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

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

The Churchman Advertiser.

JULY—SEPTEMBER, 1939.

CONTENTS.

THE
CHURCHMAN

July—September, 1939.

RESERVATION

By the Rev. C. SYDNEY CARTER, D.D.,
Principal of Clifton Theological College

THE Report of the Commission on "Church and State" is not so dead a document as it is sometimes said to be, and its first Recommendation was that an attempt should be made to secure agreement on the "Use and Limits of Reservation." It is therefore probable that this important, crucial and long-standing question will shortly be raised again as a practical issue. Consequently it is well that we should examine afresh this difficult subject from a Scriptural and historical standpoint and in the light of modern developments and claims.

It is first of all necessary, in dealing with a matter of this highly contentious character, to "define our terms." This was done very clearly by Archbishop Temple in his declared "Opinion" in May 1900. He stated that popularly the term "Reservation" covers three distinct practices:

(1) A custom based on Justin Martyr's account of the Eucharistic Service in his day, during which the elements are not "reserved" at all, but, at the time of the administration, portions are taken at once by the deacons to the sick who are supposed to be following the service in church, and who therefore in some sense form part of the congregation. This is really "coincident or concurrent Communion" and it should not be called "Reservation." To such a simple and practical custom, if it could be safeguarded from abuse or extension, few, if any, Evangelical or loyal Churchmen would object.

(2) The permission allowed under the First Prayer Book of 1549 for the priest to reserve from the elements left over from the "Open Communion" in church a portion to administer, with certain prayers, to some known sick person later on during the same day—as soon as may be. Under this rule there was no form or permission of permanent reservation contemplated. But in the 1552 Book even this practice was prohibited.

(3) The extension of this custom by keeping such reserved portions in the Church for any case of sudden emergency of sick cases which may arise. This is really "continuous reservation." In May 1900

the considered "Opinion" of the two Archbishops after the lengthy hearing of expert evidence on both sides, was that "the authorized formularies of the Church leave no place for any kind of Reservation, since the language of the XXVIIIth Article cannot be taken otherwise than as condemning the practice altogether. To say that 'the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up or worshipped' is to say, with clearly implied condemnation, that those who do these things, *use for one purpose what our Lord* ordained for another." This judgment only confirmed the declaration of the *Upper House of Canterbury Convocation* which in 1885 stated that "the wise and carefully revised order of the Church of England, as expressed in the Book of Common Prayer, leaves no place for the practice of Reservation, and that no Reservation for any purpose is consistent with the rule of the Church of England."

It would be well to pause here to say a word on the Scriptural and Church of England teaching on the Presence of Christ. In the Fourth Gospel Our Lord told His followers that "He would not leave them orphans but would come to them" in the gift and mission of the Holy Spirit; so that, as He also said, "where two or three are gathered together in My Name there am I in the midst of them." It does not appear that the New Testament anywhere teaches a *special* Presence of Christ in any ordinance which He instituted. Neither, as Waterland points out, is the actual term—Real Presence—used in our Formularies, although as he admits, "the term seems to be grounded on Scripture."[1] It would seem to be true to the teaching of our Church to affirm that in the whole Ordinance or service of the Lord's Supper we realize in a very real and special way the Presence of Christ and that the elements are the divinely appointed signs "given unto us" in order to intensify and "signify" to us the "inward part" of the Sacrament, which is "the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." And these "faithful" at every administration, are exhorted to "feed on Him in their hearts by faith." Therefore in view of the teaching of our Catechism, the actual term "Reservation of the Sacrament," so commonly employed, is ambiguous and scarcely accurate. Because while it is possible to "reserve" the "outward visible sign," it by no means follows that it is possible to reserve the "inward spiritual grace," or the "inward part or thing signified." Our Church does not assert that a change takes place in the elements themselves, but in the "worthy receivers" (Art. 25), since our Catechism declares that "the Body and Blood of Christ" are the "inward thing *signified*" by the outward sign. Christ is present by faith to our spirits only. As Bishop Jeremy Taylor expressed it, "we by the real spiritual presence of Christ do understand Christ to be present as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful by blessing and grace."[2]

But to return to the Archbishops' Judgment of 1900. Their "Opinion" on the present illegality of Reservation, either temporary or permanent, has been confirmed by the Ecclesiastical Courts in 1906

[1] *Doctrine of the Eucharist*, p. 171.
[2] '*Real Presence*' Sect. i.

(the Henley Case), in 1920 (the Salford Case), and in 1931 (the Truro Case). Moreover, after a careful examination of the *Law and Custom of Reservation*, Professor W. M. Kennedy—a well-known ecclesiastical scholar, whose leanings towards Reservation, for the Sick at least, are natural enough in one who has joined the church of Rome, acknowledges that "all idea of reserving the sacrament regularly for the Sick seems to be historically untrue to the Anglican position." He adds, "Any notion of a 'sacrament chapel' or 'tabernacle' or 'receptacle shut off from the people' is quite contrary to the history of the Reformation in England."[1] But these weighty verdicts and "Opinions" have been challenged by partisans of an extreme school of churchmen of mediæval-catholic outlook, the most learned exponent of which is, probably, the late Dr. C. Harris, who contributed a long article on the subject published in *Liturgy and Worship* in 1932. It is full of unsupported and amazing dogmatic assumptions and assertions, and of most improbable special pleading, made more plausible by the omission of clear contrary evidence. For instance Dr. Harris attempts to defend Reservation from the Constitutions of Archbishop Peckham (1279 and 1281) and Lyndwood's *Provinciale*. He contends that these obsolete Canons are still in force and are authoritative, because the Commission of 32 appointed by Henry VIII to revise them, never concluded its task. He entirely overlooks the fact that the "Act for Submission of the Clergy" 25, Henry VIII, cap. 19 (which is still in force) only allowed the use of Canons, Constitutions and Synodals "which are not contrarient or repugnant to the laws and customs of the realm." This Act has the effect of ruling out Reservation (*a*) as being contrary to the rubrics of the present Prayer Book, "to the doctrine and discipline of Christ, as this Church and Realm hath received the same"; ("Ordination of Priests"), and (*b*) as contrary to the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity, which the Convocations of 1661 accepted and inserted as the first item in our present Prayer Book. The last-mentioned Act distinctly forbids under heavy penalties "any whatsoever Minister to use any other rite, ceremony or order, *form or manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper* openly or privily . . . than is *mentioned* and set forth in the said Book." This prohibition was merely carrying out the Revisers' method in their Preface in *Of Ceremonies* of "Abolishing Ceremonies" by not "retaining them" or specifying them.

Now it is quite clear that the 1559 Book does not "mention" and "set forth" any order to reserve the elements in celebrating the Lord's Supper. Moreover, this unequivocal exclusive prohibition of the use of any other rites, ceremonies or services, is confirmed and, if possible, made even more definite in the last clause of this Act, where it is enacted "that all Laws, Statutes and Ordinances, wherein or whereby any *other* Service, Administration of Sacraments or Common Prayer is limited, established or set forth to be used within this Realm . . . shall from henceforth be utterly void and of none effect." This rules out any reference to "other" services or ceremonies allowed in 1549 or in 1552, and certainly leaves no loophole whatever for an asserted

[1] Page 31.

permanent obligation of a mediæval Canon regarding Reservation. It is amazing therefore that Dr. Harris, in his long, comprehensive article on this subject, can assert that " the Revisers in 1552 left the whole question of Reservation discreetly vague and failed to prohibit it " (p. 560-1). This statement is made in spite of the language of Article 28 of 1552 which declares that " Christ had not commanded the Sacrament of His Body to be reserved," as well as in spite of the deliberate removal of the rubric in the 1549 Book allowing reservation for the Sick when there was an " Open Communion " in Church. Further, the wording of the rubric directly after the " Gospel " in the " Communion of the Sick " service in 1552 and 1559, proves that Reservation of any kind at that service was prohibited. It states : " At the time of the distribution of the holy Sacrament the priest shall first receive the Communion himself, and after minister unto them that are appointed to communicate with the Sick." Now if it had been intended (as allowed in 1549) to communicate the sick person with the " reserved sacrament," the priest would not have *first* received the Communion himself. The very object and great plea for reservation, is that the priest can at any time of day administer the reserved sacrament to a sick person (without having fasted) because he *does not himself* partake of it. He would not " receive the Communion himself " unless he had *then* consecrated it, when, according to a mediæval rule, he *must receive*, in order to " consummate the sacrifice " which is not otherwise completed. So in 1549 it was only when there *had* to be a celebration in the " Sick " house (because of no " Open Communion " in church) that the priest is ordered " first to receive himself."

It is also singular that Dr. Harris entirely overlooks the *additional* last rubric which was inserted in the Service for the Communion of the Sick in the 1552 Book, because its insertion at once proves that ministering to the Sick with the reserved sacrament was no longer allowed. It states that in cases of " Plague or of contagious diseases " when no neighbours can be persuaded to join the sick person for Communion, the Minister *alone* (that is without others joining in) may communicate *with* him. The fact that the Minister had himself to communicate shows that he was not administering the reserved sacrament to the sick person. In fact, if reservation had been permissible this rubric *would not have been necessary at all*, for the infectious person would naturally have been communicated by that method. Bishop Cosin's attempt to alter this rubric in the 1661 revision confirms this fact. He wanted permission for the sick person with a contagious disease to be communicated even when the terms of the rubric about " others to communicate with him " could not be complied with. He asks " if there might be here some indulgence given in case the sick person doth so earnestly desire the sacrament that he cannot be in a quiet state of mind without it."[1] But this could at once have been possible if the 1549 rubric regarding reservation from the " Open Communion " in church, had been operative. It must not be forgotten in this connection that there was an important alteration in the rubric for " spiritual Communion " in the 1552 Book which proves conclusively that Reserva-

[1] *Works*, v. 524.

tion was altogether prohibited and unused from that time. In 1549 there was the possibility of communicating the sick person *alone* (without others) with the reserved sacrament from the "Open Communion" in church—"if there be any," are the words of the rubric which prove that the participation of others is not essential. But this was not allowed in 1552 and the rubric for "spiritual Communion" added a further reason for the Curate to employ *that* method. For this rubric provided "spiritual Communion" for the sick person when there was "lack of company to receive with him." If Reservation had not been abrogated it would have covered just such a case—"Let the sick person be communicated with the reserved sacrament" would have been the rubric. But *instead* the Curate is instructed to comfort the sick person by reminding him that he can make a "spiritual Communion" if he "truly repents him of his sin and stedfastly believes that Christ suffered for him on the Cross," and that this would be equally profitable for his soul's health. Clearly these two rubrics alone prove that no Reservation was contemplated or practised under the rules of the 1552 Book. It has been somewhat speciously urged that the statement in Article 28 that "the Sacrament was not by Christ's ordinance reserved" leaves room for its authorization by "*ecclesiastical* ordinance." But there is not the slightest trace of evidence that the Reformers, who compiled the Articles, would for a moment countenance superseding or contradicting "Christ's ordinance" with the "Church's" ordinance. The expression "Christ's ordinance" is used frequently in the Articles, and always with the implication of asserting a final and full authority. The constant anxiety of the Reformers was to use the Sacrament, as Jewel expressed it, "as Christ Himself commanded" (Works III. 55). Bishop Cooper describes it as "exceeding arrogancy to make your spiritual governors omnipotent in altering the Sacraments by *Christ ordained*" (*Private Mass*, 114). He lays down the clear rule that "In the celebration of this Sacrament of the Lord's Supper we ought to do that only, and nothing else, that Christ the author of it did in His institution" (*ibid* 74). Moreover, it is plain that a definite prohibition of Reservation, *excluding* an alternative authorization by another co-ordinate, if not superseding authority, is intended in Article 28, since the other three practices mentioned—"carried about," "lifted up" or "worshipped" were at the same time definitely prohibited. The object of the statement regarding "reservation" in the Article is made quite clear by the language of Article 25 which declares the purpose for which Christ ordained sacraments—not that they "should be gazed upon or carried about, but that we should duly use them." Christ ordained them to be used and not to be "reserved." As Dr. Bicknell very truly says: "We must not presume to argue about our Lord's presence in the Eucharist as if it were in any way an earthly presence. . . . We cannot be certain that that Presence abides when we use the consecrated bread and wine for . . . a purpose not ordained by Christ, but prompted by the fallible logic of human devotion. . . . We cannot, as it were, bind Him to earth by our treatment of the elements . . . there is nothing in His institution or in the outward signs to suggest in any way that He gave us the Eucharist

that through the consecrated elements He might dwell among us to-day by an abiding external presence comparable to His presence during His life on earth." (*Thirty-nine Articles*, 503, 507/8).

We have further direct contemporary evidence that absolute prohibition of Reservation was intended, since the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* published in 1552 and drawn up by Cranmer, contains the distinct statement : " And so we allow this sacrament neither to be lifted up, nor carried about, nor *reserved* nor worshipped, and lastly we suffer no greater veneration of the Eucharist than of *baptism* and of the *Word of God*" (cap. 19). It is also important to remember the historical setting of Article 28 of 1552, because by comparison with the contemporaneous Canons of the Council of Trent, we get clear evidence of the purpose of its definite language. The Council of Trent at its 13th session had declared in canon 7 that if any one asserted that the Eucharist may not be *reserved*, but must necessarily be distributed to those present immediately after the consecration, or that it may not be carried to the sick with due honours, let him be anathema." This was enacted on 11th Oct., 1551. Cranmer refers to this Roman canon in a letter to Calvin in the following March (20) : " Our adversaries are now holding their councils at Trent for the establishment of their errors. . . . They are making decrees respecting the worship of the host, wherefore we ought to leave no stone unturned, not only that we may guard against idolatry, but also that we may ourselves come to an agreement upon the doctrine of the sacrament" (*Original Letters*, P.S., vol. i, p. 24). When the Articles were issued the next year it was at once seen how Cranmer had " guarded " against this " idolatry," of the " worship of the host," by the clear statements of Articles 25 and 28—that the sacraments were to be used and not " carried about," "worshipped " or "reserved." The anathema of Trent was directly challenged and completely accepted. Not content with this, in his learned treatise on the *True and Catholic doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, Cranmer unequivocally condemned the Romish practice of " keeping the host under lock and key," " as leading the people unto all error and idolatry, not bringing them by bread unto Christ, but from Christ to bread " (" Lord's Supper," 238). As early as 1550 Bishop Ridley, illegally anticipating the complete abrogation of Reservation in the 1552 Book (as he also did the removal of altars), inquired " whether any doth reserve the sacrament and not immediately receive it ? " Roger Hutchinson also, even before the issue of the 1552 book, condemned not merely the adoration, but also the *reservation* of the sacrament. He says : " Undoubtedly Christ would have left us some commandment or else have taught us by His ensample, if either the bread or the wine were to be heaved up or to be *reserved*, or hanged up in a pyx, as it hath been abused " (*Works*, 253). Bishop Hooper in a series of fifty *Articles concerning Christian Religion* issued for his clergy, declares that the fact that the Sacraments " were not instituted for a spectacle or wondering stock doth evidently prove that they ought not *to be kept* nor *worshipped*, or any other ways to be used than as Christ did institute them " (*Later Writings*, 125).

Yet in face of this and other definite and clear evidence, Dr. Harris

actually asserts that the compilers of the 1552 Book adopted the policy of " saying *nothing whatever* about Reservation " (561) as " they found themselves unable to condemn Reservation outright " ! When we reach the Elizabethan period we find that Queen Elizabeth on May 9, 1559, the very day on which this restored 1552 Prayer Book came into use, removed the reserved host from her Chapel and the Royal Commissioners in the same year in their Visitation to enforce the use of this Prayer Book, made Incumbents publicly *recant*, amongst other customs, " the *reserving* and keeping or worshipping of the Sacrament." Yet in spite of this direct evidence Dr. C. Harris asserts that the *English Book of* 1552—the one restored by Elizabeth in 1559—" discreetly left a loophole for Reservation " (p. 577), He even goes further and declares that the Royal Commissioners of 1552 " regarded *continuous* reservation *in one kind* as lawful under the Second Book " (556) ! !

But we have, further, the clear statements of prominent Elizabethan bishops on the subject. Bishop Jewel, in his long controversy with Harding the renegade Papist, accepts his imputation that Reservation was denied by the Elizabethan Church, and speaks of the " abolishing of the Reservation of the Sacrament," and justifies it " for that Christ said ' not to take and *keep*, but take and eat.' " He declares that they cannot tolerate in their churches " the carrying about of the bread, nor worshipping it, nor other such idolatrous and blasphemous fondness which none of them can prove that Christ or his Apostles ever ordained or left unto us " (*Works*, III. 550).

Bishop Cooper in 1562 admits " that in the primitive Church divers used Reservation." But he argues that this is no justification for saying " that we have any testimony in the Word of God to justify it, or that all the holy Fathers did approve it." He adds that because some " good men " used it " it is not sufficient to prove that it must therefore be always used ; or that all did well at that time in using it." We have, he declares, " a number of sound testimonies that all did not allow Reservation nor think it according to the Word of God." He then cites Origen as condemning the practice and also Cyprian. He quotes the supposed 2nd epistle of Clement of Rome, who ordered that if any consecrated bread remained it " was not to be kept until the morrow, but, with fear and trembling, let the ministers eat it up " (*Gratian decret.*, p. 3). He concludes : " Therefore you may not force upon us to receive reservation as a thing either grounded in Scripture or generally allowed by the primitive Church. . . . If ye will prove us impudent or mad for not receiving reservation, I trust you see, that we shall have company in our impudency and madness " (*Private Mass*, 150-1). This is not the language of an Elizabethan Bishop who knew that the traditional custom of perpetual Reservation based on Archbishop Peckham's obsolete Canon, was still lawful in the Church of England !

Prebendary Becon in his *Catechism* also speaks of " reserving the sacramental bread " as well as " keeping it in pyxes " as an " abuse of the Papists " : " Christ said, ' Take ye, eat ye,' He said not ' take ye, reserve ye.' The Sacrament was instituted of Christ to be *received* and not to be reserved." " They therefore that reserve the sacramental

bread after the Lord's Supper be done, enterprise that which is not found in the Word of God" (*Catechism*, 251-3). To go a generation further, we find that Bishop Andrewes condemned the practice, although he admitted that "reserving the Sacrament was suffered for a long time in the Primitive Church." But following the language of Article 28, he said: "It was instituted as a sacrament that it should be *received and eaten*, and not to be reserved and carried about." Quoting Theodoret, he says, "the sacramental symbols after consecration go not from their own nature, so . . . it is easily shown no divine adoration can be used to them." With regard to the need of the sick or dying, he says that the English clergy "may not refuse, but go to him and minister it to him. So that Reservation needeth not, the intent is had without it" (*Minor Works*, 17-9). There was evidently no thought of the possibility of administering the *reserved* sacrament to the sick in the mind of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, for he says clearly, "the *manner* of the sick man's reception of the holy Sacrament hath in it nothing differing from the ordinary solemnities of the Sacrament" (*Holy Dying*, sect. 4, para. 12; *Works*, 2. 206). Bishop Cosin enunciated what were practically current Lutheran views on the subject, when he declares that the consecration "only lasted as long as the holy action remained for which the bread and wine were hallowed and which being ended, return to their former use again." Therefore, he added, "Christ in the consecrated bread cannot be kept preserved to be carried about because He *is present only to the communicants*" (*Hist. of Transubstantiation*, p. 51). Such teaching excludes the possibility of any idea of Reservation.

Bishop William Beveridge, another prominent Caroline divine, in his Commentary on the 28th Article is most emphatic in his condemnation of the practice of Reservation. After giving Scriptural evidence against the doctrine of transubstantiation he says: "Now we having before proved that this bread is not the very body of Christ, but bread still after as well as before consecration, we have overthrown the very foundations of these gross superstitions; it being only upon *that account* that they perform so much homage and worship to it. . . . Neither need I heap up many arguments to prove that according to Christ's institution, the sacramental bread is not to be reserved, much less worshipped, but eaten. Howsoever or whensoever this superstition first crept into the church, by their own confession it is contrary to Christ's institution. . . . They must know that the bread they reserve and carry about, is not the body of Christ, nor hath any relation to it upon that very account, because they reserve and carry it about, and do not eat it" (*Works*, VII, 487-9). It is also worthy of notice that in the last Revision, of 1661, there is a slight alteration of wording in the first rubric before the Service for "Communion of the Sick." In 1552 it had read, "he shall there *minister* the holy Communion." It is obvious, from the context, that the term "minister" there, is equivalent to "celebrate," but the 1661 Revisers were determined that it should be quite clear that the priest was not to "minister" the reserved sacrament to the sick person, so they altered the wording of this rubric to read—"shall there *celebrate* the holy Communion."

It is necessary here to say a word about the Latin Prayer Book of 1560. It is boldly claimed that "the official and authoritative character of this Prayer Book is beyond doubt" (Harris, p. 562). It is then argued that because this 1560 Latin Book provides, in its service for the "Communion of the Sick," for some sort of "Reservation" (which we will consider later) therefore "Elizabeth did not regard Reservation of the 1549 type as in any way inconsistent with the 1559 Prayer Book which was authorized by Parliament, nor with the 1552 office for Sick Communion, which was retained unaltered" (p. 564). In fact, it is dogmatically asserted that "the 1552 office for the Communion of the Sick was *officially interpreted* as permitting Reservation of the 1549 type" (p. 562).

(To be continued.)

Starting Afresh, by the Rev. Pat McCormick (Longmans Green & Co., 2*s.* 6*d.* net) is the Bishop of London's Lent Book for this year. Mr. McCormick is well known through his broadcasts from St. Martin's-in-the-Fields. These addresses are conceived in the same direct, homely and arresting style as his Sunday addresses, and should be effective in their appeal to those who should make a fresh start. The road to travel with its difficulties, the help that is given and the ultimate end are set out with many impressive illustrations.

A volume of addresses by the late Bishop of Jarrow, the Right Rev. Geoffrey Gordon, has been issued by Messrs. Skeffington & Sons Ltd. (3*s.* 6*d.* net). The title *The Life of Mastery*, indicates his purpose. He shows in a practical way that the Christian Faith is the way of victory over the troubles, disappointments, limitations through circumstances or poverty, and all the failures of life. He deals with the ills that flesh is heir to, and his treatment of them are specially suggestive to preachers who will find many helpful thoughts in these discourses. The Bishop of Durham pays a sympathetic tribute to the memory of his late Suffragan.

The Master and the Disciples, General Editors the Rev. J. P. Hodges and R. B. Parker, is a series of Sunday School Lessons published by the S.P.C.K. for the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement (2*s.* net). Its aim is "to foster a true spirit of discipleship," and is intended for "the eleven-plus" age. The Bible lessons are illustrated with many modern illustrations and the lives of modern Christians.

Miss C. M. Fox has arranged a series of *Prayers for Women's Meetings* (The Lutterworth Press, 2*s.* 6*d.* net). A wide variety is provided to meet every kind of need and they are arranged in four divisions: Times and Seasons, Thanksgivings, For Mankind, and For Graces of Character.

THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

TO JUSTIN MARTYR

By the Rev. A. W. PARSONS
Vicar of St. John's, Boscombe

The Primitive Church.

THE worship of the Primitive Church *followed the precedents both of the Temple and of the synagogue.* At first the Apostles were diligent in their attendance at the Temple, and the keen desire of St. Paul to keep the feast at Jerusalem (Acts xx. 16) shows that the services of Christian assemblies were as yet regarded as supplementary to the central shrine.

But it is important, as the Abbé Duchesne writes, " not to confuse the *cultus* of the Temple at Jerusalem with that of the synagogues. The former exercised no influence upon the Christian liturgy : the comparisons which mediæval interpreters loved to establish between the ritual of the Pentateuch and that of the Church are not to be taken seriously. All that has been said on this subject is due to mere ingenuity, with no foundation on tradition. Except then, in the principles which underlie all worship, the services of the Mosaic Dispensation are not a model for ourselves."

The Christian Church to-day is in no sense a Temple. Fairbairn's conclusions, with some modifications, may help us in this connection. He is speaking of all temples whether heathen or Hebrew.

The Temple was built in a sacred grove or in the place it consecrated, which signified that God was chained to the spot ; thither man had to come to find Him and to present the offerings He loved. But we build our churches in cities and amid the haunts of men, for (John iv. 24) :

" Where'er we seek Him He is found and every place is hallowed ground."

In the Temple the priest officiated and offered the sacrifices that pleased God ; in the Church the people offer the sacrifices of prayer and praise and a man with a prophetic gift speaks concerning the truth of God. In the Temple man tried by shedding of blood to propitiate God ; in the Church a Gospel of Divine grace is preached which commands all men everywhere to come to a God Who is reconciled. In the Temple men gave to God that they might get from Him what He alone could give ; but in the Church men worship a God whose

favours they cannot purchase, Who ever does what becomes Himself and Who has Himself given to the uttermost.

At the same time we must recall that St. Luke evidently attached much importance to the fact recorded at the end of his Gospel, that after the Resurrection the Apostles were continually in the Temple, blessing God (xxiv. 53). Their assurance that Jesus was the Messiah, proved by His victory over death, made no breach in the continuity of their Jewish faith and practice. It rather revealed in their minds a new wealth of meaning in the old ritual, and so fired them as worshippers with a new enthusiasm. A. C. McGiffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, thinks that it may fairly be supposed that the effect of their Christian faith was to make all the early disciples more devout and earnest Jews than they had ever been. F. J. A. Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, says, " We have distinct evidence that Christian Jews, like other Jews, frequented the Temple, the sanctuary of the nation, and thereby maintained their claim to be Jews in the true sense." After the baptism of fire on the day of Pentecost they are found continuing steadfastly with one accord in the Temple (Acts ii. 46). Peter and John went up to the Temple at the hour of Prayer (iii. 1); they found their best audiences in the Temple Courts and performed the first Christian miracle at its gates. They were arrested not by the religious, but by the secular authorities and the Sadducees for a disturbance of the peace. The reproof administered to them was as mild as their imprisonment was brief and the Christian Jews continued to meet in Solomon's Porch (v. 12). Until the appearance of Stephen created a new situation, the Apostles were daily in the Temple, teaching and preaching that Jesus was Messiah. The bearing of their teaching upon the Temple Worship itself was not perceived until Stephen declared that the worship of God in this Temple " made with hands " was not in accordance with the will of God. It was not so much the worship, however, which he condemned, as the spirit of the worshippers. He warned them, in the manner of the old prophets, that no amount of attention to outward ordinances could ever succeed in obtaining God's favour. He demanded a spiritual, as opposed to a mechanical religion.

For *St. Paul* the observance of the ancient ritual laws, which had long been a matter of principle, became at last a matter of indifference. He was consequently accused of " teaching all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses " (Acts xxi. 21). This he never did and to prove that the charge was groundless, he was advised, during his last visit to the Temple, to conciliate the great mass of Christian Jews by performing the vow of a Nazarite in the Temple. It had results which were not contemplated, for the Jews rose in arms against Paul as a profaner of the Temple, and the Romans arrested him as a disturber of the peace.

James the Just, the Lord's brother, represented two ideas—the continuance of the Church in union with the Temple and the hope of Israel's Conversion. After his martyrdom his spirit and ideals survived for a time, but when, in 67, the Christians found it necessary, in view of the approaching crisis with Rome, to quit Jerusalem and migrate

to the Hellenistic city of Pella, beyond the Jordan, the hope of a Jewish national Church, with its worship centralized in Jerusalem, and giving both the law and the Gospel to all men, had to be postponed and was finally abandoned when the Temple was destroyed.

The influence of the worship of the synagogue is more easy to trace than that of the Temple. The synagogue did not define itself as an institution until the Greek period, i.e. the period subsequent to the conquests of Alexander the Great, 323 B.C. In the time of Our Lord they were found in practically every town and village where a Jewish population existed. Contemporary Jewish literature states that there was a synagogue in the Temple. Ancient synagogues were arranged differently from the modern. In the Talmudic period they seem to have been modelled on the Temple—the entrance was from the east and the ark containing the scrolls of the law was in the west. In the modern synagogue the position is exactly reversed—the ark is placed in the east and the reader, while on the bema, faces east.

With the destruction of the Temple, A.D. 70, Jewish worship naturally concentrated on the synagogues. Had the altar system of tabernacle and temple been the exclusive means of divine access available to the Israelites, the cessation of sacrifices would have marked a much greater liturgical disturbance than actually took place. As a fact continuity was preserved and the keynote of the transition was Hosea xiv. 3 (Heb. xiv. 2, R.V.) : " Let our prayers make up for the bullocks of our sacrifices."

As I am able to say very little in the space at my disposal about ritual traces and elements in the O.T. it may be well at this point to remind you that the word *hostia* or host is used by the Vulgate for the Sin-offering, Burnt-offering and Peace-Offerings. Christians, like the Jews to-day, have no such literal sacrifices. We have no Sin-offering nor Burnt-offering except the one offering on the Cross, the virtue of which is continuous. Our Peace Offering is the sacrifice of praise (Heb. xiii. 13), that is, the joyful offering of a thankful heart, and that there may be no materializing misconception we are told that by this sacrifice is meant no material offering but " the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His Name." The only Christian " host " is the immaterial sacrifice of prayer, praise and thanksgiving.

It was along this path that the worship of the synagogue developed after the Destruction of the Temple. We trace three lines of development

(1) Prayers of repentance and penitence (including fasting).
(2) Thanksgiving and praise (this centred in the feasts).
(3) Petitions.

Study and the recital of teaching passages of Post-Biblical literature were later institutions. In harmony with its origin the Synagogue worship is essentially of a democratic or popular type. It has no organic connection with the priesthood ; its ministers were essentially laymen—at first it had no professional ministers at all, the Rabbis whom it singled out for special honour being simply learned laymen.

It is important, however, to remember that the Temple Worship profoundly influenced the structure of the synagogue liturgy and the

form and substance of its prayers. From the time when the worship at one central shrine was established (18th year of Josiah, 621 B.C.) down to the destruction of the Temple about seven centuries later, the worship of God was regarded as finding its complete and adequate expression only in the Temple service, with its elaborate cultus of priesthood and sacrifice.

G. H. Box writes : " The immense and manifold religious activities that concentrated themselves in the Temple worship can only be adequately realized when it is remembered how unique was the position occupied by Judaism's central shrine. It was absolutely the one and only sanctuary where the highest expression of the religious life of the whole people could be offered. Judaism possessed but one Sanctuary and that was in Jerusalem."

Moreover, for the purposes of the National worship the land of Palestine was divided up into 24 districts, corresponding to the 24 courses of priests, and one course from each district, consisting of priests, levites and lay Israelites was on duty in the Temple for a week at a time. Not all the priests belonging to a particular course could do duty at the sacrifice during the whole week when that course was on duty in the Temple ; the course was therefore divided into " fathers' houses." In the same way not all the laymen could be present. Consequently each course was represented by deputation at the sanctuary ; the others who had been left behind assembled in the local synagogues, at the time of sacrifice and engaged in prayer and the reading of Scripture.

When we pass to the N.T. the main fact seems to be that our Lord's own example and teaching are associated with the synagogue rather than with the Temple, the seat of the sacrificial and priestly system of worship. To Him the Temple was primarily a " House of Prayer." His teaching on worship is mainly on genuine prayer as opposed to formal prayers, " vain repetitions," and even the Lord's Prayer is given as an example of the right sort rather than as a form for regular repetition.

Such a valuation of forms of worship, in proportion as they express simply and directly the spirit of worship, is not only continuous with that of the prophets and of parts of the Psalter but appears in the Apocrypha and in some Rabbinic utterances such as that of R. Menahem of Galilee (about the Christian era) : " One day all sacrifices will cease, only the thanksgiving prayer will not cease." This saying seems to point to a Messianic era of perfected worship, when sacrifices for sin would no longer be needed and this is just the position in which the first followers of Jesus felt themselves to be, as spiritually united to the Messiah. In the Epistle to the Hebrews their new relation to God is worked out as conditioned by the representative self-oblation of God's sinless Son (Heb. x. 1-18 ; ii. 10, 11). Through Him all Christians are made priests to God as united in spirit with the Great High Priest and as such have access for communion with God of the most intimately spiritual kind (x. 19-22). This conception, as we shall see, conditions the whole of the practice of the Primitive Church as regards worship.

It is to the Apostolic Church that we must now direct our attention.

The Apostolic Church.

Meetings at fixed times for worship began at once in the Apostolic Church and were gradually shaped by the needs of the time, for as Gwatkin says in *Early Church History*, there is no reason to suppose that the Lord Himself left any regulations for conducting them. At Jerusalem, as we have seen, the first Christians went up to the Temple to pray. Elsewhere they frequented the synagogues as long as they were allowed. But they had meetings of their own from the first and they developed the services of the synagogue in a very independent way. Gwatkin says, and the other authorities I have consulted agree, that : " They had the same general structure of prayer and thanksgiving, reading and exhortation. But the prayer seems to have been extempore, with (if we may judge from Clement of Rome) a decided touch of the synagogue prayers and a strong tendency to fall into grooves."

They must also have had a distinctly Christian element emphasized by the early appearance of Christian hymns. Hymns are nearly always the first literary efforts of infant Churches and the Apostolic Age was no exception. We find more than traces of them in the N.T. itself (1 Tim. iii. 16 ; Eph. v. 14) and our *Gloria in Excelsis* is so related to Polycarp's last prayer before the fire was lighted that its earliest form may date from long before A.D. 155. The reading would at first be of the O.T., much in the Jewish way, unless there was an Apostolic letter to be read, or some other edifying communication. But the reading of the N.T. (Gospels as well as Epistles) must have been introduced quite early in the 2nd century. Then came the sermon, which must have differed greatly from the Jewish. Our first sample of one after N.T. times is the so-called Second Epistle of Clement (120-160, Streeter), apparently preached at Corinth in the middle of the 2nd century. " It is poor stuff no doubt " (that is Gwatkin), but it conforms to the rule that every Christian sermon must be directly or indirectly a preaching of Christ. After the sermon came the distinctively Christian ordinance of the Lord's Supper. In the N.T. and the *Didache* (90, Streeter) it is the solemn grace which closed the evening meal, but at Rome in Justin's time it had already been separated from the *Agape* and transferred to the Sunday morning service. We find evening communion, however, as late as the 5th century. With this change another may have been connected. In the N.T. and the *Didache* no distinction seems to be made among Christians. Even a heathen may come to the prophesyings and there are practically no catechumens to be shut out from the *Agape*. But with the transfer of the Lord's Supper to the Sunday morning it assumed more the character of a Mystery which none but the baptized might see. In the *Didache* there is no sign of a priest and the celebration is the common act of the whole Church. Only the baptized are to partake of the Eucharist, which is that holy thing that cannot be given to the dogs, though not because the Eucharistic elements are regarded as conveying some mysterious power or are in any sense sacrificial ; for as yet there is not much advance on Rom. xii. 1.

(To be continued.)

THE SWORD AND THE CROSS

" All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."
—St. Matt. xxvi. 52.

Being a brief historical exegesis from the Early Fathers to the present time.

By the Rev. R. F. WRIGHT, M.A., LL.B., Ph.D.
Vicar of Spring Grove, Isleworth.

WHEN our Lord came to this earth, three festering sores were draining the vitality of the world. They were : slavery, the degradation of women, and war. The position of women was the first to be altered by the influence of the Christian faith ; slavery as a legal system lingered for some eighteen centuries ; but the problem of war, so far from being solved has become far more difficult and complex with the passing of time. A careful enquiry into our Lord's teaching on the subject is, therefore, of the utmost importance.

It is not possible in this short article to examine all the passages in the Gospels which have a bearing on the subject of war ; but our purpose is to take one apposite statement of Christ, which has always been the debating ground of contending parties, and examine it in the light of the great commentators of the Christian Church.

" All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

Prima facie it would seem that Christ uncompromisingly condemned the use of the sword ; but the Christian Church has never unanimously accepted that view. The early Christians for the first two centuries were practically of one mind in refusing to make use of weapons of war ; the obvious retort is that they lacked the means to employ them with any chance of success. Be that as it may, it cannot be denied that the testimony of these people as expressed by Tertullian and others has had a lasting influence on Christian thought.

In dealing with our text, Tertullian wrote : " Jesus cursed the works of the sword forever after."[1] " How will the Christian make war without the sword, which the Lord hath taken away."[2] " The Lord afterward in disarming Peter, unbelted every soldier. No dress is lawful (i.e. the soldier's uniform) among us if assigned to any unlawful action." There can be no agreement, he argues, between " the standard of Christ and the standard of the devil ; between the camp of light and the camp of darkness." We cannot serve two masters.[3] " Will it be lawful (for the Christian) to occupy himself with the sword, when the Lord declares that he ' who takes the sword will perish with

[1] *Writings* (*De Patientia*), Ante-Nicene Lib : I. p. 208. *Itaque et gladii opera maledixit in posterum* (Migne Ed : I. 1254).
[2] *On Idolatry* (Military Service). I. p. 171.
[3] *Ibid.* I. p. 170.

the sword'?"[1] Origen and Cyprian follow Tertullian in condemning war absolutely as inconsistent with Christianity. The former argues that if the Gospel were an invention, why did the disciples follow this text even unto death? Their application of this truth in life was evidence of its having been spoken by our Lord.

"It is a very evident proof to all candid judges that they (the disciples) were fully persuaded of the truth of what they wrote, seeing they submitted to trials so numerous and severe for the sake of Him Whom they believed."[2] Cyprian links this incident of the sword with that of the Love Feast in the upper room and lays it down that "after celebrating the Eucharist, the hand ought not to be spotted with the use of the sword and with blood."[3]

Ambrose discusses a legal question concerning two shipwrecked sailors, of whom one is wise and the other foolish. May the wise take away from the foolish, a plank, and so save his own life? He comes to the conclusion (which is accepted by English law) that such conduct amounts to murder. "The verdict is plain in the Gospel"; and then he quotes our text: "All who take the sword, etc." "What robber is more hateful than the persecutor who came to kill Christ?" he continues; "but Christ would not be defended from the wounds of the persecutor, for He willed to heal all by His wounds."[4] By the fourth century, however, the Christian Church was weakening its faith in the doctrine of non-resistance.

In one of the early letters of Basil, soldiers are classed as "intentional murderers."[5] But a little later he says that "homicides in war are not reckoned by the Fathers as homicides. This is, I presume, from their wish to make concessions to men fighting on behalf of chastity and true religion. Perhaps, however, it is well to counsel that those whose hands are not clean, only abstain from Communion for three years."[6] Clerics who have assailed robbers are degraded from their Orders; "for it is said: 'All they that take the sword, etc.'"[7]

St. Jerome uses the text to prove the superiority of the New Testament over the Old. In arguing the claims of monogamy against the polygamy of the old dispensation, he remarks that in the Old Testament, the command was: "Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty!" Whereas now it is said to Peter: "Put up thy sword . . . for all they . . ."[8] How far the Christian Church at this period was really pacifist has been a matter of dispute; but by the end of the fourth century, champions of war were not lacking.

Chrysostom, in his Homilies on this Gospel, dealing with this text says that Christ *comforted* His disciples "by the punishment of them that were plotting against Him; 'for all they,' He said, 'that take the sword . . .'"[9] Chrysostom dwells not on the rebuke to a militant

[1] *De Corona.* I. p. 347.
[2] *Contra Celsus.* II. p. 14.
[3] *Writings* (*De Bono Patientiae*), A.D. 256. II. p. 31.
[4] *Writings* (Duties of the Clergy). III. c. 4 (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers).
[5] *Letters of S. Basil.* No. viii.
[6] *Ibid.* No. xiii.
[7] *Ibid.* LV.
[8] *Letters.* cxxiii.
[9] *Homilies on St. Matt*: xxvi. 52.

disciple but sees comfort for them in the doom of their enemies.

By the time of Augustine, war was receiving ecclesiastical sanction and the theological precepts of Augustine on this subject were later to be incorporated in the official Canon Law. In the hands of this writer, the text is transformed from a general condemnation of war into a general sanction of "war under judicial authority." In writing against the Manichees, a sect which deemed all warfare unlawful, Augustine had to deal with these words of Christ. "To take the sword," he wrote, "is to use weapons against a man's life *without the sanction of the constituted authority.* The Lord indeed had told His disciples to carry a sword; but He did not tell them to use it."[1] Again; in a letter to Vicentius, written in the year A.D. 408, he says that it was essential in the New Testament period that the "gentleness of love should be manifested"; hence St. Matt. xxvi. 52; but in the same letter, continuing the same thought he added: "In some cases both he who suffers persecution is in the wrong, and he who inflicts it is in the right. The good persecutes the bad, seeking to do good by the administration of discipline . . . prophets put the wicked to death. What is important to attend to is this: Who were on the side of right?"[2] Needless to say, this is a philosophy which both sides to every contest have found sufficient warrant for the most brutal crimes against every law of Christ.

Once again in the hands of Augustine the Old Testament becomes a military text-book. He quotes the wars of Moses as evidence of God's attitude on the subject, and explains away the rebuke to Peter as an example of "adversity for the sake of that felicity."[3]

There was no doubt about the subject in the Middle Ages. Popes did not hesitate to hold their temporal possessions at the point of the sword; and the Church often enforced its dogmas on the minds of men by destroying their bodies. One of the greatest thinkers of this period was Thomas Aquinas who definitely approved the capital punishment of heretics. It is not therefore surprising that in his *Catena Aurea*—a Commentary on the Four Gospels, taken from the works of the Fathers—he urges that our text does not condemn war. His quotations are so important as representing the Mediæval mind that they may be given at some length.

After the incident of St. Luke xxii. 36, it continues: "It was natural that there should be swords for the paschal lamb which they had been eating. Hearing then that the pursuers were coming to apprehend Christ, when they went out from supper they took these swords as though to fight in defence of their Master against His enemies. In another Gospel, Peter is represented as having done this, and with his usual hastiness; and that the servant's name was Malchus, and that the ear was the right ear. In passing we may say that Malchus, i.e. one who should have been king of the Jews, was made the slave of the ungodliness and the greediness of the Priests, and lost his right ear so that he might hear only the worthlessness of the letter in his left.

[1] *Harmony of the Gospels by Augustine.* iv. 299.
[2] *Letters.* I. 381 ff.
[3] *Anti-Manichaean Writings.* IV. p. 302.

For though they seem even now to hear the Law, yet is it only with the left ear that they may hear the shadow of a tradition concerning the Law, and not the truth."

There are many more quotations in exactly the same strain, taken from the works of Jerome, Origen, Rabianus, Hilary and Leo in which Peter is regarded as the instrument of Divine judgment; but there is not a word of condemnation of Peter's act. The section ends with these words:

"The Lord of the zealous Apostle will not suffer *his pious feeling* to proceed further. 'Then said Jesus, put up again thy sword into his place.'" From these words he continues the comments: "It was contrary to the sacrament of our redemption that He Who had come to die for all, should refuse to be apprehended. . . . It behoved also that the Author of grace should teach the faithful patience by His own example, and should rather train them to endure adversity with fortitude than incite them to self-defence. To move the disciples to this He adds a threat, saying: 'all they that take the sword, shall perish by the sword.'" Then follows the quotation from Augustine already stated which interprets these words merely as a prohibition of 'unauthorized' wars. To this he added the opinion of Hilary: "But all who use the sword do not perish with the sword; of those who have used the sword either judiciously or in self-defence against robbers, fever or accident carries off the greater part. Though if according to this every one who uses the sword shall perish by the sword, justly was the sword now drawn against those who were using the same for the promotion of crime. . . . The Lord then bids him return his sword into its sheath, because He would destroy them by no weapon of man, but by the sword of His mouth." The opinion of Chrysostom already quoted, that Christ by these words "soothed His disciples by the declaration of punishment against His enemies," ends the Commentary on the text.[1] It will be noted that the opinions of the pacifist Fathers are not mentioned in this important work.

A few years later (A.D. 1302) Boniface VIII issued the Bull *Unam Sanctam* which asserted that both the Spiritual and the Temporal Swords belong to the Church, and argued that when the disciples said: "Behold, here are two swords," it was obvious that they were both "in the Church"—*in Ecclesia scilicet*; and Christ replied that these two were sufficient. He did not say that less than two would suffice; *uterque ergo in potestate est Ecclesiae spiritualis scilicet gladius et materialis*. The former, however, is employed *by* the Church, whilst the latter is to be used *for* the Church, by the hand of the Prince in accordance with the order and permission of the Pontiff; but the temporal is under the spiritual.

At the close of the Middle Ages, the greatest scholar in Europe was Erasmus. Although a loyal member of the Catholic Church, he attacked unceasingly the failure of Christians to live up to the ideals of Christ; and the condemnation of war is an ever-present theme in his writings. As a wholehearted pacifist he views war from every angle, and comes to the conclusion that it cannot be harmonized with

[1] *Commentary on the Gospels.* Eng: Ed: 1874. vol. II. pt. 2.

the Christian faith. Christ's command to His disciples to buy a sword, he maintains, must be understood spiritually: "not with the carnal sword, as rogues and highwaymen for murder and bloodshed, but with the sword of the spirit. Did not Christ rebuke Peter for drawing the sword which He had but just before so strictly charged him to buy"[1]; and Erasmus pours scorn upon those Commentators who would "furnish out the disciples with halberts, spears and guns for the enterprise of preaching Christ crucified."

Again; in his "Complaint of Peace," which tells the story of peace seeking an abiding place, first in the States and then in the Church, but always without success, he says: "Christ chides Peter, though half a Jew, who drew a sword in His defence, when His life was in immediate danger and orders him to put it up into its scabbard. And yet Christians keep the sword constantly drawn and are ever ready to use it on their brother Christians on the most trifling provocation. Could He wish them or His cause to be defended by a sword, Who with His dying breath pleaded for His murderers? . . . If you say you belong to the Church, what can you have to do with the operations of war? If you say you do not belong to the Church, what have you to do with Christ?"

But Erasmus was only a voice crying in the wilderness; men did not immediately take to heart his message. The Wars of Religion were not far distant.

Let us turn to England of the 16th century, when this country was threatened with invasion from abroad in the name of religion, and Catholics were plotting within the realm. The one thing most needful was a strong central government which would check all sedition and the possibility of civil war; and so in the year 1547 Coverdale published a treatise in English entitled, "The Old Faith, an evident probacion out of the Holy Scripture, that the Christian fayth hath endured sens the beginnyng of the worlde," in which he showed the lawfulness of war and the sinfulness of rebellion. "For thus saith the Lord: 'Whoso taketh *away* the sword shall perish through sword.'"[2] It will be seen that this exegesis is that of St. Augustine, already mentioned; and is, no doubt, a reasonable interpretation; but what is wholly unwarrantable is the translation of our Lord's words, for neither the Greek text nor the Vulgate will sanction the phrase, "take away." Coverdale himself in his own English translation, some twelve years previously had rendered it into English by our usual translation. Furthermore, this treatise of Coverdale is not original: it is a translation of a work in Latin by Bullinger; but that affords him no justification, for Bullinger wrote: *alioqui enim Christus Petru gladium stringentum ita affatur: converte gladium tuum in vaginam suam siquidem qui gladium sumunt, gladies etiam peritur.*[3]

The Christian Church having failed to abolish war, philosophers tried to hedge it round with laws and prohibitions. In 1625, Hugo Grotius, who has been called the father of International Law, wrote

[1] *In Praise of Folly.* Ed: 1876. p. 178.
[2] *Coverdale's Works* (Parker Socty. Pub:). II. p. 52.
[3] *Antiq. Fides et Vera Religio.* p. 37. (In Lambeth Palace Library.)

his famous book on *The Law of War and Peace*, in which he said : " I saw prevailing throughout the Christian world, a licence in making war, of which even barbarous nations would have been ashamed."[1] In this treatise he enumerates the sources of International Law as being, *ipsa natura, leges divinae, mores et pacta* ; and under the second heading, our text amongst many others is given consideration. Grotius was in a difficulty ; war was hateful, but he could see no escape. Other methods, however, must be tried first, and so he demands that nations should submit to arbitration : " Especially ought Christian kings and States to adopt this way of avoiding arms." Private warfare was, therefore, condemned as contrary to the teaching of the New Testament ; and our text is cited as proof, and the argument of Augustine is once more pressed into service. Peter was seizing the sword in a *private* warfare ; but Grotius will not allow that these words forbid public wars in self-defence. Peter was rebuked by Christ for three reasons : first, because it was used for revenge. " We may conclude that Peter was transported with eager desire for revenge and not of defence only "; for in the second place, Christ had no need of defence : " twelve legions of angels " were at his command. And thirdly, it was part of the divine purpose that Christ should suffer. Grotius sums up by saying that St. Matt. xxvi. 52 was " either spoken proverbially to show that blood requires blood," or perhaps rather " as Origen, Theophylact and others interpret, that we should not be too rash in taking the sword of vengeance out of God's hand, Who will certainly in His own time pay blood with blood." . . . " In these words of Christ there seems to be couched a prophecy of those punishments which God would take of the bloodthirsty Jews by the sword of the Romans."[2]

This legal and theological treatise forms a landmark in the history of warfare ; but the worst horrors of the " Thirty Years War " were yet to come. By the end of that century, a new sect had arisen, " The Society of Friends " or Quakers, which took up an uncompromising attitude and denied the right of Christians to take up the sword for any cause whatever.

In 1678 Robert Barclay wrote *The Apology for the True Christian Divinity, as the same is held forth and preached by the People called in scorn Quakers*, in which he sets out to prove that war is inconsistent with the teaching of Christ,[3] " Who reproved Peter for the use of the sword, saying, ' All they who take the sword, etc.'." To this he adds the testimony of Tertullian, already quoted. These opinions spread so rapidly that by 1680, there were said to be 40,000 Quakers in this country ; but by 1697, it is estimated that nearly 17,000 had been imprisoned, 152 transported and that 370 had died in confinement or in consequence of their sufferings.[4] Nevertheless, their religious faith continued undimmed and unaltered ; and in 1823 Jonathon Dymond made his " Enquiry " into the principles and causes of war in relation to Christianity ; and in quoting our text he remarks : " if ever war

[1] *Prolegomena.*
[2] *De Jure Belli ac Pacis.* LI, c. 3.
[3] *Prop.* xv. Ed. 1886. p. 403.
[4] Nelson's *Encyclopaedia.* X.

was just, surely it was here, in defence of Himself from the hands of bloody ruffians ; but Christ did not allow the sword to be drawn. What reason then can it be lawful to draw it ? " Dymond points out that the sword was not condemned merely " because it would rob Christ of the cross ; but because ' whosoever takes the sword, etc.'." Neither was the sword forbidden merely because it would have been useless in the circumstances when the disciples were outnumbered, because Christ said that He could command twelve legions of angels. The real reason, he suggests, is found in our Lord's statement to Pilate : " My kingdom is not of this world ; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight."[1] The kingdom of Christ has no alliance with the kingdoms of the world ; the sword is inconsistent with the cross of Christ. Such is the teaching of the Society of Friends : a dogma which has never been popular either inside or outside of official Christendom ; and modern commentators agree in rejecting that interpretation.

During the Great War an article appeared in the *Hibbert Journal* from the pen of Professor Bacon of Yale University, which maintained that " when Peter raised his futile weapon against the servant of the High Priest, it was no time to smite. But the time might come later. Peter was *not disarmed.* His sword was only returned to its sheath to await the predicted day of need."[2]

Other writers have questioned the authenticity of the words. Dr. Plummer says : " The source of verses 52-4 (St. Matt. xxvi.) is unknown "; although he points out that part of these words are confirmed by St. John's Gospel.[3] J. Weiss says that the words were spoken at *some other* time, *if at all,* for they appear to be only a free reproduction of Revelation xiii. 10 : " He that killeth with the sword, must be killed with the sword "[4]; but adds that " the early Christian Communities may have often supported themselves under persecution, by this word and example. Would that the lesson had not been so rapidly forgotten ! "

It has been suggested that our text was merely " a general legal maxim." The *Westminster Commentary* says that these words are " probably an echo of a proverbial saying and recall our Lord's half satirical rejoinder (St. Luke xxii. 38) to the disciples' earlier claim to being armed. They serve too as a forcible comment on a war of *wanton aggression* which inevitably brings its own revenge." The International Critical Commentary says that " Christ did not desire the plans of His enemies to be thwarted," but it passes over the condemnation of the sword in silence. It has been argued that it was not a military sword which Peter used, but only a small knife used for the Passover Feast. This is true ; but it was the same instrument, with which Judas and his band were armed ; and our Lord's statement concerning the twelve legions of angels is expressed in " military language."

[1] *St. John* xviii. 35.
[2] *Christus Militans.* July 1918. p. 551.
[3] A. Plummer : *St. Matthew.* Ed. 1910. p. 374.
[4] *Expositor.* I. 317.

It will be seen therefore that commentators have differed widely in their interpretations of these words. Roughly, they may be divided into four groups :

(1) The Pacifist group which has uncompromisingly and consistently urged that these words of Christ forbid Christians to take any part in warfare.

(2) The Nationalist group which finds condemnation only for " unauthorized " wars : that is, civil war and rebellion.

(3) The Legal group which, whilst hating war and all that it entails is unable to accept the Pacifist position. Christ rebuked Peter, they say, because this disciple was too impulsive and was seeking revenge rather than self-defence. War is inevitable, but the teaching of our Lord demands that it shall be minimized and humanized and fenced round with international laws and conventions.

(4) The Critical group which asserts that these words have either no bearing upon war as such, or their authority and interpretation are open to serious criticism.

Of course, these " labels " for parties cannot strictly be accurate or adequate, but they serve our purpose. Which group is right ? We cannot escape that question, for on it depends the peace of the world. It cannot be denied that interpretations throughout the history of the Church have been moulded to a very large extent by the circumstances of the time, and to-day we are probably much more anxious to see a condemnation of war in these words than were the Christians of the last century, for we have seen the horrors and the futility of 1914-8. Let us, however, try to examine the text in the light of our Lord's life and general teaching.

It is probably true to say that these words have no more direct bearing upon war than at least a dozen other passages which are not usually regarded as " war " texts in any sense of the word. Our Lord seldom attacked great social evils directly. It was the cumulative effect of His teaching which revealed His condemnation of slavery ; and the same thing is true of war. The sheathing of the sword in the Garden of Gethsemane is only one more illustration of the demand : " love your enemies "; " if a man smite you on the right cheek "; " if a man compel you to go a mile "; " seek ye first the kingdom of God "; " My kingdom is not of this world "; " thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself "; the parables of " The Prodigal Son " and " The Good Samaritan "; the commands : " resist not evil "; and " take up the cross and follow Me "; " the meek shall inherit the earth." The whole of our Lord's life and teaching was the insistence on the fact that goodness and suffering will remove the causes of evil. The sword and war are the denial of this. It is the expression of faith in violence and bloodshed as a greater power than goodness.

The sword in the Garden was futile ; and war has been proved equally useless. Both came under the condemnation of Christ. After the refusal of the sword He went to Calvary ; but it was from the Cross and not the sword that the salvation of the world has come ; and the Church has been strongest when it was willing to follow in His steps.

Its greatest power was probably revealed in the first two centuries when pacifism was at its height. In the Middle Ages it was St. Francis of Assisi who, condemning the Crusades, was the great energizing power of the Christian Church and not Pope Boniface with his theory of the " Two swords." At the Renaissance we go to Erasmus for light and leading and not to Pope Julius II, the warrior pontiff. In later times no sect has exercised so much influence for good, in comparison with its numbers, as the Society of Friends.

To-day the Christian Church stands in the Garden of Gethsemane ; the world must be saved : it must find a new way of life—the way of Christ. But are its members willing, if needs be, to face the Cross ?

NEW MORALS FOR OLD. By V. A. Holmes-Gore, M.A. *Longmans.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

The main contentions of this attempt to re-state and defend the Christian idea of Marriage are : (1) Christ set forth an Ideal. He did not lay down rules. (2) Divorce in certain circumstances should be allowed, and would certainly be approved by Christ. (3) St. Paul's view of Marriage is on a lower level, and the Prayer Book conception, based on that of the Apostle, is to be in part repudiated. With much that is said we are in hearty agreement, but, like the Bishop of Liverpool who contributes an Introduction, we could " not endorse every opinion contained in it."

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND MODERN DISCOVERY. By Stephen L. Caiger. *S.P.C.K.* 1*s.* 9*d.* (paper 1*s.*).

Not only is there much light yet to break forth from God's Word, but, as Mr. Caiger says, " Modern discovery has shed such a brilliant light upon the Bible, that it may almost be said to have re-discovered the Book itself." The S.P.C.K. does a good service in publishing at so low a cost this valuable summary of all that patient investigation has brought to light. We are taken to Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Palestine and other lands. The author is careful not to overstate his case. His restraint makes his book the more valuable. He too has conferred a benefit upon Christian workers, who should possess themselves of this most informative publication.

UNIVERSITY SERMONS. By Archibald C. Craig, M.C., M.A. *James Clarke & Co. Ltd.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Mr. Craig is Chaplain to the University of Glasgow. Last year a Mission to Undergraduates was held at Oxford and Mr. Craig was one of the Missioners. These University Sermons come, therefore, from one who understands exactly how to present his message to that special type of hearer. They are certainly calculated to help those who are genuinely seeking guidance on the deepest questions, and they always bring the hearer face to face with the living Christ. They deal with a variety of topics, each of which is discussed in the light of modern knowledge and illustrated by a wealth of quotation from writers of all kinds.

THE RISE AND DECLINE OF THE ENGLISH GILDS

By F. D. Cope.

THE Gilds which played so important a part in the development of the industrial, social and municipal life of this country in the Middle Ages, gave their name to the system of industrial organization which was the forerunner of the Domestic and Factory systems. Prior to the time of the Norman Conquest, there had been various gilds both religious and social (the latter being known as Frith gilds), but it is not until the eleventh century that mention is found of the type of gild with which this article is concerned. Professor Salzman tells us that on account of the great development of the cloth-weaving industry by the middle of the twelfth century, "The weavers of London, Winchester, Lincoln, Oxford, Huntingdon, and Nottingham, and the fullers of Winchester, had formed themselves into gilds, which were sufficiently wealthy to pay from forty shillings to twelve pounds yearly to the king for various privileges which practically amounted to the monopoly of cloth-working in their several districts."[1]

In the main, the gilds consisted of three chief classes: (1) Merchant gilds; (2) Crafts; and (3) Religious gilds. In many cases, however, the lines of demarcation between the three were narrow and at times non-existent. In actual fact, the functions of all three classes might be combined in a single gild, especially in the early days. "In many cases," says Dr. Westlake, "it is impossible to determine whether a religious association developed into a craft-gild or whether a gild was formed primarily for trade interests and enrolled itself in customary fashion under the protection of religion."[2] Again, one gild might contain within its ranks representatives of two or more different trades or crafts. The great gild of Corpus Christi at Ipswich, for example, was thus composed.

The Merchant-gilds were, in general, the forerunners of the Crafts. They reached the zenith of their power by the end of the twelfth century. By this time they had obtained for their members many privileges, such as monopoly of local trade and freedom from imposts. They controlled production within their particular town, for which they were often instrumental in obtaining a charter. They also represented their town in its dealings with other towns, and played many parts in the regulation of urban life which, at the present day, are carried out by the representatives of local government. With the rise of the municipalities they lost many of their civic functions, these being transferred to the burgesses.

[1] *Mediaeval English Industries*, Chapter ix, p. 194.
[2] *Parish Guilds of Mediaeval England*, Chapter ii, p. 23.

Although termed Merchant-gilds, they were not confined to traders, but had craftsmen also within their ranks. As, however, the specialization of industry proceeded and markets widened, there came a tendency for the producing and trading functions of merchant-gilds to fall into separate hands. By the middle of the fourteenth century, this process was almost complete. Conflicts between the old and new organizations, and the municipalities who wished to control them, were frequent. In the end, however, the newer craft-gilds managed to maintain their own; and, in the course of time, the Merchant-gilds were merged into other institutions.

Membership of the Craft-gilds consisted of three grades: apprentices, journeymen, and masters. Journeymen were required to be apprenticed for a specified number of years (usually seven), apprenticeship becoming compulsory in nearly all trades, possibly by the end of the fourteenth century.[1] Before an apprentice could become a journeyman, he usually had to show competence in his particular trade, a "masterpiece" being demanded from those who aspired to this rank. In speaking of masters and journeymen, it must be borne in mind that there was not the sharp social cleavage between these classes that developed between employers and employees in later times. In the majority of cases a journeyman could look forward to the day when he, too, would attain to the master stage. This was, in fact, the usual course to follow. Hogarth's Industrious Apprentice who marries his employer's daughter was no doubt true of the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries, but must have been exceptional in the eighteenth. A mass of employed labour working for a wage, without much hope of rising above their present position is essentially a condition of modern capitalistic industry. It did not exist to any extent until the early fifteenth century, and where it did so before that time, was the exception rather than the rule. In theory as well as in practice, custom was the deciding factor in the problems of industrial organization. The mediæval conception of commercial ethics derived from the teachings of Aquinas, and embodied in the Doctrine of the Just Price, regarded it as immoral for a merchant to manipulate the market. The cost of production was assumed to fix the price of an article, allowing for the producer a fair margin of profit. To-day, the existence of economic forces is recognized, and their operation understood and allowed free play, except where it is to the interests of the community, or any considerable section of the community, to restrain it by legislation. It is in the light of this essential difference between mediæval and modern economic theory that the gild system is to be viewed. Again, Capital, the life-blood of modern industrialism, had no predominance in mediæval economic organization. The mediæval economist recognized only two instruments of production—land and labour.

> "As a rule, fixed capital in the shape of machinery and buildings played a subordinate part in mediæval industry. The basis of industrial life was craftsmanship—tools and technical skill were the resources upon which a master was content to rely to gain a livelihood."[2]

[1] Ashley's *Economic History and Theory*, Book II, Chapter ii, pp. 84-5.

[2] E. Lipson, *An Introduction to the Economic History of England*, Vol. I, Chapter viii, p. 328.

On the social side a later development of the crafts was the provision of money and shelter for necessitous members, much on the same lines as a modern friendly society. In many gilds it was the rule if a member was sick or in poverty, that he should be maintained out of the funds, or, if he died, should be buried at the common expense. Thus the members of the gild of the Painters (B.V.M. and St. Luke) attached to St. Giles, Cripplegate, received 10½*d.* in helpless poverty,[1] while the gild of Pater Noster in York, gave burial to needy cases at the gild's expense ; " help in need from robbery, fire, or false imprisonment."[2] The Cutlers' gild, founded in 1370, enacted that if any member came to hurt " through storm at sea, fire, robbery, or other misfortune, by the Will of God, he shall have 10*d.* a week payable at the end of each month while the hurt lasts."[3]

Sometimes a gild would advance loans either in money or kind to its members. R. H. Tawney, in *The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century*, refers to a gild in Suffolk making loans of cattle at a charge. " The gild let out in one year 8 cows and 4 neats at 19*d.* each."[4]

These activities were carried on successfully for many years, and the gilds acquired varying degrees of power, their zenith being reached in the fifteenth century. After this time, however, a decline can be traced in their powers, the principal cause being undoubtedly the change in the industrial system which was gradually taking place. The rise of the domestic system of industry rendered an organization like a craft-gild unnecessary. Industry was being reorganized on the modern basis of wage-labour producing for a capitalist employer, rather than that of independent craftsmen who sold their products direct to the consumer. A class definitely consisting of employers and suppliers of capital became predominant. The line dividing workmen from employers became more accentuated. Instead of vertical divisions of craft from craft, there appeared horizontal lines, stereotyping class divisions. From the domestic system, it was but a step to the factory system, in which the employers and employees were drawn from quite different social classes, and their interests were, in fact, often antagonistic. These changes did not, of course, take place at once ; nor were they in water tight compartments. The three systems existed side by side until the Industrial Revolution in the eighteenth century gave an impetus to the Factory System. Between the craft-gilds and the modern trade union there does not appear to be any continuity. This is not strange when it is borne in mind that the economic conditions which called the two organizations into being were vastly different. The gilds were associations of independent craftsmen, who usually combined the double functions of producers and traders, each working with their own capital and employing only their own family and one or two journeymen. A class who were distinct purveyors of capital which they loaned to others had not yet arisen on any large scale. A

[1] Appendix to *Parish Guilds of Mediaeval England*, p. 236.
[2] Ibid, p. 234.
[3] Ibid, p. 188.
[4] Quoted by Tawney from *Victoria County History, Suffolk* : *Social and Economic History.*

modern trade union, on the other hand, is an association of labour only, out to make with capitalist employers the best bargains it can for maintaining and improving the standard of life of its members. It is true that towards the end of the period of the gilds there appeared a class of organizations known as "yeomanry" gilds, consisting for the most part of journeymen. But any evidence that the gilds as such survived into the period of trade unionism is vague.

A contributory factor of the decline of the gilds is to be found in the decay of the towns which is the universal lament of the early sixteenth century. The gilds had had a considerable share in the task of developing urban industry, their interests being in many cases identical with those of the towns, and the decline of the latter involved a corresponding decline in relative importance of the gilds. This decay of the towns which, according to a statute passed in 1540, was general from Berwick-on-Tweed to the Land's End, may easily be misinterpreted. On the face of it, such a phenomenon would appear to imply a decline in the industries and general prosperity of the country. Were such a thing to occur now, no other explanation could be given. But, in fact, the security of life and property which the cessation of civil strife and the orderly government of the Tudors had brought about, made it no longer necessary to seek for safety the protection of walled and fortified towns. The open country had become secure and population and industry began to flow into it. Hence that temporary decay of the towns which so much disturbed Henry VIII and his parliament. It was more a sign of growing prosperity than a cause for serious alarm.[1] Moreover, the Tudor monarchs favoured a national as opposed to an urban policy, and men had begun to think of England as an entity rather than as a collection of towns and villages. Markets were expanding; and internal peace, after the Wars of the Roses, favoured commercial development. Great quantities of ready-made goods were imported from abroad to the detriment in many cases of the gilds and their members whose markets had been mainly local. This is aptly expressed in the words of an anonymous sixteenth century writer, which have a curiously twentieth-century ring.

> "I knew the time when men weare contented with cappes, hattes, girdeles and poyntes, and all maner of garmentes made in the townes next adjoininge: whereby the townes then weare well occupied and set aworke; and yet the money paide for the same stuffe remayned in the countrie. Nowe the poorest yonge man in a countrey can not be contented either with a lether girdle or lether pointes, gloves, knives or daggers made nigh home. And specially no gentleman can be content to have eyther cappe coat doublet, hose or shirt made in his countrey, but they must have their geare from London; and yet many things thereof are not theare made, but beyond the sea, whereby the artificers of our townes are Idle."[2]

In many cases also the restrictions of the gilds tended to become vexatious and quite unsuitable for the changed conditions of industry. Craftsmen often deserted the towns in order that they might practise their craft in local villages where these restrictions did not apply. At

[1] Cf., Froude: *History of England*, Vol. I, Chapter i.
[2] Quoted: *Unwin's Industrial Organization*, p. 71.

first the gilds had forced all who wished to practise a craft to join them, but towards the end of their existence they placed a restriction upon their numbers so that the gilds should not be overcrowded. By the end of the fifteenth century many gilds had developed into livery companies, such as the Clothworkers, Mercers, etc., whose members were divided into those " of the livery," and those " not of the livery." The former alone wore the livery of their particular company and from amongst these were elected the officers. This development created a tendency for control to fall into the hands of the wealthier members, the poorer ones being often excluded. Capitalists, rather than craftsmen, now began to control the industries. Entrance fees were so increased that many journeymen were unable to join.

It is sometimes represented that the principal reason for the decline of the gilds was the alleged partial confiscation of their funds by Protector Somerset in 1547. This view was held by the late Professor Thorold Rogers and others. Modern investigations, however, have conclusively proved that this view is not in accord with the known facts. The religious gilds only were suppressed; the others being deprived merely of that part of their funds set aside for religious purposes. In many cases the motives which united the members of a gild were religious as well as secular. A common practice was to bequeath money to provide masses for the repose of the souls of deceased members. " It is evident," says Dr. Westlake, " that the strongest bond that united the brethren was their belief in the efficacy of masses and alms for the dead, and the value of the invocation of those saints under whose protection they had enrolled themselves."[1] Thus, in 1392, one Cantelaw gave a chalice and 12 pence, with a request for prayers for the repose of his parents, friends, etc., to the Gild of Tailors at Winchester.[2]

Therefore, it is natural that the gilds, like the monasteries, should come under the notice of the Reforming party in England in the sixteenth century. An act was passed in the last year of the reign of Henry VIII (38 Hen. VIII, Ch. 4), investing the properties of colleges, chantries, fraternities, brotherhoods and gilds in the Crown, but the king died before it could be carried into effect.

One of the first acts of Edward VI was, however, directed to the same purpose. Nor was this the first occasion upon which the Crown had coveted the property of the gilds. In 1388, in the reign of Richard II, an order was issued that the officials of all gilds and brotherhoods should make a return to the government giving particulars of the gilds over which they officiated. The idea behind this order was probably confiscation or taxation of their funds in order to provide money for the many wars in which Richard II indulged. A further object was to stop the activities of the journeymen's associations and to limit the amount of land passing into mortmain.

[1] *Parish Guilds of Mediaeval England,* Chapter iv, p. 43. In the list of gilds given in the Appendix to this volume, there is scarcely one which does not include among its objects the provision of masses for the dead, prayers to the B.V.M. and votive lights.

[2] Quoted : Gasquet, *Eve of the Reformation,* p. 327.

Again, in 1437, it was enacted that the crafts should have their rules approved by the Justices of the Peace.

To return to the Act of Edward VI. The preamble of this Act (I.Ed. VI, Ch. 14), is of interest, as showing how parliamentary opinion was tending to the religious views of the Reforming Party. " Considering," it said, " that a great part of superstition and errors in Christian religion hath been brought into the minds and estimations of men by reason of their ignorance of their very true and perfect salvation through the death of Jesus Christ ; and by devising and sanctifying vain opinions of Purgatory and Masses satisfactory to be done for them which be departed." And, it went on to enact that all monies devoted to the furtherance of these purposes should henceforth be vested in the Crown. Although the revenues devoted to " superstition and errors in Christian religion," were confiscated, the general funds of the gilds were not. Though, of course, if there was any doubt as to the division into which such monies fell, the Crown, and not the particular gild concerned, received the benefit of that doubt. By this Act, 90 collegiate bodies, 110 hospitals, and 2,374 gilds, chantries, and free chapels were deprived of those funds devoted to such religious usages.[1]

Thorold Roger's opinion that the Act of Edward VI dealt a devastating blow at the gilds is not borne out by the facts, and his further statement that, " Protector Somerset did not venture on appropriating the estates of the London gilds, for London had it in its power to make revolutions, and they were spared, after ransom paid, under the plea that the gilds did good service to trade,"[2] is misleading.

Professor Ashley interprets the situation thus : " The meaning of the statute would be perfectly clear : where there was a religious fraternity composed of members of a craft, but clearly separate from the company itself, it would share the common fate of all religious fraternities ; where in any company the religious and industrial features were both present, those revenues would pass to the king, and those only, which had actually been bequeathed or otherwise set apart for definite religious purposes."[3] The Merchant Taylors' Company, quoted by him, from Clode's *Early History of the Merchant Taylors' Company* (1888) is an example in point. The Company, " held 29 hereditaments standing at an annual rental of £440 13*s.* 10*d.*, *all* of which (to some extent) were charged either by the company's contract, or by will, with payments to provide for masses and obits. Out of this £440 13*s.* 10*d.*, only £98 11*s.* 6*d.* was reported by the Commissioners as due to the king, i.e. about two-ninths."[4]

Thus it will be seen that it was economic change, rather than the confiscation of their funds, which was mainly responsible for the decline of the gilds. Like the monasteries they had in many cases outlived their usefulness and in the new system of industry could no longer find a place. By the middle of the sixteenth century many workmen carried on their trade altogether outside the scope of the older gilds. But the fact that they had declined in power and influence

[1] *Parish Guilds of Mediaeval England*, p. 135.
[2] *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*, Chapter xii, p. 348.
[3] *Economic History and Theory*, Book II, Chapter ii, p. 147.
[4] *Economic History and Theory* Book II, Chapter ii, p. 150.

did not mean that their main ideas were effete. The Statute of Artificers, that great Act of Elizabethan legislation dealing with the problems of industry, was, in many points, based upon the gild organization.

The Statute of Artificers aimed, *inter alia*, at checking the decay of the towns and represented an endeavour to restore them to their former prosperity; and also at maintaining the balance between the supply of labour for agriculture and industry. This Act introduced, on a national scale, many of the gild regulations. For example, a seven years' apprenticeship. (In some cases apprenticeship was even prolonged until an artificer was 24 years of age if the craft was being learned in a specified town.) It placed a restriction on the sons of agricultural labourers becoming artificers, thus endeavouring to maintain an adequate supply of labour for agricultural purposes.

The duty of administering the details of this Act fell upon the Justices of the Peace who, as Professor G. M. Trevelyan remarks, "Became the agents of the vast and intricate economic control taken over by the State from the old corporations—regulation of wages and prices, relations of masters and apprentices."[1]

Some measure of this task, too, fell upon the new industrial companies which were revived at the end of Elizabeth's reign. These were built on the foundations of the crafts, though in organization, they were very different, being rather associations of employers than of craftsmen. They carried out many of the duties previously performed by the organizations which they had replaced, but they did not attain either the importance or the influence of the older gilds.

The gilds had played their part well in the development of English industry, and when their work was done they were merged into other undertakings which have successfully carried on their traditions. The spirit of the gilds has survived in organizations like the Oddfellows and the Foresters, who now carry out many of the "Friendly Society" duties of the mediæval gilds.

In a short article it is obviously impossible to touch upon every aspect of the gilds, or to do more than indicate the various developments which occurred as the years went on. There is, however, one point which it may be of interest to mention. It has become fashionable among a certain class of historians to represent the period when the gilds had reached their zenith as one in which all classes of the community dwelt together in amity and concord, and as a world in which the disruptive conflicts between Capital and Labour so common in our own day, were totally unknown. In a mosaic of mediæval life, drawn more from imagination than fact, they have pictured the Middle Ages as a golden era when the craftsman worked diligently for the love of his craft and not for the profits of a capitalist employer. It is true that some beautiful work was produced in this period, as our Cathedrals, in the main, bear witness. But it is not to be supposed that this roseate picture is a true representation of the case, or that it represented the rule rather than the exception. It is only necessary to read the ordinances of the gilds, with their frequent penalties for bad workmanship, and their guard against fraudulent practices, to realize that the Middle

[1] *History of England*, Book III, Chapter i, p. 278.

Ages, no less than our own, had its bad craftsmen and shoddy materials. Salzman is quite clear upon this subject: "Cloth," he says, "was stretched and strained to the utmost and cunningly folded to hide defects, a length of bad cloth would be joined on to a length of superior quality, or a whole cheap cloth substituted for the good cloth which the customer had purchased; superior leather was faked up to look like the best, and sold at night to the unwary; pots and kettles were made of bad metal which melted when put on the fire; and everything that could be weighed or measured was sold by false measure."[1]

The rigorous insistence upon a decent standard of workmanship and just weights and measures, shows that the gilds did their best to promote good and honest work. But their regulations were often evaded when opportunity permitted.

We may well be thankful for the great creative ideals and for the constructive work of the Middle Ages, but we must not read into the past that which was not there, and institute comparisons unfavourable to our own age. There is no sufficient reason why admiration and gratitude for the past should lead us to depreciate or undervalue the achievements of the present, or to look back upon an imaginary golden age of whose existence history reveals no trace.

[1] *Mediaeval English Industries*, Chapter xiii, pp. 309-10.

Aims and Ideals of Christian Living (S.P.C.K., 2*s.* 6*d.* net) contains forty-eight Lessons for Bible Classes, Youth Groups, and Study Circles, by various contributors. It is edited by the Rev. J. R. Lumb, Rector of Chislehurst, and the Bishop of Bradford contributes an Introductory Essay. The series is divided into eight sections, and covers the general course of Christian thought and life. It also gives some useful hints on such subjects as Communism, Fascism, and Humanism. It contains a large amount of useful information, and in general should be helpful, although we cannot accept the teaching that is given on some points such as that of Worship. It is a book to be used with discrimination.

Loyalties to Church and State, by H. W. Fox (Student Christian Movement Press, 1*s.* 6*d.* net), is by the Hon. Secretary of the British Council of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, who is well qualified to explain the principles underlying the relationship of men as members of the Church of Christ and as citizens of their native lands. These are presented under the four headings—Man, The Community, The Church and The State. A useful bibliography and a series of questions are added for the use of Study Groups.

A World Picture Book of Prayers, by Phyllis L. Garlick, is a fascinating collection of prayers for children charmingly illustrated. (Church Missionary Society, 2*s.* 6*d.* net.) It includes prayers for "All Our Friends" and these can be had in a smaller form for threepence. It is just the book that many will be glad to give to young children. It provides an excellent training in the meaning and scope of prayer.

THE SECRET RELIGION OF JONATHAN SWIFT

By the Rev. R. WYSE JACKSON, LL.D. (*Nenagh, Ireland*).

JONATHAN SWIFT, Dean of St. Patrick's, author of Gulliver, 18th-century politician and intriguer—such is the popular estimate of Swift. That he had a real religion is realized by few—but actually this was the case. He is still remembered in Dublin as the best Dean who ever held office, as a devoted churchman, and in the narrow, squalid streets of St. Patrick's liberty, as a patriot and benefactor of the poor.

This brief paper will attempt merely to estimate the man's personal faith, and to show something of Swift's prayer-life.

Samuel Butler wrote in *Hudibras* of his Puritan Knight-Errant,

> " For his religion it was fit
> To match his learning and his wit."

Of Swift this was very far from being the case. His religion was something very private, hidden away within himself, and very different in kind from the side of his nature which he chose to show to the world. And because of this reticence in religion Swift was often judged in religious matters only by his learning and his wit—which were in fact poles apart from the simple and straightforward creed which he believed devoutly and practised sincerely and quietly.

Swift made as little show of religion as possible, because he had an abnormally strong hatred and fear of hypocrisy in himself. It is rather curious that in his own life he would never allow any of the redeeming merits of hypocrisy which he pointed out in his *Project for the Advancement of Religion*. His customary public worship in London was attendance at the early Sacrament, because in that service he thought that he would make less parade of piety. He was reticent about his deepest thoughts, and it is quite remarkable how his correspondence deals almost entirely with mundane and superficial matters, and very rarely indeed touches on the spiritual side. In his desire to avoid appearing hypocritical he developed what was really an affectation of disclaiming all appearance of piety, lest the reality of his faith might be questioned. It had, of course, the opposite effect, that the reality of his faith was very seriously doubted by many people. He became what has been neatly described as " a hypocrite inverted." He developed a fear even of Church observances like Lent. " I wish you a merry Lent " was one of his greetings to Stella. He dined off a shoulder of mutton on the last day of Holy Week out of sheer defiance, just in order to show his superiority over hypocrisy. " I hate Lent ; I hate different diets, and furmity and butter and herb porridge ; and sour, devout faces of people who only put on religion for seven weeks," he declared petulantly. And then, in unwitting contradiction to his rough show of religious matter of factness, he retired to bed early that same night in order that he might be prepared for attendance at Holy Communion at eight o'clock next morning—Easter Sunday.

It is a significant and little known aspect of Swift's religion, his sincere and devoted attention to Holy Communion. In a frigid and

unemotional age his love for the Church's central service was remarkable. He was a devout and regular communicant, and his devotion can in no way be estimated by his bitter attack on Transubstantiation in the *Tale of a Tub*. Indeed, it was due to Swift's insistence that St. Patrick's became and remained for more than a century the only church in Dublin at which there was a regular weekly Holy Communion Service.

He prayed, and he believed devoutly in the power of prayer. Very lovely is the spirit of devotion with which his Evening Prayer was charged. "The coming into Thy presence, the drawing near unto Thee, is the only means to be charged ourselves, to become like Thee in holiness and purity, to be followers of Thee as Thy dear children." Swift's sincerity of belief was recognized by the small circle of his more intimate acquaintances. When his very dear friend Sir Andrew Fountaine was seriously ill, it was Swift who was called in to pray at his bedside, as he told Stella in the Journal, "He has been very ill this week, and sent to me early this morning to have prayers, which, you know, is the last thing." And Sunday by Sunday, as Sir Andrew became convalescent, Swift came to pray with him. A week later he read prayers with "poor Mrs. Wesley," who was "very much out of order," instead of going to church.

As Archbishop Bernard observed, men and women do not seek such services from their friends, however brilliant and delightful in company, unless they are convinced of their sincerity.

Yet he kept his belief in prayer as discreetly hidden as he could. He did not object to telling his very worldly friend Bolingbroke that he went "every day once to prayers at St. Patrick's," but then he knew that those observances would pass as official prayers, and that no credit for piety could very well attach to him for the performance of his bare duty.

What he did not tell Bolingbroke, nor indeed, even Delaney, who was one of his closest friends, was the fact that he said family prayers nightly at home in the Deanery for his servants.

So fearful was Swift of giving away his true feelings, that actually Delaney had spent months living in the Deanery before he stumbled upon the existence of this carefully concealed custom.

Yet this habit of prayer was a regular thing and at a fixed hour every night in the Dean's own bed-chamber. "To which the servants regularly and silently resorted at the time appointed; without any notice from a bell, or audible call of any kind, except the striking of the clock."

Delaney sums up this curiously contradictory strain in Swift's character neatly, and one cannot but feel, correctly. "There was no vice in the world he so much abhorred as hypocrisy, and of consequence, nothing he dreaded so much as to be suspected of it. This naturally made him verge sometimes too much to the other extreme."

It was a trait which could only be known to sympathetic friends. The world probably thought Swift an atheist, as did Archbishop Sharp, who advised Queen Anne that it would never do to make a bishop

out of a man who had written a *Tale of a Tub*, and who did not even believe in Christianity. That inverted hypocrisy was probably unknown to the majority of his acquaintances, and it was too subtle a psychological trait to be explained to people who did not wish to believe in it. It was much easier to call him an atheist. It was much easier, like Thackeray, to laugh poor Delaney's defence to shreds with a little convenient inaccuracy and to sneer, " There was no need surely, why a Church dignitary should assemble his family privily in a crypt, as if he were afraid of heathen persecution." It was much easier and more convenient for his enemies to accept the obvious, and, like Jonathan Smedley, to nail up witty verses about the Dean's worldliness upon the Cathedral door.

" Hard to be plagued with Bible, still,
And Prayer Book before thee ;
Hadst thou not wit, to think at will
On some diverting story ? "

" Look down, St. Patrick, look, we pray,
On thine own church and steeple ;
Convert thy Dean, on this great day ;
Or else, God help the people ! "

" And now, where'er his deanship dies,
Upon his tomb be graven ;
A man of God here buried lies,
Who never thought of Heaven."

And indeed it must be accounted a fault with Swift that his contempt for mankind and its opinion was such, that he never exerted himself to correct this very obvious estimate.

Was it of himself that he thought when he wrote, " Some people take more care to hide their wisdom than their folly " ? The sentiment sums up his own failing very accurately.

The true religion of the man was only laid bare in moments of utmost extremity. With his friends he was the man of the world, the politician, the wit ; even to Stella he did not often reveal his deepest thoughts, if we are to judge by the Journal. But when the Stella he loved lay dying, the little girl whom he had taught to write, so that her hand became almost a duplicate of his own ; the Stella for whom he had bought a Bible and commended her for wanting to read it ; when she was ill, then we see behind the mask of pretence. There is a very wonderful spirit of devotion and of faith in the prayers which he composed for her and which he used at her bedside.

Here is an extract from one of the three which are preserved—almost too private and too sacred they are to dwell on in public.

> " Lessen, O Lord, we beseech thee, her bodily Pains, or give her a double Strength of Mind to support them. And if thou wilt soon take her to thyself, turn our Thoughts rather upon that Felicity which we hope she shall enjoy, than upon that unspeakable Loss we shall endure. Let her Memory be ever dear unto us ; and the Example of her many Virtues, as far as human Infirmity will admit, our constant Imitation. Accept, O Lord, these Prayers, poured from the Bottom of our Hearts, in thy Mercy, and for the Merits of our Blessed Saviour. Amen."

One can see in these intimate thoughts something of Swift's trust in God as a God of Love. Dr. Johnson wrote of Swift's prayers a

remark which, if it was not spiteful, was entirely misjudged. He said, "The thoughts of death rushed upon him at this time. . . . It seems that his first recourse was to piety."

That is certainly untrue. His revealing *Thoughts on Religion*—one of the few writings which go really deep—speak of a trust in a God who is merciful and loving. "God's mercy is over all his works," he said, "but divines of all sorts lessen that mercy too much." And it is sure that through all his pain-racked life he did not fear death. He looked on death as a gateway to a fuller and greater life, and a month before Stella's death he could write to a bereaved mother to assure her that this world was but a preparation for a better one, "which you are taught to be certain that so innocent a person is now in possession of; so that she is an immense gainer, and you and her friends the only losers."

Death held no real terrors for him. "It is impossible," he wrote, "that any thing so natural, so necessary, and so universal as death, should ever have been designed by providence as an evil to mankind."

Perhaps after Stella's death it was what he would have wished for himself. There was an unbearable emptiness in his life when she was gone. There is something infinitely tragic in the way in which he sat down when he heard the news and began to write feverishly his pathetic little catalogue of her virtues, until his head ached and he could write no more. On the night of the funeral he was too ill to attend, and he moved from his study into another apartment, that he might not see the funeral lights in the church.

The next seventeen years were years of loneliness, forgetfulness, oblivion. And during those years he prayed; prayed still after he became too ill to attend daily service in the Cathedral, prayed until he could no longer remember anything of his devotions save "Our Father." In after years his faithful servant, Richard Brennan, told how he kept on saying that prayer until the very end!

It is not within the scope of this paper to do more than to indicate Swift's loving care for and building up of Laracor, his tiny country parish; his incessant pastoral work in his Dublin slum parish; his diligence in the preaching office, so admirably shown in his *Letter to a Young Gentleman*; his burning hatred of immorality and infidelity, set out with sparkling wit in the *Argument against Abolishing Christianity*; his zeal for the beauty of his cathedral services, for his choir and clergy; his wonderful care for the fabric and beauty and economy of his great Gothic church.

Yet these all must be considered in order to arrive at a true estimate of the character of St. Patrick's Dean.

In his adopted country, Ireland, much of this is recognized. It is the object of these few pages to suggest thoughts which may give a more balanced picture of a fine churchman whose memory has long been under a cloud.

[It must be added here that these notes have been incorporated into the author's book: "Jonathan Swift, Dean and Pastor," and that they have been printed here by permission of the Editorial Secretary of S.P.C.K.]

SOME PARALLELS BETWEEN ANIMISTIC AND CATHOLIC BELIEFS AND PRACTICES

By the Rev. G. T. BASDEN, O.B.E., M.A., D.Litt., F.R.G.S.,

formerly Archdeacon of Onitsha and Member for the Ibo Division, Legislative Council, Nigeria.

"HE mixed the salt and the water, and prayed that, through the divine help, all persons and things to which the Holy Water is applied may be preserved from all evil and enjoy heavenly protection."

Several months have elapsed since the above words appeared in print. They form part of a newspaper report of the foundation stone-laying ceremony of a Roman Catholic Church. Concerning that ceremony, *per se*, I have no more to say, but the phrase " all persons and things to which the Holy Water is applied may be preserved " stimulated into activity impressions and experiences of African belief and practice.

In the country where I was resident for many years, just inside the entrance to the compound of any man who had respect for himself, his household and his friends, there stands a pot containing liquid. This consists of water and a small collection of roots. This, in due course, had been made " holy "; it has but one use, namely, to give protection from evil. The method is by sprinkling. On entry and, more particularly, on departure, the person lifts the bunch of twigs from the pot and splashes the " holy water " across his feet. By this means, he assures himself of safe keeping. On certain occasions, the walls on either side of the entrance door are also dowsed in order to secure protection of the house and compound.

One asks the involuntary question, " What is the essential difference between salt and water and herbs (called " medicine ") and water ? " In both cases they seem to be used for the same purpose and, presumably, are equally effective, at least, both parties are satisfied with the alleged benefits conferred.

Other comparisons naturally arise though, as the proverb states, " comparisons are odious." In the pioneer days of missionary work, the converts were not numerous while the number of communicants was very small. As it happened, the people of the country were addicted to cannibalism and were also acquainted with the custom of human and other forms of bloody sacrifice. Hence, it was so, that, when they observed a small company of men and women withdrawing themselves in private session, and overheard the words " body " and " blood," they were dubious as to what was being enacted behind the

closed doors. They, at first, naturally concluded that these strange people were celebrating a feast, but of what sort? Were they following the age-long custom of partaking of flesh and blood under special privileges?

Nor did the idea come strangely to many of the communicants themselves. Some of them, indeed a good proportion of their number in those early days, had participated in cannibal feasts and they held a fervent belief that, in the eating of flesh and blood they, thereby, imbibed additional strength and courage. This was especially the case when the victim happened to be of outstanding personality, most probably a soldier killed or taken captive in battle. By eating the smallest particle, they asserted that, in some mysterious manner, they would be strengthened in spirit. Is there any fundamental difference in theory between this and the Sacrifice of the Mass?

The African Animist, with his inveterate belief in the realm of the spirit, maintains emphatically that the priest has a delegated faculty of being able to induce a spirit to enter material substance. This is the important factor to remember when contemplating animistic worship. Whatever figure is used, it, in itself, is of no religious value; it is not even a symbol until a spirit has been invoked to take up its residence within it. Until this is done, the fetish is nothing more than a piece of carved wood, a stone or, possibly, a lump of unformed clay. The bringing in of spirit is the essential feature and this can be achieved only by an act of consecration; it cannot be accomplished by any other means whatsoever. Moreover, the ceremony must be performed by a duly qualified priest and by no other. After appropriate sacrifices have been offered for cleansing and atonement, supplications follow and then, suddenly, an exclamation is heard declaring that the spirit has entered the wood or stone symbol. From that moment, the piece of wood or other material is different from all others, different even from similar examples produced by the same craftsman from the same material. It is, henceforth, sacrosanct; a god dwells within it and it, forthwith, becomes the owner's most treasured possession. Are we reminded of a similar belief nearer home of being able to bring spirit into material substance by an act of consecration? It is not without significance to note that, in the animistic version, the spirit enters at a specific moment in the service of consecration.

And this is not the end. It is not good enough that a man should be blessed with spasmodic visitations of his god; he desires his presence and protection continuously. How can this be arranged? The obvious thing is to devise a means whereby he can be assured of the abiding presence of his guardian spirit. For this purpose, a small medium is required which, while always available, will not be obtrusive. A piece of bone, a cowrie shell or a similar small object is chosen. A service of consecration is celebrated as described above. At the precise moment that the spirit enters the piece of bone or the shell, it is deposited into a small receptacle (tabernacle) provided for the purpose, the cover is fixed and the box placed upon a shelf in the private inner room of its owner. From that hour he has his guardian spirit ever at hand to help him in all times of adversity and to prosper hm in his

enterprises. Daily, he pays due veneration to this spirit and duly acknowledges benefits received.

Is this practice and belief much, if in any way, inferior to some found in civilized countries? Is it a subject for debate among theologians or does common sense supply an answer? Must it be admitted that many of us are animistic in practice and belief with the qualification that ours have been christianized? If christianized, is the resulting Christianity according to the New Testament? or shall we be honest and admit that we have absorbed animistic ideas pretty freely?

In one respect the animist has an advantage. From the moment the consecrated symbol is deposited in his room, he has it permanently in his possession. It is his own; he has no need to visit any particular building, nor is he dependent upon the services of any other man; he is in direct contact with his guardian spirit; there is no further call for the ministrations of a priest.

Other practices might be exemplified, but sufficient have been related to set us thinking whether the Church has gathered to herself animistic beliefs and practices and christianized them into acceptable forms and, if so, to what extent? On the other hand, the missionary who studies the religious conceptions of such people, and probes deeply into their real beliefs, will find much upon which to build and will be in a more favourable position for teaching his converts a "more excellent way."

THEY THAT ARE LEFT! By B. M. W. Grautoff. *Thynne & Co.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Following upon her previous stories with a Christian background, Miss Grautoff has now published an interesting imaginary story of what may take place in the coming days. As a background she uses two passages from the Thessalonian epistles and two chapters from the Revelation. The scene of the story is somewhere on the continent of Europe, and centres around Bertha Bergmann, the daughter of a pious home, whose parents and brother are taken away at the period of the Rapture. She is among those that are left, and the authoress pictures her movements under the Tribulation, showing how she found faith and stood firmly for the Lord. In an "Author's Afterword," Miss Grautoff states that she has written the story in the hope that it may serve as a call to Christians to "think, study for themselves, prepare and watch for that which shall come."

WITH ALL OUR STRENGTH. Prayers for the Kingdom. *C.M.S.* Paper, 6*d.*

This is a very helpful book of devotions, a companion volume to *All our Days*. It follows the cycle of the Church's year in praise and prayer for the Kingdom of God, drawing out the special lessons of each season and giving new meaning to several familiar texts. Though primarily intended for senior scholars it will enrich and enlarge the prayer life of all who use it.

DURHAM UNIVERSITY IN THE NINETIES

A Cathedral View.

By the Rev. EDWIN GREEN, M.A., L.Th.

THE would-be undergraduate of Durham University as he travelled, it may be, by the Great Northern Railway and its continuation the North Eastern, knew not that the last decade of the 19th century would go down to posterity as the "Naughty Nineties." The particular indiscretions of that age may not have been manifest to our young friend. In fact he may have rejoiced at his country's prosperity which was one of the causes of those follies—a prosperity so great that, only two years before, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Goschen, had carried out a remarkable conversion of the National Debt. Our student's exultation will soon appear somewhat premature, for he will discover that his Durham scholarship has suffered a diminution of a quarter per cent. through Mr. Goschen's operation. But when our undergraduate-elect, as his train slackened speed on the long, high viaduct leading into Durham railway station, caught sight of the Cathedral and Castle magnificently high on the Wear-encircled peninsula, he knew that he had reached the end of his journey : Durham University.

. . . . . .

Durham Cathedral is closely connected with the University. Three of its canonries are, for the sake of their emoluments, attached to the University professorships. Attendance at the Cathedral service on Sunday morning is compulsory for all the students, and attendance also at a short service held in the Galilee Chapel is necessary towards making a day of the forty-five days required to keep a term.

. . . . . .

The Sunday morning service at the Cathedral was of the usual cathedral type : designated or it may be stigmatized by some churchgoers as "Glorified Matins." The question as to who was to be the preacher was always interesting, although the preacher himself sometimes failed to be so. On rare occasions the Dean preached. Dean Lake was aged ; he sat on a high stool in the pulpit, and with voice quavering from old age read his manuscript. Although the Dean had never been an orator, and was now long past his prime, he was always heard with respectful attention : most notably on that occasion when he preached on the fiftieth anniversary of the death of Thomas Arnold. One recognized that when Dean Lake spoke of the famous master of Rugby School he spoke not without authority, for the Dean was contemporary and friend both of Arnold and of Arnold's biographer, Dean Stanley.

Another aged but more vigorous preacher was Canon Tristram. He was a great authority on the topography and natural features of Palestine. The worthy canon was a prominent evangelical churchman, and a fundamentalist. One Sunday morning he spoke somewhat scathingly of the scholars who doubted the unity of the book of the prophet Isaiah. It was most amusing to hear in lecture room a few days later the Professor of Theology, Canon Adam Storey Farrar, say with a chuckle : " The last twenty-seven chapters of the Book Isaiah are now usually ascribed to an unknown prophet of the Exile, although some preachers still think otherwise." Canon Farrar himself was a more popular preacher—never too abstruse or too long-winded ; and always giving food for thought. Whenever the Master of University College, Dr. Alfred Plummer, preached he was worth hearing ; but he had an unfortunate break in his voice, as if he were overcome by his emotions. The Professor of Hebrew, Canon, afterwards Archdeacon Watkins, was, as became a Welshman, an orator, and he fulminated with Celtic fire. He got louder and louder until at last he literally shrieked. Sometimes by invitation outsiders stood in the Cathedral pulpit. Among these was Dr. Moore Ede, in later years Dean of Worcester. He died in 1935. Dr. Moore Ede preached an impressive ordination sermon : admonishing the newly ordained men to stand with prayer and exhortation amongst the people to whom they ministered, as of old Aaron, when the Israelites rebelled and were plague-stricken, ran with his censer and stood between the dead and the living.

. . . . . .

Our undergraduate in his second year is no longer a freshman. He knows the dons and the lesser fry not only in person but also in caricature, for he must needs have purchased that amusing Varsity cartoon *Don Dunelmo* in which are portrayed most of the professors and tutors in characteristic fashion.

Picture the student as he attends daily morning service in the Galilee Chapel. From his seat he can see the tomb of the Venerable Bede, and read the well-known words :

" Hac Sunt In Fossa Bedae Venerabilis Ossa."

From his seat also he has a good view of the door, and if he is early he can watch and see who enters. Here come Dr. Pearce, Professor of Mathematics, and Dr. Kynaston, Professor of Greek. Enters now a grey-haired old man, tall, finely built, grand head, clean-shaven upper lip, but scarflike whiskers under his chin. He is Dr. Adam Storey Farrar, Professor of Divinity. Farrar is popular and in some respects the Grand Old Man of the University. He is a former Bampton Lecturer ; although he is not a great theologian he has a good all-round knowledge of divinity; and he is a born teacher, knowing how to differentiate between essentials and particulars. The Divinity Professor is at his best in history and least efficient in pastoral theology.

With Dr. Farrar—they may have met at the door—comes Canon Watkins, the Professor of Hebrew, bearded with raven-black hair, which gives him the nickname of " Satan." In the *Don Dunelmo* cartoon

Dr. Farrar is a stalwart knight with battle-axe and crusader's shield; whilst Dr. Watkins is distinguished by his umbrella which has a handle shaped like a bishop's crozier. The expectation or the prophecy is not fulfilled: Canon Watkins became archdeacon but he never sat on the episcopal bench. Now appear two heads of colleges: Dr. Alfred Plummer, Master of University College, and the Rev. Archibald Robertson, the Principal of Hatfield Hall and Censor of Unattached students. Dr. Alfred Plummer is a scholar of world-wide reputation, noted for his Biblical commentaries and other works. Although future bishops sit and listen to him with respect, yet Alfred Plummer is, and will be content to remain only in deacon's orders. His nickname is "Polycarp," and he figures in the cartoon as a tonsured monk. His companion, the Rev. Archibald Robertson, is also a scholar. He is a great authority on the writings of Athanasius. Dr. Robertson, as he soon will be, has a great future before him: Principal of King's College, London; and eventually Bishop of Exeter. Among the undergraduates Robertson is called "Tiddly." He is reckoned a wit, and in *Don Dunelmo* he is drawn as a clown. A short, benevolent-looking old man, Dr. J. T. Fowler, is our next don. He is a cleric, a liturgical authority, a doctor of medicine, and well beloved. Now follow some of the lesser fry: Professor Jevons, quite a favourite with the students, future Master of Hatfield Hall and future Censor of the Unattached; the Rev. Rushton Shorte, known as "Bulldog"; the Rev. H. Ellershaw, one of the few dons who is a genuine Durham man: he will end his days as Dr. Ellershaw, the respected Master of University College. Not all the dons are clerics. Here is one who is not even a professor or tutor. It is "Agag," for he steps delicately as did the captive king before Samuel. He is Mr. K. Hilton, the University Bursar. Here is another layman in his M.A. gown—Mr. Herbert L. Wild, the classical tutor—a handsome young man, looking something like Mr. Anthony Eden, the Foreign Secretary in Mr. Baldwin's administration. Mr. Wild is clever, somewhat reserved but popular. He will go far: take holy orders, become archdeacon and finally Bishop of Newcastle (1915-1925).

Enough of dons! Our *quondam* undergraduate, seated by the tomb of the Venerable Bede, watches with interest his fellow students, and knows enough of not a few of them to picture, as he thinks, their future. This man from Hatfield Hall: youthful, almost boyish, studious, yet exuberant with fun and humour, a convinced evangelical, and equally convinced of his missionary call. One day four years hence he will stand in Exeter Hall, and in rousing tones voice the missionary challenge, quoting the historic words of Garibaldi: "Whoever wishes to come with me, I can offer him neither money, nor lodging, nor food. I can only offer him instead hunger, thirst, forced marches, battle and death. All who have the name of Italy not only on their lips but in their heart also—let them follow me." Then after many years of strenuous work as a C.M.S. missionary, labouring among the Ainus of Japan, this one-time merry undergraduate, and sometime licentiate of theology, returns to England, and is known as a doctor of divinity, and the respected incumbent of a west of England parish.

The hour of nine approaches ; the students hurry in, and one more at least catches the eye, and deserves recollection. He too is a Hatfield man ; gifted with wisdom and learning, yet foremost in his college boat on the river ; Julius Hancock is much loved, and without any disrespect he is known by one and all as " Julia." What shall be his future—an honours pass, ordination, curacy, benefice, perhaps canonry and all that ? " Crockford " unrolls the passing show : the honours graduate, and then the call to work as a missionary of the U.M.C.A. ; and before many years the early death of the fever-stricken priest. Surely one of Durham's greatest monuments is that lonely grave by African lake. Durham University in the " Nineties " is not without its heroes.

A MISSIONARY LOOKS AT HIS JOB. By W. J. Culshaw. *S.C.M. Press.* 2*s.*

In writing an introduction to this little book Dr. William Paton says, " The book should be of most definite value, especially to those who are considering the missionary vocation." A perusal of the book confirms this opinion. Yet Dr. Paton's verdict might be extended, for certain chapters can be read equally well in reference to all Christian ministerial activities, especially " Patience Worketh Experience " ; " Changing Motives " ; and " The Primary Task." Mr. Culshaw clearly understands what can be the Christian contribution to Indian life, and the circumstances under which it must be worked out. The last chapter—" The Way of the Cross "—goes right to the heart of the matter in its view of that path. In writing this book, Mr. Culshaw has rendered a service to the entire Christian cause, and the S.C.M. Press is to be complimented on adding it to its list.

CURIOSITY JOE, by Montague Goodman. JILL WANTS TO KNOW, by Dorothy Dennison. *Paternoster Press.* 1*s.* each.

The " Wantoknow Series," while they keep up their standard, will certainly meet a need. Suitable books to put into the hands of adolescents are not produced every day. The two latest additions to this series are worthy followers of their predecessors. Among adolescents are both Jacks and Jills, so a suitable book for each has been forthcoming. For the Jacks there is *Curiosity Joe*, by Montague Goodman ; for the Jills there is *Jill Wants to Know*, by Dorothy Dennison. Curiosity Joe is truly the son of his father Jack Wantoknow. The truth of the Gospel is clear in every chapter, and presented with a skill that combines that of a first-rate writer with that of an earnest evangelist. The book is calculated to thrill boys of every age.

Not one whit behind the book for the Jacks is the one for the Jills. It tells of the spiritual pilgrimage of four schoolgirls beginning with the freedom of camp life up to the time when all have given their lives to their Lord.

The books can be warmly recommended. Godparents might well use them at the Confirmation periods of their spiritual charges.

E. H.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

A CRITICAL STUDY OF PRIMITIVE LITURGIES. By K. N. Daniel. *Printed at the C.M.S. Press, Kollayām,* 1937.

This is a valuable account of the Greek and Syriac and Coptic liturgies. The printing of many pages of Syriac from various liturgies reflects great credit upon the printers as the compilation of the liturgies as well as their translation by the learned author deserves high commendation. After some general observations, and a list of authorities extending over 15 pages, he presents the Jacobite Liturgy of St. James, in a translation in three columns : in the first column, " St. James " as known to Moses Bar Kepha, 9th and 10th centuries ; in the second column, " St. James " as known to Dionysius Bar Salib, 12th century ; in the third column, Patriarch Abdulla's MS. of St. James. He shows the triple division of the liturgy—the pro-anaphora, the anaphora (corresponding to the Roman Mass), and the concluding service. He then gives approximate sixth century forms of the liturgies of St. James and St. Mark. Next he makes a study of liturgies in connection with certain doctrines. The first he considers is Invocation of Saints. He states that in the orthodox liturgy of St. James there is absolutely no invocation of saints. He shows how the commemoration of the saints developed gradually into invocation. In the orthodox St. James (Neale's *Primitive Liturgies,* p. 42f.) the litany closes with such a commemoration concluding with what is evidently a later addition—" that we may obtain mercy through their prayers and intercessions." In the Jacobite " St. Mark " there is no formal invocation of saints, but " through the prayers of the saints " occurs in two prayers. In the liturgy (St. James) used by and commented upon by the famous Moses Bar Kepha, Jacobite bishop of Mosul (9th century) there is no trace of this invocation. And in the liturgy of Dionysius Bar Salib, Bishop of Amid (12th century) there is no trace either. He gives instances of a Jacobite litany containing the words, " We remember them that they may remember us," etc. He remarks that in the ancient Roman liturgy there is no invocation of saints strictly so called. But the sacramentary of Leo has " grant that we may be assisted by the prayers of those whose help thou hast mercifully provided for us " (p. 92).

Next he discusses mediatorial priesthood in the various liturgies, and shows how the idea crept gradually in. In the orthodox liturgy of St. James, it is the Church that offers ; in the Jacobite " St. James," it is the priest. In the liturgy of Chrysostom it is the Church ; and also in the orthodox " St. James "—" the love of God the Father and the grace of the Lord and Son, the communion and gift of the Holy Ghost be *with us* all." But in the Jacobite " St. James "—" be with *you* all." This of course is not a strong instance, it is a permissible form of blessing. But in the Jacobite " St. James " the priest says, " Brethren, pray for me that my sacrifice be accepted." This is a later addition.

In the late Patriarch Abdulla's MS. the priest says: "Receive this offering from my weak and sinful hands." Dr. Adrian Fortescue* (*The Mass*, p. 31) comments—"before the secrets the celebrant asks for the prayers of the people." It is again a mediæval addition. The Latin liturgy of the Roman Catholics has—"Pray, brethren, for me that my sacrifice *and your own as well* may be accepted by the Lord our God." This suggests that "your own as well" was deliberately omitted in the other liturgies, and this changed the whole idea, for sacrifice as it stands in the above liturgy can only mean thanksgiving.

Next he deals with what he calls "the localization theory or the theory of transubstantiation or consubstantiation" and the liturgies. In the earlier liturgies this idea is not found. It is warded off by the quotation from 1 Cor. xi. 26—"for as often as ye eat this *bread* and drink this *cup* ye show forth my death till I come," which is used in the orthodox St. Mark (Neale, p. 22), the liturgy of Clement (Neale, p. 84), the liturgy of Basil (Neale, p. 133); the liturgy of Nestorius (Badger, vol. II, p. 226). The Roman Catholics altered this formula which appears in all the primitive liturgies (after the words of institution) into "as often as ye do these ye shall do them in remembrance of me"—thus avoiding calling the elements "bread" and "cup": not holding it to be bread and not giving the cup to the laity. Even the later Jacobite liturgies of Dionysius Bar Salib (12th century) and Moses Bar Kepha have 1 Cor. xi. 25f. But a Jacobite made this alteration—"when ye communicate in this mystery"—for the same reason.

In Chapter VIII he gives six stages of the formula of Consecration. The first is in the Didaché where there are thanksgivings for the wine and the bread, but no prayer for either. The thanksgivings are reminiscent of the Sabbath meal and blessings. Dr. Buchwald regards them as pure Jewish Berakhoth. Matthew and Mark, who wrote for Jewish Christians, used "blessed" while Luke and Paul, who wrote for Gentiles, used "gave thanks." Our Lord did not pray for the elements. The Early Church followed him. Justin (*Apology I.* 65, 67) gives an account of an Early Communion Service. Here again there is no prayer over and for the elements, but thanksgiving is made for them. There is one expression in I. 66 which literally runs so—"the food for which thanks are given by prayer of the word that is from him" on which much has been written, some regarding it as an invocation of the Holy Spirit. See a long discussion on its meaning by the present reviewer in the *Protestant Dictionary* (*Epiklesis*, p. 239,) and his explanation, through prayer (the formula that is from him). That this is what is meant is proved by the immediate recitation of the words of institution. It is to be remembered that Justin wrote in a very unfinished style. Words are frequently misplaced, there are many doublets, etc. Having written "through prayer" he proceeds

* The author, Mr. Daniel, quotes Fortescue in other places, "During the first two centuries (roughly) the only book used in Church was the Bible. Nothing else was written, the celebrant and deacons said their prayers extempore." This possibly is true, but it was for lack of a fixed liturgy. We have fixed formulae in the New Testament and a liturgy was a distinct improvement on extempore prayers.

to define it, " I mean through his own formula." This of course would exclude any prayer for the elements of bread and wine in Justin. Neither is there any prayer for the elements in the Apostolic Constitutions VII. In the second stage he places " the Testament of our Lord " (c. 400 A.D.) : " Cause that this drink and this food be to us—for the medicine and support of our spirit." The third stage is the Ethiopic liturgy : " Send thine Holy Spirit on the oblation of this Church . . . give it . . .", but no change in the elements is prayed for. The fourth stage is the Chaldean liturgy of Addai and Mari which does not pray for a change, but for the blessing of the elements. The Chaldeans like all other Orientals place the Epiklesis after the words of institution. The Chaldean Uniats, 1767, reversed this order, and so have the Romo-Syrians for the reason that it would be useless to invoke the Holy Spirit to work on elements already transubstantiated by the Words of Institution. The fifth stage is in Apostolic Constitutions VIII : " Send down upon this sacrifice thine Holy Spirit . . . that He may show this bread to be the body of Thy Christ and the cup to be the blood of thy Christ." Sarapion's liturgy has : " Let thy Holy Word come upon this bread that the bread may become the body of the Word, and upon this cup that the cup may become blood of the Truth." The sixth stage is in Cyril's (Jerusalem) lecture : " We call upon God to send forth His Holy Spirit upon the gifts lying before Him and that He may make the bread the body of Christ, for whatsoever the Holy Ghost touched is sanctified and changed " (*Catechet*, Lect., p. 154). In the Roman Church it is held that transubstantiation takes place by the recital of Institution. Gregory the Great (Ep. XII) said that it was the custom of the Apostles to use the Lord's prayer only, and " it seemed to me very unsuitable to say over the oblation a prayer which a scholastic composed, and not say the prayer the Lord composed over His body and blood." Duchesne (*Christian Worship*, p. 184) says we are not obliged to believe this but " it is difficult to argue against St. Gregory's having thought so." Mr. Edmund Bishop (*Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, p. 146) remarks : " Of the two great traditional Christian communions one says that by the completion of the Recital of Institution the bread and wine have become the Body and Blood of our Lord, the other that they are only bread and wine still." He regards this as no mere theological *scitum* but a practical and vital difference. Daniel points out that in the orthodox " St. Mark " there is an address to the Logos, " Thou that didst give thyself for the life of the world, we pray thee to cause thy face to shine upon this bread and upon these cups " (Neale, p. 13). In the Coptic " St. Mark " we have this later addition to the above—" bless them, sanctify them, hallow and *change* them." Daniel next gives the forms of Epiklesis in the orthodox " St. James," the Jacobite " St. James," the orthodox " St. Mark " and the Jacobite " St. Mark." Neale gives the orthodox forms, Brightman the Jacobite. The orthodox St. James addresses God Almighty—" Send down the most holy Ghost, Lord (address to Christ? despota), upon us and upon these gifts *set forth* (prokeimena) that He may make this bread the Holy Body of thy Christ, and this cup the precious blood of Thy Christ " (Neale, p. 51).

A similar Epiklesis is found in the Orthodox St. Mark. The Jacobite "St. Mark" introduces the word "changed." As all the four invoke the Holy Spirit upon the worshippers and the gifts, it is suggested that the original form was the former and that the invocation of the elements was added afterwards. In some liturgies the former "upon us" was abandoned and the elements were only considered. Daniel shows how gradually the presentation of the fruits of the earth to God became changed into an oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ and thus into a tremendous and unbloody (reminiscent of the oblation of bread and wine) sacrifice.

There is one important point connected with the Greek Liturgies which has not been noticed by Daniel, and that is their confusion of the shewbread with the Holy Communion. This has been shown at length by the present reviewer in an article—*The Greek Sources of the New Consecration Prayer*—published in the *Churchman*, October, 1927. The erroneous rendering of the LXX of Lev. 24. 7: "They (loaves) shall be for loaves for a remembrance (*anamnesis*) *set forth* (prokeimena) before the Lord." The shewbread was not the memorial (*azkarah*). That was the incense portion which was burnt, the shewbread was eaten by the priests. The word set forth (*prokeimena*) is used of the bread and wine in the four principal liturgies. It was taken from the account of the shewbread. *Anamnesis* is not "memorial" either, which is a thing, whereas anamnesis is a verbal noun denoting action. On the table of the shewbread were also flagons and cups for libations. The word "table" figures prominently in the liturgies. Chapter XV on the growth of liturgies is a very useful appendix. In the early days presbyters and bishops were free to make alterations. This freedom was taken from the Roman Church in 1570 by Pope Pius V, but was never taken, as far as is known, from the Jacobite Church, all the changes being in the direction of ascribing more importance to the sacramental elements. The moment of consecration according to the Jacobite Church is when the Holy Spirit is invoked. The recital of the words of institution which are regarded as the great moment in the Roman service make the bread and wine Sacred, nothing more. He quotes some Syriac passages on this subject. He also notes that the Order of Baptism has undergone similar changes to that of the Eucharist. There was an epiklesis of the Spirit on the water and the candidates. In later times the latter seemed superfluous and was removed. To appreciate the industry of the writer one would have to read the book. The Syriac, though seemingly formidable, is clearly printed and not too difficult. On page 207 should not the passage run, "the body of redemption . . . the blood of the new covenant, the blood of redemption"?

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

THE UNITARIAN CONTRIBUTION TO SOCIAL PROGRESS IN ENGLAND. By the Rev. Raymond Holt. *George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.* 10s. 6d.

In this volume the Rev. Raymond Holt, a Unitarian minister who is also a distinguished historian, records the contribution to social

progress in this country made by a religious body that is often abused and misunderstood—the Unitarians.

This book is not a defence of Unitarian theology nor even a history of the Unitarian Church in this country. Chapters 7 and 8, however, describe the formation of the Unitarian tradition and the changes through which Unitarian thought has passed since the 18th century. As a separate denomination the Unitarian Church may be dated from 1774 when the Rev. Theophilus Lindsay, formerly vicar of Catterick, opened the first definitely Unitarian place of worship in London; but Unitarian views had previously been held by some individuals who were brave enough to avow them and also by some congregations that had begun as Presbyterian or Independent or Baptist. Mr. Holt briefly describes the change from the Unitarianism of Dr. Priestley at the end of the 18th century to that of Dr. Martineau who died in 1900; the former built his Unitarian theology on an unquestioning belief in the authority of Scripture, and while his view of the Bible led him to reject the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation it led him to accept prophecy and miracle and even to look forward to the second coming of Jesus Christ; the latter in the course of a long life found "the seat of authority and religion in human experience of the divine, in the conscience, soul, and mind of man; this is not infallible any more than Church or Bible, but there is no other (p. 342).

The greater part of the book, as we should expect from its title, deals with the record of Unitarians in social progress from the industrial revolution (which coincided with the formation of the Unitarian Church in this country) until the beginning of the present century; it shows how in the enlightened direction of industry, the extension of the franchise, education and local government, Unitarians have played a part out of proportion to their small numbers; and many Christians who are not Unitarians will agree with the principle taught in so many Unitarian churches that a Christian should show his religion not only or chiefly in what is called "church work" but in the purifying of social and public life. Throughout this volume the names of Unitarians are printed in italics, and the reader can see from the text and from the index the part played in social progress both by Unitarians and by social reformers, Christian or non-Christian, who were not Unitarians.

The book is marked by a refreshing candour. Though he claims Bentham as a Unitarian in thought Mr. Holt is careful to add that he was not a worshipping Unitarian; he also notes that Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, who carried out such salutary reforms in the local government of Birmingham in 1873-6 "seems to have lost something of his religious faith" in his later years (p. 232). Nor again does Mr. Holt deny or excuse the "coldness" which has so often been attributed to Unitarians (p. 332); he also mentions that sometimes the relations between a minister and the congregation that support him have not always been happy (p. 334).

Possibly the non-Unitarian reader will be surprised at the number of eminent individuals in the 18th and 19th centuries who can be claimed as Unitarians, even when allowance has been made for those like Erasmus Darwin who was more of a "Deist" and Charles Darwin

who tended to agnosticism, though both at times had attended Unitarian worship.

On p. 284 there may be a slight chronological error ; Archbishop Secker (who succeeded to the primacy in 1758) is mentioned in company with Archbishop Tillotson and the Unitarian layman Thomas Firmin, a passage that may suggest that Secker belonged to the age of William and Mary. Mr. Holt does not, as a rule, mention the names of living Unitarians ; hence his survey does not include the events of the last 30 years ; but a reviewer writing near the end of 1938 may well mention the latest contribution made by a Unitarian to social progress (if such progress includes the preservation of peace), namely the courage, the patience and the perseverance of our present Prime Minister, a member of a distinguished Unitarian family.

As this book is not a defence of Unitarian theology the writer of this notice does not think it his place to pronounce on the merits or the defects of Unitarian theology ; but while he does not think that Unitarianism will be the prevalent type of Christianity he maintains that, when tried by our Founder's test, " By their fruits ye shall know them," many a Unitarian ought to be reckoned as a Christian ; and he hopes that the obloquy that fell upon two Broadchurch clergymen of a century ago, Bishop Stanley and the future Bishop Hampden, will not be repeated to-day when a minister of the Church of England follows their example in regarding Unitarians like the author of this book as our fellow-Christians.

Mr. Holt concludes his survey by speaking of the belief in progress that inspired so much reform during the peaceful and prosperous period known as the Victorian age. Then he adds the following sentence : " These hopes crashed after 1919. Men and women in the 20th century will try to solve their problems in their own way, but, if they abandon those ideals of truth, liberty, humanity, and democracy which animated the best minds of the 19th century, the time may come when the historians of the future will look back with longing on that century as in some-ways a little oasis in the history of man. And as later generations painfully take up again the work of striving to create a society in which the head is held high and the mind is free, they will wonder why those who came before them lost their nerve and threw away the gains of centuries."

This is the closing paragraph in Mr. Holt's interesting volume, and in the hopes and anxieties which it expresses the author will have the support of all Christians who regard the value of the individual soul and its right to freedom and justice as among the essentials of the Gospel of Christ. J. F. CLAYTON.

SELECTED MYSTICAL WRITINGS OF WILLIAM LAW. By Stephen Hobhouse, M.A. *Daniel.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

Mystics are to be found in almost every religion, and they have appeared in almost every age. The Christian Faith has had its quota of these people, male and female, who have sought to turn their eyes away from the world to God, and enjoy communion with Him.

Mysticism has often been the expression of the soul's cry for freedom in a reaction against a hampering formalism.

William Law, the devout Anglican and Non-Juror, is perhaps the most well-known of English Mystics. He is best known by his *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*, the book which deeply influenced John Wesley. This book is perhaps more highly appreciated than any other English book of practical religion with the exception of *The Pilgrim's Progress*. Law was an accomplished scholar, and a great Christian. His mystical writings were many, and there is no doubt that he was deeply influenced by the work of Jacob Boehme, the German Mystic of the Reformation, when in middle life, Law came into contact with these writings.

Mr. Hobhouse has rendered a great service to those who would know more of Law's Mystical Writings. His book is the result of extensive research. It has three parts. Part I gives lengthy passages from Law's works. These in themselves are moving, by their quiet piety and longing for God. Their spiritual quality is enhanced by their faultless English. Part II consists of notes on the selected passages, and are of untold help to the student who would know more of Law's outlook. Their references to other writings by various authors provide a mass of useful information. Part III gives twenty-four short studies of certain subjects treated by Law. These are most interesting, and amongst them, the two on " Jacob Boehme " and " The Sources of his Mystical Theology," are most illuminating.

The volume is of good proportions (almost 400 pages) and is equally fine in its contribution to the study of this great Anglican Mystic. E. H.

WHAT THINK YE? E. L. Allen, M.A., Ph.D. *James Clarke & Co. Ltd.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

It is satisfying to notice signs that once again men and women are willing to give thought and consideration to the things of the spirit. Dr. Allen's book is the very thing to put into the hands of enquirers who may wish to consider the Christian approach to the problems of life. The questions put by the author are regarding Man, God, Christ, the Cross, Pain, Death, Immortality.

The whole volume is provocative of thought, and Dr. Allen seems to have ever in his mind the answers given by other systems of thought (Communism, Fascism, National Socialism) to the questions he asks. It may be that here is to be found the reason why he begins by asking " What think ye of man? "

Although the traditional answers of Christian thought to these questions are not given in their usual form, they evidently give a background to Dr. Allen's presentation of the matter. This way of approach is apparent in the chapter about God. He says on p. 30 : " There is . . . another pathway to God, and the entrance to it is in our own hearts. Where we give reverence, we give it not to power without limit, but to character without flaw. It is so with man, and shall it not be so with God? " One might have wished that the answer given

about the person of Christ might have been stated in terms of His Godhead rather than His Divinity. One finds that the term Divinity is used very ambiguously in these days. A Unitarian would readily acknowledge Christ's Divinity under these terms, but not so His Godhead. The chapter on the Cross is not so clearly defined in outline as is the rest of the book. A statement on p. 67 is not helpful. "What exactly Jesus meant to accomplish by His sacrifice we cannot hope to know. Nor does that greatly matter. Let it suffice that He put Himself into the hands of God, that He might lead Him whithersoever he would." One could scarcely say that the Bible is so indefinite on that matter as is our author. The chapters on pain, death, and immortality are most useful in opening up fresh avenues of thought as one considers these matters. E. H.

CHRIST AND FAIRIES. By the Rev. C. M. Chavasse. *S.P.C.K.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

St. Paul used every opportunity which presented itself for preaching the Gospel. Mr. Chavasse sees in fairy tales the embodiment of the first gropings of child races after God. Further, he says, "The chief religious value of fairy tales is that in them the supernatural is the commonplace, and miracles are normal happenings" (p. 21). Because of these observed characteristics, ten fairy tales are examined, traced to their origin, examined as to the reason why they developed as they did, and used as a background for a Gospel message in each of the ten sermons included in this present volume. The title is arresting, the treatment is arresting, and the whole volume is certainly interesting. E. H.

BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY. By George H. Richardson, Ph.D., D.Sc. *James Clarke & Co. Ltd.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Biblical Archæology is always a fascinating study, and is now considered as an indispensable aid to the Bible Student. The present volume claims to deal with "its use and abuse." The writer has a great deal to say about what he considers its abuse. His contribution about its use is almost entirely confined to the last chapter. Ultra-conservatives and ultra-liberals in this sphere of study are severely criticized, and the writer advocates what he terms "the moderate liberal position."

In his preface, the writer takes exception to such titles as "The Bible is True" and "The New Knowledge about the Old Testament." Yet a study of the present work leaves one with the impression that Biblical Archæology has little to produce in proof of what the Bible tells. It is admitted that much has been discovered which throws light on the Bible. However, readers are reminded again and again that "illustration is not confirmation." One is glad to find a passage on p. 118 with which full agreement can be accorded: "The Bible does not need the aid of archæology to prove its truthfulness. Faith ought to rest on something more substantial than a cuneiform tablet or on a flimsy sheet of papyrus, yea, on something more solid than a diorite monument." There is another passage in a similar vein on p. 169,

" Have we not spent too much time upon the outward Bible and too much neglected the inner word? Have we not been more concerned about the letter than about the spirit? "

The book deals mainly with the Old Testament, and the writer sweeps aside much of what has been written about the period covered by the Pentateuch by such men as Sir Charles Marston; and even Canon Sayce is gently chided. Alas! little is put in the place of that which is rejected. E. H.

MISSIONARY IDEALS. By the Rev. T. Walker, M.A. *I.V.F.* 1s.

This book is really a series of studies in the Acts of the Apostles, chapters i.-xv., as a background of missionary endeavour. It is most admirable as a book for study circles and might profitably be used for private Bible study. Several chapters are most arresting, particularly is this the case with chapter iv., " A Missionary Designate." In illustration, there are many sidelights taken from actual missionary enterprise. As is to be expected, these are taken mostly from work in S. India. E. H.

PERFECT FREEDOM. By T. C. Hammond. *Inter-Varsity Fellowship.* 5s.

In writing this " Introduction to Christian Ethics," it may possibly be that Mr. Hammond has had in mind the needs of theological students. The book will be of untold value to them. However, its sphere of usefulness will not be limited, for the author has presented the subject in such a manner that those without particular theological and philosophical training can easily follow him.

After his introduction of the subject, Mr. Hammond divides his study into five parts. The first section deals with the fundamental matters of personality. In this part, the chapter on Conscience is most helpful. The author recognizes that " the principal interest for the moralist resides in the essential nature of conscience " (p. 63). His conclusion is that " Conscience must not be regarded as a negative element but as a positive " (p. 70) and that " it witnesses to Him who is higher than ' self.' It is the recognition of the Divine demand " (p. 71). The second section deals with Natural Ethics, and forms a splendid introduction to a historical study of the subject. Throughout this part, the author is at pains to explain that his aim is to introduce the reader to a fuller study of the subjects he mentions, yet these pages are marked by sound scholarship and penetration. The third part deals with the distinctive claims of Christian Ethics. " We have to regard it as a cardinal defect in Natural Ethics that it reckons without the supernatural " (p. 153). The better way is that of the Christian Faith, for " Christianity is the fixed point of reference for all that occurs in nature and in man " (p. 167). Section four deals with " The Moral (Christian) Life " and is intensely practical in its application of Christian principles to conduct. Section five is found in the final chapter and presents the author's conclusions on the contribution of Christian Ethics in the future.

The volume has a series of questions for study ; it is well indexed. We are indebted to the author for a masterly treatment of a most important subject. E. H.

OUR GREAT HIGH PRIEST. By Canon Peter Green. *Longmans.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Several distinguished writers have devoted their attention to St. John 17, amongst them Bishop Moule and Professor Swete. Canon Peter Green has now added to the thoughts of others, his own contribution to the devotional study of this chapter. He commends its study paragraph by paragraph, the reader making his reading the basis of his own meditations. There can be little doubt that this will prove to be the most profitable use of this book.

Spiritual truths are set forth in their fullness and beauty, yet the Canon repeatedly " puts his finger on the spot." He declares that in his experience " individuals and congregations well grounded in doctrine show a gravity, a steadfastness, and a sanity which is too often lacking where religion is made altogether a matter of emotion and feeling " (p. 25). He also shows the disaster which must befall education which is divorced from religion. In this connection he edits the words of Caliban : " We have taught the nation to read and write ; and our profit on't is, they can read the betting news and fill up their pool slips " (p. 46). Where the Canon emphasizes the Incarnation, evangelicals would probably emphasize the Cross, yet a perusal of the book makes it clear that this does not constitute a fundamental difference on the person and work of Christ. E. H.

PRACTICAL PROBLEMS IN CHRISTIAN LIVING. By the Rev. Hugh McKeag, D.D., Ex-President of the Methodist Church in Ireland. Senior Chaplain to the Parliament of Northern Ireland. *James Clarke & Co.* 3*s.* net.

The Rev. Dr. McKeag has for several years contributed to the columns of the " Christian Advocate " articles which deal with problems of Christians. The present volume contains many of these in permanent form.

In addition to a much-appreciated ministry, Dr. McKeag preached effectively by his pen. There is no attempt in these chapters to put forth anything profound, theological or mystical. They are just homely, fire-side talks ; and his audience is that large company of people who are questioning, suffering, struggling and sorrowing along the journey of life. They are marked by discrimination of character, sanctified common sense, and wholesome humour. The matters dealt with are twenty-five in number, and range over a wide variety of subjects. Three deal with the various aspects of the " Group Movement," and many of them deal with matters of applied Christianity. There is hardly a dull page in the book, and no one can read a chapter without real benefit. Ministers will find it a mine of wealth for the preparation of sermons that will get the message across to their hearers.

CHAS. E. WILSON.

THE CHRISTIAN IN ACTION, A RECORD OF WORK IN WAR-TIME CHINA. By Seven Missionaries. *Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd.* 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

This little book comprises in the short compass of 114 pages, the war-time experiences of seven missionaries in China.

It is a wonderful inspiration in days when in the home-church, the keenness of many has waned, and the hearts of so many are filled with fear. It describes "how the church in China is facing this present crisis, its daily life under war conditions, and the difference made to the outlook of the ordinary Chinese in the challenge of this crisis by whether they are Christians or not."

What this composite book lacks in unity, it may gain in its representative character, as the contributors come from different regions of China, and each has been living for more than a year under the strain of the absorbing preoccupation of war.

The purpose throughout this little book is to record the faithful spirit of the Chinese churches during the past year of war.

An excellent map illustrating modern China is given.

The reader will be well rewarded for perusing these pages, and the Christian will take heart from the heroic record.

CHAS. E. WILSON.

MEDITATIONS ON THE CROSS. By Toyohiko Kagawa. Translated by Helen F. Topping and Marion R. Draper. *Student Christian Movement.* Price 2*s.* net.

Anything that comes from the pen of this remarkable Japanese Christian will be interesting and instructive, and the present volume is all that the name of the writer would suggest.

With the varied background of his wonderful experience, he stands as it were before the Cross, and gives us the benefit of his meditations that are deep, original and stimulating.

No one will read this volume without being made to remember Christ on His Cross, and to face the claim He makes upon our obedience in every realm of modern life.

There are 18 chapters, each one of them dealing with the Cross. The approach is quite original, and it is interesting to see how an Oriental mind absorbs and expresses the central facts of the Christian faith.

It might well be that the hearts of many English Christians would be stirred by this message that comes from the East.

CHAS. E. WILSON.

PLAN AND SERVE. By A. P. Young, O.B.E. Foreword by Sir Felix Pole. *Management Publications Trust, S.W.*1. 3*s.* 6*d.*

This thoughtful and useful book originated in a remark addressed to the author by the Rector of St. Mary Woolnoth, after he had given an address entitled, "Do Christianity and Business Mix?" Mr. Young is well qualified to answer this kind of question for he is the Manager of the great Electrical Works seen by every traveller passing

through Rugby by train, and he has also for many years believed implicitly that " the word ' service ' lies at the core of Christianity . . . and a spirit of service harnessed to national and international service is the intangible power that can save democracy from itself."

This quotation gives the key to the main object of his book. It consists of lectures and addresses which have been given to various scientific and literary societies during the past seven years and running through all of them is the dominating theme Plan and Serve. He begins with an excellent survey of the past in which he stresses the fact that increasingly Christ's teaching has vitally influenced all human progress. In the new era in industry which has now dawned he points out the significance of Christian Reunion in relation to his subject. " Christian bodies of different denominations are uniting in a common desire and purpose to influence the whole process of economic and industrial reconstruction." There is no doubt that this book is a real contribution to the bringing about of this new order in big business generally. It is a practical Tract for the Times, very different in scope and design to those issued ninety-seven years ago, and it can be strongly recommended to all who are planning and working for the world-wide extension of Christ's Kingdom. J. W. AUGUR.

THE PROFESSOR AS PREACHER. Edited by D. P. Thompson, M.A. *James Clarke & Co. Ltd.* 5*s.*

There are far too many books of sermons being published to-day without any real justification for their appearance, but an exception can be made in the case of the one under review. It consists of representative sermons by seventeen Scottish Theological Professors and there is not a word of controversy in them ! We doubt whether the same happy unanimity would be possible in England but perhaps we are gradually moving in that direction, and it was not always so in Scotland. Both the older and the younger generations of theologians are represented in the list and all the sermons reveal ripe scholarship, evangelistic zeal and homiletic power. They deal with such subjects as The Cross as Revelation, Dynamic Personality, The Church's Witness, The Christian Hope of Immortality, The Love Incomparable and The Day of Visitation. Many Anglican clergy will find them useful and suggestive. J. W. AUGUR.

THE RISE AND GROWTH OF THE CONGRESS. By Andrews and Mookerjee. *George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.* 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Mr. C. F. Andrews, the co-author, with Mr. Mookerjee, of this book, is a recognized authority on India and the Congress movement. He has already written several books on the subject, but none more valuable than the present volume. It traces the history and growth of the Congress movement from the days of its inception down to the year 1920, the time of the Panjab disturbances and the beginning of the successful form of non-co-operative civil disobedience.

The Congress was a movement which from its earliest days has expressed the deepest loyalty to the Crown, and desired freedom only

within the Empire to develope its own national form of government. As Dadabhai Naroji declared as far back as 1885 : " We are British subjects . . . and we have a right to all British institutions. If we are true to ourselves and perseveringly ask what we desire, the British people are the very people on earth who will give us what is right and just."

To read this book is to gain an insight into the lives of many great Indians, who lived and worked for the welfare of their country, and the development of a system of self-government suitable to India and its people. It is impossible not to sympathize with their aims and aspirations, and this book provides the background so essential to a proper understanding of the political situation as it exists to-day.

It is to be hoped that a companion volume will soon be produced, bringing the story of the Congress down to the present day and telling the story of the last twenty years.

W. H. BISHOP.

KESHUB CHUNDER SEN. By P. K. Sen. *Allenson & Co.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

In the life story of Keshub Chunder Sen, who died over fifty years ago, we have a fascinating account of the spiritual development of one of India's great saints. A deeply spiritual man, he laid well and truly the foundations of the Brahma Samaj, the Theistic Church of the reformed Hindus. A deep student of all that was best and highest in religious teaching, he gathered together the best moral and religious precepts from all sources, and incorporated them into his " New Dispensation."

Prayer and worship, love and service, were the ways in which life should be lived. All distinctions of race, caste or creed must go, woman must be raised to her true position in life, and the great brotherhood of mankind established in the world.

Though never a Christian, he was a great admirer of Christ and His Gospel. He was outspoken in praise of the true Christian life, and equally outspoken in his condemnation of those who professed to follow Him, but rendered merely the lowest form of lip service.

He once said : " I regard every European settler in India as a missionary of Christ, and I have a right to demand that he should always remember and act up to his high responsibilities. But . . . behold Christ crucified in the lives of those who profess to be His followers." An indictment which, alas, is so often true to-day ! ! But he spoke more truly than he knew when he said : " In Christ Europe and Asia, the East and the West, may learn to find harmony and unity."

This is a book to be read by all who are students of Comparative Religion.

W. H. BISHOP.

America and our Schools (Oxford University Press, 2*s.* net) is a strong plea by J. Howard Whitehouse for a more extensive knowledge of America and a better understanding of that country in our schools.

NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS.

A CHATTY book of miscellaneous hints on public speaking and preaching by Mr. D. B. Knox is issued by Messrs. James Clarke & Co. as a *Handbook for Speakers and Preachers* (5*s.* net.). Special reference is drawn to the prevailing habit of inaudibility on the part of speakers and good advice is given on voice cultivation. Useful suggestions are made on a variety of subjects such as sermon making and sermon subjects. A selection of anecdotes suitable for various occasions and brief breezy paragraphs make up a book that will interest all who have to give addresses of any kind.

God's Iron is the title of a life of the Prophet Jeremiah by George Birmingham (Skeffington & Son, 2*s.* 6*d.*). The author is well known as a novelist, and his experience as a writer of imaginative works serves him well in depicting some of the aspects of Jeremiah's life and character. He has made the prophet a living personality playing an important part in the national and foreign politics of his time. As a native of the village of Anathoth, he was of a cowardly disposition, and shrank from the responsibilities which were placed upon him. He led a lonely life and was doomed to disappointment and failure. The invasion of Jerusalem brought calamity to the people, and Jeremiah became unpopular as the messenger of God, He suffered much and was cast into prison. Finally he goes with some of those who fled to Egypt and dies there, still proclaiming God's messages to those who would not hear him. The book is not written for scholars as specialists, but for general readers who are interested in the Hebrew prophets. They will get a vivid impression of the prophet from the author, who has consulted the writings of great Old Testament students, such as Dr. Skinner, Sir George Adam Smith, Dr. Driver and Professor Cheyne. It will be found a helpful book by those desiring to understand fully Jeremiah's writings.

Dr. Zwemer, who has returned from his long years of work in the Moslem mission field, has given the results of his extended experience in a book published by the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of University Unions, *Dynamic Christianity and the World To-day* (2*s.* 6*d.* net). The first portion of the book explains that dynamic Christianity centres in the unchanging message of the Cross. There can be no compromise on this. It is an absolute and not a relative condition, and there can be no admixture of comparative religions. The death of Christ holds the fundamental place in Christian teaching. If this is taken away Christianity is destroyed. This is a stumbling block to Islam. In the second part is a graphic description of the world to-day and of its need of the Gospel. Interesting details are given of the conditions prevailing in various countries, and of the progress of

Christian work among the people. Yet while much has been accomplished much remains to be done. There are yet many unoccupied regions. Dr. Zwemer makes a special appeal for work to be undertaken in them. "The heart of Asia is the greatest unevangelized region in the world." The great hindrance to advance is the indifference within the Church. The claims of the Mission Field are presented with a stimulating and inspiring force, and the facts presented in an attractive form.

Canon Peter Green's short life of Christ issued under the title *The Gospel Story* (Longmans Green & Co., 2*s.* 6*d.* net), although intended primarily for use in mission schools abroad can be used with advantage by general readers and by teachers who wish for brief but clear explanations of some of the questions that naturally arise in connection with the life of Christ. The general outline covers the period of our Lord's private ministry, and then goes on to give the characteristics of his public ministry in three clearly marked periods. Special attention is then given to the Passion, the words from the Cross, the Resurrection of our Lord and His appearances afterwards. He gives his reasons for his interpretations and although we may not agree with all his opinions, the whole tone and character of the book render it of special value for the purposes for which it was written.

A re-issue of Mr. Albert Close's *Rome's Attack on the British Empire and the United States of America* (Thynne & Co. Ltd., 2*s.* 6*d.* net) provides a very full statement covering the period from the time of the Reformation up to the present day of the attacks upon the Protestantism of this country especially on the part of the Jesuits. The information given will not be found in any other single volume and it forms a body of evidence on the machinations of Romanists against the welfare of England, and the Protestant succession of our Throne.

The Rev. R. J. E. Boggis, B.D., went *Down the Jordan in a Canoe* and has written an interesting account of his experiences (S.P.C.K., 6*s.* net). He also gives particulars of previous similar journeys with the accidents that befell those who undertook them. Some account is given of recent developments along the banks of the river and at the Dead Sea which will be of special interest to those who have visited the region in days before the present régime.

Those who have read the first book of Walter Miller, M.R.C.P., L.R.C., on Nigeria—*Reflections of a Pioneer*—will be glad to read his further account of that land in his new book *Yesterday and To-morrow in Northern Nigeria.* In the opening chapters he gives a number of pictures of the many changes which he experienced during his long residence in the country as a Medical Missionary of the C.M.S. He describes the life of the natives and the revolution that has been wrought in their condition by the rapid advance in the introduction of European inventions. In the later chapters he gives advice as to the future

developments and the right methods to be pursued both in missionary and administrative work. Mr. Miller has strong convictions which he does not hesitate to express and his long experience warrants attention being paid to his criticisms.

A selection of extracts from letters of some of the German Pastors who are imprisoned on account of their faith have been translated and issued under the title *I Was in Prison* (Student Christian Movement Press, 1*s*. net). Many thousands of the German edition were circulated before the booklet was confiscated by the police. It is a significant fact that the booklet was confiscated. The spirit shown by these Pastors must have been extremely inconvenient for those who had condemned them to their prisons. They show a brave spirit of Christian confidence and a power of endurance which is born of their faith in Christ and His cause.

Those who have to read the lessons in Church should read *How to Read the Bible Aloud* by the Rev. R. S. T. Haslehurst, B.D. (S.P.C.K., 4*s*. net). Sound practical advice is given and the points are illustrated in a way calculated to impress them on the mind. There is always room for improvement in the conducting of the services and Mr. Haslehurst gives many useful suggestions.

Cross and Swastika is an account of the Ordeal of the German Church by a Swiss writer, Dr. Arthur Frey. It is translated by J. Strathearn McNab, and there is an Introduction by Dr. Karl Barth, who says that the state of the Church in Germany cannot too often be brought before the people of other lands. Dr. Frey's exhaustive examination of the whole painful subject deserves careful study. (Student Christian Movement Press, 6*s*. net.)

The Student Christian Movement Press has issued an edition of Forbes Robinson's *Letters to His Friends* which were printed for private circulation many years ago. In this new edition these letters of deep spiritual interest will reach a wider circle of readers and those who were familiar with them in the past will be glad to recommend them to others, especially to students and those beginning their life work. (4*s*. 6*d*. net.)

New Testament Translations—A Correction.

The New Testament, translated by John Wesley, 3*s*. 6*d*., and *The Book of Books*, 2*s*. 6*d*., a translation of the New Testament by R. Mercer Wilson, were both described as publications of the Epworth Press. They are really publications of the Lutterworth Press, which belongs to the United Society for Christian Literature. *The Book of Books* was published to celebrate the centenary of the R.T.S. Paragraph Bible, as well as the fourth centenary of the English Bible in the parish churches.