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

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

The Churchman Advertiser.

OCTOBER—DECEMBER, 1939.

CONTENTS.

THE
CHURCHMAN

October—December, 1939.

JEREMIAH HORROCKS

By the Rev. CANON BATE, D.D.

THE 24th of November, 1939, marks the three-hundredth anniversary of an outstanding event in the history of astronomy and calls to memory a remarkable young man of extraordinary genius who died, his life's work completed, at the early age of twenty-two. The event was the first observation of the transit of the star Venus ; the young man was Jeremiah Horrocks, whose memorial tablet can be seen in Westminster Abbey close to that commemorating Sir Isaac Newton.

The life of Jeremiah Horrocks is involved in a certain measure of obscurity. It seems clear that he was born in 1618, certainly at Toxteth Park, now part of Liverpool. The Park had been disafforested in 1592 by Sir Richard Molyneux and divided into about twenty small farms. The new tenants came from Bolton, which, according to Royalists was " abhorred by all good churchmen as a nest of vile Puritans." These tenants were Puritans, hardy folk, simple and pious. To the Horrocks family was assigned Jericho Farm, Lower Lodge, on the site of the present Grassendale Station. In 1611 the tenants brought from Winwick, as their schoolmaster, and later their pastor, Richard Mather,[1] father of the famous Increase and grandfather of the equally famous Cotton Mather. To the little school in the centre of the park, to be taught by Mather, went young Jeremiah Horrocks who soon displayed extraordinary mathematical capacity. At the age of 14 he proceeded to Cambridge as a sizar of Emmanuel College, a distinctly Puritan college which attracted Lancashire men in large numbers. Against what difficulties the mathematical student of the day had to contend may be judged from the experience of Seth Ward, afterwards Savillan Professor and Bishop of Salisbury, who entered Sidney College in the same year (1632). Ward related that he found in the college library books wholly new to him but when he enquired for " a guide to instruct him " none was to be found. The books were Greek to all the fellows. The only thing to do was to puzzle through the books himself. Undoubtedly Horrocks experienced similar difficulties. Text-books in English hardly existed.[2] In Horrocks' own library at his death was not a single English text-book. It was probably at Cambridge that he conceived a taste for astronomy and he must have made great strides in his mathematical knowledge. For some reason he came down from Cambridge without a degree.

[1] Said to have been appointed Master of Winwick School at the age of 15.

[2] Trinity College, Cambridge, library possesses Horrocks' own copy of Lensberg's Tables which he purchased at the University in 1635. On one side of the last sheet is an alphabetical list of writers on astronomy available for students. The only English name in its list is John of Halifax.

The probability is that he was summoned back to Toxteth to take the place of Richard Mather, who had grown increasingly uncomfortable in his relations with the Archbishop of York, who had silenced him in 1633. In 1635 Mather left England to join the Pilgrim Fathers in New England, and Horrocks took his place at Toxteth where for the next four years he taught in the school and preached, as a layman, in the chapel, the "ancient chapel" of Toxteth. Those years were marked by significant events. Early in their passing (1636) Horrocks was introduced to William Crabtree, a keen student of astronomy living at Broughton, Manchester, with whom he corresponded to the end of his life. It was during these years that he prepared himself for his greatest achievement. His first astronomical observation took place in June, 1635. In May, 1638, he communicated to Crabtree that he had purchased a rather more efficient telescope at the cost of half-a-crown. Undoubtedly too, it was at Toxteth, that he made his first careful observations of the tide for the purpose of philosophic investigation. In these years he probably suggested the correct theory of the moon and reduced the sun's parallax to 14″. All was accomplished in the face of discouragement and disabilities. In the preface to his *Astronomia Vepleriana*, in which he showed that Lensberg's mathematical hypotheses and tables were unreliable, he wrote of his many difficulties: "The inadequacy of my gifts oppressed my aspiring mind. There was no one who could give me instruction; none of my friends could help me. Languor and lassitude were ever present. What could I do? I could not facilitate the labour of study nor increase my resources. But to cease study because of difficulties would have been weak and unworthy. I determined therefore to overcome the tediousness of study by industry, my poverty by patience, and that for a master I would use astronomical books." It was after this period of which he writes that he lighted by chance upon a tract of Professor Gellibrand that was of great help and that he met William Crabtree who was able to assist considerably with calculations and observations. They both discovered that the recognized mathematical tables upon which they had been relying were faulty and proceeded to make their own corrections.

In 1639, at the age of 21, Horrocks was ordained and appointed to work at Hoole, a few miles south of Preston. Hoole was a chapel of ease to Croston. The 15th century chapel had been rebuilt in 1628 by John Stones, of Carr House, Hoole, who had endowed it to the extent of £40 a year. The vicar of Croston was James Hyett, a very unbending Puritan who later took part in the establishment of Presbyterian discipline and signed the Harmonious Consent. The curate of Hoole in the returns of 1631 and 1639 is given as Robert Fagg, so sturdy a Puritan that he flatly refused to assist in contributions in aid of the war against the Scotch. It was probably his place which Horrocks temporarily supplied. There is reason to believe that Horrocks had rooms in Carr House, about a mile from the church. His first letter to Crabtree from Hoole was dated June, 1639. He entered upon his ministerial duties with devout enthusiasm. His religious faith was simple but sure. Astronomy attracted him partly because he found it "beautiful to contemplate the manifold wisdom of my Creator

in His wonderful operations." To him there was a real music of the heavenly spheres, with the universe as the strings and the finger of God as the striking force that brought out the hidden harmony. He had an answer for those who suggested that the speculations of astronomers tended to undermine the Word of God. His certainly brought him close to the heart of the Creator.

In the course of his correspondence from Hoole he warned William Crabtree that the conjunction of the sun and Venus would take place on November 24th, that no one had ever beheld the transit of the star and that it would not again be possible during the 17th century. He pointed out that according to Kepler November 24th was the date and 8.8 a.m. (in Manchester) the hour. According to Horrocks' own calculations the hour would be 5.57 p.m. He advised Crabtree to watch the whole day and, indeed, on the previous afternoon, to allow for possible miscalculations.

Horrocks made his own preparations. In his darkened room at Carr House the telescope was so arranged as to project the object on to a screen. Horrocks tells how he began his watch on Saturday (November 23rd) but the sun itself was not visible. The next day was a little clearer. He watched from dawn till 9 a.m., and again from a little before 10 a.m. until 1 p.m. at varying intervals. His watch was again interrupted by the afternoon service in the little church. It is worth noting the exact words in which Horrocks records the interruption: "I was called away to things of greater importance which it did not become me to neglect for these by-studies (parerga)." That he was a Christian minister before he was an astronomer, is more fully comprehended when it is realized that this was the only chance for 130 years to see the transit of Venus. The great moment came at 3.15 p.m. when Horrocks had returned to his room. He tells the story: "At fifteen minutes past three, when I first had leisure to repeat my observations, the clouds were entirely dispersed and invited my willing self to make use of the opportunity afforded as if by heaven itself. When behold! the most pleasing spectacle, the matter of so many prayers! I saw a new spot of unaccustomed magnitude, perfectly circular in shape, so completely entering the left limit of the sun that the limits of the sun and the spot precisely coincided. I immediately set to work to observe it sedulously." The only other person to make the observation was his friend, William Crabtree.

There the story of Horrocks almost ends. For some reason, possibly ill-health, he returned to Toxteth in June or July, 1640. He remained in correspondence with Crabtree and was working upon his scientific account of the transit. Again and again he made plans to visit Crabtree in Manchester, but generally something occurred to make the visit impossible. Finally he made a definite engagement to be in Manchester on January 4th, 1641. He failed to keep that appointment; God had called him.

On the back of that last letter of Horrocks, kept with the rest, Crabtree wrote: "D. Jeremiae Horrox ii ad me literae, anniis 1638, 1639, 1640 usque ad mortis suae diem, Jan. 3rd, mane, valde subitaneæ; pridie quam statuerat ad me venire. Sic Deus finem imponit rebus

subsolanis omnibus. Hic amisi (proh dolor) Charissimum mihi Horroxium. Hinc illae lachrimae! Inœstimabile damnum!"

A few years later Crabtree himself was dead.

Unfortunately many of Horrocks' papers were lost. His brother Jonas of Liverpool took many of them to Ireland and there they disappeared. Crabtree, happily, had the M.S.S. copy of *Venus in Sole Visa*, upon which both of them had been working. It was published by Hevelius in Danzig in 1662, as an appendix to his own *Mercurius in Sole visus*. On Crabtree's death the papers of Horrocks fell into the hands of Crabtree's representative and were rescued by Dr. John Worthington. Other papers came into the hands of Jeremiah Shakerley and were used by him for his *Tabulæ Britanniae*. He left the papers with Nathaniel Brooks (*Bibliopolan*), London, and they were destroyed in the Great Fire of London.

Possibly because his lines were cast in times when England was passing through civil disturbance and deciding great issues, the work of Horrocks was practically unnoticed. Until the fact was suggested by Professor Rigaud it was not even known that Horrocks had been ordained. His own county ignored him for nearly two hundred years. It was not until 1826 that an amateur astronomer provided a commemorative tablet for St. Michael's, Toxteth (not a very suitable place for the first memorial). In 1857 the vicar of Hoole appealed publicly for a memorial in Hoole of one whom Sir John Herschell described as "the pride and boast of British astronomy." As a result of his appeal the church was enlarged by the addition of a chancel aisle with seats free to the poor for ever and by an east window which portrayed Horrocks observing the transit. Still later, through the instrumentality of Dean Stanley, a tablet was placed in Westminster Abbey.

There is a curious connection between Horrocks and Australia. One hundred and thirty years after the observation made by Horrocks there was due, according to him and his successors, another transit of Venus. In order that the transit might be observed under the best possible conditions, the Royal Society petitioned the Government to fit out an expedition to the Southern Seas, and invited Captain Cook to lead it. He sailed with scientific experts to Otaheite and there the transit was observed under ideal atmospheric conditions. The historian of that expedition comments: "The pomp, state and results (of later observations) cannot draw us away from a sympathizing memory of the young lonely Lancashire clergyman and the revelation for which he waited so anxiously, yet confidently, in the humble chamber in the village of Hoole." From Otaheite, Captain Cook proceeded to the islands of New Zealand, but found the natives emphatically hostile. From there he made his way to New Holland (Australia) and came in sight of Botany Bay. Here, despite the hostility of the aboriginals, he landed, taking possession in the name of Great Britain, giving to the new possession the name of New South Wales. It requires not a very great imagination to see accompanying Captain Cook, as he landed, the shade of the delicate young curate of Hoole, whose work had, even though indirectly, led Captain Cook's steps to that spot.

RESERVATION

By the Rev. C. SYDNEY CARTER, D.D.,

Principal of Clifton Theological College

(*Concluded.*)

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).

Now as we have seen, not only did Cranmer and the leading Reformers, who compiled the 1552 Book, strongly denounce the mediæval practice of Reservation, but in the Service for "Communion of the Sick" no provision for even the temporary type of 1549, or mention of it, was made. It is therefore important to study the actual facts concerning this 1560 Latin Book and its supposed authority to amplify, and even contradict, the rules clearly laid down in the legal statutory Prayer Book of 1559. Now this Latin Prayer Book of 1560 certainly has a peculiar origin and standing, and "its authoritative character," instead of being "beyond doubt," is most questionable. Bishop Anthony Sparrow in his *Rationale* of the Prayer Book (1657) says, "It is a translation of some private pen *not licensed by authority* as I guess" (Preface). Mr. Clay, who edited it in 1847 with the *Liturgical Services of Queen Elizabeth*, declares "that it came forth with the express sanction of Elizabeth's Letters Patent," but he adds that this was done by a "stretch of her prerogative," and that instead of it being, as the "Letters Patent" assert, *convenientem* or agreeable with the 1559 Book, "it was almost an independent publication" (xxi and xxiii). Research, however, has revealed that these asserted "Letters Patent" *do not exist*, and that there is no trace of them in the Public Records and that in addition they are irregularly drawn up. (Franey, *Reservation of the Sacrament*, p. 53, 1899). But even if they were genuinely Elizabeth's "Letters Patent," this Latin Prayer Book was only issued on her *sole personal* authority which could not override the exclusive authority of the Statutory 1559 Prayer Book. Any attempt therefore to "use any other rite, ceremony or order of celebrating the Lord's Supper," which was not "mentioned and set forth" in the 1559 Book

was clearly illegal and liable to the severe penalties prescribed by the Act of Uniformity 1559.

Now the pious purpose for which Elizabeth requested Walter Haddon to prepare a Latin translation of the Prayer Book was the same as that stated in the First Edwardine Act of Uniformity—"It was for the furthering and encouraging of learning in the tongues in the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford," to which Elizabeth added, in her Letters Patent, the Public Schools of Eton and Winchester. It was, in fact, the laudable desire that the dons and students, who knew Latin, should say their Morning and Evening Prayers in their own Colleges Churches and Chapels in that language. The Book was not to apply to ordinary parish churches, and although the whole Prayer Book with its Occasional Offices was translated into Latin, obviously there would be few young students or Fellows who would during their Term time want to use the Service for Communion of the Sick !, and Chancellor Wordsworth is probably correct in concluding that it is a question whether Walter Haddon's *Communio Infirmorum* Appendix was ever used (*Prayer Book Dictionary*, 404). This may account in some measure for the "liberties" which were taken by the translator with this particular Service. But in any case Haddon, rather strangely, *did not take the* 1559 *Prayer Book as his model.* Instead he turned to a professed translation of the 1549 Book made in 1551 by a Scotch Professor at Leipzig named Aless. It certainly was a very free "translation," since in the *Visitation of the Sick* Haddon deliberately alters the rubric about the desire of the sick person for Unction, to the permission to say a certain Psalm ! ! But Dr. Haddon does not even make an exact translation of Aless's faulty *Latin Prayer Book.* He makes careless or deliberate alterations which in important cases make it a compilation very much *sui generis*, and certainly not "in harmony" with the authorized Elizabethan Prayer Book. This is very conspicuous in his translation of the Service for "Communion of the Sick." Dr. Harris declares that on account of the provision in this Latin Service for Sick Communion, the 1559 Prayer Book office was "officially interpreted as permitting Reservation of the 1549 type." But if we study this Latin service carefully, we soon discover that it did *not* authorize Reservation "of the 1549 type." According to that Book, if there was a Celebration of Holy Communion in Church, "the priest was to reserve as much of the elements as shall serve the sick person and so many as shall communicate with him (if there be any)," and then the same day he is, as soon as convenient, "after the open Communion ended," to "go and minister the same first of all to those who are appointed to communicate with the sick (if there be any) and last of all with the sick person himself." He is, before ministering the reserved sacrament, to say the General Confession, Absolution and Comfortable Words. Now this Order did not require the priest himself to communicate a second time, and thus he need not be fasting. It was a clear case of so-called "Reservation," scarcely differing from that practised in Justin Martyr's day. But the corresponding rubric in Haddon's Latin Prayer Book *differed materially from this.* Like the 1549 rubric it orders the priest from the

Celebration in church to " reserve so much of the sacrament as suffices fot the sick man." But then it introduces an *entirely new feature*, when it adds : " And soon after the Supper is finished he shall go to the sick man *with some of those present*, and shall first communicate with those who are at the sick man's bedside and with *those who had taken part in the Service in Church*, and lastly with the sick man."

Now this order is more akin to as full an extension as possible, and repetition of the service in church, *in the sick man's room*. The priest himself had to communicate *again* (and one of the main reasons for the 1549 " reservation " was to avoid this necessity) and some of the church congregation were also to do the same, and the friends of the sick person were also to communicate with him. And we should note carefully that there *must be* such " friends " present, as the 1549 qualifying clause—" if there be any "—was omitted from this rubric. This sort of " extended Communion " was clearly not " the 1549 type of Reservation," nor was there any authorization for such a practice in the 1559 Book which Haddon was supposed to be translating into Latin ! It conformed neither to the one nor to the other. The same was the case with the order of service when there was a *Celebration* in the sick man's house. In the 1559 office there was merely the Collect, Epistle and Gospel ordered to be said. Haddon has these, but he inserts " The Lord be with you " and the *Sursum Corda* and then adds, " Unto the end as stated above "—" *Usque at finem ut supra dictum est.*" As this apparently refers to the Order of Communion Service in the 1559 Book, this would mean the omission of the Confession, and Absolution, which come *before* the *Sursum Corda* in the 1559 Order—a serious omission both devotionally and liturgically.

It is not surprising that this independent, curious " hotch potch " production met with small favour in the learned world for which it was designed. Most of the Cambridge Colleges refused to use it, describing it as " the Pope's dregs " (p. xxxi, Clay). Accordingly we find that this irregular " royal " Latin Prayer Book was never reprinted. It was obviously altogether too " original " a translation to be acceptable as the equivalent of the 1559 Prayer Book. Dr. Haddon was quietly dropped, and Elizabeth allowed her printer Wolfe the patent and monopoly of issuing in 1572 another Latin Prayer Book which adhered far more closely to the 1559 Book and had therefore no provision in it for any kind of reservation. The rubric in it for the " Communion of the Sick " is an exact translation of that in the 1559 office. Chancellor Wordsworth declares that this, and later Latin Prayer Books, superseded the 1560 Book, although Dr. Harris tries to disparage these later Latin Prayer Books by asserting, *without any evidence*, that they were " for private use alone." He does not, however, explain the insertion of the office for " Communion of the Sick " in a Prayer Book designed only for the use of " private people " desiring to say at home the Common Prayer in Latin !

A further ingenious but rather far-fetched attempt is made to claim Archbishop Parker as favouring the use of Reservation of the 1549 type. In 1561 Parker re-drafted the Edwardine text of the *Reformatio Legum* and in so doing he made a verbal alteration or addition

to chapter 19 on transubstantiation. After the statement that transubstantiation is opposed to Scripture and the true nature of a sacrament, it adds : " Therefore neither do we allow this sacrament to be lifted up on high, nor do we suffer it to be carried through the fields, nor to be reserved (till the morrow), nor to be worshipped." In the Edwardine draft the words " *in crastinum* "—to the morrow—were absent. They were inserted by Parker in 1561 and consequently it is urged that the Archbishop *by this addition* wanted to retain the 1549 practice of " reserving " for the use of a sick person on *the same day*, but no longer. This is a very slender foundation for charging Parker—the Primate—with the deliberate aim of disobeying the clear statement of the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity 1559 which declared that " any other form of *administering* the sacraments " than that carefully prescribed in the 1559 Statutory Book should " from henceforth be utterly void and of none effect " ! It is far more likely that Parker was correcting this passage, by this addition, to make it agree with the well-known and then often-quoted reference to a supposed Second Epistle of Clement of Rome—" Let so many holy loaves be offered upon the altar as may be sufficient for the people. If any remain, let them not be reserved *until the morrow*, but be carefully consumed by the clerks with fear and trembling." But whatever the reason for Parker's addition, we must remember that this *Reformatio Legum* had no real authority since it was never legally authorized, and that in the next year when the Convocation, presided over by Parker, issued the Thirty-eight Articles, this addition of " *in crastinum* " was significantly absent. Even if we grant, what is highly improbable, that Parker had desired that the additional words might be construed as allowing some sort of " extended Communion " for the sick with the reserved elements, he must soon have realized that such a practice was quite ruled out by the Act of Uniformity and by the clear language of Article 28 to which he had assented. Moreover, no specific case of any attempt to practise the 1549 type of Reservation after 1559 has been discovered, even though there were in those days amongst parochial incumbents many secret favourers of the old mediæval practices.

An attempt is also made to prove that Reservation for the Sick must have been practised and tolerated by the Reformers, on the very precarious and slender evidence afforded by an Edwardine Visitation to Saffron Walden church in October 1552—just a month *before* the 1552 Prayer Book came into force. The Commissioners mention amongst the ornaments of the church " a little round box to carry the sacrament in." Such a box or pyx would *at that time* have been lawful for taking the reserved sacrament to a sick person, as allowed by the 1549 rubric ; but Dr. Harris claims it as evidence that " *continuous* Reservation *in one kind* was lawful under the 1549 Book " (556). He also boldly suggests that it would continue under the 1552 Book. The awkward records of the removal by the Commissioners of pyxes, in all the instances known to us does not disturb him, since he asserts that such definite action by the authorities cannot " fairly be regarded as evidence that pyxes were ' illegal ' ornaments." It would be interesting to discover what kind of evidence would have been sufficient

to convince Dr. Harris of the prohibition of any practice which he favoured! But against such purely partisan assertions, Chancellor Wordsworth frankly admits that "in 1552 the Prayer Book dropped all provision for even a limited Reservation" (*Prayer Book Dictionary*, 610); while instead of "continuous Reservation in one kind being lawful under the First Book, Bishop Dowden, deservedly reputed for his careful and exact liturgical scholarship, declares "that Reservation in the Church of England between 1549 and 1552 was in its purpose limited to communicating the sick, in no case was the Sacrament to be kept beyond the day on which it was consecrated" (*Further Studies, etc.*, 249). This is obviously a correct statement when we remember that the 1549 Book only authorizes the reserved sacrament to be taken to the sick as soon as possible *on the day* of a celebration in church; and the Act of Uniformity 1549, under heavy penalties, forbids "any other form or manner of administration of the Sacraments" "than is *mentioned* and set forth" in that Book (*Gee and Hardy*, 361). Of course, during Mary's reign reservation, and continuous reservation were restored and pyxes consequently returned and were in general use, but "after the death of Mary, pyx and tabernacle were sold or done away with everywhere" (*Prayer Book Dictionary*, 610). As evidence of this we find that Archbishop Grindal in his Visitation Articles in 1576, inquires whether amongst "other relics and monuments of superstition and idolatry" "any pyxes remain undefaced and *undestroyed*"? (Cardwell *Documentary Annals*, I, 399). Yet Dr. Harris declares, *without any evidence*, that in 1560 Reservation of the 1549 type was *explicitly* authorized by the Queen and Archbishop of Canterbury and was in considerable use among the parochial clergy" (584)!

Both Dr. Harris and Professor Kennedy try to make capital out of a natural query raised by Bishop Sparrow in his *Rationale* of the Prayer Book, and they contend that it proves that Reservation for the sick was considered allowable under the 1559 Prayer Book. Sparrow's *Rationale* was published in 1657 and was followed by a second edition in 1661 and one or two later editions. He had noticed that the Service for "Communion of the Sick" in the 1559 Book gave no "directions" as to "*how much* of the Communion Service was to be used in administering to the sick person" (p. 349). In perplexity Sparrow referred to the 1549 Book and there he found clear directions on this point and so he recites the rubric there simply to show "*how much* of the Communion Service shall be used" at the delivering of the Communion to the Sick. This point was all he was concerned with. But he very significantly stops at the words "following in the open Communion" and *adds* "and so proceeding in the Communion Service to the end of the *Consecration* and distribution." This was obviously to show that he knew that Reservation under the 1559 Book was prohibited. But he added an *errata* list at the end of his first edition 1657, and said that these words should be omitted. He evidently felt that *with this addition*, the 1549 rubric was not *accurately* transcribed. But in the next edition of 1661 the words still remained, and they were never removed even in later editions. But the quotation of the 1549 rubric was not in any way intended to give the idea that the 1549 permission

to minister to the sick person with the reserved Sacrament could be continued under the 1559 Book, and this no doubt was why Sparrow added "proceeding in the Communion Service to the end of the Consecration and distribution." He realized that the Consecration prayer must be used, because the new 1559 rubric presupposed a consecration when it said that "the priest shall first receive the communion himself." The 1549 rubric had merely directed the priest when visiting the sick with the *reserved* sacrament to "minister the same first (*not to himself, but*) to those which are appointed to communicate with the sick, if there be any, etc." We have Sparrow's own admission that any kind of Reservation was illegal under the 1559 Book, for a little before in this same *Rationale* (p. 279) he says, in commenting on the 5th post-Communion rubric, "if any of the bread and wine remain the curate shall have it to his own use"—"That is, if it were *not* consecrated, for if it be consecrated, it is *all* to be spent with fear and reverence by the communicants *in the church.*" This was not what the actual 1559 rubric ordered, but it was what Sparrow thought *ought* to be done, and the Caroline Revisers, of whom he was one, took Sparrow's view and added a new rubric ordering this practice. But the statement shows clearly that Sparrow had no thought of "reservation" for the sick, with the surplus bread and wine, as in 1549, or that he regarded the new 1661 rubric—that no consecrated bread and wine were to be carried out of the church—as simply designed to prevent "Puritan irreverence" of taking such surplus to the curate's "own use." But whatever the imagined purpose of this new rubric its actual language that "the consecrated elements remaining over shall at once be reverently consumed and *not carried out of the church*" must, in effect, rule out any possibility of their use for Reservation. Yet Dr. Harris makes the unsupported categorical assertion that "Sparrow declared Reservation to be still lawful" (591).

In this connection it is perhaps worth while to notice an alteration of some significance in 1662 in the 5th and 6th rubrics regarding the disposal of the surplus bread and wine which carried out Sparrow's wishes just referred to. In 1549 a rubric just before the *Sursum Corda* directed "Then shall the minister take so much Bread and Wine, as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the Holy Communion." Bucer in his *Censura* had taken great exception to this rubric as causing superstition, inducing people to think that if any bread and wine of the Communion remain after it is over, there is something wrong in applying it to common use, "as though there were in this bread and wine in itself something divine or holy *outside its actual use in Communion*" (*Censura*, p. 552-3). He held the Lutheran view of the elements (just as we have seen Cosin did) "that they were 'signs' and 'exhibitive tokens,' and have no union whatever with the glorious body and blood of Christ, but of exhibition and testification that by them Our Lord truly communicates Himself to His, to be seen and fed on by faith. They have no other use than that of arousing the mind and certifying the true communication of Christ" (cf. *Censura*, 473). Bucer's objection was evidently accepted, and accordingly in 1552 this rubric was entirely omitted and there was added to the

rubric about the kind of bread to be used—the significant words, " And if any of the bread and wine remain the curate shall have it to his own use." There is no doubt that this referred both to the consecrated and unconsecrated bread. But this " Lutheran " view of consecrated elements which had been solemnly set apart for a special sacred use was certainly not shared by *all* the Caroline divines, and this explains Sparrow's comment on this rubric in his *Rationale.* It also gives us the origin of the new 6th rubric in the 1662 Book, which then made a clear distinction between the " consecrated " and " unconsecrated " bread, giving the latter *only* to the " use " of the curate, and ordering the consecrated elements to be reverently consumed and " not carried out of the church." In Dr. Harris's comments on this new 1662 rubric we get a glaring example of the *petitio principii* form of argument which is so characteristic of his methods of special pleading and groundless assumptions. Referring to this rubric—" if any of the bread and wine remain of that which was consecrated it shall not be carried out of the church, etc.," he declares, " It is historically certain that the object of this rubric was not to forbid Reservation " (589). He gives no " historical " proof for this dogmatic assertion, yet on the next page he adds to this mere assumption, and says : " It being granted that down to 1661 Reservation was lawful (and this upon evidence that can hardly be reasonably disputed !) this rubric could only naturally mean at the time, that at the offertory the priest was to place upon the Table so much as he thought sufficient for *all intended Communicants,* whether those were all at the moment in church, or some of them sick at home awaiting Communion " (570). In this way Dr. Harris adds to the rubric the words in italics, because he *wishes them to be there.* With an imaginative interpretation of this sort it is easy to make definite orders mean exactly the reverse of the actual words used !

But we must remember that the basis of these disingenuous methods is the preposterous claim, which is openly advanced throughout Dr. Harris's thesis, that even though a mediæval practice or ceremony has been deliberately dropped, it is still permissible to use it, unless it *is specifically forbidden in so many words* ! He thus contemptuously disregards, without troubling to quote its convincing language, the declared " Opinion " of Archbishops Temple and Maclagan in 1900, based on the careful researches of very competent ecclesiastical lawyers, that " rubrical omission is equivalent to prohibition " (see p. 596). On the other hand, Chancellor Wordsworth regards this official " Hearing " and " Opinion " of the Archbishops on the subject of Reservation, as " the highest English authority " (*Prayer Book Dictionary,* 611). Consequently Dr. Harris declares that the 1549 Prayer Book in spite of its careful and *limited* provision for the Communion of the Sick, allowed " Perpetual Reservation " because it " was not forbidden " (553). In the circumstances it would be almost as reasonable to argue that an English military officer might appear on parade in the dress of an Italian cavalry regiment because such uniform was not actually " forbidden." Moreover, the principle employed by the Reformers is clearly stated in their Preface—*Of Ceremonies—Why Some be Abolished and Some Retained.* Those that are " abolished "

are quietly dropped out and not "retained." And surely any attempt to prohibit a large number of practices *by name*, would have been most unsuitable and unedifying in a book of devotion? By implication, this was equally well effected by the clear statement in the 1549 Preface —*Concerning the Service of the Church*, which declared that "the curates shall need none other books for their public service but this book and the Bible." This limiting order was made perfectly clear and definite in *each Act of Uniformity* which forbade under heavy penalties the Ministers to vary, add to, or alter the services, rites and administration of sacraments in any way from what is positively "mentioned and set forth" in the authorized Book of Common Prayer. In connection with this definite order—"It shall not be carried out of the Church"—Bishop Creighton told Mr. Linklater, "I know the attempts made to explain that away, but we must not try to explain away plain words, which have to be read in the light of the previous concession" (*Life and Letters*, 311) i.e. of "the 1549 permission to 'reserve' for the sick person".

As regards Reservation for the purpose of *Adoration* there is unanimous and severe condemnation of such an un-Scriptural custom both by prominent Elizabethan and Caroline Churchmen. Bishops Jewel and Bilson use strong language about it. Jeremy Taylor declares "It is certain they commit an act of idolatry in giving divine honour to a mere creature" (*Works*, VI, 1862, 162-3). Archbishop Bramhall denounces it in similar terms: "We dare not give divine worship to any creature—there is no more adoration due to the sacrament than to the garments which Christ did wear upon earth" (*Works*, I, 21). Bishop Burnet, whose liberal views would allow him to join in fellowship even with those who taught transubstantiation, drew the line at the Adoration of the Reserved Sacrament: "If . . . the adoration of the elements is taught and practised, this we believe is plain idolatry, when an insensible piece of matter, such as bread and wine, has divine honour paid to it, when it is believed to be God, when it is called God and in all respects worshipped with the same adoration that is offered to Almighty God. This we think gross idolatry" (*Articles*, 453).

This may sound to some uncharitable language, but it is merely confirming a little more forcefully the statement of the post-Communion *Black Rubric* which declares that "no Adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received or unto *any* Corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians)." Bishop Creighton was certainly correct in saying that Adoration "is clearly against the mind of the Church of England" (*Life and Letters*, 313).

This question of "Adoration" is really the pivot on which the controversy over Reservation turns, and it is pertinent here to notice the complaint which Dr. Harris makes regarding the decisions of the ecclesiastical Courts. He affirms that our rubrics should be interpreted "with reference to the liturgical tradition of which they form a part, or to the known views and intentions of their authors"

(595). With regard to the latter standard we have already seen that the "known views" of Cranmer and his fellow liturgical scholars, who were "authors" of almost all these rubrics, were definitely opposed to any form of real "Reservation." In fact, even the 1549 experiment of a sort of "extended Communion" for the Sick was ruled out after a three years' trial because they found it led to abuses. The clear evidence which we have in Cranmer's reply to the demands of *The Rebels in the West* in 1549 is really conclusive of the falsity of Dr. Harris's assertion that "continuous Reservation in one kind was lawful under the 1549 Book" (556). For these "Rebels" complained that the mediæval practice (carrying out Archbishop Peckham's Canon for "reserving Christ's body") had been abrogated by the new 1549 Prayer Book. "We will have," they demand, "the Sacrament hang over the high altar and *there to be worshipped*, as it was wont to be"; and they charitably add, "and they which will not consent thereto we will have them die like heretics against the holy Catholic faith"! Cranmer chided them severely with their ignorance of "the holy Catholic faith," telling them that this corrupt practice was not heard of for more than a thousand years until the times of Popes Innocent III and Honorius III. "In the beginning of the Church," he says, "it was utterly forbid to be kept" (*Remains*, 172-3). It was therefore the definite aim of the Reformers and Revisers to frame their rubrics concerning the Sacrament so as to break any previous "liturgical tradition" of reserving, carrying about and worshipping the host, which they denounced as idolatrous and un-Scriptural. They all strongly denied that the Sacrament should be worshipped by adoration of the reserved host hung up in a monstrance or pyx. As Roger Hutchinson said, "The bread and wine are not His flesh really and corporally, but a certificate, a seal, a patent or lease thereof." "Christ's flesh is to be honoured by coming to His Supper and obeying His precept, 'Take, eat, drink of this all,' by receiving of the sacrament, not with kneeling before bread and wine." So, discountenancing all such traditional customs, he prays, "Deliver us from superstition, idolatry and ignorancy with which both we and our forefathers have been snared and fettered in times past" (*Works*, 261). It is impossible, therefore, to conceive that the "authors" of a rubric saying that the consecrated elements are to be consumed and "not taken out of the church" would intend this order to be "interpreted" as still permitting the pre-Reformation abuse of "continuous Reservation" and the worshipping of the reserved host.

It cannot be seriously questioned that the attitude and teaching which we have outlined represents the traditional Anglican view of Reservation with its corollary—Adoration—from the Reformation at least till the rise of the "Tractarian Movement." Even Bishop Gore candidly admits that "I should have thought that there could be no question at all that the *abandonment* of the practice *of Reservation in the XVIth century* was with a view to cutting at the roots of a growing cultus which there was a desire to get rid of" (*Reservation*, 73). It is not therefore surprising that the Royal Commission of 1906 included "the Reservation of the Sacrament under conditions which lead to its

Adoration" as one of the practices "which must be promptly made to cease." It would certainly seem that this mediæval practice is both un-Scriptural and unprimitive. There is not a trace of any such teaching in the New Testament. Moreover, as we have seen, it arose as a direct result of the promulgation of the mediæval theory of transubstantiation in 1215; but even then the prolonged "Exposition" of the Reserved wafer for Adoration was not practised until 1539 (p. 74, *Reservation*). Fr. Thurstan, a learned Roman theologian, admits that "In all the Christian literature of the first thousand years no one has apparently yet found a single clear and definite statement that any person visited a church in order to pray before the body of Christ which was kept upon the altar" (*History of Holy Sacrament in Great Britain*, p. 170).

Mr. Freestone in his comprehensive research work, *The Sacrament Reserved*, in citing this statement of Fr. Thurstan's, adds that "It is in the latter part of the 11th century that the rudiments of a *cultus* definitely paid to the reserved Eucharist first appear," and that "the development of any *cultus* of the reserved Eucharist was the direct outcome of the acceptance of the doctrine of transubstantiation as the orthodox belief" by the Lateran Council of 1216 (*The Sacrament Reserved*, pp. 259 and 266). He adds that in the 13th century "there is yet no trace to be found of any custom in which the presence of Christ is secured in the church out of mass time for purposes of devotion" (p. 264).

But to-day through a policy of drift or *laissez faire* we are faced with a most anomalous position on this important question. It amounts to little less than the comprehension in the one Church of what look very like two contradictory doctrines or religions. The one teaches that Christ dwells in our hearts by faith through His indwelling Spirit. The other teaches the worship of Christ supposed to be localised in a consecrated material symbol. This contradictory teaching was abundantly evident when the Conference on "Reservation" was held at Farnham in 1925. The E.C.U. Declaration of 1922 enunciated a virtual transubstantiation of the elements through consecration, and added that "Christ thus present *is to be adored.*" Dr. Darwell Stone endorsed this teaching, when he declared not only that "Anglican priests offer the unbloody sacrifice of the Eucharist for the living and the dead," but that "by consecration the bread and wine are changed and become the true body and the true blood of Christ and that Christ thus present in the elements is to be adored." He added that "this Presence *is permanent* and so when the Sacrament is reserved *Adoration* is right." Therefore "a 'Service of Devotions' in which the Reserved Sacrament is a centre for worship is of real spiritual help" (*Faith of an Eng. Catholic*, 51-4). But needless to say there is absolutely nothing in our Articles or Prayer Book to support such dogmatic statements as these. And on historical grounds Bishop Samuel Wilberforce was justified in declaring that "the predicating of a local Presence of the Eternal Priest in the elements was the peculiar distinction between the Reformed and the Unreformed faith" (*Quarterly Review*, July 1866). More recently Bishop Headlam declared that to

fix the moment of consecration " introduces a somewhat mechanical idea into the whole service, because in the Service, we adore Him, but to extend this Adoration to the Reserved Sacrament means introducing a form of Adoration which is inconsistent with the whole idea of the Liturgy " (*Reservation*, 148-9). Canon Storr puts it shortly when he says, " Behind the demand for Reservation lies a view of the Sacrament which is difficult not to regard as materialistic," since " the fact remains that phrases are used such as ' Jesus in His House of bread,' or ' the Prisoner of the Tabernacle,' or ' I will bring your Lord down to you from the altar,' which the ordinary worshipper will interpret as meaning that Christ is there in the wafer " (*Reservation*, p. 9, A.E.G.M.).

We are told that God is Spirit and dwelleth not in Temples made with hands, but in the humble and contrite heart, and therefore in the face of such crude statements as these it is difficult not to use language which may be, by some, considered offensive or uncharitable, especially when we are told that Our Lord's glorified humanity can be localised in a pyx or monstrance for purposes of adoration. For to quote Canon Storr again, " At the Holy Communion the spiritual Christ feeds us with spiritual food of His body and blood. The whole service—including its central feature, the reception of the bread and wine—is the means through which He does this. But we have no warrant for saying that apart from communion there is any special presence of Christ in common with the elements " (*Reservation*, p. 11). Canon Tait expressed this truth in another way at Farnham when he said, " The use of the consecrated elements is not, I believe, to introduce us to the presence of the Incarnate Lord, but through their reception to enable our spirit the more readily to feed upon Him " (*Reservation*, p. 96).

The projected Revised Prayer Book of 1927-8 proposed to limit Reservation for the Sick only, and ordered that " there should be no service or ceremony in connection with the sacrament so reserved, nor should it be exposed or removed except in order to be received in Communion." But unfortunately we have abundant evidence that with any authorization of Reservation, nothing short of permanent Reservation for Adoration will satisfy a considerable section of extreme Churchmen whose constant doctrinal outlook is " South of the Alps." Once the elements are reserved, with this new theological teaching of Anglican extremists—that " the reserved sacrament is the body of Christ "—it is impossible to prevent the practice of Adoration. In 1917 the Bishop of London, publicly in Convocation, recognized this impossibility, and on this *ground alone*, refused to restrict it for the " sick only."

Archbishop Maclagan in 1900 also realized this result, when he said, " wherever Reservation is practised there arises the danger contemplated by Article 28 of the Holy Sacrament being worshipped as well as reserved " (Archbishop of York's *Opinion*, p. 14).

We fully realize and sympathize with the practical administrative difficulties which many of our diocesan bishops have to contend with over this serious question, especially where they have inherited it as a sort of *damnosa hereditas* from their predecessors, yet it seems quite

clear that the root of the present impasse lies in the implications arising from the Tractarian and mediæval doctrine of the Real Objective Presence of Christ in the elements by virtue of consecration. It can scarcely be seriously questioned, however, that it was the rejection of this doctrine which brought our leading Reformers to the stake. But it has now by some means forced its way back as a doctrine "in the Church of England." Without this doctrine and its logical outcome—the adoration of the reserved elements—it would be comparatively easy to frame a rubric permitting something of the nature of "extended Communion" in cases of sickness.

But even here a further question arises as to its NECESSITY. The late Bishop Watts-Ditchfield, on more than one occasion, made a most important affirmation when he declared that while he was at Bethnal Green he never found any need for Reservation for the Sick. Even in the humblest and untidiest homes he found that seemly and reverent arrangements could always be made in the sick room, so that the sick person need not be deprived of the undoubted benefit of the short form and the Consecration prayer provided in the Service for the "Communion of the Sick." Further the plea of *necessity* on the ground of the priest's convictions or preference for Fasting Communion when neither Holy Scripture nor our Church has any rule enjoining this practice, cannot be regarded as a sufficient one. As Bishop Creighton more than once pointed out in this connection, "It is clear that the Prayer Book contemplates *the good of the sick person*, and provides that he should have the satisfaction of a complete service, including Consecration, in his presence. . . . Reservation in any form upsets this, and substitutes the *convenience* of the priest as the *determining factor*. This is the main point to be considered." "The priest must not consider his own convenience till he is driven by absolute stress to do so." (Creighton, *Life and Letters*, II, 310.) He added that "the separation of the recipient from the act of Consecration is opposed to the spirit of the Prayer Book. I can never feel that the case of *necessity* is made out, but if we sanction it in case of necessity, people are sure to go on. Therefore we will not sanction it in any form" (*Life and Letters*, II, 310). These were wise words and they have proved to be prophetic.

But in cases of Communion for the Sick the one quite uncontroversial provision which our Church has sanctioned for cases of extreme sickness, when physical conditions do not allow of any service, or when there is "lack of company to communicate with the sick person," seems generally to be disregarded. For it is always possible to comfort the sick or dying person with the Scriptural method of "spiritual Communion." It should not be forgotten that this rubric for "spiritual Communion" was merely the expansion of a rubric in the Order for Extreme Unction in the pre-Reformation *Sarum Pontifical*—which ran: "Then (i.e. after the Unction) let the sick man be communicated, unless there be a probable fear of vomiting or other irreverence; in which case let the Priest say to the sick man, 'Brother in this case a true faith sufficeth thee, and a good will. Believe only and thou hast eaten" (Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, 894-5 (1872)). Dr. Harris

frequently emphasizes the importance of the *Viaticum* for the dying as a traditional custom from quite early times. He quotes a Canon of the Council of Nicea urging this as " most necessary." Apart from the fact that we have no scriptural warrant or injunction for the " absolute necessity " of such death-bed communion or " Viaticum," this Nicene canon is dealing with cases of dying " excommunicate " penitents. The 1549 Prayer Book, therefore, makes no mention of the *Viaticum* or of any special provision for it. With the Reformers the *Viaticum* as such, silently disappears, and Dr. Harris is not able to give any definite contemporary evidence to its observance at this time. In fact, it is difficult to find any reference to it in Reformation literature. Dr. Harris claims, however, that because for many centuries it had been the traditional practice to administer this *Viaticum* with the Reserved Sacrament in one kind only, therefore the Revisers of 1549 " intended to permit or at least tolerate the giving of the *Viaticum* in the traditional way " (p. 557). His only supposed support for this conclusion is the statement of the 1552 Act of Uniformity that the 1549 Book " was agreeable to the Word of God and the *Primitive Church.*" But, as Dr. Harris himself shows, in the *early* Primitive Church the sacrament was administered to the dying in *both kinds* (p. 547) and not by the method of *Reservation.* So that an appeal to the usage of the " primitive Church " in this respect does not necessarily support his contention, especially in view of the general attitude of the Reformers to Reservation.

He makes a further claim that this Nicene regulation regarding the *Viaticum* can claim the approval of the " Church and State " on account of a clause in the Act of Supremacy of 1559. This clause includes the " First Four General Councils " as one of the standards for " adjudging heresy." Obviously this test was intended to safeguard the Catholic Faith concerning the Holy Trinity which was so carefully defined by those Councils. There is nothing to show that it was intended as a necessary endorsement by the Elizabethan " Church and State " of an isolated statement of the Nicene Council concerning the importance of a particular use of the Holy Communion as a *Viaticum* for the special cases of excommunicate penitents.

As regards primitive usage we do well to remember the evidence which Mr. Freestone has collected on this subject, since he finds that cases of private sick communion are lacking in the first age of the Church, and that it " must remain doubtful whether in the Apostolic times any provision was made at the Eucharist for those who were absent for sickness or for any other cause, from the Liturgy " (*Sacrament Reserved*, pp. 16 and 24). He also adds that " there is no evidence of any general practice of Reservation for the Sick in the first six centuries and that evidence of a satisfactory kind for the official Reservation of the Sacrament is extraordinarily scanty " (*ibid.* 106).

Now that we have reviewed the whole subject of Reservation from the liturgical and historical sides, it does not seem possible to doubt the accuracy of the declared " Opinion " of the two Archbishops given in May 1900. It is surely worth repeating them.

Archbishop Temple declared that " The Book of Common Prayer contains no order, and provides no opportunity for a practice of

Reservation. But this is not all. The language of the 28th Article cannot be taken otherwise than as condemning the practice altogether. . . . All four (of its) prohibitions must be taken together, and all of them in connection with the doctrine of Transubstantiation emphatically repudiated just before. By 'worshipping' is meant any external act of devotion, and this is the chief object of prohibition. The authorities of the Church knew well that external gestures are the very stronghold of superstitious doctrines, and they forbade on this account all worshipping of, i.e. all external acts of devotion to the consecrated elements, because, if retained, they would retain in themselves the doctrine which it was necessary to root out of people's minds. And lifting up and carrying about are forbidden, as giving opportunities for worshipping, and for the same reason was Reservation forbidden. The reason for the prohibition is clear. These practices led to gross abuse which the Church of England felt bound to stop. And even the administration direct from the Church during the service is shown to come under the same head, for it gives an opening to the same abuse." "The administration of the Holy Communion to those who are too ill to understand fully what they are doing is certainly not to be desired under any circumstances. The Holy Communion is not to be treated as if it worked like a magical charm without any co-operation on the part of the recipient" (p. 10).

The Archbishop of York's "Opinion" was similar: "In the absence of any provision for Reservation, the phrase 'shall not be carried out of the Church' must evidently cover the whole of the remaining consecrated bread and wine. It appears therefore evident that the administration of the Holy Communion by reservation is no part whatever of the form contained in the Book of Common Prayer" (p. 13). Regarding Article 28 the Archbishop says (p. 15), "It is a matter of common notoriety, apart from the admissions of Mr. Lee, that wherever this reservation is practised *there follow inevitably* acts of adoration offered to the Holy Sacrament as supposed to embody the actual presence of our blessed Lord." "I can come to no other decision than that the practice of reservation has no sanction from the Church of England at the present time; that it was deliberately abandoned at the time of the Reformation; and that it is not lawful for any individual clergyman to resume such a practice in ministering to the souls committed to his charge."

There can surely be little question that, on the final appeal to the teaching of the New Testament, our Church is amply supported in this position.

THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

TO JUSTIN MARTYR

By the Rev. A. W. PARSONS

Vicar of St. John's, Boscombe

(Concluded)

Lindsay's *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries* has described in a graphic way the meeting for edification in one of the Gentile Churches founded by St. Paul.

" The brethren fill the body of the hall, the women sitting together, in all probability on the one side and the men on the other ; behind them are the enquirers ; and behind them, clustering round the door, unbelievers, whom curiosity or some other motive has attracted, and who are welcome to this meeting " for the Word."

The service, and probably each part of the service, began with the benediction : " Grace be to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ," which was followed by the invocation of Jesus and the confession that He is Lord. One of the brethren began to pray ; then another and another ; one began the Lord's Prayer and all joined ; each prayer was followed by a fervent and hearty " Amen." Then a hymn was sung ; then another and another, for several of the brethren have composed or selected hymns at home which they wish to be sung by the congregation. . . .

After the hymns came reading from the O.T. Scriptures and readings or recitations concerning the life and death, the sayings and deeds of Jesus. Then came the " instruction "—sober words for edification, based on what had been read, and coming either from the gift of " wisdom," or from the intuitive power of seeing into the heart of spiritual things which the apostle calls " knowledge." Then came the moment of greatest expectancy. It was the time for the prophets, men who believed themselves, and were believed by their brethren to be specially taught by the Holy Spirit, to take part. They started forward, the gifted men, so eager to impart what had been given them, that sometimes two or more rose at once and spoke together ; and sometimes when one was speaking the message came to another, and he leapt to his feet, increasing the emotion and taking from the edification. When the prophets were silent, first one and then another, and sometimes two at once, began strange ejaculatory prayers, in sentences so rugged and disjointed that the audience for the most part could not understand, and had to wait till some of their number, who could follow the strange utterance, were ready to translate them into intelligible

language. Then followed the benediction : " The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all ": the kiss of peace and the congregation dispersed. Sometimes during the meeting, but oftenest when the prophets were speaking, there was a stir at the back of the room, and a heathen, who had been listening in careless curiosity or in barely concealed scorn, suddenly felt the sinful secrets of his own heart revealed to him, and pushing forward fell down at the feet of the speaker and made his confession, while the assembly raised the doxology : " Blessed be God the Father of the Lord Jesus, for evermore. Amen." The elements of such worship-prayer, praise and instruction—combined to make what Duchesne in a happy phrase calls " a Liturgy of the Holy Ghost after the Liturgy of Christ, a true liturgy with a Real Presence and Communion."

The normal character of primitive Christian worship then is thanksgiving, at once praise and prayer, which, as Menahem said, remains after other kinds of " prayers " have ceased. Christians offer up through Jesus " sacrifices of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to His name (Heb. xiii. 15, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 5 ; Rev. i. 6 ; v. 8 ; viii. 3 ff.).

As for outward sacrifices, only the thankoffering remains, viz., deeds of beneficence and fellowship " for with such sacrifices God is pleased " (Heb. xiii. 16). " He knows little of himself who is not much in prayer, and he knows little of God who is not much in praise." These words, says Dr. A. E. Burn, express the habitual thought and practice of the Apostolic Church.

Dr. Bartlett in *E.R.E.* sums up the evidence of the N.T. in this way : " Evidently the forms of worship in the Apostolic Age were not fixed or uniform. The new Christian spirit brought a fresh element of spontaneity (2 Cor. iii. 17) into the forms of common worship, which otherwise followed in the main synagogal usage. To this the earliest converts, both Jews and proselytes, were accustomed and it would naturally be adhered to, save for any feature distinctive of the New Messianic form of their faith, such as the breaking of bread with thanksgiving to God for the Messianic redemption in Christ and in His Name. This note of adoring gratitude to God for His goodness in creation and redemption which explains the term ' Eucharist ' as used for the central act of Christian worship remains through all ages its abiding characteristic."

Early Christian Writings to A.D. 155.

The forms of worship in the Sub-Apostolic Church were still determined mainly by those of the synagogue as modified by the " prophetic " spirit in the Primitive Church. Our first glimpse of Christian Worship, as reported in the well-known letter of Pliny, c. 112, shows us the Christian assembly meeting on a stated day (Sunday) and singing a hymn to Christ as to a God, and a pledging of themselves in solemn form (sacramento) against theft, adultery and other social wrongs. No doubt the other elements of Synagogue worship were also present in primitive Christian worship though they are not named by Pliny. The letters of Ignatius (115, Streeter) prove that the essential

atmosphere of this early Christian worship was loving unity. " For if the prayer of one and another hath so great strength, how much more that of the Bishop and of the whole Church. Whosoever therefore cometh not to fellowship (lit : together, cp. Acts ii. 1, 44, 47) stands apart from the altar (Thusiastērion), the holy place where the assemblage of God's people (which Methodius later styles a " bloodless altar ") offers up the sacrifice of prayer and particularly that of the " Eucharist." For a similar reason, because they are specially devoted to the offering of the sacrifice of prayer, widows are called by Polycarp, " God's Altar." These expressions show how intense was the early Christians' sense of the sacredness of prayer as the supreme form of worship and how spiritual was their idea of Christian sacrifice.

In Ignatius " Eucharist " usually denotes the Holy Communion Service, the whole act of worshipful thanksgiving associated with the memorial bread. This act seems also in the *Didache* (xiv. 4) to be called the Christians' " pure sacrifice " of praise to God's Name (cp. Mal. i. 11, 14) and its profoundly spiritual nature is shown by the warning that the Church's sacrifice will not be a pure offering if unbrotherly feeling be present even between two of the worshippers.

At this point we must quote from Justin's Apology (155, Streeter) which gives us our one connected picture of Christian corporate Sunday worship in the 2nd century. On Sundays there is a gathering together of the local Church and the memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the Prophets are read as long as time permits. Then the President gives an address. Next we all rise together and send up prayers " making common prayer for ourselves . . . and for all others everywhere earnestly . . . that we may be deemed worthy . . . by our deeds also to be found good livers and keepers of the commandments, that so we may be saved with the eternal salvation." When we cease from the prayers we salute each other with a kiss. Next, bread is brought, and wine and water, and the President, taking them, sends up as best he can prayers in like manner and thanksgivings " sends up praise and glory to the Universe through the Name of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and makes thanksgiving (eucharist) at length for our having been deemed worthy of these (blessings) at His hands . . . and the people chime in with the Amen. Then takes place the distribution to each, and the partaking from the elements for which thanks were given, and to the absent, portions are sent by the hands of the deacons.

Eucharistic worship in Justin, as in Irenæus (185, Streeter) and during the 3rd century for the most part, if I may anticipate, has no relation to sin in the worshippers. Christians as such are consecrated by union with Christ and as such are counted worthy of the high function of offering as priests their prayers and giving of thanks as acceptable sacrifices to God. Thus far then the Eucharist has no propitiatory aspect even for the living, let alone the dead, although on the anniversary of martyrs from Polycarp (Martyrdom, 156) onwards, eucharistic worship was offered in their name also (since they were the supreme human examples of the offering of the body as a living sacrifice) and the Communion of saints was conceived as including also the Church Triumphant.

Canon Meyrick, in *Scriptural and Catholic Truth and Worship*, is right in his general statement that the history of the Sub-Apostolic and Early Church betrays the existence of no doctrine that does not appear in the Gospels, or the Acts or the Epistles.

Christian Worship in all the early Christian writings is the fulfilment of Paul's injunction: "Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, well pleasing to God, your rational service." It is this worship which Justin Martyr contrasts with that of the Pagans as worship of the Creator of the Universe who needs no blood offerings and libations and incense but is worthily honoured only by praise "in words of prayer and thanksgiving over all our food." Such worship generally is not distinguished from the Eucharist but each alike is a form of the "unbloody sacrifice" which Christians may offer to God. But we do find the prayer of "Eucharist" or Thanksgiving to be the heart of primitive Christian worship as it was of Judaism. This thanksgiving, however, covers the whole of life. There is an echo of this conception in our own Communion Service. "It is very meet, right and our bounden duty that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto God." At first no doubt, the thanksgivings were extempore, but it is of the nature of extemporaneous addresses, frequently repeated, to become, after a time, forms; we know from Justin Martyr and the *Didache* that when the minister was competent even the Consecration Prayer in the H.C. was extempore down to the middle of the 2nd century. There is, by the way, some well-grounded proof that the Apostles consecrated the Elements by the use of the Lord's Prayer.

In the *Didache* there is a provision that a person to be baptized is to fast one or two days previously and also "let him that baptizes and any others that can, fast." No such regulation is given as to fasting before Holy Communion, nor could the practice have existed while the Holy Communion was administered together with the *Agape* or evening meal.

After the separation of the Eucharist from the *Agape* (both are found together in some places up to the date 300, though most churches severed the connection between the two about A.D. 100) certain liturgical changes took place due partly to the inclusion of the Eucharist in a morning service of the synagogue type. Ere long (under the influence of current sacramental ideas other than Jewish) it took on a mysteriously realistic character alien to the original Jewish notion of a meal of religious fellowship with blessing or Eucharist of God. (There I almost quote Dr. Vernon Bartlett.) The former of these developments, the liturgical, was fostered by the ancient notion of worship outside prophetic Judaism, that some *material* offering was essential to worship. Hence the oblation of a humble and contrite heart came in time to appear to most Gentile Christians to fall short of perfect worship; and this led to the Eucharistic prayers receiving a new meaning as an offering of the elements to God in worship, as a gift to the Giver of all. To this there was added, by a natural reaction of old associations as to such worship—particularly in connection with the mysteries (the superficial likeness of which to the Christian Eucharist Justin feels and apologizes for)—the notion that God met the earthly gift with a Divine Gift in

return, by filling it with a new and mysterious quality. In Justin this has led to the belief that the words of institution, cited in the Church's Eucharistic prayer, were a formula of Divine power, producing in the elements themselves the presence of the body and blood of Christ. This laid the foundation of the so-called Catholic conception of the Eucharist and of the corresponding devotional attitude towards the elements themselves, the full fruit of which is hindering the true development of liturgical worship to-day.

In Justin (155) and later in Irenæus (185), however, this idea appears only as the belief that the worshippers' bodies are prepared for resurrection by partaking of Christ's resurrection body and blood. There is no suggestion that such presence of Christ's body and blood is of benefit to the *soul*. Adoration of Christ as present in the elements and the notion that He in them was being offered as the Christian Sacrifice do not appear until the fourth century.

The Mystery Religions.

The striking likeness of some Christian rites to those practised in certain of the so-called Mystery Religions did not escape the observation of Justin Martyr, as we have already noted, and this likeness has been the subject of much discussion recently. Dr. Burkitt in the *Legacy of Israel* writes : " Whatever be the cause of the resemblance between the Eucharist and the rites of Mithra, the Christian Religion is a cult whereby the worshippers, who have all been individually admitted members of the Society by a holy rite, believe that they obtain the favour of Heaven now and a happy immortality hereafter by partaking of a sacred meal, whereby they get in some way communion and fellowship with the God whom they worship." Dr. Burkitt is emphatic in his belief that the Christian Sacraments are certainly no part of the inheritance taken from Judaism. They are not derived from the Temple worship nor, except in certain minor details, from the services of the synagogue. Indeed, he finds the Jewish elements in Christianity easy to enumerate. They are two : Jesus and the Bible.

Dean Inge at the date of *Contentio Veritatis* thought that there had been borrowing from the Mystery Religions. But recent criticism, so far as I may estimate its drift, does not incline to favour the account of Christianity as a " Mystery Religion " (see N. P. Williams, *Ess. Cath. and Crit., Origin of Sacraments*, p. 392). It cannot now be assumed with the former confidence that all these mystery cults were exemplifications of a single conception or that their rituals were variations of a common and that a sacramental principle, or that of these rituals Christian worship in its apostolic or sub-apostolic phase was one. (See A. Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters*, p. 192). Dr. Wotherspoon's *Religious Values in the Sacraments* says : " It may be admitted that there are analogies and in a sense parallels to the Christian Sacraments in some of the Mystery religions, if, that is, they were religions. To call them so is, I think, an extension of that word . . . . If on the Christian side there was a borrower it must have been St. Paul (St. John concurring and following) and a more improbable borrower from Heathenism than that Hebrew of the Hebrews, Pharisee of the Pharisees,

it would be hard to imagine." Mr. K. D. Mackenzie, in his contribution to *Essays Catholic and Critical* has pointed out that if St. Paul had either so borrowed or had been supposed to borrow, he would have heard of it from his watchful critics, the Christian Jews.

Gwatkin in his *Early Church History* has some strong things to say on the subject of the influence of the Mystery religions. He writes : " Baptism and the Supper and the Church may be adapted from Judaism ; but it is as certain as any historical fact can be that they were instituted by the Lord Himself, not copied vaguely from the heathen world by the second generation of Christians. This latter theory does worse than set aside some exceptionally strong historical evidence, for the whole trend of early Christian thought must be fundamentally mistaken before it can be supposed that the table of the Lord was copied from the table of devils."

Dr. Vernon Bartlett may sum up for us (*E.R.E.*) when he says : " The Gospel of Christ itself emerged out of the religion of Israel, and accordingly its genius or distinctive nature defined itself largely in relation to Judaism, both as to faith and as to worship. In both Jesus claimed to 'fulfil' the religion of the Hebrew prophets, whose emphasis was on the heart or inward attitude . . . obedience of life was the truest sacrifice, and moral relations, rather than ritual or formal acts of worship, were the primary form and means of communion with God. . . . Where known moral relations are at fault, worship is inacceptable ; the gift of homage is to be left unoffered until it can be offered with a good conscience (Matt. v. 23). Our Lord never treated ritual or cultus as determinative of man's real relation to God, as did the Judaism of His day—a fact revolutionary in the history of ancient religion. Nor did He while creating a new religious bond between His disciples and constituting them a new Israel within Israel spiritually, make them a new community for purposes of worship or prescribe new forms of worship proper. 'Pray without ceasing and in every thing give thanks,' rightly became the watchword of the Christian life. Worship thus becomes relatively independent of any given forms of expression, so far as these are not bound up with normal human life, the fulfilment of all relations as unto God and not unto men."

Surely Dr. Bartlett is right in stating that there can be no absolute rules or laws of worship in Christianity. As Bishop Lightfoot put it : " The Kingdom of Christ . . . has no sacred days or seasons, no special sanctuaries, because every time and every place alike are holy. Above all it has no sacerdotal system. It interposes no sacrificial tribe or class between God and man, by whose intervention alone God is reconciled and man is forgiven. Each individual member holds personal communion with the Divine Head." The conception is indeed, as he adds, strictly an ideal, which cannot be applied rigorously either in the practical life of individuals or of the Christian Society, the Church. But it remains the regulative principle behind all Christian institutions of worship, as of organisation generally, giving them a conventional value, as expediencies tested by much experience, yet as such to be treated reverently, especially for the sake of others, that is, in love as well as faith.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE SYLLOGISMS OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN.

By the Rev. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

Rector of Tolleshunt Knights.

THERE are many points of resemblance between the Fourth Gospel and the first epistle of St. John, but the differences are even more remarkable. The resemblance lies chiefly in the prologues. In them we find many parallels, *e.g.*, "in the beginning was the Word . . . in Him was life" (Jn. i. 1f); "that which was from the beginning . . . of the Word of life" (1 Jn. i.); "the light shineth in darkness" (*skotia*) (Jn. i. 5); "God is light and in Him is no darkness" (*skotia*) (1 Jn. i. 5); "the Eternal Life Who was with (*pros*) the Father." (1 Jn. i. 2); "the Word was with (*pros*) God. He was in the beginning with (*pros*) God" (Jn. i. 2); "We beheld (*etheasametha*) His glory" (Jn. i. 14); "That which we beheld (*etheasametha*) of the Word of life" (1 Jn. i. 1); "The *Word* . . . dwelt in us (*en hēmin*) (Jn. i. 14); "His *Word* is not in us" (*en hēmin*) (1 Jn. i. 10).

It is also usual to emphasize the similarity of the styles of these writings, the peculiar structure of the sentences, the repetition of ideas, the contrasts of light and darkness, love and hate, etc., the sententious character of the compositions. But, while both are homiletic and explanatory, the gospel is diffuse while the epistle is dialectical. In its condensed brevity the Prologue of the Gospel resembles the Epistle, but that Prologue was the work of the author summarizing what he had seen and heard and witnessed and already recorded in the Gospel.

(1) "In the beginning was the Word," recalls the saying, "Before Abraham was, I am."

(2) "In Him was life," recalls, "I am the way, the truth and the life." "I am the Resurrection and the life."

(3) "He was the true light which lighteth every man" recalls "I, light, have come into the world that whoso believeth in me may not abide in darkness" (xii. 46). With the latter phrase compare, "the light shineth in darkness" (John i. 5).

(4) "His own (*hoi idioi*) received Him not" recalls "having loved His own (*tous idious*) (xiii. 1).

(5) "The darkness overcame (*katelaben*) it not" recalls "lest the darkness overtake (*katalabē*) you (xii. 35).

(6) "They loved the glory of man rather than the glory of God," (xii. 43) is recalled by, "We beheld His glory as of the Only-begotten from the Father."

(7) "Who were born of God," recalls the explanation of the new birth in iii. 3-5.

(8) "The light coming into the world," recalls "I have come as light into the world" (xii. 46). (cf iii. 19. "The light has come into the world.")

It was evidently written after the gospel and prefixed as an introduction like the *argumentum* of the Roman drama which introduced the characters and summarized the story. We might also compare the Prologue of *In Memoriam* which introduces the theme that is to be developed. We note that the writer of the gospel used several expressions in the prologue which are not found in the gospel, such as "the Word," "in the beginning," "fulness," "tabernacled," "lighteneth"[1] but which occur, some in the epistle and others in the Apocalypse. This is an argument that our Lord's speeches in this gospel were not free compositions of the evangelist, as he would, otherwise, have introduced some of these expressions into them. This argument is also supported by the fact that when the evangelist makes a comment upon our Lord's sayings he does so pointedly, *e.g.*, ii. 21, "But He spake concerning the temple of His body"; vii. 39, "But this spake He of the Spirit"; xii. 33, "This spake He signifying by what death He should die." Here the evangelist's comments are easily distinguished from the Lord's words. Had he freely composed the speeches in the gospel there would have been a greater similarity between the Prologue and the Gospel. The style would have been uniform.

As to the style of the epistle, it is logical and practical. The writer emphasizes consistency of life, thought and action. His logic is inevitable and irresistible. His conclusions follow strictly from the premisses. The spiritual result of the new birth is stated as if it were the logical consequence of the new birth, when the seed of God has been sown in the heart, and the consequence is that man does not sin, he no longer has the habit of sin, and he cannot hate his brother (iii. 9). The logic of love is consistent if the love be genuine.

This thought is worked out in the closing chapters of the epistle where we pass from the external conflicts of the Faith with the world and anti-Christ to consider its internal character. Here we find the thoughts of the previous chapters presented in syllogistic form, the middle term being sometimes expressed and sometimes omitted, *e.g.*, iii. 9—"the seed of God cannot sin" (everyone who is born of God has the seed in him). Therefore he who is born of God does not sin, and conversely, everyone that doeth righteousness is born of Him (for He is righteous, ii. 29); iv. 8—"God is love" (to love is to know God, v. 7). Therefore he that loveth knoweth God and he that loveth not knoweth not God.

In the following passages the Authorized Version by rendering the Greek word *menein* in one place by "abide" and in another by

[1] *ho Logos, en arche, pleroma, skenoun, photizei.*

" dwell " has obscured an interesting connection which is apparent if either rendering be adopted consistently.

iv. 16—" God is love " (to love is to abide in God). " Therefore he who abides in love *abides* in God."

iv. 12—" God is love " (to love is to have God abiding in one). Therefore " if we love one another God *abides* in us." And as God manifests Himself in and as Life (" the Life was manifested ") (i. 2) " no murderer, that is, one who hates his brother, has eternal life abiding in him." iii. 15 (iv. 13, v. 13).

iv. 15. v. 13—*To believe in Christ is to have eternal life.* (" Whoso confesseth that Jesus is the Son of God, *God abideth* in him and he in God." " I write to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, that you may know that you have *eternal* life.")

Therefore Christ is eternal life. (" This is the true God and eternal life " v. 21.)

We have another syllogism in iv. 17f, " The love with us hath been perfected that we may have boldness of speech." " Perfect love casteth out fear " (v. 18). " Therefore he that feareth hath not been perfected in love " (v. 18).

We have an almost perfect syllogism of faith in chap. v. The word " faith " occurs but once in this epistle, but in a striking connection. " This is the victory that overcometh the world even our faith " (v. 4). This victory is expressly claimed by our Lord in the gospel—" I have overcome the world " (xvi. 33). And by faith that victory is ours too, for by faith we enter into His conflict and share His victory. So even though he feels that the world is in the power of the wicked one (v. 19), the writer assures us of ultimate victory. " You have overcome them, because He Who is in you is greater than he who is in the world " (iv. 4) for " He is the true God and eternal life " (v. 20). The birth from above (*anōthen*) and the victory of Christ, mentioned in the gospel, iii. 3ff and xvi. 33, are united by a nexus of Divine logic in the syllogism of the faith which we have in the epistle. chap. v. 1-5.

" He who believes that Jesus is the Christ hath been born of God " (v. 1).

" He who hath been born of God conquers the world " (v. 4).

" He who believes that Jesus is the Son of God conquers the world " (v. 5).

It would seem from this syllogism that the epistle was written later than the gospel, for it states in a clearer and more logical form the connection between the new spiritual birth and the new spiritual victory. At the same time it should be pointed out that if both are from the same hand, as internal evidence proves, it only establishes the priority of the literary forms of the gospel which may not have been put in writing until later. And if the writer was the apostle John we may regard the gospel as the final result and summary of the sermons, lectures, and exhortations of half a century. This might explain how it is that the moulds of an earlier period, that is, earlier meanings of words, are retained in the gospel, and how it is that the epistle is expressed in a more logical and connected form.

To return to the syllogism of faith. It shows how love leads up

to and is crowned by faith which is the conquering principle, because it springs from love and works through love. And as all love is of God, there cannot be true faith in God and Christ without true love, and there cannot be true love for God and Christ without true faith. And the love for Christ implies the love for the Christian brother, just as faith in God implies faith in His Son Jesus Christ. There cannot, therefore, be genuine love without true faith or genuine faith without true love. Such faith is the victory that overcomes (v. 4). Cf 1 Cor. xv. 57—"Thanks be to God Who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." But it is not the man who believes but the Christ in the man who believes that conquers. Faith unites us with Him Who has conquered, and so we share in His conquest and the fruits thereof. As St. Paul says, "we are super-conquerors (*hypernikōmen*) through Him that loved us." All this is set forth in this epistle which is logical in form. In aim it is practical, so practical that it might be regarded as socialistic (good sense). Its object is not merely to lead men to the faith, but also to a practical manifestation of brotherly feeling to members of the Christian community. The practical nature of the writing is also shown by the tests, the practical tests of faith, love and righteousness, that it supplies. In iv. 1. he says, "Test (*dokimazete*) the spirits whether they be of God." Belief in the Incarnation is the test laid down (iv. 2). This test might be applied to modern spiritualism which does not regard the Incarnation as a necessary doctrine for its votaries. He also supplies nine tests for love, faith, righteousness and union with Christ. Around these four topics the writer's thought revolves, not moving as from point to point, but as it were ascending a spiral stair, continually rising, while revolving, to a higher plane. His formula is—"Hereby ye shall know"—only found in this writing in the N.T. but sometimes in the O.T. *e.g.*, Gen. xlii. 33—"hereby I shall know" (*en toutō gnōsomai*) (Joseph's test of his brethren); Num. xvi. 28—"hereby ye shall know" (Moses' test of his mission); Josh. iii. 6—"hereby ye shall know" (Joshua's test).

It may have been this O.T. use that suggested the tests found in this writing in which "hereby" (*en toutō*) is found seven times with the same verb to know (*gnōsomai*).

1. "Hereby we know that we have known Him, if we keep His commandments" (ii. 3).

2. "Hereby we know that we are in Him." *i.e.*, by keeping His word (ii. 5).

3. "Hereby we know the love, because He laid down His life for us" (iii. 16).

4. "Hereby we shall know that we are of the truth, by showing love in truth" (iii. 19).

5. "Hereby we know He abideth in us, by the Spirit He hath given us" (iii. 24).

6. "Hereby ye know the Spirit of God. Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God" (iv. 2).

7. "Hereby we know that we abide in Him and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit (iv. 13).

In iv. 6 he used *ek toutou* but same verb, "*Hereby we know* the spirit of truth and the spirit of error." "He that knoweth God heareth us"—this is another test. In iv. 10 we have the test of God's love for us—"herein (*en toutō*) is love," or, this is a proof of His love, (not that we loved God but that He loved us). "He sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins." Not "*And* sent His Son, etc." for the sending of the Son was the proof of His love. The "and" (*kai*) after "He loved us" (*hēmas kai*) came in through the scribe glancing down and seeing the same words (*hēmas kai*) two lines lower down. At all events these nine tests show the practical bent of the writer's mind.

The mystical turn of his thought is shown by the way in which he emphasizes the double indwelling—of God in us and of us in God, and of love as it is perfected in us, and with us, and as we are perfected in it. We find this double indwelling in the Pauline Epistles expressed by the terms "Christ in us"[1] (six times) and "We in Christ" (some thirty times). We have it in the Gospel "I in the Father and the Father in Me" (xiv .10), but we find it most developed in the Epistle, "We abide in Him and He (abides) in us" (iv. 13); "he that keepeth His commandments abideth (*menei*) in Him and He in him" (iii. 24). "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth (*menei*) in him and he in God" (iv. 15). "He who abides in love abides in God and God in him" (iv.16). God is, accordingly, an indwelling principle in a man that makes for righteousness, faith, and love. This indwelling principle is also represented by the indwelling Word and Spirit, *e.g.*, "The Word of God abideth in you and you have overcome the evil one" (ii. 14); "the Unction abideth in you and teacheth you" (ii. 27); "Greater is He that is in you than he that is in the world" (iv. 4). The Divine presence is the power that makes for goodness and love. The man who loves, loves because of the indwelling principle and spirit in his heart. It is a Divine gift, for love is first shown in its perfection by God. All love is from God. We love[2] because He first loved us. The Divine influence in us creates and fosters the will to love. The rendering of iv. 16 in A.V. "the love which God hath to us" and R.V. "which God hath in us" are accordingly inadequate, the reference being to the indwelling God, as is shown by the preceding words, "God abideth in him and he in God," and the passage should be read, "we know and have believed the love which God in us (*ho Theos en hēmin*) hath." With the form of the saying compare (*meth' hēmōn ho Theos*) (Mt. i. 23) "God with us," Immanuel. If we love one another—this is a proof that God abideth in us and that His love hath been perfected in us (iv. 12).

This indwelling principle corresponds to the principle of physical life which is represented as breathed into men by God. It is a vitalizing, energizing power that spurs us on to action and practical duties. This indwelling, forceful principle when identified with love recalls the Pauline phrase—"the love of Christ constraineth (*sunechei*) us"

[1] E.g. Rom. 8. 10. "If Christ be in you"; "Christ liveth in me." Gal. ii. 20. Cf. Gal. iv. 7; Eph. iii. 17; Col. 1 27; Col. ii. 11.

[2] Not "we love Him" (iv. 19).

(2 Cor. v. 14). It may even represent Christ under his attribute of love which is personified by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xiii. where our Lord is—the "Love that suffereth long and is kind" (v. 4). But religion is more than a power: it is also an atmosphere. As an environment is necessary for the existence and development of physical life, an enveloping atmosphere of godliness, holiness and love is essential to the existence and progress of spiritual life. As the fumes of sewer gas destroy the body, the atmosphere of sin corrupts the soul. "Whereas the whole world lieth in the atmosphere of the wicked one (v. 20) we are in the atmosphere of the True One, in His Son Jesus Christ" (v. 20). This atmosphere is not congenial to the sinner. "Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not" (iii. 6). For this atmosphere is Christ Himself (ii. 6). This atmosphere is light. "He that loveth his brother abideth in the light" (ii. 10). And if we walk in the light, "as He walked" (ii. 6) and in the light that He is, we have communion with our brethren and a purified conscience (i. 7). But above all, the Divine atmosphere, in which the human spirit lives and moves and has its being, is an atmosphere of love. "He that abides in love abides in God" (iv. 16). "He who feareth hath not been made perfect in love" (iv. 18). Religion is not an attitude, or an emotion, it is a living force within and a Divine atmosphere without, in which that living force may find both a sphere of action and means of sustenance, in which the soul of man may develop its powers and receive from his surrounding "fulness"[1] (Jn. 1. 16) by assimilation, grace for grace, or grace after grace. It is an atmosphere of liberty, truth, righteousness and love, and therefore may be summed up in one word, eternal life. On the other hand, the soul that hates abides in the very different environment of death (iii. 14). Thus love is an indwelling principle, vitalizing and energizing. It is also an atmosphere. But love is more, it is a companion. This is clear from iv. 17—"The love with us (*hē Agapē meth' hēmōn cf. meth' hēmōn ho Theos*) (Mt. i. 23) hath been perfected." Not "love is made perfect with us" but, the Love with us hath been shown in all His perfection, or has reached His consummation (*teteleiōtai*) in this that we have freedom of speech in the day of judgment, because as He (*Ekeinos*, Love) is, so are we in this world. This companionship of Love completes the threefold manifestation and relation to man of God as Love *around*, *in*, and *with* us and is paralleled by St. Paul's expression "*above* (*Epi*) all, *through* (*dia*) all, *in* (*en*) you all" (Eph. iv. 6). Truth is similarly personified in 2 John 2, and described as a companion; "The Truth who abideth in us and shall be *with* us (*meth' hēmōn*). "Except God be with him" (*met' autou*) (Jn. iii. 2) said Nicodemus. St. John thought of his Master as Love, personified, spiritualized, Divine, just as St. Paul portrays the Master in 1 Cor. xiii. Without the companionship of Love there can be no true love of God or brother Christian. The love with us has been revealed in all its perfection in the Life of Christ. Without true faith in Him there can be no real love. For He it was Who revealed

[1] "Of His fulness (*pleroma*) have we all received and grace for grace." This is a reference to environment. St. Paul refers to the common ideal of all Christians, the common goal. (Eph. iii. 23.)

the Father's love. Were He not the Divine Son, the Word Who was in the beginning with God, He could not have known Him or revealed Him to man. Not to accept the Son is not to honour the Father. "He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father Who sent Him" (Jn. v. 23). "He who denies the Son hath not the Father" (1 Jn. ii .23). "But he who confesseth the Son hath the Father also." (ibid). "We love[1] because He first loved us" (iv. 19). "Love is from God" (iv. 7). He who loveth hath been born of God, and knoweth God. Love is an outcome of the new birth, and leads to the knowledge of God. We are bound to extend this love to the brethren, to all who believe in and love Christ—the redeemed body of the faithful in Christ. This is the brotherly love (*philadelphia*) of 2 Pet. i. 7, which may be extended so as to embrace all men but chiefly and primarily must be shown to those who love Christ, for He taught us what love is. He gave us love. Such love is ready to make the supreme sacrifice. "By this we know the Love because He laid down his life for us, and we ought to lay down[2] our lives for the brethren" (iii. 16). Love is unselfish and generous (iii. 17) and is not content with lip service (iii. 18). The man who shows love in a practical way will have the assurance of his conscience now and hereafter. We shall convince our hearts in His presence, even if our heart condemn us,[3] that (not because, R.V.) God is greater than our heart and knoweth all things (iii. 20). The fact that is to be impressed on our hearts even "if it condemn us" (A.V.) or "whereinsoever it condemn us" (R.V.) is that God is greater than it and knows all the circumstances of our case, our temptations, struggles, etc. (iii. 20). The man who loves has also freedom of speech (*parrēsia*) with God. (iii. 21). Such love was born into the world with the Incarnation. The man who believes not in the Incarnation knows nothing of true love in its essence and energy.

To summarize the epistle briefly. It is an exposition of the Christian life—the eternal life—in many of its phases and relations. This is a life of communion with the Father and the Son restored by Christ. It had been broken by sin in its threefold manifestation, *anomia*, the lawlessness of a free agent (iii.4), *adikia*, the injustice that includes impurity (i.9), and chiefly *hamartia* the failure of a free agent; which form the dark background of a screen on which are thrown the rays of the Life, Light and Love of God. This Life is manifested in obedience, belief and love. It is described in such terms as knowledge of God, faith which overcomes, righteousness. It is the gift of Jesus Christ, Who is Eternal Life, and Who gives what He is, Who actually became incarnate, Who actually died, and Who actually purges our hearts from sin. There exists no ideal world, halfway between the world of sense and spirit for this writer. This life is developed by our abiding in God and having God abiding in us, by abiding in Love and having Love abiding in us. The Spirit also

[1] "Him" is omitted in the best MSS and editions.

[2] *tithenai tēn psuchen* here and in gospel (6 times) nowhere else in N.T.

[3] There is no reason to render the second *hoti* by "because." It owes its place to dittography.

as Chrism or Anointing—the gift of God—helps to advance this life by His abiding in us, and by His instruction and direction. This life of love issues in victory over darkness, sin, death, the world, the evil one, Antichrist. "We have passed from death into life" (iii.14). The climax and consummation of such a life is the vision and likeness of Christ. When He is manifested, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is" (iii. 2). Christ-likeness qualifies for the vision of Christ which leads to a greater likeness, as the face reflects the sunlight. We shall be changed, as we stand at gaze before His glory and His beauty, into His likeness. We shall become like Him. We shall see the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ (2 Cor. iv. 6) and we shall understand what He meant when He said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (Jn. xiv. 9), and what St. Paul meant in 2 Cor. iii. 18.—"we all beholding, or reflecting as in a mirror, the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory."

The gospel represents an earlier stage of thought than the epistle, even though it may have been reduced to its present form at a later date. The Epistle belongs to a later stage of the writer's mental and spiritual development, when the great thoughts of Jesus which are recorded in the gospel, and as to which John Stuart Mill demanded which of the disciples could have invented, had sunk deep into the soul of the writer, and had become part of his experience and the material of his present thought. This is shown by the marked development in the meaning of many terms employed in the epistle, *e.g.*, "the world" (*Kosmos*), "confidence" (*parrēsia*), "confession" (*homologia*), 'eternal life' (*aiōnios zōē*). (i) The word *Kosmos* is at first used in the gospel of *humanity* "God so loved the *world*" (iii. 16). "I came not to judge but to save the world" (xii. 47). With growing opposition the "world" takes on a more sinister meaning. It stands for humanity, as represented by the Jewish nation and the Roman Empire,[1] not only separated from, but hostile to God. "If the world hate you, you know it hated me before it hated you" (xv. 18). And yet He asserts that He has conquered the world (xvi. 33). In the Prologue of the Gospel, which was written afterwards as a brief summary and introduction, we have these two senses of "world" and in the same order. Firstly, "the true light cometh into the *world* (i. 9. cf iii. 19; xii. 46).[2] Secondly, the world rejects the light (1. 10) "He was in the world and the world knew Him not."[3] His own people, part of His world, rejected Him. Others accepted Him and are made sons of God, and are not of the world but of God (*ek Theou*). The Prologue thus briefly tells the story of His coming into the world and of His rejection by the world, but of His reception by the faithful ones born of God. Now in the Epistle the sinister sense of the world as a sphere hostile to God in principle and organization prevails all through. "They are of the world, but we are of God" (*ek Theou*)

[1] Tacitus *Ann.* xv. 44. speaks of "the hatred of the *human race*" for Christians.

[2] "The light has come into the world"; "I, Light, have come into the world."

[3] *ouk egno* cf. xvii. 25.—"The world did not know (*ouk egno*) Thee"=would not know Thee.

(iv. 5). "The whole world lieth in the power of the evil one" (v. 18). "Love not the world" (ii. 15). The attitude of the writer to the world shows that the epistle is written in a darker environment. The spirit of evil which is in the world (John xvii. 15; 1 Jn. iv. 4) has succeeded in getting the world into his grasp for the time. This is an advance beyond the position of the gospel.

(2) The word *parrēsia* is used in two distinct senses in the Johannine writings. In the gospel it describes Christ's freedom of speech and action to man, in the epistle man's freedom of speech to Christ. "No one does anything in secret and seeks to be known *publickly*" or to be in the limelight (*en parrēsia*) vii. 4—the brethren's taunt. "Lo, he speaketh *openly*" (vii. 26). "Jesus said *plainly* (*parrēsia*) "Lazarus is dead" (xi. 14). "Jesus no longer walked *openly*" (*parrēsia*) (xi. 54). "The hour cometh when I shall show you *plainly* of the Father" (xvi. 25). "I spake *openly* to the world" (xviii. 20). In the epistle the word is used to express one's confidence of speech with, and approach to Christ. "Abide in Him that we may have *freedom of speech*, and not be dumbfounded at his *parousia*" (ii. 28). "Then have we *free speech* with God and whatever we ask we receive from Him" (iii. 21); "that we may have *freedom of speech* in the day of judgment" (iv. 17); "This is the *freedom of access* that we have to Him that if we ask anything according to His will He heareth us" (v. 14). Such freedom of speech with Christ is encouraged by Him in the gospel (cc. xiv., xvi. 19f), although it is not explicitly named. In the same way we have in the gospel a real (in some ways ideal) fellowship (*Koinōnia*) between the Lord and His disciples, but we have not the word. In the Epistle we have the word "our *communion*, (fellowship) is with the Father and the Son" (i. 3). If we say that we have *communion* with Him and walk in darkness we lie" (i. 6).

(3) The use of "confession" (*homologia*) in the Epistle shows a more advanced stage of theological thought than the gospel. In the latter it is used of the acknowledgment of the Messianic claims—"If any should confess (*homologēsē*) Him to be the Christ" (ix. 22). In the Epistle it is used in connection with the Incarnation. "Every spirit that confesseth (*homologei*) that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" (iv. 2).

(4) In the use of "*eternal life*" (*zōē aiōnios*) a favourite topic in both writings, there is marked development in the Epistle. In both it is a Divine spiritual life infused by God, but in the Epistle, it is more directly associated and identified with the Christ. John iii. 16 says, "aeonian life" is the portion of those who believe in the Only Begotten Son, so much so that they are "born from above," "born of the Spirit." The reason is stated in 1 Jn. v. 11f, "God gave us eternal life and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life." "This is the true (*alēthinos*) God and eternal life" v. 20. But the gospel has "This is eternal life that they may *know* thee, the only true (*alethinos*) God and Jesus Christ whom thou didst send" (Jn. xvii. 3). Possession is an advance beyond knowledge even though that be no mere intellectual acquaintance but a vital apprehension. He that *hath* the Son hath life (1 Jn. v. 12). The Gospel was written "that ye may

believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have (*echēte*) life in His name" (xx. 31). The Epistle was written "to you who believe in the name of the Son of God that ye may know that *ye have* (*echete*) eternal life," that you are actually now in possession of that life (v. 13). The Gospel was written to create that faith in its readers, the Epistle contemplates its readers as having that faith. In the Epistle the possession of Christ is regarded as the possession of the aeonian life. "We show unto you the *eternal life* ("the Life was manifested," is said of the Word of Life) which was with (*pros*) the Father" (1 Jn. i. 2)—a phrase that recalls that of the prologue of the gospel—"the Word was with (*pros*) God," and justifies this identification of "the eternal life" with the Word. The conclusion of the letter "This (Jesus) is the true God and eternal life" makes this identification still clearer. "This life is *in* the Son" (Jn. i. 4); nay this life is the Son (1 Jn. v. 20), and he who has the Son has this life.

(5) *Katharismos* of ritual cleansing in the gospel (ii. 6., iii. 25), *katharizō* of moral cleansing in the Epistle (i. 7-9).

Furthermore, in the epistle the writer employs Old Testament terms to elucidate statements made in the gospel, *e.g.*, "propitiation" (*hilasmos*), "unction" (*chrisma*), "seed" (*spērma*), "blood" gives "purification" (*katharizō*). "Who taketh away the sin of the world" becomes "the propitiation for our sins." "He gave His Only-Begotten Son" becomes "He sent His Son to be the *propitiation* (*hilasmos*) for our sins." "The Holy Spirit . . . He will teach you all things" becomes "You have an unction (*chrisma*) from the Holy One and you know all things." "His unction teacheth you about all things." Anointing in O.T. was associated with the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the action of the Holy Spirit upon a man is described as an anointing. Is. lxi. 1 "He anointed (*echrise*) me." The use of "seed" in 1 Jn. iii. 9[1] "every one who hath been born of God sinneth not, because *His* (*autou*) seed abideth in him" recalls Malachi ii. 15—"a seed of God" (*zera Elohim*) etc.

The blood that "cleanseth[2] from all sin" is explained by Lev. xvii. 11—"the life of the flesh is in the blood; it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of (or 'for') the life."[3] The use of *en toutō* with *ginōskō* "Hereby I know" etc. has been shown to be borrowed from the lxx. Finally, the Hebrew use of "he" (*hua*) for God is sometimes found in the Epistle, where the Father and Son are referred to as He (*autos*) and the Son as He (*Ekeinos*) *e.g.*, i. 7.—"if we walk in the light as He (*autos*) is in the light, the blood of Jesus Christ His (*autou*) Son." i. 10. "We make Him (*auton*) a liar, and His (*autou*) word is not in us;" ii. 6, "He that saith he abideth in Him (*autō*) ought so

[1] 1 John iii. 9. His seed *sperma autou*, God's sowing. Contrast Cicero *de Nat. Deorum* iii. 75. where a speaker ascribes the *malorum sementis* to the gods; there is no need to see a *gnostic* term here.

[2] The *cleansing* power of the blood is suggested by lxx. of Ex. xxx. 10.

[3] The *blood* of Christ seems to have made an indelible impression on this writer. The only gospel that refers to it is the Fourth, xix. 34. cf 1 Jn. v. 6. 8. It is not mentioned in the Pastorals. Does not this fact confirm his evidence in the gospel John xix. 34f?

to walk as He (*Ekeinos*) walked" ; iii. 16. "He (*Ekeinos*) laid down His life for us." Cf also "He (*Ekeinos*) is just" iii. 7. "He (*Ekeinos* is pure" (iii. 3) ; "He (*Ekeinos*) was manifested" (iii. 5), etc., always of Christ (five times) in this first epistle : 2 Tim. ii. 25 (*Ekeinos*) of God.

The use of these pronouns instead of the name Jesus Christ is peculiar to the Epistle, and may express the intimacy of the writer and his audience with the personality of Jesus. For them Christ was the only "He." Whereas St. Paul said, "in Christ," he said, "in Him."[1] This may be the tender touch of a devoted follower. But it may be also due to the Hebrew use of "He" (*hua*) for God, *e.g.*, Deut. xxxii. 39—"I am God" (*hua*) cf Is. xli. 4 ; xliii. 13 ; xlviii. 12 ; Ps. cii. 28 ; Jer. v. 12. It is a peculiarity of this Epistle. In conclusion, we have shown the marked development in many of the terms used in the Epistle, the O.T. expressions employed to explain statements of the Gospel, the syllogistic form in which many of the propositions are set out, the generally practical aim of the document and the gradual progress of the theme until it reaches the climax of the Christian mystic's hope—the vision of the glorified Christ and the attainment of His likeness.

[1] *en auto.* ii. 5 ; 6 ; 27 ; iii. 6, 9 ; iv. 13.

THE FATE OF THE NON-ARYAN CHRISTIANS IN GERMANY.

By GERTRUDE FARION.

THE sufferings of the non-Aryan Christians in Germany, though perhaps not so spectacular as those of the Jews, are none the less real. This body of unfortunate people with their divided allegiance and tragic fate deserve all the sympathy and assistance which their fellow-Christians can afford.

In order to understand, to some extent at least, the measure of their sufferings, it is well to remember that the term non-Aryan is as new as the persecution it involves. It was coined by National Socialists in order to deal more adequately with those members of the community who, though no longer professing Jews, were yet of Jewish origin. Until 1933 numbers of Christians in Germany were unaware of the fact that any difference existed between them and their fellows. They belonged to the same nation and professed the same creed. In no wise did their outlook differ from that of the average German. Or so they believed. The National Socialists were of a different opinion. In their desire to purify Germany from alien interlopers, they soon realized that there were living in that country a comparatively large number of men and women whose " blood " was tainted and who must be prevented from spreading the contamination further. They were for the greater part Jewish converts or descendants of mixed marriages. For since the abolition of the Ghetto about one hundred years ago, frequent intermarriages between Jews and Gentiles had taken place. The children born of such unions were mostly received into the Church. Moreover this number of Christian citizens of Jewish origin was greatly increased by those converts from the Jewish faith who, for various reasons, had adopted Christianity, *e.g.*, in the days of the Kaiser higher posts such as chairs at universities, which were closed to professing Jews, were immediately obtained on baptism. This was in itself a sufficient incentive to conversion for those whose belief in the Jewish religion was practically non-existent and who remained the same after the ceremony had taken place. High respect is due to those Jews who, though no longer believing the religion of their fathers, were honest enough not to exchange it for another creed because of the material advantages such a " conversion " offered.

It is indeed difficult to assess the exact percentage of the total population of Germany which these non-Aryan Christians constitute. According to the figures published in the official Swiss organ *Der Bund* on July 3, 1938, there lived in Germany at the time of the National Socialist Revolution 500,000 professing Jews, about 175,000 to 200,000

half Jews and 100,000 quarter Jews *i.e.*, Christians with one Jewish grand-parent. To these must be added the non-Aryans from Austria and Czechoslovakia, making a sum total of about one and a half million. Even should the number of non-Aryans in Germany exceed the figure quoted here, it would barely be more than one eightieth of the entire population. It is a fact worth mentioning that, families in this section of the nation being very small, according to some computations even without the efforts of the National Socialist Party it would have died out in the near future or have been absorbed entirely.

The purification of the German people from alien blood, however, being one of the cornerstones of the Nazi programme, steps were taken to ensure it. In fact, the very elasticity of the term non-Aryan, which figures so largely in the decrees that caused the first wave of fugitives to cross the German frontiers early in 1933, was suited to the needs of a new government that had to feel its way very carefully at the beginning. The original definition of the term as used in the Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service, issued on April 7, 1933, runs as follows, " A non-Aryan is one who is descended from non-Aryan, particularly Jewish, parents or grandparents. It suffices if one parent or one grandparent are non-Aryan. This obtains especially if one parent or one grandparent belonged to the Jewish faith."[1] This definition has been modified in the course of time, the interpretation being more severe or laxer as the situation might demand. The Nuernberg Laws of 1935, for instance, by which the status of Jews and non-Aryan Christians within the Third Reich were defined, deprives all Jews and descendants of either two Jewish parents, two Jewish grandparents and one Jewish parent, of their German citizenship. The descendants of those who are of half Jewish and half Aryan origin, having not more than one Jewish parent and two grandparents, can be absorbed into the German community, provided that they contract suitable marriages and avoid all further " contamination."

On the other hand there has been an evergrowing tendency towards a stricter interpretation of the term non-Aryan. The law regulating peasant holdings (September 29th, 1933) no longer spoke of parents and grandparents but declared that: " A person is not considered as of German or cognate blood if his paternal or maternal ancestors have Jewish or coloured blood in their veins," and went on to fix the " first of January, 1800, as the day beyond which probing would be unnecessary. A new regulation concerning the press which was issued in April 1935, likewise barred from the publishing business all persons who could not prove their own Aryan descent and that of their consorts . . . up to 1800."[2] The same test was subsequently applied to the army, where marriages between the nobility and Jewish heiresses had been frequent in the days of the Kaiser. Moreover, in all cases where exposure of non-Aryan descent would remove the holder from a much coveted post, a stricter interpretation of the term non-Aryan seemed indicated.

[1] Annex to the Letter of Resignation of James G. McDonald, High Commisioner for Refugees coming from Germany, p. 17, issued by Friends of Europe.

[2] *ibidem*, p 18.

These unfortunate non-Aryans suffered severe material losses through the discriminatory legislation levelled against them. The first of these laws, the so-called Aryan Decrees, mentioned above, are the central part of the Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service. They served as a model for the purge of the liberal professions. The legal and medical professions were affected first, then followed measures applied to the fields of education and general culture, industry, agriculture and commerce. The situation of the non-Aryan has been aggravated by the fact that these laws found a different application according to the temper of the local authorities entrusted with their enforcement. Nuernberg and Breslau have been noted for the severity of their officials, while the non-Aryans inhabiting large centres like Berlin and Frankfurt were left comparatively unmolested at the outset. However, on the whole a steadily growing tendency towards the strictest interpretation of the term non-Aryan can be traced. "The legislative disabilities of 'non-Aryans' which have just been analysed prove that it is the intention of the National Socialist rulers of Germany to eliminate Jews and Christians of Jewish ancestry from all public and semi-public institutions, from the liberal professions and from intellectual and cultural life; to restrict their opportunities as business men, employers or labourers; and to segregate them as a group of outcasts."[1] These words, if true in 1935, and they were certainly true then, are even more true in 1939.

Although the non-Aryan Christians were spared the worst outrages and humiliations which followed the murder of von Rath in Paris last November, although their homes were not ransacked nor their menfolk rushed off to concentration camps, the hatred of the Jews rekindled by these atrocities could not fail to have its effect on non-Aryan Christians. To-day they are finding it all but impossible to retain their positions in business, though, and this is a strange paradox, even Jews can find employment as manual labourers because of the scarcity of hands due to Germany's extensive re-armament programme. Sooner or later every one of them is faced by the problem of emigration. For this fate he is as little, possibly even less prepared than the Jew, because his ties to his native land are very close.

Though, together with the professing Jew, he is subject to the most cruel persecutions a civilized country has ever known, the non-Aryan Christian lacks the solace which common adversity can provide. The pure Jew may find comfort in the contemplation of his nation's glorious past. He may learn patience when he considers that his people have survived all their persecutors of previous ages. The rebuilding of the National Home in Palestine may offer to him an ideal for which he can live, and fill him with hope for his children though, maybe, not for himself. He will concentrate on his own national values and draw from the feeling of community strength to suffer and endure. Even to the assimilated Jew who has always rejected Zionism as a one-sided solution of the Jewish problem, the way to the religion of his fathers remains open.

[1] *ibidem*, p. 20.

No such reflections can alleviate the sufferings of the non-Aryan Christian. His links with the Jewish community may be, and very frequently are, only slight. They may not exist at all. If he is merely a professing Christian, he may be extremely antisemitical. The persecutions inflicted upon him must appear even more unreasonable to him than to the Jew with his long and tragic history. In all probability he shared so intimately the life of the German nation that he cannot understand why he should be branded as an outsider and denied his part in the task of national regeneration. There seems to be no rhyme or reason why a teacher of Scripture should be dismissed because one of her grandparents was Jewish. Why should a Christian minister deny help and spiritual guidance to a Christian youth whose father happened to be a Jew? Why is it wrong for a German congregation to be ministered to by a non-Aryan pastor?

In the early days of the National Socialist Revolution when people still believed that the "positive Christianity" of the party programme would be put into practice and the persecutions of the Jews were directed against their religion and not their race, a number of non-Aryan Christians formed a union in order to vindicate their rights. Mistaking the issue for a religious one, they emphasized the fact that, though of Jewish origin, they shared the faith of the nation. This effort was doomed to failure. In the course of one year it became apparent that the persecutions were of a racial and not a religious nature. Nay, more than that: it was soon realized inside and outside Germany that this new *Weltanschauung* called National Socialism claimed to be a religion and had engaged Christianity in a life and death struggle. It was no longer a question of: Here Christian, here Jew! it was a question of: Here true follower of Christ, here unbeliever! And once the establishment of the Confessional Church in Germany had taken place, the issue was perfectly clear.

Under these circumstances the non-Aryan Christian could not fail to receive his share of the persecutions. Gradually he was excluded from all spheres of national life. Mention has been made of the purging of the liberal professions. This example was followed. Non-Aryan Christians were forbidden to join the National Labour Organization (*Deutsche Arbeitsfront*) which was all but compulsory. It is true, employment could still be found in Jewish firms, but their number was steadily decreasing, and since last January, they are practically non-existent. Aryan employers would in most cases prefer to employ Aryan workers to avoid enquiries by the authorities. Even where non-Aryan employees were retained, they were subjected to all manner of slights and humiliations. A case of a non-Aryan Christian employed in an Aryan firm is known to the author, who was forbidden to take part in a ceremony in honour of the war dead though he was the only man to have fought in the war and still bore the marks of his wounds! He was excluded from all social gatherings and made to feel his inferior position in every way that ignorance and hatred could devise. It would be unsatisfactory as well as useless to dwell any longer on these pin-pricks, which in their endless repetition can have the effect of breaking hearts and wrecking homes.

Especially tragic, however, is the fate of children from mixed marriages. Sooner or later such a child is bound to find out that one of his parents is an outcast, a pariah, an enemy of the people. In one of his lessons the teacher will describe the Jew as the parasite battening on the substance of the nation, and the whole class will turn round and stare at him. Former friends will drop him. And even if he is spared such experiences, there still remains the *Stuermer*, posted in all conspicuous places, which will pour out its filth into minds that are too immature to discriminate. Even into the home the spirit of discord may penetrate, when the Aryan mate regrets having married a non-Aryan and divorce is easily obtained on grounds of racial incompatibility. It is difficult to picture the extent of harm done to minds young and old by thus sowing the seeds of an implacable hatred. For by virtue of such persecution the non-Aryan Christian is gradually driven to hate and despise his country, or at least those who govern it at the present moment, though retaining that passionate love for all things German, which strikes everyone who comes into contact with refugees from that country. He is all but forced to side with those whose enmity towards Germany is purely destructive.

Fortunate are those who find their consolation in the Christian Faith. But even here, this most sacred private sphere is spoilt for them. Unless the non-Aryan Christian can find a parson belonging to the Confessional Church, he will be destitute of the spiritual help and guidance he so sorely needs. For it is sad to confess that German pastors outside the Confessional Church have by no means been prepared to open the Church of Jesus Christ, who died on the cross for all men, to all and sundry. It is only within the Confessional Church, which by this very fact proves itself to be the only true Church of Jesus Christ in that country, that the non-Aryan Christian is admitted as an equal.

The Confessional Church is, however, not the only body ministering to the spiritual and temporal needs of the non-Aryan Christians. Great services are rendered to them as well as to Jews to-day by foreign societies, *e.g.*, the Society of Friends, the Baptists, and the Mildmay Mission, as well as by other denominations. They provide for these people who frequently have no pastor to minister unto them an experience of Christian fellowship and service, and endeavour to keep the light of the gospel aflame in a country enveloped in spiritual darkness. Many a tale could be told of hope rekindled and suffering relieved, of friendships formed and new openings found abroad, but it is better not to say too much. One fact, however, seems worth mentioning, that the services of other denominations are attended even by Aryan Protestants who do not belong to the Confessional Church, because of the failure of a great part of the Lutheran clergy to preach the pure Gospel.

No essay dealing with the fate of the non-Aryan Christians in Germany can fail to point out, in conclusion, the urgent need for assistance to emigrate. There can be no doubt that it is becoming increasingly difficult for non-Aryan Christians to obtain a livelihood in Germany. They are forced to turn to other countries, in order to

support themselves and give unto the world their own precious contribution. This is impossible unless help is obtained from abroad. In this country various organizations[1] are endeavouring to assist those fellow Christians who, united with us by the bond of a common faith, by their sad fate should make a special appeal to our Christian charity.

[1] Church of England Committee for non-Aryan Christians, 20 Gordon Square, W.C.1. Catholic Committee for Refugees from Germany, 120 Victoria Street, S.W.1. The Society of Friends, Friends House, Euston Road, N.W.1. a.o.

SEEING IN THE DARK. By Rev. S. Greer, M.A. *Lutterworth Press.* *2s. 6d.*

There is often a tendency to say as one hears or reads short addresses to children: "Oh, how simple. Anyone could have done that." And yet, in such a collection as this, there are dozens of illustrations and points and pegs which show how gifted the author is for this particular kind of work, and though the talks may not be especially arresting, they will be found very useful and suggestive.

GUIDANCE. By W. J. Noble. *Student Christian Movement.* *1s.*

Some people haughtily reject the notion that God gives particular guidance to such an insignificant creature as Man. Others seek His guidance in all kinds of circumstances, in which it is quite unnecessary to do so. Others claim divine guidance when it is more than doubtful whether such could possibly be the case. All these types and others besides will find a wholesome corrective to their misguided views in these sane and balanced pages. We commend wholeheartedly Mr. Noble's very helpful treatise.

ONCE UPON A BEDTIME. By Sibyl Harton. *S.P.C.K.* *5s.*

The Stories of the Old Testament seem to defy reproduction in any but their original form. If any version of them for young children is desirable, here it is in these "fifty-two delectable stories from the Bible for the want-to-be-read-to's." There are 49 stories from the Old Testament, two from the Apocrypha, and the story of the Birth of Christ.

Details here and there may not please everyone. In the story of Adam and Eve we are told "God did not want them to be ill, so He warned them never to taste that fruit." Would physical illness ever occur to anyone as a reason for the prohibition? Jacob's wrestling at Jabbok is entirely spiritualized. It is refreshing to find that the story of Abraham and Isaac in Gen. 22 is not explained away.

There are 16 good illustrations and a Bibliography.

With the maximum of narrative and the minimum of moralizing the book makes good reading for the young.

H. D.

SCIENCE—OR ASTROLOGY?

By E. H. BLAKENEY.

WHEN religious faith is declining, various forms of freak religions have a curious fascination for a certain type of mind. To-day we are witnessing a recrudescence of ancient Gnosticism—that inveterate foe of Christianity—in many strange shapes and under many disguises. Theosophy has a vogue in unexpected quarters. Spiritism reckons its followers by the hundred thousand. Nor has this persistent quest of the occult left those "who profess and call themselves Christians" unscathed—and this, despite the Apostolic warning against the "vain talkings" of a false γνῶσις. Mascots are to be found everywhere. The users of these things may elect to laugh, rather shamefacedly, at them in public; but secretly they indulge the fancy that "there may be something in it after all." Even less reputable incursions into the realm of magic will not be looked for in vain. Flirting with the false supernatural has become the fashion; and, if rumour is not a lying jade, the cult of Black Magic is practised in all the great cities of Europe and elsewhere, London itself not excepted. In addition to these and kindred cults, we are confronted by the costly advertisings of Pyramid cranks, Joanna Southcott devotees, and so on; while lectures and addresses by British-Israel crotcheteers, and—much more dangerous—by the queer folk posturing as "Christian" Scientists (with Mrs. Eddy for their inspired Sibyl) are incessant.

And now Astrology is coming once more to the front, as the Astronomer Royal has lately reminded us, and the recent gathering of the astrologers in a famous holiday resort has indicated. One might have supposed that this hoary superstition had long since been ousted by exact science, and followed Odin and Zeus to equal doom.[1] But it is not so. Astrology has had a long and, in some respects, a distinguished career; so much so that Astronomy has been designated its sister. Admittedly we owe something to the seers of ancient Babylon (the greatest centre of this pseudo-science), who, under a cloudless sky, patiently mapped out the heavens, noted eclipses, and marked the rising and setting of constellations. It was rightly asserted, by Comte, that the study of astrology was the first systematic effort to frame a philosophy of history by reducing the apparently capricious phenomena of human actions within the domain of law. The belief in astrology may even have, to some extent, enhanced man's dignity, but it tended to thrust God from His conduct of affairs, everything being pre-determined by the action of celestial bodies. Yet, despite

[1] It has been asserted, apparently on good authority, that Hitler has decided leanings towards this superstition. That would account for much, if it could be proved to be a fact.

this, it must be remembered that the purpose of the ancient astrologers was not scientific but magical; their aim was to forecast the future, and, on the basis of their observations, to demonstrate that the whole course of human life was governed by star and planet. Poets have, for artistic ends, made play with all this, and our language bears many traces of astrological lore. Yet few remember this fact when they speak of being born under a lucky star, or of having embarked on an ill-starred enterprise; of someone having a jovial manner, a mercurial temperament, or a saturnine expression.

The ancient Jews, in many cases, imagined that the planets influenced human destiny, though, officially, this belief was discouraged. In the Old Testament there is, perhaps, only one *certain* reference to astrology; this will be found in Isaiah xlvii. 13, where the prophet is mocking at "the astrologers, the star-gazers, and the monthly prognosicators" (evidently Old Moore's Almanack must have had some sort of counterpart in the times of Isaiah).[1] Possibly, though not certainly, the word "signs" in Genesis i. 14 (lxx. gives σημεῖα) may have an astrological significance. It seems clear that celestial forecasts were not unfamiliar to the Hebrews; but the opposition to such forms of divination—as Pinches has pointed out—was owing, in great part, to the fact that, as monotheists, they had no wish to refer to practices which suggested heathen cults. It is interesting to note a reference to astrology in the case of the Star of the Nativity. The star seen by the Magi was regarded as a portent only by professed astrologers. There is no necessity to suppose that this star was a comet, or even a star of exceptional brilliancy (*cf. Encycl. Biblica* 4785).

To the primitive Greeks astrology was almost unknown; that it became known at a later period—for the Stoics were firm believers in astrology—was owing to the subtle and contaminating influences of the Orient. The Romans, in their best days, appear to have had no dealings with it; but in imperial times it became increasingly fashionable, an impulse having been given to its study by the Emperor Tiberius. Readers of Tacitus may recollect a brief but interesting passage in the *Histories* (i. 22); and there are hints to be found in Horace, and something more than a hint in Juvenal. In official quarters it was not customary to look with favour on astrologers or their craft, the presumption being that the practice of astrology, and the drawing of horoscopes, were in the nature of a political menace. At an early date of the empire Augustus ordered the books of the astrologers to be burnt, while subsequent emperors improved upon this by banishing the professors of the cult.

The Christian Church never countenanced, in its official capacity, any dabblings with the forbidden thing. The passage in Acts xix, describing a literary *auto-da-fé* at Ephesus, shows the effect of Christian teaching on some of those who were wont to practise magical arts: doubtless among the books burnt were handbooks of astrology and formulas for casting horoscopes.

It is worth recalling to mind that Augustine, at one period of his life, had decided leanings toward astrological speculations, but re-

[1] Is there an astrological reference in Judges v. 20?

nounced all confidence in this pseudo-science after his conversion, as we learn from the seventh book of the *Confessions*. Lactantius denounced the whole business as daemonic in its inception; and probably most of the Church Fathers concurred with him; Origen was a possible exception.

Not till the advent of the scientific study of nature did astrology slowly begin to beat a retreat. Bacon sounded a right note when, in the *de Augmentis*, he declared that it was so stuffed with superstition that scarcely any sane doctrine could be found in it. Presumably, there is to-day no scientific man of any acknowledged eminence who would venture to hold a brief for astrology. Yet the cult still persists, as certain publishers' catalogues appear to indicate. Not long since, when passing through a crowded thoroughfare in London, I noticed a number of hawkers on the pavement selling pamphlets on popular astrology and apparently doing a tidy business in disseminating this nonsense.

False creeds are often tolerated, or laughed at, on the ground that they do no harm. But is that so? Occultism, in its protean shapes, may do great mischief, especially among the young, the thoughtless, and the half-educated. It is therefore regrettable that some of our newspapers regularly devote space to advertising the cult of astrology and print paragraphs of forecasts—political and otherwise—for the delectation of a curious or deluded public. The "fatalism" inseparable from astrology cannot be otherwise than harmful. Superstition is the shadow of religion. Unluckily many people take the shadow for the substance.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE ORIGINS OF THE REFORMATION. By James MacKinnon, Ph.D., D.D., D.Th., LL.D., Regius Professor—Emeritus of Ecclesiastical History, University of Edinburgh. *Longmans, Green and Co.* 16*s. net.*

Dr. MacKinnon has already placed students of the Reformation under a deep debt for his four masterly volumes on *Luther and the Reformation.* He has added to that debt in the present volume by his careful presentation of the various causes which led up to the Reformation and rendered the work of Luther successful. In describing the variety of forces or factors that were operating towards the great religious upheaval to which the religious genius and indomitable will of Luther gave the decisive impulse, he classifies them as political, economic, social, constitutional, intellectual, religious and moral. In a masterly analysis of these various elements he presents an account of the later medieval period which is of the utmost value as giving a review of all those movements of emancipation without which the Reformation cannot be adequately understood or interpreted.

The opening chapter deals with the Medieval Empire and Papacy, and illustrates the constant conflict that there was between the Popes and the Emperors. The national spirit in many lands was opposed to the claims of the Papacy. Philip of France could write to Boniface viii :—" Let your grand fatuousness know that we are subject to no one in things temporal." It was at this time that the famous bull Unam Sanctam (1302) declared that there was no salvation outside the Church and that it was necessary for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff. Papal Prestige and Authority declined seriously during the " Babylonish Captivity " of the Popes at Avignon (1305-1376). The extortions and corruptions of the Papacy still further lowered its prestige, and the existence of rival Popes in the Great Schism (1378-1417) destroyed the validity of any claims to a true apostolic succession. It only needed the debauchery of the Borgias to bring the Papacy to its lowest stage of deterioration.

There were during these years other movements in progress. St. Francis of Assisi was the leader of a spiritual movement, and intellectual movements were led by Dante and Marsiglio of Padua who anticipated in the fourteenth century the critical efforts of the fifteenth. In England Wicklif appeared as the Reformer of the fourteenth century and ample space is given to his work, and that of the Lollards who continued his reforming efforts.

The Reform Movement arose in Bohemia in the work of John Hus who was influenced by Wicklif. His shameful execution after having received a safe conduct to attend the Council of Constance

was a disgrace to all concerned. It was evident that no attempt at reform by means of General Councils was likely to be successful, and so the unreformed papacy went on its way towards disruption. A Reformer like Savonorola might for a short time arouse interest in Florence, but his death at the stake in 1498 showed that there was no hope of reform from within. The widespread unrest in Germany was preparing the way for a great upheaval. The mystic societies of the Free Spirit and the Friends of God were preparing the way for a purer interpretation of the teaching of Christianity, and Luther was greatly influenced by some of the writings of their leaders. The Scholastic Philosophy on which the learning of the medieval age was based was gradually giving way before the disintegrating force of the new learning, and the new culture was a considerable factor in the preparation for the Reformation. Dr. MacKinnon gives special attention to " Humanism in Relation to the Reformation " showing its spread in various countries. In a concluding chapter of special interest he draws together the various threads of his theme and shows the inevitable character of the final development in " Luther." His reforming mission was only the consummation of the reaction on political, economic, social, constitutional and intellectual, as well as religious and moral grounds, from the secular papal absolutism and the demoralization of the late Medieval Church.

This book should be carefully studied by all who wish to understand adequately the Reformation Movement. They will learn from its scholarly survey the true nature of the forces at work, and the real effect of the Reformation which was the return to the true Catholic conception of the Church " as it preserved the doctrine and usage of the early Church as distinct from its later papal form, to which it pleases our Roman Catholic brethren exclusively to apply the designation Catholic." G.F.I.

THE BOOK OF JOB. (Under the title *The Book of the Ways of God.*) By Emil G. Kraeling, Ph.D., Prof. of O.T., New York. *S.P.C.K.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

This is really a beautiful book, with eight marvellous illustrations from the studies of William Blake in the British Museum. The whole get-up of the book, printing, binding, etc. is excellent, and reflects credit upon the editorial staff of the S.P.C.K. The style of the author is attractive and distinguished; and he deals with his great theme in a worthy manner. There are many verses by Walt Whitman and others which are worthy of insertion in its pages. It requires a man of solid erudition and rich imagination to attempt to publish a study on a work which is on the same lofty and detached level as the Prometheus of Aeschylus. In his introduction the author compares the work to a great cathedral. The earlier chapters represent the facade and vestibule, the dialogue with its three cycles of speeches are likened to the nave and the aisles, while the speeches of God form the choir. Perhaps the most valuable part of the book is the bibliography, which comprises commentaries and translations, critical literature and kindred

studies, English, French and German, dealing with the culture and ethical questions of the book of Job. He opens with an apt quotation from Walt Whitman :—

To get the final lilt of songs,
To penetrate the inmost lore of poets—to know the mighty ones,
Job, Homer, Aeschylus, Dante, Shakespeare, Tennyson, Emerson;
To diagnose the shifting delicate tints of love and pride and doubt
—to truly understand . . . .

" The architectonic structure of the book, and the exotic imagery that blooms forth from its pages in such prodigality and effulgence afford the eye a rare delight. And all in such flowing outlines," says Carlyle, " grand in its sincerity, in its simplicity, in its epic melody and repose of reconcilement . . . oldest choral melody as of the heart of mankind, so soft and great as the summer twilight, as the world with its seas and stars." It is hard to find a work to compare with Job. There is nothing like it in the Old Testament. He discusses certain suggestions regarding the origin and form of the book as we have it now. The most interesting is that it was constantly revised and rewritten by the author, as *Faust* was by Goethe, being a veritable document of his soul. This would explain all the inconsistencies and retain the speeches of Elihu, which some critics would reject, but which have been added by the author or by another because they help to complete the work and provide it with a literary *raison d'être.* Another and less attractive theory is that like the Minster of Strasburg, or the Iliad, it is the work of many hands, the result of collective literary effort. He compares the Lay of the Nibelungen, but that Lay consists of many plots, and various materials badly woven together and most confusing, bewildering and inconsistent as well as inconceivable. Whereas there is an underlying unity in Job—with a real advance and progress in thought and argument. It is a drama, whose beginning is set in another world, and therefore full of mystery even from the commencement. The author gives an earlier date than that usually accepted—after the Exile. Because of the parallel to the opening scene in 1 K. 22, and the description of the Chaldeans and Sabaeans as marauding tribes, who afterwards became great nations, he dates it about 800 B.C. but he should have entered more fully into the discussion of the date. The nucleus of the work—supposing there is a nucleus—might have been written about 800. The editor or editors, if there were editors, were probably post exilic. The state of society is Arabian and the East never changes, similar moral problems were discussed in the early psalms. The coin *kesita* (xlii. 11) is mentioned in Genesis ; the name " Yahweh " does not appear ; and there are allusions to the law of Moses. While one may find the earlier as well as the later date in the use of Satan, which was of Babylonian origin. The least satisfactory fact about the Book of Job is the obscurity of its authorship and date. But the book as we have it deserves the enthusiastic praise of its admirers and the warmest admiration of its critics. The problem that is worked out is certainly a theodicy, the problem of good and evil and of the Divine Ruler's attitude to men of good and evil and their fortunes in life. Dr. Kraeling says, " it is rather the question whether there is such

a thing as unselfish piety, or as the Rabbis already put it, did Job serve God out of fear or out of love?" I leave this problem with the readers of this review. F.R.M.H.

KÁLVIN ÉS A KÁLVINIZMUS. Essays on the Fourhundredth Anniversary of the Institutes of Calvin by the Professors and Doctors of the Reformed Divinity Faculty in the Stephen Tisza University. Debrecen, Hungary, 1936.

This volume of studies on Calvin and his teaching and his influence on the Hungarian people is a worthy recognition of the 400th anniversary of the publication of the Institutes. For the sake of foreign readers a résumé of each essay in English, French, German or Dutch is appended. The first essay indicates the debt, which Calvin owed to Bucer in composing the Institutes. It is then pointed out, in later essays, that Calvin developed his system on a basis of biblical study; and his independence and capacity in this department are emphasized. It is interesting to observe, that his commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians is ignored by Westcott and Armitage Robinson. The dispute between Brunner and Barth on the possibility of Natural Theology is discussed, and it is shown, that the latter stands nearer to Calvin.

In reference to predestination the absolutism of Calvin is contrasted with that of the Vedanta, that of Plato and that of Kant. Calvin's conception of predestination is more fundamental than that of S. Augustine or that of Luther. It rests upon three presuppositions, the denial of human merit, the certainty of blessedness and the sovereignty of God. It is supralapsarian. It avoids the Scylla and Charybdis of Manichaeism and Pelagianism. "Cadit homo Dei providentia sic ordinante sed suo vitio cadit" are characterized as the most tragic words ever written. Criticisms of this doctrine by Pighius and Bolsec and others are discussed, the most weighty being, that it made God the author of sin. Melanchthon accused Calvin of Stoic fatalism. Calvin defended himself by the contrast between "Deus absconditus" and "Deus revelatus." He also attempted to distinguish between "necessitas" and "coactio" in regard to the Fall.

Calvin according to the essayist really saved Protestantism and Christianity. He developed an active positive line of religion in contrast to the negative pessimistic line, which is represented by Tolstoi and Dostoievsky. Calvinism represents a great force in history. In particular it has consolidated Hungarian national life in the Alföld (great Hungarian plain) in struggles with the Turks and the Habsburgs. We must turn to it for inspiration to-day, as we confront modern atheism. And in the fight for religion Calvinists, as their great leader Count Tisza observed, should co-operate with Roman Catholics.

The next essay is a most impressive presentation of what Calvin understood by the ministry of the Word. "Soli Deo gloria" was his motto. The minister must be so filled with the power of the Word as to be able to present it effectively to his flock for their edification. The three elements in a Calvinistic service are (1) penitence, (2) preaching, (3) prayer and praise. The Bible must be expounded from

beginning to end, and the Church seasons as a human invention must disappear.

Calvin the theologian is contrasted with Zwingli the humanist.

There is a careful study of Meliusz, the Hungarian reformer. He was fonder of Scholastic and Patristic adjuncts to his theology than Calvin. He differed from him in his account of predestination, where he was infralapsarian and spoke of things happening by God's permission, and in his doctrine of the Eucharist, where he was more subjective.

Two following essays describe the missionary activity of the Hungarian Calvinists from their earliest days, embracing in principle and to some extent in practice not only home missions but also the evangelization of the Turks. Clergy and laity combined in their zeal for the diffusion of their faith under persecution and in spite of the greatest material obstacles. Charitable institutions, orphanages and almshouses were established in Transylvania, but in part lost during the Counter-reformation.

The principles underlying the successful Dutch intervention on behalf of persecuted Calvinist ministers sent to the galleys in the XVII Century are discussed. They show the solidarity between co-religionists and illustrate the effect of Calvinism on international law. To some extent they represent a new feeling for toleration, foreshadowing the Enlightenment.

There is a short study of the disabilities endured by Calvinists at Pápa, when they were prevented by the Roman Catholics from repairing their church tower. The R. C. parish priest observed tauntingly, that if they believed in predestination, they ought not to complain of persecution.

The volume further contains a study of Hungarian Protestant hymnology, in which it is shown, that Calvinists and Lutherans might have combined to greater advantage in publishing their hymn books, and an account of Bible MSS. and printed editions of the Bible in various languages existing in Hungarian libraries.

It is well, that the Hungarian Calvinists should thus speak for themselves and set forth their position. Those, who do not accept this line of development, will be assisted thereby to appreciate it. Calvin was nothing, if not theocentric and systematic. He makes his position unmistakably clear. No doubt he does justice to certain passages in the Bible regarding the sovereignty and transcendence of God. But he presses them relentlessly to their utmost consequences, ignoring the force of other passages. For instance in the book of Hosea a certain reciprocity between God and man is set forth, which balances the imagery of the potter and the clay. Calvin suffered the limitations of an extravert. With all his force and earnestness there is something in him, which does violence to experience. And his onesided transcendence in the long run tends to defeat its own object. There is a certain monotony about his work resembling that of the Koran, which will prevent his influence from enduring as long or as widely as that of S. Augustine or that of Luther. Where we are repelled by some of their statements, we are attracted by others. But Calvinism must be

taken or left as a whole. Their rejection of free-will may be partially, though not wholly, discounted as psychological. But Calvin's theory is hard and dogmatic and only seems to escape from making God the author of sin by the verbal distinction between "necessitas" and "coactio." Predestination apparently in its strictest form survives more extensively in Hungary than in Scotland. It is doubtful, whether Lutherans would accept the statement in this volume, that Luther stood for "theologia crucis," while Calvin stood for "theologia gloriae." It would have been interesting, if a further study had been added comparing Calvin with S. Ignatius Loyola.

Altogether we may welcome heartily this memorial volume both for the sake of Calvin himself and for that of his Hungarian followers.

C. T. HARLEY WALKER.

JESUS AND HIS CHURCH. By R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D., Principal of Wesley House, Cambridge. *Published for the Fernley-Hartley Trust. The Epworth Press. 6s. net.*

This work naturally suggests reference to Hort's *Christian Ecclesia* which has been for nearly half a century one of the standard works on the Church in the New Testament. Since his time many fresh questions have arisen which were scarcely discussed then, and some treatment is demanded of such enquiries as "Did Jesus intend the Church?" "Is the charge to Peter—'On this Rock I will build my Church'—an authentic utterance of our Lord?" and "In what sense is the Church the Body of Christ?" Dr. Flew's aim is to set out the New Testament answers to such questions as these and he has accomplished his task with a masterly skill which puts all students in his debt. He has produced a work that will rank amongst the best in dealing with problems that are of the first importance at a time when the consideration of reunion is one of the subjects uppermost in the minds of the leaders in nearly all the Churches.

As Dr. Flew says, "It had become clear that there was only one great Christian doctrine, that of the nature of the Church, which really divided the different communions from one another, and he believes that "it is a mistake to set the divisive subject of the Christian ministry in the central area of debate unless the prior question has first been faced: What is the nature of the Body to which the various ministries belong, and which its ministers serve? How is the Ecclesia constituted, and what makes it one, in spite of all severances?" In answering these questions he sees that the teaching of Christ on His Church is the most important element and to these he devotes his attention. He notes the characteristic of *Basileia* as kingly rule, kingship, of sovereignty, and in the sixty passages in which our Lord speaks of it, in only nine is the thought of a community prominent or distinctive. A large section of the book deals with "The Idea of the Ecclesia in the Mind of our Lord." In this he develops five lines of argument which involve the idea of the community which he is gathering. These include the idea of the New Israel and of the Remnant,

the ethical teaching of Jesus, His idea of Messiahship and His conception of His message. The conclusion which he draws is that the origin of the Ecclesia lies in the will of God and all who accepted the revelation through Jesus Christ entered into the New Israel, "the one universal Ecclesia of God, which is manifest on earth, inheritors of a glorious past, and destined to a still more glorious future in the heavenly city, the New Jerusalem which is the home of the saints." This is the unanimous testimony of the New Testament writers. In considering the promise to Peter he holds that no true interpretation of the passage can be reached if the assumption, so common in this country, is maintained that the Church is identified with the Kingdom of God. This is the largest and most important part of the book.

Part two considers the life of the primitive Church and part three shows the unity of the Apostolic Teaching. In both these sections Dr. Flew finds confirmation of the view which he sets out in the earlier part of his study. The message, the mission and the ministry of the early Ecclesia and the teaching of the Epistles and the life of the early Church support the position which he has so ably set out. He shows the bearing of his conclusions on the present problems of Christendom. "To-day there is stirring in the minds of men a strong discontent with the present broken communion of the Ecclesia, and a fresh hope of a clearer expression, in outward act and form, of its essential unity in Christ." We need "to make a venture in fellowship on the basis of the New Testament idea of the Ecclesia, to acknowledge one another gladly and frankly as within the one Ecclesia of God on earth." We need to recognize that we are one in Christ, and we join in his hope that it is not too late to give real expression to that truth.

HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN TEACHING. *Sheldon Press.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

This book is designed for use with agreed syllabuses of Religious Teaching in Senior Schools. It gives a critical background to the Bible, and sums up much of current criticism, making it available in a compact form. There are sections of the book devoted to a study of the elements of the Christian Faith and life. These include a study of the Nicene Creed and the doctrine of the Trinity. The contributors are drawn from Anglican and Free Church ranks, whilst the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett each contribute a foreword. The book shows that care has been given to the subjects made available to the pupils. Yet one wonders how far the teachers themselves will be able to decide amidst the conflicting views (presented as they must be) which they themselves must adopt. The authorship and teaching of the fourth Gospel will serve as an instance. If the impression on pupils is one of "Here are the views; please yourselves which you adopt for it doesn't much matter," the result will be disastrous. The great necessity is for Christian teachers to teach Christian subjects.

MUSIC IN THE VILLAGE CHURCH. By Stuart M. Morgan. *S.P.C.K.* 2*s.*

Out of his first-hand knowledge, Mr. Morgan has produced a book for which many people will thank him warmly. It gives sane and sound counsel on a subject which is a continuous source of perplexity to many people. There is a charm about a village service when it is rendered naturally. Mr. Morgan's aim is to enhance that charm. He deals with matters concerning "Choir and Congregation," the Choir and its training, Chanting, Hymns, Responses, and has a splendid chapter on "The Organist." Sir Sydney H. Nicholson has contributed an interesting preface. The book is worth careful study, and the suggestions offered deserve detailed consideration.

SERMONS FOR LAY READERS. By Reginald Stephen, D.D. *S.P.C.K.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

These sermons were published in Australia a year ago, and now they are available in an English Edition. It seems that they are intended to serve as suggestive themes for Lay Readers, to help in their task of preaching. Their usefulness will not be limited, for the clergy who see them will probably find them stimulating and suggestive of topics which simply ask for further development. The sermons are forty-two in number and their themes provide subject matter for almost the whole of an eccleciastical year. One of these, on Demas, is most stimulating, whilst those for the festivals of the Ecclesiastical Year are truly helpful. Two splendid sermons are devoted to the subject of prayer; its reasonableness and its power. The one devoted to the sacramental system will be questioned by many Evangelicals. The Bishop says, "We are told that Christianity is a sacramental religion. That means that, as a general rule, the grace and life that God gives to us come through material channels." The word "through" is not a happy choice. The Catechism speaks of "a means" and "a pledge," and Evangelicals will elect to use such terms as expressing New Testament teaching.

It would be interesting to know how many people read sermons in these days. Many of these will repay perusal.

PULPIT, LECTERN AND STUDY. By Robert H. Jack. *S.P.C.K.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Lay Reader has wonderful opportunities in these days, and there are signs that the Church is willing to make use of his ministry. Whilst the call for him to witness must be from God, he needs to be equipped for his task. This book from the pen of an examiner of the Lay Readers' Board of the Chelmsford Diocese, is designed to help the would-be Lay Reader. It deals with the matter of witness in preaching, the preparation of the witness, and its delivery. The counsel is sound, and the methods put forward are admirable. Not only does the subject of preaching appear in the book, but also the matter of reading the Lessons in Church. This subject is treated admirably, for it must be remembered that the Lessons consist of the Word of God, whilst the sermon, important as it is, is a human

reflection upon the Word of God. The book also deals with the subject of study, especially for examination purposes, and closes with a suggested list of books suitable for the Lay Readers' library. Unfortunately this list has books which are chiefly critical in character; no one should take it as a final list.

The author has evidently a great regard for the methods of some outstanding Free Church preachers, particularly Spurgeon, whose sermons will always repay close study. This book will serve a purpose no doubt, but there are a number of fine works on the subject such as *Lectures on Preaching*, Phillips Brooks; *In Christ's Stead*, A. J. Gossip; and one of great value whilst cheap in price, *If I were a Preacher*, by a London Journalist.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF COURAGE. By Philip Leon. *George Allen & Unwin.* 6*s.*

The author of *The Ethics of Power* has followed his previous work with this present volume, to which he gives an alternative title: "The Oxford Group Way." The book is an approach to the questions of God, Christ, and Life, by the way of Philosophy. The author presents his case with conviction showing that Groupism can be approached in more ways than one. Moreover, the book is no mean contribution to the subject of Moral Philosophy. In turn, the author deals with the "Undeniable Facts" of God and man. Then follows a study of life headed: "Demonstration by Experiment." This is followed by the spreading of "The World Revolution" under the Oxford Group Way. Under the chapter "Changing Society" the author deals with a variety of subjects including, amongst other items, education, sex and marriage, and the economic problem. The last chapter is in the form of a personal testimony, headed "A Personal Note."

THE DOCTOR COMES TO LUI. A Story of Beginnings in the Sudan. By Eileen Fraser. *Church Missionary Society.* 1*s.*

In the Preface to this little book the Bishop in Egypt and the Sudan, having realized that the chief persons concerned in the work it described had said nothing about themselves, gives us a short character sketch of the Doctor and Mrs. Fraser, and helps us to understand how such a wonderful work as the evangelization of a tribe could be accomplished in the short space of fourteen years. Throughout the narrative itself, which is full of interest and well illustrated, though Mrs. Fraser gives due meed of praise to her husband, it is the work that they both have so much at heart that always comes first, and of herself she scarcely speaks at all. It is a very special privilege to be the first to carry the news of the Gospel to those who spend their lives under the domination of the fear of evil spirits, as was the case with the Moru tribe until the Doctor arrived, and many interesting stories are told of the way in which he was able, through the power of the Gospel, to release them from their bondage. The story, too, of how they were taught the meaning of Christmas is a thrilling chapter. But the book must be

read to realize the great change brought to the district by these two devoted servants of God, the Doctor and his wife.

CHINA'S FIRST MISSIONARIES. By the Rev. T. Torrance, F.R.G.S. *Thynne & Co. Ltd.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Those who are interested in the habits and customs of different races in far-off regions, no less than those who are concerned with missionary endeavour, will be gripped by this account of a race of men who live in a remote part of Western China. The author is an ex-missionary of many years standing, and his observation of the Chiangs has led him to the conclusion that they are descendants of the tribes of Israel. Their customs are in many respects remarkably similar to those of the Old Testament. A number of excellent illustrations reinforce the learning and research which these most interesting pages display.

THE POWER OF GOD. By Dr. Karl Heim. Lutterworth Press. 5*s.*

The plight of our fellow Christians in Germany is much in our thoughts at this time, and our sympathy with them will be quickened by the reading of such a stirring series of addresses as these. Karl Heim received the Hon. Degree of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh last year, and for three years he was Secretary of the German Student Christian Movement. There is a ring of Gospel fervour and a keen insight into the meaning of Scripture in all these sermons. It is heartening to think that these are samples of what our German friends are receiving from some of their Pastors.

REVELATION OF ST. JOHN : THE FOUR VIEWS OF TIME EACH REACHING TO THE END OF THIS AGE. By Rev. H. C. Robertson. *Chas. T. Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd.* 1*s.*

The writer, while holding to the Historical Interpretation of the book of the Revelation points out that in the chapters entitled : " The Seven Seals " ; " The Seven Trumpets " ; " The Seven Signs " ; " The Seven Vials," are four views of things to come, each ending at the same point, namely at the close of this age ; that these four views dealing with four different aspects of the Church's history until the return of our Lord are parallel, not consecutive.

" By understanding this, the difficulties are removed which were felt to be inherent in an Historical Interpretation continuous from beginning to end of the whole Prophecy. The overwhelming advantages of an historical interpretation are retained, and the necessity of a *continuous* interpretation removed." T. S.

THE WAY OF PARTNERSHIP IN INDIA. By Phyllis L. Garlick. *C.M.S.* 1*s.*

A fresh issue in the " Partnership " series every Autumn has now become a feature with C.M.S. The issue is devoted to the special

area which the Society has selected for study during the winter months, and so is particularly useful for study circles. In this book Miss Garlick has made a valuable contribution to the small library which has recently been published on the subject of Indian Christianity. Whilst giving a background to the Church in India the authoress has emphasized its opportunities, its needs and its dangers.

Miss Garlick sets herself the task of answering two questions. First : " Is the missionary society still needed ? " and second : " Where and why is the C.M.S. in India to-day ? " The beginnings of C.M.S. in India, " Out of yesterday," is first traced, then follows a study of the present position and a vision for the future with a native witnessing Church. In this vision the villages occupy the foreground, " The future of C.M.S. must be primarily in the villages " (p. 25). Much of the book is most assuring, for it demonstrates that evangelization is the aim which underlies every department of mission work. Four vital needs are stated. They are those of Leadership ; Instruction which overcomes illiteracy and enables the Church to understand, and to express itself ; Unity ; and Spiritual Fellowship with the West.

C.M.S. has been wise to entrust the presentation of this picture to one person, for the last two issues in this series have suffered the inevitable limitations of a composite work. Readers would be wise to read the book through at one sitting, if possible, and then return to it section by section, for it both demands and merits close study.

E. H.

CHRIST'S WAY TO INDIA'S HEART. By Bishop J. W. Pickett.

Bishop Pickett is one of the recognized experts on Mass Movement work in India, and no one interested in the growth of the Christian Church in India can afford to neglect reading this, and his previous book, *Christian Mass Movements in India.* The books have been written after years of intensive study and personal enquiry. The conclusions reached may seem revolutionary to Western readers who have always thought in terms of personal individual conversion, but there can be no doubt that for India, with its highly developed " family " life, the " group-family " method of reception into the Church is the form which is best suited to its people. Further, that this method should develope from the " bottom-upwards," from the Outcaste to the Caste people, is only what might be expected, and is in accord with the general history of the growth of the Christian Church. " The poor have the Gospel preached to them." They respond to it, and through the witness of their lives the higher castes are won. Christianity in India has to be lived under the full glare of public criticism and examination. In most cases it stands the test ; its results are obvious. As one Brahman observed, " There is something here I do not understand. These people are certainly sincere. If this is Christianity I am for it. It's what the whole country needs." He spoke more truly than he knew.

While the full life of the Christian must be that of a personal experience with Christ as Saviour, yet, as Bishop Pickett says, " the

conclusion is inescapable that Christ is moving into the heart of India not along the lonely road of the detached individual but through the crowded thoroughfares of community life." W. H. BISHOP.

A CATHOLIC LOOKS AT WAR. Natalie Victor. *James Clarke & Co. Ltd.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

The number of books devoted to the study of war, disarmament, pacifism, and kindred subjects, continues to grow. This present book is one of the latest additions to the number. It claims to be a statement on the subject from a definite viewpoint by an author who claims to be an Anglican Catholic. Strictly, the study is not one from a general pacifist angle, nor really from a so-called Catholic angle, but one from a distinctively Christian angle. The particular viewpoint it claims to represent is confined to the last two chapters, and a perusal of them leaves the impression that actually they are an appendix to the book, and do not in the least affect the main exposition of the case for Christian Pacifism.

Even those who disagree with the conclusions presented in the book, will acknowledge that their presentation is both earnest and convincing, for it is a powerful plea that is put forward.

BEHOLD THY KING. Suzanne de Dietrich. *S.C.M.* 4*s.*

The experience of Mlle de Dietrich provides another instance of one who has been led from the outer into the inner circle of faith. In the preface to the English edition of her book she reveals this fact. "It is the *Man* Jesus who attracted me first. But as I tried to follow Him, His figure grew and grew, until the day came when I had to confess with Thomas: My Lord and my God!'" (p. 10). Further, she disclaims any attempt to have written a devotional book. "I have simply tried to write down what the Gospels have come to mean to me as I dig deeper and deeper into the texts" (p. 9). Her faith is stated simply and plainly in a manner calculated to move the souls of men. "I firmly believe that in matters of evangelical truth there is a Christian tradition that we might call 'catholic,' in the etymological sense of that word because it does not belong exclusively to any particular Church or confession, since it really is the continuity of the testimony which God bears to Himself, in the Church and in the souls of men" (pp. 11-12).

The meditations will assuredly be found helpful by many. The thoughts expressed on the Holy Communion are penetrating and humiliating. Here is one gem, "Thou givest Thy life for us. We can only receive, believe, adore—give Thee all in return." Equally moving are the thoughts on the mystery of the Passion. Here are but two instances taken from many gems of thought. One can imagine that this might easily become a beloved bedside book for many. Perhaps it might be well for the publishers to consider the advisability of printing an index of its Scripture passages in any subsequent issue.

E. H.

NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS.

IN *Preface to Faith* (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 6*s*. net) Dr. Louis Arnauld Reid considers some of the fundamentals of the Christian faith from a philosophic point of view, and arrives at the conclusion that he must reject many things which those who accept the Christian tradition consider to be vital. He questions the divinity of Christ, the resurrection, the atonement as connected with the death of Christ, and yet he believes that he retains much that is profoundly valuable.

Essential Christianity by S. Angus, Professor of New Testament and Historical Theology, St. Andrew's College, University of Sydney (John Murray 6*s*. net), is a frank restatement of what the author regards as of the essence of Christianity. He denies the value of dogmatic tests. The essential factor is the Christ-like character. What divides is not of Christ, and disputable things are not essential. His demands are few and simple: "Purity of heart, loving service, active sympathy, obedience to the Highest Will, ceaseless concern about the inner light that it be not darkness, a balanced inwardness, the sifting sense of values, which drives a man to sell all that he has for the priceless pearl and to repudiate the kingdoms of this world and their glory at a price." We may question whether such a Christianity represents the teaching of the New Testament or would stand against the onslaughts of the enemies of faith.

An Anglican in Estonia by the Rev. H. R. Wilson Chamberlain of York Minster (S.P.C.K. 2*s*.) is an account of a visit of a party with Anglo-Catholic sympathies to the Orthodox Church in Estonia in order to make contact with the members of that Church and to give them some idea of our forms of worship. It is written in an interesting and chatty way giving particulars of the people they met and the monasteries in which they were accommodated. They left, however, a wrong impression of our worship in their "offering of the Holy Sacrifice" and presenting the "Western Mass" as a *missa cantata*. Mr. Wilson took with him in his care for the spiritual welfare of the party "a case containing altar vessels, linen, cross and candlesticks, wine, wafers, a set of reversible green and white vestments, and another set of cloth of gold." He was thus well equipped to give a service quite unlike that provided for in the Book of Common Prayer.

Jamaican Interlude, by George F. Timpson, with a Preface by Lord Oliver (Ed. J. Burrows & Co., 6*s*. net) is an account of the Emancipation of the Slaves in one of our oldest Colonies, and gives a

graphic picture of the part played by the Baptist ministers on behalf of the people. An interesting account is added of Jamaica as it is to-day.

The aeroplane accident which cut off the career of Bishop Guy Bullen in the Sudan in December, 1937, caused a great shock to all his friends. A life of great promise for the future of mission work in Africa was suddenly ended. Already he had left his mark on the Mission Field. During his time in Nigeria he had effected changes in Zana which had opened a new era for the work there. His devotion, his clear vision, his capacity for effective action, his personality which charmed all who met him, are all displayed in the memoir of him which has been brought out by " His Friends " (Church Missionary Society, 5*s*. net). His life is an inspiration to service for the Master.

Modern Illustrations of the Gospel, by P. C. Sands, M.A., is one of the S.P.C.K. series of Education Works (2*s*. net). It is intended for Teachers in Senior or Secondary Schools or Bible Classes, to meet the need of modern illustrations calculated to interest, attract and instruct those who desire to bring Bible lessons into touch with everyday life. Teachers will welcome the copious and well-arranged matter provided.

Our Faith, by Emil Brunner (Charles Scribner's Sons Ltd., 5*s*. net). This is a translation by Mr. John W. Rilling and is an exposition of Christian teaching intended to meet the needs of those who are thinking out the eternal message of our religion. It deals with thirty-five topics beginning with Is There a God? Is the Bible the Word of God?, and ending with The Last Judgement and Eternal Life. Professor Brunner's method of dealing with these various questions has an originality for English minds which renders it very suggestive of new lines of treatment in dealing with old problems.

Search the Scriptures is the sixth booklet of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship Bible Study Course of which the general editor is the Rev. G. T. Manley. (1*s*. net.) The Rev. A. M. Stibbs has drawn up a comprehensive series of outlines for daily reading which concludes the whole course which is intended to cover the three years of a Student's university life.