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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

July, 1927.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

"The Composite Book" and "The Deposited Book."

ON March 29 and 30 the Bishops presented the final form of their proposals for the revision of the Prayer Book to the Houses of Convocation of Canterbury and York in the form of "the Deposited Book." The change of title from "the Composite Book" presented for consideration to the Houses of Convocation in February was due to technical changes in the method of procedure and was intended to simplify the presentation of the New Book to Parliament. Such a change at the last moment seems to indicate that the Bishops had not given that full and mature consideration to the details of the Book which the importance of the occasion and the issues depending on it demanded. One of the strongest claims put forward for the Bishops' proposals is that they are the result of twenty years' work, and represent the mature judgment of the united episcopate on the problems involved. It has been pointed out that in the end, either from undue haste or ill-considered methods, some unfortunate mistakes were made. Among these was the inclusion in the Composite Book of a form for the ordination of deaconesses which had to be removed from the Deposited Book as it had never been brought before the House of Laity. Although these may be comparatively small matters in themselves they are sufficient to minimize the confidence that may be claimed for the New Book on the ground of its being the result of long years of careful consideration.

The Probable Results of the Revision.

In spite of many forecasts as to the benefits to be gained from the revision, the truth is that no one can foretell the probable results of the acceptance of the Deposited Book. Its interpretation will give rise to many complicated legal problems. One fact is clear, that almost unlimited powers will be put into the hands of the Bishops to compel the laity to accept one or other of the many combinations of services which will become possible if the new Book becomes the Prayer Book of the Church. It has been pointed out that there are seven different ways in which the Athanasian Creed may be used, that there are four ways of using the Psalter, and that twenty-seven pages are taken up with the variants that may be adopted in Morning and Evening Prayer. "At the discretion of the

Minister of the Parish" any alternative order of Service or any paragraph may be substituted for the corresponding Order of the Book of Common Prayer. This provision is subject to the limitation that such changes should not be made arbitrarily or without the good will of the people, as represented in the Parochial Church Council. If any question arises it is to be referred to the Bishop of the Diocese and he is to "make orders thereupon, and these orders shall be final." The purpose of the passing of the Enabling Act was to secure for the laity a large share in the settlement of the affairs of the Church, but in the matter of worship recent legislation has tended to place them more than ever before under episcopal direction. In this and many other directions no one can foresee what may arise from the adoption of the new Prayer Book.

Unfortunate Elements in the Controversy.

It is regrettable that in the heat of controversy some of the supporters of the new Prayer Book should have referred to those who found themselves unable to vote in favour of it as "extreme" men. It is generally recognized that even so short a period of time as twelve years ago the Bishops would not have made the proposals for Reservation and an Alternative Communion Service contained in the present book. No one would have spoken of them as "extreme" men. They represented the teaching and practice of the Church of England since the Reformation. Those who are now maintaining the same teaching and representing the same position cannot with any fairness be described as holding extreme views, and they are justified in protesting against the attitude thus adopted by those who have supported changes which many regard as a departure from the past tradition of our Church. One of those who voted against the acceptance of the New Book says: "As long as the assertion that our Lord instituted the Eucharist to be a memorial before the Father and an invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements remain in the Canon, I, for one, shall continue to oppose the Book on the ground that these features stand for doctrine which cannot be found in the New Testament, which in my opinion are untrue, and which, in consequence, it is the duty of every Christian man thinking as I do to witness against." That is a clear statement of a position hitherto recognized as representing the Anglican teaching contained in our Prayer Book. To describe it as an "extreme" position is to obliterate old landmarks.

The Bishops and Change in Doctrine.

In the discussion on the Bishops' Proposals we are constantly brought back to the question: Do they involve a change of doctrine? In the Preface to the Deposited Book the Bishops declare, "If the minds of any be troubled because we have allowed another Order of Holy Communion as well as the old, and have made further provision for the communion of the sick, let them not think that we mean thereby any change of doctrine or intend that the Sacrament be used otherwise than as our Lord Himself appointed. In all

things we have set before our eyes the duty of faithfulness to the teaching of Scripture and the godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers." This declaration of the intentions of the Bishops is satisfactory, but it does not relieve the rest of the Church from responsibility in considering two questions which are involved in the changes proposed. First, What is the actual teaching of the Church which the Bishops say they do not intend to change? and secondly, Can the statements introduced into the new Communion Service be regarded as in accord with the teaching of Scripture? The answer of many churchpeople to these questions is that although the Bishops may not have intended any change, yet the introduction of the epiclesis and the memorial in the new Canon involve a change that is more than a mere matter of emphasis, or of rendering explicit what was before implicit. They also maintain that there is no ground in Scripture for the statement in the new Consecration Prayer that a memorial is set before the Divine Majesty which our Lord willed us to make "with these thy holy gifts."

The Ultimate Good of the Church.

A number of churchpeople are willing to accept the Bishops' proposals in spite of the fact that they do not regard the teaching contained in them as in harmony with our present Prayer Book, partly out of regard to loyalty for the episcopal office and partly from a desire to give the Bishops the opportunity, which they say this book will provide them, of securing peace and order in the Church. We are told that it is the only means of preventing "the indefinite prolongation of anarchy," although it would seem strange in any other organization than the Church to prevent anarchy by yielding to the demands of those who produce it. We are told that those who voted for the proposals "put the good of the whole Church first." It remains to be seen whether the acceptance of the Bishops' proposals will be for the ultimate good of the Church. If the changes give opportunity for the development of our Communion Service on the lines of the Roman Mass, as we are assured it will, and as the acceptance of it by a large section of Anglo-Catholics seems to imply, there can be no doubt that serious injury will have been done not only to the Church but to the Anglican Communion throughout the world. There are some matters on which, as Sir William Joynson-Hicks said at the Annual Meeting of the National Church League, compromise is impossible. The whole scheme of revision seems at present to be based on the idea that two mutually exclusive conceptions of Christianity can be comprised in our Church. One or other of them must prevail and oust its rival, and that is the issue which has to be faced, but which some seem anxious to ignore.

Indications of Future Episcopal Action.

Meanwhile there are indications that the limitations on Anglo-Catholic advance provided in the Deposited Book will not be effective. It is significant of future developments that while these

proposals were under consideration one of the Suffragan Bishops in the Diocese of London—the Bishop of Kensington—at the ordination of a priest in St. Matthew's, Westminster, on March 13, introduced an unwarranted ceremony by presenting to the candidate the Eucharistic vessels. This is the *porrectio instrumentorum* to be found in the ordinal of the Roman Catholic Church, but not in ours. The Bishop of Truro has introduced the use of incense at the Communion Service in the Cathedral of his diocese. In the dioceses of Liverpool and Lichfield recent decisions show that it will be possible to have a light burning before the aumbry containing the reserved elements. In addition to these indications of more or less official developments, there are the pronouncements of Anglo-Catholic organizations and individual clergy that they will not accept the book. One of these organizations pronounces the book "heretical in tendency, subversive of catholic constitutional principles, and liturgical proprieties, and mischievous in the highest degree, and advises Priests without hesitation or qualification to refuse acceptance of it." Several parochial clergy of the Anglo-Catholic School have declared that they cannot accept the Revised Prayer Book owing to the restrictions that it would impose upon them. In view of these actions of some of the Bishops, which we have pointed out, churchpeople are anxious to know how the episcopate will deal with the conditions indicated in these pronouncements.

The Free Churches and the Revised Prayer Book.

The Free Churches in England have obviously an interest in the teaching of the National Church. The Baptists and the Presbyterians have recently expressed their views on the new Prayer Book. The Baptist Union passed a resolution declaring that many of the changes in the Revised Prayer Book were definitely anti-Protestant. Dr. Rushbrooke, in moving the resolution, said that "the *via media* between Catholicism and Protestantism, which it was the old boast of the Church to represent, would, if the Revised Prayer Book were adopted, be removed to a new position—half-way between the old middle course and the Roman Catholic margin. There was not the slightest guarantee against the shifting of the line still nearer to the Roman line. Who would have the audacity to assert that the authority of the Bishops could hold in check the agitation of the Anglo-Catholics? That authority was defied whenever it suited the Anglo-Catholic party to challenge it." The Bishops had surrendered position after position, and had not set up a single effective safeguard against final, absolute, unconditional surrender. If the Anglican Church trod the Rome-ward path, others could not incur the guilt of acquiescence by a feeble silence.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of England passed a long reasoned resolution in which it disclaimed any wish to interfere in the domestic concern of another Church, but as issues were involved in which the nation and the Churches, especially those which value the maintenance of evangelical and reformed truth in the land, have a legitimate and responsible interest, the Assembly,

while not called on to express approval of the Book, declined to join in seeking its rejection in Parliament on the ground, among other reasons, that "it would not check, but would rather perpetuate, practices within that Church which are inimical to the principles of the Evangelical and reformed faith." The Assembly added that it was due to the nation that the episcopate should give unambiguous and adequate guarantee that the Book "will be administered in what it inhibits as well as in what it sanctions, and will set a limit as to what is permitted within the Church of England as by law established." This cautiously worded resolution contains sufficient indications of the anxiety of English Presbyterians regarding the existence in our Church of practices inimical to the Evangelical and reformed faith.

Roman Catholics and the Revision.

The Roman Catholic Church is also interested in the probable issues of the acceptance of the Bishops' proposals. A representative writer of that Church in giving his impressions of the situation, says that the main body of the Church of England will accept—though many of them with reluctance—the guidance of the Bishops in order to procure peace. This peace depends on the acceptance of the measure by the Anglo-Catholics. The recent declaration of Lord Halifax against the new Canon, and the pronouncements of other Anglo-Catholic leaders do not "seem to open out a very cheerful prospect for the Church of England." The "extreme Low Church party" professed readiness to accept the new Prayer Book, much as they disliked it, if the Archbishop of Canterbury would guarantee the suppression of all extravagances. This pledge the Archbishop was not in a position to give. These considerations, with the holding of an Anglo-Catholic Congress in London "which is to be as far as possible an imitation of our Eucharistic Congresses with many 'High Masses' and other demonstrations of what the Congressists will call their Catholic principles" may endanger the passing of the Book. The writer thinks that the acceptance of the Book will result in a "Low Church schism" as soon as it is seen that "the violently Protestant character of the Church of England will be lost, as it certainly will be." Those who leave the Church may join the Wesleyans and thus "form a really strong and eminently respectable Protestant body." It is harder to prophesy about the "Anglos." They will not follow the example of the Non-jurors and form a new schism, but they are hopelessly divided, and the extremists must speedily find their home in the Catholic Church. They must see that there is no alternative. "So far there has been excitement and constant progress towards true Catholicism. In their hearts they have realized what Cardinal Newman wrote long ago, that 'the goal of the Movement is Rome.' Now progress will be impossible. The Movement will become static, no longer dynamic. . . . I am therefore convinced that the work of the Movement, *as a movement*, has run its course. Catholics may hopefully watch and pray as they see the harvest slowly gathered

in." Rome has always anticipated being the residuary legatee of the Oxford Movement, and Revision has apparently increased its hopes.

Editorial Note.

We are grateful to the Archbishop of Armagh for allowing us to print the summary of the lecture in which he gives an interesting and valuable interpretation of Primitive Christian worship as illustrated in the Ancient Churches of Italy. Dr. G. G. Coulton's statement on the present condition of Religion in France is the outcome of a recent visit to that country. Bishop Knox puts forward the view that the Epistle of the Hebrews was addressed to the Samaritans and states a number of interesting arguments in support of his opinion. The Rev. Thos. J. Pulvertaft's article on Prayer Book Revision is a strong statement of the case against the acceptance of the Deposited Book. Bernardino Ochino of Siena was a preacher of note in his day who favoured the views of the Reformation. Mr. John Knipe has given an account of his life which will help to stimulate the attention due to his work. The account of Puritanism: Its History, Spirit and Influence, is from the pen of the Rev. Sydney Carter, whose historical writings are well known to readers of THE CHURCHMAN. Dr. Downer's Study of the Epistle to the Hebrews in his article on The Session of our Lord at the Right Hand of God is a contribution from a writer on Biblical subjects who is also well known to our readers. The Editorial Comments deal mainly with various aspects of Prayer Book revision, as the subject of most pressing interest at the present time. We have been obliged to hold over reviews of many interesting books, but we have made a selection which we hope will prove a guide to our readers on some subjects of special current interest.

We live in an age when health concerns interest all classes. It is our duty to be healthy, but we think that a great many are unhealthy through fussiness about their health. Mr. J. Ellis Barker has formed an alliance with the distinguished surgeon, Sir Arbuthnot Lane, and has published books that are full of knowledge. We read and we sometimes think that wisdom may linger. There is much good advice in *Good Health and Happiness* (John Murray, 7*s.* 6*d.*), but we also believe that it contains a good deal of speculative uncertainty. The ideas may be sound and unchallengeable, but all ideas are not universally applicable. And what do we really know about vitamins? The road to good health does not lie in food fads but in good living, moderate eating and healthy exercise. And most of us keep well by avoiding what we know disagrees with us and living plainly. Mr. Barker knows how to write with interest and the bibliography at the end of the book proves his industry.

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN WORSHIP AND THE ANCIENT CHURCHES OF ITALY.

By the Most Reverend Charles F. D'Arcy, D.D.,
Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate of all Ireland.

We have received the kind permission of the Archbishop of Armagh to print this summary of a lecture given to the Armagh Clerical Union.—The Editor.

NO one can visit Italy, and give some attention to the structure and arrangements of the ancient churches there, without observing certain respects in which they differ from our churches here, and indeed from the churches of Northern and Western Europe generally. Let it not be imagined that these differences arise from the fact that the ancient churches of Italy are under the rule of the Roman Catholic Church. The features I have in mind are as distinct from those of the cathedrals of Northern France, for example, as they are from those of the familiar cathedrals and parish churches of England and Ireland. I have visited Italy many times in the course of my life, and have seen very many of the ancient churches, in all parts of that beautiful and wonderful country, from the Alps to Sicily, and I am quite convinced that the points I shall bring to your notice have a historical significance which has been too little realized. It may be that these points have been dealt with fully by competent scholars. Some, indeed, have been set forth with knowledge by great authorities. But, so far as my researches have gone, I have not found any sufficient effort to co-ordinate them, and explore their real meaning.

Briefly, my theme is that, in arrangements still surviving in the ancient churches of Italy, can be detected certain characteristics of primitive Christian worship which cannot be so clearly discerned in our customs. And let me say that I am not now dealing with anything controversial. Whether as regards the Roman communion or our own Church, I have nothing to say "for or against." I want to take you back to the early days of Christianity, long before those developments, and subsequent controversies, out of which our modern divisions arose.

Few to-day can realize the amazing change which passed upon both the Church and the world when the first Christian Emperor triumphed over all his foes and established what has been called

ever since " the peace of the Church." Constantine was certainly, both as soldier and as statesman, one of the greatest personages in history. No man, among earthly potentates, has left deeper marks upon the world and upon mankind. Read Books IX and X of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History,* and you get some idea of what the conversion of Constantine meant for the Church of that age.

One of the first acts of Constantine was to promote the building of churches. No such founder of churches ever lived. The first Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem was his work. At Rome he built the original St. Peter's, the original St. Paul's, the original St. John Lateran (called Basilica Constantiniana) the cathedral of Rome, the original San Lorenzo outside the walls, and, I believe, others as well. He also erected churches in his new Capital of Constantinople; and, as we know from Eusebius, he promoted church-building in other cities throughout the Empire.

An edict of Diocletian, ordering the destruction of Christian churches, shows that there were churches before the time of Constantine. Some of Constantine's decrees prove it also. But we must remember that the period immediately before Constantine, indeed the greater part of the third century, was the period of the bitterest and most sustained persecution. The catacombs, those amazing subterranean cities of the dead, with their passages which run into several hundred miles in extent, became hiding places for the living, though modern research seems to prove that they could never have provided permanent habitations. It must have seemed, when Constantine triumphed, and espoused the cause of Christianity, that the Faith had literally emerged from under ground.

For the first time in history, great churches were built with State approval and assistance. And the model for the Christian Church was a type of building which was, at the time, familiar to every dweller in Rome, and in the other cities of the Empire. The Basilica is commonly said to have been a Roman Court of Law. But that is hardly correct. It was really a public meeting-place where business and social intercourse could be carried on. Magistrates held courts there, just because the Basilica was a place of public resort. That was the custom of the time. The original Basilica, like the great Basilica Julia in the Roman Forum, was

a rectangular enclosure surrounded by a covered portico, but probably uncovered in the centre. Later Basilicas were entirely roofed over, like the enormous Basilica of Constantine, also in the Forum.

When this type of building was adopted as the model of the Christian Church, it was not much altered. A rectangular building with an arcade on each side, making a central nave, with aisles, with a low-pitched roof and sometimes a flat ceiling, to which was added an apse at one end, became the usual form. The apse, like the rest of the building, was taken over from the civic architecture of the Roman Empire. It is not found in the earlier examples, but it became common in the later Basilicas, and was the place where the magistrate, or judge, presided over his court.

In Southern Italy there are many churches which have preserved this simple form. They are sometimes bare and ugly as barns, except, perhaps, for some ancient mosaic in the apse, or, it may be, a pulpit of rare workmanship. The only respect in which these churches often depart from the primitive model is in having three apses side by side, the central one being much the largest; the others, at either side, are often used as vestries or places for storing small properties of the church; sometimes they have been made into side chapels.

There are, of course, magnificent Basilican churches. The grandest, I suppose, is St. Paul's outside the Walls, at Rome. It was destroyed by fire in 1823, and restored with great magnificence, preserving as much as possible the features of the ancient church. This Basilica has transepts, which are, to us, peculiar. They do not project much beyond the walls of the nave. The apse is in the furthest transept wall facing down the nave, through the great arch in which the nave ends.

It should be noted that, in Rome, the word "Basilica" is now used in a special sense for those ancient churches which are supposed to possess exceptional importance and sanctity. They were all, originally, strictly Basilican.

I now ask you to leave Rome and turn to Milan. Here the vast and amazingly ornate cathedral, of late Gothic type, often absorbs attention. But there is a church which is of infinitely deeper interest—San Ambrogio. It is the ancient cathedral, and there is no more interesting church in the world. Built by the great Ambrose, in the fourth century, it was here that he baptised

St. Augustine in 387, and here that he shut out the Emperor Theodosius after the cruel massacre at Thessalonica. Here, in later times, the Lombard Kings and many of the mediæval Emperors were crowned with the iron crown of Lombardy. Before the gate stands a pillar at which the Coronation oath was made.

Before the door of the church is an Atrium, the most perfect of its kind in the world, exactly like that described by Eusebius in his account of the great church at Tyre, built in the time of Constantine: "an extensive space between the church and the entrance—with four porticoes all round—a quadrangular space with pillars on every side—open in the middle, so that the heavens can be seen."

The Church of San Ambrogio was restored in the ninth century, and again in the twelfth. It was modernized in the seventeenth, but was brought back, as much as possible, to its earlier form by a very careful and learned restoration in the nineteenth century. The church is of early Basilican type, with a high gallery.

Now I come to the points which will help to lead to my main argument. That part of the church which we should call the chancel is a deep apse. In Italian it is called the *Tribuna*—a word which takes us back to early Roman times. It is elevated very considerably above the nave, but does not contain the High Altar. This Altar stands below, in the nave, and is approached by a flight of steps leading down from the Tribuna to what we might be inclined to call the back. And, curiously, the top of the Altar is exactly on a level with the floor of the Tribuna. Further, the Archbishop's throne, a very ancient thing indeed, is in the centre of the apse, facing down the church, and on either side of it, round the circular curve, are seats for the assisting clergy. Mark, the Altar is in the body of the church, among the people, and the clergy are ranged in a semi-circle behind the Altar, as we should say, facing the congregation.

Now, it is important to note that you will find this arrangement, or something very like it, in almost every ancient church in Rome, so far as I have had opportunity to observe. In St. John Lateran the High Altar is so arranged that it can only be approached from the side of the Tribuna, and the celebrant must face the congregation. The present St. Peter's is, of course, a Renaissance church, dating from the sixteenth century. But it is on the site of old St.

Peter's, a great Basilica founded by Constantine, and the old arrangement has been preserved. St. Peter's chair, as it is said to be, is in the middle of the apse, while the High Altar is far away under the great dome. When the Pope celebrates, he faces down the church. I could give you many illustrations of this arrangement. You will, indeed, find it in nearly all the ancient churches of Italy. The main points are these: the High Altar is not pushed away to the far end of a long chancel; it is down in the church, among the people. If we say that the congregation are facing up towards the Altar, then the seats for the clergy are facing downwards towards the people. The Altar is in the middle.

Now, where did this arrangement come from?

In recent years some very interesting and remarkable discoveries have been made in connection with the Catacomb of San Sebastian. This catacomb has been, for centuries, one of the best known of all the catacombs. It is strange that anything new should be discovered in it or near it. Close to it is the Church of San Sebastian. It is not an ancient church, but it is built on the site of a very ancient church. It has long been known that under it was some kind of deep vault; and an ancient tradition affirms that near here the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul were laid for a time, after their martyrdom.

Now it turns out that the old church was built on the top of an ancient Roman house. The rubbish which filled this house has been cleared away, and the house disclosed, the church still standing above. Excavations are still going on. Many questions are still undecided. But it seems clear that at a very early date the house was inhabited by Christian people: it communicates with the catacomb, and is in close relationship with certain early tombs, and there is an inscription which marks it as the house of M. Clodius Hermes. One of the rooms seems to have been used for Christian worship. The learned antiquarian who is over the excavation is of opinion that the Hermes who was owner of the house may be reasonably identified with the Hermes mentioned by St. Paul in the sixteenth chapter of Romans; for he believes that the house is a first century house. Others put it later, giving it a date early in the second century, about A.D. 120. It is believed by some that the tombs adjoining the house were those of St. Peter and St.

Paul before their bodies were moved to the places of their martyrdom, the sites of the churches bearing their names. On these, and many other questions which have been raised, I offer no opinion.

I mention all this to bring before you certain rude and primitive drawings which have been disclosed upon the walls of one of the rooms. These show a scene which can hardly be anything else than a primitive Celebration of the Holy Communion. There is a table, as it seems; it is of a rudely oval shape, or, rather a very much rounded pear-shape. At the smaller end is the President, drawn larger than the rest to mark his importance. All round are the communicants. On the table are a great cup, and, as it would seem, bread. The cup is also drawn very large, to mark its importance. As the learned custodian pointed out these drawings, he said, "That was how they celebrated the Eucharist in those primitive times." I think he was right. The marked simplicity, the absence of symbolism, the crudeness of the drawing, the obvious sincerity —these characteristics seem to point to a time much earlier than that of the abundant drawings of more symbolic type which are found throughout the catacombs. There is only one objection which could be made here. It might be imagined that these drawings represent some of those pagan, or semi-pagan, feasts for the dead which St. Augustine deplores, and which were strictly forbidden by Councils at a later date. But the evidence seems to point in the opposite direction. Those pagan feasts seem to have had a character very different from the simple rite indicated by the drawings I have described, and to have been a comparatively late development.

Let us now interpret the picture. At the head of the table is the President (as Justin Martyr calls him), Bishop or Presbyter, let us say. If there are other clergy, they are ranged on either side, the general congregation of the faithful completing the circle. In the centre are the Elements for the Sacrament.

Here we may ask, Do the catacombs supply any other evidence? They certainly contain many tombs which probably served as "altar tombs," to use a later expression. They have many *cubicula*, which were, doubtless, used as mortuary chapels. But there is one large excavation which may be reasonably described as a church. It is in the catacomb of St. Agnes, and is a series of five chambers opening widely into one another, the uppermost, as we may call

it, having a stone chair in the centre of the end wall, with a bench on either side in a line with it. Place a table in front of the stone chair, and you have exactly the arrangement that you find in all the ancient churches of Italy. Only, as churches of large size were built, the Episcopal throne was moved back, the seats for the assisting clergy on either side were moved with it, the congregation spread out into the spacious nave and transepts, when there were transepts, and the Holy Table maintained its position in the centre. That is exactly what is found in all, or nearly all, the ancient churches of Italy to-day. It is a survival from the earliest times.

A signal proof of the accuracy of this explanation is provided by the accounts which are given by Eusebius of the church built by order of Constantine at Jerusalem and of the church of Paulinus at Tyre. The former is in the *Life of Constantine*, the latter in the *Ecclesiastical History*. Of the church at the Holy Sepulchre he writes that "three doors facing towards the rising sun admitted the entering crowd," and "opposite to these doors was the apse, the head of the whole work." Of the church at Tyre he writes that it had "three gates on one side towards the rising sun," and that "at the top," which I take to mean the highest position in the interior, or, in other words, the apse, it was "adorned with thrones for the Presidents," and other seats, and that the "Holy Altar" was placed "in the middle."

These two churches, built so soon after the peace was established, and so particularly described by Eusebius, give us exactly the link we need between the persecuted Church of the catacombs and the victorious Church of the Christianized Empire.

You will have observed that Eusebius states clearly that in the two important churches he describes the great entrance doors were towards the rising sun. He says this twice about the church at Tyre.

With us, and throughout Northern and Western Europe, the arrangement is exactly the opposite. The great entrance doors are towards the West; the Sanctuary is towards the East. Now, it is a curious fact that, with the ancient churches of Italy, the order described by Eusebius prevails.

The late Mr. George Gilbert Scott, father of the architect of Liverpool Cathedral, and himself a distinguished authority on architecture, went into this question thoroughly, and, by systematic

examination, reached remarkable results. There are 47 churches in Rome which are either ancient or built on the sites of ancient churches, and which carry on their old traditions. Of these, 7 have an Eastward Sanctuary, like our churches, and 40 have the Sanctuary towards the West, the great entrance doors being towards the East. Among those which have Westward Sanctuaries are St. Peter's, St. John Lateran, Sta. Maria Maggiore—the three greatest churches in Rome. St. Paul's without the walls is the only one of the greater churches which has an Eastward Sanctuary. I should add that I am much indebted to the work of Mr. G. G. Scott for many of the particulars I have given you.

Why the primitive church builders placed their doors to the Eastward and their Sanctuaries to the West is not clear. In each case Eusebius mentions the rising sun. Writing of Tyre, he describes the sun as shining in through the open doors. Perhaps people who had been worshipping in hidden places, even underground, liked the sun to shine in upon their early Services. Perhaps they liked the celebrant to face towards the East, and, at the same time, had no thought of changing the accustomed order with the Holy Table in the middle. It is clear, however, from the number of exceptions, that they had no cast-iron rule as regards orientation.

On this question I lay no stress. But the custom of the primitive Church as regards the positions of the ministers, the congregation and the Holy Table is well worth pondering. The Communion is the Feast of the Lord. The Bishop, as a father, calls his family round the Table of the Lord, quite literally. The Reformers tried to restore this beautiful custom; but the effort was not a success: Gothic churches, built in the Middle Ages, do not lend themselves easily to such a change. Nor does it appear that the way the Reformers took to carry out the change was wisely directed. It is a curious point, not always realised, that the arrangement they made is still ordered in our Prayer Books.

Here in Ireland, I believe it is the fact that our primitive churches preserved the original custom until influences from outside changed it. Although they were square ended, and not apsidal, there was a stone bench for the clergy across the end wall of the little chancel, and the Holy Table stood between this bench and the congregation. So I read. If this be so, there is an additional historic reason, as well as sentiment, to inspire a hope that, at some time, or in some

way, we of the ancient Church of Ireland may have opportunity of enjoying fellowship, in order and arrangement, with those glorious heroes of the Faith who suffered and triumphed in the great days of old.

The fifth volume of the World Call to the Church contains "The Call from Our Own People Overseas" (*2s. 6d.* net). It is described as "Being a comprehensive statement of the facts which constitute the Call from our own People Overseas to the Church of England, prepared by a Commission appointed by the Missionary Council of the Church Assembly." The Bishop of Salisbury contributes a preface and the Bishop of St. Albans a concluding chapter. The Foreword by the Members of the Commission explains the construction of the Report. The first four chapters deal with needs and problems in relation to our people overseas in almost every part of the world; the next nine treat of special circumstances and needs in nine geographical sections. The aim is to bring home to the Church of England the work which the Anglican Church overseas, and specially in Canada and Australia, "cannot yet accomplish without aid, e.g., the provision for the spiritual needs of the new settlement now going on." The volume contains six maps which serve to illustrate special points concerning our people overseas. This brief description of the volume must suffice to indicate the wide range of work concerned, and the importance of the subject to churchpeople will without doubt lead them to study the interesting details given of the growth and present position of our Church throughout the world. Evangelical churchpeople will be specially interested in the references to the Colonial and Continental Church Society which is described as by far the most extended in its operations of the Societies working exclusively for our own people. We should have been glad to see more detailed information of the work which this Society has accomplished during the hundred years of its existence, and more particularly of its contribution to the development of our Church in Western Canada, where but for its workers large areas would be left without any representatives of the Anglican Communion. A special chapter is given to the important work among the 330,000 men and women on the sea carried on mainly by The Missions to Seamen.

Fitly Framed Together is the title of the shilling volume issued as the story of the year's work of the Church of England Zenana Missionary Society, showing how the work of the Society fits into the building of the mighty Temple of God. It is a record of work done by women in India, China and Ceylon on behalf of those who can only be reached by such a Society as this, and is a challenge to prayer, and more self-sacrifice, on the part of those who stay in the Homeland.

RELIGION IN FRANCE.

By G. G. Coulton, D.Litt.

SOME weeks ago, a correspondent wrote to ask me whether it was true, as he saw sometimes asserted, that Roman Catholicism had made great progress in France during the war. I replied, as I think most English observers would have replied, that I had seen no real trace of this on my fairly frequent visits, but that I would answer him more fully in a few weeks, when I hoped to have spent another fortnight cycling in Burgundy and Berry, and at a Congress of Religious History in Paris. Now that I am recording my impressions of that visit, it seems worth while to share them with readers of The Churchman.

The progressive decrease in vocations, and the consequent shortage of clergy, are notorious. At a political trial in Alsace just before Easter, an editor (Abbé Haegy) was accused of pro-German propaganda, of fomenting religious hatred against the "atheist" government of France, and of asserting that there were 10,000 parishes in the country without a priest. He denied the words imputed to him; but I myself found the assertion placarded on the walls of the great church of Notre Dame at Semur, in Burgundy. The placard, about a yard long, and emphasized by every typographical device of capitals and italics, began as follows:—

> [We want] Priests! Such is the bitter cry of the Church of France. The war killed 4,618 of her clergy [i.e. including those in lower orders], and it emptied the seminaries for five years. It is reckoned now that 10,000 parishes have no priest! Nowadays, on an average, there is only one priest to 1,061 souls. And, in this number, how many are old men at their last gasp! [*à bout de souffle*]. . . . Too often, the dead priest is not replaced! What a desolation! The priest is far off, priests are few. . . . Therefore, folk live without priest and die without priest. And yet, can we do without the priest? No, France must not lack priests. Give us priests."

This is only a fraction of the document, which bore the imprint of one of the best-known orthodox publishing houses in Paris ("Edition Spes," 17, Rue Soufflot).

At the neighbouring town of Avallon, the great church had been decorated with a similar but less emphatic appeal, beginning:—

> DES PRÊTRES! . . .
>
> Les prêtres manquent, partout, chez nous . . . que de paroisses privées de Curé! Bientôt, si cela continue, il n'y aura peut-être plus, ici ou là, qu'un Curé par canton!

In Paris, I had an opportunity of talking with a representative of one of the oldest families in France, Catholic by immemorial

tradition. She and her family were practising Catholics, and had recently had a private audience with the Pope. I asked whether these figures of 10,000 were not exaggerated; she replied, as nearly as I can remember, as follows: "Perhaps; but the shortage is certainly very serious. Since the Government no longer pays the clergy, and therefore they must look to the congregations for their sustenance, things go very badly in the villages; there is a great lack of vocations. In Paris, it makes little or no difference; but in the villages it is otherwise. In our department (about 50 miles from Paris), a single priest often serves three, or even four, villages. There is no doubt that dogmatic religion is decaying in France, as it is apparently everywhere. But there is one other effect of this shortage; we have few priests now, but the people have personal respect for them. If you have read anything of mediæval history, you know that that was not so in those days." It was interesting to hear this French lady, of immemorial Catholic ancestry, taking it for granted that well-informed people knew things which would often be vehemently denied not only by Roman but also by Anglo-Catholics in England.

An Italian professor whom I met at the Congress, a Modernist Catholic, told me that, though the *personnel* of the clergy at Rome was far more respectable now than in the days of papal government in the city, yet the village clergy were often notoriously immoral, especially in the South, and that this was a serious factor in the religious situation. He mentioned this quite spontaneously, as arising from what he himself had been saying, and not in connexion with any question or suggestion from me.

I had an equally intimate talk with a waiter at Bourges. My companion had lost a foot in the war; this led the waiter to speak of his own experience in the trenches, and he was so intelligent and straightforward that I felt safe in questioning him as to religion since the war. He thought there was no definite change either way. I remarked how, even on Fridays in Lent, the hotels, great and small, provided meat dishes as a matter of course, and apparently nobody refused them. "Oh, no," he said, "scarcely anybody refuses meat except on the one Friday before Easter. A few strict folk do here and there, but scarcely any. So with the High Mass; on Easter Sunday you will find the Cathedral full; but we don't go often as a rule. There are vast numbers who are not practising Catholics. We respect the priests; some of us take off our hats to them in the streets; we Catholics are baptized in the Church and get married there and the priest buries us, but there are many of us who have little else to do with him." That was his way of describing what the lady described: "dogmatic religion is undoubtedly decaying." One reason is certainly the childish absurdities which are still permitted, and which must offend really thoughtful souls among the faithful. In the cathedral of Nevers, on the railings which enclose the chapel of St. Antony, hangs a long printed litany for repetition in honour of that saint. The last two verses run: "Throughout the course of our life, O St. Antony,

protect us. Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world." [1]

A word should be added about the *Action Française.* This is a powerful society, with an ably-edited daily paper as its organ, representing a jingoist and anti-republican movement. It may be compared, as to extent of influence, with the Anglo-Catholic party of to-day, with its organ the *Church Times.* The numbers in both cases are probably fairly equal, and both have the tactical advantage of extremist views and close organization; beyond that, I have no wish to suggest any parallel. For the *Action Française* is mainly run by men who have no dogmatic faith, and who frankly accept Catholicism simply as an organization, and as a convenient avenue of approach to the Higher Paganism of the future. Maurras, their ablest writer, has openly repudiated Christianity and Christian morals; " natural law preaches one virtue alone, and that is, force." But he preaches the greatness and the necessary authority of the Church, as a bulwark against democracy; the Pope and the leader of the *Action Française* are the two beacons of humanity. The society is violently anti-German, and the present Pope has the reputation of being rather pro-German; this may have precipitated a crisis which was perhaps inevitable in any case. The Cardinal Archbishop of Bordeaux condemned the *Action Française* publicly as a movement led by atheists, who are " Catholics by calculation and not by conviction " (August 25, 1926). He then asked papal approval (of which he had doubtless had private assurance) for his action. The Pope, in a brief of September 5, supported the condemnation; this organization, he said, showed traces of the paganism which infects this present generation, educated in the godless schools of to-day. Practising Catholics, like my Paris informant, accept the Pope's decision, in some cases reluctantly. Meanwhile the *Action* refuses to bow, publishes its paper as usual, and boasts (truly or falsely) that its adherents are increasing, even among the priests. Here is a serious dilemma for many good folk, especially for old Royalist families; and the " Editions Spes " have published a booklet by a prominent priest (J. Boullier, S.J., de *l'Action Populaire,* " L'Eglise et *l'Action Française,*" 2 fr. 50 c.). The good Jesuit writes in the form of a dialogue; he is advising an enthusiastic and religious young man. " At your age, John, in 1909," I also seriously thought of joining the society; but great theologians warned me of the danger. Now, at last, " *Roma locuta est* " and " permit me to read you those words which, for me, are the first rule of orthodoxy:—

> " ' In order to be assured that I am holding to the truth in all things, I must cleave constantly to this principle, that what *seems* to me white, I must believe to be black if the hierarchical Church were thus to define it; persuading myself that, between our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is the Bridegroom, and the Church His Bride, there is but one and the same spirit which governs

[1] Dans tout le cours de notre vie, St. Antoine, protégez-nous. Agneau de Dieu, qui effacez les péchés du monde.

and rules us' (S. Ignatius Loyola, *Spiritual Exercises*, Rules for thinking as the Church thinks)."

I give this Jesuit's exact words, with his own italics, etc., at the end of the article. Many readers will realize why in Roman Catholic countries there is now, and always has been, a deep gulf between two strong and bitterly antagonistic parties, the Clerical and the Anticlerical. And, as the idea of a *via media* is repugnant to the Catholic mind, this means that men are mostly either professing Catholics or antichristian. Freemasonry, which is a moderate thing in Britain, and one of the greatest friendly societies in world-history, is fiercely political and anticlerical abroad. It is almost impossible, in any Catholic country, to be a Socialist and a Christian. A Belgian professor who spent the war-years at Cambridge and made many friends there, told me of his surprise, as an orthodox Catholic, to find here a country in which men could differ enormously in religious belief, and yet remain really religious.

From page 3 of Fr. Boullier's book :—

" Pour être assuré de tenir la vérité en toutes choses, il me faut tenir constamment à ce principe que ce qui me paraît *blanc, je dois le croire noir, si l'Eglise hiérarchique le définissait ainsi ; me persuadant qu'entre Jésus-Christ Notre-Seigneur qui est l'Epoux, et l'Eglise son Epouse, il n'y a qu'un même esprit qui nous gouverne et nous régit."*

SELECTIONS FROM THE POETICAL WORKS OF BENJAMIN GEORGE AMBLER. London: *Elliot Stock, Paternoster Row, E.C.* 1s. 6*d*. net.

The other day we found a friend, with literary tastes, at work with an interesting tool, in the shape of a *Dictionary for Versifiers*, wherein you discover that " cat " rhymes with " rat " and so on ! But the art of writing poetry cannot be acquired in such an easy fashion and the instrument in question is one for which such poets as Mr. Ambler have no use ! This little peep into his work will doubtless whet the appetite and a list of seven volumes, all published by Mr. Stock, is given.

These charming lines—To My Wife—speak for themselves :

Twenty-nine years of joy beyond all guessing,
Not all unmixed with pain in love's despite,
Twenty-nine years of God's embodied blessing,
Twenty-nine years of leading to the light.

How shall I tell you all that they have taught me ?
Words are too weak and so my lips are dumb,
The everlasting gain that they have brought me
May yet be spoken in the life to come.

S. R. C.

THE SAMARITANS AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

By the Right Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D.

THE word "Samaritan" does not occur in the Old Testament. In the New Testament it is found eight times. In St. Matthew x. 3 the disciples on their mission are forbidden to enter into any city of the Samaritans. In St. Luke ix. 56 we read of the village of the Samaritans which refused hospitality to our Lord—I take it an unexpected act of discourtesy—and as we shall see later one out of keeping with the character of the Samaritans. In the two other places where they are mentioned by St. Luke, first, a Samaritan shows compassion which Priest and Levite had failed to show, and secondly a Samaritan leper shows gratitude not shown by his Jewish companions in misfortune. In St. John's Gospel, though we are told that the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans, not only does our Lord speak to the Samaritan woman, but the disciples seek and easily obtain food from the Samaritans, and they show wonderful readiness to receive our Lord's teaching, St. John iv. 9. On the other hand, the Jews elsewhere in the same Gospel in contempt of our Lord give vent to the utterance, "Say we not well that Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil" (St. John viii. 48). In the Acts of the Apostles we read of the successful mission of St. Philip the Evangelist not only to Samaria but also to many villages of the Samaritans. (Acts viii. 25.)

The distinction between Jews and Samaritans is expressed thus: (1) The Samaritan woman makes it to consist in rivalry of places of worship, but our Lord rests it on superiority of religious knowledge. "Ye worship ye know not what. We know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews." Yet it is to this poor woman that He definitely proclaims Himself to be the Messiah in terms more distinct and categorical than He ever used to His own disciples —and His choice of a Samaritan as the type of true neighbourliness in one of the greatest of His Parables cannot be regarded as a mere accident. When, after His Resurrection, He was commissioning His disciples, the plan of campaign marked out for them places Samaria immediately after the Jewish world and before the heathen, but also before Galilee: Jerusalem, Judæa, Samaria, and the rest of the world. That is the order.

While the New Testament view of the Samaritans is unfavourable we find there no charge of idolatry brought against them. The most severe words concerning their religion are those of our Lord, "ye know not what ye worship." Yet their readiness to receive Him as the Messiah, and their swift response to the teaching of Philip indicate a spirit more accessible to the truth than we find among ordinary Israelites. The New Testament evidence may be supplemented from the Talmud, for the Talmud is distinctly less hostile to the Samaritans than the attitude of Josephus could have

led us to expect. Within the compass of this paper it is impossible to attempt more than a scanty summary of the Talmud legislation, but on some points this summary will be quite decisive.

(2) The Samaritans are never denied entire devotion to the Law of Moses. Even their falsifications of that law pass unnoticed; while Rabbi Simon Gamaliel, who died about A.D. 165, says: "Every command the Samaritans keep they are more scrupulous in observing than Israel." They were more rigorous than the Jews about circumcising on the eighth day; more punctilious in keeping the Sabbath; their unleavened bread could be accepted by a Jew, and a Jew might say Amen to the benediction of a Samaritan. On ethical questions the references to them are honourable to their memory. They observed carefully the distinction between clean and unclean food. We have even the explicit statement that "the land of the Kuthim (i.e., Samaritans) is clean, the gatherings of their waters are clean, their roads are clean." There was no reason why Jews should not pass through Samaria, so far as the law was concerned. In fact, the more closely contemporary evidence is examined, the more certain does it appear that as far back as our Lord's time the Samaritans were neither heathen nor semi-heathen, but were what they are to-day, a sect, the oldest sect of Israel. Their general type of physiognomy is distinctly Jewish. They are Hebrews of the Hebrews. The distinctive features which separate them from the rest of the Hebrew race are these: (1) They hold that Gerizim is the place chosen by Jehovah for His sanctuary, and have expressed this teaching in their Tenth Commandment, which is long, and elaborately compiled from different parts of the Torah; (2) They reject the whole of the Old Testament except the Pentateuch. They have a book of Joshua, but great as is their reverence for Joshua, they do not count that book a sacred book. Other peculiarities will call for mention presently, but these are emphasized here that it may be understood that no explanation of the origin of the Samaritans can be satisfactory which does not make room for their existence as a strict sect of Judaism at the opening of the Christian era.

It will be convenient to work backwards, and without attempting a history of the Samaritans to mark certain salient features. The Jewish Canon of the Old Testament was definitely formed 150 B.C., and since it included the prophetic, historical and wisdom books and Psalms, it stamped those who denied the authority of these books as heretics. We are therefore not surprised to find acute hostility between Jews and Samaritans going so far as the destruction of the Samaritan Temple on Gerizim by John Hyrcanus, 128 B.C.; and before that, of fierce rivalry between the two sects as to their respective Temples. Indeed, some think that the question of the destination of Temple dues collected in Alexandria by the two sects for their respective Temples led to the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek by both, each trying to prove to their Hellenic rulers that theirs was the true word of God. In any case, both sects are found in Egypt as clamorous

rivals, and so we go back to the pre-Hellenic period. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah reveal bitter hostility between the remnant of the two tribes returned from Babylon to Jerusalem and "the people of the land." We find the "people of the land" desirous of assisting in the building of the Temple. When their offer is repulsed, they apply to the Persian Court for an injunction to stay the building, and apply for a time successfully. In the end they are defeated, and a crusade against intermarriage with them is vigorously prosecuted at Jerusalem, even though such intermarriage had spread as far as the ranks of the Priesthood. Who then were these people of the land?

In the 4th chapter of Ezra they describe themselves as inhabitants of Palestine whom Esarhaddon, King of Assyria, brought up. But in the same chapter, in a letter to Artaxerxes, they speak of themselves as those "whom the great and noble Osnappar brought over." Osnappar is identified with Ashurbanipal, and nine races, besides others not mentioned, claim to have been brought over by him. Not one of these is the same as the five races introduced by Esarhaddon. The importation of fourteen whole races into Northern or Central Palestine cannot be intended. Certainly importations on this scale would make no room for such depopulation as would bring about an invasion of lions. We must therefore envisage the garrisoning of Palestine by the two monarchs above named, and this accords with Sargon's own account of his victories. Sargon, in a contemporary document, records the deportation of 27,290 Israelites, adding that the rest he allowed to keep their property and set a governor over them. These garrisons would correspond to the English settlements in various conquests of Ireland. That they did not extirpate the Israelites is certain, for Hezekiah would never have invited heathen or semi-heathen to his Passover. In the same way we find Josiah destroying high places in Israel, but there is no mention of his destroying heathen temples. It would seem then that the mixed worshippers of 2 Kings xvii. were the imported garrisons, as a careful reading of the passage suggests, nor is it at all improbable that some of the garrisons were recalled and replaced by others. Behind them were no doubt Israelites as indomitable as the Irish were, strictly preserving their own faith, winning over to it by intermarriages their conquerors, and as the English settlers became, in quite a short time, *Hibernis ipsis Hiberniores*, so may some of the imported races have become *Israelitis Israelitiores*.

A natural question arises. Are we not told of the utter demoralization of Israel? had not the Ten Tribes become idolaters past all remedy? No doubt this was true of the upper classes, and probably of a great mass of the people. But we must remember that when Elijah thought that he was the only worshipper of Jehovah left, there were nevertheless 7,000 in Israel who had never bowed the knee to Baal. The extraordinary tenacity of the Samaritans through ages of devastating persecution in the Christian era lends probability to the supposition that the same tenacity

characterized the remnant in Israel through centuries of idolatry that preceded the captivity.

Such allegiance to Jehovah does not, of course, fit in smoothly with the belief that the Pentateuch was incomplete even in the days of Ezra. On the other hand, it does explain in the simplest manner how one sect of Judaism recognized the Torah only. On the assumption that the other books of the Old Testament were later than the Torah, it is perfectly natural to think of a stubbornly conservative body clinging to the law which Joshua had transmitted to it from the hand of Moses. I forbear to press here the arguments on these lines which you may find for yourselves in Thompson's *Samaritans* and Gaster's *Samaritans*. I only note that neither Dr. Kidd for the Society of Sacred Study nor Dr. Peake could inform me of any serious attempt that has been made in England to answer either of these books, which have behind them a formidable mass of palæographic study. Dr. Cowley—a learned Samaritan scholar—in his Aramaic Papyri suggests a notable modification of the Higher Critical teaching, while he adheres to the substance of that teaching. He writes: "The strength of Ezra's moral appeal . . . lay in his insistence that the law had hitherto been neglected, and that this neglect was the cause of the national misfortunes, and that the only hope for the future was to be found in a return to the supposed faith of an ideal past. To have admitted that the Law was a new thing, invented even with the best objects, would have defeated his whole purpose. And perhaps it was not new. Various documents of different dates must, or may have been, in existence, from which the complete work was produced very much in the manner on which modern criticism insists—only that previously the documents had not been generally accessible, and that the final reduction took place at one definite time, and not as a gradual and rather undefined process." The truth is that the Samaritans are a serious stumbling-block to the theories of Higher Criticism. For there is no doubt that the acute hostility between Jew and Samaritan dates from the time when—according to the critics—the Samaritans accepted from the Jews the Pentateuch and the Pentateuch only as the Word of God. But that date is prior to the completion of the Pentateuch according to most of the critics.

Permit me now to turn your thoughts in an entirely different direction. My reading about the Samaritans suggested to me the possibility that the Epistle to the Hebrews might have been written to Samaritan Christians. The Samaritans do not indeed call themselves Hebrews, but their position, as the Christian Church formed itself, compelled them to lean to the Jewish rather than to the Gentile branch of the Church. Conversion to Christ ideally blotted out nationality. But the realization of the ideal must have been gradual. The Samaritan convert could not be either a Gentile or a Jew. But the term "Hebrew" would place him in right relation to both sections of the infant Church. There were strong settlements of Samaritans, prosperous communities in Rome and in Alexandria as well as in Samaria. At all events the term

" Hebrews " is in marked contrast with St. Peter's " to the twelve tribes who are of the dispersion." We must not, of course, forget that the title is not part of the Epistle. But the fact remains that in some way the Epistle secured for itself an unusual designation.

Does the main tone of the Epistle, it may be asked, accord with its being addressed to what must have been comparatively a small circle? Dr. Nairne in his *Epistle of the Priesthood* says (p. 10): " Let the first readers be ' a little clan,' and let that little clan be no church, not even the church at so-and-so's house with its complement of numbers from various classes, but understood to be a group of scholarly men like the author," and again (p. 20): " that he wrote to a little company of friends who had been brought up in Judaism." This suggestion needs modification for " them that had rule over you " (xiii. 4) unquestionably implies a church, but the " little clan " would certainly suit the Samaritan Christians. Their position between Jew and Gentile gave them precisely that position in the Christian world.

This " little clan," Dr. Nairne suggests, was under pressure of temptation to forsake its new " synagogue " and to return to the old in defence of their ancient creed. They were inclined to give up their new faith at the call of patriotism. Such a call came in the year A.D. 67 " when the mad fury of the Jews infected the Samaritans with its contagion, and dragged a large body of them deceived by apocalyptic frenzy to a like destruction with the Jews " (Montgomery, p. 86). Over 11,000 perished in this rising. It did not infect the whole Samaritan community, but only the more fanatical members of the sect. We have here an appeal to a comparatively small circle, but a very urgent appeal uttered at a moment when apocalyptic hope was pervading the Christian as well as the Jewish world. The Christian leaders who discouraged violence would be counted as lukewarm traitors. This would be the moment for an appeal from those leaders to the more thoughtful; for their influence might restrain the hot-headed advocates of a national rally to the cause of the Messiah. There could not, of course, be any denial of Messianic hope. On the contrary, " yet once more I will make to tremble not the earth only, but also the heaven " (xii. 27). Only " ye have need of patience, that having done the will of God, ye may receive the promise. For yet a very little while, He that cometh shall come and shall not tarry " (x. 36). But the way to prepare for His coming is not to throw off your Christian hope, and to cast in your lot with zealots. Bear yet awhile the miseries incident to your membership of a *religio illicita*. For " my righteous one shall live by faith, and if he shrink back my soul hath no pleasure in him. But we are not of them that shrink back unto perdition " (x. 38, 39). Yield not to the temptation to cut short your persecution by rallying to the standard of a false Messiah.

If this date A.D. 67 be accepted, we have the death of St. Paul A.D. 64 followed, may we suggest, by the liberation of Timothy, who may well have shared St. Luke's companionship of the great

Apostle's imprisonment. "Know ye that our brother Timothy hath been set at liberty" (xiii. 23). It is not a bold flight of historical imagination to draw to that prison Philip the Evangelist, the intimate friend of both Luke and Paul. Philip's home was Cæsarea, the capital of the united province of Judæa and Samaria, only a score of miles distant from Sichem. Philip was, of course, the evangelist of the Samaritans, and in closest touch with the growth of their infant Churches. He fits quite easily into the description required by chapter ii. 3, where the writer refers to "the salvation which having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard, God also bearing them witness by signs and wonders and by manifold powers, and by gifts of the Holy Ghost." The words have a singular fitness for Philip, whose effective preaching does not seem to have been accompanied by "gifts of the Holy Ghost." These apostolic gifts, exercised by others, confirmed the word of salvation, which Philip had heard, but could not deliver as an eye-witness.

There would be very little in this suggestion, if it had no confirmation from within the Epistle. On the other hand, if the letter bears traces of arguments or other matter of a character distinctive of Samaritans and differentiating them from other Hebrews, our hypothesis will receive some corroboration.

The first hint that Hebrews might be Samaritans came to me in the study of St. Stephen's speech, in which there seemed to be suggestions of the Samaritan controversy. Among these I noticed the reference to Joshua and the Tabernacle. In our Bibles, outside the Pentateuch, these are the only two references to Joshua except the passage in the Book of Kings about the rebuilding of Jericho. Those two passages are in the 7th chapter of Acts and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the Apocrypha Joshua is only mentioned three times, though fully enough in the 46th chapter of Ecclesiasticus. His name occurs fairly often in the Apocryphal books, that is, outside the accepted Canon of the Old Testament. Nowhere is he connected with any uncompleted work, with any entry into future rest or future glory. But in the 4th chapter of the Hebrews the argument is a sharp contrast between the unfinished rest achieved by Joshua the son of Nun, and the entry of Jesus the Son of God into heaven, "the sabbath rest of the people of God." That Joshua was held, and is held, in great honour by the Samaritans is well known. It has even been asserted that the Messiah or Taeb is to be Joshua himself. The following hymn, of a later date no doubt than the Hebrews, helps us to understand how a writer could pass from Joshua the Messiah to Jesus the Son of God, our Messiah and High Priest. "The advent of Taeb (Messiah) shall be in peace and his star shall shine in heaven. . . . He shall dwell upon the holy hill. Then shall be revealed the Tabernacle with all its furnishings, and the ancient ritual shall be restored in the full ministration of the Priesthood. Israel shall dwell in safety and security, and perform its solemn feasts in peace, and the Taeb shall have a perpetual Kingdom to the latter day" (Montgomery, p. 248). There

is certainly no passage in the O.T. that gives such a clue as this to the aspirations which undoubtedly lie behind the Epistle to the Hebrews.

So we are led on to the most distinctive contrast between Jews and Samaritans in respect of Messianic hope. The Jewish Messiah was to be a king descended from David. The Samaritans resting on the promise (Deut. xviii. 15) "The Lord Thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet, from amongst their brethren like unto thee," insisted that the Taeb could not come from any house but the house of Moses and Aaron. The Samaritans refuse to derive the promise of the Messiah from the prophecy of Balaam. The Taeb is to be a Teacher, a Restorer, but emphatically he is a priest. In this respect the Epistle to the Hebrews stands in marked contrast to the rest of the New Testament. There, both in the Gospels and in the Epistles, repeated stress is laid on our Lord's Davidic descent. The writer of the Hebrews does not hesitate to point out that such descent was a disqualification for priestly office. "It is evident that our Lord hath sprung out of Judah, as to which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priests" (vii. 14).

On the other hand, in this Epistle the Melchizedec Priesthood eclipses, and almost evacuates of its glory, the Priesthood of Aaron. How are we to account for this? There can be but one answer. The root quarrel between the Jews and Samaritans was as to the true line of Aaronic Priesthood. Rivalry between the descendants of Eleazar and those of Ithamar, the two sons of Aaron, has left its traces even in Old Testament history. As between Jews and Samaritans it was most acute. The Samaritans held that Eli of the Ithamar branch moved the Tabernacle from Shechem to Shiloh and so brought to an end the period of Divine favour. The Samaritan priests to this day trace their priesthood to Eleazar. This schism could not be continued in the Christian Church. It was a happy solution which used for this purpose the 90th Psalm, quoted by our Lord in connection with his Davidic descent. The same Psalm claimed for him the Priesthood of Melchizedec. The Samaritans were able to honour Melchizedec by making him King not of Jerusalem but of a Salem which is to the East of Shechem.

It should not be forgotten that there was a moment in Jewish history when the offices of prophet, priest and king met in the person of John Hyrcanus, the great enemy of the Samaritans. John Hyrcanus raised in his person Messianic hopes which came to a miserable end in his successors. He had claimed the title and rôle of "Priest of the most High God," but his successors had taken all the glory out of the name. It became hateful to the patriotic Pharisee, and singularly inappropriate in a letter to ordinary Jewish Christians. Here in our Epistle we might almost read between the lines: "That Melchizedec Priesthood, to which your great enemy John Hyrcanus falsely aspired, has found its fulfilment in Jesus, Whom the whole Hebrew race may acclaim as the true Prophet, Priest and King superseding both Aaron and David."

Before passing from the High Priest to the Tabernacle let me

call your attention to the characteristics of the High Priest on which our writer dwells. They may be summed up in the word "sympathy," the fruit of brotherly fellowship. In the Pentateuch this sympathy finds expression in the mention of the sins of Aaron and his sons, and in the constant need for atonement of such sins. But in the New Testament the collusion between the Priesthood and foreign powers has made the Priesthood very unpopular with the devout. With the exception of Zechariah, the father of John Baptist, I doubt if there is favourable mention of a single priest in the New Testament. The Priesthood are the persecutors of our Lord and of His Church. Not one of the Evangelists or Apostles mentions them with favour, still less is any spiritual lesson drawn from them. On the other hand the Samaritan Priesthood fell under no such disfavour. They were never supporters of a foreign dynasty. Their sympathy with the people, and close association with them in modern times, is abundantly testified by visitors, and it is not unreasonable to believe that the presentation of our Lord as the great High Priest would have been more acceptable to a Samaritan than to a Jewish Christian. Christian sacerdotalism has made it easy and natural for us to read the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is quite conceivable that to St. Paul it would have been difficult of acceptance. It follows a line of thought of which there is no trace in his writings.

From the Priesthood we pass naturally to the *Tabernacle.* Bishop Westcott (Hebr., p. 11) in suggesting reasons why our writer in spite of "the close connection of the early Church with the Temple (and) the splendour and majesty of its ritual," chose to dwell on the Tabernacle, says two things in which he most unconsciously confirms this Samaritan hypothesis. He says (1) that the writer "in order to lay his reasoning on the deepest foundation goes back to the first institution of the system. He shows how the original design of the priestly ritual of the Law . . . was satisfied by Christ." In other words, like a Samaritan he disregards all the post-Pentateuchal instructions as to the building of the Temple; (2) Bishop Westcott adds that "the Temple, like the Kingdom with which it was co-ordinate, was spiritually a sign of retrogression." Here we have an unconscious echo of St. Stephen's speech, which works up to the building of the Temple as the culminating act of Jewish apostasy. We may compare Stephen's "the Highest dwelleth not in hand-made buildings" with our writer's "Christ having become a High Priest . . . of the better and more perfect Tabernacle not hand made." (What? Is Philip echoing the dying words of his brother deacon?) We need not force this point. Whether the Gerizim Temple was standing at the beginning of the Christian era is very doubtful. But there are words in Montgomery's *Samaritans* (p. 230) which seem very apposite to our writer's treatment of the Mosaic ordinances as having a spiritual value far above the literal. Montgomery writes: "In general the control of the community has lain in the hands of the Priesthood, has not been usurped by lay doctors. Despite this fact Moses has

triumphed over Aaron, probably because of the enforced spiritualization of the Samaritan religion during its long suffering of persecution since the days of John Hyrcanus. The Samaritan theology is not interested in the sacrificial laws of the Pentateuch. . . . A certain tone of spirituality marks Samaritan theology, so that it appears in a way as one of those numerous developments of Old Testament religion which were the forerunners of the spiritual worship of the synagogue and of Christianity. This stage may have been reached earlier than in Jerusalem, for the glory of Gerizim fell two centuries before that of Jerusalem." Montgomery's words help us to a right understanding of the Epistle. The writer is not arguing that the Aaronic Priesthood, with its Holy of Holies is a foreshadowing of a Christian Priesthood or that our High Priest is continually offering a memorial of His earthly sacrifice in Heaven, but that the whole Tabernacle with all its belongings was a figure of the eternal self-sacrifice of the Son of God. He is the true Holy of Holies, His flesh is the veil, by His blood, that is His death, the Veil is rent and His Godhead is revealed, by His one offering of Himself His people are for ever perfected. He is the altar and He is the burnt offering. "The Holy Tabernacle," say the Samaritans, "has disappeared, but it is only exalted, existing in some mystic fashion above the mount, but it will return with the Ark and all the sacred paraphernalia of worship to perfect the ritual of the Saints in the age of grace." (Montgomery, p. 239.) Was not this kind of thought in the back of our writer's mind ? and belief of this kind was current among the Samaritans in the first century A.D.

Lack of space compels me to pass over many points on which I would fain dwell, such as the "effulgence of the Father's glory," the prominence given to the sabbath rest, the insistence on the new Covenant, the ashes of the heifer, and the extraordinary simplicity which remembrance of Philip's difficulties at Samaria imports into the well-known passage: "the word of the beginning of Christ, the foundation of repentance from dead works, doctrines of baptisms and laying on of hands, of resurrection of the dead and of eternal judgment." I must content myself with one final passage where Samaritan reference solves many difficulties. In the 11th chapter our writer travels over the same ground as the 44th and following chapters of Ben Sira. In both a roll of Hebrew saints is unfolded. Common to both rolls are Noah, Enoch, Abraham, Moses, Samuel and David. Joshua, though not named in Hebrews, is practically included in both. Of those whom our writer omits, we may notice especially Aaron and Phinehas, names that are redolent of controversy between Jew and Samaritan. Again he has no room for Caleb, of the tribe of Judah, but he includes (besides Jacob and Joseph, father of Ephraim), the Israelite Judges, Gideon, Barak, Samson and Jephthah, who are not named by Ben Sira. Of these by far the most remarkable is Samson. He is never mentioned in the Bible apart from the Book of Judges. His name does not occur in the indices of the Apocrypha or of the Apocalyptic books. How is it that he is found here among the heroes of faith ? Westcott

points out that these judges overcame different enemies, and that "the writer passes no judgment on character"—yet the divorce between faith and character is not very convincing. Nairne does not even mention Samson, who has given many a preacher exegetical trouble. But when we turn to books on the Samaritans the difficulty vanishes. He was last of the Judges or Kings, and his reign was a landmark in Samaritan history. For it was in his time that Eli usurped the High Priesthood and moved the Tabernacle from Shechem to Shiloh. In his days the period of Divine favour came to an end and the present rule, the age of God's disfavour, was inaugurated. It may be open to question how far these Samaritan traditions go back. They come to us in chronicles of a later age. But I cannot doubt that the departures from the roll of Ben Sira are deliberate, and they certainly accord with our records of Samaritan tradition.

I am aware of weighty arguments on the other side—such as the free use of proof texts from books which the Samaritans did not regard as canonical. Especially adverse to my suggestion is such a passage as xii. 22: "ye are come to Mount Zion, and the City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem." But we cannot suppose that Samaritan Christians stood out against the belief of the rest of the Church either in the matter of canonical books or of the heavenly Jerusalem as equivalent to the City of God. They could not have accepted a suffering Christ on the basis of the Pentateuch only. I am far from pretending that my hypothesis solves all difficulties. But it does fit in with the growing sense of the importance of Cesaræa as a fountain of Christian tradition. It does provide for some survival of the mission to Samaria begun by our Lord Himself and continued on the death of Stephen. It does go a long way to remove the central difficulty of the Epistle, the appeal to the Priesthood of Christ and to the Tabernacle, not the Temple. Imagination carries me to St. Paul's prison, to Philip joining there his friends, Paul and Luke, to the drafting of this Epistle on the eve of Paul's martyrdom or after it, to its remaining in the Church of Rome along with the parchments of the great Apostle. I love to read it as a great manifestation of the reunion of Israel and Judah in the infant Church of Christ.

In *An Outline of the History of Christian Literature* (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 17*s.* 6*d.* net) Mr. George L. Hurst, B.D., seeks to give "guidance along an hitherto untrodden path." There is, he says, "no easily accessible work that tells the story of Christian Literature." Into a little over 500 pages he crowds brief references to writers of many lands, some of whom can scarcely be described as Christians. There is a full index, which will enable the reader to find the names of many who may not previously have been known to him. The writer shows himself an industrious collector of information, and it must have been a severe task of compression to embrace so large a number of authors.

PRAYER BOOK REVISION.

By the Rev. Thos. J. Pulvertaft, M.A.,
Vicar of St. Paul's-at-Kilburn.

IT is a commonplace on platforms and in articles that the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer contained in the Bishops' Book is the fruit of twenty years' labour. It is true that twenty years have elapsed since the Royal Commission reported, but it is equally true that no one in 1906 would have believed possible the Book about to be presented for the approval of the Church Assembly. The many preliminary stages of revision show that a changed attitude was adopted, as circumstances made it seem advisable to make legal what is avowedly illegal. The war made lawlessness epidemic in the Church, and Anglo-Catholicism was the only section of religious life in England that realized to the full that the religious condition of England after the war would be determined by its condition during the war. While others dreamed dreams and saw visions of a new England called into being by a returning army of heroes christianized and sanctified by war, Anglo-Catholics seized every opportunity, and when control was slacker than usual, introduced innovations that brought their service nearer and nearer to that of the Roman Church. The grief, the uncertainties and the general concentration on great national and personal issues gave the opportunity, and this was utilized to the fullest extent.

The Bishops who helped to frame the first Revision in Committee for the most part have not taken part in the last Revision. Those who saw the Book through its final stages have not been, with a few exceptions, specially noteworthy for their knowledge of the proposals rejected or the so-called science of Liturgiology. They were more intent on meeting a situation that demanded the legalization of the illegal with the minimum disturbance of doctrine on their part. Their Lordships were in a dilemma. They knew they had to face the convinced attachment of Anglo-Catholics to certain ceremonies, and they were aware that these, in many cases, could not be brought within the range of permitted doctrine in the Church of England. They wished to restrain these, and the path they chose was to make clear the doctrines that lay behind these ceremonies, and then to restrain the expression of the doctrines in ceremonial practice. They were ready to surrender to the full to the demands of forty years' agitation on the doctrinal side—they were unwilling to allow the logical fruit of the doctrines to be displayed in our Churches.

And the Bishops did not know their own minds as to the form in which their Book should be presented. One of their number on the eve of its publication announced that it would be a schedule of permissible variations. When it was published it came as a surprise on the Church that the model of the Episcopal Church

in Scotland had been followed. The Book is a Composite Book with the old and the new intermingled, and when additions or important amendments are made, they are marked by lines in the margin. They published a measure that had a definite scheme of Rubrics and a logical outline of procedure. This has been changed into something different and the arrangement of the Rubrics has been altered in important respects. The Composite Book contained a Service for the Ordination of Deaconesses, and the Deposited Book which represents the Bishops' final thoughts knows nothing of this service. It had escaped them and their advisers that it had never been submitted to the House of Laity. So while it is technically true that Revision has occupied certain Bishops at intervals during twenty years, it is equally true that during the last weeks of crystallization the Book was rushed, and has signs of the haste that are visible to all who study the final stages.

But we are not concerned with the preparation of the Book save in so far as to comment on claims that it is the result of mature consideration as regards its form and presentation to the Church. What matters to us is its doctrinal teaching. We are ready and willing to accept great changes in the customary Services of the Church, if they meet what are known as modern needs and the altered conditions of life. The form of worship is secondary to its content. The Church exists to spread the knowledge of the Gospel and to extend the Kingdom of God. It stands for Truth and for fidelity to the Revelation of God in Christ. The Church has a history of nearly nineteen hundred years, and we see in the course of its history the emergence of almost every form of heresy and superstition. It has taken over what is innocent in Paganism and has baptized it into Christ. It has been influenced by what is untrue in Paganism, and has by syncretism adopted it as part of its message. It has met many enemies and has triumphed over them. It has also fallen a victim to the desires of ambitious men for domination over the minds and consciences of men. At the Reformation, which has been held for centuries by Churchmen of all types to be one of the greatest blessings in Church history, it was purged from Medieval accretions to the Gospel and returned to the teaching of Holy Scripture. To-day the Reformation is considered by many to have been " almost an unqualified calamity, the evil consequences of which have not yet been exhausted." And the Bishops have had in their mind when revising the Prayer Book the men who hold the latter view. It was due to them that the doctrinal changes were made, and it was a desire to do all that was possible to retain their inclusion in the Church as law-abiding men that has led to alterations that have pained many of the most loyal children of the Church. The Revision is not a surrender of the Bishops to the spirit of adaptation of services to modern needs, so much as a capitulation to men who frankly dislike the distinguishing features of our Liturgy in so far as they differ from medieval models.

We were told when the Book was introduced that there was

no change of doctrine in its pages. Later this was modified by those who wished to win support for the Book into "no change of essential doctrine." Essential doctrine has different meanings. It may imply that doctrine which is common to all who profess and call themselves Christians—doctrine that is contained, e.g., in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. Or it may mean that doctrine which was asserted by the Reformers in accord with the Teaching of Holy Writ in opposition to the doctrine of the Church of Rome. Doctrine considered essential by the Church of England has been changed in the Bishops' Book, with its Alternative Communion Service that restores what Cranmer rejected because it was capable of teaching Roman error, and on Reservation, which gives outward expression to that teaching in a manner that has been emphasized by the Church of Rome. It is easy to assert that as the Prayer of Consecration in the Alternative Order does not specify at any one point where the change in the Elements takes place, it is more Evangelical than the existing Order. But the whole question is "At a valid consecration by a duly ordained Priest, does a change in the Elements occur which attaches to the Elements a local Presence of the Saviour? Does Christ come on the Altar when the Prayer has been said, and does His Presence remain after the Service has ended?" The New Prayer, in the opinion of those familiar with the history of its various parts, implies this teaching on the surface. It is possible to employ it in an evangelical sense, by deliberately closing the eyes to history and forgetting the permissive use of Mass Vestments and the allowance of Reservation. But otherwise it is a direct concession to the forces of illegality that demanded for themselves a place in the Church of England made plain by the teaching of its formularies.

In an able pamphlet the Ven. J. W. Hunkin (who is one of those who advocate the acceptance of the Bishops' Book) tells us that the Epiklesis, whose history he traces, may be, as it has been, perfectly innocent, and may be, as it has been and is, the vehicle of false teaching, and concludes that: "In actual practice, for three hundred years Cranmer's office has been freer by far from mechanical and materialistic abuses than any other liturgy in Christendom. . . . It is, most happily, at the critical point that Cranmer's liturgical genius reaches its highest points—in the centre of the Consecration Prayer: 'Grant that we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine according to Thy Son our Saviour's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood: who in the same night that he was betrayed . . .' No more beautiful form of words has ever been suggested to express exactly what should be expressed here, and no other form that has ever been suggested can be so well taken over literally and without qualification into modern thought." And the Bishops have definitely and decisively deleted this from the prayer in favour of a form of Epiklesis which in the opinion of those familiar with Eastern Liturgies marks a change in the substance of the bread and wine. Taken in connexion

with the Anamnesis restored in the Prayer, from which it has been excluded since 1552, it is impossible to deny the contention of Bishop Knox: " 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. This idea is reinforced by the introduction of the Anamnesis, the words of Thankful Remembrance, which are defined by liturgiologists to be the offering of the Son to the Father." Anglo-Catholics accept this interpretation of the Prayer. And the teaching of the Greek Church is that by the recitation of the Epiklesis " there is wrought the change in the Elements and the very Bread becomes the very Body of Christ, and the Wine His very Blood, the species only remaining which are perceived by sight."

And if proof were needed, that the Bishops intend that this should be a possible interpretation and a natural interpretation taken in connexion with Reservation, it is found in the position of the Black Rubric, which alone of all the concluding Rubrics in the Communion Office is not embraced in the preliminary Rubrics in the New Order but is placed at the end of the present Office. There it stands condemned by its isolation to be considered as inapplicable to the new Office—a monument of a past that has been replaced by a present which will have nothing to do with its plain implications. In the Composite Book it was possible to apologize for the position of the Rubric. In the Deposited Book no ingenuity can explain its lonely proclamation that what is taught in one Order is not necessarily taught in the other.

The outstanding feature in the Bishops' Book from the disciplinary standpoint is the great increase of Episcopal Power in regulating Services and determining parochial conflicts on the character of the Services. The Church—if the Book become law—will be episcopalized in a manner that is novel in the Anglican Communion. The powers of the Bishop extend from a possible prohibition of Evening Communion and a compulsory ordering of the Eastward position, to the direction that an Incumbent, appointed to a Parish where Vestments have been worn, should continue their use. In proof of this, it is sufficient to quote the Rubrics. " When the Morning or Evening Prayer is immediately followed by another Service provided in this Book, it shall be permissible for the Minister, at his discretion, to begin at the versicle, ' O Lord, open Thou our lips,' and to end with the Third Collect, or with the Canticle after the Second Lesson; or else after the Canticle he may say, ' The Lord be with you.' *Answer:* ' And with thy spirit.' *Minister:* ' Let us pray '; and then he shall say any of the following: the Collect of the day or the Second or the Third Collect, and so end.

"But inasmuch as it is to be desired that changes sanctioned by this Book in the customary arrangement and conduct of the Services should not be made arbitrarily or without the goodwill of the people, as represented in the Parochial Church Council:

any question which may from time to time arise between the Minister of a parish and the people as so represented, with regard to such changes, shall stand referred to the Bishop of the Diocese, who, after such consultation as he shall think best, both with the Minister and with the people, shall make orders thereupon, and these orders shall be final.

"If any doubts or diversity arise concerning the manner how to understand, do and execute the things contained in this Book, resort shall be had to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the settlement of the same, so that it be not contrary to anything contained in this Book, nor to any Rules for the conduct of publick worship in accordance with this Book which may be made from time to time by the Archbishops and Bishops of the Province. And if the Bishop of the Diocese be in doubt then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop."

It is generally believed that Evening Communion is sanctioned —it never has been illegal—by the first Rubric quoted. We know that Fasting Communion has been one of the main motives for the sanctioning of reservation, and we are aware that in the past the Bishops held that teaching, implying the participation of the Communion, after breaking the fast to be sinful, is contrary to that of the Church of England. If the so-called Rule of the Church be held by any Bishop to be obligatory on all Communicants, then he may say that he has no discretion but to forbid Evening Communion, and the Minister may be brought in opposition to his Bishop on the interpretation of the discretion given him by the Rubric. And the little word "at" before "God's Board" may be interpreted by a Bishop to mean the Eastward Position and so ordered, in spite of the evident desire of the Bishops as a whole to leave the position of the Minister open. If a Clergyman be appointed to a Vestment-wearing Parish and he cannot conscientiously wear them, then, if the Parochial Church Council be opposed to the change, the Diocesan may agree with the Council and forbid the Minister to abandon the customary use of Vestments.

It is contended that this interpretation is opposed to the Measure (2 c). "A minister shall not be under any obligation to use in public worship any orders or forms of service other than those contained in the Book of Common Prayer, or to follow any rubric, table or direction not contained in the Book of Common Prayer, except such rubrics as under this Measure are to have effect as contained in the Book of Common Prayer." The General Rubricks of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion are in this class, and it is here that the alternative use of the Surplice and Chasuble is found. The permissive Rubric concerning the use of combined services is not in this position, but the history of that Rubric which followed the rejection of the recommendation that Evening Communion should be explicitly recognised makes it possible for a Bishop to declare that Evening Communion is outside the discretion of the Minister. A Church Council which

does not represent the wishes of the Parishioners may make it very difficult for a new Incumbent to introduce Evening Communion and to discontinue the use of Vestments. The Bishop's decision is final. It is of course possible for the Electoral Roll to be increased and a new Council of different views elected. But this means strife and trouble. We do not think that the Measure gives an Incumbent the protection he ought to have, and which he at present legally enjoys so long as he observes the law of the Church. The law is changed, and he is deprived not of freedom to act against the existing law, but of freedom to act within " the law of this Church and Realm " as it exists to-day.

It may be argued that no Bishop would be so foolish as to take these steps. But there are Bishops and Bishops, and it is more than conceivable that a Diocesan may hold such strong views that he feels himself bound to act in this fashion. He may have, as the Archbishop of York said before the Royal Commission, a bad time with his brethren in Council, but they cannot well restrain him. And Bishops can very easily pass strong Resolutions in their Lambeth Meetings, and individually in their Dioceses yield to strong local pressure to reverse in practice what has been collectively resolved. In dealing with things as they are, we see how the Bishops have acted, and we see no strong reason for assenting to the contention that matters will be very different when the Bishops have their Book with their new powers.

Two recent incidents throw light on what Bishops may do. The Bishop of Kensington—in the absence of the Diocesan—introduced " robing the candidate "—whatever that may mean—and handing to him the Communion paten and cup at an Ordination in St. Matthew's, Westminster. And the Bishop of Truro, who is Dean of the Cathedral as well as Diocesan, has introduced incense into the Communion Service in Truro Cathedral. And these things have been done since the Bishops issued the Composite Book. They are an index of the working of the minds of some Bishops, and they prove how the liberty that is believed to be given by the Book can be interpreted.

And this leads to the important question, " Will the Deposited Book restore order in the Church ? " Bishop Knox has made a detailed analysis of the provisions of the Bishops' Book, and shows that opportunity is given for the disloyal to avail himself of the liberty given him, to introduce practically all the ceremonial of the Roman Mass. Dr. Knox says, " It is not even clear that the Measure will enable the Bishop to intervene, if the Incumbent introduces the Mass without recourse to the Deposited Book. The clause to which the Bishop of Gloucester refers (as quoted above concerning conference with the Parochial Church Council) covers only changes " authorized under this Measure." It does not touch changes of any other kind. The Mass, as we know, has been introduced under the old Prayer Book, and can be introduced again. " What will the Bishops do in that case ? " It may be said that the comparison of the Changes introduced by the Deposited Book

compared by Bishop Knox with "An Order of High Mass from Prayers for Church of England People" is marked by an ingenuity that is rare among English Churchmen. Experience has abundantly proved that the ingenuity of the Bishop has been exceeded in practice by many clergymen, and there is no reason to believe that the Bishops' Book will destroy the subtlety of those who believe that every approximation to Rome is a thing for which we ought to be thankful.

To those who are profoundly convinced that the Bishops' Book introduces a change of doctrine in the Church of England the question of Order is of secondary importance. We are convinced that the teaching of the Book is such that it cannot be expected to bring the lawless to obedience. We hold that its teaching is a summons to disobedience, as the grounds of the disobedience are granted to the lawless, who can confidently hold that the Book so clearly implies a localized permanent Presence of Christ in the consecrated Elements, that Adoration must of necessity follow in the case of men and women who believe that their Lord is in the Aumbry or the Tabernacle. If, as seems probable from the Southport and Lichfield decisions, a lamp before the Aumbry will be considered legal, there is a direct incentive to worshippers to gather near the Aumbry and fix their minds upon its contents. Is there anything in the Book to prevent the spontaneous singing of hymns to the Blessed Sacrament and all the worship now given to the Sacramental Elements with their Mysterious Presence being continued? And how can the clergyman who holds the belief of his people stay outside these devotions? And when the renewal or removal of the Sacramental Elements takes place, is it possible to prevent people organizing devotions? We are told that "There shall be no service or ceremony in connexion with the Sacrament so reserved, nor shall it be exposed or removed except in order to be received in communion, or otherwise reverently consumed." The Incumbent may not arrange any service or practise any ceremonial "save that enjoined by reverence for the sacred mystery," but who is to restrain the devotions of the people, who may act without the direct guidance of the Priest? And may it not be necessary for the sake of due decorum for some one to regulate the form in which these "spontaneous devotions" find expression? As has been stated by an Anglo-Catholic publicist: "Devotions have been specifically permitted in various English dioceses. Now they are to be forbidden in all. It is obvious that the bishops cannot enforce the general ban unless they will boldly denounce Benediction, Exposition and Devotions as idolatrous. And they cannot do this while publishing a Communion Office which, with all its defects, clearly teaches the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice."

With all our heart we desire peace in the Church. Bishop Welldon has written: "The hope of the Church lies, I feel, in collective Episcopal action, and I would appeal to the Bishops to act together, for the individualism of the Bishops is an even greater

peril to the Church than the individualism of clergymen." Will the Bishops be as brave individually as they resolve collectively? We have the past to guide us, and we see how collective Resolutions have been individually violated. We have seen in recent months how a Suffragan Bishop interpreted the Ordination Service and how a Diocesan introduced Incense into his Cathedral. We find that the men, with whom some, at any rate, of the Bishops have shown sympathy, have resolved not to accept the limitations of the Book, holding them to be illogical and calculated to deprive their people of benefits that the doctrine underlying the Book provides. Under the old Book direct prohibition failed to secure obedience. What hope is there that under the new Book the strong combination of clear annunciation of teaching by revival of what was rejected in the past, the permission of what was forbidden under the old Book, and the strong emotional urge of the doctrine of a localized permanent Presence in connexion with the Elements will not prove too strong for the Bishops? We are convinced that it will, and if ever the Book be legalized, we shall be in the presence of increased opportunities for going beyond the limits that seem to lie on the surface of the Book, and for a growing approximation of our Services to those of the Church of Rome in these ceremonies that have hitherto marked the Romeward side of a line of deep cleavage. We are not opposed to Prayer Book Revision. We wish to see our Book of Common Prayer capable of meeting the devotional requirements of an age of great complexity. But the parts of the Bishops' Book, to which we find ourselves completely opposed, mark not a step forward in meeting these needs, but a step backward in restoring in the Church of England teaching associated with medieval conceptions of worship, that were deliberately rejected in the sixteenth century and have since that date been rejected by the Church of England in her Formularies and by all the Reformation Churches. And they were rejected because of their unscriptural and anti-scriptural characteristics. They have not lost what was false in them. For this reason we are forced by conscience and by our love of truth, by our loyalty to the Truth of the Gospel and by our devotion to a Faith expressing itself in rightly ordered Worship to resist the passage of a Book which would have been inconceivable to our fathers and would never have been proposed by a pre-war English Episcopate.

The Wife of Evelyn Strode, by Lucien Smith (Thornton Butterworth, Ltd., 7*s*. 6*d*. net) is a novel of modern type dealing with the conflict of ideals which the ascetic life present to a young peer who is in holy orders, and the claims of a married life upon which he enters under peculiar circumstances. The story is highly dramatic but its closing scene is unconvincing.

BERNARDINO OCHINO OF SIENA: CAPUCHIN AND REFORMER (1487—1564).

By John Knipe.

"False Christians desire a Christ after their manner, rich, proud and magnificent."—Ochino.

Ochino the Franciscan.

FOR thirty years the most famous of Italian preachers, the personality of Bernardino Ochino has been compared to a defaced portrait in the gallery of the great men of the Later Renaissance. His name has been blotted out for centuries by the deliberate malice of an unforgiving Church.

It is a local nickname. Siena was divided into *Contrada* (Quarters). One was called "Oca" (Goose). It extended from the Dominican Church to Dante's Fonte Branda, and here there stands to this day the house of the Dyer's daughter, Caterina. We know his father's name by an item in the Account Book of the Cathedral Treasury: "January 1540. Was paid 32 Lire to Fra Bernardino son of Domenico Tommasini called Ochino." It is the preacher's modest fee.

He was still a lad when he joined the Observants, a Reformed Order of the Franciscans, whose monastery was some two miles from the City Gate, and it is quite possible that he had been influenced by Savonarola's preaching. Ochino declared in later life that he never regretted his decision, which had kept him from many temptations and sins of the world, and given him the opportunity to study the Scriptures and contemplative theology. Bible-study was then only permissible in the Cloister. He took the cowl, hoping thus "to gain Paradise, though not without the aid of Divine Grace," and he concluded "that the Observant Rule, being the most austere, should best represent the example of Christ."

There is a doubtful statement that he left the Order for some years to study medicine in Perugia. He rose to high office, being elected first Provincial (1524) and later a General, and he distinguished himself by his natural gifts of acute reasoning and persuasive eloquence. We have his own account of his spiritual experience: "I remained until the Capuchins arose. When I saw the severity of their life I put on their dress, yet not without a severe struggle. And I well remember that I turned to Christ with: 'Lord, if I do not now save my soul I know not what more I can do!'"

He begged the Pope to let him join the Capuchins as a simple brother. Clement VII, ever a vacillator, hesitated, unwilling to offend the Observants. The zealous young Order was provoking much jealousy among the older branches of the Friars Minor. Finally the papal consent was given, and the triumphant Capuchins rejoiced to receive so important a secession into their Community.

Ochino Preaches in Rome. Lent, 1534.

He was then thirty-seven, and the Capuchins, hoping to attract public notice, appointed him Lenten Preacher in S. Lorenzo in Damaso. "Brother Bernardino," ex-General of the Observants, drew crowded congregations. No such preaching had ever been heard in Rome. The unworldly and ascetic lives of the Capuchins rebuked the corrupt splendour of Rome. They were reverenced by the people as "the Soul of Saint Francis."

The hierarchy as a whole disliked their zeal, and the bishops listened to the envious attacks of the Observant General, who hinted at fanaticism and heretical tendencies.

One spring morning Rome was startled by the coming of the Capuchins in a body. They walked barefoot, in procession, one hundred and fifty strong, lean, burning-eyed and eager, in coarse brown habit and white cord girdle and leather sandals, wearing the distinctive *Cappuccino* (pointed cowl), and they visited devoutly the Seven Churches, St. Peter's, St. John the Lateran, St. Paul beyond the Walls, St. Maria Maggiore, the Franciscan Ara Cœli, and the ancient churches of St. Clemente and St. Prassede. But their enemies wrote letters from all over Italy, and the wily General of the Observants plotted that these should be put into the Pope's hands, together with his own, on the same day. "Holy Father," he concluded, "rather dissolve the little Order than allow it to undermine the great one."

We know how Clement's vacillations galled our Henry VIII, and the Pope was loth to dissolve the Order which he had so recently confirmed. But the Curia was hostile. On April 25th, St. Mark's Day, Clement exclaimed in exasperation, "We command that the Capuchins, one and all, shall leave the city this day, before the taper that we now kindle shall have burned down." The papal messenger found the friars silently eating their scanty noontide meal in St. Euphemia. They took nothing but their breviaries as they followed the tall wooden cross on their way to the Convent of St. Lorenzo. Here they were hospitably received and remained. But Rome rebelled against the unjust expulsion; the citizens thronged the streets clamouring for their return. The Princes Colonna and Orsini, hereditary enemies, petitioned the Pope, while Duchess Vittoria Colonna hurried from her Villa on the Alban hills, and Duchess Caterina Cibo came from Tuscany.

Pope Clement tried to save his face. He said the decree was only provisional and he let the Capuchins return as individuals, though not as a Community.

Death of Clement VII, September, 1534.

On September 26th Clement died and the new Pope, Paul III, showed himself favourable to the Capuchins.

Ochino had been among the first to return, since from this time there is recorded the beginning of his long personal friendship with Vittoria Colonna, the great Roman Lady. At the request of his

Order Ochino asked her to persuade the stubborn Vicar-General, Lodovico, to convene the General Chapter, which he refused to call together. Lodovico declined a pressing invitation to Vittoria's beautiful Villa, but she secured the ear of the new Pope, by whose command the delayed Chapter was held, November, 1535.

Ochino Elected One of the Four Generals.

The Capuchins chose Bernard of Asti, a gentle and pious man, as Vicar-General, and Ochino a General, for, in spite of the fact that he was a recent adherent, he had distinguished himself greatly by his preaching. The Pope heard him with unfeigned pleasure, and the Cardinals admitted the beauty, learning and force of the Capuchin's sermons. Preaching was little esteemed in Rome. The Humanists mocked the ignorance of the pulpit, and as Antonio Bandini neatly observed: "No one was then considered in Rome a gentleman or good courtier who did not hold, besides the clerical doctrines, his own little erroneous opinion."

Monsignor Bembo, later Cardinal, said to a friend, "What am I to do at sermons? One hears nothing but the *doctor subtilis* (Duns Scotus, Francis:) inveigh against the *doctor angelicus* (Aquinas, Domin:) and then comes in Aristotle as a third and ends the dispute."

Revival of Religion in Italy. "The Oratory of Divine Love."

The Reformation stirred the dead bones of Medievalism. In Rome there was founded in 1523 on the Janiculum a pious society, both clerical and lay, called "The Oratory of Divine Love." It was strictly orthodox in its rules, but it did aim at the revival of personal religion, by devout religious observance and private prayer.

Under Leo X the members were first enrolled in the rectory of Giuliano Dati, and these included famous names, such as Giberti, and Antonio Bruccioli the Florentine who translated the Vulgate; Caraffa, and the great Contarini. When Alva's troops (1527) sacked Rome the Oratory was dispersed. Its influence was not great, but it is an instance of the widespread acknowledged feeling that the Paganism of the Renaissance had destroyed the spiritual power of the Catholic Church.

Juan Valdez, "The Knight of Christ."

In 1536 Paul III gave Ochino a signal mark of his favour by appointing him Lenten Preacher to Naples. Ochino little dreamed that his mission to Naples was to be the turning-point of his life. The whole city flocked to hear the renowned Capuchin who preached a Course of Sermons in the pulpit of St. Giovanni Maggiore. The Emperor Charles V deigned to hear him more than once and he spoke of the bold friar long years after. Among the Imperial suite in the nave there stood the Viceroy, Don Pedro of Toledo, and beside him his secretary, Don Juan Valdez, a Castilian nobleman of Cuença.

Valdez listened in wonder and delight as Ochino preached simply the Gospel of Christ. The friar avoided controversy and legends, he made charitable appeals, he awoke consciences, he cheered and consoled and uplifted his hearers.

"Ochino preaches with such power!" exclaimed one. "He would move stones to weep."

It may have been Carnesecchi the Florentine, a mutual friend, who presented Valdez to the Capuchin. Good men who met Juan Valdez were drawn to love him. He had the face of a saint, "in which was reflected the invisible world," the charm of a scholar and the courtesy of a gentleman. "He seemed appointed by God as a teacher of noble and distinguished men, although he was so good that he served the humblest" (Curione). He had started in his own house the Reading Circle named after him. At first the Circle consisted only of his personal friends, who introduced others, but Valdez extended the membership and encouraged frank discussion. The best account of these Italian Reformers is in the Inquisition Report of the Trial of Carnesecchi, the Papal Protonotary, martyred in his old age. "All his (Valdez) thoughts and deeds," he said, "were merged in the study of Holy Scripture and a Christian life. But what attracted me to him and won my entire confidence was that Bernardino Ochino, who was at that time preaching to admiring crowds, held him in such high esteem." The Circle was unique in that it met avowedly to study the Bible. Valdez was a mystic, one who cared little for forms. It was Ochino, with another monk, who gave the meetings a more intellectual and logical character. This other, who became his greatest friend, was Peter Martyr Vermigli, the Prior of the Augustinians in Naples. Martyr took the cowl as a youth against his father's will. He was very learned and an acute reasoner. He was presented to the Circle by his old friend and fellow-student at Padua University, Gusano. Others were the Don Benedetto of Mantua, who was the real author of the first Italian tract on Justification by Faith, "Of the Benefits of Christ's Death," and Mollio, a Minorite Friar, expelled from Bologna on suspicion of heresy, now lector and preacher in St. Lorenzo, Naples. There came also Ragnone of Siena, Aonio Paleario the Humanist, Giulio Terenziano of Milan, and the gentle, pensive dreamer and poet, Flaminio, who joined his dear friends Carnesecchi and Paleario.

Of the notable ladies Vittoria Colonna was a Patroness, for while not really devout she was much interested in religion. She brought her sister-in-law, Duchess Giulia Gonzaga, a famous beauty, and her friend, Duchess Caterina Cibo. The most faithful of them was Donna Isabella Manriquez, who, in persecution days, preferred flight and exile to the surrender of her faith. And she was a Cardinal's sister.

The Circle thus began among scholars, for the ladies were as intellectual as any of the later Renaissance, and Calvin's *Institutions*, Bucer's *Commentary on St. Matthew*, and Luther *On the Psalms* were discussed, while Valdez expounded St. Paul's Epistles and wrote in Spanish his *Commentaries on Romans and I Corinthians*, besides

his mystical treatise, *The Hundred and Ten Divine Considerations*, which were translated into Italian by his friends. His most remarkable book was *The Christian Alphabet*, which was based on a conversation with Caterina Cibo over a sermon of Ochino's which they had both heard. " You were convinced by Ochino's words," Valdez told her, " that you cannot attain the goal without being mocked, misunderstood and despised by the world. It is only self-love which makes you so restless."

Did Caterina treasure the warning ? We know how she remained true when many denied.

The Circle was beautifully free from jealousies or dissension. It grew until its influence touched the world without. " There were so many who sympathized, and among these especially were many schoolmasters, that the total number included three thousand persons " (Caracciolo).

Not " three thousand schoolmasters," as Ranke mistranslated it.

The growth of the Circle was certainly encouraged by the popular interest excited by Ochino's sermons, " which were discussed as the most important daily event," and as Valdez sometimes suggested in writing the next subject, by degrees disputes arose over " Faith and Works, Purgatory, the Authority of the Bible and of the Pope," for the artisans talked in the wineshops and the women at the doorsteps.

Charles V had left Naples, and Don Pedro the Viceroy " favoured the schoolmen." Rival preachers among them suddenly denounced Ochino " for spreading Lutheran opinions secretly," contrary to the recent Imperial edict. The Governor was charged to inquire into the matter. He must have thought it a delicate question for a layman to declare the Pope's Missioner a heretic ! However, he suspended Ochino until he replied clearly to certain points. " But the friar, being a learned and eloquent man, defended himself so stubbornly that he was permitted to continue his Course of Sermons undisturbed. And not only was all suspicion silenced . . . he even gained in repute and the number of his adherents increased. These continued secretly to spread his doctrines after his departure " (Giannone).

From 1536–41 Ochino made brief and valued visits to the Circle, which met either at Valdez' house, or at Vittoria Colonna's magnificent Villa on the Island of Ischia, or at Caserta, and probably it should be identified with the Group in Rome of which she was the patroness at St. Silvestro (Quirinal). At this time Ochino did not dispute the accepted dogmas. He objected to religious observances which had grown rigid. 1536 was a year of hope for devout souls. Pope Paul III appointed a " Church Reform Commission of Nine Dignitaries," including Cardinals Pole, Caraffa and Contarini. Many clergy agreed with Ochino in his bold plea for a more spiritual meaning in worship, with " faith, love and gratitude " defined as necessary to the devout reception of the Holy Communion.

Ochino made Apostolic Missioner and Chosen Vicar-General. 1538–42.

Ochino may have been in Rome when the Report of the Nine was signed and presented to the Pope (1537). ("Consilium de Emendanda Ecclesia.") Paul III hesitated. He disliked the idea of reforming abuses in the Church, but he was proud of Ochino's success in reforming souls, and about this time the Pope appointed him "Apostolic Missioner to All Italy," reserving to himself the decision of the eager claims of the cities for Lent, and later also for Advent. One reason for the Capuchin's fame was that he knew the Vulgate by heart—his memory was marvellous—and he made extempore translations from the Latin into fresh, vigorous and simple Italian. Other preachers used the popular Repertory called *Aurea Biblia* of Rampegolo, a work so inaccurate that it was afterwards put on the Index!

A pause sometimes gave effect to Ochino's words, but above all he was amazingly human. "I am not deprived of the sweet ties of love of country," he wrote to "my own Siena."

In 1538 Ochino was Lent Preacher to Venice. With the consent of the Vicar-General he founded the first Capuchin Convent in the city and his friars served Venice nobly in an epidemic the same year. Bernard of Asti fell ill and in September he resigned his office at a special Chapter. "Bernardino was a wise, prudent and experienced man. Gifted and magnanimous . . . undeterred by the most difficult undertakings. His appearance and pure life lent belief to his saintly repute. . . . Nearly all votes were for him" (Boverio).

The Pope approved highly of the election and he dispensed Ochino from observance of the Canonical Hours. A brother warned the new Vicar-General: "If you rule the Order without prayer you are as one who rides without stirrups."

"To do good is to pray," Ochino replied. "He who does not cease from doing good does not cease from prayer."

He always travelled on foot and he crossed the frontier to visit the Shrine of Baume by Marseilles. He founded several new houses. Monsignor Bembo wrote to Vittoria Colonna a year ahead to secure Ochino for Venice the next Lent. The letter is somewhat condescending: "At the wish of several citizens I appeal to your kindness to induce our worthy Fra Bernardino Ochino to come and preach. . . . I myself should count it as great happiness to listen to that man and make his acquaintance."

Ochino delivers His "Nine Sermons." Lent. Venice. 1539.

By his very first sermon the Capuchin startled the pleasure-loving Venetians. "Thou, my city!" he cried in the ringing voice which could be heard on neighbouring house-tops so that men often lined the roofs to listen: "Alas! Thou remainest ever as thou wast. . . . I am persuaded that had I spoken so much

in Germany or in England I should have found more fruit than here." Next time he pleaded: "I am grieved, my city, because thou wilt not turn from thy wicked ways. Weeping, I implore Christ for thy sake because I love thee with my whole heart."

Monsignor Bembo declared himself a convert, at least for a time. "I opened my heart and mind to him," he wrote to Vittoria, "just as I should have done in the presence of Jesus Christ" (March). In April, in a second letter to the same lady: "Our Fra Bernardino—from this time I shall call him my own in conversation with you—is literally adored here." Again he wrote: "Bernardino expresses himself quite differently and in a far more Christian manner than any others . . . he speaks with much more real sympathy and love. . . . When he leaves us he will carry all hearts with him."

To the Rector of the SS. Apostoli in Rome, Bembo, a practical man, addressed an appeal that he would influence Ochino to relax his "severe abstinence, which always causes him stomach disorder." It was Ochino's "Thorn in the flesh" throughout his life.

Turning from the friendly account we find Ochino described by an envious critic, Bishop Graziani, then secretary to Cardinal Commendone; he noted that Ochino had every attraction for the multitude; "his famed eloquence, ingratiating manner, advanced years, austere life, rough Capuchin habit, long beard . . . grey hair, thin pale face" (now comes the touch of envy), "feigned appearance of frail health (!); lastly, the repute of a holy life. Wherever he was to speak no church was large enough . . . men were as numerous as women. . . . Ochino was honoured . . . by princes . . . everywhere offered hospitality; met at his arrival and escorted at his departure by local dignitaries. He knew how to increase the longing to hear him and the reverence paid him. He was never seen to ride, though his health was delicate and he was growing old. . . . As the guest of nobles—an honour he could not always refuse—he could never be persuaded to alter his rule of life. . . . He ate of one simple dish and he drank little wine, if a soft bed was ready for him he begged to rest more comfortably and lay down on his cloak spread on the floor" (*Life of Cardinal Commendone*).

The "Nine Sermons" were printed in Venice the same year. Their tone is evangelical but not aggressive. They show the influence of Valdez on his mind.

Ochino visited Siena in June where he founded a new Convent.

The Magnificent Signori passed a Council Resolution inviting "Fra Bernardino, who preached this morning in the Great Council-Chamber before all the people, to remain some days and preach in the Duomo or Town Hall."

Siena was very proud of her illustrious son, and carefully preserved his letters in her Town Archives.

Ochino proceeded to Rome, and after a brief stay he went to Naples.

SECOND VISIT TO NAPLES. JULY, 1539. THEATINE SPIES SUSPECT HIM.

The Valdez Circle had grown, and Ochino was warmly welcomed back in their midst. But a new heresy-hunting Order, the Theatine Monks, were established. They spied on Ochino in the church and when he entered Valdez' house. Caracciolo, the Theatine biographer, wrote: "Our fathers discovered the heresies in Naples. . . . Gualante and Cappone by their intercourse with Ochino and Valdez had themselves become somewhat defiled with their pitch, but *in confession our fathers led them on to relate everything that they knew concerning these secret heresies.* By these means our people became aware that Valdez and Ochino were sowing tares in the assemblies of men and women which they were in the habit of holding." (*Life of Paul IV.*)

The Theatines sent black reports to Caraffa in Rome. He remained silent, waiting a more propitious time to attack the heretic Friar.

From Perugia University Professor Nelli of Siena wrote to Aretino the humanist: "Last Advent we had our Fra Bernardino here. He is now preaching at Naples" (February, 1540).

The "Seven Dialogues" appeared at this time. They mark a distinct change in Ochino's doctrine. They treat "Of Love to God" and "The Pilgrimage to Paradise." Like many of his writings they are conversations between himself and another; it is Caterina Cibo who enters "the Order of Christ for noble souls" and takes the Vow of Surrender and Faith in the Merits of the Crucified. Ochino was at Modena also. "Ah!" muttered some of the hearers. "He does not preach as he did. He preaches too much of Christ and now he never mentions St. Geminiano."

After visiting Lucca and quieting local feuds at Perugia, Ochino spent September in Rome. Siena begged him to promise for next Lent. He replied cordially, referring them to the Pope and offering to come in Advent. There is mention of his personal friend Monsignor Ghinucci, who was the ex-titular Bishop of Worcester (Hugh Latimer's predecessor), a prelate who never had set foot in England, and was deposed for absenteeism by Henry VIII.

Siena was in trouble from internal quarrels, threatened war, unsafe roads and a bad harvest. Ochino wrote to the Dominicans recommending the sick in the City Hospital to their daily care, and advising the "Forty Hours' Prayer," a celebrated Capuchin devotion.

His friends of the Circle, Paleario, afterwards a martyr, and Ragnone met him.

Next year he was at Modena and in Milan for Lent, where the Imperial Governor Del Vasto was his friend.

(To be continued).

PURITANISM: ITS HISTORY, SPIRIT AND INFLUENCE.

By the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A.,
Principal B.C.M.S. Training College, Clifton, Bristol.

IT would be safe to say that the name "Puritan" implies to most people to-day a type of person of a forbidding and unattractive character, one who was in the main opposed to a healthy and natural enjoyment of life, and whose code of morals was usually associated with the "thou shalt not" of the Decalogue. To sum him up in popular phraseology we think of the Puritan as a stern typical "kill-joy," and if we are interested in history we recall the era of Puritan ascendancy and power with a sense of repulsion or at least with a sigh of relief that we live in freer and happier days. As a recent writer well expresses it, "To modern ears the word (Puritan) naturally suggests the dour look and sombre habit familiar in fiction and in art, as typifying an austere code of morals and a harsh and narrow outlook upon life" (Tatham, *The Puritans in Power*, p. 1).

There is no doubt that there were distinct eccentricities and idiosyncrasies about the genuine Puritan which have lent a certain measure of truth to these impressions, and which very easily enable him to be caricatured and held up as a butt for scorn and ridicule, but to dismiss Puritans or Puritanism in this contemptuous manner is to display a criminal ignorance of history and wilfully to shut our eyes to the profound influence which the Puritan movement has exerted on our national life and character. A little knowledge of its history, spirit and influence would soon rescue the name from obloquy and demonstrate the great debt which we owe to the movement.

The early ancestry of the Puritan, as Dr. Coulton has so fully pointed out,[1] is to be sought for in the history of the early Friars, whose principles and practices resembled in a remarkable degree those of the later Puritans. There was the same doctrine of conversion and personal assurance of salvation. The same gloomy, austere outlook on life and exaggerated other-worldliness in conduct. The same sighs and groans in prayer and the same great reality of hell. There was also a striking similarity in the simplicity of their worship and in the barrenness of ritual and ceremonial, and in the dislike of Church music. Even slovenliness of worship and general neglect of Church buildings were features common to both movements.

These comparisons receive very full confirmation from a recently published work on "Preaching in Medieval England," in which Dr. Owst declares that "all that that unpopular word Puritanism has ever stood for to the minutest detail, shall be found advocated unceasingly in the preaching of the Pre-Reformation Church. The

[1] In his *Medieval Studies*.

long face, the plain diet, the plainer attire, the abstention from sports and amusements in company, the contempt of the arts, the rigid Sabbatarianism, the long household prayers, the stern disciplining of wife and children, the fear of hell, are typical of the message of the faithful friar."

But the name "Puritan" was first applied in derision to those more advanced Reformers who in Edward VI's reign contended for what they considered an absolutely "pure" Scriptural form of worship, purged entirely of all medieval and popish usages and superstitious practices. In its extreme form it involved a rejection of all forms and ceremonies in worship not *expressly commanded* in Scripture. Consequently the "non-conforming" clergy in Elizabeth's reign, who refused to wear the surplice and square outdoor cap, which they described as "rags of Antichrist," were styled "Puritans," and they soon gained an unpleasant notoriety as factious and irreconcilable disturbers of the peace of Church and Nation. Half a century later, through the influence of Archbishop Laud and his party of Arminian churchmen, the connotation of the term was widened to include all the *conforming* clergy of Calvinistic opinions (and up to this time these had formed the large majority) who opposed Laud's ecclesiastical reforms. Laud drew up a list of clergy with a view to preferment in the Church, and put after these names the letters "O" and "P" to signify Orthodox, standing for those clergy who shared his own views ("orthodoxy is my 'doxy"), and Puritan, for those of Calvinistic opinions. We can imagine how much preferment the "P's" would receive! Thus the name "Puritan" soon stood for those clergy and laity, whether inside or outside the National Church, who were opposed to Arminian or High Church doctrines and principles both in Church and State, and who were exasperated by the persecuting policy inaugurated by Archbishop Laud. The party therefore which supported the Parliament in its struggle with the absolutism of the king, and in the course of this struggle, largely through force of political circumstances, overthrew episcopacy in favour of presbyterianism, was pre-eminently *Puritan.*

But if such is the history of the term, what were the main principles and ideals which inspired the Puritan party? For in spite of its accidental divisions into a conforming and a non-conforming section, in its outstanding religious principles it was one party. We may safely affirm that its fundamental principle was, that it is righteousness alone which exalts a nation; and the great aim and ideal of the Puritans was to make England a "holy nation," a people conspicuous for purity of life, doctrine and worship. Needless to say that for this standard of purity they looked to the Bible alone. In common with all the Reformers their great appeal was to the Scriptures as the sole rule of faith and practice. Their great ideal was to frame and fashion their lives and conduct according to the primitive purity and simplicity of the days of the Apostles. They rigidly applied this standard, too often forgetting that conditions which were suitable and helpful for an infant struggling

society of believers were not necessarily the best for the life of a settled historic Christian nation. We must remember, however, before criticizing the Puritan ideals or methods what a tremendous revolution had been inaugurated through the translation and free circulation of the Scriptures. Before the Reformation the *English* Bible was almost an unknown book and the ignorance of the Scriptures, even by the clergy, was deplorable. Those few people who secretly possessed a copy of Wycliffe's Bible were in constant danger of persecution as heretics. It was the translation of the Scriptures by Tyndale and Coverdale which had done more than anything else to destroy the papal power, and such unscriptural medieval doctrines as transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the Mass, and it was the Bible alone which created Puritan England. There was, we must remember, very little other English literature, and the Bible was therefore the one book which all Englishmen read. It was a new book and came to them with a freshness and charm which it is impossible for us to imagine. In the well-known language of Green, "England was the people of a book and that book was the Bible." The Puritans were pre-eminently the people of the Book, it transformed their characters and moulded their lives. It inspired them with a passionate zeal for purity and righteousness, and with a seriousness of purpose which led to a stern opposition to everything which savoured of a godless frivolity and levity in conversation or conduct. The moral effect produced by the Bible was, as Green says, "simply amazing," "a new moral and spiritual impulse spread through every class" (*Short History*, 449).

It is impossible to estimate correctly the Puritan character and ideals unless we understand a little of the age in which the Puritans lived and the environment which surrounded them. In their theological opinions they were Evangelicals and definitely Calvinist. They held strongly the doctrines of conversion, personal assurance of salvation, justification by faith, election and often reprobation. They had, what unfortunately we lack to-day, a deep, and it must be confessed, sometimes even a morbid sense of sin. Thus they often deplored as heinously sinful, instincts which were frequently but the natural and harmless desires of a normally healthy mind. John Bunyan thought that his passion for bell-ringing and for sport and games were leading him straight to hell. In their consuming zeal for holiness, they were in danger of regarding all recreations, however innocent, other than prayer and meditation on God's Word, as inimical to godliness of life. They were too eager to denounce their early careers, before the conscious vivid realization of the work of God's Spirit in their hearts, as having been passed in utter darkness and godlessness. "Oh, how I lived in and loved darkness and hated light," says Cromwell of his early years of boyhood, when probably he had never indulged in anything seriously wrong. It would be easy to multiply examples of the excesses and extravagances of the Puritan creed and conduct. Thus the Puritans were undoubtedly narrow and one-sided in their outlook on life, they possessed very little sense of humour or of the relative value

and proportion of things. They were usually over-serious, stern, severe and often most intolerant. But many of these characteristics were faults common to their age. Intolerance was a legacy of the Middle Ages, and therefore when the Presbyterian leader, Thomas Cartwright, would have executed all heretics, even if repentant, he was merely inheriting the spirit of the Spanish Inquisition. We must remember that religious toleration was a tenet condemned by all parties at this time. It was foolishly regarded as dangerous to the peace of the State. The early Puritans, especially, shared this belief, and even the second generation never fully broke free from it, as the painful records of their persecution of the Quakers in New England abundantly testify. But we may safely affirm that it was the better and more enlightened spirits amongst the Puritans, and especially the Independents, who first advocated, even if imperfectly, the principle of freedom of conscience. Cromwell courageously refused to ban people for civil offices because of their religious convictions. Writing before the battle of Marston Moor he declared, " Sir, the State in choosing men to serve it takes no notice of their opinions, if they be willing faithfully to serve it, that satisfies." When in power he demonstrated this principle practically by the issue of a Proclamation in 1655 for religious liberty which foreshadowed the Toleration Act of 1689. Certainly these Puritan pioneers for liberty of conscience were sometimes humorously inconsistent. Although Cromwell declared liberty of conscience to be a " fundamental matter " and a " natural right," yet in his " Instrument of Government," this natural right is denied to the adherents of " prelacy " and " popery," and when he was requested by the Governor of Ross to grant liberty of conscience to a surrendered Irish garrison he replied, " As to what you say touching liberty of conscience I meddle not with any man's conscience, but if by liberty of conscience you mean liberty to exercise the Mass, I judge it expedient to use plain dealing with you and to tell you that where the Parliament of England have power that will not be allowed of."

But we may fairly say that the faults and foibles of the Puritans were largely accidental and temporary, and were far outweighed by their outstanding virtues, which have been the beneficent legacy that has so largely moulded the character and conduct of English-speaking people to the present day. They were conspicuous not only for their love of the Scriptures, but for their integrity of conduct and their fidelity to their conscientious convictions. We should not forget that what has often been derisively described as the " nonconformist conscience " is a distinct Puritan heritage. What a fine testimony to the nobility of the Puritan character is given in Frederic Harrison's description of Oliver Cromwell, when he asserts that, " In the whole history of modern Europe Oliver is the one ruler into whose presence no vicious man could come and whose service no vicious man might enter " (*Cromwell*, 208).

The Puritans were also conspicuous for their love of home and for the piety of their home life. In the humble cottage of the

peasant, as well as in the more luxurious and spacious abodes of the upper and middle classes, God's Word and name were honoured. The family altar was regularly erected both morning and evening, and by example as well as precept children were brought up "in the fear and admonition of the Lord." It is to the Puritan that we owe not only the persevering industry and the dogged tenacity of purpose, but also the real virtue and uprightness of character which still are the conspicuous features of the typical English family life to-day. Green well says that "Home as we conceive it now was the creation of the Puritan."

But if we owe the piety of our home life so largely to the Puritan, still more are we indebted to him for our reverence for the Lord's Day. Mr. Gladstone declared that the English character owed almost everything to the English Sunday and the English Bible, and both these influences are in a real sense Puritan legacies. It may be granted that the extreme Puritan was often far too rigid and pharisaic in his observance of what he described as the Sabbath, but it was the courageous stand which the Puritans made to uphold the sacred obligations of the weekly day of rest which has given us an *English*, in contrast to a "Continental" Sunday, a precious heritage which too many to-day seem determined to rob us of. The Stuart kings endeavoured to perpetuate the medieval conception of Sunday as largely a day of amusement and recreation, and James I issued a "Book of Sports" outlining the various games which might be lawfully indulged in on Sundays. The Puritan clergy stood firm in their opposition to this desecration of the Lord's Day, and refused to obey the royal order to read this proclamation from their pulpits. A few may have adopted the device of the cautious yet courageous minister who, after complying with the Royal Order, declared, "Now, brethren, having delivered to you the commands of man, I will read to you the command of God," and proceeded to recite the fourth commandment! It is perhaps a sad sign of the times that our modern advocates for Sunday sport do not trouble themselves to excuse their aim under such specious pleas as were employed in the seventeenth century, when Sunday games were urged for fear that "the common and meaner sort of people would be prevented from using such exercises as may make their bodies more able for war" (Tatham, u.s., 20). We should not forget that the author of the well-known couplet, "A Sabbath well spent, etc.," was the great Puritan Lord Chief Justice, Sir Matthew Hale, who, in spite of his exacting public duties, never travelled on Sundays or missed attending public worship on that day for thirty-six years. Canon Flynn well says of the Puritan era, "Criticize those times as we may, they produced a race of men renowned for godliness, honesty, sobriety and valour, and women of such piety, chastity and modesty and homeliness as England had never previously known, and it is doubtful if England will ever look upon the like again" (*Influence of Puritanism*, 73).

In spite of their passionate zeal for righteousness, their love of a pure, primitive and simple worship, and their hatred of forms and

ceremonies and outward display, and their seriousness of purpose, it is a mistake to regard the Puritans as a body, as *gloomy, austere and morose fanatics, who despised all culture and learning and art.* They may have rigorously excluded from their churches all pictures, images or monuments calculated to encourage superstitious worship, or to distract the spirit of the worshipper, but they still had a love for the beautiful. It is manifestly unjust to condemn a whole party on account of some excesses committed by its more extreme or fanatical members. Doubtless Cromwell's soldiers may have committed some wanton acts of vandalism or sacrilege in the churches, out of a mistaken zeal for righteousness and purity of worship, but most of the tales of destruction of monuments and architectural masterpieces, which are popularly ascribed to them, rest on very doubtful foundation. Certainly a sour and joyless asceticism was not the characteristic trait of the pre-eminent leaders of the movement. Cromwell is described by a contemporary, *who greatly disliked him,* as a man of great "vivacity and hilarity." He was fond of hunting, good music, cheerful society and a good table. Another regicide and prominent Puritan, Colonel Hutchinson, was conspicuous for his patronage of art and learning. The memoirs which his wife has left of him give us a picture which is peculiarly attractive and fascinating, and they prove that amongst the upper classes there were Puritans who combined true piety and godliness with a love of nature, mirth and innocent amusement. He fenced, rode, hawked and was a good linguist and a skilled musician. "As he had a great delight, so he had a great judgment in music, and advanced his children's practice more than their tutors. He spared not any cost for the education both of his sons and daughters in languages, sciences, music, dancing and all other qualities befitting their father's house. He was himself their instructor in humility, sobriety and all godliness and virtue, which he rather strove to make them exercise with love and delight than by constraint" (*Memoirs*, 349). Yet he was the sincere and humble Christian in belief and conduct, for "in matters of faith his reason always submitted to the Word of God, and what he could not comprehend he would believe because it was written," while with true Christian charity and humility "he never disdained the meanest or flattered the greatest."

We should also be wrong if we regarded all the Puritan theologians as hopelessly narrow, uncharitable and censorious in their creed. No doubt there were many who held a hard, cold and unlovely faith, especially as they lived in a dogmatic and intolerant age, but there were conspicuous exceptions. Probably we can find no more typical Puritan divine than the well-known author of the *Saint's Everlasting Rest.* Richard Baxter, with his chequered career of ill health and cruel persecution for conscience' sake, might well have cultivated a bitter, harsh and narrow outlook, especially as naturally he had a love of controversy; yet those who have read his striking *Self-Review* get many surprises at the charity, breadth and liberality of his sentiments. "I am much

more sensible than ever," says Baxter, "of the necessity of living upon the principles of religion which we are all agreed in and uniting these, and how much mischief men that overvalue their own opinions have done by their controversies in the Church, how some have destroyed charity and some caused schisms by them, and most have hindered godliness in themselves and others." In our struggles and aspirations towards Christian Unity to-day we certainly have not improved on these wise reflections. "Now," says Baxter, "it is the fundamental doctrines of the Catechism, which I highest value, and daily think of, and find most useful to myself and others. The Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments" furnished him, he declares, "with the most acceptable and plentiful matter for all my meditations," but he adds, "that is the best doctrine which maketh men better and tendeth to make them happy" (Wordsworth, *Eccles. Biog.*, 482–4).

But it is well to say a word as to the great influence which the Puritan movement exercised on the life of its day. Its main principles had a direct effect in moulding the political ideals and convictions of the men of that generation, and we should not forget that in so doing they moulded the course of our national history. It was not only the religious but the *political* convictions of the Puritans which brought about the Civil War, the emigrations to America and later on the revolt of the American Colonies from the Mother land. For their political principles were the direct outcome of their religious convictions and beliefs. It was only natural that the doctrine of the royal priesthood of all believers, the equality of prince and peasant in the sight of God, the sense of the Christian brotherhood of the elect as "the Lord's free people"—tenets which were peculiarly precious to the Puritans—should affect their conception of civil and political liberty. It was inevitable that their strong belief in the common ruin of mankind as well as in its common redemption by Christ's atonement should lead them to offer a strenuous resistance to claims for the divine right of kings to rule in an arbitrary and absolute manner over the Lord's redeemed people. Their sense of the great value of the human soul led them to a new conception of social equality and to the assertion of the individual rights of citizenship. The implications of their belief may not have been fully realized at first, it is taking centuries to work them out under the new names of democracy or "liberty, equality and fraternity," but they were sufficiently understood then to constitute the Puritans the champions of civil and political freedom against the tyranny and despotism of Stuart kings or of Caroline ecclesiastics. The struggles of such famous Puritan patriots as Eliot, Pym and Hampden to assert the liberty of the subject and the responsibility of the King's ministers to Parliament, and to combat the theory that the king was above all law, settled the principles of political freedom in our laws and constitution beyond recall even of the great reaction of the Restoration period. The Puritan had a dual battle to wage since the Church had foolishly allied itself with the Crown in its endeavour to govern absolutely

both in Church and State. It was the hatred of the tyranny of Laud and the bishops in Church government which led the Puritan "Church party" to espouse the parliamentary cause in the struggle with Charles I which resulted in the temporary overthrow of monarchy and episcopacy. Laud's persecuting policy drove the Puritan clergy into a hatred of episcopacy, and led them, not so much from conviction as from a prudential policy of expediency, to throw in their lot with the more extreme non-conforming and presbyterian Puritans. It was this great struggle between the Parliament and the Crown, allied with the Church, which welded together the Puritan party in their opposition to arbitrary government and to the denial of civil and religious freedom. Thus as Canon Flynn well puts it, "Wherever we can trace the democratic spirit in the State—the principle that the will of the people must prevail, and the prominence of the lay element in the Church, there you have Puritanism."

The establishment of the Commonwealth saw the high water mark of Puritan power and triumph, and it is sad to relate that the opportunity of their unfettered authority was also in the main the period of their failure. For we cannot hide the fact that those who had suffered and fought valiantly for constitutional freedom against arbitrary government, in their turn resorted to despotic and tyrannical acts when they possessed the reins of power. In the end most people would have preferred the royal despotism which had been overthrown to the military despotism of the Puritan régime. The rule of the Saints was certainly not an unqualified success. With their earnest insistence on the depravity of human nature it was singular that the Puritans made so little allowance for it in their attempt to govern a nation of fallible human beings. Cromwell exhorted his first thoroughly Puritan Parliament "that as men fearing God had fought them out of their bondage under the regal power, so men fearing God do now rule them in the fear of God"; but the rash and drastic methods of reform which they advocated soon alarmed even Cromwell, who declared that nothing was in their hearts but "overturn, overturn." Rather than this hasty and ill-considered rule of "the Saints," Cromwell preferred to govern, like Charles I, in an arbitrary and despotic manner, on his own personal authority as Protector. He naïvely excused this form of tyranny by declaring that "the people will prefer their real security to forms." Dr. Coulton is not far wrong when he says of this period that "the pursuit of an exaggerated and irresponsible other-worldliness, with all its natural fruits of frequent formality and hypocrisy, has damaged for ever the reputation of that religious revival which for the first time found itself strong enough to force time-honoured ideas for a brief moment upon an unwilling nation" (*Medieval Studies*, 1st Series, 45).

But not only was the Puritan régime a time of national security and peace, it was also a time when, owing to the brilliant victories of Blake, the Puritan Admiral, and to the vigorous foreign policy of Cromwell, England's prestige abroad was greater than it had

ever been. But nevertheless it was *not a time of liberty*, for peace and tranquillity were based on the sword. England was held in check by the hated military rule of the Major-Generals, while the pacification and subjugation of Ireland by fire and sword and cruel persecution have left an indelible stain on the justice and humanity of Puritan rule. As Green well puts it, "Among the bitter memories which part Ireland from England the memory of bloodshed and confiscation which the Puritans wrought remains the bitterest" (u.s., 572).

It seems a curious paradox to say that the fall of Puritanism saw the beginning of its real triumph, but it is true nevertheless; and possibly it cannot be better expressed than in the language of Green when he says that "Puritanism, as men believed, had fallen never to rise again. As a political experiment it had ended in utter failure and disgust. As a religious system of national life it had brought about the wildest outbreak of moral revolt that England had ever witnessed. And yet Puritanism was far from being dead; it drew indeed a nobler life from its very fall." When "it had laid down the sword it ceased from the long attempt to build up a kingdom of God by force and violence, and fell back on its truer work of building up a kingdom of righteousness in the hearts and consciences of men. It was from the moment of its seeming fall that its real victory began" (u.s., 582–6).

The influence of the Puritan spirit and ideals on moral and national righteousness from that day to the present would be difficult to overestimate. How can we measure the extent of the influence, not only on our literature, but on the religious life and character of our people, of such two pronouncedly Puritan books as Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*? We should also remember that the sufferings and persecutions which the early Puritans endured proved in the end a divine blessing on other lands to which they were driven. The "Pilgrim Fathers," although not Puritan in name, were mainly so in their spirit and religious ideals, while the large emigration of Puritan exiles to New England in Charles I's reign not only laid the foundation of the future United States, but in spite of the modern infusion of numerous peoples of other races and religions, it stamped a Puritan character on the laws, literature and religion of America which it retains to this day. It was the Puritan spirit of opposition to unjust oppression which precipitated the War of Independence. The opposition to British "tyranny" was greatest in Puritan Boston, while the Presidents of the United States have been almost without exception men of Puritan traditions and ideals. It has been well said that "the immigration from England and Scotland has mainly fixed the type of civilization alike in the United States and Canada" (*Chambers's Encyclopedia*).

If we consider the history of our country for the last two hundred years we have not to look far to discover the prominent part played by the Puritan spirit and ideals in all the beneficial reforms, both social and religious, which have been effected. The spiritual torpor,

the Latitudinarian, deistic and infidel opinions which were so rife in the first half of the eighteenth century were met and largely overcome by a religious revival which was essentially Puritan. Wesley and his fellow members of the " Holy Club " may have held a few High Church principles and practices, but not only was Wesley's ancestry definitely Puritan, but his decidedly Evangelical conversion in 1738, which really inaugurated the Methodist revival, attracted to his side all the clergy of strong Puritan convictions, and these and others of like opinions remained the life and soul of the movement both inside and later on outside the Church. The practical results of this revival were seen in the formation of the great missionary societies at the end of the century, such as the Baptist, the London, and the Church Missionary Society. These, as well as such kindred societies as the Bible Society and the R.T.S., were all due to the spiritual zeal, energy and self-sacrifice of men of Puritan Evangelical convictions. When we turn to the more purely humanitarian efforts, such as the reform of the prison life, or the abolition of the slave trade and slavery, we find that it is the Puritan who is again the pioneer. The great leader and champion of the Anti-Slavery crusade, William Wilberforce, was an Evangelical churchman converted through reading the Puritan Doddridge's *Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*, while his stalwart henchmen and supporters, like Thornton, Clarkson, William Carey and Thomas Scott, were all men of strong Puritan convictions. It was mainly the same men again who were the supporters of Hannah More, the Evangelical churchwoman, in her pioneer efforts for Village Schools, while we only have to come down another generation to find that it was the Puritan churchman, Lord Shaftesbury, whose noble efforts were successful in overthrowing the worst evils of a system of industrial slavery which existed in our mines and factories. Again it was the Puritan North which was so strongly opposed to slavery in the American Civil War. Coming to modern times we see the Puritan spirit of righteousness exemplified in a strenuous opposition to all forms of injustice and evil. The agitation for the protection of the Native races against European cruelty and exploitation, the crusade against the Opium Traffic and the Drink Traffic, have all been carried on mainly, although not exclusively, by Puritan Evangelicals, both churchmen and nonconformists. *They* have been the pioneers, even if others have loyally aided their efforts. We might multiply other evidence and cite the case of a Barnardo, a Puritan churchman, as the pioneer in rescue work amongst orphan children, or a Puritan churchwoman, like Agnes Weston, in her work amongst British Bluejackets.

Certainly Puritanism as an organized and definite political party system no longer exists, since all parties now contain men of Puritan principles, but its spirit and influence remain and are far-reaching, even if not as great as they were in the seventeenth century. Its ideals are the same, the ideals of purity and righteousness, and they lie at the basis of all our social reforms. Could we find a better standard for a truly Christian democracy to aim at than that

contained in the advice Cromwell gave to the Parliament after the Battle of Dunbar? "Own your authority," he urges, "and improve it to curb the proud and the insolent such as would disturb the tranquillity of England, though under what specious pretences soever. Relieve the oppressed, hear the groans of the poor prisoners in England. Be pleased to reform the abuses of all professions, and if there be anyone that makes many poor to make a few rich, that suits not a Commonwealth" (*Letters and Speeches*, 217).

It may be that at the moment, as a reaction from the horrors of a world war, an anti-Puritan spirit of materialism, indifference and mere selfish pleasure-seeking is predominant in our midst, but this should only constitute an urgent call to rally the forces making for righteousness to mould and influence our national life and especially our great political parties. It should constitute a call for another Puritan revival without the narrowness of the first, for it is the strenuous, serious, godly spirit of the Puritan which will always be the leaven that will purify and preserve our national character. Such a revival should naturally begin by a real union of all Christian forces and Churches, and especially of those possessing a common Puritan ancestry, whose fundamental principles were first enunciated, or rather reasserted, at the Reformation. We may thank God and take courage that Puritanism still lives in this twentieth century and will always continue to live so long as pure, primitive, Scriptural Christianity lasts. It lives, to quote Canon Flynn's fine description, as "a great force for righteousness, not because in thought and speech and garb it resembles or is a replica of the Puritanism of three hundred years ago, but because it has outgrown all these and adapted itself to the modes and requirements of a new age" (u.s., 38).

A second edition has appeared of the Rev. J. M. Connell's *A Book of Devotional Readings* from the Literature of Christendom (Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd. 5s. net). The selection is excellently made and is arranged in chronological order from the New Testament down to Stopford Brooke from whose sermons a short passage is included in this edition. Some notes and a useful index of authors and subjects are added. It is admirably adapted for private devotional use and for public reading when occasion offers.

Christ The King, A Study of the Incarnation, by K. D. MacKenzie, M.A. (S.P.C.K. 1s. 6*d*.), is one of "The Churchman's Popular Library" series. It presents an account of Christ with special reference to the special problems which have been raised in recent years, and though brief is clear except on the meaning of "the Eucharistic presence" which the author seems to imply is to be found in the elements of the Sacrament.

THE SESSION OF OUR LORD AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD.

By the Rev. A. C. Downer, M.A., D.D. Oxon, sometime Rector of Selham.

THE present paper is not concerned with proofs of the miraculous element of its subject and still less with philosophical discussion upon it. It simply takes the records of fact stated in the New Testament as they stand, with a view to inquiring into their implications and bearing.

The subject before us, then, is an article of the Christian Faith, which, in the belief of the present writer, does not receive due attention, and is indeed in danger of dropping out of its due place, to the injury of our teaching, which can never achieve its full results without a full-orbed presentation of all the various elements involved, as they have been delivered to us in the Scriptures.

I. The Session of our Lord Jesus Christ at the Right Hand of God held an important place in the faith of the Primitive Church. We find it in all three Creeds, in the same relative position and in almost identical language.

(1) The Apostles' Creed exhibits it thus: "He ascended into heaven. And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

The preceding and following articles are here given in this case only. They are the same in the other two Creeds.

(2) The Nicene Creed yields: "And sitteth on the right hand of the Father."

(3) The Quicunque Vult has: "He sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty."

(4) The Te Deum Laudamus, which is itself a kind of Creed, or rather, a combination of two Creeds, states it thus: "Thou sittest at the right hand of God in the Glory of the Father."

Our own National Church, jealously faithful to primitive truth, besides adopting the ancient document already cited, presents the idea of our Lord's joint reign with the Father in certain of the Collects: for example, those of the First and Third Sundays in Advent, that of the Nativity, and many more. In the magnificent hymn at the close of the Communion Service, we are taught to say, "Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us." And in the Fourth Article of Religion the Church says that Christ, with "all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature," "ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth."

II. In order that we may see upon what a firm basis of Holy Scripture these ancient statements rest, we turn first to St. Matthew's account of the final encounter between our Lord and the Pharisees (Chap. xxii. 41–6), in which He quoted Psalm cx. 1, "Jehovah saith unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I

make thine enemies thy footstool," His purpose being to show the pre-eminence of the Messiah above David and, by inference, to establish his Divine Sonship. It will be noted that He entirely endorses the Jewish view of the Messianic character of this Psalm,—a point of the utmost moment in prospect of the further use of it in the Epistle to the Hebrews—and also that, in so doing, He foretold His own coming exaltation to sit as King at the Right Hand, or position of honour and authority, of His Father. (Compare the parallels in St. Mark xii. 35–7; St. Luke xx. 41–4.)

The next passage we take is Acts ii. 34, in which St. Peter, in his address to the crowd of Jews on the day of Pentecost, quotes the same verse from Psalm cx., but with a different purpose. St. Peter no doubt had heard the Lord confound the Pharisees and Scribes with this quotation; he had, later, witnessed the Crucifixion; and finally, he had beheld the fact of the Ascension into Heaven. He now employs the Session of the Lord at God's right hand in order to bring home to the Jews their guilt in having crucified Him. It was at this point that their pride and obstinacy broke down. Psalm cx. 1 completed the work of conviction. The murderers of the Messiah became conscience-stricken inquirers after salvation and a mighty revival of religion was the result. We may wonder whether, in after days, when St. Peter composed his First Epistle, he was thinking of that wonderful scene in Jerusalem, when he wrote (1 Peter iii. 22), "Who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him." We may at all events recognize here, first, our Lord's exaltation after, and on account of, His sufferings; and next, His pre-eminence over angels, in which the thought resembles that of Hebrews i., where the Session of the Son at God's right hand is employed to show how greatly He was preferred before the highest of the angels, on none of whom had such an honour ever been conferred.

St. Paul has four passages in each of which there is a clear reference to Psalm cx. 1.

(1) The first is in the great Chapter on Resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 24, 25), "When he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death."

(2) The next passage is Ephesians i. 20, where St. Paul says: "The God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory. . . . raised him from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule," and then adds "and [he] gave him to be head over all things to the Church, which is his body," from which we gather that Christ's People are even now in union with Him upon His heavenly throne.

(3) In Romans viii. 34, he says, "Christ Jesus . . . who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." This is important as being the only passage in the New Testament, apart from the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which any priestly function is attributed to our Lord, though neither here nor in any passage

but the Epistle to the Hebrews is He actually spoken of as a priest.

(4) In Colossians iii. 1, St. Paul bids his brethren "seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God."

The Vision of our Lord in the Apocalypse agrees with the foregoing; as in Chapter i. we read of "One like unto a son of man (margin, the Son of Man), who appears in the midst of seven golden lampstands; manifestly an appearance of Christ in heaven. In Chapter iii. 21, He who has already described Himself as "The Amen, the faithful and true witness," says, "He that overcometh, I will give to him to sit down with me in my throne, as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." With these passages compare Chapter v. 6, "I saw in the midst of the throne . . . a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain"; and also Chapter vii. 9, 10, 17, "The Lamb which is in the midst of the throne."

Now in all these passages the Session of our Lord at the Right Hand of His Father is connected with His Kingly Office. In none of them is anything said of His Priesthood, either as the antitype of the priesthood of Aaron or as in the succession of the order of Melchizedek. The only priestly function attributed to Him, as we have already seen, is that of intercession. It remained for the writer to the Hebrews to complete the argument by developing the doctrine of our Lord's Sacerdotal Office.

This he does in many passages, and especially in the fifth, sixth and seventh chapters of the great Epistle, which we must now proceed, however briefly, to consider; since our Lord's Priesthood is intimately connected with His entry into Heaven upon His Ascension and His subsequent Session at God's right hand.

It must be premised that, for the purpose of this discussion, the word "priest" is not employed in its etymological sense, the sense in which it is used throughout the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordinal, in which it is the abbreviated form of "presbyter"; which is indeed the true and original meaning of the word. We are here employing "priest" as the translation of the Greek word ἱερεύς or the Latin "sacerdos," which is, in fact, an accommodated sense, there being no word in the English language implying a sacrificing priest; since our Lord's Priesthood is a ἱερωσύνη, or "sacerdotium," because it was His function to offer a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of His People, in Heaven, in the same way that Aaron, on the annual Day of Atonement, offered an ineffectual sacrifice for the sins of the Hebrew people, and also for himself, on earth.

III. It is not possible in the present article to exhibit in detail the splendid argument in which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews draws out the doctrine of our Lord's High Priesthood for the comfort and establishment of the tempted and wavering Hebrew believers. We must content ourselves with noting some of its leading features, and we shall see how closely connected it is with our subject, the Session of the Messiah at the Right Hand of the Father.

Now we are accustomed, and rightly so, to speak of our Lord as, in His official capacity, holding the three offices of Prophet, Priest and King.

The first of these offices, that of Prophet, He undoubtedly exercised during His earthly ministry. "The multitudes said, This is the prophet, Jesus, from Nazareth of Galilee" (St. Matt. xxi. 11). Our Lord accepted the title. He could not do otherwise; for He had ever acted as the prophet and teacher of the people.

On the other hand, He was never, while on earth, spoken of as a priest, nor does it appear that it ever occurred to anyone, among either His friends or His enemies, to attribute the sacerdotal character to Him. As the writer to the Hebrews says (chap. viii. 4), "Now if he were on earth, he would not be a priest at all, seeing there are those who offer the gifts according to the law." There was no scope whatever for His priesthood on earth. Its exercise was reserved for another sphere, that of the heavenly Tabernacle.

It is true that He was regarded, in the early enthusiasm of His followers, as a King, and they were prepared to rise against the Roman power to make Him such; but we know how He treated all such attempts. "My kingdom is not of this world."

How, then, did our Lord's Sacerdotal Office develop?

The last scene of His earthly life exhibits Him as a Victim. "As a lamb that is led to the slaughter," "The lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." This is the first stage of the Divine sacrifice; the Mactation at the hand of man.

But where a victim is, there must also be a priest. If the Mactation is the first stage, the Oblation is the second. Where are we to look for the priest who could, or who did, offer this Victim to the Father? It is plain that the Aaronic priesthood could not do it. Caiaphas was high priest at the time of our Lord's death; but we can hardly look to him as capable of offering to God, on this Day of Atonement, the Infinite Victim whose precious blood availed to redeem His people from their sins.

We must transfer our thoughts to the heavenly courts. There we behold the glorious entrance of the Eternal Son in human nature upon His Ascension into Heaven. He did not take to Himself the honour of priesthood nor glorify Himself to be made a high priest (Hebrews v. 4, 5), any more than did Aaron, whose definite call to be the high priest of Israel is fully set forth in the twenty-eighth chapter of Exodus. Two utterances of His Father convey to Him His appointment to a far greater priesthood than that of Aaron. The former is, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," which recognizes His triumph over death (Psalm ii.); and the latter, following after and hinging upon this, "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek" (Psalm cx. 4). Here, then, is our Lord's formal appointment to be the High Priest of His People. It is confirmed, as Aaron's was not, by an oath. This is one distinctive feature of our Lord's Priesthood. The other is, that it is vested in one Person, not in a succession of persons, as the Aaronic priesthood was; because this Priest "abideth for ever," and

consequently His Priesthood is intransmissible, *ἀπαράβατον*, as the writer to the Hebrews terms it, thus realizing to the full its Melchizedekian character, "having neither beginning of days nor end of life," but "abiding a priest continually." Here we have the complete fulfilment and realization of Psalm cx. 4, "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek."

Our Lord, being thus formally appointed *προσαγορευθείς*, now enters upon His High Priesthood, and at once proceeds to execute its functions. Though not a priest after the order of Aaron, He fulfils the type of Aaron, but upon the infinitely higher plane of the Melchizedekian Priesthood. The Victim, slain on earth, has not yet been offered. Like Aaron on the Day of Atonement, He enters the holy of holies, not of the earthly tabernacle, but of "the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands," "through His own blood," "once for all (*ἐφάπαξ*)," "having obtained eternal redemption." This sacrifice availed, as Aaron's never could avail, to take away sin: this precious blood had power, such as the blood of bulls and goats never possessed, to cleanse the conscience; this offering, once made by our Lord on His Ascension, was once for all accepted and can never be added to, repeated or re-presented, even by Himself, seeing that He is not now standing at a heavenly altar continually offering His sacrifice, but, just because that offering has been accepted once and for all, has ceremonially taken His seat, *ἐκάθισεν*, at the Right Hand of the Father, in royal dignity and everlasting glory, "a priest upon his throne" (Zech. vi. 13).

This is perfection, *τελείωσις*, Hebrews vii. 11. This is what the Old Covenant could never give and what nothing that we on earth can do can add to, can modify, or any way whatever deal with, except to accept or reject it. The inference from the features of our Lord's Priesthood, as already stated, is glorious in the extreme. "Wherefore," says the writer, reasoning by a sure and unchallengeable deduction from the basic facts—"Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost, *εἰς τὸ παντελές*, them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them" (Hebrews vii. 25).

Unspeakably glorious truth! The sure foundation on which we build our confidence for eternity; the unshakeable ground of the Evangelical message which we, who are in the brilliant succession of its preachers, the children of that unfailing stream of evangelists and pastors who have ever kept the lamp of life alight in our Church and country, and revived it when it has begun to burn dim, hold forth, and will for ever hold forth, in our pulpits and parishes, that the weary, the sinful and the sad may believe it and be glad once more.

For turn the argument the other way. If the Priesthood of Christ could be thought of as transmissible, as passing from its great holder to other men, then, since no other could possibly have the eternal character of the Melchizedekian Priest, and consequently

must be totally unable to save to the uttermost, not to say, to save in any degree whatsoever, it would follow that a sacrifice would have to be offered by each one of them, as the descendants of Aaron offered the same sacrifices year by year continually. In that case, it is plain that the comers thereto could never be made perfect; they would still have the conscience of sins, a remembrance of which would be made every time such sacrifices were offered. Priests would be compelled to stand daily at earthly altars, ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which could never take away sins, and consequently, since there would be an ever-renewed offering for sin, there could be no remission, no peace, and no boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus.

To this earthly, ineffective priesthood, incapable of bringing pardon or peace, we have been invited to return. For reply, we point to Jesus, the great High Priest after a new and perfect order, Who once for all offered a prevailing and a finished sacrifice and Who now is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through Him, because He ever liveth to make intercession for them.

You cannot have it both ways. You cannot rely upon a fallible, human, dying priesthood, whose feeble and fruitless sacrifices can accomplish nothing toward the salvation of men, and at the same time enter, with a heart sprinkled from an evil conscience, through the rent veil, in full assurance of faith.

The writer calls upon the Hebrews to rest upon a finished work. It is upon the same finished work that we are called to rest to-day. Nothing remains to be done. Christ has completed the work of His Priestly Sacrifice for sin and sits, a King, in the heavenly place. By one offering He has perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Nothing is left that can keep us from Him or from our Father in Heaven. Let it be ours, in the sacred hour when we approach the Mercy Seat, to rejoice in the infinite consolation that in our Great High Priest we have all we need, and that through His blood-shedding, once for all offered in the Holy of holies, we are accepted in Him and our sins and iniquities are remembered no more.

"THE KING'S BUSINESS" SERIES (Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, *2d.* each). Under the above title the S.P.G. has published an excellent series of booklets dealing with the work of the Society in Africa, India and China. Healing the Sick, Work among Women, Industrial and other Schools, and Itinerating work are dealt with in separate booklets for each Continent, giving a very good idea in small compass of the various activities of the Society, and pressing the urgency of the "World Call." The booklets are well written and attractively got up, and friends of the S.P.G. should see that they are widely distributed.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

THE "Living Church Series" continues to maintain its variety and interest. It already covers many aspects of Church life and history. One of the latest additions provides an interesting and novel method of presenting the development of religious thought and work throughout the centuries. The book is called *Representative Churchmen of Twenty Centuries*, and its author is the Rev. Hugh Watt, D.D., Professor of Church History, New College, Edinburgh (Messrs. James Clarke & Co., 6s. net). He "has set himself to envisage and depict the particular problems which have confronted the Christian Church in each of the twenty centuries." He has chosen one man as the representative of each century, and "his series consists of the men whom he regards as having combined at each period the truest vision of the immediate task and the soundest contribution to its fulfilment." The choice in some centuries is fairly obvious, but in others it is difficult to decide which is the most representative Churchman, yet, on the whole, Dr. Watt has shown remarkable judgment in his selection and ability in his method of presenting the chief features of each age. A brief summary of each century prefixed to the account of its representative gives an opportunity of providing the necessary setting and the connecting links. St. Paul and Justin Martyr for the first and second centuries are followed by Cyprian for the third. The brief account of his work leaves just the necessary impression of his abilities and of that departure from the New Testament teaching which led on to so many of the errors of the medieval Church. Constantine in the fourth century is shown as the determining influence in the development of the Church in that critical period. No question can be raised as to the claim of Augustine to represent his age. "He stood on the border line of two worlds." The Church suffered from the great mass of the half-converted. "They brought their old heathen ideas with them, and found for them a new expression within the Christian Church. Its worship became paganized." The missionary zeal of the Celtic Church is represented by Columbanus and Boniface in the sixth and eighth centuries. Charlemagne, Odo of Cluny, Hildebrand and Bernard of Clairvaux form a succession and indicate the lines of movement in their days. Francis of Assisi stands out as quite a different type from any of the others, while Wyclif and John Gerson, whose name is the least familiar in the list, indicate the coming reforms, which reach their height in Luther as the man of the sixteenth century. Once again an unexpected choice is that of the Scotch leader Alexander Hamilton as representative of the seventeenth century. His leadership of the Presbyterians of Scotland against the attempts to force episcopacy on the Scotch Church justifies his place. No other name than that of John Wesley could be chosen for the eighteenth century, and David Livingstone well serves to indicate the missionary enthusiasm of the nineteenth.

In spite of the obvious limitations of the scheme, the impression thus given of the successive ages of the Church is of special value. The picture is not blurred by the mass of detail which in other histories often serves to render the general effect indistinct. A student with the background provided in this volume will be well equipped in every way to benefit by the study of the larger and more detailed histories. Dr. Watt has provided a book that might well be used as a text-book for study circles on Church history. It will serve well as an introduction to that study for students generally.

Another interesting volume in the "Living Church Series" is *The Church and Science*, A Study of the Inter-relation of Theological and Scientific Thought, by Hector Macpherson, M.A., Ph.D. (6*s*. net). Many books have been written on the past warfare between Religion and Science, but there is ample room for a popular historical account of the great principles involved on either side in the unhappy relations of religious and scientific thinkers. Dr. Macpherson commences with an account of scientific speculation in the ancient world and the Hebrew conception of the universe, "the cosmography of appearances." A chapter on the pre-Reformation Church and Science leads up to the more interesting discussion of the Church and the New Cosmology. The first great clash took place over the Copernican System. He is somewhat severe on Galileo for his weakness before the Inquisition, but we must feel sympathy with the old man when face to face with what Dr. Macpherson describes as the amazing bigotry and brutal violence of the official representatives of Jesus Christ. At the same time we cannot ignore, in view of the attitude of many modern Christians, the fear of theologians like Bellarmine that the displacement of the earth from its central place in the universe would be fatal to the Christian religion. The fact that these theologians were mistaken ought to be a sufficient warning that the advance of scientific knowledge, however much it may appear at the outset to conflict with the teaching of Divine revelation, must in the end be found to be in harmony with it, as there is but one source of truth whether the truth comes to man by discovery or revelation. Kepler ought to be our leader in this respect. "All discovery he viewed as revelation; in a phrase which has become classic, he regarded discovery as 'thinking the thoughts of God after him.'" The influence of the new Cosmology on theological thought is traced through its various stages, and due credit is given to the thinkers of the Church who estimated the new knowledge at its true worth, and helped Christians to adapt their outlook to the new conditions. Modern developments are treated at considerable length, and the work of Christian thinkers on similar lines is presented with great clearness. The writer's conclusions in the last chapter on Science and Religion to-day will not all be accepted, but we shall all agree with his appeal for an open mind on many of the great problems which remain to be solved by future generations. "For science and religion are alike activities of the

human spirit which lead mankind nearer to God, and are alike due to the promptings of the Spirit of Truth which guides into all truth."

Sir Thomas More, who was a skilful diplomatist, as well as Speaker of the House of Commons and Lord Chancellor of England under Henry VIII, is not the man whom most of us would describe as " the first modern socialist," yet this is the description given of him by a German author, Karl Kautsky, whose *Thomas More and His Utopia, with a Historical Introduction*, has been translated by H. J. Stenning and published by A. & C. Black, Ltd. (6*s*.). He finds the principles of modern socialism seriously set forth in More's fancy picture of an ideal state, although like Bacon's *New Atlantis*, Harrington's *Oceana* and other similar works, it was more in the nature of a *jeu d'esprit*. It was a play of fancy with a touch of satire on the actual conditions of government in the land most familiar to him. Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* represents the same spirit with the satirical element more strongly developed. In addition to the analysis of *Utopia* a summary is given of the tendencies of European history for several ages prior to the reign of Henry VIII. It is written from the same socialistic point of view, and it is interesting as an example of how a mind obsessed with one idea can colour the whole succession of events and attribute them to materialistic sources. The struggle with the Papacy is more particularly represented in this light. The medieval Church was in his view merely a political organization. The Popes sought means to secure their control over Christendom by the acquirement of property. The revolt against Rome was solely an effort to resist this material aggrandisement of the Papacy. Few of us will be prepared to accept this as an adequate or full interpretation of the great spiritual movement which created the modern world.

A number of writings of the earliest days of the Church are interesting from many points of view, but chiefly because they illustrate the thought and in some measure the life of the sub-Apostolic age. A new edition of some of them has recently been issued under the title *Excluded Books of the New Testament* (Eveleigh Nash & Grayson, 7*s*. 6*d*. net). The volume is well printed and tastefully produced, and has an introduction by Dr. Armitage Robinson, Dean of Wells. It contains The Book of James, The Gospel of Nicodemus (Parts I and II), The Gospel of Peter, The Revelation of Peter, The Genuine Epistle of St. Clement, The So-Called Second Epistle of St. Clement, The Epistle of Barnabas, and The Shepherd of Hermas. The translations are by Bishop Lightfoot, Dr. M. R. James, Professor H. B. Swete and others. Some of these documents of this early period are well known, and the others deserve more attention than they have perhaps received. Dr. Armitage Robinson's introduction supplies some interesting information about them. He dislikes the title " Excluded Books," and shows that the character of the books was an adequate reason

for their finding no place in the canon of the New Testament. The Provost of Eton has treated the whole subject of this Apocryphal literature in his recent book, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, and to it readers are referred by the Dean for a full account of these writings as well as to his own book, which deals with two of the documents, "Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache." The ordinary reader will, however, find all he wants both in the way of a good translation and an explanation of the origin and significance of the writings in this edition.

The latest volume of *The Speaker's Bible* (Speaker's Bible Office, Aberdeen, 9s. 6*d*. net) is on the First Epistle of the Corinthians, and covers the first eleven chapters. I have already on several occasions described the contents of these volumes, which are so valuable a help to all preachers and teachers of Scripture. The present volume maintains the same high standard of excellence as its predecessors. The First Epistle to the Corinthians provides preachers with a wide range of subjects, and especially with those of the practical character which most congregations prefer, while doctrinal topics of importance are also abundant for special occasions. On all of them there are suggestive ideas, and there is the same wealth of illustration drawn from all kinds of sources, and more particularly from modern thinkers who are in touch with the special outlook of to-day. This source of adequate equipment for the preacher leaves no excuse for dull sermons, and even good sermons may be made better by the judicious use of the valuable selection of the thoughts of great minds provided in the comprehensive studies of each text. In the present volume Professor W. Fulton, D.D., of Aberdeen University, contributes the introduction, brief but adequate. Special articles are contributed by Dr. J. H. Morrison, on "The Foolishness of Preaching," "Knowledge and Love" and "Christian Expediency." Dr. W. M. Grant writes on "Personality in Service." Sermons on many of the chief aspects of Christ and His work are very prominent. Such age-long subjects as the conflicting claims of culture and the Cross, the limits of liberty and the value of the Holy Communion are among the contents of the chapters treated. A full index of sermons and of references to other books completes the usefulness of this valuable addition to the preacher's library.

There are some books which, although they were written a number of years ago and in some cases were intended to meet special conditions, are yet of great value as containing material of great usefulness. Some of them contain facts which cannot be readily obtained without considerable research in larger and not easily accessible volumes. At the present time some of these facts are of special importance in view of recent developments in our Church politics, and of the relationship of our Church to other Communions and especially to the Church of Rome. One of these is the Rev. H. W. Dearden's *Modern Romanism Examined*. It is

a full and clear statement of the errors of the Church of Rome, written with scholarly appreciation of the points at issue between the teaching of that Church and our own. The book was originally issued with strong recommendations from Dr. R. Sinker, the learned Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge, and from Bishop Moule, both of whom wrote introductory notes to earlier editions. A fourth edition has just been issued by Messrs. Chas. Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd., at the very moderate cost of half-a-crown. Some additional notes have been added to this edition, which give recent facts showing the present position of the Roman Church and the increasing claims being made for it in different parts of the world. In view of the aggressiveness of Romish propaganda this book will be found of exceptional use, as it gives quotations from authoritative documents and a full explanation of their significance. It is a useful handbook on the Roman Controversy, and I may remind my readers that the controversy, so far from being an affair of the past, as some members of our Church would have us believe, is likely to become more acute as the essential intolerance of Rome's claims is realized through personal contact with them. An Anglo-Catholic rector, in whose parish a Roman Catholic squire and his daughter are revolutionizing the whole character of the village by turning out the Protestants and replacing them with Romanists, at the head of whom is a priest of the most aggressive type, said not long ago: "I used to have a favourable opinion of the Roman Church, but I have revised my views since I have experience of them and their methods in my parish." The best weapon with which to combat Romanism in all its forms is an accurate knowledge of its teaching and its results, and this is supplied with studied moderation and a complete absence of exaggeration in this useful and comprehensive volume by Mr. Dearden.

Another similar volume is Bishop J. C. Ryle's well known *Knots Untied,* of which Messrs. Chas. Thynne & Jarvis have issued a twenty-ninth edition under the editorship of the Rev. C. Sydney Carter and with a Foreword by Bishop Chavasse, Dr. Ryle's successor in the bishopric of Liverpool. It is unnecessary to describe this work. Most Evangelical Churchmen know that it well answers the description on its title page, "Plain Statements on Disputed Points in Religion from an Evangelical Standpoint." Mr. Carter in his preface to this edition points out "how extraordinarily appropriate it is in view of the controversy which is so acute now over the Revision of the Prayer Book." The only changes made by the editor are in certain expressions and allusions which with the lapse of time are out of date, and in a certain prolixity and repetition unacceptable to the ordinary reader in an age "which seems able to afford less and less time for any serious or solid reading." This may be just one of the reasons which make this book so necessary to-day. As Bishop Chavasse well says, "It will help to answer the difficulties of many Church people at the present time." The Bishop also records two incidents which show that Dr. Ryle "was

not a mere controversial writer, but a keen winner of souls and a true follower of Christ in the path of self-sacrifice." He adds: "The words of such a man acquire new force as we read them. He lived near to God, and God spoke through him." It is a good sign that there is such a demand for these books as to warrant the issue of new editions. If they are carefully studied they will help to defend our Church and country from the encroachments of Medievalism.

C.M.S. has issued its "Story of the Year, 1926–7," under the title *Building the Church* (1s. net). The writer of this unusually interesting account of the work of our great Evangelical Missionary Society during the past year is Miss Phyllis L. Garrick, and the Society is to be congratulated on securing the help of one who has so thoroughly mastered the art of selection and artistic presentation of a wealth of almost bewildering detail. The feature of the present stage of Missionary work in many places is the setting up of the Christian Church in accordance with the needs of each land. "There is no greater problem confronting the Church of Christ to-day than that of the indigenous Churches and the issues involved in growth." "What are to be their standards of doctrine, the varieties of their organisations, the limits of their freedom to build according to the leading of their own genius and aspirations, quickened and sanctified by the Spirit of God?" These are some of the questions which Miss Garrick sets herself to answer. She arranges her story in a framework suggested by Ruskin's "Seven Lamps of Architecture"—the lamps of Sacrifice, Truth, Power, Beauty, Life, Memory and Obedience. The materials supplied by the workers of the Society are brought together under these aspects. The appeal of the workers from every field of operation is searching and the note of urgency is sounded on every side. Examples are too numerous to quote. They are given from the Mass Movements in India, from the educational work in Africa, faced with the temptations to the people which come from the rapid increase of material prosperity; from China with its unrest and awakening spirit of Nationalism, its cry of "China for the Chinese." Devolution is needed but it presents dangers, and the native Churches are not yet in a position to become self-supporting. European guidance and help are still needed, and are perhaps more important now than ever. This story shows that there is now an opportunity which will, if used, bear abundant fruit, but if neglected may lead to future disasters to the purity of the Christian Faith.

G. F. I.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

CANON RAVEN ON THE HOLY SPIRIT.

THE CREATOR SPIRIT. A Survey of Christian Doctrine in the light of Biology, Psychology and Mysticism. By C. E. Raven, D.D. *Martin Hopkinson & Co.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

Dr. Raven shows himself to be in possession of a remarkable range of knowledge. He seems to be the Admirable Crichton among Hulsean Lecturers, as he is equally at home in Church History and Biology, Theology and Psychology, and is a Field Naturalist with highly developed gifts of observation. He is transparently honest and is full of strong likes and dislikes. We have a suspicion that he is at times carried away by his prejudices, as when he attacks Archbishop D'Arcy and rubs home his criticism with the remark that his conception of the Deity is " appropriate perhaps of the Calvinism of Ulster, but hard to reconcile with any other form of the Christian Faith." This animus against Dr. D'Arcy was expressed also in another criticism of his work by Dr. Raven. We hold no brief for the Archbishop, who does not need our defence, but we may say that he is far from being a Calvinist, and the Calvinism of Ulster exists very largely in the minds of those who do not know that province. And when we examine the philosophical conceptions of Dr. Raven himself and his view of teleology, we confess we do not seem to find much contrast between what he assails and what he accepts in the last analysis. God is Love and God wills. We cannot separate the two except in thought, and there is a subtle anthropomorphism which cannot possibly be abandoned, if we believe that in any way man is made in the image of God. Everything depends on whether we attribute to God the highest or what is low in man. Reason as well as love reigns supreme in God, and there is no conflict whatever between the Divine Love, Thought and Will.

It is precisely on the philosophical side we find this book weak. Dr. Raven becomes the slave of words. Dr. Temple comes in for severe criticism—with much of which we sympathize—but when the author and the Bishop agree we think they either misunderstand the meaning of a word or else find refuge in ambiguity. As is well known, Dr. Temple escapes from sacramental difficulty by substituting Transvaluation for Transubstantiation. Dr. Raven writes: The doctrine of the Mass " implies that ritual and formula can alter the substance of matter. Such separation destroys both the nature and work of sacraments." In a footnote he adds: " If we accept Dr. Temple's suggestion and give to the Scholastic ' substance ' the meaning of ' value,' this objection would be met; but the miraculous view of the Sacrament would be abandoned, and a complete change of doctrine be accomplished. Many of us could accept ' transvaluation ' for whom ' transubstantiation ' is intolerable." Now everything depends on what " value " means

—it may either be purely subjective or entirely objective. If we have anything comparable to the Scholastic substance, then we have the magic element just as strong; if, on the other hand, value is individual, personal and subjective, we have a view of the Sacramental Presence that is true to English Church standards. And we have to say that in the text the treatment of the Sacrament of our redemption is such as we should endorse.

It may be thought that this book is one we cannot recommend our readers to study for themselves. On the contrary, we believe that they will learn much from it and find matter for serious fruitful thinking. It is a brave book, and has as the background of its conception the idea that ran through the pages of *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, with this difference. Drummond emphasized law as rule. Raven looks upon the working of the Spirit as distinctly personal. He takes all nature for his outlook. He has reached a synthetic view which enables him to view nature as a whole, and by nature he would say that every phenomenon observed is part of nature. We may draw working distinctions between inert nature, living nature, thinking nature and spiritual nature. These distinctions are convenient labels that classify our thought, but behind them all and through all that they denote and connote the Spirit of God works. Eternal Wisdom and the Love of God are over and in them all. By adopting this position he hopes that it is possible to form a Christo-centric view of the Universe that will end the conflict between religion and science. And he is most suggestive in his treatment of the theme. We find striking analogies and similarities. We discover that without the sustaining Spirit all would be chaos, and we sympathize with his attempt to reach not a monistic view of the Universe but a spirit-pervaded conception of a Universe in which God is immanent through His Spirit. He never loses sight of the fact that God is greater than the Universe. And he believes in the Incarnation.

There is a delightful freshness about this book. It is free from much of the narrowness we encounter in so many contemporary volumes. And it is genuinely human. He has the hopefulness of youth and yearns to get to work for the extension of the Kingdom of God. "The fish won't wait while we argue and criticize. Stop talking. Shake hands! Man the ships and to sea." "Was John old, or Paul cautious, or Peter afraid of initiative? God's fools, God's mountebanks, God's troubadours, those are His ministers and wonder workers. And in the mission field there are plenty of them still. It is for the Spirit who manifests Himself in life and life abounding, in liberty and love that the world waits." Dr. Raven is far from accepting Schweitzer's views, but we find in him that same boundless faith and devotion which has made Schweitzer so lovable among his black folk. And who can end on a fault-finding note with those we love?

A PHILOSOPHER'S LETTERS.

BARON FRIEDRICH VON HÜGEL: SELECTED LETTERS, 1896–1924: Edited with a Memoir by Bernard Holland. *J. M. Dent & Son.* 21s.

This is a fascinating volume which can be neglected by no one who wishes to understand the intellectual movement in religious circles during the period of 1896–1924. The Church of Rome knows when and where to strike. Mivart was placed on the Index, George Tyrrell was excommunicated; Acton and von Hügel remained in life communion with the Roman Church. It is true that the former had in them the spirit of rebellion against authority combined with an intellectual honesty that was not rivalled by the latter, who on many vital points of controversy appear to have been out of conformity with the Vatican. But they while speaking and writing frankly had the will to conform. Rome therefore took action against the two former and permitted the two latter to utilize their intellectual and historical gifts without incurring penalties. In consequence, von Hügel has had a very great influence on the thought of Anglo-Catholics as well as on all who value sincerity and devotion. We find it hard to combine the rigorous intellectuality of the man with his affection for the rosary and popular devotions. It seems impossible to fit all we learn of him into a consistent whole—but he remains from beginning to end—in his days when Tyrrell was his greatest friend and in the years when he stepped aside from the Modernist path. No one who reads this book will think for one moment that von Hügel ever consciously compromised what he believed to be truth for his own personal peace.

We do not think we err when we say that the contradictions in the case of the philosopher were largely due to his ancestry and his environment. His father seems to have been a man of liberal outlook. His mother had been bred a Presbyterian and became a Roman Catholic a short time after her marriage. Von Hügel studied science under a Quaker geologist, and the influences that surrounded him during his early years were such as to broaden his outlook and free him from doctrinaire tendencies. He married young, and his wife had some time before joined the Roman Church —so he once more was brought into contact with influence that had been formed in non-Roman environment. Incidentally we learn from the letters that he had great inward struggles that were given rest through the teaching of his Roman Catholic guides. His youthful experience was never forgotten, and we think it accounts for the two chief characteristics of his career—a determination to seek truth and hold it at all costs and a reverence for the authority of the Roman Church due to gratitude for the part it played in stilling the lawless insurgence of youth and guiding him into a harbour where he found, under authority, help in his struggles.

One of the most attractive sections of this book is the appendix giving in French some of the sayings of Abbé Huvelin, who when

von Hügel was thirty-four had a great hold over his mind. It is worth while giving two of them. " Ne lisez jamais les journaux religieux; ils vous jetraient en toutes sorts de tentations, ils vous feraient un mal inoui. Jamais moi-même je ne les lis. Lisez les Actes du Saint-Siege, mais séparément." Notice the last two words. Von Hügel at times read the Actes together ! " Il n'y a pas d'ennemi plus profond et plus dangereux du Christianisme que tout ce qui le rapetisse et le rend étroit." Von Hügel in these letters yearns for Christianisme, and his intercourse with Protestants made him, we believe, yearn for something wider than what is generally known as Catholicism. But we see him in the toils of the system. He often appears to be in the Church of Rome but not of it. The greater part of this book might well be written by a Protestant without the elision of a sentence. And yet when it is taken as a whole we see how strong the hold authoritative Romanism had on his mind.

In his last volume of essays we read with appreciative admiration his wonderful paper on " Suffering and God." In his letters we have him putting his teaching into his correspondence with sufferers and we see the reaction of suffering on himself. Here we have also an account of the reception of that paper by the London Society for the Study of Religion. Twelve of those present spoke on the subject and only two agreed with him " that although, of course, God is full of sympathy and care for us; and though we cannot succeed vividly to represent His sympathy otherwise than as a kind of suffering, what we experience in our own little lives as suffering, we must not press this to mean that suffering is *as such and literally* in God. God is overflowing Love, *Joy*, and delectation." This lay at the foundation of his thought of God, who is transcendent.

We wish we had space to comment on many matters in this book, which is one of the best guides we know to the thought that lies behind much that is current to-day in philosophical and religious circles. We use the word religious advisedly instead of theological, for the outstanding fact in von Hügel's outlook on life is that nothing is theologically of importance unless it can find expression in religion. There was a bigness about the man that entrances. We disagree with a great many of his positions, but we are always convinced that here is a man who according to his lights wished to follow Truth and found Truth in our Lord Jesus Christ. Here is a warning. Referring to the appointment of Dr. Frere to Truro, he writes, contrasting Dr. Frere continuing in the Community with Dr. Gore leaving it, " surely a proof in its way, that since the day when Charles Gore left them, the militant Protestant watchdogs have become less keen or are considered more negligible. Well, that does not break my heart provided it be not a symptom of indifference, which surely is worse than many a more irritating stupidity." Dr. Henson says Evangelicals are illiterate—have they become indifferent ?

CRANMER.

THE LIFE OF THOMAS CRANMER, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. By Anthony C. Deane, M.A. *Macmillan.* 6*s.*

It is extraordinary to find this book in a series entitled "Great English Churchmen," for its purpose is to deprive Cranmer of any claim to greatness either as a man, a churchman, or an Archbishop. It is significant that it should appear at the moment when the final stages of the attempt to undo Cranmer's liturgical work are being reached. If the principal author or compiler of the Prayer Book can be effectually belittled, the book itself must suffer disparagement, notwithstanding that we are told, "As we follow the sad record of weakness and incompetence, we can rejoice to think that it was Thomas Cranmer who gave us our English Prayer Book, and we shall take this work as his best memorial" (p. 187).

It would take long to discuss the manner in which Canon Deane ignores the evils which made the Reformation a necessity, misunderstands its processes and results, and misrepresents those who took part in it; nor would it be worth while. The book may be trusted to furnish its own refutation. As an example may be cited the references to Cranmer's first marriage. It is suggested that he had become enamoured of a "barmaid" and that the marriage was one of necessity, and this is repeated by innuendo more than once. The author also tells us that the authorities at Cambridge were much opposed to the New Learning because, having seen the licentiousness which in Italy attended its progress, they were anxious to safeguard the morality which its pursuit endangered. At the time of his marriage Cranmer was a Fellow of Jesus College. This position he thereby forfeited, since, until modern times, Fellows of Colleges were required to be bachelors, yet so little had he lost the respect of authorities specially regardful of morality that he was appointed Reader at Buckingham (now Magdalen) College and, on the death of his wife in childbirth a year after the marriage, he was re-appointed to his Fellowship. If Canon Deane will extend his studies so far as to read the article on Cranmer in the *Dictionary of National Biography* by the late Dr. James Gairdner, who was no great friend either of the Reformation or of the Reformers, he will find a better and far more probable account of the social standing of Cranmer's wife. The author's references to the dominating influence of foreign Reformers upon Cranmer are no less remote from the facts. The suggestion that there is something malign about foreigners is an appeal to a narrow insular prejudice, but we only hear it, as a rule, when they are Protestant. Augustine, Bernard, and Francis of Assisi were foreigners as much as Peter Martyr or John Alasco. But, in truth, Cranmer was by no means the docile tool of foreign Reformers he is represented to be. The late Rev. W. E. Scudamore, whose authority cannot lightly be disregarded, and the most recent of writers on Cranmer, Mr. C. H. Smyth, have both vindicated his independence.

Canon Deane appears to think that it would have been better

for the English Church had some tempestuous and strong-willed person like Thomas à Becket or Cardinal Wolsey been Archbishop instead of Cranmer. He says with reference to the execution of Fisher and More, and contrasting their firmness with Cranmer's weakness, we can but regret that such a post as that of Archbishop was held by such a man at such a time. "We can but mingle pity for the timid servant of a tyrant king with unfaltering censure of an Archbishop who betrayed his Church." But, at the end of the book we read, "Unquestionably he was a weak Archbishop. Yet a strong Archbishop would probably have lost his place under Edward if he had not already forfeited his life under Henry." On this view Cranmer is expected to make futile protests against things which he was not responsible for and could not have hindered, when the only result would have been that he would have forfeited either his life or his office and have lost any opportunity of doing the work which, under God, he was enabled to accomplish.

We have not often seen a book with so little sense of historical perspective or so much solid prejudice. To read it, as was once said in another case, is an illiberal education.

ARNOLD OF RUGBY.

THOMAS ARNOLD. By the Rev. R. J. Campbell, D.D. *Macmillan & Co., Ltd.* 6*s.* net.

Dr. Campbell has found in the great nineteenth century Head Master of Rugby a congenial subject, and he has done ample justice to the ability, scholarship, force of character, and independence of one of the outstanding Churchmen of a unique period in our Church's history. He has shown what a character built on intense love for and a strong faith in Jesus Christ can be. For Arnold "Christ was central and determinative. Christ was the Deity he worshipped, the ever-present friend and saviour to whom his love and allegiance were whole-heartedly given." "The one great purpose of his life was the expression of the Christian idea in ordered society." Although Dr. Campbell says that "he was hardly a theologian at all," yet he had a firmer grasp on the essentials of theology than many of those of that day who have since acquired reputation as theological teachers. He had, however, greater gifts, and the impression he made upon his contemporaries shows the power of personality, especially the finest type of single-minded Christian personality. "His greatest contribution to the life of his own generation—was his personal character. Its distinguishing ingredient was a rare nobleness, disinterestedness, and elevation of spirit."

It would be impossible to write of a great representative of the religious life of England in the first half of the last century without discussing the religious forces of the time. Dr. Campbell freely criticizes the Evangelical Churchmen of that age, but he acknowledges that "there was a peculiar beauty associated with the evangelical type of character at its best which has never been surpassed." He does not find the same contemplative and de-

votional habit in the new Evangelicalism of to-day. Although he says that a century ago they " produced no thinkers and few scholars " yet he has to acknowledge that they were not alone in this respect. He is probably correct in saying that Evangelicalism to-day is more truly the inheritor of the Arnold tradition than that of Charles Simeon, yet this is no disparagement of the gifts and influence of Simeon on his day. Dr. Campbell, although more favourable to the Oxford Movement, does not spare its weaknesses. He praises its scholarship, yet it is generally acknowledged that it has left little impression on the main current of national life. It has produced " no corresponding evidence of a quickened spiritual life," and the Church has become more sectional. Arnold had no sympathy with the Tractarians and expressed his views in language that would now be regarded as highly controversial. He regarded the whole movement as reactionary, unhistorical in its assumptions, and unscriptural in practice. Its basis of Apostolical Succession implied a false and superstitious idea of the Church—a foundation of machinery and organization. We are grateful to Dr. Campbell for his picture of a great, strong, noble-minded honest Churchman, and we agree with him that the course of English Church history would have been different if Arnold had lived another twenty-five years.

ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY.

ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY. By Sidney Dark. *Macmillan.* 6s.

The editor of " Great English Churchmen Series " has assigned to himself the task of writing a biography of Thomas Becket. When he penned that strange medley of fact and legend, *The English Child's Book of the Church*, he called the Archbishop, Thomas à Becket, but he has evidently learned from Dr. Hutton the proper way to describe the man he hails as Saint. So Mr. Dark is able to add to his knowledge accuracy in minor detail. He seems to have taken as his text two sentences : " I, as a credulous person, actually believe that legend is often fact," and " I regard the Reformation as almost an unqualified calamity, the evil consequences of which have not yet been exhausted." As he is the author of both these sayings we know what to expect in this audacious tract, written to exalt the Hildebrandine ideal and to make Thomas a martyr for the sake of Truth and the Church. Nationalism is an evil for Mr. Dark, and yet he is never tired of telling us that Becket prided himself on being an Englishman. He brings Becket and Francis of Assisi into close connection with one another and tells us that Becket made Francis possible. We do not see the connection any more than the apparently obvious connection between sanctity and being verminous, because both were anything but clean in their personal habits. We do not forget that the Franciscan Order soon lost the sanctity its founder undoubtedly possessed, and we are more than inclined to believe that any claims to being included among the martyred saints came to Becket after his death and by reason of it, and not through the deeds of his life.

It is extremely hard to grasp the motives and acts of men of the Middle Ages. We do not think that Mr. Chesterton is as safe a guide as Dr. Coulton, and strange to say prefer other historians to Mr. Dark as guides to the character of Becket and the underlying motives that directed his policy against the King and for the Pope. We are told enough of the man to see that he never left anything undone to exalt his own importance, whether as servant of the King or official of the Pope. And we cannot acquit him of the many charges brought against him by sober historians, some of which are mentioned by our author, who makes fact legend, and legend fact, as it best suits his purpose. We do not think that those who wish to form right judgments will find much of value in this book, which will serve historians as an object lesson of the lengths to which a biographer will go when he has a thesis to maintain and historical verdicts to forget. Mr. Dark rejoices in dilemmas, and we are content to say that Holy Church may be holy, but all the deeds of its officers are not necessarily holy, and its characteristics have not always been those we expect to find adorning the Body of Christ.

ANTE-NICENE EXEGESIS OF THE GOSPELS.

ANTE-NICENE EXEGESIS OF THE GOSPELS. Vol. III. By the Rev. Harold Smith, D.D. *S.P.C.K.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

The third volume of this monumental work is before us. Like its predecessors it is full of interest for those who wish to know what the Fathers considered to be the true interpretation of the Gospels. And its lessons are many. We see an absence of uniformity of teaching, a failure to agree, such as distinguishes commentators of to-day, and a marked difference in the intellectual insight as well as the spiritual gifts of the writers. The arrangement is excellent and enables the student to form his own opinion with ease. The translations are set forth in good sound English and are never ambiguous in their meaning. No one but a classical scholar of proved excellence and a master of English could have written this work.

The ground covered in this volume begins with St. Matthew xiii. and ends with St. Matthew xviii. and the Synoptic parallels. The passages from St. John on which comment is made start with John vii. 11, and end with the close of the eighth chapter. As the famous Petrine Text comes under review many will turn to this section and, will see it preceded by a chapter which says that the Ante-Nicene Fathers are silent on St. Mark viii. 22–26, which tells the story of the healing of the blind man who saw on his way to recovery men as trees walking. Origen tells us, " Each founder of a heresy has built a gate of Hades. There are many gates of Hades and death; but behind them all is the Evil One. Let us beware of each sin, since if we sin, we come down to some gate of Hades." The whole of the long quotation is of great interest.

Turning to another passage, the early verses of St. John viii. are only once referred to in the Ante-Nicene Fathers and that

reference is found in the Didascalia. It ends with the words, " But He who searches the heart asked her, ' Have the elders condemned thee, my daughter ? ' She answered Him, ' No, Lord.' Then said He to her, ' Go thy way, I also condemn thee not.' Herein must our Saviour, King and God, be a pattern to you bishops." The exegesis of the Fathers will enliven and enrich many a sermon, for whatever the limitations of the writers may have been they were men of faith who stood very near to the life of our Lord, and often had to live the faith they professed in surroundings that were anything but favourable to their teaching. We congratulate Dr. Smith on his work, which is one of the outstanding books of our day.

JERUSALEM BEFORE THE WAR.

WHEN WE LIVED IN JERUSALEM. By Estelle Blyth. London: *John Murray*. 12*s*. net.

This very readable volume of recollections comes from the pen of one of the late Bishop Blyth's daughters. The Bishop desired that no records of his work should be published—that only the buildings he had erected should tell their story. Although Miss Blyth's book does not profess to be a memoir of her father, she goes at times perilously near the edge. It was perhaps inevitable —it would be a difficult task to tell of those eventful years spent in the Holy Land, without unintentionally and unconsciously presenting a portrait of her father. That a portrait of him *does* appear in these pages is beyond all question. Even literally this is true, for the first thing in the book is a photogravure of the Bishop in his study in 1913 ! The chequered history of the Jerusalem Bishopric is outlined. Founded in 1841, jointly by England and Prussia, after the death of the third Bishop—Dr. Barclay (whose episcopate only lasted two years)—there was a hiatus of five years, owing to the failure of Prussia to nominate. However, in 1886 Archbishop Benson revived the See as an English bishopric, and in 1887 George Francis Popham Blyth was consecrated on March 25. During the vacancy the London Jews Society and the C.M.S. had carried on their work, a fact which Miss Blyth records, and she is ungracious enough to say that " there seemed little sense of Churchmanship or of Church obligations." She, however, omits to mention that there was considerable objection to the appointment, and though the good Bishop lived down much of the opposition and prejudice, it was felt that he was never very fully in sympathy with the two Societies to which Palestine owes so much. We have no wish to exhume buried controversy—this is merely, as lawyers say, a question of fact.

Miss Blyth writes of many things of which she has intimate knowledge—for instance of Turkish rule, of Russia in Palestine, of the Eastern Orthodox Church, of Islam, the Samaritans, the Armenians, the Abyssinians, etc. The narrative runs on to the time of the Great War and Lord Allenby's entry and proclamation in December, 1917. By that time, however, Bishop Blyth had gone

to his rest, for he died in November, 1914, shortly after his resignation. The past has been by no means free from difficulties, and the future, too, has its own problems. Miss Blyth writes plainly of two of these—of the revival of Islam and the rise of Zionism, and she writes with understanding, realizing how vital these really are. The book is enriched with eight illustrations, including one of the interior of S. George's Collegiate Church—the Cathedral of the Diocese. S.R.C.

THE BISHOPS' PRAYER BOOK.

THE NEW PRAYER BOOK. By the Rt. Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, C.H., D.D., Bishop of Gloucester. *John Murray.* 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Bishop of Gloucester's Charge on the occasion of his second Visitation is devoted to a defence of the Bishops' revision proposals. His first Charge on the character of the Church of England was in the main a defence of the doctrine, worship and policy of Anglicanism and was written in a spirit of engaging frankness which Evangelical Churchmen appreciated in spite of disagreement with him on several important points. The present volume shows that he shares the subtle change of outlook which has come over the majority of the Bishops, and that he is anxious to find grounds for compromise on matters of which he does not personally approve and with which he does not sympathize. The result is an array of special pleading of which the Bishop scarcely seems conscious. He has been accused of giving way to expediency and numbers, and this can be substantiated by the fact that he acknowledges that the aim of the new Prayer Book is to adapt our services to the usage of the day. The Bishop aims at securing ultimately one use, and thereby "to forbid definitely what is in the opinion of the great majority of members of the Church inconsistent with Anglican traditions." Although this may be meant as a warning to Anglo-Catholic extremists, Evangelicals may take it to themselves as an indication of their fate should the majority of churchpeople at any time decide that their teaching is "inconsistent with Anglican tradition." It is unfortunate that the Bishop should speak of some churchmen "whose views are extreme and their minds narrow" because they are devoted to truth as not only they see it, but as the majority of the Episcopal bench saw it for centuries, and even so short a time as twelve years ago. Into the criticism of Eastern and Western theories of the Consecration Prayer we cannot enter. They depend for their value on belief in the attachment of a Presence to the elements which Anglican theology since the days of Hooker did not recognize, and our present prayer of consecration obviously discards. The Bishop has made the best defence that is possible for the New Prayer Book, but he leaves us unconvinced that it represents the old doctrine of our Church, and that it will prevent the introduction of errors that will ultimately lead to the deterioration of the worship and faith of our Church.

THE SPIRIT OF GLORY. By Rev. F. W. Drake, Rector of Kirby Misperton and Canon of York. London: *Longmans Green & Co. Ltd.* 4*s.* 6*d.* net. Paper cover, 3*s.* net.

A volume of devotional studies on the Holy Spirit and His work in human life. The author is a prominent Anglo-Catholic and these meditations are, of course, coloured by his theology. In view of the present controversy over the "Epiklesis," his chapter on "The Holy Eucharist" is specially illuminating. He quotes from the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, as it is used to-day in the Orthodox Church of the East, "Send down upon us and upon these gifts here set forth, the co-eternal and consubstantial Holy Spirit, by Whom blessing this bread Thou wilt make it truly the body of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and blessing this cup Thou wilt make it really the blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, changing by them Thy Holy Spirit." He admits that the Western Liturgies have "preserved nothing in their rite so full and explicit as this," but he quotes approvingly. He goes so far as to apply the words of Jesus "He shall take of mine and shall shew it unto you" to the Sacramental Presence. What are we to make of such teaching as this: "That Presence is there and I am sustained by it, whether I acknowledge God or forget Him." This is the "ex opere operato" view with a vengeance! Elsewhere much of the language is such as Evangelical Christians are accustomed to hearing and using, which in itself makes such books as this very dangerous. S. R. C.

BOOKLETS AND PAMPHLETS ON PRAYER BOOK REVISION.

The booklets and pamphlets issued in connection with the various aspects of the revision of the Prayer Book during the last few months have been so numerous that we can only refer to a small selection of them here.

Bishop Knox in *Will the Deposited Book Restore Order in the Church?* (3*d.* net) examines the structure of the new Communion Office and shows that the Anglo-Catholics have in it "all for which they have contended for the last forty years," to quote the statement of Bishop Gore and the Bishop of London. He shows that by the introduction of anthems and in other ways opportunity is given for the full ritual of the Mass and all its accessories.

Bishop Knox has also written, *Does the Deposited Book Change the Doctrine of the Church of England on the Lord's Supper?* (1*d.*). This booklet, which has already reached its second impression, puts side by side what the Church of England teaches and forbids to be taught, and shows how much of the latter is contained in the Deposited Book. It contains a number of useful references to authoritative documents and quotations from them with which defenders of the faith of our Church should be familiar.

Canon Lancelot, Proctor in Convocation for the Diocese of Liverpool, issues as a booklet a paper read before the Ruri-Decanal Chapter of North Meols on "Prayer Book Revision: Why I voted 'No'" (2*d.*). His fellow-proctors, Canons Copner and Lomax,

indicate their concurrence with Canon Lancelot's arguments. Reservation appears to him to lower the character of God and of the Christian Revelation. A false position is given to the Virgin Mary, prayers for the dead are introduced without scriptural authority for them; the alternative prayer of Consecration contains the anamnesis and the epiclesis, both similarly without authority. These are among the reasons ably stated for Canon Lancelot's vote.

Canon Ronald Symes, Proctor in Convocation for the Diocese of Carlisle in *Against Reservation* (4*d.*) pleads as an old-fashioned High Churchman that Reservation destroys the distinctive teaching of our Church, that it is not necessary for the sick, that there will be great danger of adoration of the Reserved Elements, and that it is unfair to the missionaries of C.M.S. to make such changes in their absence on the work of the Church abroad. It will introduce a bone of contention that will have deplorable results, and it will lead to a falling off of candidates for Holy Orders.

A new edition has been issued of Professor Burkitt's valuable pamphlet *Eucharist and Sacrifice* (6*d.* net). In this he indicates the true doctrine of sacrifice in our Communion Service.

Canon W. H. M. Hay Aitken has written *The Idea of Sacrifice in connection with Holy Communion* (1*d.*). With his usual clearness of thought and expression he emphasizes the truth that there can be no repetition of the one great sacrifice of our Lord and that the confusion between "pleading" and "offering" must be kept clear if error is to be avoided.

Mr. Andrew Williamson, Vice-Chairman of the Parochial Church Council of St. Paul's, Onslow Square, gave an address to the members of the congregation of that Church (1*d.*) which deserves attention as a careful examination of the alternative Communion Service and a statement of the effect it will have in bringing our use closer to that of the Church of Rome and its erroneous teaching on the Presence and on Sacrifice. Reservation, Confession, Prayers for the Dead and other points of importance are similarly treated.

Mr. Henry J. Guest, Representative of the Diocese of Birmingham, writes *A Layman to Laymen on Prayer Book Revision* (1*d.*). The Bishop of Birmingham says of this booklet, "I hope it will have a wide circulation, for I believe that the conclusion which you reach is thoroughly sound." In four sections he deals with past history, the present position, points of difference and personal duty. His conclusion is that "for the sake of our children, for the sake of our Protestant nation and Empire, we must stand for what we believe to be truth against error, light against darkness. God's word against man's traditions."

Mr. W. Guy Johnson's booklet on Incense (1*d.*) examines the arguments put forward for the use of incense both from Scripture and other sources and shows the illegality of the use in our Church.

Early Liturgies, by Harold Smith, D.D. (2*d.*), describes in a popular way the early forms of worship to which appeal is constantly made in defence of changes in our Communion Service. It gives just the information that so many require at the present time to enable them to estimate this defence at its true value.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

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

Prayer Book Revision.—The following pamphlets have been issued by the Church Book Room at 1*d.* each or 7*s.* per 100, suitable for general distribution in connection with the Prayer Book Revision proposals:—(1) *Does the Deposited Book change the Doctrine of the Church of England on the Lord's Supper?* by Bishop Knox. (2) *A Layman to Laymen on Prayer Book Revision,* by Mr. H. J. Guest (Representative of the Diocese of Birmingham to the Church Assembly). (3) *The Idea of Sacrifice in connection with the Holy Communion,* by Canon Hay Aitken. (4) *Early Liturgies,* by Dr. Harold Smith.

Bishop Chavasse has written a little pamphlet entitled *The Holy Communion: Its Meaning,* which is published in the Church Booklet Series at 1*d.* or 7*s.* per 100. The manual is particularly suitable for distribution to young people and Communicants' Unions, but at the present time its wider circulation in the parish will be of extreme value as it sets out very shortly and clearly the meaning and purpose of the Lord's Supper.

Bishop Knox has just published a striking pamphlet entitled *Will the Deposited Book Restore Order in the Church?* (3*d.*), in which he shows how the changes unostentatiously displayed in the Deposited Book make it acceptable to Anglo-Catholics, and compares the Holy Communion Service of the Deposited Book with that published in *Catholic Prayers,* an Anglo-Catholic publication.

A pamphlet by Professor F. C. Burkitt, D.D., entitled *Eucharist and Sacrifice,* has been reprinted at 6*d.* net, and is of great value in view of the present position. The author states in his Note to the present edition that he is glad to have the opportunity of republishing the pamphlet while the old Prayer Book of 1662 is still the only legal form in the Church of England.

Archdeacon Thorpe has also published a new pamphlet entitled *Memorial and Invocation: An Examination of two passages in the Communion Office in the Deposited Book,* price 2*d.* The pamphlet is clear and direct, as the Archdeacon's writings always are.

Leaflets suitable for insertion in parish magazines have also been issued at the following special prices:—(1) *The Revised Prayer Book,* by the Rev. C. M. Chavasse (6*d.* per 100). (2) *The Prayer Book* (6*d.* per 100). (3) *Reservation of the Sacrament,* by W. Guy Johnson (1*s.* per 100). (4) *The Lord's Supper* (1*s.* per 100). (5) *The Lord's Supper,* by the Rev. E. S. Allworthy (2*s.* 6*d.* per 100). (6) *Prayer Book Revision,* by Canon J. B. Lancelot (6*d.* per 100).

The XXXIX Articles.—A new edition of the Rev. B. C. Jackson's pamphlet *The Thirty-Nine Articles: A Short Exposition* (3*d.*) has now been issued. Mr. Jackson gives an historical introduction covering the main facts of the Articles, and in five groups deals with their chief points. Each of these contains an explanation of things essential and a longer reference to matters of special difficulty. For Churchpeople generally who desire to make themselves better acquainted with the Articles, and yet have not time in this busy age for the study of the large commentaries intended for the use of divinity students, nothing could be more suitable.

Confirmation.—*The Creed of a Young Churchman*, by Canon H. A. Wilson, has now been reprinted. Canon Wilson describes the book as a manual for Confirmation Candidates and for young Churchpeople, but it is not, however, in the ordinary sense a manual, nor is it merely a series of notes of Confirmation instruction, but it is a book which may well be put into the hands of Confirmation Candidates during the time of their preparation. It is a book of instruction on fundamentals, and it is admirably designed and most suitable to retain the young people in loyal communion with our Church. It is published in cloth at 2*s.* net.

A new edition of *Confirming and Being Confirmed: A Manual for Confirmation Candidates*, by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D., Principal of St. John's Hall, Highbury, has also been republished at 1*s.* net. This manual has now reached its third edition.

Romanism.—A popular re-issue of the Rev. H. W. Dearden's *Modern Romanism Examined* has just been published at the small cost of 2*s.* 6*d.* net. We are particularly glad to see this book re-issued as we know of no other book so suitable to place in the hands of those who are attracted by Roman Catholicism, or those of inquiring Romanists. Bishop Moule, in his Preface to the first edition, describes the book as one which brings "to the difficult and painful process of religious debate a noble spirit of mingled decision and fairness which in itself educates the reader for right thinking."

The Spanish Brothers.—The R.T.S. have just published a new edition of *The Spanish Brothers*, by Miss D. Alcock, at 3*s.* 6*d.* net. The book is attractively bound and has a coloured frontispiece. It is difficult to estimate the value of this book in the past, nor are we sure of the number of copies which have been circulated of the numerous past editions. The story is that of the Spanish Inquisition, and Miss Alcock, in putting before us the reign of terror in which the Inquisition placed Christendom, has given us a story of thrilling human interest which is as interesting to read to-day as it was when she wrote it some years ago. The question may be asked as to how much of the book is fact and how much fiction, and Miss Alcock gives us a special note at the end to the effect that, as her object was to reveal, enforce and illustrate Truth, whatever relates to the rise, progress and downfall of the Protestant Church in Spain is strictly historical. Miss Alcock was a true student of history and always went to original sources for her facts, and we have no hesitation in recommending and pressing the circulation of this most excellent book.

Catalogues.—A new edition of *A Short List of Books for Theological Students and Others* has been prepared and is now available. Copies will be gladly sent on application. The list has been compiled with a view to assisting Churchmen, both clerical and lay, in making additions to their Libraries, though it is more particularly designed as a help to Ordination Candidates and the younger clergy. It is classified as far as possible under various headings.