

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

"NO POPERY," BY HEBBERT THURSTON, S.J. *Sheed & Ward.*  
1930. 7s. 6d. net.

BY G. G. COULTON, D.LITT., F.B.A.

Fr. Thurston is perhaps the oldest of living Jesuit controversialists, and he was for some years on intimate terms with the celebrated Fr. George Tyrrell. Tyrrell, a few months after he had taken his final leave of the Society of Jesus, wrote to a friend: "[The Jesuits] live on the blunders of their critics. Instead of saying 'they have killed three men,' they say 'three men and a dog.' The Jesuits produce the dog alive, and win a repute as calumniated innocents."<sup>1</sup> If Fr. Thurston's book had been written for the express purpose of illustrating this remark of his confrère, it could not have been better done. My attention had twice been called to it in general terms; but I seemed to have more important books to read. Now, however, a Cambridge Editor has sent it and asked for an extended review; it was scarcely possible to refuse without seeming to shrink from a challenge; but my review presently became so long that I sent him only a short notice, and am printing the rest here.

I find that, in conjunction with Dean Inge, I am attacked on the ground that we have written things incompatible with the judgments of distinguished historical scholars. These incompatibilities are brought out—or, more strictly speaking, are invented—by the rudimentary process of contrasting brief detached quotations from us and from them, with noble disregard of the context. The majority of these other scholars are dead, or comparatively inaccessible in foreign lands; but three, fortunately, are both alive and accessible: Dr. A. J. Carlyle and Professors J. P. Whitney and E. F. Jacob (pp. 142-4, 174-5, 173). I have consulted all these, and they reply unanimously that their words cannot legitimately be used in the sense in which Fr. Thurston takes them.

Another device in this book is to couple together two men who have practically nothing in common, and thus to imply that whatever can be said against the one is legitimately applicable to the other. The American Dr. H. C. Lea extorted Acton's admiration for his learning and fairness; seldom did Acton review any bulky book so favourably as Lea's *Inquisition*. Fr. Thurston returns to him over and over again (pp. 289, 291-4, 302, 307, 311). Yet he never comes to hand-grips, or produces documentary evidence; he simply appeals to the credulity of his own public; e.g.: "No thoughtful student can doubt that Dr. Lea's picture of the evils of the times is overcharged"; "I absolutely and entirely disagree with Dr. Lea and his sympathizers." Yet among Lea's warmest sympathizers was Acton, who invited him to write

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, Vol. II, p. 294 (September 16, 1906).

one of the most important articles in *The Cambridge Modern History*, and who as Editor approved it. How, then, does Fr. Thurston, who is no historian, gnaw at this particular file? The method is engagingly simple; it is no less easy than flute-playing as described by Hamlet. Fr. Thurston devotes forty pages of his book to a certain Dr. Rappoport, who seems to be a mendacious anticlerical hack, professing to write from Rome and displaying that blind hatred of the Roman Church which flourishes so much more in the Latin countries than in those where Romanists and non-Romanists have so long lived side by side. This Rome-bred anticlerical, it appears, still believes in the fable of Pope Joan, and has published it again in derision of the Papacy. That story is so far from being a No-Popery invention, that it was believed practically by everyone during the last seven generations of the Middle Ages, was quoted as evidence at the Council of Constance, and was tacitly accepted (it may be said) by at least three Popes. It was a seventeenth-century Calvinist, David Blondel, who first set himself to explode it scientifically; and Döllinger, whose historical conscience made it impossible for him to believe in Papal Infallibility, gave Pope Joan the death-blow so far as self-respecting students are concerned. But to have emphasized these facts would have been foreign to Fr. Thurston's purpose. His method is to go out into the streets and lanes of the city, to rake in all the poor and maimed and halt and blind No-Poperists, and to butcher them for his Roman holiday. I doubt whether there is a single historian in Cambridge who has even heard the names of half these obscure folk with whose writings he makes sport—Rappoport, Lachâtre, Pianciani, Vésinier, Petrucelli della Gattina, Nicolini, Weld, Legge, McClintock and Strong. Yet these form the very corner-stone of Fr. Thurston's edifice; for, after all this (no doubt deserved) exposure of Rappoport, he is able to write (p. 289): "If Dr. H. C. Lea, or Dr. Rappoport, or Dr. Coulton, had employed their flair for the unwholesome in compiling a 'History of Clerical Wedlock since the Reformation,' instead of concentrating upon the irregularities of the Catholic Church, no one of them would have failed to produce a record which would be not less repellent to British respectability than anything they have written in condemnation of sacerdotal celibacy."

To begin with, here is either great ignorance or great want of candour. The current volume of the *English Historical Review*, for instance, contains an official report of an episcopal visitation of Hereford diocese in 1397, which shows sixty-three clergy reported as unchaste in 281 parishes. Fr. Thurston must know that these, with similar official statistics, point to such a state of things as has never existed among any body of Protestant clergy. The fact is, neither he, nor any writer of his party, has ever dared to meet Lea's two massive volumes of evidence in the open. Neither he nor they have ever dared to face the three dead men; but they produce a dog alive. Rappoport, otherwise comparatively insignificant, is of inestimable value for controversial purposes. For

he can be bracketed with Dr. Lea and another author who feels the compliment of this juxtaposition ; and then the class of readers for whom Fr. Thurston writes have a comfortable feeling, for the rest of their lives, that they may conscientiously consign all three to the waste-paper basket.

I have written deliberately, produce *a dog alive* ; for a little legerdemain comes in sometimes, and the animal produced is not always *the dog*. Nobody would guess, from the dozen pages devoted to Léo Taxil and his impostures, that the full story of this man supplies one of the strangest examples in all history of a vast community duped by a notorious rascal. He rose to be one of the central figures of a great Anti-Masonic Congress at Trent, where thirty-six bishops attended in person and about fifty by proxy, and Leo XIII blessed the work by telegram. He had fabricated out of his imagination the oath with which Freemasons invoke the Devil at their most solemn meetings : it began *Hemen Etan!* (thrice repeated) . . . *El Ati!* . . . *Titeip!* . . . *Azia!* . . . *Hiu!* . . . *Teu!* . . . and, after three lines more of similar stuff, it ended with *Hy!* . . . *Hau!* . . . *Hau!* . . . *Hau!* . . . Archbishop Meurin, whose forte was Oriental scholarship, proved to the general satisfaction that this was derived from the Hebrew, indicating "open addiction to the practices of diabolic sorcery." An echo of this may be found in Mr. Shane Leslie's recent *Memoir of J. E. C. Bodley*. At an examination in catechism, French boys were asked whether there are idolaters in France, and a large proportion answered : Yes, the Freemasons, who adore the Devil under form of some beast (pp. 308, 323, 330). The clergy, in fact, were almost unanimous in favour of this "converted" impostor, until the very eve of his exposure. Anyone who takes the trouble to read H. C. Lea's brief contemporary account of the story, which is in our University Library, may compare the real dog Taxil with the animal produced by our present Jesuit in this volume.

But there is one matter upon which Fr. Thurston does produce a show of original contemporary evidence ; a matter of capital importance in medieval history, and therefore worth discussion here. To what extent did Innocent III, in 1215, anticipate Gregory IX's formal decree of the death penalty for heresy (1231) ? The decree of 1215 made it a duty of all magistrates to *exterminate* all heretics. That word, in the Classical authors, had meant only *banish*, as its etymology would suggest ; but in what sense did Innocent use it ? The editor of the Inquisitor Eymeric's manual, publishing at Rome in 1585 under Papal patronage, takes it for granted that Innocent used the word in the modern sense of *destroy*. *Exterminare* is not a very common word in Classical literature ; Innocent was not deeply versed in the Classics, nor were the Fathers of the Lateran Council. On the other hand he, and all the most learned among them, were familiar with the Vulgate Bible. The word occurs thirty-nine times in that book : not once is it used definitely in the sense of *banish* ; in twenty-seven cases the Roman Catholic (Douay) version renders it *destroy*, and in seven *cut off*,

*lay waste, or make havoc.* Fr. Thurston "economizes" very diplomatically in face of this evidence; he only tells his readers that "the Vulgate often uses the word in the sense of *destroy* or *make an end of it*": moreover, though he quotes silently in this very line from a discussion of mine with his colleague Fr. Leslie Walker, S.J., he conceals the upshot of that discussion. Fr. Walker finally wrote to me: "In view of Vulgate usage and context, I think *exterminare* in the Lateran decree might fairly be translated 'get rid of.' I admit that strong words are deliberately chosen and that consequences were largely foreseen. The intention of Council and Pope was, as you say, 'to rid Christendom of heretics . . . the question of method was quite secondary.'" It is perfectly true, as Fr. Thurston insists, that *exterminare* was sometimes used both by and before and after Innocent in the original sense of *banishment* pure and simple, without necessary connotation of violence or actual war. But it is equally true, though he does not say so, that the word occurs still more frequently, both before and after, in that Vulgate sense in which it was understood by the papally-approved editor of 1585. If Innocent had intended to stop short at the milder "banishment," then he had at his command such natural and perfectly unambiguous words as *expellere*, *deportare*, *ejicere*, *projicere*, *bannire*.<sup>1</sup> But he knew perfectly well that such "driving forth" would be, in most cases, violent and by force of arms; he therefore chose the more violent word, which might be, and frequently was, taken as coextensive with *destroy*. Indeed, he himself, in his letters, uses it as parallel not only with *expellere*, but also with *mortificare*, *pernicies*, *conterere*, *destruere*. And that is why the word is used in his congratulatory letter after the slaughter of Béziers, when the Legate had reported to him the massacre of nearly 20,000 inhabitants without distinction of rank or sex or age. This enormous exaggeration of numbers is not to the point here; Innocent probably believed them as his Legate believed them; in fact, the most determined modern Romanist apologist dares not to put the figures lower than 4,000. At Carcassonne, again, the Papal Legate was moved not by mercy but by reasons of policy to allow the heretical defenders to come to terms, which were that they should "go forth naked from the city, bearing with them nothing but their own sins," and with a safe-conduct for only one day's march. Can it be reasonably doubted that, for the majority of the fugitives, this was practically a sentence of death? Innocent, in his answering letter, alludes to this process as a "driving out," but, in the same breath, as a "putting to death," "destruction" (three times) or "extermination." Can it be doubted that Fr. Walker's confession is true; Innocent's main object was to "get rid of" the heretics; the question of method

<sup>1</sup> I believe I am right in saying that the long section dealing with heretics in Gratian, the first volume of the *Corpus juris canonici*, uses *exterminare* only once, and then in the plain sense of *destroy*, without any sense of *banishment* whatever. When the writers intend *cast forth*, they twice use *projicere* (Pars, II, c. xxiv. quaest. I, c. 25, 28, 41).

was secondary with him, and he knew quite well that the methods chosen would often involve death. Moreover, it was Innocent who invented that parallel upon which St. Thomas Aquinas built his argument for the death of the impenitent heretic; heresy (said the Pope) is treason, and the worst of treasons, for it is against no mere earthly ruler, but God. All this Fr. Thurston ignores; perhaps he is actually ignorant of the well-known fact. But other things he has less excuse for ignoring; his brother Walker's confession, and the mass of evidence which I produce from Innocent's own letters in my study on *The Death Penalty for Heresy from A.D. 1184 to 1921*. In that study I quote freely from documents which my critic accuses me of not having read, not indeed in so many words, but by characteristically furtive insinuations (pp. 196-7). And I quote medieval sentences which, if Fr. Thurston had taken full notice of them, would have rendered much of his argument impossible.

Yet the book has great negative value, as an index of the culture which Fr. Thurston expects in his own particular public. Newman confessed sadly the cultural inferiority of his new fellow-churchmen as compared with the Anglicans whom he had quitted: he fought impatiently (he tells us) against "the evil delusion that Catholics are on an intellectual and social equality with Protestants."<sup>1</sup> It is for such people that Fr. Thurston has generally written. Among these, he is a coryphaeus; the *Catholic Who's Who* testifies to him as to an archangel: "Born London 1856 . . . A writer of marvellous range and research, from whose fiercest polemics the note of the special pleader is uniformly absent." Therefore nobody can accuse us, when we deal faithfully with him, of choosing a cheap and easy victim from the Romanist Underworld.<sup>2</sup> He is master of his trade; he commands a dignified and scholarly style which carries off even his most outrageous *suppressiones veri et suggestiones falsi*; his book has been taken at its face value, and commended, by some of our most serious literary periodicals. Indeed, every page of it is impressive to the reader who has not the leisure or the opportunities for looking beneath the surface. It exactly earns that famous qualified praise from Abraham Lincoln: "For those who like this sort of book, here is just the sort of book they would like."

---

THE VISION OF GOD. THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE SUMMUM BONUM. By the Rev. K. E. Kirk, D.D. (Bampton Lectures, 1928. Price 25s.)

BY THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP KNOX, D.D.

When John Henry Newman was about to launch the *Tracts for the Times* upon the Clergy, he began with five letters to the *Record*, he being at the time not yet dissociated publicly from his early

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, by W. Ward, Vol. II, p. 45.

<sup>2</sup> The reader may realize this even more clearly from his own letters written under cross-examination (*Roman Catholic and Anglican Accuracy*, Simpkin Marshall, Ltd. 6d.).

Evangelicalism. The object of those letters superficially was to revive Church discipline, and if they had been successful, in this way to make a breach between the Evangelicals and the Dissenters. But the Church of England, of which Newman and his friends were subconsciously dreaming, was the Church of the seventeenth century, maintaining Church discipline penally by close alliance with the civil power. A special value of the book under our review is that it approaches the question of Church discipline as one of supreme difficulty, and approaches it from the historical point of view. If we ask how Church discipline is connected with the Vision of God we come to the aim which Church discipline has in view, the formation of the ideal Christian character, and that ideal must be determined by the true end of human life, which according to Dr. Kirk is neither happiness, nor service, but worship. He does not, of course, exclude happiness or service from a place in the Christian ideal, but the chief place, the supreme end, is reserved for worship. In a notable passage (p. 446) he writes thus: "If the conclusion of the apostles of energy is accepted the whole development of Christian thought about the vision of God must be adjudged a wasteful, if not a tragic, mistake. Selfish the ideal of the vision of God may not be; erroneous it is. It mistakes the means for the end, and in so doing veils the true end from men's eyes. It diverts them from the King's highway of loving energy into a maze of contemplative prayer wholly remote from God's purposes. Unless I am at fault that is how robust common sense, even among Christians, has always regarded, and to-day more than ever regards, those who insist that worship or contemplation has the primary place in the ideal life. Its test is wholly pragmatic. If it uplifts, but only then, is worship commendable; if it strengthens and purifies, so far, but only so far, has it a place. But it has no value for its own sake, or apart from these possible influences which it may exert. And in any case a little of it goes a long way; it must never be allowed to oust positive benevolence from its position as the Christian's first, final, and only genuine duty." Again (p. 451) we read: "Disinterested service is the only service that is serviceable; and disinterestedness comes by the life of worship alone. But at once a further criticism presents itself. Christianity has taken the way of the Cross as its example; it has made disinterestedness the test of all ideals. By that test worship is vindicated as being an integral part of the full Christian life. But is the test a fair one?—is it indeed a test that has any meaning at all? The criticism strikes at the very heart of the doctrine of self-sacrifice; but it cannot on that account be disallowed."

These extracts furnish a fair example both of our author's style and of the interest of the problem which he has set out to solve. But they hardly indicate the rich harvest of illuminating historical proofs and analogies with which the book abounds, making it, we venture to think, a model for those whose duty it is to give instruction in Christian faith and doctrine. We do not mean that we accept all Dr. Kirk's conclusions or even his main contentions, if we rightly understand them, but we are indebted to him for the care

with which he produces the evidence on which they rest. He is not a writer who, starting from an *a priori* conclusion, fishes for evidence here and there, and produces a *catena* of extracts suited to his own purpose. He works with a trained historical sense, has a sound instinct for important facts, and uses them appositely.

Dr. Kirk traces the theme of the Vision of God and the problems of discipline starting from Pagan and Jewish anticipations, through the teaching of the New Testament, and the early days of the Church, on to monasticism in its primitive and later forms, through the days of mediævalism, on to the Reformation and the later Roman Catholic teaching. He distinguishes throughout between (1) Institutionalism or corporate discipline; (2) Formalism, the round of religious observances, and moral restraints and excitations which the individual of his own free will adopts, and (3) Rigorism, the life of self-mortification and other-worldliness, the method of systematic and extreme asceticism. His general conclusion is that (1) Penal discipline inflicted by the Church has always defeated its own ends, and that "the Church must always and everywhere set before men the highest standard she knows in conduct, the truest forms of worship and creed. But she must be very slow indeed to enforce them even by the threat of confining her membership to those who acquiesce; (2) That a reasoned orderliness is the Christian's best safeguard against the cyclones of temptation, the gusts of passion which beset his soul. He must have rules of life, but he does not go out into the void to seek them; they are forced upon him by the exigencies of his worship; and (3) that no true scheme of Christian ethics can be without its permanent element of rigorism, to which our guide must be the life of prayer which consists in seeing God—in meditating on the person of Jesus."

It is obvious that no review for which we have space can do full justice to a learned work, about 550 pages long, and these annotated constantly with notes in small print. We can only say that the book is one which we can commend to the perusal of thoughtful readers, and that we do not doubt that those who follow this suggestion will be thankful for it. We will but conclude by quoting, as a specimen of the profoundly interesting problems which it treats, our author's comment on the supposed connexion between predestinarianism and moral laxity, which is in fact contradicted by the tendency of the doctrine of irresistible grace to enhance the impulse to moral effort (p. 547). "Among the earnest-minded the chief occasion of moral sterility is despair—the sense of the futility and inadequacy, in face of the evils of life, even of the highest human effort. Once substitute for despair the certainty of achievement, and activity revives again to put forth its strongest effort. We might expect the certainty of achievement to rob effort of all interest, transforming life from a splendid adventure into a commonplace and predetermined end. Actually, however, this does not happen, even in the lesser things of life. The moment at which the scholar sees that his problem is going *to be solved*—however distant the solution may still be—is the moment which stimulates him to renewed and better

(because care-free) efforts. . . . The doctrine of irresistible grace (or rather, as Augustine has taught us to conceive it, of irresistible love) perpetuates for the moral life the tension of these 'moments' which the scholar and the athlete prize; it elicits greater effort by dealing a death-blow to anxiety."

---

MEMORIALS OF WILLIAM WARD, D.D., BISHOP OF SODOR AND MAN, 1828-1838. Compiled by his granddaughter, Edith Caroline. London. S.P.C.K. 6s. net.

In the days of Bishop Ward the Isle of Man was not, we fear, very prosperous and the Church was confronted by many difficulties, but these the Bishop faced with a stout heart when in 1828 he succeeded Dr. Murray who was translated Bishop of Rochester. He distinguished himself as a church builder and founded King William's College. But his greatest service to the Island Church was his courageous opposition to the scheme for merging the Diocese into that of Carlisle. He made a brave fight for his ancient See, which was founded by St. Patrick in A.D. 430. At that time he was in failing health and was almost quite blind and it was tragic that he died before the result of his courageous defence of his interesting little Diocese was made known. Sixty years later the story was told by Miss Ward, the Bishop's only surviving daughter, then sixty years of age; and it will be found in the present volume of memorials.

The Bishop was born in Ireland on Michaelmas Day, 1762, and was ordained as "a Literate" in 1788, but later he graduated B.D. "as a ten-year man" at Cambridge, under conditions now obsolete. He had considerable parochial experience, gained first in London at Mayfair Chapel of which he was Incumbent and subsequently in the neighbourhood of Colchester, where he held the Rectory of Myland and later the benefice of Great Horkesley. By a strange coincidence this notice has been written by a recent Rector of Myland, whose study windows looked out on the remains of the little church in which good William Ward ministered and on the churchyard where several of his children await the Resurrection. A larger church has been built. Mr. Ward was among the founders of the C.M.S. and the Bible Society, both of which have to-day many friends in Myland and where this interesting memorial volume will be welcome with its records of long ago. S. R. C.

---

THE REVELATION OF DEITY. By J. E. Turner, M.A., Ph.D. *Allen & Unwin*. Pp. 223. 8s. 6d. net.

This writer is already well known through such works as *Personality and Reality* and *The Nature of Deity*. The University of Liverpool is to be congratulated upon its Reader in Philosophy.

Dr. Turner's view is very definitely Christian; and he puts his thesis with strength, cogency, clearness and illustration. God makes Himself manifest to man through nature. Materialism

implies an absence of any directive mind. On the other hand (as is so obvious to the ordinary layman), nature is an imperfect revelation of God. A personal God could not be manifested only in machinery. And underlying all Dr. Turner's thesis is the proposition that God is personal. "When the philosopher contends that to attribute even the highest conceivable mode of personality to Deity is an altogether illegitimate anthropomorphism . . . Such virtually says, 'I cannot fully understand how certain extremely perplexing phenomena are brought about; I cannot comprehend their ultimate, nor often even their proximate, causes and conditions; they plainly differ *in toto* from all that I myself can do; and therefore,' he concludes—exactly as does the savage—'their ground and origin must be either wholly impersonal or wholly superpersonal—either an impersonal Nature or an absolutely transcendent Deity'" (p. 77). By a lovely illustration (one of many, by the way, with which the volume abounds) the author suggests that such philosophy, however relatively logical, may be in *reality* childish.

There are degrees of revelation of personality and of Divine personality. There is the aesthetic, but altogether the greatest is the ethical. "Deity, as personal, incessantly sustains those ideals whose realization man feels to be imperatively demanded from himself. . . . The divine selflessness manifests itself objectively throughout the entire universe . . . as the expression, not only of knowledge and power, but still more fundamentally of love" (pp. 172, 173).

The two final chapters on "The Revelation in Selfhood" and "The Supreme Revelation of Deity" are valuable contributions to Christian philosophy. Dr. Turner gives a brief but fine appreciation of Jesus as "morally perfect." The Professor's definition of the Incarnation would not be, we should judge, the Chalcedonian, and to that extent it must fall short of what many of us hold. But we sincerely and cordially thank this thinker and teacher for such a confession as "Religion, morality and personality . . . their uniqueness in the case of Jesus constituted the incarnation of the divine nature in the human" (p. 202). Similarly valuable is such a passage as: "In His life and personality Deity became incarnate; and this in no merely passive and static way, as when natural beauty is viewed as one form of divine revelation, but on the contrary as essentially active and dynamic—as doing for man what man himself incessantly but vainly tries to do" (p. 206). Dr. Turner's philosophy will be, we believe, a valuable aid in Christian apologetics.

The printing and paper are excellent. There appear to be no slips. However, on p. 13 should not "but deeply" be read "and deeply"? "History" is spelled with a capital, but "divine" with a small letter. There are references to many writers, but there is neither quotation of, nor specific allusion to, any of the books of the Canon.