

and Blood of Christ remain on this earth and will so remain until the end of time to continue the work which He came to do, to give His Body as food for the whole world, that we might be incorporated into His divine life, which is the life of God Himself. The Eucharist is the greatest of the sacraments because it does not only cause grace in us, like the other sacraments, but it contains the Body and Blood of Christ. It is the greatest of the sacraments because by it man receives the greatest blessing of God, for he receives God Himself; and he worships God most perfectly in his Eucharistic worship, since here he blesses God by his thanksgiving. So here that double process which we found earlier on, when discussing the first blessing at the creation, is found at its highest: we thank God in our supreme act of thanksgiving by blessing the bread, because at the moment of blessing the bread it becomes the sacrifice of the Body of the Lord.

DANIEL WOOLGAR, O.P.

THE WORKS OF DR. DARWELL STONE

THE passing of Dr. Darwell Stone may seem to many of us like the end of an epoch. It is less difficult to believe that he has been taken away from us than to believe that he was, even though in retirement and with failing health, so recently among us. He was, in a sense, the last of the Tractarians. Not that a younger generation of Anglican divines may safely build on foundations other than those which they, and he, have laid—it will be a bad day for Anglican theology if that should ever come to pass. Yet he was the successor of the Oxford Movement in a directness of line which it is hardly possible for a newer generation to follow. And that, in part, by reason of the

very completeness of his own work. He consolidated the foundations which the Tractarians had laid, surpassing them in his ability to synthesise, and to extract the essentials from, the patristic data to which the scholars of the Oxford Movement had recalled the *Ecclesia anglicana*.

Darwell Stone's was not perhaps an adventurous mind, nor was his writing, though always lucid and free from jargon, exactly exhilarating. He was a conservative of the conservatives. The great spiritual and religious upheavals of his day seem (if we may judge from his writings) to have passed him by. The lectures which in 1901 he delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral, and which were published under the title *Christ and Modern Life*, show that he had indeed devoted considerable attention to many of the questions which were tormenting his contemporaries—questions of comparative religion and of Christian apologetics confronted by 'modern thought.' But the very assurance and ease with which he treated of them tend to show that they did not present him with any serious challenge or any deep spiritual problem. The Scriptures and the Fathers, the Fathers and the Scriptures; there is little evidence that he ever saw occasion to look beyond them, unless it were, to the Schoolmen and to the more Catholic-minded divines of the Church of England as inheritors of the Scriptural and Patristic tradition. The problems which occupied him, the controversies in which he engaged, were mostly of a purely domestic character: the reservation of the Sacrament, the invocation of saints, the epiclesis, the episcopal principle as the foundation of Church Order, the vindication of his own strait way of Anglo-Catholicism against Protestantism on the one hand and the claims of Rome on the other. That contemporary discovery or research could present any problems to the theologian or to the simple believer seems seldom to have occurred to him; that they could in any way enrich his understanding of or alter his approach to the faith once delivered to the saints would seem to have been a thought quite foreign to him. The uniqueness of the Judæo-Christian revelation was to him self-evident, as witnesses the almost naïve simplicity with which, in collaboration with David Capell Simpson, he dismisses 'other re-

ligions' in his otherwise excellent *Communion with God* (1911). The two books we have mentioned represent his only excursions outside the domain of strict theology and history of dogma, and in both of them to theology he soon returns. It was characteristic of the man that, in the first decade of the twentieth century, he could write two large volumes on the history of the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist in which the relevance of comparative religion could be disposed of in a paragraph of allusion to a *prae-paratio evangelica*, and the origins of the doctrine be examined in Holy Scripture without so much as an eye on the problems of New Testament criticism and without reference to the syncretistic theories which so exercised his contemporaries.

Looking back on his written work we find that it forms a pattern which is typical of the orderliness of his mind, and the homogeneity of its development. The stage is already set at the turn of the century when, with Canon Newbolt, he undertook the joint editorship of the *Oxford Library of Practical Theology*. It was a finely conceived effort at *haute vulgarisation* to which contributed most of the leading divines of the day in the tradition of the Oxford Movement. Its purpose is implied in the word 'practical'—to make theology a living thing and to show its relevance to life as its editors and contributors knew and conceived it. It must be confessed that 'life' to them may seem a very sheltered, secure, privileged affair; a harder task confronts those who would undertake a similar labour in our own day and with fuller awareness of contemporary social and psychological conditions. But as an effort to present the teaching of ancient tradition regarding the principal articles of the Christian creed, especially in the light of the witness of the Fathers of the Church, it has hardly been surpassed; though there is much in these volumes which must be found unsatisfactory by the inheritor of a more living tradition. The series served the further purpose of seeking to vindicate the standpoint from which it was written. This was set out more explicitly by Canon Newbolt and Dr. Stone in an additional volume published in 1903—*The Church of England: An Appeal to Facts and Principles*. The chief preoccupations of Dar-

well Stone himself during his whole lifetime are already manifested in the title of this and his own contributions to the series: *Holy Baptism* (1899) and *The Holy Communion* (1904). For it was the doctrine of the Sacraments and of the Church—the minister of, as well as the reality signified and effected by, the Sacraments—which was destined principally to engage his attention.

The doctrine of the Church and Sacraments was his speciality; but he had already, in 1900, published something like a *summa* of the whole corpus of Christian doctrine. *The Outlines of Christian Dogma* may be regarded as the general background against which his later, more specialist work was to be set. In this volume is already revealed his really remarkable powers of synthesis and condensation, the orderliness of his mind and not a little of its painstaking scholarship. The appeal throughout is to the Scriptures and the Fathers, to the *auctoritas* of tradition rather than to *ratio*; in this sense the book challenges comparison with a *Liber Sententiarum* rather than with a *Summa*. But the ground-plan is as original as the plan of such a text-book can be and the fashion in which it reduces the vast material which it employs to system and order compels our admiration. Inevitably such a textbook is something of a fleshless, bloodless skeleton, and the *Outlines* are no exception. It is rather as a general scheme and background that such works should be regarded, as works of general reference which must be employed to check the hypertrophy of the parts through concentration upon them to the neglect of the whole. As such, we may believe, the *Outlines* served Dr. Stone in his later work, and well may they still serve others in similar fashion.

In 1905 came his important work on *The Christian Church*. We may suppose that it was prompted by a sense of the necessity for digging deeper to reveal the foundations of the position he had outlined in 1903 with Canon Newbolt. As a contribution to the study of the ecclesiology of the Fathers it is a work of lasting value, even to those who are unable to accept its ulterior conclusions as a vindication of the distinctively Anglo-Catholic position as its author understood it. The book maintains a firm stand against the Papal claims, which the author en-

deavours to show to be not merely unsupported by, but incompatible with, the conception of the Church and of ecclesiastical authority known to early tradition (pp. 375 ff.). On this point Dr. Stone was unyielding, and concerned rather to vindicate his own position by way of anti-thesis than to pursue the path of eirenic synthesis. But that latter task, if it is to be undertaken without disregard for truth and without compromise and the slurring-over of real difficulties and differences, presupposes the work which was done by such men as Stone, and his friend Pullan, with such manifest sincerity of purpose. For Darwell Stone was not the man to ransack the Fathers in search of texts to prove a foregone conclusion. He conceived the claims of Rome, as he understood them, to be destructive of the nature of the Church as it had been understood in earlier times and as it had been intended by her Lord and Founder. We may question the assumptions on which his approach to the subject was based, as we must also question his conclusions. But his work provides a dialectical moment which can only be neglected at peril in the larger and more constructive task which still waits to be achieved. Even the Catholic ecclesiologist may do well to avail himself of the work done by Darwell Stone and his friends in this field as a necessary corrective, not indeed of the dogmas which he accepts as of faith, but of simplifications and accentuations which may distort his presentation of the doctrine of the Church as a whole.

Dr. Stone saw, however, that the ground was cut from under his feet once the evolution of dogma were admitted (*op. cit.*, p. 388), and some of the most trenchant pages of this book were devoted to criticism of Newman's *Development*. He saw that book not as a legitimate growth from, but as a direct repudiation of, the principles of the Oxford Movement, and, as he believed, of the immutability and apostolicity of ecclesiastical tradition. His argument against Newman is an extraordinarily interesting one, and it is in the name of Catholic and Apostolic orthodoxy, and quoting the decrees of the Vatican Council, that he sets out to attack the line of reasoning which had led Newman to Rome. He argues that Newman's theory opens the door to the possibility of the imposition of new

dogmas at variance with tradition, and he traces Newman's 'abberation' to an implicit Hegelian belief in the priority of the Idea to its external expression. Newman had said that Christianity came to the world first as an idea rather than as an institution. Stone commented drily: 'If that sentence is true, the whole standpoint of the present writer is wrong . . . The fact of the Church—not as an *a priori* assumption or an undeveloped idea—is the starting point of the historical progress of the Christian religion . . . And if it is true that Christianity came into the world not "as an idea rather than an institution," but as an institution giving effect to an idea, with the rejection of Newman's sentence, his theory collapses.' It may be doubted whether Newman's ambiguous *obiter dictum* is indeed so essential to his main argument as Stone would have us believe. Stone himself, although increasingly occupied with the fact of doctrinal development, seems to have paid little heed to the task of constructing a theory which would account for it, and to have contented himself with these negative criticisms of Newman's pioneer work. We have no means to ascertain whether he would have considered the homogeneity of tradition, which he considered Newman to have endangered, to be adequately safeguarded in the more scientifically precise account of dogmatic development, through the logical unfolding of the implicit content within the primitive data of Revelation, such as was to be propounded by Marin-Sola.

This same preoccupation with the doctrine of the Church and its extension in that of the Communion of Saints may be seen to have prompted his defence of the growing practice within the Anglican communion of *The Invocation of Saints*, first published in 1903 and revised and expanded in 1909. It is a useful and sober vindication of the practice in the light of ancient tradition, and argues for the legitimacy of the practice within the Church of England, a legitimacy which, at the time, was hotly contested.

During these years he was busily engaged on the work which was to prove his masterpiece, the work for which posterity must be chiefly indebted to him. The two large volumes of his *History of the Doctrine of the Holy*

Eucharist appeared in 1909. The work grew, as he tells us, out of the series of articles he had contributed on the subject to the *Church Quarterly Review* in 1901-1904. Its purpose was 'to set out in as simple and clear a form as may be possible the doctrines of the Holy Eucharist which have been current among Christians.' Darwell Stone was too good a scholar to allow his aim of simplicity and clarity to over-simplify or falsify his facts; but it must be acknowledged that the absence of the original Greek and Latin of the vast quantity of texts which he marshals and translates may somewhat impair the value of the book as a theological source for the specialist. Stone's anxiety to translate his texts into good and clear English, and to avoid technicalities and Latinisms, must often leave the wary student guessing the exact *nuance* of the original terminology, and even to suspect that the clarity of the translation may obscure the real meaning of the author. A case in point is the translation of St. Thomas's much controverted article under the heading *Utrum in celebratione huius sacramenti Christus immoletur* (S.T. III, lxxxiii, 1), in which *immolatio* is consistently rendered by 'offering.' But the specialist can always refer elsewhere for the original; Stone's work will be none the less valuable in providing the texts he must look for. As a collection of the relevant material for the theology of the Eucharist it is probably unsurpassed.

But the work could be, as Stone foresaw, no mere 'collection of facts and *catenæ* of quotations.' It demanded the utmost not only of his capacity for tireless research, but also of his critical acumen in interpreting his material and in tracing the trends and influences which prompted each stage in the development of Eucharistic teaching and speculation. Here again his work is possibly not entirely above criticism; he certainly shows himself more at home with the Fathers than with the Schoolmen, whose metaphysical preoccupations he fully appreciated, but perhaps did not fully share. The student of the Augustinian-Thomist controversies of the thirteenth century must be surprised to find that, in Dr. Stone's view, the Dominican theologians lacked originality as compared with their Franciscan brethren.

But these are very minor blemishes on a great work. The first volume carried the story down to the eve of the Reformation, and is for the theologian the more valuable of the two. The second volume studied the variations of Eucharistic doctrine in Continental Protestantism, in the Church of England and among the Nonconformists, and traced the later developments of speculation among the Catholic theologians and controversialists of the Counter-Reformation. Less valuable theologically, the volume, nevertheless, serves a high eirenic purpose. We are enabled to see the motives which underlie the perplexing variety and contrariety of Protestant Eucharistic teachings, and to see that the acrid controversies of the Reformation period arose, as a rule, from a sincere anxiety to safeguard certain truths concerning the Eucharist which are, indeed, integral to the full richness of traditional Catholic doctrine, but which, thus isolated and accentuated, involve a denial and a distortion of the fullness of the whole. It was supremely distressing to Darwell Stone that the Sacrament of unity in 'one bread, one Body,' should have become a principal occasion of disruption, disintegration and bitterness; yet he found it 'touching to notice the language of devotion which men of the most divergent beliefs have used in reference to the rite as to the explanation of which they have widely disagreed.' He saw that 'rough methods of controversy have done little to promote real understanding of the questions with which they have dealt,' however inevitable he also saw such methods to have been at the time of the Reformation. But the time had come, he believed, to sift out the fundamental agreements which underlie the utmost diversity and contrariety of language, and he saw good reason to believe that disagreements were on the way to solution. He believed, what his own work amply confirmed, that such doctrinal history as he had undertaken could do much to dissipate misunderstanding; and his splendid *Conclusion* has applications far beyond its immediate setting. It is a fine statement of the important role which the theologian and historian of dogma must play in healing the divisions of Christendom, in other spheres besides that with which Stone's own work had been concerned.

In this *History* the author had rigidly adhered to his role as an objective historian, and though it was impossible for him to conceal his own faith in the Real Presence and the Eucharistic sacrifice, he had not there explicitly proclaimed it. This he had already done, and he was to do it again more clearly in the two volumes he was to contribute to Dr. Sparrow Simpson's *Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice: The Reserved Sacrament* (1917) and *The Eucharistic Sacrifice* (1920). In the first of these, he begins by appealing to tradition in favour of reservation for the Communion of the sick, and goes on to justify the worship, individual or corporate, of the reserved Sacrament, and to set out the doctrinal justification for such practice in the Real Presence and in transubstantiation. The publication coincided with the campaign—in which the police were sometimes called in to implement episcopal suspensions and eject refractory clergy from their churches—against the growing practice of introducing Benediction as an adjunct to Anglican worship. The ultimate failure of that campaign, and the fact that a modified form of Benediction under the name of 'Devotions' is now a regular feature in many Anglican churches, is perhaps due in no small measure to the support of Dr. Stone's learning and prestige. *The Eucharistic Sacrifice* is a volume of sermons, dogmatic and devotional, which is chiefly of interest as summarising the doctrinal convictions which had emerged from the preacher's study of the history of the doctrine.

No other major work was to come from Darwell Stone's pen. In 1917 appeared *The Discipline of Faith*, a volume of miscellaneous sermons revealing his strong, unflurried personal piety. He was still to contribute articles to periodicals and encyclopaedias. He contributed two pamphlets on marriage to the *Pusey House Occasional Papers*; and compiled a brief summary of the witness of the early Church on the subject of *Episcopacy and Orders* (1926). Thus, if we may include his editorship of Bishop Churton's *The Use of Penitence*, he had contributed at least one monograph on six of the seven Sacraments.

The controversy which centred round the revised Prayer Book Measure in 1927-8 was to bring him to the fore

again, and for the last time. He took part in the debate with an unexpected vigour and outspokenness. There were provisions in the new Book which seemed to him to threaten all he held most dear, especially regarding Eucharistic belief and practice within the Church of England. His appeal, now as always, was to tradition; and he felt that tradition was being seriously undermined, and that the achievement of the 'Catholic revival' in teaching and in the enrichment of ritual were in danger of being destroyed. To an outsider his appeals to the liturgical principles of 1549—the principles of uniformity of rite, of simplicity, of the annual reading of the whole Bible and the monthly recitation of the whole Psalter—may seem disingenuous as a defence of the liberties of present-day Anglo-Catholic liturgical practice. And Stone was not indeed entirely free from the strange blend of over-subtlety and guilelessness which characterises the type of Anglo-Catholic who feels it incumbent to protest his loyalty to post-Reformation formularies. (He had out-Tract-Ninetied Tract Ninety in his suggestion that the 'Black Rubric' could be interpreted as a vindication of Dominican and Thomist against Franciscan and Scotist Eucharistic theology!—cf. *Hist. of the Doct. of the H. Euch.*, Vol. II, pp. 141-2.) But he saw that the Measure would defeat its own purpose of establishing a greater degree of liturgical uniformity, and would succeed only in inducing more grave divisions. He was determined for his part to see to it that it did so. But far more important to him than any effort to unify the Church of England was the vindication of liberty to teach within it the whole Catholic faith as he understood it and to carry out the fullness of Catholic ritual as he loved it, whatever might be the cost in lack of doctrinal and liturgical uniformity. To maintain that tradition, to strengthen its foundations by the scholarly study of its origins and development, had been his life's work, and he believed that nothing less than that was at stake.

To continue and consolidate the work of the Tractarians had been the task he had set himself, and which he faithfully fulfilled. The work of patristic scholarship had never wholly died out in the Church of England even in the most

arid days before the Oxford Movement, and it will not be allowed to die with Darwell Stone. A newer generation of Anglo-Catholic theologians may feel called to advance beyond where he left off, to explore fields which he disregarded, and to treat of implications of theology at once deeper, wider and more problematic than those of which he treated. For them it cannot be enough to dig up the past of bygone tradition or to solve all questions solely by invoking its explicit testimony. As in the Middle Ages the period of *florilegia patristica* and *sententiæ* gave place to the period of original speculation on the data which the former age had collated, so it may be felt that the needs of the time impose the necessity not only of conserving and assimilating tradition, but of contributing to it and working out its further implications. Darwell Stone and his like-minded contemporaries, with their predecessors, the Tractarians and the Caroline divines, are links of a chain which, if not wholly uncorroded, ensure continuity with the teaching of the ancient Catholic and Apostolic Church. It would be lamentable if that chain were to be broken, and if, in the more constructive tasks which lie ahead, efforts were to be made to build on other foundations, or to invoke the criterion of other and alien standards. We cannot view without misgiving a certain tendency among some Anglo-Catholic theologians to seek their inspiration in the solifidian theology of revived Continental Protestantism, to which the Church of England as a whole has hitherto succeeded in remaining impervious, rather than in the patristic tradition. That the 'Barthian' conclusions which they embrace involve 'Barthian' premisses which are in conflict with the fundamentals of Catholic tradition is a point which cannot here be argued; but it may be permissible to express the hope that the passing of Dr. Stone may serve as a reminder to check their findings and speculations in the light of a tradition of which he was so conspicuous a vehicle.

VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

Cambridge, 18.2.1941.