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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1936.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Charles Simeon Centenary.

THE centenary of the death of Charles Simeon is to be celebrated at Cambridge in November. A Commemoration Service will be held on Friday, November 13, the actual anniversary of his death, in Holy Trinity Church, and a series of commemoration services will be held on the following Sunday, and during the subsequent week. The addresses at these various services will be published in book form by the Lutterworth Press under the title, *Charles Simeon: An Interpretation* (1s. net). We are glad that the centenary of this great Evangelical leader is to be suitably commemorated. It has been noted that Evangelical Churchpeople have only too often in the past failed to do honour to those who have faithfully represented their cause. The life of Simeon was originally written in 1846 by the Rev. William Carus, a Canon Residentiary of Winchester. In 1892 Dr. Handley Moule wrote a *Life* in which he acknowledged his indebtedness to the *Memoirs* of Canon Carus. This volume was published by Methuen & Co. and has been for a long time out of print. They do not contemplate issuing a new edition of Bishop Moule's work, and we are, therefore, glad that Dr. Arthur J. Tait, Residentiary Canon of Peterborough Cathedral, has brought out a brief account of Simeon's Life in view of the coming celebration of the centenary. It is entitled *Charles Simeon and his Trust* and is based on Bishop Moule's *Life*. The Literature Committee of the S.P.C.K. express their pleasure in publishing the book especially as Simeon was blackballed for Membership of the Society between 1820 and 1824. He was, however, subsequently admitted.

The Simeon Trust.

Canon Tait gives a vivid account of Simeon's conversion, of his persecution in his early days as Vicar of Holy Trinity, Cambridge, where he was from 1782 to 1836. He tells of the foundation of the Patronage Trust and as there is so much prejudice in these days it is well to recall the conditions of many parishes in those early days. The Clergy have been described as unashamed pluralists, place-seekers and pleasure-hunters who displayed a spirit anything

but commendable. The Evangelical Clergy of those days were treated with practical barbarity. The Dean of Exeter, in his *Church and People*, tells of Bishop Marsh's theological trap to prevent Evangelicals being admitted to his diocese. He goes on to say: "They were even the victims of popular persecution. Charles Simeon's Church at Cambridge was made the scene of disgraceful rioting. For years they could obtain no preferment, and they propagated their message largely by means of Lectureships founded for afternoon sermons, and in proprietary chapels. Many of the best of them remained unbeneficed nearly all their lives. It was, in fact, this particular manifestation of the dislike which was felt for them which led to the founding of the Simeon Trust. . . . The moral improvement which can be traced in the quality of English life between the latter part of the eighteenth century and 1830 was mainly due to them." It is probably not too much to say that religion in many parts of England during those years of worldliness and stagnation was saved by Charles Simeon, who spent his own fortune very largely in his devotion to his efforts for the spread of the Christian Faith.

The New Catholicism.

Reference has recently been made in several quarters to the misuse of the word "Catholic." It is now frequently used in contrast with the term "Protestant" and even writers who ought to know better give away the title "Catholic" to the narrow and exclusive section of Christians who lay emphasis upon the Apostolical Succession and the peculiar system of religion that is bound up with it. The older English Churchmen used the term in its original sense of universal, and some of them declared that they were more truly Catholic because they were Protestant. The old Vincentian Canon that the Catholic Church must adhere to what has been believed everywhere, always, and by all, was used by such a writer as Bishop Andrewes to defend the Catholicity of the Church of England in his controversy with Bellarmine. It is largely due to the Tractarian movement that the prevalent misuse of the term has developed. This misuse is to be deplored as it gives a false impression when the words "the Catholic Church" are used in the prayer for All sorts and Conditions of Men. We are glad to see that a new conception of Catholicism is developing. It may well be based on Bishop Headlam's statement that "Catholic means universal and those things may claim to be Catholic which have been held with some degree of universality. By a curious aberration of mind the word Catholic is generally employed for what is clearly and definitely not Catholic." The conception of the "New Catholicism" is closely associated with the Declaration of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 which said: "The vision which rises before us is that of a Church genuinely Catholic, loyal to all truth and gathering into its fellowship all who profess and call themselves Christians, within whose visible unity all the treasures of Faith and Order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present shall be possessed in common

and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ." Those who look forward to the reunion of English-speaking Christians throughout the world can help to restore the word "Catholic" to its true meaning by using it only in the sense of this universal teaching which must be the essential feature of the New Catholicism.

William Tyndale.

William Tyndale was martyred at Vilvorde in Belgium on October 6, 1536. The four hundredth anniversary of his martyrdom will be commemorated during the present month. Probably few residents in London are aware that a statue of Tyndale stands in the Thames Embankment Garden. He is represented standing beside a printing-press with the open volume of the New Testament beside him. A tablet in front of the statue has the following record: "William Tyndale, First Translator of the New Testament into English from the Greek. Born A.D. 1484. Died a Martyr at Vilvorde in Belgium A.D. 1536. 'Thy Word is a lamp to my feet and a light to my path.'—'The entrance of Thy Word giveth light' (Psalm cxix. 105, 130). 'And this is the record that God hath given us Eternal Life and this life is in His Son' (1 John v. 11). The last words of William Tyndale were, 'Lord, Open the King of England's eyes.' Within a year afterwards a Bible was placed in every Parish Church by the King's command." On a tablet behind the statue is recorded the names of a number of organisations and institutions which contributed £100 each to the erection of the statue. This is a noble memorial in a prominent position to the memory of one of the great men to whom England owes her heritage of the Open Bible. His life was one of hardship and persecution nobly borne in the prosecution of a great design. One of his biographers says that "Heroic is in truth the appropriate epithet for the character of Tyndale; and heroic in the noblest and highest sense of that somewhat misused word. . . . His simplicity, his earnestness, his noble unselfishness, his love of truth, his independence, his clearness and force of mind, his invincible energy and power—these mark him out as a true hero, one of those great men specially raised up and qualified for a noble work whose lives always constitute a landmark in the annals of human history." Another writer says of him: "It is difficult to exaggerate the greatness of this achievement. Solitary, poor, in exile, exposed to the hostility of the ruling powers, William Tyndale was enabled to confer upon his countrymen a benefit quite incalculable in its blessing." It is fitting that "one of the simplest, noblest, most heroic of human souls" should be commemorated in a land which owes so great a debt to his arduous, lonely and persevering labours.

The World Situation.

The world situation seems to grow more menacing every day. The invasion and overthrow of the Abyssinians by the Italians had scarcely ceased to occupy attention before fresh distractions arose in Palestine and Spain. The conflict between the Jews and the

Arabs has accentuated a bitterness that has been growing ever since the immigration of the Jews into the country assumed such large proportions. A Commission has been appointed to enquire into the problems of Palestine, but we fear it will be a very long time before peace will be restored to that unhappy land. In the meantime the work of Christian missions to both Jew and Arab is being carried on with the greatest difficulty and there is little hope of much progress until the present turmoil has subsided. In Spain the Civil War has developed into a struggle in which no mercy is shown on either side. The revolt against the Government has evidently been long planned and has united the parties represented by the Army, the Royalists, the Fascists and the Roman Catholics. The Republican Party represented by the Government has naturally given the extremists an opportunity of expressing their hatred of the Roman Church and its allies. Communists, anarchists, syndicalists and all the disaffected members of the proletariat, assisted no doubt by a sprinkling of Bolshevists and financial aid from Russia, have come in on the side of the Government probably in the hope of ultimately securing their own aims. The wholesale murders and the burning of churches have shocked the conscience of Europe. No one can say what the future of that unhappy land will be. The small groups of members of the Reformed Church will, we fear, be in a difficult situation. If the Roman Church regains its sway the old persecution will be resumed and if the Communists win there may be a campaign against all religion similar to that which has been carried on in Russia. We can only pray that God will overrule events for the advancement of His Kingdom.

Our Contributors.

Among our contributors this quarter are several whose names are well known to our readers. Bishop Knox makes an original examination of the University life of the medieval period. Dr. Sydney Carter subjects the report of the Rumanian Delegation to a careful scrutiny. Dr. Montgomery Hitchcock deals with the recent work of a Roman Catholic writer on the Reformation Mass and Priesthood. Mr. W. Guy Johnson gives an account of William Tyndale in view of the celebrations of the present month. Dr. Lieselotte Linnhoff is a German writer who has made a special study of Spain when the Reformation Movement was strong there. Some portions of her book have a special appropriateness at the present time.

THE STORY OF THE STRONG MAN ARMED.

(*The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages.* By the late Hastings Rashdall. A new edition in three volumes, edited by F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden. £3 3*s*. Oxford, 1936.)

A REVIEW BY THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP E. A. KNOX, D.D.

I. RASHDALL REVIEWED.

AMONG gossipy legends current in Oxford Common Rooms in the 'seventies was one of a dispute in the Common Room of University College, when (so it was said) one of the Fellows maintained the fabulous foundation of the College by Alfred the Great. Professor Freeman, who was present, took up the cudgels, and bludgeoned the head of the rash maintainer of the College's antiquity with the formidable argument that he could prove to a certainty that Alfred the Great never owned an acre of land in or near Oxford. "Has it not occurred to you, Professor," was the reply, "that the great King is much more likely to have given away the land of other people than his own?" The story is characteristic of an age in which few members of either University were seriously interested even in the history of their own Colleges, to say nothing of University History. College histories were still unwritten. Guide-books, not far in advance of the days of Verdant Green, did service to reply to inquisitive sisters or aunts, who wanted to know how old the College was, and how it came by this building or that. Muniment rooms, very storehouses of medieval life, were still unexplored, or visited only by a few Dryasdusts.

It was by a strange irony of fate that the Tractarians branded as heretical Dr. Hampden, the one man among their contemporaries who had made some study of medieval philosophy. It is true that they based their system on the belief that it was to be found in the Fathers of the second and third centuries. "Men, not more remote in time from the Apostles than I am from my own grandfather taught the doctrines which I teach." So said Dr. Pusey to the writer of this article. Had the Tractarians studied theology in medieval Oxford they would have known that the Fathers were not all of one mind. They would have spent two years upon Peter the Lombard's *Harmony of the Discordant Opinions of the Fathers.* Not till they had mastered it would they have been permitted to read lectures upon the Bible. When the learned Evangelicals, Dr. Goode and Dr. Harrison, pointed out the errors of the Tractarians, they simply refused, with the exception of Dr. Ward, to read the confutation of their cardinal supposition that the Fathers all thought alike. It would have seemed to them incredible that Cranmer or Ridley should have known more about the Fathers than Newman or Pusey. But they did.

Now Dr. Rashdall was a student of philosophy, and was not content, as most Oxford teachers of his time were, to jump from Plato and Aristotle to Descartes, Spinoza, and Hume. He refused to leave the Schoolmen of the Middle Ages in the literary grave to which the Humanists of the seventeenth century had consigned them. He made it his business to trace the stream of philosophic thought through the "Dark Ages," and to know something of that forgotten world in which men, who had lost the knowledge of Greek, still contrived to study Aristotle through translations, and to relate him to the Scriptures and the Fathers. So he found himself at home in the Medieval Universities. He became especially at home in Paris and in Oxford. But thence he passed to the Italian Universities, to Bologna and Salerno, and on to the Universities of Spain, Germany, and Scotland. Anticipated slightly by Father Denifle's work on the *Origins of the Medieval Universities*, he was to all intents and purposes a pioneer in England. Though Bass Mullinger had written an excellent *History of the University of Cambridge*, it needs but a comparison of his book with Dr. Rashdall's to see how much the latter gained by not confining himself to a single University. For student life in the Middle Ages was not national, but cosmopolitan. It is true that provision was made for national groups within a University, and that we read of "Nations" at Paris, Oxford, Prague, Bologna, and several other Universities, though not in the German Universities. After all this was a most natural arrangement. When all the Lancashire towns took their holiday at Blackpool in the same week, it was common to see the lodging-house keepers describe themselves as "Mrs. A. of Bolton," "Mrs. B. of Burnley," "Mrs. C. of Blackburn," and so forth. Fellow-townsfolk flocked together. So they did in old days at Paris and Oxford. But for all that the Universities, especially in their earlier days, were not founded by nations, nor governed by nations. They had a common language, Latin, and spoke it fluently. They had common teachers. The *jus ubique docendi* was a highly coveted privilege. In their institutions, their studies, their relations with Church and State, and with the town in which they grew up, they had not only resemblances, but deliberately adopted common principles and practices. It was impossible to isolate their histories in the Middle Ages if any study of them was to be fruitful.

So Dr. Rashdall's book was epoch-making, at all events in England. But with a theme so vast finality was out of the question. Many other disadvantages had to be encountered. Though the Universities had so much in common, each had also its individual life, its origin, the story of its growth, the method of its government, often also the study to which it gave precedence. Hence came frequent repetitions in Rashdall's volumes; hence also dangers of hasty generalisations. The ten years which Dr. Rashdall devoted to the production of his book were all too short for his purpose. In the forty years since it appeared, diligent explorations in the muniment rooms of Universities and Colleges have brought to light stores of material which were not in Dr. Rashdall's reach. It is,

however, a real tribute to the greatness of his work that two such eminent students as Dr. Powicke and Mr. Emden have found in a fresh edition of Dr. Rashdall's book a convenient means of embodying some of the results of their studies. This does not mean that they are satisfied with all Dr. Rashdall's conclusions—far from it. But they recognise that his book gave the impetus to a more fruitful study of medieval life and thought, and that it has real value for the study of medieval thought now actively pursued by historians.

The natural effect of these researches has been to give a new outlook on what were called the Dark Ages.

" The result," says the Introduction, " of these labours is that the intense intellectual life of the Middle Ages is no longer presented as a long and weary orgy of barren chatter, interrupted by the orderly argument of a few men of genius, who are as isolated in history as they are great, but as a process of incessant wisdom and folly with distinguishable lines of development in it, a process which did not come to a sudden close on the appearance of Erasmus and Luther, nor linger fruitlessly in obsolete schools, but threw up ideas and ways of thought and speech which have profoundly influenced the science and philosophy of the modern world."

Rashdall was not unconscious of the influence of medieval philosophy on modern thought. His whole book is evidence to the contrary. But his rigid adoption of the year 1500 as the limit of his researches not only exposed him to the suspicion of yielding " to the artificial barrier which was set for so long by men's minds between the centuries," but it also deprived him of the opportunity of tracing the processes which both linked the old world with the new, and also set them in violent contrast with each other. On the whole, however, it is probable that the general reader will share our surprise that the corrections and additions in the new edition are not more serious and numerous than they are. It is a tribute to Rashdall's genius and industry that his work has stood so well the searching tests applied by modern exploration of archives.

To most readers of this Magazine no small part of the interest of Dr. Rashdall's work will lie in the evidence which it furnishes of the enormous strength of the fabric, spiritual and intellectual, against which the battle of the Reformation was fought. We are so accustomed to think of the corruptions of the Papacy, of the decay of monasticism, of the obscurantism exposed by Erasmus and Ulrich von Hutten, and of the cruel bondage imposed by ecclesiastical courts, to say nothing of a multitude of other sins, crimes, and infirmities of the Church of the Middle Ages, that the victory of the Reformers appears to be a foregone conclusion. It seems as though the walls of a world so debased must inevitably have fallen at the first blast of the trumpet of Luther, Calvin, and Knox. What surprises us is not that the victory was won, but that it was not won more universally and permanently. Readers of Macaulay's Essay on Ranke's *History of the Popes* will not have forgotten his characteristic denunciation of the failure of the Reformers. There is, however, another point of view, which is suggested by perusal of Rashdall's book, and still more by the researches of modern

historians into medieval life and thought. Behind the corruptions with which historians of the Reformation have made us familiar, there was a world of piety and learning built up by the studies and prayers of countless generations, a world to which belonged S. Anselm, S. Bernard, S. Francis, Dante, and in later ages such men as Sir Thomas More, Bishop Fisher, and the monks of the Charterhouse. However seriously we differ from the faith which they held and the doctrines which they taught, we cannot doubt that they believed themselves to be representatives of a Church which had saved Europe from barbarism, enriched it with thought and marvellous works of art and architecture, in fact representatives of a civilisation and devotion threatened with destruction by ill-taught fanatics and rebels. Was it any wonder that they loved the old order, and stood by it? And considering what forces were enlisted on its side is not the marvel rather that the Reformation gained a footing in Europe at all, rather than that its success was not more universal?

II. The Universities and the Reformation.

Amid such reflections as these the following remarks of Dr. Rashdall will be of peculiar interest:

"The Teutonic nation was the last of the nations of Europe to attain to moral and intellectual maturity: it was the last to assert its manhood by a rebellion against Roman usurpation, but it was the first to carry its revolt to a successful issue. The Reformation which succeeded, like the earlier Reform movement of the Middle Ages which had failed, was born in a University. There only were the culture and the learning, the leisure and the possibilities of co-operation, which were necessary for the growth of intellectual and religious revolt, found in union with that measure of liberty which was essential for an even temporary resistance to authority. The mass of the higher clergy was incapacitated for the work of reform, not so much because they were ecclesiastics as because they were primarily politicians and lawyers: the lower clergy were incapacitated by their ignorance and their obscurity; the monks by their wealth and their essential conservatism. An individual friar might indeed be a reformer, but the religious orders were opposed on principle to individual liberty, and were decidedly ultramontane in their tradition, except when they were carried away by visionary and unpractical enthusiasm like those of the spiritual Franciscans and the Fraticelli. It is hardly too much to say that the existence of Universities—Universities of the Northern type with secular faculties of theology—made the Reformation a possibility" (II, 2323).

The foregoing is only one of several allusions in Dr. Rashdall's book to the contribution of the Medieval Universities to the Reformation. In reality, however, his whole work stimulates reflection on the contrast in currents of thought which made, some for the old order, and some for the new. Some of these contending influences, as they are suggested to us by perusal of Dr. Rashdall's book, may be usefully traced in this article, leaving it to our readers to think out for themselves others yet more important, which lie beyond the confines of this study.

III. Canon Law.

A powerful factor, the study of Canon Law in the Universities, Dr. Rashdall stigmatises "one of the worst corruptions of the Middle Ages, since it transformed the sacerdotal hierarchy into a hierarchy of lawyers" (I, 140). Now the Canon Law was the law which was administered in the Courts of the Church. It consisted of Decrees of Church Councils and of Popes, and had at one time, in the days of barbarian inroads, been the law by which the clergy claimed to be governed, in contrast to the rude and harsh laws of their conquerors. It was a compound of Roman law, and Church law based on the Old and New Testaments. At the beginning of the eleventh century when Europe was settling down, and recovering from the inroads of barbarian hordes, collections began to be formed of the Canons or rules on which Church law rested. By far the most important of these was the *Decretum* of Gratian, published early in the twelfth century. It did not claim to be more than a textbook, a collection and harmonising of discordant decrees. It would not, however, be easy to exaggerate the importance of a textbook in the Middle Ages, when the written word was the last word in a dispute. But in fact "the *decretum* was the basis of a vast superstruction."

"By it the decrees of the Roman pontiffs were practically placed on a level in point of authority with the Canons of General Councils. Individual doctors might differ from the views of Gratian, particular States or even particular Churches might refuse to accord to the decrees of the Roman Pontiff the reception which was given them in the courts of Rome or the schools of Bologna, but nevertheless the eventual triumph of the *Decretum* is a monument of victory, at least within the bosom of the Church, of the ideas for which Hildebrand contended against the Emperor Henry IV, and St. Thomas against our Henry II" (1,129).

Important as the publication of the *Decretum* was in itself, it was even more important for the desire which it inspired in the minds of Canonists to elaborate a code of Church Law as complete and consistent as the code of Justinian, and to find for the Church and code a supreme authority as great and awe-inspiring as that of the Emperor on whose authority the Civil Law rested. That supreme and unquestionable authority they found in the Pope. Nor were the Popes slow to take advantage of the method of imposing their will on Christendom, which the *Decretum* suggested. In 1234 Gregory IX put out five books of Decretals to be studied in the schools of Paris and Bologna. In 1298 followed the *Liber Sixtus* of Boniface VIII. The *Clementines* of Clement V were added by John XXII in 1317, and were followed by the *Extravagantes* of Sixtus IV.

Now it has sometimes been contended that no part of the Canon Law was in force in England unless it had been expressly adopted in the Convocations. This view, in spite of high authority claimed for it, is erroneous. What is true is that the English Court of Law claimed as belonging to their authority first one, and then another of the matters for which provision was made in Canon Law. They

clipped the wings of the Canonists by drawing cases into the King's Courts. But they never denied that for ecclesiastical causes the Canon Law sufficed, nor drew any distinction between Decrees accepted or not accepted in England.

Thus there grew up in the Universities, and assuredly in Oxford and Cambridge, a study which came to be recognised as a training for public business and an avenue for preferments. All the Archbishops and Bishops who held civil office under the Crown, or were recognised as its advisers, were Canonists. Again, their secretaries were Canonists. A highly important brand of the clergy came into being, whose whole interests were bound up in the maintenance of Papal authority. They were men of vested interests of no common order. Their status had been laboriously and expensively acquired. For, after three years spent in an Arts Course, they had spent eight years on the study of Civil (i.e. of Roman) Law, and three years more in study of the *Decretum*. For two years, probably concurrently with the above, they must have heard lectures on the Bible, and must have themselves lectured on the Bible, and on a book of the Decretals. Some of our readers may remember how keenly Stephen Gardiner contested passages of Scripture, as well with Cranmer as with other Reformers, whom it fell to his lot to examine. Canonists were probably the pick of graduates for general ability and training, and, next to theologians, they were, so late as the latter part of the fifteenth century, the most numerous of the students at Cambridge (*Grace Book A*, Vol. 2, p. xxix.). No class of men had more cause to oppose the Reformation, or to uphold the Papacy. "The Canonist," says Dr. Rashdall, "was by his profession a champion of the power which had created his class. No Canonist (with the doubtful exception of Cranmer), ever headed a Reform party or inaugurated a religious movement" (I, 262).

It fell outside Dr. Rashdall's self-imposed limitation of the date with which his book was to be concluded, to carry the story of Canon Law to its end. It is obvious, however, that the abolition of Papal jurisdiction in the reign of Henry VIII was bound to be fatal to the study of Canon Law. After 1535, by the Injunctions of Henry VIII, it disappeared from the University curriculum, and with that disappearance vanished also the ancient *hierarchy* of lawyers. A few survive in the shape of Diocesan Chancellors, but the hierarchy is gone. Canon Law has never been abolished altogether in England. Where it is not repugnant to the laws of the Realm, it still holds good in ecclesiastical courts. But it lives a moribund life, the life of an archaic survival. Recent discussions on the relation between Church and State have restored some faint interest in it in the minds of some clergy and ecclesiastically minded laity. But Ichabod. The body cannot live without the head, and the Pope is unquestionably the Head to whose decision cases of Canon Law must be ultimately referred. It was the law of an *imperium in imperio*, of a sacerdotal hierarchy which claimed by Divine authority to rule the consciences of the laity, to prescribe laws for them as well as for the clergy, to enforce those laws by the dire penalties

of excommunication and interdict, to grant remissions and indulgences, and to follow even the departed with pains and penalties in another world. We are so unfamiliar with the idea of Law which punishes *sins* as well as crimes, that we can hardly, even in imagination, picture ourselves living in a world where neglect of religious duties, unhallowed thoughts and desires, even religious doubts and questionings could bring us in as offenders before constituted courts armed with a full system of pains and penalties. Yet such was the medieval world, with this mitigation, that wealth could purchase remission of sentences incurred. But the overthrow of such a system might well seem impossible to those who had lived under it, they, their forefathers and ancestors for many generations. The destruction of such a system would in that case appear to be handing the world over from the rule of Christ to the rule of Satan. In fact the Courts of Bishops and Archdeacons did, even after the Reformation, continue to exercise discipline, and up to a quite recent date the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge yearly pronounced a solemn absolution for certain academical offences. But the rule of the Vice-Gerent of Christ on earth, with all that this awe-inspiring title implies, came to an end in England when Henry VIII compelled his subjects to recognise *him* as Head of the Church of England. History does not really record any greater revolution, in spite of the apparent ease with which it was effected. For his subjects Henry VIII supplanted the Pope; and the *Decretum*, *Clementines*, and *Extravagantes*, with all the Papal Bulls, disappeared from the Schools of Oxford and Cambridge.

IV. Sacred Theology.

More exalted in dignity and importance than even the School of Canon Law was the School of Sacred Theology. A technical description of the theological course is given in the Introduction to *Grace Book A* of the Luard Memorial Series of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, in the following words:

"The course in theology according to an old Statute . . . requires ten years' study of Theology. . . . The first four or six years will no doubt be filled up by attendance at lectures on the Bible, at lectures on the 'Sentences' of Peter the Lombard, and at public disputations. In the fifth or seventh year of study theological candidates are admitted to oppose." (They may take part in the disputations as well as listen to them.) "This act was a serious one. It extended over the chief part of an academical year . . . and might involve taking part in not less than sixteen disputations. Candidates were bound also to act as respondent to their own master only, and *pro forma* at any rate to all the masters Regent in the Faculty" (i.e. to all who have been admitted to the D.D. degree within the last two years). These forms fulfilled, 'the deposition' (in favour of the candidate) "of one master is required as to his knowledge, and of all the others as to his character." The candidate is then considered to be a duly qualified bachelor in theology, and is admitted to 'enter the Sentences' (i.e. of Peter the Lombard). The next two years are given to the *cursory* reading of the Sentences, and other theological studies. The candidate then 'enters' the Bible, i.e. begins a course of lectures on some book of the Old or New Testament. He has also to preach a sermon at S. Paul's Cross (in London). The sentences concluded,

after a fresh course of oppositions, responsions, and replications, he has to preach one sermon at least, a test sermon in Latin, to the clergy in S. Mary's Church. Finally, three years after the completion of the Sentences, by the usual deposition of doctors in the faculty, and on taking the usual oaths to obey the Statutes and to proceed to his inception in due course, he is admitted to 'incept' by the licence of the Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor. After inception he becomes Doctor or Master Regent in Theology. For two years he is bound to continue his Regency and then his arduous course is done" (*Grace Book A*, xxvii).

It must be remembered that we have been reading the description of the Cambridge course—but it is sufficient for our purpose. It is a fair specimen of the course required for the coveted degree of Doctor of Divinity at other Universities.

V. The Cost of a Degree.

This description of the D.D. Course cannot but enhance our sense of the sacrifices entailed by pursuit of it. We may picture to ourselves the son of a country gentleman or prosperous yeoman, forsaking his country pursuits or his farm, because he has somehow, from a chantry-priest, or otherwise, been bitten with a thirst for learning. He joins the company of lads whom a traveller is picking up in villages and towns on his road, and undertakes with them the extraordinary discomforts of several days' journey and the risks of highway robbery. Arrived at his University he places himself in charge of the Keeper of a hall for students, is received formally into the care of the University, and begins his course of studies in the Arts. Books he has none, or one or two very costly manuscripts—among them perhaps a Latin Bible. A common room, shared by half a dozen or more boys of about fifteen, is lit by one lamp. The windows are not glazed but shuttered. The floor is bare or strewn with straw. The ceilings are unplastered. Meals are meagre. There is no fire. To get to sleep he has to take a run before he goes to bed. The streets are narrow and reek with accumulations of filth so foul that pestilence is quite a common visitor. Work begins at 7 or 8 a.m. in the School with lectures or disputations, and our student must listen with intentness if he is to give a good account of himself next day. Perhaps, as a beginner, he attends the "cursory" or less formal lectures delivered by Bachelors of Arts. When lectures are over, we expect to hear of recreations, and we do, in the shape of abundant prohibition against all sorts of amusements, not only against such expensive pursuits as hunting and hawking, but against games with balls, marbles, cards, and even chess.

"The ideal student of the Middle Ages probably amused himself little or not at all. The only relaxation which the University system provided for was the frequent interruption of the regular routine for the whole or part of a day in honour of the greater holidays of the Church, or of the festivals of a particular nation or province, or faculty. For the faculty of Arts the great days were the feasts of S. Scholastica and S. Nicholas. Some Statutes contain severe prohibition of carnival licence, but in Scotland two or three

days' holiday was expressly allowed for cock-fighting at this season. In all medieval Universities—but especially at Paris—the student enjoyed an abundance of what may be called ecclesiastical dissipation. For the masters at Paris there were national Vespers and national Mass once a week as well as on many festivals. These functions were followed by a distribution of money or a dinner at the expense of the Nation. For masters and scholars alike there were frequent processions, University Masses, and University Sermons, which at least afforded a welcome relief from morning lecture. The afternoons of holidays supplied the chief opportunity for country walks" (Rashdall. III, 423).

It is not surprising that animal spirits held in check by so many prohibitions reacted from restraint in the shape of furious faction fights, whether of Town and Gown, or of Nations against one another. "Fighting was perpetually going on in the streets of Oxford. . . . There is probably not a single yard of ground in the classic High Street that lies between S. Martin's and S. Mary's which has not at one time or other been stained with blood. There are historic battlefields on which less blood has been spilt" (III, 96). The description of "The Slaughter," the great disturbance of 1355 which follows the foregoing quotation in Dr. Rashdall's book, shows that the medieval student went often in peril of his life, and that Oxford was no home for pacifists then. Even allowing for the general prevalence of hard conditions in the Middle Ages, the student's life was a hard life, a very campaign—to use the terminology of those days. The theologian could not, as a rule, hope for the higher prizes of ecclesiastical life. These went to the Canonist. A Prebend or Benefice was as much as the D.D. could expect.

VI. The Strong Man Armed.

A position won at such cost and with so much difficulty could not easily be surrendered. Still less does it appear assailable when we remember the awful sanctity that "hedges" a Priest. He was one of an Order before whom Emperors and Kings might tremble. The penances of Frederick II and Henry II formed the subject of many an illumination in MSS., and were doubtless the theme of many a sermon. From the argument in the Lollard Tract *Wyclif's Wicket*, it appears, as well as from many other sources, that the Priest in the Mass was popularly believed to "make God." Of that holy Sacrifice the layman was rarely a participant, never more than a participant in one kind, and never actually a participant with the Priest of the same loaf. For the laity the "housel" bread sufficed, but the celebrant alone consumed "the singing bread," the very Christ created by the act of his consecration. In the Name of God, and of coercing power bestowed by God, he had the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, the power of admitting to that Kingdom by baptism, and thenceforward the power of maintaining or shutting off all intercourse with God. It is practically impossible for us to recapture, even in imagination, the world to which these powers were solemn realities. But the world existed. Those were the days of the Strong Man Armed. Who was the stronger than he?

VII. The Stronger than He.

In the Providence of God "the stronger than he" was raised up in the very heart of medieval scholasticism, in the University, so often called the "Home of lost Causes." Strongly as it has been maintained, especially by J. Gairdner in his *Lollardry and the Reformation*, that Wyclif's work and influence finished with him or soon after his day, there is abundant proof that Milton was right in hailing Wyclif as the true herald of the Reformation, and that Milton's words in the *Areopagitica* are rather extravagant than untrue.

"Why else was this nation chosen before any other, that out of her, as out of Sion, should be proclaimed and sounded forth the first tidings and trumpet of the Reformation of all Europe? And had it not been for the obstinate perverseness of our prelates against the *admirable* and *divine* spirit of Wyclif to suppress him as a schismatic and innovator, perhaps neither the Bohemians Hus and Jerome, no, nor the names of Luther and Calvin had ever been known, the glory of reforming all our neighbours had been completely ours. But now, as our obdurate clergy have with violence demeaned the matter, we are become hitherto the latest and backwardest scholar of whom God offered to make us the teachers."

Naturally Milton writes as a Congregationalist, who regards even the Church of England as imperfectly reformed. Nor had Milton access to many of Wyclif's works, which were for centuries later still unknown in England. But, though Milton writes as a partisan rather than as a historian, he hit upon the truth when he described Wyclif as "*the trumpet of the Reformation*," the pioneer who achieved a work that could never be undone. It is in the light of the history of the Universities of Europe that this proposition can be firmly established.

Certain outstanding facts help us to fix the true place of Wyclif, especially in connection with medieval thought. The following extract from Dr. Rashdall's work should be noted by all students of Reformation history:

"It is a striking illustration of the success which attends well-conducted persecution that Wyclif had been almost ignored by the historians of philosophy. His great works remained in manuscript up to the quincentenary of his death. This is not the place in which to assign to Wyclif his proper place in the history of scholastic philosophy. But, although it is probable that he was not one of the greatest or most original intellects of the Middle Age, the intellectual movement of which Wyclif and Wyclifism were the outcome does represent the culmination of that speculative fermentation of which fourteenth-century Oxford was the centre. The movement represents the last great effort of expiring scholasticism: its fate may be considered to have shown that scholasticism could not effect either the intellectual or the religious emancipation at which Wyclif aimed. The first of the Reformers was the last of the Schoolmen, at least in England. The ecclesiastical repression which followed the collapse of the Wyclif heresy meant the extinction of all vigorous and earnest scholastic thought. Archbishop Arundel's triumph over the University in 1411 sounded the death-knell of Oxford Scholasticism. The great realist and nominalist debate lingered on for a century more; but all the life had been taken out of it; all real, fresh intellectual activity was being diverted into other channels" (III, 269 ff.).

VIII. The Strength of Lollardry.

Now here is a solid fact which should arrest attention. At the beginning of the fourteenth century Oxford attained European fame as a centre of scholasticism. Its intellectual activity far surpassed that of Paris. Its great doctors, sons of Oxford, though they afterwards taught elsewhere, included Richard Middleton, John Dumbleton, Walter Burleigh, John Bunthorp, Roger Swinsheed, William Heytesbury, Ralph Strode, Richard Billingham, John Chillmark, and above all William of Occam, who had studied and graduated at Oxford before he taught in Paris. "Not all the other nations and Universities of Europe," says Dr. Rashdall (III, 267), "could between them muster such a list." Yet by the fifteenth century all this glory, all the fertility in producing great doctors, had passed away. Even though the Editors of Dr. Rashdall's book think that he attributes too much force to Arundel's Constitutions, holding that they were not strictly enforced, it is unquestionable that the connection between Wyclif's work at Oxford, and the decay of the scholastic philosophy, which had been the glory of Oxford, was very real. Wyclif, in fact, made his University once more "the home of lost causes." But Wyclif did not wound scholasticism thus deeply without pointing the way to a new study of the Bible, in which Oxford might have led the way but for the Lollard persecutions.[1]

Mention of the Bible brings us at once to the greatest of all Wyclif's achievements—his securing a translation of the Bible, and its circulation among those who would never hope to attain a knowledge of it through a University education, or to devote ten years to the study of theology. The more we study this achievement, the more wonderful is it found. Starting with the ordinary layman we find him shut out from knowledge of the Bible by his ignorance of Latin. Scraps of it he might hear in sermons, but sermons were comparatively infrequent. When we pass from the layman to the secular clergy, these fall into two classes, the graduates and those who were ordained without a University course—these latter amazingly ignorant even of the meaning of the services which they performed. Of the graduates

"the poorer," writes Dr. Rashdall, "must usually have left the University with a degree in Arts or no degree at all, and consequently without the rudiments of a theological education. Theological knowledge the artist had none, except what perchance he may have picked up at a university sermon. It is a mistake indeed to suppose that the medieval Church, at least in England, up to the re-action against Wyclifism, was actively opposed to Bible reading even on the part of the laity: still less would it have any disposition to interfere with it in clerks at the University. But a student in Arts would have been as likely to read the Bible as he would to dip into Justinian or Hippo-

[1] Rashdall's estimate of Wyclif as a Schoolman is open to challenge, as reference to H. B. Workman's *John Wyclif* will show (vol. i, p. 4). He is there described on the authority of his contemporary Knighton as "the most eminent doctor of theology of his time, in philosophy second to none, in the training of the schools without a rival."

crates.[1] Much astonishment has sometimes been expressed at Luther's 'discovery' of the convent Bible at Erfurt. The real explanation of his previous ignorance of its contents is that Luther entered the Order a master of arts who had never studied in a theological faculty. Even the highly educated secular priest, who was not a theologian, or at best a canonist, was not supposed to know anything of the Bible but what was contained in his missal or his breviary" (III, 450).

It may indeed be questioned whether Dr. Rashdall has not in the above extract somewhat overstated the lack of Bibles—i.e. of Latin Bibles—in University life. For we have a list of books deposited as pledges by students as security for loans from the Proctor's chests. Between the years 1454 and 1488 we have forty-eight Bibles so deposited. The number is not large, but it is greatly in excess of any other book so deposited. Nor is it perhaps quite without significance that in 1500 the Bibles deposited are seventy-four, keeping pace with the growth of students at Cambridge, the University from whose records these facts are taken. The number of Bibles in both cases is small, but books were still rare, and apparently Bibles were more commonly in possession than any other book. Of course they were Latin Bibles.

IX. Circulation of the English Bible.

When, however, we turn from Latin Bibles to the English, called Wyclif's, but written at his instigation rather than by him, we are amazed to learn, on the sound authority of Dr. Guppy (Librarian of John Ryland's Library), that

"not fewer than a hundred and eighty copies of English Bibles, or portions of the Bible have survived the organised and relentless efforts carried on throughout the fifteenth and early sixteenth century to destroy them. None of these appear to have been written later than 1450. Half the copies are of small size such as could be made the constant daily companion of their owner. Many of them probably owed their survival to the high rank of those to whom they belonged; one was the property of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, another of Henry VI, and another of Richard III."

With these facts before us we cannot doubt that reading of the English Bible, and listening to it read by Wyclif's "Simple Priest" prepared the way for the Reformation of the sixteenth century. In homes of the poor, in secluded woodland haunts, the flame kindled by Wyclif was kept alive, though it seemed to have been successfully smothered by the Church.

To appreciate fully what Wyclif, under the Providence of God accomplished, we must first do justice to the ideal of the medieval Universities. That ideal was to bring all knowledge into correspondence with Revelation. Thus Theology, of which the apex was study of Scripture, was Queen of the Sciences. But in the process of study Theology had become an arid science of abstract attributes of God, a wearisome discussion of problems that had no relation

[1] A good illustration of this occurs in a Franciscan constitution *circ.* 1292. "Let no brother have a Bible or Testament out of charity, unless he be apt for study or fit to preach."

to life. For ordinary folk it was unapproachable, and they who had laboriously acquired the key of this knowledge were not disposed to make it cheap. What Wyclif did was not merely to open the door to knowledge of God, but to carry it out of the Universities into highways and hedges, and to make the ploughman and artisan hear the voice of God, not in Latin but in their own tongue. The voice so heard was the voice of the "living God," [1] no longer far off, and approachable only through a graduated hierarchy of priests, saints, the Blessed Virgin, Angels and Archangels, but the voice of the God Who was the "friend" of Abraham in the tent, the companion and guide of Jacob as he tended Laban's flocks, the protector of David in the valley of the shadow of death, the voice of the Friend of publicans and sinners. To the learned Doctor of Divinity such treatment of the Bible was rank desecration, profane casting of pearls before swine, and above all the destruction of the learning which he had acquired at great cost, and on which he depended for his living. What Paul's gospel was to the silversmiths of Ephesus, Wyclif's Bible was to the Divines of the medieval Universities. For more than a century the Schoolmen with the aid of the Church triumphed successfully, as they believed, over this arch-heresy. But they forgot, "the stars in their courses fought," "the Providence of God fought" against the entrenched strongholds of medievalism. What Oxford defeated, Cambridge carried to a successful issue. Coverdale was the spiritual heir of Wyclif. Nor was England so completely robbed of pre-eminence in the Reformation world as John Milton imagined, for England is the home of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which counts its yearly issues of Scripture "in every nation and kindred and tongue," by millions. Oxford was not "the home of lost causes" when Lollardy was crushed. The last of the Schoolmen was the first of the Reformers.

[1] Stephen Gardiner said that a heretic could be known by his constant mention of "the living God."

Three booklets issued in the Lutterworth Press Papers are: *The Edict of Nantes and Afterwards, 1685–1935*, by Henry J. Cowell, Fellow of the Huguenot Society of London. This has been issued in a revised and illustrated form, and should be read by English people in order that they may realise what the Huguenots have suffered and done. *Man and His Need of God* contains Broadcast Talks by J. S. Whale, President of Cheshunt College, Cambridge. It is reprinted from *The Way to God*. Nearly two hundred people wrote to ask questions after the addresses, and the answers are summarised in a useful way. *Church Unity* is by Dr. A. J. Macdonald and is an urgent plea for unity.

SPANISH PROTESTANT REFUGEES IN ENGLAND.

By Dr. Lieselotte Linnhoff, Author of Spanische Protestanten und England.

IN the 'forties and 'fifties of the sixteenth century, the Protestant doctrine was received with great rejoicing in Spain, the two towns of Valladolid and Seville, where a great number of the noble and more refined section of the population formed the first Protestant congregations on Spanish soil, taking the lead. Also the greater part of the monasteries and nunneries in the neighbourhood of these two centres of Protestantism had been imbued with the new doctrine. Of the greatest significance were the events in the Hieronymite convent of San Isidro del Campo, in the vicinity of Seville. Many of the monks had been converted, due chiefly to the influence of important Sevillian Protestants as Dr. Egidio, Dr. Constantino, Garci-Arias—commonly called " el Maestro Blanco " —and to the devoted study of evangelical books imported from Geneva and Germany. Within a few years, considerable reforms were introduced into monastic life: the fixed hours for prayer were now spent reading and interpreting the Bible; prayers for the dead were omitted; papal indulgences and pardons were entirely abolished; the concentration on the Holy Scriptures superseded the obligation of novices to submit to strict monastic rules. Only the monastic garb and the external ceremony of the Mass were retained as a precaution. A few monks, however, found it difficult to reconcile with their conscience the keeping to external rules for reasons of fear only. Therefore in 1557 twelve monks left the monastery to enjoy peace of mind and religious freedom in Protestant countries. The most important of these were Cassiodoro de Reina, Cipriano de Valera, and Antonio del Corro, whose lives and works we propose to deal with in detail later on. A contemporary account of these events is contained in Montano's *Sanctae inquisitionis Hispanicae artes aliquot detectae, ac palam traductae* . . . and Valera's *Dos Tratados*.

The monks first went to Geneva, the town of Calvin and the refuge for all Protestants who had to flee from their country for reasons of religious belief. Here already in 1555 seven Spaniards —Dr. Perez may have been among them—had been given a kind reception and many Spaniards had followed later on. The Spanish exiles were admitted to the Italian Protestant congregation and met many fugitive foreigners. Here they came into intimate contact with numerous English Protestants, who had escaped the terrors of Mary's persecutions and found their way to Geneva, where in 1555, under the leadership of William Whittingham, they founded an Anglican Congregation. As a matter of fact the religious exiles from both these countries had much in common; the very persecution which threatened them at home formed a

strong link abroad: while the Englishman would recall with horror the incidents at the "Smithfield Fires," the Spaniard would tell grim tales of inquisitional persecutions and *autos de fé*.

The accession of Queen Elizabeth to the throne in 1558 was the signal for the English exiles to return to England; at the same time the Spaniards were offered a new refuge in a country of religious freedom and safety. Thus from 1558 on, most of the Spaniards made their way to England, stopping only for short periods of time at Geneva and other Protestant places. This drift towards England was accentuated by the Counter-Reformation, which made it impossible for the Spaniards to stay any longer in the Protestant parts of Germany, France or in the Netherlands, so that England rapidly became their new home. Their faith had been strengthened by exile, by continuous wanderings, by pains and misery. When they finally settled in a country free from religious persecutions, their hostility against the old church was deeply rooted in their breasts and it is in their writings that we find that real fighting spirit of Spanish Protestantism. Though in exile no task seemed worthier and better to them than to endeavour by word and deed to convert the rest of their countrymen to the true faith.

Cassiodoro de Reina (1520–94)

Cassiodoro de Reina, born about the year 1520 in Seville, entered at an early age the monastery of San Isidro, and, with many other monks, embraced the doctrines of the Protestant Church. Early in his youth he had studied the Holy Scriptures with much eagerness, but his intentions of translating the whole Bible into Spanish could only be realised, when in foreign countries he had escaped the control of the Holy Office. In Geneva, the first stay after his successful flight from Spain, he became a member of the Italian Protestant Congregation, and in Frankfort-on-the-Main, where he proceeded in 1558, he joined the French Church. As his liberty in Germany, however, seemed to be endangered by the vigilance of King Philip's spies, Reina went to England shortly after the accession of Queen Elizabeth. Here he met a considerable number of his own countrymen. Many Spanish merchants had migrated to London during the reign of Henry the Eighth. Their numbers had increased in the times of Philip and Mary, and some of them had been converted to Protestantism. It evidently was but during the reign of Queen Elizabeth that they joined to found a Congregation of Spaniards; for up to that time there is mention only of a French, Italian, and Dutch, but not of a Spanish Protestant Community in London. After his arrival in London Cassiodoro de Reina entered the French Church, when soon afterwards John Strype mentions him as the first preacher of that Spanish Protestant Congregation: . . . "I find now a congregation of Spaniards in London; and one Cassiodorus was their preacher . . . which congregation began about the last year (1569), when they met in a private house for their devotion." [1] Reina composed a confession of faith, entitled:

[1] John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, I, i, p. 355.

" Declaracion, o confession de fe hecha por ciertos fieles Españoles, que huyendo los abusos de la iglesia Romana, y la crueldad de la Inquisicion d'España hizieron a la Iglesia de los fieles para ser en ella recebidos por hermanos en Christo," to bring about his countrymen's admission to the Protestant Church. It was a simple and clear-worded confession in which they submitted to the Church by combining the Lutheran and Reformed doctrine, that is to say the Augustana of 1530 and the 42 articles of Cranmer and Ridley. It was Cassiodoro who organised the simple services of that first community of Spanish Protestants in London, who, in order to avoid public annoyance were advised by Bishop Grindal and the Secretary of State, William Cecil, to meet in a private house rather than in a church. The Spanish ambassador in London, Bishop Alvaro de la Cuadra, vividly complains of this in a letter to Philip the Second. " I wrote that the Spanish heretics had been given a very large house belonging to the bishop of London in which they might preach thrice a week, which is true, as it also is that they are favoured by the Queen. . . ." [1] These private meetings very soon were felt to be prejudicial to the exercise of religious worship, so that in 1560 Cassiodoro filed a petition, signed by all members of the Congregation, asking for the right to have a church of their own ; a detailed account of this is given in Strype's *Life and Acts of Archbishop Grindal* (p. 47 f.).

Though Strype is unfamiliar with the outcome, we know from a report by the above-mentioned ambassador De la Cuadra (1562) that the petition was actually granted. The Spanish Protestants got the church " St. Mary Axe " as a place of worship. De la Cuadra's report induced King Philip to give instructions to his ambassador to have Cassiodoro de Reina expelled from England as soon as possible and also Gaspar Zapata, who assisted him in translating the Bible. That way the Spanish sovereign thought to get hold of Cassiodoro and Zapata in the Netherlands, bare of the protection of England's free soil. Unfortunately De la Cuadra's attempts were successful. Queen Elizabeth, who up to then had greatly favoured Cassiodoro by giving him a pension of sixty pounds yearly and by assisting him financially to attend the conference at Poissy, took amiss his marriage (in 1563) and withdrew her favour. Moreover, the accusation of being a Sodomite—a charge of which he fully cleared himself later—seemed to make a longer stay in England appear impossible.

The few quiet years in England were followed by a life of restlessness and struggle, a life hard to live for a man like Reina, rather infirm and aged before the time. From England he first proceeded to Antwerp in the spring of 1563 ; but here he was not safe from the persecutions of Philip the Second, who had put a price upon his head. In 1564 we find him at Montargis as a minister of Renée

[1] Minute of the Conversation between the Ambassador and the Lord Chamberlain and Dr. Wotton respecting the charges made against the Ambassador. (*Spanish State Papers*, Elizabeth, P. 247, 1562, 20 June, 170. Simancas, B.M. MS.Add. 26, 056*a*.)

de France, Dowager Duchess of Ferrara, together with Antonio del Corro and Juan Perez de Pineda. Soon afterwards (in 1565) he went to Frankfort. Beza's recommendations to the French Protestant Congregation in Strassburg to get Reina's services as a preacher were not followed, partly because of differences of doctrine, partly because some doubt still existed as to the crime he was charged with in London. In Frankfort he finished his translation of the Bible. He got much assistance and useful suggestions from his two Strassburg friends, Johann Sturm and Conrad Hubert, with whom he not only anxiously kept up correspondence, but discussed his work whenever he came to see them. In 1569 the whole translation of the Old and New Testament was published in Basle, one of the central places for the printing of Protestant books at that time. Thus Cassiodoro had successfully completed the work of his life, and his most ardent desire was fulfilled. With indefatigable zeal he had kept up translating the Bible in all periods of his restless life, without getting discouraged by obstacles of various kinds. He rightly states in the preface to the first edition of his Bible, that, deducting the time taken by illness and professional work, he had for nine long years not laid aside the pen. Translating the Bible, Reina made it a principle to keep as close as possible to the original text. As he did not know Hebrew very well, he generally used the Latin version of Santes Pagninus for his translation of the Old Testament, comparing the original only when there were doubts about something; likewise he often made use of the Spanish version published by the Jews in Ferrara. As for the New Testament, Reina had to translate it by himself, for the translations then extant, as those of Enzinas or Juan Perez de Pineda, had become rather scarce by this time. The dedication is addressed to " The princes of Europe and especially to those of the Holy Roman Empire " (" a los principes de Europa y especialmente a los del Sacro Romano Imperio ") followed by a letter of John Sturm to Queen Elizabeth, in which he highly praises Reina's perseverance in his work. Reina dedicated a copy of his Bible to the University of Basle as a token of his gratitude. In the summer of 1570 he returned to Frankfort, where, as a member of the French Protestant Congregation, he soon got the freedom of the city. A new period of life began for Cassiodoro, when in 1578—after having cleared himself of the suspicions and the crime he was charged with in England—he accepted the post of a French pastor to the Lutherans in Antwerp. Though the Calvinists often attacked him, who was a firm Lutheran and a faithful adherent to the Wittenberg Concord of 1536, by reproaching him, for example, with having signed in the presence of the Archbishop of Canterbury certain articles concerning the Lord's Supper not in accordance with the Lutheran doctrine, and though differences about predestination and the Lord's Supper often set at variance the small Protestant congregation, the seven years of Reina's activities here were successful and satisfactory. In 1580 his catechism composed for his community, following the example of Luther's, was published by the Antwerp church in three languages, in French,

Dutch and Latin. Reina was even proposed for the post of superintendent of the Augsburg Confessionists in Antwerp, but he declined.

It was only by the surrender of Antwerp to the Prince of Parma in 1585 that Reina was forced to leave and returned to Frankfort. At the repeated requests of many French, Dutch and German Lutherans here, Reina, after having accepted the Concord of 1536, got the permission to preach in the French Protestant Congregation. He died in 1594.

Cassiodoro de Reina is the only one among the Spanish refugees who explicitly stood by the Lutheran doctrine and remained faithful to it all his life. He alone really deserved to be called a Lutheran, a name which the Inquisition employed to designate the adherence to any kind of Reformed doctrine, without making a difference between certain individual forms. He may well be called the strictest and most devoted one to dogma among the Spanish Protestants of his time.

Cipriano de Valera (1532–1602)

Another fugitive monk from the monastery of San Isidro, Cipriano de Valera (born in 1531 or '32 in Seville), in the " Acts of Inquisition " commonly called " the Spanish heretic " (" El hereje español "), is rather well known for his literary activities. For six years he studied dialectics and philosophy at the High School of Seville ; he also devoted himself to theological studies in common with the learned Benito Arias Montano. He was extremely fond of hearing the sermons of Dr. Egidio and Dr. Constantino, and soon came into contact with the Sevillian Protestants, especially with Juan Perez de Pineda and Julian Hernandez, not to forget his close companion Cassiodoro de Reina. On October 10, 1558, he was admitted with seven other Spaniards to Geneva and to the Italian Protestant Congregation there. In the same year the Spanish Protestants in Geneva got a church of their own (Saint-Germain) and one of their countrymen as a preacher.

From Geneva Valera went to England, a country which had become very hospitable to foreign refugees after the accession to the throne of the Virgin Queen. Here he continued the studies he started with in Spain, and in February, 1560, got the bachelor's degree of the University of Cambridge on account of his studies and his knowledge acquired in Seville ; at the same time he was elected a fellow of Magdalene College. On June 12, 1563, he took his master's degree ; three years later (on February 21, 1566) we find his name and degree registered at Oxford. Here he acted as tutor to Mr. Walsh of Ireland, who afterwards became a Bishop.

Unfortunately it cannot be seen from the few documents of this time still in existence, whether Valera was a member of the Congregation of the Spanish and Italian fugitives in London, or even Reina's successor as a Spanish preacher there. It might have been possible that Valera belonged to that Church, for in the last will of a certain Alfonso Baptista on July 15, 1573, Valera is mentioned as " a schoolmaster resident in London " ; besides, we do know that

in March, 1579, he assisted in carrying on Reina's lawsuit there. The chance to prove his activities as a preacher is small though, because the members of the small Spanish Congregation were forbidden to have divine service in a church of their own and a compatriot as their preacher. Strype, for example, our most reliable authority, does not give us the slightest account of an appointment of Valera, whereas he particularly mentions Cassiodoro de Reina and later on Antonio del Corro as Spanish preachers. Most of the members of the Spanish Protestant community were attending the services of the Italian or French Church. Anyhow, there must still have existed some kind of a Congregation of Spaniards in London: Don Diego Guzman de Silva, the new Spanish ambassador, who in 1564 got precise instructions from Philip the Second to make exact inquiries as to the names of all Spanish Protestants in London, the date of their arrival and departure, reported in a letter to the King that this community of Spanish heretics would be dissolved in the very near future:

("... The Conventicle of Spanish heretics here is on its last legs. A certain Gaspar Zapata ... awaited here some security or assurance from the Holy Office in order to return to Spain. I have managed to get him away with his wife and family, and he has gone to Flanders with a safe-conduct from the duchess of Parma ... I understand it to be to the interests of God and your Majesty that Spaniards who have gone astray in this way should be brought to submit again. It is even important for the national honour, for they make much of an heretical Spaniard everywhere in order to pit him against ... (undecipherable) who are not heretics. This man was held in high esteem, and if affairs are managed skilfully I hope that his example will be followed by the submission of the greater number of them, because such are the evil doings of these heretics, that more of them (the Spaniards) are held by fear than ignorance of the truth ...") [1]

Guzman de Silva's assumption should prove wrong, and his successor Guerau de Spes started with new complaints about the "continuance of the evil," stating that a heretic was appointed pastor to the 150 Spaniards imprisoned at Bridewell, and that Spanish Protestant books were publicly printed in London. This very readiness of continuously admitting Spanish fugitives to her country and aiding Spanish Protestantism—by the way, one of the most grievous charges made against Queen Elizabeth in Pius the Fifth's Bull excommunicating her in 1570—was to her an effective means to arouse her enemy Philip the Second. To get an idea of the manner in which English people would judge the Spanish Protestants, it may be of interest to refer to a certain passage in Bishop Jewel's reply to the papal Bull written to defend against all attacks the dealings of his Queen. He sharply distinguishes between the Spaniards newly arrived and those who came over to England in the retinue of Philip and Mary.

"These are few, those were many; these are poor and miserable, those were lofty and proud; these are naked, those were armed; these are spoiled

[1] *Spanish State Papers*, Elizabeth, 1565, 26 April, 296. Guzman de Silva to the King.

by others, those came to spoil us; these are driven from their country, those came to drive us from our country; these came to save their lives, those came to have our lives; if we were content to bear those then, let us not grieve now to bear these."

Interpreting the scarce notes on Valera, we might well say that the traces left by his activities in London were anything but considerable. The importance of this reformer lies mainly in his literary and enormous propaganda work to convert his countrymen in Spain during the years 1558–1602. How little Valera cared for reaching the ears of an English audience, can be seen from the fact that he wrote exclusively in Spanish. His writings published in London since 1588 may be divided into three groups:

1. Polemical writings directed against Rome.
2. Spanish translations of the fundamental works of Calvin.
3. A second edition, revised and improved, of Reina's whole translation of the Bible.

Apart from the *Dos Tratados* and the pamphlet on the jubilee proclaimed by the Pope, *Aviso a los de la iglesia Romana sobre la indiccion del Jubileo por la Bulla del Papa Clemente Octavo*, the first group contains the treatise addressed to the Spanish prisoners in Berbery, among whom had taken place an evangelical revival: "Tratado Para Confirmar los pobres cativos de Berueria en la catolica y antigua fe, y religion Christiana y para los consolar con la Palabra de Dios en las afliciones que padecen por el Evangelio de Jesu Christo," published in 1594, and the preface to the *Catholico Reformado*, William Massan's Spanish translation of the *Reformed Catholic* of Perkins, professor in Cambridge, a Calvinistic Puritan.

The "Tratado Para Confirmar los pobres cativos de Berueria . . ." may be considered as an imitation of the "Epistola consolatoria," by Juan Perez de Pineda, both serving a similar purpose. The aim of Valera's treatise was to strengthen the faith of those Spaniards suffering the most terrible imprisonment in the midst of pagans; it was their task firmly to defend their religion not only against Popery, but also against the influences of Mahometanism and to display a model of true Christian life to the heathens. The author sharply criticises the institutions of the Roman Catholic Church as "Popery," "Worship of Saints," "Purgatory," "Holy Mass," etc., which he regards as nothing but diabolical arts to blind the people. He emphasises that God wants a repeated and zealous reading of the Holy Scripture which should include the interpretation and explanation of important passages. There are some people who conceive the title of the treatise, "Los pobres cativos de Berueria," to be fictitious, hiding the sufferings of the Protestants of Seville. We think, however, that this interpretation is rather unfounded. Apart from the fact that anything indirect or allegorical seems as a rule to be somewhat alien to the nature and style of Valera and that the simple way of explaining the Protestant doctrine was well suited to the mentality of those newly converted prisoners who were surrounded everywhere by heathens and Jews, the year

of publication (1594) appears to be rather late for addressing such a treatise to the Sevillian Protestants, whom numerous *autos de fé* had released from their torments.

Strongly antipopish as he was, Valera without doubt highly approved the contents of the above-mentioned translation of William Massan, to which he wrote an introductory letter: "Epistola al Cristiano Lector." In this treatise, as well as in Valera's writings, the numerous outward ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church, which had been created by men against the will of God, form the most important points of attack against Romanism. His whole life Cipriano de Valera fought Rome, the mortal enemy of Protestants, of Lutherans and Calvinists. Though he did not adhere to any strict dogmatism, did not advocate a religious system of his own and proposed more or less general reforms, his strongest sympathies were with the Calvinistic doctrine. This sufficiently appears from the fact that in 1596 he finished an entirely new edition of Calvin's catechism, which had been translated into Spanish as early as 1550 and again been edited in 1569, furthermore that in the succeeding year (1597) he had published the first Spanish translation of Calvin's standard work, *Institutio Religionis Christianae*. In the encyclical epistle—addressed to all Protestants in Spain—preceding the translation, he deals with the value of true knowledge of God and calls for defending Calvin's teachings against all false prophets.

Valera did a great service to his co-religionists in Spain by re-editing, in 1596, the New Testament of Cassiodoro de Reina, followed, in 1602, by the revised edition of Reina's whole translation of the Bible, "La Biblia, Que es, los sacros libros del vieio y nuevo testamento. Segunda Edicion." Some very important corrections regarding form and contents were made by him and he himself explains in his "Exhortacion" that he spent twenty years of his life without any outside assistance thoroughly revising Reina's Bible, not omitting certain textual improvements.

Valera had the Bible printed in Amsterdam; it was published by Lorenzo Jacobi. In a letter of October 30, 1602, from Amsterdam, Arminius, the leader of the Remonstrants, recommends Cipriano de Valera to a certain John Uytenbogard in the Hague. ". . . I hope you will do your best to care for Valera and aid him with money sufficient to return to England. I have done for him whatever I could and he rightly deserves to spend free of care the few years left to him." Soon afterwards Valera returned to England. The date of his death is unknown, though he probably died in 1622 in England.

Only a small part of Valera's writings was known in Spain during his lifetime. The only work of his cited in the first Expurgatorial indices of the seventeenth century is the translation of Calvin's *Institutio*. By far of the greatest importance to his countrymen was his edition of the Bible which, according to the report of Diodati —the translator of the Bible into Italian—soon spread all over Spain and in later centuries became the prototype for modern versions of the Bible in Spain and America.

Antonio del Corro (1527–91)

Whereas his two countrymen, Cassiodoro de Reina and Cipriano de Valera, excelled in their works, Antonio del Corro chiefly interests us because of his unrelenting vitality and certainly pugnacious attitude. Through all his stirring life, in numerous differences and discussions, he asserted himself against his adversaries with the utmost tenacity.

Antonio del Corro—usually latinised " Corranus "—was born in the winter of 1526–7 as the son of a Sevillian lawyer. He was a relative and most probably a nephew of the inquisitor Antonio del Corro in Seville, who had to conduct the process against Dr. Egidio. One day this inquisitor gave vent to his feelings and related to the amazed monk how indignant he was at the most iniquitous way in which the Holy Office was carrying on the lawsuit against Dr. Egidio, who was known for leading a truly Christian life.

At the request of his young friend the inquisitor enabled him to have a glimpse into the inquisitorial records. Comparing the accusations against Dr. Egidio and the subtle theological definitions given by the monks with the replies of the defendant, Corro readily grasped which side really was attached to the true faith.[1] The officers of the Inquisition, not thinking in the least of possible consequences, gave him Protestant books imported from Germany in exchange for some favour of his. By studying them, Corro was fortified in the conviction he already had gained from the apologies and sermons of Dr. Egidio, and firmly embraced the Protestant doctrine. His escape with the eleven monks was a complete surprise to all persons staying behind, as up to the last minute he had been on good terms with the inquisitors and spoken of his inner change to his most intimate friends only.

In Geneva Corro, as the first of the Isidrians, paid homage to Calvin and professed himself an adherent of his doctrine. After a short stay in Geneva he went to Lausanne, where he entered the academy, a training seminary for Protestant ministers, and he came into intimate contact with Beza, who was only seven years older. It was of importance for Corro's further development, that already here in Lausanne he came to know the fatal consequences of the dissension among the different Protestant sections as to the Lord's Supper and the doctrine of predestination. As soon as a certain degree of religious liberty made itself felt in Navarre, he left Lausanne to preach somewhat nearer to his native country. Recommended by Calvin, Corro first got a position as a preacher in Nérac. The next year (1561) we find him in Aire, soon afterwards in Bordeaux and finally as " pasteur des capitouls " in Toulouse, which city he had to leave rather hurriedly after a short period of time, as a religious war broke out, in which Protestants were persecuted with the utmost cruelty.

At the end of 1563 Corro stayed at Théobon, *maison seigneuriale*

[1] Corro himself gives a vivid account of this later on in his letter to King Philip.

in Lot-et-Garonne, *arrondissement de* Duras, from where, on December 24, 1563, he wrote a letter to his friend Cassiodoro de Reina. It was in this memorable letter, which his enemies frequently used against him later on, that he invited Reina and Cipriano de Valera to come to Théobon and start printing the Bible in a castle granted for this purpose by the Queen of Navarre. He further asked Reina to get him some books, as those written by Caspar Schwenkfeld and Valentin Crotvald and others, " who [he says] treat of the doctrine of our religion to edify our conscience." He also wanted to read Osiander's treatise on justification, in which the author deals with the three different phases of Christ. Besides, he asked Reina several questions—for example, what opinion people there held on Velsio and the Italian Aconcio, and what was to be thought of the ubiquity of Christ as a human creature. " I should like to know [he says] what edification it might give to a Christian heart to know whether the glorified Christ is a creature or not." He inquired how the Lord's Supper was celebrated in the churches dominated by Crotvald and how they interpreted the words of Christ, etc. But this letter did not reach Reina at all ; neither did all the others Corro sent from Bergerac, his next stay. For by this time Reina had already left England, and the letters were delivered to the French Consistory instead, which kept them as valuable evidence of the theological opinions of the two Spanish fugitive monks thought to be so dangerous.

However, the two friends finally met in Orléans, from where they both went back to Bergerac. Because of a royal edict exiling all foreign Protestants Corro was made to flee, and he and Reina found a refuge in Montargis, the residence of Renée de France, Duchess of Ferrara. Here they met their compatriot, Juan Perez de Pineda, who had lost his position in Blois for the same reason. Meanwhile the Consistory of Antwerp had tried several times to appoint Juan Perez, and after his death Corro, preacher to the Protestant congregation there. The reason why Corro did not at once accept this offer with the enticing prospect of preaching to a Spanish auditory in his native language, could only have been that the Duchess was sorry to part from him.

At that time the Prince of Orange endeavoured to smooth the differences between the numerous Calvinists and Lutherans living in Antwerp. He tried to make the Calvinists accept the Augsburg Confession, so that one might possibly join the Protestant Princes of Germany. It seems that shortly after his arrival in Antwerp Corro took part in a discussion, between Calvinists and Lutherans (Martinists they were called there) on the one side and Romanists on the other, on the subject of the Lord's Supper.

The Regent of the Netherlands, Margaret of Parma, learning of the arrival of the Sevillian apostate Corro in the Spanish Netherlands, prohibited his preaching in Antwerp. The Prince of Orange tried to make the Regent alter her decision, using as an argument the repeated request of the Protestants to grant Corro the right to preach. But the controversy, which Corro soon started with

his colleague, the Istrian Flacius Illyricus, concerning the Eucharist and his publishing the whole affair in a letter addressed to the Augsburg Confessionists kept the Prince from further assisting him. A letter written by Corro to the King of Spain in March, 1567, was in vain. After an armed rebellion of the Calvinists in March, 1563, had been quelled with great difficulty, the Regent exiled Corro and other Protestant ministers who had just arrived in Antwerp.

As did his two countrymen, Cassiodoro de Reina and Cipriano de Valera, Antonio del Corro also went to the England of Queen Elizabeth where, contrary to his previous intentions, he remained for good. From the very beginning of his stay in London he was embittered by the numerous intrigues of the French Protestants. His fiercest enemy, the French preacher Jean Cousin, had been collecting material to accuse him. Corro's above-mentioned letter to Reina (" . . . which rather smells of the abstract speculations of Servet and Osiander and the ubiquity of Brenz . . ."), his two Antwerp publications, and numerous details on his life were sufficeint reason for Cousin and the Elders of the French Consistory to refuse Corro admission to the French Church in London; they accused him publicly of being a Latitudinarian and adherent to heresies. Corro complained of this to Bishop Grindal, who, after first having examined the case on June 5, 1567, gave the following rather favourable judgment:

" . . . We, moved with the desire of preserving the concord and peace of the church and of defending the good fame of the said master Antonius, have cited him before us and have diligently conferred with him, in the presence of some pious and learned men, on those points of the Christian religion, concerning which he had fallen under some suspicion, and, from the conference had with him, we have plainly understood that the said master Corranus is averse from all impious opinions and that he entertains right and pious sentiments concerning Christian religion, and embraces from his heart the pure doctrine of the Gospel, which our own and other reformed churches profess. And since he has abundantly satisfied us, that all others also may be satisfied and that his character may remain unimpeached, and the suspicions which had been conceived may be removed from the minds of all, we wish these things to be testified by this writing unto all who may read or hear it." (Given on the 5th of June, 1567.)

This testimonial, issued by an ecclesiastical authority like Grindal, silenced all possible objections Girolamo Jerlito, the preacher of the Italian Church in London, might have had to admit the Spaniard to his Congregation. Corro even got the permission to preach to the Spanish members of this community. On a list of 1568, Corro is mentioned as one of the foreigners going to the English Church, a member of the Italian Protestant Congregation and a Spanish preacher: " Strangers that go to the English Church: . . . Anthony Coran in Cripplegate ward, preacher in the Italian Church, born in Spain; tenant to the duchess of Suffolk; Mary his wife; John and James, their children; David de Dieu and Joan Leveresse their servants; and they go to the Italian Church. (He preached also in Spanish.)"

But Corro's joy of having reached what he endeavoured to obtain

all his life was soon spoiled by new violent attacks led by his opponent Cousin and the French Protestants: The National Synod of the Reformed Churches of France at Vertheuil in Angoumois in September, 1567, issued a decree prohibiting the appointment of Corro as preacher of any church until he had cleared himself of the heresy he was charged with. Corro, indignant at this, wrote a treatise in his defence, called " apology," in reality nothing but a sharp polemic in which he gives vent to his anger provoked by the deceitful and unjust proceedings and does not even shrink from violent invectives against his adversaries. The irritated French made new attacks against him and it took months and years to bring to an end the fierce combat of the two forces, with the final result that, because of the accusations raised against him, Corro, after two years of activity, was dismissed from his post and his small Congregation dissolved.

At the same time the publication of his *Tableau de l'œuvre de Dieu* involved Corro in the greatest difficulties with the members of the Italian congregation. In Antwerp he had got a copy of this little work which in short sentences sums up the Christian doctrine. He had revised the book, improved it and given assent to its publication. A French minister had brought forth twenty-five arguments against the *Tableau*, which the Italian preacher, Girolamo Jerlito, made use of when criticising the Latin translation of the *Tableau* he had prepared for Bishop Grindal. The gravest attacks centred on Corro's opinion of the doctrine of justification. In 1570 a Congregation called together to settle the affair decided against Corro and excluded him for some time from the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Nevertheless, Corro sent a copy of the revised French edition of his *Tableau* to " Madame de Staffort " in 1570 as a New Year's present, and in the same year dedicated to Queen Elizabeth the first edition of his Latin translation.

The indignation of the Italians regarding the *Tableau de l'œuvre de Dieu* was seized upon by Corro's adversaries, the Elders of the French Consistory. A protocol of their discussions enumerates the faults they found with Corro's work: Amongst other things they reproached him with confounding the Eternal Word of God with the preached word, consequently accepting the heresy of Osiander and destroying the deity of Christ. They furthermore maintained that he professed the doctrine of freewill, that he believed that part of our justification could be derived from our works; that he did not call Christ nor the Holy Spirit God, and never openly spoke of Christ as Redeemer. These accusations, together with previous events, caused a violent conflict between Corro and his enemies extending over years. May it be sufficient to say that it was finally brought to a close on the French National Synod at Nîmes in May, 1572. During the different phases of this long struggle, Corro defended his opinions with the subtlety of a great lawyer. Again and again he emphasised that errors in his *Tableau* should be attributed to his somewhat obscure and unusual way of expression, but on no account to any bad intentions on his part.

He repeatedly assured how much he abhorred all dogmas contrary to the doctrines of the Holy Scripture. It must have been a great disappointment to Corro that his friend Beza, whose assistance he had asked for in numerous letters, left the decision of the first-mentioned case entirely to Bishop Grindal as to the only authority competent in this matter and that on a National Synod in La Rochelle he publicly rejected Corro's doctrine contained in his *Tableau de l'œuvre de Dieu.*

But Corro knew how to get the assistance of influential English patrons, as for example of Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, the new Bishop of London Sandys, Leicester, the Chancellor of Oxford University, the Earl of Huntingdon, etc., who all highly appreciated his thorough theological knowledge. In 1571 Corro was asked by the two London Temples to deliver theological lectures in Latin and in 1573 Bishop Sandys gave his official consent to that appointment.

In these lectures Corro explained the " Epistle to the Romans " and in the next year he collected all his notes on the subject into a theological dialogue, *Dialogus theologicus. Quo epistola divi Pauli apostoli ad Romanos explanatur* . . . which he dedicated to " the generous Lords of the two London Temples." In his dedication Corro again refers to all his previous misfortunes, and gives expression to his joy of having finally obtained the present position, adding that he would be very happy indeed to remain an active member of this community as long as possible. Two reasons made him publish his dialogue: 1. That the reading of the book might bring again to the remembrance of his pupils the things he had dealt with in his lectures; 2. That he might proclaim the pureness of his theological doctrines and defend them against the calumnies of his enemies. To make quite clear his opinions, Corro at the end of his dialogue sums up the Articles of Faith, particularly stressing those points which had sometimes aroused the opposition of his listeners, such as predestination, justification and freewill. Contrary to Calvin, he rejects the doctrine of predestination in its strictest form, conceding to anybody the possibility of obtaining everlasting happiness by a steadfast and unweary endeavour. Corro partly affirms the doctrine of freewill, as a reply to those who reproached him with exhorting his hearers to good works. He states that he did not mean in the least to degrade Christ's work of redemption but recommended good works only to counteract the prevailing evil inclination of human nature.

A sharp competition arose between Corro and Villiers, a preacher belonging to the French Protestant Congregation, when they both endeavoured to obtain an academical degree of theology from Oxford University. In 1576 Corro sent his petition to the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University, Lawrence Humfrey, with a letter of recommendation by the Chancellor, the Earl of Leicester. At that time Villiers also made application. As a matter of fact Corro's enemies, the preachers and Elders of the French Congregation, did their best to hinder Corro's graduation. Taking extracts from his works, from

his Temple lectures, from the ominous letter to Reina and even from casual remarks in private conversation, they put up a list of 138 heretical theses, which they refuted with an equal number of antitheses. " Theses excerptae ex lectionibus, colloquiis et maxime ex scriptis D. Corrani, quas verbi Dei Ministri Belgicae Gallicae et Italicae Ecclesiarum quae Londini . . . conveniunt Duo : Edm. Cantuarensi Archiepiscopo proponunt.—Antitheses quibus Belgicae, Gallicae et Italicae ecclesiarum Ministri ostendunt, quae in doctrina vel in doctrinae D. Corrani forma reprehendunt."

A convocation in Oxford made Corro's promotion depend on his refuting the charges made against him. It is worthy of notice, moreover, that Corro met not only the opposition of the French Protestants in London, but also of the English University professors in Oxford. Wood tells us in his *Athenæ Oxonienses*, p. 578 :

" . . . the chancellor had designed Corro to read divinity in the university, and to allot him a catechist lecture, upon some consultation (as it was pretended) for the utter extirpation of the Roman Catholic religion from the university. This being the seeming design to plant him among the academians, you cannot imagine what fear and jealousies were raised in the heads of the old puritanical doctors and others, who were fully bent to root out the dregs of popery in the university, lest that which they laboured in, should be frustrated by a stranger. I have seen a copy of a letter written by Jo. Rainolds of Corpus Christi College to Dr. Laur-Humphrey, then Vice-Chancellor, dated June 7, wherein several things being said of Corrano and his doctrine, you shall have the contents only. That (1) if Corrano be settled in the University, it is to be feared that it will raise such flames therein that they will not easily be quenched. (2) 'T is requisite that it be really known whether he be able to show that he be lawfully called to the ministry of the gospel and charge of teaching publicly, either by the order of any Christian church beyond the sea or by the authority of the church of England, or whether ordained by a bishop, of which matters there be some that doubt. And if he be not, how can he read ? And if he be, it would be well if it be known. (3) That he is evilly thought of for heresy of the French church and others, and Beza doth publicly charge him of it in an epistle of his that is extant. (4) That he is supposed to be tainted with Pelagianism which partly appears from certain Tables which he brought with him and afterwards scattered abroad. On which a certain person of sound judgment made such notes that from thence one may evidently perceive that Corrano's obscure speeches in the said Tables do give just suspicion of very great heresies about predestination and justification by faith, two of the chief points of Christian religion, etc. And therefore it is hoped that as you were a means to remove Franc. Puccius, so you will endeavour to stop Corrano from coming among us, who is thought to be a master of Puccius, etc." [1]

The fact that in 1579 Corro was appointed reader in Divinity to the students of three Halls, Gloucester, St. Mary and Hart, sufficiently proves the probity of his character and the pureness of his doctrine. Many important and well-known personalities stayed in Oxford at that time and must have attended his lectures, as John Lyly, Richard Hakluyt, Thomas Lodge, Sir Edward Hoby, Thomas Pie and perhaps John Thorius. As Wood relates in his *Athenæ Oxonienses*, Corro was living as a student in Christ's Church in 1579, if not earlier, where he was " Censor theologicus " from 1581 to 1585. At the age of fifty-nine he was matriculated there.

[1] Also compare Wood's *Hist. and Antiqu. Uni. Oxf.* (Gutch), p. 195 f.

In 1581 Corro edited a second work on the Epistle to the Romans, with a preface addressed to the students of Oxford University: "Epistola beati Pauli apostoli ad Romanos, e Graeco in Latinum versa et in Dialogi formam redacta . . ." During the last years of his life, Corro seems to have joined for good the Anglican Church. In 1582—most probably on the recommendation of Leicester—Bishop Aylmer conferred upon him the prebend of Harleston in St. Paul's, London, where he died in 1591.

It is not easy to judge at the end of this biography how far the numerous charges made against Corro and his doctrine were justified or whether they were justified at all. Perhaps it may be concluded from the mere interest Corro took in works like the *Dialogi* by the Italian Bernardino Ochino—whose mentality is doubtless akin to his own—Osiander's treatises, the writings of Schwenkfeld and so on, from his admiration of Castalio, Ochino's friend and the translator of his works, that there were similar tendencies in him and a certain inclination for critical analysis of religious conceptions. On the other hand—and this is extremely important for any judgment on Corro—the first reformers, notorious for their intolerance, were easily inclined to condemn as heresy anything slightly different from their own doctrine. They were never quite free from personal hatred or jealousy, and had no scruples about slandering their adversaries as much as they could. Besides, any possible reconciliation of the two parties was rendered even more difficult by Corro's violent and unyielding character.

WHICH Is; or the Unknown God. By an Unknown Man. *Alden Press.* 6*s.*

From internal evidence we learn that this book was first written in 1909. It is reprinted after many years, by the author's widow, as a fitting memorial to him and as a thankoffering to God for the new experience of Him which has come to her at the age of seventy-three, through meeting the Oxford Group. The unknown man is made known in this edition as A. H. Pilkington, M.A., Peterhouse, Cambridge, and Balliol, Oxford. His aim is described by his old friend, Sir Hugh Hall, in the following words: "To reawaken spiritual faith by the manifestation of the power of Christ." The key verse of the book is Revelation i. 8. The argument revolves round the idea of gravitation. God is the centre of attraction in His universe. Mr. Pilkington is a strong advocate of the doctrine of Evolution. He believes that if the beginning of the universe expressed itself in a descent from the spiritual to the material, the end of this universe will express itself in an ascent from the material to the spiritual. God is drawing us all to Himself. It is an unusual book. It is not everybody's book. But those who value constructive solutions of the problem of the universe will be delighted by the ingenious and original ideas expressed by one "who being dead, yet speaketh."

A. W. P.

REUNION: THE APPROACH TO THE EASTERN CHURCHES.

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

TO-DAY, even more than when the words were penned six years ago, Christian people feel it is true that "the time has come for all separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church." [1]

In face of the well-organised and world-wide attacks on Christianity itself and of the alarming spread of rival and competitive systems such as a semi-pagan Nationalism and Totalitarianism and materialistic and atheistic Communism, the suicidal policy of divisions and mutual denunciations, in the different sections of the one great Christian Army, are really inexcusable and intolerable. Surely all those who name the name of Christ and own Him as Lord and Saviour should be able to recognise each other as brethren and thus have some kind of "family" association or fellowship, even if on some important but subordinate matters they may hold different doctrines or varying opinions. Those who are able to accept—to get down to a closer definition—the general teaching expressed in the great Catholic Creeds of Christendom, should have sufficient in common to be able to show to the world that they can and do extend the right hand of fellowship to one another. The statement of that persecuted but enlightened and tolerant French Roman Catholic of the eighteenth century—Father Courayer—expresses the inner convictions of most churchmen to-day regarding those who are of another Christian fold: "Though separated from us, they are still our brethren, nor is anything foreign to us of that which is marked by the seal of Jesus Christ." [2]

The aim, therefore, as an outward expression of this sincere conviction, to get into closer contact and fellowship with our brethren of the Eastern Orthodox Churches is one which should strike a deep responsive chord in all our hearts. It is our clear duty as Christians to seek to understand more fully their doctrinal teaching and worship and to discover what measure of agreement exists and what amount of real fellowship it is possible to secure with them. It is with this laudable object that negotiations have been conducted by the Anglican Communion with the various branches of the Orthodox Church during recent years, and in particular that an Orthodox Delegation was welcomed by, and conferred with a Committee of the Lambeth Conference in 1930. This, and similar Conferences, took their origin from the great "Lambeth Appeal" of 1920. This "Appeal" was sent to the Eastern Orthodox Church and as a result

[1] Lambeth Conference Report, 1930, p. 111.
[2] Quoted my *Reformation and Reunion*, p. 188.

the Patriarch of Constantinople, followed by the Patriarch of Jerusalem and Cyprus, made Declarations accepting the validity of Anglican Orders. In 1930 a most representative Delegation from the Orthodox Church was present at the Lambeth Conference and as a result of its discussions with the members of the Anglican sub-Committee, a Report on " the Unity of the Church " was published at the Conference. This sub-Committee also proposed that a joint Theological Committee should be appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and by the Œcumenical Patriarchal, to report both to the Lambeth Conference and to the Pro-Synod of the Holy Orthodox Church. This Proposal was accepted by the Lambeth Conference, and in Resolution 33 (*b*) the Archbishop of Canterbury was officially requested " to appoint representatives of the Anglican Communion and to invite the Œcumenical Patriarch to appoint representatives of the Patriarchs and Autocephalous Churches of the East to be a Doctrinal Commission which may . . . prepare a joint statement on the theological points about which there is difference and agreement between the Anglican and Eastern Churches." The Archbishop accordingly appointed representatives to the Joint Doctrinal Commission, and a very misleading " Agreement " was reported in October, 1931. The Archbishop then also nominated certain Anglican Representatives to meet representatives of the Rumanian Church at Bucarest in June, 1935. The Report of this Conference has recently been published, and the unanimous Agreements which have been reached demand very serious thought from Churchmen since they claim to express the Church of England teaching on the important subjects discussed at this Conference.

There is, in the first place, a certain apparent confusion and uncertainty as to the precise authority of this Commission to speak thus for the doctrinal position of the Anglican Communion, and especially for the Church of England. It should be carefully remembered that the Lambeth Conference is a voluntary body and only partially representative of the Anglican Communion as a whole, since the ordinary clergy and the laity have no representation on it. It is therefore more in the nature of an Anglican Debating Society, certainly of wide influence, and greatly respected. But it is not in any real sense a properly constituted legislative or executive Body competent to define doctrine or to make laws for the various branches of the Anglican Communion.

There is a clear recognition of this limited and unauthoritative status of the Conference in Resolution 33 (*c*) where it is stated that " The Conference, *not having been summoned* as a Synod to issue any statement professing to *define doctrine*, is unable to issue such a formal statement on the subjects referred to in the Résumé of the discussions between the Patriarch of Alexandria with the other Orthodox Representatives and Bishops of the Anglican Communion." Yet the conclusion of this Resolution endeavours to make a curious distinction between a " formal *doctrinal* statement " and the " acceptance of statements on doctrine," since inconsistently it actually endorses the *doctrinal* statements in this Résumé of the

Discussions between the Eastern Church delegates and the Anglican sub-Committee. Moreover, Resolution 33 (*b*) appears to contradict the clear statement of section (*c*) just quoted, since it requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint representatives of the Anglican Communion to join with representatives of the Orthodox Churches to constitute a " *Doctrinal* Commission " and prepare a joint statement on the " theological points of difference and agreement between the Anglican and Eastern Churches."

It is rather difficult to comprehend how the Lambeth Conference can in one Resolution declare its want of authority to " define " Anglican *doctrine*, and in the next, authorise the appointment of representatives to form a " *Doctrinal* Commission " to declare and define Anglican Doctrine ! But in any case the Anglican representatives on this Rumanian Commission have not been slow to exercise full powers for defining Anglican doctrine, which their originating authority declared to be beyond its province ! For they speak dogmatically of the " doctrine of the Anglican Church " on such important subjects as the Thirty-Nine Articles, Holy Scripture and Tradition, Holy Eucharist, and the Divine Mysteries and Justification. They claim in conclusion to have " prepared a solid foundation for *dogmatic* agreement between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches " (Report, p. 12).

Before we deal with these actual " Dogmatic Agreements " it is well to notice that such claims and statements raise certain serious constitutional problems and issues which should not be passed over in silence. For—

(1) The sole originating authority for these Doctrinal Commissions is the Lambeth Conference which authorised the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint them.

(2) The Lambeth Conference has no authority to define doctrine even for the Anglican Communion, still less for the Church of England. In calling the First Lambeth Conference, Archbishop Longley in 1867 expressly stated that " it would not be competent to make declarations or lay down definitions on points of *doctrine*," and Archbishop Tait confirmed this in 1875 by saying that no " questions of *doctrine* would be submitted for interpretation in any future Lambeth Conference." [1] He added that Anglican doctrines were " contained in our Formularies."

(3) The Doctrinal Formularies of the Church of England are—

(*a*) The Bible.

(*b*) The Thirty-Nine Articles drawn up by the Convocations of both Provinces for " the avoiding of Diversities of opinions and for the establishing of consent touching true Religion."

(*c*) In a subordinate sense, the Homilies as authorised by these Articles.

(*d*) The Book of Common Prayer, in so far as a Book of Devotion is able to express and convey clear doctrinal statements.

Accordingly we find that Canon 51 of 1604 forbids any doctrine to be " published " disagreeing " from the Word of God or from

[1] See *Reformation and Reunion*, pp. 207–8.

any of the Articles of Religion, or from the Book of Common Prayer." Consequently any " Agreements " on doctrine arrived at by Commissions deriving their authority from the Lambeth Conference cannot claim to be regarded as Anglican teaching if they are in any way at variance with the doctrines " set forth " in these authorised Church of England formularies.

In view of these facts we will now consider in detail the doctrinal agreements which have been reached by this Bucarest Conference. We are at once confronted with the extraordinary assertion of the Anglican Delegates concerning the authority of the Thirty-Nine Articles which is of a most misleading and serious character, since it actually declares that " the doctrine of the Thirty-Nine Articles is authoritatively expressed in the Book of Common Prayer and that the meaning of the Thirty-Nine Articles must be interpreted in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer." And it adds that " the Thirty-Nine Articles are to be regarded as a document secondary to the Book of Common Prayer " (Report, p. 6).

It is well to notice that this curious declaration is taken verbatim from No. 10 of the Résumé of the Discussions between the Eastern Church representatives and the Anglican sub-Committee at the Lambeth Conference of 1930. And inasmuch as this Résumé was accepted then by the whole Lambeth Conference as " containing a sufficient account of the teaching and practice of the Church of England " (Resolution 33 (*c*)) its re-affirmation here becomes the more serious. That the Articles, as a statement of Anglican Doctrine, should be declared to be subordinate or " secondary " to the Prayer Book, is both unreasonable and impracticable. For the Prayer Book was compiled primarily as a Manual of devotion for Churchpeople and not as a clear, concise, comprehensive statement of doctrine, nor as a warning against error or " heresy." There are obviously many doctrinal questions which are not even referred to indirectly or by implication in the Prayer Book—such as the authority of General Councils or Tradition or the doctrine of Justification. While, except in the case of the Catechism, we cannot properly speak of the doctrine of the Church of England as being " set forth " in the Prayer Book. But this phrase is entirely accurate as regards the carefully worded statements of our authorised Confession of Faith. Moreover, the position that the Articles and not the Prayer Book are the authoritative primary standard of doctrine for the Church of England has been held by all leading Churchmen since the Reformation. Archbishop Parker regarded them as establishing a " unity of true doctrine ".[1] Rogers, Archbishop Bancroft's Chaplain, in his Commentary on the Articles, declared definitely that " the doctrine of our Church is best known by the Thirty-Nine Articles . . . other doctrine than in the said Articles is contained our Church neither hath nor holdeth."[2]

Prominent Caroline and eighteenth-century divines all express

[1] *Correspondence*, p. 293.
[2] *Catholic Doctrine of C. of E.*, p. 29.

the same view, viz. that the Articles " are the constant and settled doctrine of our Church." [1]

The importance of correcting this singularly erroneous statement about the Articles is very evident when we consider the Agreement at this Conference of Rumanians and Anglicans on " Holy Scripture and Tradition . . ." or in other words on the " Rule of Faith." The Articles, especially Articles VI-VIII, deal most unequivocally with this subject, but it is rather from inferences drawn from chance statements or liturgical phraseology that we find it dealt with in the Prayer Book. It is pre-eminently on this crucial point where this Report contradicts the clear position of the Anglican and other Reformed Churches, by its acceptance of the Rumanian Church's statement that " the Revelation of God is transmitted through the Holy Spirit *and the Holy Tradition*" (p. 8). We must not forget that this question was the great dividing line at the Reformation, since the Reformers maintained that everything necessary for salvation could be found in Holy Scripture, while the Romanists declared that Scripture needed to be supplemented and interpreted by Tradition. Our Anglican Reformers undoubtedly took the Reformed side on this question and enshrined it in our Articles and Prayer Book. And yet this Church of England Delegation now wishes to revert to the Roman and Unreformed position by declaring that we must listen, *as a part of the necessary Divine Revelation,* to the " truths which have been defined by Holy Councils or are taught by the Fathers " (p. 8).

Confining ourselves at first to the Prayer Book, we would ask how such a statement is consistent with the question to the Priest at Ordination—" Are you persuaded that the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently *all* Doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation in Jesus Christ, and are you determined *out of the said Scriptures* to teach nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which *you* shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by *the Scriptures* ? " There is no hint here of Scriptural doctrine " necessary for salvation " having to be " completed, explained, interpreted and understood in the Holy Tradition " (p. 8). In fact in the Bishop's " Charge " to the priest, while there is much stress placed on " reading and learning the Scriptures," and on the doctrine and exhortation which they must " take out of Holy Scripture," there is *not one word* concerning the necessity of studying the " Holy Tradition " as defined by " Holy Councils " or as taught by the " Fathers."

When we turn to the Articles, we find in them no mention of Tradition in Article VI, while the 21st Article definitely asserts that these " Holy Councils " " have erred in things pertaining to God," and the 22nd Article, in effect, condemns the Seventh General Council of 787 in its authorisation of Image Worship, by its denunciation of the " Worship and Adoration of Images " and other kindred abuses like the Invocation of Saints, as " repugnant to the Word of God." Moreover, Article VIII bases the acceptance of the

[1] *Bishop Beveridge on the Articles,* vol. I, 9, 1840.

Catholic Creeds on Scripture and *not* on the " declaration of the Church in the Ecumenical Councils " as the Orthodox Church does.[1]

This agreed statement concerning the " Rule of Faith " is specially harmful and misleading in view of the fact that the Eastern Church has already, in its " Declaration " of August, 1927, refused to conceive of a United Church in which some members would *not* accept the doctrine that " Apostolic tradition is the *necessary* completion of Holy Scripture." [2] Consequently if Doctrinal Agreement and Union with the Rumanian and other Eastern Churches is to be based on this serious obligatory addition to the present Anglican " Rule of Faith," of Scripture only, it would at once close the door on the promising and urgently needed Reunion Scheme now nearing completion in South India. In fact it would shut us off from all chance of fellowship and intercommunion with our Home Free Churches with whom racially, historically and doctrinally we have far more in common than with the foreign and little-known Eastern Churches.

This attempt to exalt the teaching of the Fathers or of Tradition on to a level with Holy Scripture was, we should remember, expressly condemned by our Reformers. Cranmer, while declaring that " the authority of the orthodox Fathers is by no means to be despised," adds " but that the Holy Scripture should be interpreted by their decisions we do not allow, for Holy Scripture ought to be to us both the rules and judges of all Christian doctrine." [3] Hooker also states clearly that " Whatsoever to make up the doctrine of man's salvation is added, as in supply of Scripture's insufficiency, we reject it. Scripture purposing this, hath *perfectly* and fully done it." [4] Bishop Jewel reaffirmed this position, and Archbishop Parker says: " Our Reformation detests the Romish errors . . . which make your Romish writers and popes to add, alter and diminish, nay also to dispense with the words that Christ Himself spake, as well as the writings of the Apostles." [5]

Bishop Jeremy Taylor declares: " We have no reason to rely upon Tradition for any part of our Faith," and he adds, positively, " that Scripture is the rule of our Faith is a main protestant doctrine and therefore certainly must not be quitted." [6] Again we find that Bishop Sanderson in his " Preface " to our Prayer Book declares that " it contained nothing contrary to the Word of God." But he does not add nor " to the Tradition of the Church." He could scarcely have done so, since he taught that " the perfection and sufficiency of the Holy Scripture is a most sound and eminent truth and justly maintained in our own and other reformed Churches." [7] Dean Jackson, whom Dr. Pusey eulogised as " one of the greatest minds our Church hath nurtured," speaks even more strongly, when

[1] See *Reformation and Reunion*, p. 122.
[2] Bell, *Documents of Christian Unity*, Second Series, p. 27.
[3] *Reformatio Legum*, p. 7 (1850).
[4] *Eccles. Polity*, II, ch. viii, p. 6. [5] *Correspondence*, p. 110.
[6] Quoted *Reformation and Reunion*, p. 117.
[7] Wordsworth, *Christian Institutes*, iv, 535–6 (1842).

he says that " the making of ecclesiastical tradition to be an integral part of the Canon of Faith, doth not only pollute but undermine the whole fabric of the holy, primitive and Catholic Faith." [1]

But apart from such universal testimony of our leading divines on this question, we may ask where in any of the authoritative Formularies of the Church of England is the individual priest or layman ever told to rely on the teaching of the Church or on Catholic tradition for additional knowledge or for the correct interpretation of Scripture? With regard to the Agreed Statement on the " Holy Eucharist " we seek in vain for confirmation from either the Prayer Book or the Articles or Scripture, for most of the dogmatic assertions which it makes. For instance, where in Scripture can it be shown that Our Lord at the " Last Supper " " gave Himself to the Apostles in the form of bread and wine? " Again with reference to 3 (p. 7) where is there any language used in our Formularies which implies that in the Holy Eucharist " the Sacrifice on Calvary is perpetually presented in a bloodless fashion under the form of bread and wine through the consecrating priest, and through the work of the Holy Ghost *in order* that the fruits of the Sacrifice on the Cross may be partaken of by those who offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice? " Or what authority have we in the Prayer Book for saying that " in the Eucharist the bread and wine become *by consecration* the Body and Blood of our Lord? " Does not the language of the Prayer Book and Articles far more support the statement of Hooker, when he says, " I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ where the bread is His Body or the cup His blood but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them," [2] when we recall the well-known injunction to the communicant—" Take and eat this and feed on Him *in thy heart* by faith." Our Consecration Prayer speaks of the one oblation which was *once* offered on the Cross, but it has no hint of the consecrating priest " perpetually presenting in the Holy Eucharist in a bloodless fashion the sacrifice of Calvary " *in order* that we may be " partakers of the fruits of the Sacrifice of the Cross." It merely prays that " we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood."

Again the assertion in No. 4 of the changing, or virtual transubstantiation, of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ through consecration, is a doctrine deliberately repudiated by all our leading divines till the Tractarian Movement, and it is certainly contradicted by the clear statements of Article XXVIII which declare that teaching of this character " overthroweth the nature of a sacrament," since " the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner . . . by faith." This teaching is confirmed by the Prayer Book rubric in the service for the Communion of the Sick, when the sick person is assured that his repentance and faith in Christ's death on the Cross, apart from his actual partaking of the elements, will secure for him the spiritual nourishment of the body and blood of

[1] *Works*, xii, pp. 168–9 (1844). [2] *Eccles. Polity*, V, lxvii, 6.

Christ. But Article XXVIII says nothing at all of the effect on the elements of consecration. It is also difficult to see how this identification of the bread and wine with the Body and Blood of Christ as claimed in Nos. 4 and 5 (p. 7) can be reconciled with the definitions in the Catechism which clearly distinguish and separate them into " an outward part or sign of bread and wine " and " an inward part signified "—the " inward and spiritual grace " of the " Body and Blood of Christ." For this statement that the elements " remain the Body and Blood of our Lord as long as they exist " (No. 5) is also directly denied by one of the chief Revisers of our Prayer Book—Bishop Cosin. He declares that " though the bread and wine remain, yet the consecration, the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ *do not remain longer* than the holy action itself remains, for which the bread and wine were hallowed, and which being ended, return to their former use again." [1]

No. 6—" Those who receive the Eucharistic bread and wine truly partake of the Body and Blood of our Lord "—is also directly contradicted by Article XXIX which declares definitely that " the wicked " partaking of the sacrament " *in no wise* are partakers of Christ." The Catechism also plainly implies that the inward thing signified—" the Body and Blood of Christ "—is only " taken and received by the *faithful*, in the Lord's Supper."

The agreed Statement on " Justification " that " man partakes of redeeming grace through faith *and good works* " is directly opposed to the clear language of St. Paul in Ephesians ii. 8, 9—" For by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: *Not of works*, lest any man should boast," and also to the statement of Article XI, based on this Scriptural teaching, viz. that " we are justified by Faith only, and not for our own works or deservings, through the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

The Statement concerning the " Divine Mysteries " on pp. 8–9 quotes the two Statements made at the Joint Doctrinal Commission, by the Orthodox and the Anglicans in October, 1931. It is most incorrect regarding Anglican teaching on the *number* of the Sacraments. Not only does the Anglican statement omit the disparaging mention of the " other five commonly called sacraments " of Article XXV as " not to be counted as sacraments of the Gospel, since they have no visible sign ordained of God," but it refrains from quoting the answer of the Catechism that Christ " ordained only two sacraments in His Church."

What is really serious about all these " Agreed Statements " on Doctrine, is the action taken by the Rumanian Commission based upon the erroneous assumption that this Anglican Delegation had actually defined Anglican Doctrine, instead of presenting a very grave misrepresentation of it. Consequently the Rumanian Commission's Declaration unanimously recommending the Holy Synod of the Rumanian Orthodox Church to recognise the validity of Anglican Orders is made under this very mistaken conception of the doctrinal teaching of the Church of England. For it was made,

[1] *Works*, V, p. 356.

as the Report states, because they had " considered the declarations of the Anglican Delegation on these questions (i.e. on Apostolic Succession, Holy Orders, Holy Eucharist, Holy Mysteries in general, Tradition and Justification) which declarations are in accordance with the Doctrine of the Orthodox Church " (p. 10).

We can rejoice in the fact that the Eastern Church, unlike the Roman, with its demand for unconditional submission and confession of " heresy," is willing to conduct negotiations with us on terms of equality. We also fully realise the necessity and value of the recognition of the validity of our Orders for the purpose of Christian Reunion. But we do not welcome such recognition if it is gained by a false representation of the theological position and teaching of the Anglican Church. We endorse to the full the wise words uttered by the Committee on the " Unity of the Church " of the Lambeth Conference of 1930, when it declared that " We cannot for the sake of union, *barter away our special heritage*, for we hold it in trust for the whole body of Christ " (p. 112). But we are equally sure that, if these " Agreed doctrinal Statements " at this Rumanian Conference are accepted as offically expressing the doctrinal position of the Church of England, the traditional teaching and position of our Reformed Church will have very largely been destroyed.

Very singularly, we are not informed what the " conclusions " of the Papers on Apostolic Succession and Holy Orders were, at this Conference, although they are referred to! But we gravely suspect that the Rumanians were led to the " conclusion " that the Tractarian view of Episcopacy was the *official* teaching of the Anglican Church, so that it could be supposed that Anglicans agreed with the Patriarch of Alexandria's Declaration that " the Church has no power to recognise Ordinations in Churches where the Apostolic Succession has been broken." [1] Such a view, of course, directly contradicts the traditional attitude and practice of our Reformed Church, since our Reformers and their successors sought for and enjoyed Fellowship and Intercommunion with other foreign Reformed Churches on the basis of a common Orthodox *Faith*, without any insistence on a uniform *Order* or polity. They lamented, indeed, as Bishop Hall did, the want of this latter bond, but they, like him, hold that " there was no essential difference between the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation." We " accord in every point of Christian doctrine without the least variation." [2] They participated with these non-episcopal Churches and brethren in " the Holy Supper of our Lord," as Du Moulin testified of the French Churches.

The negotiations of the past few years with the Eastern Churches and the " Old Catholics " reveal, however, a very serious effort to change the doctrinal orientation of the Church of England, and, as this Rumanian Report shows, to equate it with that of a Church which our Article XIX declares has " erred in matters of faith," although retaining the historic episcopal orders. For the purpose

[1] *The Christian East*, p. 34, Spring, 1931.
[2] *Works*, V, p. 56 (1811).

of Christian Unity, we are now being told that " Order " is of equal, if not of superior, importance to " Faith." For instance, to quote again from the Report on " the Unity of the Church " of the Lambeth Conference, we find in relation to the Free Church non-episcopal ministries the " general principle " emphasised, that " Intercommunion should be the *goal* rather than a means to the restoration of union." [1] This " principle " is, however, conveniently disregarded in the case of the " Old Catholics " because, presumably, they possess the historic Catholic " Order " ! For although divergence " in doctrine and practice " created " impediments to Union," yet full Intercommunion has now been established with them " as a means to " and " not as ' the goal ' for " " the restoration of Union " !

Such partial discrimination against orthodox non-episcopal Churches is of ominous significance. We cannot but think that the modern history of Christian Missions—e.g. in China—would, for instance, make it very difficult to define the special " gifts of Grace " which, it is asserted, " the Providence of God " has " associated with Episcopacy." [2] Equally with the framers of the Report on " the Unity of the Church " we feel the strong appeal of the " vision " of " a Church genuinely Catholic," " loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all who profess and call themselves Christians," but we feel that even the attainment of this longed-for goal, would be purchased at too great a price if it involved the " bartering away " of our vital " special heritage " of Scriptural Truth which the Reformation bequeathed to us.

[1] Lambeth Conference Report, p. 117.
[2] Lambeth Conference Report, p. 119.

CONCERNING THE MINISTRY. John Oman, D.D. *Student Christian Movement.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

An enthusiastic admirer of Bishop Pearson said of his minor works that " the dust of his writings is as fine gold." The same can with truth be said of the lighter production of Dr. John Oman's pen, of which the book before us is a specimen. Dr. Oman is one of the most distinguished of living theologians whose works judicious readers look for and treasure. *Concerning the Ministry* is a series of talks to his students on Saturday evenings and, though informal in character, there is behind these quite simple utterances the momentum and value of ripe scholarship, mature thought and keen observation ; and the young clergyman who assimilates the teaching they contain will experience the benefit in all departments of his ministry. These pages are filled with wise and shrewd epigrams flavoured by a keen sense of humour, which could be quoted without limit did our space permit. It is perhaps better to leave readers to discover for themselves the wisdom contained in this practical and stimulating book.

W. G. J.

"REFORMATION, MASS AND PRIESTHOOD."

THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD. By E. C. Messenger. Vol. I. *Longmans.* 16*s.*

A Review by the REV. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

IN reviewing a large book of 577 pages dealing at great length and detail with Roman doctrine and with the Reformation in England, written for Protestant consumption, one must select portions for criticism. The writer says "the present work arose out of a desire entertained by the author (E. C. Messenger, Ph.D. Louvain) to set forth a reasoned account of why the Catholic and Roman Church refuses to allow that Anglican clergy have the powers of the priesthood." The essential point, he says, is the difference in the conception of the priesthood in the two Communions, which is linked up with the respective doctrines in the Eucharist. He proceeds to show that there is, as we all know, a serious difference in these doctrines. He begins with the scriptural and patristic doctrine of the Eucharist and Priesthood and endeavours to show that the teaching of Scripture and Early Tradition is that the Body and Blood of Christ are really and objectively present under the appearances of bread and wine, and that this Sacred Body and Blood are in the Mass offered up to God the Father, in memory of the Passion and Death of His Son. He maintains that this doctrine was held by the Early Church and was only reaffirmed in the Council of Trent. Of course the view of the priesthood depends on this view of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, for the Roman view is that the priest (presbyter, prester, priest) is a sacrificing priest (*hiereus*), who offers up Christ as a sacrifice on the altar.

In reading this voluminous work in which the writer acknowledges his indebtedness to Darwell Stone's *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,* Canon Dixon's *History of the Church of England,* Canon Kidd's *Documents Illustrating the Continental Reformation,* the collection of books published by the S.P.C.K. on *Liturgy and Worship,* and numerous other works both Anglican and Roman, we must appreciate the labour and the research which such an undertaking involved, while differing with the author in some matters, and agreeing with him in others, especially as he says, "we have endeavoured to write *history* and to be as impartial as circumstances will permit and to get at the real facts." At the outset, we must take exception to the claim for the Council of Trent to be an œcumenical or universal council. It was nothing of the kind, and its findings afterwards briefly summarised in the creed of Pius IV have no authority at all over the conscience of Christendom. For years before it met in 1545 the Christian nations had looked forward to and clamoured for "a general unfettered

council of Christendom" to reform the ethics and doctrine of the Italian Church. At the Council, which was by no means representative, there was little liberty of speech, but much variety of opinions, and it was under the domination of a pope, whose powers were greatly extended by it. If the Christian conscience in order to be called Catholic, or universal, must accept transubstantiation, that is, that after consecration of the bread and wine, there is in the sacrament truly, really, and substantially, under either form, the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body and of the whole substance of wine into the blood; so that there are no longer two substances or realities, bread and Body, but one substance only, Body; it must also accept the other doctrines, viz. that the Roman Church is the sole interpreter of Scripture; purgatory where souls detained are helped by the prayers of the faithful; the invocation of Saints; the veneration of images; indulgences; and that the Roman Church is the mother and mistress of all Churches and that obedience is due to the Pope as the vicar of Christ. And any further doctrines and innovations such as papal infallibility which the Pope and his council may devise, any further so-called "developments" of doctrine. The Council, in which 187 Italians sat and 83 others, has no claim to be "a general unfettered council of Christendom," such as an œcumenical council ought to be, especially as "none had suffrages but such as were sworn to the Pope and the Church of Rome and professed enemies to all that call for reformation and a free council" (Laud), none of the Eastern Churches were present or assented, and "in many sessions scarce ten archbishops and forty or fifty bishops were present." Every Christian who did not consent to all the findings of that Roman Council was anathematized. It was practically a papal manifesto against the reformers' positions, one sided, narrow based and intolerant. "For a Roman Catholic who has accepted the dogma of 'papal infallibility' there can (says our author, p. 5) never be any appeal from a later council to an earlier one, or from a papal or conciliar definition to Scripture or patristic tradition. In this sense the appeal to history would be treason to a Catholic. He can never admit that the Church has been mistaken in its definitions. Once she speaks, the cause is ended." Accordingly, the Pope is elevated as an authority superior to scripture and patristic teaching. What he says goes; even against God.

It is well that non-Romans should understand the situation. Anyone who denies that the whole Christ, body and blood, spirit and divinity are in the bread and wine consecrated by a Roman priest, or who says that they are only in it as in a sign, figure or virtue, is under the anathema of Rome. Anyone who shall say that the substance of bread and wine remains, or shall deny the conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, the appearances of the bread and wine only remaining, lies under the Roman curse.

Now it is easy to show, for all our writer's efforts to read back transubstantiation into Scripture, the early Fathers and even later times, that the expressions " images " and " types " were used of the consecrated elements. Johannes Damascenus (A.D. *circa* 780) in his *De Fide Orthodoxa* attacked those who said that the consecrated elements were " images or types of the Body and Blood of Christ, who did not say : ' This is an image of my body or a type of my blood.' " He was followed by the Second Nicene Council A.D. 787. This proves that the symbolical theory of the sacrament must have been widely held as it was by St. Augustine and many other Fathers. And yet Johannes did not teach transubstantiation, but an equally illogical theory—augmentation, that Christ's body is continually being added to or augmented by the new-made bodies of the Eucharist, which He takes into His own Body, so that all become one and the same personal body of Christ ! At all events, such a theory of addition would not have appeared admissible in the eyes of Johannes, who must like all the rest lie under the anathema of Trent, if transubstantiation had been then conceived. Neither can Irenæus be quoted in defence of the position that " the doctrine of the real objective Presence ultimately formulated as ' Transubstantiation ' is contained explicitly, so far as its essentials are concerned, in the data of Scripture and Tradition, that is to say, the doctrine ultimately formulated by the Council of Trent is contained in the Scriptural and Patristic statements that the Eucharistic bread and wine *became* and *are* the Body and Blood of Christ " (p. 3). For his emphatic assertion (iv. 18. 5)—" the earthly bread receiving the word of God, is no longer common bread but is a *Eucharist consisting of two realities, an earthly and a heavenly*," shows that he was unaware of any such conversion required by transubstantiation, which Gore said " owed its origin to the monophysite tendency of the Eastern Church, the tendency to absorb and annihilate the human in the divine, the natural in the supernatural."

In a Greek fragment (XIII) (which Massuet the Roman Editor accepted as genuine, regarding it as an abridgment) containing a passage from the story of the examination of Sanctus and Blandina at Lugdunum under torture—the account of their martyrdom is told in a letter from Irenæus partly preserved by Eusebius—it appears that their slaves examined under torture " had nothing to say to please their torturers, except that they heard from their masters that the divine communion is the blood and body of Christ. They themselves, thinking that it was really blood and flesh, told this to the examiners. They, thinking that this was really done by the Christians, compelled the martyrs to confess. Blandina answered ' how could they endure such things who not even partook of permitted food ? ' "

The pagans actually believed that the Christians ate flesh, and condemned them for their Thyestean banquets, not understanding that it was a spiritual feeding on Christ, not a literal or carnal. But Irenæus did not teach this. Otherwise this fragment quoted

by Oecumenius misrepresents him, but as the letter in Eusebius mentions the charge of Thyestean feasts—cannibalism—against the Christians, it is clearly genuine, and proves that the conversion of the bread and wine into the substance of the body of Christ was not contemplated by Irenæus. Again, Dr. Messenger quotes passages from Irenæus in which he finds the Sacrifice of the Mass. We submit that he is mistaken. In iv. 17. 6 " in God Almighty the Church makes her offering *per* Jesum Christ "—*through* Jesus Christ, not Jesus Christ. When speaking here of the Christian's offerings Irenæus says, " the conscience of him who offers sanctifies the sacrifice." Would the Son of God need any such sanctification from men ? What is the oblation in Irenæus ? " We must make oblation to God, and in all things be found *grateful* to our Creator, with *pure mind* and *faith*, in *sure hope and fervent love*, presenting to Him the firstfruits of His creatures. This oblation the Church offers to her Maker, pure and with thanksgiving from His creation. . . ." This language is not consistent with the Sacrifice of the Mass, but agrees with the " gifts " mentioned in Clement of Rome (40. 44). There we learn what this early Bishop of Rome meant by sacrifices (*thusiai*) and offerings (*prosphorai*) to God: " the sacrifice to God is a contrite spirit " (18) ; " the sacrifice of praise . . . *Christ the high priest of our offerings* " ; and similar passages based upon Heb. xiii. 15, 16. See also the *Apostolic Constitutions* (third century), II. 25 " the then sacrifices are now prayers, supplications and thanksgivings ; *the then firstfruits*, and tithes, are now offerings presented by holy bishops to the Lord. . . ." " the gift to God is the prayer and thanksgiving of each " (53). Note the emphasis in Irenæus upon the proper spiritual condition of the offerer's soul as a *conditio sine qua non* for the validity of his offering. With him it was no mechanical contrivance, the instantaneous result of a magical formula, but a spiritual offering from a believing soul. He also says "We need to offer something to God. He takes to Himself our good works."

Messenger says that in the discourse in John vi. 49–52, " the real objective presence of Christ's Body and Blood under the appearances of bread and wine is taught." We maintain against that statement that our Lord is not referring to the Sacrament at all, but to the absolute necessity of His followers being united with Him in the closest possible way. The Jews were familiar with such expressions as " eating " and " drinking " being used symbolically of an inner process. Eating His flesh and drinking His blood was a Jewish or Oriental metaphor for incorporation in His body, and consequently for appropriation of His life. See Isaiah lx. 16 : " Thou shalt suck the milk of the nations and shalt suck the breast of kings." The eating of a book in Ezekiel II was a figure of the soul taking in divine commands. Rabbinical writers spoke of the bread of the Torah as " spiritual food." " Flesh and blood " here denote the humanity of Christ. " Body " not " flesh " is the word used in connection with the Last Supper (Matt. xxvi. 26 ff. ; Mark xiv. 22 ff. ; Luke xxiv. 24 ff. ; 1 Cor. xi. 23 ff.).

When giving the bread and wine later at the Paschal Supper our Lord did not emphasise the absolute necessity of eating and drinking as He does here (v. 53), neither do the Fathers. The reading back of that Paschal Supper into John vi would be an illogical *hysteron proteron* or inversion, a putting of the cart before the horse, giving an explanation of a ritual before the ritual was appointed.

Again, to " drink blood " (an expression not used at the Last Supper) is metaphorical in 2 Samuel xxiii. 17, where the phrase is used by David, when refusing the water procured by his men at the risk of their lives. " Far be it from me that I should *drink the blood* of men who ventured their lives " (lxx). Looking at the water they fetched, he said this just as our Lord holding the cup of wine said : " This is my blood of the New Covenant which is shed, etc."

Besides this, our Lord spoke of *coming* to him, as equally necessary. " Ye will not *come* to me that ye might have life " (v. 40). And here when the Jews murmured at His saying—" Every one who *beholdeth spiritually* (θεωρῶν) the Son and *believeth* in Him, hath eternal life " (vi. 40) asking : " Is not this man Jesus the son of Joseph ? " He replied, " No man can *come* to me except the Father draw him." Then when He went on to develop His teaching of incorporation, they resented not the symbolism with which they were acquainted ; but the fact that the son of Joseph the carpenter, used it of Himself. The word carefully and deliberately chosen, *theōrōn*, of spiritual contemplation and discernment that leads to faith, lifts the whole discourse out of the material rut, in which the literal interpreters of the discourse would bury it, into the pure azure of the heavenly life. The Jews had seen Him with their eyes, and had not believed, but those who see Him with the eyes of the soul must believe. These spiritual attitudes are required for incorporation in the spiritual Body of Christ. This shows that the *faith* of the recipient is a prerequisite of sacramental grace, according to the Master's teaching ; and that the sacrament does not work " *ex opere operato*," as the R. C. Church believes.

Again, he reads this real objective presence of Christ's body and blood under the form of bread and wine into 1 Corinthians x. 6 : " the cup of blessing . . . is it not the *koinōnia* of the blood of Christ, etc. ? " asserting that " five times out of six, when used with a genitive *koinonia* signifies a *material* participation in an object." This word *koinonia* is followed by a genitive in ten places, e.g. " the *koinonìa* of His Son " (1 Cor. i. 9), " the *koinonia* of the Holy Spirit " (2 Cor. xiii. 13), " fellowship of spirit " (Phil. ii. 1), " in His sufferings " (Christ's) (Phil. iii. 5), *of faith* (*Philem.* 6), of the mystery (reading doubtful) (Eph. iii. 9). On several occasions, e.g. Romans xv. 26, it simply means contribution. But when followed by a genitive, five times out of six outside this passage it refers to a *spiritual* participation. And that a spiritual conception is here is proved by the preceding terms " *spiritual* food " and " *spiritual* drink " (v. 4). St. Paul used *thusia*, the general

word for sacrifice, five times, but never in connection with the Church's offerings or with the Holy Communion, but of Christ's offering of Himself, of our offering of ourselves, and of gifts he had received from the Philippians. In Philippians ii. 17 he has " the *sacrifice* and liturgy of your *faith*" (profession). In discussing Hebrews vii. 27, ix. 25–28 where " once for all " (ephapax) and " once " (hapax, three times) is used of Christ's Sacrifice of Himself—a most emphatic reiteration of the writer's belief that such a sacrifice is not to be repeated he admits—" *There can, then, be no repetition of Christ's death.*"

What then is the sense of teaching that in the Sacrifice of the Mass the mystical death of Christ, by the separate consecration of the bread and wine, is caused by the priest so that " the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass does not differ in its essence from the Sacrifice offered upon Mount Calvary " (*Catholic Belief.* Di Bruno, p. 77) ? Is not this the duly authorised Roman method of repeating Christ's death ? The dogma of transubstantiation in connection with the Sacrifice of the Mass is not patient of a dramatic *representation* of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, it demands a real, actual creation of the whole Christ, Body and Divinity, the actual slaying by the priest at the altar of the whole Christ, the actual sacrifice to God on the altar of that whole Christ at every celebration of the Roman Mass, or it means nothing. This is the logical *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole conception.

St. Paul said, 1 Corinthians xi. 26, " As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup (consecration implied) you *proclaim* (or preach) the Lord's death until He comes." The word *katangello* is always used of *preaching* in the New Testament (e.g. the resurrection, the word, Jesus, the way of Salvation, the Unknown God, light (spiritual), " your faith," " the testimony of God, the Gospel, and Christ " (three times)) and cannot bear any sacrificial meaning; nor can it mean repeat, re-enact or exhibit, or stage. It implies a proclamation.

Dr. Messenger proceeds : " there can and must be a sacrificial commemoration or memorial of Christ's Death." Christ's death itself was a sacrifice. A Commemoration of a Sacrifice cannot be a sacrifice itself. A sacrifice of a sacrifice is nonsense. The repetition of the one sacrifice once offered is also a contradiction in terms. He refers us to the Lord's saying (Luke xxii. 19), " this do (*poieite*) in my remembrance " (*anamnesin*) claiming a sacrificial use of both terms *poieite* and *anamnesis*, which we do not allow. God the Father does not need any reminder, much less one that repeats His appointed Sacrifice, of His Son's Sacrifice. He requires no " remembrancer." The passage in Isaiah lxii. 6, " Ye that are the Lord's remembrancers take no rest," should be " Ye that make mention of the Lord " (the Hebrew means " mention with praise "). It was the followers of Jesus that required the constant reminder of His sacrifice. It is *our remembrance* of Him and it only that is to be kept alive. The words were spoken by One Who was returning to the Father Who would not require to be reminded of the Son's

sacrifice, having the " Lamb as it had been slain," always before Him ; and who was leaving people who had short memories which He was constantly stimulating. " Remember the word which I spoke unto you " ; " that ye may remember " (the Holy Spirit would remind them), " do you not remember ? " etc. The New Testament use of *anamnesis* is not, therefore, patient of the meaning " a commemoration made unto God." This is also clear from Hebrews ix. 3, where we have an *anamnesis* of sins, not a record, but a calling to mind (man's not God's) of human sins. The contrast between the Jewish sacrifice and the Holy Communion is that in the former their sins were brought back vividly to the offerers ; while in the latter the recollection of man's redemption from sin by Christ's sacrifice once offered is kept alive. In Wisdom xvi. 6 we have the word—" a symbol of salvation to put them in remembrance (*eis anamnesin*) of the commandment of thy law." It occurs twice in the Greek titles of Psalms 38 and 70, which are not connected with sacrifice, the first dealing with the Sabbath and the second with deliverance. In Numbers x. 10, the word is used in connection with the blowing of trumpets, and in Leviticus xxiv. 7 of the *incense* that was placed on the shewbread, and burnt " that it may be to the bread for a *memorial*," whereas the bread was eaten by the priests. It was the *shew*bread, not the incense, the memorial that was burnt, that was treated in the Church liturgies as a type of the bread of the Holy Communion. So that *anamnesis* cannot be said to bear a sacrificial meaning in connection with the bread and wine.

The question that remains is, can " *touto poieite* " mean " sacrifice this " ? Great scholars of the Roman Church denied it. Bellarmine explained this order as meaning : " that which we are doing, I consecrating and distributing, you receiving and eating." He interprets " hoc facite " as " do this action," and describes the statement that Catholics take the words to mean " sacrifice this " as " *impostura adversariorum*, Catholici non tam inepte argumentantur." And yet they do. Estius (1614) said " to render this as ' sacrifice this ' is contrary to the mind of scripture " (praeter mentem scripturae). He said the words of the Canon, " haec quotiescunque feceritis in mei memoriam facietis " cannot, except in a forced sense, mean " make a sacrifice." The words " hoc facite " give the authority for doing these things which Christ did. The " hoc facite " with the cup restricts it to the act of drinking. He proceeds : " that which I now do and what you do at my command, I desire to be done by you and your successors in commemoration of me—that is recollecting (*recolentibus*) my passion and death for you." This, he says, is made clear by Paul's words : " as often as . . . you will announce (annunciabitis) the Lord's death, and by the following words of the Mass, " unde et *memores*." Maldonatus, the Jesuit, also rejected the rendering " sacrifice this." He says the words mean—" Do this which I have done,—that is, consecrate for the end for which I consecrated."

It is a fact that *poiein* is frequently used in connection with

sacrifice; but it would be difficult to prove that in any single instance it must mean "sacrifice": for in every case where it is used with a sacrificial animal it can mean "prepare." Messenger refers to Exodus xxix. 39 which describes the preparation of the lamb or the "doing with" the lamb. If *poiein* must be rendered "sacrifice" there, it must also be rendered "sacrifice" in verse 35 of the same chapter—"thou shalt sacrifice *to* Aaron and his sons"! And in 2 Samuel xii. 4, "he *sacrificed* it (the lamb) to the visitor"! The correct word *anapherō* is used in Exodus xxix. 39 and in Psalm lxvi. 15 (which he refers to) where *poiein* is used in the second clause, instead of repeating the technical verb, according to the Hebrew parallelismus. There is also good manuscript authority for reading *anapherō* in the second clause. In Luke ii. 27 "to do for him (Jesus) according to the customary law," cannot mean "sacrifice" as there is no object there and the reference is to the presentation of the first-born and the payment of the redemption money. Next he refers to Justin Martyr (*Dialogue* 41) who described the offering of the cake for leprosy as "a type of the Eucharist which our Lord commanded us to *do* (*poiein*) *in remembrance* of his passion." Justin simply introduces this phrase as a quotation of the original order. This is clear from other passages, Apol. 1, 66, where he gives the Lukan [1] passage fully, mentioning the feast of bread and water in the Mithraic cult, in which there is no suggestion of an objective presence, as an imitation of that service, and Dialogue 117, "prayers and thanksgiving made by worthy people are the only perfect sacrifices (*thusiai*) well pleasing to God I myself assert. For these are the only things Christians have been taught to *do* (*poiein*) even at the commemoration (*anamnesis*) of their food, both dry and liquid, in which they remember (memnēntai) the passion of the Son of God." The whole service was thus in Justin's eyes an act of commemoration of God's natural gifts of food and drink, as well as of the passion of Christ, in which the only sacrifices are prayers and thanksgivings. This passage is therefore strongly against the explanation "Sacrifice this," and follows such scriptural passages as "let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually" (Heb. xiii. 15). "To do good and to distribute forget not, for with such *sacrifices* (*thusiai*) God is well pleased"; and "a holy priesthood to offer up (*anapherein* not *poiein*) spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God *through* Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. ii. 5) which cannot be explained as offering Jesus Christ Himself. We grant the contention of the author that the priesthood of the Church of England is not a sacrificial priesthood in the sense in which the Roman Church claims that her priesthood is, which sense would require this alteration of St. Peter's words—"to offer up a sacrifice to God, even Jesus Christ."

Again, Messenger finds the real objective presence in Ignatius, but the language of that martyr cannot be taken literally, especially

[1] This passage is entirely absent from D. and some old Latin MSS. It inverts the order, putting the wine before the bread, and Mark and Matthew have not "This do in remembrance of me."

as he was contending against the Docetics who denied the reality of our Lord's humanity and accordingly stressed the "flesh" of Jesus. At the same time we have such passages in his letters as "taking refuge in the Gospel as the *flesh* of Christ," "*faith* which is the flesh and *love* which is the *blood* of Christ," which show his symbolical style. How far Justin was from the dogma of transubstantiation may be gathered from the way in which he used *metabole* not of the conversion of the consecrated bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, but of the conversion of them into our blood and flesh (*Apol.* i. 65). He also refers to the teaching of Tertullian, but he emphatically says, "This is my body" means "this is a *figure* of my body." He had just spoken of the "*figure* of the blood." It is impossible to make the figure of a thing—its symbol—be the thing symbolised. Tertullian's point, as he argued with Docetics, was that there was a real body of Christ and the bread was its *figure*; whereas an airy thing such as a phantom would not have a "figure," as we would say a "shadow," but the "shadow" is not the "substance." He also refers to St. Augustine as giving a definite statement of the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice; but Augustine, as the Roman Catholic writer Rauschen says, "inclines to the symbolical explanation of the Eucharist" (*Die Einsetzung des Abendmahl*, p. 21). Augustine also gave us the caution that "all men are wont to call signs by the names of the things signified." He says, "Our Lord did not hesitate to say 'this is my body' when giving a sign of His body." We often find the bread and wine called the Body and the Blood without any suggestion of a change in the elements, e.g. Cyprian (Ep. lxiii). But that he has a symbolical meaning is clear from the passage, "In the *water* we see that Christ's people are understood, in the wine that Christ's blood is shown." He says that the sacrament is "spiritual and heavenly" when the wine is mixed with water, the water representing the people; just as water (that is the people) is mixed with flour to make the bread (lxiii. 13). This would involve the transubstantiation of the water into the people, if that dogma was held about the wine! Messenger quotes from the 17th homily of Chrysostom, a perfervid rhetorician with an extravagant imagination, but stopped short before an important qualification. "We do," he says, "the same sacrifice, not another, but always the same, *or rather we make a memorial of a sacrifice.*" So Eusebius said, "Christ offered an oblation and sacrifice and charged us to offer unto God continually a memory (mnēmē) instead of a sacrifice" (*Dem. Evang.*, i. 10). He also said: "He gave to His disciples the symbols of the divine dispensation," while Origen (also referred to by Messenger as a supporter) was consistently symbolical. The Eucharistic Body is a "typical and symbolical body." The expression "*antitypes*" was frequently used by Church Fathers, e.g. by Gregory (Naz.), Macarius, Eustathius, Epiphanius, and Theodoret. Serapion used "likeness ('homoioma') of the body" and spoke of offering not body and blood but bread and cup. The same symbolical expressions, *anti-*

types, *figures*, etc., are found in the Coptic *Egyptian Church Order*, and in the Syrian *Apostolic Constitutions* of the fifth century.

Accordingly, we have proved that the Roman view of transubstantiation in the sense of modern Roman Divines, i.e. " that at the time of consecration, the material substance of the elements ceases to be, and is replaced by the substance of the Body and Blood of our Lord, which substance sustains the outward appearance of bread and wine, of which the substance has ceased to be " has no support whatever among the patristic authorities mentioned in this review, much less in the Scripture.

This conclusion is supported by the findings of the late Dr. Pusey (*Real Presence*, pp. 162–264) from whose work the above definition of transubstantiation is taken. " The Romans," he says, " say that the Anglican writers do not use such language, therefore their position is different from that of the Fathers. But what of their own position ? Pope Gelasius said, ' the elements remain in their own proper nature,' Irenæus, that ' the Eucharist consists of two things, an earthly and a heavenly.' Many of the Fathers held that they are symbols, types, antitypes, figures, images of our Lord's Body and Blood. Chrysostom declared that ' the nature of bread remains ' (*Ep.* to Caesarius) ; and Theodoret that ' the mystic symbols do not after consecration depart from their own nature. For they remain in their former substance.' After examining the various terms used to express a change, he says that Suarez, the Roman theologian to whom he refers, admitted that none of them adequately expressed the modern Roman doctrine, and he himself points out that the only word that could signify transubstantiation (*metousiōsis*) was not used by the Fathers. He also quotes the words of Cyril of Alexandria (one of Messenger's authorities), " That becoming does not wholly imply a change of nature will be evident, for one says to God : ' *Become* thou to me my shield,' ' The Lord *became* my salvation.' " He (Cyril) also speaks of a change of the elements not into the Body and Blood of Christ, but into the *energy* or *virtue* thereof. But the energy or virtue of a substance is not the same as that substance itself. The expressions become, or be changed into, the Body and Blood, cannot mean, as Pusey says, that that which is changed or becomes something ceases to be, e.g. The Word became flesh " does not mean that the Word ceased to be."

We must draw to a conclusion this review of Dr. Messenger's work with the remark that theological or doctrinal controversies should be carried on without bitterness or personalities. There was no real necessity for the writer to mention the apocryphal story of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn's sister, or the youthful marriage of Cranmer when discussing the Reformation in England, just as it should be possible for others to examine the Roman dogma of transubstantiation without referring to the private life of Pius IV or to some of his unworthy predecessors.

WILLIAM TYNDALE, MARTYR, 1536.

By W. Guy Johnson.

TEN years ago, in October, 1926, an article on William Tyndale and the English New Testament, by the present writer, was published in The Churchman. That year marked the fourth centenary of the appearance in this country of the first printed New Testament in the English language. The translation which was the work of William Tyndale, then an obscure English priest, had been printed on the Continent at the end of the year 1525 and speedily found its way into England, notwithstanding the efforts of the authorities to prevent its entrance. The fourth centenary of an event so far-reaching in its ultimate results did not attract the amount of attention which its importance deserved, for considered as a literary achievement alone, Tyndale's work marks an epoch in the history of our country. By way of commemorating it, Dr. Henry Guppy, the well-known librarian of the Rylands Library, Manchester, wrote an article, afterwards reprinted in pamphlet form, entitled "William Tindale and the Earlier Translators of the Bible into English," which has all the qualities of scholarship, lucidity and general interest characteristic of Dr. Guppy's pen. This pamphlet has now been incorporated with other material in a larger one issued from the Rylands Library last year to commemorate the four-hundredth anniversary of the publication of the first complete printed English Bible, October, 1935 (Coverdale's) Dr. Guppy's later pamphlet should be secured by all who are interested in studying the history of the text and transmission of the English Bible.

Tyndale only survived the completion of his work on the 1525 New Testament by eleven busy and troubled years, when his earthly course was closed by a violent death at the hands of his enemies and the enemies of Bible translation, on October 5, 1536, exactly four hundred years ago from this present month, and it is fitting that so noble a life should be once again brought to mind. If we are to obey the injunction to praise famous men there is none more worthy of such honour than the heroic and devoted scholar whose life, work and untimely end are being commemorated this year.

Tyndale's life was in one sense uneventful, for he stood apart from the stirring events and movements of his time and lived the life of a scholar and specialist. But there were few of his more active contemporaries who did as much as he to stimulate and to give permanence to the movements for reform which were going on around him. When in the household of Sir John Walsh, he is reported to have said to a priest, "If God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plough shall know more of the Scripture than thou doest." And to this purpose, in spite of dangers, discouragements and difficulties which would have daunted anyone of less heroic temper, he successfully devoted himself for the next sixteen years, at the end of which his only earthly

reward was martyrdom at the stake. As Bishop Westcott wrote: "From the first he had exactly measured the cost of his work; and when he had once made his resolve to translate the Scriptures, he never afterwards lost sight of it." [1]

The date and place of Tyndale's birth are not known. The general view seems to incline to somewhere near the year 1490, probably rather earlier, for he showed a maturity of opinion, scholarship and literary expression at an age which on this reckoning was very early in view of the limited material in the way of texts, grammars and lexicons at his command. A like obscurity envelops his early years, of which we know only what Foxe tells us, that "Tyndale was brought up from a child at the University of Oxford." This probably means that being a precocious boy he was sent to Oxford at an earlier age than was usual. Our knowledge of his earlier life is in fact confined to the following brief summary given by Foxe:

"William Tyndale, the faithful minister and constant martyr of Christ, was born about the borders of Wales, and brought up from a child in the university of Oxford, where he, by long continuance, grew up, and increased as well in the knowledge of tongues, and other liberal arts, as especially in the knowledge of the Scriptures, whereunto his mind was singularly addicted; insomuch that he, lying then in Magdalen Hall, read privily to certain students and fellows of Magdalen College, some parcel of divinity; instructing them in the knowledge and truth of the Scriptures. His manners also and conversation being correspondent to the same, were such, that all they that knew him, reputed and esteemed him to be a man of most virtuous disposition, and of life unspotted.

"Thus he, in the University of Oxford, increasing more and more in learning, and proceeding in degrees of the schools, spying his time, removed from thence to the University of Cambridge, where, after he had likewise made his abode a certain space, being now further ripened in the knowledge of God's word, leaving that University also, he resorted to one Master Walsh, a knight of Gloucestershire, and was there schoolmaster to his children, and in good favour with his master. This gentleman, as he kept a good ordinary commonly at his table, there resorted to him many times sundry abbots, deans, archdeacons, with divers other doctors, and great beneficed men; who there, together with Master Tyndale sitting at the same table, did use many times to enter communication, and talk of learned men, as of Luther and Erasmus; also of divers other controversies and questions upon the Scripture.

"Then Master Tyndale, as he was learned and well practised in God's matters, so he spared not to show unto them simply and plainly his judgment in matters, as he thought; and when they at any time did vary from Tyndale in opinions and judgment, he would show them in the book, and lay plainly before them the open and manifest places of the Scriptures, to confute their errors, and confirm his sayings." [2]

No reason is given for this removal from Oxford to Cambridge. We may be sure that the "divinity" he taught was of the new reforming type and we know that the authorities were already becoming suspicious of the spread of heretical opinions in the University. The expression "spying his time" would fit in with this. Or, it may be that the fame of Erasmus, who was lecturing

[1] *History of the English Bible.* Third Edition, p. 27, n.

[2] *Acts and Monuments.* Fourth Edition, Revised by the Rev. Josiah Pratt. Vol. v, pp. 114, 115.

on Greek at Cambridge, drew him. The late Principal Lindsay wrote of Tyndale as the favourite pupil of Colet,[1] a very interesting suggestion and perhaps not an impossible one, but the evidence, if there is any, seems to be lost. Colet exercised a profound influence upon Erasmus; and Tyndale's was the nature to profit largely by the same influence had he come within its range. He would not have come into direct contact with Colet at Oxford or with Erasmus at Cambridge, for both of them had left before Tyndale arrived, though the influence they had exerted would remain.

During the time when he was attached to Sir John Walsh's household he met the various local magnates, clerical and lay, who visited there, and as he appears to have spoken his mind freely, he fell under suspicion of heresy, and was cited before the Chancellor of the diocese, though nothing came of it. It was in Sir John Walsh's house that he declared his intention to translate the Scriptures, and in the preface to the Pentateuch, he gives the reason:

"Which thing only [the objection of those in power 'that the Scripture should come to light'] moved me to translate the New Testament. Because I had perceived by experience, how that it was impossible to establish the lay people in any truth, except the Scripture were plainly laid before their eyes in their mother tongue, that they might see the process, order, and meaning of the text."[2]

Finding no place to accomplish his purpose in Gloucestershire, he turned his steps to London, where he hoped to find encouragement from the Bishop, Tunstal, who had felt the influence of the Renaissance and whose love of learning had been praised by Erasmus. With a translation of one of the orations of Isocrates in his pocket, and an introduction to the Controller of the Royal Household, he reached London in the middle of the year 1523. But as one of Tunstal's qualifications for his office was that he could with suitable dignity entertain the persons of consequence who visited London and the Court, he was hardly likely to be impressed by a poor and undistinguished student seeking his patronage. Tyndale in fact speedily found that there was no place in my lord of London's palace to translate the Scriptures, and he was soon to find that there was no place for the purpose in all England. He remained in London for about ten months, during which he preached at St. Dunstan's, Fleet Street, though the existing registers have no record of the fact. The church itself was destroyed in the Great Fire, the present building standing on the site. By a fortunate circumstance, Tyndale here made the acquaintance of a wealthy London merchant, Humphrey Monmouth, who took him into his house and befriended him both then and afterwards at much risk to himself, for he was later on brought before the authorities on the charge of aiding and abetting him.

It was by now plain that some other country must be sought

[1] *History of the Reformation*, vol. ii, p. 319.

[2] *Works* (Parker Society), vol. iii, p. 394. *The Five Books of Moses, a verbatim reprint of the edition of 1530*, p. 3. Edited by the Rev. J. I. Mombert, D.D. London, 1884.

where the New Testament could be with safety printed and published. Accordingly, in the month of May, 1524, he set sail for the Continent, never to see his native land again. He landed at Hamburg and, according to all contemporary evidence, proceeded to Wittenberg, to confer with Luther.

It is hardly necessary at this time of day to defend Tyndale against the charge of want of originality either in the design of his work or in its execution. He doubtless discussed scores of points of grammar and rendering with Luther and others, but they could give him no assistance with his English version, for the Continental reformers as a whole were generally unacquainted with the English language. The close and vigorous examination to which his work has been subjected has long since vindicated his claim to independence as a translator. The late Bishop Westcott has dealt fully with the matter in the work already referred to, and it is indeed no longer in dispute. Tyndale was undoubtedly greatly indebted to Luther, as every scholar is indebted to other scholars in the same field; but when the question of independence is raised differences have to be considered as well as resemblances, and the differences here are many and not always unimportant.

So far as is known Tyndale did not return to Wittenberg after his business at Hamburg was completed and the money needed for printing was in hand, but went to Cologne to have the book put into type. The choice of Cologne was well advised, for though it was a city thoroughly under orthodox influences, yet its printers were quite prepared to print in secrecy the Bible or other heretical books if it paid them to do so. It was less likely to be suspected than Wittenberg, and it offered greater facilities for the exportation of books to London, and here it was that Tyndale put the work in hand. The secret, unfortunately, leaked out: the story is well known, and Tyndale, taking with him the sheets already printed, fled farther up the Rhine to Worms, where he found a printer to complete the New Testament begun at Cologne. That version had the glosses or marginal notes which are said to have been responsible for the hunting down and destruction of Tyndale's translation. The notes were in some cases controversial, though in the fragment of the Cologne version which survives the great majority are merely explanatory or expository. There is nothing in them comparable to the very pointed note placed in the margin of the Pentateuch against Balaam's question "How shall I curse whom God hath not cursed?" where Tyndale says "The Pope can tell how." But arrangements were made to seize the books before it was known whether there were any notes or not. And the same efforts at destruction were levelled as fiercely at the edition without notes as at the one which had them. The annotated edition was in small quarto and only one fragment of it, which consists of St. Matthew's Gospel as far as ch. xxii. 12, and is in the Library of the British Museum, is known to exist. This has been reproduced in facsimile by the late Professor Arber and subsequently by the Oxford University Press. Professor Arber's edition has a valuable introduction with

much documentary matter, including William Roye's " Rede me and be not Wrothe."

But beside completing this quarto edition begun at Cologne, Tyndale put another in hand, an octavo volume without annotations or comments of any kind. Of these two editions six thousand copies were printed, three thousand of each, and of the smaller, the octavo, only two vestiges are known to have survived the furious energy of destruction which was for years directed against them. It is indeed remarkable in view of the circumstances and of the ordinary ravages of time, that one of these two survivals of four centuries should be complete and perfect except only for the title-page. This has been supplied by a facsimile title of a later edition, and the volume now rests safely in the strong room of the Baptist College at Bristol, one of the most precious possessions of the College and of the City. The other survival of this edition is only a fragment and is in the library of St. Paul's Cathedral, London.

In spite of the efforts which were made to keep copies from entering the country, large numbers were smuggled into England by various means and found eager purchasers and readers. Tunstal conceived the idea, suggested to him by a merchant named Packington, of buying up all the available copies at the source, viz. from the Continental printers, and commissioned Packington to execute it. It was a costly undertaking, but a goodly number was purchased and forwarded to the Bishop who had the satisfaction of sending them up in flames only to find when the bonfire had died down that the book was reaching England in more numbers than before. The sale had, of course, had the effect of enabling Tyndale to print more copies with some much-needed correction and revision. A further suggestion from Packington that he should buy the printer's stamps [types] found the Bishop unresponsive. He no doubt realised by then that, as the chronicler puts it, while he thought to have got God by the toe, he had got the Devil by the fist.

Thus within about two years of his leaving England Tyndale had accomplished the main portion of his original design. The Old Testament had still to be translated and this was the longer and more difficult part of the task, but except for the Pentateuch and the Book of Jonah it was to be left to other hands, though Tyndale's plans were probably well advanced. The Pentateuch which is almost as long as the whole New Testament, was translated and seen through the press within four years. It appeared quite early in 1530. It contains in the margin many of Tyndale's most pungent notes. To our modern ears the version would have been better without them; but we have not the hard, daily experience of sacerdotal tryanny, intolerance and extortion by which they were provoked. When all around men were being imprisoned, tortured, fined and even burnt alive for possessing the Scriptures in their own tongue or for doubting the monstrous fictions presented to them as truth, men can scarcely be blamed for expressing their abhorrence in language adequate to the occasion. No one who has heard of " annates," " first fruits," " Peter's Pence " and the whole

train of Papal extortions which history records can think that on Exodus xxxiv. 20 " None shall appear before me empty," the comment " That is a good text for the Pope " is unjustified. But when we have said this, and it ought to be said with emphasis, there is no doubt that of the truth of Demans's judgment that " the greatest of Tyndale's admirers must admit that his keen sarcasms are by no means so suitable an accompaniment to the sacred text as Luther's topographical and expository notes."

In the year following the issue of the Pentateuch, he published his translation of the Book of Jonah, which was the last contribution to be published in his lifetime of his translation work on the Old Testament. We need not dwell upon Tyndale's great qualifications as a translator. His knowledge of the original languages; his fidelity to the text; his choice of the simplest forms of expression; the dignity and restraint of his style; and his grasp of the spirit and meaning of the sacred writings, have been testified to by all competent scholars. Indeed, the proof lies in the fact that ninety per cent. of our matchless Authorised Version is the work of William Tyndale who thus gave to the English-speaking people the greatest treasure they possess. The astonishing thing is that he should have done so much in so short a time and done it so admirably under conditions so unfavourable to serious literary work of a kind which required the utmost concentration and ease. The choice of the right and appropriate words which should express most nearly and accurately the sense of the original text, needed a freedom from anxiety and some feeling of security from interruption which Tyndale could hardly ever have enjoyed for long together. At the first, moreover, he had much trouble with his amanuensis William Roye, a volatile person who was useful as a copyist and reader, but a great hindrance in other ways. Tyndale says of him: " As long as he had no money, somewhat I could rule him, but as soon as he had gotten him money he became like himself again. Nevertheless, I suffered all things till that was ended which I could not do alone without one, both to write and to help me to compare the texts together." Roye was a friar who had availed himself of the opportunity of the times to leave his monastery at Greenwich for a life freer from restraint, and was hardly a safe companion for one whose work depended so much on secrecy. Tyndale got rid of him at Worms after the New Testament was so far advanced that such mechanical help as he could give was no longer needed. He would hardly deserve mention if it were not that his facility in the making of " railing rhymes " rendered him actually a danger to his associates. His account, given in doggerel verse, of the action of the Bishops in burning the New Testaments, contains such satirical attacks on Wolsey, that the Cardinal, believing them to be by Tyndale, was not unnaturally provoked to violent personal hostility. Wolsey had not hitherto shown any special eagerness to hinder or to destroy the work of Bible translation, or any enmity to Tyndale, of whom probably he knew little if anything, but on the appearance of Roye's " Rede me

and be not wrothe," he set agents to work to find Tyndale's whereabouts and to obtain his arrest, though happily he did not succeed in this. It is the fact that he was driven from place to place in the effort to avoid his enemies which makes it so difficult to obtain any clear or definite knowledge of Tyndale's movements during the ten years which followed the publication in 1526 of the New Testament. We hear of his being at Hamburg, Wittenberg, Cologne, Worms, Marburg, Nuremberg, Antwerp, but rarely at one place for long.

It was not a life conducive either to study or continuous work of the kind he had in hand, but Tyndale so far from being deterred or discouraged spent the time in revising and perfecting his New Testament, in proceeding with the translation of the Old, in writing Prologues or introductions to the various books, in replying to Sir Thomas More's attacks and in other expository and controversial work. It may all be read in the three volumes devoted to Tyndale in that invaluable repository of first-hand Reformation documents, the publications of the Parker Society, now too rarely used. The Answer to More is in one volume by itself, for the duel was carried on during some five or six years. More had been urged by Tunstal to undertake the defence of the Church against the attacks which were being made upon it from so many quarters. Learned, witty, popular, of high personal character and great public and social standing, he was the one man best fitted to reply to the critics of the Bishops and clergy. He had seen Tyndale's New Testament, his "The Wicked (unrighteous) Mammon," and the "Obedience of a Christian Man"; and his treatise in the first place was an attack upon the translation, in which "above a thousand texts were wrong and falsely translated," but also on the teaching given in the Reformer's writings and notes and introductions to the separate books. As a literary production More's Dialogue has been judged to be the better, but in force of argument and demonstration of the truth of the position which the study of the Scriptures had led him to adopt, Tyndale, without doubt, had the advantage over his distinguished opponent.

In his various writings two main doctrinal positions of the Reformation stand out clearly and definitely. The first is naturally the sole and supreme authority of Holy Scripture, God's Word written and its sufficiency as a guide for the salvation and enlightment of any, even the humblest, believer. It was this only that moved him to make it accessible to his own countrymen in their mother tongue, and for this he was ready, if need be, to lay down his life. The other main principle of which he had a grasp no less firm than that of Luther himself was the doctrine of Justification by Faith only. This and what follows from it was one of the principal articles charged against him at his trial and there was no denying that he had boldly and without compromise taught it as a cardinal axiom of the New Testament. His own words were: "The key to the saving knowledge of Scripture is this: God gives us all things freely through Christ without regard to our works; or in other words faith in the mercy of God through Jesus Christ,

by the grace and works of Christ, and without any regard to any merit or goodness of our works, alone justifies us in the sight of God." This will be found again and again as a dominant note of his teaching throughout his writings; and his life was a complete answer to the calumny that such beliefs tend to make men disregard good works and lead to looseness of living. Sir Thomas More testified to his "right good living" before he left England. Similar testimony was given by Humphrey Monmouth with whom he resided for the ten months of his stay in London; and even the spies who were sent out to see in what way he could be captured gave a good report of him personally. Just as his enemies did not attempt to deny his learning, so they brought no imputations against his character. It was sufficient that he defied the powers of the Church by giving people the Bible that they might read and judge for themselves and therefore he must die. "The pitcher goes often to the well but is broken at last" and so it was with Tyndale. He had had many marvellous escapes, but was fated at last to be captured through the treachery of a fellow-countryman, and after an imprisonment of nearly a year and a half in the castle of Vilvorde during which period his trial dragged its weary course to its foregone conclusion, he was led to the stake on October 6, 1586, and after being strangled, his body was burned. Even in prison he was able to continue his work and it is generally understood that there he brought his translation of the Old Testament to the end of the books of Chronicles. The only specimen of his handwriting known now to exist is a letter which he wrote from prison asking that he might have new and warmer clothes for he suffered much from catarrh which his cell increased—a medieval dungeon was not a luxurious place—and he asked also for his Hebrew Bible, Hebrew Grammar and Hebrew Dictionary, and finishes "but if before the winter, a different decision be reached concerning me I shall be patient, abiding the will of God, to the glory of the grace of my Lord Jesus Christ, whose Spirit, I pray may ever direct your heart." It is a tragic, yet triumphant, ending to a noble life. His enemies might destroy his body, but his soul was unconquered, and the seeds of truth which he had sown grew and flourished exceedingly.

Tyndale has left a great example of what unflinching purpose and self-sacrifice for the truth can accomplish in the person of a man who accepts the words of Christ: "Fear not them which kill the body"; "He that loseth his life *for my sake*, the same shall find it." As we call him to mind this year, well may we say with the writer of old time, "The memory of the just is blessed."

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. By Sir Charles Oman. *Methuen.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

Sir Charles Oman, Regius Professor of Modern History in Oxford, tells us, in his Preface to this book, that he is "profoundly averse to formulating philosophies of history," and to working out "theories of evolution." This statement alone is enough to tempt many readers to turn to his pages. For it is well known that he stands in the very front rank of our modern historians, a man of vast erudition, and a brilliant writer. When one, who has devoted his whole life to historical study, frankly confesses his aversion to "philosophies of history," there is an instinctive tendency to trust his guidance. We shall expect to find that "facts" will not be forced to suit "preconceived impressions," and we shall not be disappointed. On the other hand, we shall expect a wide range of research will have left on so cultivated a mind general impressions profoundly valuable and interesting to average readers of culture, and again we shall not be disappointed. Those who have had the pleasure of perusing Sir C. Oman's *Things I Have Seen*, will know that he has singular gifts of observation and of telling us what he has observed. These gifts constitute him a guide of peculiar value to all who wish to know the truth about the sixteenth century, which he aptly calls "a wonderful time"—wonderful, and of inexhaustible interest to all patriotic Englishmen and all loyal members of the Church of England. To see that century with Sir Charles for our cicerone is a rare intellectual treat.

We begin, then, with a chapter on "looking forward and looking back," on "historical perspective," as Sir Charles aptly calls it. "The moment that man begins to think about something more than the passing troubles of his daily life, and starts consciously or unconsciously to reflect about himself and his neighbours, their ends and their objects, their past and future, he has begun to look at things in perspective. And when he extends his survey so as to draw deductions from what he knows of the past records of his family, his tribe, his nation, or the neighbouring tribes and nations, he is beginning to look at the world in *historical perspective.*" So we are invited to remember how this perspective has been gloomy to men in various ages, and in others full of hope and sunshine. To the Pagan at the beginning of the fifth century the breakdown of old culture and old moralities synchronised with the ruin of the defences of the civilised world before barbarian inroads. To him it was an age of gloom impenetrable. Again, when Christianity had conquered paganism, how overwhelming was the apparent catastrophe, as the borders of Christendom shrank before barbarian and Mohammedan invasions. On the other hand, what new hopes attended the Renaissance of the eleventh century, what an outburst of Christian zeal culminating in the Crusades, what anticipations of the revival of learning in the first days of scholasticism. Yet

hope revived, as it seemed only to die down again, when the Papacy, in bondage to France, and in schism, lost all moral value, and the Holy Roman Empire proved to be a rotten reed in face of Turkish invasions of Europe.

In the fifteenth century the historical perspective was profoundly depressing—a theme which Sir Charles illustrates with great vigour in his second and third chapters. "The unhappy year, August 1492–August 1493, marks the juxtaposition of the worst of the Pontiffs—Alexander VI—and the weakest of the Emperors—Frederick III. From whence was hope to come? The old ideals were worn out after four centuries of internecine conflict between the successors of St. Peter and the successors of Charlemagne. From what source were new ideals to be derived? . . . The fifteenth century was a thoroughly demoralized age. I know of no period so poor of good men of mark, and as full of bad ones. The secular historian thinks of it as the age of Louis XI of France and Richard III of England, just as the ecclesiastical historian thinks of it as the age of John XXIII and Alexander VI. It produces hardly a figure of appealing interest save John Huss, Joan of Arc, and Girolamo Savonarola—and it burnt all three, after trials which were a disgrace to spiritual and lay authority in equal measure."

Sir Charles goes on to tell of the pessimistic prognostications which were the natural outcome of living in an age when evil triumphed and goodness was trodden under foot. Men naturally turned to think of the end of the world as the only possible solution of the miseries of mankind. "What was there to hope for? Enthusiasms were all worked out, no spiritual initiative was left. Men felt the blankness of the outlook everywhere. The Dance of Death which Dürer drew was a typical expression of the spirit of the age." So also was *The Shepherd's Calendar*, one of the most popular and widely circulated books of the fifteenth century. Its appalling realism in its pictures of Purgatory convey an indelible impression of the despair that had settled on the world.

"But turn on a few years," continues Sir Charles, "and from the perspective of the ordinary man we are no longer at the end of a feeble and moribund Christendom, but at the start of a new and vigorous age, full of explosive ideals, moral, cultural, philosophical, social, religious. The change is complete and astounding, and the foundations of the modern ways of thought have been laid, while the 'Seven Ages' in the depressing series have dropped out of men's conception of the Universe. A new visualisation of the world had begun." With a wealth of illustration which none but a trained historian could command Sir Charles develops this theme, pointing out some of the consequences of the astronomical and geographical discoveries that were revolutionising man's conception of the Universe. From these illustrations he passes on to "one most notable change . . . the growth of the importance of the layman specialist in all spheres of life." Embassies begin to be conducted by laymen, not by Bishops. The whole administrative system of governments passes from clerical to lay hands. Wolsey in England, Adrian in Spain,

Du Prat in France, Lung in Germany, are succeeded, if not at once, yet before long, by laymen. A clerical Chancellor becomes as extinct in the political world as the dodo in the natural. Another product of the sixteenth century is the literary layman ; in recounting the names and achievements of such laymen Sir Charles thoroughly enjoys himself. He does not, however, connect with this change one of its principal causes—the new conception of a religious Life, which was among the chief revolutions of the sixteenth century, and specially attributable to the teaching of Calvin. Up to the sixteenth century " religion " was a vocation, we might almost say the only vocation. The Reformers taught the world that religion should pervade every vocation, and should be the guide and mainspring of all. Erasmus wrote to Colet, telling him how he had tried, without success, to persuade a graduate at Cambridge that he might serve God as truly by accepting the post of Surmaster at St. Paul's school as by entering a monastery. It is, of course, not pretended that all laymen realised the conception of the Reformer, or understood what was involved in the priesthood of the laity. But it is beyond question that the Reformation effectually and permanently altered the relative positions of priest and layman, even in countries which continued to be unreformed.

The chapters which follow on " tendencies and individuals " contain most fresh and interesting estimates of the rulers of the sixteenth century, the Popes and the Kings of France, of Charles V and Philip of Spain, of Henry VIII, of Gustavus Vasa, of Elizabeth and of Catherine de Medici. The whole treatment of these characters is in keeping with the historical perspective, the spirit of optimism that pervaded the latter part of the sixteenth century and the whole of the seventeenth. Naturally readers of these pages will not accept all Sir Charles's estimates of the sovereigns and statesmen whom he discusses. Nor would he wish them to do so. More than once the writer of this article has found himself in disagreement. But he has always been interested. From among the passages valuable, because they set us thinking, the following seems to be specially noteworthy :

" It is marvellous that there were many who took the hard road to the stake, rather than that there were many others who took the easy road of submission. Wherefore let us not be too severe in our judgement on William Cecil and his fellows of the Council, who went to Mass in the reign of Mary. Or on Cranmer for his shifts and hesitations before he took the final plunge and recanted his penultimate recantation. Despite of many conformists in hard times, both from those of the old faith and those of the new, I am under the impression that the moral fibre of the nation had vastly improved since the fifteenth century. The proportion of Lollards who recanted under the Lancastrian persecutions is immensely greater than that of either the Catholics or Protestants who, when brought to the last trial, failed to keep their troth. This was specially true of the clergy : friars and Jesuits went to the gallows, Protestant preachers to the stake, with a good grace and

splendid confidence, when their party was out of power. I imagine that this was due to the new spirit of the sixteenth century. The lethargy of the Middle Ages was over, and men braced themselves up to face the hard duty imposed by conscience and a sense of moral obligation. The opportunists were, no doubt, still in the majority, but it is not the opportunists who set the spirit of the time, though they may have to fall in with its waves of change. So Martin Luther's 'Here I stand: I can do no otherwise: God help me' at Worms, or Thomas More's 'I pray God preserve me in my just opinion even to death,' are the things that counted in history."

Such a passage as this conveys the spirit that makes Sir Charles Oman's book pre-eminently worth reading, even though we do not accept all his conclusions. "It is not the opportunists who set the spirit of the time" are words to be remembered in an age of pacificism in Church and State. We thank Sir Charles Oman for them and for a most delightful and instructive historical study.

E. A. KNOX, Bishop.

P.S.—The three concluding chapters, which we have not space to discuss, are not the least valuable.

CATHOLICISM IN ENGLAND, 1535–1935. By David Mathew, Litt.D. *Longmans.* 9*s.*

This is an interesting and useful work, lightly and brightly written, containing a lot of information of the life of the Roman Catholic minority in England from Tudor times. The book is entirely without references to authorities. A short biographical notice mentions some printed sources such as the *Register of Sir Thomas Butler*, and some unprinted—the Norfolk MSS. at Arundel. It is distinctly partisan, for it passes lightly over the Spanish Armada, the Bull of Pope Pius against Elizabeth (1570) excommunicating "the pretended queen of England," and ordering her subjects no longer to obey her mandates or laws. It says nothing of Gregory XIII's answer to some English Roman Catholics who had applied for absolution if they murdered Elizabeth, December 12, 1580 (letter from the Cardinal of Como containing the Pope's answer). "Whosoever sends her out of the world not only does not sin but gains merit." It was to Spain that these "Recusants," as the Roman Catholics were then called, looked for the restoration of the Roman Ritual; they pleaded with King and Pope for the invasion of England. But when the Armada was signally defeated the patriotic spirit of many revived, and they rejoiced in a national deliverance even if their religious hopes were shattered. Even Cardinal Allen, who encouraged Philip while he slanged Elizabeth, "that woman hated by God and man," as he described her, was completely changed by the defeat of the Armada. His natural love for his country which he had tried to kill awoke at last, and he intervened to save many of his "heretical" countrymen in Rome from the horrors of the Inquisition. Dr. Mathew, however, says nothing

about this. Now Mary burned, from 1555–8, some 260 persons, including an archbishop, several bishops, many clergy and women, for not believing in transubstantiation—that was for heresy, for obeying the dictates of their conscience and reason. On the other hand, in Elizabeth's reign it was for treason that people suffered. The executions began after the Pope's (Pius V) Bull (1570) against the pretended queen of England, enumerating her crimes, excommunicating her and releasing her subjects from their allegiance. He had given his blessing to the Rebellion in the North of England. The Bull was full of legal flaws. Pope Pius IV had recognised her as queen, had tried to open diplomatic conversations with her. It was also false to charge her with declaring herself "supreme head of the Church in all England," after she had repudiated the title.

Dr. Mathew (p. 46) estimates that between 1581 and 1588 at least 64 priests, 18 laymen and 2 laywomen were put to death. But generally speaking, the repressive measures of Elizabeth's reign were caused not by religious views which she had determined to crush, but by political expediency and considerations for the personal safety of the Queen whose life was threatened continually by Roman Catholics. Dr. Mathew says: "It was not so much a direct struggle between opposed religions . . . the conflict was rather between the values of the new Elizabethan world and the Christocentric(!) standards of the old religion." The popes surely cannot be said to have shown such standards in Elizabeth's reign, if ever. It is hard to accept this statement of Dr. Mathew with regard to the Babington Plot (1586) that "*the government naturally fostered this plot* as they would any other form of disaffection which they could keep under control" (p. 45), or another statement with regard to the Gunpowder Plot—"it seems most improbable that Government agents were not aware of the plans in their early stages and very likely that agents cultivated the 'practice'" (p. 64). John Ballard, a Roman priest, Mendoza, the Spanish Ambassador, and Philip II—all were involved in the former plot to assassinate Elizabeth. It is absurd to charge Walsingham with fostering it. . . . The Gunpowder Plot—it is as well known as anything in history, that it was discovered through an anonymous letter to Lord Mounteagle, which King James alone could explain, as his father had been blown up by Bothwell. The hatred and dread of the power of Rome and the Inquisition which the Armada was to have set up in England—the "Inquisition of heretical pravity" which had tortured and burned to death many English subjects in Italy and Spain—lived long in the hearts of the English. The Popish Plot was the outcome of it. The hatred of everything Roman was so strong in the English that Nell Gwynn, who was taken by the crowd for one of Charles's French ladies, had to cry out, "I am the protestant whore," to save herself. The Jacobite rising of 1745 was free from all taint of Romanism; Prince Charles Edward had become a member of the Church of England before he claimed the throne. The Irish Rebellion did not improve this feeling. But since the emancipation of the Roman Catholics was carried through largely as a result of

Protestant backing, the feeling of mutual toleration has grown and spread widely among all the educated classes at any rate. This book, which throws a light upon the inner life of members of the Roman Church in England—its title itself is a challenge—may be read by anyone. Dr. Mathew has a story and tells it well. Incidentally while relating the progress of his religion in England he throws a sidelight on the development of the country, in which his co-religionists have taken part. He does not fail to mention the converts the Oxford Movement brought to the Roman Church. This review is rather sketchy. It is so difficult to review a book written from a different standpoint from one's own. Anyhow, this reviewer can recommend it without prejudice to those who desire to know something of their Roman Catholic countrymen, what they schemed, attempted, plotted, endured, wrought and achieved, even though many of the happenings related and persons discussed can be very differently explained. A great deal of valuable matter bearing on Elizabeth's reign may be found in A. O. Meyers' *England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth* (Kegan Paul, 1916), which contains copies of important letters from the popes.

F. R. M. H.

EDWARD STUART TALBOT, 1844–1934. By Gwendolen Stephenson. *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.* 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Bishop Talbot held for many years an influential place in the life of the Church of England. He owed it not only to his personal qualities but to the environment of his life and to some of those with whom he was most intimately associated. He was at Oxford during the period when the Tractarian influences were developing strength and he was associated with the group of men who gave Tractarianism a new impulse in the publication of *Lux Mundi.* Among the chief of them were Charles Gore and Scott-Holland. These three contrived to give the teaching of the Oxford Movement a strong hold on the University and through it to spread the distinctive doctrines of the Movement in clerical circles throughout the country. Talbot was a fervent Tractarian, and his endeavour throughout his life was to make the Movement dominant in the Church of England. His biographer says: "Talbot was, as he always gratefully acknowledged, a son of the Oxford Movement. From childhood and youth nurtured in the Tractarian tradition, he passed to the Headship of a College which was founded not only as a memorial to a dead hero of the Movement, but with the direct object of carrying on its teaching to future generations." At Keble, at Leeds, and later in his episcopate he was faithful to his aim and was able to use the great influence which he acquired for the prosecution of his object. In his earlier days he was affected by the stiff rigidity of the Tractarian outlook. This was shown in his attitude towards Nonconformists. He refused, in 1899, to take part in the centenary of the Sunday School Society founded by Rowland Hill to which he was invited in very cordial terms by the Rev. F. B. Meyer, the Minister of Christ Church, Westminster Bridge Road.

His attitude, however, changed somewhat after the Edinburgh Missionary Conference in 1910, when he was brought into close contact with many of the leaders of the non-Episcopal Churches. In later life also he had reason to express his anxiety at the Romeward developments of Anglo-Catholicism. He wrote: "One does feel the immense trust of a Catholicism, such as it was given to our forebears to secure for us, and the urgent duty of seeing that we are *Catholic* in worship, and faith and discipline. That was what fired the enthusiasm and shaped the piety of the generation to which I owe everything. Conceive then the interest, *deeply* tinged with anxiety, with which I watch the Anglo-Catholic developments of the present day." The misuse of the term Catholic was due to Tractarian theories, and the natural developments to which this misuse led were in a Romeward direction of which the Bishop felt compelled more than once to express his strong disapproval.

As a Bishop he could not fail to recognise the good work that was done by many of the Evangelical clergy in his diocese and he appointed some of them to honorary canonries in the cathedral, but it was nevertheless true that in the case of Southwark his influence succeeded in turning a diocese which was once Evangelical into an Anglo-Catholic stronghold. When his successor was being appointed he wrote to the Prime Minister that a "modern-minded man" was needed, and he added: "The younger Evangelicals fall in heartily under such a rule. I had with me the other day one of our finest young men of this sort, trusted curate of one of our typical Evangelical churches; and he told me how little at ease he and others felt with the older Evangelical and Protestant men. This is typical. It is important that I should say this, as this had once the character of being an Evangelical diocese. And it might be represented to you that it *is* this, though its natural course has been suspended by fifteen years' tyranny under me."

As a faithful exponent of a Tractarianism which is already old-fashioned he played a remarkable part, but Anglo-Catholicism has long gone beyond the type of "Catholicism" which he and Gore maintained. They failed to see the obvious developments of the theories which they held and they were unable to restrain the younger men who pushed their teaching to its logical conclusions. There can be nothing but admiration for the deep spirituality of his character, and his efforts to deepen the spiritual life of all sections of the Church.

THE MONKS OF ATHOS. By R. M. Dawkins, M.A., F.B.A., *Geo. Allen & Unwin, Ltd.* Pp. 408. 15s. net.

The author of this book was formerly Director of the British School of Archæology at Athens and is now Professor of Byzantine and Modern Greek at Oxford. He has four times visited the monasteries of Athos, and he brings to these pages his enthusiastic sympathy with the monks of Athos and the religion they profess. The more valuable half of the book is the first. The description of the geography of the famous peninsula, illustrated by a careful map,

the sketch of the Athonian monk, the picture of the early history of the Mountain and its contact with outside history, and some (rather involved at times) explanations of the differing Athonic communities, are useful. The book will be good for reference. We learn the difference between cœnobitic monasteries (practising the common life) and idiorrhythmic monasteries (of easier life), and between monasteries proper and *sketes* (mainly cœnobitic). There is, however, comparatively little about the liturgical life of the communities —that does not seem to have greatly interested the learned author —and nothing at all about the architectural features of the peninsula or the higher artistic attainments of its inhabitants. It is the weird rather than the beautiful that attracts the author when he is dealing with man and man's handiwork (although he is not unsusceptible to beauty of nature), and if we may draw a fair conclusion from his omissions and references there is no indication of any kind of learning calculated to serve God or help mankind. Later in the book the author becomes engrossed in the superstitions and legends of the peninsula and its communities, largely centred in its icons and legends affecting them. He shows no want of sympathy, is ingenious in his discovery of reasons for legends, and eager to trace resemblances indicative of a common origin for the legends of the different icons or various communities. There are several good plates and some sketches. But we confess to being unutterably bored by the puerility of most of the legends, and are left with the feeling that the picture is of a state of life and standard of religious conception that is not only distressingly backward but also painfully retrograde. Much may be forgiven to those who carry the marks of the Turkish oppressor on their minds and souls; but it is easy to understand that such a presentment of Christianity has been of so little power either to witness or to evangelise; and we are driven to the conclusion that the professing Christianity of the Near East is in as urgent need of evangelisation as its Islamic environment. Perhaps this may be the true lesson of the book. But the labour involved in its compilation must have been great; and it is markedly the product of thorough investigation and patient study in the by-ways of the Ægean. When all is said and done there remains a problem of Near Eastern Christianity that has not yet been solved: and is not likely to be solved either by those who take "the Orthodox" at their own valuation, or by those who go entirely to the opposite extreme. Such a book as this must make a thoughtful English Churchman very uneasy.

A. M.

MODERN GOVERNMENT "AS A BUSY-BODY IN OTHER MEN'S MATTERS." By E. J. P. Benn. London: *G. Allen & Unwin.* Price 6*s*.

It is just over half a century ago that Herbert Spencer published a little volume, containing four essays, entitled *The Man versus the State.* The very title was suggestive, and provocative; but it is safe to say that Spencer never did a better bit of work than

what was contained in that book. It is interesting to read it, to-day, in the light of what has happened since the year 1884. That his forecasts were, in the main, correct, modern history has made only too clear. In Germany, in Russia, in Italy—and perhaps elsewhere—the "man" has been swallowed up in the "state", and, in the process, human liberty has been almost lost. Things have not, indeed, got to such a pass in England, but it cannot be denied that every year has seen some encroachment or other on the "liberty of the subject"—a phrase often in the mouths of men, it is true, despite the fact that this very liberty is being curtailed by the inroads of officialism. *All* repressive or inquisitorial government tends to be bad, in the long run; but (human nature being what it is), some form of government is a necessity; the less, however, we have of it—for coercion is involved in the notion—the better. Mr. Benn's book runs, in part, on Spencerian lines; the author's contention being that the power of modern bureaucracy is almost sure to enslave in the "sacred name of democracy". Of old the object of the Governed was to put something *into* the state; nowadays it is to get something *out*. Mr. Benn admits that the nation is, in many directions, still sound; but we are, unconsciously, living on the capital laid up by past generations of liberty-loving Englishmen, and we are not where we were before the Governmental machine began to move in the direction of State Socialism. Too many people (mostly ignorant or thoughtless), regard the Government as a sort of Universal provider; that is wrong in practice; its function should be to diminish trouble, not to amass legislative enactments that infringe a rightful freedom. The Lord Chief Justice, in a very useful book, warned us of this not so long since; he had marked how the bureaucrat exists to interfere with a man's liberty of action—which is, however, dignified by the word Reform. Nowhere is the trend of the Socialistic movement so clearly seen as in the Civil Service, which has become a new governing class *within* a governing class. Only the Courts of Law, nowadays, are left to protect the individual from State encroachments. The worst of it is that Conservatives have followed the lead of Socialists; they pillage their foemen's treasury, yet still call themselves Conservatives. Mr. Benn deals with all these matters, and with many others of vital consequence—e.g. the failure of the recent housing-policy, the folly of fixing prices and imposing "quotas", the way in which moral and religious restraints are gradually giving way to political and economic restraints. And he calls—rightly—for the moralisation of politics, a thing without which the commonwealth cannot be healthy. Such teaching is old, but never more needed than now. We hope Mr. Benn's book will be widely read, and, in conjunction with it, Spencer's work already mentioned. They should be found in every public library.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM AND FREEDOM. By C. J. Cadoux, D.D., Professor of Church History, Mansfield College, Oxford. London: *Independent Press*. Price 5s.

This is one of the most important books that we have seen for a long time. The questions it deals with are of no transient importance, nor of any mere archæological interest; they are living and active to-day. Hence the book, to use Bacon's words, "comes home to men's business and bosoms." That it will be abused by the Roman Catholic press, sneered at by "superior persons", and roughly handled by our Bellocs and Chestertons, is only what might be expected. Nor will this signify much; what we fear is that the book, being quite unanswerable in its main contentions, will be suppressed as far as possible. It is the function of the Press, too often, to *suppress*, wherever the propagandist methods of Romanism are challenged. Undoubtedly Professor Cadoux has flung down his gage into the controversial arena, and he has written a book which ought not, and indeed cannot, be overlooked by those who desire to acquaint themselves with things as they are, and not merely as they would like them to be. After a brief Introduction headed "A case for vigilance," we are taken on to Chapter I, "The Roman record for the nineteenth century." The evidence is carefully set out. Next comes a chapter, "Were the Protestants as bad?" Historically, it is interesting enough, but perhaps it is more open to criticism than anything in the volume. The heading of Chapter III is also in interrogative form, "Would Rome persecute now?" Inherently this is more than probable, for the Papal Church has never repented of her past iniquities; and the only reason that she does not apply the screw to heretics to-day is that the secular forces of the day are one too many for her. When she gets a chance—and she does, now and again, as Dr. Cadoux very clearly indicates—that "Mistress and Mother of all Churches" is perfectly ready to apply that screw. But we may console ourselves by the thought that it is extremely unlikely that the State —here or elsewhere—will ever again give the Vatican a free hand. Chapter IV discusses (and most ably) the apologetic for persecution; Roman Catholic priests, professors, and propagandists will find it uncommonly hard to confute Dr. Cadoux, despite their well-known skill in manipulating facts of history to square with their ecclesiastical theories. Lastly, we come to the most important chapter of all, on Roman propaganda to-day. It is an astonishing record, yet we find amiable people (not all incompetent) who appear perfectly indifferent to what is going on, patently or latently. Consider the use these astute, but none too scrupulous, propagandists make of broadcasting, as of the Press (see pp. 139 *sqq.*). That this sort of thing is accomplished with skill, and tact, makes it all the more incumbent upon Protestants to be alert, for the price of religious freedom, as of all freedom, is perpetual vigilance. We may, and often do, love individual Romanists, many of whom are the salt of the earth; but the system they are pledged to support —with this indeed no wise Protestant can ever make terms.

That Dr. Cadoux's arresting and carefully thought out volume will create controversy and arouse bitter opposition is not unlikely; that it will be readily answered is hardly possible. And for that very reason, as Dr. Cadoux perfectly well understands, every effort will be made to smother the book, not indeed by open attack, but by that most effective of weapons, silence. All we can say is that we have never read a more effective bit of criticism; we put it alongside of Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, Janus's *The Pope and the Council*, and Dr. G. G. Coulton's admirable work on Papal Infallibility. No higher praise could be given.

E. H. B.

THE BIBLE GUIDE BOOK. Arranged by Mary Entwistle. *S.C.M. Press.* 6*s.* net.

The publication of this useful volume has come at a time when there is a strong desire amongst Sunday School teachers to know more of their Bibles. The questioning minds of many children to-day very often place Day as well as Sunday School teachers in the position of wishing that they had more time for study. In some cases, pressure of everyday duties causes those who have charge of the young to long for a short cut to general knowledge of the Bible —Miss Mary Entwistle has come to the rescue of such folk.

The book is well arranged, and with its Index of Biblical references, and General Index, is a great time-saver for the busy worker. Sections might well be read aloud to Bible Classes and Senior Scholars as they study the Word of God. The six divisions of the work are as follows: (i) The Land of the Bible—dealing with the geography and natural history. (ii) Life in Palestine in Bible Times—gives details of dwellings, dress, food, occupations, games, education. The section devoted to explanations of money, weights, and measures is very instructive. (iii) Times and Seasons—as the title suggests, this division is concerned with seed-time and harvest, and the feasts of the Jewish year. (iv) Religion and Religious Leaders—This is a useful survey of Bible History concerned with the religious life of its peoples. (v) Under the title "Rulers" we are given the most helpful section of all. It provides a bird's-eye-view of the method of government, not only in Old and New Testament days, but between the Testaments. Most interesting to read because of its picturesque and clear presentation, this part, occupying 18 pages, will do much for students in fixing the historical sections of the Bible in their minds. (vi) is called "Time Chart of the Books of the Bible." Miss Entwistle's note at the beginning reminds us that there is a division of opinion as to many of the dates of the Books.

Turning to her Bibliography, she tells us that detailed bibliographies are included in The Teachers' Commentary, and that only a few general books are mentioned by her. It is a matter of surprise and disappointment that many well-known, reliable works on this important subject are missing from her lists. The works of Eder-

sheim, Cunningham Geikie, Neil, Thompson and Tristram should surely have found places!

The general appearance of the book, with its artistic dust cover and splendid inner-cover maps, is good. The reader may be very disappointed in the pages of illustrations—as thumb-nail sketches interspersed among the letterpress they would have served well. Assembled in pages, their proportions are incorrect. On page 143 there is a striking example of this—the minute drawing of the Tabernacle looks foolish between the Candlesticks, and suggests that the blocks from some other work have been made use of. Is it too much to hope that in later editions some good photographs and stronger line drawings may appear? Uniform spelling of names is helpful, e.g. Nablus or Nablous, but not both. "Bethany and Hebron" on page 73 should read "Bethlehem and Hebron."

It would be good to see a cheaper edition of this valuable work, one day. To the vast army of earnest students of the Bible a six-shilling volume is a prohibitive price. May *The Bible Guide Book* have started out on a long and successful journey.

D. M. G.

THE OLD TESTAMENT: A REINTERPRETATION. By Stanley A. Cook, Litt.D. *Heffer, Cambridge,* and *S.P.C.K.* Pp. xiii + 265. *7s. 6d.* net.

During the last few years it has seemed to many of us to have become an increasingly common experience to hear people, laymen, and not seldom ministers of Religion also, decrying, deploring or depreciating the Old Testament as a whole. Some people go so far as almost to boast that they have eliminated it from their scheme of things. Yet, surely, it is a fact that every serious student of the New Testament needs the Old Testament; and, moreover, the Old Testament contains teaching about God Himself which even the New Testament does not surpass.

We venture to maintain that no one who has availed himself of such a volume as Dr. Cook's could despise the Old Testament. "A Christendom scarcely able to live up to its highest ideals cannot condemn the rude standards and outspokenness of ancient peoples who were below their best. The Old Testament is a record of very human folk" (p. 102). And again the writer fixes upon a correct principle when in the Introduction (p. vii) he says that it is not God who in the course of ages has changed, but it is men's conceptions of Him. "I am the LORD, I change not," is true for all time.

Or again, take the writer's analysis of the Prophets' theory of Religion. "The gulf between *this* world and that inner world—the latter being the more real to them—could only be bridged by God's intervention or interposition; He takes the first step. Thus the prophets laid the foundation of a religious philosophy that would bring the supersensuous and the world of Space and Time within the same focus" (p. 189).

Few men possess Dr. Cook's equipment—Semitic Languages,

Epigraphy, Archæology, History upon a broad plain. One of his earliest studies was *A Glossary of Aramaic Inscriptions*; for years he was Editor of the *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly* and, of course, his work as Editor of and contributor to the *Cambridge Ancient History* is well known. And his "Criticism" is more than these and other facts would of themselves suggest. Technical equipment is accompanied by spiritual insight: cf., for example, his appreciation: "One and the same profoundly religious spirit pervades practically the whole of the Old Testament and unites it with the New Testament."

The volume is based upon the general Critical position, but it is written with a tolerance and a graciousness and a readiness to make available to the reader points of view not shared by the writer himself (e.g. that of the Jesuit Lagrange, of Garstang or of Yahuda).

In four pages Professor Cook is able to throw light upon the English Bible in a way as to be new even to men who are tolerable readers of the Hebrew text (pp. 105–108). "One could speak of a '[very] David' (Ezek. xxxiv. 23), or 'Elijah' (Mal. iv. 5)." A "house" is, rather, a "household" (Gen. vii. 1, etc.) . . . and "for ever" (*lĕ'ōlām*) means "permanently" rather than "eternally." The Oriental finds it difficult to think except aloud. Hence God's purpose is generally expressed in His own words (Gen. xviii. 20 f.).

Dr. Cook's chapter on the Prophets, like all else in the book, is concise and clear. A century ago the Regius Professor of Hebrew, Dr. Lee, wrote a book upon Prophecy almost without reference to Amos, Hosea, Micah and Isaiah. Daniel and his predictions dominated the minds of all men. The present Professor, of course, recognises the predictive element in Hebrew prophecy (who could not?), but "the supposition that Prophecy is merely or even mainly Prediction is misleading." The fact is the Prophets point both backward and forward. The Prophets come before us as "great creative figures" (p. 166).

Forty pages of Chronological Summary, of Bibliographical Notes and of full Indexes bring the volume to a close.

R. S. C.

THE CATHOLIC REGENERATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By Paula Schaefer. Translated from the German by Ethel Talbot Scheffauer. *Williams & Norgate, Ltd.* 10s. 6*d.* net.

Although this book is described on the jacket as neither a partisan eulogy nor a coldly indifferent historical report we can only describe it as one of the most perverse misrepresentations that it would be possible to produce of an important period in the history of the English Church. German authors are credited with being *echt gründlich* in their treatment of the subjects with which they deal, and the same may be said of their errors when they start on wrong lines of interpretation. The author's preface indicates the sentimentalism that has influenced her in her own religious outlook,

and she plaintively tells us that if the South Indian scheme should be put into practice in its present form the Church will cease to be a Catholic body, and she will succumb to the temptation to go to the Church of Rome. This indicates the misuse of the term "Catholic" that pervades the whole volume, even in its opening historical account leading up to the actual Tractarian Movement. It is in keeping with this outlook that the Thirty-nine Articles are said to have "a certain currency to this day," but they are to be interpreted according to the Prayer Book and not vice versa. There is a curious jumble in endeavouring to associate Hooker with Laud, and the extreme school of Anglicans. Every hint of a sacrificial character in the teaching on the Holy Communion is emphasised and enlarged upon, and her attitude towards the Low Church party, which still exists, is not concealed. We may remark here that Whately was not called to the archbishopric of Armagh but to that of Dublin. We have said enough to indicate the character of the whole volume. It can only be regarded as a perverse misinterpretation of the whole movement, and will provide an interesting study for those who wish to see how far a one-sided and prejudiced view can lead to the complete transformation of history. Among the other mistakes which we have noted are the attribution to Hooker of the "Apology" by which Jewel's work is probably meant, and 1872 is given as the date of the foundation of the *British Magazine* by Hugh James Rose, of Cambridge.

INDIA AND BRITAIN: A MORAL CHALLENGE. By C. F. Andrews. *Student Christian Movement Press.* 5s. net.

Mr. C. F. Andrews has long been regarded as the champion of Mahatma Gandhi and in this book he states the Indian point of view with the laudable purpose of promoting mutual friendship and co-operation. It is written in the form of a dialogue between a group of Indian and British students at an Oxford College, and is supposed to represent the present attitude of the Indians towards this country. It opens with a strong condemnation of the attitude of Mr. Winston Churchill, and thinks the day is gone by when England can treat India as an inferior country which has been conquered and can only be held by force under a foreign British rule as the Indians regard it. The foreign rule of the British in India will lose the good effect of its earlier impact, and the country cannot be expected to remain an integral part of the British Empire without its own consent. When it is strong enough it must choose its own course, and our duty as Christians is to follow the golden rule which Christ has set before us to do to others what we should wish done to ourselves. "That's the only final solution of the moral tangle between India and Britain." The moral evil of subjection is emphasised, and the Indian outlook upon the West is said to have been completely altered by films of Western life which illustrate all that is base and brutal in it. The World War has had a similar effect. It destroyed the Indian's respect for the Christian West:

" When Christian brothers killed one another, and Christian sisters sang hymns of hate, we said to ourselves that the West hadn't even begun to understand what Christ taught."

The whole question of the colour bar is treated with vigorous frankness, and the treatment of Indians in other parts of the Empire is indicated as a source of deep irritation. Unjust racial discrimination inflicted on Indians outside India itself has most of all poisoned the springs of human kindness and tainted the sources. Mr. Andrews deplores the condition of poverty in the Indian villages, and approves heartily of the methods devised by Gandhi for the relief of distress by setting up home industries. The importation of British cotton has in Mr. Andrews' view been a disaster and has helped to keep the poorest people in a vicious circle of poverty. England's only hope, apparently, of satisfying Indian ambitions is to leave the country to develop on its own lines. " You have got to learn over again to meet us as equals, just as you do here in Oxford. You've got to be on our side in our longing to be free and not to bind us hard and fast with safeguards and reservations which show a fatal lack of trust." Indians will have none of it, if Great Britain comes to stand for a white race Empire wherein Indians are to be treated as racial inferiors. This book is a vigorous statement of the Indian point of view which should be read by all who desire to understand every side of a complicated situation. After reading it, a book entitled *The Unique Christ and the Mystic Gandhi*, by P. V. George, published by the Malabar Christian Office, reached us, and it represents the failures of Gandhi through his Hinduism and the desire of the people of India for Christ Who has been the means of uplifting such vast numbers of the depressed classes. It presents another side of the Indian picture and an equally important one.

SONGS OF ZION. By Lionel James. *John Murray*. 7*s*. 6*d*. net.

The author has set himself an interesting task, and he has accomplished it with assiduity and perseverance. It is " a new approach to the Psalms in the Prayer Book wording arranged in groups with other lyrics of the Old Testament." The inspiration of this treatment of the Psalms came through the reading of Prothero's well-known book, *The Psalms in Human Life*. The volume is dedicated to him as one to whom " all lovers of the Psalms owe the tribute of sincerest admiration and gratitude." It would be impossible to give a full account of all the varied points in this treatment of the Psalms. It gives an account of their origin and place in the Old Testament. It explains the English of the Prayer Book version. It tells, among other things, of life in Palestine as pictured in the Psalms, of the use of Personification in them, of Christ's use of them, of their influence in English poetry, but the chief feature is the text of the Psalms arranged in groups with short introductions and with passages from *The Psalms in Human Life*, and notes on the pages facing the text. The concluding portion is devoted to some other Old Testament Lyrics, The Canticles

and The Song of the Three Children. A Glossary of words differing in sense from modern use and an index of the opening words of the psalms is provided. This completes a book that should prove a most useful handbook to the Old Testament poetical literature, and should help the reader to a more complete understanding of its various characteristics. It is a book to keep at hand and to consult when reading the Psalms, either for instruction or for devotional purposes. It will be found to throw light on many obscurities and to suggest many helpful ideas. Preachers will find the book a treasure-house of suggestions for sermons, and the notes on words will give an opportunity of explaining the true significance of many passages either obscure or obsolete. It will fulfil its purpose of providing for the plain man who loves the Psalms " a key to their full appreciation and enjoyment."

BIBLE STUDIES. By Albert Ervine. *Thynne & Co., Ltd.* 2*s.*

This very interesting and comprehensive study of the expression " Word of God " deserves the serious attention of Bible Students. The " Word of God " is defined as " The Thought and Will of God in expression." In no case does it refer to a book or to the contents of a book. Three rules are laid down: 1. Call the Book the Bible; 2. Call its component parts the Scriptures; 3. Call its message the Word of God. These challenging pages have earned the warm commendation of the Archbishop of Armagh.

The second part of the book contains the substance of a Bible Reading on the Nature and Person of Christ. The author accepts unreservedly the facts of true Deity and true Humanity. Of this section Archbishop d'Arcy writes: " What you say on page 90, ' Beware of constructing an artificial Jesus. The Jesus of the Bible is better,' seems to me quite admirable."

This Study of the Person of Christ is also published separately at 2*d.*, with special terms for quantities.

SPEAKING OF RELIGION. By Bruce Curry. *Chas. Scribner's Sons.* 6*s.* net.

Briefly stated this is an American exposition of religion from the standpoint commonly known as " Modernist." " High Religion " is contrasted with " Low Religion." By the former is meant not a system but an attitude; and that attitude, while critical of much in the religious and philosophical thought of to-day, reserves its severest condemnation for " Low Religion," which really means the traditional way of approach commonly known as " Conservative." The egregious patronage extended to the latter is annoying or amusing according to the temperament of the reader. There is, of course, something to admire in and something to learn from these pages, but we are neither convinced by the argument nor captivated by the style. The Cross, as an atonement for Sin, and St. Paul's exposition and application of the meaning of the Cross do not appear anywhere. They belong to " Low Religion."

H. D.

THE REFORMATION. By A. E. Simpson, B.D. *S.P.C.K.* 4*d.*

This is a cleverly composed contribution to the well-organised campaign design of rewriting and misrepresenting Church history so as to bolster up the Tractarian revival of medieval Catholicism. The account given of the Pre-Reformation corruptions and abuses in Church life is frank, accurate and illuminating, but the Continental Reformation is outrageously misrepresented by bare dogmatic assertions largely devoid of all historic basis, e.g., " Luther trying to tear up the Catholic religion by the roots " and the German Reformers who " deliberately broke with the Catholic Church of the ages." Mr. Simpson conveniently ignores the English doctrinal Reformation as expressed in the thirty-nine Articles of Religion and the all-important part played by the publication of the English Bible in producing it. His ideal never travels farther than the inadequate and ineffective reformation of morals represented by the Renaissance. In his largely imaginative description of the different parties in the English Reformation, he bestows the title of Protestant on the Puritans, when as a simple matter of history the three parties in England at the time in question were called " Papists," " Protestants " (e.g. English Churchmen), and " Puritans " (e.g. the Nonconformists). Mr. Simpson is evidently possessed with an earnest desire for unity, but it will never be achieved by falsifying history and misrepresenting facts. C. S. C.

THE DRAMA OF THE PASSION. By Armand Godoy. Translated by Malcolm McLaren. 2*s.* 6*d.*

This remarkable example of the work of the Franco-Cuban poet is translated by Mr. McLaren into an English metrical version for the first time, and it may be obtained from the translator at his address, Burford, Oxford. The Drama is in three parts. The first covers the events from the celebration of the Passover to the Betrayal in Gethsemane. The second leads us to the Cross and the Burial. The third part, which we like best, is introduced by the words: *Sinite parvulos venire ad me.* It is a plea that the Crucified may come to life again, and this cry is uttered from various points of view by the Pharisees; the dead; the night; the nightingale; the lark; a blind man; the lightning; the thunderbolt; a beggar; the mountain; a leper; the forest; Judas; the flowers; the sea; the past; the future; chorus of young maidens; Satan; death; the Woman of Samaria; the Disciples; the three Kings; Mary Magdalene; Mary; and last of all by a little child. And the little child says:

" Jesus, little Jesus, I'm so very tired. All my limbs ache.
May I go to sleep and feel sure that I'll see Thee when I wake?
Is it true that Thou wilt rise again? Or is there some mistake? "

JESUS:

' Yes, yes, thou mayst go to sleep. I shall rise again for thy sake."

That is the end. Is it not a beautiful ending? Are we not all His little children begotten unto a living hope by the Resurrection from the dead? A. W. P.

NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS.

S.P.C.K. issues *Churches, Sects and Religious Parties*, by G. W. Butterworth, Litt.D. (paper, 2*s*. net; cloth, 3*s*. net). Several of the chapters have appeared in the *Southwark Diocesan Gazette*. The author writes from the standpoint of the Church of England, and seeks to be fair to the other communities with which he deals. He has succeeded to a considerable extent, but there is a tinge of Anglican rigidity about some of his expressions which will not be altogether acceptable to those who do not share his views. He covers a wide range, beginning with the Church of England, and then goes on to consider Catholicism which represents authority in contrast to Protestantism which exalts private judgment. He accepts the common but erroneous idea that Protestantism is now definitely negative although originally it was not so. He speaks favourably of many of the features of Anglo-Catholicism although he admits that the Prayer Book does not enunciate the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. Evangelicalism and Liberal Evangelicalism occupy two chapters—somewhat critical, and we are told that Evangelicalism has never been strong in Theology. Three sections are devoted to the Roman Catholic Church, and he is prepared to go a considerable way towards Reunion, for he believes that there is "evidence of turmoil beneath the apparently calm waters of Romanist life," and perhaps Reunion is nearer than we suppose. He closes the section on the "Historic Churches" with a sympathetic account of the Eastern Orthodox Church. Eight chapters are devoted to the Free Churches, and their members would not, we fear, be altogether satisfied with the accounts that are given of them. The closing section deals with various modern developments such as British Israelism, "Great Pyramid fundamentals," Christian Science, Spiritualism, Christadelphianism, Judge Rutherford, Theosophy, and Rosicrucianism, of which he gives a presentation of a freak organisation in California which has no connection with the English Order.

Jesuit Plots from Queen Elizabeth to King George V, by Albert Close (2*s*. 6*d*. net), is issued by the Protestant Truth Society, and contains a quantity of interesting information "compiled from old State Papers and recently recovered Vatican documents, 300 to 400 years old, and Great War disclosures." Among the documents are some discovered in recent times in the Vatican secret archives, and these are now in the Public Record Office. The book is a compilation, apparently, of various tracts, and, in consequence, there is some repetition and a lack of arrangement that might have made the compilation clearer on some points. The reader, however, who is interested will find a mass of well-authenticated evidence of a surprising nature covering the last 400 years. The particulars given of the events of the Great War show that the activity of the

Romanists against England has not ceased. It is a matter of serious concern to English Protestants to know that Roman Catholics occupy to so large an extent important positions in the Foreign Office and posts of great influence in the Diplomatic Service.

The Student Christian Movement Press is issuing a number of reprints in their Religion and Life Books at the small cost of one shilling each. The late Dr. Percy Dearmer, Canon of Westminster and Professor and Lecturer in Art at King's College, University of London, issued a revised edition of *Art and Religion*, first published in 1924. Those who are interested in art and its use for religious purposes will find the book full of instructive and suggestive material, and will obtain a vivid impression of the close association there should be between the Church and artistic workmanship. In the same series, Dr. H. R. Mackintosh re-issues his book, *The Divine Initiative*, first published in 1921. Originally given as Lectures to Missionaries on furlough, it is intended to cover the essential meaning of Christianity. It deals with the "Need for God," and shows how God meets that need in Revelation and the Incarnation, and goes on to "The Response of Man," concluding with "Christianity, a Corporate Life."

Progress in Prayer is a small book of Forms of Prayer (arranged by Canon Peter Green) for use by grown-up people in daily private prayer (S.P.C.K., 6*d*. and 1*s*.). A preface explains the purpose and plan of the prayers, which are arranged for six days.

The Glorious Ministry of the Laity in the Early Days of the Christian Church, by W. S. Williams, Member and Hon. Secretary of the London Readers' Board (twenty-three years) and London Diocesan Reader (thirty-seven years) (2*s*. net), is issued privately by the author and can be obtained from him at 73, Fairdene Road, Coulsdon, Surrey. It is written to advocate the use of the Lay Ministry of the Church to-day. It is introduced by the Archbishop of York, who says that it brings together a large amount of material otherwise only to be discovered by research through a vast number of writings, and he is sure that it will be of the greatest value as providing a mine of useful information. The author's bibliography shows that he has read widely and consulted the chief authorities for the four centuries which he covers. In Part One he considers the foundation of the Christian ministry and the difficulties of primitive organisation. Part Two deals with the charismatic or missionary ministry, and Part Three with the formation of local and permanent ministries and the minor orders. The lesser minor orders and the inclusion of the minor orders within the clergy are then considered and the lessons for to-day are briefly indicated. Appendices and a full index close a volume which indicates the extensive research and study which have been devoted to the subject.

Co-operation and the World Mission, by John R. Mott (Student Christian Movement Press, 2*s*. net), gives the results of the author's extensive journeys and of missionary conferences in regard to co-operative work, and shows that it is indispensable for future success. He states also some of the difficulties which such efforts have to encounter. All who are interested in missionary policy will find this book instructive and suggestive.

With All Our Strength is a little book of "Prayers for the Kingdom," issued by C.M.S. (6*d*. net.) for Seniors, as a companion to *All Our Days*. They are arranged for some of the seasons of the Christian Year, and a useful index is provided.

Messrs. Thynne & Co. publish *Tabernacle Talks*, by Edith Goreham Clarke (1*s*. net), a series of addresses for the use of Bible Class Leaders, Sunday School Teachers and children, based on the making of a model of the Tabernacle and the various lessons that can be drawn from its various parts and furnishings, and arranged in the form of a narrative of a class engaged in the actual work. They also issue *That Day, or The Day of Jehovah*, in which the author finds lessons for the present day in the three prophets, Joel, Zephaniah and Obadiah. Also *Angels in White*, a series of Messages of Comfort, by Russell Elliott (2*s*. and 2*s*. 6*d*. net). This is a reprint of a book of which some of the chapters have been issued in tract form and the author has received many messages of appreciation of the help that he has given to readers.

S.P.C.K. issue as "Saint Nicholas Plays," *A Pilgrimage to Bethlehem*, by Prebendary Wellard, B.D. (6*d*.), *A Happy Christmas*, by Barbara G. Stone (4*d*.), and *The Everlasting Miracle*, by Joan Burnham (4*d*.). They are written for performance by children.

The Religious Tract Society have issued a second series of "Home Leaflets," at 5*s*. per hundred. They are very attractively produced, with a coloured frontispiece, and deal with New Testament subjects. They will be found useful and will be widely circulated.

Pax Dei, by Patrick Cowley, M.A. (S.P.C.K., 4*s*. net), is "An Approach to Mystical Theology," and the Bishop of Southwark, in a Foreword, says that it indicates in an untechnical manner certain ways in which ordinary men and women of to-day may be guided to share the vitalizing convictions of the saints and heroes of our Faith. It presents in an interesting form the main lines of the thoughts of some of the mystics.

Charles Simeon and His Trust, by Arthur J. Tait, D.D. (S.P.C.K., 1*s*. net), is a brief account of the great Cambridge Evangelical leader written in view of the celebration of his centenary in November. It contains a general impression of Simeon's life and work, the influence which he exerted, and the principles of the Patronage Trust which he founded.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

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

Telephone : Central 9203.

Holy Baptism.—The question of Baptism, especially that of Infant Baptism, is a real stumbling-block to present-day young people. May we suggest that this problem would be solved if some of the books and pamphlets issued by the Church Book Room were read and studied—we mention a few : *The Catholic Faith*, by the Rev. Dr. Griffith Thomas, 1*s.* 6*d.* ; *A Churchman and his Church*, by Canon Barnes-Lawrence, 1*s.* ; *The Meaning of Holy Baptism*, by Canon Boughton, 1*s.* ; *Infant Baptism*, by Canon Barnes-Lawrence, 6*d.* ; *Confirming and being Confirmed*, by the Rev. Dr. Gilbert, 1*s.* ; *The Meaning of Baptism and its Relation to Infants*, by the Rev. G. W. Neatby, 2*d.* ; *Holy Baptism*, by Bishop H. C. G. Moule, 1*d.* ; *Is it true that Infant Baptism is Scriptural?* by the Rev. E. L. Langston, 1*d.* ; and *Baptism*, by the Rev. H. G. Grey, 1*d.*

A fourth edition of *Is Infant Baptism Scriptural?* by the Rev. T. S. Hall, B.D., has also just been published, and copies are now on sale in the Book Room at 1*s.* each. The author deals with the question of Infant Baptism in all its phases and states in his Preface : " It is earnestly hoped that this new edition may be used of God in serving to remove the difficulties of those who have been perplexed. As the following pages appeal to Holy Scripture the writer would desire that they should be studied prayerfully, and with Bible in hand. As will be seen from the introductory chapter the object of the writer is to lessen the divisions amongst God's children, that we may be more ' perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment ' (1 Cor. i. 10)."

Confirmation.—Enquiries are constantly being received for helpful, but simple, instruction in regard to Confirmation. *Confirmation*, by the late Archbishop of Sydney, Dr. J. C. Wright, is an admirable penny pamphlet to place in the hands of persons of maturer years who wish to be confirmed ; *Confirmation : Why we have it, what it means, and what it requires*, by Canon Dyson Hague (6*d.*), can also be strongly recommended to those seeking a clear statement of the nature and purpose of the Rite ; *Confirming and being Confirmed*, by the Rev. Dr. Gilbert (1*s.*), also mentioned above, is helpful alike to the adult candidate, and to the fair-minded enquirer, who, though not a member of the Church of England, seeks to know the meaning, nature, object and value of Confirmation ; and *Talks on Confirmation*, by the Rev. F. A. Roughton (2*s.*), is invaluable to all who seek to give freshness and point to their classes.

In addition, the following Class Notes have been prepared : *The Christian Disciple*, based on the Church Catechism, by Canon E. R. Price Devereux ; *Class Notes for the Use of Candidates for Confirmation*, by the Rev. Henry Edwards ; *Strength for Life's Battle*, based on the Catechism, by Canon Edward Hoare ; *In Covenant with God*, Confirmation questions and answers, by Canon Michael Pryor, and *The Christian Fellowship*, by the Rev. C. H. E. Freeman.

The Notes (2*d.* each, 1*s.* 9*d.* a dozen, or 14*s.* per 100) are intended to be distributed separately to the Candidates before each lecture. The Candidates will thus be enabled to concentrate upon what is being said, and to dispense with the necessity of taking notes themselves.

National Church Almanack.—The Almanack for 1937 is in preparation and will be ready shortly (*2d.*). It contains the full Table of Lessons according to the Old and Revised Lectionaries. The introductory matter contains notes on Church matters and is specially useful to members of the Parochial Church Councils. A specimen copy will be sent on receipt of *3d.* to cover cost and postage.

New Sunday School Lesson Book.—In October there will be published the first volume of a new course of lessons for the Church Sunday School. The complete course will provide lessons for three years from the Old and New Testaments and Prayer Book. The lessons have been arranged by the Rev. Llewellyn E. Roberts, the author of *Lessons on the Collects.* They are written in the same suggestive style, with brief additional notes for the teacher. The object of the course is to provide lessons which combine spiritual teaching with Evangelical Church doctrine. They are intended for the middle and senior schools, but it will be found that each lesson can be adapted to suit even younger children. Volume I, covering the first year, contains 26 New Testament, 18 Old Testament and 8 Catechism lessons.

Other Lesson Books available for 1937 are: *Days in the Life of Christ,* by Marcella Whitaker, *1s. 6d.*; *Bible Tales for Little Folks* and *More Bible Tales for Little Folks,* by J. M. M. Ferguson, *1s. 6d.* each, and *More Stories for the Little People, 1s. 6d.*, for the younger children; *Lessons on the Collects,* by the Rev. Ll. E. L. Roberts, *1s. 6d.*; *Children of the Church, Lessons from the Hymn Book, The Message of the Prayer Book,* by the Rev. G. R. Balleine, *2s.* each, and *The Complete Christian,* by the Rev. Cuthbert Cooper, *2s.*, for Intermediates and Seniors.

" Home Words " hope to re-issue two of the Rev. G. R. Balleine's books, *Boys and Girls of the Bible,* and *The Young Churchman,* at *2s.* each.

Parish Needs.—The Church Book Room has published and can supply the following:—Register of Services, *7s. 6d.*; Confirmation Register, *5s.* for 500 names, *7s. 6d.* for 1,000 names; Freewill Offering Boxes, *3s. 6d.* per 100; Church Offertories and Collection Form, *2s.* per 100; Pastoral Visitation Cards, *2s. 6d.* per 100; and Sunday School Registers from *4½d.* If you have not received a catalogue containing particulars of these and other publications, please write for one.

Notices and Reviews.—May we remind readers that all books mentioned in this issue of THE CHURCHMAN may be obtained at the published price from the Church Book Room. Books wanted as Christmas presents for friends abroad should now be ordered.
