

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

July, 1931.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen.

THE Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen held at St. Peter's Hall on April 13, 14 and 15 was a most successful meeting. In view of the Lambeth Conference Report on Unity and the important problems raised in it the Conference reviewed the whole situation in a general consideration of "The Basis of Anglican Doctrine and Fellowship." It was pointed out in the letter summoning the Conference that in the Lambeth Report "a new view of the Anglican Communion has been accepted, and its relation to the Unreformed, Reformed and the New Missionary Churches has in consequence received a new orientation" and therefore "it is a matter of primary moment that Evangelicals should grasp clearly what is involved in the new outlook, as some of the proposals can only be adopted by the acceptance of changes in our historic attitude to the Reformation and to the Reformed and Unreformed Churches." The main object of the Oxford Conference was "to discover where Evangelicals stand in the new phase of the Reunion movement and to set forth unambiguously the convictions that determine their attitude." Thanks to the kindness of the readers of the papers at the Conference we are able in this number of THE CHURCHMAN to give a verbatim report of all of them, and it will be seen that they form a valuable contribution to the discussion of some of the most important problems before the Church at the present time. We regret that we are unable to give any of the addresses of the speakers who took part in the discussions. They formed a useful contribution to the final drawing up of the Findings.

The Findings of the Conference.

For the convenience of our readers we give the Findings of the Conference.

The following Findings were agreed upon at the final session of the Conference. They are to be taken as in previous years as expressing the general sense of the Conference and not as representing in detail the views of individual members.

The Conference is in agreement with the Findings issued at previous Conferences on the subject of Reunion.

1. The Conference holds that the Anglican Communion historically and doctrinally stands definitely among the Reformed Churches whose Rule of Faith is the Catholic doctrine of the Supremacy of Holy Scripture.

2. The Conference holds that the distinctive doctrines of the Church of England are clearly "set forth" in the XXXIX Articles of Religion, which are its authorized Confession of Faith and its final interpreting authority of the doctrine "contained" in the Book of Common Prayer.

3. The Conference affirms its conviction that in the proper and natural order any steps towards closer Fellowship and Reunion with other Communion should first be taken with those great non-episcopal Churches which are akin to us racially, historically and spiritually.

4. The Conference welcomes the fostering, on the part of the Anglican Communion, of a brotherly spirit of friendly intercourse with unreformed Churches which manifest a desire to reciprocate, but it believes that the present approach to a formal union or full intercommunion with either the Eastern Orthodox Church or the Old Catholic Church will jeopardize the Reformed and Scriptural Basis of our own communion and will seriously retard the movement towards Union between the Church of England and the Free Churches. The Conference takes this opportunity of expressing its sympathy with those Christians in Russia who are enduring the storms of persecution.

5. The Conference rejoices in the vision of a wider unity of the Catholic Church presented by the South Indian and Persian schemes of Church Union, and trusts that under the guidance of the Holy Spirit those efforts may result in the formation of strong and stable branches of the Church of Christ.

6. The Conference reaffirms its belief that intercommunion is one of the most effective means of promoting rather than of consummating organic union between the Anglican and non-episcopal Churches, and regrets that the Lambeth Conference definitely refused to encourage so fruitful a means of achieving unity. The Conference repeats its conviction that the time has now come for Anglican Churchmen to enjoy this liberty.

A Memorandum on the Doctrines of the Orthodox Eastern and Old Catholic Communion.

The Findings of the Oxford Conference received strong support in a memorandum issued by forty clerical and lay members of the Church of England on "The Lambeth Conference Report and the Old Catholic and the Orthodox Eastern Churches." In this memorandum a number of the statements in the Lambeth Report are questioned. The Bishops accepted the Old Catholic Declaration of Utrecht as containing nothing which might be an impediment to union with our Church. The Memorandum points out that the

Old Catholics communion appeals "primarily to the 'Primitive Church' (by which it seems to mean the Church of the first ten centuries) not as with us primarily to Scripture." It says also that our Church does not approve of the Second Council of Nicaea (787) which approved the worship of images. The statement in the Declaration of Utrecht "We receive the Body and the Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ under the species of Bread and Wine," while it is capable of an interpretation not inconsistent with the tenets of our Church, is much more suggestive of teaching which our Church has rejected as false. The exegesis of Hebrew ix. 11, 12, propounded in the Declaration of Utrecht, has been rejected by our most scholarly theologians. This refers to the statement that the Holy Communion "is a sacrifice because it is the perpetual commemoration of the sacrifice offered upon the Cross, and it is the act by which we represent upon earth and appropriate to ourselves the one offering which Jesus Christ makes in Heaven, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews ix. 11, 12 for the salvation of redeemed humanity, by appearing for us in the presence of God (Heb. ix. 24)."

Some Further Points in the Memorandum.

In regard to the teaching of the Orthodox Church the Memorandum regarded some of the statements made by the Bishops to the Representatives of that Church as ambiguous and one-sided and not presenting our position truly. It was stated that the XXXIX Articles are to be explained by the Prayer Book and not *vice versa*. The significant words in the Articles "And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith" are omitted. These words expressly exclude the possibility of the "Body" being given by the hand of the minister or taken by the hand of the communicant. For the statement in the Report that "after Communion the consecrated elements remaining are regarded as the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ in that they have the same efficacy as before the administration" no authority is given, and is the view not of the Church but of a party in it. The Report also states that the phrase "that we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins," applies "to the whole company of faithful people living and departed." There is no justification for linking these words with the phrase "the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice," which is itself an expression not to be found in our Prayer Book, nor is there anything in the Articles or the Prayer Book to support its use. The memorandum shows that the XXXIX Articles were drawn up to show the official interpretation put upon the Prayer Book by its compilers. The Declaration prefixed to the Articles shows that Charles I and Laud regarded the Articles as presenting the standard of doctrine of the Church.

Criticism of the Memorandum.

The Bishop of Gloucester has issued a long statement in reply to this Memorandum. He thinks that the 300 Bishops at Lambeth have more authority to define the doctrine of our Church than

40 lay and clerical members. He evidently overlooked the fact that the Lambeth Conferences were originally called on the distinct understanding that they would never define doctrine, as the doctrine of the Church is contained in its formularies. It has also been pertinently suggested that among the Bishops may have been many from overseas with little acquaintance with the doctrines of either the Orthodox or Old Catholic Communions. But the chief fact is that although the formularies of these Communions may contain an appeal to Scripture, it is of a different character from that of our Church, and it permits practices which our appeal to Scripture disallows. The Lambeth Conference of 1888 indicated this when it said: "It would be difficult for us to enter into more intimate relations with that Church so long as it retains the use of icons, the invocation of Saints, and the cultus of the Blessed Virgin." It is well known that in other respects there are also serious divergences between the practices of the two Communions. The Orthodox Church uses the term "Transubstantiation" to indicate the presence in the elements, and although we are told that it is not used in the same sense as in the Church of Rome, yet the Orthodox doctrine is held by a large section of the Church of England. The views of that section are apparently to be regarded as the true view of the Church of England, and to be bound upon our Church by union with the Orthodox.

The Rev. Thos. J. Pulvertaft.

The paper by the Rev. Thos. J. Pulvertaft on "The World Position of the Anglican Communion," included among those read at the Oxford Conference, was written by him some time before his lamented death, which occurred before the Conference was actually held. His presence and help were greatly missed at the Conference sessions. In previous years his sound advice and wide knowledge were always at the service of the Conference and proved on many occasions, especially in the drawing up of the Findings, a source of wise guidance. His help will also be missed in many other directions. He took an active interest in *THE CHURCHMAN* and was not only a constant writer of articles and reviews, but was one of those to whom we turned for counsel when any question regarding the editorial work had to be decided. Of his personal character and fidelity to Evangelical teaching it is not necessary to speak here, as ample testimony has already been borne to them in *The Record* and elsewhere. We shall long miss his many gifts and his sympathetic and attractive personality.

THE OXFORD CONFERENCE OF EVANGELICAL CHURCHMEN.

(In continuation of the Cheltenham Conference)

HELD AT ST. PETER'S HALL, OXFORD, APRIL 13, 14 AND 15.

SUBJECT: THE BASIS OF ANGLICAN DOCTRINE
AND FELLOWSHIP.

Inaugural Address by the Rev. CHRISTOPHER M. CHAVASSE,
M.A., M.C., Master of St. Peter's Hall.

THIS is the third year that this conference has met at Oxford, since it moved its venue from Cheltenham; and this is the third year that our discussion has centred round the subject of Reunion.

The fact is at once encouraging and instructive. It is indicative of the paramount place which Reunion holds to-day in the thought of Christendom. Also it reveals that theories about Reunion are giving place to practical steps towards Reunion, which demand our eager and anxious attention.

Last year it was the South India scheme of Reunion and its reception by the approaching Lambeth Conference, which claimed our consideration. This year it is the Lambeth Report regarding Reunion with the Episcopal Churches of the East and West which requires examination. The Anglican Church is a Reformed Church. If, therefore, her union with the sister Churches of the Reformation is chiefly a question of order, her union with unreformed Churches must obviously turn upon matters of doctrine. However passionately we may pray and work for Reunion; however intensely we may believe that progress towards union is to seek to do the Father's will on earth as it is done in heaven, to fulfil the Saviour's high-priestly prayer, and to release limitless power through the fellowship of the Holy Ghost; however thankful our hearts may be for the unexpected and strong desire evinced by the Orthodox Church to draw closer to us; yet we have to remember that there is one thing greater than Reunion—namely, Truth; and we must never dream of gaining any measure of Reunion through false pretences, or, still more, at the expense of truth dearly bought and faithfully maintained. It is, then, in view of actual advances towards Reunion and of practical steps suggested with regard to them, that we have chosen this year as the subject of our conference "The Basis of Anglican Doctrine," with special reference to our fellowship with other Communion.

Bishop Headlam, in his pastoral charge, "The Church of England," has declared that "the fundamental principle of the Church of England is the supremacy of Scripture." It falls, there-

fore, to me in introducing this subject of "the basis of Anglican doctrine," to attempt first a description of what the Church means by the supremacy of Scripture; and then to outline the exercise of its authority in matters of Church doctrine and worship—for Scripture is the basis of Anglican doctrine.

I.

First, with regard to the Church and Holy Scripture:—Two statements are commonly made to-day regarding Scriptural authority. On the one hand, the authority of Scripture is supposed to be weakened because a belief in its verbal infallibility has been abandoned.

On the other hand, it is asserted that the authority of Scripture does not lie in the letter of Scripture but in the mind of Christ which it perfectly reveals. But did the early Reformers who gave us our Articles and Prayer Book hold or teach the verbal infallibility of the Bible? The doctrine was of later development in Protestant churches. The first Fathers of the Reformed Anglican Communion based the supremacy of Scripture upon this very truth which is advocated to-day—namely, that the Bible is the supreme revelation of the mind of Christ, and therefore did they require its authority not only for articles of faith, but also for ordinances of worship.¹ Of course, it would be absurd to suppose that the Reformers in their thought or formularies regarding the Bible could have anticipated the discoveries of four centuries of research and scientific advance, or have foreseen the particular problems of theologians to-day. But this does not mean that the authority of the Bible as the foundation basis of their doctrine has shifted or been weakened in the slightest degree.

There are no grounds whatsoever for arguing that because the verbal infallibility of the Bible is no longer accepted—that therefore a broader sanction than the Bible is required, and that Church doctrine may be enlarged by tradition. My strong contention is that, in broad outline, the view of the Bible held by the early Reformers is the same as is generally accepted to-day; and that it was in fulfilment of such a view that the doctrine of the Church of England was formulated, and the same non-scriptural traditions (for which authority is now sought in some quarters), were rejected. That is to say—the supremacy of Scripture is as much the fundamental principle of the Church of England in this year of grace 1931 as ever it was; and nothing has happened since the Reformation to impair its authority, but rather the reverse.

To substantiate this statement I must venture a few steps into dangerous territory. The inspiration of Holy Scripture is a difficult question in which it is far more easy to err in what one denies than in what one affirms. The inspiration of the Bible is unquestioned,

¹ "If it is asked why this (*the supremacy of Holy Scripture*) is and must be so, the answer is because Scripture embodies the revelation of God to the world as the source of authority. The revelation of the Person of Christ is found in Holy Scripture in its clearest, fullest, and purest form." (Dr. Griffith-Thomas in *The Principles of Theology*, p. 123).

and I wish we could be content to leave it at that. It is when with an over-bold curiosity we seek to define the precise mode, process, and mechanism of inspiration that schools of thought become sharply divided, and rival theories only make confusion worse confounded. It is the same with the doctrine of the Atonement and the conveyance of Sacramental Grace ; with regard to all three God has not vouchsafed to reveal the exact working of His effectual love. Neither can our finite understanding ever hope to comprehend more than in part the operation of Divine mysteries, which nevertheless may be accepted and appropriated to the full. And this demand for intellectual comprehension regarding the precise mode and method of spiritual activities seems to be a feature of modern times, and is not characteristic of the Reformation age. The exact process by which holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost is a question which for the early Reformers did not arise. They took over a belief in the inspiration of Scripture from the medieval Church, and from the early Church before that. They never thought to define inspiration, but only to affirm it and to witness to its truth and its effects.

To-day we are called upon to decide—generally speaking—between two definitions of Inspiration. There is the verbal infallibility of mechanical inspiration—according to which the human writer is an automaton recording direct dictation. And there is the plenary perfection of dynamical inspiration, according to which (as Bishop Chavasse was wont to quote) the human writers are not the pens but the penmen of God. Though as we have seen the specific question of Inspiration did not arise for the early Reformers, yet in effect they were confronted with much the same choice ; and they affirmed the dynamical inspiration of the Bible *writers* as opposed to the verbal infallibility of the Bible *writings*, which was held by the Roman Church. The Reformers found a Bible made of none effect through the traditional teaching of the schoolmen. Medieval theologians claimed to base all Church teaching upon Scriptures verbally infallible. But as they regarded the Bible as a mass of isolated sentences all verbally inspired, they sought for hidden meanings even in such unpromising material as genealogies. They therefore declared that the Church and the Church alone possessed the divine insight to explain Scripture with allegorical and mystical interpretations. And thereby, in effect, they established the Church with its traditions as the supreme authority of doctrine ; while the Bible became a useful depository of proof texts, any of which could be used apart from its context to substantiate any doctrine whatsoever. The Reformers, equipped with the new learning of the Renaissance, rediscovered the Bible by treating it historically and as one connected whole. To quote Erasmus they “ struck boldly down through the layers of mystic, allegoric, scholastic, traditional lore, which had been accumulating for ages over the holy volume, and laid open the vein of pure gold beneath—the plain, obvious, literal meaning of the Apostolic writings.”

In so doing they established the two principles which have ever since constituted the Bible as the supreme authority of Reformed doctrine. First, their own experience convinced them that the Bible treated as an historic unity explained itself to the intelligence even of the common man, and required no special interpretation by the Church. Secondly, they discovered (again by personal experience) that the voice of the living God spoke to them from its pages, and that a study of them brought them into immediate fellowship with Christ Himself. Perhaps I may be allowed to illustrate my point by re-interpreting an analogy employed by Irenaeus when arguing against Gnostic heresy. Irenaeus likened Scripture to a portrait in mosaic; and affirmed that the key to the correct arrangement of its many fragments was to be found in the body of catechetical teaching, not in the arbitrary plan affected by the Gnostics of piecing together verses in defiance of their contextual meaning. Like Irenaeus, the Reformers saw the Bible as a portrait—but as a finished production which conveyed its own truth; not as the jigsaw puzzle of mosaic fragments which required a key before the portrait could appear, and then perhaps be wrong. To them all portions of Scripture were not of the same relative value—as with fragments of mosaic; but in the one portrait some portions depicted the central figure—which they called “the Gospel,” others formed the background and were not of such intrinsic value though equally necessary to make up the whole. And then as they studied the portrait, the wonder happened; the figure came to life, and through Scripture they found Christ.

So, indeed, does Professor W. P. Paterson of Edinburgh sum up the position in his book *The Rule of Faith*. “The Reformers,” he writes, “proclaimed the Scriptures to be the supreme standard, yet the authority which they practically acknowledged was not that of the *whole* Bible, but the Bible *as a whole* interpreted from its centre.” And it is this truth of the essential unity of Scripture which the 20th Article affirms against the allegorical interpretations of the Schoolmen, when it forbids the Church so to expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another.

The attitude of the Reformers to the Bible has been elucidated most ably both by Dr. Lindsay¹ in his *History of the Reformation*, and by Mr. Sydney Carter in his book *The Reformers and Holy Scripture*. I speak merely as their disciple, and I find that their conclusions agree together on all essentials.

I am, however, more than a little doubtful whether Mr. Carter is quite justified in suggesting that while continental Reformers held a belief in the dynamical and plenary inspiration of Scripture, the views of English Reformers inclined more nearly to a view of mechanical and verbal inspiration. The Zurich letters show that the early Reformers themselves were unconscious of any such distinction between them, but that they regarded the Reformation

¹ “All this Reformation Doctrine is ably stated in Lindsay, *The History of the Reformation*, Vol. I, pp. 453-467. (Note by Dr. Griffiths-Thomas in *The Principles of Theology*, p. 287.)

as an international movement in which all were agreed upon fundamentals. And this view is strikingly confirmed by the *Harmony of Protestant Confessions* published in 1586, for which Cranmer himself worked hard in 1551.

It is, also, dangerous to press too far the affirmations of early Reformers (often pictorially expressed) concerning Inspiration into precise definitions of the mode of Inspiration, which as we have seen was not then a matter of inquiry.

And in any case the fact remains that there is no suggestion of the verbal infallibility of Scripture in any of their formularies—either in the Articles of Religion or in the authoritative Confession drawn up by Bishop Jewell for the Protestant Harmony on behalf of the Church of England. The phrase in the 20th Article “Gods word written” quite obviously does not mean “written by God,” but is a Reformation formula contrasting the Bible with the “unwritten word” of Church tradition—and is so employed by Cardinal Bellarmine in his work, *De Verbum Dei*. He writes—“All necessary doctrine concerning faith and morals is not necessarily contained in Scripture, and consequently beside the Written Word is needed an unwritten one, whereas they [the Reformers] teach that in Scripture all such necessary doctrine is contained and consequently there is no need of an unwritten word.”

Neither do I quite follow Mr. Carter in refusing Dr. Lindsay's distinction between “the Word of God” and “the Scriptures” as held by the early Reformers. Dr. Lindsay means, I take it, that the Reformers experienced a living voice speaking to their hearts from pages which heretofore had been but a dead letter. Also, that they found in Scripture a kernel and central content which explained all the rest and to which all the rest pointed. This central content I have ventured to liken to the figure in a portrait. The Reformers called it “the Gospel,” and, possessing it, Luther was rashly willing to scrap the remainder. And it is this Gospel to which the 6th Article refers when it declares that “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation.”

There is no need to be frightened at this good Reformation word “contain” which is also employed in the Homily on Holy Scripture—“in it is *contained* God's true word setting forth His glory and man's duty.” It has no derogatory significance as if the Bible contained also other matter not necessarily inspired. As used by the Reformers Scripture *contained* the Word of God as a material body contains a living soul, and so *was* the Word of God. Only, as Dr. Lindsay warns us, when we affirm that the Bible is the Word of God we must not exaggerate the copula “is” to denote complete identity, “but some relation as can be more exactly rendered by *contains, presents, conveys, records*—all of which phrases are used in the writings of Reformers or in the creeds of the Reformation Churches.”

If, therefore, Holy Scripture has been the supreme authority in the Church of England since the Reformation—this is not because the early Reformers held a doctrine of Inspiration which is

untenable to-day, nor does that authority rest in any degree upon a belief in mechanical inspiration or of verbal infallibility. And I wish very much that we would be content to copy the early Reformers in affirming from our own experience what the Bible effects as the Word of God, rather than to spread doubt and dissension by a barren speculation as to what exactly Inspiration means. Bishop Jewell's Confession regarding the canonical Scriptures, which he drew up on behalf of the Church of England, is most illuminating in its affirmations in contrast with the endless definitions over which we quarrel to-day. To Jewell the Scriptures were the heavenly voices whereby God hath opened to us His will ; in them can be abundantly and fully comprehended all things whatsoever we need for our help ; they were the foundations of the prophets and apostles whereupon is built the Church of God—and therefore they are the very sure and infallible rule, whereby may be tried whether the Church do swerve or err, and whereunto all ecclesiastical doctrine ought to be called to account ; and against the Scriptures neither law nor ordinance nor any custom ought to be heard.

What is this but to affirm from experience that in the Scriptures, as nowhere else, is perfectly revealed the mind of Christ Himself? Accepting this premise with the Reformers, we must also accept their conclusion—namely that Scripture is the supreme authority for church doctrine. And, as a matter of fact, has any doctrine or cult of worship unknown to the Reformers been discovered since their time which might make us hesitate to affirm with them that “ Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation ” ?

II.

I pass from the supremacy of Holy Scripture to the other part of my subject—namely the exercise of the authority of Scripture in church doctrine and worship.

The question is of first-rate importance, for in our negotiations with other Churches it would be fatal to allow as the official teaching of the Church of England any belief or practise which is ruled out by its “ fundamental principle.” And I would underline the phrase “ *official teaching*.” It is one thing to allow a wide latitude to the private opinions of individual members of a Church. It is quite another matter to construe such rightful toleration into what the Church allows to be officially taught or practised.

Four of the Articles of Religion—Articles 6, 20, 21 and 34—define more particularly the authority of Scripture and exemplify its working.

According to these Articles, the sanction of Scriptural authority is of two kinds—positive and negative. Positively, there is the warranty of Scripture—namely what is contained therein or may be proved thereby. And negatively, there is the silence of Scripture—namely what is not contrary to Scripture though it cannot be proved from it.

According to these Articles, again, the ordinances of the Church (all of which require Scriptural authority) fall into two categories—doctrine and worship. And according to these Articles, once

more, all *Church doctrine* requires both sanctions—it must be proved by the express warranty of Scripture as well as not being contrary to it; but the *Rites and Ceremonies* of worship require the latter sanction only—they must not be repugnant to the Word of God.

It is necessary, therefore, to be quite clear as to the difference between doctrine and the less important rites and ceremonies. A *rite* means the form of words used in the services of the Church, and a *ceremony* is any accompanying action, such as the use of the ring in marriage; even as the title page of the Prayer Book speaks of the “administration of the Sacraments, and *other Rites and Ceremonies* of the Church.” Now the 20th and 34th Articles declare quite definitely that particular Churches have power and authority to decree Rites or Ceremonies, so that nothing be ordained against God’s Word. Does this mean that the official prayers and practices of Church worship do not require the express warranty of Scripture, but that the silence of Scripture is itself sufficient sanction, as long as they cannot be shown to be forbidden by its teaching? It was, you will remember, upon this crucial point that controversy centred regarding the Revised Prayer Book; and the question is again raised in an acute form in negotiations on Reunion.

It is then of the greatest consequence to observe that the compilers of the Prayer Book drew a clear distinction between the Sacraments “ordained by Christ Himself,” and other Rites and Ceremonies “ordained only by man’s authority.” The distinction is made not only, as we have seen on the title page of the Prayer Book, but also in those Articles which treat of the Sacraments and the Traditions of the Church.

And the practical effect of the distinction is that the Sacraments (in that they are “generally necessary for salvation”—as the Catechism puts it) rank with articles of faith in requiring the express warranty of Scripture as the authority of their rites and ceremonies. Thus while the 34th Article affirms that ceremonies or rites ordained only by man’s authority can be ordained, changed, and abolished by particular Churches, so that nothing be ordained against God’s Word; the 25th and 28th Articles forbid the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper to be gazed upon, or carried about, or reserved, or lifted up, or worshipped because, though Scripture does not specifically forbid such practices, they do not possess the sanction of Christ’s ordinance.

As practically all discussion regarding Prayer Book revision, and all negotiations regarding Reunion with other Episcopal Churches, is concerned with the office of Holy Communion, it is essential to know that, as long as the Church of England is true to herself and her principles, she cannot authorize, or assent to, any kind of Eucharistic worship which does not possess the express warranty of Scripture. But more than this the principle followed by the Reformers in framing the service and ritual of Holy Communion reveals a further principle which regulates all other rites and ceremonies of the Church—namely that, although rites and ceremonies themselves require only not to be contrary to Scripture, the doctrine

behind them which they express must possess the clear warranty of Scripture in addition.

This principle is affirmed by the Lambeth Conference Report on the Unity of the Church, when the Delegation of the Orthodox Church was informed that "if there were any ambiguity in the Thirty-nine Articles, they should be interpreted by what the Prayer Book itself said." A statement which was accepted by the Delegation as satisfactory to the Orthodox. That statement at the top of page 135 of the Lambeth Report will justify, in the eyes of all, the opposition that many of us felt compelled to maintain against the controversial portions of the Revised Prayer Book. Historically, of course, the statement cannot be true. The Thirty-nine Articles were intended to interpret the Prayer Book not the Prayer Book the Thirty-nine Articles. Much of the devotional language and forms of pre-reformation Service Books were conserved by the Reformers and incorporated into the Prayer Book, because they had become dear to worshippers by long use. But the risk of misconception in so doing was avoided by the formulation of the Thirty-nine Articles, to which all clergy were required to subscribe. That is to say—the Reformation teaching of the Articles is the interpreter of all in the Prayer Book that is borrowed from non-reformation sources, and not vice-versa.

At the same time I do not seriously quarrel with the statement if considered as an ideal at which to aim. Certainly the Prayer Book and the Articles of Religion of a Church should be complementary and should explain and express each other. As was strongly urged during the Prayer Book controversy, the Book of Common Prayer is not simply a collection of Prayers but a People's Book of Doctrine—"Lex orandi, lex credendi." And the doctrine expressed by all rites and ceremonies should be approved by the clear warranty of Holy Scripture.

Such was certainly the working principle of those who gave us both the Prayer Book and the Articles. When in the Second Act of Uniformity Archbishop Cranmer described his First Prayer Book as "a very godly order . . . agreeable to the Word of God," he referred to the book in general not to every particular prayer, and he declared what had been the sincere intention of a first "tentative and provisional" effort. He condemned as "Mistakers" those who had sought to interpret Reformed doctrine by the prayers of his Common Service, and he was careful to make the Second Prayer Book "fully perfect" by removing all errors and ambiguities which experience had discovered in the First Book. This he effected (as the result shows) by subjecting the First Prayer Book to the bar of Scripture and removing from it whatever could not be proved thereby—and so producing that Second Prayer Book which, to all intents and purposes, is the one which enshrines to-day the doctrine of the Church of England. If then both the Articles and the Prayer Book reveal the express sanction of Scripture as the basis of Anglican doctrine, the "supremacy of Scripture" must ever remain as the basis of any fellowship with other Communion.

THE WORLD POSITION OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

BY THE REV. THOS. J. PULVERTAFT, M.A., Vicar of
St. Paul's-at-Kilburn.

FEW things can be more illuminating than statistics, and fewer still, more deceptive. The clever use of figures can prove anything, and the reason is that in other departments of discussion words have in themselves some concrete meaning, whereas figures are adjectives, that derive their character from the nouns with which they are associated. In the comparatively few figures I shall give in the course of this paper I shall try, to the best of my ability, to avoid fallacies, and to set forth figures in relation to facts in a manner that will be in accordance with things as they are.

We who live in England, where it is assumed that seven-tenths of our people would return themselves as Church of England, whereas only about one in four communicate on Easter Day, naturally think that in other English-speaking lands—particularly our own Colonies—the same proportion is observed between population and attachment to the mother Church. When we read of the hundreds of Dioceses of the Anglican Communion, we unconsciously, but inevitably, have before our minds Dioceses that compare in size and influence with those that are most familiar to us. And when we look round at our Parochial organization and contrast it with the scattered and congregational efforts of our Non-Episcopal brethren, we are apt to be confirmed in our idea that throughout the English-speaking world—at any rate, throughout the Dominions—the Church of England, as represented by its sister Churches, is the greatest of religious forces.

And we are not alone in this belief. A distinguished ex-President of the Free Church Council, during the war, went to the United States of America in company with one of our most prominent Bishops to lay England's case before the American people. He felt that he was merely an appendage to the Bishop, for the fame of the Bishop in England was very great; whereas, outside Free Church circles, the Nonconformist Minister had no reputation. On his arrival he soon found that he had made a mistake, as far as religious leaders were concerned, for his host pointed out to him that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the States was a comparatively small religious influence, and owed its importance to its communion with the Church of England and the wealth of its representatives in the Eastern States. His "inferiority complex" disappeared and he felt that he represented far more than the Bishop, as far as the forces he knew to be sympathetic with his denominational point of view were concerned. This anecdote represents the disillusion shared by many visitors to the English-

speaking world and Mission Field, where they expect to find our Church occupying the position it does at home. Roughly, we represent one-eighth to one-ninth the strength of Protestant missionary effort, and are in about the same proportion to the adherents of the Protestant forces throughout the world.

This at once raises the question: Is the Anglican Communion Protestant? In the eyes of the Roman Church it is—in the eyes of the Orthodox it is, or was until chameleon-like it now seems to take in the eyes of many who support Reunion with the Orthodox Church, a non-Protestant complexion—in the eyes of the Non-Episcopal Missionaries in most parts of the field it is Protestant, and in its own eyes, in some Dioceses, it is avowedly non-Protestant, in others Catholic-Protestant, and in the minds of the vast majority of its adherents and Communicants it is definitely Protestant. And here let me remark that the Church of Rome and the Anglican and other Protestant Churches are the only Missionary Churches. Even before the Russian *débâcle* Orthodox Missions to the heathen and Mohammedan world were so small as to be negligible. Whatever the Eastern Churches may be, they certainly were not in the days of their strength, since the eleventh century—Missionary Churches. I have already implied that, on grounds of history, on grounds of witness, and in the eyes of the vast majority of the Christian world as well as in its own eyes, the Anglican Communion must be reckoned a Protestant Communion.

As regards the distribution of the Christian world, Whittaker informs us that it consists of 331,500,000 Roman Catholics, 144,000,000 Orthodox, and 206,900,000 Protestants. These are rough figures, which are based on the assumption that all who live in a country profess and hold the religion of the country, unless the minorities represent a fair percentage of the inhabitants. All who know the proportion of non-practising Roman Catholics in Roman Catholic lands are aware that, as an index of religious convictions, the figures must be discounted. In connexion with the Orthodox, Professor Zankov says that the total of all Orthodox is between 146 and 150 millions, of whom 132 are Slavs—120 live in Russia—twelve are Rumanians, and Greek six. It is surprising to learn that the historic Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem have only 630,000 souls attached to them, of whom 300,000 live in the Constantinople Patriarchate. It is important to bear this in mind, for a Church with a long and distinguished pedigree is not of necessity a Church that speaks with authority due to its capacity for producing leaders able to speak with learning and the prestige that comes from a large constituency. In America, where Anglicans and Orthodox come most in contact with one another, the number of the Orthodox is variously estimated as between half a million and 800,000.

One of the great difficulties in dealing with any comparative estimate of the relative strength of religious denominations arises from the fact that in some countries a religious census is taken and in others only Church membership is returned. And when we

come to Church membership we are faced by the different methods the Churches have of registering their membership. Omitting the personal equation of the compilers dependent on their accuracy, the revision of their rolls, and the line drawn between adherents and members, we have to face the different bases. For example, some Churches return members plus those on the Baptismal Registers, and those others known to be in active membership—all adults. I shall not attempt to dissect the returns for two reasons : (1) I have not a full table which will enable the differentiation to be made on a scientific basis ; and (2) it is better to let the official figures speak for themselves. In England and Wales the number of Communicants of the Church of England and Wales in the 1929 *Year Book* numbered 2,715,571 ; and the returns of the membership of the Baptist, Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches amounted to 2,087,000. In Scotland there were 50,206 Communicants of the Scottish Church as against 1,338,000 Non-Episcopalian Church members. In Ireland at the last census there were 502,939 members of the Church of Ireland as against 476,000 of Non-Episcopalians. These figures broadly mean that in the two islands there are 2,786,000 Communicants of the Anglican Churches as against 3,425,000 enrolled members of the Non-Episcopal Churches, and a census return of 503,000 Church folk as against 476,000 Non-Episcopalians.

When we turn to the great Dominions of Canada and Australia we find that the census return of Canada gives us 1,408,000 Church folk as against 3,020,000 Non-Anglicans ; and in Australia we have 2,373,000 Church folk as against 1,444,000 Non-Episcopalians ; and in New Zealand there are 515,000 Episcopalians as against 444,000 Non-Episcopalians. From this it is clear that the Antipodean Churches are stronger in proportion to the Non-Episcopal population than is the case in Canada. The rough totals for the chief constituent English-speaking parts of our Empire are :

Church membership as disclosed by Easter Communicants and Non-Episcopal Rolls—

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Communicants | 2,786,000 |
| Non-Episcopal Members | 3,425,740 |
| Census Returns— | |
| Churchmen | 4,883,000 |
| Non-Episcopalians | 5,456,000 |

The greatest of English-speaking countries is the United States of America, and here we find a medley of religions which show how fissiparous Protestantism has become. I believe that in the States there are no fewer than 212 registered religious denominations. This growth of Churches is by some regarded as a proof of life, for one good man has said : " What you call ' schism,' I call ' salvation ' " ; but it is in reality a testimony to the extreme individualism of the people and the fruit of a population expanding rapidly without any definite plan of meeting the religious needs of the community. I find that there are 1,200,000 Communicants

of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States as against more than 29,000,000 registered members of the organized Protestant Churches.

Leaving the English-speaking world, in South Africa the non-Anglican Churches outnumber the Anglican by nearly four to one ; but the returns are incomplete, and whites and coloured are classed together. Omitting South Africa, an estimate, made as carefully as the figures available warrant, shows that the Anglican Communion has a membership in the English-speaking lands of 3,966,000 and an adherent census of 4,883,000 ; and the Non-Episcopal Churches in English-speaking lands a membership of 32,000,000 and a census return of 5,456,000.

On the continent the Episcopal Church of Sweden has a census membership of about six millions—it is practically coterminous with the population ; and the other continental Protestant Churches have a census membership of about fifty millions.

These figures prove that the Anglican Communion is by no means the predominant religious factor in the English-speaking lands and that, when we look at it through English eyes, we are led to exaggerate its importance as a world religious force. Broadly speaking, a survey of the Mission Field shows that the proportion of missionary work under the care of the Anglican Communion represents between one-eighth and one-ninth of the whole foreign work that is being done by the Protestant Churches of the world. At the best we can say that, roughly speaking, the Anglican Communion to-day is responsible for one-eighth of the work of God in Protestant Christendom.

It would be wearisome to give in detail the estimates of the relative strength of the various Churches. The Methodist, Presbyterian and Baptist Churches, as world organizations, outnumber the membership of the Anglican Communion. The Lutheran Church is also a larger Church than the Anglican Communion. We come really about fifth in the list of World Protestant Churches, and our main strength is centralized in England. A careful analysis of all the facts and figures available proves clearly that more than half of the Communicants of the Anglican Communion reside in England and Wales, which have only about one-seventh to one-eighth of the total number of the members of the other Churches of the Reformation in English-speaking lands.

A rapid survey of the growth of the Churches during the past century proves that the Non-Episcopal Communion have extended far more rapidly than the Church of England, and that the multiplication of Dioceses bears no proportion to the spread of our Communion. The Lambeth Bishops were convinced of this, for they placed the greatest weight on the opinions and leadership of the English Bishops, who won their respect by their learning, ability, and the greatness of the Dioceses they represented. They knew that in the lands from which they came they did not represent more than a minority of the Protestant Christians in these countries.

The survey also shows that the growth of Non-Episcopal Christ-

ianity has been accompanied by the spread of Anglo-Catholic teaching in our Home Church. Whatever may be said of the proportional decline of Nonconformity in England with the falling off in Church attendance, it is undoubtedly true that in the last century the growth of Nonconformity has been rapid in England and Wales, and has far outpaced that of the National Church. Most of this has taken place since the propagation of the Tractarian teaching in our Churches.

We claim to be a Bridge Church in Christendom—a claim also put forward by other Churches. To-day our Bishops seem to be more anxious to draw close to the Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches than to be in communion with the great progressive Churches of the Reformation, with which our people throughout the world live side by side, and who know us and we know them. Others will deal with the doctrinal and ecclesiastical issues at stake. But no one who has striven to see clearly the position of the Anglican Communion in World Christendom can fail to observe that there is a very great danger of falling into the error of taking *omne ignotum pro magifico* and thinking that because we, in this country, are happily the Church of England representing historic continuity, noble traditions, and the majority of the Church-going people, we hold as members of the Anglican Communion an equally important place in the minds of our fellow-Protestants of other lands.

THE TASK OF HAPPINESS. By C. A. Alington, D.D., Headmaster of Eton College, Chaplain to H.M. the King. London: *Student Christian Movement Press*, 58, *Bloomsbury Street*, W.C.1. 3s. 6d. net.

Dr. Alington admits that this little book contains allusions to the circumstances in which it has been written and believes that whatever is good in it, is due to the beauty which has surrounded its composition. The fact that it was written at Ravello led to an absence from books of reference which might perchance have given it a more learned tone. But the learned author has no need to apologize for any supposed defects in his book which is brimful of sound, sanctified common sense. The last section—almost half the book—is worth more than reading, it should be *studied* carefully as the work of one who understands children—their education in matters of sense—their amusements—their family life and their choice of a profession—all of them considerations of the first importance. Questions that are in everyone's mind are dealt with in a very human and understanding way. S. R. C.

THE BASIS OF ANGLICAN DOCTRINE AND FELLOWSHIP

AS "SET FORTH" IN THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

BY C. SYDNEY CARTER, F.R.Hist.S., Principal of
B.C.M. and T. College, Clifton.

SINCE the divisions of the East and West and of the later Reformation, even if not earlier, there has necessarily been no properly "Catholic" dogmatic theology apart from the general acceptance of the fundamental doctrines enshrined in the Catholic Creeds. The distinctive theology of each "particular or National Church" has therefore to be sought for in its authorized public Confessions of Faith. These impart a historical doctrinal continuity to each section or branch of the Catholic Church, and they are the dogmatic standard of final appeal by which all the devotional language used in subordinate manuals of worship must be tested. Consequently we must look to our own authorized Confession of Faith as enunciating the distinctive theology of our branch of the Church Catholic.

I would like to emphasize this point, since there is a tendency in some quarters to assume that this distinctive Confession of Faith is subordinate to, if not superseded by, the superior authority of the "teaching of the Catholic Church." But it is an incontrovertible fact that for the Anglican Churchman in Holy Orders no such indefinite standard of general Catholic Truth or Teaching possesses superior claims, or is an allowable Court of Appeal from the teaching "set forth" in the Thirty-Nine Articles, which, together with the Prayer Book, are the supreme doctrinal authority for clergy of the Church of England. To them alone, and not to some nebulous standard of "Catholic Truth," has he to give his "Declaration of Assent."

Now if Christian doctrine is the product of truth and of individual minds, we may say that its history is the record of various efforts to embody the contents and implications of the Gospel in definite propositions and conclusions in order to systematize them. In such attempts the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion issued by our Anglican Reformers take a prominent and important place, even though in their influence upon Christian theology they may fall behind the epoch-making "Institutes" of John Calvin. But by their fidelity to Scripture, their charity, breadth and moderation of statement the Articles have appealed ever since their first compilation to widely varying types of churchmen. Canon Dixon well declared of them: "They showed a surprisingly comprehensive and moderate spirit. The broad soft touch of Cranmer lay upon them when they came from the furnace. Nearly half were such as is common to all Christians, but even in these the brevity of state-

ment and the avoidance of controversy is to be admired." ¹ From a different angle—that of an outstanding Broad Churchman of the Victorian era—Charles Kingsley—we get similar testimony. Kingsley declared of our Church, "Her Articles bind men to none of the popular superstitions, but are so cautious, wide and liberal that I could almost believe them to have come down from heaven." ²

I would like to say a word first of all as to the precise character or orientation of the Articles. This is very clearly brought out in what I believe was the first commentary on them, that written by Thomas Rogers. Rogers was Archbishop Bancroft's Chaplain, and his commentary, which he entitled "The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England," was circulated by Bancroft throughout his Province of Canterbury.

This title reminds us that the Articles are "Catholic," while the further delineation of his aim and purpose—"to prove that their teaching was in accord" with the doctrinal standards of the various Reformed Confessions, or as he expresses it—"with all the neighbour Churches Christianly reformed"—"in all matters of chiefest importance and fundamental points of religion," tells us that the Articles are also "Reformed." I would like to observe in passing that these terms "Catholic" and "Reformed" are mutually inclusive rather than complementary characteristics. For we may boldly affirm that the Articles cannot be properly "Catholic" unless they are also "Reformed." I would also emphasize what I consider to be the most conspicuous evidence of their Catholicity—that is their constant and consistent appeal to the Bible as the sole Divine Rule of Faith. Not only is this truth plainly enunciated in Article VI, but in several other Articles there is a similar definite assertion or implication. For example, we are taught that "Creeds" are only to be believed because "they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." Even though it is definitely asserted that the Church "hath power to decree Rites and Ceremonies," its authority is to be entirely subordinate to that of "God's Word Written." Again the decrees of "General Councils" are also discredited unless they are "taken out of Holy Scripture"! The lawfulness of the Marriage of the Clergy, the unlawfulness of Praying in an unknown Tongue, the doctrine of Purgatory, Transubstantiation and the Worshipping of Images are, we find, all judged by the same supreme standard. In the imperfectly authorized Canons of 1571 a subordinate reference is made to the teaching which "the old Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops" have collected from the Scriptures. Now it is certain that the *one thing* "of the Faith" which these "Catholic Fathers" "collected from the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments"—that is what is called "the unanimous consent of the Fathers"—that which "has been believed *always, everywhere and by all*"—was the fact of the supreme authority of Holy Scripture as the ultimate Rule of Faith for the Church. So that our Articles in reasserting this Rule are conspicuously Catholic.

¹ *Hist. of Ch. of Eng.*, III, 520. ² *Letters and Memoirs*, p. 177 (1895).

I would like here to correct a false assertion which is frequently made—viz. that the Rule of Faith to which our Church appeals is “the Scriptures and the First Four General Councils,” or “the Scriptures and the Undivided Church.” I do not know of any foundation for these assertions from the authorized Formularies of our Church. On the other hand, everything goes to support the correctness of Cranmer’s statement, that “The Holy Scriptures ought to be to us both the rules and judges of all Christian doctrine.” It is true that the Act of Supremacy, 1559—an “Erastian” and not a “Church” authority, be it noted—empowered its Ecclesiastical Commissioners to judge “heresy” by the Scriptures and the First Four General Councils. But this clause of the Act was repealed in 1641 when the High Commission Court was abolished, and therefore this standard of reference is no longer in force.

But it has been objected that Article VI is ambiguous as to whether the “Church” or the individual is the proper interpreter of what is to be “read in” or “proved by” Holy Scripture. Some have even claimed that the language supports the well-known dictum “The Church to teach, the Bible to prove.” This point is, however, made quite clear by the language of the *Homilies*, and for once we can fully agree with Newman’s statement, in “Tract XC,” that the *Homilies* are “authoritative when they explain more fully the meaning of the Articles” (p. 71). Now the *Homilies* urge the humble Christian to search the Scriptures to discover the Truth. “We are to search diligently for the well of life in the books of the Old and New Testaments.” We are distinctly told that even “the humble man may search any truth boldly in the Scriptures without any danger of error.” If he be in doubt as to its meaning through “ignorance,” he is not directed to seek for an authoritative interpretation from the Church, but instead to read the Scriptures again for further enlightenment. He is exhorted “the more to read and search Holy Scripture to bring him out of ignorance.”¹ The Articles, in fact, assert the right of private judgment of the individual Christian with regard to the “rule of faith,” and in this liberty they are supported by the Prayer Book, or to be exact by the “Ordinal,” which exhorts the newly ordained presbyter to teach “nothing as required as of necessity to eternal salvation” but that which *he himself* “is persuaded can be concluded and proved by Scripture.”

But having emphasized this Catholic character of the Articles, especially in their appeal to Holy Scripture, a further question arises as to the *nature and extent of their authority*. Is it right to describe them as the basis of distinctive Anglican doctrine? And is their authority in our Church paramount, or only co-ordinate with or even subordinate to, other authorized Anglican formularies? This question leads me to refer to an official statement recently made by a Committee of Bishops and endorsed by a Resolution of the Lambeth Conference last year—a statement which I cannot but regard as both erroneous and seriously misleading, and which,

¹ *Homilies*, pp. 2 and 6 (1844).

coming from accredited leaders and teachers of our Church, must not be allowed to pass without challenge and contradiction. I refer to the statement made in Resolution 33 (c) that "the Conference records its acceptance of the statement of the Anglican Bishops contained in the *Résumé* of the discussions between the Patriarch of Alexandria with the other Orthodox Representatives and the Bishops of the Anglican Communion," "as a sufficient account of the *teaching and practice* of the Church of England." Now in this "*Résumé*," Clause 10 states that "the Anglican Bishops have declared that the Doctrine of the Anglican Church is authoritatively expressed in the Book of Common Prayer, and that the meaning of the 39 Articles *must be interpreted in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer*" (p. 139). This is really an amazing statement, and certainly unsupported by any historical or legal evidence. For a Manual of Devotion is one thing, but a Confession of Faith is quite another. It has been well said that "the primary aim of any liturgical formula is to assist the piety of the faithful, and not to afford a *touchstone of error*."¹ It is true that we may be able to gather the general standard of doctrine from the liturgical phraseology and from isolated expressions in the Prayer Book, but to get an authoritative statement of our Church's Faith we must go to the clearly defined and concise definitions of the Articles. The doctrine of the Church of England may be "contained" in the Book of Common Prayer, but it is clearly and unequivocally "set forth" in the Articles. This is the undoubted meaning of the wording of the "Declaration of Assent" to the Articles, required of every ordained Minister. He does not merely accept the doctrine therein "contained," but clearly "set forth" in the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Prayer Book. The "Set Forth," in the nature of the case, must refer specially, not so much to the statements of doctrine which may be gleaned or implied from certain Prayer Book services and prayers, as to the clear and orderly "setting forth" of Anglican authorized doctrine in the Articles. There is no doubt that it is the Articles and not the Prayer Book which have historically and traditionally been accepted as the recognized standard and expression of Anglican Reformed theology. As evidence of this we may cite the explanatory statement affixed to the Articles which stamps them as the authoritative source of Anglican belief, when it says that Convocation in 1562 drew them up "for the avoidance of diversities of opinion and for the establishing of consent touching true religion." Consequently Canon V of 1604 declares that anyone denouncing the Articles as "erroneous or superstitious" is *ipso facto* excommunicate. Moreover, Rogers in the title of his book not only calls their teaching "Catholic," but he declares them to be the (Catholic) *Doctrine of the Church of England*. In this connection it is not irrelevant to refer to the "Royal Declaration of 1628," drawn up with episcopal advice. This definitely states as a well-known and indisputable fact, that "the Articles of the Church of England do contain the true Doctrine

¹ Gasquet & Bishop, *Edward VI and Bk. of Common Prayer*, p. 184 (1891).

of the Church of England agreeable to God's Word," and the King "takes comfort" from the fact "that all clergymen have always most willingly subscribed the Articles established." There is no hint whatever that the teaching of these authorized Articles is subordinate to that contained in the Prayer Book. But although we may reassert their paramount doctrinal authority over all other Anglican formularies, we feel bound to add that we do not thereby admit that there is, in fact, any contradiction between the teaching of the Articles and the Prayer Book. On the contrary, we would endorse the assertion made in the Canons of 1571, which after declaring that the Articles "agree in all points" with "the heavenly doctrine contained in the sacred books of the Old and New Testaments," proceed to affirm that the "Prayer Book contains *nothing different* from that very doctrine."¹ Doubtless the language of the Prayer Book not being so precisely or theologically expressed as the exact statements of a definitely doctrinal formulary, can sometimes be explained or interpreted in a sense which does not accord with the explicit definitions of the Articles, but in such a case the Articles are undoubtedly the conclusive determining authority.

A word must also be added in this connection concerning the seriously disturbing suggestion made recently in the Report of the Commission of the Church Assembly on "Staffing of Parishes," where it is urged that "some relief would be given if assent to them (the Articles) was no longer required as a condition of ordination" (p. 59). It is quite likely that we could easily fill our parishes and pulpits with Unitarians and Romanists by such a simple device, but we should at one blow destroy the Reformed character of our Church and alter its historic distinctive doctrinal basis. History seems to be once again about to repeat itself, for a similar determined attempt was made in the eighteenth century by Archdeacon Blackburne's party in the "Feathers Tavern Petition" of 1772. It was then decisively rejected by Parliament, and I believe another attempt would meet with a like result to-day. A modern Edmund Burke would again tell such Petitioners, even if they were bishops, that "they want to be preferred clergymen of the Church of England as by law established, but their conscience will not allow them to conform to the doctrines and practices of that Church, i.e. they want to be teachers in a Church to which they do not belong and to receive the emoluments appropriated for teaching one set of doctrines while they are teaching another. This is an odd sort of hardship."² Are we, I wonder, to have a twentieth-century revival of a similar campaign?

In any case it would almost appear that many to-day have implicitly accepted the dictum of the famous Arian divine, Dr. Samuel Clarke, who in the early part of the eighteenth century declared that "every person may reasonably agree to forms imposed by Protestant communities whenever he can *in any sense*

¹ Cardwell, *Synodalia*, I, 127 (1842).

² Speech by Edmund Burke, *Parli'y Hist.*, Vol. XVII, 251-2 (1813).

at all reconcile them with Scripture " ¹ without regard as Waterland said then, " to their meaning and intention, either of the persons who first compiled them or who now impose them." Such a position is really an unwarrantable and illegitimate exercise of the Protestant claim to the right of private judgment. We have had a warning as to the practical consequences of Dr. Clarke's position in Newman's interpretation of the Articles as *not necessarily condemnatory of distinctive Roman doctrines*, an interpretation which to the ordinary and unsophisticated mind still appears a non-natural and dishonest attempt to " explain away " for personal or party interests teaching which is not really believed. We see no reason to call in question the censure of the Oxford Hebdomadal Board in 1841 on Tract XC, when it declared that " modes of interpretation, such as are suggested in the said Tract, evaded rather than explained the sense of the Articles, and reconciled subscription to them with the adoption of ' Roman Catholic ' errors which they were designed to counteract." ² Let me, however, make it quite clear that we do not claim either that the Articles are perfect or that their language could not occasionally be modernized with advantage, or their phraseology improved. But we are entirely convinced that the general body of doctrine " set forth " in them is not only " agreeable to the Word of God " but also as " necessary for these times " as for those of the sixteenth century. This is all that our modified " Declaration of Assent " demands, because we should not forget that prior to 1865 Assent had been exacted to " *all and every* the Articles." We are undoubtedly committed to the clear doctrinal statements concerning such great questions as the Scriptures, the Creeds, the Church, the Ministry and the Sacraments. But this " Declaration " does not bind us rigidly to minor statements concerning, for instance, a Christian's view of war or the " taking of oaths," since these are not in any proper or technical sense matters of doctrine.

I would therefore again emphasize the fact that the Articles form the basis of distinctively Anglican doctrine, and that their Evangelical Catholic teaching is not only Scriptural and primitive, but is also definitely in harmony with that of other Reformed Churches. They are, therefore, the basis of Anglican *Fellowship* as well as of doctrine, since they are careful to exclude none from brotherly communion who make the same Catholic appeal to the Scriptures as the supreme Rule of Faith, and who hold the Trinitarian faith of the Catholic Creeds. No rule is therefore enunciated in them for any essential form of Church polity or Order.

There is no question that the silence on this subject was deliberately designed, since at this very time our Reformers were living in closest fellowship with those Continental Reformers who, mainly through stress of circumstances, had discarded episcopacy. I have confined myself in this paper to the positive *doctrinal* basis of the Articles, but as regards the Basis of Anglican " *Fellowship*," it is impossible to deny the implied negative teaching of the Articles

¹ Waterland's *Works*, I, 35 (1843). ² Tract XC, pp. xiv. and xviii.

concerning, for example, corporate relations with the Church of Rome, or the Orthodox Eastern Church. For not only are several of our Articles framed as deliberate answers to the decrees of the Council of Trent, but "Fellowship" with a Church which is declared to have erred "in its living and manner of Ceremonies," or whose doctrines are described as "superstitious" and "repugnant" to the Word of God, is obviously not even contemplated.

We Evangelical Churchmen have thus in this Basis of Doctrine and Fellowship an unassailable historical birthright, and as long as it remains unchanged, as Bishop J. C. Ryle was fond of declaring, we also have an impregnable position in the Church. But should the Articles be seriously tampered with or Clerical "Assent" to them be waived, a most critical and precarious situation will at once be created which might easily result in disruption.

"THE NEW COMMANDMENT." By C. S. Phillips, D.D. 6s.
(S.P.C.K. 1930.)

The Church Historical Society has done wisely to reduce the price of one of its publications to a reasonable figure, without lowering its standard in printing, paper and binding, although the relegation of the footnotes to the end of the book hinders the reader's concentration. Dr. Phillips inquires into "the social precept and practice of the ancient Church." He writes easily, with the literary capacity of a writer to whom style is natural. Yet the work is lacking, particularly in the chapters dealing with the New Testament in synthesis. The author analyses his material well, but too many texts are quoted in full, and the first half of the book is somewhat dull. He does not appear to have obtained a complete view of the terrain before beginning the review. His narrative does not present the synthetic compactness so well maintained in the books of the late Sir Samuel Hill. So the reader has difficulty in memorizing the broken threads of his analysis. Yet there is merit in the book, especially in the account of social practice and principles under the Empire in Sub-Apostolic and early Patristic days. He is at his best when he breaks away from his texts and allows an obviously natural and trained historical instinct to express itself. He maintains throughout a calm, balanced and impartial critical faculty.

THE BASIS OF ANGLICAN DOCTRINE AND FELLOWSHIP IN RELATION TO THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH.

BY THE REV. F. S. CRAGG, M.A., Organizing Secretary, Evangelical Churchmen's Ordination Council, and late Secretary Palestine Mission (C.M.S.).

THE Eastern Orthodox Church occupies a position of the highest importance in Christendom. This is seen to be true even if that position is considered merely from a geographical point of view, for that Church is intimately concerned with and is challenged by two of the greatest and most aggressive of anti-Christian forces, Secularism and Islam. It is not surprising that at this particular stage in history the relations between British Christianity and the Christianity of the Near East should have come under review. Secularism, which is threatening the moral foundations of our own civilization, has assumed its most militant and revolutionary form in Russia, the largest of all Orthodox countries. The witness of the Christian Church in Russia, faced by the cruellest opposition, is of vital concern to the Church in Britain. Islam, the religion of nearly 100 millions of subjects of the British Crown and of many peoples for whom Great Britain has assumed a special responsibility, is the next-door neighbour as well as the ancient foe of all the Orthodox Churches in the Near East. It is not too much to say that the behaviour of the Christian Church in the Near East, the very heart of Islam, will have a far-reaching effect upon the future well-being not only of Palestine, Iraq, and Egypt, but also upon the Moslems of India, the Soudan and Tropical Africa. The Christian Church in Great Britain cannot but be concerned that the Christian witness in the Near East shall be real and effective. Evangelicals, too, will feel that they have a special concern, in that hitherto the burden of the evangelization of the Moslem world has been laid almost entirely upon the shoulders of Evangelical Christians, and not least upon the Evangelicals of the Church of England.

We approach, therefore, the consideration of our Fellowship with the Orthodox Church with a deep sense of our responsibility. We realize what a tremendous power for Christian evangelism the Orthodox Church may become. We sympathize deeply with the peoples and churches who have endured for centuries the yoke of Turkish oppression, and particularly do we sympathize with our fellow-Christians in Russia who are enduring perhaps an even more grievous yoke to-day. We should be lacking in Christian charity and deaf to the clear call of God if we did not desire to extend the right hand of fellowship to the Eastern Churches. We must help them if it lies within our power, that they may enjoy

a new freedom of spiritual life, a new sense of God's call to them and a new fellowship in service with other Christian Churches. It would be a mighty achievement in the extension of the Kingdom of God if we could secure in the Holy Land and throughout the Near East a united Christian witness.

These considerations form the essential background in any steps which are taken to establish any form of unity between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches. Apparently reunion has entered the realm of practical politics. The last Lambeth *Encyclical* says that

"a most important delegation from the Orthodox Churches of the East arranged by the Œcumenical patriarchs and headed by the Patriarch of Alexandria visited our Conference. Another delegation headed by the Archbishop of Utrecht represented the Old Catholics. Both of these delegations came to tell us that they desire definite and practical steps to be taken for the restoration of Communion between their Churches and ourselves. This is a notable advance crowning a long period of increasing friendliness. The Conference had asked the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a commission of theologians to confer with similar commissions if appointed by the authorities of the Orthodox and Old Catholics, and it is hoped that these commissions can find such a unity of faith and such a similarity in practice to exist between the Churches that restoration of communion may become possible as soon as the Assemblies of the various Churches can meet."¹

It will be noticed from this that the problem has now become mainly one of theology. The Orthodox have made it very clear that the prior condition of inter-communion must be "dogmatic union." And already much has been done to justify the hope of the *Encyclical* that dogmatic union will be achieved. The question has been before the Orthodox Churches for many years. It was raised as a question of real urgency by the spiritual needs of Orthodox Churchmen in America and the Dominions, who wished to receive Communion in Anglican Churches, in places where there was no provision of an Orthodox Ministry. While such communions had been permitted in many places, no general permission was possible until the Orthodox Church in General Synod had satisfied itself as to the validity of Anglican Orders. At the request of the Great Church of Constantinople, Professor Androustos proceeded in 1902 to investigate the validity of Anglican Orders. His report may be regarded as the basis of later investigations. In it he stated his satisfaction as to the "visible part" in Anglican Ordinations, including the "historic sanction" and "formulæ of consecration," but was not completely satisfied in regard to the "invisible part," which concerned the "purpose to make a priest" in the Orthodox Catholic sense. The stumbling-block in his view consisted in the XXXIX Articles, and also in certain ambiguities in the Prayer Book. Canon Douglas, in his very illuminating book on the *Relations of the Anglican Church with the Eastern Orthodox*, states that the result of his investigations was so satisfactory that if a declaration upon certain points could be made, not necessarily by the authorities of the Anglican Church but by a large section of the Anglican Church, e.g. the High Church, then the Orthodox

¹ Report of Lambeth Conference, p. 25.

Churches would be justified in accepting as authoritative the Orders of an Anglican priest who wished to be received into Orthodoxy. The position is made so clear by Professor Androutsos that his own words should be carefully studied.

"In particular, the High Church (party) will solve the question of its priesthood by defining, wisely and truly, what faith it holds as of primary importance, and by defining what doctrine it holds in the dogmas which are bound up with the priesthood and which are shown in its divinely bestowed character and in its excellent power, that is to say:

"1. As regards the Sacraments. Does it receive the Seven Sacraments ?

"2. As regards Confession. Does it take Confession as a necessary condition for the remission of sins; and the priestly absolving of sins as included in the authority given to it by the Lord ?

"3. As regards the Eucharist. How does it accept the Real Presence of the Lord ? And what is the character of the Unbloody Sacrifice ?

"4. As regards the Œcumenical Councils. Will it receive these Councils as infallible organs of the true Church the declarations of which bind *eo ipso* every particular Church and accept them always as the true faith ?

"If the High Church (party) define these dogmas correctly and lay down the rest of its doctrines in an orthodox manner, all doubt would be taken away as to the succession of English ordinations, and at the same time solid foundations would be laid for a rapprochement and for a true union with the Eastern Church—a work well pleasing to God and one of blessing from every point of view."¹

Incidentally it is interesting and historically important to observe the place which the High Church occupied in the thinking of the Orthodox. They still believe that essential Anglicanism is represented by the Anglo-Catholics. Even so recently as 1929 Archbishop Germanos wrote that he had quieted the misgivings of a fellow-Orthodox by pointing to the steady progress which had been made inside the Anglican Church towards Catholic ideas. "Why should we not," he said, "think that the time is coming when the Catholic nucleus which always existed in the Anglican Church should not prevail over the whole body?"² When this tendency is taken into account the "Declaration of Faith," which was presented to the Patriarch of Constantinople in 1922 and signed by 3,715 members of the English Church Union, assumes a very real importance. This statement was intended to satisfy the doubts of the Orthodox on various questions which Professor Androutsos had raised. It accepted the Œcumenical Councils, the seven Sacraments and the Catholic theory of Apostolic Succession. It stated that there has been conferred upon Anglican priests the Sacrament of the Order with the purpose that they

"should (a) preach and teach the Word of God; (b) offer the unbloody sacrifice of the Eucharist for both the living and the departed; (c) sacramentally absolve sinners who repent and confess their sins; and (d) otherwise minister to the called of Christ according to the ancient faith and practice of the Universal Church."³

This statement further proceeded:

"We affirm that by consecration in the Eucharist, the bread and wine being

¹ *Relations of the Anglican Church with the Eastern Orthodox*, pp. 14-15.

² *Christian East*, 1929, p. 30. ³ Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity*, p. 92.

blessed by the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit, are changed and become the true Body and true Blood of Christ and as such are given to and received by the faithful. We hold therefore that Christ thus present is to be adored."¹

The statement also gave satisfaction in regard both to the honour to be paid to the Saints and to the use of sacred images, and counted "the XXXIX Articles of Religion as a document of secondary importance concerned with local controversies of the sixteenth century." This Declaration of the English Church Union would have relatively little importance but for the fact that the Orthodox leaders had been encouraged to believe that genuine Anglicanism and Anglo-Catholicism were synonymous terms, and that this view would appear to have received support rather than otherwise by their consultations with Anglican bishops at the Lambeth Conferences in 1920 and 1930. An official delegation of Orthodox attended the Lambeth Conference for the first time in 1920. Archbishop Germanos, in writing of the meeting of this delegation with the bishops' committee, stated that "the patriarchal delegation insisted upon the Anglicans recognizing the Holy Eucharist as being of a sacrificial character and the introduction of the Epiclesis of the Holy Spirit as necessary for the change in the Holy elements." The delegation remained satisfied because the Anglicans accepted the decision relating to ikons of the Seventh Council. The delegation mentions the impression created by the declaration made by the Anglicans that "prayers for the dead are now in use by the Anglican Church and their use is becoming more general by the permission of the Bishops."² The delegation on its return presented a careful report and one of its number, Professor Comnenos, was requested by the Patriarch of Constantinople to investigate afresh the validity of Anglican Orders. His investigation was so favourable that in 1922 the Great Church of Constantinople officially declared its opinion that Anglican Orders were valid. This was followed by similar declarations by the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Cyprus. Apparently they had received satisfaction in regard to the points raised by Professor Androustos twenty years before. No doubt the E.C.U. "Declaration," issued a few months earlier, had been of real assistance. In particular, the place of the XXXIX Articles in Anglicanism had been settled. The delegation reported the Chairman of the Anglican bishops as stating that the XXXIX Articles "were written to suit the sixteenth century, for the confuting of heresies. Many of them are already obsolete."³

Professor Comnenos, in his report which led to the declaration of the validity of Anglican Orders, wrote as follows:

"It must not be forgotten that a very secondary authority is assigned to the XXXIX Articles, which in their details are not binding upon the clergy themselves, are designated as Articles of Religion and not of Faith, to-day have chiefly an historic value, are being abandoned every day by this or other of the Episcopal Churches, and being formally retained almost only in England because of their former political importance."⁴

¹ Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity*, p. 92. ² *Christian East*, 1929, p. 25.

³ Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity*, p. 66. ⁴ *Christian East*, Vol. II, p. 110.

The situation is very plain. Abolish the XXXIX Articles; interpret the Book of Common Prayer according to Anglo-Catholicism, and the result is an Anglicism which is able to enter into dogmatic union with Orthodoxy. But the place where officials of the Established Church of England should endeavour to abolish the XXXIX Articles, which after all have their authority from the Crown of England, is in the councils of this realm and not in official committees with the Churches of other lands. To say the least, it is most unfair to the other Churches.

The report of the later delegation to the Lambeth Conference of 1930 brought forth a similar declaration as to the validity of Anglican Orders from the Patriarch of Alexandria. Very shortly there is to be a Synod of all the Orthodox Churches. Its declaration as to Anglican Orders will no doubt be forthcoming and intercommunion will be possible. But it will not be Union. There is far too much misconception and misrepresentation, however unintentional they may be, in the making of this reunion movement. Unity must have stronger links than these.

It is of very real importance that the whole Anglican Church should examine the Report of the Archbishops' Commission when it appears. In the meantime a document which appeared in the Lambeth Conference Report and is called a *Résumé* of the Discussions between the Delegation of the Orthodox Church and Bishops of the Anglican Communion at Lambeth, 1930, is worthy of close study. A few examples of statements which it contains will suffice to reveal its importance, especially if they are read in the light of Orthodox teaching.

(1) The *Résumé* contains the statement by the Anglican Bishops that "in ordination a special charisma is given to the person ordained." Dositheus, the author of one of the five books received as symbolic throughout all Orthodox Churches, describes their doctrine of Orders as follows: "Episcopacy is so necessary that if that were taken away there would be neither Church nor Christian. Episcopacy seems to us as necessary to the Church as breath to a man or the sun to the world."¹ A later theologian of high rank contends that "Priesthood is a sacrament in which the Bishop lays his hands upon him who is chosen, invokes upon him the Divine Grace and *imparts* to him the grace of Priesthood."² It is difficult to read these statements without coming to the conclusion that, in other words, (a) Episcopacy is of the "esse" of the Church, and (b) a grace which is inherent in the Apostolic Succession is transmitted from bishop to priest through the laying-on of hands: this is the theory which in Orthodox eyes underlies the statement of the Anglican Bishops. This is not Anglican theory. It is contrary to historical evidence and it is a theory which was held by no leading Anglican theologian before the days of the Tractarians. It would rule out completely any possibility of reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches.

¹ Quoted in *The Relations of the Anglican Church with the Eastern Orthodox*, p. 150.

² *Ibid.*, p. 152.

(2) A second statement of the Anglican Bishops in this *Résumé* is to the effect that "after Communion the sacred elements remaining are regarded sacramentally as the Body and Blood of Christ." This statement means that the bread and wine after consecration are not simply bread and wine but have been changed, and was regarded by the Orthodox as satisfactory from their point of view. There is no ambiguity in their view as to what this change means.

"At these words" (referring to the Epiclesis), "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 the sight. . . . This Holy Mystery is also offered as a sacrifice for all Orthodox Christians as well living as those who sleep."¹

Or take Dositheus :

"In the celebration of the sacrament we believe Our Lord Jesus Christ to be present not typically or figuratively nor by a greater degree of grace than in other sacraments nor by a bare presence . . . nor by conjunction whereby the Divinity is substantially united to the bread as the Lutherans foolishly and wretchedly suppose, but truly and really that the bread and wine after consecration are changed, transubstantiated, transformed, the bread into the true Body of Our Lord which was born in Bethlehem of the true Virgin, the wine also is changed and transubstantiated into the very Blood of Our Lord which as He hung on the Cross flowed from His Side for the life of the World. We believe that the substance of bread and wine remains no longer but the very Body and Blood of the Lord in the form and figures of bread and wine."²

Theologians are able to do wonderful things with words, but it will be difficult to persuade any ordinary person that either the official teaching or practice of the Orthodox Church does not imply a material change in the elements. But the surprising fact is that the Orthodox now believe that Anglican teaching is the same as theirs.

(3) It was further stated by the Orthodox Delegation that the explanation of Anglican doctrine . . . made with regard to the Eucharistic sacrifice was agreeable to Orthodox doctrine. Professor Androutsos declared that one of the points upon which satisfaction would be required was as to the offering of the "unbloody sacrifice for the living and the dead." The Synod of Alexandria declared after the Lambeth Conference that it accepted Anglican Orders because in these declarations endorsed by the Lambeth Conference "complete and satisfying assurance is found as to the Apostolic Succession, as to the real reception of the Lord's Body and Blood, as to the Eucharist being 'thusia nilasteria.'" There is a reluctance to translate these words. They either mean "propitiatory sacrifice" or else the bishops have committed the Church to something which cannot be translated into English. But the Orthodox teaching is clear enough. Mogila says: "This Holy Mystery is also offered as a sacrifice for all Orthodox Christians as well living as those who sleep";³ or Bulgariis: "The end of the Holy Liturgy is that the Lamb of God may be offered as a sacrifice for the sins of the world."⁴

(4) The *Résumé* also states that in the Eucharistic prayer the

¹ *The Relations of the Anglican Church with the Eastern Orthodox*, p. 143.

² *Ibid.*, p. 143.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

Anglican Church prays for the "faithful departed." In the "Terms of Inter-communion," a document drawn up in 1921 by the Eastern Churches committee, of which this *Résumé* speaks with approval, agreement was expressed with the decision of the Seventh Council about the use of ikons. It is possible to interpret the Seventh Council in such a way that an ikon will mean no more than will a sacred picture in the National Gallery to a reverent observer. But in fact "Saints" and "Ikons" have led to much superstition in the East just as they did in mediæval England. One picture will suffice of peasants in Roumania as described by Dr. Kidd in his *History of Eastern Christendom*:

"God is to them a very shadowy conception; Jesus Christ is worshipped rather from a distance, but they feel at home with their Saints; Saints Nicholas and Dmitri, Basil and Gregori, and especially the Holy Virgin. They burn candles before their shrines, pray to them in distress, take the clothes of the sick to the Holy images to be blessed by the priests, and they scrupulously keep the feasts of the saints."¹

This is a characteristic picture, and it is this picture which has, at any rate to the reverent Moslem mind, been the greatest offence in Christianity. It has locked the doors of Christendom against Islam. The warning contained in the words of the Rev. W. W. Cash still holds good

"Islam in proclaiming the unity and greatness of God was putting forth an idea that grew in the minds of men into a profound conviction. The simplicity of it appealed to them as an immense relief from the complexity of mediæval Christian teaching with its priestly offices, saint worship and its labyrinth of theological difficulties."²

It is no wonder that the XXXIX Articles have been ruled out of consideration. Every one of these statements on the part of Bishops at Lambeth, interpreted by Orthodox teaching, are contrary to the XXXIX Articles as they were understood at the Reformation and after the Reformation by all Anglicanism with the exception of the Anglo-Catholics. In 1920 the Bishops stated that many of these articles were obsolete. In 1930 they declared "that the doctrine of the Anglican Church is authoritatively expressed in the Book of Common Prayer and that the meaning of the XXXIX Articles must be interpreted in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer." It would naturally be presumed that the particular articles which refer to Orders and the Sacraments and to the Councils are among those which are now obsolete, or are so to be interpreted. It may be true that there are certain articles which had special reference to difficulties in the sixteenth century and which are now chiefly of historic interest; but the articles to which the Orthodox take exception are not among them. These particular articles state principles of Anglican faith and practice, which are equally true, or false, both in the sixteenth and the twentieth centuries. They are not final, absolute and infallible statements of doctrinal truth, but they are the truest expression which we possess of the mind of the Anglican Church in regard to the matters with

¹ P. 350.

² *Expansion of Islam*, p. 271.

which they deal. They cannot be summarily dismissed as matters of secondary importance unless the Anglican Church is prepared to confess that in doctrinal matters it has no mind at all. It is interesting to notice how different is the attitude of the Orthodox to their own traditions, and also to observe the principle underlying dogmatic union with the Orthodox which raises perhaps the greatest difficulty of all. The Orthodox have made it perfectly clear that complete dogmatic agreement is essential for Reunion. "Where the totality of the faith is absent there can be no 'communio in sacris.'" This was the declaration of the Orthodox delegation at Lausanne. Archbishop Germanos explains :

"Faith and the exposition of Faith are so closely allied that only when one accepts the true theological exposition of the Faith is one in touch with the truth of the Faith. The fundamental basis of Faith for the Orthodox is the content of the Divine Revelation as it survives in the Holy Gospel and in the Apostolic traditions and as expressed in the Seven Œcumenical Synods and believed in the first eight centuries of the undivided Church."¹

And Canon Douglas declares that

"in postulating full dogmatic agreement as an essential basis of Reunion, the Orthodox are constrained to look for essential identity with their traditional faith as to the Church, the Ministry, the Eucharist and so on, as expressed in the writings of their theologians, their Liturgy and in their practice."²

The sole question in any "dogmatic" approach to the Orthodox is as to whether the Anglican faith is identically the same as the faith of the Seven Councils and of the first eight centuries. That faith cannot be questioned. It is incontrovertible. Consider this position in the light of the Articles. Article 6 states that

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation ; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

Article 21 on the authority of General Councils contains the following words :

"And when they be gathered together, (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God,) they may err and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of the Holy Scripture."

Are these Articles merely of historic interest? Are they not rather the expression of the very principles which secure the spiritual freedom of the English Church? And they represent a mentality which is fundamentally different from that of the Orthodox.

Much space has necessarily been devoted to the consideration of "dogmatic union" because that is the immediate issue. But it is never the most important issue in the achievement of Christian fellowship. Living unity between Churches will come neither from the agreements of theologians nor ecclesiastical formulæ, but from a new sense of a common purpose in the extension of the Kingdom of God. The body of Christ is living, organic, active. It is by

¹ *Christian East*, 1928, p. 14. ² *Christian East*, 1930, Summer Number.

co-ordination of its members in the pursuance of some definite Christ-purposed action that Unity in a living body will be revealed. It is my own conviction that the line of obedience to God's call for Christian witness in Moslem lands is far more hopeful of ultimate reunion than any other. Neither its importance nor its difficulty can be exaggerated. Nothing less than a spiritual awakening throughout the whole Church of England will enable us to obey the call of God. I do not think it is presumptuous to assert that the same need is equally evident in Orthodoxy. The following are the words of a devoted and scholarly Eastern churchman :

" Really the conflict in the Near East has not been between Christianity and Islam as pure religions ; . . . It has been a nationalistic struggle with a mixture of religious fanaticism. There has not yet been started a purely spiritual campaign in these Moslem lands to influence Islam for good."¹

At the present time it must be confessed that there are few signs that the Eastern Churches are alive to the great missionary challenge of Islam. One's own personal experience entirely bears out the opinion of Bishop McInnes, who speaks with very real sympathy and after a long residence in the Near East.

" Not merely have they," referring to the Eastern Church, " lost their old missionary zeal, but they regard the notion of the conversion of Moslems with actual abhorrence. Too often any reference to the call to missionary effort and to any responsibility to try to win the Moslems arouses in them obvious astonishment ; they would argue that such people are beyond the pale. We may not degrade our holy things by giving them to the dogs ! " ²

By all means let us welcome discussion between the theologians of both Churches in order that we may the better understand each other's point of view. Although in this connection we feel that the Committee appointed by the Archbishop to consult with Orthodox theologians would be more useful if it were more representative of Anglicanism.

Let us welcome every opportunity to place at the disposal of the Orthodox Churches any experience which we may have gained that will enable them to grapple with their difficult educational and social problems. There is, for example, a unique opportunity in Palestine to serve the Orthodox in the region of Christian education. Above all let us Evangelicals see to it that our missionary witness in the Near East is as worthy of the occasion and the need as lies within our power. It is a not insignificant fact that it is Protestant missions which at present occupy the Moslem field. It is they alone which have made any impression on the Moslem mind. The Church Missionary Society has played a great part in the difficult " sowing " years of the past century. That Society is called upon to play an even greater part in the years to come. Opportunities loom large to-day for which our fathers prayed. In seizing these opportunities there will be achieved the greatest possible service to the Ancient Churches of the East. The inspiration which proceeds from a common sacrifice will bring not only life to these Churches and to our own, but also, we pray, a unity born of a living experience of fellowship in the service of our Lord Jesus Christ.

¹ *Levonian Moslem Mentality*, p. 153. ² *Moslem World To-day*, p. 273.

IN RELATION TO THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCHES.

BY THE REV. W. H. MACKEAN, D.D., Canon of Rochester.

THE Old Catholic Movement came into being because a number of Roman Catholic priests, including some of high distinction, who refused in 1870 to accept the new dogma of Papal Infallibility, eventually found themselves excommunicated. It began in Germany and Switzerland, where self-governing Churches gradually grew up ; it was joined by the famous Church of Utrecht in Holland, that had long been independent of the Papacy ; and from Utrecht it derived its episcopal succession. In 1889 these Old Catholic Churches were consolidated by a statement of faith, known as the Declaration of Utrecht, which was the result of a conference of their five bishops and chief theologians ; and the bishops undertook not to consecrate anyone to the episcopal office without the consent of the whole episcopate. The Old Catholic Church has now been in existence for nearly sixty years. In Holland the number of its members, though small, has steadily grown ; in Germany and Switzerland it has declined ; but on the other hand the movement has spread to other countries—to the Poles in U.S.A. and Poland, to Austria, Czechoslovakia, Croatia, together with a congregation in Paris. It has altogether thirteen bishops ; and omitting the Polish Church in America and Poland, whose numbers are uncertain, there are about 142,000 Old Catholics. It has appealed chiefly to the educated ; it has never won the enthusiasm of the masses ; and its early hopes have not been fulfilled. Holland is more conservative than Germany or Switzerland, and the country districts of the two latter countries are more conservative than the towns. The services are in the vernacular. There are no weekday services except on a few festivals, and the churches are kept closed. In appearance they are more subdued than Roman Catholic churches ; but they contain various images and pictures, sometimes two side-altars and confessional boxes. The organ and choir are in a gallery at the west end. The consecrated bread is reserved in either an aumbry or a tabernacle. The Mass Vestments are worn. The services at the chief Church in Utrecht, on the Sunday I was there, were Holy Communion at 8, High Mass with Sermon and Benediction at 10, Vespers and Benediction at 6.30. But in many churches of Germany and Switzerland a service is not provided on every Sunday of the month. The only service at Berne, on the Sunday I was present, was High Mass with Sermon at 9.30 ; yet even so, there were no communicants, as there were none at the High Mass in Utrecht. About a hundred people attended the latter, and sixty at Berne, excluding the choirs. Men sat on one side of the Nave, women on the other. A bell was rung at the consecration of both the bread and the wine ; and there

was much genuflecting afterwards by the priest and his attendants. The Filioque clause in the Creed is, I believe, generally omitted; but it appears in the German and is optional in the French Prayer-book. At Baptism salt and chrism are used, and the child is given a lighted candle to hold for a few seconds, but the service struck me as simple and informal. Chrism is also administered at Confirmation. Holy water is used, and incense on certain occasions. Private confession to a priest is not compulsory. Indulgences are abolished. The clergy are free to marry.

There is much in the Declaration of Utrecht with which we are in agreement; but is there anything implied in it which is contrary to the position of the Church of England? I will begin with section 5, which states, "We refuse to accept the decrees of the Council of Trent in matters of discipline, and as for the dogmatic decisions of that Council we accept them only so far as they are in harmony with the teaching of the primitive Church." Nevertheless there are various doctrines, and practices in which doctrine is involved, which the Old Catholics have retained. One of my authorities is a Catechism in French (*Catéchisme Catholique, Historique et Dogmatique*), which bears the approval of the Archbishop of Utrecht, who wrote that he found nothing in it which did not conform to the doctrine of the Catholic Church; it is dated 1905, and is on sale at the Old Catholic Church in Paris.

Take first the Sacraments. It states (pp. 88, 55) that the Sacraments were instituted by Jesus Christ, that they are seven in number, but that Protestants admit only two. This is in accordance with the Council of Trent, the number of Sacraments having been fixed at seven in the twelfth century. There are two main differences between us: (1) One of these so-called Sacraments, Extreme Unction, has been entirely abandoned by the Church of England, and is described in the 25th Article as "having grown . . . of the corrupt following of the Apostles," for the practice mentioned in the Epistle of James was a medical remedy, intended for the purpose of recovery, whereas Extreme Unction is a rite, as the French Catechism (p. 98) explains, for the dying or those dangerously ill. (2) Rome and the Old Catholics say that the Sacraments are neither more nor less than seven and that they were instituted by Jesus Christ. The Church of England does not allow that they were all so instituted (Article 25), but (in that Article and the Catechism) limits the word to two rites ordained by Christ Himself, containing both an outward sign and an inward grace. Moreover, if this definition is not accepted, and Sacraments are regarded simply as sacred rites, there is no reason for limiting the number to seven. Archbishop Bramhall, a distinguished member of the Laudian School of thought, expressed the mind of the Church of England, when he wrote that it denied "the septenary number of the sacraments" (*Works*, i. 55; ii. 634).

Further it is the practice of the Old Catholic Churches of Holland and Germany, and of country districts in Switzerland, to administer the Communion in one kind. But it is possible for a com-

municant to receive in both kinds, though the Lambeth Report, in its account of the Archbishop of Utrecht's statement, does not add that in Holland special permission must be obtained from the Bishop. This custom, opposed to Scripture and rejected in Article 30, did not grow up in the Western Church before the twelfth century, and was based upon the medieval doctrine of Concomitance that Christ is received in His entirety under either species. This doctrine, which Archbishop Laud called "the fiction of Thomas of Aquin" (*Works*, ii, 338), was accepted by the Council of Trent and is approved by the French Catechism (p. 94) and Prayer Book (*Abregé de Liturgie Catholique à l'usage de l'Eglise des Anciens Catholiques de Paris*, p. 144).

The invocation of saints is also adopted by the Old Catholics. The Catechism, to which I have referred, states (p. 55) that the rejection of invocation is a feature of Protestantism, and says (p. 132) that those who are ordinarily invoked are the Holy Virgin, the Guardian Angels and the patron saints. The Salutation of Mary, which occurs several times in the course of this little book, ends as follows: "Saint Mary, Mother of God, pray for us, poor sinners, now and at the hour of our death"; and in the Litany of the Holy Virgin (pp. 164 ff.) the request "pray for us" is repeated many times. Likewise in the French Prayer Book (pp. 1, 164 ff., 177 f.) there is invocation of Mary and other saints. The practice of invocation is uncatholic: there is no evidence in Scripture that the saints are even cognizant of our prayers, and invocation was not countenanced until the latter part of the fourth century. The mind of the Church of England is clear. In the 1549 Prayer Book all invocations of saints were deleted, it is condemned in the Homily "Concerning Prayer" (part ii), and Article 22 states: "The Romish doctrine . . . concerning invocation of saints is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."

Next, the Council of Trent commanded that images be retained and that due honour and veneration be paid to them. That is also the official attitude of the Old Catholics, whatever their practice may be. For in recognizing the Œcumenical Councils of the first thousand years, they accept the seventh, the Second Council of Nicaea, which was held in 787. (See also French Catechism, p. 45 ff.) It directed that images be set up and "treated as holy memorials, worshipped, kissed, only without that peculiar adoration (*λατρεία*) which is reserved for the Invisible, Incomprehensible God." The use of images was strictly avoided in the early Church, and their veneration was unknown for several centuries. Our Church has no doubt upon the matter. It is opposed to Holy Scripture, for the second Commandment forbids worship in any form being offered to images; they were swept away at the Reformation; all image-worshipping is strongly condemned in the Homily "Against peril of idolatry"; the Church of England has never recognized the Seventh Œcumenical Council; and Article 22 describes the Romish doctrine concerning "Worshipping

and Adoration . . . of images" in the same terms as it does the invocation of saints. It has, however, been disputed whether the term "Romish" in this article refers to official Roman teaching or merely to extreme medievalism. After a careful examination, Bishop John Wordsworth (*The Invocation of Saints and the Twenty-second Article*, 2nd edit.) showed that it signified the former. But while Dr. Bicknell, Dr. Gibson and Dr. Kidd do not accept this interpretation in their books on the Articles, they do not claim that there is any solid ground for believing that our prayers can reach the saints, nor do they support the worship of images.

Let us now turn to section 6 of the Declaration of Utrecht, which says: "We maintain with perfect fidelity the ancient Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, by believing that we receive the Body and the Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ under the species of bread and wine." This is ambiguous, for (1) though the expression "under the forms of bread and wine" is associated with Roman doctrine, it was very exceptionally used by some who strongly held Reformed doctrine (N. Dimock, *Euch. Presence*, p. 148 ff.); and (2) it is possible to draw a distinction between "receive" and "present" under the forms of bread and wine; for it can be maintained that many things, which are not present, are received under the form of documents, and that to receive one thing under the form of another implies the absence rather than the presence of the thing received. But the point is in what sense do the Old Catholic Churches understand it. There is no doubt that according to their faith the Body and Blood of Christ are really present under the species of bread and wine. That belief is stated in the French Catechism (p. 133), and it underlies the service of Benediction which is prevalent in Holland and the country districts of Germany and Switzerland. It is also implied by the observance of Corpus Christi Day, which under its German name Fronleichnam appears in the *Alt-katholischer Kalender* for 1931, and is one of the few days, other than Sundays, to have a special Epistle and Gospel. Further, Old Catholics regard the belief in the real presence under the species of bread and wine as of great importance, so much so that if a member of the Church of England wished to receive the Holy Communion in Holland, he would be asked whether he held this doctrine. That is what the Lambeth Report, in its account of the Archbishop of Utrecht's statement (p. 141) means when it says: "The Old Catholic Church is prepared to give Communion to Anglicans provided that they give notice to the priest beforehand and *satisfy him as to their orthodoxy as loyal members of the Anglican Church.*" [*The italics are mine.*]

But the belief in a presence of our Lord in or under the species of bread and wine by virtue of consecration is not the teaching of the Prayer Book or Articles. It was definitely repudiated by Archbishop Cranmer on behalf of the Church of England in these notable words to Gardiner:

"As concerning the form of doctrine used in this Church of

England in the Holy Communion, that the Body and Blood of Christ be under the forms of bread and wine, when you shall show the place where this form of words is expressed, then shall you purge yourself of that, which in the meantime I take to be a plain untruth" (*Cranmer on Lord's Supper*, p. 53).

Hooker made the well-known statement: "The real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament." This Old Catholic doctrine is opposed also to the teaching of the Caroline divines, for when Cardinal Perron referred to a real presence under or in the sacramental species, Bishop Andrewes, who held high sacramental views, replied: "The terms of *sous les espèces* or *dans les espèces sacramentales*, it would pose the Cardinal and all the whole College to find they were ever heard or dreamt of in S. Augustine's time, or many hundred years after" (*Minor Works*, p. 14). Nor again was it the teaching, as Bishop Gore agrees (*The Body of Christ*, p. 50 ff.), of Waterland in his famous book.

Then as regards the service of Benediction, is it not a mode of worship which the Church of England is determined not to allow even within its wide limits? Likewise the observance of Corpus Christi Day, dating only from the thirteenth century and intended to popularize the doctrine of Transubstantiation, takes us into a thoroughly medieval atmosphere. It was omitted deliberately in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI and has never since found a place in our Prayer Book.

The Declaration of Utrecht in the same section proceeds to the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion: "It is the act, by which we represent upon earth and appropriate to ourselves the one offering which Jesus Christ makes in heaven . . . for the salvation of redeemed humanity, by appearing for us in the presence of God." But the theory that Christ is continually offering Himself in heaven or pleading His sacrifice rests upon an unsound interpretation of Hebrews ix. 11, 12, 24 (*Wescott, Hebrews*, p. 230), and is unknown to the Book of Common Prayer and the Articles; and the other theory that the object of the Holy Communion is to represent the same offering on earth is also absent from the Prayer Book and Articles: in them, as in the New Testament, the Holy Communion is associated with the death of Christ, not with His life in Heaven, and the Communion Service, following the New Testament, knows only three sacrifices, of ourselves (Rom. xii. 1), our gifts (Heb. xiii. 16) and our praises and thanksgivings (Heb. xiii. 15).

Having considered sections 5 and 6, we are in a better position to understand section 1 of the Utrecht Declaration, which accepts the Vincentian definition—that is truly and properly Catholic, which has been believed everywhere, always and by all. "For this reason," it goes on to say, "we persevere in professing the faith of the primitive Church, as formulated in the Oecumenical symbols and specified precisely by the unanimously accepted decisions of the Oecumenical Councils held in the undivided Church of the first thousand years." But it is clear from the examination

of sections 5 and 6, that the Old Catholic Churches do not interpret the Vincentian definition of Catholicity, so as to give adequate value to what has been believed *always*. Holy Scripture is one source of their faith, but they also find in later tradition the source, e.g., of (a) the doctrine of the Holy Communion that results in Communion in one kind, the service of Benediction and the observance of Corpus Christi Day, (b) the doctrine of the seven sacraments, especially "the corrupt following of the Apostles" in Extreme Unction, (c) the doctrine underlying the invocation of saints, (d) their approval of image-worship that is directly opposed to Scripture. On the other hand, the position of the Church of England is laid down again and again in the Articles (6, 8, 20, 21, 34). It will not allow any necessary doctrine to be based simply on the traditions of the Church apart from Holy Scripture, nor does it countenance rites and ceremonies which are opposed to Scripture. The chief test of Catholicity lies in essential agreement with Holy Scripture.

Such is the Declaration of Utrecht. In it there is, we are glad to acknowledge, a Protestant element; but unfortunately it includes also important differences of belief and of practices, in which doctrine is involved, between the Old Catholic Churches and the Church of England. And yet in a memorandum in the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Faith and Order, dated February, 1930, the writer says (p. 147): "It is so entirely in accordance with the teaching and spirit of the Prayer Book that it is difficult to see how any one loyal to that teaching and that spirit could refuse to accept it." Further, even the Lambeth Conference of 1930 in Resolution 35(c) makes the inexplicable statement: "*The Conference agrees that there is nothing in the Declaration of Utrecht inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of England.*" This is a matter of no mere academic interest, we are dealing with one of practical importance, for the Encyclical Letter (pp. 25 ff.) says: "The Conference has asked the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint Commissions of theologians to confer with similar Commissions, if appointed by the authorities of the Orthodox and of the Old Catholics, and it is hoped that these Commissions may find such a unity in faith and such a similarity in practice to exist between the Churches, that restoration of communion would become possible as soon as the appropriate assemblies of the various Churches can meet." And further, it was stated in the Report of the Committee (p. 142) "that there was to be a Synod of the Old Catholic Church held in Vienna in September, 1931, that the question of the relations with the Orthodox Church and the Anglican Church would be discussed, and that it was hoped that a very close union between all three might be the result of that Conference. The hope was expressed that the Delegations from both the Orthodox Church and the Anglican Church would attend."

I come now to the subject of Reunion. In the first place, what is the Old Catholic attitude towards the Church of England? In 1925 the Old Catholic Church of Holland, with the agreement

of the other bishops, decided at last that Anglican Orders were valid. As regards the XXXIX Articles, it certainly dislikes and is repelled by them, as were von Döllinger, and the Archbishop of Utrecht who would not consecrate Bishop Cabrera for Spain because he had adopted them. Further, great importance is attached in Holland to what is considered purity of faith in a Church. And, as I understand it, it is the vast mass of English Churchpeople, who do not hold Anglo-Catholic views, that are a serious obstacle to reunion. But at the same time Old Catholics do not sympathize, I gather, with the Roman proclivities of Anglican extremists; naturally so, for while they at great cost were cut off and have gradually moved further away in thought and practice from Rome, they see a section of the English Church drawing closer towards it in doctrine and customs.

In the second place, what is our attitude to the Old Catholics? We admire this gallant little Church for its courageous stand against the powerful ecclesiastical organization of Rome. We appreciate its Protestant aspects. We are impressed by the determination which has inspired Old Catholics in the face of opposition, difficulty and disappointment. We readily acknowledge their high-mindedness, their love of religious liberty, their evangelical piety. We value the friendly relations which exist between us, and are ready to meet them and other Christians at the Lord's Table on the understanding that intercommunion does not imply uniformity of doctrine or practice. But it is rendering no real service to the cause of Christian unity to disguise the positions of the two Churches. With all goodwill and friendliness we must acknowledge that their standpoint is not ours. The *ἡθός* of the two Churches is different. The Old Catholic Churches stand midway between the Church of Rome and the Church of England. They are in our eyes semi-reformed churches. If union were achieved here and now, it could only be by their regarding one section of our Church as if it were the whole, and by emphasizing views which have recently found their way into the Church of England and are opposed not only to Evangelical Churchmanship, but to the historical High Church School in the English Church. Neither Old Catholics, however, nor we wish to compromise our Churches. We stand resolutely by our position as a Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed and Protestant Church; we cannot sacrifice that for the sake of union with a Church great or small; nor are we willing that association with a small Communion, remote from our ordinary life, should jeopardize our closer relationship with the great non-episcopal Churches at home, not because they are mighty indeed in numbers, but because living in the same country, speaking the same language, and sharing a common life, we and they are linked together by ties, racial, historical and spiritual.

THE BASIS OF ANGLICAN DOCTRINE AND FELLOWSHIP IN RELATION TO THE OTHER REFORMED CHURCHES.

BY THE REV. W. DODGSON SYKES, M.A., Vice-Principal and
McNeile Professor, St. John's Hall, Highbury.

BETWEEN the National Church of Sweden and the Church of England reciprocal relations of inter-communion have already been established. As a result of the Lambeth Conference of 1920¹ and of previous approaches, members of the Swedish Church have partaken of Holy Communion in Anglican Churches, and Swedish clergy have given addresses from Anglican pulpits. Two Anglican Bishops, the Bishops of Durham and Peterborough, took part, on September 19, 1920, in the consecration of two Swedish Bishops in Upsala Cathedral, and a Swedish Bishop took part, in Canterbury Cathedral, in November, 1927, in the consecration of the Bishop of Dover, the Bishop of Central Tanganyika, and the Bishop of Hokkaido (Japan). All this is an early result of the general drawing together, and one cannot but rejoice in the establishment of such happy relations between two National and Reformed Churches.

But it is especially interesting to note the appreciation of Anglican Doctrine and Fellowship made by the Lutheran Church of Sweden, based as it is on their reading of the XXXIX Articles. After the appeal of Lambeth, 1920, had been sent to the Primate of the Swedish Church, the Archbishop of Upsala, a long and reasoned reply was made by the Swedish Bishops,² a reply which, in my judgment, deserves special attention at this time. The Bishops of Sweden stated that in the question of inter-communion their Church had "not attached decisive weight either to the doctrine of the ministry in general or to what is usually called the Apostolic Succession of Bishops and the questions thereby implied." They referred back to statements which had been previously laid before the Archbishop of Canterbury's Committee with respect to the doctrine of the Swedish Church on the Ministry, quoting among others two passages :

(a) "No particular organization of the Church and of its ministry is instituted *iure divino*, not even the order and discipline and state of things in the New Testament, because the Holy Scriptures, the *norma normans* of the faith of the Church, are no law, but vindicate for the New Covenant the great principle of Christian freedom, unweariedly asserted by St. Paul against every form of legal religion, and applied with fresh strength and clearness by Luther, but instituted by our Saviour Himself. . . ."

¹ Lambeth Conference, 1920, Resolution 24.

² April 21, 1922. *Documents on Christian Unity, 1920-4*, G. K. A. Bell, pp. 185-95.

(b) "The value of every organization of the *ministerium ecclesiasticum*, and of the Church in general, is only to be judged by its fitness and ability to become a pure vessel for the supernatural contents, and a perfect channel for the way of Divine Revelation unto mankind."

While the Swedish Church—which is both Lutheran and yet episcopal in form and continuity—is in no way indifferent to her venerable legacy from the past, to her the decisive importance is attached "not to any questions of a more formal character, but to the question whether and how far the two communities agree in these ideas as to the content of that message of Salvation, founded on the divine revelation, which had been committed to both of them." The Swedish Bishops, therefore, in their reply to the Lambeth Appeal, felt impelled to call attention at some length to two points more decisive to them than all others: (a) "The recognition of Scripture as *norma normans* both with regard to life and doctrine"; (b) "The building of our salvation on God's grace alone received by faith."

On these they remarked:

"The first of these principles means to us that in matters of faith no other authority must be put directly or indirectly above or, which is the same thing, on a level with the prophetic and apostolic word in Holy Scripture. . . ."

As to the second point—the principle of faith or grace—they wrote:

"The revelation is throughout essentially a revelation of God's prevenient and unconditional grace, precedent to and independent of all human endeavour—that is a revelation of the love of God, which, while condemning sin, searches for the sinner and restores him with His forgiveness. . . ."

Their summary was:

"Both principles could be most simply combined in this: Between God and the soul, or which is the same to us, between Christ and the faith, nothing, no third principle, no institution, no law, no proper works, must intervene" (p. 191).

And, in warmly grasping the fellowship of the Church of England, they added:

"The same conception is contained in its outlines, so far as we have been able to see, partly in the sixth, partly in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth of the XXXIX Articles. We are convinced that between our branches of the Universal Church of Christ, notwithstanding the shades of opinion that may exist, there is an essential unity in that fundamental conception which we have now briefly indicated, and to which we unswervingly adhere. In this conviction we accept with fraternal confidence the outstretched hand."

This appreciation of the principles of the Church of England made by the Swedish Bishops is, I suggest, truer to the historic position and standards of the Church of England than that which is now apparently being represented to the members of the Old Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches.

Let us take, first of all, the Church of England statement con-

cerning the Ministry. It is one that goes back to a conference between Anglicans and Lutherans. When Henry VIII was seeking a political alliance with the Protestant Princes of Germany, some Lutheran divines were invited to England to confer with Cranmer and others with a view to drawing up a joint confession of faith. The negotiations eventually broke down; but Thirteen Articles (1538) were agreed upon, and the statement in our Article on the Ministry (Art. XXIII) reproduces substantially the form of words deliberately framed in 1538 so as to include the Lutheran ministry within their scope:

“Those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord’s vineyard.”

When dealing with Ministry in general the Church of England, it is clear, deliberately refrained from making any one form of Church government essential to the being of the Church. She took no rigid, exclusive position in such matters.

NATURE OF MINISTERIAL WORK.

Further, with respect to the view taken by the Church of England concerning the nature of Ministerial work, we can find some clear indications in the reforming of the Ordination Services. Anyone who will carefully compare the unreformed Latin Services and the reformed English Services will realize the deliberate omission of references to sacerdotal offering¹ and the definite description of the ministerial office in terms of evangelistic and pastoral work among the souls of men. Pope Leo XIII, in 1896, put it from the Roman standpoint as follows:

“In the whole [English] Ordinal not only is there no clear mention of the sacrifice, of consecration, of the *sacerdotium*, and of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifice, but every trace of these things, which had existed in those prayers of the Catholic rite not wholly rejected, was deliberately (*de industria*) removed and struck out.”²

Bishop Dowden commented on this that the Pope’s statement was true to the facts. One other remark needs to be made here. To state that the power of offering propitiatory sacrifice is assumed under the general phrase of “ministering the sacraments,” or to suggest that the Preface to the Ordinal, in referring to the “continuance” of the threefold ministry, therefore assumed the continuance of the pre-Reformation doctrine of the priesthood, seems to me to refuse to face the plain issue suggested by the reformed character of the Ordination Services of the Church of England.

ANGLICAN ATTITUDE TO THE REFORMED CHURCHES.

Attention may again be drawn to the historic friendliness between the Anglican Church and the Reformed Churches. Cranmer openly

¹ E.g., the omission of the Commission: “Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, missamque celebrare, tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis.”

² Pope Leo XIII, *Apostolicae Curae*, September 13, 1896.

gave hospitality to Protestant refugees from the Continent. He was the close friend of several Continental divines. Peter Martyr became Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford and Martin Bucer Regius Professor at Cambridge. The Anglican Archbishop frequently consulted them both. The earlier Elizabethan divines (to quote Archdeacon Hunkin):

"follow Cranmer in regarding each national Church as free to choose that form of Church government which seemed to suit it best. But later, under the stress of the controversy with the Puritans who were seeking to replace episcopacy by the presbyterian form of polity, there was a tendency to say that episcopacy—supported as it was by a continuous tradition stretching back (as Cranmer himself allowed) to Apostolic times—was the norm; and that any departure from it was to be regretted, and to be excused only on the ground of some exceptional circumstance."¹

The Elizabethan Church permitted men holding presbyterian orders of foreign Reformed Churches to minister in the Anglican Church. In 1582 a Scotch divine, Morrison, was given Archbishop Grindal's official licence "to celebrate the divine offices, and to minister the Sacraments throughout the whole Province of Canterbury."² The Caroline divines similarly ranged themselves alongside the Reformed Churches. To quote Principal Carter's conclusion after an ample supply of historical evidence, "we find the later, equally with the earlier, Caroline divines professing their willingness to recognize such ministers."³ Archbishop Sancroft (1688) hoped for "a blessed union of all Reformed Churches both at home and abroad against her common enemies."⁴ Archbishop Sharp (1702) declared that, if abroad, he "would willingly communicate with the Protestant Churches where he should happen to be."⁵

Dr. Sanday has concluded:

"The more sweeping refusal to recognize the non-episcopal Reformed Churches is not and can never be made a doctrine of the Church of England. Too many of her representative men have not shared it. Hooker did not hold it. Andrewes expressly disclaimed it. Cosin freely communicated with the French Reformed Church during his exile. Indeed it is not until the last half of the present century [the nineteenth century] that more than a relatively small minority of English Churchmen have been committed to it."⁶

THE XXXIX ARTICLES.

Finally, the authoritative doctrinal statement of the Church of England was not unconnected with those of the Reformed

¹ J. W. Hunkin, *Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation in Relation to Inter-Communion and Reunion*, p. 26.

² Strype, *Grindal*, i, 402.

³ C. Sydney Carter, *The Anglican "Via Media,"* p. 193.

⁴ D'Oyley, *Life of Sancroft*, i, 325.

⁵ *Life*, ii, 28.

⁶ Sanday, *The Conception of Priesthood*, p. 95, quoted in Archdeacon MacNeice, *Reunion: the Open Door* (Belfast, 1929).

On the question of the Anglican attitude to the Ministries of the Reformed Churches, see especially: C. Sydney Carter, *The Anglican "Via Media"* (1927), pp. 77-105, 181-94; J. W. Hunkin, *Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation in Relation to Inter-Communion and Reunion* (1929); H. A. Wilson, *Episcopacy and Unity* (1912).

Churches of the Continent. Cranmer, who was mainly responsible for the first issue of the Anglican Articles in 1553 (the Forty-two Articles), had at heart the publication of a United Confession of Faith of all the Reformed Churches. The Anglican Archbishop seriously took up this idea,¹ which had been previously constantly urged by Melancthon. Cranmer hoped for a Lambeth Conference in which the chief divines of the various Reformed Churches should meet and draw up a book of Articles and heads of Christian faith and practice to serve as the standing doctrine of Protestants. He approached Bullinger, Calvin, Melancthon. "This object [of a Conference]," he wrote to Melancthon (February 10, 1549), "we are most anxiously endeavouring to accomplish to the utmost of our power." The difficulties of the times, however, frustrated Cranmer's hopes, to which he again gave expression in 1552. It was thus in the atmosphere of friendly approach to the Reformed Churches that the Anglican Articles eventually saw the light, and we are not surprised to find in them connections with Continental Confessions. In keeping with this, we find later that, when Thomas Rogers, Chaplain of Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote his book (1607) on the Articles, it was to show that they were "agreeable both to the written Word of God and to the extant confession of all the neighbour Churches Christianly reformed." Bancroft ordered all the parishes in his province to provide themselves with a copy of this book. If the proposal to dispense with assent to the XXXIX Articles be pressed, it will raise the whole problem of the attitude of the Church of England towards the great questions at issue between Rome and England, and will tend to rob the Church of England of her historically acknowledged place among the Reformed Churches.

A true estimate of the basis of Anglican Doctrine and Fellowship can be made only in the full light of her authoritative statements in the Articles and of her historical attitude as revealed in part by some of the facts given above. With every respect, it has to be declared that a negotiating committee, which in dealing with an Unreformed Church omits to give adequate weight to these principles to which the Church of England has adhered for over 350 years, cannot be regarded as truly representative of Anglican doctrine. The Church of England has, in general, historically ranged itself with the Reformed Churches. Her appeal is to Scripture. In particular, in the question of Episcopacy she has adopted no rigid, narrow position with respect to other Churches, and the fresh investigations of recent times have tended only to show conclusively that the Episcopate was a growth in time and that there is no sufficient evidence that it was instituted by the Apostles.

What, then, are our more immediate hopes in the light of these facts?

1. Firstly, pending the realization of a universal Church based

¹ Cranmer, *Works* (Parker Society, Camb., 1846), Vol. II, 420, 422, 425, 430, 431, 433; Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, I, 584-5, 588 (Oxford, 1812); *Annals of the Reformation* (Oxford, 1824), I, i, 351.

upon Scriptural truth, we hope that Churches which are near to one another in the apprehension of such truth will draw together first. We rejoice in the inter-communion established with one of the Churches of the Reformation, the Church of Sweden. We feel that the reunion of the sister Churches of the Reformation is one of the first possibilities of to-day. It can be said of the Reformed Churches in a far truer sense than has been said of the Old Catholics and the Eastern Orthodox that we "may find such a unity in faith and such a similarity in practice to exist between the Churches that restoration of communion may become possible."

A NATIONAL CHURCH.

2. Secondly, it is, I think, true to say that public feeling within this Christian nation looks eagerly for fresh signs of the realization of a vision of a National Church of England truly representative of the Protestant convictions of the nation as a whole. Through recent movements there has come more into prominence the idea of National Churches "enabling the God-giving genius of great nations to find its appropriate expression in the worship and work of the Church." The two largest Christian communities beyond the Tweed have united their forces in a single National Church, and the membership of the reunited Church of Scotland totals, we are told, nearly half of the entire population. In England we are observing with interest the approaching corporate reunion (1931) of the three Methodist Churches. Moreover, Lambeth, 1930, had held out the possibility of the renewal of the Conferences between the Free Churches and the Church of England—it has expressed the hope

"that at an early date such Conferences [as those held from 1921 to 1925] may be resumed with a view to ascertaining whether the Proposed Scheme of Union prepared for the Churches in South India, or other proposals which have been put forward, suggest lines on which further advance towards agreement on questions of order can be made. . . ." ¹

Can it be that, under the influence of a new Comprehension Movement the opportunities lost in 1662 and the succeeding decades can be recaptured? It is, in my judgment, a crying need of the time that the unfortunate breaches of Reformed Christianity in England should be speedily healed, and that a National Church should be evolved which would be truly expressive of the Christian feelings of the nations as a whole and which would more effectively influence the national character and life.

¹ Lambeth Conference, 1930, Resolution 44.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE NEW MISSIONARY CHURCHES.

BY THE REV. G. FREEMAN IRWIN, B.D., Vicar of Wandsworth.

MY subject is the Church of England and the new Missionary Churches. The difficulty at the outset is that there are as yet no new Missionary Churches. There are a number of proposals in different stages of development for the formation of such Churches. Until they are completed it is impossible to discuss with definiteness the relation of the Church of England to them and their relation to the Anglican Communion.

At the present time there are, I believe, more or less informal negotiations being carried on in various parts of the Mission Field between the representatives of our Communion and the leaders of other Reformed Churches to see if some method of union can be devised, as union is desirable in order to overcome the obvious difficulties in the relationships of the converts in the different Communions. These difficulties have been discussed on several occasions at these Conferences.

Only two of these sets of proposals are mentioned in the Report of the Lambeth Conference. One concerns the steps towards union in Persia. The other is the South India Scheme. The Lambeth Conference Report notices the proposals for a United Church of Persia as approved by the Inter-Church Conference held at Ispahan July 23-August 5, 1927. The reference to this Conference is brief. There is a Presbyterian Mission in North Persia and a C.M.S. Mission in South Persia. The Lambeth Conference Committee encouraged the Church in Persia to go forward towards the goal of union carefully studying present movements in other parts towards Church Unity and, in particular, the Scheme for a United Church of South India. They note as essential for the Unity of the Church the Historic Episcopate in a constitutional form, but they do not mean that the Church of Persia should be an Anglican Church. They hope that, developing along the lines of its own genius, it will have some particular contribution of its own to bring into the Catholic Church. In regard to a proposal that two ordained Ministers from the Northern (Presbyterian) Churches should join in the laying-on of hands at the ordination of an Episcopal Minister; and similarly that the Bishop should take part in the laying-on of hands at the ordination of a Minister of the Presbyterian Church, they say:

“ We recognize that there are inherent difficulties in this proposal but recommend that in view of the situation existing in Persia due inquiry be made with a view to discovering whether some Scheme of Joint Ordination be possible, always providing on our part that the essentially episcopal nature of the ordination be properly safeguarded.”

Two important points are to be noticed in the policy thus indicated: (1) The insistence upon the Episcopacy and episcopal

ordination as essential and (2) the Church of Persia is not to be an Anglican Church, but is to develop on its own lines as a National Church forming part of the Universal Catholic Church—provided of course that none of the developments arising from the special circumstances in Persia shall conflict with any of the essential elements of teaching or worship of the Catholic Church. The significance of these points will, I hope, become clearer as we proceed.

The main features of the South India Scheme are sufficiently well known not to require any but the briefest mention: only the features will be noted which serve to guide towards the wider application of the scheme to other new Missionary Churches that may be formed—if any such are formed. The South India Scheme is evidently intended to be the model on which such movements are to be based.

I expect the Scheme as it came from the Lambeth Conference proved a surprise to most of us. From the basis that the Lambeth Conference has no constitutional authority to accept or reject the proposals—the responsibility for action lying with the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, the Report continued:

“The Church formed by the uniting bodies is to be autonomous in the fullest sense and free from any control, legal or otherwise. The Anglican dioceses concerned are to be no longer a part of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon; but they go forth from the Anglican Communion in order to make their own distinctive contribution to the faith and order of the new United Church. The new organization will be ‘a distinct province of the Universal Church,’ but (and here is a limitation which should be carefully noted) it is understood on all sides and is recognized in the Scheme itself that no province of the Universal Church is free to act according to its own choice in contravention of the faith once delivered to the Saints or without regard to the preservation of the fellowship of the Church Universal.”

We shall have to consider the nature of these limitations, as much will depend on what is regarded as a contravention of the faith once delivered to the Saints and what is essential to the preservation of the fellowship of the Church Universal.

To the whole scheme general endorsement was given by the Lambeth Conference and comments made on the following points: (1) The Episcopate is to be accepted with the functions assigned to it, but the acceptance of any one particular interpretation of it is not required. (2) The rule of the Anglican Church is to be recognized that an episcopally ordained ministry is required for the due administration of Holy Communion for those congregations which have in the past been bound by that rule. (3) Eventually every Minister will be an episcopally ordained Minister, and the Scheme is to be modified so as to make it clear that the intention is to reach finality in the unification of the ministry of the united Churches. (4) Confirmation is not to be insisted on as a pre-requisite term of union, but its use is earnestly commended.

On the definite questions submitted to the Lambeth Conference answers were given as follow: (1) The anomalous position of the new Province being in communion with the Anglican Communion and also in communion with bodies not in communion with the

Anglican Communion is to be met by the principle of "economy" and it is explained that this is a technical term representing administrative action to meet a temporary situation without prejudice to any principle of ecclesiastical order. (2) Consecration *per saltum* is not invalid and is justifiable in the special circumstances of the inauguration of the United Church. (3) Confirmation is not an indispensable preliminary to the Ordination of a Priest or the Consecration of a Bishop. (4) With regard to the participation of presbyters in the laying-on of hands at the Consecration of Bishops, it is regarded as legitimate at the inaugural Service of Consecration, but at all subsequent Consecrations they prefer that it should not be adopted, and care should be taken to make plain that the presbyters do not take part as Consecrators.

It is clear from these statements that we are brought face to face with the problem of the Ministry which has been frequently discussed at these Conferences, and we can only reiterate the statements which have already been made on several occasions.

Many feel that it is a great pity that these problems concerning the relationship of our Church towards the non-Episcopal Churches could not have been courageously faced in the homeland, and settled by the negotiations carried on between the leaders of the Free Churches and representatives of our own Communion. It looks as if the Anglican Communion in general and our own Church of England in particular were saying to a remote and small missionary community in India :

"We do not want to face these difficult problems ourselves. We fear that no agreement upon them could be reached at home with our inherited traditions and prejudices. As the difficulties have become acute with you and it is essential that you find some solution for them, we agree to your doing so ; but, while you are attempting to solve them, you go out of the Anglican Communion for all practical purposes. If you fail to solve them, we do not quite know what your position will be. If you solve them on the lines of which we approve, we shall be glad to receive you back among us. You will have provided us with a happy solution which may become the model for all similar movements in the formation of new Missionary Churches throughout the world."

This may help to save our Church at home from immediately facing and dealing with the relationship of our Communion with the non-Episcopal Churches, and of carrying to their logical conclusion all that is implied in the decision of a Committee representative of the Anglican Communion which declared that :

"Ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church."

This was obviously the crux of the Lambeth Conference, and many regret that some means was not found for the Mother Church to deal with the question. To relegate it to a small missionary community in India does not seem the most dignified or statesman-like way for the Mother Church to deal with so large and important a problem.

The Lambeth Conference has laid emphasis upon the benefits which are to accrue to the Universal Church from the special gifts brought into its treasures by the Native Churches. There is a very strong national spirit in some of these Churches already, and the national spirit tends to grow stronger. It sometimes takes the form of objecting to be bound to the leading strings of the West. The causes of division in Western Christendom do not in great measure concern them. They wish to develop on their own lines, and it is possible that some of the developments may raise problems on a number of the subjects which are the sources of our differences. It may be that the Native Churches may see no reason to pay attention to the restrictions which the West would appear to impose upon them.

The Eastern mind may easily arrive at interpretations of Christ and His Message that may not accord with some of the formulæ of Chalcedonian Orthodoxy or with some of the institutional features of Western Christianity which are held to be essential, more especially by those who cling to the belief that Episcopacy is the sole method given to the Church by the Holy Spirit for its organization, and that the Holy Spirit can never in the future alter that method once given. We may also ask: Are we right in our methods of dealing with these Native Churches? A change is no doubt coming; but in the past we have sent out our missionaries, and their duty has been to place before the people Christianity as it is understood in the West. The Christian education of the people has gone forward under the constant instruction and oversight of the foreigner. We have been fearful of trusting the natives. We have at times shown a want of confidence and faith in their advance on right lines. It has been suggested that we have departed from the lines of the earliest missionaries. St. Paul and the other leaders of the Early Church did not act in this way towards the Churches which they set up. They taught the people, many of them converts from gross heathenism, and after a brief period they were left with occasional visits and supervision to develop their own Church life. Ministers from among themselves were chosen, and the work went forward under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Many and grievous mistakes were no doubt made, but probably not more than have been made by the Church in every age. Christianity was adapted to the special needs of the peoples of various countries, and the Truth tended, as it always does, to prevail. The Early Church had a sure confidence in the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and we probably require far more of that confidence than we have hitherto displayed. This subject has been treated more at length by Mr. Roland Allen in his book *Missionary Methods, St. Paul's and Ours*, a volume which I understand has had the largest circulation of any recent work on Missionary Policy. If these lines were adopted fully, it is impossible to say what the future development of the Native Churches would be. But can we be satisfied that they would universally adopt our present form of the Episcopate, or deal with doctrines along the lines of Western thought?

There are, however, signs that a new conception of the Church and especially of the Anglican Communion is emerging, which will give rise to a completely new conception of the relationship of the Church in this land to the new Missionary Churches. When we turn to the section of the Lambeth Conference Report dealing with the Anglican Communion, we find a remarkable change of outlook. No longer, they say, are we to look for a distinctive Anglican Communion throughout the world.

"Our ideal is nothing less than the Catholic Church in its entirety. Our Communion in its present character is transitional, and we forecast the day when the racial and historical connections which at present characterize it will be transcended, and the life of our Communion will be merged in a larger fellowship in the Catholic Church."

The Report examines the principle underlying this conception. The bond which unites is spiritual. It is based on common doctrines and common ideals. The risk of divergence to the point even of disruption has to be faced, but belief in the Holy Spirit leads to trust in His power working in every part of His Church as the effective bond to hold us together.

The racial bond indicated in the title Anglican has begun to disappear. The Churches growing up in China, Japan, India and other parts of the world are joined to us solely by the ties of common beliefs and common life. The prospects which these considerations open to us indicate that

"the development of unity with other churches will be something other than the expansion of the Anglican Communion as we have known it. It looks forward to the final unity of the Catholic Church."

This beautiful ideal of unity is very attractive, and we all sincerely desire that it should be achieved; but it requires careful examination to realize the difficulties to be overcome, and to test it in the light of past experience. Such an ideal of unity must include the Roman Catholic Church with its theory of the supremacy of Peter and the Popes as his successors. This rules out the consummation unless some radical change occurs in the Roman Communion, of which there is no evidence as yet.

The attitude of the Roman Church towards any movement in the direction of reunion is amply displayed in the "Encyclical Letter on Fostering True Religious Union, of our Most Holy Lord Pius XI, by Divine Providence Pope to his Venerable Brethren the Patriarchs, Primate, Archbishops, Bishops, and other Local Ordinances in peace and communion with the Apostolic See," issued in 1928.

The following sentences indicate the unbending attitude of the Head of the Roman Communion :

"And in what manner, we ask, can men who follow contrary opinions belong to one and the same Federation of the faithful? For example, those who affirm and those who deny that sacred Tradition is a true fount of divine Revelation; those who hold that an ecclesiastical hierarchy, made up of bishops, priests, and ministers, has been divinely constituted, and those who assert that it has been brought in little by little in accordance with the conditions of the time; those who adore Christ really present in the Most

Holy Eucharist through that marvellous conversion of the bread and wine, which is called transubstantiation, and those who affirm that Christ is present only by faith or by the signification and virtue of the Sacrament; those who in the Eucharist recognize the nature both of a sacrament and of a sacrifice, and those who say that it is nothing more than the memorial or commemoration of the Lord's Supper; those who believe it to be good and useful to invoke by prayer the Saints reigning with Christ, especially Mary the Mother of God, and to venerate their images, and those who urge that such a veneration is not to be made use of, for it is contrary to the honour due to Jesus Christ, 'the one mediator of God and men.'¹ How so great a variety of opinions can make the way clear to effect the unity of the Church We know not; that unity can only arise from one teaching authority, one law of belief, and one faith of Christians."

After a reference to distinctive doctrines of the Roman Church which are to be received as completely as the doctrines held in common by all Christians, the Pope states the grounds of his refusal to allow his subjects to take part in the assemblies of non-Catholics.

"For the union of Christians can only be furthered by promoting the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it, for in the past they have unhappily left it. To the one true Church of Christ we say, which is visible to all, and which is to remain, according to the will of its Author, exactly the same as He instituted it."

But the Roman conception of the Church is maintained by members of other Communions, the Orthodox, the Old Catholics and a section of our own Church. The organization of the Church on Episcopal lines is regarded by them as essential, and the validity of the Sacraments is made to depend upon the Episcopal succession. This view is not acceptable to Evangelical Churchpeople, or to the members of the non-Episcopal Communions which are so extensively represented in the Mission Field. They have very generously been ready in their earnest desire for unity to accept the Episcopate in order that the unity of the Ministry may be realized. A fear has been expressed that where the present generation might thus be willing to accept the Episcopate without tying themselves to any one theory in regard to it, future generations might insist on the rigid theories of Apostolic Succession, and all the developments of Institutional Christianity. It is not unknown that Evangelical Churchmen have turned their back upon the liberty with which Christ has made them free, and have accepted the bondage of our modern Judaistic system.

The history of Western Christendom provides us with a warning as to the lines of development which may be followed when the theories of Institutionalism are accepted. The growth of the Papacy is evidence of the power of Episcopacy to capture the machinery, and then become entangled in the work of the machine till there is no escape. In England we have seen develop in the last sixty or seventy years a view of the Church which excludes, if applied logically, all non-Episcopal bodies. For the achievement of the ideal put forward by the Lambeth Conference there must be a free, full, absolute reliance upon the Holy Spirit to guide the Christians of all lands into a fuller realization of all the possibilities of a United Christendom than has yet emerged.

¹ Cf. I Tim. ii. 5.

AYMER DE VALENCE, BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

BY H. P. PALMER, M.A.

ISABELLA, daughter of Aymer, Count of Angoulême, was the wife of King John and by him the mother of Henry III and several other children. She is described as the Helen of her age and was certainly a lady whose virtues were less resplendent than her beauty. John treated her badly and confined her for some time in Gloucester Abbey. He is said to have hanged some of her lovers. On John's death, in 1216, Isabella returned to Angoulême with her daughter Joan. The girl became engaged to Hugh de Lusignan, Count of March, to whom her mother had once been betrothed and whom she had deserted for the charms of King John. The Count, however, found the attractions of his former mistress irresistible. He bade farewell to Joan and married Isabella, her mother. Joan eventually indemnified herself by bestowing her hand on the King of Scotland. By the Count, Isabella became the mother of four sons and a daughter. Of the sons, Aymer, the future Bishop of Winchester, was the youngest.

Isabella's family had little reason to love Poitou, the district in which their lot was cast. As faithful subjects of Henry III, they were derided as traitors to their country and pointed at with the finger of scorn by the Poitevins, who hated the English rule. They hailed with delight, therefore, an invitation from their half-brother, the English King, to live in his country, which for them was to prove a land flowing with milk and honey. Guy of Lusignan, William of Valence, Aymer of Valence and their sister Alice, arrived in 1247. Their brother Geoffrey came later.

King Henry, with his natural ebullieny, welcomed his brothers and sister with embraces and kisses. He promised them wealth and fortune, and fulfilled his promise only too well, to the loss and displeasure of his subjects. He provided handsomely for two of his brothers and found a rich husband for his sister. Aymer, a young man about twenty years of age, had embraced the clerical profession. Henry knew well how to push him forward and tried to make him run before he could walk. Those were days when pluralism ran riot, when a single individual was known to own thirty livings, which, if served at all, were served by hack priests on a starvation wage of ten marks a year. Though Aymer was only in minor orders, the King kept the sharpest watch for vacant preferment.

There was, however, another with the eye of a hawk for everything of value. Pope Innocent IV was as deeply interested in finding benefices for his countrymen as was Henry in pushing the fortunes of his brother. Inasmuch as the greater part of the livings were appropriated to the monastic bodies, and in their gift, the

Pope was insistent in claiming them from the Abbots and Priors of these institutions. About the time of Aymer's arrival in England, he sent a mandate to the Abbot of Abingdon, demanding a provision for "a certain Roman." This favoured priest came to England and waited, vulture-like, until a really valuable piece of patronage fell vacant. Such a living was that of St. Helen's in Abingdon, worth a hundred marks, or in modern values, two thousand pounds a year, which was vacated in 1248. On receiving the news of the vacancy, the Roman swooped down immediately and claimed it. The King was not to be outdone and sent a mandate, demanding the church for Aymer. The Abbot was in a sore strait. He saw, that whatever he did, he must make a powerful enemy either in the Pope or in the King. After much mental conflict, he decided to confer the living on Aymer and to ask for the King's protection, should the Pope in any way proceed against him. But he found in Henry only a broken reed. The disappointed "Roman," enraged at losing the living, went at once to Rome and persuaded the Pope to cite the Abbot before him. The Abbot, though stricken in years and in infirm health, was compelled to obey the Papal order, and incur all the trouble, risk and expense of the long journey. Only by the gift of fifty marks a year to the Roman, was he able to propitiate the angry Pontiff.

In the next year, 1249, the see of Durham, almost the richest in the Kingdom, was vacated by the resignation of the Bishop, Nicholas of Farnham. The retiring prelate was a distinguished scholar and theologian, who had been a professor at the University of Paris and had afterwards studied medicine at Bologna. He had then turned his attention to theology and lectured on this subject. He was both the physician and the confessor of the King and of the Queen, ministering as he did alike to the maladies of the body and the worse diseases of the soul. Moreover, he was the intimate friend of Grosseteste, the greatest scholar and divine of his age. It is scarcely credible, but it is the fact that, on the news of the vacancy, the King sent messengers to the Convent of Durham to elect such a whipper-snapper as Aymer to the see that had been held by so eminent a man as Nicholas. The monks assumed a valiant attitude. "Remember," they instructed his messengers to say to the King, "Remember your Coronation oath. Did you not promise to respect the liberties of the Church and its right of free elections? Do you not know, as everyone else knows, that this youth, your brother, is utterly unfit in age and in attainments for such a position?" The King is said to have threatened the monastery with leaving the see vacant for eight or nine years. At the expiration of that time, Henry sarcastically suggested, the monks might regard Aymer as old enough to please them. He contented himself with this threat and did not attempt to interfere with the election. It was in 1250 that the see of Winchester fell vacant. There was no greater ecclesiastical prize in England, for its revenues were said to be only exceeded in value by those of the King himself.

At the last vacancy of the see twelve years before, Henry, at

the solicitation of his wife, had urged the monks of the Abbey to elect her uncle, Boniface, as bishop. He was a man more fitted to be a prize-fighter than a bishop, yet he was appointed soon afterwards to the Primacy. The Convent refused the royal request and elected William de Raleigh as their bishop. Greatly incensed, the King had visited his wrath on those of the monks who had favoured this election and had punished them by ejection and imprisonment. Turning his attention to the Bishop, he had shut him out of Winchester, forbidden the citizens of London to supply him with food and appealed to Rome against him. A reconciliation between the King and the Bishop was eventually brought about by the Pope, who, "being well remunerated, opened his bosom of consolation." The Bishop was so impoverished by his struggle with the King and by his payments to the Pope, that in order to husband his resources, he spent his closing days at Tours with quite a small retinue. That "watchful and unwearied searcher after gain," the King, was delighted at the news of the fresh Winchester vacancy. He was on the alert at once. Though Aymer was only an acolyte and about twenty-three years of age, Henry lost not a moment in sending two of his principal clerks to urge the monks to elect him to the see. They begged, they entreated, they threatened. For a fortnight they were instant, bringing all their artillery to bear in favour of Aymer. But they spent their breath in vain. The monks were resolute. They could not, and they would not, elect an ignorant youth like Aymer to the Church of St. Swithun. The envoys, at the end of the fortnight of entreaty and cajolery, found that they were powerless to break the will of the monks. On receiving their report, the King decided himself to proceed to Winchester and try the effect of a personal appeal. The Prior and the brothers were summoned into the church and presently the King and his retinue entered. The King was conducted to the episcopal throne and proceeded to preach a sermon, prefacing it, as was and still is, the custom, with a text. Henry chose as the text of his discourse, which was in Latin, part of the 10th verse of the 84th Psalm, "*Justitia et pax osculatae sunt invicem*"—"Justice and peace have kissed each other." Of the more spiritual part of the oration nothing remains, and the world is probably not the poorer. The practical part of it bore reference to the election and was a mixture of coaxing, threats and far-fetched scriptural allusions. The sting of the sermon was in the tail, for it concluded with a sentence which must have struck terror into the hearts of the monks. "If," said the preacher, "my wishes are not respected, I will confound you all."

The unfortunate brothers, at the King's command to proceed at once with the election, left the church and discussed the situation, remembering only too well their "former tribulations," when they had ventured to resist the royal will. They knew that, if they opposed the King again, they would incur his bitter enmity. They would also make an enemy of the Pope, who was "in a tight corner" and "corruptible." If, on the other hand, they elected the young

foreigner, Aymer, what mischief he would do not only to the see but to the whole Kingdom! They were indeed between Scylla and Charybdis. They had no help, no comfort anywhere. Yet there was no means of preventing the election, save at the cost of their own ruin. The brothers therefore decided that they must yield, and Aymer was unanimously elected.

The King's delight on receiving the news was apparent in every tone, look and gesture. At once he instructed his most facile letter-writer to indite an epistle to the Pope, urging him to consent to the election. Moreover, he sent "eloquent" messengers to Rome, men acquainted both with the Pope and the Cardinals, and able to accomplish much alike by prayers and payments.

The King was not disappointed, for the Pope proved as pliant as was expected. His price for this service was an annuity of five hundred marks to the young son of the Count of Burgundy. It may be remarked that where money was concerned, the Pope always dealt in large figures.

The King's brothers from Poitou had now been upwards of four years in England. Of all the numerous foreigners introduced by the King into the country, they proved the worst importation. Presuming on their relationship to the King, they supposed that everything became them and were the pest of the community. Even theft was not beneath them and it was their pleasure not infrequently to seize the horses, the clothing and the provisions of others not strong enough to resist them. We are told that one of them made exactions from monasteries, "the recital of which would draw tears from the reader's eyes."

Aymer, after a visit to Lyons to receive the Papal confirmation of his election, returned in triumph to England with a princely retinue in the summer of 1251. He was greeted with a warm welcome by King Henry, by his brothers and by a crowd of his countrymen, who had left Poitou to get what they could from a racked and impoverished country.

Aymer was now confirmed in his possession of the see of Winchester and had obtained that Papal sanction without which an election was nugatory. Yet he was not consecrated as bishop, probably because he had not reached, nor nearly reached, the canonical age for this appointment. He remained for ten years Bishop-elect and was always designated by that title until his consecration in 1260. In consequence, he could perform no episcopal duty of a spiritual nature. He could not ordain, nor confirm, nor consecrate churches, nor altars, nor holy oil. This disability for spiritual work probably troubled Aymer but little. He was quite content to leave such things to hirelings, Welsh or Irish bishops, who drew but an infinitesimal part of the income of the see. He possessed all that his ambition coveted, a splendid position, wealth "passing the dreams of avarice" and the powers of administering the affairs of the diocese. That power gave him ample opportunities of enriching his friends and of vexing his enemies.

In the meantime, Henry was constant in his practice of con-

ferring benefices on unknown and ignorant foreigners, coming either from Provence, the home of the Queen, or from Poitou, the home of his brothers. Such a man was a certain chaplain in the service of Geoffrey de Lusignan. He is described as "despicable in speech, in dress, and in person"; as utterly foolish and besotted. Yet the coarse wit of this chartered libertine which delighted the King and his Court, won him the living of Preston, which had been held by the King's treasurer and was one of the most valuable benefices in the country. Matthew Paris himself watched the proceedings of this caricature of the priesthood one late summer evening of the year 1252, in the orchard of St. Alban's Abbey. This light of the Church was in the company of the King, his brother, and "other magnates." He was diverting himself by throwing sods, stones and green apples at the distinguished guests of the Abbey and was even squirting the juice of unripe grapes into their eyes. In such wise did the great unbend in those days and such were some of their companions.

Aymer, Bishop-elect of Winchester, soon showed himself in his true colours. He was a man violent, greedy and unscrupulous—"parcus Deorum cultor et infrequens," emphatically one who minded only earthly things, a reproach and a scandal to his profession.

Insolence and ignorance went hand in hand with him, as was seen about this time in the affair of the Hospital at Southwark. This hostel or hospital belonged to the diocese of Winchester, but, as the Archbishop was its patron, his concurrence had to be obtained in making appointments in connection with it. Aymer chose to ignore a practice which was both legal and courteous. He appointed a Prior, without communicating with the Official, Eustace of Lynn, who represented the Archbishop, then absent from the country. This Official at once ordered the new Prior to relinquish his position. He refused. The Official then excommunicated him as contumacious. As the law stood, unless a person under excommunication surrendered within forty days, he was arrested. In compliance with custom, the Official ordered that this should be done in the case of the Prior. The latter defied arrest by sheltering himself in the church and barring it against his pursuers. The ministers of the law soon effected an entry and carried off the Prior to the Archbishop's gaol at Maidstone, in which, many years later, the famous priest John Ball was confined. The news of this arrest reached Aymer, who became frantic with rage. At once he called upon his brothers for aid. They readily responded and went with a large band of followers in pursuit of the Official. They proceeded first of all to Southwark. After they had searched the Hospital in vain, they hurried to Maidstone, to free the imprisoned Prior. Once more they were baffled, for he too had disappeared. In impotent anger they then set fire to the Primate's buildings and went on to Lambeth. They effected an entry into the Palace by breaking down the doors, and on entering, found the Official. They seized him and treated him as they would a serf, who had been caught in

the act of theft. They forgot, if they ever knew, that the Official was a priest, that he was the representative of the Archbishop, that he was renowned as a scholar and a man of letters. Placed on a horse and not allowed to guide it, they dragged him by the reins the whole distance to Farnham and kept him for some time a prisoner. At last they gave him his freedom. The Official, an old man, half-dead with fright and seriously injured, fled for his life to Waverley Abbey, where he was nursed and tended by the Cistercian monks of that institution.

At the time of these outrages, Archbishop Boniface was absent from England, but he returned almost as soon as they had been committed. He was naturally a man of a choleric disposition and quite capable of becoming, and willing to become, a pugilist on an emergency. On this occasion, he took more orthodox measures. He set out for London with two of the bishops, and the three prelates afterwards went to the Church of St. Mary-le-bow. There, in the presence of an immense congregation, which had been called together "by the voice of the crier," the three prelates, wearing their pontifical robes, solemnly excommunicated "the authors and favourers" of the outrage on his Official. In this sentence the Bishop-elect of Winchester and his brothers were, of course, involved. Moreover, the Primate ordered the sentence to be read in all the churches of his province. The Bishop-elect retaliated by ordering the Dean of Southwark to denounce the sentence in the very face of the Archbishop as "frivolous and a foxy excuse for sins." The Archbishop possessed two cardinal virtues. He was vigorous and he was prompt. Surrounded by his friends, chaplains and men-at-arms he proceeded to make a stately journey to Oxford. He meant, when he reached that city, to make his visit the means of publishing the infamy of Aymer and of his brothers to all the world.

When the procession was within a mile or two of Oxford, the Doctors, Proctors, Regent Masters and Scholars of the University came to meet the Primate. Many of them were riding on noble steeds, which were gaily caparisoned. So imposing was this great procession, that the Archbishop and his Provençal companions were surprised and delighted. They declared with one accord that the University of Oxford might fairly be considered as a rival of that of Paris. The Archbishop, on entering at the city, was entertained at a magnificent banquet.

On December 7th, 1252, being the morrow of the Feast of St. Nicholas, the knolling of a bell summoned the entire University to hear the sentence of excommunication read. It was probably in St. Mary's Church that Aymer and his brothers were thus held up as examples and warnings—as men liable to a severe penance, before they could again associate with their fellow-men. From them, however, such a penance seems never to have been exacted.

Less than three weeks after the Archbishop's visit to Oxford, on Christmas Day, 1252, Henry III was feasted by the citizens of Winchester. The King repaid this hospitality by a demand of two hundred marks, thus "turning delight to dole." Aymer's excom-

munication was for the King a skeleton at the feast, and both he and the Queen strained every nerve to procure his absolution. The Bishop-elect swore publicly that he had never consented to the attack on the Official and the other acts of violence of which his brothers had been guilty. He was taken at his word, even if he were not believed, was absolved and received the kiss of peace. In order that things might not be done by halves, all the persons concerned in the outrage on the Official received soon afterwards "the benefit of the most comprehensive absolution."

The King had received many warnings that his frequent breaches of Magna Carta were intolerable alike to the clergy and the people. The bishops, in 1253, had informed him that they could not consent to a subsidy of tenths from the Church, for which he was asking through the agency of the Pope, unless he were willing once more to promise to observe the Charter and to respect the liberties of the Church. Even Aymer was found on the side of the bishops, and the King made it very clear how indignant he was at this conduct. When, on asking the royal permission to return to his diocese, the Bishop-elect commended the King to God, the latter replied, "and I commend you to the living devil."

The same terms were demanded in the following year from the King by a great Council at Westminster before either the tenths from the clergy or a scutage from the knights were granted. More than a fortnight was spent in negotiations between the King on the one hand, and the bishops, barons and knights on the other. The bishops sent as messengers to the King, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Salisbury, the Bishop of Carlisle and the Bishop-elect of Winchester, imploring him to respect the Great Charter, and not interfere in episcopal and other ecclesiastical appointments. The King expressed his repentance, but caustically remarked that the very bishops who stood before him and were lecturing him, owed their positions to his intervention.

"Is not that the case," said the King, "with the Archbishop?" "Did I not," he inquired of the Bishop of Salisbury, "exalt you from being the writer of my briefs to your present dignity?" "You, Silvester of Carlisle," he continued, "do you not remember how I raised you to your see, though you were a petty clerk in my Chancery when there were many theologians and men of repute to choose from? Similarly, brother Aymer, against the wishes of the monks, I elevated you to the noble height of the Church of Winchester, when you were only fit to be at school."

"Surely all four of you," he concluded, "ought to assume a penitential attitude and resign what you have unjustly obtained, lest you fall into eternal condemnation."

The bishops must have felt the sting of the royal remarks, but contented themselves with saying, "We are not speaking of the past, but we propose to provide for the future."

The fruits of a fortnight's discussion were seen on May 3, 1253, when the Charter actually signed by King John was produced before the King and the Assembly in Westminster Hall. The

bishops in their robes then solemnly pronounced the sentence of excommunication "against the transgressors of ecclesiastical liberties and the free customs of the realm, and especially those contained in the Charter of the liberties of the realm of England and the Forest Charter." The King, while the sentence was being pronounced, was serene and cheerful. When the candles were thrown down on the floor and the bells clashed, he declared, "All these obligations will I keep, as I am a man, as I am a Christian, as I am a knight, as I am a crowned and anointed King." It will scarcely be believed that Henry's evil advisers soon told him that he could easily break the Charter by bribing the Pope to give him absolution for his breaking his word.

The harsh and tyrannous character of the boy-bishop Aymer was seen in his treatment of the monks of Winchester. On one occasion, he kept them fasting in their church for over three days, probably because they refused to show him their accounts. So miserable were the monks under the Bishop-elect, that many of them left their monastery and fled to St. Alban's and other convents, where they were warmly welcomed. They described the Bishop as ignorant of grammar and of all the arts, as unacquainted with the English language, as incapable of preaching, of hearing confessions, or of any other spiritual duty. In place of the monks who had left Winchester, Aymer selected drunkards and men illiterate and utterly unsuited for the cloister. Even the King was provoked by Aymer's conduct to the monks, telling him that he was returning evil for good to the men who had made him their bishop. Aymer, in reply, reminded Henry that "His innocence knew the cupidity of the Roman Court." He added in vindictive language, "that his own resources were inexhaustible and that he would spend them freely in the right quarter in glutting his vengeance on the spongy entrails of the monks." The Bishop-elect added to his injuries by himself appointing a new Prior.

William of Taunton, the Prior deprived by Aymer, went to Rome in the hope of obtaining justice for himself and the monks from the Papal Court. He found that Aymer's purse was longer than his and was not restored to his position. The injustice with which he had been treated was, however, so glaring that certain lands were assigned for his support. The Bishop-elect of Winchester found it easier to place men without character in the Priory than to make them stay there. They apostatized and gave up a life every detail of which must have been irksome. The Bishop-elect, in consequence, was compelled to summon back to the Priory the brethren whom his harshness had driven away. We shall find evidence that, at the close of his life, he seemed sensible of his misconduct towards them.

A worse case of cruelty was the outrage on a priest presented by a private patron to a living of which the Bishop-elect claimed the patronage. It is almost certain that Aymer's claim rested on insufficient grounds, as the patron appointing was the son of the Justiciary of Ireland and is described by the chronicler as "disting-

guished by his high birth, his riches and his influence." Moreover, this patron seems merely to have consented to a provision to the living by the Pope himself. Despite these circumstances, the priest and his servants were so savagely attacked by Aymer's orders and by his agents, that some of them died within a few days of the assault.

The patron, on appealing to the King, was begged not to bring about a scandal by making an accusation against the Bishop-elect. The deed was, however, brought to the notice of the Council, when the popular party had the upper hand.

The year 1258 was long remembered as one of famine and mortality. The home crop of corn seems to have failed and such supplies as came from the Continent were purchasable only by the rich. Many died of starvation or of the pestilence that stalked through the land. Their bodies, we are told, lay unburied along the streets, or on dung-hills.

The same year is remarkable for the determined efforts of the barons to hold the King in check. He had proved as elusive as Proteus himself, and his oaths and promises of amendment were invariably broken. But the historic assembly of the barons, known as the Oxford Parliament, which held the greater part of its session in the House of the Dominican Friars, most certainly removed some of the worst abuses from which the Kingdom suffered. The barons and knights and their military attendants came to Oxford armed, with the express purpose of compelling Henry to submission. At once they demanded the observance of Magna Carta by the King and also required that both he and Prince Edward should swear to obey the ordinances of the Parliament. Proposals were soon made to resume certain of the extravagant grants of land made by the King to his brothers and others. The brothers swore "by the death and wounds of Christ" that they would never surrender lands granted to them by the King "as long as they breathed the vital air," and William of Valence seems to have been the loudest in his protestations. He was promptly told by Simon de Montford, himself the brother-in-law of the King, that if he did not restore these lands, he would "lose his head."

The brothers, who had done what they could to wreck all measures of reform, saw the temper of the Parliament and were aware that they were so detested that the country people were already engaged in demolishing their castles. They therefore fled for their lives to Wolvesey Castle, the fortress of the Bishop-elect. They were, however, pursued by the barons and they surrendered. With their retinues they were conducted to the sea, banished from the country and "committed to Neptune." They were afterwards enclosed in Boulogne by a force brought by Henry, son of Simon de Montford, who was burning to avenge William of Valence's insult in calling his father "an old traitor." After being compelled to wait for a considerable time in Boulogne, the brothers at last obtained permission from Louis IX to travel through France, and hastened to Poitou, where they were as little loved as in England.

The barons had succeeded in dismissing the King's brothers and the other Poitevins, who for a decade had done so much to harass and impoverish the country. Yet they were aware that the exiles would strain every nerve to bring about their return. They were determined, if possible, to prevent this catastrophe. They were anxious, above all, that Aymer, the most powerful of the brothers, should never see England again. They decided to invoke the aid of the Pontiff, who at this time was Alexander IV, and in a letter to him denounced the Bishop-elect and his brothers as guilty of such excesses that the cry of the poor rose to Heaven against them. They denounced them as the determined enemies of reform, as obstructionists who had moved Heaven and earth to prevent it and as corrupters of the King and Prince Edward, his son. The barons and knights who signed and sealed this letter to the Pope "in behalf of the whole community" implored the Pontiff in the most earnest terms to deprive Aymer of his see. This letter was conveyed to Rome by an embassy, whose expenses were paid out of money belonging to the brothers, which had been seized and confiscated at Dover. The ambassadors handed the letter to the Pope, and, in a personal interview, acquainted him with "the homicides, rapines and oppressions" which the Bishop-elect and his brothers had committed. The letter and the embassy accomplished little or nothing, for it was followed by a second letter gravely reflecting on the partiality of the Pope. In that letter Aymer was described as "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence," as a "liar," as "a base seeker of sordid gain," as "a man given over to death wherever in England he might be found." The baronage found the Pope still unsympathetic, for the second letter was followed by a third, couched in similar terms. At length a reply to the last two letters was received from the Pope. It treated of anything and everything save the conduct of the Bishop-elect and of his brothers. The latter were ignored and Aymer was dismissed in a very few words. If what was said of him were true, declared Alexander, he regretted it, but, as Aymer had not been represented before him by counsel, nothing could be done.

Alexander IV, like his immediate predecessors, was always in desperate need of money, and the suspicion is provoked, a suspicion which seems to have been entertained by the barons, that he was corrupted by Aymer's wealth. From a letter of Henry to the Pope written in September, 1259, it appears that Brother Velasius, a Papal chaplain and penitentiary, was sent by the Pontiff to England to demand Aymer's restoration to his see. This friar appeared before the King and his Council and threatened excommunication if the request were refused. The King appealed from the Nuncio to the Pope and stated that Aymer by his "grave and notable excesses" had made his return to England impossible.

Aymer had made up his mind at all costs to go back to Winchester. As a preliminary step, he succeeded in obtaining consecration from the Pope, and the ceremony was performed either on the Feast of the Ascension or on the Vigil of Trinity Sunday, 1260.

The Bishop was aware that, outlaw as he was, he would never be able to make a peaceful entry into England and take possession of his see. But he was resolute. For some time, doubtless with the aid of his brothers, he must have been collecting a considerable force of men and ships, with which he hoped to achieve his desperate purpose. He had also obtained from the Pope the power of laying an interdict on the country, and the Bishop of Tours was chosen for this purpose. What would have happened if Aymer had appeared as an invader, can only be conjectured, but there is little reason to doubt that the adventure would have cost the Bishop and his companions their lives. Fortunately the bold experiment was never made, for it was arrested by the hand of death. Aymer expired at Paris, so the Osney chronicler tells us, about the middle of December, 1260. The heart of the Bishop was brought to Winchester and buried on the north side of the high altar where it still rests. It may be that Aymer repented of his evil deeds before his death, for he bequeathed the manor of Portland to the monks of Winchester. This manor had passed from the monks to the Bishop, owing to expenses incurred by them in appealing to the Pope against him.

Messrs. George Allen & Unwin publish *Jewish Views Of Jesus*, by the Rev. Thomas Walker, D.D. (4s. 6d. net). In the introduction he explains some of the Jewish traditions concerning Jesus, and then gives a selection of Six Views, representing Jewish Orthodoxy, Jewish Liberalism, and two Jewish portraits of Jesus by Jacobs and Klausner. A closing chapter gives some reflexion on these Jewish views, showing that on the part of some there is a high appreciation of many aspects of the Life and Teaching of Jesus.

The Student Christian Movement Press has issued *Morning Prayers and Readings for School and Family*, arranged by Mrs. Guy Rogers (3s. net). The purpose of the book is to arrange a series of prayers and readings in systematic order to meet the needs of Morning-prayer in schools and families. The series is arranged for twelve weeks with appropriate Scripture passages for each period of the year. A special section is devoted to Lent and Easter and other special days. Prayers are drawn from a wide variety of sources; a large number of them are taken from Mr. Thornhill's *Family Prayers*, which is one of the best and cheapest forms which we know.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—

As Dr. Maynard Smith has taken the trouble to write an Article in the April Number of the *Church Quarterly Review* in order to hold up to scorn my historical interpretation of the "Case of Robert Wright" with regard to the date of his foreign Ordination, perhaps you will kindly allow me a few words in defence of the statements which I made in my Article in the January CHURCHMAN.

Dr. Smith accuses me, without any evidence, of writing with a "controversial bias," but my purpose is really to discover the correct period in which to place Wright's foreign Ordination, from the precise historical data which we possess.

Now while we may admit that the documents are not absolutely conclusive on the point, I still confidently maintain that the available evidence is sufficiently strong and full enough to support my contention that this Ordination took place within the year May, 1581 to May, 1582, and thus necessarily within the first half of this period, since during the latter half of it Wright was in prison in England. Canon Maynard Smith now asserts that "the year 1578 is a suitable date and is consistent with the other data we possess." Now I submit that the evidence before us practically precludes the possibility of this early date. For in the account furnished by Strype (*Annals*, III, 124, 1728) we are given the official "Answers" which Wright *himself* gave to the "Notes of Matters laid to his Charge" at his trial in the Consistory Court in October, 1581. These official "Answers" were sent to Wright (on account of his appeal against his imprisonment) to examine, by Lord Burleigh, when Wright was in jail in May, 1582. In one of these official "Answers," which Wright gave at his trial, he distinctly "confesses that *Being a Layman* he hath preached and catechized in the House of the Lord Rich . . . Lord Gray (and others) within two or three or four years past." Now if Wright himself in September or October, 1581 describes *himself*, even *less* than three years ago, as a "layman," obviously he cannot have been ordained abroad in 1578? Also since he definitely states that he has been called "since the death of the old Lord unto the Ministry" ("Appendix," p. 40) (thereby indicating his foreign Ordination) we have additional confirmation that he was not ordained till *after February*, 1581, the date on which this "old lord" Rich died. I do not overlook the fact that Dr. Smith challenges my construction of this paragraph from the Lansdowne MSS.—that the "old lord" mentioned there must refer to the one whom Wright also styles the "late lord" Rich who died in February, 1581—because to imagine, as Dr. Smith does, that this expression ("old lord") *could* refer to a previous "old lord" who died when Wright was only 17 in the year

1567, makes as much sense as if Wright had said that "he was called to the Ministry since the *death of Henry VIII.*"

Moreover, when we combine this statement—"that he was called to the Ministry since the death of the old lord"—with the other definite statement concerning the actual date of his foreign Ordination (a statement which I notice Dr. Smith carefully omits to mention?) we get confirmatory conclusive proof that Wright's Ordination *could not have been* as early as 1578. For in his letter to Burleigh, Wright denied that "any Magistrate ever examined him" "by what authority I preached," but he adds that if "I ever spake the words," i.e. that "I was called by the Reformed Church," "*within the last year*" "*I might truly say it*, though I took not upon me *thereby* to do any *public* duty." This letter or answer to Burleigh was written in May, 1582, and thus it clearly puts the date of his Ordination as not before May, 1581. It consequently confirms Wright's statement that "he was called unto the Ministry since the death of the 'old' or second Lord Rich," in February, 1581. It is quite evident that Wright styles him the "old lord" as equivalent to the "late lord," because in the very next sentence he draws the distinction by adding "And this (present) Lord being desirous to use his Ministry, etc.," where he obviously refers to the third Lord Rich then living in 1582.

Canon Smith wonders how Wright could crowd into a two months', or as he is pleased to reduce it, into a fortnight's short visit to the Low Countries, "the study of Divinitie in sundry Universities at home and in foreign Countries." But there is no reason whatever why this "study" should not have been spread over several years, as Canon Smith himself suggests in another place. Wright may well have been abroad in 1578 "studying," although not ordained abroad that year. And again after his release from prison in 1582 he had ample opportunity for a further visit to the Continent for this purpose, since we know nothing of his movements or employments until he was instituted to a living in 1589.

Dr. Smith's reconstruction of Wright's life and career is all built up on mere and, in many respects, most improbable conjectures which are devoid of any contemporary evidence.

C. SYDNEY CARTER.

B.C.M. & T. College,
Clifton.

Hosanna is a book of praise for young children, artistically produced and containing a number of hymns specially suitable for small children. The illustrations are the work of the Chelsea Illustrators. (4s. net. S.P.C.K.)

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

DR. G. G. COULTON holds a unique place among scholars as our greatest living authority on the medieval ages. He has established his position by dint of unremitting research. He has taken nothing for granted but has sought out the original sources and has gained his knowledge from the first-hand authorities. As a true scholar he is actuated solely by the desire to arrive at the truth. He has been the means of removing many false impressions, and with a scholar's modesty he is always willing to examine afresh any of his statements which are questioned, and if there is anything doubtful he is willing to restate his case in the light of fresh facts. The members of all the Reformed Churches must therefore be deeply indebted to him for turning aside from his chief line of study and devoting much of his valuable time to the task, so often uncongenial and thankless, of exposing the errors and misrepresentations of writers of the Roman Communion. Controversy is distasteful to most of us, but controversy with Romanists is specially distasteful. The ordinary individual who engages in it may expect to be snubbed, abused, and generally treated with contempt. When a scholar of Dr. Coulton's eminence, who cannot be ignored and treated with scurrility, enters the field he is sure to be the object of specially bitter attack. He lays himself open to every form of misrepresentation, his character will be attacked, his veracity questioned, and when he has got his opponents into a corner from which there is no escape, their fury will be vented in all manner of devious ways. From long and bitter experience, Dr. Coulton has learnt the ways of Roman controversialists, and having suffered much at their hands he has published two volumes which will serve as a guide-book and a handbook of method and of warning for all future champions of truth who enter the lists against Roman errors and the falsification of history. These two volumes on *Romanism and Truth*, published by the Faith Press, a publishing institution not usually associated with the issue of books on Roman controversy. The first volume, *The Fatal Heritage* (price 3s. 6d.), was published some time ago. The second volume, *The Struggle against Common Sense* (price 7s. 6d.), has recently appeared. The Head of the Faith Press in a Publisher's Note explains his reasons for publishing these volumes. A challenge from Dr. Coulton appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* on a simple question of fact. "To this challenge Mr. Chesterton, assisted by another Roman Catholic journalist (Mr. Belloc) replied by what I can only describe as a torrent of personal vituperation." The question did not call for mud-slinging and, after an ineffectual appeal to Cardinal Bourne to arrange a public disputation, the courtesy of publication was offered to Dr. Coulton by the Faith Press. We recommend our readers to study the facts set out by Dr. Coulton in these volumes in order to realize the kind of statements made on behalf of Roman claims, and the methods adopted

by Romanists when they are placed in difficulties in defending some flagrant misrepresentation.

To these volumes Dr. Coulton adds *In Defence of the Reformation* (Simpkin Marshall, Ltd., 5s. net). It contains the three lectures delivered at the Central Hall, Liverpool, with Discussions, Comments, and Documentary Vouchers. The subjects of the lectures were Infallibility, Persecution and The Reformation. The various comments added serve to illustrate the treatment to which Dr. Coulton was subjected while defending historical accuracy.

The Bishop of Southwark has given a striking account of the conditions of the life of the poor in his diocese, in his book *In the Heart of South London* (Longmans, Green and Co., 3s. 6d. net). His purpose is to give some account of the social conditions under which many are living in South London, and especially of the evil effects of overcrowding on the health and happiness of those whose homes are in the poorest districts. It is an appalling picture and will arouse the sympathy of all readers. It is painful to realize that people are living in the state here depicted. The district was described over forty years ago by Sir Charles Booth in his *Survey of Life and Labour in London* as the largest area of unbroken poverty in the world, and the conditions seem scarcely to have improved in the intervening years. The Bishop has made himself familiar with the conditions through personal visits to the areas described and by information received from workers in the parishes. He tells of families of eight and ten living in one or two rooms, some of these are basement rooms in damp unventilated houses quite unfit for human habitation. Some of them are infested with rats, and in several places the vermin are so numerous that the children cannot go to bed until they are so sleepy that they will not notice the bites. Great efforts have been made by the County Council and the other responsible authorities, but they have not been able to overtake the need. Large slum areas have been cleared and immense blocks of flats have been erected. Great tracts of land have been acquired in the outer suburbs and small houses to accommodate many thousands have been placed upon them. The difficulty is that these new houses are far from the place of work of the greater number, and the rents of both houses and flats are in excess of what the labourers can afford. As the Bishop says: "The crux of the whole problem is to build a bridge between the rent which can be afforded by the unskilled labourer with a family of three or more children and the amount which normally would be asked for a suitable house." One suggested remedy is to offer a reduction of one shilling a week for every child of school age, but even this seems inadequate. It is also suggested that the building of new houses should not be left solely to the public authorities but that Public Utility Societies should be formed to undertake the work of providing houses at a low rent. The Bishop gives an account of the many activities of the Church to ameliorate the

conditions of life and to bring the influence of Christian teaching to the people. He recognizes that a change of environment is not sufficient. There must be a change of heart and life. The Church is sadly handicapped from want of workers and the means to support them. There are many voluntary workers who are doing splendid work in the numerous clubs and other organizations which exist for the purpose of building character, and more particularly of winning the young. Many stories could be told of successful work by which the lives of men and women have been changed through the power of the Gospel. The work is carried on quietly and perseveringly and it would be difficult to realize the terrible conditions which would exist if the Church were not at work in the midst of the people. At the same time the Bishop pays a graceful testimony to the self-sacrificing and devoted work carried on by workers of other Churches.

With the title *The Lambeth Series*, Messrs. James Nisbet and Co. have published under the general editorship of the Bishop of Liverpool a series of pamphlets dealing with subjects arising out of the Lambeth Conference Report. The purpose of the Series is to help in the study recommended in the Archbishops' Pastoral, "Concerning the Way of Renewal." Three of these books deal with the Doctrine of God. Dr. D'Arcy, the Archbishop of Armagh, writes on *God in Science*, and considers the various problems recently raised by scientific research. He then touches upon the "Lessons of Art," and finally shows the gradual awakening of man to the Presence of Spiritual Powers which led to religion. This brief but comprehensive study exhibits all the Archbishop's well-known qualities and his power of setting out the results of modern research. The Venerable Archdeacon Storr, in *God in the Modern Mind*, deals with the popular aspects of the Report in relation to everyday life. He touches upon those aspects which show God in relationship to Man, and the possibilities in the Revelation of Jesus Christ. *God in Worship*, by the Rev. Francis Underhill, has three sections—"Thought of God in Worship," the "Relation of Prayer and Worship," and "Eucharistic Worship." In the last he touches upon several much-controverted points. The Bishop of Winchester writes on *The Witness and Faith of the Church in this Generation*. He tells something of the work of the Conference, and of the application of Christianity to everyday life and to the problem of the reunion of the Churches. The Bishop of Liverpool and the Bishop of St. Albans jointly write on Marriage and Birth Control—dealing with some of the most debated subjects in the Conference Report. Canon C. E. Raven, in a book entitled *Looking Forward towards 1940*, ventures upon a criticism of some features in the 1930 Report, and suggests some lines of progress which may help to make the Report of 1940 a real stepping-off place for a great advancement of the Kingdom of God.

Since the appearance of the Report of the Lambeth Conference Committee on the Doctrine of God, a number of books have appeared dealing with different aspects of that Doctrine. The Bishop of Liverpool has written one addressed specially to ordinary men and women, and his purpose is to lead his readers through the two channels of revelation presented in the Bible, and of the study of our world and its setting in the universe to the full realization of God in contact with the whole human personality. He calls his book *Our Father* (James Nisbet and Co., 2s. 6d. net), and urges that the insufficiency and misuse of human fatherhood should not be allowed to obscure the fullness of meaning in our Lord's use of the term. He considers the various conceptions of God which have prevailed at different times, and shows that God revealed in Jesus Christ is the highest conception man has reached. God's call and man's response to it in prayer lead to the closer association of personal experience, and the practice of the Presence of God. The final chapter is devoted to some aspects of worship in which he deprecates the unwise insistence on details of what is called full Catholic ritual.

Canon T. A. Lacey has collected a number of essays written at various periods during the last twenty-five years in a volume entitled *Essays in Positive Theology* (Methuen and Co., 6s. net). They cover a wide range. Some of them deal with questions of strict theology in regard—especially to the doctrine of Grace; others are concerned with practical problems of current interest. An essay on Inter-Communion, after much evidence to the contrary, arrives at the unconvincing conclusion that the celebrant must have received Ordination at the hands of a Bishop. "Manning, as an Evangelical," illustrates an unknown and unsuspected aspect of his character. We believe it is true that in the closing hours of his life he acknowledged the value of his early views. Two essays on "Aspects of the Resurrection" bring in some valuable suggestions gained from modern scientific research. "Why Bishops?" is an endeavour to maintain that the Episcopate is indispensable to the Church. These are a few of the interesting topics considered by the Canon with his usual versatility.

Bible Stories and How to Tell Them, by William J. May (Student Christian Movement Press, 6s. net), is a useful book of instruction for those who are engaged in teaching. The first part tells of the Art of Story Telling; how to find the story and how to build it up and adapt it. The second part tells of the Craft of the Bible Story and shows how various portions of both the Old and the New Testament may be used by the story-builder. The third part gives a large number of stories to tell; and from these the teacher may learn how to make a story vivid and interesting to young people.

Dr. T. R. Glover has written several books which have helped to a better understanding of the earliest days of Christianity. He

has added to our debt by the publication of the *World of the New Testament* (Cambridge, at the University Press, 6s. net). His purpose is to give the ordinary reader of the New Testament some knowledge of the society in which the early Church found itself, some of the hopes and ideas that inspired men, the political conditions in the Roman Empire, and the everyday life of the home and of the street. The whole subject is treated in Dr. Glover's usual vivid style, and the reader is made to realize the problems which faced the early Church on every side, and the Power which led to the Victory obtained by Christ. His review of the Greek mind, of Alexander the Conqueror, of the Roman outlook, of the Position of the Jew, and of the Conditions of the Roman Empire, provide a fascinating study which will greatly help to a more complete understanding of the life of New Testament times.

Two books of missionary interest will attract large circles of readers. The C.M.S. Story of the Year 1931 has been written by the Rev. E. F. E. Wigram, M.A., who was C.M.S. Secretary for India from 1915 to 1929. The title is *Weapons that Win* and is explained in a sentence in the Preface: "It was through the unstinted serving and suffering of the incarnate Son Christ Jesus that the love of God opened up the high road of the world's deliverance. There are no alternative methods for completing the undertaking. Only through the unstinting serving and suffering of Christ's true Body, the Church, in all its members, can the love of God march on to final victory." One significant fact recorded demands special notice. The concordat between the Vatican and the kingdom of Italy has placed tremendous additional financial power in the hands of the Church of Rome, "not only as a missionary church, which would be good, but as a proselytizing Church in missionary lands, which is evil." "From widely-separated fields this year's letters refer anxiously to increased and efficient Roman propaganda right in the midst of our own struggling work." No comity of missions binds the Roman Church, and its surplus wealth will no doubt be used to secure converts from Protestant missions wherever it can obtain a foothold. The Story of the Year contains inspiring accounts of devoted work in every field. Fresh opportunities are opening everywhere, but it is impossible to make use of them because of the lack of means and of workers. From East Africa comes the cry re-echoed in other fields: "Alas, but a mere fringe of the work to be done—crying out to be done—is being accomplished. The lack of workers is heartbreaking." The call of the Congress held in London last year is emphasized in these pages, and we trust that the Church at home will respond more fully than ever during this present year.

In *Tanganyika's New Day*, the Right Rev. G. A. Chambers, Bishop of Central Tanganyika, gives an interesting survey of the past and makes an impressive appeal for special efforts in the

future. The possibilities are great. As he says : " The wonderful story of Uganda may be repeated in Tanganyika if only the Church at home catches the vision of the infinite possibilities that lie before us in those parts of Africa." He tells in graphic language of the beginning of the Church in his diocese, and of the progress that has been made. The opportunities to-day are widespread, especially for educational work. Medical Missions are also needed to meet the need. The book is excellently illustrated and will be read by many with great interest. We hope it will fulfil the Bishop's hope of bringing many supporters to his great work.

Institutional Christianity in England, by the Rev. J. Gordon Hayes, M.A. (Richards, 7s. 6d. net), is an examination of the failure of the Christian Churches to retain their membership and their attendance at public worship. It is a severe condemnation of the tendency to make Christianity depend upon institutional elements, and of any kind of machinery that tends to destroy the real life of the Spirit. With many quotations from a wide circle of writers, Mr. Hayes supports his contention and leaves a very strong impression that much might be done to make Christianity a far greater power in the world if there were a return to the simple facts of the spiritual life and a full reliance on the Holy Spirit.

In *Sitting For The Psalms*, the Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A., Professor of Pastoral Theology, King's College, London, has given an account of different practices of standing and sitting at various portions of Worship. Standing and kneeling have been regarded as the two most appropriate positions. Sitting has been supposed to indicate a want of reverence, but in some of the Reformed Churches on the Continent it has long been a widespread custom to sit while singing and to stand for prayer. There have been occasions when to sit for the singing of Psalms was customary. This has been attributed to Puritan ideas but, on the other hand, the practice is frequently found in the Roman Communion. Standing is more appropriate as it is practically the universal custom to stand for the Gloria. Mr. Rogers' interesting study has been issued for the Church Historical Society by the S.P.C.K. (1s. 6d. net).

G. F. I.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

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

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

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

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

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

¹ *Life*, Vol. II, p. 294 (September 16, 1906).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹ *Life*, by W. Ward, Vol. II, p. 45.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

7, WINE OFFICE COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

The Sunday School.—Sunday School Lesson Books which are being issued this year are as follows :—A reprint of *Lessons on the Hymn Book*, and *The Message of the Prayer Book*, by the Rev. G. R. Balleine (2s. each), which are now ready; and *The Faith of our Fathers*, also by the Rev. G. R. Balleine (2s.). The last book is being issued with stamps in books at 4s. sufficient for ten children for the year. Mrs. Macdougall Ferguson, author of *Bible Tales for Little Folk* which was published last year, is writing a further series entitled *More Bible Tales for Little Folk* (1s. 6d.). This is for the infant school. The book by the Rev. L. E. L. Roberts, mentioned in these notes last quarter, will not be published until the new year.

Book Racks.—The following penny booklets are recommended for the Book Racks, which are supplied by the League: *Reading the Bible, Some Thoughts and Hints*, by Bishop H. C. G. Moule; *The Clear Heavens Beyond*, by the Rev. F. W. Boreham; *Recent Science and Christianity*, by the Rev. G. T. Manley, and three by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, *What Do We Believe?*, *Why Do We Believe?* and *The Claims of Christianity*.

The Prayer Book Teaching pamphlets are supplied now at 1d. each, and have been added to by *St. Peter and the Pope* and *Purgatory*, both by Archdeacon Thorpe; and the Church Booklet Series has been added to by *Bible Reading*, by Mr. W. Guy Johnson, and *Holy Baptism*, by Bishop H. C. G. Moule. A list of pamphlets suitable for the Racks has been issued,—discount of 25 per cent. is allowed on supplies for this purpose.

The XXXIX Articles.—It is proposed to issue within the next two months a series of short pamphlets on the doctrine and history of the XXXIX Articles, the first of which, by Dr. Harold Smith, entitled *The Origin and History of the Articles*, will be ready early in the month. The second pamphlet, which is nearly ready, is by Archdeacon Thorpe, and is entitled *The Appeal To Scripture*. They will be issued at 2d. each, and should be widely distributed.

Roman Catholic Missions.—Several letters have been received recently, drawing attention to the Missions being organized by Roman Catholic Communities, particularly at seaside resorts, and asking for useful literature to circulate in the various districts. In one case a letter from the Vicar of a seaside town states :—“The large Roman Catholic Convent is holding an eight-days’ Mission obviously to obtain converts to the Roman Catholic faith from the Reformed Churches. Meetings are to be held on the following subjects: Why Pray for the Dead?; Transubstantiation; Is the Pope infallible?; Why become a Catholic?, etc. This is to be followed by a large open-air Corpus Christi procession, which in previous years has been cause for violent attacks on Protestants.” Should any of our readers be similarly placed the following pamphlets can be recommended for distribution: *Rome and England*, by Canon Elsley, issued at 2d., and three pamphlets published by the Joint Board of Divinity in the Diocese of Liverpool for circulation in that diocese :—*Is Rome Right, some Questions and Answers, Marriage*, and *Infallibility and the Bible*; *St. Peter and the Pope* and *Purgatory*,

by Archdeacon Thorpe, and *Why I am not a Roman Catholic, Eighteen Reasons*. These are published at 1d. each.

Beliefs of To-day. Clergy and others are constantly coming into contact with those who are confused or ill-informed in regard to the several modern religious beliefs. We should like to draw attention to a very valuable review of modern cults and creeds which has been issued under the title of *Beliefs of To-day*, by the Rev. Edward T. Vernon (5s.; post 6d.). Two other useful books, *The Truth and Error of Christian Science* (6s.; post 6d.) and *Theosophy and Christianity: A Word to Western Theosophists* (2s. 6d.; post 3d.), by Miss M. Carta Sturge, can be confidently recommended. The author treats each subject respectfully, allowing each to speak for itself as far as possible; and then shows what elements are compatible with Christianity, and what are not. In the second book she specially writes for Western minds, to whom Theosophy is presented in a very different manner from that in which it is given to the Indian, and she succeeds in making clear what are the real and essential differences between Theosophy and Christianity.

A smaller pamphlet by the Rev. W. St. Clair Tisdall, D.D., entitled *Modern Theosophy Tested* (3d.), should also be mentioned. Dr. Tisdall's pamphlet is clear and concise, and deals with the principal points of Theosophical teaching.

Amongst the valuable books that have been added to our second-hand shelves are the following: Orr's *Problem of the Old Testament* (4s. 6d.), Robinson Lee's *Life of Christ* (5s.), Burgon's *Lives of Twelve Good Men* (2 vols. 7s.), Adam Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (15s.), Meyrick's *Old Anglicanism and Modern Ritualism* (1s. 6d.), Froude's *Life and Letters of Erasmus* (1s. 6d.), and *Lectures on The Council of Trent* (1s. 6d.), Meyrick's *Sunday Observance* (1s.), Trench's *Notes on the Parables* (1s. 6d.), Ranke's *History of the Reformation in Germany* (5s.), Balleine's *History of the Evangelical Party* (2s. 6d.), and *The Layman's History of the Church of England* (1s.), Archdeacon Hughes Games' *Evening Communion* (1s. 6d.), Beckitt's *Reformation in England* (1s.), Ryder's *Priesthood of the Laity* (1s.), Wace's *Prophecy: Jewish and Christian* (3s. 6d.), Ingrouille's *Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving* (1s.), John Edwin Watts-Ditchfield (2s.), Prothero's *Psalms in Human Life* (1s. 6d.), Demans' *William Tindale* (2s.), and *Hugh Latimer* (2s. 6d.).

An Appreciation.—We recently received the following letter from one of our members in South Africa:—

“As one of the very few Evangelical Clergy in the South African Church, I wish to testify to the great help your Book Room has been to me in providing just the literature I need, not only for myself and my work, but to put into the hands of many others for their instruction in the faith of our reformed Church of England.”
