

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

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1927.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Composite Book.

THE Prayer Book revision proposals of the Bishops were presented to the Lower Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York on February 7, in the form of a "Composite Book." Its reception has illustrated the wide variety of views held by the clergy and laity of the Church of England—*quot homines, tot sententia*. The majority of the Bishops declare that the Book makes no change in the doctrine of our Church. The Archbishop of Canterbury, speaking on this point, said: "I wish to say emphatically that in my deliberate judgment nothing that we have suggested makes any change in the doctrinal position of the Church of England"; but he adds, "the balance of emphasis may here and there be somewhat altered." Other Bishops, supporting the Archbishop, have added some further points. One of them says that the effect of the changes is to give a more frank and full recognition of the rightful position of what he might term the Catholic element than was given in the old book. "That which was implicit had been made explicit, but there had been no change in the doctrinal position of the Church." We have no doubt of the sincerity of these claims, but questions have been raised as to the accuracy of the statements. There is considerable doubt in the minds of many on the view that everything which has been made explicit in the new book was implicit in the old. The opinion has also been expressed that a balance of emphasis may be so altered as to imply a change in the actual doctrine.

The Future Form of our Services.

We take for granted that a large number of the changes will be welcomed by members of all schools of thought. The book provides in many respects much needed variety, elasticity, enrichment and freedom. It is calculated in many ways to give fuller expression to our worship. The use of shorter forms on various occasions will be an advantage. At the same time, as has been pointed out, there is a danger of a complete revolution in the traditional worship of our Church for the last 380 years if the new and abbreviated forms for Morning and Evening Prayer are adopted to the exclusion of the forms in the old book. This danger will be increased where

the desire to make the Communion Service the principal service on Sunday morning leads to the cutting down of the form for Mattins. Objection has also been raised to the new book on the grounds of its complexity. The old book has proved sufficiently difficult for worshippers not intimately acquainted with its contents. In the new book these difficulties are greatly increased. It must be, in any form, a cumbersome book to handle, and it will not be easy to find the particular part of the service which is being used. These are not, however, the points on which the chief discussion turns. The attention of Churchpeople is directed to the alternative forms for Holy Communion, the permission to reserve the elements for the sick, the observance of All Souls' Day, and the legalization of the chasuble as the vestment to be worn at the Communion Service.

The Bishop of Birmingham's Views.

Two of the Bishops do not share the view that there is no doctrinal change in the new book. The Bishop of Birmingham was the first to criticize its contents. He fears that by its adoption uniformity will have vanished, and that by the appointment of a Service for Thanksgiving for the Institution of Holy Communion the *cultus* associated with Corpus Christi day in the Roman Church may be encouraged. He regards the new form of Consecration Prayer as unnecessary unless the old was defective. It brings our Communion Office nearer to the Roman Mass, and gives colour to the belief that a particular form of words effects a miraculous change in the bread and wine over which they are said. Although it may be maintained that it does not change the doctrine of the Church of England, yet "by the dexterity of theological casuists innocent formulæ can be misinterpreted." He is strongly opposed to the permission of perpetual reservation and the proposal to leave it to the Church to frame from time to time rules governing the mode of reservation. The whole *cultus* of transubstantiation can be set going with the apparent consent of the Church. "The Church of England will thereby seem committed to a belief that spiritual properties can be given to material objects." It is unthinkable that even thirty years ago the Bishops would have allowed perpetual reservation. The present proposals are an attempt at compromise. They open the way for "the crude religious instincts of the Mediterranean peoples" which have found a place in "Catholicism."

The Bishop of Norwich on the Proposals.

The Bishop of Norwich has also expressed his strong disapproval of some of the proposals. Although approving of revision, he condemns its present form. The schools of thought in the Church are not complementary to one another: that is the ideal of the existing book. They are contrary. One school—tending rather to exclude than to include, looking backward rather than forward—speaks more loudly than any other. The present revision tends in this one direction. He condemns any alternative form of the

Prayer of Consecration. Those who uphold the new service tell us there is nothing in it but what is already to be found in the old. What reason can there be then for an alternative form? And an alternative is no true alternative, but a travesty, if it leaves out essential conceptions in the original. Even stronger is his condemnation of perpetual reservation. There would be much less talk about the necessity of reservation, he says, if the clergy for the sake of the sick would give up their rigid fast. It is clear, he adds, that if reservation is allowed, worship will be given to the Blessed Elements. One who believes either that the consecrated Bread and Wine are Christ Himself, or that in or under them He is presented, is by his very reverence for Christ bound to adore the Blessed Sacrament, however reserved. The new Prayer Book reintroduces into the Church of England something which all past experience shows must widely diffuse this cardinal error. He is therefore convinced that the doctrine of the Church of England is being altered, and he questions the statement of those who say that the new book does not change its teaching.

The Bishop of Exeter on the Fundamental Mistake.

The fundamental mistake underlying the revision has been a wrong aim. The Bishop of Exeter, who also disapproves of the proposed alternatives, points this out. He mentions the complex character of the book and the difficulties it will present to the members of an ordinary congregation. He then deals with the line of cleavage indicated. It was intended that the two services should appeal to two different parties in the Church, and this seems to him disastrous. It is a policy opposed to the purest ideals of Christianity. He says: "I felt that we were approaching the question from the wrong standpoint. We were considering too much the tastes and desires of this or that body of Churchpeople and were forgetting that there is only one consideration that is worthy to be entertained, namely, whether our worship is pleasing to our Saviour." "The new form," he adds, "brings us no nearer to peace with our Catholic brethren, while it digs deeper the trench which separates us from the Protestant Churches." Beside this striking statement may be placed the Bishop of Birmingham's equally emphatic declaration: "Not vague comprehensiveness, but loyalty to truth is the paramount necessity of sound religious progress." These statements of the Bishops indicate that even among themselves there are wide differences of opinion, and if the Bishop of Worcester's suggestion in *The Times*, that the account of the discussions on the various points should be published were adopted, we should probably find that much was accepted by the Bishops, not because it was regarded as sound doctrine, but for the sake of peace.

Will the Revision bring Peace?

The revision is intended to bring peace to the Church, but one of the chief questions is: Will it do so? From these statements of

the Bishops it is clear that the revision is intended to satisfy the claim of the Anglo-Catholic party for a more adequate expression of their views on the Real Presence of our Lord in or under the bread and wine of the Communion Service. This doctrine leads some of the extreme Anglo-Catholics on to demand the Reservation of the elements in order that they may pay adoration to Christ as present in them. This demand the Bishops have not met. They limit reservation to one purpose—communicating sick people who are unable to be present at the Communion Service. Will this limitation of the purpose of reservation satisfy those for whom the concession is made? There has been no evidence so far that they will be content with this. On several occasions a number of them have declared that they will be satisfied with nothing less than complete freedom to use the elements for purposes of devotion. There is no sign that they have abated this demand. We cannot see that if they hold this view of Christ's presence in the elements they can be expected to refrain from adoration, and from the imitation of the Romanists in their service of Benediction. It is apparent that there is no hope of peace in the Church if this doctrine, which was unacceptable even to the great Caroline divines, is held by any large section of the Church.

Eastern and Western Theories of Consecration.

Some discussion on the alternative form of the Prayer of Consecration has turned on the question whether it favours a Western or an Eastern theory of consecration. According to the Western theory the actual moment of consecration is when our Lord's words, "This is My Body" and "This is My Blood," are pronounced. The Eastern theory is that consecration takes place when the Holy Spirit is called down upon the elements. It is urged that one of the merits of the alternative form is that it is based on the Eastern theory, and that therefore is further removed from the view of the Church of Rome than our present form. The value of this discussion is based on the view that at some point in the prayer a change occurs in the elements, that at some point there is a Presence attached to them which was not there before. The best method of meeting these theories would be to go further back behind either Eastern or Western theory, and to ask with all reverence what was our Lord's theory on the evening of the original institution. It will then be seen that no importance attaches to either of the two conflicting theories, for the presence of our Lord on that occasion was not in any way attached to the elements. Above all, His risen, ascended and glorified humanity was not then connected with the elements. His presence was there in his capacity as President of His own Feast, and that is the sense in which we believe He is really present at every Communion Service, communicating Himself, i.e. the benefits of His death and passion, His fellowship through the Holy Spirit to those who in obedience to His command receive the appointed elements, with faith. There can be no greater gift in the Sacrament.

The Primitive Form of Consecration.

The prayer in the Scottish Communion Office has been brought forward as an example for our imitation. It has, however, been pointed out that when the proposal was made during the revision of the Canadian Prayer Book to introduce the Scottish form, it was rejected on the ground that "our own is better, because more scriptural, more primitive, more apostolic, more in keeping with the practice of the Early Church in its purest stage." We may add to this a statement of Dean Wace when this point was under consideration. He said: "Recent discoveries have tended to show that our present canon of consecration of Holy Communion is more primitive than the Roman, or than the primitive canons which were adopted by the Scottish and American Churches. In point of fact, the English reformers, with their extraordinary learning—far more learning than people supposed—really penetrated through the mists of ancient history, and have put into our present Prayer Book perhaps the most primitive form of consecration that ever existed. . . . Our present canon is perhaps the most primitive liturgy that exists." It is obvious that if we could get rid of the obsession of liturgiologists that some peculiar merit or scientific value attaches to the productions of the ages from about the fourth century onward, lovers of truth should be content to maintain the simpler and scriptural forms to which the great majority of Church-people are attached.

The Epiklesis and the Memorial.

The Committee of the Anglican Movement for the Maintenance of the Doctrine of the Church of England as Catholic and Reformed has issued a brief statement touching upon two points in the alternative consecration prayer—the Memorial before God the Father and the Epiklesis on "the gifts." They point out that neither of these has scriptural warrant. The wording of the memorial, they say, seems to give either an erroneous meaning to our Lord's word or to be equivocal. The Epiklesis for the first two centuries consisted solely of prayers for a descent of the Holy Spirit on the worshippers. "We have already such a prayer in the opening collect of the Service. In this position it is not only devotionally in the right place, but also cannot be associated with dubious teaching concerning the elements." It is difficult to form any intellectual conception of the significance of the Holy Spirit being called down upon the bread and wine. We have heard it urged as an analogy that the Holy Spirit is called down upon those who are presented for Confirmation. There is all the difference between bringing personality into contact with personality, and of bringing it into contact with inorganic matter. The same objection holds against the view that the presence of Christ in the elements is analogous to the Divine presence with humanity in the Incarnation. If our Lord had used any form of Epiklesis at the institution of the Sacrament, there is doubt that it would have found a place in the earliest liturgies.

The Best Course of Action.

The chief aim of the proposals is clearly to bring the Anglo-Catholics into line and to give the Bishops power to enforce obedience. It is said that they will be able to require the observance of regulations made in the twentieth century. They cannot demand it for those of the seventeenth century. We are inclined to agree with the Bishop of Norwich that obedience will only be the outcome of a new spirit among the clergy, and there is no sign of its appearance yet among those whom the Bishops desire to conciliate. In view of these facts the opinion of many is that in order to secure for the Church the useful elements of the revision, the book should be divided. Large portions of it are uncontroversial and these would be gladly accepted by all sections of the Church. The alternative Communion Service and the permission of Reservation are the chief matters of controversy. It does not seem impracticable to secure the omission of these and the adoption of a large portion of the Composite Book. Evangelical Churchpeople would probably be compelled to strain conscience to the utmost limit to accept some of the proposals that remain, but we believe that they would be prepared to do so if in this way the objection could be removed that the rejection of the new book means the loss of the work of twenty years on revision and the continuance of the present lawlessness unchecked. We may add that we are not impressed by the frequent statement that the new forms are merely permissive and not compulsory. Once they are accepted, experience shows that the old will be largely ignored in favour of the new, and the tendency will be to secure the return to a single form, which will mean the complete rejection of the old.

The Centenary of the Islington Clerical Meeting.

The celebration of the centenary of the Islington Clerical Meeting was an event of importance in the history of the Evangelical School. It cannot be allowed to pass without special notice. It marks a stage in the course of a movement in the Church which has left its mark for good on the life of the nation. We have no desire to occupy the place of a mere *laudator temporis acti*, but Evangelical Churchpeople are apt to do an injustice both to their predecessors and to themselves in not recognizing fully the strength of their position as true interpreters of the teaching and practice of the Church of England, and in neglecting to pay due tribute to the memory of those who have in the past stood for the great and undying principles of Evangelicalism. It is easy to point out the faults and failures of the past. Many of them are attributed to the Evangelicals when fuller knowledge would show that they were shared by all sections of the Church. It is therefore with special pleasure that we are able to offer our readers in this number of THE CHURCHMAN Archdeacon Buckland's admirable vindication of the character and influence of the Evangelical Churchmen of the past. Let us not forget Lord Macaulay's classical utterance: "A

people which takes no pride in the noble achievements of remote ancestors will never achieve anything worthy to be remembered with pride by remote descendants."

The Larger View.

At the meeting of the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches held recently in Birmingham, Professor Carnegie Simpson, of Westminster College, Cambridge, gave a striking confirmation of the claim that "the 'Evangelical' as distinct from the so-called 'Catholic' view is the larger and more comprehensive view of Christianity." He claimed that "Evangelicalism," so far from being narrow in its range and limited in its outlook, presents a more adequate and Christ-like system of salvation for the souls of men than the "Catholic system" does; that it has a less limited view of the Universal Church; and that it has a wider and better idea of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. He illustrated this last point by a reference to the demand of the Anglo-Catholics for the "Reservation of the Sacrament." They desire Reservation because they say our Lord is present in the consecrated elements, which can be reserved, and under which He can be adored. Without entering into controversial points as to the error and danger of this view, he said "their view is not large enough; Christ is present, as I hope we all believe, in His own ordinance. Yes, but that is in the Sacrament. Now the elements are not the Sacrament. They are but a bit of it. The part is not the whole. The very expression, 'the Reservation of the Sacrament,' is not correct. The Bishops should not have used it as they do, at least in a rubric, because it is simply not accurate. You do not reserve the Sacrament. You cannot."

The Evangelical Teaching on the True Presence.

He goes on to point out that "the Sacrament in any right and reasonable view of the term is the whole action, and is a company of faithful people in the Church celebrating in a duly authorized manner the whole act which the Lord instituted. The elements are not the Sacrament, but a part of it. As Evangelicals we stand for the larger view—the view of Christ, not in the part, but in the whole. I would let a man hold almost as "High" a view as he likes about Christ's presence in the Sacrament, but a man stands for the smaller view when he says that the presence is to be located in this material part of the Sacrament." He described those who held this view as "quite literally and simply Elementarians." The Evangelical is the larger view. These are truths that require to be emphasized by Evangelical Churchpeople. They have too long appeared to acquiesce in the well-fostered opinion that there is something superior in the Catholicism which finds its model in Rome. It is important, in view of the conflict that is inevitable between the two conceptions of Christianity, that the Evangelical view should be given its full significance and its proper place as a complete and adequate inter-

pretation of the teaching of our Lord and of any legitimate developments that can be drawn from it. The history of the Christian Church shows the constant tendency that there is to fall away from the highest and most spiritual interpretation and to fall back upon what has rightly been described as the sub-Christian.

Editorial Note.

The attention of Churchpeople is mainly occupied at the present time with the Bishops' proposals for the revision of the Prayer Book. We have therefore devoted considerable space in this issue of THE CHURCHMAN to some of the chief points in the Composite Book. The article on "Three Prayer-Book Revisions" is a brief survey and comparison of some points in the recent Irish and Canadian revisions. It is by a writer well qualified to deal with the balance of doctrine as illustrated in past and present revisions. We hope that the information brought together by him will be found useful in forming a judgment on the features of the new book. We have already referred to the appropriateness of Archdeacon Buckland's historical review of the Evangelical school of thought in connection with the centenary of the Islington Clerical Meeting. The recent decision in the Marlborough case gives point to the discussion of "The Roman Church and the Annulment of Marriage," by the Rev. Alfred Fawkes. He deals with some of the claims made by the Roman Church, and their effect on national and social life. Canon J. B. Lancelot's study of "St. Paul at Athens" will interest Bible students in a subject which has given rise to a wide variety of opinions. An article on the true significance of the Reformation is specially useful at the present time when questions are raised as to the value to be given to the great movement of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and its influence upon the Church life and thought of today. A layman's view is of special value. Mr. L. H. Booth's careful estimate of "Some Aspects of the Reformation" will be found a fresh and accurate study. The movements in Australia, which have culminated in the recent decisions of the General Synod of the Australian Church, ought to be of interest to English Churchpeople. The Rev. W. H. Irwin, of St. Peter's College, Adelaide, writes of them with intimate personal knowledge and gives an explanation of the attitude of Evangelical Churchmen in Australia towards the Nexus. We have endeavoured to give our readers an account of some of the most important books recently published.

"Friendly Talks with Thinking Young People" is a series of penny booklets issued by the Church Association to supply teaching on the Bible, Prayer Book and the Reformation. The latest numbers are on *Our English Bible: How We Got It*; *Two Brave Englishmen (Bishops Ridley and Latimer)*; *A Simple Talk about Holy Communion*; *Pray to the Virgin Mary? Surely Not*. The writer is the Rev. F. G. Llewellyn, M.A., B.D., Vicar of Kidgrove.

ISLINGTON AND THE APPEAL TO HISTORY.

BY THE VEN. A. R. BUCKLAND, Archdeacon of Norfolk.

WITH some of us first memories of the Islington Clerical Meeting carry us back to a small gathering, mainly of older men, collected in a stuffy, not over-clean room down a by-street near the Parish Church. Our earliest memories of the Chairman are of Daniel Wilson the Second, shrouded in a heavy overcoat, brooding over the assembly in what, to some of us younger men, seemed a stern and almost discouraging fashion. Probably our judgment was at fault. But memories of those Meetings must often with many have thrown into happy and reassuring contrast the gatherings of later days. With no one of them could the contrast have seemed greater than with the Meeting of this present year. For in a spirit of confidence, void of boasting or of bitterness, it looked back upon the past hundred years and claimed their witness as sure ground of hope. The survey was worth making, and if here that survey is in some parts extended, it is only in order to draw out more fully the claim of Evangelical Churchmanship to have rendered high service to the nation as well as the Church at a most critical period in the history of both.

The survey made this year had a domestic as well as an external value. It had a domestic value, a lesson for all allied in organization or sympathy with the Evangelical school. For there have been times and quarters in which men of Evangelical convictions have very inadequately presented their own case. They have spoken and written in terms which have led the careless to suppose that the one claim of the Evangelical School to a place, and a place of honour, within the Church of England lay in its steadfast adherence to a certain theological position, to principles of belief and practice settled at the Reformation, and to a whole-hearted repudiation of the claims of Rome. No doubt this theological position stands in the forefront of Evangelical claims. By it the Evangelical school is marked off sharply from at least one other school within the Church. But the defence of this position is not a claim which stands by itself. On the contrary, it gains its force from the fact that it has always been allied with an eager, passionate concern for the souls of men; with well-ordered zeal for the extension far and near of Christ's Kingdom; with a just concern for the well-being and progress of our own Church. All of this is very plainly witnessed to in the sermon and in the addresses of this year's Meeting; and their emphasis on the general as well as the particular claims of the Evangelical School will weigh with many who may have been touched by the popular disposition to make less of theological distinctions and more of the witness borne by life and work.

Again, it has been too much the habit of some Low Churchmen to regard their party as one which has always been an obscure,

despised and isolated body of men. It looks as though they had all but forgotten the men and women of parts and learning,¹ of position and of social influence identified with the earlier history of the Evangelical Revival. They can hardly have remembered that there was a time when observers might have been forgiven for thinking that the Evangelicals would dominate the Church. They may have forgotten the later prospect that, when Newman went over to Rome, the Evangelicals would carry the whole country with them; when, as Mr. Benn reminds us,² "they counted a fair number of intellectual and scholarly writers among their number, such as Sir James Stephen, Isaac Taylor, Henry Rogers and Robert Alfred Vaughan. Contributions from these began to appear in the *Edinburgh*, formerly notorious for its veiled scepticism; at their head stood the most philanthropic statesman of the age, Lord Ashley; and the most resplendent literary genius of the new generation, John Ruskin, had been nursed on their tenets." They must have overlooked that interesting phase in the life of the Church when the choice of Bishops was supposed to reflect the wishes of Lord Shaftesbury. They may never have noted the bitter complaints, heard, for example, in the seventies and eighties of the last century, that there were dioceses in which no High Churchmen need look for advancement. The causes of this misapprehension are not obscure. For many years there were foolish prelates who harried clergy known or assumed to be "Methodist." Their follies are remembered, whilst the policy of others who sympathized with the Revival is forgotten. Moreover, the teaching and life of Evangelicals rebuked in plain terms the materialism and levity of much in the world around them. It was easy to hit back; to jeer at the strain of Puritanism that marked their conduct, and to mock at the language—something, perhaps, of a pose in the case of many who used it—which employed familiar words in new and surprising senses. But all this did not of necessity mean that the Evangelicals were either few, feeble or without honour.

Once more, as years went on, the defenders of the School sometimes talked as though, apart from the theological position, it was the foreign missionary enterprise which gave the party its chief claim to attention. It is needless here to dwell on the value of that enterprise. No one familiar with the history and inner working of modern missions can fail to see that it has been of value beyond the ranks of its own supporters; that it has served as a stimulus to other organizations beyond the limits of our own Church. But, whilst keeping this in mind, we should be unjust to our own past if we did not remember the zeal and organizing ability thrown into work at home, work social as well as spiritual, work which will ever associate the history of the Evangelical School with public philanthropy not less than personal piety.

¹ For a list of men of high academic distinction closely identified with the Evangelical Revival see a useful little work recently issued, *Evangelical By-Paths*, by Alfred Leedes Hunt (Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd.), pp. 19, 20.

² *English Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century*, ii. 17.

But the survey made at Islington this year had also an external value. There is a large body of religious feeling in England which does not ally itself with any school of thought. It includes men of distinction and of high office in the Church. It includes laymen of intelligence and character in every walk of life. And beyond these there lies a still larger body of persons holding no definite religious belief and yet with no definite hostility to belief. Now the long-continued allegations or suggestions of extreme Anglicans have created in many minds curiously perverted views both of Church and of national history. In one quarter you may find a vague impression that the revival of religious life amongst us began with the Oxford Movement; in another that zeal for the Kingdom of God, zeal for the Church, and zeal in good works have always been and still are more conspicuous amongst High Churchmen than Low Churchmen; in a third, that extreme Anglicans are the only progressive party, and that the Evangelical position is solely one of protest and resistance. Of course one need not dwell on the fact that such misapprehensions find no countenance in the works of sober and responsible historians, whatever their school of thought. By them the solid worth of Evangelical life and effort, whether in the eighteenth or nineteenth century, is never denied nor minimized. But their works hardly reach the public amongst which these misconceptions have been so diligently propagated. The Islington papers may encourage a wider diffusion of the facts, and so lead to a more just apprehension of what the Evangelical School has done for the nation as well as the Church.

They may be helpful also in another way. Principal Tulloch once wrote that "the Evangelical School, with all its merits, had conceived Christianity rather as something superadded to the highest life of humanity than as the proper development of that life. . . . Philosophy, literature, art and science were conceived apart from religion."¹ Without accepting the terms in which Professor Tulloch states his view, we can still see the defect at which he aimed his shaft. There long seemed to lurk amongst Evangelicals a tendency to aloofness from intellectual pursuits, a vague apprehension that there was something "carnal" about them, a dread lest, if indulged in, they should come between the man and God. Ability, unless it would conform absolutely in thought, and perhaps even in diction, was suspect. Incompetence was at least competent to hint a doubt whether this man or that was "sound." As a result of this the School has no doubt failed to bring into intimate relations with its own organizations and work many men of capacity, who in all essentials of creed and conduct were entirely at one with it. The platform of the Islington Clerical Meeting has, upon occasion, been so enlarged as to ensure their participation; but in the main they had not, until quite recent times, found encouragement to join forces with the main body. This year's meeting had characteristics which suggest a growing tendency to comprehension without sacrifice of old and cherished convictions.

¹ Quoted by Overton, *Anglican Revival*, p. 216.

Upon one more point the sermon and papers should help to correct misrepresentations. It has been very freely stated that between the High Churchman and the Low Churchman there has always existed a fundamental distinction, in that High Churchmen were collectivists and Low Churchmen individualists; that the one School stood for the truth that God purchased to Himself a Universal Church by the precious blood of His dear Son, whilst the other lived absorbed in the task of seeking the individual soul's salvation. It would be easy to quote statements made in one direction or the other which would lend colour to this assumption. Nor will it be denied that in some quarters there has been much talk about "Mother Church" in terms which repelled rather than attracted. But is it anywhere written in the history of the Evangelical School that they forgot or were indifferent to the existence of Christ's Church as a whole? Would not their policy in many details point to a wider conception of that Church than has been prevalent amongst some of their critics? And, if it be concern for their own Church's welfare that is required, are not the very faults imputed to them a proof of most zealous concern for its purity and progress? Let us by all means admit a stress upon the value of the individual soul; but that by no means implies disloyalty to any view of Christ's Church sanctioned by Holy Scripture, or by the formularies of the Church itself. Assuredly no candid reader of the Islington sermon and papers will find therein support for the old assumption. High regard for the truth of the Church Universal and for our own Church within it is there, but no hint or suggestion of such gross and unworthy individualism as would leave the true believer lonely, isolated, without relation to or tie with others in Christ.

One more point is suggested by the papers. Popular views of Church history often fail to mark the relation of movements to each other. Thus by some the Evangelical Revival will be thought of as though it stood an isolated and entirely independent fact in history. By others the Oxford Movement will be looked at in just the same way. But neither the one nor the other can be separated from things that went before it or things that came after. The Evangelical Revival followed a period in which brilliant and lasting work had been done by English theologians in the field of Christian apologetics. They had put to flight the armies of the adversary. But their triumph could not take the form of a popular victory. They wrote for reading and thoughtful men; they did not touch the general public. The unlearned masses knew nothing of them, though they may have gathered some few anti-Christian watchwords from the popular works of lesser men. Then came the Revival. Here was appeal not to the mind but the heart. Here was approach not to the leisured or the learned or the speculative alone, but a voice bidding all men repent. The Revival put into active work the truths re-established and vindicated anew by the learned. By the grace of God it extended and made effective what otherwise had reached only the few. In like manner there is a visible link between the Evangelical Revival and the Oxford

Movement. It is seen not only in the fact that the truths taught by the one were held first by some of those who led the other; it is seen also in the influence of Evangelical effort on the minds of High Churchmen, who also desired new life in the Church and nation; it may, perhaps, be found in the just antagonism of the early Tractarians to any form of rationalism and to their growing apprehension of the dangers threatened by reason to faith. That these apprehensions extended even to published views of Pusey himself is often overlooked.¹

It may, then, be felt that the Meeting of 1927 has pointed the way to a wider realization of what the Evangelical Revival and Evangelical Churchmanship have done for the nation and for the Church. If that be so, more weight may justly be given to their influence during the Georgian period, to the effect which the teaching and practice of the early Evangelicals must have had during the stormy period of the French Revolution, and all through the long, dark years of our protracted struggle with France. It is admitted that the rise and growth of the Evangelical Movement gave new life to the Church, increased its efficiency and extended its influence. As Mr. Lecky has said, "The Evangelicals gradually changed the whole spirit of the English Church. They infused into it a new fire and passion of devotion, raised the standard of clerical duty, and completely altered the whole tone and tendency of the preaching of its ministers."² Is it to be supposed that all this went on without influence upon the general life of the nation; that it was no more than an ecclesiastical movement which left the world around it untouched and untroubled? On the contrary, is it not a fact that, long before the Islington Meeting came into existence, the Evangelicals—and notably those in open allegiance with the Church—had done much to create a higher moral tone in all classes; had at least in some measure shamed profligacy in life and coarseness in literature; had aroused a new sympathy with the poor, the ignorant, the afflicted; had remembered the sorrowful sighing of the captive; had indeed given an impulse towards works of practical philanthropy, which, coming as they did in an age of brutality and self-pleasing, amaze us by their courage? Bishop Butler who, in 1751, deplored the "general decay of religion in the nation," thought that the influence of the Christian faith was "wearing out of the minds of men." That it did not "wear out," that, on the contrary, the religious life of the nation had by 1827 become more real, more zealous, more fruitful, must surely be traceable in no small degree to the work of the Evangelical Churchmen.

But whilst the origin of the Islington Clerical Meeting does not mark the beginning of Evangelical power or usefulness, it does focus attention on the opening of a period in which again the school of thought or party was to render essential service to the nation and the Church. Candid historians agree that the earlier

¹ Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, I. viii, *passim*; xi. p. 254.

² *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, III. Chap. viii, pp. 134, 135. And *cf.* VII, Chap. xxi, p. 353.

years of George the Fourth's reign found the Church in a far stronger position as to work and influence than it had held in the preceding century. But, despite this, it is also certain that those years found the Church, in regard to her association with the State, in a position of far greater peril. It was, no doubt, a peril that threatened not the Church only, but also the Throne and the Constitution. It may very well be that the rising tide of animosity against the Church found its chief impulse not in any peculiar or restricted enmity against religion in general or a Church in particular, but in the wide-spread ferment manifest in the political and social life of the time. The very horrors of the French Revolution may have checked the tendency to revolutionary thought in Great Britain, but they had not made revolutionary thought powerless amongst us. The financial stress which followed the crowning mercy of Waterloo and the establishment of peace brought with it difficulties closely corresponding with those through which we have passed since the year 1918. Agriculture suffered heavily. Farmers, who had sucked no small advantage out of the country's necessities in time of war, found themselves confronted by ruin. Between January 1819 and July 1822 the price of wheat fell from 74s. to 43s. a quarter, and beef from 4s. 6d. to 2s. 5d. a stone. The fall, which brought relief to the wage-earner, spelled ruin to the farmer and heavy loss to the landlord. In 1833 a Parliamentary Committee had evidence that the landlords had lost £9,000,000 by reduction of rents, and that in parts of Kent and Sussex no tenant farmer was solvent. In the towns unemployment was rife. The close of the war had not brought the desired demand for the products of our factories, for impoverished peoples had neither the cash nor the credit with which to buy them. In the winter of 1825-26 a commercial crisis—in which Bank failures were counted by the hundreds,—intensified the hardships of the time. Poverty—hard, grinding, cruel poverty, unrelieved by the merciful if costly provisions of later days—cried out for relief. Men in their misery drank in readily enough the promise of a new earth to be won by drastic reform of Church and State. To those who know how, even in our own days, the minds of simple folk will accept promises the most fantastic, if made with sufficient verbosity and ardour upon the village-green or in the local tap-room, it will be no surprise to find that, years later than 1827, the passage of the first Reform Bill was accepted as surety for the most sweeping changes in social life. Lord Malmesbury has told us that when that Bill was before Parliament, in 1831, "Servants left their places, feeling sure that somehow they need never serve again. Marriages were put off until the great redemption of the poor was effected."¹

Is it too much to believe that at such a time the sobering and restraining influence of a body of Evangelical Churchpeople, masters as well as men, must have been of high advantage to the State? It may have been that in them alone was there found any firm faith in the Church's future. In quarters strangely contrasted the outlook

¹ *Memoirs of an Ex-Minister*, i, 38.

was deemed hopeless. T. Mozley believed that "the Church of England was folding its robe to die with what dignity it could." Joseph Hume assured the House of Commons that the Church was "a body condemned by the country" whose "charter was on the eve of being cancelled by the authority that gave it." Lord Grey, coming into office, warned the Bishops that they must "set their house in order." *The Times*, in October, 1831, exasperated by episcopal opposition towards the Reform Bill, plaintively asked "what business" the Bishops had "in Parliament at all," advising them to restrict their superintendence to "the souls of the faithful, and let them begin with their own." Within the Church, Connop Thirlwall wrote of it as "powerless for any good, and at the utmost only able to preserve itself from ruin." Outside the Church, Thomas Binney, an honoured light of Nonconformity, gave it as his "serious religious conviction that the Established Church is a great national evil; that it is an obstacle to the progress of truth and godliness in the land." These melancholy forebodings found encouragement in disturbing manifestations of popular feeling. The Archbishop of Canterbury, during the ferment of early reform movements, was insulted in his own cathedral city. The life of the Bishop of Lichfield was threatened. The palace of the Bishop of Bristol was fired by a mob. Truly there was need of such restraining influence as Evangelicals within the Church could provide.

If it be asked why they did not do more, an answer may be found in the general condition of the Church at that time. There was no lack of abuses that might be employed to inflame the popular mind. The large revenues of most of the prelates and the state in which they lived invited the resentment of a distressed proletariat. Durham, when reform of the Church itself drew near, had a yearly income of £19,480; Canterbury of £18,090; London of £13,890. At that time these were enormous revenues. Moreover, the Bishops were amongst the worst of pluralists, usually holding a good deal of well-chosen preferment in addition to their sees. Majendie, Bishop of Bangor, who died in 1830, held eleven benefices. Great Henry of Exeter (no friend, by the way, to reform) sought, on going to his Bishopric, to retain the Rectory of Stanhope and his stall at Durham, each worth about £5,000 a year. It is little wonder that some prelates left great wealth to their progeny, who, if in holy orders, had usually received other manifest tokens of their approval. Nor was a touching solicitude for the advancement of clerical sons-in-law altogether unknown. Unhappily, it could not be said that it was the financial side of episcopacy that alone invited criticism. Whilst some prelates—of whom Stanley, on going to Norwich, was a good example—worked with wisdom, energy and resolution, others grossly neglected their duty and rarely stayed in their dioceses. Bagot, the predecessor of Wilberforce at Oxford, ordained men whom he met for the first time at the service. When Wilberforce went to the diocese an innkeeper sought compensation because candidates for holy orders no longer attended a ball he had been accustomed to give at the Ember seasons. Some Bishops

held only one Confirmation in the year, and pronounced the words with the imposition of hands once for the whole company of candidates. Possibly by way of compensation the wife of one prelate gave a dance for the newly confirmed. Of the general condition of the clergy at this time it is needless to write in detail. Amongst others, R. W. Church¹ has depicted with candour the position amongst the beneficed clergy, not sparing the faults of "its worst members." With the times when the Islington meeting took its rise the social status of the clergy had improved, and there were not wanting holy and humble men of heart, outside as well as within the Evangelical School, whose patient toil and honoured lives shamed the worldliness and slackness of many neighbours. But here, too, there were scandals that supplied the Church's opponents with an inexhaustible store of ammunition. Non-residence, the inevitable outcome of extended pluralism, was rampant. A Return to the House of Lords in 1807 had shown that of the 11,164 parishes in England and Wales only 4,412 had resident clergy. When Stanley went to Norwich in 1837 there were 500 beneficed clergy in his diocese who did not live in their parishes, and nearly 500 churches in which only one service was provided on Sunday. The contrast in the value of benefices was far greater than it is to-day. In 1832 there were 4,361 livings worth less than £150 a year. London, Lancashire and Yorkshire held parishes with populations of 20,000 or more, the incomes of which were about £150. By way of contrast there were rural parishes of small populations with £3,000, £4,000, and even £7,000 a year. In the face of these anomalies some Bishops sat unmoved. Others did not. Blomfield, who went to London in 1828, later on contrasted the spiritual destitution of Bethnal Green with the position of St. Paul's, then almost valueless to the diocese or the Church, with its "Dean and three Residentiaries with incomes amounting in the aggregate to between £10,000 and £12,000 a year," and, in addition, "twenty-nine clergymen whose offices were all but sinecures" sharing between them an income nearing £12,000 a year.

Another scandal, which by deference to the sacred rights of property has survived in a truncated form to this day, flaunted itself unrestrained and unrebuked. Advowsons were advertised and disposed of at public auction with eloquent allusion to their amenities and none to spiritual responsibility. As late as 1877 it was computed that of the 7,000 saleable livings, 2,000 were in the market. The proportion was doubtless greater in 1827; the prices perhaps lower. In the 'seventies £16,000 was asked for a Yorkshire advowson; £11,000 for one in Lancashire; and £9,300 for (save as to income) an unattractive living in the Fens. But with the birth of the reform movement a further difficulty came into prominence. Nonconformity, vexed by religious disabilities now happily removed, found in the making of church rates a popular ground of hostility to the Church. Resistance took the form of organized refusal to pay. Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds

¹ *The Oxford Movement*, p. 10.

and Rochdale were the scenes of vigorous campaigns. But it is significant that although the first Church Rates Abolition Bill was introduced into the Commons in 1834, Mr. Gladstone's final measure did not pass until 1868.

In the face of conditions such as these—and it would be easy to enlarge the catalogue of the Church's ailments and sorrows—most observers will marvel at its escape from the threatened chastisement of disestablishment and disendowment. We may, in simple faith, set down our conviction that the Church came through these perils because God had work for her to do which needed whatever strength might be drawn from union with the State and from the use of great possessions. But we are bound to seek for the human agencies employed to secure this end. Is it unreasonable to suppose that the new period of deeper personal conviction, of greater parochial activity, of fresh zeal for the extension of Christ's kingdom abroad, of righteous endeavour to grapple with outstanding evils at home, laid some restraint upon clamour for the Church's downfall? Is it idle to suppose that, had there been no Evangelical Revival, no "Methodists" inside as well as outside the Church, no such men as John Venn and Daniel Wilson in parochial life, the verdict of the country might have gone against her? Is it conceivable that the heavy and complicated task of Church Reform could, in the then temper of the people at large, have been carried through if there had been no forces within the Church which compelled respect and invited confidence in a purged and reorganized Establishment? It is unnecessary to assume—it would be false to history as well as charity to assume—that all the righteousness and all the zeal lay within one party in the Church. There had been a Clapton sect as well as a Clapham sect. If on the one side there were men like Henry Thornton, on the other there were men like the father of E. B. Pusey. If there were dignitaries who took a line against "Methodism" in the Church, there were others who gave it countenance. Admittedly there were, as Reform demands grew most insistent, quiet, steady-going, truly earnest High Churchmen of the old School. But their lives and their labours rarely touched the public imagination and never created any enthusiasm for the cause they upheld. On the other hand, the impression left by the history of the period justifies belief that the Évangelicals, whatever their defects, had widely and definitely influenced the public mind. That surely must have been the influence which was used to the advantage of the Church and the preservation of its status when the storm rose high against it.

But whilst so much may fairly be inferred from history, the position has not everywhere been understood. In some quarters a vague impression seems to have prevailed and may still prevail that the salvation of the Church at this crisis was due to the Oxford Movement. It seems to be forgotten that the origin of the Movement can hardly be placed earlier than the point fixed by Newman—the delivery of Keble's assize sermon in July, 1833. But it created no great interest until the appearance of the Tract on

Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge, and no general hostility until the publication of Tract 90 in 1841. So far as any widespread influence on the public mind is concerned, the Movement had no existence for some years after the storm against the Church reached its height. Its most powerful agents in its early days were Newman's sermons at St. Mary's, without which, as Church held,¹ "the movement might never have gone on, certainly would never have been what it was." But whilst Newman—still retaining much of his original Evangelical zeal—was profoundly influencing a group of able and devout men at Oxford, it will hardly be pretended that he was changing the current of thought amongst the general public and influencing the man in the street. Most of his followers were young, and some of the hardest workers for the Movement in later years were still in their childhood. When Daniel Wilson went to Islington in 1826, Newman himself was only twenty-five; Pusey, at twenty-six, had gone to Germany for theological study; Richard Hurrell Froude, just becoming Fellow of Exeter, was twenty-three; Hugh James Rose was thirty-one; and Isaac Williams twenty-four. R. W. Church was a boy of eleven; Charles Marriott was sixteen; Manning, the future Cardinal, was eighteen; G. A. Denison was twenty-one and at Christ Church; W. F. Hook was a young Lecturer at Birmingham.² Moreover, no one could allege that the Movement, for long after its birth, enlisted public interest on the Church's side. On the contrary it suggested new lines of assault, and mightily encouraged the adversary. Those of us whose memories go back to the 'sixties of the last century can remember that even then the existence of "Puseyism" in the Church was a favourite weapon in the hands of her critics, and deemed a very present help in the task of winning her downfall. If that were so in the 'sixties, how can it have been a means of gently disposing to better ways an excited popular mind in the days when its pretensions were novel, or in the years when one man of prominence after another followed his convictions to their legitimate end and went over to Rome? But just as in some quarters devices and devotions of the Middle Ages are referred to "primitive" usage or teaching, so the later prosperity and influence of Anglo-Catholicism is ante-dated to the years when the Oxford Movement was struggling for bare existence.

Here, then, we may leave the retrospect suggested by the sermon and papers of the Islington Meetings. It may, perhaps, lend some further support to the plea of Bishop Chavasse that men who are tempted to lose heart may discover "a great cordial to low spirits" in "Church history during the last hundred or hundred and fifty years." Assuredly it will confirm the Bishop's claim that "an overruling hand has guided us through every tempest; has given us light in darkness, and brought good out of evil." Wherefore the wise will, with him, "thank God and take courage."

¹ *The Oxford Movement*, p. 129.

² Bishop Charles Wordsworth held that the Movement "was from the first too much in the hands of young men." *Annals of My Early Life*, p. 342.

THE ROMAN CHURCH AND THE ANNULMENT OF MARRIAGE.

BY THE REV. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., Vicar of Ashby St. Ledgers.

1. **T**HE recent decision of the Supreme Court of Appeal in the Roman Catholic Church known as the Rota in the much-discussed Marlborough case has two sides, a private and a public. On the former, it concerns only the parties to the suit. As these persons were divorced in 1920, in so far as the Nullity decree does no more than give ecclesiastical confirmation to the liberty of re-marriage granted by the Divorce Court, it may be held that substantial justice has been done. It is the latter side of the case, the public, which is a matter of general interest. The Roman Catholic Church is so world-wide and so important a body that the larger bearings of its decisions cannot be regarded as affecting its members only; they concern the community as a whole.

2. The question of Divorce *a vinculo*, i.e., Divorce which carries with it the right of re-marriage, has been definitely settled in the negative by the Roman Catholic Church. Even, however, in the Ages of Faith its marriage law was never more than an aspiration: in lawless times it was defied, in settled times it was evaded. It was here, indeed, as it was with the parallel case of the celibacy of the clergy; in proportion as nominal values were inflated, real values declined. It was impossible to impose submission; nor did the attempt to do so have the result of raising the moral standard: those who would make marriage, in Selden's phrase, "a desperate thing," are not its best friends. "The frogs in Æsop," he says, "were extreme wise: they had a great mind to some water; but they would not leap into the well, because they could not get out again."¹ The practical wisdom of the Popes found a way out of the difficulty by the expedient of Declarations of Nullity, which could be obtained easily enough by important persons or for political purposes. Nor were coarser methods of escape wanting: in 1530 Henry VIII's agent at Rome wrote to him—"A few days ago the Pope (Clement VII) secretly proposed to me that your Majesty should be allowed two wives."² There are persons of repute among ourselves who are simple enough to take the rigorism of Rome at its surface value, and to regard it with admiration. When an English Bishop expressed himself in this sense before a recent Royal Commission, "I observe, my Lord," said a Scottish judge, "that you approve of the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church that marriage is indissoluble. May I ask you whether you also approve of the *subterfuges* to which this Church notoriously has recourse when it wishes to evade the rigour of the law?" Such subterfuges are apt to recoil on those who employ them—with disastrous effect.

¹ *Table Talk*, LXXXIV.

² *Henry VIII*, A. F. Pollard, p. 216.

3. In the well-known lines for the Commemoration of Gunpowder Treason, the *Christian Year*, referring to the Church of Rome, bids us "Speak gently of our sister's fall." We would gladly do so. But she *does* make it difficult! The Gunpowder Plot is ancient history: and if, remembering the *Strages Ugonottorum* medal struck by Gregory XIII on the occasion of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, we wonder whether, had things gone differently on that memorable Fifth of November, 1605, the Papal mint would not have issued another with the inscription *Strages Anglorum*—well, it would be an endless task to determine the *ifs* of history; and we live in milder times. But we have left the horizons of the *Christian Year* behind us. Anglo-Ultramontanes no longer speak, gently or otherwise, of "our sister's fall"; the fall, they tell us, is on our side. "With her authoritative beliefs most English Catholics have no quarrel: and, if it is merely a question of local corruptions the Church of Rome can show no such corruptions as, from a Catholic point of view, are only too common in the Church of England."¹ The example given is Evening Communion.

Risum teneatis amici!

So that the aspiration of the Lyra Apostolica—

"O that thy creed were sound!

For thou dost soothe the heart, thou Church of Rome,"

is out of date. For we are assured that this creed is, in substance, our own. Efforts are now being made to express this identity of substance in identity of form. We are, it seems, to have a Revised and Amended Prayer Book; and, though the contracting parties appear to be reckoning without their hosts, Parliament and the Pope respectively, certain negotiations between Anglican and Roman Bishops have been, and are said to be still, in process at Malines.

4. To be out of sympathy with these novel features of English religious life is to write oneself down a Victorian. "Jones is sixty." Well, a man is not necessarily a fool at sixty; and he may be one at a less advanced age. What is a Victorian? I am tempted to describe him as a person who believes, and is not ashamed of believing, that two and two are four. Those who do so find the Marlborough case disconcerting. What can be said for a Church which, while it boasts of its refusal to admit divorce by the front door, lets it in, thinly disguised, by the back? The allegiance even of Roman Catholics has been tried. One, writing to *The Times*, signs himself "Bewildered"; another says, "Many Catholic heads are aching, including my own":—though he subsequently withdrew his remonstrance in terms which can only be described as abject, "in view of a communication which he received," we are not told to what effect or from whom. A third, in a letter to a friend,— "It horrifies me. Surely it will arrest conversions?" And again, in an objection which goes to the root of the matter: "they are destroying marriage by way of denying divorce; the defence is worse than the deed."

¹ *The Catholic Movement in the Church of England*, Rev. W. L. Knox, p. 248.

5. On the question of the indissolubility of marriage English opinion is not inclined to rigorism. It regards divorce as an evil ; but as being, under certain circumstances, the lesser of two evils. This attitude was that of the wisest of English Bishops, Bishop Thirlwall.

" I am, indeed, persuaded that in a community regulated by the pure mind and will of Christ, marriage would invariably be held indissoluble. But I am not equally satisfied that all the precepts which would be binding on such a community are likewise applicable to one placed in circumstances so widely different as are those of our age and nation, or were intended to be universally enforced by legislative authority. I am afraid that whatever 'hardness of heart' warranted a relaxation of their rigour under the Mosaic dispensation may be found in an equal degree in modern English society ; and the question how it may best be treated is one of prudence rather than of principle." ¹

But by the Roman Catholic Church the matter is held to have been once for all decided by our Lord's well-known words, repeated, though with an important variation, by each of the Synoptic writers, and by the general practice of the Church. This rigorism undoubtedly leads to hard cases ; and if a Church which is committed to it strains her own laws to meet such cases, and interprets the "diriment" impediments to matrimony in a large sense—well, it may be better to do so than to refuse relief. But casuistry of this sort has its dangers ; in the present case suspicion has been excited and scandal caused. Its aspect of "millionairism" is, to say the least, unfortunate ; the question is being asked on all sides, "*How* were the authorities squared?" For in Italy the decrees of nullity granted by the Church Courts are not taken seriously ; it is believed, rightly or wrongly, that by hard cash and hard swearing the matter can be arranged. A general proposition is not identical with a universal ; there are, no doubt, cases in which such suspicions would be out of place. But, even in reference to a secular tribunal, they would not be thought either so improbable or so discreditable to those concerned, as here. An Englishman, living in Sicily, and acting as agent for a London firm owning property in that island, used to tell the following story. An action was taken in the local tribunal against this firm, and the Sicilian lawyer employed advised that the Court should be "personally approached." The agent communicated this advice to the partners, and received a reply from the firm to the effect that they could not lend themselves to so nefarious a proceeding. The senior partner, however, wrote by the same post instructing him to take whatever steps were necessary. He did so ; with the result desired. And the Roman Rota, great as is its name and universal as is its jurisdiction, does not command the confidence of those who live under its shadow and may be presumed to be best acquainted with its methods and procedure. "Nay, my sons," they say with the venerable Eli ; "for it is no good report that I hear" (1 Samuel ii. 24). Again, the lapse of time between the original marriage (1895) and its annulment (1926) is a further diffi-

¹ Charge, 1857.

culty; nor has this difficulty been removed by the publication of the evidence received by the Rota in the official *Acta Sanctae Sedis* for December; and summarized in the English press. Here, of course, as before, presumption yields to fact. But the fact must be established. And, after a lapse of thirty years, memory for detail is unreliable. It is impossible to remember particular facts with precision; yet it is on particular facts that the case turns and judgment depends. We remember the broad lines of a situation; but the rest falls into the background: "the world is too much with us"—we cannot be sure of more than the outline of things. Few would care to be cross-examined as to events which took place in their own experience at this distance of time—the sayings and doings, the comings and goings, the dates and the daily routine.

6. The decision has undoubtedly discredited the Church of Rome in English public opinion. The answer of its officials will be that the Church is profoundly indifferent to this opinion: "Hippokleides doesn't care." But the drastic suppression of criticism from within shows its unreality. Hippokleides cares, and cares greatly. Hence the policy of least said soonest mended. Rome neither is, nor can afford to be, indifferent to English opinion. It is an opinion which, as she is well aware, it is eminently worth her while to conciliate, and which her political interests make it eminently unadvisable to offend. It is, as has been said, possible that substantial justice has been done. But this is not the point. The question is a general one: i.e., whether, after a lapse of thirty years and the birth of children, absence of consent can be pleaded as a ground for nullity. If it can, what marriage is beyond doubt? As a French correspondent of *The Spectator* puts it—*on n'en est jamais sûr*. Under such circumstances the plea of non-consent falls under the head of those objections of which Paley says that "they may always be alleged, but are impossible of testimony to be ascertained"; and that "to allow implicit credit to them, and to dissolve marriage whenever either party thought fit to pretend them, would lead in its effect to all the licentiousness of arbitrary divorces."¹

7. Most married people have experienced previous attachments; parents are apt to discourage "detrimentals"—the term is a relative one; and marriage, when it comes, is by no means invariably the result of overpowering impulse: the decision is often arrived at after deliberation, and with certain searchings of heart, or even regrets. But these feelings are transient; people settle down, and live in contentment. In Miss Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* there is a happy touch of eighteenth-century wisdom when we read of Willoughby, the villain of the piece, that "he long thought of Colonel Brandon with envy and of Marianne with regret. But that he was for ever inconsolable, that he fled from society, or contracted an habitual gloom of temper, or died of a broken heart, must not be depended upon—for he did neither. He lived to exert and frequently enjoy himself. His wife was not always out of humour, nor his home always uncomfortable! And in his breed of horses

¹ *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*, p. 216.

and dogs, and in sporting of every kind, he found no inconsiderable degree of domestic felicity."¹

8. No one will quarrel with the casuists when they lay down that *Vis* or *Metus*—i.e., force and the fear inspired by it—is one of the fifteen "diriment" impediments to marriage. But this fear (they tell us), must be "grave"—otherwise "innumerable marriages would be invalidated, to the great detriment of society"; and, where its gravity is open to question, "the marriage must stand, both because the presumption is in its favour—*causa matrimonii favorabilis est*, and because of the reverence due to the Sacrament."² The *metus reverentialis*, or reverential fear, the possible gravity of which is admitted, is characteristic of, or at least more commonly found in, another age and civilization than our own. Manzoni describes this past state of society in *I Promessi Sposi*: it was one of violence and oppression both in private and public life. But he was writing of Italy in the seventeenth century, not of New York of to-day—where deference to parental authority is seldom excessive, and where republican simplicity is not, as a rule, averse to a great European alliance. Hence the incredulous smile with which the "evidence" for compulsion has been received. Better proof of the alleged facts is required than that which satisfied the Rota! "We are much of the mind of Falstaff's tailor. We must have better assurance for Sir John than Bardolph's. We like not the security."

It is not, however, in reference to the parties to this particular suit, but in its bearings on marriage in general, that the judgment calls for comment. For, as a correspondent of *The Times* points out, it justifies the following statements:}

"(1) That the Canon Law has no counterpart to the rules, common alike to the civil and the Common Law, by which a party, whatever his cause of action, is estopped from asserting that to be true which his whole conduct for years belies.

"(2) That, consequently, a married person may blow hot and cold about his marriage by keeping a convenient impediment up his sleeve during years of married life.

"(3) That the impediment need not be one of those grave impediments which are recognized by all Christendom; but may be a minor impediment, which could have been removed by a dispensation before marriage.

"(4) That a decree of nullity obtained in such circumstances answer all the purposes of a divorce *a vinculo*; since it leaves the parties free to marry again without bastardizing the issue of the void marriage.

"(5) That the jurisdiction to grant such decrees is exercised by Courts where the evidence given by the witnesses is not reported, and the grounds on which the decree is granted are not published.

"If any of these conclusions is incorrect, it would be well that it should be corrected. If not, they amply account for the shock which the public conscience has received."³

¹ *Sense and Sensibility*, p. 378. ² Gury, S. J., *Theologia Moralis*, ii, p. 808.

³ *The Times*, November 25, 1925.

9. The word "shock" is not too strong. "We deeply regret that the decree annulling the marriage has been made," says *The Church Times*, to its credit; "it has done much to weaken the sanctity of the marriage tie." Whether it will, as some think, "arrest conversions" is doubtful: once embarked upon the Rome-ward slope, emotion takes the place of evidence, and credulity that of the sense of fact. But, if it has little effect on those in whom the will to believe is stronger than the reasons for believing, it will have much on the independent lay mind. The No Popery cry has a bad record in English history; no sensible person would wish to revive it. But an increasing indifference, I will not say to religion itself, but certainly to "modes of faith" and to religious institutions, has led us of late years to shut our eyes to certain obvious facts. For Giant Pope is by no means as enfeebled, nor Giant Pagan as dead, as honest John Bunyan thought. The magicians of Egypt have worked their enchantments; and both have renewed their strength. The Romanism of to-day does not, indeed, attract those whom Jowett described as "persons of education." Writing in 1912, the late Baron Von Hügel notices that "the conversions to Rome, so numerous and remarkable between 1845 and 1870"—the former date being that of Newman's secession, the latter that of the Vatican Council—"have notably diminished in both respects, especially during the last decade"—i.e., that following the accession of the reactionary Pius X. The seceders of our own times are, for the most part, temperamental persons of both sexes, who find in Catholicism a Cave of Adullam—the refuge of the malcontents of civilization, of "everyone that is discontented, or in distress, or in debt." But their number is larger than could be wished. No community can regard the loss even of its weaker members with indifference: and with regard to Catholicism—I am using the word in its European sense; but the warning applies no less to the backward section of our own Church which claims connection with that great international system—if we see in it nothing more than one of the many other Churches or sects of Christendom, we are making a very great mistake. It is "the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof."¹ And it is a mixed magnitude. Were it wholly evil its power for harm would be less than it is: it is, in fact, a strange mixture of good and evil, of what is false and of what is true. The good attracts, and attracts powerfully; the evil disgests and repels. We are apt to think—and religion has no greater temptation than this—that we can take the good and reject the evil. From the first this has proved impossible. For this Church suffers no divided allegiance; we must trust her "not at all, or all in all."

"Catholicism is much more than a theology or a religion; it is much more than one among the denominations of Christianity. It is a whole habit of mind, founding itself upon deeply-seated principles of philosophy, and striving, like the forms of animal and vegetable life, to develop itself under the given conditions of air and

¹ *Leviathan*, ch. 47.

light and warmth. In this struggle for existence it meets another principle, or set of principles, of no less vigour and vitality than itself; and founded, like itself, on a widely-extended survey of the facts of life. Its rival and competitor is the whole of that science—moral, political, physical—which has been slowly built up by the labour of four centuries, and the results of which tend more and more stringently to govern the conduct both of individuals and of communities. Men of piety and wide views, afflicted at the sight of our unprofitable religious differences, have at different times proposed schemes of pacification among the Churches. There seems no reason why such a reconciliation might not be effected, if not in the way of compromise, at least in the way of comprehension, where these disputes turn only on dogmatic differences. But no amalgamation is possible between the organic forms of social life, which each claim universality, which aspire to possess the whole man, which are impelled by their inward force to realize themselves in fact. Between the Catholic Church and modern civilization, the question is a struggle for existence—a struggle which can only be settled by the survival of the stronger.”¹

Hence the futility of the well-meant “Conversations” of Malines. Only by the renunciation of her birthright, i.e., by ceasing to express the life and mind of the English people, can the Church of England unite, or enter into organic relationship, with the Church of Rome.

10. Since the rise of the Oxford Movement the dream of the Conversion of England has floated before enthusiasts. It is improbable that the officials of the Roman Curia, who know their world, and do not suffer fools gladly, share it. Their present policy is to concentrate their activities on the Near East, where mass secession is still possible, and the *débâcle* of Russian Orthodoxy has left the field free. The communications which occasionally take place between the Vatican and the English Government have been misrepresented, perhaps misconceived, by the continental clerical press which is emotional by calculation and has a genius for advertisement. These communications are political, not religious: such measures as in the recent Roman Catholic Relief Act are complimentary; and the establishment of a Nunciature in London, while no doubt desired at Rome, would be opposed by the Irish bishops, as it was by Cardinal Manning, and is outside practical politics. It is not Roman, but Anglo-Catholicism that is the danger in England. Not to the nation, which is indifferent to both; but to the Church, which sits increasingly loose to the principles of the Reformation: to its loss. For the latest fashion in religion, known as Anglo-Catholicism, or more correctly as Anglo-Ultramontanism, *mole ruit sua*. It is gravitating rapidly and inevitably Rome-ward. And the differences between Roman and Reformed Christianity are not only religious and cultured; but, as the Marlborough case shows, moral.

¹ Mark Pattison, *Sermons*, p. 224.

THREE PRAYER BOOK REVISIONS.

THE Anglican Communion consists of the Church of England and the Churches in communion with it. The Church of England by reason of its numbers, its missionary and colonizing activity and its historical position holds a special place in the Communion. The Church of Ireland is older—the other Churches are much younger. All have adopted the Anglican Liturgy in its broad outlines, although the Churches in Scotland, America and South Africa have made structural changes in the Communion Office, that are due to historical considerations in Scotland and the United States and to doctrinal developments in South Africa. Scotland gave its episcopate to the United States, and Bishop Seabury for some time adopted the Scottish Rite. For four years this was used, and in 1790 changes were made that brought the Service more into line with that of the Church of England, and these changes have persisted. Nevertheless in its main structure the American Communion Office is based on that of the Scottish Liturgy. In South Africa the doctrinal trend of the Church since its separation from the Church of England sufficiently accounts for the adoption of the existing Liturgy.

The late Dr. Swete, writing of the English Communion Office, said :

“ The Communion Service of 1549 was as a whole a revised Sarum ; it belonged to the Roman family of liturgies. This can scarcely be said of the present English Liturgy ; while it makes large use of Sarum and other materials, in its structure it follows an order peculiar to itself. In other words, it heads a new liturgical family, and one which already has taken root, in slightly different forms, wherever the English tongue is spoken. There is no reason why English Churchmen should regret the fact, or pine for a restoration of the Roman Mass. It was fitting that the Church of England should possess not merely a uniform use, but one which, while in accordance with ancient precedent in things essential, should proclaim independence of foreign dictation in the order of her worship. It would have been a grave misfortune if the English race had been tied for all time to customs and forms which rest ultimately upon the local traditions of an Italian Church. While we are far from claiming either perfection or finality for the present English use, we regard it with the loyal affection due to a national rite which has commended itself to the conscience of devout Englishmen for more than three centuries, and which is destined, as we believe, to surpass even the Roman Mass in its influence on mankind.”¹

These words of one of the most learned of Victorian High Church-

¹ *Church Services and Service-Books*, 120-1

men deserve the careful consideration of all who are concerned with Revision Problems.

We have had lately Revisions of the Canadian and Irish Books of Common Prayer. The former has been printed in a complete form, whereas the latter, although authorized by the General Synod, has not yet been printed as a whole. The English Bishops have issued the Proposals of their Composite Book, and it will shed light on the character of the three Revisions if we compare them on points that seem to most Churchmen to involve doctrinal considerations. All three Revisions profess that there is no change of doctrine involved in the alterations. The Revisers had this before their minds and proposals have been rejected because they were considered in Ireland and Canada to be *ultra vires* on doctrinal grounds. The Canadian Primate deliberately rejected the proposal that the Invocation of the Holy Spirit should be inserted in the Consecration Prayer at Holy Communion on the definite ground that it involved doctrine and made a change in the teaching of the Church. The Composite Book contains this Invocation and the Archbishops of the Church of England declare that no doctrine is involved. This one fact shows that high ecclesiastical dignitaries in the Anglican Communion are by no means of one opinion on what constitutes change of doctrine.

Before discussing the changes made, one other fact should be taken into consideration. It is boldly stated that the Church of England has been metamorphosed during the past twenty years. No one who knows the existing worship of the Church and compares it with the illegalities so widely introduced since the beginning of the twentieth century can doubt that the Anglo-Catholics, who make this boast, are, so far, correct. There has been a definite retrogression to medieval conceptions of the approach to God in the services conducted by them. This has been done either with the approval, the acquiescence or the unwilling tolerance of the Diocesans. Twenty years ago the great majority of the Bishops were in favour of one Communion Office for the whole Church. Now the majority plead for an Alternative Office. What seemed treason then is now the fruit of successful treason, and it is hardly too much to say that the urge for uniformity in the Sacrament of Unity will be so great that in the future one Order only will be in existence. As we are told that the Composite Order, if adopted, will have behind it an unrivalled authority due to its acceptance after twenty years' incubation by the Bishops, the assent of Convocations, the Church Assembly and Parliament, it is the duty of all who value the doctrine of the Church of England and its appeal to Scripture to weigh every word and arrangement in this Order and to ask whether or not a doctrinal change is involved.

We confine our consideration to three subjects. Prayers for the Departed, the Communion Office, and the Reservation of the consecrated Elements.

Prayers for the Departed. In the Irish and Canadian Books no change has been made in the Book of Common Prayer, as far as

prayer for the Departed is concerned. Additional prayers provided are in full accord with those already in existence. When we turn to the Composite Book we find in the Occasional Prayers a section (31) devoted to the Commemoration of the Faithful Departed. The first prayer is a mere commemorative thanksgiving, the second is a prayer for "thy whole Church in Paradise and on Earth," and the third, a prayer to "multiply to those who rest in Jesus, the manifold blessings of thy love, that the good work which thou didst begin in them may be perfected unto the day of Jesus Christ." And then there follows a provision which is capable of abuse: "If it is desired to pray for other needs it shall be sufficient to say, 'Let us pray for . . .' and silence shall be kept for a space." The invitation of the Prayer for the "Church Militant here in earth" is changed into "Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church," and a commendation of the faithful departed is inserted. A Collect with Epistle and Gospel is appointed for All Souls Day—a new feast in the Calendar—and in the Burial of the Dead, Prayers for the Departed find a place. The faithful in Ireland and Canada are as attached to the memory of their dead as those in England. They love their memory and know that they are safe in the keeping of the hands of God. Scripture is silent on the subject of Prayers for the Dead—we say this with full knowledge of the exegesis of certain passages—and the Church of England is also without them in public worship. The object of the changes made in the service of 1552—which remains to-day what it was then—is to mark a distinct return in the Composite Book to 1549 and its medieval models. And in our opinion not only is there a doctrine taught which has no place in Scripture, but one that has in it elements distinctly contrary to the assurance of full salvation for those who die in the Lord, and is in danger of bringing with it the doctrine of Purgatory. It is easier to read into the final prayer in the Occasional Prayers (31) and the following Rubric and intercession, the doctrine of Rome than to contend that it is excluded from our Book of Common Prayer, especially when the history of All Souls Day is remembered.

The Communion Order. In both the Irish and Canadian Revisions the Commandments in their unabridged forms must be said at least once on Sundays and at other times our Lord's Summary may be used. The Irish Book provides additional Offertory Sentences and new Prefaces for Whitsuntide and Trinity Sunday, and also permits one or both of the Post-Communion Prayers to be said. With some minor translation, and other, changes the services are both identical with those in the Book of Common Prayer, and both retain the title Lord's Supper which is omitted in the Composite Book. We now turn to the Composite Book which provides an entirely new Order. In Ireland and Canada the Introductory Rubrics remain unchanged, but in the Composite Book the First Rubric provides for the wearing of a "white alb plain with a vestment or cope." This seems to give the key to the interpretation of the whole Rite. The Rubrics from the close of the service are placed at the beginning, and there is a significant Rubric,

“It is much to be wished that at every celebration of the Lord’s Supper the worshippers present, not being reasonably hindered, will communicate with the Priest.” Is “reasonable hindrance” the obligation to communicate fasting? And does the shortening of Morning Prayer imply that the Holy Communion should be the Holy Communion transformed into a Mass at which the worshippers assist and do not communicate? “Every confirmed member of the Church” replaces “every parishioner” when the duty of communicating is inculcated, but remains when the duty of making payments is concerned.¹ Wafer bread is permitted, and the mixing of water with the wine allowed. Before the Service the Priest is allowed to say with the people “in a distinct and audible voice” a Devotion in which the Anthem, “I will go unto the altar of God : even unto the God of my joy and gladness,” is twice sung. The Psalm from which this verse is taken is said, and it is argued that the use of the word Altar has no significance sacrificially. As well say that the interpretation of passages in the Psalter applied to God and transferred to the Virgin Mary has no significance. Unfortunately human nature does not devotionally think, with theological niceties, to restrain errors. There is only one interpretation of the Devotion and that interpretation will be given by all who use it.

The Priest stands “at God’s Board”—not at the North Side which he may adopt, or for that matter he may face the congregation. The Commandments are said in an abbreviated form, and they may be omitted in favour of our Lord’s Summary provided they be said once a month. On weekdays there may be substituted in English or Greek, “Lord have Mercy,” “Christ have Mercy,” “Lord have Mercy.” The Collect for the King is omitted, and the Nicene Creed may be omitted on any day not being a Sunday or Holy Day. In the Creed a comma is placed after the word Lord, applied to the Holy Ghost (in this the Irish and Canadian Books concur), and the word Holy is added to the description of the Church. Additional Offertory Sentences are provided, and the Intercession follows for the whole Church with the commendation of the Departed and additional prayers and thanksgiving.

In “The Preparation” after the Exhortation, Invitation, Confession and Absolution a shorter form of Invitation, etc., is supplied, the Comfortable Words are said and “The Consecration” follows. This begins with “The Lord be with you,” followed by the *Sursum Corda* (Lift up your hearts), and the well-known words of our Office are used with the Proper Preface, followed by the *Ter Sanctus* (Holy, Holy, Holy). The Prayer of Consecration is composite. It begins, “All glory to thee, Almighty God, our heavenly

¹ It is noteworthy that the Rubric at the close of the Confirmation Office reads, “And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed, or be found in the judgement of the Bishop to be ready and desirous to be confirmed,” replacing the old Confirmation Rubric with its historical interpretation and in contrast to the Irish Rubric, “Every person ought to present himself for Confirmation (unless prevented by some urgent reason) before he partakes of the Lord’s Supper.”

Father, for that thou of thy tender mercy didst give," etc., to the words "coming again" as in the present prayer. Then the paragraph, "Hear us, O merciful Father," with the significant words "these thy creatures," is omitted, and the words of Institution follow. The Prayer proceeds:

"Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance the precious death and passion of thy dear Son, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension according to his holy institution, do celebrate and set forth before thy divine majesty with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which he hath willed us to make, rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits which he hath procured unto us. Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and with thy Holy and Life-giving Spirit vouchsafe to bless and sanctify both us and these thy gifts of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour, Jesus Christ, to the end that, receiving the same, we may be strengthened and refreshed both in body and soul."

The prayer concludes with the first Post-Communion Prayer in our Order and the Lord's Prayer.

It is significant that permission is given that immediately before the Consecration Prayer after the *Sanctus* (Holy, Holy, Holy) is said the Anthem may be said or sung, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest," and that after all have communicated the Priest prefaces the Post-Communion Prayer (the second in the present Order) with the words, "Having now received the precious Body and Blood of Christ, let us give thanks unto our Lord God." Looking back on the history of our Consecration Prayer and the form of the new Prayer, it is certain that it retains precisely those elements which were removed from the 1549 prayer in order that the doctrine of a sacrifice and of transubstantiation might not be read into them. The whole structure of the Order and the way in which the service is compiled makes it clear that it has been arranged as a concession to those who hold and believe in the doctrine of the Mass. The Consecration Prayer has been defended as non-Roman because it has no specified point at which the change takes place. Does it occur when the words of Institution are said or when the Holy Spirit is invoked? It makes very little difference when it happens, so long as it does happen. And the Alternative Order brings forcibly the conviction that in the mind of the man who uses the Order a change transforms it—the sign—into It, the thing signified. Vestment, Gift, Memorial, "be unto us" preceded by "Blessed is He that cometh" and followed by "having now received the precious Body and Blood of Christ" have no other meaning than the attachment to the elements by virtue of consecration something—the localized Presence of the Redeemer—they did not previously possess. And this is the core of the difference between the scriptural and the unscriptural interpretation of the Supper of the Lord.

When this is the case it is absolutely impossible to remove abuses. And the regulations or absence of regulations concerning the manner of Reservation and the permission to reserve the elements continuously confirm this conviction. Here we have definite change in the use of the consecrated elements. It is true that in 1662 the new Rubric was added to prevent the careless disposal of the elements that remained over after open communion. Its existence is the best proof that Reservation did not take place before its enactment and Reservation definitely ceased to exist in the Reformed Church after 1552 until in the last century a number of the Clergy reserved the elements owing to their objection to communicate after having broken their fast. The need of the sick was secondary. They wished to communicate the sick, but they laid much more stress on their conceptions of Catholic custom. Then the natural results followed: Adoration, Devotional services, Benediction and all the usual accompaniments of a belief in the continuous Presence of the Body and Blood in, with, or under the elements.

The Alternative Order for the Communion of the Sick entirely consists of Rubrics. The first provides that when the Holy Communion cannot reverently or without grave difficulty be celebrated in private, then the Communion may be administered with the reserved elements if the sick person so requests. This is to be done with as little delay as possible on the day of open communion. Then if further provision be needed, with the permission of the Bishop continuous Reservation may take place. In both cases, the elements must be used only for the communion of the sick and both kinds must be reserved and administered. "All other questions that may arise concerning such Reservation shall be determined by rules framed by the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province, or by Canons lawfully made by the Convocation of the Province, and subject to any such rules and Canons, by direction of the Bishops." "Any of the consecrated elements that remain over shall be reverently consumed, or else taken back to the Church." "The sacrament so reserved shall not be brought into connection with any service or ceremony, nor shall it be exposed or removed except in order to be received in Communion, or otherwise reverently consumed." Arrangements are made for administration by intinction, and "if any question arise as to the manner of doing anything that is here enjoined or permitted, it shall be referred to the Bishop for his decision."

Here we have the permission of continuous Reservation, the directions for communion and returning the surplus elements to the Church and the plan of administration by intinction. All must be in both kinds, and it will be noticed that the Bishops are the supreme regulative body and that the local Bishop has wide discretionary powers. Since the decisions of the Bishops were made on this subject—according to report—we have had two interesting instances of Judgments of Consistory Courts. In one the Bishop definitely advised the Chancellor to give permission for Reservation

in an Aumbry with a lighted lamp before the Aumbry, and in the other the Chancellor granted a faculty for an Aumbry, and the Incumbent immediately requested his people to pay the same reverence to the reserved elements in the Aumbry as they paid to them in the administration of the Communion! When we turn to the Measure we find (Sect. 1. 3) the following provision: "The Archbishop and Bishops of each Province may from time to time make and at their discretion rescind rules for the conduct of public worship, in accordance with the Composite Book (including any rules required or authorized to be made by them under any rubric of the Composite Book), and any rules so made shall have effect within the Province for which the same are made as if contained in rubrics of the Composite Book." In Ireland and Canada such regulations can only be made by the General Synods. There is a danger of an Episcopal Church becoming episcopalized and that danger is at our doors. When we recall the very grave changes of orientation shown by the Bishops since 1906—not to go further back—we see at once the way opened to pressure that will break down obstacles. If they acted as they did in the green tree in which Reservation was forbidden, what will they do in the dry tree when it is permitted? If they have enlarged the teaching of the Prayer Book so as to embrace the rash and perilous statements that avoided condemnation because of the penal consequences involved, what will they do when the logical and emotional results of the Composite Book are seen in practice? It will be impossible to stay the tide of medievalization that will overtake the Church, and the episcopal Canutes cannot say "Thus far and no further" with any hope of being obeyed.

It is argued that the Alternative Prayer of Consecration does not assimilate the doctrine of the Church of England to that of Rome, as the Consecration of the Elements does not take place at any one moment but is a continuous process. It is not so much when the change takes place as the change itself that matters. Creation and Evolution supply hypotheses as regards the origin of species. But the species are there, and it is because they exist a theory is required to explain their being. In the case of the localized Presence we have the assertion that something has occurred in or in connection with the elements that makes them different in kind to what they were before, and it is this that makes all the difference between the new and the old Order. We maintain that the old Order transforms the Mass into a Communion and that the new Order restores the Mass. And we have behind us the consentient interpretation of Anglican divines and the Formularies since 1552 until the rise of Anglo-Catholicism, rooted in the Tractarian movement. Bishop Knox has written: "The new prayer is consistent with the idea that a change is wrought in the elements by the action of the Holy Spirit and with the idea that a sacrifice is offered by the priest for the remission of the sins of the living and the dead." Anglo-Catholicism proclaims that Dr. Knox is right, and that "the inclusion of the *Epiklesis*, therefore, emphasizes the

Catholic doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice, and it should be welcomed by Catholic opinion." For us the Catholic doctrine is not the doctrine taught in common by the Greek and the Roman Church, but the doctrine taught by the New Testament and believed by the Primitive Church. The misuse of the word Catholic is the parent of many gross errors.

It is also urged that in the Alternative Service no opportunity is given for the use of the sacring Bell, as no one can tell at what point the change occurs. Already we have had detailed instructions as to the time the Bell should be rung, and the absence of prohibitory rubrics that will prevent the ceremonies that are the normal accompaniments of the Mass will be utilized for their continuance and introduction when the Alternative Liturgy is substituted for the existing Order. It would be folly to close our eyes to what has been done and the tendency that is at work. The aim of Anglo-Catholicism is to square the doctrine of the Church of England with that of the Council of Trent. And it is made easy by the formularies of the Composite Book which will be undoubtedly used for this purpose. Catholicity is not synonymous with the Catholicity of the New Testament and that of the Primitive Church, but with a syncretism that is neither Scriptural nor Primitive.

The Preface to the Church of Ireland Book of Common Prayer says :

"As for the error of those who have taught that Christ has given Himself or His Body and Blood in this sacrament to be reserved, lifted up, carried about or worshipped, under the Veils of Bread and Wine, we have already in the Canons prohibited such acts and gestures as might be grounded on it, or lead thereto; and it is sufficiently implied in the Note at the End of the Communion Office (and we now afresh declare) that the posture of kneeling prescribed to all communicants is not appointed for any purpose of such adoration; but only for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the Benefits of Christ, which are in the Lord's Supper given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and a disorder as might if some such reverent and uniform posture were not enjoined."

Had the Church of Ireland authorised the Alternative Order this Preface could never have been written, and the Order in the Revised Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland is identical with that in our present Book save for the provision of the Lord's Summary of the Decalogue which, however, must be said once at least on the Lord's Day, the addition of a comma after the word Lord in the Nicene Creed, the provision of new Offertory Sentences, and the permission to say either or both of the Post-Communion Prayers. Here we have two voices in the Anglican communion, and the Church of Ireland is the oldest Church in the communion.

The Church of England by reason of its numbers, its importance historically, and its world influence has a unique place in the communion. When it gives the lead other Churches may and will

follow. The apologists for the Alternative Order point to Scotland—a very small Church—South Africa—a Church in which it is made difficult for Evangelicals to minister and to use as their spiritual home, and the American Church which is more comprehensive than either of these Churches and has an ethos of its own. The Church of Ireland is at our doors and we have seen what it teaches, and its teaching has been contradicted by the Alternative Order. If the interpretation given by the Church of Ireland to the Book of Common Prayer be right—then the Alternative Order is in error. And the error is not on minor matters of taste but on central doctrine. Those who believe that the interpretation of the divines of the Church of Ireland is in full accord with the teaching of our Formularies and is upheld by Holy Scripture, and the practice of the Primitive Church, have no option but to use all their strength to prevent the legalization of a Book that will change the whole orientation of the National Church, make deeper and wider its separation from Reformed Christianity and prepare the way for the return to a Medievalism which the Church has rejected for more than three and a half centuries. We may incur the ill favour of those in authority, we may be charged with opposing the mind of the collective Episcopate and of a narrowness that is contrary to the tolerant indifferentism of the day. We cannot help this. When Truth leads we have no option but to follow.

Uriah the Hittite : A Tragedy, by W. Franck (J. W. Ruddock), is a setting of a well-known Old Testament story in dramatic form. The personalities are well conceived and the action of the play well maintained.

Labyrinthine Ways, by Dorothea C. Waller (S.P.C.K., 6d.), is an account of the writer's personal experience of spiritual progress told to help others along the same path. There are some interesting and touching incidents drawn from her life in India.

From a Victorian Post-bag (Peter Davies, 1s. net) contains a number of letters addressed to the Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies by Thomas Carlyle, John Ruskin, Sir J. R. Seeley, Sir J. F. Stephen, Sir Leslie Stephen, Herbert Spencer, F. D. Maurice, Charles Kingsley, Bishop Westcott, Dr. F. J. A. Hort, and other equally well-known men of the nineteenth century. The interest is enhanced by the personal touches they reveal of some of the intellectual giants of a great age. They are written to a scholar and divine who never received the recognition in the Church which he deserved. A great variety of topics are dealt with, some of personal and some of general interest. They form a welcome memento of the relationship of Dr. Davies with his contemporaries.

ST. PAUL AT ATHENS.

BY CANON J. B. LANCELOT, M.A., Vicar of St. James',
Birkdale, Southport.

IT was a wonderful sight that awaited St. Paul when he landed from the boat and made his way from the port of Athens into the upper city. Public buildings, temples and statues met his gaze on every side. In style and character the place was entirely unlike any he had so far visited. It was not military like Philippi, nor commercial like Thessalonica, but at this period a quiet university town, to which Roman gentlemen sent their sons. But alike in learning and history Athens had long ago seen her best days. These, of course, had been really brilliant. We still owe a great debt to her citizens. Her poets, her philosophers and historians form the basis of the best education there is to be had in the world to-day. These, however, had lived and died four centuries or more before St. Paul set foot there, and their place was now taken by jangling sects who "questioned everything and settled nothing," while the ancient quest for truth had sunk into a mere love of what was smart or novel: "all the Athenians," we read, and the visitors and students and holiday-makers doubtless as well, "spent their time on nothing else but saying or hearing some new thing." What wonder that an Apostle of lively intellect like St. Paul should catch the spirit of the place, become for a time a philosopher like themselves, meet them on their own ground (as it were) in accordance with his rule of becoming all things to all men, if only he might save some! But was it a success? We shall see.

It seems fairly clear that St. Paul's visit to this seat of learning was not part of his original plan. The place he was really making for was Corinth, a city vastly more important for his missionary purpose: for it was rich and cosmopolitan, throbbing with life, if lax in morals, the meeting-place of north and south and, what was even more important, of east and west, with a population of perhaps three-quarters of a million. But he stayed at Athens to await the arrival of his two friends and fellow-travellers, and, we read, while he waited for them, his spirit was provoked within him, as he beheld the city "filled with idols"—images, that is to say, of gods and heroes, objects, to many, of the greatest artistic interest and value. But it is obvious that to him Art as such made no great appeal. He was a Jew, you see, at bottom, in spite of his Hellenic culture and Roman citizenship, and Jews had little or no feeling for "the stone that breathes and struggles, the brass that seems to speak." Statuary and sculpture interested them hardly at all. They were specialists in religion, not in Art—indeed, would hardly allow to it that ministerial and helpful function which is accorded to it, in greater or less degree, by religious people among ourselves. We delight in making our churches beautiful: Westminster Abbey is

adorned with statues, though they are not there to be worshipped. In that age and to St. Paul such things meant "idolatry"—hence his distress and indignation of spirit.

But he was not the man to suffer in silence. He discussed the matter both in the Jewish synagogue—we are surprised to hear that there was one—and in the market-place. Here certain "philosophers" fell in with him. Some of these rather degenerate followers of greater men of old gravely maintained that pleasure was the end of life; others were more austere and made virtue the end. But they were none of them complimentary to the new teacher, called him a babbler, a charlatan, a retailer of second-hand opinions, little realizing the power of his master mind or the fire of conviction that burnt in his great soul. Nevertheless, they were so far interested that they took him to the Hill of Mars, a quiet spot where they could give him calm and uninterrupted hearing. There St. Paul stood, in that clear and bright open air, a temple immediately below him, another on his right hand, in front the glorious Parthenon—a great scene and a great occasion (Raphael has painted it): what might not be the issue?

How should he begin? Only in one way, with such sights in view. Objects of worship everywhere! To judge by their profusion, the Athenians were religious almost to a fault! They even carried their "God-fearingness" so far that in the multitude of their divinities they actually paid honour to one whose name they did not know. "As I passed along, I found an altar with the inscription, To an unknown God." It did not mean that the donor had some conception of a Being girt with clouds and darkness but exalted high above other deities: it meant only that he was afraid that he had unwittingly offended some deity or other, and wished to propitiate him. But the altar gave the Apostle a start. Such an inscription showed clearly that, even in their own eyes, this beautiful and artistic paganism, multitudinous as it was, was yet inadequate: their very catalogue of gods was incomplete: and the God, by them confessedly unknown, was, to him, the supreme and only Reality—"What ye unknowingly worship that set I forth unto you."

There follows, you will remember, an argumentative passage of some difficulty. It seems to be an answer to questions which the Apostle's mind must have been continually revolving, but which he does not lay, not at least in so many words, before his academic audience, What do you mean by "God"? How much, to you, does the Name express? Clear up your ideas and think them out. Then, when you have done so, is all your statuary really to the point? Valuable as Art, is it not, as religion, weighed in the balances and found wanting?

Let us look at the lines of thought which the Apostle follows. First, he reminds both them and us that we are face to face with a very wonderful world. "Nothing that happens in the world can ever be so wonderful as the existence of the world itself," said St. Augustine: and the question inevitably present sits itself: Whence came it? To St. Paul it implied a Creative Intelligence, who, so

far from being "unknown," had revealed Himself, in a measure, by His handiwork. It is a plea which still has force. I will not say that we can demonstrate the existence, still less the character, of God from Nature—Newman once said that Nature alone would make him an atheist, thus differing from Bacon, who declares that God never wrought miracle to convince atheism, because His ordinary works convince it—but I do say that that belief in Him which we bring with us to our study of Nature from an intuitive source is confirmed by what we find there, and the morning sunshine becomes to us a sacrament of Divine Love. So, we say, "In the beginning God." The world—do you ask about? He made it. Life? It is His gift. The beauty of the sunset and our power to see it? They come alike from Him, Who in power and loving artistry is Supreme and Alone. "It is *He* that hath made us." To forget that—and in the midst of their triumphs over Nature, with all the resultant comfort and wealth, men *are* forgetting it—is perilous to worship, and to all true reverence. In view of the world, this majestic, awe-inspiring cosmos, and of our own selves, we, I trust, rather bow the head and give thanks.

But he goes on—I interpret his words somewhat freely—having made the world, God also governs its inhabitants. He reveals Himself thereby in Providence (as we say). Look at history: is there no unseen Hand there, no one "behind the curtain"? The separation of men into nations, each with its own territory and destiny, has meaning. "It leads to wars," you say. Well, it does. Yet there is purpose in it, somewhere, we assert. We may not understand the whole world-process—we certainly do not. The ways of Providence from everlasting to everlasting are assuredly beyond us. But we grasp enough to assure us that history is not all chance—nay, more, enough to make us sober and serious-minded men. We "see enough of the play to get an inkling of the plot," and the plot points to a Ruler that "judgeth the earth."

You notice that in this the Apostle makes no reference at all to the Old Testament, or to Jewish history, and for the obvious reason that before a Greek audience such reference would have been out of place. The Athenians knew nothing of Jewish faith and experience. He starts from what his hearers and he shared in common, namely, the world of Nature, to the glory and mystery of which they were fully alive, and the history of mankind, of which they knew at least something. Both, in a way, reveal God, here the Creator, there the Governor. There was Providence, he might have added, in their own history—we, at any rate, can see it now: had the Persian fleet won at Salamis, the history not only of Greece but of the whole world would have been altered.

But was this all? God above creation—yes: God behind history—yes: then, only dimly discerned, you say, largely unknown. But stay, there is more. "God," he says, "is not far from each one of us." "In Him we live and move and are."

Why do we believe in God? Ultimately because we cannot help

it. Faith works at the centre of our personality : it is part of our "make-up." The instinct of faith may be rudimentary or timid ; it may be stifled in course of time by sin, or overlaid with intellectual pride. But it is there. When it speaks it says "Father." Your own poets, he says to the Athenians, bear witness to your heavenly origin : "We are also His offspring." As He is Spirit, so also are we, and we know it. Genesis is right : God "created man in His own image," and our consciousness bears witness to Him.

Now this is a great and valuable argument. It is widely used to-day ; for if the world and history seem sometimes to conceal God, man reveals Him. Our best reason, after all, for believing in Him is ourselves. "We are made in His image, to witness Him." But St. Paul does not press the argument in this, its wider application, but turns it with unerring force against the cult of images. Does a statue reveal a man ? "There's Pericles, you say," pointing to a masterpiece across the road : "but can the dull cold marble express his spiritual nature, his warmth of feeling, his inner history ? If so, how much less can it express God ?"

Of course, there is nothing in what the Apostle has said, so far, that is definitely and distinctly Christian. A Jew might urge it, or any believer in God. Probably he took the line he did in order to get a hearing. But he has not finished ; his argument is yet to have a Christian conclusion. God, he said, had "overlooked" the times of men's ignorance—note the charity of this judgment on the heathen world—"but now commanded men that they should all repent." Yes, and repentance (we all feel) is the supreme requirement, if God is, and if He be holy.

There is no need to argue the point—we all see it. But his appeal had this further driving-power behind it, that God had "appointed a day on which He would judge the world in righteousness by a Man whom He had ordained." It is Jesus Christ. That He would come and execute that function the preacher was convinced : had not God guaranteed it by raising Him from the dead ?

Here then, at last, the Apostle reaches distinctively Christian doctrine, and it gave offence. "Jesus and the Resurrection"—no, not that. A Creator they were prepared for. Providence was not unlikely. A shadowy survival in the lower world—they might venture so far.

But Resurrection was impossible. The idea of a glorified body, no longer a clog to, but a worthy handmaid of, the soul, was altogether beyond their speculations. So "some mocked." It is quite easy to mock on this subject if you despise the body as mere "matter," as though there were no question behind—And what is matter ? or if you feel sure that there are no things in heaven and earth not dreamt of in your philosophy. So these supercilious Athenians had their jest. They did not treat St. Paul as the soldiers had done at Philippi, or the mob at Thessalonica ; they claimed to be gentlemen, and "their weapon was not force, but ridicule." This, I do not doubt, was very hard to bear, and to Athens, whether by accident or design, he never returned—"the noblest of ancient

cities and he the noblest man in history, and apparently he never cared to look on it again." ¹

Yet it was not all failure. Some were interested: some even believed. But no great church was planted there. There is no "Epistle to the Athenians." He had tried to meet philosophy with philosophy, and, whether he was right in the opinion or no, he seems to have believed that he had failed, for so most people venture to read between the lines at the beginning of First Corinthians. So it was that he set out for Corinth "determined not to know anything among them but Jesus Christ and Him crucified"—a great and significant resolve.

Wherein lay his mistake, if mistake he made? Was not the argument of his speech sound? Yes, it was. And he must have taken pains, we think, to let St. Luke have an adequate summary of it: how else was it inserted on his pages? And reasonings have their value. "Evidences," as we call them, are often useful, though, as Pascal says, the heart has its own reasons, and the ultimate question is, "Like you this Christianity or not?" The intellect nevertheless has its claims, and we ought always to be able to give a reason concerning the hope that is in us, even though in a world where it is so much easier to ask questions than to answer them we may not be able to explain everything. Such a study may help to clear away difficulties, our own and other people's, as well as to distinguish what is essential from what is not—a process which most men need at some period of their lives or other. But I suppose that at Athens the emphasis was misplaced. All said and done, it made too much of intellect. The Christian message is addressed more strikingly to the needs of the moral and spiritual than of the intellectual nature. It appeals especially to the affections, to the conscience, and to the will. Think—yes: read, study, argue, wrestle with problems—yes, the more the better. But the first Christian "beatitude" is addressed to the "poor in spirit," and the great Christian text is "Repent ye," and a hold upon religion that is merely intellectual may ignore repentance altogether. You may remove men's doubts or correct men's mistakes without touching their real lives; yet it is the lives that matter. By all means show them the folly of graven images as objects of worship: that alone will not convict them of sin. Tell them of judgment to come, its absolute and irrefutable certainty: fear will not produce a permanent change of heart—it is love alone that can do that, and when next the Apostle speaks, it is a message of Divine Love that he will give. He will not feed men's vanity by meeting them on their own "high intellectual ground," but will apply himself to their real wants, to their aching hearts and troubled spirits. He will lead them to the foot of their Saviour's Cross for their sins' forgiveness, to the steps of His throne for their light and peace. It is not, after all, the fact of Creation, or the study of human nature, or the drama of history that is God's great argument with the soul; it is this

¹ Furneaux, *The Acts of the Apostles*, p. 290. Students of this commentary will notice that I have been indebted to it again and again.

rather—Jesus died, Jesus is risen again, and all for you and for me. “We love Him, for He first loved us.”

It is said—I know not with what degree of truth—that as he lay dying the great philosopher-bishop of the English Church, in great spiritual distress declared it to be an awful thing to appear before the moral Governor of the world. “I am afraid,” he said, “afraid.” In days when, with a flippant light-heartedness which ill becomes responsible beings, too many can toss aside such a conception of God as merely tiresome or irrelevant, we need, we greatly need, some of that high and noble gravity which can contemplate it without flinching, and then, because of it, seek to live in all seriousness a godly, righteous, and sober life. But “the Moral Governor of the world”—is it all? Would this have won men’s hearts? Will it minister comfort to us at our last hour?

My lord, saith one,
Hast thou forgotten how Christ came to be
A Saviour? Nay, the bishop made reply,
How know I He’s a Saviour unto me?
The chaplain paused, then answered thoughtfully:
Lo, him that cometh unto Me, Christ said,
I will in no wise cast out. Need we more?
The bishop slowly raised his dying head:
I’ve read a thousand times that Scripture o’er,
Nor felt its truth till now I near the tomb;
It is enough. O Saviour Christ, I come.¹

¹ Alexander Whyte, *Bishop Butler*, p. 88.



The Sermon on Prayer Book Revision, preached in Norwich Cathedral on February 13, 1927, by the Bishop of Norwich, has been issued by S.P.C.K. (4d. net). In this he states the grounds of his objection to many of the proposals of the Bishops in the Composite Book. The Sermon has already reached several editions and has commanded wide attention.

The Church Book Room is issuing a series of Sunday School Lessons on the Collects, illustrated from the Epistles and Gospels in quarterly parts (6d. each quarter). The Editors are the Rev. W. H. Flecker, D.C.L., late Headmaster of Dean Close School, Cheltenham, and the Rev. L. E. L. Roberts, M.A., Vicar of St. Luke’s, Deptford. They are intended to meet the need for lessons which are spiritual, scriptural and evangelical, and at the same time constructed along the lines of modern Sunday School methods. There are also four lessons devoted directly to Missionary instruction. Picture Booklets can be obtained for the lessons illustrating the Sunday Gospels.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE REFORMATION.

By L. H. BOOTH

(Member of Church Assembly).

THE revision of the Prayer Book has produced much discussion on the Protestant Reformation, but it has been a discussion largely confined to the questions of how far the English Reformers intended to make alterations in doctrine and ritual and how far those intentions were actually made effective in the Elizabethan Settlement. Some contend that the English Reformers intended to make changes but were so clumsy that they failed to express what they meant ; others that the Reformers never intended changes but unhappily blundered into making them. There is also a school which appears to think that there was nothing to reform but that reasons largely political and purely local brought about regrettable but unimportant alterations which have long since ceased to have any significance.

I do not, however, propose to plunge into the troubled waters of theology and will content myself by saying that the Church in England prior to the Reformation was an integral part of the Church of Rome and identical with all other parts of it not only in organization but in doctrine and ritual, and that contemporaries considered that the Elizabethan Settlement made changes of a radical nature. In 1570, after that Settlement was completed, the Pope excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, deposed her and released her subjects from their allegiance—he at any rate knew what had happened.

On what was the general intention of the Reformation Bishop Burnet summed it up about 100 years later in his dedication of his *History of the Reformation*, when he said, "The design of the Reformation was to restore Christianity to what it was at first and to purge it of those corruptions with which it was over-run in the later and darker ages."

Loose statements are sometimes made which suggest that the Reformation in England was the act of an arbitrary monarch, though no one has had the temerity to suggest this about Scotland. This theory attributes the Reformation solely to the refusal of the Pope to annul Henry VIII's marriage with Catherine of Aragon—a matter which could have been easily arranged if it had not been that Catherine's brother was the Emperor. It is perfectly true that this refusal was the cause of Henry VIII repudiating the Papal supremacy and proclaiming himself Head of the English Church, but he did not understand himself by this action to be changing either his own religion, or that of his subjects. There was a constant struggle with the Pope all through the Middle Ages, and Henry VIII was by no means the first English King to repudiate his supremacy in ecclesiastical matters. There is even an Act of Parliament of Edward III in which the King is described as Supreme Ordinary, and there are at least three other Acts of

Parliament before the reign of Henry VIII to the same general effect. Henry VIII considered himself as merely doing what his predecessors had done when they were strong enough.

Henry VIII did, however, further the Reformation by letting loose a great flood of Protestant feeling, and he did this most of all by sanctioning the introduction into England of the English Bible and furthering the use of it.

The Reformation was neither the act of an arbitrary monarch nor a merely local event peculiar to England. It was part of a great movement of thought which spread all over Europe.

The recovery of the literature of the Classical period, and in particular of Greek thought, created the "New Learning," or "Renaissance." The New Learning was the parent of the Protestant Reformation, and together they transformed the Middle Ages into the modern world.

The idea that the age so transformed was a golden age is fashionable but quite fallacious. Looking backwards, the Middle Ages lie between modern times and the centuries of barbarism which followed the collapse of the Roman Empire of the West. Between the Norman Conquest and the accession of Henry VII there were eighteen Kings of England. Several of them were either deposed or murdered or both. In practically every reign there were armed insurrections, often headed by one or more of the reigning monarch's sons, and there were prolonged periods of civil war. War or a sort of war with Scotland and in or with France was practically continuous, and if by any chance there was no fighting in Ireland, there was pretty sure to be trouble on the Welsh Border. Society was organized on the basis of fighting being not an abnormal, but a normal, condition, and if there was no public war, powerful land-owners would ride about with small armies, oppress each other's tenants and attack each other's castles. Castles did not exist solely for protection against foreign enemies; in 1218 Richard de Umfraville was afraid that a castle being built at Nafferton threatened Prudhoe Castle, and he was influential enough to obtain a writ from Henry III ordering the Nafferton fortifications to be pulled down.

Under such conditions, it is not surprising that the civilization of the Middle Ages was of a comparatively low type. An illustration of this is the state of the means of communication, which is at any rate some index of material civilization. The Roman Empire had a magnificent system of roads, with relays of post horses, and it was possible to travel at the rate of 100 miles a day. In the Middle Ages, the art of road-making had been lost, and what roads there were, beyond mere tracks, were the remains of those left by the Romans. Wheeled vehicles were few, and road traffic was on foot or horseback, or in litters.

Sanitation as we know it did not exist—in the towns the streets were full of garbage—taking the wall meant taking care not to be knee-deep in filth in the gutter. As a result disease was rife, and in the towns in moderately healthy times when there were no epidemics, the death rate is believed to have been as high as 50 per thousand

per annum as against 12.4 for the whole of England and Wales in 1924 and 16.8 for the county borough having the highest death rate. Plagues producing great mortality were frequent; the Black Death in 1349 was only one of many, though the worst, as can be readily believed, since it swept off a third of the whole population of England.

Partly owing to the uncleanly habits of the people, skin diseases were prevalent. Leprosy itself was common. The number of deformed people was large—this was due to bad and insufficient food and the absence of medical and surgical attention. Though hospitals were numerous, they were not hospitals for the cure of disease so much as refuges for the aged and infirm. Medical and surgical science was in a primitive stage and doctors were a subject of popular ridicule.

In the Middle Ages mutilation was a common punishment for crime; its mildest form was the loss of an ear, but the felon might be deprived of a limb or his eyes. Imprisonment was worse: prisoners were not fed except by their friends or the charity of strangers. A person who could not pay the gaoler suffered severely. Most prisons and many castles had an underground dungeon. (Fourteenth-century humour called the underground prison in the King's Bench "Paradise.") Some of these places were merely dark narrow pits having their sole opening at the top, and through this the prisoners were lowered or dropped, with a risk of broken bones. For capital crimes, there was burning and disembowelling as well as hanging.

The *peine forte et dure* to compel accused persons to plead was not easily distinguishable from torture, though torture as a means of extracting evidence never became part of the ordinary machinery of English law. Edward II, however, urged by Pope Clement V, admitted Papal inquisitors into England and the use by them of torture. On the Continent, where they had been corrupted by the persecutions of heretics, torture was common enough.

Unauthorized and unofficial torture for the purpose of extracting money was not unknown in England, and there are many recorded instances of it. Justice could be and was corrupted. Salzman quotes among other cases that of Wilkin of Gloseburn in the reign of Henry III. Wilkin accused Gilbert Wood of killing his son, thereupon Gilbert resorted to bribery and took steps to have Wilkin arrested on a charge of theft and thrown into York Gaol. The gaoler bound Wilkin naked to a post and kept him without food till he paid 40s. to be released. Justice, particularly for the poor man, was dangerous to seek and difficult to obtain in the golden age.

The great achievement of the Middle Ages was its Ecclesiastical Architecture. It is common to assume that the profusion of ecclesiastical buildings necessarily indicated lofty religious motives and high moral standards. It is, however, unsound to deduce that motives which may be reasonably assumed to-day necessarily prevailed then. The anarchy and cruelty of the time of Stephen was such that men said that Christ and his Saints slept, but it was in this reign that a hundred new foundations of monasteries were made.

Mr. G. M. Trevelyan, in his recently published *History of England*, has the following interesting passage:—"Those who caused and exploited the anarchy were foremost in making liberal grants to the Cistercian monks, who first came over from France at this period. We need not suppose that religious motives of a very high order were always at work, any more than that they were always absent. A Baron, whose imagination was perturbed by some rude fresco in the church of a long-clawed devil flying off with an armoured knight, would reflect that a grant to a monastery was an excellent way of forestalling any such unpleasant consequences that might follow from his own habits of torturing peasants and depopulating villages."

Until the revival of learning began to take effect in the later Middle Ages, the number of those who could read and write was comparatively few outside the ranks of the clergy. It is not without significance that the word "clerk" originally meant a cleric.

It will be useful, therefore, to see what was the state of education among the clergy, in the age of faith. All through the Middle Ages there were complaints of their ignorance. Salzman gives some illustrations of this in his *English Life in Middle Ages*. In 1222, at a visitation of seventeen parishes in Berkshire it was found that five of the clergy could not construe the Mass; in other words, they did not understand the words of the Church Service any more than their congregations did. When Louis de Beaumont was made Bishop of Durham in 1316 he did not understand any Latin, and had to be carefully coached for some days in the consecration service. At the service itself when he came to the word "metropolitan" he could not pronounce it, and after a good deal of gasping exclaimed in French, "Let that be taken as read." Bishop Hooper's visitation in 1552 is said to have shown "scores of clergy who could not tell who was the author of the Lord's Prayer or where it was to be found."

Celibacy being considered the holiest of states, marriage and family life held a lower status than they now do. St. Bonaventura affirmed that married people would have no aureolas in heaven. The rule of celibacy among the clergy was frequent in its breach and did not produce high standards of morality. Luther says, "We see also how the priesthood is fallen and how many a poor priest is encumbered with a woman and children and no one does anything to help him though he might very well be helped." The last Archbishop of St. Andrews before the Reformation was, of course, pledged to celibacy, but he lived openly with Lady Stair and had six children.

The monastic system had been a necessity of a rude age. When violence was rampant, the regard (largely superstitious) paid to the monks enabled them to live a life of meditation and to keep alive, to some extent at any rate, the pursuit of learning. The history of monasticism, however, is a history of constant failure to maintain an ideal. One attempt after another was made to restore the asceticism and rules of discipline which were their central idea, but they were never successful for more than a generation, probably because the ideal contemplated, or at any rate the way in which it

was attempted to be carried out, was false to human nature. When, therefore, the Middle Ages were coming to a close, ideas were turned to suppressing monasteries rather than reforming them, and this was not peculiar to England; there had been a partial disendowment of monasteries in Spain as early as 1494, when part of the over-swollen funds of the monasteries were restored to the parishes to which they originally belonged or diverted to the use of hospitals. When Henry VIII suppressed the monasteries in England, he was not attempting to carry out a change of religion but was trying to effect what was felt to be necessary throughout Europe. The monastic system came to an end as a universal system because it had outlived its usefulness.

The age which the New Learning and the Reformation swept away was an age of crude and materialistic conceptions. The veneration of relics was part of the Church's financial system. A thirteenth-century example of this is given in Coulton's *Five Centuries of Religion*. The monks at Heisterbach built a new church; being a new foundation, it had no relics; this was financially unsound, but the difficulty was overcome by a monk having a vision in which he saw a casket containing relics belonging to a chapel at Godesburg floating in the air on its way to Heisterbach. The casket duly arrived with the relics belonging to some one else.

Most relics were bogus, and there was an immense duplication. Canterbury had a complete set of the bones of St. Dunstan, and so had the monks of Glastonbury. The deliberate deceptions on the one hand and the credulity on the other with regard to relics had indirectly a detrimental influence on morals, as they promoted that "indifference to truth which was one of the characteristics of the Medieval Church."

Medieval theologians seriously discussed whether volcanic eruptions were not due to the overcrowding of Hell by the damned, and a medieval text-book asks the question, "Why is the sun so red in the evening?" and gives the answer, "Because he looketh upon Hell and reflecteth the flames thereof."

The system of Indulgences¹ shows the Medieval Church at its worst, and the revolt against the system marked the formal beginning of the Reformation. In the ancient Church, members who had been excluded for serious sins could be re-admitted (1) by making public confession and expressing contrition or real sorrow, followed by (2) the making satisfaction for the sins committed by the performance of some action prescribed on the particular occasion; this might be fasting or the freeing of slaves. After the satisfaction had been performed, came the re-admission into membership.

In its final form the system consisted of, first, private confession to a priest accompanied by "attrition"; at first contrition or sincere penitence had been required, but later "attrition," or the condition of being rather sorry, was considered sufficient. After this came absolution by the priest, not after but before the satisfaction; abso-

¹ For a full account of this subject see Dr. Lindsay's chapter on Luther in the *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. II, pp. 123-129.

lution removed the guilt and with the guilt the eternal punishment due. This did not end the matter, otherwise the sinner would escape all punishment, including the pains of purgatory, and to avoid these it was still necessary to make satisfaction by performing penance. The priest prescribed the penance, but the torturing doubt was left of whether the priest might not have made a mistake in calculating the temporal satisfaction or penance exactly equivalent to the purgatorial punishment entailed by the sin. The penance might not be sufficient and there might be some purgatorial punishment left over. Here came the importance of Indulgences. The medieval theory was that the good deeds of all the members of the Church were the common property of all, and that there was a common store house in which superfluous merits had accumulated and had been placed in charge of the Pope to be dispensed by him to the faithful. If the sinner obtained an Indulgence then he was safe from the purgatorial penalties for the sins he had committed. Indulgences could be procured on the terms of fighting in the armies of the Pope, visiting certain churches or altars, making pilgrimages to Rome and visiting certain altars there. Then, if it was impossible on account of health to make the pilgrimage, it became sufficient to pay some one else to do it. Finally it came down to a plain money tariff, with the sale of pardons for sins on a regular scale. "The Lord," remarked an official at the Court of Innocent VIII, "does not will the death of a sinner: He wills that he shall live and shall pay." Though in theory, the Indulgence only relieved from purgatorial penalties, they used language which made intelligent people, including Dante, think that they removed the guilt of sin. When in 1513 Leo X proclaimed Indulgences for the building of St. Peter's, Tetzl and his fellows may possibly (as has been recently alleged) have preached the necessity of repentance, but the effect on the mind of the average man was that he was buying a ticket which both freed him from purgatory and remitted his sins.

The great difference between the Middle Ages and modern times does not lie solely in material civilization or even in moral or intellectual standards: there was also a difference of attitude. The Middle Ages looked upon the organization of Society as being static. Society did, of course, change, but there was no conscious idea of progress. For instance, there was very little direct legislation and a great part of what there was was looked upon as merely restating what was already the law. When Englishmen in the early part of the Middle Ages complained of bad government, they did not ask for new laws; what they asked for was that the laws of Edward the Confessor should be restored. They probably did not know what the laws of that "holy but imbecile monarch" were, and if the laws had been restored, they would have been unsuitable, but in their view no new machine was needed: the old machine, which in their belief had existed unchanged from time immemorial, was all right if it was only worked properly.

This attitude of mind was not confined to laws and customs but extended into other spheres. Speculation was almost entirely

confined to theology, and even where it was not, the Church was the authority, and speculation must only take place within the limits which the Church laid down.

The chief feature in the revival of learning was the recovery of the Greek literature. This received a great impetus from the fall of Constantinople, which had the effect of introducing into Europe Greek manuscripts in large numbers and an influx of people who understood the literature and could teach the language.

The effect of the revival of learning was that the Greek philosophers became known again in Western Europe. Aristotle had only been known in fragments in imperfect Latin translation, and Plato not at all. Scholars discovered that the current ideas and methods of thought were not the only possible ideas and methods. The habit of free private inquiry spread, to the inevitable detriment of the belief in a fixed and stationary society whose knowledge and modes of thought were controlled by the authority of the Church. Then the discovery of printing enabled both the classical literature and the new ideas to be disseminated and to reach large numbers of people.

The discovery of the new world, in 1492, was also very disturbing. In the words of Mr. R. H. Murray in *Political Consequences of the Reformation*, "the moment that men completely realized there was another continent where the eagle of the Holy Roman Empire had never flown, the whole structure of medievalism was undermined."

The period was one of intellectual ferment, and the way having been paved by the revival of classical learning, attention was turned towards the Bible and the Early Fathers. Erasmus published a Greek edition of the New Testament in 1516, and it was found that the Vulgate which had the authority of the Church was full of errors.

In England there were still in existence written copies of Wycliffe's English Bible which had been translated from the Vulgate about 1380. Tyndal's English Bible was printed and published in 1525, and other English translations followed. Between 1530 and 1546 there were fifty-two editions of the Lutheran Bible and 98 reprints issued from Wittenberg. Between 1566 and 1644 there were at least 140 editions of the Geneva translation of the Bible. Europe was flooded with copies of the Bible in the vernacular.

This further shook the authority of the Church, as the reader of the New Testament could not find in it any precedents for the worship of the Virgin Mary or the saints, for celibacy of the clergy, for the use of Indulgences or for the veneration of relics. The Papacy was corrupt, the Church was full of abuses, attempts at reformation from within had failed, partly because they affected the Church's financial system. Wycliffe had been before his time, but in the sixteenth century intellectual freedom had become the dominant note, and the time was ripe for revolutionary change.

Luther, in 1520, formulated the standpoint of the reformers in three great treatises: *The Address to the Nobility, On Christian Liberty* and *On the Babylonish Captivity of the Church*. These

were partly an attack on specific abuses and partly the framing of a new theological basis.

I only wish to draw attention to two points—one is the doctrine of Justification by Faith. Whether all the implications of the doctrine can be supported, I am not competent to judge, but the idea that the response of the inward mind to the Divine promise is the true criterion, appealed to the men of that time as being on a higher plane than the system of Indulgences, which made a priest the judge of the remission of sins and allowed the Pope to fix the money payment which would absolve from Divine punishment. Luther did not hold that works were of no account, but that a good man would produce good works.

The other point is the doctrine of the priesthood of all faithful Christians, which Luther supports from the New Testament and the writings of the Fathers. Luther deduces from this doctrine the right of the laity to communion in both kinds, and that Orders are not a sacrament but a matter of Church organization. In this way he put the laity on an equality with the clergy with a corresponding increase in the sense of individual responsibility. It has been said that henceforth "the religious were no longer men and women in a monastery, and life and religion were now fundamentally one." On its other side this implied the right of private judgment, upon which are based the modern ideas of religious, intellectual and political liberty.

Calvin, on these questions, followed in the same line: he held that the laity and pastors are equal among themselves. He also said, "Christ is the only Head of the Church, and no constraint can be exercised over the conscience which Christ has made free."

What the authority of the Church meant may be gauged by the fact that Tyndal, the translator of the Bible into English, was executed for heresy. Copernicus, who revolutionized ideas on astronomy by putting forward the theory of Pythagoras that the earth moved round the sun, was accused of heresy on that account. Galileo, who elaborated and proved Copernican theories, spent twenty-seven years in prison for heresy. Reuchlin, the first of the great Hebrew scholars, was condemned for heresy on account of his translations from the Hebrew, though the sentence aroused such a storm of ridicule that it was reversed.

In the Massacre of St. Bartholomew alone, ten thousand perished; on receipt of the news in Rome, the Pope had the city illuminated, attended a solemn service of thanksgiving with thirty-three cardinals, and struck a medal to commemorate the massacre.

The first index of prohibited books included all (about forty) of the existing translations of the Bible into the vernacular.

Practically all scientific discoveries which have been made since the close of the Classical period have been made or rediscovered since the revival of learning and the commencement of the Reformation.

As regards literature there is very little in English from before the Reformation of which we can both understand the language and appreciate the ideas.

About 1492—the date of the discovery of America—is generally considered the end of the Middle Ages, but the acceptance of the New Learning and the Reformation did not take place in a day or in any one year; they cover a long period. Some of the ideas and practices of the Middle Ages were fighting for existence and in process of disappearing long before that date; others did not disappear for many generations after. The age of faith was, however, an age not only of low material civilization, but of ignorance, cruelty and gross superstition, and whatever may have been the highest teaching of the Church, the system, as it worked, produced religious ideas of a mechanical and materialistic type. Historically the Middle Ages are the end of the Dark Ages, while the Renaissance and the Reformation belong to the modern world.

NOTE—The principal authorities of which use has been made are:—

Luther's Primary Works, translation by Wace & Buchheim.
Political Consequences of the Reformation, R. H. Murray.
Five Centuries of Religion, G. C. Coulton.
Cambridge Modern History (Vol. II, "Reformation").
History of English Law, Pollock & Maitland.
English Life in the Middle Ages, L. F. Salzman.
History of European Literature, Hallam.
England in the Age of Wycliffe, G. H. Trevelyan.
Anglicanism, Carnegie.



The Swarthmore Lecture was established in 1907 as "an annual lecture on some subject relating to the message and work of the Society of Friends." The lecturer for 1926 was Mr. A. Neave Brayshaw, who took as his subject "The Things that are before us." It is an interesting examination of the principles of the Society of Friends and their application to the changing conditions of the life of to-day. The lecturer is a candid critic and does not hesitate to indicate any weakness, but he is convinced that the spirit and fellowship of his Society have still much to do for the world. He speaks of one chief change during the past century—the members mixing with the world undistinguished by dress and speech. "Nothing is now closed to us on the ground that we are Friends; middle-aged men and women are enjoying recreations, for indulgence in which their grandparents would have been disowned, our lives have been enriched by the literary and æsthetic life in which we share. We can look back on two generations of freedom, and estimate gain and loss." The old problem of self-expression and self-denial faces the members, and they must realize the fundamental truth—no cross, no crown. A body of Christians which has done so much in the past will not be found wanting to meet the opportunities of changing conditions as they arise.

AUTONOMY IN THE AUSTRALIAN CHURCH.

BY THE REV. W. H. IRWIN, M.A., ADELAIDE.

A GENERAL convention comprising representatives from every diocese in Australia was held just prior to the quinquennial meeting of the General Synod in October last. The purpose of the convention was the consideration of a draft Bill containing a new constitution for the Church of England in Australia. An interesting course of development led up to the calling of this conference, which bids fair to prove an event of great importance in the history of Australian ecclesiastical affairs. In the days when Sydney was purely a convict settlement the official organization of the Church of England was that of a government department, with a number of chaplains under its control. In 1824 the Home Government appointed the Rev. T. H. Scott to be Archdeacon of the colony, having ecclesiastical powers over the chaplains and being himself subject to the episcopal oversight of the Bishop of Calcutta. A step forward was taken in 1836, when the succeeding Archdeacon, W. G. Broughton, was advanced to the episcopate, as first Bishop of Australia. Within the next twelve years four more bishoprics were cut off from various parts of the original diocese and the bishops thereof took oaths of obedience to the Bishop of Sydney, as their Metropolitan. Two important facts should be borne in mind regarding these bishops and some others appointed in the years immediately following. In the first place the sees of most of them were associated with the capital city of a particular colony and a strong local church feeling developed in each diocese in sympathy with the growth of local feelings in the colony at large. The other fact is that these bishops were appointed by the Crown, the method of their appointment being by Letters Patent, issued by the Sovereign in Council. These documents purported to confer on a bishop, among other things, legal jurisdiction over all the clergy of the Church of England and lay members within the limits of his jurisdiction and provided that bishops in Australia should take an oath of obedience to the Bishop of Sydney, who by his Letters Patent was made subordinate to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Thus the Anglican Church in Australia was united under autocratic bishops, duly subordinated to their Metropolitan and the see of Canterbury. This system of union collapsed in 1867 when the Law Courts declared that Letters Patent were *ultra vires* in self-governing colonies. Archbishop Tait strove to save the situation by imposing upon a bishop at his consecration an oath of due obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury, while in addition the bishop made a solemn declaration after his arrival in the colony, that he would render due obedience to his Metropolitan, the Bishop

of Sydney. But this policy met with very strong opposition and was given up. The course of development was on other lines.

During the fifties of last century discussion was rife in all parts of the Empire upon projects of church government. As early as 1850 a conference of the six Australian bishops favoured the establishment of diocesan synods, and, when these were set up, the laity successfully insisted on forming an integral part of them. Thus, we find that even before the collapse of the system based upon Letters Patent several synods of the modern type had been organized, though the declaration of the invalidity of Letters Patent gave an impetus to their formation and greatly increased their status and importance. In different dioceses different bases were favoured, upon which to found synodal government. There was the statutory basis, adopted first by Bishop Perry in Victoria and later in Tasmania and New South Wales. In these colonies an Act of the local legislature was obtained, settling the powers and constitution of the Synod. This plan did not commend itself to those who were influenced by the opinions of Bishop Selwyn of New Zealand—it savoured too much of Erastianism—and so it came about that in the other three colonies there was adopted as the fundamental principle a consensual compact or voluntary agreement whereby the churchmen of a diocese joined together to form a synod. After many years' experience there appears to be little difference between the practical working of these two methods of organization. Perhaps the statutory constitutions are more august and the enforcement of the law seems more certain under them. But whatever the basis of the diocesan synods, strong local feeling was soon evident in them and it was plainly seen that therein lay seeds of future disruption, unless wise measures were taken. Consequently a General Synod, consisting of all diocesan bishops and both clerical and lay representatives from each diocesan synod, was formed by consensual compact in 1872. Just as the Federal Constitution of the Australian Commonwealth is a strictly limited one, owing to the existence of strong State-rights feelings in the different States, so the powers of the General Synod were deliberately restricted in the interests of the diocesan synods. General Synod legislation, called Determinations, does not become effective till each Determination has been accepted by two-thirds of the diocesan synods and, even then, it is very doubtful whether a Determination has any legal force in a diocese that refuses to pass it. Certainly no legislation of General Synod can override the statutory provisions of the State acts constituting the dioceses in New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania. In spite of all this, the General Synod has not proved useless, for it has originated many measures of great value, which have kept the dioceses to some extent in step with each other, and, best of all, it has stood for over forty years a symbol of unity. It is most important to observe, that the powers of General Synod are further restricted because each diocese has voluntarily restricted itself in a certain respect. At the foundation of all the synods there was written into their constitutions provisions which forbade them

ever to alter the Book of Common Prayer or the Articles of the United Church of England and Ireland, except as they may be legally altered in England. This course was taken to preserve the unity and permanence of the faith and because Churchmen in those days were proud to belong to the Church of England, for the "Catholic Church," which rivals it to-day in the affections of many, had then but scarcely appeared on the horizon, no bigger than a man's hand.

For many years the increase of the powers of General Synod was debated in an academic way, till at length two things brought the matter prominently before Australian Churchmen. Some twenty or more years ago the claim was made that the decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council did not apply in India, and thereupon a similar claim was made in Australia. To ascertain whether this was so or not, the General Synod in 1905 appointed a committee to obtain the opinions of learned counsel in England and Australia as to the legal position of the Australian Church. This committee reported to General Synod in 1916 that the unanimous opinion of counsel was that by their own acts the different Australian dioceses had bound themselves absolutely to the Church of England and could not alter the Prayer Book or Articles without endangering their property. Anglicans in Australia thus found themselves in the peculiar position, that, though they were not an integral part of the Church in England, yet they were tied to Canterbury and York. The General Synod of 1916 appointed another committee to inquire what ought to be done under these circumstances, and as a result of this committee's labours a Determination was introduced into the General Synod of 1921 providing for very great increases in the Synod's powers. This measure passed its second reading by large majorities, but, when the constitutional point was about to be raised concerning the power of the Synod to pass such legislation, it was decided to refer the Determination and the committee's report to the diocesan synods, with the result that the Determination was rejected in the archdioceses of Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane and in the diocese of Tasmania, while some of the dioceses which accepted it suggested further safeguards. This result strongly supports the contention of those who have maintained that General Synod is a very unrepresentative body. The Determination of 1921 is dead, but the precaution had been taken at the last General Synod to empower the Primate to call a Convention of the whole Church for the express purpose of drawing up a new church constitution. This Convention met in October and for a basis of discussion a Draft Bill had been prepared mainly by the Bishop of Bathurst and Professor Peden of Sydney.

What has been the attitude of Australian Evangelicals to this movement towards autonomy? In its first stages they were frankly hostile, and it has been their opposition mainly which has prevented any changes being made to date. We venture to think that this past attitude of Evangelicals towards severing the legal nexus

with the Church in England was a perfectly justifiable one. Rejoicing in a position which, to say the least, was legally very strong, and regarding with considerable distrust both the complaints of those who held that they were hindered in their labours by the rigidity of the Prayer Book and also the appeals to Australian sentiment by bishops not specially sensitive to Australian ideals in other respects, Evangelicals relied, and relied successfully, on a *non-possumus* policy. This policy has been revised by many, though perhaps not by a majority of Evangelicals, in order to meet the changed conditions of the present time. It has become increasingly clear that the existence of the legal nexus with England does not prevent each diocese developing along its own doctrinal and ritualistic lines, and the expressed fear of the Archbishop of Perth is well grounded, that a few small dioceses, urged on by earnest though unbalanced men, may compromise the Church. We have not in Australia the prevalence of ritual anarchy which we are told exists in England, but things are moving in that direction, and the only method whereby we are able to escape this danger seems to be the construction of clear and definite Church laws. To do this we must sever the legal nexus and draw up our Church constitution afresh. There are risks in this policy, but they are less than those which arise from leaving things as they are, for the present trend is towards the gradual isolation and alienation of dioceses, and it can only end in the disaster of schism. A further consideration, which appeals more strongly to the members of the great Evangelical diocese of Sydney than does the danger of schism, which impresses especially those Evangelicals who form minorities in High Church dioceses, is the character of the present revision of the Prayer Book in England. To quote the Archbishop of Sydney, "The present revision in England, amid very much that is excellent, contains several provisions from which many amongst ourselves gravely dissent. If mistakes are to be made, I, for one, would prefer that we ourselves make them rather than accept them from someone else." But we must not give the impression that only Evangelicals are chary of attempting to reorganize the Church. Large numbers of High Churchmen, who are temperamentally conservative, view any changes with great dislike, while some Anglo-Catholics, recognizing that the present state of "lawlessness" in the Church plays directly into their hands, are nervous when it is proposed to straighten out the law and tighten up discipline. They suspect an Australian revision will not give them as much as the English one. They are probably right.

To turn to the Draft Constitution proposed for consideration at the Convention. It was agreed on all sides that Bishop Long and Professor Peden had put an able and statesmanlike measure before the Church. The form of the Bill was determined by the peculiar circumstances that the Church in every State of the Commonwealth is so bound by its past actions that only a Parliamentary measure can give it freedom to participate in a new Australian Church constitution. The restricted powers possessed by the Commonwealth Parliament preclude any attempt to obtain a

Federal Act, and recourse must be had to each separate State Parliament. The Draft Bill took the form, accordingly, of a measure to be enacted by a State Parliament. The Bill itself was a very short one, consisting merely of title, preamble, and three small clauses. The crucial part of the measure, the proposed constitution, was set forth in a schedule to the Bill. A perusal of this schedule showed that those who drafted it had adopted the leading features of the system of synodal government which has been developed in the Anglican communion.

These are too familiar to need description here, and were generally of a kind to which no one took exception. It is interesting to observe that the final outcome of these machinery sections reveals the inevitable trend of Australian democratic sentiment in the large number of small but important diminutions of episcopal powers.

Broadly the Convention had to face two main problems: (1) The future doctrinal and ritual standards of the Church; (2) The relation of the powers of General Synod to those of the dioceses. Here marked differences of opinion showed themselves. Before the Convention met, the Sydney Synod had put forth an alternative Draft Bill upon conservative lines and upholding diocesan rights. This measure, though not substituted for the Draft Bill as the basis for discussion, was laid on the table for reference and greatly influenced the final form of the constitution.

(1) The Draft Bill set forth the proposed faith and order in a series of Solemn Declarations, of which the important ones were:

"2. The Church of England in Australia is a part of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church and this Church will not by its own act or will sever communion with the Church of England in England, nor with other national, regional, or provincial Churches maintaining communion with that Church.

"3. This Church doth hold and will continue to hold the faith of Christ as professed by the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church from primitive times and in particular as set forth in the creeds known as the Nicene Creed and the Apostles' Creed.

"4. This Church doth accept and receive all the scriptures of the Old and New Testament as given by inspiration of God and containing all things necessary for salvation.

"5. This Church doth receive and approve (the Prayer Book, Ordinal, Articles, Prohibited Degrees).

"6. This Church will ever teach the doctrine and administer the sacraments and discipline of Christ as He hath commanded, and preserve the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons in the sacred ministry."

Now these declarations were far from satisfactory, especially to the Evangelicals, and so they were re-drafted in the following much more satisfactory form:

"2. The Church of England in Australia, being a part of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and in communion with the Church of England in England, will ever remain and be in com-

munion with the Church of England in England, and with national, regional, or provincial churches maintaining communion with that Church, so long as communion is consistent with the solemn declarations set forth in this chapter.

" 3. This Church doth, as heretofore, receive all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith given by inspiration of God and containing all things necessary for salvation.

" 4. (Add 'One' before 'Holy'.)"

" 5. This church will ever obey the command of Christ to teach His doctrine, administer His sacraments of Holy Baptism and Holy Communion, follow and uphold His discipline, and preserve the three orders of bishops, priests and deacons in the sacred ministry.

" 6. This church doth retain and approve the book of Common Prayer and the doctrine and principles contained therein, and will not in any revision of the book of Common Prayer or otherwise make or permit any alteration which would change the character of this Church as shown by its assent to this as well as to the other solemn declarations set forth in this chapter." (N.B.—The book of Common Prayer includes Articles by definition at end of Bill.)

These declarations are to be interpreted by a Supreme Australian Tribunal, constituted thus: A president (who must be a bishop) and six other members, three of whom should be bishops or priests, and three of whom should be laymen, belonging to the legal profession. The Draft Bill had stated baldly that no Australian church court should be bound by decisions of the Privy Council, but this was altered by the addition of the words " nothing in this section shall preclude any such decision from being cited to any Court or Tribunal as a persuasive precedent." What exactly is the effect of this amendment not even the leading lawyers seemed able to decide, but the intention of the Convention was that Privy Council judgments should be the law until reversed by the Supreme Church Tribunal in Australia. In deciding questions of faith and order the tribunals are to have recourse to " the history, practice, custom and canons of the Church of England in England." A long process was devised for an Australian revision of the Prayer Book and care was taken to remove the possibility that Prayer Book changes made in England shall not automatically become compulsory or permissible in Australia. But General Synod can accept all or part of the English revision, and further a diocese may forbid within its own boundaries any part of what the General Synod has accepted.

(2) As the members of the Convention were actually representatives elected by dioceses, it is easy to see how important to them was the transference of powers from the dioceses to General Synod. Here the Draft Bill was remodelled on the lines of the Commonwealth Constitution. In a number of matters the canons of General Synod are to prevail entirely, and in others, where there is any inconsistency between a canon of General Synod and an ordinance of any diocese, the canon, to the extent of the inconsistency, is not to apply to that diocese, e.g., the Consecration of Bishops is con-

trolled by General Synod and the organization of Home and Foreign Missions by diocesan synods. The larger dioceses have long had a decided grievance concerning General Synod's system of representation, by which the smaller dioceses were over-represented. The Convention decided to rectify this matter by making the number of representatives directly proportional to the number of licensed clergy—taken as roughly indicating the size of a diocese. Of course the significance of the controversy over this matter consists in the fact that the strength of the Evangelicals lies in the larger dioceses, e.g. Sydney and Melbourne, hitherto under-represented.

The Convention began in an atmosphere of suspicion, but as time went on Bishop Long of Bathurst so impressed on the Evangelicals that he was out for the good of the Church and not for the predominance of a faction, that the Draft Bill, as revised, was finally carried with enthusiasm and almost unanimously. It has now to be approved by each diocesan synod, and a private Act has to be passed through each State Parliament. The outlook is very promising for the accomplishment of all these steps.

Three Simple Discussions on the Prayer Book of the Reformation, by B. M. G., with a Foreword by Bishop Knox (Chas. J. Thynne & Jarvis, 3d.). The author acknowledges his indebtedness to two articles which appeared in THE CHURCHMAN—Professor Alison Phillips' "The Study of the Reformation," and Mr. Albert Mitchell's "Vestments." Some important facts are briefly and clearly stated.

Among the Magazines received are :

The Church Missionary Review. The Bishop of Uganda writes on Church and State in Uganda. 1s. net.

The East and West. 1s. net.

The Moslem World. 2s. net.

The Dublin Magazine. A Quarterly Review of Literature, Science and Art issued in Dublin. 2s. 6d.

Theology. 1s. net.

Anglican Theological Review. An American Church Quarterly for which the Oxford University Press is the English representative. 4s. 6d. net.

The Expository Times. A useful monthly review of current theological literature. 10d. net.

The Dawn. An Evangelical Magazine issued monthly. 6d.

The Chronicle. A Protestant Episcopal Progressive-Liberal monthly.

The magazines of the C. and C.C.S. (*Greater Britain Messenger*), S.A.M.S., L.J.S., Evangelical Alliance (*Evangelical Christendom*), London City Mission, Women's Protestant Union, Church Association (*The Church Intelligencer*), Irish Church Missions (*The Banner of the Truth in Ireland*).

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

THE Bishop of London's Lenten Book for this year is written by Dr. Cyril Alington, the Head Master of Eton College. The Bishop is fortunate in securing a wide variety of writers to contribute to this useful series of annual volumes which has now reached its ninth or tenth year. The title of the book is *Elementary Christianity* (Longmans, Green & Co., 2s. 6d. net). The name might suggest that the line of thought is of an elementary character, but this is far from being the case. In fact, Dr. Alington's association with the educated classes of the country leads him to deal with his subject in parts on a level that will be above the apprehension of the more ordinary type of readers. The idea which he wishes to convey by the term is that if a man accepts the belief that there is behind creation a personal and loving Power, for which good reasons are given in the book, he can hardly refuse to believe that Christ is what St. Paul called Him, "the image of the invisible God," that He showed our earth all of divinity that can be shown in the conditions of one human life, more than His own people could understand, more than has yet been fully grasped by all the generations that have followed. This, he says, seems to him to be Elementary Christianity. He sets out to meet many of the current objections raised to these views. He notes the wide diffusion of "a Christian spirit" but the absence of definite Christian belief. The defence of Christianity is carried on, he says, at an intellectual altitude unapproachable by the average man, which is probably, as I have indicated, the charge which will be brought against Dr. Alington himself. Yet he states some deep truths in as popular a way as it is probably possible to put them. He is perhaps unaware of the limitations of the ordinary man's thought, as well as of his lack of interest in art and literature. The relation of belief to other knowledge, the unity of truth, the influence of the Romantic School of poetry, are all useful points in dealing with educated people, but they will not make much appeal to the great mass of average men and women. This is no disparagement of the book, for it will serve a valuable purpose, though not quite that which Dr. Alington apparently had in view. His appeal is to a class that is probably more difficult to reach, and his book is, therefore, all the more important and timely. With converts to Mohammedanism, and Buddhism in its theosophical form, in our midst, the claims of Christ need to be stated on the lines which he has adopted. Recent teaching again on psychology, telepathy, spiritism and Christian Science requires the careful statement of the Christian point of view in relation to modern developments. He believes that the XXXIX Articles and the Athanasian Creed present intellectual obstacles to many. Doctrinal statements couched in obsolete terms such as "Person" and "Substance," and crude theories of the Atonement, are also indicated as obstacles. He presents St. Paul's conception of the

Church as given in the Epistle to the Ephesians as the best view for a "good Catholic." He pleads for room for a wide difference of belief among Christians.

The moral obstacles receive special and necessary attention. It is unfortunately only too true that the attitude of many is expressed in the words: "Christians are not, in fact, good enough to make it worth while to join Him." Dr. Alington adds: "We stand before the world as the disciples of a Master whose message to the world was love, a message delivered in the name of a God in whose sight whosoever liveth without charity is counted dead: and the world regards us as a small society which believes that the road to heaven is in its particular and private keeping. Can there be any doubt that this is because neither as individuals nor as a body we 'put first things first'?" These extracts are sufficient to show that thoughtful readers will find much useful teaching in this book, and preachers may draw from it some valuable suggestions for sermons.

I referred in my notes last quarter to Miss Constance L. Maynard's interesting life of Dora Greenwell. Since then the promised new edition of *Two Friends*, edited by her and published by H. R. Allenson (3s. 6d. net), has been issued. Miss Maynard contributes a useful Introduction and Summary which will be a guide to those unacquainted with the purpose and style of the author. As the landmarks in the progress of thought from bewilderment to satisfaction revealed in these six chapters are difficult to find, Miss Maynard gives a summary of each chapter "in clear and prosaic terms." In Chapter I, "The Young Life of the Soul," is portrayed as it passes through the period of immaturity to the place where the vision of the Cross of Christ comes as a revelation, and thence through the sense of loneliness to security. The second chapter discusses the question which at some time faces the thoughtful, "Is there a strife between Christ and Beauty?" This is, as Miss Maynard says, "a very wonderful chapter" containing "the most essentially beautiful passage in the whole book." "The contrast between Individual and Collective well-being" is the subject of the third chapter. Here the problems of the conflicts between the duties of the individual to himself and to the community of which he forms a part are discussed. There is some searching criticism of the weaknesses of various sections of Christianity in Chapter IV on "The Strength of the Church considered as a Whole." She deals especially with the relative values of Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. The penetration and appropriateness at the present time of the following statement illustrates the mind of the author: "It is the irrational which is above all else the unspiritual; we shall ever find that the least rational view, or in other words, the most superstitious one, of any divine ordinance, is invariably the one which least helps to spirituality." The further conclusion naturally follows: "As with its rites so with its great institutions; it is those who understand what a Church is who are least likely to rest in it,

or in anything short of Him to whom it leads." The fifth chapter carries some of these thoughts still further. Its title is, "Truth is the Basis of Faith." The last chapter, on "Natural and Spiritual Comfort," deals with the ultimate harmony that must prevail when all antagonisms shall be reconciled. No summary can give an idea of the style in which the thoughts are expressed or of the charm of the whole of this discussion of life and its meaning. This is again a book for preachers.

The Sermon on the Mount suggests many questions to thoughtful minds. Its interpretation, and its application to the circumstances of our lives, are not always a simple matter. Conduct and prayer are both subjects on which the young especially need guidance. The Rev. Canon J. B. Lancelot, of Liverpool, has written a book containing twelve lectures on the Sermon on the Mount which is just the kind of explanation of its teaching which should be put into the hands of anyone seeking to understand the bearing of the Sermon on life to-day. Its title is *Guidance and Rule* (Skeffington & Son, Ltd., 2s. 6d. net) and it contains clear, sane, direct treatment of the chief points in the Sermon. There is an introduction explaining its characteristics and place in our Lord's ministry. The paradoxes of the Beatitudes are presented in their true light. The values of the Kingdom are clearly explained. The Lord's Prayer is made the occasion of an admirable summary of the character of true prayer. Such a sentence as "Better be rugged and silent Moses standing alone than ready-tongued Aaron and a foolish crowd at his heels" gives an excellent idea of the sound and practical way in which Canon Lancelot deals with problems of life and conduct. The use of money and the questions arising out of the non-resistance of injuries are treated in the same rational way, showing that our Lord did not intend men to adopt an ascetic life in order to be His followers. The Christian character is portrayed in the Sermon, yet, as he shows, the Sermon cannot be taken as complete, apart from Christ and His work for mankind.

Archdeacon Buckland, in his interesting presentation of the character and influence of the Evangelical School in this number of *THE CHURCHMAN*, refers to a book recently published in which some account is given of events not generally known in the history of Evangelicalism during the last hundred years. It is *Evangelical By-Paths*, by the Rev. Alfred Leedes Hunt, M.A. (Chas. J. Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd., 3s. 6d. net). It is described as "Studies in the Religious and Social Aspects of the Evangelical Revival of the Eighteenth Century, and a Reply to Critics." Its publication comes appropriately at the time of the celebration of the centenary of the Islington Clerical Meeting, when attention is naturally directed to the place and development of Evangelical life and thought in the Church. Mr. Hunt, in the course of preparation for a life of David Simpson, incumbent of Christ Church, Macclesfield, a friend of Wesley, Rowland Hill, the Countess of Huntingdon, and the Ryle

family, has had access to a quantity of contemporary documents from which he has drawn many of the interesting points contained in this volume. He gives facts and incidents which show that the estimate of Evangelical influence given by Canon H. A. Wilson at Islington is a just one. At a time when St. Paul's Cathedral had no more than six communicants on Easter Day, the churches of the Evangelical clergy were crowded. It is strange to read that these numbers were a ground of complaint. One Evangelical leader was cited before his Bishop on the charge of "overcrowding his church." Thomas Jones was refused permission to deliver sermons at St. Saviour's, Southwark, because his congregation was too large. It would be difficult to imagine episcopal intervention on such a ground to-day. Nor would it be possible to imagine an Archbishop telling one of his clergy: "Were you to inculcate the morality of Socrates, it would do more good than canting about the new birth." "Canting crew" was one of the terms in which reference was made to the Evangelicals. Others of a similar character were "fanatical divines," "clerical enthusiasts," "sanctified cobblers," "mercenary strangers," "spiritual pedlars." Yet we read of churches with six hundred communicants at a service, and of the occasions when Grimshaw had so many that "as many as thirty-five bottles of wine" were used. Gladstone's testimony to the Evangelicals is quoted: "The Church of England at large is profoundly and vitally indebted to them for having aroused her from her slumbers and set her vigorously about her work." We are amazed to find that the Evangelical institution of Sunday Schools was opposed on the ground that "any good impressions formed would die away when the child went out into the world." These scattered notes are full of interest to Evangelical Churchpeople. A little more care in the arrangement of them would have added much to the usefulness of the book for purposes of reference.

Increasing and helpful attention has been given in recent years to the study of the work of the Holy Spirit. The last Church Congress held at Southport was devoted to a fresh consideration of the subject from many points of view. The Committee of the Congress determined to embrace a wide range of thought, and to give the broadest interpretation of the whole field of spiritual activities. The papers were exceptionally valuable, but the volume containing the report of them is likely to be beyond the reach of many purses. It was a happy inspiration that led the Bishop of Liverpool to invite Canon Raven to write an account of the Congress and to issue it in a cheap form so as to make it available for all. The volume is published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton under the title *The Eternal Spirit* (2s. 6d. net, in paper cover). The aim of the Congress is stated by the Bishop of Liverpool in a brief Foreword. It is "a review of Christian thinking and experience so designed that contributions from many different sources might be brought to bear upon a common quest. Scientists, philosophers, theologians, artists, administrators, and leaders of social and religious

movements were invited to show us human aspirations towards truth, beauty and goodness in the light of the eternal striving of the Spirit of God in and through the spirit of man." This promises an unusual treat and the reader is not disappointed. But in such a complex and varied subject a capable guide is needed to point out the various stages of the progress, and Canon Raven proves such a guide. He had no easy task, but he fulfils his duty to the benefit of all who follow his leadership. He explains the thought which led to the selection of the subject and its method of treatment. It was carefully arranged to give fresh insight into the most important subject in the life of the Church not only and especially to-day but at every period of its existence. The need is, however, specially felt in our own times, and we have no doubt that the Congress has given a strong impetus to a fuller understanding and realization of "The Eternal Spirit" in human life. "What is manifestly needed to-day is simply spiritual power," and this volume brings before us great truths concerning the source of that power. It is impossible to attempt to summarize even the outline of the Congress programme, or to mention the names of those who took part. It began with "The Eternal Spirit in Nature and the Bible." The paper of Dr. Adami on the first section made a powerful appeal. His death so soon before the Congress made peculiarly effective the declaration of his conviction, practically his dying utterance, that "the love of God is everything, and that if a man possesses this other things are secondary." There are a host of other striking statements and a valuable presentation of old and new truths, which it is impossible to read without feeling the inspiration of the power that was manifested throughout the gathering.

So much has been written about psycho-analysis that many of us who have never had any practical experience of psycho-therapy or of the need of it have frequently desired some treatment of the subject that would give a clear impression of its value and significance. I have found in Mr. A. E. Baker's *Psycho-analysis Explained and Criticised* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.) a book that seems to meet the need. He sets himself to answer as briefly as possible the question, Are the leaders of the psycho-analytical movement among the world's great discoverers, or are they to be placed among the great charlatans? Whatever opinion we may form of the answer, the book itself will provide us with an interesting, instructive and at times amusing insight into the teaching and methods of the system. Mr. Baker has in an exceptional degree the gift of being entertaining. No subject could be dull in his hands, and his illustrations are real windows which admit light. Our Forgetfulness and Mistakes are explained to us. Our dreams are analysed in true psycho-analytical fashion, but the verdict on the theories advanced is "Not proven." We are then introduced to the study of the "complex" and that leads to "the unconscious," which is, we are shown, only a metaphor. There is nothing existent corresponding to it. Symbols and Rationalization represent some of the least comprehensible phases

of psycho-analysis, especially when the latter represent the tribute vice plays to virtue. His final conclusion is that "psycho-analysis contains much plausible speculation, many interesting and amusing assumptions" and when the whole imposing structure is tested by the ordinary rules of evidence and laws of logic an unbiased critic would conclude that "it is not proven."

Bishop Handley Moule's *Ephesian Studies* and his *Colossian Studies* are well known in Evangelical circles. His method of dealing with the text and of drawing from it the special significance which an intimate knowledge of the Greek reveals has proved of immense advantage to students of these Epistles. A new impression of the second edition of each of them has just been issued by Messrs. Chas. J. Thynne & Jarvis (3s. 6d. net each). These will give an opportunity of making a new generation acquainted with the results of the ripe scholarship of one of our Evangelical masters. They will be a useful addition to the library of theological students and of those who are in the early years of their ministry. The same firm has also issued a new impression of Bishop Lightfoot's important essay on "The Christian Ministry" (3s. 6d. net). This is another book which every theological student should possess. Nothing has been found since this essay was written to alter the conclusions arrived at by the Bishop, who was one of the great trio of Biblical scholars of the nineteenth century, his companions being Bishop Westcott and Dr. Hort. The essay, as is well known, shows that there is no place for a sacerdotal system in the Church, and that no sacrificial tribe or class can come between God and man. "Each individual member holds personal communion with the Divine Head."

The Report of the Islington Clerical Conference Centenary Gathering, published by the *Record* with the title *Grace and Truth* (1s. post free), will be treasured as a souvenir of a memorable occasion. The papers contain a useful record of Evangelical activity for a century, a valuable estimate of the influence of the School, and statements on the fundamental truths maintained by it. The writers are the Rev. H. W. Hinde, Canon H. A. Wilson, the Bishop of Warrington, Canon J. B. Lancelot, Rev. C. M. Chavasse, Rev. C. Sydney Carter and the Rev. the Hon. W. Talbot Rice. The Centenary sermon preached by Bishop Chavasse is also included in the book.

G. F. I.



REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

REALITY: A NEW CORRELATION OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION.
By B. H. Streeter. *Macmillan*. 8s. 6d.

This is a supremely honest book. Disagreeing or agreeing with the writer, he places all his readers under a debt of gratitude. Dr. Streeter writes with charm, conviction and persuasiveness. He never runs away from a difficulty. Whether the spectre of the mind is discovered to be either a ghost or a man in armour, he faces it and, if he cannot defeat it, he acknowledges his perplexity. Unlike most men who would call themselves "liberal thinkers" he is definitely religious. Again and again when we found ourselves in conflict with his views we were tempted to say, "I prefer to be wrong with Streeter than right with many of his critics," for he always has the soul naturally Christian, and his passion for Christ and the Cross comes to the front to disarm our wrath and to force us to hail him as a brother much as we may dissent from him. This is at once the value and the danger of the book. Readers learn to love the writer and find it hard to attack his conclusions lest they may seem to quarrel with his sincerity.

To most readers the Introduction will prove the most attractive part of the volume. It is a self-revelation that evokes sympathy. He had intended to become a lawyer. When reading for "Greats" he suddenly realized "that the religious beliefs in which I had been brought up rested on a very slender intellectual foundation; and I awoke one day to find myself an agnostic." (Parenthetically we may remark that this is by no means an unusual experience for the ardent young Christian who is immersed in the study of philosophy and finds speculative doubt, living and working in one department of his mind, suddenly invading his most profound beliefs. Several of the men who have passed through this eclipse of faith have found that what they considered to be an insufficient foundation was not the foundation on which faith should be and was thereafter built.) He struggled, and strange to say determined to be ordained, as he had reached what he considered to be Truth through an amalgam of T. H. Green, Gore, and Illingworth. Again doubt attacked him. He wished to relinquish his orders and was only restrained by the influence of a senior friend. Through the Christian Student Movement he gained a knowledge of Reality—of that "Beyond which is also Within." This was a new starting-point, and this book is the reasoned statement of the conclusions he has reached. And let us say at once that though his conclusions must be understood as personal, they reflect a state of mind that is by no means unique. "This book is not a 'Defence of Christianity'; indeed, in Christianity as traditionally presented there are some things which (if I had any taste for theological controversy) I should be more inclined to attack than to defend. It is an attempt to discover Truth."

And therein lies its value. When Dr. Streeter discusses the popular views on Materialism, Absolutism and other theories as destructive of Faith, all he says is worth not only reading but following. The old Materialism is dead, but a subtle Mechanism takes its place and against this the argument is convincing. "The grand error implicit in most apologetic literature is to treat Religion and the 'evidences' for it as if it were a branch of Science. A Religion is true if, and in proportion as, the quality which it expresses is actually existent in, and characteristic of, Reality. It follows that to test the element of truth in any religion we must direct our attention first of all, not to the intellectual constructions of the theologian, but to myth and rite, to hymn and prayer, to parable and proverb, to the mystic's meditation and the prophet's trumpet call." He has no contempt for the theologian, but this is his way of saying that we must get back to the experiences, either individual or historical, which lie at the root of logical expression. In a brief appendix to the chapter from which we quote, Dr. Streeter shows that christianity is the only religion that has "faced up" to all the facts of experience. "Christianity was flashed upon the world as a Vision; and its synthetic unity is not that of a well-drawn committee report, but that of a work of art; and like a mediæval cathedral it is the objectification of corporate, as well as of individual intuition." But something more must be said. "The Vision came in the Person of the Incarnate Son of God. He is the Truth, and in Him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. And precisely, because Christianity is the religion of the personal Revelation of God, it is unique, universal and final."

The chapter on "The Christ" is the core of the book. He holds that if the ideal Man who is Divine appeared on earth he would be found creative. He asks, "Is Christ such an Individual?" and shows from many angles of approach that He fulfils this condition. While all men are potentially sons of God—not slaves but freemen, our Lord was the one great Freeman who showed in His life true Sonship of God. Step by step he proves that our Lord realized the Ideal in every respect, and his answers to the criticisms on His character are at once convincing and inspiring. We, however, do not agree with his criticism of the conventional evidence of the "sinlessness" of Christ. It is by no means negative. It does not convey to our mind that the moral ideal is merely to do no harm—for with us abstention from doing all that can be done and ought to be done, is in itself a missing of the mark and therefore sin. It is true that our Lord attained moral perfection in His positive and creative passion for righteousness. With others sin enters into the effort. In those who serve most truly the highest, there is the deepest consciousness of imperfection and sin. With Him there was no such consciousness of failure or imperfection. Therefore we hold that the argument from His sinlessness to His Divinity is valid.

The chapter on the New Psychology is specially valuable at this time. Here are sentences worth pondering. "The intensity

of a religious, as of any other, conviction might in itself be explained in psycho-neurotic terms; but its quality is a different matter. Putting it in another way, fanaticism may well be a pathological symptom; insight is not. In almost every asylum there is some one who is quite convinced that he is the Messiah; so was Jesus Christ—but that is the end of the resemblance between them." This is one of the many startling passages in a supremely honest book. Is it irreverent? No it is not, for right down at the foundation of much of the pathological nonsense that passes for normal psychology lies the same error—an assertion of identity, when everything is radically different. As we have said, agree or disagree with Dr. Streeter—he has always something to teach. We believe that he has not reached the end of his quest, and that a great deal he jettisons to-day he will find has real importance and will bring him nearer to Reality at its best, highest and truest.

THE FUTURE OF CHRISTIANITY. Edited by Sir James Marchant.
John Murray. 7s. 6d.

"The modern world is not, like the ancient world in the first centuries of our era, wearied and disillusioned. Quite the contrary: it is eager for knowledge, for discovery, for enjoyment, for adventure. Even the Great War could not damp its ardour or depress its spirit. It is for this reason that the world of to-day does not trouble itself much about the greatest of all questions." These suggestive words appear in the ablest of all the essays in this valuable work. They are written by the Archbishop of Armagh, and they clearly point to what we all experience—a good-natured tolerance for Christianity and its teaching as one of the many departments of modern life in which men of a certain temperament find an opportunity for exercising that timeless quest of the human soul to find satisfaction. The Christian is classed with the scientist and discoverer, the philosopher and the pleasure seeker—all out for ends, and no question is raised as to the relative value of these ends. Religion has ceased to be in the minds of many a pursuit of the ultimate end that interests all humanity. It is the domain of the specialist who is drawn to it, and this in our opinion is an aspect of modern life too little taken into account. As the Archbishop adds: "Fifty years ago, men who doubted called themselves agnostics, and men who denied were frankly atheists. Now, politely tolerant of all kinds of opinion, men accept the forms of religion as tolerable elements in a civilized life, and do not worry about the ultimate meanings, feeling vaguely that the problems raised are too difficult for solution." And yet men live, sin and die. Men cannot put conscience to sleep and the great weight of this unintelligible world rests upon them. Mysticism may be to many a way out, and here it is said they come in contact with a supreme Reality. But the study of mysticism shows that this Reality is conditioned very largely by contemporary thought and the ideas in which mysticism flourishes. Mere mysticism opens

no doors to Reality of the universal type. We need something more.

This book discusses the future of Christianity as synonymous with the future of Religion ; and it is right in so doing. For there can be no doubt in the mind of the Christian that his religion is ultimate and universal. As Dr. Cave says : " If we believe that in Christ there is true revelation of God, true communion, true redemption, we are committed to the belief that Christianity is of final and universal worth." In his essay he supplies a corrective to the loose and inaccurate accounts given of Modern Hinduism, Buddhism and Islamism. There are few things in contemporary missionary literature more annoying to those who know, than the eulogies on the Christianity, latent of course, of certain Asiatic teachers. They may have professedly a high admiration for Christ, but they are among the most thorough-going opponents of the religion which He taught. There are many Christian writers who are unstinted in their praise for Sakyi Muni, but this does not make them apostles of Buddhism—quite the reverse, for they see in his teaching, in its corruptions, the elements that are antagonistic to the Revelation of God in Christ. And too often admiration for the Christ is employed by those of alien faiths as a weapon against Christianity. The claims of Christ are all-compelling or nothing on those who accept Him as Lord and Saviour ; and this book teaches this lesson.

The best review of the work is to be found in the Introductory Essay by the Bishop of Gloucester, who seems to have read some pages that are not to be found in the published volume. Dr. Headlam shows with his usual clarity that Christianity does not vary. Science and philosophy change. This fact is sufficient to make of little value the many re-statements we find of Christianity in terms of contemporary thought. What Science or Philosophy establishes as unassailable conclusions or probable hypotheses we have to take into account. No Christian apologetic is of value that bases itself on the denial of the known, and therefore when we find writers ignoring what every man acquainted with the progress of discovery knows, we can place little trust in their arguments. Christianity does not live in a sphere different from that in which men live and move and have their being. It lives among men—modern men, and must have a definite message for them, and so it has. We may find the idea of timelessness of little account with many thinkers of to-day, but there are two kinds of timelessness—the timelessness of Truth, which for the Christian means the timelessness of God and His Eternal Son, and the other a speculative timelessness which divides all into a dualism of the eternal that changes not and the shadows that vary in experience. And our Religion is ultimately the union of that which in man responds to the timeless Personality that is behind all things, dwells in all things and sustains all things, God the Transcendent—God the Immanent. Here we find this book most helpful. It has a firm grasp of the Eternal, and it shows how the Eternal manifests Him-

self in time and thereby comes close to us. Dr. Matthews in his masterly essay on "The Doctrine of Christ" tells us: "The empirical, historical personality of Jesus is the adequate incarnation in time and space of the Eternal Word." We may here state that after reading Baron von Hügel's paper on "God and Suffering," we find ourselves unable to endorse with full assent Dr. Matthews' dictum. Dr. Garvie is surely justified in his remark that "only the human nature in Christ is a survival of Greek philosophy which hindered an understanding of the Gospel story." We can go so far as to accept that the Person of our Lord suffered, without entertaining the dogma that God suffers. But here we are in the presence of mystery. We can only bow our heads and say, "I cannot understand, I love."

We have read with the greatest interest all the essays. We do not assent by any means to all the volume contains. Professor Peake, according to Dr. Headlam, "does not defend the Bible: he understands it." The destructive criticism of the Bible from the traditional standpoint by no means prepares the reader for the glowing enthusiasm of his closing paragraphs. It may be true that "the search for an infallible authority is a quest that must end in disappointment." The infallibilities, as our fathers conceived them, have gone. But there is an infallibility of Revelation that is contained in the Bible which we cannot avoid holding. Our interpretation is certainly not infallible, but as Dr. Headlam says in his Introduction "there can be no manner of uncertainty" as to the fundamental teaching of Christianity. Dr. Matthews says: "Christ is the completely adequate revelation of the nature of God." This is certainly infallible, and we can rest there. But where do we find this revelation—nowhere else but in the Bible, and Christian experience confirms it. Where Christian teaching departs from this teaching it switches itself on to wrong lines. We have not mentioned the greater part of the contributions to this valuable book. We should like to direct attention to Dr. Tennant on "Sin," Dr. Garvie on "Atonement," and Canon Storr on "Immortality." They as well as the other writers have much to teach us. We close with two criticisms. Some of the writers prefer rhetoric to argument, and this is a pity. And the book has no index. Why are so many contemporary volumes published without a guide to their contents, which are too often forgotten by those who wish to use them. A book of this class without an index loses half its value to the working student.

THE ANGLICAN "VIA MEDIA." By C. Sydney Carter, D.Litt.
Thynne & Jarvis. 3s. 6d.

Dr. Carter has published his book at an opportune moment. We are passing through a phase of English Church history that will profoundly influence the entire future. The Composite Book proclaims to the world that the Church speaks with two voices—one sympathetic with the Reformed Churches and the other an

echo of those teachings which at the Reformation our Church abandoned. And the knights who defend the double voice would say we do this because we are Catholics, not Roman but English, and follow not Rome but the guidance of the Medieval Church. Let it be remembered that it was from the Medieval Church that England revolted on the religious side of our national life, and a return to Medievalism implies a return to the teaching rejected at the Reformation, and ever since held to be incompatible with the plain meaning of our formularies except by an intellectual *tour de force* which twists them into saying the exact opposite of what they do say and were meant to assert.

The book is divided into two parts—the first deals with the Elizabethan Religious Settlement and the second with the Caroline Divines. Both sections are well documented, and as far as we have checked them they may be trusted as giving a faithful account of the opinions held and the books quoted. In this respect Dr. Carter deserves commendation, and we believe with Bishop Knox that the travesty of history which maintains the Elizabethan Reformation to have been on Tractarian lines will not stand a moment's examination in the light of the facts. Our author also deals with the Caroline Divines and proves that their teaching was far removed from what it is proclaimed to be by current Anglo-Catholicism. They never wished to move Romewards or towards the Medievalism abandoned once and for all. In their reaction against a militant Puritanism they stated certain positions with vigour and over-emphasis, but they never forgot that the orientation of the Church of England was not that of Rome but that of the Reformed Churches.

All this and much more will become abundantly clear to the students of *The Anglican "Via Media,"* and we wish to direct attention to one matter of pressing importance. We are told again and again that the doctrine of the Church of England is not altered by the sweeping changes proposed in the Composite Book. Archbishops and Bishops have repeated the slogan, "No Change of Doctrine," and many have accepted their word as the last utterance of well-informed wisdom. We for our part are convinced that there is a change and that our assent if given to the Bishops' Book will be interpreted as agreeing with its plain meaning and not with its subtle patience of interpretation. The alteration of Article XXVIII in 1563 is an historical fact on which much has been built. In 1553 the Article read: "forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth that the body of one and the self-same man cannot be at one time in diverse places but must needs be in some one certain place: therefore the Body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and diverse places. And because (as Holy Scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue until the end of the world, a faithful man ought not either to believe or openly to confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." Parker proposed a new Article

which Convocation rejected and substituted in its stead the statement that "the body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." Bishop Guest declared at the time that this new clause was "of mine own penning" and was not intended "to exclude the Presence of Christ's body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof." At the same time Parker compiled the new Article which we now have on the "wicked which do not eat the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper."

Bishop Gibson maintained that the change in the Article implies "an objective Presence in virtue of consecration, as something external to ourselves, in no way dependent on our feelings or perception of it" or "on our faith." There is a world of difference between saying that "the Body of Christ is given . . . only after an heavenly and spiritual manner" and declaring that the "Body and Blood of Christ are present." The late Bishop of Gloucester held that the new clause we have quoted in Article XXVIII so radically changed the doctrine of the Church that the opinions of Cranmer and Ridley have no more than an historical interest for us. Dr. Carter shows with convincing proof that there is no difference in doctrine between the teaching of the two great Reformers and the teaching of Articles XXVIII and XXIX, and anyone reading the evidence will agree with him unless words have a very different meaning from those they usually bear. We have mentioned this one point as illustrating the inferences that will be drawn from the Composite Book if it become law in anything like the form submitted by the Bishops on February 7. When it is remembered that the Archbishop of York declared his wish to have the Canon of 1549 restored and that the claims of the Anglo-Catholics have been so far admitted in the omissions and insertions in the new Consecration Prayer taken in connection with the permissible and other additions to the Service and the sanctioning of continuous Reservation, it will at once be seen that any declaration that no change of doctrine is intended will be looked upon as merely a "Save face" to cover a fact that cannot be disputed. If so learned a divine as Dr. Gibson could hold that a change has been made when none can be discovered by impartial investigation, how much more can a change be alleged when only by tortuous disingenuity it can be shown not to have occurred? We sincerely hope that *The Anglican "Via Media"* will be widely read. Its appearance is most timely for all interested in Prayer Book Revision, and its study will supply a full answer to those who say that no doctrinal change is involved in the acceptance of the Composite Book. If Evangelical Churchmen accept this book, let it be remembered that it is not their gloss on its teaching which matters, but the plain meaning of its language and teaching as determined by contemporary facts and the circumstances that gave rise to its existence. Dr. Carter has placed us under a debt of gratitude by giving us this carefully written volume.

JOHN WYCLIF: A STUDY OF THE ENGLISH MEDIEVAL CHURCH.
By H. B. Workman, D.Lit., D.D., Principal of Westminster
College. *Oxford: Clarendon Press.* 2 vols. 30s. net.

All who are interested either in John Wyclif or in the history of Church affairs in England in the fourteenth century will give a warm welcome to this full and careful study by Dr. Workman. Wyclif is a difficult subject for a biographer as he very rarely made any personal references to himself either directly or indirectly in his writings; and though he came into close contact from time to time with the world outside, his career was in the main of purely academic interest. Moreover, any decision with regard to some of the points in his life is complicated by the fact that there were other persons bearing the name of John Wyclif living at the time. But Dr. Workman knows the ground well. His earlier books on the period, small though they are, show a clear understanding of its problems, and the one now before us exhibits a range of knowledge and a mastery of detail not often equalled even in work of this kind. These two handsome and well-printed volumes contain indeed such a mass of minute erudition that the reader is at times hardly able to see the wood for the trees. The discussion of Wyclif's absenteeism in regard to his Prebend at Westbury is a case in point. We are there given a great deal of interesting, if not strictly relevant, biographical information about his fellow-Prebends, with the result that the thread of the narrative is apt to get lost. It is the same with the accounts given of the other Commissioners with whom he was associated on the Mission to Bruges; but these details add to the interest and historical value of the book which, though mainly concerned with Wyclif, is, as its sub-title reminds us, a study of the English Medieval Church. We think that some of the material in the book, especially in the chapters "Early Years" and "Graduate Days," would have been better placed in Appendices so as to avoid the overloading of the text with details, but this is a small matter in a book for which all students of Wyclif must be profoundly thankful. Dr. Workman deals very sensibly with the attempts which have been made to detract from Wyclif's character by charges of neglectful pluralism. He did hold the Prebend at Westbury, at least for a time, without residence and without providing a Vicar, but there was no cure of souls attached to it, and after the Black Death and during the French War there were great difficulties in the way of finding suitable clergy. When appointed to the Rectory of Lutterworth he at once took steps to resign his benefice at Ludgershall, and though he did not at first go into residence at Lutterworth, the silence of his enemies is sufficient evidence that he provided a Vicar. In the chapter on Wyclif's place among Schoolmen, Dr. Workman reminds us that one of the reasons why Wyclif's writings have had so little interest for those who have come after him is that though in substance and idea most of them are modern enough, in form they are so completely medieval as to be almost unintelligible except to those familiar with scholastic modes of expression. Their greatest

influence after Wyclif's death was in Bohemia, for though the Hussite movement was of native origin, it received a great impetus from Wyclif's writings.

Dr. Workman takes the view advocated by Miss Deanesley in *The Lollard Bible* in claiming for Wyclif, in association with his fellow-workers, the credit for the first complete English translation of the Bible. The chapter on this subject is one of the best in the book. Dr. Workman discusses the theory revived by Cardinal Gasquet and others that there was an English translation of the Bible, issued with the authority of the Church, current in the fourteenth century before Wyclif began to translate at all. Miss Deanesley gave its quietus to this theory, and Dr. Workman comes independently to the same conclusion and furnishes a brief summary of the evidence. He gives a useful caution against exaggerated statements as to the opposition of the Medieval Church to vernacular translations of the Scriptures. The opposition was real enough, but though licences to translate Scripture or parts of Scripture, or to possess such translations, were rarely given, the theory at least was that with due episcopal licence it was allowable. But medieval practice and medieval theory were two different things, and the fact that to possess any vernacular Scriptures without such licence "was after 1407, as Lyndwood shows, to have taken the first step towards the fire for both book and owner," is sufficiently eloquent with regard to the attitude of the Church. It was, however, not in his earnest desire that the Scriptures should be read by the people in their own tongue that Wyclif showed his originality so much as in his claim that Scripture alone, and not the traditions and decisions of the Church, was the determining factor in regard to doctrine and practice. There is an amusing story, given by Dr. Workman, which Hus reported on the authority of Nicolas Faulfiss. "When Faulfiss was in England in 1407 he dined with a cook whom a bishop reproved for reading the Scriptures in the English tongue contrary to orders. The cook defended himself, to the bishop's disgust, by a quotation from the Bible. 'Do you know to whom you are speaking?' growled the bishop; 'do you dare to answer me with your quotations from Scripture?' The cook replied that "As Christ heard, without anger, the devil quoting Scripture, why will not you, who are less than Christ, hear the Scripture from me?" That the medieval Church was in fact and practice hostile to the circulation of the Scriptures in the language of the people no reasonable doubt can be felt after an impartial study of the evidence.

Dr. Workman's two volumes will be indispensable for any student of Wyclif or of the English Church in the fourteenth century. Author and publisher have combined to give us an excellently arranged, attractively bound, well-illustrated and well-printed book. It is a candid and really learned treatment of a subject of great interest; it contains a bibliography sufficient, but not overweighted with minor authorities; its references for statements in the text are unusually full; the index is good;

and there is not only an analysis of each chapter, but in addition a most serviceable chronological table of events concerning Wyclif which occupies three closely printed pages. We cordially commend the book to the notice of our readers.

LORD SHAFTESBURY AND SOCIAL INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS. By J. Wesley Bready, M.A., B.D. *George Allen & Unwin*. 16s.

No charge against Evangelical religion used to be commoner than that it consisted in a selfish regard for the welfare of one's own soul. The sneer implied that the Evangelical was indifferent to the more material necessities of others. The fact is quite the opposite. At a time when the Evangelicals were insisting most emphatically on the importance before God of the individual soul, they were foremost in efforts for the amelioration of the lot of their fellow-men. Bishop Welldon, in his recent work on "The English Church," supports Mr. Bready in the work under review in pointing the contrast between the leaders of the Tractarian Movement and their Evangelical contemporaries—the former engaged in ecclesiastical controversies and indifferent or hostile to social reform, while the latter were doing all they could for the factory worker, the child labourer, and the poor generally.

Foremost in the philanthropic labours of the maligned Evangelicals was Anthony Ashley Cooper, seventh Earl of Shaftesbury. It was fully time that a new life of him appeared, for Hodder's valuable work is forty years old, and has been long ago out of print. The Hammonds' recent memoir attempted to describe Lord Shaftesbury whilst ignoring or ridiculing the religion which was the inspiring force of his life.

Mr. Bready, in the volume before us, confines himself, it is true, to the economic and social side of Lord Shaftesbury's activities, but he is in full sympathy with its Evangelical basis. His own bias in favour of Wesley leads him to trace Shaftesbury's faith to the direct influence of the great revivalist, saying "Wesley was Shaftesbury's spiritual father." In the ordinary acceptation of the term this statement is incorrect. Shaftesbury owed no more to Wesley than any other Evangelical of his time. Next to Maria Millis, the devoted nurse of his early childhood, the strongest spiritual influence upon him was exerted by that younger generation of Evangelicals of whom Charles Simeon, the Venns, John Newton, the Buxtons, William Wilberforce, Thomas Scott, Zachary Macaulay, and others were representatives. Mr. Bready also introduces a curious comparison between Shaftesbury and Karl Marx, with whose teaching he assumes, without adducing any evidence, that the Englishman was acquainted.

These are trivial defects in an excellent book. Mr. Bready, once launched on his main theme, takes up the social reforms initiated or supported by Shaftesbury and deals with them subject by subject. The reader who has not previously studied what

has been called the Industrial Revolution in England will be amazed to read of the downtrodden condition of the working classes, and especially of the young, during the early part of the nineteenth century.

Shaftesbury's earliest effort after entering Parliament was on behalf of lunatics, who were then treated with inhuman brutality. It took seventeen years of work to get put on the Statute Book the Lunacy Bill of 1845, which laid the foundation of the modern treatment of the insane. Long before that date he had begun to agitate on behalf of the toiling children. The fate of pauper children or the offspring of callous parents was, in the early years of the last century, so piteous that Mr. Bready's accounts, had they not been authenticated by ample evidence, would have been incredible. Practically sold into slavery to manufacturers, boys and girls not yet in their teens were set to labour long hours in unhealthy surroundings, so that they knew little except work and sleep. Others of equally tender years spent their time in coal-mines, half naked, harnessed to coal trucks which they hauled on their hands and knees along low-roofed passages. Others, only so far better off that they worked in the open air, carried heavy loads in brick-field gangs. Tiny boys were used by chimney-sweeps to climb up and sweep chimneys. All alike were liable to cruel treatment and exposed to great moral danger. Step by step, Shaftesbury won their gradual emancipation in the face of opposition from those who regarded their lot as an economic necessity. In like manner, he strove to improve the conditions of adult labour, of which his Ten Hours Bill was the outstanding result. He was not, of course, the only labourer in these fields, but the harvest reaped owed most to his inspiration, his eloquence in Parliament (for he had not yet succeeded to the title) and on the platform, and his untiring labours. He owed something also to his having married the daughter of Lady Cowper, afterwards Lady Palmerston, so that the powerful influence of that *beau sabreur*, Viscount Palmerston, was always enlisted on behalf of "Em's son-in-law." Yet when all such deductions are admitted, Shaftesbury stands out as a truly great man.

The list of his endeavours is far from being exhausted by those already indicated. His prominence in the Church Pastoral-Aid Society, the Bible Society and other spiritual and missionary agencies, his share in the abolition of slavery, the patronage which he wielded in the Church during Lord Palmerston's premiership, and many of the varied interests of his later life, do not fall within the limitations which Mr. Bready has imposed upon himself. Our author does give us some insight into the simple faith and whole-hearted Christian love which govern'd Shaftesbury's actions, and when we have added to the picture these omitted traits, we have an even heightened conception of the man.

History is said to be a tonic for drooping spirits. Evangelicals who may be tempted to despondency at the present outlook should read Shaftesbury's life and pluck up heart again. The same all-

powerful force which armed him for his multitudinous labours and crowned them with success is ready to the hand of the true-hearted Evangelical of to-day.

ARCHBISHOP BRAMHALL. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D.
S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d. net.

The Bishopric of Derry has been associated with men of widely differing gifts whose work has had considerable influence on the life of Ireland. The names of Alexander and Chadwick stand out in our own day. The famous Earl of Bristol represents an earlier period, and earlier still, before Derry had won fame through its siege, the office was held by John Bramhall who, like his successor Alexander, passed from that see to the Primatial Chair of Armagh.

Bramhall was one of the many Englishmen who have endeavoured to make rules and regulations for Ireland without sufficient regard for the character of the people, and the conditions of their age. Most of these attempts have failed and have left an unpleasant memory behind them. Bramhall came to Ireland in the train of Sir Thomas Wentworth the Earl of Strafford, the author of the policy of "Thorough." He was a disciple of Laud and was imbued with the teaching and spirit which ultimately brought the English Primate to the block. The attempt to introduce among the northern Irish, many of whom were of Scotch Presbyterian origin, and had strong sympathies towards that religious system, the rigid ideas of episcopacy was doomed to disaster. It contributed largely to the failure of the Royalist cause in Ulster and roused Puritan antagonism to an uncompromising fury. No doubt the Church of Ireland at that time was in a "deplorable condition," but the fact cannot be ignored that this was in a great measure due to the action of the English and of the English sovereigns. Bramhall in his reports to Laud was not likely to minimize the defects, nor to attribute them to their true source. A Bishop who entered upon the work of his diocese with a sermon on the text, "What will ye? Shall I come unto you with a rod, or in love and a spirit of meekness?" was not likely to prove an acceptable Father in God to his people. We may pass over the part played by Bramhall in regard to the Irish Articles. Dr. Simpson makes it an opportunity for some special pleading as to "the doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence of Christ" in the English Articles. The Bishop, he admits, was "a man of hasty temper and sharp tongue" and rendered himself obnoxious to the Irish. "Next to Wentworth he was the most unpopular man in Ireland."

He was obliged to fly to the Continent when the rule of the Commonwealth began, and here he was soon engaged in controversy with representatives of the Roman Church. The attitude of the Caroline divines towards the Church of Rome constitutes an unpleasant aspect of the past for the Anglo-Catholic apologists of to-day, whose sympathies are so much engaged with the teaching and practice of Latin Christianity. These divines understood the real

significance of Roman dogma ; they saw its incompatibility with the Reformed standards of the Church of England ; they were too loyal to truth to seek to prove the XXXIX Articles to be patient of a Roman Catholic interpretation, and they understood the true presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper too well to endeavour to adapt it to a modified interpretation of Transubstantiation. Indeed it is well to remember in the case of Bramhall that when he is claimed as an upholder of the " real objective presence " he states very definitely that " the true real presence which no genuine son of the Church of England did ever deny " was " after such manner as the body and blood of Christ were present at the first institution." That, as is clear, cannot have been the glorified and heavenly body, for our Lord was not yet risen or ascended.

It is interesting to find that Bramhall had formed a just estimate of the Romish doctrine of intention. If the value of a Sacrament depends altogether on the intention of the individual minister, no man can be secure either as to his Baptism, or as to the consecration of any particular Eucharist, or as to the reality of any Ordination. We are told, of course, in defence that " the meaning of a Sacrament depends neither on the construction placed upon it by the minister nor on the construction placed upon it by the recipient, but on the construction intended by the Corporate Institution within which it is bestowed." It is a pity this line of argument is not carried to its proper conclusion—that the intention ultimately depends upon the construction intended by Christ as the founder of the Corporate Institution. Bramhall's theological position, Dr. Sparrow Simpson says, is unmistakable. It is well described by the term Anglo-Catholic. It should, however, be added that there is little trace in it of the medievalism of the modern Anglo-Catholic. Bramhall never hesitates in company with the other Caroline divines to call himself a Protestant. This naturally requires some explaining away, as it is an awkward fact for the twentieth-century Anglo-Catholic, and Dr. Simpson does the best he can with it from his point of view. The volume has the merits and demerits to be expected from the outlook of those who have taken to themselves the title of Anglo-Catholic in defiance of the plain facts of the history of the English Church.

MODERN PSYCHOLOGY AND THE VALIDITY OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. By Cyril H. Valentine, M.A., Ph.D. (Lond.). With a preface by the Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, M.A., D.D., Principal of Hackney and New College, London. *S.P.C.K.* 7s. 6d. net.

This thesis, approved for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of London, is a contribution to an important branch of study. The value of modern psychology in relation to religion and especially in relation to religious experience is being examined and tested from many points of view. What may be described as the stage of experiment is already well advanced. Many conclusions have been put forward. They have been sub-

jected to severe criticism, but it is too early yet to say if the final estimate on them can be formed. Every fresh study of any portion of the field of inquiry is to be welcomed, in order that the ultimate relation between psychology and religion may be defined.

Dr. Valentine brings to the study of the subject a power of analysis and a freshness of thought that are of special value. He has been brought up in the atmosphere of modern psychology. He is peculiarly at home therefore in all its methods and is well equipped to throw light upon many of the points raised by the psychological treatment of the facts of Christian experience. His old teacher, Dr. Garvie, in a graceful preface modestly acknowledges himself a learner from his former pupil, as Dr. Valentine's "range of reading in modern psychology has been wider than my own; and he has used it in what appears to me a very convincing fashion in his application of it to the proof of the validity of Christian experience." They share the conviction that the basis of Christian theology must be Christian experience, and Dr. Garvie adds this warning: "The book is timely, as at the present hour it is psychology which is popularly believed to be the most dangerous menace to the Christian view of life; as biology was in a former generation; and geology in a still earlier time."

It is impossible to deal with the whole argument of the book. We can only indicate that after dealing with the objections raised by the psychological processes of rationalization, projection, determinism and subjectivism, he considers the inadequacy of merely intellectual qualifications for the interpretation of reality, and this leads to the statement of the need of the whole personality for the full understanding of reality; this in turn leads on to the need of moral qualities for its full apprehension, and to the final thesis that as human personality attains its full height and perfection in Jesus Christ so he fulfils "all the subjective conditions stipulated by modern psychology as necessary to valid knowledge of reality."

There is one section of his thought which it is difficult to follow. We have for example this statement. "Holy Communion expresses the nature of ultimate being." It is not evident in what sense this is to be taken, but we gather from some other references that Dr. Valentine follows Dr. Temple's line of thought in *Christus Veritas* on Sacramentalism. Everything is sacramental. This is derived from the Incarnation which is "the principle of sacramentalism." "The implication of the principle of sacramentalism is that the whole universe is a graded system with the Incarnation as its highest value," so things are to be regarded "as sacraments or symbols of other things which have greater value and higher spirituality." We thus arrive at Dr. Temple's view that "the universe itself is an organ of God's self-expression." This is admitted, but why is the term "sacramental" used to describe it? We recall some lines of Goethe's "Faust," in which the "Spirit" says:

"So schaff' ich am sausenden Webstuhl der Zeit,
Und wirke der Gottheit lebendiges Kleid."

To represent the universe as the living garment of the Godhead is a simpler mode of symbolism and obviates the many objections which are involved in speaking of the universe as a sacrament. No doubt the desire is to secure a unity of conception that will harmonize all in line with the Incarnation, but even Dr. Temple finds this effort difficult, for when he reaches the conception that "the Church itself is the sacrament of human nature indwelt by God," and he explains the relationship of Baptism to it, he is obliged to confess, "The statement tends to become involved; that is what always happens when we try to analyse a single and living whole." The whole process might be simplified by a return to the use of the term Sacrament as it was employed before "the sacramental principle" was introduced as the explanation of every relationship between the spiritual and material. We fail to see that "for a Christian philosophy, the principle of sacramentalism is vital."

ECONOMICS AND CHRISTIANITY. By the Bishop of Gloucester.
Murray. 1s.

Books cannot be judged by their size, and this pamphlet contains matter that is worth considerably more than the price asked warrants the buyer to expect. It is the result of the reflection by an acute and well-balanced mind on the many problems raised by the General and Coal Strikes. Dr. Headlam does not despair of England, but he sees in the Coal industry a not too cheerful prospect, and he bewails the intervention of "the Bishops" and others in a controversy which they did not understand—however well meaning their efforts to conciliate may have been. "The misfortune is that underlying their actions lie certain theories on the relation of Christianity to the science of economics which, if carried out in practice, might bring disaster both to the industry of the country and the authority of the Christian religion." The pamphlet proves the case against these well-meaning theorists, who by their action did disservice to the men they thought they would help, and weakened the influence of the Church in the minds of millions of thoughtful people. Bishops and others should remember that they act not as individuals whose opinions can be weighed by the arguments they bring forward, but as high-placed officials whose office adds weight to their contentions; and they should be slow indeed to lend their office to support one side or other of what they as individuals imperfectly understand. But Dr. Headlam is not content with the discussion of the economics of the Coal problem. He gives in his concluding section an exposition of the attitude of the Christian to wealth. Briefly, all a Christian has, he holds in trust to be used wisely, not for selfish interests only, but for the common good. Every man, no matter what his social position or plutocratic state may be, must make his working contribution to the well-being of society.

IMMORTALITY. Edited by Sir James Marchant. *Putnam's.* 2s. 6d.

The greater interest shown in recent years in the immortality of man is reflected in the numerous volumes published on the subject. Three years ago this book appeared in a seven-and-sixpenny edition, and we welcome it in its cheaper form, for it contains an amount of really good material on non-Christian and Christian conceptions of the survival of the soul after death. Essays written by Lord Ernle, Sir Flinders Petrie, Mr. Cornfold, Drs. Macdonnel, Welch and Macintyre, as well as by such well-known men as Principal Galloway, the late Dr. Eucken, Maurice Hewlett and the Bishop of Birmingham, cannot fail to interest and instruct. Speaking for ourselves, we read the book on its first appearance and found it extremely useful. In its cheap form it will reach a much wider circle of readers who will find in its pages able and accurate summaries of the thoughts of the ablest thinkers of the past and the convictions of some of the leading minds of the twentieth century. As Lord Ernle truly says: "No cogent proof can be offered either of the truth or of the falsity of the hope of immortality. But the central point on which the essays converge is that it is not only a possible truth, but the object of a reasonable faith such as that on which men act in all practical affairs, and the most adequate interpretation of the ethical and spiritual values of the life of mankind."

MINISTERIAL LIFE AND WORK. By (the late) W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. Chicago. May be had at the Church Book Room, Wine Office Court, E.C.4. 7s. 6d.

Mrs. Griffith Thomas has abridged and made suitable for all Evangelical Ministers the well known work—now out of print—of her late husband Dr. Griffith Thomas. Everything he wrote was well thought out and we have always believed that "The Work of the Ministry" was the most suggestive and inspiring of his writings. Mrs. Griffith Thomas has done her work well. The book is divided into two parts—The Man and the Work. In both we find his marvellous gift of dividing his subject into sections that fit in with one another and leave a definite impression of the mind of the reader. Few works on pastoral theology are equal to that of our author and those who do not know the book will be grateful for our recommendation of pages that recall a virile personality, wholly consecrated to the service of God.

HEARTS AFLAME. By Rev. J. Woodside Robinson, B.A. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.*, Racquet Court, Fleet Street, E.C. 6s. net.

The Minister of Cadder Parish Church, Glasgow, gives us in this volume twenty-two of his sermons, and those who read them will certainly want more, so that we hope Mr. Robinson may be tempted to prepare another collection of his "live" pulpit utterances. The texts and titles are striking and the subject-matter is never dis-

appointing. Effective illustrations and apt quotations are skilfully woven into the fabric of these discourses, and Mr. Robinson's congregation certainly cannot accuse him of being "long-winded!" We all know the preacher who after the "thirdly" section, merrily starts off again, but Mr. Robinson knows when to stop. Best of all, he knows how to keep the Living Christ in the foreground. We warmly commend the book.

S. R. C.

UNDER THE SHIELDING SHADOW. By Rev. E. W. Shephard-Walwyn, B.A. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.*, Racquet Court, E.C. 1s. net.

The author's several volumes of addresses to young people have had a large circulation and this is the second edition of a little book which was commended by Dr. Handley Moule when it first appeared, and the hope is expressed that it "may bring a maturer message to the author's boy and girl friends of pre-war days." These brief meditations will be found sensible and suggestive. There are a number of "telling" illustrations, here is one of them—"Mr. Blatchford said 'I never pray and I never feel the need of prayer.' But what does that prove? Supposing he said—'I never wash and I never feel the need of washing'? Why his words are merely the cry of an animal. Any cow looking over a gate might say the same."

S. R. C.

LIFE AND POWER—HUMAN AND DIVINE. By V. Edwards. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.*, Racquet Court, E.C. 3s. 6d. net.

This is described as "A Book for the Thoughtful." It comes from the facile pen of one who is alive to the problems that confront thinking people. In the first three sections he asks and answers three questions, "What am I?" "What is my relationship to other human beings?" and "What is my relationship to the world of things?"—while in the fourth and last, he deals with "The Power of the Second Adam," and it will be seen that the author's remedy for the ills of humanity, is the Good News of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. It is impossible to turn over these pages without noticing the many apt poetical quotations, they appear on well-nigh every page, they come from Myers' *St. Paul* as well as from the works of George Macdonald, Gilbert White, Dr. Handley Moule and others. The book will undoubtedly help to make the crooked straight and the rough places plain.

S. R. C.

BLESSEDNESS EXPLAINED. By the Rev. R. P. Byers, M.A., B.D. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.*, Racquet Court, Fleet Street, E.C. 3s. 6d. net.

A thoughtful treatise on a by no means unimportant subject. There seems to be some justification for Mr. Byers' contention that

the treatment of blessedness, outside the Bible and Hymns, "has been almost paltry" and that in theological literature it is usually "taken for granted," or the discussion of it "shoved into a corner." The chapter on *The Human Heart* as the seat of the emotions is most interesting and the author shows that the words "Out of the heart are the issues of life" has an additional meaning besides those attached to them by expositors, and that the human heart is not merely "the tract in the centre of the chest thus described" but that "what counts is the escape from it of the nerve-forces and their instant and continuous formation into living penetrative purposes," and that these "often translate themselves into expressions, states and deeds, all of which can be rendered into the language we ordinarily use." The chapter *Gifts and Experiences* is eminently practical and suggestive. Enough has been said to show that the book is anything but a collection of platitudes. S. R. C.

UNDER THE SHADOW. By G. H. Lunn, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Surbiton Hill. *Morgan & Scott, Ltd.* 3s. 6d. net.

These meditations, which appeared originally in *The Christian*, are intended for the use of those who through illness or infirmity are unable to attend the services of the Church. The title is intended to suggest "the rest and confidence which are the assured possessions of those who dwell in the Secret Place of the Most High." There are meditations for twenty-six Sundays. They deal with well-known portions of Scripture, and are preceded by appropriate hymns, prayers and passages of the Bible. Mr. Lunn's style is clear, direct and forcible, and he applies the teaching of our Lord to some of the great facts and problems of life and death and the life hereafter. Many will find his treatment of such themes as The Lord my Shepherd, Now is Christ risen, and the four addresses on Facing Alternatives, helpful and inspiring.

RESURRECTION; AND OTHER ESSAYS ON MAN AND HIS ETERNAL DESTINY. By H. Temple Wills, M.A., B.Sc. London: *Elliot Stock*, Paternoster Row, E.C. 1s. net.

A vigorous and able defence of Conditional Immortality. The author maintains that Rome is mainly responsible for the current teaching on the immortality of the soul. Although he "does not claim infallibility or to know all truth," there is a certain "cocksureness" about his essays which is irritating, and we confess we do not feel certain about *all* the names in a list he gives of those who are supposed to have supported these views. By the way, if "Thompson (Archbishop)" in that list, is meant for a recent Archbishop of York, the surname should be spelt without a "p"! S. R. C.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

DEAN WACE HOUSE, WINE OFFICE COURT,
FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

Prayer Book Revision.—Many of the questions raised by the publication of the Bishops' proposals are as old at least as the Reformation, and it is important that Churchmen should familiarize themselves with the principles underlying the proposals and the opposition offered to them. An interesting and instructive article on this subject recently appeared in *The Record* newspaper, and we commend here some of the books specially mentioned there, both for reading, lending and distribution. One of the best books on the whole subject is *Scriptural and Catholic Truth and Worship, or The Faith and Worship of the Primitive, Mediæval and Reformed Anglican Church* (1s. 6d.), by the late Canon Meyrick, who was well fitted by scholarship and the gift of lucid writing to give a popular sketch of the development of faith and worship and to display a close relation between the doctrine and practice of the early Christians and those who follow the teaching of the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer. We are led from century to century, and, by quotation from contemporary writers, are enabled to see for ourselves what the Fathers and their successors taught. Other general books are *The Catholic Faith* (1s. 6d. paper ; 2s. 6d. cloth), by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. This book was written as a manual of instruction for members of the Church of England and covers a very wide ground. In it the author indicates the fundamental principles of the Church of England. He shows how these principles are expressed in its formularies of doctrine and worship. It also shows that the Prayer Book and Articles need consideration in the light of their origin and combination. Answers are given to many questions, and there are very useful chapters on Prayers for the Dead, Fasting, Confession and other questions raised in the Composite Book ; *English Church Teaching on Faith, Life and Order* (1s. 6d.), by the late Bishops H. C. G. Moule and Drury and Canon R. B. Girdlestone. In this book the teaching of the Church of England as settled at the Reformation will be found clearly given in a plain, constructive manner. Valuable features are the Conspectus of Church History and notes on disputed texts, and the chapters on Holy Communion, Non-communicating Attendance and Fasting Communion ; *The Story of the English Prayer Book, Its Origin and Development* (5s.), by Canon Dyson Hague, was published last year and has merited much commendation for the pointedness of its appeal and the clarity of its style. It is attractively written and shows the minds of those responsible for the book we use, and is especially valuable as it gives an account of recent revisions in other branches of the Anglican Communion.

The Holy Communion.—The following books should be especially noted : *Primitive Church Teaching on the Holy Communion* (1s.), by the late Dean Goulburn, whose great learning makes this book particularly valuable, written, as he states in his preface, because since the original publication of his book, *The English Office of Holy Communion*, "two or three practices which seem to me wrong in principle and to have a tendency to undermine the true doctrine of the Holy Eucharist have shot up with amazing rapidity." The subjects particularly dealt with are Fasting Communion, Non-communicating

Attendance and previous Private Confession ; *The Holy Communion ; A Study in History and Doctrine* (1s.), by Mr. Albert Mitchell, is a valuable publication and useful for the notes it contains on the doctrinal emphasis of the Reformation, Vestments, the Prayer of Humble Access, Consecration and Reservation. We may also mention *The Holy Communion of the Church of England* (1s. 6d. paper ; 2s. cloth), by Canon Dyson Hague, with a preface by Bishop Knox, which was published a little over a year ago. In this book the author explains the doctrine of our service of Holy Communion as contrasted with the Roman Catholic Mass ; *A Sacrament of our Redemption*, by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. (1s. paper cover ; 2s. cloth). In this Dr. Griffith Thomas draws the reader's attention to the connection of the Last Supper with the Jewish Passover Feast, and gives an excellent summary of the New Testament teaching. He also traces the various changes which took place in the Book of Common Prayer ; *What Mean Ye by this Service ?* (1s. paper cover ; 2s. cloth), by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D. In this book Dr. Gilbert draws very clearly the meaning and significance of Holy Communion. Two valuable chapters are entitled *The Feeding upon Christ and Our Lord's Work in Heaven* ; and a useful pamphlet by the Rev. N. Dimock, entitled *The Black Rubric ; Its History and Evidential Value* (2d.).

History.—As history sheds light upon the developments that have taken place and are now incorporated in the worship and teaching of many of our churches, we mention the following volumes : *The English Church and the Reformation* (5s.), by the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, Litt.D., a new and enlarged illustrated edition of which was published last year. Dr. Carter is an accurate scholar and has gone back to the original documents and quoted them with due regard to their context ; *A Manual of English Church History* (3s. 6d.), by the Rev. Chas. Hole, with a preface by Dean Wace. This is a scholarly history of the Church, written from the point of view of one in full sympathy with the Reformation, who may be relied upon for an accurate statement of the leading events in our history and their influence upon the life and doctrine of the Church ; and a new edition of *Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation* (7s. 6d.), by Professor A. F. Pollard, also re-published in the last few months. The writer is an unquestionable authority and his biography is eminently readable. We may also mention a small handbook, *What Happened at the Reformation* (6d.), which is an admirable lecture by Professor W. Alison Phillips.

Reservation.—The Bishop of Norwich published a book in 1917 under the title of *The Holy Communion and Reservation* (1s. 6d.), four articles which are of great value at the present time. It contains a useful appendix dealing with the rubrics, and particularly the Black Rubric. *Reservation*, by Mr. Albert Mitchell, has been mentioned before in this column, and has now been published in a 2d. edition, completing its tenth thousand. It is useful for distribution.

Parochial Church Councils.—A new four-page leaflet by Mr. Gilbert Mitchell for circulation amongst members of Parochial Church Councils has now been issued, price 3s. per 100. The leaflet gives particulars as to the election and formation of the Council, its powers, procedure, scope, interest and responsibility. It will supply a felt want.