welcome will be given to the reprint at a cheaper price of Canon Peter Green's *The Problem of Right Conduct* (Longmans, Green & Co., 3*s*. 6*d*. net). When it first appeared in the year 1931 it achieved a wide circulation as many felt that this was just the book for which they had been seeking in order to set out the bearing of Christian teaching on some of the practical problems of life, especially those which were the subject of thought among the younger generation. The book is called *A Text Book of Christian Ethics* and Canon Green makes clear the very definite use he makes of the term "Christian Ethics." There are numerous books on Ethics, but they are not written with a clear and definite Christian background. He seeks to answer the questions, "What do you mean by right and wrong?" and, "Why may I not do as I choose?" and these lead back to first principles. These must be Christian throughout, and must present a complete system, showing the basis of Ethics, the principles deducible from the basis and the application of those principles under special conditions. Conduct cannot be dissociated from belief. Such truths as Incarnation, Atonement, Regeneration, Conversion and Sanctification must affect ethical theory, and the value of Canon Green's study is that it shows the bearing of them upon conduct. The main fact is that man is a spiritual being and all his actions must be governed by that fact. The practical application is one of the most useful and interesting portions of the work, which form an excellent guide for the study of both young and old.

The Rev. Bernard Clements was recently appointed Vicar of All Saints', Margaret Street, London, by the Bishop of London. The nature of the teaching given in this Church is indicated by a book called *The Precepts of The Church* which the Vicar has just issued (Longmans, Green & Co., 2*s*. 6*d*. net). The first precept is to be present at Mass on Sundays, and the greater Holy days, and here, as in several other places, reference is made to the requirements of the Church of Rome as if they represented the true standard. The third precept is to go to Confession at least once a year, and instructions are given as to the way to make a Confession. The fourth precept is to fast in Lent and to eat no meat on Fridays. This is said to be required by Canon law. The fifth precept is to uphold the Church's marriage law, and here, again, the Roman Church with its useful Decree of Nullity is set up as a standard. The sixth precept is to give regularly to the support of the Church and Ministry, and its comparative importance may be judged by the fact that about thirty-four lines are devoted to it. The last section is devoted to a plea for the use of the Hail Mary, and we are told that it should be accompanied by a genuflection or a bowing of the head. St. Louis of France, we are told, said it fifty times each evening, and knelt down and stood up each time. St. Margaret of Hungary recited it on certain days a thousand times with a thousand prostrations. We can only feel that their time might have been more usefully employed, and that

such methods of devotion seem to be in line with the praying wheel of the native of Tibet.

Anglo-Catholics are ceaseless in their propaganda activities in all directions. Public School religion has been a favourite subject of their animadversions for a considerable time past. Two writers now come into the open with a demand for *The Catholic Faith in Public Schools* (Williams & Norgate, Ltd., 4*s*. net). The authors are the Revs. F. G. Baring and G. J. Ince, who claim to have some acquaintance with Public School life. They are backed by the Bishop of Bradford, who writes a Foreword, and Dr. Hubert Box, who contributes a Preface. The Bishop thinks that the teaching in the Public Schools is not dogmatic enough, and that the Chapel services lack the appeal of mystery and beauty which he thinks a more sacramental worship would give. We are not surprised that he lays the blame partly on the homes, for the great majority of parents do not desire their children to be brought up in an Anglo-Catholic atmosphere any more than in what the Bishop has described more than once offensively as " flat-faced undenominationalism." The authors pay a tribute to the zeal of Evangelicals in making the religious life of the boys in their schools effective, but their desire is to introduce into the larger Public Schools auricular Confession under the guise of what they call " The Sacrament of Penance." They inform us that in a Roman Catholic School this is part of the normal religious life, but it cannot at the present time be said of Church of England Schools. We hope that it will never be possible to say it of such Schools, knowing as we do the weakening effect of such Confession on moral character. They also wish the introduction of the Mass, but we believe it will be a long time also until this hope has any likelihood of being realised.

The Bishop of London's Lent book this year is *O Men of God* and is written by an American clergyman, Canon B. Iddings Bell, of Providence, U.S.A. (Longmans, Green & Co., 2*s*. 6*d*. net). In his preface the Bishop of London says that the writer goes straight to the point " if man is only a clever animal, then religion goes by the board . . . if it is true that the ' successful man ' is naturally that one that makes the best of this world and is able to amass wealth and comfort and have a good time. If it is not, and man is a ' praying animal ' and born for higher things, then the so-called ' successful man ' is the worst failure possible, however rich he may be."

Worship and Intercession, by Ruth Hardy (Longmans, Green & Co., 3*s*. 6*d*. net), is written by a busy doctor in the Mission Field, and is preceded by a Foreword from the Bishop of Bradford. Apart from the advanced Churchmanship represented, there is much earnest and sincere devotional writing which some may find helpful.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

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

Church and State.—Bishop Knox has written an admirable little pamphlet on the recently issued Report on Church and State entitled *The Cry for Freedom*, which suggests as a policy for Evangelicals that they should do all in their power to prevent the submission of the proposals of the Report to Parliament, as it is impossible to foresee what disastrous effects might attend the demand for severance between Church and State. *The Cry for Freedom* is published by the Church Book Room, price 2*d.*

The Report of the Archbishops' Commission on the Relation between Church and State should be studied, together with the Evidence. It is issued in two volumes, price 10*s.*

We would again recommend the following books and pamphlets for study on this subject: *Establishment in England*, by Sir Lewis Dibdin, D.C.L. (7*s.* 6*d.*); *The Nation and the Nation's Worship* (1*s.*), and *Disestablishment and the Prayer Book* (6*d.*), by the Bishop of Norwich; *The Christian Church and the Christian State*, by Robert Stokes, with a Foreword by the Rt. Hon. Sir Thomas Inskip (6*d.*); *A Christian State* (6*d.*), articles reprinted from *The Times*, with a preface by Sir Lewis Dibdin, D.C.L.; and *Whither the Church?* by Captain W. A. Powell (6*d.*).

Holy Week.—A course of seven addresses entitled *The Significance of the Cross*, by the Rev. Edwin Hirst, Vicar of St. Paul, Stockport, will be found valuable for use in Holy Week. It contains a concise history of the doctrine of the Atonement. For Good Friday we would remind our clerical readers of *A Form of Service for the Three Hours on Good Friday*, arranged by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D., and published by the Church Book Room at 2*d.* or 12*s.* per hundred. In connection with this Dr. Gilbert has also written a series of addresses, Some Great Truths about Redemption, entitled *Seven Times He Spake* (6*d.*). The two can be sent for 9*d.* post free. Another series of addresses entitled *The Seven Words from the Cross*, by the Rev. H. Browning (6*d.*), is also published by the Church Book Room.

New Pamphlets.—The following have been issued in the "Church and Life Series" (Church Book Room, 2*d.* each): *The Evangelical as a Churchman*, by Canon Dyson Hague, D.D.; *The Priesthood of the Laity*, by Canon A. W. Parsons; *The Practice of Confession in the Church of England*, by Prebendary H. W. Hinde, M.A.; and a fourth on Gambling, entitled *Tips and Tipsters*, by Canon H. Frazer, is now in the press.

Young People's Services.—A new edition has been called for of the Four Forms of *Young People's Services*, with Prayers for Special Occasions, arranged by the Rev. R. Bren, M.A., Vicar of Leyton. These have been found exceedingly useful, as will be seen from the fact that the booklet is now in its nineteenth thousand. The price is 3*d.* or 18*s.* per 100.

The Life and Work of John Wycliffe.—"'If I have been able, in the writing of this new edition of Wycliffe, to stir anyone to stand up for Christ and the Truth,' so Canon Dyson Hague expresses his aim and hope. And the book is so sound, so well informed, so loyal to Reformation truth and to

Bible truth, that his aim and hope will be fulfilled in those who read it." The foregoing paragraph is an extract from the review of the book which appeared in the *Expository Times*. Another reviewer says, " This book has been pronounced, by many of those who read it before publication, to be the best of Dr. Dyson Hague's works." Yet another notice states, " This is a volume to be commended without reservation, and we bespeak for it the widest circulation." The price is 3*s*. 6*d*.

Nails Well Fastened.—This collection of passages from God's Word was compiled by an experienced missionary in India with a view to giving elementary instruction to those who have just emerged from heathenism. They have already been translated into many languages, and are now reissued in English as a suitable basis for elementary instruction at home, or for translation into the vernacular of any mission field. The booklet (2*d*.) is divided into the following sections, among others: Who and What is our God ?; God's Dealings with Men; Jesus the Saviour from Sin; Who is the Lord Jesus ?; The Christian Life; The Way to Victory. The Book Room has copies on sale, and suggests that in addition to the purpose named above, the booklet could be used by Christian workers when visiting in hospital or home.

The Revised Version.—Bishop Ellicott's *Addresses on the Revised Version of Holy Scripture* were reissued in view of the Jubilee of the Revised Version in 1935. The Addresses give the early and later history of the Revision, the character of the work and the public use of the Version. Appendices contain illuminating extracts from the writings of Westcott and Lightfoot. The price is 1*s*.

The Gospel of Grace.—The Islington Conference Papers for this year have been published under this title, and can be obtained for 1*s*. 6*d*. from the Book Room.